

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill. The Schedule was added to the Bill. Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT ON TEXTILE POLICY

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): We shall now take up Short Duration Discussion under Rule 176 on the Textile Policy laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha by the Minister of Supply and Textiles on the 30th July, 1985. Shri M. M. Jacob to initiate the discussion.

SHRI M. M. JACOB (Kerala): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Inside the Lok Sabha and also outside through press and in several places, we heard the discussions on the national textile policy. So this is a really important topic because India at one stage was the leader of the textile industry in the world. India was known abroad in all parts of the world for the quality of the textiles that we produced. The beauty of India lies in the different languages existing in India and the different varieties of textiles produced in India. This has been accepted by all the people all around the world. Such an India, which is a pioneer in this field, had to think twice about the recent developments the world over. Indian textiles were pushed back from the markets. Our share in the world market is hardly 2 per cent today. So the Government correctly thought it fit to bring a new policy for the revival and reconstruction of textiles. While I do not deny the fact that the Government brought a policy in 1981 which worked all these years, yet the result

was not encouraging. The handloom sector had their own problems—the problem of growth, the problem of wages. The mill sector had more difficulties just like the handloom sector. So all these sectors of the textile industry felt restless. It is an opportune time that the Minister of Supply and Textiles thought that a new policy statement is appropriate at this moment.

Sir, the textile industry is 176 years old in this country. It employs 120 lakh workers in the textile industry as a whole. We cannot afford to let such an industry to suffer any more in this country because it is the major employment area next to agriculture in India. We find from the statement that many mills are sick. That is one of the reasons for our bad performance. I was going through the statement. On page 5 the reasons for this sickness are narrated—and I quote:

"The reasons for sickness are manifold and complex which include financial difficulties, managerial incompetence and negligence, obsolete plant and machinery, inadequate maintenance, incorrect product mix, poor marketing, excess labour and poor industrial relations."

Sir, this is an eye-opener to every one in this country. Even today, with all these constraints, we are happy we are exporting more than Rs. 2,000 crores worth of textiles and making money out of it. As I mentioned earlier, a large number of people, a good number of people, live on this. In this context it is appropriate that we are now discussing this policy statement. I am very happy about one aspect of it.

About six months back the Government of India appointed a Committee to go into the problems of the textile industry. This Committee, headed by a Secretary, did not take much time; the report came soon without wasting much time in going back and forth. Soon we found a national textile policy

and the statement on the textile policy. So, in that way, I congratulate the Government and the Committee for expeditiously working to bring out a result.

Sir, I want to point out the salient features of the policy; I am not taking away the time in describing all the features. I am really happy to note the integrated approach in this policy. The new policy emphasizes that it will provide cloth for everyone in this country. It sees everything in the national interest. How long can a country like India lose money on production of textiles which is the premier industry in our country? So, at some stage we have to take corrective measures. In the policy we have mentioned about the duty deduction in more than one case. I would like to know: Are we going to pass on the benefit of duty deduction to the consumers? In the past it was not the experience. Whenever there was a duty deduction, the big magnates of the mills used to take advantage of it. Are we going to pass on the benefit to the consumer this time? This is the right question to which we expect to know the answer correctly. This time the policy has taken the spinning, weaving and processing as different stages of manufacture instead of compartmentalizing as handloom, power loom, mills and so on and so forth. This is a good beginning. Here, one point of fact which can be appreciated is the fuller flexibility. That means reduction of rigidity in the textile policy. Again in the statement—you will permit me to look at page two—the multi-fibre approach is mentioned

“The multi-fibre approach implicit in providing fuller fibre flexibility would be guided by the following considerations:

(a) Full fibre flexibility as between cotton and man-made fibres/yarn...

(b) Adequate availability of man-made fibres/yarn at reasonable prices.

(c) Creation of capacity by new units and expansion of capacity by existing units for production of synthetic fibres/yarn ... to reduce costs of production,

(d) Fiscal levies on man-made fibre/yarn, and of the intermediate used as inputs for the production of such fibres/yarn to be progressively reduced for absorption of increased domestic production and keeping open the export window for man-made fibre/yarn.”

Sir, this approach is commendable.

Now I come to the handloom sector. In the handloom sector the policy statement has given eight points, clearly mentioning what, exactly it means. Sir, I happened to read many of the editorials and comments on this and I am glad to say that most of the editorials of the leading newspapers in this country, whether it is in the southern papers or the northern papers or the central papers, in fact the editorials were in favour of the new policy, appreciating the stand taken by the Government. Of course, we used to get our mail every morning with criticism as well as appreciation. The MPs used to get several voluminous letters criticizing and also congratulating, but I found that the number of congratulations were more when compared to the number of criticisms and adverse remarks. So, in the handloom sector, the one aspect of undertaking the responsibility of giving cheaper cloth to the teeming millions of this country is not a small thing. Shifting the work to the handloom sector, entrusting them with the responsibility of producing cloth for the millions of people in this country—the critics in some corners used to say—is meant for wholly destroying the handloom sector. You are asking them to produce the *janata* cloth. But, Sir, on the contrary, the Government is taking up the responsibility of the *janata* cloth. The Government is taking up the responsibility of the handloom industry. And in a statement of the Minister,

[Shri M. M. Jacob]

recently I happened to read that by introducing this new norm, this new approach, we would be able to produce 1 million jobs additionally. In a country like India, to provide jobs for 1 million, is it a small thing, Sir? It will be a real achievement if it is achieved. And I hope it is going to be achieved. This year 400 million metres of the *janata* cloth we are going to produce. If the calculations are correct, by 1990 we will be able to produce more than 900 million metres of cloth under the scheme for the common man.

Sir, the subsidy of Rs. 2 per metre is there. But I feel, even it is worth consideration whether this subsidy can be increased from Rs. 2 per metre. Sir, again, the subsidy total comes to more than Rs. 180 crores. It gives a boost, it is a moral booster, it is an economic advantage to the handloom workers who are the backbone of this industry in this country.

Some critics used to say that the skilled workers would be adversely affected when the *janata* cloth was going to be manufactured. I went through the statement again and again to find out whether the skilled workers are neglected. Sir, there is an area of the skilled workers, of upgrading their skill, modernising their skill, giving them more training, giving them more orientation and making them more competent in their work. Sir, by production of the finer varieties of handloom by the skilled workers we are able to capture the foreign markets of China, South Korea, Turkey, Japan. They are all dumping their goods all around the world. But the Indian handloom has got a market everywhere provided the cloth is superb. Sir, the quality and the expertise is more important. So, I feel that the Textile Minister will certainly give more thought to the research and development in the handloom sector because it is the handloom sector that is going to sell India in the world because India

has the name on account of our finer varieties of handloom. Sir, this research and development is also highlighted in this scheme as the Weavers Service Centres and the Design Centres. I hope this will really do good to the industry.

Sir, the welfare of the handloom workers, also mentioned in the scheme, is commendable, especially when it concerns about the creation of a provident fund and workshop-cum-houses. Sir, housing for the textile workers, housing for the handloom workers, was the real need, felt need, in the country. Representations were flowing to all MPs and all people in authority from the handloom workers who are down-trodden and who do not have proper conditions of living in their own areas. So, if this textile policy is able to meet at least that on a priority basis, I will be the happiest man because a larger number of people are employed in the handloom sector.

Sir, now comes powerloom. I do not want to elaborate anything on powerlooms. The powerlooms sector used to have a free ride, and some people said that the powerlooms had now control. But the powerloom people have their own complaints that nobody is to look after them. The mills used to complain that the powerloom is a curse for them and *vice-versa*. But now in this policy we see a proper place given to the powerloom. Not only that, registration, compulsory registration of the powerloom is included in this policy statement, but that means, they will have to pay taxes regularly. That means, they will have to be fair to the labour. They will have to be honest in their handling. And it is a beginning of the trend of improvement of the powerloom sector also in this country in the total scheme of things. I am very sure about it, Sir.

Now, Sir, about cotton the prominent role taken by the Cotton Corporation. I am only mentioning about the role of the Cotton Corporation of India.

I am happy the Minister has mentioned the other day that he is going to restructure the Cotton Corporation of India. But I do not know how he is going to restructure it. I feel first and foremost priority should be given to the restructuring of the Cotton Corporation of India to ensure remunerative prices for the cotton growers. Without remunerative prices to the cotton growers India's textile policy cannot go forward. In future the Indian textile industry would depend upon the strength of the cotton growers of this country. Sir, this year we exported 3 lakh bales of cotton. But at the same time we imported 1 lakh of medium variety. Exported long and extra long cotton. We have exported it at higher value and imported it at lesser value. That was the correct policy also. When the remunerative prices have been assured for the cotton growers, I am sure, the steady supply of cotton is also going to come and in good quality. I request the Minister to consider having a buffer stock always in this country rather than going in for imports on and off. We may be able to have a buffer stock when the prices go above your expectations. Then, you can release from the buffer stocks. When prices go down you can buy the cotton in the open market and keep it in the buffer stock. By this method you will be looking after their interests properly.

Sir, about the mill sector, I do not know much. But many of the hon. Members from the mill sector who are here now may like to speak about it. The mills have started getting sick from 1960 onwards. I am unable to understand whether it is due to the sickness of mills or due to the sickness of the management.

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM
(Tamil Nadu): Both are same.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I feel it is because of the sickness of management. May be an old man started a good industry some time back in the country. But when generations

come, it is not the export who is the emperor of the empire. It may be somebody—his son or his son-in-law who happens to head the mill. But what does he know about the textile industry or intricacies of it? What does he know about the labour legislation or the modern methods of handling the labour? I am not casting aspersions on anybody. But the fact of the matter is that unless you have an expertise in handling a large number of people—the result will be what happened in Bombay textile mills will take place. In these mills thousands and thousands of workers were thrown out of employment. The reason they say is: it is uneconomical and the mills are getting in the red. By advancing this reason they close it. The workers were thrown out in the streets mercilessly. I think we have a social responsibility towards these workers.

I am glad that in the textile policy the Minister and the Government have come out with a statement that they will be having a rehabilitation fund to take care of the workers who lose their employment. I think it is a good thing. But I would like to know from the Minister how he is going to operate this rehabilitation fund? Is it from the cess? If it is going from the cess, how much time the Government is going to take to lay down the procedure of rehabilitation fund? Is it going to be an unending process of rehabilitation? Since many mills are in the red and the rehabilitation process will continue. Whether the Minister will have a specific theory of rehabilitation? If so, we expect that the work will start soon.

Finally, I would like to know about the subsidy to the handloom sector which the Government is contemplating. Are you going to increase the subsidy? Are you thinking of a housing complex for the handloom workers in the areas where they live in

[Shri M. M. Jacob]

a cluster? Are you contemplating creation of an expert agency for marketing of the handloom products?

One more point I would like to mention is about price printed on the cloth. Previously all the clothes used to bear the price per metre on it and that too at a fixed price from any shop. But today we find in one shop a saree costing Rs. 100; and the same saree costs in another or near-by shop Rs. 200/-. Sir, the poor people, who go around the market to buy things find it difficult to know the real price of it. So, when you are implementing these things. You make it a compulsory thing that the retail price is also written on the piece of cloth, whatever may be the variety of cloth, whichever may be the agency which produces it, whether it is Handloom or Powerloom or Mill, price must be written on the cloth. It will be a very good relief for the people. Sir, work out the market share of different sectors in the new policy. We would like to know how you work out the market shares when you plan things. Sir, I congratulate the Government and the Minister for this National Textile Policy and also request you to see that the workers' interests, at any cost, are protected when you contemplate the implementation and please implement it as speedily as possible and the machinery for implementation is going to be more important than the Textile Policy. Thank you.

SHRI K. MOHANAN (Kerala):
Sir, I am sorry I cannot congratulate the Minister for his new Textile Policy. I do not know what is there in this policy to call it a new one. It is something like some new brands of tooth paste and toilet soaps being produced as 'new' brands, but there is nothing new except the wrapper. If anything is new there, that is a little reduction in the quality and quantity. Like that, this new Textile Policy is nothing, but it reflects the policy of this Government to

protect the interest of the monopoly houses and the rich people of this country. Sir, it is nothing but a complete surrender to the pressure and blackmail of the monopoly houses and the mill-owners of this country. It repudiates the interest of the poor consumers. It repudiates the interest of the workers and it also repudiates the interest of the millions of cotton growers of this country. Here, this policy declaration is nothing but the total acceptance of the demands raised by the Indian Mill-owners Federation or Mill Federation of India. What is the essence of this new policy? I would like to examine that. I would like to be precise. I would try to make it in three important points. That is: the essence of this new policy is promoting liberal import of textile machinery in the name of modernization, number one.

2. To lower rates of custom duty; and

3. treating powerlooms and mills as the same by withdrawing the preferential treatment of powerlooms in relation to mills.

Sir, these are in the name of new policy and I am quoting from the policy statement itself.

That is "for increase in production of cloth of acceptable quality at reasonable prices to meet the clothing requirements of a growing population".

This is what he has said in this policy statement but this is nothing but to cheat the millions of under-clothed poor in this country and to conceal the motivation behind this new policy. You cannot achieve this declared objective through this policy or the scheme envisaged in this policy and I know that you have no intention, at all, to achieve this declared policy. That I know very well, I am now coming to the first point, that is, modernisation. When we are discussing the question of modernisation, another question that is arising out of

it is, modernisation for whom? Modernisation for whose interest? Is it in the interest of the poor people or the workers, or is it in the interest of the textile magnates of this country? In your policy statement, this modernisation is intended for the third category, that is, to protect the interests of the mill-owners of this country. That is my charge.

Now, Sir, the modernisation envisaged in the policy will never help to reduce the prices of the common varieties of cloth. I do agree that it will cater to the growing demands of the top class, that is, 10 to 15 per cent of the population, for synthetic and mixed fibre fabrics. It will not cater to the needs of the underclothed millions, the underclothed population of this country in any way. And it will not reduce the price of cloth also. For all these years we have invested crores of rupees in the name of modernisation in a section of the mills. But what happened? Did the prices come down or increase? I would like to know from the Minister whether this policy for modernisation of mills through liberal import of textile machinery from foreign countries and reduction of customs duties, help to bring down the price of cloth.

The mill magnates of this country are always crying that the industry is in a crisis. Actually whether the industry is in a crisis will have to be studied. We will have to look into the realities. Actually there is no crisis at all in this industry. That is my point. If there is any crisis, it is for the workers, the poor consumers and the cotton growers, not for the mill magnates. Sir, I would like to quote some figures. The RBI made a study and according to the RBI study, in 1950-51, 145 mills in the country earned a profit of Rs. 15 crores. But in 1980-81, in 230 mills the mill-owners earned a profit of Rs. 277 crores. That is from 1950-51 when it was Rs. 15 crores for 145 mills, it increased in 1980-81 to

Rs. 277 crores from 230 mills. Not only that, their assets also increased from Rs. 228 crores in 1950-51 to Rs. 2,260 crores in 1980-81. Where is the crisis for this industry? The latest study made by the RBI or 245 mills reveals that the net profits in one year are about three-fourths of the original investment. I would like to know where is the crisis in this industry. Or is this crisis man-made. The crisis, as I have already mentioned, is to the poor consumers, the workers and cotton growers. I would like to know whether you have envisaged anything in your new Textile Policy to overcome the difficulties of these sections, that is, the workers, the consumers in the rural area and the poor cotton growers.

Sir, in this new policy, the Government's interest is to protect their beloved partners through the liberalisation of import of textile machinery, reduction in customs duty and withdrawal of fiscal preferences to the powerlooms. Another peculiar feature of this policy is—this is my charge—that this policy will accelerate the displacement of workers in the handloom sector. The emphasis on modernisation and rationalisation and giving freedom to contractors is nothing but displacing even the present strength of workers engaged in the industry in the organised sector as well as in the unorganised sector. Here I would like to quote what the fact-finding committee on handlooms and mills said in its report in 1941 in reference to the dangers involved in encouraging powerlooms. According to the committee—there were then only 16,000 powerlooms in the country—"A mill will close down if it does not earn a profit but a handloom will go on even if it brings no profit because the weavers depend on it helplessly." This is the plight of the poor handloom labourer in this country. You can close down a mill.

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar): It is only to remove the helplessness of the handloom weavers that this measure has been initiated.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: The handloom weavers helplessly depend upon their handloom. They have no other way out. If a mill does not earn profit, you can close it down but a handloom weaver cannot throw away his handloom because that is his only means of livelihood and he is forced to depend upon it even without adequate profit or income from it. That is my point. It is in that context that I ask whether there is anything to protect the poor handloom weaver envisaged in this new textile policy. No, nothing at all. Not only that. This new policy will accelerate the displacement of handloom workers in the unorganised sector as well as mill-owners in the organised sector.

Another feature of the new textile policy is that it encourages mill-owners to close the mill which they consider to be unprofitable or non-viable. This is nothing but a jungle law. This is the jungle law of capitalism. If the owner considers that his mill is unprofitable or non-viable, he can unilaterally close down the mill. You are encouraging that and you are giving an Open General Licence for closing down whichever mill the owner wants to. This is another feature which I am opposing in this new policy. You are repeatedly referring to the need for protecting the workers' interests in this policy statement. But what is the reality? It is only a lip service. I know what you are arguing. My friend, Mr. Jacob, already mentioned about the rehabilitation fund. You yourself stated in this policy statement that this fund is provided for giving relief and I think it is for a limited period. This rehabilitation fund is to give relief for a limited period. And the joke of the statement is about its protection of workers. It says the displaced worker would be given priority in securing employment in other units under the same management or other industrial units in the same area. A wonderful observation! I do not know what else I can call it. In other words, I am thankful to the Government that

they have conceded that if this new policy is implemented, there will be a large-scale unemployment and displacement of workers in this industry. They have conceded it. And, Sir, as a remedy, they propose to rehabilitate the workers. I think that the Minister's statement on the Rehabilitation Fund and on giving employment to the displaced workers in other industrial units under the same management or in the same industrial area is a wonderful joke and I think that the editors of the "Guinness Book of World Records" will try to include this invention of the Minister in their next edition. And, Sir, I do not know whether these people are living in a wonder land. Everybody knows the realities of our labour market and nobody can expect that such a protection would be given by the monopoly houses and big industrialists of this country to the displaced labourers in the textile industry. (Time bell rings). Sir, for want of time, I am trying to conclude within one or two minutes.

Summing up, Sir, I would like to say, as I have already mentioned, that there is nothing new in this so-called new textile Policy. If there is anything new, that is only to strengthen the hands of the mill-owners, the profit-hungry mill owners, of this country. This is nothing but a reflection of the industrial and economic policies pursued by this Government. This is a clear reflection of that and that is why I am opposing this policy statement totally. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Now, Mr. Vithalbhai Motiram Patel.

SHRI VITHALBHAI MOTIRAM PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I disagree with my friend when he says that the policy is totally dark. I have gone through the Textile Policy and I think it will help in improving the health of the textile industry in the country.

Sir, the textile industry went through one of the severest periods of recession since last three years, and my State, Gujarat, is the worst sufferer because many textile units have been closed down in my State. In Gujarat, there are 114 mills. But, Sir, today, half of them are facing a serious crisis and the State Government is trying its best to restart the closed textile units. Unfortunately, not a single unit has been fully restarted and about forty thousand workers are jobless. 'Textiles' is a subject within the purview of the Union Government. But, till now, the Government of India has not taken any serious steps to restart the closed textile units. Talks are going on between the State Government and the Central Government to restart the closed textile units. But, till today, Sir, no final decision has been taken. The Gujarat Government has requested the Centre to nationalise about a dozen textile units in Gujarat as they have done in the case of 13 mills in Bombay. But the Central Government is not ready to nationalise the textile industry. The State Government has requested the Central to allow it to nationalise all the sick textile units there and the State Government has also requested the Central Government to provide some funds to restart the sick units to provide employment to thousands of workers. Earlier Sir, the Commerce Ministry was sympathetic and now the Textile Ministry is sympathetic to the demands of the Gujarat Government. But, unfortunately, the Finance Ministry is hesitating to help the State Government to restart the sick textile units. For the past two years, negotiations have been going on on the question as to how to provide funds to the Gujarat Government to restart the sick textile units and to help the textile industry. The State Government is worried about it because of the fate of thousands of unemployed workers. This is a human problem. So, the Minister of Textile should use his influence with the Finance Minister to see that the

necessary funds are provided to the Gujarat Government for restarting the sick textile units. The Finance Ministry officials have raised enough queries and the State Government has replied enough. Why can't they sit together once and settle the issue? Since last two years it has been hanging fire without any solution. Sometimes we feel that the Centre's attitude towards the State of Gujarat is stepmotherly as far as the Finance Ministry is concerned.

In the Textile policy it has been mentioned that the interests of the farmers will be looked after. But going through the policy it seems that the interests of the textile industry have been given upper-most place than the interests of the farmers. Cotton growers must be assured remunerative price. In the textile policy more importance has been given to man-made fibre. I can understand to provide cheaper cloth to the common man; the use of manmade fibre should be increased, but it should not be at the cost of cotton growers. I request the Minister to assure the House that farmers will be assured remunerative price level should not be below the support price plus 25 per cent.

I was also surprised by the decision of the Government to import one lac bales of cotton. There was a record crop of cotton last year and this year also. And there is no necessity to import cotton. Government should reconsider the decision and should not import cotton from abroad when all the required cotton is available in the country.

In the new textile policy it has been assured that the interests of the labour will not suffer. But let me tell you two things, cannot go together. Modernisation and interests of workers cannot go together. If you want to provide cheaper and good cloth to the people, modernisation is absolu-

[Shri Vithalbhai M. Tiram Patel]

tely necessary. And I welcome the policy of the Government to modernise the textile industry. In modernisation Government should see that workers do not suffer. If retrenchment is unavoidable, the workers should be paid full compensation.

I also welcome the policy of not running unviable units which cannot be viable in any case. So unviable units should be scrapped and the workers should be given full compensation by selling the land, etc. If the textile industry is healthy, the workers will be benefited.

In these circumstances, to make the industry healthy the management and the workers all should be prepared to sacrifice. Somebody will have to sacrifice in the long-term interest. While modernising the Government should take into confidence the workers also. I hope the Government will look after the interests of the workers and farmers, besides the industry.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Miss Jayalalitha.

MISS JAYALALITHA (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will try to be brief in my remarks on the new National Textile Policy announced by the Government of India on June 6, 1985.

Much has already been said on this subject in the other House as well as this one. Not only the Members in the Opposition but even most of the ruling party Members who participated in the discussion in the other House have expressed grave misgivings about the new textile policy. I find myself quite in agreement with the doubts and apprehension already expressed and the criticism already voiced against this new textile policy. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said, since

most of the hon. Members in this House would have gone through the speeches made by the hon. Members in the other House on this subject. I shall, therefore, confine myself to a few important points.

It has been announced by the Minister for textiles that the proposed restructuring of the textile industry will have three main dimensions, namely: (a) The industry shall be viewed in terms of the stages of its manufacturing process, namely, spinning, weaving and processing; (b) The industry shall be provided with fuller flexibility in the use of various fibres; and (c) The industry shall be subject to more pragmatic policies regarding creation or contraction of capacities by units, in order to increase competition and promote healthy growth in the industry.

As regards clause (a), I see nothing wrong in it. In clause (b) there is a catch. There is more to it than what meets the eye in this seemingly innocuous statement. As for (c) it is positively dangerous. It is, as deadly as an atom bomb, whose nuclear fallout will spell the doom of lakhs of workmen employed in the mill sector. But I will come to that later.

At another point in the text of the new textile policy the Minister has announced a whole plethora of steps running into 8 sub-sections. These measures are purportedly designed to ameliorate or better the lot of handloom weavers, and in addition to all this, two more schemes have been enunciated to provide direct benefit to handloom weavers, namely, (1) A contributory thrift fund scheme to provide assistance to the handloom weavers during times of need; and (2) a workshed-cum-housing scheme to provide a better place for work and living to the handloom weavers.

At first glance, all this looks very nice on paper, and it also sounds very wonderful when we first hear it. But

what is the reality? An in-depth analysis of the new textile policy reveals that it is heavily loaded in favour of the mill sector. This new policy offers maximum concessions and a tremendous flip to the rich tycoons and magnates of the mill sector and pays only lip service to the needs of more than 75 lakhs of poor, humble handloom weavers all over the country.

This new policy is not going to restructure and promote the healthy growth of the entire textile industry in the country. It is going to boost up the structure of the mill sector only. The powerloom sector will also benefit as it is closely linked with the mill sector in several ways. It is the handloom sector which is going to receive a death blow if this new policy is followed.

As a result of this new policy, in about 3 to 4 years' time the structure of the handloom sector will not be restructured or built up or shored up; instead this new policy will completely demolish and destroy the structure of the handloom sector, culminating in the total obliteration of the handloom industry. If the policy is followed, in about 4 years' time, the handloom sector will be killed, wiped out totally.

I am being very blunt, I know; but this is the truth which is plain for all to see, if this new policy is viewed with an unbiased mind.

Can the country tolerate or withstand this? In Tamil Nadu alone, there are more than 25 lakh workers in the handloom sector. What about the handloom workers in other States? In particular, what about the handloom weavers in the North Eastern States of India? The North East is well known for its beautiful traditional handloom textiles.

The Government itself admits that 75 lakh weavers are engaged in the handloom industry. I am sure the actual figure must be much higher, since whole families of weavers engage

themselves in handloom cloth production, which is their only means of livelihood, and on which they depend totally for their very existence.

What is to be the fate of these lakhs of poor workers? The Government speaks of a scheme to help them in times of need. As far as handloom weavers are concerned, they are always in need. They are already, since time immemorial living and existing in pitiable, miserable conditions of abysmal poverty. In this regard, I must mention that the AIADMK Government in Tamil Nadu is the only State Government which has enacted a unique Act for the payment of minimum wages to handloom weavers. It would be a good thing if the Union Government came forward to enact a similar Minimum Wages Act for handloom weavers throughout India, and the minimum wages prescribed for production of controlled cloth must not be lower than the wages paid in accordance with the Tamil Nadu Act.

Referring to the workshed-cum-housing scheme for handloom weavers now announced in the new textile policy, if I am not mistaken, I recall that even 2 years ago, the Central Government announced that the implementation of the scheme for building houses for handloom weavers and beedi workers would be accelerated and measures would be taken on a war footing. But what has been done? What happened to the grand proclamation? made two years ago? I ask the Central Government—have you even moved a little figure in this direction. If you say you have, I am sorry to say that I am not able to see any tangible evidence or results. Can you provide details of where such houses have been built and how many such houses have been built and how many such houses have been built for handloom weavers during the past two years since that scheme was announced?

I now refer to the release of funds by the Government of India for the

[Miss Jayatilalitha]

handloom sector. If we take a look at history, we find that unfortunately or otherwise, through the years, the whole concept of the handloom industry has historically become a subsidy-oriented one. By observing a special Handloom Week or Weeks, as the case may be, every year, huge rebates up to 30 per cent are given to the co-operative societies as incentives for increasing sales and to dispose of accumulated stocks. This 30 per cent rebate is supposed to be shared in equal measure by the Central Government and the State Governments. The Centre is supposed to give 50 per cent and the States 50 per cent of the rebate.

Because of huge resource constraints which the States are constantly facing, some State Governments may not have released their share of the rebate amount. But I ask the Centre—have you released your share of the rebate amount to the States at least to prove your *bonafides*. As I have already admitted, some State Governments may not have released their share of the rebate amount. But at least the Centre can prove its *bonafides* by coming forward to release its share of the rebate to the States with the condition that the States should disburse their share of the rebate within the same period or within a stipulated time limit such as three months or so, failing which the amount will revert back to the Centre. Surely the Centre can do this much. But you have not done even that. In addition to all this, by way of further repression, the Government has reduced the number of annual rebate days for handlooms from 60 days to 30 days.

The sales of handlooms in Tamil Nadu touch 75 per cent of the total production only during rebate days. In the larger interest of handloom weavers, the Centre must again restore the number of rebate days to 60 days. I fail to understand the

rationale behind the Centre's decision to reduce the number of rebate days from 60 to 30. On the one hand the Government talks of encouraging the handloom sector and on the other, the Government does everything possible to stifle it.

The Government has not reserved the production of controlled cloth exclusively for the handloom sector. Controlled cloth is the poor man's cloth no doubt, but that is also precisely the reason why movement of such cloth will be slow, and the remuneration to the handloom worker will be less, and needless to say, the profits will also be so low as to be of no account, or, practically non-existent. Now the entire burden of producing less remunerative, non-thrust or dumped on the handloom sector. Yarn is being manufactured by mills, and this yarn is the raw material for the handlooms. Yarn supply is controlled by the mills. So they can gradually tighten the noose and kill the handloom sector which is at their mercy. Controlled cloth stocks have already piled up and are not moving. In Tamil Nadu alone, Rs. 9 crores worth of stock has accumulated in the co-operative handloom sector, and they are unable to move the stocks. There is nobody to purchase it. And in this regard I must mention that I have already spoken about this last time in this very House. Several times, representatives of the Tamil Nadu Government and of the handloom industry have met the Centre and they pleaded with the Centre that the Ministry of Defence and other public sector undertakings should purchase handloom goods and encourage the growth of the handloom industry. Only yesterday I met and spoke to some handloom workers from Tamil Nadu. They have come all the way to New Delhi to plead with me to take up their cause in Parliament. They are convinced that this new textile policy spells their doom, and is specifically designed to finish them off once and for all time to come. It is up to the

...ally their
...ance and
...concrete
...do.

...new
...in
...wealthy
...sector
...I ap-
...to
...with
...The
...the num-
...ly for
...relative-
...which
...handloom
...ex-
...handloom

The
...new po-
...their ca-
...allow-
...sophisticat-
...danger-
...to the
...mills,
...thousands
...work-
...What
...hand
...for con-
...while
...report of
...from
...that
...in sev-
...be-
...More
...naturally
...labour. If
...what
...employ-
...going to
...be
...employ-
...just go-
...starve and
...the country
...by in-
...leaps and
...policy
...unemployment
...creat-

ing more jobs for the unemployed, the Government is adopting a policy which is going to deprive lakhs of workers already employed of their jobs, and throw them into the wilderness to starve. Is this the way you are going to develop the country?

I strongly submit that unless and until adequate compensation or alternative employment is assured for the workers in the mill sector, unless the future livelihood of the workers is guaranteed beforehand so that they will not suffer, the Government should not permit the contraction of any units in the mill sector. You cannot play with the lives of lakhs of hard-working mill labourers like this in order to benefit a few wealthy tycoons of the mill sector in the textile industry. If any mill owners are going to contract the capacities of their units, let the owners first tell us what they are going to do to compensate the workers who will be thrown out of their jobs. I repeat—unless and until the workers' future is satisfactorily assured, unless solid guarantees are provided, no mill should be allowed to contract the capacity of its units. I now come to the final part of my remarks. I do not vouch for the veracity of what I am now going to refer to, but I understand from very reliable sources that Mr. Dhirubhai Ambani—it is needless for me to say who he is—and his close associates were openly flaunting copies of the new National Textile Policy several weeks before it was officially announced by the Government. And, what is more, after the official announcement was made, it was found to be an almost verbatim copy of what Mr. Dhirubhai Ambani was flaunting and boasting about, well in advance of the Government's announcement. Now, what does this prove? From this it is obvious that those who constitute the powerful mill lobby have either shaped the new textile policy themselves, or they have been a party to influence its shaping. The major point to be stressed here is that the Report

(Miss Jayalalitha)

of the Experts Committee on Textiles, on whose recommendations the New Textile Policy is supposed to be based, has not been made public. It has been classified as 'secret'. Despite this point having been raised by several Members in the Lok Sabha, the report has not been made public. It is now confirmed that even the State Governments had not been consulted at the time the policy was formulated, or at the stage of finalisation. Handloom industry is a State subject and so is employment. Any adverse consequences on employment would have to be borne by the State Governments.

These two points, one about the report of the Experts Committee being withheld from the public, and the other about non-consultation of even the State Governments in evolving such an important policy, illustrates the process used for evolving a policy of such significance. The Indian Cotton Mill owners Federation is claiming that all its demands have been conceded in the New Policy. This could have happened only if its members had full access to the Textile Ministry and Experts Committee.

The hon. Member, Mr. Jacob who spoke on behalf of the ruling party, commended the Experts Committee for having finalised the new textile policy in a very short time—at record speed. No wonder! After all, the policy had already been formulated by the likes of Mr. Dhirubhai Ambani and all that the Committee had to do was to put its stamp on it.

SHRI VITHALBHAI MOTIRAM PATEL: It is all wrong. It has nothing to do with the Policy. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Why are you protecting Dhirubhai Ambani?

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, she has spoken

about an individual. Why do you worry about it. (*Interruptions*).

MISS JAYALALITHA: It shows that the hon. Member must be a close associate of Mr. Ambani. All along the Government of India in the larger interests of the country, has been advocating a textile policy, taking into account not only the needs of the mill sector, and that of the powerloom sector, but also keeping in mind the ancient heritage so special to handlooms and in particular, the special requirements of the handloom sector.

But now, after the Bombay Textile Mill Workers' strike, in order to give a fillip, a boost, to the mill sector, instead of taking into account the basic requirements for long overdue modernisation and replacement of obsolete equipment, and instead of giving special incentives for this purpose, the Government has tried to dodge this issue, and instead of ensuring the continuity and safety of both sectors—here I say both, because I am clubbing the mill sector along with the powerlooms, and taking the handlooms as the other sector—the Government has moved in the wrong direction by giving an enormous boost to the mill sector, at the expense of the handloom sector.

In effect, the handloom sector has been sacrificed like a sacrificial goat, at the all powerful altar of the mill sector.

In view of the more than 75 lakh poor handloom weavers, whose whole families depend entirely on the handloom industry for their very existence, I feel it is the handloom sector which should be considered more sympathetically by the Government, and this consideration should be extended in concrete, practical terms, instead of just paying lip service to it. This statement of mine should not be misconstrued. Because I say

this, it does not mean that I am against the mill sector. I am not against the mill sector. Let me not be misunderstood. What I am saying in effect is ... (Interruptions). Mr. Ramchand Yadav, if you shout like this, I can outshout you at any time. (Interruptions). Otherwise, let me speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): I can tell Mr. Yadav, do not provoke, and I can tell the hon. Lady, do not be provoked. Order please.

MISS JAYALALITHA: What I am saying in effect is that let the mill sector also grow and flourish. The growth of all sectors is necessary for the nation's economic progress and development. But in any policy decision, the Government should ensure that the growth of one sector is not at the expense of the other. The crux of my statement is this. The growth of an already strong sector should not be encouraged to such an extent as to practically obliterate and wipe out from existence the weaker sector. The Government should evolve a more balanced and fair policy. That is all I am saying. With these remarks, I oppose the policy in toto and conclude. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Mr. Minister, if you want to intervene briefly, you can.

The Minister will reply at the end. Shri Mahendra Prasad.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, centuries back, before the dreadful darkness of British imperialism engulfed India, the golden goose of beauty, abundance and plenty, a vivacious, charming, beautiful princess, the daughter of a Moghul emperor gayfully and showfully entered into the *darbar* of her father. The *darbar* was in session attended by high dignitaries, ministers and audience. The sight of the dazzling beauty of the princess in her glittering attire made the emperor embarrassed and ashamed. The

other attendants too were embarrassed. The seven times folded beautiful muslin dress of the princess was glass-like transparent. The hiding dress was unhiding. The embarrassed emperor ordered disappearance of the princess and rise of the *darbar*. The fine beautiful muslin, of which the seven-fold dress of the princess was tailored, was not an imported muslin. It was a world-renowned product of the Bengal artisans.

Today, Indians are fascinated about foreign clothes. Then, foreigners were fascinated of fineness and beauty of Indian clothes. The reverse position makes us ashamed. It is a challenge of potency and worthiness of every Indian. It should be our endeavour to reach the same stage of yesterday when foreigners should be attracted towards the quality of our textile products rather than we hanker after theirs.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It can be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: Right from time immemorial, before the dawn of civilization, from the prehistoric days of stone-age, when human beings used leaves and skin of trees and animals to protect them from the vagaries of nature, till today, the day of utmost sophistication and most advanced science and technology, the day of space, starwars and computers, and the day of what not, clothing has been, after food, the second most important necessity of life...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We can take it as read.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN): Some Members are in the habit of consulting notes.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: Our textile industry meets the need of this basic necessity of life. Ignoring textiles is ignoring ourselves. Our textile industry enjoys the proud and unique position in our national economy. From Fort Gloster in 1818 till date, it has travelled a long way sur-

(Shri Mahendra Prasad)

mounting several milestones. Our textile industry very rightly holds the first position in spindleage in the world before China, the USA and the USSR. The number of textile mills in India increased from 389 in 1937 to 875 in 1984. In 1947, we produced 350.90 million metres of cloth while the production rose to 11,824 million metres in 1984-85. This is no mean achievement. The progress in other spheres of textile industry deserves praise. Our textile industry gives employment to millions of our countrymen. It earns us scarce foreign exchange. But is it all that we should have achieved? Is there nothing else to be done? It is a disgrace to our dignity and nation-hood that still we have a large number of semi-naked people living in remote villages of our country. There are a lot more things to be done. India, with its vast and teeming millions, of ill-clothed people, cannot afford to commit mistakes and ignore this vital industry.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Chimanbhai Mehta, in the Chair)]

Sir, behind the crest and stratum of success, our textile industry suffers from serious black patches also. The white elephant of National Textile Corporation is one of such cancerous ills which requires immediate cure. The NTC, with 16 mills at the time of its inception in 1968, today in 1983-84, boasts of having 125 ill-managed units in its large chest. The capital employed in the NTC a very small part of which may be in other Government textile industry, was to the tune of Rs. 492.80 crores and the net turnover achieved in 1983-84, was around Rs. 600 crores. The ratio of capital employed turnover is very poor. The NTC made a net loss of Rs. 137.36 crores in 1983-84 and the loss may cross Rs. 150 crores in 1984-85 because at the end of December, 1984, the loss was Rs. 131.79 crores. What a pathetic performance and wasteful expenditure of public

money. The pity is that the NTC has decided to waste another Rs. 320 crores of tax-payers money in the name of modernisation and expansion. Intoxicated with the arrogance of better art of management, NTC was incorporated with the laudable objective of managing the affairs of sick textile units. In the process, the NTC has landed itself in the worst type of mismanagement. A good management is one which makes profits. The NTC has reaped heaps of heavy losses year after year. Many sins and misdoings are safeguarded under the shelter of social obligation and protecting the interests of the workers. Rather than lifting the junk of a sinking sick mill and finally dropping and breaking it into irreparable pieces, in the name of protecting the employment of workers, attention should be paid to the improvement of quality of textile products, so that it can compare with world standards. By doing so, we would be able to earn more by exporting our quality products and investing the earnings in other industrial endeavours creating more and more employment opportunities for our workers.

We should learn from our experience. The performance of other public sector enterprises is not less pathetic. Look at the mounting losses of IDPL, SAIL and FCI, to count a few among many.

Let us study the performance of public sector enterprises in general. From an investment of Rs. 29 crores as on 31st March, 1951, in 5 public sector enterprises, the investment stood at Rs. 30,038 crores as on 31st March, 1983 in 209 pride-position-holding public sector enterprises, and Rs. 35,411 crores as on 31st March, 1984, in 214 public sector enterprises. The gross turnover of these enterprises in 1983-84 was Rs. 47,294.32 crores. The pre-tax profit after setting off losses by the loss-making units was Rs. 1,484.56 crores, in 1983-84. The profit of ONGC alone was Rs. 1,607.66 crores in 1983-84.

Therefore, if the profitability of only one unit, that is ONGC, is taken out, total investment of over Rs. 33,370 crores in 213 enterprises with a turnover of over Rs. 43,842.04 crores make a total loss of 123.01 crores. What a disgrace? And to remember here is the fact that ONGC and other oil producing concerns are monopoly enterprises. These concerns can charge any price for oil as they like. We can increase the price of oil at our will as we have been doing for quite some time, including the oil price rise in the last budget.

The poor performance of our public sector enterprises has been agitating the mind of everyone who is concerned about the future of the country. The question is what is the cause of the poor performance of our public sector concerns. To show better performance, public sector units must produce, and produce abundantly, and manage the affairs efficiently. Production is conditioned by hard work and hard work in turn is conditioned (a) by fear and (b) by incentive. A thorough and deep study of human nature and psychology reveals that a person, and every being, work either because of incentive or because of fear. Communist countries by introducing the element of fear, have achieved wonderful performance in the arena of production and economic development. In Communist countries, if you do not work, you are shot dead. You work hard there because of the fear of punishment. The economic progress of the USSR and their set of countries is an example. On the other hand, the democratic countries, such as the USA, West Germany and Japan have created wonders by introducing the element of incentive in their economy. People work there because they are rewarded by way of profit etc. Fantastic economic growth of these countries is another example. Both of those two pure but ideologically separate sets of countries have made wonderful performance in the arena of production. In our public sector enterprises there

is neither fear nor incentives. The result is pathetic disaster and economic ruin of many of these enterprises. The performance of our public sector units, barring patches of a few exceptions, will always be like this as it is not based on human considerations. This is truth and nothing else can be truth.

Sir, our textile Minister is a man of crudition. I hope and trust he will learn from instances and experiences. I am sure no dogma of ideas and ideologies will blur his vision in the task of building textile industries in the national interest.

Sir, the sad memory of infamous a year before last year's Bombay textile strike is fresh in our mind. It did great damage to our national economy. It did good neither to workers nor to the industry nor to the nation. It damaged the interest of workers, it had almost ruined the textile industry of Bombay. The strike was resorted to by, and there was influence of antisocial elements on this infamous strike. As is known and talked, it was a blackmail, in the name of trade-unionism, by antisocial elements to squeeze money from the industrialists. As is talked it was also used, specially later on after the strike was carried through several days and months, by industrialists, in connivance with the union leaders to remuneratively close down the mills under a legal excuse. In this case, money making by the union leaders and bad managing industrialists was the motive. This strike was a same of manipulation, manoeuvring, blackmailing and money making by rowdism. It was a sinister design. The workers were mislead. The workers suffered and they should have suffered for committing the mistake of having allowed themselves to be misguided. Mistakes must be punished to debar their occurrence in future. Punishment for mistakes helps in the healthy growth of civilised society. The Government, by taking over some of the Bombay mills falling sick because

[Shri Mahendra Prasad]

of the textile strike, resulting in threatened unemployment of some of the striking workers, has done a blunder. The Government should have known its limitations, determined by its previous performance as a managing agent of a strike-infested sick industrial unit. It has unconsciously helped manipulation and money making by anti-social union leaders, as also bad industrialists, by blackmail and rowdism. It has created a precedent and given encouragement to the trick of blackmail and money making at the cost of the workers and the national economy. I hope the Government will reconsider its decision to take over these sick textile mills so that the closed sick mills may act as a lesson in future for the workers to desist from being misled by anti-social elements. Non-taking over of these sick mills will be in the larger interest of the nation in the long run.

Sir, the public sector units always hide their limitations and inefficiency in management under the garb of popular gimmickry of serving the social obligation and the interest of the workers. As a word of advice to the Government, I may remind that there are several other Government agencies and the Government can open further more agencies to serve social obligations. The Government should not allow the public-sector units to hide their inherent weaknesses as managers under the cover of social obligation. While managing the affairs of an industrial unit there should be only one obligation and consideration and that should be the obligation of running the unit on scientific principles of management. Industrial units should be run purely on commercial basis where profit making is of paramount importance. The money earned from profits by public sector units will go to the Government coffers which in turn can be used for meeting the ends of social obligation. While in Rome behave like Romans. While running an industry we should be

guided by only one principle—that is the principle of scientific management where the test of a good management lies in sustaining the life of the industrial unit which in turn is dependent on its profits.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Please conclude now. You have taken too much time.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: I am concluding, Sir. I am sorry to speak on nowadays an unconventional and unpopular line as I feel strongly and honestly on these lines and my feeling is based on facts, figures, study and carefully given thought. It arises from a sense of responsibility towards our society, our country and our countrymen and not just a popular emotional outburst. Can I take a couple of more minutes?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): No, please. There are quite a few other speakers.

DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA (Maharashtra): Is this the preamble, Sir?

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: Sir, with these words...

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): I hand over my speech to the hon. Minister.

SHRI MAHENDRA PRASAD: I wish the Government well in formulation of its textile policy to increase the production of clothes of acceptable quality at a reasonable price to meet the clothing requirements of our growing population.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL (Maharashtra): Sir, the textile industry has a history of national importance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Dr. Patel, you are given just seven minutes. So please conclude within the time.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: Two minutes are taken away by this, Sir.

Sir, I was submitting that this is an industry of national importance not

merely in economic terms but also in terms of the movement for Indian Independence. It was the wheel of *charkha* which was projected as a symbol of our fight for Indian Independence. It was Gandhi ji who projected it further not merely for the sake of its show or appearance, but it represented the economic conditions of this country and that is why round it he did not merely spin yarn but he also spun the movement of Indian Independence the fruits of which we are enjoying today. After reading the textile policy document one is constrained to say that this very wheel is sought to be destroyed, if not turned in the other direction.

Sir, the handloom sector is an important sector of textile production in this country, both in terms of money and in terms of the number of people who are employed. About 75 lakhs out of 120 lakh people are employed in this particular sector. It is true that no reliable figures or statistics are still available, as all the so-called spokesmen of the Government have been giving different figures. Whatever that may be, the fact remains that here is a sector which employs the largest number of people. It is said in the document that there is going to be an unique role for this sector to play in the new textile policy. I do not know, but I think the word "unique" has lost its meaning when it is sought to be used in the context in which it is stated in this particular document. Now it is going to be the liquidation of this particular handloom sector. I am not exaggerating when I say this. Because here is a sector which is asked to compete with the most modern, sophisticated machinery-employing sector and sell its goods. I know the Minister will turn round and say we are going to have certain preservation of production, and controlled cloth is something which will be totally produced by this particular sector. But if you go into the history, it was the mill sector which could not produce this

And when we are talking of production by the mill sector, let us realize one thing. What is the objective of this policy? Is it merely production? Is it merely economic? Are we not going to have some social objective which we must have under any policy, under any plan, that we envisage or try to implement in this country? Here, for the first time the social objective is sought to be guillotined and now only production—which I believe is also necessary—will be the guiding star as far as the textile is concerned and that is how this whole thing has been viewed and woven.

Talking of the handloom sector, it is not simple to organize. Sir, you are aware—you have been working amongst the people, particularly the working people—that it requires a lot of labour. Right from the beginning, yarn supply, finance, the cost marketing and technology are all involved in it. All these factors have to be so harmonized, so harnessed, that the real product can come out and compete with the mill sector or the power loom sector. Now here, the performance on all these fronts has been unfortunately far from satisfactory. This is not what I am saying. This is evident from the reports of the Government Committees.

May I draw the attention of the Minister? I do not know what he is going to reply unless he is going to read like the other Member. May I have the attention of the Minister? I am sure he is not going to read his reply.

Sir, I was referring to this, that these are the factors which are important for proper production in the handloom sector. May I know from the Minister as to what has been the performance of the Government in the past? Have they not failed miserably as far as yarn supply is concerned? A man in the rural area, in the village, has to move from place to place to get

[Dr. Shanti G. Patel]

yarn, and when he gets it it is at very high price. It is not just like a city, Ahmedabad or Bombay, where one can easily corner or get the yarn of the quality and at the price that one would like to have.

The same is the sad story in the case of finance also. It is not possible for a villager, for a small rural worker who is trying to supplement his income through this weaving business, to get finance. It is again a very difficult process.

May I ask also what has happened to the technology? What we should be try to develop is that the self employed character of this handloom sector should be maintained, should be sustained, at least for some time to come. I am not one of those who like to say, "No. This must remain for all time to come." But during the period it remains or it progresses from one stage to another we have got to develop new technology. "And what has been the advance made," I ask, "in the last 37 years after the independence? Have any improvements been made in this particular regard so that the weaver can get more wages, can get more earnings on this particular machine or the equipment that he is using?"

Sir, the same story comes as far as marketing is concerned. In the case of marketing, he is again a victim of those moneylenders and of those traders who operate and corner this cloth at the most cheapest possible price. Again there is an exploitation in this particular sector.

So, all these things need to be met. You should try to do something.

Again it has been said that the controlled cloth will be reserved for handloom. I would like to refer to the "Economic Times" of the 4th of July, 1985. This is not a friend of the weaver, I can tell you. If at all, it is

a friend of the Bombay and Ahmedabad mill-owners. This is what it has to say regarding the yarn availability, I quote:

"There is no knowing, if net of exports, yarn available to the handloom sector will be adequate. Availability apart, at what price-will cotton yarn be available to the handloom sector which is charged with the responsibility of more than doubling cheap cloth output in the year?"

Because now it is going to be 1,000 million metres. So, this is one important aspect that unless all these things are made available, it is no use.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SUPPLY AND TEXTILES (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH): What are you quoting?

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: We are moving in the other direction.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHILMANBHAI MEHTA): The Minister wants to know what you are quoting?

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: I am quoting that the Government is trying to export cotton and yarn when they are very necessary as far as the handloom sector is concerned. And this is what will lead to shortage.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: What was quoted by you?

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: The "Economic Times" of the 4th of July.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: There was no point in that sentence which you read.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: Pardon, Sir? I did not hear? A little loudly, please.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: There was no point in the sentence which you quoted just now.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: Without quoting, I can paraphrase it for you because it seems it is difficult for you to follow the quotation. Because the Government has adopted a policy of export of yarn and even cotton, that is why, there is going to be shortage of yarn availability. The availability will not be there.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Are you aware of the fact that there is no shortage of yarn at the moment in the entire country? Are you aware of it?

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: But now that you have started exports, there is going to be.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: In spite of that, this is the situation.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: That is why I have paraphrased it for you that there is going to be shortage.

Anyway, you can reply to this point. After all I am sure, your officers must have seen this. (*Time bell rings*).

Sir, a part of the time has been taken by the hon. Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): You have been given more time.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: I am not reading my own speech at least.

Sir, I was submitting that the mill sector has been given the prominence which it does not deserve. After all, if the textile industry has been reduced to the present stage, particularly the sickness stage, nobody else but the mill-owners themselves are responsible. I am not saying all of them. There are some good people. I would refer to the Mafatlals in particular who have modernised, who have invested in the industry, who have not taken away funds by robbing the mills of their profits and invested somewhere else or speculated with it.

Sir, this is the real disease. Instead of treating the disease—130 mills have

been closed, some are in the NTC and some are going to be closed soon—we are trying to give them more concessions in the form of soft loan.

Sir, may I ask the Minister whether they have been given Rs. 1700 crores in the last several years since this system for giving soft loan on modernisation has been started—what have they done? Where has this money gone? Are these textile mills working properly? Are they selling the cloth cheap as envisaged? The same is going to be the fate of this particular money. They will take it for the textile mills and somewhere else they will use it and we are not going to have the benefit. Even excise duty and a number of concessions are sought to be given which was asked by the Indian Cotton Mill owners Federation. It has been reported in the "Commerce" magazine. I do not want to quote because the Minister finds it difficult to follow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Please conclude.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: I think he knows about. I am just inviting his attention. The Commerce Research Bureau brings out an important magazine in this country which is known as the "Commerce". In that magazine it has been reported that all that the mill owners whatever they wanted, has been given—as if the Textile Ministry has been the extension of the mill owners' own association—all has been given in whatever form or in whatever manner they wanted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Please conclude now.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: I am concluding. Sir, again the mill sector is going to be partially closed and contract also, I think, at ten places in this document has been repeated, which makes me to lead to no other conclusion except that there is guilty conscience inside which makes them say

[Dr. Shanti G. Patel]

repeatedly that the workers' interests will be safeguarded. What are those interests? By creation of a rehabilitation fund or by giving retirement benefits to which they were otherwise also eligible. What is the obligation that has been carried out? What a worker wants is not just a lump sum amount, what he wants is: a job. Are you going to give him a job? A person who is going to be unemployed at the age of 40 or 50 or 55 he cannot get a job. Perhaps a politician even at this age can find a job in some House or in some legislature. The worker needs to maintain himself and his family. Now, this is what we would like to have as far as these workers are concerned. Unless this is provided, it is no use giving him a dole. What is necessary is a job. The Government is following a policy of doles which is not going to be helpful. It can be only a temporary expedient to get over a certain period which is not going to satisfy the worker who will be in search of his livelihood for the rest of his life.

I would also like to support what my hon. friend, Miss Jayalalitha some time back said that there is an Experts' Committee Report. Why it has been hidden from the House? Why it was not made public before the textile policy was declared? Let there be a public debate both outside as well as inside the House. Then the Government can draw their own conclusions from this debate. This is something which I believe is undemocratic. It is not proper to function in an undemocratic manner. Despite repeated requests in the other House, it has not been done. If at all it will be done it will be done only after all decisions are taken.

Another point that I would like to repeat and support is in connection with the role of the State Governments. The State Governments have not been consulted in this regard. They are vitally and intimately concerned

with this subject. They should have taken the State Governments into confidence. Ultimately unemployment problem has to be faced by the State Governments but not by the Central Government. It will only watch the situation and probably shed tears for the sad plight of the unemployed people and workers who are retrenched.

Therefore, I would appeal to the Minister most humbly and most respectfully to listen and try to understand us and modify the present policy and not just make it a point of prestige. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHITAMBAI MANBHAI MEHTA): Mr. Vasudeva Panicker

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the textile policy. I am standing in support of the policy statement issued by the Honourable Minister. I also thank my hon. friend Mr. Jacob for having initiated a discussion on the textile policy. I congratulate the Minister and also the Government mainly for two reasons: one, for building harmonious balance between the mill and powerloom sector Khadi synchronising and the handloom sector. I am congratulating the Government for the two divergent but great economic philosophies—one that of Mahatma Gandhi which is called the Gandhian philosophy and the other economic and industrial policy as enunciated by Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, I have read a few articles against the industrial policy written in some of the leading newspapers and magazines. I have been listening to the speech delivered by Madam Jayalalitha, and of the CPI(M) leader, Shri K. Mohan. After considering all this I somehow feel sorry for the authors and I have sympathies for the two leaders from the Opposition. I feel sorry for the simple reason that these journals and the magazines have brought out the

articles attacking the textile policy without understanding the situation. The speakers who spoke against the textile policy have not understood the economic context that is available in India. I want this House to appreciate one fact. The fact is that the handloom industry as also the khadi industry in India is facing three inherent limitations. Both these industries in India have three constraints. And what are the constraints as far as production of cloth is concerned? First, the cloth is comparatively expensive, in terms of utility of handloom and khadi cloth, vis-à-vis the synthetic and mill cloth. Second, the less durability of the products in the handloom and the khadi sector and three, the exorbitant maintenance expenses incurred in khadi and mill cloth. Because of these three constraints, the industry is facing a serious problem. Regarding the cost of khadi as also of the handloom cloth you can buy one saree for hundred rupees from the handloom sector. You can buy one saree for hundred rupees from the khadi sector but I can say, you can buy a saree from the synthetic and textile sector for the same hundred rupees. In India, an average Indian, especially, an average woman, who is working, is preferring a synthetic cloth which is cheaper a synthetic saree compared to handloom saree or a khadi saree. What is the reason? The reason is that the purchasing power of an average Indian is comparatively meagre that he or she is not in a position to buy cloth at a higher price. For example, if you buy a nylon saree or any other synthetic saree for a hundred rupees or two hundred rupees, that saree will be much more durable. And a girl working in Bombay, Delhi, Calcutta or elsewhere in this country is going to prefer the cheaper, durable, easy cloth than any other cloth. For this reason our textile industry is facing a serious problem. The working girl, after she comes back from her office before going to bed, washes her saree and hangs the same for drying purpose. The next morning she can use the

sari, wear it and go to her office. I am a Gandhian. I belong to the Congress Party and my party believes in the Gandhian philosophy; and my party believes in the philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru. I am wearing khadi. I feel pity for most of the Opposition leaders who spoke in the House who do not use Hantex and khadi mostly. You can check in this House whether it is the Congress Party which is supporting Dhirubhai Ambani or it is Madam Jayalalitha who is supporting Dhirubhai Ambani.

MISS JAYALALITHA: I am not supporting Dhirubhai Ambani. I think you did not listen to my speech.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: Will you please sit down?

SHRI K. MOHANAN: You are wearing khadi but opposing Gandhiji.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: I am not saying that Madam Jayalalitha never used khadi. There are other illustrious members of the fair sex, for example, Margaret Alva and Najma Heptulla, who also sometimes use the synthetic cloth. (Interruptions) I am trying to elucidate the point not because these illustrious women of this House are....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): But they look splendid in synthetic dress.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: ...not using khadi or handloom material. For example, other leaders, be it Mr. Mohanan or be it Mr. Gopalsamy or any other...

SHRI K. MOHANAN: I am wearing both.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: If I wear khadi, that will give a different picture.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: ...Any other leader of the Opposition also uses synthetic cloth. Sometimes I also use it. It is not because I am opposed to the khadi industry; it is not because I am opposed to the textile

[Shri K. Vasudeva Panicker]

industry. It is because of the economic situation which is available, the economic context which is available in this country. A poor girl who can buy a sari from the synthetic sector can use the sari for two years or three years. If the same girl buys a khadi sari after paying the same Rs. 100, she cannot use it for more than a year. This fact has to be looked into.

MISS JAYALALITHA: What about women? He is talking about girls.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: I am very happy you understand my sentiments.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Panicker, our hon. Prime Minister also uses synthetic dress when he goes abroad. Don't forget that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Please proceed Mr. Panicker.

SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: What I was suggesting was that our industry is facing a serious problem arising from the economics of the industry itself. So there is no point in attacking the Government or in accusing the Government. The point is whether we should send a girl on the road absolutely nude or we should give her some material to wear. If that is the context, then the Government cannot ignore the part of the synthetic sector as well as the mill sector. This is the main question. That is why a harmony has been drawn between the two sectors in the policy statement.

Mahatma Gandhi who was the leader of the freedom struggle in this country, also understood that the mill and synthetic sector is something which is obnoxious to his very conception. But having understood the complexity of the problem, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru formulated a new economic policy, a new industrial policy which was good enough to ac-

commodate the philosophical conception of Mahatma Gandhi. And that economic policy has been the guideline so far as the textile policy is concerned. I you want the handloom sector and the khadi sector to grow further and develop alone, then what is the purchasing power of the poor men and women in the villages? What is the purchasing power of the poor student? What is the purchasing power of the NGO or the average Indian in this country? It is absolutely impossible. Has the Government got a responsibility to provide cheaper cloth to its own citizens? I believe that as a responsible party, as a responsible Government, my Government has got the responsibility to provide cheaper cloth to the poor people in this country. I am not opposed to the khadi industry. I am not opposed to the handloom sector. Rather I am for Hantex and khadi. But the question is, if you are going out of the way in order to protect the khadi industry and the handloom industry, then you are going to face serious problems. In the policy statement itself the Minister stated that we are not in a position to supply the necessary thing, for that we have to develop, wherever possible, the prospect of the industry, the prospect of developing the industry without creating further problems touching the purchasing power of the people of India. The scope lies only in the mill sector and in the handloom sector. Can this House say that the Government should close down all the mill and the powerloom sector? Is it possible to do so? Therefore, what this policy statement has tried to do was to re-enact the Industrial Policy Resolution enunciated by Pandit Nehru keeping in mind the concept of Gandhian contention.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): Mr. Jagdambi Prasad Yadav.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार):
मैं मंत्री जी से कुछ सफ शब्दों में...
(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA): May I tell you that you are given only six minutes?

AN HON. MEMBER: Even before the take off?

श्री जगदम्बो प्रसाद यादव : एक मिनट तो ऐसे ही चला जाता है. . (व्यवधान)

मैं मंत्री जी को जानता हूँ कि खादी परिवार से और हथकरघा के काफी कामों के नजदीक से आने वाले हैं, लेकिन इस नीति में वह अपने को इस बात को प्रमाणित न कर सकेंगे। मैं इस बात के लिये सावधानी बरतने के लिये अवश्य कहना चाहूंगा। हमारे उपसभाध्यक्ष जी तकाजा करते हैं— मैं कुछ तथ्य की बात रखना चाहता हूँ और अगर समय मिलेगा, तो इसका विश्लेषण करना चाहूंगा।

मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि दस लाख लोगों को काम मिलेगा और मेरा तथा अन्य मित्रों का कहना है कि इस नीति से दस लाख जो हथकरघा बुनकर हैं और दूसरे भी उनके काम खत्म होंगे। दस लाख को काम मिलेगा, इसका डम नीति में कही पर उल्लेख नहीं है, उसका आधार नहीं है, उसका तथ्य और कोई विवेचन नहीं है। लेकिन हम तो कहते हैं कि इसमें कोई एडीशनल एम्प्लायमेंट की बात नहीं कही है कि कैसे होगा और जब नहीं कही है तो फिर आप भाषण के अन्दर बोल जायें, तो यह भी अज्ञान है, लेकिन तथ्य से बात परे हो जायेगी, वह तथ्य में नहीं जायेगी।

दूसरी बात, बाजार में मिल का, पावरलूम और हथकरघा का क्या परसेंटेज होगा बिक्री का, इसका भी कोई केलकुलेशन, स्टेटिस्टिक्स तैयार नहीं किया है। उत्पादन के मंत्री जी बहुत नये-नये तरीके हो सकते हैं, लेकिन गांव में जो अनएम्प्लायमेंट है और विशेषकर ग्रैंडर-एम्प्लायमेंट है, उसका निराकरण अभी तक नहीं हुआ है और यह जो विचार करने की चीज है, वास्तव में यही विचार करने की चीज है कि गांव में जो ग्रैंडर-एम्प्लायमेंट है, जो खेती भी करता है, जो खेती से समय मिलता

है तो वह हथकरघा का कार्य भी करता है और ऐसे खेतिहर के गांव से या गांव में जैसे मोची था, का काम खत्म हुआ, बड़ई का काम खत्म हुआ, बर्तन बनाने वाले का काम खत्म हुआ, तेली का काम खत्म हुआ, जूता बनाने वाले का काम खत्म हुआ और अब जो गांव में रूरल एरिया में बुन कर जो बचे हुये हैं, उनका काम खत्म होगा। उसके लिये आपने कुछ उपाय नहीं किया है।

इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एम्प्लायमेंट के लिये अगर आप कुछ कहना चाहें कुछ तथ्य के साथ तो आप कह सकते हैं। यह सब लोगों ने आपके सामने बात उपस्थित की है कि किम समीक्षा के आधार पर आपने यह प्रतिवेदन, यह नीति तय की है, वह सीक्रेट क्यों हो गया क्या बात है कि वह सीक्रेट है ?

क्या उसमें ऐसे लोग है जिनका ग्रामीण आंचल से कोई सरोकार नहीं रहा, ग्राम की गरीबी, बेकारी नहीं देखी है, या उनका ज्ञान सीमित है उन मिल-मालिकों तक और मिल वर्कर्स तक, इसलिये उसको छिपानी चाहते हैं क्या ?

तीसरी बात जो आती है जो यह बुनकर हैं, खास करके हथकरघा और वह राज्य सरकारों के हिस्से में आती है, उसमें बेकार; उसके हिस्से में है, इसलिये इस बड़ी नीति का घोषणा करने में राज्य सरकारों से विचार नहीं किया है, कनसल्ट नहीं किया गया है।

इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नीति भी जल्दबाजी में या बिना सोच-समझकर ही अफसरों के कहने पर आप ले आए है, बल्कि उल्टा है उसका, जो मिल एसोसिएशन का सेक्रेटरी है सी बी० राधाकृष्णन, वह कहता है कि हमारी सब मांग मान ली गई।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर सिंह : मैं एक मिनट के लिये इन्टरवीन करना चाहूंगा। आपने कहा कि यह दस लाख की फिगर कैसे आई, यह जानना चाह। बहुत साधारण गणित है। अभी 300 मिलियन मीटर का अंदाज हैंडलूम में प्रोडक्शन होता है... (व्यवधान)

5 P. M.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हमारी बात का जवाब नहीं आया ? (व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्र शेखर सिंह : आप पहले मुन लीजिये और 1999 तक 900 मिलियन मीटर हैडलूम को दिया जायेगा । 600 मिलियन मीटर का फर्क है । एक एवरेज वीवर हर दिन चार सड़ि चार मीटर बनाता है और साल में डेड सौ दिन काम करता है और एक एवरेज वीवर 600 मि०मीटर लगभग बनायेगा । आप 600 मि० मीटर को 600 में भाग दे दीजिये, 10 लाख नये जाव निकलेंगे । यह सिपल साधारण गणित का प्रश्न है, इसमें बहुत बारीकी का सवाल नहीं है ।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने एक बार सवाल पूछा कि बिहार में कितनी सिचाई भूमि है ? इन्होंने कहा कि एक जिले का ले लीजिये, एक लाख एकड़ भूमि है, हमने वहां पर प्रत्येक पांच एकड़ पर सिचाई कुआ दिया और हमने 20,000 कुआ दे दिया और एक लाख एकड़ की सिचाई हो गई कि नहीं ? चाहे कुआ खुदा हो या नही सिचाई होती हो या नही । मैं उसका दूसरा जवाब देना चाहता हूं कि तीन हजार मि० मीटर हाथ करघा से कपड़ा तैयार होता है 300 मि० मीटर ही खरीदेंगे और यह इन्होंने लोक सभा में खरीदने का कहा है कि हम और खरीदेंगे 2400 मि० मीटर उसका चेगा और अब मिलों पर रिस्ट्रक्शन है, पावरलूम पर रिस्ट्रक्शन है, . . . (व्यवधान) तब तो 2400 मि० मीटर बेच पाते हैं, लेकिन 2400 मि० मीटर बेचने के बाद भी अभी हमारी माननीय सदस्या जय ललिता जी ने कहा कि पांच करोड़ का सामान हथकरघा का कांथापरेटिव में वही मद्रास में पड़ा हुआ है और सारे देश में कितना होगा यह पता नहीं और यह कैसे बिकेगा, यह सवाल बहुत जबरदस्त है ? दूसरी बात जो मैं उठाना चाहता हूं कि अभी तक हमारी नीति में रहा है कि हम इसको प्रोटेक्शन दे, प्रोटेक्शन ही नहीं बल्कि इसका हम राष्ट्रीय नीति मान करके चलते रहे और तीस वर्ष तक इसको सुरक्षा दी । [उपसभाध्यक्ष डा० हुमती] सरोजिनी महिषी] पीठासीन ई ।] लेकिन प्राक्कवन समिति ने कहा

है, आपकी आर्काशियल कमेटी ने भी कहा है, कि कमी इसको लागू करने की कोशिश नहीं की गई और जब कोशिश ही नहीं की गई तो फिर इसका क्या हिसाब बैठेगा ? इसलिये आपके मैनेमेटिकल कैलकुलेशन और प्रैक्टीकल कैलकुलेशन दोनों में जमीन-आसमान का अन्तर पड़ेगा । मैं तो एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं, इसलिये कि मैं और आप बिहार के हैं, तो इसके साथ उत्तर प्रदेश, तमिलनाडु, आसाम, ये चार का ही उदाहरण देता हूं । पावरलूम का 6 मीटर है, पांच महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात में है और एक तमिलनाडु में है । 90 प्रतिशत उत्पादन वहां होगा । किस प्रकार इसका डिसपर्स करेंगे और क्या करेगा बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश और आसाम का बुनकर और कहाँ ले जायेगा वह कपड़ा बेचने के लिये ? आप विचार करके देखें कि यह स्थिति आप के बिहार के उत्तर प्रदेश के सारे बुनकरों को क्या उजाड़ देगी ? आप किम कैलकुलेशन से कैसे हिसाब करेंगे ? आप मीटर से दौड़ने वाले को माईकल में और पैदल दौड़ने वाले में कंपीट करने को कह रहे हैं । चेक हटाने के लिये आप जा जा रहे हैं इसका कुछ इलाज मोचिये, मस्ते कपड़े की बात बताएं । 1737 करोड़ रुपया आईडीबीआई ने माडर्नाइजेशन के लिये दिया । आप पांच मिल का भी बता दें कि क्या सस्ता कपड़ा लोगों को मिला ? नहीं मिला । जहां तक एक्सपोर्ट की बात है इसका भी तथ्य नहीं रखा, कितना करेंगे, कैसे करेंगे और कितना कर रहे हैं ? इसका भी वर्णन नहीं है । बल्कि अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी बन-वासी क्षेत्र में गये । वहां एक महिला ने कहा कि मुझे रोजी और रोंटी चाहिये । तो रोजी और रोंटी कैसे मिलेगी जब तक उनका काम छीना जायेगा, तो तब तक उनका रोजी और रोंटी नहीं मिल सकती है । इसलिये मेरा एक और निवेदन होगा कि आप इस नीति को लागू करने के साथ-साथ सप्तम पंचवर्षीय योजना का भी समन्वय करें । सप्तम पंचवर्षीय योजना कुछ कह रही है और यह नीति उसके विपरीत जा रही है । जब तक उसका हिसाब नहीं करते हैं, तब तक यह बढ़ना नहीं है ।

दूसरी बात, जो छूट रही है उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, रेशम भी हैडलूम का है और

रेशम भारत का प्रमुख उद्योग चीन के बाद आता है। मूंगा हमारे हिन्दुस्तान का आसाम में है और दुनिया में यह अकेला है। यह रेशम उद्योग मर रहा है। रेशम का कपड़ा आज नहीं मिलने वाला है। हम जो कम्पिट करने जा रहे थे, उस मार्केट में हम उड़ते जा रहे हैं। मैं आपसे पहले भी निवेदन किया था कि आपने मलवरी जोन में सेंटर कार्यालय भेज दिया बंगलौर में। आसाम जो कि एक छोर में है, वहां क्या होगा और काश्मीर एक दूसरे छोर में, तो ऐसी अवस्था में इस उद्योग का क्या होगा? मलवरी, जो उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में डेवलप कर रहा था, उसका भी कोई उपाय नहीं। आपने पॉनिंग रिमार्क करके चला दिया पॉनिंग रिमार्क से रेशम का तो कुछ होगा नहीं और हैंडलूम के फेर में और मिन के फेर में पड़कर यह क्या किया? इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि इसके बारे में विस्तार में मंत्री जी बताएं और मैं इतना जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी यह अवश्य बताएं कि रेशम को देश में कैसे आप डेवलप करेंगे और इस उद्योगों में लगे लोगों का कल्याण कैसे होगा (समय की घंटी)

उपसभाध्यक्ष [डा० (श्रीमती) सरोजिनी महिषी] : यादव जी, अब आपसे प्रार्थना करती हूं कि खतम कीजिए . . .

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : मैं खतम ही कर रहा हूं। मैं नाथ ही तो ले रहा हूं। कुछ कह ही नहीं रहा हूं।

दूसरी बात किसान के बारे में, दूसरे, माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हर उद्योग का, हर व्यापार का बेसिक आधार किसान होता है और मैंने देखा है, जानने की कोशिश की है, अनरीका जो सबसे बड़ा उद्योगशील है, उसका आधार किसान है, उसके प्रोडक्शन पर उनकी उन्नति हुई है। आज आप हमारे किसान की कपास को लें, तो उसकी सुरक्षा की कोई गारण्टी नहीं है, हम उसे गारण्टी नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। उसी तरह से हम खादी उद्योग, जिसमें लाखों लोग लगे हैं, इसमें

हैंडलूम भी हैं, चर्खा भी है और यह खादी उद्योग हमारी स्वतंत्रता के साथ, हमारे रचनात्मक कार्यों के साथ, हमारे जीवन की प्रक्रियाओं के साथ एकमय हो गया है। लेकिन उसको विकसित करने के लिए जितनी चिंता हमारी सरकार को और हमारे सरकारी बड़े अधिकारियों को मिली की है, उतनी भी चिंता आपने इन खादी वालों के लिए नहीं की। चूंकि यह चिंता आपकी थी, हमारे सरकारी नौकरों की नहीं थी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि खादी का भी कुछ विस्तार से बताएं। खादी के भी जहां बांग मिलते हैं, कहते हैं कि हम तो ड्राइव-आउट होना चाहते हैं। एक ओर हैंडलूम जाना चाहता है, दूसरी ओर खादी जाना चाहती है, तीसरी ओर रेशम भी जा रहा है और किसान भी जो है, वह भी जा रहा है। तो मैं आपसे इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि देखिए इस बारे में भी आप सोचिए।

अब हार्वेस्टर आ रहा है पंजाब में तो हार्वेस्टर आएगा, लेकिन मारा कौन जाएगा? मारा जाएगा बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश का मजदूर जो लाखों की संख्या में पंजाब में काम कर रहा है। अब मिला को मोडर्नाइज कर रहे हैं, पावर-लूम आगे बढ़ेगा, महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात आगे बढ़ेगा, लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार का जो बुनकर है, वह मारा जाएगा। कहीं तीर चलता है और निशाना कहीं पड़ता है। इसका कोई हिसाब आपने नहीं किया। इस प्रकार से आप बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश के बुनकरों की हत्या करेंगे और ही सकता है तत्काल लोगों को पता न लगे। कल ही मेरे एक मित्र बता रहे थे कि मद्रास में पहले वहां की सरकार ने इस नीति का स्वागत किया लेकिन जैसे ही पता चला, किसी ने 'मद्रास' तो दौड़े-दौड़े आपके पास आए कि यह नीति ठीक नहीं है। . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : फिर किसका दिया जाएगा, तो स्वागत करेंगे

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : उच्च प्रतिनिधि क्या कह रहे हैं वह कह गए और जो कह सकते थे उतना कहा । इसलिए मैं आपसे पुनः निवेदन करूंगा कि इस बिल को विचार करें और विचार करने के साथ-साथ मैं यह आश्वासन जरूर चाहूंगा कि बिहार उत्तर प्रदेश के जो बुनकर हैं, जो इस बिल के कारण आतंकित हैं, उनका आतंक दूर होना चाहिए । अगर आप उनका आतंक दूर नहीं करते हैं तो कम से कम बेस जो कुछ है आपका जो आपको नजदीक से जानते हैं जो आपके नजदीक रहता है, वह कहेंगे आपके हाथ से उनका नुकसान कैसे हुआ उनका सत्यानाश कैसे हुआ ?

SHRI M. S. RAMACHANDRAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the new textile policy which is a concrete expression of the Government's anxiety to ensure the textile industry to regain its pre-eminent position. At the same time, I would also like to avail this opportunity to draw the hon. Minister's attention to certain doubts and deficiencies.

Under this policy the Government have decided to give the textile industry full flexibility in use of fibre and allowed creation of new capacities and expansion, both in spinning and weaving. This should naturally go a long way to ensure availability of quality fabrics at cheaper cost. The basic objective of the Government to make available quality fabrics at reasonable prices to the consumers could be achieved in a reasonable time if only we have the honest cooperation of the textile managements.

The New Textile Policy also promises progressive reduction in fiscal levies on man-made fibres. I doubt very much the effective usefulness of this proposal. I am not against any reduction in levy to man-made fibre, but I expect more favourable terms to the cotton fibre. As we all know, our

country is one of the major cotton growing countries in the world. Substantial sector of our population consumes more cotton fabrics than man-made fibre fabrics. This policy would have been accepted is more balanced if there had been more liberal terms to cotton fibre to ensure availability of more and cheaper cotton fabrics to masses of this country and reasonable return of the farmers growing cotton.

Apart from this, I am afraid, this will affect the cotton spinning industry. Sir, I come from Tamil Nadu where the Textile Industry is predominantly cotton spinning. With more and more favourable fiscal relief to composite mills and man-made fibre, the cotton spinning mills in Tamil Nadu will suffer more and more. I demand a categorical assurance from the hon Minister that interests of the cotton spinning sector will be taken care of in the implementation of this New Policy.

One glaring omission in the New Textile Policy relates to the mushroom growth of a new section in the name of Waste Cotton Spinning. In late sixties, waste cotton spinning units were given licences to work with less than 2,000 spindles, to produce coarse cotton yarn below 10 counts, using only waste cotton. In course of time, large number of these units have come up. They have any number of spindles and they produce any count of yarn using good cotton. They install only second-hand old machinery and pay very low wages to workers. In practice, these units are free from all rules and regulations. I appeal to the hon. Minister to take suitable measures to bring these waste-cotton spinning mills under some sort of discipline.

This policy allows closure of non-viable units. I also agree that non-viable units must be closed when there is no other alternative. Our experience shows that most of these sicknesses is only man-made sickness, to be more specific management-made sickness. In several cases,

sickness was due to management's deliberate acts of diversion of funds to their family-owned new units in the same industry or other industries. Though the mills have become sick, these managements are more healthy and prosperous. It is only the financial institutions like I.D.B.I. and banks who have lost their money and the workers who have lost their jobs. I request the Government to expedite giving effect to the measures announced by the Finance Minister in his budget speech against management who were responsible for making a mill sick. I also request the Government to evolve suitable schemes, providing for greater degree of supervision and control by financial institutions and to diagnose sickness before it becomes incurable.

Even before the New Textile Policy was announced, there were a large number of closure of sick mills resulting in unemployment of several thousands of workers. Provision for closure in the New Textile Policy has given rise to fears in the minds of workers about possible further loss of employment. These fears can be allayed only if the Government comes out with details of an effective rehabilitation programme. I am happy to note that the Government have already created a Rehabilitation Fund. Retraining and reemployment of workers should be under taken in an effective manner.

I welcome the Policy of the Government regarding compulsory registration of all powerlooms. This is a welcome move in the right direction. The present unorganised industry of the powerloom sector is posing problems both to the organised textile mills as also to the handloom weaving sector. However, I would like to caution the Government to take lessons of their failure in the past in this direction. On several occasions earlier Government did attempt to bring the powerloom sector under some discipline. Whenever attempts were made to issue licences to unauthorised looms already installed, it only ended up with few looms getting registered and

licenced. Sale of looms not authorised and sale of licences without looms have become a day-to-day routine. It is, therefore, very essential that all the looms should be registered and brought under some of regulation. At the same time, I feel, it is not desirable to allow any additional looms in the so-called powerloom sector. It is equally essential to see that the existing powerlooms are enabled to function without imposing any additional fiscal burden on them. It will reduce the gap between their cost of production and that of the composite mills. As at present, it so happens that the composite mills are situated more in the western region of the country and the cotton spinning mills are situated more in Tamil Nadu and rest of the Southern States. This imbalance should be gradually regulated in a manner without affecting the economy of the mills. It is also necessary that spinning mills in the Southern region should be helped to have the required number of looms, and those mills should also become composite mills in course of time.

Regarding the handloom sector, in my opinion, the relief, if any, given is too inadequate. With all the problems on hand, it is only the handloom industry that provides employment to a larger section of the people engaged in the textile industry as such. I would, therefore, appeal to the hon. Minister to examine whether anything more could be done to the handloom sector.

In my opinion, giving the responsibility of producing controlled cloth to the handloom sector by itself is not a relief to the handloom sector. It is more a case of relieving the composite sector from the burden of producing the controlled cloth and just passing on the burden to the ill-fated handloom sector. Unless the handloom sector is assured of regular availability of yarn at a reasonable price, it will be too big a burden for the handloom sector to bear and discharge. It may also affect the availa-

[Shri M. S. Ramachandran]

bility of controlled cloth to the poor people of the country. At this stage, I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister that no section of the textile industry including the co-operative sector which are supposed to be co-operative venture of handloom-weavers themselves, have not been helpful to the handloom sector. In spite of clear directions from the Textile Commissioner to the spinning mills that a specified quantity of their production of yarn should be only in banks, none of spinning mills including the co-operative mills follow those directions. It is unfortunate that the Inspectorate of Textile Commissioner's office also did not take serious note of the lapse. As a result, there were very often periods of non-availability of yarn even at unreasonable prices. Unless the Government makes up its mind to help the handloom sector by making available regular supply of yarn at reasonable price, this sector which is not only providing employment to larger section of the people but also very dear to the Father of the Nation, will have its natural death in course of time. I, therefore, repeatedly appeal to the hon. Minister to re-examine the policy with regard to suffering of the handloom sectors and I hope the hon. Minister will react favourably. With these words, I welcome and support the New Textile Policy.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Chairperson, let me say at the beginning that the Textile Policy was formulated without consulting the trade unions at all. This is an example how the Government would like the participation of the workers in the execution of its own policy. Let me also state that the Report of the Textile Enquiry Commission was not published because it would have made the position of the Government inconvenient. Under this situation, we are discussing the policy called the Textile Policy.

Madam, the first point that arises is: Whom shall this policy benefit;

whether millions of Indian people living on the povertyline or just above the povertyline will be able to get cloth, coarse cloth, of course, at a price within their meagre purchasing power? My point is whether this policy shall result in the increase of production at a less price for the millions of the Indian people. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us whether this policy shall generate more employment opportunities in the country as a whole, which will give the people a little more purchasing power to buy a little more food and cloth for the millions. Thirdly, I would like the Minister to tell us whether the policy will result in the punishment of the management of the NTC mills who had been misusing their office and making money for their own benefit. Fourthly, I would like to ask the Minister to explain kindly whether this policy will punish the private mill owners who had been exacting as much as possible from the industry diverting the funds from this industry, investing it somewhere else, may be, outside the country, even eating up the contributions made by the workers to the ESI and the provident funds and thereafter discarding the industry as a sick industry. All these questions are relevant just to come to the conclusion whether the policy is progressive or regressive, reactionary or it will mean a little more advance. To raise the question again who will benefit by this policy, let me quote Madam Chairperson, not a radical Congressman, neither shall I quote Mr. Maken, whom you might not have forgotten, who, on the day before he was murdered, delivered a speech in Lok Sabha, and I shall request the Minister himself to keep in mind that I shall not quote people like this, but I shall be quoting the Secretary-General of the Indian Cotton Mills Federation. I am in possession of a statement issued by him published in the Financial Express on the 23rd July, 1985. The gentleman says and it is his statement. He begins the statement of the research bureau and I quote: "Almost all the demands of

the mill sector as to the parity with the powerloom, freedom of the fibre use, adequate availability of fibres, liberal and concessional import of the machinery for modernisation, permission for closure of non-viable units etc. has been conceded by the Government." There ends the statement of the bureau. Then there is the comment of the General Secretary. He says: "In fact, this is so," What a great character certificate for the Minister himself and what a great compliment for the policy that he tends to pursue in the country! Therefore, this is a policy which in the opinion of Mr. Radhakrishna, General Secretary of that organisation it is in his words, that this policy shall benefit not the small powerloom sector, not the small handloom sector, not the NTC mills, but the big textile barons for whom he has been too generous to offer concessions, for whom he has been too generous to offer liberal import licences, for whom he has been too generous to give the right to close down the mill, which they consider to be non-viable. Therefore, it is clear whom the Minister serves, who will benefit from the policy that he stands to explain today in the House.

To give an example, Madam Chairperson, let us take the example of the janata cloth which was produced by previously by NTC. The task of producing the janata cloth for the starving millions was the responsibility of the NTC mills. What was the target? The target was 65 crore square metres. Even then the NTC mills could not reach the target. It reached somewhere 35 to 40 crore square metres. It was their production. The NTC mills could not reach the target. Now the Minister has given the task to the handloom with much less productivity. He expects the handloom sector to reach the targetted production.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: Sixty-five crore square metres was the target not for the NTC. It was for NTC plus the handlooms and the NTC reached the target.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: It was never reached.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH: It was reached.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The Minister's statement strengthens my point. The production was never reached. The 65 crore square metre target was never reached. The NTC did not produce enough cloth, even at the rate of two yards per head for the Indian population. Is it not true? If this was true previously, it is going to be true more so in the future because handloom sector has much less productivity. How can he come to the conclusion? A powerloom, a worker in a factory can work four looms and can produce 120 square metre; in handloom a worker can work one loom and can produce 20 to 30 square metre. Therefore, my point is, this policy will result in non-availability of cloth production will be less and in the present system that we are living if the production is less price is bound to be high and it will go in the black market. Can the Minister tell us that it did not go into the black market? In the case of Calcutta NTC mills; the controlled cloth went to black market; it was sold to fictitious buyers and money could not be realised and the man; Mr. Banerjee; has not yet been prosecuted according to the criminal law. If that was the situation previously; more so will be the situation in the coming period. Therefore; this policy will not only ruin the NTC mills; it will not only ruin the handloom sector; it will mean less cloth for the people. Why? Handloom sector is known for its own characteristic brilliance. Now the sector which is known for its characteristic brilliance is being asked to produce Janata cloth; and it will never reach the target. Therefore; the handloom will lose all brilliance, nor will the target be reached. On the other hand, you do not ask NTC mills to produce Janata cloth. It means. NTC mills will have to enter into unequal competition with Gwalior Rayon, with Mafatlal and the other big textile giants who have

[Shri Gurudas Das Gupta]

modernised their industrial machinery and for whom he has the generosity so well. It means, NTC mills are going to be closed; NTC mills will be declared unviable and more unemployment is in the offing, more retrenchment is in the offing, more misery for textile workers in the offing. That is what our Minister stands for. (*Time bell rings*) only two minutes, many speakers have spoken much longer. Therefore, this policy will result in misery, unemployment, less production and more prices.

The point is, whom does this policy help? It only helps the big giants; big giants will eat up small people. As a result, NTC mills will be closed; more unemployment will be there. It is the Tatas, the Birlas, the Mafatlal, the Goenkas, the Kotharis, the Sarabhais and people like that who have been fleecing the country, who stand to benefit by the policy that the Minister has initiated. It is not the language I am speaking; it is the language (*Interruptions*). I think I could reproduce the statements that the Congress people made in the Lok Sabha. And I tell you one thing. On 12th of September there is going to be a strike in Calcutta. INTUC also is in support of the strike. What is their main demand? The main demand is reversal of the textile policy; the main demand of the strikers is reversal of the jute policy. Therefore, I compliment the Minister because his policy has resulted in our unity, beginning from INTUC, the AITUC, the CITU in West Bengal. There is going to be Bengal bandh and I feel if this policy is pursued by the Government we shall be having India bandh next time with the support not of left but with the support of many of our friends who are sitting there who are now supporting the Minister and many of whom will be forced to support us in the coming period (*Interruptions*). Akalis were always your friends; don't forget who was with Bhindranwale, who touched the feet of Bhindranwale. I will not

name him who touched the feet of Bhindranwale.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : महोदय, मैं टेक्सटाइल पालिसी के समर्थन में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे मित्र वेस्ट बंगाल के यह कहने हैं कि इस टेक्सटाइल पालिसी से बिरला को फायदा होगा, टाटा को फायदा होगा लेकिन उनके चीफ मिनिस्टर ज्योति बसु ने अभी दो दिन भी नहीं हुए कलकत्ता में सभी देश के बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Because you are not giving money to West Bengal. We have no love for Tatas and Birlas.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : जरा सुनिये तो सही। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैडम मेरा समय बरबाद हो रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष [डा० (श्रीमती) सरोजनी महिषी] : आप उनका जवाब दे रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री रामानन्द यादव : आप खड़े हो गये हैं आपको भी मैं जवाब देता हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) ...

मेरा समय बरबाद कर रहे हैं। ये सब हल्ला कर रहे हैं। ये बर्दाश्त करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। अभी ज्योति बसु जी ने जो कि वेस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर हैं उन्होंने इस देश के बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों को बुलाकर कहा कि वेस्ट बंगाल

[उपसभापति महोदय! पीठासीन हुईं]

को कैसे इम्प्रूव किया जाये ? आप यहां इंडस्ट्री लगाइये। हम आपको कंसेशन देंगे, बिजली में देंगे, वाटर में देंगे, एकानामिक कंसेशन देंगे ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Electricity is not concession. Tax is concession.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : बैठिये बैठिये।

मैडम, ये जो लोग हैं, इनके लिये कहने की बात कुछ तथा करने की बात कुछ और होती है। एक तरफ ये पूंजीपतियों को कंसेशन देंगे और दूसरी तरफ यहां पर इस तरह की बात बनाएंगे, यह इनकी आदत है। दूसरी बात, हमारी जो

बहुत जय ललिता जी है, जब मैं खड़ा होता हूँ तो वह भड़क उठती है। न मालूम मेरे खिलाफ उनको क्यों क्रोध आ जाता है। जब मैं कुछ इंटरफियर करने की काशिश कर रहा था तो उनका चेहरा ऐसा तमतमाया जैसे मैं जंगल का कोई शेर हूँ, ऐसा मुझे लगा। तो मैं बहने ...

कुमारी जयललिता : आपने यह नहीं कहा कि मैं शेर हूँ।

उपसभापति : आप अगर जंगल के शेर होते तो वह डर जाती।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मैं जानता हूँ कि इनकी अपनी कमजोरी है। इनको स्टेवरस को भी खुश करना है, हैडलूम सेक्टर को भी खुश करना है, टेक्सटाइल मैनेज्मेंट को भी खुश करना है, लेकिन जो उन्होंने कहा क्या उनकी पार्टी का कैरेक्टरिस्टिक है, आपका कैरेक्ट-रिस्टिक है कि सब लोगों को खुश करना है।

कुमारी जयललिता : माफ करना, आपने मेरा भाषण ठीक से नहीं सुना। फिर पढ़िये।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मैडम, सरकार ने यह नई पालिसी जो एक्सपोर्ट करने की प्रिपेयर की है इसके बेरियस कारण है। रिविजिट क्लाय जो पर-कैपिटल बढ़ना चाहिए था वह नहीं बढ़ा और इतना पैसा उममें पम्प करने के बाद भी बहुत सी इंडस्ट्रीज मिक कर गई। "पर हेड" जितना प्रोडक्शन होना चाहिए उसकी मात्रा भी नहीं बढ़ी है। इसके लिये मिनिमम टारगेट जो फिक्स किया गया, श्री डिफरेंट सेक्टर का, मिल सेक्टर का, हैडलूम सेक्टर का और पावर सेक्टर का, वह अचीव नहीं हुआ। केवल पावर सेक्टर ने अपना टारगेट अचीव किया है, लेकिन हैडलूम सेक्टर और मिल सेक्टर ने अपना टारगेट अचीव नहीं किया। इससे भी गवर्नमेंट वाध्य हुई इसके लिये एक एक्सपर्ट कमेटी बेंठे जा देखे कि हर वर्ष इस तरह से सिक मिले क्यों हो जाती है, कपड़े की पैदावार क्यों नहीं बढ़ रही है, कीमतें क्यों बढ़ती जा रही हैं। इसके कारण जो स्टेवर है वह अन-इम्प्लाइड हो जाती है। सबसे अधिक

अन-इम्प्लाइमेंट हैडलूम सेक्टर में है। 75 लाख आदमी हैडलूम सेक्टर में काम करते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि जो आर्गनाइज्ड मिन है, ट्रेड यूनियन है इनके मजदूरों की, उसमें इनके प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं।

उपसभापति : रामानन्द यादव जी, एक मिनट मैं आपका ध्यान इधर खींचना चाहती हूँ कि हम लोगों को यह डिसकशन 6.15 बजे तक खत्म करना है। इसके बाद हाफ एन आवर डिसकशन होगा जो कि 6 बजे शुरू होना चाहिए था। वह 6.15 बजे शुरू होगा। इसलिए कृपया संक्षेप में सब मेम्बर बोलें तो ...
(व्यवधान) अगर आप जवाब का इतजार करना चाहेंगे, तो कम बोलिये और अगर आपको जवाब नहीं चाहिए तो ...

We will finish the discussion today whether he answers or not.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA
(Gujarat): Madam, it will go up to 6.15 p.m.

उपसभापति : वस, वा फिर ब्रीफ हो जाइये।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : तो आर्गनाइज्ड सेक्टर भी ... (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't disturb.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): I want to make one submission. There are so many speakers from this side and that side. How are we going to finish by 6.15 p.m. today? If you want, you can extend it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, it cannot be extended. It has to be finished within the time allotted to it. It has to be finished today.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Why is more time given to some Members at the cost of others? I do not agree with that.

उपसभापति : आप दो मिनट में खत्म कर दीजिए।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : इसका क्या मतलब कि दो मिनट में ...

उपसभापति : इसका यही मतलब है कि आप खत्म कर दीजिए ।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मेरा सारा समय इन लोगों ने ले लिया और मुझको पेनेलाईज कर रहे हैं । एक महिला ने मुझे पेनेलाईज किया, अब आप भी मुझे पेनेलाईज करना चाहती हैं । मुझे पेनेलाईज मत कीजिए ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to be very strict. (Interruptions). You should address the Members.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : यह एक्सपर्ट लोगों ने एन्टायर टैक्सटाइल पालिसी को रिस्ट्रक्चर किया है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यह जो ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : मैं सभी से बोलूंगी कि आप डिस्टर्ब मत करिए । अगर आपको इतना ही शौक है, तो आप अपनी ... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सभी लोगों ने लोक सभा में ... (व्यवधान)

श्री रामानन्द यादव : यह मेरा समय बर्बाद कर रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : मेरी यह जानने की कोशिश है कि ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आपका समय आया तो आप मैत्री जी से पूछिए । उनके पास रिपोर्ट नहीं है; वह तो खुद भी पूछ रहे हैं ।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : तो यह रिपोर्ट का रेफरेंस क्यों दे रहे हैं ?

श्री रामानन्द यादव : यह मेरा समय बर्बाद हो रहा है । मुझे आप पेनेलाईज मत करिए ... (व्यवधान) ऐसा है मैडम ... (व्यवधान) बोलने दो ना भाई । मैडम हैडलूम को इम्पण्डस्ट्री में काफी त्वज्जह दी गयी

है । हैडलूम सैक्टर को जितनी भी सुविधा देनी चाहिये थी, मंत्री जी ने कोशिश की है, एक्सपर्ट कमेटी ने कोशिश की है कि हैडलूम सैक्टर जिसमें सबसे अधिक लोग एम्पलायड हैं, इस सैक्टर को हम अधिक से अधिक लाभान्वित करें । साथ ही साथ काटन कारपोरेशन आफ इण्डिया के रोल को इसमें डिफेंड किया है, एनलार्ज किया है । इस पहलू को भी हमारे मित्रों ने समझने की कोशिश नहीं की है और साथ ही साथ नेशनल हैडलूम कारपोरेशन है, जोकि वीवर्ज की नीड्स को कैंटर करता है, उसकी भी पावर को, शक्ति को बढ़ाने की कोशिश की गयी है । इसे पालिसी के माध्यम से जो वीवर्ज सैक्टर है, उसका कौनसा फायदे का काम इस पालिसी में एन्युमेरेट किया गया है, उसको मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ । जहाँ तक सबसे बड़ा काम जो देहात में वीवर रहता है, उसको क्या मिलना चाहिये ? यार्न का सप्लाई । टैक्सटाइल पालिसी में इस बात की कोशिश की गयी है, इस बात को बतलाने की कि इस पालिसी के माध्यम से यार्न की सप्लाई देहात में वीवर्ज को निश्चित रूप से मिलेगी । (समय की घंटी)

साथ ही साथ पहले वह यार्न बहुत महंगे रेट पर मिलता था, अब वह रॉजनेबल प्राईस पर मिलेगा । इसके साथ ही वीवर्ज को लोन मिलेगा और पोस्ट-लोन भी मिलेगा । अगर उसने कपड़ा तैयार कर लिया और तैयार करके उसका मार्केटिंग करना चाहता है, तो मार्केटिंग करने के लिये उसको फैसिलिटी मिलेगी । (समय की घंटी) मैडम, जरा ...

उपसभापति : नहीं यादव जी, दूसरे लोग भी बोलने वाले हैं । आप इतने मिनट बोल चुके हैं, और अगर अब आप बोलेंगे, तो रिकार्ड नहीं होगा Let him speak for half an hour. Please don't record.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : *

उपसभापति : आप आर्गुमेंट न करिये ।

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, हमारे मित्त रोज-रोज कसम खा रहे हैं, 21 वीं सदी में चलना है अब यह है 1985, अभी 15 वर्ष बाकी हैं इसमें, रामानन्द जी कूद कर पहुँच जायेंगे 2001 में अब महोदया, यह 15 सीढ़ी जो कूदेंगे, तो इनकी हड्डी और पसली बचेगी कि नहीं, यह मैं नहीं जानता ? शायद यह पहलवान हैं, इसलिये इनकी हड्डी बच जाए ?

उपसभापति : कुशवाहा जी, 5 वजकर 44 मिनट पर आपको अपना भाषण खत्म करना है, इसलिये आप चाहे टेक्सटाइल पालिसी पर बोलिये या फिर रामानन्द यादव जी पर बोलिये ?

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : मैं टेक्सटाइल पालिसी पर बोल रहा हूँ। ठीक यह वैसे ही है, यह पालिसी वैसे ही है। हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबों को सभी नारा देते हैं कि रोटी, रोजी और कपड़ा देंगे। लेकिन अभी तक दो गज भी कपड़े का औसत हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं बना। अभी कहा गया है कि एकदम एक्सपोर्ट लोगों में यह कपड़ा नीति बनाई है। अब मैं नहीं समझता कि कौन से एक्सपोर्ट थे। मिल वालों ने कहा कि हम कपड़ा नहीं बनायेंगे, तो आपने कहा कि मत बनाओ। उन्होंने कहा कि एक्सपोर्ट करेंगे, आपने कहा कि एक्सपोर्ट करो। उन्होंने कहा कि इम्पोर्ट करेंगे, तो आपने कह दिया कि इम्पोर्ट करो। उन्होंने कहा कि एक्सटेंशन कर लेंगे तो कह दिया कि यह भी कर लो। उन्होंने कहा कि बन्द भी कर देंगे, तो कहा कि बन्द कर लो। इसमें कौन एक्सपोर्ट का काम है, मैं नहीं समझता। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में रोटी और रोजी देना है, तो कम्प्यूटर और रेशनालाइजेशन से नहीं दे सकते। आपके यहां पूँजी की कमी है, और हाथ ज्यादा है। विदेशों की नकल करने पर हमारी हड्डी-पसली टूट जायेंगे। जैसे छत पर से 15 सीढ़ी छोड़ कर कूदने वाले की हालत होती है। जितना मशीनीकरण करेंगे, उतने ही

हाथ बेकार बनेंगे और पूँजी भी ज्यादा लगेगी। महोदया, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि सीमेंट फैक्ट्री में एक मजदूर को काम देने में 2 लाख 98 हजार 884 रुपये लगते हैं, तेल और गैस में 7 लाख 76 हजार 770, उर्वरक और रसायन में 1 लाख 80 हजार 547, उर्वरक निगम में 3 लाख 51 हजार 765, भारत प्रोसेस और मशीनरी इंजीनियरिंग में 36 हजार 603 और नेशनल टेक्सटाइल कॉर्पोरेशन में 17 हजार 720। अब महोदया, इसी के अनुपात में जरा चले आइए तो मिल में क्या लगता है प्रति हथकरघा पर काम देने में 50 रुपये, पावर लूम में 200 रुपये, पहले का आंकड़ा है लेकिन हिसाब में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ेगा, स्वचालित मिल में 1600 रुपये उत्पादन उसी में हथकरघा पर होगा चार गज, पावरलूम पर होगा 20 गज और मिल में होगा 80 गज। अगर पूँजी को हथकरघा और पावरलूम में बदल दिया जाए तो हथकरघा काम देगा 20 आदमी को, पावरलूम देगा 8 आदमियों को और मिल देगा एक आदमी को काम। महोदया, हथकरघा को तो छोड़ दिया लेकिन हैंडलूम और मिल को एक साथ जाननीय मंत्री जी ने मिला दिया। इन दोनों को समान स्तर पर माना जाएगा। क्या मैं आपसे पूछ सकता हूँ कि जितना ही लाख स्केल पर उत्पादन होता है उतनी ही लागत कम पड़ती है। जितना ही छोटे स्तर पर उत्पादन होता है, उतनी ही अधिक लागत पड़ती है। तो क्या यह छोटे सेक्टर पावरलूम ही सही हैंडलूम तो मरेगा ही पावरलूम को भी मरने का इंतजाम कर लेना है कि वह अभी मर जाए और सरकार की कोई मुविचारित नीति तो है नहीं, गल्ला पैदा करने के लिए कहा तो हमने पैदा कर दिया, रखने का गोदाम नहीं है। चीनी जब हम पैदा कर लेते हैं तो गन्ना जलाना पड़ता है और चीनी गोदाम में रिसने लगती है और अब हम बाहर से मंगा रहे हैं। ठीक वही हालत है मिलों को छूट देने से कपड़े का अगर उत्पादन बढ़ेगा और यह रेट कम होगा तो उसे खरीदने वाला

[श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा]

तो चाहिए । यह प्रचुरजग पावर कैसे बढ़ेगी, कप-शक्ति कैसे बढ़ेगी बिना काम दिए हुए ? अभी मंत्री जी ने कहा कि 10 लाख आदिमियों को रोजगार मिलेगा हमारे मित्रों ने कहा है कि 10 लाख बेकार होंगे तो एक लाला जी थे । वे नदी के किनारे पहुंचे अपने दो बच्चों को कंधे पर लेकर वह दो डग गए, उन्होंने हिसाब लगाया कि दो डग पर इतना पानी है तो पूरे 10 डग पर इतना पानी होगा । तो ग्रौसन लगाया कि 4 या साढ़े 4 फीट से कम पानी है । चल दिए, तीसरे डग पर जाते हैं तो गड़ढ़े में गिर जाते हैं । बच्चे वह गए और आप बहकर किनारे पहुंच गए उस पार, वहां जाने पर उन्होंने कहा कि नेखा-बोखा काहे और लड़का डूबा काहे ? ठीक वही हालत माननीय मंत्री जी की है । मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि गरीबों की कीमत पर आप मित्रों को जो सुविधा दे रहे हैं ... (समय की घंटी) ... मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ, कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर को गाली दूँ । हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर ने हमारे प्राइवेट सेक्टर की बुराइयों और पब्लिक सेक्टर का बुराइयों दोनों को एक साथ ले लिया है और अच्छाइयों दोनों की छोड़ दी है ।

उपसभापति : कुशवाहा जी, आपके पांच मिनट हो गए....

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : अगर आपकी इजाजत नहीं होगी, तो एक शब्द नहीं बोलूंगा । लेकिन लोगों ने पांच की बजाय दस-दस पन्द्रह-पन्द्रह मिनट लिया है ।

उपसभापति : वह तो गलत काम किया है।
Two wrongs can not become one right.

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : तो मान्यवर, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि बागा बांटने की बात हो रही है । राशन की तो सारे देश में चीनी बंटती है, जब मैं समझता हूँ कि गांव के जो लोग हैं, उनको मालूम होगा कि उनके गांव में कितनी चीनी बंटती है और वही हालत है डलूम के बुनकरों के घागे की होने वाली है ।

कागजात में सब बंट ही जाता है, सस्ती दर में बंट ही जाता है, कोई भ्रष्टाचार नहीं लेकिन वास्तव में मिलता किमी का सही दाम पर नहीं और न ही टाइम पर मिलता है, उनको रूला-रूलाकर मिलता है ।

महोदया, अगर मंत्री जी 21वीं सदी में चलना चाहते हैं । तो मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि आप मिल का कपड़ा बाहर भेजिए, बढ़िया से बढ़िया कपड़ा बतवाइए, अधिक उत्पादन बरखाइए, जैसे कि रेणुकूट में विरला साहब के थर्मल पावर में 90 मेगावाट का जो है, उसमें 120 मेगावाट बिजली पैदा होगी और हमारे जो 3000 मेगावाट के हैं, उन्होंने 700 से 1000 मेगावाट तक या उससे अधिक नहीं किया । तो प्राइवेट सेक्टर तो जो अच्छाईया है, उसे क्यों नहीं ले रहे हैं ? बुराइयों तो सब आप लेना चाहते हैं । इसलिए महोदय, मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि इन बुनकरों की रक्षा होनी चाहिए और देश में जब तक रोटी और रोजी का प्रबंध नहीं होगा, रोजी का प्रबंध नहीं होगा तो रोटी का भी नहीं होगा और यह आपकी कपड़ा नीति तो बुनकरों को बेकार बनाएगी, अधिक से अधिक लोगों को बेकार बनाने के बाद कप-शक्ति खतम हो जाएगी और कपड़े का जो लाभ आप सोच रहे हैं, वह आपको नहीं मिलेगा... (समय की घंटी) .

उपसभापति : श्री चिमनभाई मेहता —

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chair person now I have to say....

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : एक मिनट और महोदया... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : कुशवाहा जी, मैं पहली दफा यह बनाना चाहती हूँ हाऊस को, कि अगर चेयर चाहे और टाइम का सही मायने में बंटवारा करे, तो कोई मेम्बर बोल ही नहीं सकता । इसलिए आप लोग जो झगड़ा करते हैं समय के लिए, तो सोचकर करना चाहिए क्योंकि पांच मिनट में आप क्या बोलेंगे तीन मिनट में क्या बोलेंगे ? चेयर कितना कोअपरेट करती है आप लोगों के साथ, इसका भी ध्यान रखना चाहिए और

आप लोगों को भी कोपरेट करना चाहिए . . .
(श्ववधान) यह समय आपका काउण्ट
नहीं हुआ चलिए, एक मिनट में खतम
कीजिए ।

Let him conclude, Mr. Mehta.

श्री राम नरेश कुशवाहा : महोदया,
मेरे एक दोस्त ने कहा कि सिथेटिक धागे से
कपड़ा तैयार करेंगे । सूती कपड़े की ही
लुंगी बनती है, बण्डी बनती है और मान-
नीय मित्र हमारे डेढ़ सौ दो सौ की साड़ी
खरीदेंगे । महोदय, हमारे पास दस रुपया
नहीं है लुंगी खरीदने के लिए, तो दो सौ
की साड़ी जो ड्यूरेबल होगी, तो
उसको कहां से खरीदेंगे ? गरीब के सामने
यह कहना कि संतुलित आहार करो, संतुलित
खाना खाओ । सूखी रोटी तो दो वक्त की
मिलती नहीं, संतुलित आहार क्या करेंगे ?
सिथेटिक धागा चलेगा, अब लुंगी खरीदने
के लिए तो पैसा है ही नहीं कैसे खरीदेंगे
सिथेटिक ? इसलिए सबसे ज्यादा जरूरी
है कि परचेजिंग पावर हो और यह
सिथेटिक धागा और दुनिया भर का धागा
उनको पता नहीं है कि आदिवासी किस तरह
से नंगा रहता है, आदमी गांव में उनको
पता नहीं है कि दो-दो गज कपड़ा लेकर
उसमें से कितना ओटता है, कितना
पहनता है ? जिनको यह पता नहीं है, वह
सिथेटिक धागे की बात करने हैं
(समय की घंटी)

इसलिए मैं अपनी बात खतम करते
हुए आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि सिथेटिक
धागे को आप जो बढ़ाएंगे, तो इससे किसानों
का गला भी कटेगा, छोटे मजदूरों का
भी कटेगा और उपभोक्ताओं का
भी कटेगा । जिस गरीब की दुहाई
हम सब लोग करते हैं, वह उजड़ता जाएगा
. . . . (समय की घंटी) ज्यों-ज्यों
दवा की, मर्ज बढ़ता ही गया ।

उपसभापति : श्री चिमन भाई मेहता ।
यह सब आप पर भी एप्लाइ करता है ।
कृपया अपना भाषण संक्षेप में करिएगा ।
It applies to everybody.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA:
Madam Vice-Chairperson, I welcome
some of the aspects of the new textile

policy because they are step forwards
compared to earlier, past policies, and
tries to correct certain failures of
1978 and 1981. And, therefore, I think
this House should give a serious con-
sideration and should offer construc-
tive suggestions for the new textile
policy.

First of all, I have to express some
concern, because I come from Gujarat,
that 24 textile mills were closed dur-
ing the last few years. Only six have
been reopened partially, and 18 mills
are still closed. I am going to con-
gratulate our Minister because a few
days back in Bombay he declared that
the textile mills of Ahmedabad were
going to be nationalised soon and that
the Government of India was going to
offer certain loans so that the mills
could be reopened and that the pro-
duction could be resumed. Although
the official announcement has not come
it was announced in Bombay, and I
read it in the newspapers. He may
correct me. I am congratulating him
because he has considered the concern
of the workers and also helped the
situation in Gujarat.

My point is this, that mills are get-
ting closed today. I think, around
70 mills are closed, and mainly the
management is responsible. In the
textile policy document so many causes
have been given, but the most im-
portant cause is the mismanagement
of the textile industry. And, therefore
the textile industry, in consultation
with the Finance Ministry and other
Ministries, should work out a scheme
that whenever there is an apprehen-
sion of a unit going sick, it should be
taken over at that stage and not after
the whole thing is closed down. Other-
wise, there will be so many mills which
will remain closed. Therefore, some
preventive measures also should be
worked out to teach a lesson to those
who are mismanaging the economy.

After speaking about this, Madam, I
would like to say what is required of
the new textile policy. Some of the
Opposition speakers have spoken as if
they were not concerned with the pro-

[Shri Chimanbhai Mehta]

sent-day situation. This textile policy is taking care of the production and the growth of the production. This textile policy takes care of the consumer to provide a cheaper cloth. This policy takes care of the farmers so that cotton should be grown more and more and that remunerative price should be offered to them. This textile policy takes care also of the workers' welfare, although I am little afraid whether with the modernisation of the mills the workers are going to be retrenched or not. That should be clarified by our Minister. With these four aspects which are very relevant for the new textile policy this policy has taken care of the growth of production, the consumers' interests, and the farmers' interests and the workers' interests—I do not understand why the modernisation should be considered as trying to create more and more unemployment. When the State sector is there, when 125 NTC mills are functioning under NTC and the State has taken care of the closed mills by taking them under its own management, let us not create only a fear complex. Let us warn the Minister that there should not be more unemployment, that there should not be more closures. They should be a little hopeful about it. We should also have some consideration for the foreign market also because we are earning, according to this policy document, twenty per cent of the foreign exchange we are getting by exporting textiles. I may be corrected. The figure is a little more than what is indicated in other documents. Whatever it may be, textiles are one of the very important resources for earning the foreign exchange. And, therefore, the modernisation is a must. Those who are giving so many warnings about the modernisation, are not taking any care of this export aspect or growth of our industry from that angle.

Now, about the handloom sector, the people who do not wear the handloom cloth at all, have shown concern about it. About the handloom sector, I have

gone through the document. The handloom sector wants raw material, yarn. Yarn is going to be provided at a reasonable price and in the required quantity. Then the handloom sector is guaranteed about sale of its products. Regarding marketing of handloom produce, the entire produce will be consumed by the State to provide cheap cloth or janata cloth for the people. Therefore, no problem of marketing is there. The handloom sector is also going to be modernised. It is a good thing. Then the handloom workers are going to be given housing facilities. It is a good measure. These handloom workers are also being given loans. When we are giving so much facilities to the handloom sector, I do not think that one should be panicky about this sector.

Of course, modernisation is required for the foreign market. I think all the aspects have been taken care of. I once again request our Honourable Minister that when the workers are retrenched by the mill owners the Government should ensure that there is modernisation without tears. Because the mill owners when they try to modernise, they try to overthrow the workers ruthlessly. That care should be taken, because the workers are supporting this Government and this textile policy. They should not suffer on this count. Otherwise one of the very good textile policy that has been formulated will suffer. In future the criticism might come that this textile policy was worked out in favour of some vested interests also.

With this warning, I welcome the new textile policy and request the Honourable Minister to take care about implementation. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. C. Lakshamanna, please take only five minutes.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, since the time is a constraint, I will straightway take up the statement made by the Minister just now on the

floor of the House which has been a repetition of what he had made earlier that he is able to create ten lakh employment opportunities as a result of this textile policy. The reasons given are very simplistic that a worker works for 150 days in a year and produces 4 metres of cloth per day. He also stated that 900 million metres of cloth which would minus 300 million metres of cloth which is at present produced comes to 600 million metres of additional requirement. If 600 million metres are divided by 600 it will be one million job opportunities in handloom sector. Therefore, there are ten lakh employment opportunities. But my big but is: will the Minister realise the implication of this statement? If a person works for 150 days in 365 days—what type of employment is this? Is it full employment? Is it under-employment? Is it unemployment? Some hon. friends have said that it has not crossed under-employment. As a result of this policy he will be creating under-employment opportunities of ten lakhs in this country by which he will be only distributing poverty? He will be only distributing unemployment. On the other hand, if he is prepared to guarantee and assure this House that he would pay Rs. 10/- per metre—if he is prepared to say "Let me assure on the floor of this House that I will give Rs. 10 per metre for the cloth that is produced over and above the cost that is involved in giving the yarn and the incidental expenditure." Of course, it comes to $600 \times 10 \times 600 / 12$ —Rs. 500— which is still grazing on the poverty line; it is just perhaps a little above. Even if he is prepared to assure that he would give Rs. 10 per metre to that unfortunate weaver who is bringing in the employment opportunities then and then alone he would be able to bring them above the poverty line. If that is the objective of this Government, let this Government do whatever they want. What is the point in talking about millions or lakhs of job opportunities without realising the implications. Is it so simplistic? If it is so simplistic by now the country would

have been having full employment. But this Government for 37 years has failed and by advocating a policy of this nature he is only making sure to the world that they are not serious about what they are doing. This is the first point.

There are so many points on which I have done research, but I am unable to point them out due to constraint of time. Then, I will read out one statement:

G. P. M.

"I agree that unless and until we can ensure regular supplies of yarn at reasonable price to the handloom weavers and until and unless, we can move towards modernization of the looms, it will not be possible to bring down the cost of production and unless we bring down the cost of production, it would be difficult to make it and it would not be possible to compete with the two other sectors".

This is a statement made—Madam, do you know, who made this statement? The Minister of State for Commerce made this statement in this very House. Only about three months back, the Minister for Commerce made this statement in this House that unless these three conditions are fulfilled, the handloom industry will not be able to compete with the powerloom industry and the mills. I now want to know: has the Minister taken any steps to ensure such conditions as laid down by the Minister of State for Commerce for itself? What are those steps taken? Has he made any efforts, envisaged any efforts to supply yarn at reasonable prices to the weavers? How he will create ten lakhs of jobs in this country and fulfil the target of creating ten lakhs of employment opportunities in this country. What is the effect this statement, Madam, which the Minister delivered on the floor of the House? Then, Madam, in pursuance of the policy of modernization, of taking the country to the 21st century, they wanted to have a new textile policy for which a Committee was

[Prof. C. Lakshmanna]

appointed with the Secretary of Commerce as the Chairman and the Committee has submitted its report. Whether that report has been forming the basis for the new textile policy or not, we do not know, because this Committee's report has not been placed on the floor of the House. This House has every right to know what is the conclusion drawn by the Committee which has been appointed? But you will not do it. At the same time, you go one step further clarifying that it is secret. Is it a nuclear bomb? Is it something which is affecting the national interest so much that you will have to classify that document as secret. Therefore, I demand from the Minister for Textiles that he should make it possible to place the report on the floor of the House. (Interruption)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He started it a little late. Let him conclude.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I am concluding. I am concluding with two statements. These two statements are arising out of the two policy statements of 1981 and 1985. These are two statements of this very Government, if anybody wants to compare that what is the type of protection that is being given to handloom industry even in 1981 policy resolution and what is the type of protection that is being given in the 1985 resolution. Therefore, I draw the attention of this House to kindly go through these two reports. For want of time, I am not quoting. Otherwise, I would have quoted and showed how the present textile policy, as enunciated by this Textile Minister is nothing but a slap, a slur on the handloom weavers. He is kicking so hard at the back of the handloom weaver today that he will go deep into the debris from where he will never be able to come back and if that is the intention of the Government I must congratulate the Minister, kudos to him, congratulation to him for hav-

ing thrown off 1 crore of people who are depending upon handloom industry into nightmare.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Thank you very much.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

On points arising out of the answers given in the Rajya Sabha on the 14th March, 1985, to Starred Question 15 regarding vacant posts in the Jawaharlal Nehru Institute of Post-Graduate Medical Education and Research, Pondicherry and on the 20th March, 1985, to Starred Question 105 Regarding De-recognition of Degrees of Coimbatore Medical College and the Jawaharlal Nehru Institute of Post Graduate Medical Education and Research, Pondicherry

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are starting half-an-hour discussion. Five minutes late, we are starting it. At 6.35, we will finish. Shri Gopalsamy will take 15 minutes. Then the Minister will reply. Where is the Minister?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): He has gone somewhere.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You start now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: No, no. I cannot start it. Let the Minister come. Then I will initiate it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister has come. Now you start. We are starting the discussion at 6.05 and we will finish it up at 6.35. 15 minutes will be taken by Shri V. Gopalsamy. Then the Minister will reply. Then there will be a few questions and at 6.35 it will be over. Half-an-hour.