

for a period upto 31st March 1996. One such carpet exporter has more than one thousand looms working for him dispersed over a huge geographical area.

3. Carpets bearing the Rugmark have been displayed and published in Europe and in America, creating a demand for the Rugmark, as a result of which a few importers are already forcing their suppliers in India to become Rugmark Licensees or else their orders would be cancelled. It is under this threat that exporters are seeking the Rugmark License, even when no proper monitoring system is in place.
4. There is no doubt that in time to come the defects in the monitoring system of Rugmark, and the non-genuine certification resulting therefrom, will certainly be exposed by other NGOs and the Indian and International Press, which could have a devastating backlash on the carpet industry in India and the 1.5 million families of artisans involved in this industry, who would then lose their only source of employment.
5. The majority of the Carpet Industry in India, most particularly progressive Indian carpet exporters, do not wish to associate themselves with the Rugmark, unless forced to do so by importers, because they believe that the Rugmark will be a non-genuine certification while illegally employed child labour will continue to work even on Rugmark carpets.
6. It is extraordinary that neither the leading Indian carpet exporters nor the Carpet Export Promotion Council are represented on the Rugmark Foundation. Initially they were on the Working Committee for the Rugmark but later they were unilaterally excluded from the Committee because of their insistence that the Rugmark scheme be formalised and publicised only after a professional, independent and internationally credible agency confirmed that genuine monitoring was possible and agreed to undertake the same. Another reason for their exclusion was because of their very genuine concern about the composition of Board of Directors of Rugmark Foundation where the only NGO was SACCS and other well established and highly respected NGOs, whose interest in child welfare is well known, were not welcome or allowed to join the Working Committee or the Board of the Foundation.
7. The Rugmark does not have the backing or support of the Government of India. The Carpet Export Promotion Council also does not support the Rugmark Foundation. Few excerpts from the Minutes of the meeting taken by minister (textiles) on May 30, 1995 to review the action taken for eradication of child labour in the Carpet Industry will prove the same.