

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

से मैं चाहूंगा कि वह यह बतलायें कि यह अदालतों में ऐरियस किस तरीके से खत्म हों उस के बारे में वह क्या इंतजाम कर रहे हैं इस के बारे में उन्होंने कोई प्रकाश नहीं डाला है। बहरहाल हम लोग तो भिखारी सरके हैं कि जो दे उस का भला और न दे उस का भी भला। क्या मंत्री महोदय इस समय भी इस बारे में कुछ विचार करेंगे ?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : एक मिनट में मैं इस के बारे में बतला दूँ। माननीय सदस्य श्री बनर्जी जो बोले वह स्वयं इस बात को जानते हैं कि आज अदालतों में और खासकर हाई कोर्ट में जो देर होती है वह उतनी जजैज की कमी की कारण नहीं होती जितने कि कानून की पेचोदगियों के कारण होता है। कानून व नियम आदि आज इतने पेचोदा और लम्बे बने हैं कि यदि कोई आज मुकद्दमों में देर करना चाहे तो वह कानूनी तरीकों को अपना कर सालों को देर कर सकता है। इसी तरीके से कई और भी चोजें काम में लाते हैं जिनके कारण देर होती है। जजैज की तादाद में कमी होना भी इसका एक कारण हो सकता है पर असल में मुख्य कारण यह नहीं है यह मैं सदन को बतलाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : न्याय जल्दी मिलना चाहिए और दूसरे वह उस भाषा में हो जिसे कि गरीब लोग समझ सकें। वह हिन्दो भाषा में होना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is all. The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

14.35 Hrs.

**COTTON TEXTILE COMPANIES
(MANAGEMENT OF UNDERTAKINGS
AND LIQUIDATION OR RECON-
STRUCTION) BILL**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We shall now take up the consideration of the Cot-

ton Textile Companies Bill. Shri Dinesh Singh.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : How many hours have been allotted to this Bill ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : 3 hours have been proposed by Government.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : इस पर कम से कम पांच घंटों का समय होना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let us see how the debate progresses.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move* :

"That the Bill to provide in the public interest for the liquidation of cotton textile companies while keeping the undertakings thereof as running concerns, or for the reconstruction of cotton textile companies, in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House is aware that cotton textile industry is our oldest organised industry. In fact, our record in the manufacture of cotton textiles goes back to days much further than any organised industry came into this country. Our cotton textiles were not only known in India but were prized all over the world. Many people feel that it is, to some extent, cotton textiles that attracted many travellers to come here resulting into our domination. It was so highly prized that when foreigners came here, and they were not able to compete with us, we found that some of our best craftsmen who were engaged in this industry had to undergo a lot of suffering so that the textile industry in other countries could be built up. For many years, since we set up the organised sector in this country, this has been yielding profit to many big concerns which have now become very big and very famous.

Today, we have about 618 mills, 329 spinning mills and 289 composite mills. All this has been built up over the years with great patience and also with great effort. New mills have come up. Some of them are as good as textile mills any-

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

where else in the world. But, unfortunately, once these mills were built up, not enough effort was put to see that they keep pace with the world. Many of these mills are very very old; their machinery is completely out of date; they can never be productive and competitive in modern terms. Yet, as I mentioned earlier, many big houses have become very big and very famous. But they have not cared for the industry that made them big and famous and this industry has been allowed to go down year by year into its present difficulties. In terms of employment, the industry directly provides employment to about 900,000 people and, if you take the subsidiary employments given to sectors, like, handlooms and others which depend on the yarn from this industry, I think, not less than 6 million people would be connected with it. Then, there are a large number of farmers who grow cotton which is consumed by this industry. Therefore, it has a tremendous importance in the industrial map of our country and no Government can allow this industry to go down the way that it is going at present.

Sir, we have had in this House debates, ideological and otherwise, discussions about this industry, some people saying that the public sector is not running well. Here is an example of the private sector which has been allowed gradually, year by year, to go down.

In many cases we had to take over some of the mills that the private sector failed to run well; we ran them well and we have returned four of them to the famous private sector—my hon. friend is nodding his head. They are now pressing that we should give it back to them because we have been able to do much better than they were able to do. I am not today concerned with the ideological aspect, although we can never separate the ideology from our thinking or working. But ever in the most practical attitude, no hon. member, I am sure, including my hon. friends sitting Opposite, will deny that something has to be done to revive this industry. It is not only in our country but in other countries also that the textile industry had to be revived; that only shows that capitalism has had a similar trend in many other countries.

We were going through the figures the other day. I was looking at the modernisation that had to be carried out in the United Kingdom and what Japan is planning to do. I think, the House will be interested to know that Japan is going to provide for the modernisation of this industry, 277 million dollars to cover the cost of scrapping and re-equipment in the spinning sector, and 361 million dollars in the weaving section. The United Kingdom is also investing to the tune of 30 million pounds towards the modernisation of its textile industry. We had also set up some Committee to go into this question and they had given us rather staggering figures of the amount of money that will be necessary for the modernisation of our industry—it may range from Rs. 550 crores to a thousand crores, but unfortunately we do not have these resources immediately to press them into service to modernise this industry and, therefore, whatever little resources we have, we have to apportion them in such a way that this industry is revived, that each step that we take is for the strengthening of this industry, for the modernisation and revitalisation of this industry, and not let it go down as it is today.

People have talked of the profitability of this industry, that the profitability has been going down. I was going through the figures, the other day, of the profitability of this industry. It will be interesting to see that the profitability has been moving up and down from time to time. It only shows that there is a possibility of this industry being profitable only if it is allowed to be profitable. The figures themselves reveal this. For instance, take the year 1960-61; the gross profits as percentage of sales in this industry were 9.7 as against 10.3 in all industries; the gross profits as percentage of the total capital employed were 12.2 in this industry as against 10.2 in all industries; the net profit as percentage of net work in this industry was 13.7 as compared to 10.9 in all industries. Therefore, this had a better prospect as compared to the combined figures of all other industries. Then in some years it goes down. For instance, take 1965-66, the net profits as percentage of net worth in the cotton textile industry were 3.7 as compared to 8.3 in all other

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

industries. The same thing which was more than the figure of all industries—13.7 as compared to 10.9—was allowed to go down to 3.7 as compared to 8.3. This is the position of this industry and we have been somewhat concerned about the way that people who control this industry either individually or collectively have used this as an instrument to get the resources and to transfer them into the other industries and to leave this completely, without ploughing back enough into this industry to keep it going. We had, therefore, been thinking about this industry for quite some time. The House is aware that we had the power under the Industries Regulation Act to take over the mills which are not running well, either which have closed down or are about to close down. What happened in these cases was that when we took over these mills and then as soon as they started running well, we were asked to give them back to the owners. And we have an instance of a very well-known mill from where my hon'ble friend, Mr. Mody, comes...

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : I come from no mill area.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Yes, he comes from a residential area, Sir, in which the mills are also located in the same city.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Mill in a residential area? Then there must be some bad planning.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : But the point is : we took over a mill and it started running well, but then it was returned to the owner, it became a sick mill again and we had to take it over.

Therefore, we had these difficulties and we felt that when we take over a mill, then the Government should have the option of retaining it or having control over it so that it does not fall in the same position as it was before. Then also, Sir, there are also certain mills which are not run well in their present stage and modernisation will have to be gone into. It may mean selling machines. It may mean installation of some new and modern machinery, for which Government just as

a caretaker, do not have the power to do and it was felt that unless Government were able to take over these mills and without control over these mills, it would not be possible for them to go into modernisation. Then there are some other mills which one feels we may be able to run with some modernisation but are not being allowed to run because some people are cornering all the shares and are not permitting the modernisation of these mills, in which case it was felt that it should be possible for Government to reconstruct these mills to enable them to function better and also that in cases where it becomes essential, Government should be able to send these mills into liquidation where Government may have the right to purchase them or if anybody feels he can pay a better price, he can purchase and take over it provided he is going to run it as a textile mill and not take away the machinery and convert it into a modern house as Mr. Piloo Mody may like to design as an odd mill in a residential area.

We had, therefore, been considering as to what would be the best course for bringing about legislation which can take into account the modernisation of these mills and at the same time make it possible for Government to have a control so that the industry as such is properly regulated.

Now, the Bill that we have brought before the House to-day is our effort to have control in the textile industry which will give the textile industry itself a fillip to meet the modern challenges.

I should not like to go into great detail at this length because of the time you have allowed and some hon'ble Members have shown anxiety to speak. I shall prefer to give the time to them so that we may have the benefit of the new ideas they may be able to put forward and that way we may be able to save time and it may not be necessary for you to extend the time also if the hon'ble Members have exhausted their suggestions. I shall, therefore, not go into the detailed provisions of the short Bill. But the provisions are well known and I am sure hon'ble Members have already studied them and have come prepared to give their considered opinion on them.

But may I say just this? So far as the new Bill is concerned, our effort has been briefly that in respect of a textile company which is not running well or whose financial conditions are so bad that it is not possible to meet its current liabilities out of its current assets, it may be taken over by the Government. Now this provision already exists in the Industries Regulation Act that we have. Then, the choice before Government is that as soon as the mill starts running well it has to be returned back to the owner. Now, we are bringing this new Bill forward to enable Government, if necessary, to send these mills either into liquidation or into reconstruction. In both cases, Government would have the right to acquire the controlling interest in these mills.

So far as liquidation is concerned, the details have been given in the Bill itself. Government would reserve to themselves the price at which Government would be willing to buy the mill. If there is somebody else willing to pay more and run it as textile industry, Government would have no objection to his taking it over.

So far as reconstruction is concerned, under the Bill, Government are to direct the authorised controller to have a scheme prepared for the reconstruction of a textile company, where such a course is called for in the public interest or to secure the proper management of the company. Such a scheme may provide among other things for a change in the board of directors or the appointment of a new board of directors, the vesting of the controlling interest in the reconstructed company in the Central Government either by the appointment of additional directors or by allotment of additional shares, the conversion into share capital of any debentures issued or loans obtained by the company after it has been taken over under Government management, and the reduction of the interest or rights of members and creditors against the company before its reconstruction. We have also taken care to see that any loan or any other moneys given to the companies since the Government have taken over its management are not reduced in the same manner as the loans or other debentures and other things prior to that.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : May I seek one clarification? During the period for which the mill is with Government, who will be responsible for the losses or profits? Who will bear the losses? On whose accounts will the profits be?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Obviously, it will be on the account of the mill.

So far as the employees are concerned, Government will have the right to retain any of them who may wish to continue, and those who may wish to leave may leave and Government may give them due compensation as the law may provide.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Government or the mill?

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Obviously, in that case, it is the same.

So far as the management of these mills is concerned, as I have mentioned earlier, we are contemplating to set up a textile corporation. Our idea in setting up the textile corporation is twofold. One is to create under Government an agency which will have the expertise to run these textile mills. It is not our idea that these textile mills should be run by Government servants, that is, by those engaged in administration of government as such, but that we should have people who have the knowledge of running these textile mills. It will be one of the functions of the corporation that it will run any of the mills that Government may entrust to it and to the management. Another idea is that it will set up in the public sector mills of its own; they may be either composite mills or spinning mills. The third function of the corporation that we are contemplating will be to provide an agency for financing the modernisation of the mills. At the moment, the financing is being done by a number of agencies. Our idea is that all of them should be put together under this corporation which will have the best expertise under Government to manage the textile industry as a whole.

We have taken the utmost care in the drafting of the Bill to see that Government have only the necessary powers to control and regulate this industry and also set up new units in this industry as an example of the functioning of the public

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

sector, and we have tried to have the co-operation of all those who are interested in the modernisation of the textile industry. But I should like to assure hon. Members that after the Bill is passed, which I hope it will be, it will be in the best interests of the textile industry and those engaged in it.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to provide in the public interest for the liquidation of cotton textile companies while keeping the undertakings thereof as running concerns, or for the re-construction of cotton textile companies, in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration".

SHRI N. K. SOMANI (Nagaur) : We have a Commerce Minister who is a very charming and a handsome person...

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : And intelligent also.

SHRI N. K. SOMANI : I wish I could say that.

He has an infectious smile. But let me say this that if smiles could solve any of our country's problems, we would be thriving by now. If this is the result of his stewardship of the Ministry—he has been in charge of this portfolio for nearly nine months now—if this is what he has to conceive at the end of a nine-month period, if this is the understanding and assessment of the problem that he has put before this hon. House, I shudder to think of the fate of the textile industry. I was thinking that a fresh and realistic approach would be made by a new Minister but these measures that are being proposed, I am afraid, are not going to bear fruit.

The Minister does not at all react to whatever representations are made. At least his predecessor used to lose his temper and throw files at the delegations. He does not do even that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : With smiles, how could he do it?

SHRI N. K. SOMANI : Whenever he has to speak about the textile problem, he indulges in well-worn clichés and makes statements which are no longer true and probably applied to the situation that was

prevailing about 15—20 years ago. I suspect that the acquisitive lust of this Government is showing its hand and this is being further compounded by a conspiracy of the bureaucrats who want to perpetuate their empire and keep a stranglehold on all sections of society, specially the industrial one.

As far as understanding is concerned, I am reminded of a meeting with an ex-Commerce and Industry Minister of the Government of India in Ahmedabad last year. When I took him round a mill, an industrial unit; in Ahmedabad, he expressed so much wonder and confined to me that this was the first time that he set his foot into the inside of an industrial unit. He wondered when he looked at the difference between a transformer and a generator, a chimney and a loom and a spindle and a spinning machine. If this is the understanding that our Ministers show about the complicated nature of today's modern industry, I do not know what is going to happen.

There is a peculiar way by which our Minister holds communications with representatives with people. I have seen him performing or at least read about it last summer. He comes in pomp and style and addresses a seminar and then walks out. What the other point of view is, what the millowners have to say, what the shareholders have to say, what the technicians have to put forward and what the labour leaders want to urge on a particular problem, whether it is the textile industry or the jute industry, whether it is the performance of the STC or of the MMTC or of the corruption-ridden Textile Commissioner's office, he turns a deaf ear to all these. This, I do not think, is going to be conducive to the healthy development of the Commerce Ministry's functions.

One grave charge that is being levelled against the textile industry is that it is frittering away its surplus and that large dividends have been paid in the past so that it has not been invested into a modernisation and rationalisation programme. He has himself quoted figures which go to prove that that this is one industry—I am glad he recognises this—as a very important and a large industry as far as India is concerned with a large stake in exports. But if there are no dividends to pay, if there are no salaries and wages that can be met

out of the profitable functioning of the textile mills, how are the millowners to re-invest because there is no investible surplus?

Sometime ago when the recession in the engineering industry was being considered by the Finance Ministry, this Government liberalised the hire purchase credit terms for those machinery manufacturers who manufacture textile machines. The textile machinery manufacturers cannot sell equipment to the textile mills because they are doing badly, because they have no money at all to invest in this. This is beating about the bush. What should have been the attitude of the Government is to improve the profitability and the performance of the textile industry rather than coming to the aid of a very limited sector of the textile machinery manufacturers.

15 Hrs.

One of the very important premises on which this Bill is based is the considered opinion of the Minister that a mere legal change of the manager of a textile mill would be a cure and a panacea to all the problems that are being suffered by the textile industry. I do not know how far this is true. Let us see the performance of the Government of India and some of the State Governments that have some sort of experience of running these textile mills in Bombay, Ahmedabad and in Hyderabad.

Take the famous case of the India United Mills. This has been under the management of the authorised controller for several years now as most of us know, and today I am told under an authorised controller this group of mills in Bombay is losing Rs. 15 lakhs per month. If a mere change of the legal entity has not been of benefit in the case of the India United Mills, I do not know how it is going to support all other Mills that the Government wishes to take over.

Last week the Finance Minister turned down a specific request from Chief Minister Naik for additional funds to be able to run the India United Mills. If the Finance Minister considers it fit to turn down a specific request from the Chief Minister of Maharashtra on the plea that this is not a workable proposition, that this will be so much money more down the drain in a

single direction, that this will be at the cost of public charity and public exchequer, what Mr. Dinesh Singh has been denied on the one hand by the other process, he takes over through this Textile Corporation, and he will be the first to hand over money to the same ill-conceived venture. I hope he takes note of these things.

And they have the management of the companies of the Mehboobshahi Mills at Gulbarga. It is a far worse example which has been just cited. The Government of India, under the employment relief scheme, and the State Governments, assume extraordinary powers where even the workers are asked to cut down their wages, they abolish provident fund, they do not allow any gratuity or other schemes, they provide more working capital to the same sick unit, they provide cotton at extraordinary low prices and even then they are not successful in running the unit.

These are all the things that the textile industry has been complaining about. If you want to give a dog a bad name and then to hang it, it is, of course, your own attitude, but it does not behove a Commerce Minister to put this lame excuse at the door of the entire textile industry where one finds that 51 mills out of more than 600 are today closed, when in 1964 only 14 were suffering from these maladies.

In the month of March, when we were discussing this subject here in this House, I had taken that opportunity to warn the Commerce Minister that he must come to the aid of those textile mills which were on the border, and out of those border mills at least half a dozen more have closed down, and the Commerce Minister has to take them over and instal authorised controllers.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : You want the assistance of the incompetent Commerce Minister to save this industry ?

SHRI N. K. SOMANI : I had said at that time that timely help to these mills which were on the border would have to be provided, otherwise the economic and textile policies of the country would not allow the textile industry to function.

[Shri N. K. Somani]

Has the Commerce Minister ever wondered why there is this epidemic of closures in this country, when on the one side he considers that this is a tremendously important industry? When we are concerned with the fall in exports of not only textiles but other products in this country, when the life and stake of so many million workers are involved, when the shareholders' money is involved, we have to solve this problem by taking a completely helpful and realistic point of view, and not by proposing a hospital of two to four beds where hundreds require accommodation.

He talked about some financial assistance. Sir, the NIDC used to provide assistance and loans to the textile industry a few years ago. Now, its functions have been given over to the IFC and the IDBI and as he has himself mentioned, in the month of June, there was a seminar in Bombay where all the interests of the textile industry were represented: the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade was represented; the millowners were there and the entire spectrum of the cotton trade and the textile industry met there, and I think they spent about 5,000 man-hours in June, in Bombay. I do not know where the Commerce Minister takes his wisdom or counsel. Unanimous recommendations were made at that seminar. There was not one vote of dissent. It was discussed threadbare, but the Commerce Minister was not there—because he delivered a message and then walked out—not to listen to what others had to say. The unanimous recommendations of the seminar on the textile industry in Bombay have now been cold-stored for the same obvious reasons that they do not want to solve our problems.

Now, let us look at it from the point of view of the textile industry. The main reason, I submit, are the spiralling rise in the cost of production and the growing heavy excise duty that is being imposed from year to year by the Finance Ministry and the Government of India. Added to that spiral is the rising cost of living for the public which leaves hardly any surplus in their pockets to buy textile products either of coarse or medium quality or superfine or fine quality. Let me give you some figures. Between 1963 and now—the Minister quoted some figures

from 1961 up to now—the prices have gone up by 32 per cent; the wages in the same period have gone up by 62 per cent. Between these two periods, the average rise in the cost of production of the textile industry in India was of the order of 40 per cent. We have the cost of living index which has gone up from 130 in 1963 to 213 in the middle of 1967. Here you have two devils: one, the spiralling price rise in the most of production and the other, the diminishing purchasing power in the hands of the public. Therefore, if the public cannot afford to buy cloth, even at the ex-mill price, or even below that, where is the question of textile mills making any profit or profiteering as is sometimes alleged by the Government?

We have a handful of mills which are running efficiently, which produce superior goods and which are export-oriented. I submit that these are the mills that should have been given a red-carpet treatment by the Ministry. But unfortunately they were treated on par with the rest of the bulk of the units in the doddering industry out of which there is a section which has to be scrapped because it is old and archaic and those mills are to be given timely help so that they can rehabilitate themselves before it is too late and the hospital of Shri Dinesh Singh becomes overflowing full.

The third is the export-oriented, efficient mills which are on par with the world industry to which, I said, we should give red-carpet treatment. But have we given any selective approach to the industry whenever the problems are put before us? Take another instance: the ceiling on cotton which was a mockery of the regulations in India. There was not a single textile mill in the last season where it could get cotton under the ceiling. Now, of course, ceiling has been abolished. The prices are above the ceiling, but the multipliers in respect of the controlled commodities are still installed on the erstwhile controlled prices. And, therefore, the difference is being subsidised continuously by the textile mills and they are running out of funds and money.

During the last one year, against 16 per cent rise in the price rise in the cost of production, the Government very charitably

gave 4.5 per cent in April this year, and the difference between 4.5 and 16 and beyond continues due to rise in the stores, in the salaries and wages and the cost of living; and so many other things are continued to be levied on the textile industry which continues to be strangled by a host of controls, the Textile Commissioner's Office, the company law and the proposed take-over Bill.

I come back to the famous seminar in Bombay. One of the very studied and, as I said, unanimous recommendation was that Rs. 600 crores to Rs. 800 crores are required by India's textile industry to rehabilitate and modernise itself. There was a time after the Second World War when the industry could have rehabilitated itself and changed its entire plant and equipment. But it was the Government that refused permission to it to do so. Now when the mills want to modernise themselves permission is not being given. Even if it is given, where are the funds, where is the finance. Rs. 600 crores to Rs. 800 crores are required to modernise them. They have hardly got about Rs. 25 crores to Rs. 30 crores which they are going to invest in the modernisation programme. This is the crux of the problem.

Therefore, it was recommended by the seminar that this proposed Textile Corporation, which will be another bureaucratic bulge, should engage its attention in not taking over the sick mills but going to the root cause of the technical ills and providing finance in time at low interest, at 6 per cent interest, so that the mills could have adequate finance to rehabilitate themselves and be able to sell cloth at competitive prices at home and export abroad.

Let us see about exports. Why are our exports falling after devaluation? It is because of the completely unimaginative policy followed by the Commerce Ministry. They are blind to changing situation and circumstances of the world market. What the Commerce Ministry does is, at the beginning of the year, in the month of January or February, they announce their import export policy once a year and that is supposed to hold good throughout the twelve months. I was very much surprised

to hear the Finance Minister and the Commerce Minister making very casual and complacent remarks stating that the British devaluation would do us no harm. We would certainly not be very much affected. But these are the goods, textile products, jute and certain other commodities, that fall under the chairmanship of the Commerce Minister which are going to be affected further. If we do not take timely steps, Ceylon, Pakistan, Malaysia and all other countries which are in our neighbourhood are going to score still further and we will be left behind. Ceylon did it last year in the case of tea.

We have been pleading before this Government that they should allow the industry to scrap all those units which are irreparable. We have been also saying that they must provide timely and adequate assistance and also create a favourable atmosphere for mills which are on the margin, which are on the border, and we have been saying that those which are export-oriented mills should be given a red-carpet-treatment. Therefore, I would reiterate this, that this proposed Textile Corporation, if it comes up, let it be solely engaged in giving a new lease of life to the existing mills on the border rather than engaging itself in the unenviable task of trying to manage which, I know, they cannot in view of what they have done so far. I gave the instance of India United Mills. I can give several other instances where even after assuming extraordinary powers they cannot profitably run them. I am told when my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye and a host of others laid down serious, severe and continued charges against the erstwhile Textile Commissioner this Ministry could not find a successor to him for six to eight months. If they cannot find a single person to succeed the Textile Commissioner, where is the talent available with them to manage a complicated technology, a person who would understand spinning, a manager who would understand weaving, a manager who would understand finance, a manager who would understand export technology, a person who would understand marketing functions and also keep under the tap of the Commerce Ministry. I think these are impossible functions which the Ministry is trying to have.

[Shri N. K. Somani]

There is a very important plea of the industry that is continuously being ignored for a number of years by the Commerce Ministry. If they think millions of lives are involved, if they think textile industry is the primary industry and basic industry of this country which provides bread and butter to millions of workers, if they think exports have got to be sustained and improved upon, if they think that textile industry has got to perform its role, why do not they declare it as a priority industry in the Schedule as far as financial regulations are concerned? Why are the ordinary incentives, in respect of rehabilitation, in respect of depreciation, in respect of development rebate, which are available to a lot of other industries, why are they being consistently denied to the textile industry?

Lastly, this Authorised Controller, I do not know what powers he is going to have, but from what little I have read in this Bill, he is going to be armed with extraordinary powers. He is going to have the power to fix the value, the basic price of the unit, he is going to notify the directors the terms and conditions which will be sent to the High Court and he is going to sit upon the judgment of what the shareholders and the members of the company want. I would suggest that in the event of this unfortunate Bill being passed, the will of the share-holders and the members of the company should be given a little more weightage and should not be left at the complete discretion of the Authorised Controller.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Before I call on the next speaker, I would like to know the mind of the House. Three hours have been allotted for this Bill. Shall we have 2 hours for general discussion and 1 hour for clauses?

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस पर समय बढ़ना चाहिये क्योंकि यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मामला है और इस पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने के हेतु मेरे सरीखे मँबर आस लगाये बैठे हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : इस पर पांच घंटे का समय रखिये। इस तरह के बिल के

लिए काफी दिनों से हम लॉग प्रयत्न कर रहे थे और आज जब यह बिल सदन के सामने आया है तो इसे आप तीन घंटे में समाप्त कर रहे हैं। जैसा मैंने कहा इस पर पांच घंटे का समय रखिये।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : तीन घंटे जनरल डिस्कशन होना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even if we allot 5 hours, 1 hour has already gone. So we will have to set some time limit. Shall we say 2 hours for general discussion?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : 3 घंटे जनरल डिस्कशन के लिये रखिये।

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Why not see how many members want to participate?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is quite a big list.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : Then you can judge it from that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : For the time being, we will say 2 hours for general discussion. Shri P. Ramamurti has written to me that he has some engagement and so he wants to go out. Therefore, I will call him first and then the other Members in the order.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have been listening to the eloquent plea made by my hon. friend, Shri Somani, that the cotton textile industry in this country must be given a little more consideration by the government and the public because it is people's money which is given out by the Government. I would like to remind him and people of his type that they have to realise one fact that the cotton textile industry of this country has been given the greatest partial treatment by the people of this country. About 50 years ago, when the textile industry was started in this country. . .

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : More than 50 years.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : A little more than 50 years ago, when the textile industry was started in this country, that industry would not have survived but for the tremendous sacrifice made by the people of this country, in the Swadeshi Movement of 1905. Once again, during 1920, during the non-co-operation movement, but for the tremendous sacrifice that the people of this country made, the cotton textile magnates of this country would not have survived for a single day. The same thing happened in 1930. It is we the people who have given our blood. I went and picketed before the shop of M/s. Chellaram & Sons in Madras in 1930 and 1932. I was beaten black and blue not once but at least 12 times. Every time I used to go to the hospital, get myself cured a little and then come back and get beaten. It was the blood of hundreds of volunteers who picketed the foreign cloth shops in 1930 and 1932 that helped the survival of the textile industry in this country.

Now, when this tremendous amount of sacrifice of the people of this country has made this industry survive, may I know what has been the behaviour of the textile magnates and people who sustained it all these years? What did they do by the people? In the years 1939—47, during the period of the war, the moment the Second World War started, what did they do? Did they not utilize that occasion to indulge in a tremendous amount of profiteering? The amount of profits that they earned during the years 1940 to 1946, though I have not got the figures, are such that anybody must be ashamed of it. They say that they have not got the finance for rehabilitation. What did they do with all the money that they earned between 1940 and 1946? Leave alone the figures quoted by my hon. friend, like 9.8 per cent, 10.2 per cent, 12.1 per cent and that kind of thing.

But these are the legal profits made by these people. We know also that there is something else which is not shown in these accounts, that there is some such thing which is called unaccounted money and that the unaccounted money in this country has accrued to a tremendous extent from the cotton textile industry.

15.20 HRS.

[**SHRI MANOHARAN** in the Chair].

I have personally conducted strikes in mills for bonus where according to their accounts the workers were not entitled to more than 15 days' wages as bonus. But every day of the strike meant about Rs. 10,000 for the managing agents of the black money which will not go into the accounts. Therefore when I conducted those strikes for 5 or 10 days, meaning Rs. 15,000 personal loss to the managing director or the managing agent every day, immediately he settled on six months' bonus. I can give you instances of that.

Wherefrom did that money come? Therefore, let us not talk of these accounts which are shown in the balance sheets. After all, in this country we have created some experts. We may depend upon foreign experts for everything else but we in this country can supply experts to the whole world for keeping double accounts. We have created those experts. Therefore I am not bothered by these accounts which are being supplied.

AN HON. MEMBER : Export them.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Unfortunately, the other people do not want them. The other countries do not seem to be indulging in this kind of thing to the extent we are doing. That is a different matter.

Therefore I was not very much impressed by the arguments that my hon. friend made. Today it is an admitted fact that a number of mills in this country have closed down because of, what they call, mis-management. How did this mismanagement occur? I have got innumerable cases in my own State where the managing agents mismanaged the mill in such a way that today they are not able to pay their statutory dues. They have been refusing to pay the statutory dues. No provident fund contributions; no ESI dues. They do not pay. But it is certainly a testimony to the awareness of the Government of India, to the way in which the Government of India functions that despite the fact that lakhs and lakhs of rupees have accrued by way of defaults in the payments towards these statutory obligations, the Government of

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

India take no action whatsoever against those men. It is a case of criminal breach of trust. Even when criminal breach of trust has been committed by a number of managements, the Government of India did not take any action against any of these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, shame.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : That is a fact that remains there.

When the Minister promised last time that there would be a corporation, I thought that some remedies will be found to take over these mills which have defaulted. But what do I find in this? A mountain of labour bringing forth nothing. First of all, it is stated "where the industry or a textile mill has been taken over under the Industries (Regulation) Act". We know how that Act functions. In order to take a textile mill under the Industries (Regulation) Act, how many months elapse? Sometimes mills are closed for months and months. We have in our own State a number of mills which are closed down. Our Chief Minister had come and requested the Minister of Commerce that he should institute proceedings immediately to see that certain mills were taken over. The Madras Government was willing to help him and was willing to shoulder the responsibility of taking over some of the mills. I believe, I came some time in the month of August along with the Chief Minister. They appoint a committee. The committee takes its own course. How long it will take nobody knows. Then a report will be submitted. These things inevitably take not less than six months. For these six months the mill will be closed. Then, they may or may not decide to take over the mill. Therefore, first of all, the particular textile mill must be taken over under the Industries (Regulation) Act and must be run. That is the first condition.

After that, the Government or the authorised officer may make a recommendation or may submit a report to the Government. The Government will probably call for that report. That man will be taking his own time. Anyway, a report will be

called for. On that report how long the Commerce Ministry will take to come to its own decision nobody knows. After it takes a decision, it is open to the Government of India to adopt one of the two courses: The first course is to ask for liquidation proceedings. In the case of liquidation proceedings, all that the Government of India can do is that it can fix up a minimum price for the sale and if there is any price that is offered above that, it must be handed over to the particular person who comes forward to offer a higher price. If nobody offers a higher price, then the Government of India can take at minimum price. Even this is subject to the sanction by the High Court. All this is subject to the sanction of the High Court. We know how soon the liquidation proceedings take place in the High Court, how many years it will take for a particular liquidation proceedings to be gone through and completed. Even after liquidation proceedings, we know how its sale will be effected. Ultimately, it is for the High Court to decide. You may appoint your official liquidator. But the official liquidator's primary concern is to see that he gets the maximum price. Therefore, he may separate the factory, he may separate the buildings, he may separate every particular machine and he may sell them separately and say, "This is the best way I can get the maximum amount of price." How does it help once there are normal liquidation proceedings in the High Court on which you are primarily relying for the purpose? I cannot understand how this is going to be any quick remedy. Even then, it is going to be sold to the third party. Therefore, all this bragging by the Minister that this is a part of the process of nationalisation of the textile industry does not stand at all for the simple reason that the primary thing for you is to make a recommendation for sale, go before the High Court for liquidation proceedings and, once you go for the liquidation proceedings, it is nobody's guess as to what would happen.

The second thing is, if this course is not followed, the Government of India can come forward with a scheme for the reconstruction of the company. While coming forward with the idea of reconstruction

of the company, they have said that reconstruction may cover one or more of the following points, that is, reconstruction of the company may cover with the constitution, name and registered office, the capital, assets, etc. or may cover any change in the Board of Directors. Therefore, it is not necessary that it should still come to the Government. The authorised officer can make a scheme by means of which the company will still continue to be in the hands of big textile magnates. A new Board of Directors consisting of some of these big textile magnates can be constituted and the textile mill can still continue to be operated by these people. Even then, there is no certainty that this mill is going to be under the management of the Government.

Thirdly, the vesting of controlling interests may cover one or more of the assets. Here, the word is 'may'. It is not stated that it must cover all the assets. It is not stated, where the company is reconstructed, where the Board of Directors is reconstituted, *ipso facto*, ultimately, it is the Government of India that is going to have the controlling interest. Even that is not certain; it may be one of many things.

The most important thing that I want to emphasise here is this. It is stated :

"the continuance of the services of such of the employees of the company as the Central Government may specify in the scheme in the company itself on its reconstruction on such terms and conditions as the Central Government thinks fit;"

The Central Government gives notice before hand to the working class that where the Government may take over or may recommend the reconstitution of the company that there is no certainty that your conditions of service will continue as the same and that you will continue to get employment. Even the employment is not ensured. All those workers who were on the employment of the company need not necessarily be continued in service. The services of some of these workers can be

terminated. Even with regard to those workers who will be continued in service, their terms and conditions of service need not be the same as they were before. They may reduce their emoluments; they may increase their work-load and they may be forced to do extra work or in the alternative you face unemployment. Then, there is clause (m) which says, you can give notice of quit, take whatever compensation is allowed under the Industrial Disputes Act and go. This is what is stated. Therefore, this Bill does not even give a guarantee to the workers that even in those remote cases—I am saying it is a remote case—where the management has completely bungled, the working conditions are going to be the same. Even that guarantee is not given.

Finally it is said in sub-clause (4) :

"The scheme shall thereafter be placed before the Court for its sanction and the Court if satisfied that the scheme is in the public interest or in the interests of the shareholders or for securing the proper management of the company..." etc., etc.

The Court may sanction it or modify it or may reject it. Therefore, the whole thing is subjected to arbitration by the High Court; the final decision is by the High Court. Under these things, what is the remedy that the workers have, what is the remedy that the public have, against this kind of mismanagement that has been increasing day by day? Many of these people find that it is more profitable to rob this particular industry and then say, "go away; what does it matter?". After all, they have lined their pockets enough. Make hay while the Sun shines; make as much money as possible and then leave the whole thing. This is what is happening in the textile industry, in mill after mill. Under these conditions, the straightforward thing for the Government would have been to bring a Bill, or, if necessary, a Constitutional amendment and I dare say that we will get the two-third majority in this House despite the Swatantra Party, I am absolutely certain about it. If the Government really wants to do this, if the Congress Party really wants to do this, if

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

they are really interested in seeing that the private management of these textile mills, who during the last twenty years at any rate, after having got the tremendous support of the people did not look to the people but looked to their private profits and now come forward and say, "please help us with money from the public exchequer", is put an end to, either they can come with a Bill to completely nationalise the textile industry or, if, for any reason, they are unable to do it, they can have a simple measure—we can sit together and find out the terms of that measure—where by which in the case of such mismanagement—they do not deserve anything—we confiscate those mills and take over the mills without paying any compensation to those people. Why should they be given compensation? Some of those people who have mismanaged the textile industry; public funds were vested in them and they were robbing the public of their money. Therefore, they deserve to be sent to jail. (Interruption). Why should these people be given any consideration at all? They do not deserve to continue to be in charge of those particular mills at least. Therefore, with regard to those mills at least where it is a case of proved mismanagement why should the Government not come forward, if not with confiscation, at least with compulsory acquisition of the controlling interests; they may, fix the price and compulsorily acquire the controlling interests in them and also take over the management. That would have been the straightforward and simple thing for the Government to do. But as it is, this measure is not going to help in that; on the other hand, it will only be an advertisement that the Government is very seriously thinking of helping these workers by taking over the management, but in reality, I know that nothing is going to be done; these mills will continue to be closed and the Government will have a cumbersome procedure; all that might happen is that some more officers will be appointed and they will be getting fat salaries; beyond that, nothing will happen. I do not really know what to do, whether to oppose the Bill or not. This is really a very funny position. I would request the Minister to withdraw this Bill and then call us together—those who are really interested in this

thing; let us settle the terms of an appropriate Bill which will be an effective one, which will certainly help the textile industry, which will see that these sick mills are really taken over by the Government and are run in the interest of the country. That would be the appropriate course. When the hon. Minister said in the last session that he was going to think on these lines, I thought that he would have called us and had some discussion, but he never did any such thing. I would, therefore, appeal to him to call us together; let us sit together and if the Government's aim is the same, then we can find some common measure of agreement. If, however, the Government just want to show this Bill and deceive the people and the workers, then there cannot be any common ground.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It is bad enough to have a Minister without industrial expertise and if he starts taking the advice of Communists, then God help us!

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA (Kaliabor) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Mr. Ramamurti has also raised certain points though from his point of view, and it is necessary that we get a balanced consideration on this matter.

So far as the Government is concerned, it has been accused of not taking any action as well as for taking some action and it is in the very nature of the affairs of the Government that there would always be some people who would charge the Government of not taking any action and there would also be some other people who would accuse the Government of taking some action. It is a question of finding out whether it is expedient to take a particular measure. From that point of view I would like to say that this measure, though it has come possibly a bit late, is an urgent issue as Mr. Somani, most unlike the supporter of the private enterprise, has said that for 20 years the condition of the industry has not improved. But he wants to blame the Government for the failure of the industry to have a proper keel and to run on a proper keel and to function properly and to ask for finances from the Government that have been provided by the people of India.

I entirely agree and share with him the very healthy suspicion about the bureaucracy and I would certainly like and I have no doubt the Commerce Minister take this into account. The usual bureaucratic attitude towards industry has not been helpful and it may not be helpful and it is on record that if we leave textile mill to be run by the bureaucrats it may not end up very well. I would also concede the difficulties in regard to the availability of cotton. But, having conceded that, we have still to face the basic charge, the cotton textile industry has to face the basic charge that it is a sick industry of India in spite of the fact that the demand of the people has never failed. It is one thing that due to poverty of the people or due to so much of failure of monsoons and all that, there may not be that much demand, but there is sufficient demand because food and clothing are the necessities of life and the common man would continue to buy cloth unless it is exorbitantly priced. Here again, we find a contradiction. The textile industry has been demanding that the prices of coarse textiles should be raised. At the same time, it has been broadly conceded—sometimes it may be necessary, but I do not think it is always necessary to concede this demand—that a rise in the price of coarse textiles would lead to inflation and we do not want people to suffer more. But even where they demand a price rise for coarse textiles, they are themselves objecting to the excise duty which actually falls upon the common man. It is the common man who is paying the excise duty. In their very nature a capitalist system or the economy of free enterprise could never make it an argument. In the Forum of Free Enterprise, with all apology to Mr. Somani, we had a discussion once. Even in the United Kingdom the Government is not held responsible for the improvement or renovation of an industry, particularly, an industry of the type of the cotton textile industry. It has to renovate itself. Industrial ambition, the desire to take money out of one industry and invest it in other industries which give more profit, etc. has led to the abandonment of the textile industry in the matter of renovation. This has created a very difficult situation. While some mills are functioning very well and they are also making a lot of profit, yet there are some mills on the

marginal level, which are functioning very badly and recession etc. has done a lot of damage to such units. Therefore, in the circumstances, it is necessary for Government to enter this industry.

It is a new departure to have these units which are taken over by the public enterprise run by a new board of directors. Of course, we are already having it in the case of iron and steel. But in this case, I think we would have to discuss whether the type of board of directors that is contemplated would be suitable. It is necessary that we should not always depend upon bureaucrats to run these units. Having accepted private enterprise as part of our economic structure, let us see whether we can utilise their services also for this. We have accepted private enterprise as part of our economic structure, and we are not going to reject it, whatever we might say here. If private enterprise remains, then we must also include people from that sector into the public enterprises. I am not talking of those whom we call industrial tycoons but I am talking of those people who are interested in evolving a socialist order of society, who are progressive in their outlook and who would like the public enterprise also to prosper along with private enterprise; we should associate progressive businessmen and others who are associated with private enterprise. For, I see no other alternative to the bureaucrats, unless we think in terms of those political thinkers who may be socialist in their views but who may not have the necessary experience to run these industries.

We should also see that there is a healthy competition between the private sector and the public sector in the textile industry. Of course, my hon. friend Shri P. Ramamurti is entitled to have his own suspicions and doubts. I, who consider myself also as a progressive man, believe that the behaviour of the industrialists also has not been above board. Let us say then that let Government enter into the industries and put honest people in control of these industries and see whether there is any truth in what has been stated. If they do so, then the truth will come out, provided, of course, they do not put people who are hand in gloves with the industrial tycoons

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

and the big industrialists. But it is possible that they can gain a lot of experience in the running of the textile industry.

This recession is a temporary phenomenon. But it has brought home to us a lesson. While we have got unutilised capacity in certain industries, we are also having over production in certain other industries. The country's production potential is not being utilised fully, and as a result of this, we are having unemployment etc. Speaking from the purely economics point of view, of course, not of the free enterprise type, utilising the capacity of the engineering industry we can produce certain looms in India and give those looms to the factories. The cost factor should not deter us from doing so and make us afraid of the problems that it creates. But that would be because of the type of economy that we have. In terms of cost, and in terms of finance, it may prove costly, but in actual terms, the engineering industries where the workers are idle and where the capacity is lying unutilised how, may help in producing these looms, and these looms could be given to the mills which could then co-operate properly in production. For all this, naturally, the cotton textile industry has to be given the type of attention that it has to be given.

Rationalisation and modernisation is the crux of the problem. But we have to do it and the mills must function on economic lines and be able to compete. Of course, even in the best of economies, all the industrial units are not equally rationalised, but at least they have the capacity for survival, which the textile units in our country are not having. Of course, my hon. friends opposite may put the blame on the commercial and economic policies of Government for this.

I wanted to defend those policies; it would be very easy to defend also.

But so far as the commercial and economic policy is concerned, it does not touch that sector of the mill industry which is producing fine quality cloth. Possibly when we take over, it would be something like a revolutionary act. But all the legal complications that do arise when we take

over should not be allowed to mar the progress of the economy in the direction in which we really want it to progress. While we have new mills and new looms, we would have to find out whether they are to be for export or for internal consumption. Even in a country like Burma, not to speak of China, they do not produce so many types or varieties of cloth as we in this country do. Our middle classes live in a peculiar way. We still have that crease for variety and a multiplicity of types in the midst of so much misery. It is essential that here Government come into the picture and see that we do not have those hundreds of varieties of cloth. It is not necessary to have them. It is quite possible to do with a few varieties.

While taking over of these mills and conditioning their production to types which would be required for export to the world market, there is a certain difficulty which has to be taken note of. We are importing cotton worth Rs. 50 or 60 crores. For exporting cotton textiles worth Rs. 80 or Rs. 90 crores, we have to import cotton worth Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 crores. Whether this constitutes a gain is a matter to be considered. Our figures of export may be misleading because to earn foreign exchange we have to spend foreign exchange. This is a situation which is not something to be very proud of.

So while giving my support to this Bill . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : Half-hearted

SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA : Not half-hearted. I do support the Bill. While supporting the Bill, I would like all the pros and cons to be taken into account. After making these mills function, and function in a proper manner, we should not think in terms of handing them over back to private enterprise. We should be squarely in the field of the textile industry to produce and give the country its essential goods on terms which are acceptable to the people.

श्री बृज ब्रूज लाल (बरेली) : सभापति महोदय, मंत्र: महोदय जो काटन टेक्स्टाइल कम्पन:ज (मैनेजमेंट) आफ् अंडरटेकिन्ग् एंड

लिक्विडेशन आर रीकंस्ट्रक्शन) बिल सदन के सामने लाए हैं, मैं उस का विरोध करता हूँ। उन्होंने इस बिल को पेश करने में अपना यह मकसद जाहिर किया है : “व्हेयरएज आन एकाउंट आफ़ मिसमैनेजमेंट सरटेन काटन टेक्स्टाइल मिलज़ आर थ्रोटेन्ड विद क्लोज़र” और दूसरे, “व्हेयरएज दि क्लोज़र आफ़ काटन टेक्स्टाइल मिलज़ विल एफ़ेक्ट प्रेजुडिशली दि प्राइडक्शन आफ़ काटन टेक्स्टाइल एंड दि इन्ट्रेस्ट्स आफ़ लेबर”। मंत्री महोदय पब्लिक को यह दिखाना चाहते हैं कि उन को लेबर के साथ बड़ा सहानुभूति है और लेबर का इन्ट्रेस्ट उन के लिए बहुत महत्व रखता है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि कुछ सूती कपड़ा मिलों के बन्द होने की सम्भावना है। जाहिर है कि जब कुछ सूती कपड़ा मिलें बन्द हों जायेंगी और उन में सूती कपड़ा नहीं बन सकेगा, तो उस का असर प्रोडक्शन पर पड़ेगा।

ध्यान देने की बात यह है कि जो सूती कपड़ा मिलें घाटे में चल रही हैं, उस का कारण क्या है। जिन मिलों की माली हालत खराब है, वे बराबर कई सालों से सरकार से लोन और सहायता मांग रही हैं, लेकिन उन को तरफ़ कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। सरकार की तरफ़ से एक नैशनल इंडस्ट्रियल डेवेलपमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन बना हुआ है। उस के जरिए से इन मिलों के लिए यह फ़ाइनेंशियल हेल्प करते हैं तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ मंत्री महोदय से कि कितने सालों से आज आप को जिन मिलों के बारे में यह प्रश्न पैदा हो रहा है और यह शिकायत पैदा हो रही है कि वह मिसमैनेज्ड हैं उन पर आप ने क्यों नहीं तवज्जह दी, क्यों नहीं आप ने फ़ाइनेंशियल हेल्प की? जिन में कि प्रोडक्शन कम हो रहा है या उस में जो कमी आ रही है?

यह जो मिलों के प्रोडक्शन में कमी आ रही है उस को एक वजह तो यह है कि आप का टैक्सेशन इतना बढ़ गया है, इयूटी: इतनी बढ़

गई है, इयूटी इतनी हँबी हो गई है जिसकी कि वजह से कोस्ट आफ़ प्रोडक्शन दिनों दिन बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। अब जब कोस्ट आफ़ प्रोडक्शन बढ़ रहा है तब कुदरती तौर से जो ज्यादा सूती कपड़े का ऐक्सपोर्ट होता था वह गिरने लगा? वह गिरने लगा क्योंकि कोस्ट आफ़ प्रोडक्शन उस को बढ़ गई। फ़ौरन मार्केट में, दूसरे मुल्कों में जो कपड़ा तैयार होता है उस से कम्पीट नहीं कर पाता है। इस के लिए गवर्नमेंट जिम्मेदार है। आज आप इस बिल को पेश करके यह प.वर जो लेना चाह रहे हैं मैं नहीं समझता कि इस तरीके से आप इस समस्या को हल कर सकेंगे।

जहां तक यह मिसमैनेजमेंट का ताल्लुक है आप के पास जो ऐक्ट बना हुआ है इंडस्ट्रियल ऐक्ट, उस में इन सब खराबियों के लिये और उन मिलों में जहां मिसमैनेजमेंट हो रहा है वहां आप हस्तक्षेप कर सकते थे, उनको ठीक से चलाने सम्बन्धी सुझाव दे सकते थे और उस में सुधार कर सकते थे लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने इस बारे में आज तक कुछ नहीं किया। गवर्नमेंट अब इस बिल के जरिए जो पावर अपने हाथ में लेना चाहती है और जो उस का ऐम है इस बिल के लाने में कि मिसमैनेज्ड मिलें हैं या जो औपरेशन में फ़ाइनेंशियली बीक टैक्सटाइल मिल्स हैं उनका गवर्नमेंट इस बिल के जरिए कम्पलसरी लिक्विडेशन या रिकंस्ट्रक्शन करना चाहती है, जैसा कि मेरे मित्र श्री राम-मूर्ति ने बतलाया कि ऐसी मिलों का कम्पलसरी लिक्विडेशन कर देना चाहिए तो मेरा कहना है कि उस के लिए इस बिल में कम्पलसरी लिक्विडेशन का जो प्रोसैस बतलाया गया है उस को अगर फ़ौलो किया जायेगा तो मैं बतलाता हूँ कि जो ऐम्स एंड औबजैक्ट्स हैं वह बिलकुल ख़त्म हों जायेंगे। उस में इतना समय लगेगा कि आप जो यह चाहते हैं कि प्रोडक्शन हमारा किसी तरीके से घटने ने पाये वह इस प्रोसैस के कारण इस से सम्बन्धित टैकनिकल कार्यवाही को पुरा करने में इतना समय लग जायेगा जिसको कि वजह से

[श्री बृज भूषण लाल]

वह प्रोडक्शन आप का गिर जायेगा और जिसको गिरने से आप रोकना चाहते हैं उसे नहीं रोक पायेंगे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि आप जो यह कम्पल-सरी लिक्विडेशन कर रहे हैं उस का नतीजा क्या होगा? उस का नतीजा यह होगा जैसा कि इस कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट में होता चला आ रहा है, आप के जो फेवरिट्स हैं जिनको कि आप जगह देना चाहते हैं उनको पावर में बैठा देंगे। मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन कोटेन टेक्सटाइल मिलों को जिन्हें कि आप लेने जा रहे हैं उन को लेने से पहले आप उन गवर्नमेंट अंडरटेकिंग्स को देखिये, उन पबलिक सैक्टर अंडरटेकिंग्स को देखिये जो इतने सालों से रन कर रही हैं और जहाँ पर कि मुतवातिर घाटा होता जा रहा है। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट अंडरटेकिंग, गवर्नमेंट को जो कम्पनी है जो बिलकुल गवर्नमेंट से कंट्रोल हो रही है, मिसाल के तौर पर हंबो एलक्ट्रिकल्स, भूपाल और दूसरी हंबो इंजिनियरिंग रांची की है, इन दोनों को आप देखिये करोड़ों रुपये का घाटा उन में हो रहा है। यह हालत आपने कर दो पबलिक के पैसे को। गवर्नमेंट का कंट्रोल करके गवर्नमेंट अंडरटेकिंग बना कर तो यह दशा कर दो आप ने उन कम्पनियों को और मैं समझता हूँ कि यही हालत और दुर्दशा उन सूती मिलों को भी इस बिल से होने जा रही है।

जो भी चीज कंट्रोल में आई यह हम और आप सब जानते हैं और पबलिक जानती है कि उस का सुधार हो ही नहीं सकता, उस का एफैक्टिव कंट्रोल हो ही नहीं सकता लेकिन इसके विपरीत जो एक प्राइवेट सैक्टर को इंडस्ट्री होती है और उस का जो एक इंडिविजुअल होता है वह उस पर स्पेशल एटेंशन देता है और उस को कामयाबी से चलाने में स्पेशल इंटरेस्ट और पैस लेता है। पबलिक सैक्टर इंडस्ट्री में यह चीज देखने

को नहीं मिलती है और यही कारण उनके घाटे में चलने का है। गवर्नमेंट ने जहाँ किसी प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्री को टेक ओवर कर लिया उस के बाद मानों उस का परपज खत्म हो जाता है। इसलिए जो यह सुझाव या जो यह बिल आप लाये हैं और जो इस बिल के लाने के पीछे उन का मकसद है वह इस से पूरा नहीं होता है। हां, अगर आप को मंशा सिर्फ यही है कि पबलिक को दिखायें, मुल्क को दिखायें कि हमारा इंटरेस्ट कारोबार में भी है तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि आप यह इस तरह से बैकडोर से क्यों टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री को नेशनलाइज करने जा रहे हैं? अगर आप उसे वाकई नेशनलाइज करना चाह रहे हैं तो हिम्मत रखिये, खुले तौर पर रखिये कि हम इसे नेशनलाइज करेंगे यह बैकडोर से इसे आप क्यों करते हैं?

15.55 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair].

मेरा कहना है कि अगर आप इन कोटेन मिलों को माली हालत में सुधार करना चाहते हैं तो उस का हल यह है कि आप वहाँ का जो मैनेजमेंट है उस को बुलायें, लेबर के जो प्रतिनिधि हैं उन को बुलायें और जो ऐक्सपर्ट्स हों उन को भी बुलायें और उन सब के साथ में बैठ कर उन समस्याओं को हल करने के बारे में सोचें। ज़रूरतमंद मिलों को लॉस दिये जाएं, सहीलियतें दो जाएं और जो कमी हैं मैनेजमेंट में उस कमी को दूर करिये यह नहीं कि आप इस तरह का बिल लाकर और गवर्नमेंट एक पावर लेकर जो चाहे मनमानी करती रहे।

साथ ही मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि वह मिलों को मोडर्नाइज करना चाहते हैं, मशीनरीज को अपडेट करना चाहते हैं, मिलों का रिहैबिलिटेशन करना चाहते हैं तो जाहिर है कि इस सब काम के लिये पैसा चाहिए। बगैर पैसे के कोई काम होता नहीं है। अभी मंत्री महोदय

ने बतलाया कि इन टैक्सटाइल मिलों को मॉर्डनाइज करने के लिये 550 करोड़ रुपये से लेकर 1,000 करोड़ रुपये तक को ज़रूरत होगी। क्या गवर्नमेंट के पास पैसा है? बजट तो सरकार का डैफिसिट चल रहा है और ऊपर से आप यह सब काम करना चाहते हैं, उनका सुधार आदि करना चाहते हैं तो मेरा कहना है कि पैसा न रहते हुए आप कुछ सुधार आदि का काम नहीं कर सकेंगे। पावर अगर आप को लेनी है और अपने आदमियों को वहां बैठाना है तब तो दूसरी बात है लेकिन अगर आप को नीयत नेक है तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि कहां है आप के पास पैसा जो आप यह मॉर्डनाइज आदि कर सकेंगे? इसलिए बेहतर तो यह है कि जो टैडेंसी चल रही है, जो उन में मिस्मैनेजमेंट है उस को आप देखिये, उन को सहायता करिये, उन को आप रुपया दीजिये और कायदे से उन का सुधार करिये तब तो परपञ्च सब होगा अन्यथा नहीं होगा। जिस तरीके से आप ने अपने ऐम और औबजैक्ट में तो लिख दिया है कि मिलें अपना प्रोडक्शन कम न करें, वह बंद न हों और देश का प्रोडक्शन और इम्प्लायमेंट सफर न करे लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि इस बिल के जरिए उन में कोई सुधार नहीं होने वाला है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां इस बिल के अन्दर आप ने यह दिया है कि अगर किसी मिल के अन्दर कोई मिस्मैनेजमेंट है तो ऐथोराइज्ड पर्सन को रिपोर्ट पर हम एक्शन लेंगे उस का इसके अन्दर कहीं भी मेशन नहीं दिया गया है। वह कौन सा ऐथोराइज्ड पर्सन होगा किसी भी जगह उस को डिफ़ाइन नहीं किया गया है। ऐथोराइज्ड पर्सन वह कौन है जिसकी के रिपोर्ट पर गवर्नमेंट एक्शन लेगी? बिल में इस का साफ़ तौर पर मेशन होना ज़रूरी है। इन सब बज्रहात को बिना पर मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ। इस बिल के जरिए जो खराबियां आदि दूर करने का गवर्नमेंट का मकसद है वह उसे हासिल नहीं कर पायेगी जैसा कि हम देख

ही रहे हैं कि सिवाय एक पब्लिक सैक्टर की इंडस्ट्री को छोड़ कर जिसमें कि गवर्नमेंट को प्राफिट हुआ है बाकी सारी गवर्नमेंट की अंडरटेकिंग में नुकसान ही हो रहा है। मुझे कोई उम्मीद नजर नहीं आती कि इस बिल के जरिए कोई भी सुधार हो सकेगा।

श्री शशि भूषण वाजपेयी (खारगोन) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय हिन्दुस्तान में यह टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री बहुत पुरानी है लेकिन इनके चलाने वालों के सम्बन्ध में थोड़ा सा यहां कहना चाहता हूँ। कुछ सट्टे के व्यापारियों और आड़ती व्यापारियों ने इस देश में टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री लगाई। उन का मकसद क्या था। मकसद उन का मुनाफ़ा कमाना ही था उस से अधिक कुछ नहीं था। यह इस बात का सबूत है कि दूसरे देशों में जहां भी टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री है जहां-जहां उन्होंने विकास किया है जो उन को मुनाफ़ा होता रहा उस मुनाफ़े की एक बहुत बड़ी मद वह इस बात पर खर्च करते थे कि इंडस्ट्रियल रिसर्च किया जाये। इस देश का इंडस्ट्रियल रिसर्च विकास कैसे किया जाये? इस ओर हमारे देश के टैक्सटाइल के इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स ने कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया। उन्होंने सिवाय मुनाफ़ा कैसे ज्यादा से ज्यादा कमाया जाय बस इसी को ओर उन्होंने अपना सारा ध्यान दिया। कोमतें हमेशा बढ़ती रहीं। सीलिंग रही कौटन पर। किसानों को भी खूब चूसा गया। मंत्रो महोदय का मैं धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि कम से कम सीलिंग नहीं है और सीलिंग हटा दी गई वरना हम यहां के किसान तो बहुत बेदार थे। सीलिंग हटने के बाद भी आज भी सट्टा इन के हाथ में है आड़त इन के हाथ में है। एक खबर छपवा देते हैं कि विदेशों से कौटन आने वाली है किसानों को कौटन के भाव गिर जाते हैं। यह अब की बार नहीं किया बल्कि अनेकों बार कर चुके हैं। सट्टे से फ़ायदा उठाया कोमतें बढ़ीं। उस से फ़ायदा उठाया लेकिन इंडस्ट्री के विकास में एक पैसा खर्च न करें यह है हालत इन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है इस

[श्री शशी भूषण वाजपेयी]

बात का कि अगर इन को दूसरा मौका न होता आगे बढ़ने का तो यह इन इंडस्ट्रीज को चलाते नहीं। इन इंडस्ट्रीज के मुनाफ़े से करोड़ों रुपया इन्होंने अपना तो दबाया सरकार से पैसा लेकर विदेशों से कोलंबोरेशन करके बहुत से नये-नये लाइसेंसेज लिये। और उन इंडस्ट्रीज पर चले गये जहाँ उन को सैंकड़ों गुना मुनाफ़ा था। मुझे कोई यह बतला दे कि दुनिया की टैक्स्टाइल इंडस्ट्री के विकास में किस मुल्क में इतनी ज्यादा कीमतें दी गई हैं या किस मुल्क में इतना मुनाफ़ा हुआ है जितना हिन्दुस्तान में हुआ है। लेकिन उन के मुंह में खून लग चुका था और यह इंडस्ट्रीज बह छोड़ गये। पतली डाल को छोड़ कर दूसरी डाल पर बैठ गये उन को चिन्ता नहीं कि बाग फना हो जायेगा। जब इंडस्ट्रीज में यह परिस्थिति थी उस वक्त यह लोग क्या करते थे? अपने भाइयों को अपने रिश्तेदारों को हजारों रुपयों की नौकरियों पर रक्खा था। आज दिल्ली शहर में ही दस-दस हजार रुपये माहवार पर उन के कंटेक्टमैन हैं, लेकिन इस सब कुछ के बावजूद भी इतना सब कुछ खाने के बाद भी आज इस इंडस्ट्री को खाली छोड़ कर आगे बढ़ गये।

16 hrs.

मजदूरों के प्रति जो रवैया रहा उस को भी देखिये। अब तक कोई बतलाये कि कितने कानून बने हैं जिन से मजदूरों का कोई फायदा हुआ हो हर तरह से मिल वालों को फायदा दिया गया हर तरीके से उन को प्रोटेक्शन दिया गया सीलिंग द्वारा सट्टे द्वारा जिस से उन्होंने जबदस्त मुनाफा कमाया। लेकिन फिर भी उन को दूसरी तरफ जाना था और वह चले गये। मुझे भोपाल के बारे में याद है कि टैक्स्टाइल मिलों के मजदूर कहते थे कि वह उस इंडस्ट्री को खुद चला सकते हैं। हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने मिल वालों को हर तरह की सहूलियतें दीं लेकिन फिर भी वह लोग मिलों को खराब समझ कर छोड़ कर चले गये हैं। हिन्दुस्तानी मजदूर सब से सस्ता है लेकिन उन्हें भुला कर

मिल वालों को चले जाने दिया गया। जिन मजदूरों की मेहनत से उन्होंने अरबों रुपये कमाये जिन की मेहनत से उन्होंने अपने एक्सपोर्ट को बढ़ाने के लिये विदेशों को चीजें भेजीं उन का कितना-कितना हिसाब लगाया गया? विवियन बोस कमिशन की रिपोर्ट आप के सामने आई है और भी चीजें आप के सामने हैं। एक्सपोर्ट में सिर्फ इस बात का ध्यान दिया गया कि वहां से कौन सी चीजें लाई जाएं एक्सपोर्ट में उस का मकसद कभी नहीं रहा कि हिन्दुस्तान के किसान को आगे बढ़ाया जाये। हमारे इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स ने देश की मुसीबत में कभी भी साथ नहीं दिया देश का वह सिर्फ रुपया बनाने में लगे रहे। आज हिन्दुस्तान की जो खराब एकानमी है उस के जिम्मेदार यह लोग हैं।

जब हमारे यहां डिवैलुएशन हुआ तब इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान की आर्थिक हालत खराब थी लेकिन उस की जिम्मेदारी इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स पर भी है और मुझे विश्वास है कि इंग्लैंड में भी डिवैलुएशन इस लिये हुआ कि वहां डालर का दखल ज्यादा हो गया था। जब दो साल पहले में वहां था तब मेरे कानों में धनक पड़ी थी कि वहां की कार इंडस्ट्री में और कपड़ा इंडस्ट्री में जो अमरीकी सरमाया चला आ रहा है वह उन की एकानमी को चलने नहीं देगा। हमारे देश में भी इन्हीं इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स ने ज्यादा से ज्यादा कोलेबोरेशन विदेशों से लिया लेकिन उन्होंने सिवा अपना मुनाफा कमाने के कभी इस बात की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया कि जिन इंडस्ट्रीज को वह चलाते हैं उन के विकास के लिये कोई रिसर्च सेंटर खोलें।

जहां तक माडर्नाइजेशन की बात है यह बहुत बड़ा कदम है और अगर मजदूरों का सहयोग लिया जाये कोर्पोरेटिव सोसायटीज का सहयोग लिया जाये तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि मंत्री महोदय का लक्ष्य पूरा होगा। लेकिन एक बात जरूर है कि माडर्नाइजेशन के

बाद मिल वाले कोई ऐसे पत्रे फेंक कर कहीं यह मिलें बापस न ले लें, इस का खयाल आप जरूर रखें। जो टेक्स्टाइल मिल्स आप छीन रहे हैं अगर वह कामयाब हुई तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह इन इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को जवाब होगा जो कि हमेशा मुनाफा कमा कर पीठ दिखा जाते हैं।

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I fail to understand what is really behind this Bill. If it is claimed that this Bill is brought in in order to give relief to the falling fortunes of the textile industry, or to the growing unemployment in certain groups of textile workers, then I do not know whether that aim will be achieved by this Bill.

The statement that is given here as to why the Bill is brought forward contains any number of mistakes, wrong statements and gives a picture which is not true to facts. For example, why are they proposing this measure? Because, it is said, it is an important industry. That is accepted. Every industry in this country is an important industry, not only the textile industry. So, that is an obvious truth. But, then, there is another statement in the second part, that it contributes to the earning of foreign exchange substantially. This is an absolutely wrong statement. It is on record that the textile industry spends more of foreign exchange than it earns. This is recorded in the economic diaries of the Government of India, its digests and so on, that for purposes of buying cotton, buying machinery etc. the textile industry consumes more foreign exchange than it earns. So, it is an absolutely wrong statement which the Minister has put forward in this Bill.

The third statement is that it is tending to deteriorate, the textile industry is tending to deteriorate due to lack of modernisation. This is also a wrong statement. Modernisation or lack of modernisation, these are not reasons for any deterioration that may be visible here and there. If we were to go into the last year's working of the cotton textile industry, according to

"A Study of Major Companies in the Textile Industry" which has been published last year their gross profits rose by something like 54 per cent; their pre-tax profits rose by something like 81 per cent and their investment of capital has gone up. If these are not an index of prosperity, then what is? So, to state that they are tending to deteriorate due to lack of modernisation is not correct. It may be so in a few units that they are deteriorating; even in those cases it is false to say that those units are losing because they have no opportunities for modernisation. Therefore, I cannot understand these arguments.

The only reason that is valid in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill is that due to mismanagement of cotton textile industry closures are taking place, which affects the whole of the economy of the country and life of the working people. Therefore, to stop mismanagement, which is indulged in by employers,—who by themselves may be dishonest or honest, I do not know, but their working has been thoroughly fraudulent—this Bill has been brought in. But if you have to deal with mismanagement, what is the necessity for such a rignarole of such a Bill out of which nothing will come? A simple straight-forward taking over of the mills by nationalisation should have been the first step; secondly, putting those who are mismanaging them into prison for fraud and thirdly, confiscating their private fortunes.

By the law of limited companies they pass on all the losses by frauds to the companies and build up their private fortune, and when you take over the mills their fortunes remain intact and the fortunes of the workers alone are lost. Therefore, there must be a provision—I have been demanding it all the while and I am repeating it now—to protect the fortunes of the workers. Now the law of limited companies is a shelter to fraudulent employers to hide their fortunes under the protection of the law and pass on all the losses to the limited companies.

Therefore, these three measures should have been taken, I do not know by which law; it is for them to find out; not that their laws are immune from dethronement

[Shri S. A. Dange]

by the Supreme Court or any other court, but it is for them to find out. When they can find out any number of loopholes to dethrone a whole Ministry in Bengal, Punjab, Haryana and other States, should they find themselves short of any methodology or any rule or any law to dethrone some fraudulent employers in the textile industry?

Is it not easier to dethrone these few magnates than dethroning whole ministries elected by the people?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are minorities.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are there some deviations from the industrial side to the other side?

SHRI S. A. DANGE: No; this is all intermixed.

So, this Bill is merely an eyewash. There is a tremendous unrest in the textile workers. The textile workers have been the spearhead of the national movement, of the working class movement, of forcing the Government to undertake many laws even in the British days. This worker is now on the move. In the city of Bombay they are proposing to cut down the dearness allowance in a group of mills which has proved to have been going into ruins due to the fraudulent behaviour of the employers concerned. It is on record—again I am noting it—that Rs. 97 lakhs were misappropriated by the employers of the India United Mills in Bombay City. A Government of India expert went and looked into the accounts, the fraud was proved and no action was taken. Shri Morarjibhai Desai intervened with his most benevolent intervention and he rearranged the shares among those quarrelsome directors and set the mill going which again went into another fraud. Is that the way of dealing with the situation? I do not know. Now they are proposing that those mills should carry out a cut in dearness allowance and 50 per cent of the dearness allowance of something like 20,000 workers is to be cut.

There has been a report in the State of Madras, Tamilnad, by a committee appoint-

ed by the Government wherein fraud has been proved in the case of certain mills due to which they had to go into closures. The committee said, "We do not want to say anything about this." They only asked the banks to advance certain money to those mills which could be refloated and opened for working. Is this the way the Government of India is going to deal with this problem of an industry which, they say, is very necessary for the nation and for the people?

So, I do not think anything is going to come out of this Bill. Many other flaws can be pointed out. The workers' wages or the standard of living are not guaranteed under the Bill at all. They can be dismissed and new workers engaged if they do not agree to take a wage cut or dearness allowance cut. But then I want to make some more proposals. It is not only the question of the Bill; it is the question of the re-organisation of the textile industry. Is it not so? Is the Government of India serious about it? Why are they not entering the forward market in cotton purchases? Why do they not stop hedging that takes place in the cotton market by means of which the employers are able to pass on the losses of their own speculation to the mills? Are they going to stop the hedge market in cotton? They do not do that.

I have been told that the industry cannot survive with a hedge. Whoever said that the industry cannot survive with a hedge? There is no hedging in all the other commodities except in a few. Cotton is the most speculative commodity in India next to black pepper from Kerala. Yet, nothing is done. Once the STC wanted to enter the forward market and all the cotton merchants and millowners combined and stopped the STC from entering the forward market. Why do they not do it? Why do they not control the import and export of cotton, their rates of hedging and all these things, without which the re-organisation of the textile industry is an impossibility? But it will be stopped if the Commerce Ministry tries to do that because it is not to the interest of the other ministries to stop the speculation in the cotton exchange.

Then, it is not only a matter for the Commerce Ministry; the other day another Minister, for industrial production, went to Bombay to attend a meeting of the textile machinery manufacturers. The mills in India built up on the toil and blood of our own people, our own sacrifices, even in the year 1967 insist that they must have spare parts and machinery from England, America or Japan and they will not buy Indian machinery. Is there any proposal compelling every textile mill in India not to buy any foreign machinery but to buy from the machinery manufacturers who have got any amount of stocks lying unsold? Our installed capacity of manufacturing textile machinery, I am told, is something like 10,000 ring frames per year. 1,500 only are sold. In looms, our manufacturing capacity, I am told, is something like 9,000 and the sales are only in the neighbourhood of 3,400 or something like that. There, unemployment is taking place and, here, the gentlemen are all talking about saving unemployment and saving the industry, necessary to the nation. How can the textile industry be saved by imports? Why should there be imports? Some of the textile mill-owners are themselves interested in foreign imports. For example, a company like Bombay Dyeing run the best mill in the country and they are using looms which were installed in the year 1907 and they do not complain that they are suffering because of modernisation or anything. Why should others complain about it? In looms' section, specially, there is no question of modernisation. In the name of modernisation, in this very House, in the year 1958, the then Commerce Minister—I forget his name—wanted sanction for 3,000 automatic looms to be imported. We opposed it. He said, "They are required for export purposes to earn foreign exchange." After three years, we found that those automatic looms were manufacturing long cloth and grey cloth in the city of Bombay and elsewhere and just selling them in the rupee market, in Bengal market or in other Indian market. There was not one inch of cloth for export. How can you identify, in 60,000 looms in the country, whether production in 3,000 looms is being exported or sold in the country? Every product of a loom is not marked that this belongs to a particular automatic loom or whatever

it is. All sorts of humbug is practised in this House by telling people about things whose details they do not know. Now, we find that 3,000 automatic looms are just causing unemployment. The promises from that side are absolutely hypocritical and bogus. Unless there is a coordination of machinery manufacturers here and a compulsion to buy no machines except Indian-made machines, there is no solution. Even in the case of replacements which are required for machines that were formerly imported, we can manufacture the parts. Unless there is a control over hedging and speculative cotton market, unless you enter into forward market and control it by your own State sector operation, unless you arrest the mill-owners and put them in prison, there is no solution for the ills of the textile industry.

I have been leading the textile workers movement. I know the mills in the city of Bombay, from A to Z, I speak from my experience, knowledge and everything, apart from what information is supplied by the Government figures. My proposal is that this Bill should contain provisions for dealing with fraudulent employers in some better manner. Merely going for liquidation proceedings is nothing. As my hon-friend, Shri Ramamurti said, the liquidation proceedings may be launched in the life-time of an employer and will be decided in the life-time of his grandson. That is no solution. This will be the result. The unemployment is going to brew. I know the employers are going to attack the D.A. in the city of Bombay. We are going to resist it as much as possible and we are going to beat down the proposal because we are on the right lines. They are frauds: fraud is proved in south India. fraud is proved in Kanpur; fraud is proved in Bombay—fraud is proved in many other cases. What did you do? Therefore, these proposals are just dilatory proposals and the Government just, after having got discredited in Bengal and Har-yana, want to earn back credit in the ranks of some sections of the workers and say same wonderful, great things, of taking over mismanaged mills in order to give them relief.

This thing will fail unless you take over the textile industry as a whole. Otherwise,

[Shri S. A. Dange]

the proposal means that private capitalists will keep the good mills and make profits and the bad mills will be transferred to the State and we, the tax-payers, will pay for the losses. This is the proposal that they are bringing forward. Why not take one bad mill and one good mill, if not the whole textile industry, as a method of teaching a lesson to the capitalist class?

Then, the mills are taken over for mismanagement.

Now in the State sector, there is enough of mismanagement. Is it a guarantee that, when they take over, there will be good management? What is the guarantee for that? The guarantee can be there partially at least if the workers are associated with the management; otherwise, there cannot be any guarantee of improving the conditions; they cannot give us this guarantee by appointing an ICS gentleman who may be very well intentioned but who does not know the difference between 20 counts and 30 or 40 counts. What is the use of management like this? We have got these wonderful honest Managers in Bhilai, in Durgapur, in Hardwar and in so many other places and everything is going wrong. This mismanagement cannot be cured like that. For example, we proposed in Bombay certain changes in the India United Mills, a big group. There, the product was boycotted in the market because one gentleman wanted the monopoly of management and he was taken away; he organised the market and boycotted the product until something like Rs. 2 crores worth of cloth was lying in the godowns of that mill, and when they wanted more finance, Mr. Morarji Desai said, "no more deficit financing", though deficit financing was going on in other deficit areas, particularly in the deficits of the ruling Party, which deficit to some extent is made up by the cement manufacturers whose list was published the other day. Here they were denied finance. We made proposals and certain officials who were known to be corrupted and fraudulent were removed and the losses of that Mill, which were as he referred, Rs. 15 lakhs a month, came down to Rs. 1½ lakhs in the last two months. You and I belong to the same place; you can

go and find out. How did the losses go down suddenly to Rs. 1½ to 2 lakhs? It was because certain measures, by the workers' agitation, were taken by the management. But again they have found some other way and again they are going up. Therefore, this way, you cannot change matters. Such a Bill is not going to help. It only shows that the Commerce Minister has got some idea that there is some working class somewhere which is suffering and there is some industry somewhere which requires his attention or some attention. Here is this Bill. Nothing will happen. You improve, if you can; I do not want to oppose it. Why? Because here he accepts that there is some mismanagement on the part of the capitalist class and he accepts that this has got to be cured. That acceptance of his, I support, but the translation of that acceptance into practice, is thoroughly useless and it will lead to no results. Therefore, I want the Government to change the Bill and bring in effective measures so that the fraud that this capitalist class perpetrates on the people of India shall be stopped.

श्री देवराव पाटिल (यवतमाल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस हाउस में कई दफा यह मांग की गई है कि इन सूती कपड़ा मिलों पर सरकार का नियंत्रण हो। पैसे की दृष्टि से कमजोर सूती कपड़ा मिलों का नियंत्रण सरकारी अधिकार में लेने, अथवा उनको दोबारा बनवाने के बाद उन को सरकारी नियंत्रण में रखने के लिए यह विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है। इस विधेयक के अन्तर्गत वित्तीय दृष्टि से कमजोर कपड़ा मिलों को जनहित की दृष्टि से सरकार अपने हाथ में ले कर चलाने का अधिकार प्राप्त कर लेगी। अब तक यह व्यवस्था है कि पैसे की दृष्टि से कमजोर मिलों को सरकार कुछ समय तक अपने अधिकार में रखती है और उनका प्रबन्धक ठीक करने के बाद उन को फिर उनके मालिकों के हाथों में सौंप देती है। इससे कोई अधिक लाभ नहीं हुआ। इसी कारण यह नया विधेयक लाया गया है। इसके अन्तर्गत सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में काफी अधिकार मिल जायेंगे। इस विधेयक में यह व्यवस्था

की गई है कि सरकार ऐसी मिलों पर नियंत्रण करे और उन को खुद ही चलाए।

इस बारे में कहा गया है कि जो सूती कपड़ा मिलें घाटे में चलती हैं, जिन को मुनाफा नहीं मिलता है, उस का एक कारण यह है कि उन्हें समय पर सहुलियत नहीं दी गई। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक बहुत बड़ा उद्योग है और देश के लिए इस का बहुत अधिक महत्व है। किसानों और भारत के अन्य सब लोगों का इस उद्योग से ताल्लुक है। इतना बड़ा उद्योग होने पर भी इस को बुनियादी उद्योग माना गया है और सरकार की ओर से इस उद्योग को सब प्रकार की सहुलियतें देने का प्रयास किया गया है।

इस उद्योग के लिए सब से बुनियादी जरूरत कपास की होती है। इसी लिए जो सहुलियत किसी और उद्योग के लिए नहीं दी गई, वह इस के लिए उपलब्ध की गई। मैं माननीय सदस्यों को बताना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरी सब इंडस्ट्रीज तो अपना रा-मैटीरियल मार्केट प्राइस पर खरीदती हैं, लेकिन इस उद्योग के रा-मैटीरियल, अर्थात्, काटन की प्राइस पर सीलिंग लगा दिया गया। ऐसा प्रबन्ध किसी और उद्योग में नहीं किया गया था।

मिलें जो काटन लेती थीं, वह तो सीलिंग प्राइस पर लेती थीं, 100 परसेंट माल सीलिंग प्राइस पर लेती थीं, लेकिन वे जो कपड़ा बेचती थीं, उस में से सिर्फ 40 परसेंट कंट्रोल प्राइस पर बेचा जाता था। किसान को तो 100 परसेंट माल सीलिंग प्राइस पर लिया जाता था। लेकिन मिलों का केवल 40 परसेंट कपड़ा कंट्रोल प्राइस पर बेचा जाता था। इस तरह की सहुलियतें इन मिलों को दी गई थीं।

इन मिलों के घाटे के बारे में कई माननीय सदस्यों ने यह कारण बताया है कि उन में मिसमैनेजमेंट रहा है, उन का नफा कमाने और काम करने का ढंग दोषपूर्ण रहा है। काटन की

खरीद का उन का प्रोसीड्यूर यह है कि वे किसान से डायरेक्ट नहीं खरीदते हैं, बल्कि अपने दलालों को, जिन को मिडल मैन कहा जाता है, मार्केट में भेज कर उन के नाम से काटन खरीते हैं। वास्तव में काटन वे स्वयं खरीदते हैं, लेकिन वे दलालों के जरिये खरीदते हैं और डबल एकाउंटिंग करते हैं। इसलिए उन लोगों ने इतना घन कमाया है। उन लोगों ने इतना फॉरिन एक्सचेंज वेस्ट किया है, लेकिन जब किसान काटन की प्राइस बढ़ाने के लिए कहता है, तो मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान उधर नहीं जाता है।

पिछले साल जब कपास कंट्रोल प्राइस पर नहीं मिल रही थी, तो मिल ओनर्स उन के पास गए और रोए, तो मंत्री महोदय ने एक-दम आर्डिनेंस के द्वारा एसेशनल कामोडिथीज एक्ट में यह प्राविजन कर दिया कि किसी भी किसान का काटन चाहे कहीं भी मिले वह कंट्रोल प्राइस पर ले लिया जाये इस से प्रकट होता है कि उन लोगों को मदद करने के लिए मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से कितने उपाय किये गये।

लेकिन जब हम लोग कपास को कीमत बढ़ाने के लिए कहते हैं, तो मंत्री महोदय उस पर ध्यान नहीं देते हैं। पिछली बार उन्होंने सीलिंग प्राइस को हटा दिया, उसके लिए धन्यवाद। लेकिन सीलिंग प्राइस और मिनिमम प्राइस के बारे में हमारी जो मांग थी, उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। हमारे किसानों का इन्ट्रेस्ट इस में है कि सीलिंग प्राइस सपोर्ट प्राइस हो। जब तक काटन का सवाल हल नहीं होता है, तब तक यह इंडस्ट्रीज अच्छी तरह से नहीं चल सकती है।

देश को लांग-स्टेपल काटन की बहुत जरूरत है, लेकिन किसान उस को तभी पैदा कर सकता है, जब कि उस को अच्छे भाव दिये जायें। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन को किसान की तरफ भी देखना चाहिए। उन को देखना चाहिए कि कपड़ा बनाने वाले

[श्री देवराव पाटिल]

कारखानेदार को रा-मैटीरियल देने वाले किसान की हालत क्या है और उस को क्या मिल रहा है। आज इस बात की सख्त जरूरत है कि उस को अपने श्रम के बदले में उचित दाम मिलें।

इसलिये इस की सख्त जरूरत है। यह सही मांग हम लोगों ने किया है और आप ने भी रेमू-नरेटिव प्राइस देने की तय की है। लेकिन जो किसान माल पैदा करता है उसका कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है, क्या इस के देखने के लिये भी कोई यन्त्र है। स्टेटस में भी कोई ऐसा यन्त्र नहीं है जो देख सके कि कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन क्या है। उस का खर्च कितना आता है इसका हिसाब लगाने के बाद उसकी प्राइस फिक्स करनी चाहिए, लेकिन उसको आरबिट्रेरीली फिक्स किया जाता है। तीन तीन साल में हिसाब लगाया जाता है और तब काटन प्राइस फिक्स की जाती है। जैसे कल हरियाना के बारे में कहा गया कि आयाराम और गयाराम हो गये ह, उसी तरह यहाँ पर दिया और लिया चलता है। बड़े बड़े कमरों में बैठ कर सब कुछ तय कर लिया करते हैं, कपास की बात कोई नहीं देखता है। जो चाहा लिया दिया और इसी तरह से उसको मार्केटिंग चलती है। इससे किसान की लूट होती है।

इसमें कारपोरेशन बनाने का जो प्राविजन दिया गया है, मुझे डर है कि उस में जो प्राविजन्स है उन से किसानों का और मिल मजदूरों का कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। जो मिलों में काम करने वाले मजदूर हैं, जो अपना पसीना डालते हैं, उन लोगों का उस में शेयर होना चाहिए। जब वह रोग बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स पर होंगे तभी यह इंडस्ट्री दुस्त हो सकती है। आप को मालूम होगा कि काटन पैदा करने वाले जो लोग हैं उन लोगों को कोआपरेटिव जिनिंग, प्रेसिंग, फैक्टरी और वीविंग मिल्स बहुत तैयार हो रही हैं। इस की तरफ मंत्री महोदय को ध्यान देना चाहिये और हर एक स्टेट में जो वीविंग मिल्स तैयार हो रही हैं उन्हें फाइनेन्स

की बहुत सख्त जरूरत है। नागपुर की बीबर्स उद्योग है, अमरावती में है, मेरी डिस्ट्रिक्ट में दो मिल हैं, लेकिन उन के फाइनेन्स के लिये जब किसी पूंजी की डिमान्ड सरकार से होती है तो उस का पूरा खयाल नहीं रक्खा जाता है। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अगर सूती कपड़ा उद्योग को भारत में ठीक से चलाना है तो कोआपरेटिव सक्टर को दीजिये। जो कपास पैदा करते हैं हमारे किसान उन सब की तरफ आप ने जो ध्यान दिया है और जो कदम उठाया है, वह शत प्रतिशत सफल नहीं होगा जब तक आप इस घन्घे को ठीक से नहीं चलायेंगे इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि हम ने इस बिल की मांग की थी।

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore) : Under this Bill, Government want to take over the sick mills. This projects before us the ailing condition of the Congress Party and the Congress Government for the last twenty years. They have produced various sick things to and have made various things deteriorate in India. Again, unfortunately we find that these sick mills are proposed to be taken over by another sick organisation namely the Congress Government. This is a contradiction actually.

I feel, therefore, that this Bill would not remedy the disease but it will create further complications. During these years, as you know, the Congress Government have brought forward many Bills to cure the ailing condition of textile mills. There was a Bill which they had brought forward some time back, suggesting that after fifteen years, after curing the disease, they will hand over the unit back again to the mill-owners. I am sure that Government must have spent crores of rupees on these mills and after these mills were well fed with money they must have returned them to the individual owners. We find that again a similar Bill has been brought forward now. I am surprised whether Government and the Minister concerned have completely lost their reason and their capacity to diagnose the disease. This reminds of a doctor

who came to the villages after long period of work in the military. He used to prescribe tincture iodine for all sorts of diseases, irrespective of whether the disease was influenza or heart disease or minor fever and so on. Just like that doctor from the military who used to prescribe tincture iodine for all diseases, we find that Government also want to cure the disease in the textile industry through this type of Bill. I would submit that they will not be able to cure the disease; instead, they will only cause serious damage to the textile industry as a whole.

The reason why I say this is this. Why is this mismanagement taking place? This has never been spelled out in this Bill or elsewhere. The crisis in the cotton textile industry has been complicated first by the wrong policy and planning of the Congress Government and Party during the last 20 years. Then it has been further worsened by the blackmarketing, hoarding and wrong policy pursued by the textile magnates in the country.

What is the history of the textile industry during the last 20 years? During this period, exports have fallen, prices of cloth have risen and there is a huge stock which has piled up with mills. The other day I was reading in the papers that the South India handloom industry is facing a crisis because huge stocks have piled up. Actually, the South Indian textile mills have sent repeated proposals to Government to save them from this disaster.

Look at what the industry has done. During these 20 years of Congress rule, the *per capita* availability of cloth has come down to 14 sq. metres. This is one metre short of what we were getting a decade ago. This, in a nutshell, constitutes the achievement of the textile industry. Gandhiji was saying that everybody should be provided with a minimum of clothing, but we find today after 20 years of Congress raj that we are short of one metre of cloth availability as compared to the position 20 years ago. This is the picture presented by the cotton textile industry.

Let us come to the export performance. The figures present a very grim picture. Exports are falling year after year.

As again this, the gross profits are increasing. I have some figures here. In 1951, the export was 669 million square metres; in 1956, it came down to 625 million square metres; by the end of 1966, it went down further to 424 million sq. metres. We have had such a colossal fall in exports. As Shri Dange has said, this industry has not at all helped the promotion of exports and secured more foreign exchange.

On the other hand, look at the performance in the international market of other countries. During these years, countries which became free after us, like China and small countries like Japan and Hongkong have boosted their exports enormously. Today China has expanded her activities in respect of textiles to such a wide range in the international market as to make one not believe it. The other day I was reading in the newspaper which gave details of this. Compared to this, while our exports have seriously fallen, the gross profits of the millowners have increased by 54 per cent. From Rs. 28.7 crores, it has gone up to Rs. 44.3 crores, an increase of 54 per cent only during the last year. While the profit is up, *per capita* availability is down and exports have fallen in the international market. While other countries are doing very well, we, who had a great reputation in textile production in olden days—of which we are proud—are now faced with a sad picture so far as our textile industry is concerned. In the circumstances, this Bill cannot cure this big malady. This is merely a patchwork. The monster of mismanagement, the monster of blackmarketing, the monster of hoarding, the monster of bureaucratic inefficiency cannot be tackled through this sort of a Bill. This needs complete nationalisation of the textile industry.

If you want to take over the sick mills only and operate them, you cannot, because of lack of technical knowhow, capable management and finance, and competition controlled by the big business magnates in the textile industry, and you will be forced to bring in another Bill after some time to scrap this. This can be done only if you have complete nationalisation of the whole industry and you put in some workers' councils there. Do not appoint IAS or ICS officers in the management, for heaven's sake because I find that for everything,

[Shri S. Kundu]

beginning from agriculture to horticulture, one IAS or ICS officer is required to man it. People who read Shelly and Byron. I have nothing against their reading them, do not know anything about the textile industry and the techniques involved. Therefore, I feel that this Bill cannot solve the problem.

Within the compass of the Bill, what does it suggest? In a nutshell, this Bill suggests two things. First, that it must be made into a running concern, then there should be some authority who will decide whether a certain textile mill should be taken over or not. Then a reserve price will be fixed, it will be reconstructed, and then if there are no buyers, Government will take over. If you mean business, you must start from the beginning. Either you take over or you do not. Do not keep such phase-wise power. Anybody will lose his dynamism to build up the industry if he is confronted with so many steps, and ultimately for a sick mill the Government will be the only refuge.

You have, in this Bill, given wide discretionary powers to a particular officer. We do not know who that man is. Again there is a bureaucratic paraphernalia. The "authorised" person will decide whether a mill should be taken over "under the circumstances" or not and submit a report. He will be an arbitrator who will wield a lot of power. Those who want to get rid of these sick mills will run to him and say, "Please relieve us from a lot of debts we have got towards the Government and take over the mill. Whatever consideration you want, we will pay, of course, outside the purview of the Act. Please take over this mill and save us."

I feel this Bill will not solve the malady. It is a hypocrisy, an eyewash. Let the Commerce Minister tear off his false socialist mask, pick up a little courage and say that he believes in real socialism, and let him nationalise this industry, and put up workers' councils and manage it.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba): I was trying to understand what Government is wanting to do by introducing this sort of Bill. Is Government out to help the workers of those mills which are closing down for one reason or other?

Either they have gone sick or the management has gone sick or the management wants to go on strike. Are they out to help the industry, so that the production of the textile mills in this country should go up? Or, are they out to pour, sink, more money into the coffers of those who in the past have made huge profits and have not ploughed them back into the industry? The idea of taking over sick mills and running them, after going through all the processes that have been laid down in this proposed Bill, is to be considered in this light: if at all, is it going to help those who are responsible for these mills, appearing or becoming sick? If the Government is really interested in helping the workers who are being thrown out on the streets and also helping the industry, even without taking recourse to the method of nationalisation or acquiring those properties, why cannot the Minister straightaway say, "All right; the Government would like to instal new mills and would take over all those workers to these new mills."

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। इतना सुन्दर भाषण हो रहा है लेकिन हाउस में गणपूर्ति नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE: I was trying to say that instead of trying to take care of the management of these sick mills, the Government should really get interested in the workers and the industry.

SHRI S. A. DANGE: As they got in Bennett Coleman?

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE: The Government have appointed their directors in Bennett Coleman. Now, if they want to do that, let them see that the new mills are put up. But by this Bill the Government are trying to sink money, down the sink, where the old managements, due to their old methods, have made their mills sick, the Government need not take care of them or their mills, if at all, the Government is interested in helping the workers, the industry and the textile production, I would say that the way the

Bill is drafted and the procedure that has been laid down in the Bill are poor and cumbersome. It will take a long time before it could be decided that a mill could at all be taken over. In these circumstances, the industry is bound to suffer more. Is the Government going to hold a real enquiry whether, because of the bad management, the mill has become sick or because of the want of modernisation it has become sick? Is there any method by which they are going to do it? The authorised person can be their own pet Textile Commissioner who has been responsible for the number of ills during the last few years. Or, is it going to be some other authority? Will the Government be able to tell us whether by handing over the management to the present type of managers which the Government appoints in respect of the State-owned industry, they are going to bring in more production at lesser cost or, are they going to raise the cost and thereby burden the industry still more? Till the Government makes up its mind on this point, it is no good bringing this Bill. To just come to the House and say they are out to help the industry or they are out to help the workers who are being thrown out is just an eye-wash, and it is a mere waste of this nation's money and therefore, this Bill should be really sent back to the Government for reconsideration.

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are not satisfied with the provisions of this Bill. Even though the Bill is a step in the right direction it has got so many loopholes and the object which the hon. Minister wanted is not achieved by this Bill.

The Government has come forward with a Bill like this in order to reconstruct or take over the sick mills by liquidation proceedings. Why are there these sick mills? As hon. Members who spoke before me have pointed out, because of bad management, because the private operators fix high salaries for their own sons and close relatives with the result that the management cost is boosted up and it is charged to the mills, there is loss in the affairs of these mills.

There are about ten or twelve mills in Coimbatore which have been closed for about several months now rendering several thousands of workers unemployed. The State Government tried its very best to have the mills reopened. The managements of these mills are saying that they do not have the finance or rather the working capital to run these mills. Our Commerce Minister paid a visit to Madras and had a discussion with the Chief Minister there. The Chief Minister wanted the Government of India to give Rs. 1 crore or Rs. 2 crores as loan, not as aid, so that they will watch the managements, give the required loans to the mills where necessary and see that the mills are reopened.

Through this Bill the Government of India is trying to take over a very difficult task, to control from Delhi mills situated in Coimbatore, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Ahmedabad or Bombay through an organisation in Delhi. It is really a tough job. The Madras State Government wanted only Rs. 2 crores as loan repayable in a certain period. The Government of India was not magnanimous enough to give it and it has done nothing at all in that respect even though thousands of workers have been thrown out of employment in Coimbatore.

Coming to this Bill, as I have already said, it does not at all satisfy the object for which it has been brought. According to a provision here an officer is to be appointed to look into the affairs of managements in mills, start liquidation proceedings where necessary and then actually initiate compulsory acquisition proceedings. Lot of time is involved in this procedure. It may take from six months to one year and more. When the Government of India files a petition before the High Court for liquidation under the Liquidation Act, it is open to the other party to get a stay order by making interlocking applications and then go in appeal on that order. It will take several months and years before a case is settled. What about the workers, thousands of them, during all this time? The moment the Government of India files a petition for liquidation there will necessarily be a lock-out in the mill and thousands of workers will be thrown out of employment (*Interruption*).

[Shri V. Krishnamoorthi]

This Bill does not serve the real interest of the workers. If between the authorised officer's petition before the High Court and the final order there are more than six months or one year—that is bound to take place—what is the Government of India going to do for the workers? Are they going to give salaries to the workers on the basis of what they were getting previously before the closure of the mills? There is no mention about it in this Bill. That is why I am attacking this Bill specifically on this ground saying that it does not provide any provision to help the workers when the mill is closed after the starting of liquidation proceedings.

Some of my hon. friends asked, why not nationalise the whole industry? That is a big issue. I would request the hon. Minister to ponder over this subject. How many mills are there in India and how many are controlled by public sector undertakings and how many are co-operative mills? I find that the co-operative mills, even though they pay good wages, earn profits while the newly-started private mills are not earning profits even when they are not paying the necessary wages, as is done by the co-operative sector mills. What is the reason for this? It can only be mismanagement. So, I would request the Government of India to appoint a Commission to go into the question whether it is possible or feasible to nationalise all the textile mills, instead of having piece-meal acquisition.

Even if this Bill is passed, acquisition is not compulsory; it is only permissive. Suppose there are 200 sick mills. Government can at the most take over only 4 or 5, not all. Because, as and when the financial position becomes difficult, the Corporation will say that it will not acquire any more for want of funds. So, they are not going to rectify or acquire all the sick mills. This being only a permissive legislation, it will not help the real interests of the industry or the real objects of the Bill.

Then, after the recent judgment of the Supreme Court regarding acquisition proceedings involving fundamental rights, I am not sure whether government is competent to acquire sick mills compulsorily. I anti-

cipate a lot of difficulty. Therefore, I would request the Government to withdraw this Bill, reconsider the matter in all its aspects and then introduce a new Bill incorporating all the suggestions made by the hon. Members. Alternatively, the hon. Minister may agree to refer it to a Select Committee for detailed consideration of all aspects. I find, for instance, that the interests of the workers are not sufficiently protected by this Bill. I am of the view that neither the management nor the workers should suffer on account of this proposal. The Bill must be drafted in such a way. So, finally, I would again request the hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill or, alternatively, refer it to the Select Committee.

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्री महोदय से इस की तो अपेक्षा हमें नहीं थी कि नौ महीने की मेहनत के बाद इतनी फालतू चीज को बह इस सदन के सामने पेश करेंगे। जो विधेयक उन्होंने मार्च महीने में इस सदन में हमें देने के लिए कहा था उस विधेयक के बारे में बड़ी उम्मीदें ले कर हम बैठे थे कि सारे कपड़े की मिलों के व्यवसाय के बारे में कुछ नई दिशा देने वाला एक विधेयक हम लोगों के सामने आ जायगा। मगर अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक को देखने के बाद ऐसा लग रहा है कि सरकार कुछ दुविधा में पड़ी है। तय नहीं कर पाती है मालिकों का और वह भी बेईमान मालिकों का सीधा मुकाबिला करने के लिए और हिम्मत नहीं कर पाती है इस सूती मिल के घन्घे को पूरे तौर पर अपने हाथों में लेने के लिए। कई तर्क यहां पर पेश किए गए हैं खास तौर पर सरमायेदारों की ओर से जो प्रवक्ता यहां पर बैठे हुये होते हैं उन को से कि सूती मिलों का घन्घा रूई का भाव बढ़ने और वहां चीजों के दाम याना खास तौर से मजदूरों को मजदूरों बढ़ने का वजह से बहुत ही गलत अवस्था में पहुंच गया है। यह सोमाना साहब ने और दूसरे दोस्तों ने यहां पर कहा है। यह बातें सरासर झूठ हैं अध्यक्ष महोदय। न रूई का भाव, न मजदूरों को तनख्वाह का सूती मिलों के घन्घे को खराब करने में कोई हिस्सा है। मैं आपके सामने भूतपूर्व कामर्स मिनिस्टर

मनुभाई शाह ने 11 नवम्बर को जो खय व्यक्त की है सरमायेदारों के ही अखबार कामर्स में उसको पढ़ना चाहंगा यह सबूत देने के लिए कि किन कारणों से इस धन्धे का सत्यानास हुआ है। वह क्या कहते हैं कि :

"From all accounts it is quite obvious that the Indian cotton textile industry had been a sick industry."

और उसकी वजह बताते हुये यह कहते हैं :

"Many of the mill owners never cared to modernise their mills, or maintain their machines well. Lack of entrepreneurial and management skill till the late 40s has also made the cotton mills change their hands too frequently between the so-called financiers, and speculators. . . ."

खैर, वह स्पेकुलेटर नहीं बोलते है, मगर यह सो काल्ड फाइनैशियर्स—मतलब कि सट्टा करने वाले लोग—

"..... rather than really skilled management entrepreneurs"

यहां पर श्री सोमानो ने बहुत तेज प्रश्न पूछा कि अगर सरकार मिलों को लेगी तो उन को चलायेगा कौन ? कौन है उन के पास मिलें चलाने के लिये ? श्री मनुभाई शाह कहते हैं कि आज भी जो चलाते हैं वह सट्टा करने वाले लोग हैं। मैं श्री सोमानो से कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर सरकार मिलों को चलाने की हिम्मत करे तो वह बहुत अच्छे ढंग से उनको चला कर दिखला सकता है। लेकिन जो उनका वक्तव्य हुआ था वह तो बोमारो का सिर्फ एक पहलू था।

17.00 Hrs.

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो यह कहा जाता है कि रूई का भाव बढ़ा है, मजदूरोंकी मजदूरी बढ़ी है, यह बहुत गलत बात है। मेरे पास काटन टेक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट है जो 1960 में पेश की गई और 1958-59 की बनाई हुई है, जिस टेक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड पर आज के मंत्री श्री अशोक मेहता

और प्रो० माथुर सरकार के प्रतिनिधि बन कर बैठे थे, श्री जीजीभाई अध्याय थे और सूती मिलों के धन्धे की ओर से दो बड़े मिल मालिक ला० भरतराम और श्री अरविंद मफतलान बैठे थे। उस में रूई के दामों के बारे में और मजदूरों की मजदूरी के बारे में दिया हुआ है। वह एकमत से दी हुई रिपोर्ट है, जिस में पृष्ठ 9 पर लिखा हुआ है कि :

"The average national expenditure on the various heads of the cost of production has been estimated by the National Council of Applied Economic Research as follows :—

Items	Percentage to total cost of production
Cotton	48 to 52 per cent.
Wages and salaries etc.	25 to 32 per cent."

एकमत से दी हुई रिपोर्ट में दस साल पहले के आंकड़े रहे हैं। मेरे हाथों में उन्हीं की ओर से पेश की गई प्राब्लम्स आफ काटन मिल्स इंडस्ट्री इश्यूड बाई दि इंडियन काटन मिल्स फेडरेशन है, यानी सरमायेदारों की ओर से दी हुई एक छोटी सी किताब है। उस के पहले पृष्ठ पर जो उस की शुरुआत है वह इस प्रकार है कि :

"Today severe cost inflation is the major problem of the cotton mill industry."

जिस बात को श्री सोमानी गोल कर गए :

"The principal items of cost are cotton and wages. Cotton accounts for nearly 50 per cent of the cost of production of cloth and 65 per cent of that of yarn. The share of wages is 28 per cent in the case of cloth and 20 per cent in the case of yarn. On both these cost factors the industry has little control."

मान लिया। मगर दस साल पहले जो परिस्थितियां थी यानी जब 48 से 52 प्रतिशत रूई के दामों में जाता था, वही परिस्थिति आज

[श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज]

भी है। आप के ही कहने के अनुसार 50 फीसदी रुई के दामों पर जाता है। जहां दस साल पहले मजदूरी और तन्खाह के ऊपर 25 फीसदी से 32 फीसदी तक जाता था वहां अब 28 और 30 फीसदी ही जाता है। यह आप लोगों का ही कहना है। फिर यह बकवास क्यों की जाती है कि सारे मुल्क में तन्खाहें बढ़ती जाती हैं, महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ता जाता है। यहां पर यह बातें क्यों कही जाती हैं कि इन कारणों से ज्यादा खर्च करना पड़ता है और इस लिए हम आज इस घन्चे को बुरी अवस्था में देखते हैं? हम कतई इस बात को नहीं मान सकते। मोदी साहब बोले कि चीजों के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन का नफा तो नहीं घट गया। नफा तो बढ़ गया है। एकानमिक टाइम्स एक छोटी सी किताब है, लेकिन शायद मोदी साहब का पढ़ने की आदत नहीं रही है। एकानमिक टाइम्स कहता है कि पिछले साल एक मिल का मुनाफा 54 प्रतिशत ज्यादा हो गया है। तब यह किस तरह से मुनाफे की बात करते हैं और किस तरह से दामों की बात करते हैं? इस लिये यहां दामों का प्रश्न नहीं है। इस में बुनियादी बात यह है जैसा कि श्री मनुमाई शाह ने अपने एक लेख में लिखा है कि सट्टा करने वाले लोगों के हाथों में मिलें गई हैं। मैं कितने ही उदाहरण दे सकता हूँ लेकिन इस को देने की कोई जरूरत मालूम होती। क्योंकि सरकार के हाथों में यह सब चीजें होती हैं। मैं तो सिर्फ कामर्स मिनिस्टर का हवाला दे कर कहता हूँ कि आप बारसी की जयवंकर मिल्स को लीजिये। है आप में हिम्मत? आप जांच कीजिए कि इस मिल में कितना पैसा बरबाद हो रहा है। आप पता लगाइये कि कितना पैसा उस को नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट कॉरपोरेशन ने दिया, कितना पैसा कोआपरेटिव बैंक से उन्होंने लिया, कितना पैसा मजदूरों के प्राविडेंट फंड का उन्होंने हजम कर लिया और कितना पैसा मजदूरों की कोआपरेटिव

सोसायटी का हजम कर लिया। क्या आप में इस की जांच करने की हिम्मत है?

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के नेता लोगों का इस में हाथ होता है। बारसी म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी के जो अध्यक्ष हैं उन को श्रीमती जी, जिन का मिल से सम्बन्ध है, कांग्रेस की एम० एल० ए० है महाराष्ट्र में। इसलिये किसी की हिम्मत नहीं हो सकती है कि इस मामले की जांच करे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह मिनिस्टर बन सकता है।

श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज : हां, मिनिस्टर बन सकता है। इसलिये यह चीजें यहां मौजूद हैं। इसी डंग से आप हिन्द मिल्स की बात को ले लीजिये। बम्बई की एडवर्ड मिल की बात आप देखिए। वहां के मजदूरों ने दो साल पहले इन सरकार से शिकायत की थी कि हमारे मालिक इस मिल की मशीनरी को बेच रहे हैं, हमारे मालिक कपास की खरीद में पैसे की चोरा कर रहे हैं, हमारे मालिक कपास बेचते हैं और पैसे कमा रहे हैं। जो मंत्री साहब दो सालों में प्रष्टाचार खत्म करना चाहते थे उन के सामने दो साल पहले सबूत के साथ सब कुछ दिया गया था, सदाचार समिति के सामने भी मामला पेश किया गया था। सरकार के सभी मंत्रियों, यहां तक कि गृह मंत्रों तक यह मामला पहुंचाया गया, लेकिन हिम्मत नहीं हो पाई किसी सट्टाबाजार वाले के ऊपर हाथ लगाने की, जब कि यहां धन्धा विल्कुल खत्म हो रहा है।

आज तारीफ बहुत की जाती है कि यह मुल्क का सब से बड़ा घन्घा है और यह असलियत है कि हिन्दुस्तान के हर दस आदमियों में एक आदमी आज सूती मिलों के घन्चे के ऊपर किसी न किसी डंग से अवलम्बित है। लेकिन क्या सरकार को उन लोगों की परवाह है? अगर वह इस मिल से इस घन्चे का सुधार करना चाहती है तो मुझ को उम्मीद नहीं है कि इस से कुछ भी हो सकेगा। सरकार ने बुनियादी बातों के बारे में कुछ नहीं

सोचा। सूती मिल के धन्धे को हाथ लेते हुए सूती मिल के पूरे धन्धे के बारे में, खासकर कपड़े की पैदावार के बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचा गया है।

अन्त में एक ही बात कह कर मैं खत्म करूंगा। जब भी आप को सूती मिलों के धन्धे के बारे में सोचना हो तो इस धन्धे के तमाम पहलुओं के बारे में सोचियेगा। आज हिन्दुस्तान में प्रति एकड़ कितनी कपास पैदा होती है? 100 से 125 पाँड तक जब कि संयुक्त अरब गणराज्य में 650 पाँड और अमरीका में 550 पाँड यानि दूसरे मुल्कों में हम से चार या छः गुना ज्यादा कपास पैदा होती है। मगर क्या आप ने किसानों को कोई सहूलियत दी है ताकि वह ज्यादा कपास पैदा करे? इस के बारे में कभी नहीं सोचा गया। आप को जो कदम इस के लिये उठाने चाहिये थे वह आप ने नहीं उठाये, जैसा श्री डांगे ने कहा। मिलों को चलाने के बारे में अगर कोई उचित कदम नहीं उठाया गया तो फिर यह धन्धा चलने वाला नहीं है। इस लिये हम इस बिल का समर्थन करने में असमर्थ हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से इतना ही कहूंगा कि इस में कुछ सुधार लाया जाये। नौ महीने उन्होंने मेहनत कर लिया, वह नौ हफ्ते की मेहनत और कर लें और इस धन्धे के हर पहलू को सोच कर के एक और अच्छा और नया रास्ता दिखाने वाला बिल इस सदन के सामने लायें।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : मंत्री महोदय ने जो बिल तैयार किया है उस के बारे में शायद वह सोचते हों कि जितने सुन्दर वह हैं उतना ही सुन्दर बिल वह तैयार करें, लेकिन उतना सुन्दर यह बिल बन नहीं पाया। इस में काफी त्रुटियाँ हैं। उन्होंने कहा है इस बिल में कि जितना कपड़ा उद्योग है उस को सरकारी हाथ में लिया जाये। हम इस नीति का विरोध करते हैं। जब सरकार यह सोच रही है कि वह इस सारे उद्योग को अपने हाथ में रखे, तब मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन

कमजोर उद्योगों को पैसे दिये गये हैं, वह अपना काम चला नहीं पाते हैं। पैसा कहाँ जाता है मैं इस का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश में एक राजनन्द गांव है। वहाँ पर जो कपड़ा उद्योग है उस के लिये सरकार ने लोन दिया और उस को चलाने की अनुमति दी। लेकिन उस के लिये दिया हुआ पैसा उस में नहीं लगता है। तीन हजार एकड़ भूमि खरीद कर उन में खेती करना शुरू कर दिया, उस पैसे को उद्योग में नहीं लगाया। इतना ही नहीं, आप ने भोपाल टेक्स्टाइल मिल को हाथ में लिया, लेकिन हाथ में लेने के बाद उस को चला नहीं पाये। मध्य प्रदेश शासन ने एक आदमी उस के लिये तैयार किया, उन्होंने आप को पत्र लिखा, लेकिन आज तक आप के पास से कोई उत्तर नहीं मिला, न ही वह मिल चालू हो रही है। लोग बेकार पड़े हुए हैं। मेरा ऐसा कहना है कि आप जिन लोगों को उन के कंट्रोल के लिये रखते हैं, उन को किसी प्रकार का ज्ञान नहीं होता है। न वॉरिंग के बारे में वह जानते हैं, न स्पिनिंग के बारे में और फ्रेम के बारे में। ऐसे आदिमियों को वहाँ पर ले जा कर थोप दिया जाता है।

मेरा कहना ऐसा है कि इन मशीनों को अच्छा बनाया जाये, अधिक उत्पादन करने लायक बनाया जाये। उन में पैसा लगाया जाये, लेकिन अगर उन में पैसा लगाने के लिये हम बाहर से उसे लायेंगे तो हमारे लिये बड़ी मुश्किल होगी। बाहर से जब हम मशीनें मंगाते हैं तो हमारा पैसा बाहर जाता है। हमारे देश में जो मशीनें बनती हैं वे भी अच्छी हैं और उनको अच्छा बनाया जा सकता है। उन मशीनों का उपयोग हम अधिक से अधिक करें तो हमारा पैसा विदेश जाने से बच सकता है। इससे हमारा मशीन उद्योग जो है वह भी बढ़ेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस ओर आप ध्यान दें।

सब से बड़ी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह इस उद्योग के अन्दर काम करने वाले लोगों के बारे में है। इस उद्योग के अन्दर जो लोग

[श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय]

काम करते हैं क्या आपन कभी उनके बारे में भी सोचा है? मंत्री महोदय ने सदन में आश्वासन दिया था कि हम सभी पहलुओं पर विचार करके बिल तैयार करेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि न तो आपने शेयरहोल्डर्स से पूछा है, न आपने मालिकों की सलाह ली है और न ही आपने मजदूरों का विचार किया है। मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि आप तत्काल इसकी घोषणा करें कि इसके मुनाफे में आप मजदूरों को भी भागीदार बनाना चाहते हैं और उनको भी भागीदार बनायेंगे, आप घोषणा करें कि मुनाफे में मजदूरों का भी हिस्सा होगा। मैंने सतरह आठरह साल तक टैक्सटाइल मिल में काम किया है और मुझे टैक्सटाइल मिल किस तरह से काम करती है उसका पूरा अनुभव है। अगर उनको मुनाफे में हिस्सा दिया जाए तो मजदूर मेहनत से काम करेंगे, खुशी से काम करेंगे, अच्छा माल तैयार करेंगे, आपका यह माल दुनिया के बाजार में जा कर अच्छा बिकेगा, आपका नाम होगा और आपका जो उत्पादन है वह बढ़ेगा। इस बास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरों को मुनाफे में हिस्सा मिले, इसकी घोषणा आपको तत्काल करनी चाहिये।

अब मैं हंडलूम उद्योग के बारे में कुछ कड़ना चाहता हूँ। यह उद्योग बहुत पिछड़ता जा रहा है। इस में काम करने वाले लोग बहुत परेशान हैं। उनको ठीक प्रकार का माल नहीं मिलता है। उनके माल का ठीक उपयोग नहीं होता है। उसके बारे में आपने इस में चर्चा तक नहीं की है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनको अधिक सहूलियतें दी जानी चाहियें।

आपने पावरलूम पर एकसाइड ड्यूटी बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ा दी है। इसकी वजह से इन पावरलूम के सामने एक संकट आकर खड़ा हो गया है। इस में कितने ही लोग काम करते हैं, कितने ही लोग इस उद्योग पर निर्भर करते हैं। एकसाइड ड्यूटी आपने इतनी बढ़ा दी है कि सारी कमाई का जो पैसा है वह इस में ही चला जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसको आप घटायें।

जो मिलें खराब होती हैं उनको ठीक ढंग से चलाया जाए... बार बार आप बंटी बणा रहे हैं। बहुत देर के बाद मुझे समय मिला है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपकी पार्टी का एक माननीय सदस्य बोल चुका है।

श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय : मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि आप इस उद्योग को हाथ में न लें। इस बात को आप देखें कि जो पैसा जिस मिल को दिया जाता है उसका ठीक उपयोग वे मिलें करती हैं या नहीं करती हैं। ऐसे अनेकों उदाहरण हैं कि मिल को जिस काम के लिए आपने पैसा दिया उस पैसे को उसने उस काम में न लगा कर दूसरे कारखाने खोलने में उसने लगा दिया। आप बारबार इस बात की चर्चा करते रहा करें कि पैसे का ठीक उपयोग हो रहा है या नहीं। जिन खराब मिलों को आप अपने हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं उनके बारे में आप मजदूरों की सलाह लें और एक कमेटी बनायें जिस में मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि हों, शेयरहोल्डरों के प्रमुख व्यक्ति हों जो जानकार हों, सरकारी व्यक्ति हों और उस कमेटी के द्वारा मिल चलायें। तब आपको सफलता मिलेगी।

SHRI PILOO MODY : May I suggest to the Commerce Minister that the amount of money that he is going to spend on this fancy, free escapade of his could be very usefully devoted for increasing cotton production ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : मैं माननीय सदस्यों का बड़ा आभारों हूँ कि उन्होंने इस महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर मुझे अपनी सलाह दी है। शुरू में माननीय सदस्य सोमानी जी ने कुछ मेरे बारे में कहा। उस के बारे में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। उन्होंने खुद ही साफ कर दिया इसको। एक तो उन्होंने खुद ही जाहिर कर दिया कि कामर्स मिनिस्टर कुछ इस पर ध्यान नहीं करते हैं। दूसरे उन्होंने कह दिया और मेरी राय मांगी इस बारे में कि यह जो एक बहुत बड़ा उद्योग है इसको कैसे ठीक किया जाए।

इससे जाहिर है कि जो वह सोचते थे उसको वह कह नहीं सके और जो उनको कहना था वही उन्होंने कह दिया। यहीं पर मैं इसको छोड़ देता हूँ।

उन्होंने कुछ बातें कहीं। अपनी समझ में उन्होंने उनको बहुत महत्वपूर्ण समझा। लेकिन कुछ समझ में नहीं आया कि क्या वह कह रहे थे क्योंकि जो आंकड़े हैं जो कुछ वह कह रहे थे उसके बिल्कुल विपरीत हैं।

राममूर्ति जी ने जो बात कही उसको मैंने है। मैं मानता हूँ कि कपड़े का कारोबार जो बना है यह जो पूरा उद्योग यह खड़ा हुआ है यह यहां को जनता और यहां के मजदूरों के बहुत भारी त्याग और मेहनत से खड़ा हुआ है। इसका फायदा केवल एक हिस्से के लोग उठाएँ यह मुनासिब बात नहीं है। हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदे जो हैं वे पूरे देश में बंटें। जो गलत तरीका कुछ लोगों ने अपना लिया था कि इस उद्योग को अपने और उद्योग चलाने के लिए इस्तेमाल किया जाए या उन्होंने कहा कि रुपया पता नहीं कहां चला जाता है, किसी का मकान बन जाता है किसी का कुछ और बन जाता है, इस किस्म के गलत तरीकों को रोकने के लिए हम पूरी कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

SHRI PILOO MODY : Will you put them in jail ?

श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय : इन से पूछ लो कि क्या ये तैयार हैं ?

श्री बिनोद सिंह : राममूर्ति जी ने दूसरी बात प्रोसीजर के बारे में कही है। उन्होंने कहा है कि जो प्रणाली है इसके हिस्बाब से बहुत देर होगी और इस देरी की वजह से जो मिल है वह चल नहीं सकेगी, वह चलेगी नहीं। शायद वह जल्दी में थे और उन्होंने इस सारे विधेयक को पढ़ा नहीं है, पुरी तरह से पढ़ा नहीं है। इस में यह लिखा हुआ है कि जब

मिल ले ली जाएगी तभी से इसको चलाया जाएगा और इसके साथ-साथ बाकी की जो कार्रवाई है वह होती रहेगी। मिस बन्द नहीं होगी और मजदूरों को कोई नुकसान नहीं होगा।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि इस में जो लोग काम करते हैं उनको अलग करने का भी जिज्ञ है। इसकी चर्चा हो चुकी है। बहुत से लोग मिलों में रख लिये जाते हैं बड़ी-बड़ी तनखवाहों पर और उनके पास पूरा काम नहीं होता है। यह भी मुम्किन हो सकता है कि आखिर वक्त जब उनको पता चले कि उनकी मिल ली जाने वाली है तो कुछ लोगों को वे नौकर रख लें रिश्तेदार हों या और भी कोई हों। ऐसा होता भी रहा है। हमारे पास उनको हटाने का कोई जरिया नहीं रहता। इसीलिए इसको लिखा गया है। जहां तक मजदूरों का सवाल है उनको हटाने का कोई सवाल पैदा नहीं होता है और न कोई ऐसा सरकार का विचार है। हां इतना जरूर है कि जब मिल का नवीकरण होगा नए ढंग से उसको चलाया जाएगा तो कुछ दिन के लिए दिक्कत पैदा हो। लेकिन इसके मजदूरों को हटाया जाए ऐसी बात नहीं है। बल्कि उलटी बात है। मजदूर इससे और काम पा सकेंगे।

एक बात यह कही गई है कि हम क्यों इसको हाई कोर्ट के सामने ले जा रहे हैं। आप संविधान को अच्छी तरह समझते हैं। संविधान के अन्तर्गत हम बिना कोर्ट से स्वीकृति लिये आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। इसको हम यहां न रखते यह हो सकता था। लेकिन लोग चाहें तो संविधान के अनुसार वे फिर भी अदालत के सामने जा सकते हैं। इसमें और ज्यादा देरी होती। हम कार्रवाई शुरू कर देते, उसके बाद वे अदालत में जाते, अदालत में फिर वह कार्रवाई नए ढंग से शुरू होती तो हमारा ऐसा खयाल था कि उस में ज्यादा समय लगता। पहले से ही हम अदालत की राय से करें, इस में हम कोई चोरी नहीं कर रहे हैं, बात हमारी तरफ से साफ है, जो

[श्री दिनेश सिंह]

तरोका है वह भी हम ने साफ लिख दिया है और यह देरी से बचने के लिए किया गया है। इससे यह साफ हो जाता है कि हमारी तरफ से कोई ज्यादाती नहीं हो रही है जो कुछ गड़बड़ी है वह दूसरी तरफ से है।

राममूर्ति जी ने राय लेने की बात कही है। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज सुबह हमने एक मिटिंग की थी। कुछ माननीय सदस्य उसमें आए भी थे। हम आशा करते थे कि सब लोग आयेंगे और हम उन से बात कर सकेंगे। लेकिन कुछ संस्थायें शायद ऐसी हैं जोकि कंसलटेटिव कमेटी में नहीं आती हैं। वे लोग भी नहीं आए और और लोग भी पूरे नहीं आए—

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी तक हमारे पत्र का बाकायदा हमें उत्तर नहीं मिला है डा० राम सुभग सिंह जी के द्वारा—

श्री दिनेश सिंह : मैं इस विधेयक की बात कर रहा हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो फिर कंसलटेटिव कमेटी की बात को बीच में क्यों लाए ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : आप तो बहुत ज्यादा पत्र लिखते हैं। किस पत्र की बात कर रहे हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : May I suggest to you that you may take up this issue with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs ? He only casually mentioned it.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं खुलासा करना चाहता हूँ। इन्होंने लांछन लगाया है। सभी विरोधी दलों की ओर से एक मुझाब सरकार को दिया गया था कि स्थायी समिति नियुक्त की जाए। सरकार ने उसको माना नहीं। फिर हमने बीच का रास्ता निकाला कि कम से कम चार महकमों के लिए आप कायम करें, बाकी महकमों के लिए दूसरी सलाहकार कमेटी कायम रखें।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : मुझे खुशी हुई—

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं चुप बैठा था और इनका सुन्दर भावण सुन रहा था।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : इस जरूरी विधेयक में लिमये जी ने हिस्सा नहीं लिया था। लेकिन अब वह भी शामिल हो गए हैं। यह खुशी की बात है। आपकी आवाज मैंने सुन ली है। दोनों तरफ से बराबर हो गया।

हमारे डांगे साहब ने कहा था कि हम को बाहर से मशीनरी नहीं मंगानी चाहिये इस उद्योग का नवीकरण करने के लिए। मैं उन्हें बताना चाहता हूँ कि हम इस के लिए बाहर से कोई मशीनरी नहीं मंगायेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान की अपनी मशीनरी का इस्तेमाल करेंगे।

मेरे मित्र, श्री बरूआ, ने जिक्र किया है कि इस का इन्तजाम ब्यूरोक्रेट्स के हाथ में नहीं दिया जाना चाहिए, बल्कि विशेषज्ञों के हाथ में दिया जाये। मैं ने खुद ही अर्ज किया है कि जो कार्पोरेशन, कपड़ा निगम, हम बना रहे हैं, उस का यहीं अभिप्राय है कि उस में इस तरह के लेश उपलब्ध हो सकेंगे।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि इस समय जो बहुत वैरायटीज में कपड़े बनते हैं, उन की जगह पर अगर कम वैरायटीज के कपड़े बनाये जायें, तो कपड़े की कीमत भी घटेगी और उस की क्वालिटी भी बेहतर होगी। मैं उन से पूरी तरह से सहमत हूँ। हमें इस बात की पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि कम से कम वैरायटीज के कपड़े बनें, जो कि आम लोगों के इस्तेमाल के हों।

माननीय सदस्य, श्री डांगे, ने कहा है कि इस में कोई एक्सपोर्ट नहीं होता है। मेरे खयाल से उन का मतलब यह था कि हम जितना एक्सपोर्ट करते हैं, उस से इम्पोर्ट ज्यादा करते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि आंकड़ों से ऐसा नजर नहीं आता है। किसी साल में हो जाता है, किसी में नहीं होता है। हम को

जरूर इस बात की कोशिश करनी है कि हम बाहर से कम से कम कपास और दूसरी चीजें मंगाएँ और यहाँ पर पैदावार ज्यादा बढ़ायें।

मेरे मित्र ने लांग स्टेपल की रूई के बारे में कहा है। वह तो यहाँ को खपत के लिए है। वह ज्यादा बाहर नहीं जाती है। अगर लांग स्टेपल रूई यहाँ पर पैदा की जाये और वह उसी दाम पर मिल जाये, जिस दाम पर हम बाहर से लेते हैं, तो हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी कि हम उस को बाहर से न मंगाएँ। किसानों को जरूर ठीक दाम मिलने चाहिए, लेकिन यह भी जरूरी है कि इन की उपज से जो सामान पैदा किया जाये उस के दाम बहुत ज्यादा न हों।

17.23 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

माननीय सदस्य, श्री डांगे और श्री राममूर्ति और कई अन्य सदस्यों ने इस उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात कही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि यह तो एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल है। हमारा एक इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रेजोल्यूशन है, उद्योगों के बारे में गवर्नमेंट की एक नीति है। वह सब के स्पष्ट है और उस पर हम चल रहे हैं। उस नीति पर चलते हुए हम इस बात की ज्यादा से ज्यादा कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि उद्योग देश और मजदूरों के हक में बढ़ें। मैं समझता हूँ कि पहले हम को इस की कोशिश पूरी कर लेनी चाहिए। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि माननीय सदस्य इस विधेयक को स्वीकार कर लें और हम को मौका दें कि इस के जरिये हम आज की गड़बड़ियों को रोक सकें। आगे की जो बातें हैं, उन के लिए हम फिर विचार करेंगे।

यह बात बहुत आई कि सरकार बीमार मिलों को लेना चाहती है। सिक मिलों की बात बहुत चली। जैसे कि हम कोई हास्पिटल खोल रहे हों। हास्पिटल तो इस देश में वैसे ही बहुत कम हैं। हम मिलों के लिए हास्पिटल नहीं खोलना चाहते हैं।

SHRI PILOO MODY : No, the meant it for Ministers.

श्री दिनेश सिंह : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हास्पिटल तो बना हुआ है और बहुत से मरीज अब भी उस में दाखिल हैं। हम चीड़-फाड़ का एक और हिस्सा, एक सजिकल सेवशन, उस में जोड़ना चाहते हैं, जिस से हम बीमारों की चीड़-फाड़ कर के उन को जल्दी ठीक कर दें और वे अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो जायें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप्रह्व करूँगा कि सदन इस विधेयक को अपनी स्वीकृति दे दे।

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Will the hon. Minister clarify whether the Finance Minister has refused to advance money for takeover of sick mills and if he has, how is the hon. Minister of Commerce going to overcome that difficulty ?

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : Let him come out with the truth.

श्री दिनेश सिंह : इस विधेयक में यह भी लिखा हुआ है कि हम कितना रुपया इस में खर्च करेंगे, क्या जरूरत होगी। यह कोई छिनी हुई बात नहीं है। यह कहना सही नहीं है कि हमारे फ़िनांस मिनिस्टर ने इस में रुपया देने से इन्कार कर दिया। मैं ने अर्ज किया है कि बिल में लिखा है। अगर इन्कार कर दिया होता, तो हम कैसे लिखते ?

कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने यह मांग की थी कि हम इस बिल को अभी न लायें और इस बारे में और लोगों से बात करें। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि वे इस में क्यों देरी करना चाहते हैं। इस में उद्योग या देश या मजदूरों का हित होगा, ऐसी बात नहीं है। मैं माननीय सदस्यों से फिर अनुरोध करूँगा कि वे इस पर विचार करें और इस बिल को पास कर इस को चलने दें। अगर इस में आगे कोई कठिनाई आयेगी, तो हम फिर सदन के सामने आयेंगे। वे हम को सुझाव दे सकते हैं। कोई ऐसी बहुत बड़ी बात नहीं हो जायेगी।

SHRI N. K. SOMANI: I seek your protection. I did not anticipate that the Commerce Minister would understand my presentation, as he himself confessed. But he should at least answer some direct and important questions that were raised.

I referred to the unanimous recommendation of a textile seminar under the sponsorship of the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade and asked him whether he has read it and what was his opinion about it. This seminar recommended that this proposed textile corporation should, instead of having the functions envisaged in its structure he is proposing, devote all attention and energy to providing finance to sick mills.

He has also not said anything about the past performance of government-controlled mills of which he has enough experience so far.

The third question I asked was why they do not refer the matter of devaluation and fixing up the price of stocks and shares to a chartered accountant rather than to the authorised controller that he has in mind.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: My difficulty is that the hon. Member does not want to understand me. He has raised the question of some seminar organised by the Institute of Foreign Trade in which I had also the honour to say a few words.

SHRI PILOO MODY: What about listening to a few words?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I had also the opportunity of having to read through the conclusions which I must say, were not terribly impressive.

So far as the question of providing finance to the sick mills is concerned, I had mentioned that when we set up the textile corporation, we would certainly look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide in the public interest for the liquidation of cotton textile companies while keeping the undertakings thereof as running concerns, or for the reconstruction of cotton textile companies, in certain cases and for

matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall take up the next stages of the Bill tomorrow, and proceed with the half an hour discussion now.

17.29 Hrs.

SHIV SENA*

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): At the outset, I want to clear two things. Firstly, when I refer to Shiv Sena terrorism, I mean the conduct of the organisers and leaders of the organisation called Shiv Sena and not the Maharashtra people as such, who have produced such a heroic working class as the working class of Bombay. Secondly, I am not going to repeat the points already covered in this House during earlier sessions, namely, the genesis of this organisation, the socio-economic conditions which gave birth to it etc.

Shri Chavan has recently characterised this organisation as fascist. *The Economic and Political Weekly* dated 21-10-67 writes as follows:

"Link reports that Shri Bal Thakre declared at a rally that he did not mind being called a dictator because he believed that only dictatorship would save India. The country needs a Hitler, he said".

The danger to the linguistic minorities, particularly to the South Indians, the danger to the democratic movement of the people of Maharashtra and to the unity of the nation is more so when one knows that this fascist organisation is being lavishly financed and reared by some big business groups of Bombay. One of the solid financiers of this organisation is one Mr. Ram Krishna Bajaj. Do you know that when the *Indian Express* wrote an editorial recently criticising the terrorist activities of the Shiv Sena sometime back, a gentleman telephoned to the staff of the newspaper not to write criticising the Shiv Sena? Who do you think issued such warning? Mr. Goenka, the proprietor of the paper? Certainly not. It was Mr. Ram Krishna Bajaj who telephoned to the staff immediately after the editorial was written.

*Half-an Hour discussion.