

Mr. Speaker: No. The hon. Member will see it has to go to the Council of States for consideration, and we are running against time practically. It cannot be put off that way. We will just defer it and take it up any time before 1 o'clock.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: There is no use putting it off for half an hour.

Mr. Speaker: The names are not ready. Therefore, instead of taking up the time of the House in discussing the names here, it is better they are settled outside. The discussion will be more free outside than inside the House. Meantime, we will proceed with the next business, and whenever the names are ready, the motion will be taken up for voting. There is nothing more to be done about the motion now.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Latest by 12 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am agreeable. At 12 o'clock we suspend the business and put the motion.

We will proceed with the further business.

CENTRAL TEA BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, be taken into consideration".

The Bill before us has got a very restricted scope. The members nominated by Government to serve on the Central Tea Board are in the nature of persons nominated—what we call *persona designata*—in their own names. It is rather difficult for Government always to permit the same officer to go. The exigencies of services make it sometimes necessary to send another officer, and unless we ask the officer concerned to resign, his membership, accept his resignation and nominate somebody else, this is not usually possible. The amendment now sought to be incorporated is to permit a substitute being sent. The discussion on who is to nominate and who is to have the powers to do so are somewhat beside the point for the reason that the Ministry concerned is responsible for nominating the official, and it is better left for them to see that a

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]
junior officer is not nominated but only a senior officer is

nominated so that the interests of Government and the industry may not suffer. That in substance is the scope of the present amending Bill.

I would at once anticipate that discussions will emanate rightly or wrongly in regard to the entire scope of the original Act, whether that has to be revised, whether the representation on the Board has not to be changed, whether the new interests which have now come into being which have had no representation so far should not be given representation etc. All these things will be certainly the subjects for comment by hon. Members who will participate in the discussion of this Bill. But I would like to give this general assurance to the House at the outset. There are a number of such measures for which my Ministry, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, is responsible administratively,—such as the Central Tea Board Act, the enactment relating to the Central Tea Licensing Committee, the Coffee Marketing Board, the Rubber Board, the Silk Board and so on. I quite agree that the original Acts in all these cases were passed at a time when we did not have the full picture before us, and so a review is undoubtedly necessary; in undertaking that review, Government will have to see that the interests which have not been represented now or do not have adequate representation now, should be given representation. My object in referring to all this just now is to give the assurance to this House that the question of reviewing all these Acts is now engaging my attention. I do propose to go into it more thoroughly when we shall have a little more time, when Parliament adjourns and we may have a little more time, during the inter-session period. I cannot commit myself as to the date on which I would bring in the amending Bills. All that I can say now is that I shall do so as soon as possible. I think that assurance ought to satisfy hon. Members who feel that the parent Act has to be amended and would justifiably like to voice their opinions on this occasion.

But considering the fact that the present Bill relates to a very small matter relating to the Government's attitude as to whom to send as their representative in the Board, I hope, the House will pass the Bill without much of a discussion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, be taken into consideration."

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): I quite agree with the Hon. the Minister when he says that the scope of this Bill is very limited. But it does really affect the composition of the Central Tea Board. Only two days ago there were some questions in this House about the tea industry, and we tried particularly to draw the attention of the Government to the control that is being exercised now by the British interests over our tea industry. In fact some of the sections of the entire tea industry is thoroughly British-controlled. I am glad that the hon. Minister has admitted that the original Act is absolutely out of date. The other day the House amended a similar enactment in regard to the Tea Licensing Committee. Some members of that committee have been members since 1933 or 1937 or thereabouts, and the provision in the original Act was that the members would continue as long as the original Act continues. Even after we have attained our independence such things are allowed to continue.

The Central Tea Board collects a revenue of about Rs. 1 crore, out of which about Rs. 50 lakhs are handed over to the International Tea Board, in which India has almost got no voice or control. In the course of an interpellation or two some two days ago, I tried to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the question whether the auction held in London was done under discriminatory and unfavourable conditions for Indian tea. The United Kingdom have abolished the subsidy of 8d. per pound of tea or so...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly remember that the Central Tea Board (Amendment) Bill is very very restricted in its scope.

Shri A. C. Guha: But the Central Tea Board is in control of all these things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The scope of the amending Bill is very very limited. There are four official members to be nominated by Government. If per chance one of those members is not able to attend the meeting, the only question is why there should be vacancy, and why a deputy should not be appointed. The hon. Member himself suggested that a substitute might be appointed. All that the Government says here is that the nominated official may delegate his powers to a substitute officer under certain conditions to be regulated by the rules. That is the simple position. So one cannot go into the general principles of the composition of the Tea Board, how it

is to be changed, what subsidy is to be given etc.

Shri A. C. Guha: The Bill is regarding the composition of the Central Tea Board, which is controlling all these things.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have mentioned earlier that I quite realise that this Act has to be reviewed and I have also promised this House that I shall undertake that review and bring forward an amending Bill as soon as it can be done. That assurance I gave at the very outset, so that the hon. Members who are dissatisfied with the present position of the Board might be satisfied that something is being done. I am working on that, and I do not know how long it will take before I could bring in the amending Bills. I would also like to say that all these points have been impressed on the Government by way of interpellations. My hon. friend will, I hope, take this assurance from me. I think therefore that further discussion on this Bill would be needless.

Shri A. C. Guha: At the same time we should realise that the tea industry is passing through a crisis and to a certain extent the Central Tea Board is partly responsible for it. By abolishing the subsidy in London.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid I have to remind the hon. Member again that this is not within the scope of the Bill. The Bill seeks to amend only a particular clause or a fraction of a clause of the original enactment. Can we now go into the entire composition of the Tea Board, or say how the members of the Board have to be changed and so on. The only question now is that in case one of the officials who has been nominated goes on duty elsewhere, whether his place in the Board should be kept vacant or whether some other man should take his place. So for the time being, I am afraid, all these arguments however useful and good are not relevant to the Bill, which deals with only a small fraction of a particular section of the original Act, and does not in any way interfere with the principle of the Bill.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): May I submit, Sir, if you will give me the permission to say, that this Government representation has not been functioning so far in the interests of my nation and so I oppose this Bill? I do not want any Government representation at all on the Tea Board. If you will permit me to speak, I would like to give certain advice to the hon.

Minister. He referred to the great controversy over the injustice that is being done to the Indian tea industry from 1933 onwards, and how British capital is controlling the Indian tea interests. If you will allow me to speak, Sir, I would like to submit that the whole Tea Act itself must be revised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry I am placed in a very delicate and embarrassing position. I understand that the matter is urgent, important etc. But the scope of the present Bill does not permit a discussion of this kind. The only point with which this Bill deals is the question whether a vacancy that arises in case one of the nominated Government officials goes on duty elsewhere and is not able to attend the meeting, should be filled up or not. This Bill gives Government power to appoint a substitute in his place. Supposing the Bill is thrown out, what will happen? If out of the four members, one member is absent, then there will be a vacancy. That is all. So, this Bill does not even touch the outermost fringes of the original Act. There is no meaning in saying that the situation relating to the original Act should be revised, when any amending Bill to that Act comes up for discussion. It is not as if the entire situation should be re-opened for discussion. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to this important point.

Shri A. C. Guha: But the interests of the Indian tea industry are involved.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I tried to persuade the hon. Member but if he would not agree to that, I am afraid I will have to rule it out of order.

Shri A. C. Guha: The colossal British interests have forbidden the Indian tea industry from.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that the hon. Member can say is that the original Act must be reviewed as early as possible and a new act should be brought forward. The hon. Minister has agreed to do so. And pressure might be brought to bear on him to see that the amending Bill is introduced in the next session or if possible even in this session. So one cannot proceed any more than that. So the general principles of the Act should not be talked about here. I have given a concession to the hon. Member even for saying that the original Act should be reviewed. But if he proceeds still further to deal with the original Act, I am afraid, that is not relevant.

Then, Sir, as regards the provisions of this Bill, I do not like the idea that the power to nominate a substitute should be given to the officer himself. I think the Government should nominate substitute Members or alternate Members, as is done in many other Committees. Even the Central Tea Board are sending substitute Members for their International Tea Board meetings.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is covered by the amendment to Section 15. The Government will say 'Why and where we could do it?'

Shri A. C. Guha: Instead of leaving the option of nominating the substitute to the officer himself, the Government should take it up. Or there should be some provision that the officer should do it with the previous sanction or approval of the Government. I do not like that this power should be given to the officer so that he may nominate anybody. Sir, I am not allowed to speak on the working of the Central Tea Board. There is practically a collusion between these British tea interests here and the auctioneers there and that is why a crisis has come in.

Shri B. Das: My hon. friend, the Commerce Minister, never drinks tea.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Question.

Shri B. Das: He does not drink even coffee. I think most of the difficulties that the tea industry and the Finance Minister are suffering is due to the failure to do their proper duty by the representatives of the Commerce Ministry on the Board. The Board was appointed in 1933 and was carrying on in perpetuity keeping the Tea market in London so that the Indian growers of tea have suffered and all the advantages are enjoyed by England and Tea planters. My hon. friend—I am glad he is an astute economist and financier—understands the problems that India is facing today. The members of the Tea Board were mostly nominees of the British Government and their stooges in India. I recollect and you must be recollecting when I remind you there was an order.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: On the point of information, Sir. The Tea Board Act was passed in 1949 and the Tea Board was constituted in 1949. The British had nothing to do with it.

Shri B. Das: I am referring to the other thing. You can understand it and if you do not understand, then you cannot be a Commerce Minister. There was an order from the tea planters that so and so must be chairman and that man must have been a

[Shri B. Das]

stooge, a Britisher, who believed in the development of the trade of England and in the maintenance of the prosperity of England and not of India. We are ashamed, we are humiliated. The Government of India should take early steps to do away with the present nominees. We do not want them. My friend is assuring us that he is going to bring a comprehensive Bill in the near future. I think his predecessor, whoever he was.—Mr. Bhabha—ought to have brought this Bill in 1947-48. It is shameful and humiliating to us that we are exploited by the English brokers, tea brokers and other agents. Our economy is still dominated by them. I do not object to X being changed by Y, but I think X and Y should be national minded. At present they are not. They behave as almost the same stooges as they have behaved for the last so many years and it is most humiliating for me to stand here and say what I am saying. With these few remarks I hope he will bring a Bill, the first in the next session, to control England's powers over our tea trade. Calcutta should sell all Indian tea so that our dollars should not get out of India to help the British trade. It is most humiliating and shameful.

11 A.M.

श्री आर० के० चौधरी (गोहाटी) :

शायद आप को मालूम है कि मैंने और आपने एक संस्था में साथ काम किया है . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is this Assam tea?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: You and I are in the same boat, Sir. I want to speak in Hindi.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: You will not get a reply.

श्री आर० के० चौधरी : मैं शुरू शुरू में माननीय टंडनजी को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह मुझे क्षमा करेंगे अगर मैं गलत हिन्दी बोलूँ।

माननीय सभापतिजी, शायद आप को मालूम होगा कि मैं और आप एक समय एक स्थान पर बैठे थे जिसमें हम दोनों ने यह शर्त की थी कि जहाँ तक हो सके हम हिन्दी में भाषण करें। इसलिये इसमें आप को कोई तकलीफ नहीं होगी। मेम्बरों

को भी कोई तकलीफ नहीं है, जितना कष्ट और परेशानी होनी है मुझे को ही होगी क्योंकि मैं ज्यादा हिन्दी नहीं जानता हूँ। न मुझे ज्यादा हिन्दी शब्दों का इल्म है। इसलिये मैं आप को ज्यादा समय तकलीफ भी नहीं दूँगा। जल्द से जल्द बोल कर खत्म कर दूँगा।

मैं भी एक सेंट्रल सिल्क बोर्ड का मेम्बर हूँ। और सेंट्रल सिल्क बोर्ड

I beg your pardon. It is on account of the language difficulty that I have been put in this position. As regards the Central Tea Board, that is a subject in which I am vitally interested. So I give up Hindi now. I can speak with some practical experience about the nomination of official members in these Boards. I speak from the experience of my working in the Central Silk Board. (Interruption). I am sorry, Sir, if the House is annoyed with me for making that silly mistake.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the connection between silk and tea?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: The House will take this into consideration. In the Silk Board also there was representation by nominees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. What is the connection between silk and tea? Is it that some cups of tea were offered when the Silk Board was meeting?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I am speaking of my experience as a member of the Silk Board, as regards the working of the nominated members in the Tea Board. That is what I am trying to say and the language has put me in difficulty. Now in certain matters technical knowledge is necessary and such technical knowledge can only be given by a member sent by the Government. For instance, the Director of Industries is a member specially qualified to know about the silk industry in a particular State. Now, what happened was—I am speaking from some experience—in the first initial meeting of the Silk Board, there was no representative from the State of Assam in the Board. The State of Assam could not send their representative to that Board with the result that the Board was under a great handicap because they did not know about certain spinning machines. The Board could not give them the technical idea of the invention of certain

spinning machines. Similarly, even in the Central Tea Board if the particular official member who has the technical knowledge of a particular subject is exempted from attending the meeting what happens is that the man who deputises for him merely becomes a show piece, an ornamental addition, because he does not know anything about the subject. I am referring again to the Silk Board to point out that that difficulty was there also. We found that the official who deputised for the official member did not know anything worth knowing so far as that subject was concerned. The official member who was generally nominated to meetings of the Silk Board was the Chief Secretary of the State concerned. In my State one Mr. Mehta was the Chief Secretary and as Chief Secretary of the Government he could not usually attend meetings of the Silk Board. Actually he was the person who dealt with the subject and his absence greatly handicapped the proceedings of the Board. Therefore, we should take great caution in adopting this particular measure. I would say that ordinarily a responsible Government servant who is on the particular Board would not like to be present at the meetings—he would excuse himself for some reason or other: he would say he has a more important pressing engagement and therefore he cannot attend the meeting. After all, the Central Tea Board I think meets only quarterly and if there were exemption for those meetings in favour of the particular official nominated as member, then probably he will never have an opportunity of appearing at the meetings of the Board. Especially when the Board meets only about four times in the year there should be no such exemption allowed because in that case if would practically mean that the officer will not be attending the meetings of the Board at all and the Board would lose the benefit of his knowledge. After all he has been nominated by the Central Government after careful consideration, because in the opinion of the Central Government or of the State Government who have recommended that particular officer, he knows the subject. But if you say he may not be present, he may send somebody else to deputise for him, then it will so happen that the Board will not get the advantage of his experience and knowledge. We should not leave any loophole for such a thing.

Shri Vallathara (Pudukkottai): On a point of information, sir, I want to know who are the four officers at present on the Board, their status, on how many occasions how many of

them were not able to attend and how the proceedings of the Board became affected. I would also like to know the extent of the powers of delegation and of the grades of officers to whom such delegation can be made. Also, why have not non-officials been represented on that Board so far.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In the other clauses of the Bill there may be provisions for non-official members.

Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore): I thought a general discussion on the principle of the Bill would enable the hon. Minister to review the working of the Central Tea Board Act and that it would help him in bringing in legislation which he has promised to do after reviewing the working of the whole measure. But since it has been ruled that discussion should be confined strictly to the limited scope of the present amendment, I have to make only a few observations.

The difficulty which this Bill seeks to remove will arise only if the official members nominated by Government are unable to attend the meetings of the Central Tea Board but such occasions will presumably be very rare because the meetings themselves are few and if the members nominated by Government do not attend—and these are the members who act as a liaison between the tea industry and the Government—it is a sad commentary on the attitude—the officers have towards the industry as a whole.

Since the hon. Minister has promised to review the working of the Act, I think there is no urgency for trying to get this measure passed since in any case it will not affect the working of the Act in any appreciable degree. So, I would suggest that this measure be dropped in view of the promise of the Minister that he would bring in comprehensive legislation after reviewing the working of the Act. However, if this measure should be passed then I would submit that the designations of the officers be clearly stated so that this House may know whether they are responsible men and whether they are in a position to act as liaison officers between the tea industry and the Government. The preamble of the original Act says:

“Whereas it is expedient to provide for the development of the tea industry under certain control and for that purpose to establish a Central Tea Board.....”

But all that the Government has to do with this Act XIII of 1949 is to have four officers nominated by it on the Board. But now they are finding it difficult to be present at the few meetings held by the Board. I submit

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

that this is a poor testimony of the interest evinced by the Government in the development of the industry. The country has a vital stake in this industry which contributes one-third of our export trade and in which nearly a million men are employed. Therefore, I repeat that the Central Government which wants to assume responsibility for the development of this vital industry should nominate really responsible persons. And in case there is any hurry in passing this measure which seeks to enable nominated officials to send their deputies to the meetings, the designations of the officials to be deputed may be incorporated in this measure itself.

I would, however, in the end repeat that if possible this Bill may be postponed till the comprehensive legislation which is required urgently and which has been promised by the hon. Minister is introduced in this House.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): The hon. Member, Shri Guha has suggested in his amendment that instead of the nominated member deputing another official in his place provision should be made by the Government itself for such a substitute when the official member cannot attend a particular meeting. I would submit that when an official member is nominated to take part in the proceedings of the Board but if he is prevented by his duties from attending the meeting at any time, the liaison breaks. Therefore, in order to keep the liaison between the Government and the Board intact, may I suggest that along with the nomination of the official member Government may also provide for a substitute official, who should also be nominated to the Board, so that when the official member is unable to attend he can go and attend the meetings of the Board. In that case he will always be well-informed and conversant with the proceedings relating to the Tea Board and would also have a knowledge of the working of Government. I would therefore request the hon. Minister to give thought to this matter, so that when Government nominates the four persons they may also nominate four substitutes. As far as I know, the four persons in question were nominated by Government from the Ministries of Commerce and Industry, Food and Agriculture and another whose name I do not recollect. Now that the Commerce and Industry deals with both the subjects, they can nominate two persons from it, but from Food and Agriculture

which continues to be as before, there will be one person. So, difficulty will arise about the fourth man. In the circumstances, I request the Government to appoint the substitutes also.

Shri Keshavaiengar (Bangalore North): As the Act now stands, it makes it necessary for Government to take various factors into account in appointing the officials to the Board. But that object will, I am afraid, be frustrated by this amendment. I suggest therefore to the hon. Minister to consider whether it would not be wholesome to get this deputation made in consultation with the Government. Otherwise, the object of this salutary provision may be nullified. Only the Government will be able to take all matters into account when nominating the officer. If the officer himself is asked to nominate his successor, those considerations may not prevail with him. Therefore, that officer may depute, in consultation with the Government, his substitute when he is unable to attend.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): I thought that during the discussion on this Bill we would have an opportunity to discuss the working of the Central Tea Board and the present position of the tea industry. Tea has cosmopolitan appeal and many things can be said about it, but in view of your ruling I do not know whether I can deal with those matters. Further, the hon. Minister has given an assurance that he would bring a comprehensive Bill, possibly in the next Session, when we can express our point of view. Therefore, the scope of the present Bill is much too limited and it relates only to the restricted subject of the Government representative on the Central Tea Board. It seems to me that in bringing this amendment, Government consider that its nominee is not rendering any effective service to the Central Tea Board, because under the existing arrangement the nominee is unable to attend the meetings due to other work. As you know, Sir, in these Boards which indirectly or directly lay down the policies and control the working of particular industries, continuity of experience and knowledge is a very important factor. If Government sends a Deputy or Joint Secretary and at the last minute that man's services are called up elsewhere and another man is sent who has practically no knowledge about this subject, the position will be that the new man will depend upon reports from his subordinates. Unless Government thinks that their servicemen are still like the bureau-

crats of the olden days who were supposed to know anything and everything in heaven and earth, I feel that they are taking a retrograde step by this amendment. We have a National Planning Commission and in the near future we hope to plan and develop our economy and industrial resources and increase the national wealth. Let the Government therefore consider establishing a special cadre of men who have knowledge of the working of industrial undertakings. If people without knowledge and experience are sent to work on these Boards, there is every likelihood that they will try to repeat in a parrotlike fashion whatever instructions they receive from their superiors. This point of view must be considered. In future, when Government nominates any representative, they should send really experienced men and people with some knowledge of the tea industry. I also think that the Government should have brought forward another amendment in this connection in regard to the nomination of a labour representative. In our country there are many labour organisations and quite a good many of them do not see eye to eye with Government policies. I feel that the section relating to the labour representative should be amended in such a way that the labour's point of view would be represented, not by a representative nominated by Government but by labour organisations in their own rights. My feeling is that this amendment also should have been brought in by the hon. Minister along with the present one.

Shri Jhunjunwala (Bhagalpur Central): The Bill as it has been introduced appears to be a very simple one but having regard to the importance of the Tea Control Board and the important functions it has to perform I feel that we shall be setting up a very bad example for the future if any member of the Board who is nominated by Government is given the right to nominate anyone else to act in his place or on his behalf. The man who has served on the Board picks up some experience and when Government appoint anybody, I think they do it with the full knowledge that that man will go there and act properly and that he has a full insight into the working of that industry. Therefore, if he is sent there, he is sent for some particular purpose. If that man deputes somebody else in his absence, I would consider that that is not a proper thing. Therefore, from this point of view I oppose the amendment.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid my hon. friends who have spoken on this measure have misunderstood the scope of the measure and also completely ignored clause 3 of the Bill. It is not a question of leaving it to the officer concerned to depute somebody irrespective of whom he deposes and the considerations which have to be taken into account in deposing somebody else. Clause 3 says that the circumstances under which an official nominated by the Central Government under Section 4(3) may depute another official of the Government to attend any meeting of the Board on his behalf have to be taken into account. Therefore, the Government will have to mention the circumstances. It is not a question of X who is on the Board not going and sending Y who has nothing to do with the business.

Mention was made that Government neglect their responsibility in regard to these Boards. Government probably did neglect them in the past. During the last few weeks the amount of interest that this House has been taking in regard to tea matters and the number of questions which I have been hard put to answer in this House has revealed to me the necessity of having two or three official representatives on the Board who will keep me informed of what is happening and I myself realise more than ever the need for liaison between Government and the Board. I am not likely to ignore this particular and important aspect, because if the House wants to control the Ministry, the Ministry must naturally control the Board. So, we are not likely to appoint somebody who has no knowledge of the subject. What will happen is that supposing a Joint Secretary of the Ministry happens to be a Member of the Board and for some reason he is not in a position to go; his Deputy who is in charge of the work will go. It is a very simple matter. It is not a question of doing something which is contrary to the provisions of this Act or anything of the sort.

On the general question I have already said that I shall try my best to see if I cannot explore ways and means of amending this Act in a manner which will be acceptable to a large body of Members in this House at an early date. I am not able to fix myself to any particular date, because, once I make a promise it must be carried out. I am certainly prepared to give this assurance that

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

the matter will have my close attention and sooner or later, I shall bring forward an amending Bill which I hope will satisfy a very large section of the House. For the time being, I hope the fears that have been anticipated by my hon. friends Mr. Guha and Mr. Jhunjhunwala are baseless.

One hon. Member from Madras wanted to know who are the members who have been nominated to the Board. The four members are:

Mr. K. N. Kaul, Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry;

Mr. Shername, Agricultural Marketing Adviser to the Government of India;

Mr. K. R. P. Ayyangar, Joint Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance; and

Mr. Subarna, Controller of Immigrant labour, Shillong, an official nominated by the Central Government.

These are the four officials now functioning. It is true that many of them have not been able to attend all the meetings. There are four meetings of the Board every year. Mr. Kaul happens to be a member of the Executive Committee as well and it was represented to us by the Chairman of the Tea Board that it would be better if some substitute comes in his place when Mr. Kaul was unable to go. That is why we have undertaken this piece of legislation. I may also say that the Chairman of the Tea Board is appointed by Government. This is the position so far as the query raised by my hon. friend from Pudukkottah is concerned. I hope with this explanation the House will pass the motion before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2.— (Amendment of section 4.)

Shri A. C. Guha: I do not wish to move my amendment, but I would like to say a few words. The hon. Minister said that we have ignored the provisions in clause 3 of this Bill. In fact, I am perfectly aware of it. But I wish to point out to him that in clause 3 there is only provision for the circumstances in which an

official nominee of the Central Government may depute another official. It is not mentioned how he will be nominated. From the point of view of broad principles, I think this should not have been left to the official. Anyhow as the hon. Minister has stated that he will bring in a comprehensive amending Bill I do not like to move my amendment.

The hon. Minister stated that the Chairman is nominated by Government. I think you may remember that in the Estimates Committee we had occasion to review the activities of this Board; and the activities of the last Chairman also came under our examination. I hope I would not be divulging any secret if I say that we were not at all satisfied with the way in which the Chairman was functioning. It cannot be said that in any sense he was functioning as a representative of Indian interest. Of course, he is now on leave and may be removed. Even now I do not know whether Government will be able to pick up a right person who can protect Indian interests. I know that about 80 per cent. of the capital is British. But still the Central Tea Board is an organisation which should protect Indian interests. I would not have mentioned all this, if the hon. Minister had not referred to it. I hope he will at least see that the right person is nominated who will not be a stooge of British interests.

Shri B. Das: I wish to add one word. When I made that speech I had the Chairman's instance in my mind. As far as my memory goes, the Chairman has never obeyed the Government of India in any matter. He has functioned as a representative of the British capitalist interest. Whatever may have happened in the past, I hope the sovereign Government of India is not going to take orders from the British capitalists or the tea interests in England. I hope the hon. Minister will soon bring forward the Bill he mentioned, and I will have occasion to bless it.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I put one question to the hon. Minister. Is it true that in regard to the appointment of a very important official the Government did not approve the name recommended by the Central Tea Board and even then the Tea Board reasserted its right to appoint that same person and has practically asked Government to eat humble pie by accepting its nominee?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to give an answer. I have not got the information.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): I generally do not like to join issues with elderly gentlemen like Shri Jhunjhunwala, but I was really surprised when he was opposing this innocuous amendment.

The power to nominate substitutes when a representative on a particular committee cannot attend its meetings is a well-recognised principle which has been given in many committees that I know of. I have experience of one or two international conferences and I know that even in the Governing Body of the ILO which is the main executive of the International Labour Conference, there is what is called a titular delegate and he has a right to nominate a substitute when he cannot attend a particular meeting of the Governing Body. This has an additional advantage of training up junior people to take the place of senior people when they retire. Now if all the positions of a representative character are being taken up by my senior officials and younger people are not given a chance to represent them, even when they cannot attend a meeting. I do not know how we will be training up the younger generation. From that point of view this amendment is very necessary.

Then there need not be any apprehension that the substitute who will be appointed will perhaps not know the job, because I understand that there is a well-established practice that representatives who are nominated speak to a brief and the brief is provided by the Ministry or the Department concerned. So, I welcome this amending clause and I think the House will pass it without making any changes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

RESERVE AND AUXILIARY AIR FORCES BILL

The Minister of Defence (Shri Gopalaswamy): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to provide for the constitution and regulation of certain Air Force Reserves and also an Auxiliary Air Force and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

The Bill is a fairly simple one. In a modern Defence organization it has almost become a necessity that we should provide reserves to every branch of the Armed Forces for the purpose of men being trained and kept ready, for being called up in emergencies. We have already provided for such reserves in the case of the Army and the Navy. This particular Bill provides for reserves in the case of the Air Force. The Bill deals with three different kinds of these reserves. There is, first of all, the Regular Air Force reserve, then there will be an Air Defence reserve and the third is an Auxiliary Air Force. Chapter 2 of the Bill deals with the Regular Air Force reserve. It provides for the constitution of that reserve, how its personnel should be found and the classes of persons who will be members in the reserve, their period of service and so on. Similarly in the case of the Air Defence reserve provisions are contained in this Bill for its constitution, its liability for service and the period of its service and so on. The Auxiliary Air Force is a counterpart in the Air Force of the Territorial force in the Army. There also we have inserted provisions which would make arrangements for the constitution of this Auxiliary Air Force and the conditions under which this Auxiliary Air Force will be constituted, trained and will function.

The Statement of Objections and Reasons gives the House a fairly full account of the detailed provisions of this Bill. There is not very much in these provisions. In the case of the regular Air Force, officers and airmen in the Air Force will automatically get transferred to this reserve on the completion of their service. As a matter of fact in the arrangements that now exist there is a liability cast upon every one of them that if and when a reserve of this kind is constituted, they are liable to go into that reserve and shoulder the liability of being called up for service whenever required. In the case of

* Moved with the previous recommendation of the President.