

श्री सुल्तान सिंह : मोहतरिम सदर साहब, मेरा आप से नम्र निवेदन है। आप मुझे कहने दीजिए। इतनी देर में मैं अपनी बात कह लेता।

آپ سبھا ادھمکھس (شری سید

نظام الدین) : یہ آپ کے کہنے کی

بات نہیں۔ بات یہ ہے کہ آپ سے پہلے یہاں سے کئی اور انپیل ممبرس بولنا چاہتے تھے اور وہاں سے دویدی جی بولنا چاہتے تھے ہم نے ان کو منع کر دیا۔ آپ بولیں گے تو ہم کپسے کاروائی چلے دیں گے۔

†[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सैयद निजामुद्दीन) : यह आपके कहने की बात नहीं है। बात यह है कि आप से पहले यहां से कई और आनरेबिल मम्बरस बोलना चाहते थे और वहां से द्विवेदी जी बोलना चाहते थे हमने उनको मना कर दिया। आप बोलेंगे तो हम कैसे कार्यवाही चलने देंगे।]

श्री सुल्तान सिंह : इतनी देर में कह देता। आप मुझे कहने दीजिए

آپ سبھا ادھمکھس (شری سید

نظام الدین) : آپ کے کہنے کی بات

نہیں۔ جب میں کہہ رہا ہوں اتنے آدمیوں کو روکا تو آپ کو کپسے اجازت دے دوں گا۔

†[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सैयद निजामुद्दीन) : आप को कहने की बात नहीं है जब मैं कह रहा हूँ इतने आदिमियों को टोका तो आपको कैसे इजाजत दे दूंगा।]

SHRI GIAN CHAND TOTU (Himachal Pradesh): He wants to give a personal explanation.

श्री सुल्तान सिंह : मोहतरिम सदर, मेरी आप से दरखास्त यह है कि इस हाउस में और हिन्दुस्तान के अखबारों में एक खास कम्युनिटी को बदनाम करने की कांशिश

जा रही है और ऐसा तात्त्विक उस से है। जहां तक इस बात का तात्त्विक है, यह जमीन बहुत पहले अलार्ड हुई थी। कभी यहां झगड़ा नहीं हुआ। गांव में सदियों से जाट और नान-जाट बसते चले आये हैं। हरिजन और जाट बसते चले आये हैं और वहां कभी झगड़ा नहीं हुआ। यह झगड़ा क्यों पैदा हुआ? इस लिये पैदा हुआ कि जनता पार्टी की गर्दन जो है वह अरबन लोगों के हाथ में है, शहरियों के हाथ में है और वह चाहते हैं कि देहात के 80 फीसदी लोगों को आपस में लड़ा कर वह हकूमत करते रहें। उन्होंने किसानों को एक ओर उजाड़ा गन्ने के मामले में, किसानों को उजाड़ा गेहूं के मामले में, किसानों को उजाड़ा कपास के मामले में, और अब यह एक नयी चाल है जनता पार्टी की कि गांव के हरिजनों और जाटों को आपस में लड़ा कर पूरी कम्युनिटी को बदनाम किया जाता है। हम कहते हैं कि अगर जाट की लड़ाई हरिजन से होती है तो वह कंजावाला में होती। लेकिन वह मोरारजी के घर पर इस लिये आये कि वह मोरारजी को दिखाना चाहते हैं कि आज ज्यादातर उन के साथ हो रही है और मैं जनता पार्टी के लोगों को बताना चाहता हूं कि यह जो टेडेसी है कि गांव के लोगों को लड़ा कर शहर के साहूकार और कुछ पूंजीपति इस देश को खा जाये यह ज्यादा दिन चलने वाली नहीं है।

آپ سبھا ادھمکھس (شری سید

نظام الدین) : آپ تشریف رکھئے۔

شری اے۔ جی۔ گلکرنی - شری دوے - شری خورشید عالم خان -

†[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सैयद निजामुद्दीन) : आप तशरीफ रखिए। श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी, श्री दवे, श्री खुरशीद आलम खां।]

DISCUSSION ON THE TEXTILE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I

beg to raise a discussion on the textile policy of the Government laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 7th August, 1978. As the House is aware, the policy statement on the face of it makes a really impressive reading. But if examined carefully, in the ultimate analysis the net result is that it has benefited the private sector immensely and, most probably, that was intended to.

Sir, cotton textile is one of the biggest industries of our country and most probably that was the reason that the Department of Textile was created on 18-3-76 to focus attention on the development of the textile industry which is vital in the national economy.

Sir, the protection provided to this industry and the Swadeshi movement is responsible for its tremendous progress during the last 30—40 years. Some idea about the industry can be had from the fact that there are 702 textile mills, 414 spinning mills and 290 composite mills. Apart from this in the public sector also there are 105 textile mills which were taken over by the Government for management in 1975. These mills were taken over by the Government as sick mills but they were already on their way to recovery and were doing fairly well before, they again started falling ill during the last 15 months. It is rather unfortunate that whatever they had gained during this period they have gradually started losing again. The number of sick or losing mills is still increasing while the Government has made it known to everybody that they are not going to take over any more sick mills. That means the green signal has been given to the private sector that they can run their old mills to destruction, and then, in order to provide employment to the workers, all those mills will have to be taken over by the Government under their management. I want to ask this Government: Why can't they run, why can't they take over, some of the profitable mills which are doing well even now, where the intentions of the mill-

owners or the mill management are not very good? Therefore, let us have a bag of sick and healthy mills so that we can produce some better results. But it seems the Government is not prepared to do this in the interests of the private sector. The reasons are very obvious.

Mismanagement is the main factor for these mills falling sick and this management is normally family management because they do not want professional management. And family management normally runs these mills to destruction.

No doubt, the Government's new textile policy is an attempt to strike a balance between the conflicting interests of the industry, the poor consumer and the public Exchequer. However, in this exercise, intentionally, or unintentionally as I said earlier a very substantial concession has been given to the **private sector and they will not be** producing the cheap cloth which they were expected to do in the past. I would also like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has made any study, or checked up, as to which were the private sector mills which have failed in the past to produce the quota that was allotted to them, and if they have failed to produce their quota, what action has been taken and what penalty has been imposed. Under the new textile policy, the quantum of mill-made cheap cloth would be limited to 4,000 square metres annually. I am surprised that no consideration has been shown to the actual requirement and I do not know on what basis this quantum of 4,000 square metres was arrived at, who advised this and on whose estimate this decision was taken. The population of the country is increasing every year, yet we are maintaining the *status quo* in respect of this cheap cloth which is meant for the poorer sections of the society. Besides, the main burden of providing it will be on the National Textile Corporation which, as I said, is already in bad shape in respect of its 105 mills. Now should we not realise that the

[Shri Khurshed Alam Khan]

National Textile Corporation would be further burdened with this additional liability when already they were not doing well? I suppose this is being done in order to provide relief to the private sector.

It is hoped that the average price of controlled cloth will continue to be Rs. 2/- per metre as at present, but the subsidy of about Rs. 1.35 per metre will not be borne by the organised mills or the Government. The Government seems to be anxious not only to allow the mills to obtain the cost of production but also a return on the capital invested. Now the price mark-up leaves a fairly good margin for them. The Government will pay the difference in the cost of production and selling price and will recoup the loss by imposing a new levy on more expensive varieties of cloth produced. It means that the people who do not use the cheaper cloth which is meant for the poorer sections will have to pay extra and this extra money will go into the pockets of the private mill-owners. This is robbing Paul to pay Peter, I should say. The controlled variety of cloth is hardly 10 per cent of the total production of cloth in our country. The middle class and the white-collared people do not buy this cloth. When the additional levy will increase the price of the cloth which they are using, it means you are burdening those people who are already hard pressed for their expenses in the matter of buying cloth. Now, besides this, I am sure there are some more loose ends which need to be tied up. The rural areas will need bulk of cheaper varieties of cloth. But, do you have a proper marketing or selling arrangement in the rural areas? Because the distribution system is the most defective system and really what has happened is that where cloth is needed it has not reached and where it is not needed it is piling up. So unless you have a proper distribution system, this scheme will be a disaster and the benefits will not go to the poorer sections, for whom you claim to be

doing this. Are you sure you will meet their requirements and the people in the rural areas will get their requirements as they want, when they want and in the quantities they want. My own experience is that in the rural areas the way we want it and at the time we want it, it is really not available. Besides this, I would also like to say. Are you not aware that synthetic fabrics are fast becoming popular in low income groups in cities as well as in the rural areas. How do you propose to meet this situation? The people in the rural areas do not need only cheaper cloth but need this type of cloth also. What are your arrangements for distribution of this type of cloth along with the cheaper variety of cloth, particularly in the rural areas, where the need is felt?

As I said in the beginning, the policy statement makes an impressive reading, but it is doubtful if it will really help the industry or really ensure a promising beginning for the handloom sector or the khadi industry. A growing population is faced with a declining availability of cloth. This is the real trouble and this is the real problem which is facing the people today. Indeed, the production of cloth by mills has not much increased over the years. It was 4,205 million metres in 1952 and had reached only 4,316 million metres in 1974-75, being the last boom of the textile industry. Now the population is also increasing. Yet the production of cloth is not increasing. Therefore, you can imagine about the requirement and the availability. How are you going to check the number of finer varieties in which the private sector mills are particularly interested to produce because they find that there is a better margin of profit in that?

Now, Sir, it is a known fact that the industry has certain traditional problems of raw materials, the most important of them being the price of cotton. The cost of cotton accounts

for 55 per cent of the total production cost and the price of cotton has been tremendously fluctuating from season to season, from year to year, and from area to area. What is being done about it? You have said that you are going to have some buffer stock with the Cotton Corporation. Well, I will come to that later on. The Indian cloth situation is most unpredictable and is ever-changing and the textile industry is kept guessing year after year regarding price and availability. This is the main trouble, this is the root cause of the trouble of the textile industry in the country, but we find that there is very little that the latest policy of the Government is going to do about it.

The basic reason for variation in cotton production is the dependence of almost 80 per cent of the cotton producing areas on the vagaries of the weather, they entirely depend upon the rains. And this is a known fact that all the crops that are entirely dependent upon the rains, have an element of uncertainty and that that element of uncertainty is the cause of the tremendous fluctuations, advantage of which is taken by those mill-owners who have money to buy and stock while the others including those of our National Textile Corporation, suffer for lack of raw material.

Apart from this, there is another very important factor because of which even the National Textile Corporation has miserably failed, and that is that the cotton supplied to the mills is generally excessively dirty and variable in its staple length and contains a great deal of immature fibre. Besides, fluctuations in the price are always there. Unless they get proper type of raw material, it is not possible for the mills, whether they are in the private sector or in the public sector, to produce the desired type of cloth and the desired type of quality, and the result is that all the cloth that is produced with this sort of material, is not of any use.

Now the Cotton Corporation of India is being assigned the responsibility of building buffer stock besides its normal functions. May I remind the Hon. Minister that it is the general opinion in the country that we are expecting too much from the Cotton Corporation keeping in view its past performance? Its past performance has not been very creditable, and, therefore, we are very doubtful whether the Corporation will be able to rise to the occasion and discharge this important assignment properly. It is earnestly hoped that the cotton growers will not be subjected to further harassment and that the growers will be assured of a reasonable price for the produce. It is also hoped that the Corporation will rise to the occasion and do the needful.

In the statement it has been promised that the modernisation programme in the organised sector would be accelerated. We have heard about it for the last 15 months. But what has really been achieved by now? The Hon. Minister should tell us. And I would also like to ask the Hon. Minister if he has made an assessment of the cost of modernisation of the textile industry. Take it from me that over one thousand crores of rupees are needed, and that this will cover a period of about five to seven years. So, if you are expecting that the textile industry will be modernised overnight and that you will be able to achieve the result which you have promised or you are expecting, then I am sure, you are asking for the Moon.

Much of the machinery in use is obsolete and inefficient and is responsible for the high cost of production of the cloth. According to the NTC's report, the Indian textile industry is losing 184 million kilogrammes of cotton yarn and 182 million kilogrammes of open price goods owing to obsolete machinery. Obviously, this adds to the production cost. Have you given any thought to it? Are you aware of it? Are you aware of the NTC's report? If not, please go

[Shri Khurshed Alam Khan]

through that report. it is a very useful report, and you will be able to learn many useful things from it.

Now, according to this report, the other major problem is the fluctuation in the textile industry. Uncertain supplies of raw cotton, inefficient management of financial resources, flight of the capital from the industry, dissipation of internal reserves and surpluses, heavy borrowing and a dividend policy unrelated to productivity, all these are really today taking our textile industry to its eventual destruction. Besides, the lack of will to plough back profits for the future is another important factor which should need your attention. You should ensure that this is done.

Now, the steadily growing list of sick textile mills has resulted in unemployment, and the future of the industry seems to be very bleak. Why can't the Government take over as I said earlier, some of the healthier mills and run them themselves so that they have a mixed bag of sick and healthier mills and they can really produce better results? According to the Reserve Bank estimates, the rate of gross profit in the textile industry between 1968-69 and 1972-73 has remained between 4.4 per cent and 6.9 per cent, as compared to an average of 8.8 per cent and 10 per cent for other industries. What is the reason for this low return? Are you sure that the accounts are kept in the proper manner? Are you sure that the proper accountability is there and proper auditing is done? I am sure, if this is looked into carefully, you will find that there is lack of proper maintenance of accounts and proper auditing of the accounts and this results in the misappropriation of money which should be declared as profits and which should go to the shareholder.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Please conclude.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN:
I am initiating the debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Your party has a long list of Members.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN:
One or two points only.

The industry suffers from mismanagement and needs professional management, which is very important. Now it is a fact that for the last few years, the industry has not been able to utilise its installed capacity to the extent of more than 73 per cent in the case of spindles and 68 per cent in the case of looms. I want to ask, why? I would like to know whether any study has been made, whether this defect has been removed or any attempt is being made to improve the existing situation.

The statement makes impressive reading but, really speaking, it does not visualise a higher national purpose or higher national goals. What about the quick double switch in official policy on polyester filament yarn? I hope this sort of performance will not be repeated as in the notorious rubber import scandal. We only hope that this will not be done in the case of the cotton buffer-stock in which it may be necessary to import from outside.

The situation regarding the availability of woollens and blankets at reasonable prices is another very important factor. It is necessary to have social control of the woollen sector in the interest of the weaker sections of the society. Otherwise, I am afraid you will not be able to provide them at cheap rates either woollen cloth or blankets. The hand-woven carpet industry is facing a grave crisis. The industry was flourishing as duty drawback in exports had been allowed up to now. Now, I would like to know how many firms have been authorised during the last 15 months to produce machine-made carpets. These machine-made carpets, I am sure, are running them out of business and a large number of people who are engaged in this hand-made carpet indus-

country will be completely out of employment. People want quick results, of which there is little hope. Well, everything is promised within the next five years or ten years. But may I know from the hon. Minister whether he will be there after five years to fulfil their promises? How long should people in the rural areas wait for employment through the promised expansion of handlooms and khadi and village industries?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Please be brief.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN: Yes, Sir, I am finishing.

The success of the policy will depend on how efficiently and effectively the buffer-stock is used to stabilise the price of cotton and its supply is ensured evenly. According to the forecast the estimated demand for cloth ranges between 16000 million meters and 26000 million meters by the turn of the century. Have you prepared any corporate plan for it? Are you planning on that basis? Or, are you just doing patch-work to pass time so that when the real time comes, when the real difficulty arises, you are not there to answer?

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): Sir, are you satisfied that he has finished the Industry Minister? He said he would finish the Industry Minister.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the policy statement on textiles is very important and it has been stated that both in terms of employment and for meeting one of the essential consumption needs of the people this industry is a pivotal industry. Blaming the previous Government, the Minister has said that there were many faults in the earlier policy. The real part begins in the policy statement at paragraph 3:

"The absence of clearcut and unambiguous policies relating to the various facets of this diverse industry, and the failure to set definite time-bound objectives, have been

largely responsible for this unhappy situation."

The situation is such that production has gone down very much. The industries are sick and consumption is also not properly made. And then the solution are given in a number of paragraphs. I will restrict myself to one or two items only. It has been said that he is having a new policy on controlled cloth and that controlled cloth will now be handled by the National Textile Corporation. And the limit fixed is 400 million square meters. The reasons given are: The losses suffered by the weaker mills on account of the production of controlled cloth has been one of the important contributory causes for their sickness, and exemption therefore is necessary. Now, is it a new policy that he is espousing? These mills were weak mills and were given exemption by the previous Government in July 1976. Not only that. Mills having exports of 20 per cent or more were given a lighter controlled cloth obligation. If you take the figures of controlled cloth obligation, in 1974-75 it was 822 million sq. meters; in 1975-76 it was brought down to 66 million sq. meters. The whole obligation has now been put on the National Textile Corporation that it will produce controlled cloth up to 400 million square meters and raise it in future or at any time when the handloom sector will develop itself to take it over. This statement is not only vague but it is playing into the hands of the employers, the big businessmen, the industry-owners who have been allowed to go scotfree. They have now no social obligations which they were discharging up till now although reluctantly. I know for a fact, coming from Maharashtra State, that many industry-owners are deliberately not producing controlled cloth so that the scheme should fail, because they want to make huge profits on export of textiles. There are very many varieties in textiles, not one or two or four. There are 50 to 60 varieties of cloth, very good

[Shri S. W. Dhabe]

cloth. I need not take the names. They are polyester, terycot and so on. These good varieties are only meant for people who can afford to pay a heavy price, who have got the capacity to pay more. This having export-oriented cloth. The controlled cloth which they are manufacturing, is of a inferior quality which cannot be used by the common man. Our annual cloth production is 8,000 million sq. meters and the obligation put on the textile industry could be to produce 1,000 million sq. meters. The scheme was based on this. I could have understood the scheme if this quantity of cloth which has to be produced had been equitably distributed to various sectors. After all my friend is a champion of socialism and had been working in the trade union field. If one thousand million sq. meters were the target fixed out of that 400 million sq. meters should have been given to private sector and 400 million sq. meters to the National Textile Corporation and the remaining 200 million sq. meters to the handloom sector. To put the entire responsibility on the National Textile Corporation was not very wise. They take over only sick units. Government have no funds to finance them or modernise the machinery of these mills. Is it prudent to give these sick units the entire responsibility of fulfilling this social obligation and producing only coarse cloth? Will they be able to do it? Or, is it the intention to give them back to their owners after 20 years under section 18-A of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act? I will plead with the hon. Minister to frame a rational textile policy under which the production of controlled cloth should be undertaken by every sector, including the private sector. The private sector should not be allowed to go without responsibility. They have also a social obligation. Therefore, they should also produce the standard cloth. Then, you expect

the National Textile Corporation to produce this much of standard cloth. Will they be able to do it? I shall explain the position of the NTC. The NTC was constituted not to run new textile units. Unfortunately that is the impression created. When we nationalised coal mines, it was said by Mr. Kumaramangalam that the intention was not merely to take over the mines, but also to expand them. What is the history of the NTC? The NTC has taken over 105 mills. What is the state of this industry? As on 1st January, 1977 we had 702 mills in our country. Out of these 412 were spinning units and 290 were composite units. The installed capacity was 19.75 million spindles and 200,000 looms. What is the Janata Government's performance in 1977-78? Only two mills were added. The number of spindles added are about 3 million and there has been no increase in looms. Therefore, your textile policy is mainly for the benefit of private mill owners. There has been no conscientious effort to expand the industry. May I ask the hon. Minister whether the NTC is meant only to run the sick industry? How many more new textile units have been set up? Has there been any planning done by the Corporation to set up new textile units? I know, Sir, coming from these areas, that the cotton grown in the Vidarbha areas, in the Nagpur area and other areas is taken away to some other place for the manufacture of cloth. Right from the year 1956, I would like to inform the Minister, schemes were there to have public sector units in the textile industry in the Vidarbha and Marathwada areas. Similarly schemes were there for the other cotton-grown areas of Gujarat and certain other places. If the textile units are expanded, will it not be useful if they are taken away from the Bombay city and are located in the areas where cotton is grown? I would like him to consider these things seriously. The textile policy of the Government is entirely dependent on the

organised sector. Whatever he may say and whatever he may think, it is impossible, in my humble opinion, to expect the handloom industry and the powerloom industry—they may be labour-intensive—to be able to give cheaper cloth than the organised sector. I do not think that it is possible. It is good for our country if we expand the two sectors. But, in the case of the textile industry as such, we should take into consideration all these problems. Otherwise, Sir, I would only say that the whole aim of providing cloth to every person will remain only a dream. The textile policy should not be only a policy of distribution or of giving what to which sector about which we have been hearing for the last ten or fifteen years. But, the question is one of a time-bound programme in the whole textile policy. Now, what is the time-bound programme. Is it there in the Government's textile policy? I could not find any. At this stage, Sir, I would like to give a few facts for the consideration of the House and also of the Minister. Is it possible to have a textile industry, a successful textile industry or any other industry without the co-operation of the working class? Sir, in the Industrial Policy Statement, a special paragraph is there on this subject and I would like to quote from the Industrial Policy Statement made by the Minister previously. It says:

"The most important single resource of any country is the skill and hard work of its people. We, in India, have an abundant supply of labour which is capable of acquiring new skills very quickly and also an existing reservoir of technical and managerial personnel. These resources can be used effectively only in an environment in which the workers and managers develop a sense of personal involvement in the working of the enterprise. Family control of business particularly in the field of large-scale industry is an anachronism and it will be Government's

policy to insist on professionalism in management. At the same time, ways and means have to be found to create amongst workers, both in public and private sector industries, a stake in the efficient working of their units. The Government are examining the possibilities of encouraging workers' participation in the equity of industrial units without in any way adversely affecting their interests."

Sir, in his Industrial Policy Statement of which their textile policy is only a part, is there any programme drawn up to dismantle the big houses, to dismantle the monopoly houses, which people are not professional managers, but who are people in whose hands there is only the concentration of money?

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: But that is what he claims.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: What steps have been taken? The Government has a stake in this industry, in the textile industry, and it is in this industry take place. As number of strikes take place. As my friend knows very well, in the textile units, many strikes take place for the solution of the problems of bonus and other things, the problem of rationalisation of the pay structures and so on and the working class that is there in this field is a conscious working class. But, Sir, what has been done during the past one year? I would only like to say two points in this connection.

I had put a question to the Labour Minister, Question No. 578, on the 11th August 1978, and he made a statement here that the Employees' Provident Fund authorities have given a statement to the effect that the arrears of provident fund outstanding against the textile mill workers, of mills taken over by the NTC, as on 31st March 1978, was Rs. 8,39,58,000. These are the arrears of the workers' provident fund which have not been paid by the previous owners from whom the mills have been taken

[Shri S. N. Dhabe]

over. It is not only that they have squandered the money, but also they have misused the money. Some of the owners who are running other textile mills are getting benefits from the Government and out of this, Sir, I am pained to say, Rs. 249.97 lakhs were the employees' share. The employees have paid the money to the previous employers and that money has not been recovered and the National Textile Corporation also does not pay the provident fund dues. Can you expect the workers to work hard to make success of this textile policy unless these problems are solved? Provident fund to the tune of Rs. 9.21 lakhs has not been paid by the Textile Corporation after its nationalisation. Sir, in this connection, I will like to state before this House that whenever this question of previous provident fund is raised, opinion is given that they are not responsible for the dues which the previous owners had to pay. Section 19(1) of the Nationalisation Act, 1974, provides that if the employees are entitled to receive any money, then it can be paid and recovered from the employers. At least it is expected of a trade unionist of a high order like Shri George Fernandes that this section 19(1) is used for payment of provident fund. Sir, they work for years together, they are on the verge of retirement. Many are retiring. I know personally about Nanded mill. They could not get their dues. Sir, section 21 of the Nationalisation Act, 1974, says that if the money is recovered by the Commissioner, the first category will be category No. 1, which will have priority over category 2 and 3. Category 1 is given in the Schedule. Sir, category 3 is the category for workers in relation to provident fund, salaries, wages and other amounts due to employees. Sir, I would submit that section 21 should be immediately amended and that priorities are rearranged properly. For no fault of the workers Rs. 8 crores are outstanding. Immediate steps should be taken to make this payment, Government

should take this responsibility. In fact, Sir, this policy was followed earlier whenever a mill was taken over. There was reduction in dearness allowance and other matters. And if they used to make profits, then the money was paid out of the profits by the mills by the National Textile Corporation or the State Textile Corporation. Therefore, my suggestion in this connection is that it should be very seriously considered. If the national policy has to be successful, then workers' payments must be given priority and they must be treated as partners in the industry. We have the biggest employment in the National Textile Corporation. It is to be seen how they make it successful. In the textile corporations there are many frauds. Many things are not properly maintained. To my knowledge, there is not even internal audit which should be done in the Corporation. One of the examples I would like to give is the Model Mills at Nagpur. Order was given to one Rathi Electricals, electrical company at Gandhi Bagh, Nagpur for the purchase of glass wool fibre. This electrical company is a black-listed company. But the order was placed. The actual value of the materials was about Rs. 600/- (six hundred) only. Payment was made to the tune of Rs. 59,000. When the Press reacted to it, the matter was enquired up and it was found that fraudulently this huge money was paid. Sir, I would like the Minister to take up this question about internal audit seriously and set up a machinery in order to find out whether what we call the committees for purchasing the articles are properly functioning or not. There is a large scope for improvement in the National Textile Corporations in this regard. I have only one more thing to say in this connection. It has been stated by the Government in the policy statement that they will not take over more mills, but the state Governments may run the textile mills. Many State Governments have taken over the mills and they have asked for nationalisation of these mills.

Unless nationalisation takes place, the Government will not be able to run all these mills efficiently and the investment will not be proper. Why should there be delay? You say that the State Government should run the mill. When proposals are sent to you for nationalisation of the mills, the matter is delayed. I would like that this matter should be taken up expeditiously and the nationalisation which the State Governments have asked for, should be done. It is not necessary for you to bring forward an Act for each unit. A general Act can be made by which the Government can take the power to nationalise the mills if it is asked for by a State Government. Unless it is done, I am afraid, the textile policy will fail. There are 35 units still closed. What are the reasons? This is going to be the main policy, the main premise, on which we want to work. The Government policy about the closed mills is not clear and it is not stated anywhere. I would like this House to consider the matter seriously because a large number of workers are out of employment. Textile production is falling down and we are not taking action to take them over.

Lastly, before I go to the other points, I would like the Minister to consider seriously about amending the Industrial Development Regulation Act of 1951. In this Act, the Government has to take over the mills and run them for temporary periods. In the Industrial Development Regulation Act, it was provided previously that they may take over for 15 years initially. Now, the maximum period is 17 years. It was 15 years previously. Once it is found that the management has failed, there is inefficiency and there is misuse of funds and the Government has made investments, the industrialists should not have any right to take the mill back. I will cite the case of Pulgaon textile Mill in Wardha District. The textile policy of the Government must be clear in this respect. If you want the

public sector and the national sector to succeed and if you want to make this take over of mills in order to improve the industry a milestone, then the Industrial Development Regulation Act has to be amended so that once the mills are taken over and public investment is made, the Government has the right to take them over permanently and the question of giving back the mills to the original owners would not arise. I know some cases in which the owners are waiting for the period to be over so that they may get back the industry under the Industrial Development Corporation Act. I would like to say one thing more. The Government's policy about production of cotton and monopoly procurement scheme for cotton was really not good. Firstly, the Maharashtra Government when it wanted to implement the scheme was not provided sufficient finance. Secondly, they wanted a legislation also. That could not come through as the Government did not give the finance, and the previous Government in Maharashtra gave up the scheme. The incentive to produce more in the cotton-growing area has withered away. The speculation is also such that the real cotton-growers do not get any benefits or the real price of cotton. Sir, it is admitted in para 9 of the Policy Resolution that the area under cotton cultivation has gone down. If you really want the scheme to succeed, if you really want the Textile Policy to succeed, it is essential to see that the cotton-growers get the proper price. And the measure towards that end is the cotton procurement scheme in Maharashtra and it must be continued and extended to all other areas. In this connection, Sir, I would like to mention that there are two institutions called the Cotton Corporation of India and the Cotton Development Council. I do not understand why two separate institutions are kept. Sir, I had an occasion to work in the Cotton Development Council for some time. The aims and objectives of these two institutions are the same.

[Shri S. N. Dhabe]

Therefore, I suggest to the hon. Minister to consider whether these two institutions can be amalgamated. Sir, the Cotton Corporation of India was given Rs. 10 crores for the purchase of cotton. Is it possible to have a buffer stock or control the prices with this meagre amount? Therefore, Sir, if you want the cotton policy to succeed, it is very essential to have a sound policy about the production of cotton, purchase of cotton, a proper functioning of the scheme at the State level, and provision of adequate finances to the Cotton Corporation of India. These are the essential features for the cotton policy to succeed. If we don't do that, the cotton-growers will lose interest in producing more and a day may come when we will have to import more and more cotton as we do now in cement and other articles. The Textile Policy should also include how we can have a variety of cotton, a variety of cloth which we require in sufficient quantities. The cotton-growers must get an adequate price for the same. Sir, in the coal industry we have got a policy to have pit-head power stations, and you have what you call the captive mines. Sir, I would also like to point out that it is high time we thought in terms of a national sector in textiles. If we do not have a national sector in textiles, if we do not take it to the commanding heights, the promise that we are making that the people will be given cheap cloth will remain a slogan, an empty slogan. Therefore, Sir, wherever the cotton-growers areas are there, I think, it should be a cardinal principle of the textile policy, specially of the National Textile Corporation, that they must open new units in the public sector. Sir, in this connection, I do not want to dilate more on this subject. But, Sir, the utilisation capacity of the textile mills is also an important aspect. How many textile mills use their capacity to the full? Is it production-oriented or only profit-oriented? Sir, whatever the Minister may say, I am sure the private sector can never think of the

needs of the society or the community. Their only motive is profit motive and to get more profits. Therefore, Sir, extension of the public sector, and in addition to that the co-operative sector, if possible, should be aimed at by the Govern-

4 P.M.

ment. Sir, in the textile industry we have not got much success. This is one of the oldest industries in our country. This is one industry on which a large number of workers and their families are depending for their livelihood.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

This is one industry on which—as cloth is called an essential requirement next only to food—the total economy of our country depends. Therefore, Sir, I would like to say that his statement on textile policy, which he has enunciated, lacks essential particulars and lacks, what we call, the exact programme of definite objectives. The definite objective of textile policy is, and there cannot be any two opinions about it, to provide cloth for every person in our country and the cloth which is to be provided has to be cheap and also of good quality. The controlled cloth scheme could not be successful even if the workers agree to help by consenting to have cloth in kind towards their wages, because the quality of the controlled cloth is not good. But the scheme failed mainly because of the obstructionist tactics of the employers and also because the quality of the cloth was not good.

(Time bell rings)

In China and many socialist countries the standard cloth scheme has been successful. I would appeal to the hon. Minister that this policy of having only quotas fixed for the N.T.C. for the controlled cloth is highly improper and irrational. For private textile mills and for the handloom sectors also there must be some quota fixed, as suggested above. If the national textile policy is to

succeed, the co-operation of all sectors and all sections in that industry is very essential. For that purpose, I hope the hon. Minister will amend the Acts and the Regulations and see that the workers claims are also properly paid. Thank you.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदय, ग्राम जनता के लिए रोटी कपड़ा और मकान, ये तीन आवश्यक चीजें हैं, जरूरतें हैं। इन की पूर्ति आजादी के बाद भी नहीं हो सकी है। जहां तक रोटी का सवाल है, इस विषय पर समय-समय पर सदन में चर्चा होती रहती है। इसी प्रकार से हमारे देश में जो मकानों की समस्या है, उस पर भी चर्चा होती रहती है। आज हम लोग देश में कपड़े की स्थिति पर विचार कर रहे हैं। इसके संबंध में सरकार ने एक नई नीति की घोषणा की है और उसके बारे में सरकार ने एक स्टेटमेंट सदन के पटल पर रखा है। उस पर हमें विचार करना है। सरकार को यह कदम इसलिए उठाना पड़ा क्योंकि परिस्थिति बहुत नाजुक हो गई थी।

13
कपड़े के मुलानिक कुछ कहने से पहले मैं कुछ आंकड़े आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। हमारे देश में आजादी के बाद, विशेष कर पिछले 20 वर्षों में पर-केपिटा कंजम्पशन कपड़े का क्या रहा है, उसको देखने की जरूरत है। मेरे पास जो सरकारी आंकड़े हैं उनके मुताबिक सन् 1955-56 में कपड़े का पर-केपिटा कंजम्पशन 14.4 मीटर था और सन् 1976-77 में जनता सरकार के आने के बाद पर-केपिटा कंजम्पशन 11.4 मीटर हो गया। ये आंकड़े सन् 1977-78 के लिए इकनोमिक सर्वे द्वारा दिये गये हैं। इस प्रकार से कपड़े के उपयोग में ह्रास होता गया और ग्राम जनता को कपड़े की आपूर्ति जितनी होनी चाहिए थी वह न हो कर हालत और भी बिगड़ती गई। आज यही बुनियादी समस्या हमारे देश के सामने है। कपड़ा उत्पादन की जो मिलें हैं जैसा कि स्टेटमेंट में कहा

गया है ओलडस्ट इन दी कंट्री, यह बात सही है। कपड़ा उद्योग की मिलें सबसे पहले हिन्दुस्तान में एक पारसी द्वारा जिसका नाम कावसजी नाना भाई दावर था ताड़देव बम्बई में 1853-54 में लगाई गई। उसके बाद कपड़े की मिलें बढ़ती गई और अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद और पूंजीवाद की बांह के नीचे में भी यह उद्योग बढ़ता गया। एक बढ़ोतरी जिसे कहते हैं, औद्योगीकरण के लिए थोड़ा सा रास्ता बना और मशरूम ग्रोथ हो गया। प्रोडक्शन होता गया लेकिन फिर जनता में आपूर्ति न हो सकी। आजादी के बाद उम्मीद थी लेकिन फिर भी जैसे मैंने बताया कि कपड़े की आपूर्ति में ह्रास होता गया। कांग्रेसी सरकार के मातहत खास कर पिछले 20 सालों में जो भी आंकड़े मैंने बताए कपड़े की आपूर्ति में ह्रास होता गया। इसलिए सरकार को यह कदम उठाने पड़े हैं। जो मिलें थी वह सिक होती गई। उत्पादन जिस रूप में होता चाहिए था, वह नहीं हो रहा है। उत्पादन करने के कारखाने बीमार होते गए। इसके बाद वितरण की बात आ जाती है जो कि एक बुनियादी बात है। समस्याएं बढ़ती गई इसलिए यह नीति चलानी पड़ी। स्टेटमेंट में जो उद्देश्य दिए गए हैं वे बहुत अच्छे हैं। इस का उद्देश्य है कि सस्ते कपड़े का उत्पादन हो और उसकी आपूर्ति हो। कम दामों पर ग्राम जनता को कपड़ा मिले, यह इसका पहला उद्देश्य है। यह स्टेटमेंट, यह नीति जो पिछले सप्ताह रखी गई है उसका पहला उद्देश्य यह है कि सस्ते कपड़े का उत्पादन ज्यादा हो और बड़े पैमाने पर मिले। यह सस्ता कपड़ा ग्राम जनता को मिले जो कि आजादी के बाद महरूम होती रही है। तो यह एक बहुत अच्छा उद्देश्य है। इसके साथ ही साथ जो सस्ते कपड़े का उत्पादन हो उस का सही ढंग से सस्ते दामों पर वितरण भी हो, यह इसका दूसरा उद्देश्य है। इसका तीसरा उद्देश्य यह है कि जो हथकरघा, हैंडलूम, खादी और सिल्क वाले उद्योगों के

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

कपड़े है उनका विकास हो उनके जरिये कपड़ा बने और आपूर्ति हो, और इनके साथ छोटे उद्योग हैं जो रेशमी, खादी और ऊनी कपड़ा तैयार करते हैं उन से भी आम जनता को रोजगार मिले। इसमें रोजगार देने की बात आती है, यह इसका तीसरा उद्देश्य है। इसका चौथा उद्देश्य यह है कि जो हैंडलूमस हैं, सिंथेटिक कपड़ा है, फाईबर्स हों, इनका बलेंस हो। दोनों में समन्वय रहे। सिंथेटिक की भी चीजें चल रही हैं, हमारा चाहना या न चाहना एक अलग बात है, वह भी उद्योग चल रहा है। कपड़े की आपूर्ति तो काटन से होती है, जो खादी से होता है वह तो हो हो लेकिन जो आर्टिफिशियल होता है उसमें दोनों में इक्विलिबरम रहे। यह चार बड़े उद्देश्य हैं। इन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति होने पर कपड़ा सस्ते दामों पर, बड़े पैमाने पर आम जनता को मिलेगा। यह उद्देश्य रखे गए हैं, उद्देश्य बड़े अच्छे हैं, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। लेकिन उपसभापति महोदय, एक बात मुझे कहनी है, युधिष्ठिर बहुत सत्यवादी था, यह इतिहास बताता है इसमें कोई इसका महत्व नहीं है लेकिन परिस्थिति बनायी गयी, युधिष्ठिर हमेशा सच बोलता था लेकिन परिस्थिति बनायी गयी और उस परिस्थिति में युधिष्ठिर के मुंह से सुनना पड़ा 'अश्वस्थामा हतः नरोबा कुंजरोबा' चाहे जो हो लेकिन उसी धर्मात्मा से, उसी धर्मराज के मुंह से उस परिस्थिति में हुआ कि यह भी वह भी ठीक है। माने कि उद्देश्य बड़ा अच्छा है। उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिए जो कदम उठाये गये हैं वह भी सराहनीय हैं, ठीक हैं, ज्यादा खराब नहीं हैं लेकिन कुछ बातें हैं जिनकी सफाई चाहिए और उन बातों की ठीक से सफाई हो जानी चाहिए वरना मुझे कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि वह 'अश्वस्थामा हतः नरोबा कुंजरोबा' इस नीति से कपड़े का पब्लिक सेक्टर वह भी ठीक और वह भी अच्छा होगा। प्राइवेट सेक्टर को तरक्की होगी चाहे उत्पादन की तरक्की होगी, बड़े

उद्योग हैं, उनकी भी तरक्की होगी, मुनाफा खोरी नहीं होगी, मुनाफा भी होगा तो ये सब बातें निकल जाती है इसलिए सफाई होनी चाहिए। मैं तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता हूं लेकिन 2-3 बातों की सफाई मंत्री महोदय ठीक से करें यह मैं चाहता हूं। जब वह यह कहते हैं कि सिकनेस, जब यह कोटा की व्यवस्था शुरू हुई, कंट्रोल कपड़े की व्यवस्था हुई और कोटा बांधा गया, पावरलूम लिमिटेड शिफ्ट के मुताबिक, यह स्टेटमेंट में हैं, यह भार ज्यादा लगाया गया जो सिक मिलें हैं बीमार मिले हैं उनकी सिकनेस के लिए यह कन्ट्री-व्यूटरी फैक्टर है। यह बात सही है बहुत से कन्ट्रीव्यूटरी फैक्टर्स होते हैं लेकिन एक बुनियादी फैक्टर होता है मिलों की भिकनेस या किसी और कारखाने के लिए, सबकी अर्थव्यवस्था लिए बहुत से फैक्टर्स होते हैं लेकिन एक यह जो ट्रेंड चला इसकी वजह से भी यह हुआ। बहुत से डिटेल होते हैं लेकिन यदि मुख्य बात ली जाये, यदि वैज्ञानिक ढंग से करना होगा तो हमें जड़ पकड़नी होगी, कन्ट्रीव्यूटरी फैक्टर तो हैं ही लेकिन यदि जड़ ठीक नहीं होती है तभी सिकनेस की बात हो जाती है।

मिल बीमार क्यों हुए? उपसभापति महोदय, मिलें बीमार होती हैं चाहे कपड़े की मिलें हों या गन्ने की मिलें हों या और कारखाने हों, एक समस्या देश के सामने यह है कि यह मिलें इसलिए बीमार होती हैं क्योंकि उनको दुहा गया लेकिन ठीक से उनके मुताबिक उनको चारा नहीं दिया गया। मिलें एक गाय हैं उसको हम दुहते हैं इसलिए चारा देना होता है लेकिन यदि चारा न दें, खाना न दें और दुहते रहें तो गाय बीमार हो जायगी और मर ही जायगी। यही अवस्था है, मिलों से प्राफिट बनाने के लिए उन्हें दुहा गया जब से उनकी स्थापना हुई लेकिन उस प्राफिट का इस्तेमाल दूसरे उद्योगों में किया गया, दूसरे उत्पादनों में किया गया लेकिन मिलों को बढ़ाने के लिये

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

नहीं किया गया। प्रॉफिट का जितना हिस्सा मिलों को बढ़ाने के लिए लगाना चाहिए था वह नहीं लगाया गया जिसको हम कह सकते हैं कि सिक मिल के प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिए उसको माडर्नाइज नहीं किया जिससे कि वह कम्पीटीटिव हो सके, बढ़ते विकास के लिए यह काम बुनियादी तौर पर नहीं किया गया। जब हम यह लेखा जोखा करते हैं कि मिलें क्यों बीमार हुईं तो हमको देखना होगा कि इन मिलों ने जितना मुनाफा बनाया उनका उन्होंने क्या क्या किया, कहां इस्तेमाल किया। हमें यह पकड़ना है कि जब ये मिलें सिक नहीं थीं तब उन्होंने जो मुनाफा बनाया उसका कौन सा हिस्सा कहां पर खर्च किया? हमने इसका सही इस्तेमाल नहीं किया हमने इन मिलों को दुहा लेकिन इनको चारा नहीं दिया। ये उद्योग जनता की जरूरत के मुताबिक खाले गये लेकिन इनको बीमार किया गया। तुम मजा के काबिल हो, मिल मालिक को पकड़ना होगा। इस रूप में हमें सारी चीजें देखनी होंगी। मैंने कहा कि चाहे सूती कपड़े का हो या गन्ने का हो जड़ यही है कि मुनाफा खूब उठाया गया लेकिन माडर्नाइज नहीं किया, आधुनिक नहीं किया, अप टु डेट नहीं किया नतीजा यह हुआ कि सरकार को सब्सिडी देनी होगी साफ्ट लोन, हार्ड लोन, बैंक लोन, फ्रंट लोन सब तरह से सरकार को मदद करनी होती है कि तुम उठो। लेकिन तुम बीमार क्यों हो? बीमार होने की बुनियादी बात यह है, जड़ यह है 105 मिलें जो है एन०टी०सी० के मातहत और बाकी, क्या बाकी मिलें फिर उसी रास्ते पर न चली जायेंगी? आप कुछ टिगरिंग करते हैं, कुछ-कुछ कदम लेते हैं, लेकिन उन मिलों को बीमारी से रोकने के लिए मैं देख रहा हूं कोई खास कारगर कदम नहीं ले रहे हैं। जो सब्सिडी आप दे रहे हैं वे फिर उसी बीमारी की शिकार होंगे कहने का मतलब है कि बीमारों

घटेगी नहीं, बढ़ती ही रहेगी। तो यह लोग दोषी रहे हैं। मिलों को दुहा है, सिक बनाया है, जैसा उत्पादन होना है वैसा नहीं किया गया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि वे अच्छी नहीं रह सकीं। अच्छा इलाज यह है कि जिस तरह से 105 मिलें आपके एन०टी०सी० के मातहत हैं और आपको कौन रोकता है तमाम मिलों को अपने मातहत करने में, दूसरे शब्दों में सब को नेशनलाइज करने में। इतिहास आपकी ओर देख रहा है और अब तो जनता सरकार है, आपको सुनहरा मौका मिला है जब आप एक नई नीति चला सकते हैं। यह कर दिया, वह कर दिया, ठीक है इस तरह से थोड़ी दूर तक गाड़ी चलेगी, फिर बीमारी आ जायगी। इसीलिए यह जो नई नीति निकाल रहे हैं, जिसका स्टेटमेंट आया है यह जो कहा जाता है कि जो यह सिकनेस होती है, कोटा का जो आबलीगेशन है वह बीकर मिलों पर पड़ने से और सिक होती है, सब मिलों को इससे आजाद कर दो। कंट्रोल कपड़े के बारे में अब हम कम्पीटीटिव बिड पर देंगे।

दूसरा प्वाइण्ट यह है कि कम्पीटीटिव बिड उसको दिया जायगा जो कम्पीट करेगा और उसमें कौन सक्षम होगा? उपसभापति जी जो ताकतवर हैं, वेल-आर्गनाइज्ड हैं, फाइनैन्शली साउंड है प्राइवेट सेक्टर को देंगे। 50 प्रतिशत एन०टी०सी० अपने मातहत रखेगा और बाकी प्राइवेट सेक्टर में उन्हीं मिलों को देंगे जिन लोगों ने यह बीमारी पैदा की और ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा की और उनमें भी किनको जो डाक बोलेंगे? कौन डाक बोलेंगे? वही जो सक्षम होगा, जो वेल-आर्गनाइज्ड होगा, जो फाइनैन्शली साउंड है, ज्यादा मजबूत है, मतलब वे जो बड़े हैं उनको फायदा पहुंचेगा।

उपसभापति जी, जो पान बेचता है वह भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर में आता है, जो चाय बना कर बेचता है, वह भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर में है और टाटा, बिरला भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर है। उसमें यह भा साफ करना होगा कि प्राइवेट

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

सेक्टर का कौन सा तबका । उद्योग में भी तीन तबके होते हैं, तीन बर्थ, लोअर, मिडिल और अपर बर्थ । यह जो कम्पीटीटिव बिड पर देने जा रहे हैं, इससे किसको फायदा मिलेगा ? जो सुविधा आप लोअर बर्थ को देंगे, तो कौन है लोअर बर्थ में इसकी भी परिभाषा कर दें । ऐसे ही मिडिल बर्थ की कौन मिलें है और हायर कैटेगरी की कौन मिलें हैं, इसकी भी आप सफाई कर दें । लोअर बर्थ में आम तौर पर वह मिलें आती हैं जो 100 मजदूर बहाल करती हैं, 100 से 1000 तक जहां मजदूर बहाल है वह मिड-उद्योग कहलाती है और 1000 से ऊपर जहां मजदूर बहाल किये जाते हैं वह बड़े उद्योग में मोटे तौर पर होती हैं । इनवैस्टमेंट के आधार पर भी आप इसका बंटवारा, कैटेगरी कर सकते हैं । अब आप कम्पीटीटिव बिड पर यह देने जा रहे हैं कि जो कम्पीट करेगा उसको हम मदद देंगे और सबको हम फ्री कर देंगे, एक्सचेंजर पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ेगा और उत्पाद भी ठीक ढंग से होगा । तो मुझको शक है कि इससे जो बड़ी मिलें हैं और जो बड़े मालिक हैं, उनको लाभ होगा । कहने का मतलब है कि आप लघु उद्योग, खादी उद्योग को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, उद्देश्य बड़ा अच्छा है लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इसका फायदा बड़े उद्योग उठा लें ।

एक तरफ आपका बहुत मकसद साफ है, इरादा बहुत साफ है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ जिनसे आप डरते आये हैं, जिन्होंने यह परिस्थिति पैदा की है, उन्हीं को फायदा होना है ।

तो यह कम्पीटीटिव बिड वाली बात की भी आप सफाई कर दें ।

जो चीज हैडलूम पैदा नहीं करेगा आप खादी को देंगे, बहुत अच्छी बात है । पहले जो करघा उद्योग है उनको आप बढ़ावा देंगे जिसमें ज्यादा उत्पादन हो और उसको बढ़ाने में हर मदद आप करेंगे जिससे रोज़ी रोजगार भी बढ़ेगा । उसी तरह से खादी के मुताबिक उस दिन प्रवर समिति में एक विधेयक सौंपा गया था । खादी महंगी है, आपने कौन सा सुधार उसमें रखा है कि खादी सस्ती हो ? टेक्नालाजिकली कौन विकास आप उसमें करने जा रहे हैं जिससे खादी सस्ती हो ? मैंने उस दिन भी कहा कि खादी टिक नहीं सकती यदि खादी को मिल के बराबर कंपीट करने के काबिल, करने के लायक, नहीं बनाएंगे तो खादी में टेक्निकल विकास क्या करेंगे ? उसी तरह से हैडलूम में टेक्निकल विकास क्या करेंगे ? वाराणसी में सेलम में उनके छोटे उद्योगों के विकास के लिए, खादी की टेक्नालाजी में, जिससे कि लार्ज प्रोडक्शन हो, ठीक इन्स्ट्रुमेंट हों, जिसमें खादी का भी रूप रहे, आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? वह भी बात साफ नहीं हो रही है । खादी बाहर कैसे बिके ? खादी तो करोड़ों की पड़ी हुई है (Time Bell Ring) क्यों नहीं उस खादी को बांट देते हैं, क्यों नहीं उसको सस्ते में बेच देते हैं ? यह जो मकसद है हैडलूम और खादी का, कि उनके जरिए कपड़े का उत्पादन हो—यह मकसद अच्छा है—लेकिन मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि उनकी टेक्नालाजी का विकास ज़रा सा साफ नहीं है इसीलिए बाद में आपकी हमदर्दी हुई इसीलिए आपने सब्सिडी दी । आपकी तमाम फाटक खोलने की परिस्थिति सुधरेगी नहीं । उत्पादन में जितनी मदद आप करते हैं, आपकी इच्छा तो ठीक है, लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूँ रास्ता साफ नज़र नहीं आ रहा है ।

उसी तरह से रेणम का है, वह भी उद्योग है

दम तोड़ रहा है। कोम्रापरेटिव का क्या हाल हो रहा है। मैं देख रहा हूँ दम ही तोड़ रहा है। उसके लिए भी टेक्नालाजी सुधारने के लिए, उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए खास कौन सा रास्ता है आपके पास। उसके बाद ऊनी कपड़ों का उत्पादन—बड़े अच्छे अच्छे शब्द हैं, इसमें कोई दो मत नहीं—लेकिन एक सवाल मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता था कि जब हम जेल में थे बी टी कम्बल हमको दिया जाता था हालांकि लड़ाई करके दिया जाता था, तो क्या अभी भी बी टी कम्बल की जगह कोई आपने इंडियन कम्बल उसमें मस्ता बनाया है? उसको बनाने का कोई रास्ता आपने निकाला है? तो वह पुराने तरीके से कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन आपका घटने वाला नहीं है। आप चाहे सक्सिडी एक बार उसको दे दीजिए लेकिन जब तक उसकी टेक्नालाजी डेवलप करने का रास्ता नहीं करते मुझे लगता है बावजूद इन अच्छे शब्दों के, कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होने का है

(Time Bell rings)

तीसरी बात; मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ, उपमभाषित महोदय, आप घबड़ाइये मत, बात बहुत गम्भीर है, बहुत सी बातें बोलने दीजिये। केवल मुख्य बातों को कहना चाहता हूँ। कोम्रापरेटिव बेमिस पर छोटे उद्योगों का विकास जो आप चाहते हैं उसको तेजी से चालू करने में आपको कौन सी दिक्कत हो रही है? यदि आप बड़ी मिलों को नेशनलाइज नहीं करते हैं—मैंने पहले कहा कि उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण करो, इसमें दो मत नहीं हैं और यह कहने की परिस्थिति अभी ही है, परिस्थिति 30 साल में भी नहीं थी और आगे 30 साल में नहीं होगी यदि आप एट वन स्ट्रोक जिसको कहते हैं—बहुत सारे काम ऐसे हैं जिनको एट वन स्ट्रोक आपको करना होगा बगैर किसी हिचकिचाहट के क्योंकि आजादी के बाद विद्वान स्ट्रोक पंडित जी कर लिए होते

तो यह अमेका आज नहीं होता लेकिन सोचते रह गए और 30 वर्ष तक लटरपटते रहे। इसलिए नेशनलाइजेशन भी नहीं करते, कोम्रापरेटिव बेमिस पर मिलों को भी नहीं लाते, तो वह कोम्रापरेटिव वाली बात आप क्यों नहीं फैलाते हैं हैंडलूम में और अब खादी में और साथ-साथ रेशमी कपड़े में और ऊनी में तो आप देख चुके हैं कि कितना किसको फायदा होता है लेकिन आप को प्रोडक्शन को कोम्रापरेटिव की तरफ ले जाना होगा। दूसरी बात आप यह कोटा सिस्टम को फ्री कर रहे हैं। यह आप अपने हिसाब से कर रहे हैं थोड़ा एन टी सी को रहेगा, थोड़ा उन में रहेगा, लेकिन जो ग्राईवेट मिलें रह जायेंगी उनमें वर्क्स मैनेजमेंट की बात आप क्यों नहीं लाते हैं। वे मिलें उसी रूप में क्यों रहेंगी। जो मजदूर वहाँ काम कर रहे हैं उनका हाथ कम से कम उन मिलों को चलाने में होता चाहिए और इस काम को करने में आपको कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिए। लेकिन इन सब कदमों को उठाने पर आपको मालूम होता है कि यह रास्ता ज्यादा बृहत हो जायगा। और कपड़े का प्रोडक्शन जो आप चाहते हैं कि ज्यादा हो और सस्ते दामों पर जनता को मस्ता कपड़ा मिले उसकी संभावना ज्यादा हो जाती है अगर आप इन सब कदमों को उठाते हैं। इसी के साथ दूसरे कैनोरी स्ट्रेप्ट्स हैं, जैसे काटन का उत्पादन है। काटन कारपोरेशन है। हमको देखना चाहिए कि जो काटन ग्राउन्स हैं उनके पास जो उत्पादन के साधन हैं वे क्या अप टू डेट हैं? क्या वे माडर्न साधन हैं उत्पादन के। आप इसकी सफाई करें। हम देखते हैं कि जिस तरह से धान की खेती हड़प्पा और मोहनजोदाड़ो की तकनीक से आज तक होती रही है उसी तरह से काटन की खेती भी हड़प्पा और मोहनजोदाड़ो की टेक्नीक से आज भी हो रही है। इस वैज्ञानिक युग में जब काटन की मांग बढ़ी है तो काटन ग्राउन्स को भी प्रोत्साहन देने की जरूरत है।

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

उनको उसके लिए नयी तकनीक देनी चाहिए और नये तरीके सिखाये जाने चाहिए और इसके बाद काटन कारपोरेशन है। वह बफर स्टॉक बनायेगा। जब काटन का दाम बढ़ेगा तो वह सप्लाई करेगा और जब दाम घटेगा तो वह काटन बाजार में खरीद लेगा। लेकिन यह कोई रेडिकल परिवर्तन नहीं है। कुछ सुधार इससे होगा लेकिन यह हमको बुनियादी परिवर्तन की तरफ नहीं ले जायेगा। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि मनुष्य को रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान की आवश्यकता है, लेकिन इसमें कपड़े की समस्या के लिये बुनियादी परिवर्तन मिलों के राष्ट्रीयकरण से ही हो सकता है। यदि वह नहीं करते हैं तो उनको कोओपरेटिव बेसिस पर चलायें। जिस तरह से आपने 105 मिलों को लिया है एन टी पी में, उसी हिसाब से चलायें और हैडलूम, खादी और लघु उद्योगों को बढ़ावा दें। तीसरी बात प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जो मिलें हैं उन में वर्क्स को मैनेजमेंट में होना चाहिए। उनका हाथ मैनेजमेंट में बंटाने का कोई रास्ता निकालें। और दो बातें मैंने कही, सिकनेस की बात में वह प्रॉफिट को लेकर सफाई दें और जो कोओपरेटिव बिड़ की खिड़की आपने खोल दी है उसमें मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि सारा फायदा बड़े लोग ले जायेंगे और ज्यादा फायदा बड़े मिल मालिकों को ही हो जायगा और ऐसा होने पर बावजूद आपका मकसद अच्छा होने के, इरादा नेक होने के, फल उल्टा ही होगा जिस तरह से युधिष्ठिर के साथ हुआ था “अश्वत्थामा हतः नरो व कुंजरो” से मतलब उन का कुछ और था और हुआ कुछ और वही आपके साथ न हो जाये—अश्वत्थामा हतः नरो व कुंजरो।

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA (Gujarat): Sir, the Government has made the textile policy without fully understanding and explaining the implication of the policy. The policy is not detailed enough. The policy should be not for a short time but for a long term. What is new in this policy I do not understand.

Sir, it is only a declaration of the decision that 400, million metres of controlled cloth will be produced in the organised sector. There is nothing in the policy statement except a pious declaration. What is new in it I do not understand. There is nothing in the policy which assures proper prices to the farmer and the consumer. That it will benefit the consumer is also not properly explained. The only beneficiaries of this policy are the big industrial magnates who are going to get exemption from the manufacture of controlled cloth and the main sufferers will be the government Exchequer which means, again, the common man.

What will be the implication of this policy? Granting exemptions from the production of the controlled cloth and levy on the textile mills will result in the increase of the prices of cloth because the private mills are not going to pay from their own pocket. Therefore, the prices of the cloth will go up and the consumers will be the real scapegoat. Now I will explain what I have already said. Sir, it is said that the obligation of control cloth is removed so that no mill becomes sick. How do these mills become sick? The mill-owners try to get illegal money by illegal methods. They earn black money from the purchase of cotton, machinery, stores, etc. In the private sector, the managers of the mills are not entitled to supervise the purchases, etc. It is directly done by the mill-owners. The managers are responsible only for production. So, whatever they purchase, they keep some margin and that margin becomes black money. When they purchase everything, at an inflated price and when they take away the margin, then the mill becomes sick. It is not because they produce control cloth that they incur loss but it is because they are taking away the margin from the purchases of certain items which are required in their day-to-day use, and they are unnecessarily blaming control cloth.

To say that the composite mills incur a loss of Rs. 50 crores every year is baseless. The obligation of control cloth production is a social obligation and it cannot be denied. When they say that there is a loss of Re. 1/- to Rs. 2/- per metre in the production of control cloth, it is not right. Some mills were in fact getting profit by producing control cloth, but those who were producing fine, superfine and other varieties of cloth were not prepared to manufacture the Control Cloth because they were getting more margin in the fine and superfine varieties of cloth.

The lobby of the rich mill-owners brought pressure on the Government and obviously the Government succumbed to it. This lobby of rich mill-owners pressed them to remove the price stamping, and they are still pressing. Of course, this is not removed in the present policy but I think they will do it because there is great pressure from this lobby.

Sir, in the meeting of the Consultative Committee for the Industry Ministry, almost the majority of the Members have requested the hon. Minister that the obligation of control cloth should be there on these private mills and it should be done away with. But even then he has taken a decision, shift it to the NTC. Now, 400 million metres of control cloth will be produced by the organised sector as mentioned in the policy statement. Part of it will be produced by the NTC and the remaining quantity would be given to the private sector mills on the basis of competitive bids and subject to the price not exceeding the cost at which similar cloth would be manufactured by the NTC mills. Now, if the NTC manufactures it at a low price, nobody will come forward to manufacture it, and if the NTC manufactures it at a higher price, then there will be a loss and it will be subsidised by the Government. Thus, in either way, there will be a loss to the Exchequer.

Now, as stated in this policy, it is proposed to discontinue the present pattern of imposing obligation of producing controlled cloth with effect from 1-10-78. Sir, only one and a half months remain. I do not understand how they will finalise everything within one and a half months. They have to fix the quantity of the controlled cloth to be produced. They have to fix the price and, at the same time, they have to invite tenders also. All this is to be done within a period of one and a half months. Sir, I do not know how the Government will finalise it. Thus, this policy has been announced without consideration of the practical difficulties. I should like to know how the Government is going to implement this policy.

Now I will come to the second aspect of this policy, namely, the creation of a buffer stock of cotton by the Cotton Corporation of India so that cotton is made available at a reasonable price to the textile industry. I think this decision has been taken without considering the past performance of CCI. In fact, CCI had made a bungling only. CCI imported cotton on behalf of the textile mills at a very high price, nearly two to three lakhs of bales were imported in 1977. After importing, the price of indigenous cotton went down. The private mills, therefore, refused to purchase the imported cotton. Even at present there are one to one and a half lakhs of imported cotton bales lying with CCI. They want to sell it at a lower price. They purchased at the rate of Rs. 4,500 to Rs. 6,000 per candy and now there will be a loss of Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 per candy. The total loss will be Rs. one crore to one and a half crores. Who will suffer this loss? Ultimately, it will be borne by the common man. The creation of the buffer stock by CCI will mean benefits to the middle men as they do not purchase directly from the farmers. The private mills, on the other hand, purchase directly from the farmers at a low price through their agents.

[Shri Yogendra Makwana]

So the buffer stock of CCI will remain unlifted. CCI then has no option but to sell at a lower price incurring huge losses. The Government should ask CCI to purchase directly from the farmers through auction platforms. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the Government is taking to ensure that the operation of CCI is streamlined and what steps the Government is taking to ensure that there will be no corruption in the purchase of cotton by CCI, I ask this question because there were several complaints in the past about the operation of CCI. Has the Government inquired into the complaints; and, if so, what are the results of the inquiries made? I would also like to know what machinery the Government has established to ensure that the private mills purchase out of the buffer stock when it is created. Unless it is ensured, the buffer stock, as previously stated will lie with CCI and they will incur losses.

Sir, what is the approach of the Government to the multi-fibre? The Government in this policy has stated that the Government will encourage the use of man-made fibre. I welcome this declaration because it will bring down the prices of cloth by the use of polyester, nylon, viscose, etc. and it will make the cloth cheaper. It is an admitted fact. But I think this is a pious declaration only because the policy of import of viscose has not been clearly declared till now. Sir, on an *ad hoc* basis they are declaring it, and every time they change it. There are two companies in India: The Gwalior Rayons owned by the Birlas and the South India Viscose, these are the two companies which manufacture viscose, and, therefore, there is a great shortage which is met with by imported viscose yarn only. Unless a long-term policy is evolved, there will not be any change in the price of the cotton fibre. Also the only two producers of viscose yarn in the country earn huge profit by changing high prices.

I stated earlier that this policy will benefit only the big textile magnates and the big businessmen. Unless the Government takes firm steps and asks the textile industry to fulfil its obligations of the controlled cloth, the consumers are not going to be benefited.

The policy states that instead of the controlled cloth the handloom cloth will be provided for the consumers, the poor people. Sir, I do not think that the handloom industry will be able to provide cheap cloth to the consumers.

Unless all these points are taken into consideration and a long-term policy is evolved, I do not think that this will help either the consumers or the handloom weavers or the khadi industry. Sir, these are some suggestions, and I would like to request the Minister to consider them. Thank you.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश):

उपसभापति महोदय, जिस दिन यह वक्तव्य सदन में रखा गया था उस दिन सब लोगों ने और खास तौर पर विरोधी दल के लोगों ने मांग की थी कि यह बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण विषय है; इसलिए इस पर सदन में लम्बी बहस होनी चाहिए। लेकिन जितने लोग आज उपस्थित हैं उनको देख कर ऐसा लगता है कि कहने की बात और थी और करने की बात कुछ और है। अन्यथा विरोधी दल के लोग आज पूरी शक्ति के साथ जैसे पताचार पटल पर रखने की मांग करने के लिए लंगर-लंगोट कस कर आते थे वैसे ही आज भी आते। खैर। विरोधी दल के नेता पंडित कमलापति जी त्रिपाठी मौजूद हैं। वे और उनके साथ कपड़ा नीति की जो आलोचना करेंगे उसको मंत्री महोदय देखेंगे ही। मैं इस घोषित कपड़ा नीति का स्वागत करता हूँ। यह पहली बार है जब कि किसी सरकार ने कपड़ा नीति के संबंध में एक वक्तव्य सदन के पटल पर रखा है।

श्री देवराज पाटिल : यह वक्तव्य हर साल रखा जाता है ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : इस प्रकार की नीति संबंधी वक्तव्य यदा कदा बीच बीच में आते रहे हैं । लेकिन इस बार बुनियादी नीति रखी गई है । पुराने शब्द जाल से निकल कर इस बार एक नई चीज सामने आई है । सरकार की कपड़ा बनाने की, उसको बेचने की क्या व्यवस्था होगी, इस बारे में प्रथम बार मौलिक वक्तव्य आया है । जनता पार्टी ने अपने अर्थ नीति से वक्तव्य में स्पष्ट कहा था कि कपड़ा उद्योग को छोटे मध्य और बड़े उद्योगों को दो हिस्सों में बांटेगे । उपभोक्ता वस्तुओं (कंज्यूमर्स गूड्स) के विषय में भी हमने यही कहा है कि शनैः शनैः हम छोटे उद्योगों के माध्यम से ही उनका उत्पादन करेंगे । संभव होगा तो अगामी 10 सालों के अन्दर इस नीति की पूर्ति कर देंगे । इस दृष्टि से यह वक्तव्य स्वागत का विषय है । इसमें साफ हो गया है कि जिस प्रकार कुछ लोगों की मिनकियत चल रही है, और जिसे पिछली सरकार ने लगातार बढ़ा दिया उसे घटाया जाएगा और अन्त में इस इजारेदारी का समाप्त किया जाएगा । विरोधी दल के साथी यह कहते रहे हैं कि यह नीति वक्तव्य पूंजीपतियों का समर्थक है । वे इस बात को जान बूझ कर भूल जाते हैं कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने स्पष्ट कहा है कि अब बड़े कारखानों को क्षमता-विस्तार (capacity expansion) की अनुमति नहीं देंगे । एक्सपेंशन की अनुमति केवल तभी देंगे जब कोई कारखाना अपना माल बाहर भेजेगा और वह भी सिर्फ उतने से विस्तार की अनुमति दी जायगी उसका कपड़ा बाहर भेजा जाएगा । जहां तक इस नीति का सवाल है बुनियादी तौर से मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ । क्योंकि इस सारे वक्तव्य की मूल चांट इस बात पर है कि किस प्रकार बड़े मिल मालिकों को वर्तमान कठोर पकड़ घट सके तथा अहिस्ता अहिस्ता छोटे उद्योग के माध्यम

से, अर्थात् हैडलूम के माध्यम से कपड़ा बना कर गरीबों को दिया जा सके । लेकिन यह व्यावहारिक बात भी मोचनी पड़ेगी । कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं होगा कि इस दिशा में चलते चलते बड़े कारखाने न के बराबर रह जायें और मुझ कहने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिए कि 30-40 वर्ष के बाद कौन मंत्री होगा, कोई भी हो सकता है; हम दुनिया के बाजार में तब छोटे पड़ जाएं और पिछड़े जायें । इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि बड़े कारखानों के विस्तार पर रोक तो लगा दी जाए, लेकिन यह भी विचार करें कि शत-प्रतिशत विदेश भेजे जाने वाले कपड़े के उत्पादन मात्र के लिये विस्तार की अनुमति दें अथवा इससे कुछ अधिक ही । आज होता क्या है ? होता यह है कि विदेशों में भेजने के लिए जो कपड़ा तैयार किया जाता है उसकी जांच बड़ी कठोरता से की जाती है । अगर 1000 मीटर कपड़ा बना है तो हजार का हजार मीटर विदेश भेजने योग्य नहीं हो सकता । उसमें 800-900 मीटर इस योग्य हो सकता है । कारखानेदार तो यह कहते हैं कि 50 प्रतिशत मापदंड से नीचे होता है । 50 प्रतिशत न भी हों लेकिन जितनी कड़ी रोक लगी है, इसका पूरा न लगाया जाए । शत प्रतिशत का अर्थ क्या हो । इसमें थोड़ी गुंजाइश रखनी चाहिए ।

मैं इस बात का स्वागत करता हूँ कि मिलों पर से कंट्रोल कपड़ा बनाने की अनिवार्यता को हटा दिया गया है । बड़े-बड़े कारखानों के हाथ में से छीन कर अब यह काम शनैः शनैः हैडलूम के क्षेत्र में चला जाएगा । यह बिल्कुल उचित बात है । आपने यह कहा कि एन० टी० सी० और दूसरे कुछ कारखाने यह कपड़ा बनाएंगे यह भी स्वागत का विषय है कि आपने कारखानेदारों को उप-कर (cess) से मुक्त नहीं किया है । अभी एक रूपया प्रति मीटर के हिसाब से कारखाने को हानि होती है । आज वह बढ़ाई कर रहा है तो कल भी यह भार वह सहन क्यों नहीं ? कहा गया है कि यह जिम्मेदारी

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

एन० टी० सी० को दे कर बाकी कारखाने-दारों को भार मुक्त कर दिया गया है। यह अंधूरी बात है। उनके ऊपर उपकर (cess) लगना चाहिए और लगेगा। आप यह उपकर (cess) कैसे लगाएंगे। एक्साइज के आधार पर लगाएंगे या करघों (loom) के आधार पर लगाएंगे? मैं नहीं जानता कि आपने तय किया है या अभी कुछ निश्चय नहीं किया है। मेरा सुझाव है कि यह उपकर एक्साइज के आधार पर लगाया जाये। इस संदर्भ में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। इसकी जार्ज साहब अवश्य जांच करा ले। आज हो क्या रहा है? कांडे पर कारखाने का मूल्य (ex-mill price) छपी जाती है। मैं पहले की सारी कहानी में नहीं जानता चाहता। वह भी एक आकस्मिक घटी थी। धारिया साहब ने बाजार में एक बृशर्ट का कपड़ा खरीदा। तब बेचने के मूल्य के बजाय (ex-mill) की कीमत छापना आरम्भ किया। उनको मालूम हुआ है कि इसमें घपला है। आज एक्साइज के रूप अनुरूप कपड़े की (ex-mill) कीमत छपवा देते हैं। आदेश हुआ कि हर मीटर पर दाम छापो। हर मीटर पर नहीं छापे, हर दो मीटर पर मूल्य छापाने लगा। इसमें बड़े थोक व्यापारी क्या करते हैं। मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा। मान लीजिए कपड़ा पांच रुपये मीटर पड़ता है। व्यापारी कहता है कि पांच नहीं इस पर सात या आठ छाप दो। जो एक्साइज का अन्तर पड़ेगा वह आधा मेरा और आधा तुम्हारा। बढ़ा कर छापे गए मूल्य का आधा ले देकर वह कपड़े पर सात या आठ रुपये छाप देता है। असल में साढ़े पांच रुपया या 6 रुपये ही देता है। जब थोक व्यापारी नीचे के दुकानदार के पास आता है तो कहता है कि यह कारखाने की कीमत है अब मैं क्या करूं। मैं आपका बहुत लिहाज करता हूं आपसे साढ़े 6 रुपये ही ले लेता हूं। वह दुकानदार गांव में जाता है और गांव वालों को कहता है, देखों भाई आठ रुपये छपा है। यह तो कारखाने की

कीमत है। इसे व्यापारी कारखाने से लाया है। इसलिए अगर मैं तुमसे आठ रुपये ले रहा हूं तो आपको कोई तकलीफ नहीं होनी चाहिए। ग्राहक सत्य समझकर कीमत दे देता है। जो कपड़ा साढ़े पांच रुपये मीटर पड़ना चाहिए था वह खुले बाजार में आठ, नौ, दस रुपये तक ग्राहक को पड़ता है। व्यापारी और कारखानेदार मिले हुए हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि मंत्री महोदय इसकी जांच करें और कोई न कोई दूसरा तरीका निकालें। यह देखें कि व्यापारी से कारखाने को कितनी आय है। जैसे उसने हजार रुपये का कपड़ा बेचा है। 10 हजार जो आपने बड़े व्यापारी से वसूल किया उसके आधार पर (ex-mill) भाव छपा जाए उस आधार पर यदि कीमत छपी जाये तो संभव कुछ बचाव हो सके काटन के अनुसार मूल्य निर्धारित किया जाता था। उस पर विचार कर लें। या... जो भी अच्छा तरीका हो वह निकालिए। लेकिन आज जो एक्स... मिल भाव छप रहा है उससे हम घर बैठकर भले समझते रहे कि गरीब ग्राहक लूटा नहीं जा रहा है। यह धारणा ठीक नहीं है। आज वह सवाये दुगुने और चोगुने दामों से लूटा जा रहा है।

आपने कपड़ा नीति के अन्दर एक और उत्तम बात कही है। अर्थात् हैंडलूम को प्राथमिकता दी है। हैंडलूम को बड़े कारखानों से बचाया है और पावरलूम से भी बचाना चाहते हैं। यह बिल्कुल ठीक बात है। हो सकता है शायद मैं गलती करता हूं। मैंने इस्टीमेट कमेटी तथा अन्य कमेटियों की रिपोर्ट पढ़ी है उनसे यह लगता है कि सरकार के पास आज भी ठीक ठीक आंकड़े नहीं हैं कि कितने हैंडलूम और कहां कहां है। यदि यह आंकड़े अब आ गए हैं तो ठीक है लेकिन 1977 में यह ठीक ठीक उपलब्ध नहीं है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि इस बात की उचित व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए? शिरामन

कमेटी की तरफ भी मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा। कई साल पहले उसने कहा था कि हैण्डलूम बोर्ड को वैधानिक मान्यता स्टेट्यूटरी स्टेट्स दिया जाना चाहिए। यह होना आवश्यक है हैंडलूम बोर्ड कई प्रदेशों में है, लेकिन उनकी व्यवस्था भी आज ठीक नहीं है। आंकड़े जमा करने की क्या कोई मशीनरी है? गांव में बैठे गरीब बुनकरों की सबसे बड़ी समस्या समय और सस्ते भाव से जो धागा मिलना चाहिए, वह न मिलने की है। अभी कुछ मित्रों ने कहा, कि कपास की बढ़ती गिरती कीमतों के कारण उसको पता नहीं रहता कि अगली बार किस दाम पर उनको सूत मिलेगा। सूत लच्छी की शक्ल में मिलता है। पावरलूम को cone^s की शक्ल में देते हैं। हजारां लच्छी की गांठें बंधकर आती है। उनको शिकायत है कि कारखानों से जो सूत बनकर आता है। उसमें व्यापारी भी बीच में गड़बड़ करता है। गांठ के ऊपर लिखा धागे का काउन्ट ठीक नहीं होता। ऊपर कुछ और लिखा होता है और भीतर उसको कुछ और मिलता है। माल भी पूरा नहीं मिलता है। माल ठीक किस्म का नहीं मिलता है और पूरा भी नहीं मिलता है। इसका सुधार कैसे हो? कृपया इसे आप देखें।

एक और समस्या यह है कि गांव के बुनकर को मालूम नहीं है कि नये नये अच्छे नमूने कैसे बनते हैं। बाजार की आवश्यकताएं क्या हैं और हर प्रकार के पक्के रंग कैसे बनेंगे। इसके लिए कोई रिसर्च सेक्शन हर प्रदेश में बनना चाहिए जो कि उनको रास्ता दिखा सकें कि नया पैटर्न कैसे बनेगा। नये कपड़े के क्या नमूने हो सकते हैं और हर प्रकार तरक्की कैसे हो सकती है। आज जो हैंडलूम का कपड़ा विश्वास के साथ क्यों नहीं बिकता। कहते हैं कि उसका प्रायः रंग कच्चा होता है। क्यों कच्चा होता है। रंग कच्चा इसलिए होता है। कि सफेद धागा लेकर बुनकर खुद कई बार रंगते हैं। आप उसे सहायता subsidy भी देते हैं। मुझे उत्तर प्रदेश के

बुनकरों की शिकायतें मालूम हैं। कहते हैं कि आप सहायता भले ही कुछ कम दें, लेकिन जिस प्रकार के पक्के रंगों के धागे उसे चाहिए वे उसे दे दें तो उसकी तकलीफ कम हो जायेगी।

तीसरे कीमतों की बात भी मैंने कही है। कपास की कीमत बढ़ती चढ़ती रहती हैं। बुनकर को पता नहीं लगता है कि कब कितना और किस भाव सूत मिलेगा। क्या आप सूत के भंडार नहीं बना सकते हैं? 3-4 महीने पहले आप कीमतें तय नहीं कर सकते। मैं नहीं कहता कि जैसे गेहूं या गन्ने की कीमत हर वर्ष तय की जाती है उसी भांति निश्चित की जाये यह शायद संभव नहीं होगा। लेकिन क्या 3 या 4 महीने पहले भी सूत की कीमतें घोषित नहीं कर सकते। यदि आप पहले से भाव घोषित कर दें तो बुनकर शायद लूटे न जायें।

यदि सरकार सूत के भंडार बनायें और आवश्यकता पड़ने पर 3-4 महीने पहले की दर पर सूत दें तो चढ़ती कीमतें गिर सकती हैं। शायद इससे बुनकर की तकलीफ और कम हो जायेगी।

एक और बड़ी समस्या सूत बनाने की वर्तमान क्षमता और खपत के बीच असंतुलन की है। आज के स्पिनिंग मिलों की धागा बनाने की क्षमता और हैंडलूम से कपड़ा बनाने की देश में जो क्षमता मौजूद है उसमें एक बहुत बड़ी खाई है। गांव गांव में हैंडलूम से कपड़ा बुनने वाले मौजूद हैं। उनकी शक्ति का पूरा उपयोग नहीं हो रहा उन सब को काम पर लगाने और माल देने की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। लगता यह है कि शायद इसका ठीक आकलन ही नहीं किया गया है। यदि किया गया है तो पूरा नहीं किया गया। जानकारी यह है कि जितने सूत की खपत हो सकती है, जितने हाथ करघे गांव और शहर में चल सकते हैं उससे कम सूत बन पाता है। इस असंतुलन को दूर किया जाना चाहिए।

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

अंत में पावरलूम की बात करता हूं। पावरलूम और मिल में अंतर है। परन्तु केवल साइज का अंतर है। यह बिल्कुल निश्चित है कि पावरलूम के मुकाबले में हैंडलूम कभी खड़ा नहीं हो सकता। चार यूनिट पावरलूम छोटा मानते हैं। उसमें कई लाख रुपये लगने के बाद, क्योंकि उसमें केवल लूम ही नहीं होते साथ कई अन्य चीजें भी लगती हैं, उसमें 10-15 लोगों को ही काम मिलता है। इसलिए उसमें काम देने की क्षमता कम है, खर्च उसमें ज्यादा है। यह कहने का कदापि यह अर्थ नहीं है कि उसको बन्द कर दिया जाए। लेकिन हथकरघे और पावरलूम के इस प्रकार क्षेत्र बांटे जाएं कि, उनके बीच प्रतिस्पर्धा न रहे। बम्बई, या उसके आसपास के इलाके में सेंकड़ों पावरलूम मिल जायेंगे। उनमें अनेक अनधिकृत हैं। लोग एक बड़ा हाल ले लेते हैं और उसमें एक हैंडलूम लगा लेते हैं जो अधिकृत होता है और दूसरे मामा, चाचा आदि के नाम से लगा लेते हैं, और वह अच्छाखासा एक छोटा-सा कारखाना बन जाता है। यह रोका जाना चाहिए आपने इन तीनों क्षेत्रों को बांटा है, यह स्वागत के योग्य है।

अन्त में मैं खद्दर की बात कहूंगा। खद्दर एक भावना का प्रश्न बना हुआ है। शायद कोब में कुरु की बात न कर जाऊं। यहां प्रायः सब लोग खद्दर की प्रशंसा करते हैं। मैं भी वर्षों से खद्दर पहनता हूं। लेकिन आज भी खद्दर इतना महंगा है दुर्भाग्य यह है कि खद्दर और खादी के उद्योग, भ्रष्टाचार के अड्डे बने हुए हैं। They are cess fool of corruption. मैं सच्ची बात कह रहा हूं। कोई बुरा न माने। यह कांग्रेस के कार्यकर्ता बनाने, उनको पैसा देने का एक माध्यम बन गया था। गांधी जी ने जब इसे प्रारम्भ किया तब उनका लक्ष्य कदापि यह नहीं था। लेकिन पिछली सरकार ने और पिछले कांग्रेस संगठन ने उसका दुरुपयोग किया। इसलिए भ्रष्टाचार

का यह बना हुआ है। एक गरीब विधवा जो सूत कात कर लाती है या खद्दर बुनकर लाती है उसे जो पारिश्रमिक मिलना चाहिए उसका एक-दसवां भाग भी उसे नहीं मिलता मंत्री महोदय संभव है सीधे रूप में आपका इससे संबंध न हो। आपके माध्यम से सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि खादी उद्योग की गहराई से जांच की जानी चाहिए। जितनी भारी सहायता (high subsidy) खादी को मिलती है हिन्दुस्तान में, आज तक उतनी किसी भी चीज को सहायता नहीं दी गई। यह ठीक है कि उससे मोटा कपड़ा बनता है जिससे कुछ गरीबों को मिलता है। लेकिन खादी के उद्योग को इतना प्रोत्साहन क्यों दें कि वह भ्रष्टाचार का अड्डा बन जाए। उस उद्योग से पलने वाले लोगों को आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता हैंडलूम की ओर मोड़ा क्यों नहीं जाए? खादी का ढोंग जैसा भूत क्यों खड़ा किया जायें। Do not make a fact of it, जो चाहे वह खादी पहने लेकिन फड के रूप में नहीं। हिन्दुस्तान की लड़ाई के साथ उसका संबंध था। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की लड़ाई में क्रान्तिकारी भी थे। उनकी फांसी के फंदों का भी इससे संबंध है। आजादी की लड़ाई के साथ गोली और बंदूक का भी संबंध था; और अनेक चीजों का संबंध है। इस कारण इसके लिए आजादी की लड़ाई की दुहाई देना गलत है। खादी को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाए। लेकिन पिछले 30-40 सालों से उसके अंदर पनपे भ्रष्टाचार को नष्ट करना पड़ेगा। मैं तो यहां कहूंगा कि उसकी सज्जिदी, जो लालच और भ्रष्टाचार का कारण बन गयी है, यदि उसे समाप्त करना पड़े, तो वह भी करना चाहिये। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा मैं काबे में कुफ की बात तो नहीं कर रहा हूं। यहां सब खद्दर पहनने वाले हैं, मैं खुद भी पहनता हूं। लेकिन मैंने कटु सत्य आपके सामने रखा। (Time bell rings) आपने घंटी बजा दी है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय।

अन्त में फिर मंत्री महोदय को इस बात के लिए बधाई देता हूं कि उन्होंने कपड़ा नीति

को एक नई दिशा दी है जिससे बेकारी घटाने में बहुत बड़ी मदद मिलेगी। कृषि हमारा सबसे बड़ा उद्योग है। कृषि में सबसे ज्यादा आदमी खपते हैं। यदि उसके बाद कोई दूसरा उद्योग है, जो सर्वाधिक आदमी खपाता है तो वह कपड़ा है। और कपड़े उद्योग में भी हैंडलूम का क्षेत्र सबसे बड़ा है। हमारे लाखों बेकार और गरीब अनपढ़ परिवार इसमें लगे हुए हैं।

! मैं आपको फिर बधाई देता हूँ और इस नीति का स्वागत करता हूँ धन्यवाद।

5 P.M.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, after protracted exercises lasting over one whole year, the Industries Ministry has come forward, the Government has come forward, with what is called the Textile Policy. The character of this policy can be found by the fact that the biggest people who have welcomed this happen to be people like the Chairman of the Federation of Mill-owners' Associations, Mr. Mafatlal, and people of that type. When they have welcomed this statement, naturally they would not do it unless it is in their own interest. That is why, when this is paraded as a statement in the interest of the consumers, in the interest of the handloom weavers and all that, I want to question that. The statement begins with fine premises. It points out that the textile industry has been the oldest industry in the country. Nobody denies that. The textile industry has grown in this country on the sweat and toil and the sacrifices of the people and even during the British period, the Swadeshi movement and the non-cooperation movement were there when people died and it is as a result of that that we were able to withstand the competition from the British people and that we were able to grow. Then, subsequently, after independence also, they had ample subsidy from the Government in ever so many forms and that is also admitted in this document and it has

also been admitted in this document itself that whatever subsidies have been given have gone mostly to the organised mill owners, textile mill owners, and the common people, particularly the handloom people have not been able to benefit by these. That is also admitted. That is why I say that premises on which this document is based are absolutely excellent. But what is the remedy that has been suggested? That is what I am concerned with now.

First of all, it says that one of the reasons, one of the main reasons, for the mills falling sick is the fact that many of them are burdened with what is called the obligation to produce controlled cloth which cloth is not profitable. But the Government had the power to exempt these mills, those marginal mills, and they have been exempting those marginal mills which would not be in a position to produce that. Therefore, the question does not arise. Therefore, today, after exemption, after the marginal mills are exempted, the obligation falls only on those people who can afford that. But now you are taking that away. Naturally, when you are taking away that obligation from those who can do it, the obligation to produce coarse cloth which is not capable of giving much profit, it is but natural that the mill owners would welcome this statement and they have welcomed this statement. They have, therefore, welcomed that, and I have no quarrel with the mill owners, but with the Government only.

Secondly, Sir, that obligation has been taken away and that obligation is now being put on the National Textile Corporation. It is not true to say that because of this that the mills have fallen sick. I will not subscribe to that view. It is a well-known fact that long before this standard cloth scheme came into existence, the textile mills in this country began falling sick and they were falling sick because of the loot by these people and the mill owners, out of the loot

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

of the people, built their own other industrial empires in this country. Every textile mill owner has built his own industrial empire and it is all made out of the loot by these people. Therefore, to say that this has been one of the main reasons for the mills falling sick certainly does not cut any ice with me. Anyway, you have taken over various mills. Today, you have taken over all these bad mills, all these sick mills, which have been looted, and on whom you have placed or imposed the burden of debts and from the profitable mills you have taken away the obligation and it is on these mills that you are putting the obligation. You are going to put on these mills the obligation of producing 400 million sq. metres of standard cloth. Then, again, as far as the textile mills are concerned, it is on the National Textile Corporation that you are putting the obligation of manufacturing cheap cloth needed by the common people. Cheap cloth, acceptable cheap cloth—wonderful adjectives—cheap cloth, qualitatively acceptable cloth. This responsibility also is put on the National Textile Corporation. Therefore, as far as the cream of profits is concerned, it is still reserved for these top businessmen—Mafatlal, Tatas, Birlas, Bombay Dyeing and all these people. That is why they have welcomed it.

What about handlooms? You say that you are going to protect handloom by hereafter not allowing expansion of looms. Looms have been expanding for the last many years. The cloth production is falling; it has not increased. The basic point that we face in this country is that with a population of 600 millions you are not able to sell cloth that you are producing on the handlooms in the available markets. This is the condition of this country. And in such a condition you are talking of the expanded needs of the people being met and not giving expansion of looms to textile mills but to reserve it for handlooms. Today, the handlooms

are not able to sell the cloth they are already producing. Last year, for example, the entire quota of export was taken away by the mills, and not by the handlooms, because the whole quota was administered by the millowners, and not by these people. Therefore, there is hue and cry. I pressed the Commerce Ministry and the Commerce Minister was good enough later on to reserve six quota exports for the handlooms. I am glad about it, because I have been fighting for handloom weavers all my life. Now, Sir, you say that they hereafter would meet the added needs of the people. Now, when the consumption of cloth itself is falling, what is the fun of saying that the added needs of the people will be met by handlooms? The existing cloth you are not lifting. You say that you are going to put an additional cess on the millowners. They are happy about it. They know how to avoid it; they are happy about it. And you say that with this you will subsidise these things. But how are you going to ensure that they will produce the type of cloth that you want them to produce? What is the machinery? And how are you going to ensure that the cloth that is produced is actually sold? Today the handlooms are suffering for want of sale, as I told you. So how are you going to do that? And how will you ensure that the yarn supplied to them will be at cheap rate? What is it that you are doing? You are again saying that the National Textile Corporation will produce more yarn and see to it that the yarn is supplied at a cheap rate. How? The responsibility is pushed on the National Textile Corporation, Government of India. The Government of India would bear all the losses and the textile millowners will have the cream of profits. This is the sum and substance of the whole thing. Therefore, Sir, if really you are interested in seeing that today the handloom industry in this country flourishes and the textile industry in this country exists as it

exists—I do not want the textile industry to be finished—the first and the most essential thing is to see that yarn is supplied to them at a cheap price. Today you are also talking of controlling the price of yarn, of cloth, of cotton, so that cotton is available at a proper price. Previously also, we made cotton available at a fair price during the last six months. America is going to produce 50 per cent more cotton. The cotton crop in America is going to be 50 per cent more, as a result of which the prices have come down. In our country, the price of cotton has tumbled down. But the question is: Are the mill-owners passing on the benefit to the consumers?

SHRI DEORAO PATIL (Maharashtra): Absolutely not.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: This is the position. Therefore, whether the cotton prices come down or the cotton prices go up, the millowners continue to go on increasing the prices. This is the phenomenon which we have been seeing in this country and this particular phenomenon cannot be stopped. There is no method, no solution, for stopping this as far as this programme is concerned. I am suggesting a simple thing. He is now talking of increasing the availability of cheap cloth by man-made fibre also. I do not know if Mr. George Fernandes is aware of the fact that the Planning Commission had worked out the price of mixed cloth, that is, the man-made fibre and cotton fibre, recently. There was an exercise very recently by the Planning Commission about this and they have said that the mixed cloth will cost between 3 and 4 times the price of cotton cloth. This is what they have said. How is it going to be cheap? The only way to make the handloom cloth cheap is to take away all the excise duty on yarn and to take away yarn from the mills at cost plus profit price and give that yarn to the handloom. Then the handloom will be able to compete with the mills and the mills will be forced to bring down their

prices. This is what has to be done. The Government is not prepared to adopt this bold policy because they want to pander the millowners. This pandering to the mill owners has been the policy of the previous Government. It is their policy that is being continued in a different way. It is the same old wine in new bottle. Objectives are defined. They speak about time-bound programme. But there is nothing there about the time. Therefore, I want to point out that unless the Government of India is prepared to come forward with bold solutions, this cannot be done. I am not asking for the nationalisation of all the textile mills because I do not want to ask for the moon. But I want to force them to sell the cloth at a lower price. How can they do it? If the handloom cloth is sold at a cheaper price and if the people go in for handloom cloth, then the mill owners will be forced to bring down their prices. But the Government have to see that the yarn is made available to the handloom weavers at a cheaper price as a result of which they will be able to compete successfully with the mill made cloth. You should remove totally the excise duty on yarn, take the yarn from these textile mills and spinning mills at cost plus profit price and distribute it to the handloom weavers throughout the country. It is not a very difficult thing. Once you do that, then you need not organise the distributive agency because the handlooms will sell it at a very competitive price. Once they begin to sell it at a competitive price, the mill owners will, willy-nilly, be forced to reduce the prices.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): There is a mill in Kerala exclusively meant for producing yarn for handloom weavers.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: What does it matter? This is what I was saying. The National Textile Corporation, with their present position, will not be able to produce yarn at any cheaper price. Nothing is going to

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

happen with their out-dated machines. That is why I say that this Textile Resolution about which much ado is made is not at all anything new. It is certainly going to benefit only the mill owners. It is not going to achieve the objectives which are wonderfully defined. As far as the objective portion is concerned, the objectives are good and I have no objection to objectives. Objectives are good. The objectives of the Planning Commission in the First Plan, the Second Plan, the Third Plan, the Fourth Plan and the Fifth Plan have been absolutely good. Breaking up of concentration of economic power and all that were absolutely good. But what is the result of it? So, I want to point out that the result of this policy statement which has been made after so much of exercise—I do not know why they took such a long time in doing this exercise which is a simple thing—is going to be a big zero. It is not going to improve the situation in any way. They have also stated about different rates for different types of yarn. But the different types of yarn have not been properly defined. They have stated in the Preamble that they have defined it. Now even now they are keeping quiet on that. I want to bring to your notice that on the 22nd of August last year, one year before, suddenly a Government of India notification was issued at the instance of and as a result of a report made by the President of the Mill Owners Association according to a statement by Mr. Mohan Dharia. On the representation made by the President of the Mill-owners' Association, a notification was issued allowing the imports of polyester fibre yarn against the export earnings of any commodity. I was the first person who reacted immediately. I saw the notification on the 23rd. On the 24th, I fixed a special appointment with the Prime Minister and wrote a letter and said that this should be stopped immediately, and this way we cannot waste our foreign exchange. I took

it up with him and later on, it was modified to some extent. I am not going into the whole question. I pointed out in a subsequent letter to Mr. Mohan Dharia that during these 11 days, import licences to the extent of Rs. 4 crores were obtained by the Reliance Company, the Mafatlals, the Bombay Dyeing and so many companies. These people have acquired so much quantity of licences, and today you are allowing the textile mills to manufacture this cloth which has been all along reserved for the handlooms. I have been fighting this battle. I had written to the Prime Minister a letter. I had pointed out there how some of these people have been profiteering and how the handlooms have got to be protected. I want to ask the Prime Minister, I want to ask the Industry Minister: So far, is there a single reply to this? It is now six months already. 120 Members of Parliament have written that letter. He can contradict the statement. I have written from the policy statements issued from time to time. I quoted the examples that these licences were denied to the textile mills unless they undertake an obligation to export. I have written all those things. I have also written to the Law Minister pointing out the illegality of it. But despite all these things, not even a reply comes. This is my predicament. And the Ministers would say, "now, the prices have come down." Yes, the prices have certainly come down. I had suggested at that time that after all, ultimately, only half a dozen houses manufacture polyester fibre yarn, and why don't you take away their entire production and distribute it to half a dozen places? The distribution is not very difficult. This is used in only six places. You can take it over. I made this suggestion to Mr. Subramaniam when he was the Finance Minister. And I made the suggestion earlier also. They did not accept it, the Congress Government did not accept it, and this Government also does not accept that suggestion. They said that they are allowing the imports

in order to make the prices come down. I agree, the prices came down. But what is the result? As a result of the polyester yarn coming down from Rs. 230 to Rs. 130 per Kg., has the price of the end-product been reduced at all in the market? Have the common people, who purchase that cloth got any benefit as a result of this? Therefore, what you have done is this. The Birlas as the manufacturer of what is called the polyester fibre yarn fleece the people. There the profit becomes less, and as the manufacturer of the cloth, the profit increases, and the beneficiaries in the final analysis have been the textile mill magnates. Therefore, what I point out is this: Let them point out one statement which I have made to be wrong, which the Members have made to be wrong. Let them at least correct us. I am willing to be corrected. I stand for correction. Therefore, when I say this is not in the interest of the handloom weavers, you do certain things. This policy has not yet been defined even now. They are still thinking and thinking. This is a wonderful position in which I find myself. As far as this document is concerned, this is not going to serve any purpose. Let them have a re-thinking? As I pointed out in that document, I want an inquiry by a Committee of Parliament as to how that notification of 22nd August, 1977 was issued. Who is responsible for it? How is it that the mill-owners were able to influence the officials or the Minister? How did it happen in 11 days? Everybody agrees that it became a big scandal. But who is responsible for it? Why does the Government not take the Parliament into confidence? Why does it not take the people of India into confidence? Why does it not take action against those officers who have misled the Government of India or the Ministers concerned if it is a case like that? Therefore, I would ask the Minister to have a Committee of Parliament to consider this whole question. We are willing to give some concrete

suggestions. I do not want to suggest things which the Government of India will not be able to carry out. I know the limitations of constraints. I know we do not have the Government of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) here. I know that they will not be able to take over the mills. Therefore, within the existing framework, I am prepared to make concrete suggestions which will mitigate the sufferings to the maximum extent possible under the constraints under which they have got to work, if they invite suggestions. But they do not invite our suggestions. They have always got that Marathe Committee and this committee and that committee only the officials. They are the people who are all-knowing. Formerly the I.C.S. people were the all-knowing people. Now the I.A.S. people are the all-knowing people. Then they say that a committee will go through that committee's report. And that committee's report will be gone through by a committee of the Cabinet or the entire Cabinet. Poor Cabinet Ministers. Where have they got the time to go through all these things? In such matters a specialised understanding, a special knowledge of all the things is necessary and there are public people who have got the knowledge and who are interested in these matters. And, I am sure, Members of Parliament are also interested in this problem. Some of us have said that in this problem we are willing to help the Government, we are willing to give constructive suggestions to the Government. Even now I would suggest that before finalising this policy, you give us an opportunity to make some concrete suggestions. You say democracy. But democracy means when you make a policy statement, we have got to accept it and debate it. On the other hand, if it is real democracy, let us have the opportunity to sit together a committee of Parliament, go through the entire textile policy and see how the handlooms can be protected and how the handlooms can be

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

expanded and more employment can be generated. Let us sit together and make some concrete suggestions. We will do it within three months. We won't take one year like the other committees. We will sit from day to day and make some concrete suggestions and then you can examine them. I am prepared to sit with the officials also and examine the position. Let us all be associated. Let us not think here that only the I.A.S. officials are the wonderful people who have got the knowledge of everything and they alone are to lay down the policy. This is all that I would say, Sir.

Finally, Sir, I would ask the Minister not to enforce the policy which is not going to lead the country anywhere. The obligation on these textile mills must be increased. They are looting the people and they should not be let off so cheaply and all this responsibility should not be taken by the exchequer. Ultimately it is the National Textile Corporation, which is the losing concern. If you take over some of the bigger mills, I have no objection. But, I know you will not be able to take them over. That is why I am suggesting some concrete measures so that the handloom industry in this country can be saved. Last year, for example, the handlooms were not able to export and there was a glut. They were crying. I had to go to Mr. Mohan Dharia again and again and ask him, please see that this export of handlooms is left to a body of handloom weavers and not of textile mill-owners. He responded. He said that he would include these people also in that committee. That is what he did.

Therefore, what I am pointing out is that we are prepared to make some concrete suggestions and let the Minister listen to these suggestions and on that basis only let him frame the policy. Let him not come and

say that he denies this and he denies that because he has not consulted me, he has not consulted any Members of Parliament. Let a committee of Parliament go into this question. This is all my suggestion. Thank you.

श्री देवराव पाटिल : उपसभापति महोदय, अन्न के बाद अगर कोई राष्ट्रीय नीतियों में महत्व का विषय है तो वह कपड़ा नीति का विषय है क्योंकि कपड़ा उद्योग से करोड़ों किसानों, लाखों कामगारों, बुनकरों और कपड़े का उपयोग करने वाले करोड़ों लोगों का सम्बन्ध है और इन लोगों का भविष्य भी इसी नीति पर निर्भर करता है। हर साल इस नीति के बारे में चर्चा होती है। पिछले 10 साल से इस विषय पर चर्चा करने के बाद हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचे हैं कि हमारे देश की कपड़ा नीति का जिन लोगों से सम्बन्ध है, जैसे किसान जो कनास पैदा करते हैं, मिल आनर्स जो मिलों को चलाते हैं, कामगार जो मिलों में काम करते हैं और कज्यूमर जो कपड़े का उपयोग करते हैं, अगर हमें इन सब का हित देखना है तो हमें एक ऐसी पालिसी बनानी चाहिए जिसको इंटिग्रेटेड काटन टेक्सटाइल पालिसी कहते हैं। इसी बात को ध्यान में रख कर हमारे देश में इस बारे में कई सेमिनार्स भी हुई हैं। 25 सितम्बर, 1976 को हैदराबाद में इंटिग्रेटेड काटन टेक्सटाइल पालिसी पर एक सेमिनार हुआ। उसके परिणामस्वरूप इस मंत्रालय में जो एक वस्त्र विभाग था उसको अलग कर दिया गया। एक डिपार्टमेंट आफ टेक्सटाइल करके 18-3-76 को बना। इसके बाद यहाँ पार्लियामेंट में भी, हमारे आदरणीय राज्य सभा सदस्य और लोक सभा के सदस्य श्री राजनारायण ने भी इसके बारे में अपने बहुमूल्य विचार रखे। मंत्री महोदय श्री मोहन धारिया साहब ने इस मंत्रालय का भार सम्भाला तो उन्होंने इस विषय में काफी दिलचस्पी ली। और इसके

बारे में कई मीटिंग भी हुई। उन्होंने सब लोगों को 17 अगस्त, 1977 को बुलाया था और मीटिंग में तय हुआ था इस पालिसी को तय करने के लिए एक कमेटी बनाई जाए लेकिन कमेटी नहीं बनी। उन्होंने दो तीन बातें जो कही थीं। उनमें एक महत्वपूर्ण बात मैं बताना चाहता हूं, वह यह है

"Primary objective is and will be to provide cloth of requisite quality and durability at reasonable prices to the vulnerable sections." यह उनका पहला

उद्देश्य था। दूसरा उन्होंने खेद प्रकट किया था

"It is a rather undesirable state of things that we witness today that 90 per cent of population cannot be looked after by even 10 per cent of the total production of textile in this country."

यह मैं उनकी स्पीच कोट कर रहा हूं। इस मीटिंग में चर्चा के बाद तय किया था कि एक इंटेग्रेटेड काटन टैक्सटाइल पालिसी बनाई जाए। मुझे खुशो है कि मंत्री महोदय कपड़ा नीति पर जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है उसके आखिर में यह कहा। यह जो स्टेटमेंट है वह मैंने पढ़ा। इसमें क्लाज-14, पेज-7 में लिखा है—

"सरकार का विश्वास है कि अब इस महत्वपूर्ण उद्योग के लिए राष्ट्र के सामने पहली बार एक समेकित नीति का ढांचा तैयार किया जाएगा तथा यह हमारे देश की जनता की अनिवार्य आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करने के लिये दिये गये वचन को पूरा करने की दिशा में एक महत्वपूर्ण कदम होगा।"

उन्होंने कबूल किया है कि कपड़े के बारे में उनकी नीति क्या है, वह है "इंटेग्रेटेड काटन

टैक्सटाइल पालिसी" उपसभापति जी, इंटेग्रेटेड पालिसी के पहलू क्या हैं? इस टैक्सटाइल पालिसी के दो पहलू थे। एक प्रोडक्शन और दूसरा डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन। हैदराबाद की मोनार में यह दो पहलू आज तक नेगलेक्ट किए गए हैं। इन पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। इसलिए हमने इंटेग्रेटेड टैक्सटाइल पालिसी के बारे में कुछ विचार रखे और मंत्रालय की नेशनल बाइपार्टीई कमेटी ने भी महत्वपूर्ण सुझाव दिये हैं। पहली सुझाव है

Remunerative prices fixed for the grower.

दूसरी सुझाव इसमें यह है

Range of maximum and minimum cotton prices for the mills should be worked out and enforced.

हम नहीं चाहते कि मिल ज्यादा भाव से कपास खरीदे। हम चाहते हैं कि: उनको लिये कपास के भाव मैक्सिमम और मिनिमम फिक्स कर दिये जाए। तीसरा यह

To eliminate unhealthy and speculative practices.

मिल्स जो शिकायत करती है कि कपास के भावों में बढबढ होने से कपास महंगा मिलता है, उसका भी भाव फिक्स कर दें। और एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण सुझाव दिया गया

Procurement through public and co-operative agencies should be stepped up.

हर स्टेट को अगर इंटेग्रेटेड टैक्सटाइल पालिसी इम्प्लीमेंट करना है तो फर्स्ट स्टैप जो उठाना पड़ेगा वह है --

To eliminate the middle man.

चौथा यह है कि

Varieties of textiles should be drastically curtailed.

पांचवा जो सुझाव है वह है

Ceiling prices of cloth fixed based on yarn count.

[श्री देवराव पाटिल]

तो यह साइंटिफिक विचार कर के इस तरह से इंडीपेंडेड टैक्सटाइल पालिसी बनाने के लिए सुझाव दिये थे। मुझे उम्मीद थी कि हमारे मंत्री महोदय जो समाजवादी कार्यकर्ता तथा लेबर के मित्र गिने जाते हैं वे इस को स्वीकार करके कुछ क्रांतिकारी कदम उठावेंगे लेकिन जार्ज फर्नन्डीज साहब ने इसमें मेरे लिए नाउम्मीदगी की है। और उन्होंने साफ बता दिया इसमें, इस पेज 2 पर कि इस उद्देश्य के लिए प्रमुख कच्चे माल कपास के मूल्यों में काफी घटबढ़ी होने से इस उद्योग को गम्भीर हानि पहुंची है। मैं बता दूँ कि मिलों को कभी हानि इससे नहीं पहुंची है। भावों में जो घट-बढ़ हुई है उससे मिल ओरिस को नुकसान नहीं हुआ है लेकिन यह ठीक है कि उत्पादकों के बीच अनिश्चय की भावना बैठी है इस समस्या का कारण हल निकालने के लिए संगठन परक तथा नीति विषयक कोई ढांचा नहीं बनाया गया है। मैं उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपके मंत्रालय का स्पष्ट निर्णय जो है वह सदन के सामने रखा है। यही समस्या है जो 1962 से हम झगड़ रहे हैं, बुनियादी चीज इंडीपेंडेड टैक्सटाइल और काटन पालिसी में जो है वह है उत्पादकों को लाभकारी मूल्य को गारंटी देना। यह जब तक नहीं होगा तब तक यह नेशनल पालिसी नहीं कही जा सकती है।

उपसभापति महोदय, स्टेटमेंट में मंत्री महोदय ने जो बताया कि कपास के मूल्यों में काफी घटबढ़ी होने से उद्योग को गम्भीर हानि पहुंची है यह सच नहीं है। लेकिन कपास उत्पादकों के बीच अनिश्चय की भावना पैदा हो गई है, मैं इन्डिपेंडेड काटन टैक्सटाइल की सेमीनार की रिपोर्ट पढ़ना चाहता हूँ प्राइम लक्वुएशन के बारे में मेरे पास पूरी रिपोर्ट है, आंकड़े हैं लेकिन टाइम न होने के कारण मैं एक एक सेंटेंस पढ़ूँगा।

"The traders are benefited rather than the growers. August, 1974:

price of cotton reached the peak. October, 1975: It reached the lowest. The index of wholesale price stood at 299 in January, 1974, reached 381 in June, 1976. From June, 1975, to June, 1976, the price index of cotton went up by 36.7."

इसलिए मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि जुलाई, 1975 से सेप्टेंबर-दिसम्बर, 1975 के काल में रूई के भाव में गिरावट आयी, चालीस परसेंट काटन के प्राइम में गिरावट आयी लेकिन कपड़े के दाम कम नहीं हुए। इसी तरह देखा जाए जो मैंने क्वेश्चन पूछा था, अनस्टारड क्वेश्चन नवम्बर 514

"Wholesale price index of cotton and cotton cloth: Unstarred Question No. 514: The wholesale price index of raw cotton and cotton cloth (Mill) from January to July, 1977, was as under: January, 1977-raw cotton price: 213.7 and cotton cloth (Mill) price; 169.8."

इसी साल में जुलाई में रा काटन की प्राइस डाऊन हो गयी 213.7 से 206.7 और काटन के प्राइस बढ़ गये 169.8 से 178.6। कपास के भाव गिर गए लेकिन कपड़े का दाम गिरा नहीं है। इसलिए यह कहना कि भाव में गड़बड़ी होती है तो उससे मिल मालिकों को नुकसान होता है यह सही नहीं है बल्कि उससे किसान का नुकसान होता है और मैं यह भी एक मुद्दा इसमें बताना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो कपास का ट्रेंड है। मिल मालिकों को कपास लेना है तो वे डाइरेक्ट किसानों से लें, कोऑपरेटिव से लें या काटन कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया अथवा किसी राज्य एजेंसी से लें मगर उनके रिलेटिव ट्रेड्स होने हैं व उनके मातहत किसानों के कपास खरीदते हैं लोकल मारकेट से, इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि किसानों की लूट होती है टैक्सटाइल मिल वर्क्स यूनिट की रिपोर्ट पेज नम्बर तीन पर बताया है कि:

"It is reported that the prices paid by the textile industry for cotton are as high as 30 per cent compared to the prices obtained by

cotton co-operatives for the cotton sold."

या जो टेक्स्टाइल इंडस्ट्री है, आज मिल ऑनर्स जो प्राइस पेड करते हैं उससे 30 परसेंट प्राइस किसान को कम मिलता है, मैं इसमें ज्यादा नहीं जाऊंगा लेकिन दूसरा एक महत्वपूर्ण सवाल काटन के प्राइस के बारे में है जिसके कि बारे में मैंने कई दफे इसके महत्व के बारे में मंत्रालय का ध्यान खींचने की कोशिश की है। हमारे आदरणीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय 27 मार्च, 1977 को अपने अभिभाषण में कहने हैं, पृष्ठ तीन पर,

"ग्रामीण क्षेत्र की अपेक्षाकृत उपेक्षा से अर्थ व्यवस्था में एक भयानक असंतुलन उत्पन्न हुआ है, जिससे लोग गांव से शहर की ओर जाने लगे हैं। किसानों को अपने उत्पादन का उचित दाम नहीं मिला है।"

मैं इसलिए यह पढ़ रहा हूं कि ऐसे हमारे आदरणीय नेता का स्टेटमेंट है। किसानों को जितना ले कष्ट करते हैं, उनको मेहनत का दाम भी नहीं मिलता है। यह बात राष्ट्रपति ने स्पष्ट की है। इसलिए मैंने कहा कि मूल्य नीति में कुछ बुनियादी चैन्ज कीजिये। इसमें कोई भी बुनियादी चैन्ज नहीं किया है। जो कपास की प्राइसिंग पालिसी पहले से चली आ रही है मंत्री महोदय ने भी वही रखी है।

कण्ट्रोल क्लॉथ का प्रोडक्शन और मिलों के कारोबार के प्रश्न को मैं बाद में उठाऊंगा लेकिन सरकार की राष्ट्रीय आर्थिक नीति क्या है यह बनाना चाहता हूं।

There are two contradictory policies followed in national economy—full protection to the industries and complete destruction of the farm economy. If price of farm produce comes down, it is a matter of pleasure, if the similar trend is established in the industry it is treated as a danger of looming depression. In agriculture more production is associated with the falling prices while in industry more

production with higher unit prices are ensured. The farmers are caught in the scissors crisis.

इसलिये हमने कहा कि काटन प्राइसिज के बारे में भी कुछ सोचना चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट ने सोचा, एग््रीकल्चरल प्राइमिज कमीशन की एग्वाइंटमेंट हुई और कपास के भाव हमारा एग््रीकल्चरल प्राइसिज कमीशन निश्चित करता है।

एग््रीकल्चरल प्राइसिज कमीशन 1965 से कुछ कारणों के लिये नियुक्त किया गया था। अनाज कम होने से प्रोक्यूरमेंट करने का विचार था और प्रोक्यूरमेंट प्राइस तय करने के लिये ए० पी० सी० की नियुक्ति हुई। उनके टर्म्स आफ रैफरेंस देखे जाएं तो उसका फंक्शन लिमिटेड है। अगर आपका रैम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस देना है, तो ए० पी० सी० से यह काम नहीं हो सकता और फिर वट इज दी रैम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस/रैम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस देने के सिद्धान्त के बारे में सरकार ने कभी इन्कार नहीं किया।

Government has decided to give remunerative prices to the farmer.

हमारे आदरणीय एकम कृषि मंत्री जगजीवन बाबू ने कहा था।

Then, what is the remunerative price?

किस तरह से आप तय करेंगे। उसमें कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन का सवाल भी उठाया गया था। लेकिन उस पर ख्याल नहीं किया गया। कहा गया कि कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन हर स्टेट में डिफर करता है। हमने कहा कि काटन प्राइस तय करने के दो तरीके हैं, एक तो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन तय करके रैम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस फिक्स कीजिये। दूसरे कपड़े की प्राइस से कपास की कीमत निकालने का सुझाव दिया। मान्यवर मंत्री महोदय इस पर ज्यादा ख्याल दें। दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि जो कपड़े का प्राइस है, उससे काटन की प्राइस निकाल कीजिये। मेरे मित्र जिन्होंने अभी भाषण दिया था उन्होंने कहा कि रा मैटिरियल और एण्ड

[श्री देवराज पाटील]

प्राइस की कीमतों में कुछ सम्बन्ध होना चाहिये और इसके मुताबिक हमने सुझाव दिया था और मुझे खुशी है कि कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट ने उसके लिये काटन नेक्जट प्राइसेज कमेटी एग्जाइन्ट की और उस हाई पावर्ड कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट भी दे दी है।

श्री उपसभापति : जल्दी समाप्त कीजिये।

श्री देवराज पाटील : एक मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ। प्राइस लिंक करने के बारे में हमने प्रश्न 514 दिनांक 24-11-77 पूछा था—

Recommendation of the Cotton Nexus Committee: "The Committee observed that it is possible to evolve a nexus between the price of kapas and the mill-gate delivery prices for cotton and the prices of yarn and cloth."

इसमें सरकारी अधिकारी, एकानामिस्ट और एक्सपर्ट थे और कमेटी ने अपनी यह रिक्मण्डेशन दी है कि यह काम हो सकता है कि कपड़े की जो प्राइस है, मिल के बाहर जो कपड़ा आता है, उसकी जो प्राइस है, उस से काटन की प्राइस तय कर सकते हैं। मेरी बिनती यह है मंत्री महोदय से कि यह जो रिपोर्ट है, हम ने कई दफा मांग की है कि यह रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने रखें। हमें पता तो लगे इसमें क्या लिखा गया है। लेकिन यह रिपोर्ट अभी तक पेश नहीं की गई है।

मैं दूसरा सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। अगर मंत्री महोदय प्रमाणिकता से यह काम करना चाहते हैं तो कपड़ा मिलों के ऊपर लेखा-पद्धति अनिवार्य रूप से लागू करें। कोआपरेटिव्ह और कोई इंडस्ट्रीज तो उसमें भी आडिट होता है लेकिन यह नियम मिलों का अगर नहीं है जिसको अनिवार्य रूप से लेखा-परीक्षा कहते हैं, मित्रों को लागू नहीं हुआ है, कई मिलों में यह नियम लागू नहीं है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं वह लागू हो। तीसरी बात, कई स्टेट्स ने किसानों से कपास खरीदने के लिए कदम उठाए हैं। महाराष्ट्र ने काटन प्रोक्योरमेंट

स्कीम तैयार की है, मध्यस्थ व्यापारी को निकाल दिया और कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन तय कर के कपास की एक गारण्टी प्राइस हर वर्ष तय कर दी जाती है।

खर्च के बाद जो प्राइस मिलती है जिसको अंतिम प्राइस कहते हैं वह भी फाइनल प्राइस उनको दी जाती है और मिल वाले जो चाहते हैं ग्रेड में कपास, इस स्कीम में कपास की ग्रेडिंग का काम भी होता है। महाराष्ट्र सरकार ने इस साल यह योजना चालू करने का निर्णय किया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ आनंद फ्लोर आफ द हाऊस कि क्या महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट की जो काटन प्रोक्योरमेंट स्कीम है उन को मंजूर करने वाले हैं कि नहीं। आखिरी सवाल मेरा यह है कि सितम्बर में काटन की प्राइस ए० पी० सी० ने रिकमण्ड की है? फिक्स की है? हर दफा सितम्बर से ईयर उन का शुरू होता है और इसके पहले हमें प्राइस मालूम होती है लेकिन अभी तक हमें काटन की सपोर्ट प्राइस मालूम नहीं हुई है। मेरा सुझाव है पंजाब में एक बेराइटी है 34—एफ, उसकी सपोर्ट प्राइस लास्ट ईयर में 225 रु० थी पर मार्केट में उसकी प्राइस डबल थी। मार्केट में आज भी रूलिंग प्राइस 390 से 450 रु० है। यानी इतना डिफरेंस है। इतना भारी फर्क सपोर्ट प्राइस में और रूलिंग प्राइस में रहता है। नतीजा यह होता है सपोर्ट प्राइस कम होने से कि किसान को नुकसान होता है और जो काटन की खरीद करने वाले लोग हैं वे लोग उसका नाजायज फायदा उठाते हैं। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वही बेराइटी की सपोर्ट प्राइस इस वर्ष के लिए 400 रुपये रखी जाये। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Indradeep Sinha.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA (Bihar): Sir, the Minister is not here.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (KUMAR ABHA MAITI): I am taking notes.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, now the only thing new in this so-called new policy statement on textile is that this Government has completely surrendered to the textile mill-owners on the question of controlled cloth.

The question of controlled cloth has a long history. It was originally fixed that 40 per cent of the production of the textile mills will be earmarked for standard cloth. Then that 40 per cent was reduced to 25 per cent—i.e. about 1000 sq. metres. Then that 1000 sq. metres was reduced to 800 metres. From 800 metres, it was reduced to 400 metres by the Janata Government. Now this policy statement says that the private sector textile mills are completely exonerated from the statutory obligation to produce controlled cloth. At least this is one issue on which Mr. George Fernandes can claim that he has beaten the Congress Government, has defeated Mrs Indira Gandhi—and that is on the question of surrender to the textile magnates. What Mr. George Fernandes, the socialist, has done, Indira Government, the capitalist, could not do. She did not completely surrender, but Mr. George Fernandes has surrendered and the mill-owners now are showering their kisses of love on him. And I hope they will also shower on him their 30 pieces of silver. Why has this been done? The big argument in the statement is that the textile mills were running at a loss. Why? Because they were required to produce coarse and medium cloth.

Sir, I have got with me "A Hand-Book of Statistic of Cotton Textile Industry" produced by the Indian Cotton Mills' Federation. According to this hand-book the overwhelming majority of the export that our cotton mills are making to foreign countries, consists of coarse, lower medium and higher medium cloth. For example, in the year 1976, out of 534 million metres, only 58 million metres were of the fine and superfine varieties. The rest were of coarse and medium

varieties. So these mills are able to make a profit when they produce coarse, medium cloth for export. Sir, they export largely in "grey". In 1976, 64 per cent. of the cloth exported outside the country was grey. That is not processed, not bleached and not dyed. It is just rough cloth produced in the mill and sent outside. The processing is done in Europe. So they are able to make a profit on the production of coarse and medium cloth, also on the export of coarse and medium cloth. But they complain that they are incurring a loss when they produce the same cloth for the people of this country. What is the reason? The Government should explain it. Why should the mill-owner incur a loss if he is producing for the people of the country? He will make a profit if he is producing for the people of other countries. What is the riddle? What is the clue? The clue is that the price of controlled or standard cloth is controlled by the Government. And it is this price control which makes them howl so much. Whereas when they export cloth, the price is not fixed. So they can charge any price. They can negotiate a price. But here the price is fixed. So what they are really against is, is not the production of coarse and medium cloth but the production of a cloth whose prices are controlled. And against this they have been protesting. On this issue this Government has shamelessly surrendered before the textile magnates. They have completely exonerated them from any obligation to produce any variety of controlled cloth. Now that will be produced by the National Textile Corporation. The statement says "Also later on by the handloom". I will come to handloom shortly. So is there any solution to this malady? In the very first paragraph of the statement the malady has been more or less correctly defined except for this reference to production of controlled cloth. Other things are more or less correct. Then, will this lead to a solution of the crisis. Why is the textile industry facing this crisis? It is facing a crisis,

[Shri Indradeep Sinha]

Sir, because, as Mr. Ramamurti correctly pointed out, the textile magnates have systematically looted the industry.

Sir, the Reserve Bank of India made a systematic study of the finances of the textile mills during the entire period 1950-51 to 1974-75. I hope the hon'ble Minister of Industry, at least his officers, have seen that report. Certain facts are very, very revealing. For example, after every five years the percentage of their profit goes on jumping up. Between 1951 and 1956 their total profits, before tax, increased by 46 per cent. Between 1956 and 1961 it increased by 55 per cent. Between 1961 and 1966 it declined by 62 per cent. But between 1966 and 1971 it again increased by 134 per cent. After that they have given annual figures—they have not given comparative five-year figures. So, this is the situation. Prices have been rising, profits have been rising continuously. And what have they done with the profits? They have distributed most of the profits as dividends. They have paid dividends even in years when the mills had incurred losses, and this policy of paying dividends at a high rate has denuded these mills of all reserves. Sir, I have no time to go into these figures, but I will only quote the observations made by the Reserve Bank Review about their policy on payment of dividends:

"Profit allocation of cotton textile companies from 1950-51 to 1974-75: In the case of six groups of cotton textile companies, it is observed that these companies have generally followed a liberal dividend policy with its adverse impact on the amount of profits ploughed back, especially in lean years."

And this policy has resulted in complete drying up of their financial reserves and this policy is being continued even now, in the latest year, this year. In the *Economic and Political Weekly*, figures of three companies have been given—the latest figures of Mafatlal, Standard Mills and

Swadeshi Polytex. Mafatlals have distributed a dividend of 17.6 per cent, Standard Mills a dividend of 21 per cent and, Swadeshi Polytex, a dividend of 15 per cent. The same dividend policy is continued and it is this policy which has led to the drying up of the reserves. And when the reserves are dried up, they come to the Government and say, "Give us money, give us money." I won't quote the opinion of the Reserve Bank but 60 per cent of the machinery is outmoded and even this outmoded machinery is not fully utilised. And now they are howling that unless the Government advances them money, they will be unable to modernise their mills. But when they had the money they had eaten away the money, they mis-directed it in other directions.

Sir, this Reserve Bank Review has pointed out that these companies have been transferring their funds to other industries—to steel, to synthetics, to detergents, to artificial fibres, to engineering, to so many other industries. And the Reserve Bank Review has finally proposed to the Government that some legislative measure should be adopted to check this practice. For example, the conclusion is:

"The companies also invest in subsidiaries or promote new companies engaged in activities other than the manufacture of cotton textiles. Such diversification may improve their profitability but it certainly reduces the availability of funds for the replacement and rehabilitation of the existing machinery in the mills. Hence it appears desirable that in any programme of modernisation of the cotton textile industry which requires enormous funds, there should be a provision for arresting the diversion of internally generated funds to other activities." (RBI Bulletin—January, 1977)

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he was aware of this recommendation of the Reserve

Bank which is based on a study of the working of the textile mills during the last twenty-five years and if his Ministry was aware of the reason, then why this recommendation had not been included in this so-called "new" textile policy.

Sir, there is another aspect of the textile industry. The proportion of interest that they are paying to their total profits has gone on increasing. Again, according to the figures given in this Reserve Bank Review, the 104 companies which were surveyed in 1950-51 paid Rs. 1.6 crores as interest and 249 companies which were surveyed in 1974-75 paid Rs. 63 crores as interest. Now the number of companies surveyed had doubled, of course, but the difference in the interest is 1140. Why is so much interest paid? Interest payment which used to be a very small fraction of the profits before tax of these companies has acquired a significant position in their total profits now? Why? Why do they need so much money? They need this money in order to carry out other activities like speculation, hoarding, profiteering, blackmarketing. They take funds from the banks, charge the interest on the mills and mis-utilise the funds in such activities, and because of this the profitability of the mills gets reduced. Now, on the cloth that these mills produce, they start charging a premium from the very time that they sell to some wholesaler. The premium starts from the mill and that is the basis of black-marketing down to the retailer. An hon. Member from the other side—perhaps he is acquainted with the trade—recounted here in the House how the wholesaler and the mill-owner conspire to wrongly print the price on the cloth and cheat the retailer as well as the consumer. So these malpractices are taking place.

Now, Sir, these textile mills are diverting to synthetics. They are introducing synthetics. And our friend Shri George Fernandes has become a great votary and a great admirer of polyester khadi. Now, in this House,

I expressed an opinion that by introducing polyester khadi, one sphere of activity which is still in the handloom sector will be taken away and transferred to the mill sector, that is, carding. Ordinary cotton can be carded by a village carder with his own instrument. But if you want to mix cotton and polyester, this can be done only in a mill. This blending cannot be done properly in the cottage industry. Therefore, this work also will now be transferred to the textile industry. Mr. Ramamurti has quoted certain figures. On the basis of what I have come across in the press, the prices in India of polyester, viscose and nylon are five or six times of the international prices. And these high prices are continuing. So what all these mills have done during these 30 years is to loot the people, to loot the cotton growers, to loot the workers, to loot the retail traders, to loot even their own mills and amass money, build other industries—from small capitalists they have grown 6. P.M. into monopolists. And now they are shouting that their mills are "sick" and that the Government should go to their help. Shri George Fernandes has come forward with his so-called "new" textile policy to help them. One hundred and five mills, the Government has taken over. What is their gain? The Government will modernise the mills, and after modernisation, after the period of 15 years is over, the Government will hand them over to the private sector.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY
(SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES):
How can it be?

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: So, some drastic remedy is to be found. These people cannot be reformed. These textile monopolists cannot be reformed.

What is their reaction to his new policy? The Mafatlals have welcomed his new policy and they have raised the price of their products by 5 to 10 paise per metre. It is not only the Mafatlals but all the others have done

[Shri Indradeep Sinha]

so. I do not want to read the reports in the Press. All the other big mills have increased the price of their products after the new textile policy was announced. So, they welcomed the new textile policy, patted Shri George Fernandes on the back and raised the price. What is to be done with these people? Can they be reformed? They cannot be reformed. Their mills should be taken over; their mills should be nationalised.

Clothing is the second major requirement of the common people, and these mills have failed to supply cheap cloth to the people. The consumption of cloth per head is declining because the prices are too high. The Estimates Committee report has revealed that nearly 75 per cent of the cloth produced by the textile mills is priced at more than Rs. 5/- per metre. So, the textile mills cannot produce cheap cloth for the people. If the Government is serious about providing cheap cloth for the people, the only remedy is to nationalise the mills and to produce cheap cloth for the people. Otherwise, the people can never get cheap cloth. Unfortunately, the new statement, the so-called "new" statement, has not taken into account this problem at all.

Sir, the statement talks about the handloom weavers. Comrade Ramamurti spoke a bit about them. I do not want to repeat what he has said already. Yarn constitutes the biggest segment of the price of the handloom cloth. But yarn is produced by the mills and is sold by the agents of the mills, that is the distribution machinery. Similarly, the dyes are produced by the mills and are sold by the traders who are in league with the mill-owners. These things, yarn and the dyes, should be made available at cheap rates to the handloom weavers. I do not agree with Comrade Ramamurti that they can defeat the textile mills in a fair competition; they cannot. A recent study has shown that the cost of producing a pair of dhotis on a handloom is 56

per cent higher than that of producing a pair of dhotis in a textile mill. So, even by fair competition, the handloom cannot defeat the mill. About that I have no illusion. But if they are given a State subsidy, if they are allowed to have yarn, dyes and other things at controlled rates, if proper marketing mechanism is set up and if proper credit is arranged, they can make their industry survive, they can even grow for some time to come and they can earn a living. Unfortunately, this policy statement does not make any such proposal. There is no proposal, for example, Sir, that all the yarn produced by the textile mills, meant for the handloom weavers, will be taken over by the Government and distributed through a public distribution system among the handloom weavers. There is no such proposal. I would like to know why the Government has not made such a proposal.

Thirdly, I would just say a word about the cotton growers. The hon. Member, Shri Deorao Patil has thrown light on some of the problems. In this House when there was a debate during the last session, I raised the question of the Cotton Nexus Prices Committee. This committee submitted its report in 1976 and Shri Deorao Patil read out a portion of the Government's reply on this question. But unfortunately did not read out the other part of the reply given to his question. The other part says:

"The recommendations of the committee are based on certain assumptions which call for far-reaching structural changes in the textile trade and the conversion technology in the mills. Whether such changes can be effected in practical terms and, if so, to what extent, have to be considered in depth."

That means, the Cotton Nexus Prices Committee proposed certain structural changes in the cotton trade as well as in the textile industry. Now, when the Government was for-

mulating a so-called "new" textile policy, did they go into these recommendations? Did they consider the recommendations of this Cotton Nexus Prices Committee? Have they rejected them, because they have not made any proposal for any structural change either in the textile industry or in cotton trade? If they have rejected the recommendations of the committee, why have they rejected them? Is the Parliament entitled to know what the recommendations of the committee were and why they had been rejected?

Similarly, the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices went into the cost structure of the textile industry recently. They also submitted a report. Will the Government place the report before the House? What are the findings of the Bureau? These textile mills have been allowed, on the one hand, to loot the people and, on the other, to cheat cotton growers. The cotton growers have been denied remunerative prices and as Shri Deorao Patil indicated, and as I also stated here last time, that according to the admission of the mill-owners themselves, the cotton growers hardly get 50 per cent of the price which the mill-owner pays at the mill-gate; the rest is pocketed by various intermediaries connected with the mill-owners. The only solution is complete take-over of the wholesale trade in cotton. Let there be monopoly purchase of cotton all over the country on the lines of the monopoly purchase scheme of Maharashtra.

But what did this Government do to the Maharashtra scheme? That scheme was continuing for a number of years. But when this Government was installed, they refused to advance a credit of Rs. 40 crores so that that scheme was wound up last year. I do not know what will happen this year. So, if they really want to help cotton growers and also the consumers of cloth with cheap cloth, the only way is to start monopoly purchase of cotton on behalf of the Cotton

Corporation of India, make cotton available at controlled rates to the mills and make cloth available also at controlled rates to the people. Are they prepared to do that? There is no indication in this statement of any such step. So, my only request to the hon. Industry Minister is that he has already got the thanks of the textile mill-owners for the service he has rendered them, and now he should be satisfied with that. Let him withdraw this so-called Textile Policy Statement and call a committee of Members of Parliament to sit with him to formulate a new Textile Policy because his Government has completely failed to formulate any textile policy at all.

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Government has spelled out this policy which actually has been in the offing for a long time. In fact, even this Government has taken nearly 18 months to announce it. Especially for the last three or four months we were hearing about the announcement of the policy. But perhaps the internal squabbles in the Janata Party took more importance than the welfare of the people at large. Even a week before we were hearing it was coming, coming, coming. But perhaps the Minister was so busy in peace-making that he could not get time to study it and present it to the House. As is well known, the minimum needs of the people are food, cloth and a roof over the head. Now the main question is production of cheap cloth and secondly its availability to the weaker sections of the population of this country, 80 per cent of whom live in villages. So the two basic problems are: (a) production of standard cloth, and (b) its distribution channels, so as to reach the people in the remotest hamlets. In its policy the Government has spelt out a number of things. So far as production is concerned, especially about the production of coarse cloth. They have freed the private mills from their obliga-

[Shrimati Pratibha Singh]

tion. The Minister says that in place of the obligation which was both in the form of compulsory production of coarse cloth failing which they had to pay a fine, they are now required either to produce it voluntarily or to have a levy on fine and superfine cloth. The private mill sector is prepared for this levy on the fine and superfine cloth as the same will be transferred to the consumer. Secondly in respect of the levy the private mills will earn higher profits from the production of fine and superfine cloth. Thirdly, they will save expenditure which they had to incur on additional machinery required for the production of standard cloth, because the machinery required for standard cloth is a bit different from that required for finer cloth. Cotton cloth market was buoyant in 1974 and there was more demand than the supply. But in the last two three years it was dull again. This year it is expected to be buoyant as the excesses accumulated so far have mostly been disposed of. What I mean to say is the present Government has helped the private mills by removing this obligation. I will not anyway go much into the details so far the different aspects of the production policy is concerned, as all the speakers before me have gone threadbare into all the aspects connected with the production starting from the problem to cotton grower and cotton price, modernisation of mills and all the rest of it. Though without production distribution policy has no meaning, but still in his statement on page 2, para 4, the Minister specially mentions about improved arrangements for distribution of standard cloth to the weaker sections of the population. Over the last few years a number of experiments have been tried for distribution of coarse cloth down to the remotest village, but time and again there have been bottlenecks and stocks have either not been lifted or owing to their inferior quality, not been sold. The stocks were often not

lifted as there were no plant channels of marketing and secondly, the organisation which had to lift the stocks lacked credit facilities. Both of these are very important factors which the Government has to look into and work out a feasible plan for the distribution of coarse cloth. Even when the stocks were lifted with the special help of the Government, the quality at times was so poor that the people were not prepared to buy those *dhoties* and *saries*. We ourselves saw the quality of these stocks which were lying with different co-operatives and other sectors for sale.

This led to losses to the mills. One should not forget the psychology of the buyer, whether he is poor or well-to do. As Mr. S. Srinivasan says in the Indian Express today "that the low income group would not purchase an article solely on the strength of its being inexpensive if the quality, feel and look are not attractive. The last thing in the world the low income group wants to do is to appear as a low income group. The urge to go one better than one's neighbour is as strong among the poor as it is among the well heeled. Secondly, the money spent by the poor has special meaning—it is very hard earned and he likes to have the best for his small penny and buy its worth. Hence a well-organised selling is very essential which will have to pay attention to three or four factors. One is the latest market trends. The second is the psychology of the people of the area. The third is the festival seasons which consumes the best part of the stocks. Here it may be made clear that the sales are not equal all the year round. Specially with the weaker sections this is much more so. Hence I have to make two or three suggestions so far as the distribution channel for coarse cloth is concerned. Let us see who is going to have the major part of the burden for the production of the controlled cloth. This is going to be with the nationalised mills. Since the private mills have been given the option of producing controlled cloth only, on voluntary

basis, most of them are opting out of this option. In addition to the NTC., the handloom sector has also been introduced for production of standard cloth in a limited way. Therefore, any shortfall in production either from the private sector or the handloom sector is to be made up by the NTC. As the cost of production of coarse cloth is a little higher than the sale price to be fixed by the Government in consideration of the buying capacity of the weaker sections, the NTC's losses can be covered only if the distribution and sale of the same goes in a major portion through the NTC channels, i.e. its shops. So far we have tried to sell through the co-operative sector. No doubt this is an important channel but along with it we have to have additional channels for sale if we want to reach remotest parts of India and the farthest hamlets of India. Already enormous effort has gone into the setting up of three to four hundred retail outlets managed directly by the NTC and its subsidiaries throughout India even at the rural level. This is necessary as to give the NTC the opportunity to sell not only the controlled cloth but also its non-controlled cloth through its retail outlets on standard rates which are the same all over the country. When a buyer comes to buy standard cloth, if he gets a little variety and at fixed price, it induces buying with satisfaction. This is quite apparent in the NTC shops at Srinagar or Tiruchirappally—the two ends of the country—selling goods at the same price and this gives confidence to the people. There is no doubt that all is not well with the NTC. Some of the shops have very bad display and they are not located at proper sites and service too is not good. But once a decision about handing over a part of the distribution work is done, these defects can be gradually removed. Another advantage would be that along with standard cloth, the sale of non-standard cloth will help the National Textile Corporation to considerably cut down its recurring losses and also, if

the Minister cares, he can go into this question in detail of the total amount of levy to be paid to the National Textile Corporation for the production of controlled cloth, which it can partially subsidise by selling larger quantities of non-standard cloth through its retail outlets, by virtue of the fact that a considerably larger number of retail customers would be attracted to these shops, thereby ensuring the sale of controlled cloth through the National Textile Corporation retail outlets. In this way you are not only serving your purpose of making available the controlled cloth to the people at the village level, but you are also making popular other types of cloth that you produce in the nationalised sector, thereby helping this sector to cut down the losses. In short, you have to get into the psychology of the commercial-oriented sector and the profit-and-loss question has to be considered in full detail to make the public sector organisations more successful in competing with the private sector. And, Sir, the Minister has already made certain statements about this in Bombay one or two months ago. One suggestion also I would like to make and it is that these National Textile Corporation channels may have women employees as they are good sales people. One more suggestion that I would like to make is this: It is understood that the NTC has drawn up some schemes for the distribution and sale of controlled cloth and non-controlled cloth through unemployed graduates who will be financed through the State Bank of India. They will sell these types of cloth by going round the villages in selected areas and on the sale, they would get commission. The commission that they get will give incentive to these unemployed graduates to work hard to earn their livelihood and will thus help National Textile Corporation to reach every village, and thus every man. The Khadi Board people have tried this method at times and I know that some people who started sales on a commission basis in a very small way

[Shrimati Pratibha Singh]

have, today, become very big business magnates. The only caution that I would like to be there is that if the unemployed graduates in the locality are taken, that would encourage the local people and the Minister is aware of the fact that in the villages we do not have a large number of graduates, especially in the interior parts of India, and this scheme, when worked out in detail, may give employment to quite a big number. Otherwise, how long can this country go on if people only want to go in for regular government employment? The climate for commerce and self-reliance has to be created amongst our educated youth and that may be the only saviour in the present atmosphere of unrest. I have knowingly not gone into the complex production policy which the Minister has stated here. There are many vague things and there are a number of things which are not very clear in which I do not want to deal with now. But, as the Members before me have gone into the various aspects, I have tried to point out only the distribution aspect of the policy about which the honourable Minister has said that there would be "production and availability of adequate supplies of cloth of acceptable quality and at low prices for the masses" and "improved arrangement for the distribution of this cloth to the weaker sections of the population." He has just mentioned these things and he has not gone into details of the distribution and marketing plan and he has not said as to what exactly and how exactly he wants to do it. Thank you, Sir.

SHRIMATI RAJINDER KAUR (Punjab): Sir, I won't take much time because I feel that everybody is feeling tired and would like to leave early. Sir, the Minister has claimed that he has two objectives in view: to provide cheap cloth at a reasonable price and to generate employment potential. I do not understand how this Industrial Policy will be a means

to achieve these objectives. He has stated two things: He wants to take away the manufacture of controlled cloth from the organised sector and give it to the handloom sector. Already a little more than 400 million metres of cheap cloth is being manufactured by the National Textile Corporation. Now, the whole burden of producing this cheap cloth has been put on the National Textile Corporation. Will it be possible for the National Textile Corporation to double its production all at once because this compulsory production of cheap cloth is going to be exempted from the 1st October as I understand. If this cheap cloth is to be manufactured by the handloom sector and if you can manufacture it only up to the year 1982 or 1983, for 4 or 5 years, what will the poor people do? They won't have any cloth to cover their already half-naked children. He has enunciated again and again in the policy that he wants to encourage the handloom industry. But the handloom industry can be encouraged only if the worker can have a sufficient amount of earning from the handloom industry. So far as my information goes, the handloom weaver cannot earn more than six or seven rupees per day per loom. And with this high cost of living, how can the cheap cloth be manufactured in the handloom sector and how it will be possible for the weavers to make sufficient earning, and at the same time to produce cloth at cheap rate? The alternative can be that let this cheap cloth or controlled cloth be manufactured by the textile industry and the silk cloth and the woollen cloth may go to the handloom industry. Of the fine cloth is manufactured by the handloom sector, only then can they earn a living and the handloom industry will flourish. Synthetic fabrics are the costliest in the market; they are not manufactured by the handlooms but they are being manufactured by the textile industry. Let these synthetic fabrics be manufactured in the handloom industry or fine cloth

be manufactured by the handloom industry. You talk of Khadi and all that. If a lady spins it, she cannot earn more than three or four rupees per day? How do you think that this will be encouraging the handloom sector and how do you think that you are doing service to the poor people or you are generating employment, unless sufficient margin or sufficient earning is there in the handloom sector?

Thank you very much.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the Members who have participated in this debate. It has been quite an interesting debate. It started with Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan finding something good in this policy. It was not all bad for him. In fact, in the course of his long speech, he was to preface every part of his speech by saying that there was something good in this policy. But his own party comrade, Mr. Makwana, saw nothing good in it. He said that there was nothing new at all and it was the existing policy. Then, he went on to attack it. If it is the existing policy that I have presented to the House, in other words a policy by which Mr. Makwana and his party have been swearing all these years, then I do not see why he should attack this policy. He should be satisfied with it because that was his policy. But I presume that these are some of the contradictions which my friends in the opposition generally face and then are unable to reconcile. Comrade P. Mamamurti, of course, found nothing good in so far as the consumer is concerned. He thought that this entire policy has been worked out for the big business or rather in the interest of the large mill-owners. But I think it was Comrade Indradeep Sinha who took the cake by seeing in this policy a total surrender. If he had stopped at that surrender, it would have been all right. But he sounded a little romantic also thereafter. He had all the mill-

owners to come and shower kisses of love on the Minister of Industries. If he had to be romantic, he should have at least had the pretty models who generally model the cloth which the mill-owners produce. That would have been romantic. But having the mill magnates to come and shower kisses on me is neither romantic nor very desirable.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: But you look romantic to them.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:

Then, Sir, various Members expressed concern about various aspects of this policy. That is what I had expected. After all, it took us a long time to produce this policy. It was because so many interests had to be reconciled. The mill-owners are there. The private sector is there. The public sector is there. The cotton growers, the large ones and the small ones, are there. Then the workers' interests are there. Then there are traders' interests. There are various interests. There was man-made fibre and cotton fibre. Reconciling all these interests and producing a textile policy was quite an exercise. I must tell the House that it was quite an exercise. Mr. Dhabe, in particular, raised the problem of the workers also and I am glad that he raised the point about workers' participation in the management. He also raised the question of workers' dues, particularly when we take over a sick mill. I shall try to answer all these points to the extent it is possible for me to do so. But the most important thing about this policy or the debate that we had on this policy is that the Members tried to suggest that we have not been very specific in regard to details on each aspect of this policy. It is a very right criticism except that it is not justified criticism because what we have presented is a policy and not a plan of action. These are two different things. If I were to come before the House and say that this is the quantity of cloth that we are going to produce in the next 5 years,

[Shri George Fernandes]

out of it, this is the percentage of cloth that will be for the use of man-made fibres, this is the price at which this is going to be sold and this is the acreage that will be under cotton and if I were to come with specified plans of action of specific targets before the House, then that criticism would have been justified. What we are discussing is the policy a policy, I know, in the ultimate analysis, is a long-term programme. But when you discuss a policy, you do not discuss the short term unless you confine yourself to a discussion of the short term which is not what we are doing today, Sir, because, what I have presented to the House, what I have presented to the country is a broad outline of the Textile Policy which as some Members very rightly observed here has been presented for the first time in the last 30 years. There wasn't a textile policy. It was all *ad hoc*. Every sector had its way, every interest had its say and things just went on, they went on drifting. Now, what are the issues? Broadly, you have this question of control cloth on which every Member has spoken. Then you have the problem of handlooms which in my view is one of the most important aspects of this policy and in fact one of the most important aspects of our entire Industrial Policy. The question of handlooms specifically figures in our Industrial Policy also. Then you have khadi, for a variety of reasons. Then, Sir, there is wool and silk. Then you have the interest of the cotton-growers, link it with the interest of the people who deal in man-made fibres, whether they are imported or produced in our country. Relate that with the interests of the Cotton Corporation of India. These, Sir, are the basic issues involved or items that need to be discussed. But the over-arching point that must be taken into consideration while discussing the Textile policy is the interest of the consumer, the most

important thing. People are concerned as to how much profit a mill magnate has been making, how much the NTC has been losing, what the Khadi Commission or the Khadi Board is up to, whether the Cotton Corporation of India made last year profits or losses, how the cotton-growers' interests suffered, and how much profit that chap who imported some polyester filament yarn made. But, Sir, in all these, the most important factor is the consumer, who, somehow, I must say, does not figure to the extent that he should because it is very easy to say that some one is a big textile magnate and attack that man. It is easy. And one of the things that I have not been able to understand in the House and outside also when we discuss the industrial policy generally and now in the specific context of the textile policy is the feeling that anything that the industry favours must be bad. The textile industry says this is a good policy, so it must be bad. This is the view of certain people. If the mills make profits, then it is bad. But if the NTC loses, that also is bad. So, what is good? You make profits. But it is bad. These fellows have made profits. Then you make loses in the NTC. But that is also bad. Why don't you make profits? (*Interruptions*) That is what we are trying to do. That is what this textile policy is trying to do. But you cannot have an ideological approach when you discuss profits and loses; you cannot have an ideological approach. If a mill-owner feels that this policy is going to put the mill back in the business in the real sense of the term, there is nothing to grumble about and complain about. And this has been one of the problems of the textile industry. People have today trotted out figures as to how much profit the mill have been making. May be, they are making the profits. But when I look at the position of the mills in the context of the controlled cloth and there is so much that is being said about the controlled cloth, Sir, out of 281 composite textile mills presently in

operation, 139 mills have been fully exempted from producing the controlled cloth, almost 50 per cent. Why? Because they were losing money, so fully exempted. And another 24 have been partially exempted which leaves, Sir, 118 mills. So, Sir, you have this very interesting situation where during the last several years, when you had an obligation on the textile mills to produce control cloth, the textile mills were producing cloth and they started losing money, and when they started losing money, you started exempting them. And you reached a point where you finally exempted 139 entirely and 24 partially.

Now, it has never been my case, in fact, the textile policy does not say that it is only because the mills are required to produce controlled cloth that they incur losses and this renders the mills sick. That has never been my case. The contrary has been my case. I have discussed in this House and the other House the reasons for the sickness of the industry. In fact, for the first time, just as we have produced a statement on textile policy, we have also produced a statement on the reasons of sickness in the industry, soon after we produced the industrial policy. When one unit of the Swadeshi Mills went sick, we went to the extent of taking over all the mills of the Swadeshi group; we did that also. And, when I announced the take over of the Swadeshi Mills, I had to mention this also, namely, that the mill-owners have been misusing the funds of the mills and that they have been indulging in cheating and this is not only in the case of the textile mill-owners but this has been happening generally in the industry. If an industry falls sick, it is not only because of certain problems like the requirement of producing controlled cloth or non-availability of raw material but on account of all these other factors also.

But, now when you discuss this textile policy, you take the position that

sickness is there and this sickness is there because the mill-owners have been cheating and looting and this is the only reason and no other reason is given. If you are doing that you are running away from the facts because these are not the facts. The facts are that you have to exempt 139 mills completely and 24 mills partially from the requirement of producing controlled cloth. Now, Sir, we took a decision, a very deliberate decision, that where controlled cloth is concerned, we shall have 400 million metres of it produced in the organised textile sector, with handlooms producing some more. Now, when we took this decision, we had these figures before us, namely, that there were mills which were not today producing controlled cloth because they were exempted under the laws that you yourself had framed, under laws, which, in my view, are quite right. You cannot ask a mill, fold up, or produce controlled cloth and 111 mills did fold up and the N.T.C. is running them today, not entirely because of this factor, agreed, but nevertheless a contributory factor. The very fact that you exempt these, you accept it is a contributory factor. And, I have trade unions coming and telling me, please exempt our mill, trade unions belonging to all shades of political opinion come and tell me, please exempt our mill. So, we took this decision and while taking this decision we were also aware that 59 textile mills were not producing any contracting it to outside mills, to other controlled cloth because they were mills. My friend, Mr. Shiva Chandra Jha was to express a doubt as to whether now that we have said that we shall ask for tenders to produce controlled cloth, apart from what the NTC will be producing, whether the big mills will come again and corner all of it and make all the profits. On the contrary, 59 of the biggest mills of this country are not producing controlled cloth at all. They are contracting it to outside mills, to other mills. They have stated that they do not have the equipment. Controlled cloth

[Shri George Fernandes]
is coarse cloth and some of these mills have equipment and machinery which produces only fine cloth. They are not able to produce it themselves. But your rules and laws say, if you cannot produce it, someone else will produce it for you as long as you pay the difference. They pay the money and they produce it. Therefore, this risk of the big mills taking over this entire responsibility and running away with all the cream, which is not there at all, is not there.

Now, why did we remove the obligation? We removed the obligation for these reasons, namely, that there are mills which are not producing controlled cloth and contracting it to others; then there are mills which have fallen sick to a point where they had to be exempted. Then, what is the purpose of continuing with this exercise? So, Sir, we took a very conscious and a very deliberate decision. Now, there is criticism that the N.T.C. mills are already sick and you are going to make them more sick by handing over the requirement of producing controlled cloth to them. Now, Sir, here is again where the contradiction comes and you feel that if it is given to the N.T.C. mills, the sickness of the N.T.C. mills will aggravate. In other words, you yourself admit of that position, namely, that the manufacture of this controlled cloth creates conditions of sickness and therefore do not give it to the N.T.C. But we are not giving it to the N.T.C. in order to turn the N.T.C. mills sick. And with regard to those who keep on snipping at the N.T.C. making losses, I would like to make a submission once again, which I have been making constantly before. I would like to make a submission once again, particularly to those who tell me that the NTC is a losing mill, that let them not forget that NTC is nothing but the sick mills that have been taken over and converted into a Corporation. Each one of them was taken over because it was sick and for the first time when you have had a new Government that when one mill was made

sick by someone who owned a group, we went and took over the entire group and said that from now on, be careful. We told the entire industry to be careful. We told them: "If you think that you can take away the money from one unit and keep on expanding elsewhere, at least we in this Government are not going to accept it." It is another matter what the previous Government did. So, if this responsibility is given to the NTC, it is not to make NTC go sick. On the contrary, I would have liked the NTC to produce the entire controlled cloth. In the ultimate analysis, if say, the NTC produces 200 million metres or 250 million metres or 500 million metres of cloth—I do not know because we are just going to work out the details and I do not know what will be the share of NTC but in the final analysis the NTC takes to the manufacture of controlled cloth—the subsidy that will be going to NTC through the cess that we are going to impose on the entire textile industry, on all sections, on all segments of the textile industry, will underwrite some of the losses that NTC is today making. At the moment, we keep this NTC going by giving subsidy from the Exchequer. The NTC is a sick unit because it is, as I said and I repeat, an agglomeration of a conglomeration of the entire sickness of the industry. One hundred and eleven sick units amalgamated and formed NTC. There are accumulated loss of about Rs. 150 crores plus. Last year, the losses were of the order of about Rs. 35 crores to Rs. 40 crores. This year, it will be about Rs. 25 crores. These losses are constantly coming down and in the next two years, the NTC will be able to get into the black. I have no doubt about that. But in the meanwhile, in the current year, when the NTC takes over production of the controlled cloth, then instead of the Exchequer subsidising NTC losses as is being done today, we are going to use part of the N.T.C. capacity to produce cloth that is anyway going to be subsidised which even the private mill was doing. It

was subsidising itself or when some other mill was producing this controlled cloth for a bigger mill, the bigger mill was subsidising it by paying the difference. And now, for the NTC the entire industry, all sections and all segments of the textile industry will be contributing by way of a cess or a levy which will meet the actual difference between the production of the cloth and the cost of that cloth. This is what we are going to do. And I fail to understand as to why, in the course of this debate, several of the hon. Members tried to overlook the whole concept of subsidy or the cess. We have not let the mills off the hook as has been made out. No one has been left off. On the contrary, the entire textile industry will be asked to pay the levy and what will be that levy? We will come forward with proposals. We know what it is going to be.

AN HON. MEMBER: This levy will be transferred to the consumer.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Even now everything is transferred to the consumer. I would like anyone to tell me anything that you consider does not ultimately come from the consumer. Even when you had that old standard controlled cloth, who paid for that? When the mills went sick, and you put every year Rs. 35 crores, Rs. 40 crores, Rs. 50 crores into the NTC to take over the sick mills and run them, where did the money come from? In some form or the other, the poor consumer, the poor ordinary citizen, those dumb millions keep on paying in some form or the other. They have been paying. We are trying to rectify it today by making an even spread. If in this country, there is X-million metres of cloth produced, of all fibres, silk, woollens, cotton textiles, blended, then this levy—we are doing the exercise on it and will come before the House with adequate final proposals—is going to bring about an even spread.

When there is an even spread, we will so organise this spread that it does not hurt the poor man. Therefore, there is no reason why there should be any complaint after that. Instead of the Exchequer today paying from the taxes that you are collecting, you are going to impose a special levy on the cotton textile industry, evenly spread, which will not hurt the small consumer, and it is from those resources that you are going to subsidise that part of the NTC production which will be controlled cloth and also that controlled cloth which other mills may volunteer to produce. If they do not want to, they will not be compelled to. NTC is prepared to take on the responsibility.

Then again, Sir, in this context, I would like to say a word about the role of the NTC itself. Comrade Ramamurti and a few others felt very deep about this. While the big private mills are making cloth in the high-cost bracket, why should the NTC be treated as the poor cousin is the question. Are we also to get into the rat race to make more profits? I do not visualise that role for the NTC. Let me make it very clear. The role that I visualise for the NTC is as the clothier for the millions of this country, for the masses of this country. We have a body. We will expand it. Members may like to ask: 'What about expansion?'. Yes. We will expand it. We will expand it over the years. We will expand it, not in terms of the loomage because we have said that there shall be no additional loomage in the organised mill sector. All additional loomage will be in the handloom sector. But so far as spindlage is concerned, we will expand it.

Modernisation was referred to. I am not speaking about the modernisation plan of the private mills, though, with the new policy, they should have no excuse not to modernise quickly. I have not said anything about the sickness in the textile industry specifically and their modernising or not modernising in this policy paper. But

[Shri George Fernandes]

let nobody forget that there is a policy paper on sickness in industry. We are monitoring every unit today. We are monitoring all sectors of industry today, and what the private mills are going to do about modernisation is something on which we will keep an eye. Soft loans are available. We would like them to use them. We would like them to modernise their sectors. We would like them to get out of this kind of situation that most of them, or, at least many of them, have created over the years. The criticism about the mill sector is not unjustified. We would like them to get out of that situation and quickly modernise. Members may like to ask about the NTC modernisation. Well, we have earmarked Rs. 213 have a three-year plan. In the next three years, this plan will be completed. We have already spent Rs. 75 crores in modernising the NTC. Rs. 115 crores have been sanctioned. Rs. 75 crores have been spent. In the next three years, as I said, the entire NTC sector will be modernised. But even while it gets modernised, even while its capacity expands, it has some responsibility. For instance, this year, our target is to produce one billion metres of cloth. In other words, 25 per cent of the total cloth production in the organised mill sector will come from the NTC. That is our target for the next year and I am happy to observe that all the units of the NTC are today doing their best. They are doing their best to achieve this target. This is what we are doing there. But while doing this, while expanding the NTC, the whole concept is not to compete with others. This idea that NTC salesmen should be flying around the world and should be visiting the boutiques in London, New York and so on, is not acceptable to me. Let me be very clear about it. I know, many people in the NTC may not be happy about this idea, because who does not like to go abroad even if it is to sell cloth. But this is not acceptable to

me. My idea is, NTC should be the clothier for this country.

My friend Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan is not here. But he was rhetorical. He asked 'How long the people have to wait?' For what? From 16 metres per head 10—12 years ago, when the dynamic decade began, you have brought the Indian people to 12½ metres per capita per year. Suddenly, people turn rhetorical. They forget their past. They forget the policy they have pursued. They forget the fact that they have made people in this country live literally without cloth. They talk about the dynamic decade, of great achievement, publicised with crores of rupees a couple of years ago, during which, they brought the per capita consumption of cloth from 16.5 metres per head per year to 12.5 metres. Well, Sir, we have reversed this. In the next five years from the current year—we are going through 1978-79—we shall increase the per capita consumption of cloth by at least 1.5 metres. It is a big job, but we will do it. There is no use being rhetorical. There is a reversal trend. It is no use asking us such questions. We are trying to reverse the trend and it does take a little time. And this is what we are now trying to do. So, where the NTC's role is concerned, where the total perspective of the controlled cloth is concerned, where the private mills and the profits are concerned, all these factors were taken into account and we finally came to the conclusion as to what kind of a textile policy we should have. That is a blend. Someone said that everything should be blended into it. This is what we try to do.

A point was made about the workers, that provident funds have not been paid, salaries have not been paid. The take-over took place. The workers' interests were relegated to sixth or seventh category, which meant that they will not get the money. All this is truth, but why tell me? You voted for it. You voted for it with great applause. You must have beaten the desks in that House

and in this House. You voted and in this the workers' interest was relegated. We have changed it. When we have started nationalising, every unit that we have nationalised since we came into power, the first charge is the workers' dues. Since we came to power the first charge was the workers' dues. This is the difference. It was the fifth and we have made it, this Janata Government has made it, the first charge. This is the truth, Mr. Makwana. If it hurts I cannot help, but sometimes truth does hurt. But this is the truth, we have changed this.

You talk about workers' participation. Sir, I have set up a Committee. In fact, there were two Committees set up and my regret is that even the trade unionists make delays; that delaying tactics are not the prerogative of the employers. I am beginning to realise it not in the capacity of my being Minister of Industries, but in the normal course because I set up a workers' Committee to go into all the aspects of the functioning of the public sector undertakings under the charge of my Ministry, excluding the National Textile Corporation. We have 33 of them and I gave them a blank cheque. I said: You decide what should be done within the parameters of the Constitution and with any unanimous conclusion that you may come forward I will agree. This was in March and now it is August. They have not given any report. The trade unionists come to Delhi once in a month, spend a couple of days and go back and tell me that in the next month they will come again and I have yet to get the report. Regarding the NTC also we have set up a similar Committee. I have set up a 7-member Committee of trade unionists alone—no one else but trade unionists—and I have given them a full secretariat. In fact, the entire Secretariat of the Industry Ministry is at their disposal, from the Secretary downwards. You can examine, cross-examine anything, any record, any mill and then tell me

what should be done to make the NTC mills function better, more efficiently, produce better cloth, show some profits. You tell me and I will accept and I will implement it.

Some of the Members were to say that there is corruption in the NTC. I am not ruling it out. I think Mr. Dhabe mentioned a specific case of fraud. I hope he will send me the details and I will immediately investigate into it. There were a lot of things that were not right in the NTC, at all levels. For instance, in Madhya Pradesh we are losing every month Rs. 25 lakhs because the workers have gone back on the agreement and I would like Comrade Indradeep Sinha to help me. I would like anyone from Madhya Pradesh or from anywhere to help me. There are two National Textile Corporations where we are losing money. 7 P.M. One is Madhya Pradesh where the current year's loss would be perhaps 7 or 8 crores of rupees and the other is West Bengal where also we are going to lose about the same amount of money. We are losing there about 80 or 90 lakhs of rupees. These are the two Textile Corporations which are losing money, only because the management is bad. This is not to say that everybody is good, but there are agreements about the number of looms that will be worked which are being worked all over the country. In Madhya Pradesh the workers say: "We will not do it". The trade unions signed an agreement, but went back on it. There is surplus labour—10 per cent surplus labour—in Madhya Pradesh. You cannot discuss, cannot debate, cannot do a thing about it and in the process what is happening? You are taking money from the tax-payer and you are keeping idle labour going. You are paying them to do nothing.

There are problems, but where there are specific problems, where there is corruption, mismanagement, there I am prepared to go through them, examine them, but there should

[Shri George Fernandes]

be specific charges. For instance, my friend, Shri Khurshed Alam Khan, in a matter-of-fact manner said: "I do not know of a scandal like the rubber import scandal". And then he sent me a note saying: "I am sorry, I have got to go for an urgent meeting. I will not be able to listen to your reply". I called him over and said: "Your speech was excellent. You have made very good suggestions. I am very happy. But what is this rubber import scandal?" He said, "No, 15,000 tonnes of rubber was to be imported and then it was not imported". I said, "Yes, but what is the scandal?" He said, "Well, you know there is something wrong about it". I said, "Please tell me what is the scandal? What has happened where?" Then he referred to a weekly paper and said that somebody had published something. I said: "Do you know before you said that there has been an import scandal of rubber what you are talking about?" He said, "I do not." I told him that when the rubber price went up to Rs. 1,200 the manufacturers of rubber goods—the small ones, not the big tyre-wallas—the All-India Rubber Manufacturers' Association and the Northern India Rubber Goods Manufacturers' Association they are very active—came to me. They also went to the Commerce Minister because the Rubber Board is under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Ministry and the import and non-import of rubber are also the work of the Commerce Ministry. I am concerned to the extent that when the industry runs short of raw materials, it comes to me and says: "Give us the raw materials. You want production. Give us the raw materials". So they came and shouted. In fact, one Member in the other House was to make an issue saying that those people had been waiting for the last four days to see me and I was not seeing them, which was, of course, not true because I had seen them four days earlier. They came to me and raised the issue:

The cost of rubber is Rs. 1200. I knew that the cost of rubber had gone up and I knew also why it had gone up. The Rubber Board had organised export of rubber last year while they knew that we did not have enough rubber. I discussed this matter with the Commerce Minister. I told my colleague, Mr. Mohan Dharia that there was a shortage of rubber and the industry was closing down. They gheroad my residence one evening. The industrialists came in about a dozen cars—about 60 or 70 of them. Their cars piled up outside the gate of my house and they came inside late one evening. I said: "This is the problem. We need to find some answer to this". My colleague said: "The only course is to import". I said: "Let us import". Between the two of us, we discussed this matter and it was agreed that 15000 tonnes of rubber should be imported immediately. I had to answer a Short Notice Question in the other House. There this question was put to me. I said, "Yes, there is a shortage. It is an unfortunate situation. We are trying to rectify it and we are going to import 15,000 tonnes of rubber." The day this news appeared the Kerala Chief Minister made a statement in the Kerala Assembly: "We shall not accept any import of rubber. We will fight the Centres policy on the imported of rubber". The next day, or the third day, two Ministers from Kerala and all the Members of Parliament belonging to Kerala, irrespective of their party affiliations—belonging to every party—the Communist Party (Marxist), the Communist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Janata Party, the Congress Party and the Congress(I) Party and perhaps some Independents also—a plane-load of them—came over. I was not in the town. They went and met Mr. Mohan Dharia and they gheroad him saying: "If you are going to import rubber, it is going to create a major crisis. Please don't import. We will make available raw rubber at Rs. 1000". I was not in town.

But Mr. Mohan Dharia got me wherever I was and said, "Listen, all parties in both the Houses of Parliament and Members from Kerala, including Ministers, are here. They are telling me that they will be able to give rubber immediately for Rs. 1,000. They are pleading with me that we should not import rubber. So I would like to stay the immediate import of rubber. Let us give them a chance". I said, "I leave it to you though I am not very happy." He is the Commerce Minister. He looks after the rubber industry. His Ministry is the administrative Ministry that looks after the Rubber Board and he took the decision. My friend, Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan says that there is rubber scandal. What is the scandal? Someone must be specific about these things, Sir. It is very easy to just go on saying there is scandal.

Sir, as far as I am concerned, there has been a lot of debate in this House as well as outside about setting up of Commissions of Inquiry. I say let this House set up a Commission of Inquiry. Come on.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Karnataka): Mr. Fernandes, for your information the rubber prices have now come down.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is all right. That is not the question. I am concerned about the question of scandal.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: It was not a question of scandal as such. Whenever the prices of an agricultural commodity go up because the commodity goes out there is a hue and cry. And if anything happens they say there is scandal. They say we are corrupt. That is not scandal.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is all right. That is not the question.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: I am not talking against you. I am defending you. There is

no scandal. The prices have automatically come down.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is all right. That is not the point. Since the honourable Member made a statement to that effect in his House, I am making this offer. Let there be an investigation. I would ask the hon'ble Member to preside over that committee of investigation and find out what the rubber scandal is. Let us have it. I am making a very serious proposal and I hope in the Parliamentary Committee of the Congress (I) they will consider my offer to make Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan the Chairman of an inquiry committee to go into the rubber import scandal to which he referred. I am offering. But let us not have a loose talk. Let us have a political debate.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Why not appoint a committee to look into the scandal about the import of polyester fibre?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Here I am on a specific point. Have a Committee. Let all of you sit down and appoint a committee. Come out with your proposals and give your finding.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Including polyester fibre import.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Anything as far as I am concerned. In fact, I have written to the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha today about the charge that Mr. B. P. Maurya was making in the course of the debate. I have written a letter saying that a committee of this House or the Privileges Committee or any other agency that the Chairman of this decides to set up must be set up by Mr. Maurya. That matter will come up the day after tomorrow. I have sought his permission to raise the matter and I shall raise it at that point of time.

Sir, we are discussing the whole concept of the N.T.C.'s functioning of

[Shri George Fernandes]
the textile industry and its functioning.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Come to the textile policy.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:
N.T.C. functioning is part of it. And if you could bring in rubber while discussing the N.T.C.'s functioning, then I need to clarify. You cannot just have it your own way. I need to clarify this thing. So, Sir, the role that you have assigned to the N.T.C. is that of the clothier to the people and the participation in management and the total functioning of the N.T.C., the expansion of the N.T.C. and the N.T.C.'s really going to the homes of the poorest of the poor in this country and providing them with cheap and durable and good cloth. That is the policy that we are going to pursue.

We have decided on 400 million metres of controlled cloth through the mill sector. If we have decided to gradually phase it out into the handloom sector there is very fundamental contradiction that has prevailed in this entire textile industry over the years. You have been providing cloth Rs 6 or Rs. 62 by calling it controlled cloth on the one hand producing it in the textile mills making the consumers pay for it and then at the same time you have also been discussing of a policy to encourage handloom. There is handloom cloth that is very expensive, very sophisticated, that models use in India, in Moscow and elsewhere. All that is accepted. But that is not the bulk of the handloom cloth. The bulk of the handloom cloth is what the poor people use from Assam down to Kerala, from Bengal up to Gujarat. The bulk of the handloom cloth is what the poor people use.

Now if you subsidise the mill-made cloth, take it to the rural areas through your co-operative societies or what have you, and then at the same time say you are encouraging hand-

looms, then there is a very fundamental contradiction. Because, when this control cloth goes to the villagers and is sold at Rs. 1.60 or Rs. 2, the poor handloom man cannot afford because to produce a metre of cloth, the cotton that goes into it itself costs Rs. 1.50 or 1.60 and he cannot afford to sell it at less than Rs. 2 or 3 and then you run into this problem. You say you are encouraging the handlooms while actually, in some form or other, in a very open or in a very subtle way, you build up the private sector, you build up the mill sector, you build up the mechanised sector. So, Sir, when we have said that gradually from the mill sector the entire cloth will move into the handloom sector, we are also creating a situation where in the rural areas, through the handlooms, firstly we will create more jobs and, secondly, we will produce more cloth. I do not need to go through statistics; I am sure hon. Members are aware of it. But in the next five years, the production of handloom cloth will go up from 2,300 million metres in the current year to 3,700 million metres—an increase of 60 per cent. Against a total cloth production increase of 88 per cent, the production in the handloom sector is the largest. We are visualizing an overall increase of 2,700 million metres of production in the next five years. Of these 2,700 million metres of additional cloth that will be produced in the next five years, 1,400 million metres, that is, 65 per cent, will come from the handloom sector. This is the role we are visualizing for handlooms. Of course, there is the question of how one does go about it, from the supply of yarn to the marketing of the produce. (Interruptions) So we have been discussing expansion of co-operatives in the handloom sector. We have a programme. I do not like to use the term "crash programme" because it is not a term which has a very happy expression. But we have a programme and currently we are implementing this programme at a speed

that was never thought of before. So, in the next two or three years, we will be able to cover as much of the handloom sector as possible through a network of co-operatives and, finally, apex bodies. So, with regard to the handloom sector, for instance, the total outlay in the coming five years is going to be Rs. 370 crores which is a lot of money.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: You have not informed us how you will supply yarn.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I will come to that; I am discussing the entire handloom sector.

If you look at the bank credit that has been made available, whereas in 1975-76 the total amount of bank credit that was made available under the liberalised Reserve Bank Scheme for handloom finance was Rs. 20 crores, in 1976-77 it was Rs. 26 crores. Last year it almost doubled to Rs. 46 crores and, this year, in the first four months of the current year, already Rs. 36 crores have been made available to the co-operative sector. So this is what we have been doing.

Now this whole handloom sector, the logistics of it, from the supply of yarn to the marketing of the produce, is currently under examination. Through the Development Commissioner of Handlooms we are working out the best way of making yarn available, not at prices which will be fluctuating but at reasonable and constant prices to the handlooms, and marketing of the end products of the handloom sector. Sir, as I said, we are discussing the broad policy perspectives.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Are you going to subsidise handlooms?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, we propose to subsidise handlooms.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: From the 16th of this month, we would not have any fluctuation in the price of sugar. It will be Rs. 7 a kg. No fluctuation. Everybody will get it at Rs 7 a kg. after the decontrol.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES. How many paise does your rupee have, 100 paise or 35 paise? Because, we are visualizing that sugar will be sold at Rs. 2.75. My friend obviously has no concept of the economics of the sugar industry. That is why he believes that it will be Rs. 7/-. This is the trouble: People just do not want to go into it.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: Let us wait and see. I have experience at least.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am sorry, your experience....

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO: You are now peculiarly situated: Therefore, you are in the world of concepts.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: On the contrary, we are examining every question and we are taking decisions. When we took the decision to do away with the zones, so far as the foodgrains were concerned, the same hue and cry was there. Go to Kerala and tell me what the people there have to say about it. They never received foodgrains at the price at which they are now getting. Go to Bombay and ask the workers there. They never received foodgrains at the price at which they are getting now—not even during the last 15 years. Some people have become the victims of slogans. They cannot get out of it. I can only sympathise with them.

SHRI L. R. NAIK: Sir, what about the removal of the Excise duty on yarn to be supplied to the handloom sector?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is no Excise duty on hank yarn. But, in any case, we are examining

[Shri George Fernandes]
this entire question to see how to strengthen the handloom industry, how to expand the handloom industry from the supply of yarn to the marketing of their products and to eliminate the middle men also. And here I would also like to make a special mention of NTC.

SHRI KRISHNA NAND JOSHI (Uttar Pradesh): What about master weavers?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, that is the point I am making--co-operative-wise in the next two or three years.

SHRI KRISHNA NAND JOSHI: And what about powerlooms?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: On the question of marketing also, I would like to make a mention that NTC is also coming up with a marketing programme, about which I shall be able to make an announcement in the next few days. But a marketing programme which will eliminate the middle men is being worked out by NTC. This is so far as the handloom is concerned. Now, on powerloom, the policy is very clear.

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH: Would the sale of the coarse cloth also go up and would you expand the outlets of NTC through the NTC shops?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, in fact not through shops, but we are trying to take NTC across the country and the whole new marketing system which we are going to evolve will be announced very shortly.

Sir, a point has been made about the powerlooms. We have decided that we shall regularise those powerlooms which are recently called irregular or unauthorised. We have also decided that we shall be very strict in seeing that in future there is no increase in the powerlooms. I know there are people who do not like this idea. I know there are people who do not want this regularisation. I am also aware that they do not like idea

of not having more powerlooms either. But we mean to introduction a legislation, if it should become necessary, and we will seek the guidance of all the State Governments, wherever that co-operation is needed, to see that there is no additional loomage in the powerloom sector, that the additional loomage goes into the handloom sector. In the meantime, we have not defined what the penalty will be, but we mean to impose a very deterrent penalty so that unauthorised powerlooms are no more an attractive proposition to those who like to go into them, apart from as I said, taking other measures, legislative and administrative to prevent proliferation and emergence of the growth of these unauthorised powerlooms.

SHRI KRISHNA NAND JOSHI: What about the availability of cheap dyes to the handloom sector?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I will come to that at some other point of time.

Then, Sir, on the question of khadi, I found that of all the people Comrade Indradeep Sinha had opposed polyester khadi. Polyester khadi, in my view, is an area where we are going to create a large number of jobs. It is an excellent cloth, as far as the cloth goes; and that is an area where we are going to create jobs. If the policy of the Communist Party is that there should be no creation of jobs but keep on creating unemployment, then they should make this a part of their State policy also because in Kerala the policy is different. There, they say: Create as many jobs as possible, and as quickly as possible.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: That was not my point. If you excuse me. My point was whether blending could be done in the cottage sector. That was my objection. And the second thing I wanted to know whether the price will be the same as for khadi. It will be increased.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, at the moment, all the khadi blending is done in the cottage sector. Khadi blending is done in the small and cottage industry. And, so far as polyester khadi is concerned, I do not see any problem in having the blending done in the manner in which it is being done. The whole idea is to create more jobs in the rural areas. I think the matter is now before the Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament and I hope very soon we will be able to have this Bill through—and our ambition of creating hundreds of thousands of jobs—literally, hundreds of thousands of jobs—and also providing excellent polyester khadi cloth to the people would be fulfilled—with the approval of all, including Comrade Indradeep Sinha. Wool and silk is another area.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: What will be the price?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Well, I suppose, it will not be much more expensive than the conventional khadi, but certainly it will be more durable and more attractive, and it will also appeal to those who have reservation for khadi cloth because the kind of cloth you and I wear does not attract them, that is, those about whom you were very romantic a little while ago.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: They were romantic about you.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I know I enjoy it. My only grudge is that you did not have the right one. That is all.

On woollen we have made the position very clear, I do not intend to deal with that point. Now the question of the cotton growers.

SHRI L. R. NAIK: About sericulture.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: There is a whole massive plan for expanding sericulture and also expanding the wool sector.

When one discusses about wool, the whole policy over the years on wool has been to make it a luxury, to make it as expensive as can be done. This was the policy. I was to remark very casually—I do not mind to raise a controversy—whether all the policy-makers came from that part of the country where they just do not need to have wool at all. They live in Delhi and in winter they use wool. What about a third of the country? Almost a third of the country lives in the north, in the hills, and they need wool. In fact, in some parts of the country, right throughout the year you have to use wool, and yet we have a situation where wool is a luxury. We have to rectify this distortion.

As far as sericulture is concerned, it will be one of the areas in which many jobs will be created in Karnataka, in Kashmir, in the North-Eastern States, all over the country by and large, and in those states who have specialised in this area we propose to go in for a massive sericulture programme, the details of which we shall outline as the plan of action in regard to the Centre's policy starts getting unfolded. This is another area where we shall be, I am sure, doing very well.

Now the question of the cotton-grower. We have said that the prices must be stabilised. Where imports are concerned or where the use of the man-made fibres are concerned, it should not be to the detriment of the cotton growers' interests. There is this dispute constantly going on whether there should be monopoly purchase or the Cotton Corporation of India should go in only in certain situations where they need to provide the necessary price support or the whole thing should be left to the normal laws of supply and demand to take their own course. We have, Sir, decided that the Cotton Corporation of India would play a dominant role from now on in taking care of the price situation.

[Shri George Fernandes]
crop is concerned. On the question purchase, one of the Hon. Members was to say that when the new Government came, it upset the entire apple cart of the monopoly purchase scheme of the Maharashtra Government. I am sorry to say that I do not think that it was something where we had a say. I think the scheme collapsed because of the problems into which the society itself ran into. They ran into severe problems, and I am sure, those who represent the interests of the cotton growers are aware of these problems. Why should this be put on the Government of India?

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: The main problem was that the Reserve Bank refused to advance loans.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: In what situation? Why? Were the payments to the growers? Why did the Reserve Bank have to come? I am sure, Mr. Deorao Patil is aware of this fact. I am sure, Mr. Dhabe is aware of this fact. If they think that any stick is good to beat me with, it is another matter. Otherwise, there were certain situations. The Government of Maharashtra has also made a proposal. We told them that we were prepared to discuss with them. The State Government of Punjab has also come forward with a proposal. They would like to set up a cotton corporation of their own. All the cotton growing States have certain ideas. There is the Cotton Corporation of India. If we can coordinate all the States where cotton is grown, if the States have some ideas, I say, we are prepared to go along. We want the cotton-grower to be paid a fair price, a good price. We will not do anything where import is concerned, where export is concerned because we are in a position just now to export a little bit of cotton also, or the use of the man-made fibres is concerned. That is why, while discussing the question of the whole concept of the man-made fibres, we said that we shall use the man-made

our cotton sector, to the cotton-growers' interest. So this naturally will be taken care of.

Now, a point was raised that the price of cotton goes down; but the price of cloth goes up. I have tried to study the overall situation of the last few years. I do not find any linkage between the price of cotton and the price of cloth. Now, this is not to say that when the mills go on putting up the prices, it is something that we should sit back and look at. There is no control on prices. Agreed. But one would expect the mills to exercise a certain restraint where the prices are concerned because the Government has powers in relation to this; the Government has powers to intervene. The policy of my Government is—and I consider it a right policy—not to interfere, not to intervene to the extent that is possible. But if people really begin to take the law into their own hands, where prices are concerned, where the question of making available adequate supplies is concerned, then, Sir, intervention can become necessary. So, we are working on this. In fact, I think it was again Mr. Indradeep Sinha who referred to the BICP costing and all that. Perhaps he was not aware that the man who prepared the BICP report is the Secretary of the Industry Ministry currently. He asked whether the BICP report was considered while framing policy. Well, the man who prepared the BICP report was also associated with the framing of the policy as Secretary of the Ministry. Therefore, the report was not only considered, but the man who prepared the report considered it.

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Make it available.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is another matter. BICP reports are not generally made available.

SHRI L. R. NAIK: What about building a buffer-stock of cotton?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We intend to give to the Cotton Corporation of India adequate authority, ade-

✓ which both the industry and the growers face, because both have faced problems. When there was not adequate cotton produced in the country, prices shot up to a point where the industry had to lose money. Nobody can deny that also. For instance, I will give you the figures for 1977. A study was made of 115 textile mills, and out of the 115 textile mills, 70 suffered losses in the year 1977. Now this has also happened. Therefore, how to reconcile the interests of the grower with the interests of the consumer, because the mill-owner is only a processor? I know the mill-owner wants to make a quick pie. But he is only a processor. He also takes advantage of the market situation. For instance, there is no justification for the current price rise. I do not want any mill-owner to tell me "But 'here is no linkage!'" There may be no linkage, but what is the justification? When the price of cotton goes down, when cotton is available, when there has been no increase in the prices of other commodities, what is the justification for the increase in price? These questions are there. These are questions we shall deal with as and when the situation comes up. We shall deal with them, we shall deal with them specifically, with all those who are concerned, as I said, as and when the question comes up before us.

SHRI L. R. NAIK: As regards the buffer-stock, it is estimated that this year's production is to the tune of 65 lakh bales. There are 12 lakh bales of last year. So the supply would be to the tune of 77 lakh bales. Now, the country's requirement is to the tune of 66 lakh bales. So there will be a surplus of 11 lakh bales. Will that not be a buffer-stock if you purchase the whole stock through your CCI?

✓ SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Yes, wherever it is necessary for us to take any remedial measures at any given point of time, whether through buffer-stocking or through other forms of market support or monopoly purchase, we shall deal with the situation as and when it comes up. But I

would like to make a very definite statement that while considering this entire policy in regard to the textile industry, the interests of the cotton growers will also be of primary concern to the Government.

Sir, I think I have answered all the questions that came up in the course of the discussion. There have been some specific points made about the functioning of the Khadi Board and about licences being given in regard to the manufacture of carpets through mechanised methods, etc. Sir, I think ..

SHRI DEORAO PATIL: Who will fix the price of cotton?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Just now we have a mechanism, whereby the Agricultural Prices Commission is currently doing those exercises. And till such time as we do not have a mechanism to do that, I think we can use that mechanism.

I think I shall not deal with the specific points that have been raised. One or two specific points have also been made. I would like to assure the hon. Members that in any area where there has been any act of corruption, any act of mismanagement, we shall take immediate steps to see that those things are set right, whether they are the State Khadi Boards or they are nationalised textile mills. Now they are National Textile Corporation mills.

The only point which I would like to meet is the one made by Mr. Khurshed Alam Khan, that we have given licences. We have given no licences during the last sixteen months for manufacturing carpets by the use of machines. We have not done that. There were licences that were given earlier including one to Modis and one to Birlas in an area which was not open to the large houses. But this was done. So, these things have been done. Of course, sometimes people suddenly get up and speak, if I may say so, with their tongue in cheek.

[Shri George Fernandes]

but people like me have got to listen to them. But I would like to assure the House that all those points that have been made during the course of the debate would be given due consideration and our effort will be to see that through the textile policy that has been presented to the country for the first time the people get good, durable, cloth, the workers get what is their due, participation by the workers in the NTC and elsewhere is also systematised and institutionalised, the interests of the cotton-growers are protected and a proper mix of the other sectors of the cotton textile industry or the man-made fibre sector is brought about and the country gets a good cloth.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1978

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of Lok Sabha:

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Monday, the 14th August, 1978, adopted the annexed motion in regard to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1978

2. I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the names of the members of Rajya Sabha appointed to the Joint Committee, may be communicated to this House.

MOTION

That the Bill to provide for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting

of 30 members, 20 from this House, namely:—

- (1) Shri D. Amat
- (2) Shri S. R. A. S. Appalanaidu
- (3) Shri B. C. Kamble
- (4) Shri G. Bhuvarahan
- (5) Shri Bega Ram Chauhan
- (6) Shri S. Das
- (7) Shri Durga Chand
- (8) Shri Krishna Chandra Halder
- (9) Shri Ram Sewak Hazari
- (10) Shri Kusuma Krishna maidu
- (11) Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
- (12) Shri Mohan Lal Pipil
- (13) Shri K. Prakash
- (14) Shri S. Ramasamy
- (15) Shri S. H. Naik
- (16) Shri Shankar Dev
- (17) Shri T. S. Shrangare
- (18) Shri Ramji Lal Suman
- (19) Shri Suraj Bhan
- (20) Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal

and 10 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee, the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall also be instructed to examine the lists contained in the Constitution (Scheduled Castes) Order, 1950 and the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, 1950 and to suggest amendments thereto in their report;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the last day of the first week of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modi-