

Of course, we have here provide two months time.

"after having been demanded, shall be recovered in a summary way as hereinafter mentioned."

This is from the Australian Navigation Act. So I think it is only desirable that we should have such a provision in this Bill and the lacuna removed. I have nothing more to say.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : In the Rules that he proposes to make, can the hon. Minister give us an assurance that he will so draft them that in the j different ports he can introduce Rules for licensing of drivers of small craft and then see that those who have a licence under this Act are exempted from pilotage obligations ?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR : I shall have it examined.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

#### **THE CENTRAL TEA BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952**

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI) : Mr. Chairman, I beg to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration .

Sir, the scope of this amending Bill is limited. It refers only to one provision in the original Act, i.e., section 3, sub-section (3), sub-clause (v) This sub-clause gives power to the Central Government to nominate four representatives on the Central Tea Board. At the present moment, these officers are *persona destgnata* and exigencies of service often prevent them from attending the meeting; of the Board. When such contingencies happen, the Government representation suffers, and, often-times important decisions are taken by the

Board in which Government's point of view is not presented. We have now, by this amendment, sought to get over that difficulty by authorising the officials to nominate or depute a substitute. It might be mentioned that these powers should not be given unilaterally to the officials as they might nominate somebody who is not suitable for the purpose. The amendment to section 15, sub-section (2), clause (b) indicates that Government will prescribe the manner in which such substitute may be nominated, which will cover that position.

Sir, the object, as I have said earlier, is strictly limited and I hope the House will have no objection to acceding to this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN (Bihar) : Sir, I have only one or two suggestions to make regarding the rules that will be made under this Act to enable officials to nominate substitutes. My suggestion to the hon. Minister is that official nominated should not send, as his deputy, someone who happens to be his favourite ; that is suggestion number one. Number two is that he should not send junior official in his place when a senior officer is available. I would further suggest, Sir, that it would be better if his deputy is sent ; the officials who are nominated to the Central Tea Board are Secretaries and high officials and they have always got their deputies. I think it would be better if a Deputy Secretary is sent by him to represent the officer concerned at the Board. \*

SHRI S. N. MAJUMDAR (West Bengal) : Sir, this amendment, it is true, is very restricted in its nature, but I have to say that this amendment is only tinkering with the problem that is present in the tea industry. On a previous occasion, Sir, on the floor of this House, I said all what I had to say. So, I do not propose to repeat those arguments now.

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.] 9

a.m.

As regards the Tea Control Board itself, I have to say that the problem now is not merely enabling officials nominated by the Government to send their deputies when they themselves are not attending the Board meetings—that is not the problem—but the reconstitution of the Tea Control Board. That is very urgent and very necessary. If the Government do not find itself in a position to exclude the British Nationals from the Tea Control Board, they should at least see that the Board is made more representative of Indian interests and representatives of tea garden labour are also included in it. I would suggest that when the Government nominate four members to the Tea Control Board, at least two of them may be labour representatives.

I take, Sir, this opportunity of drawing the attention of Government to the necessity of taking some speedy steps regarding the tea industry, because Government is taking very long time to make up its mind. In the meantime, Sir, in the name of a crisis in the tea industry, the tea garden owners are trying to throw the burden of the so-called crisis on the shoulders of the tea garden labour. Here, Sir, I have a memorandum from Darjeeling in which it has been mentioned that in the plantations—in West Bengal, so far as I know, the Minimum Wages Act and Plantations Act have not been implemented as yet—taking advantage of this situation the tea industry is supposed to be passing through a crisis, the tea garden interests are demanding from the Government to take certain steps and are proceeding with large scale retrenchment of tea garden labour, increasing their workload and depriving them of other privileges. Now, particularly as regards retrenchment, I would like to make it clear that so far as the Darjeeling District is concerned, retrenchment of workers means not only unemployment for labourers but they are virtually rendered homeless. The workers came from Nepal and virtually settled down there. They are living there for

generations and the tea garden villages are their ancestral homes. It is the practice with the employers that when a labourer is discharged he is also generally—I do not say always—asked to leave the gardens. That means that he is rendered homeless, and that means a double calamity for him.

I am very sorry to say, Sir, that according to this memorandum it is the Indian gardens that are mainly responsible for this. I would like to say that the Indian tea planters instead of trying to throw the burden on the shoulders of the labourers should try to see where the real problem lies. About this also there is not much difference of opinion. The real problem in the tea industry is the domination of British capital and about which, so far as I understand, my hon. friend the Minister for Commerce and Industry also inclined to agree with me to a great extent the other day. The Indian tea garden owners, in their own interest, instead of antagonising the workers should join with them in ridding the tea industry of the vicious British control and monopoly. If they really take this measure, I can say—I can claim to be one of the builders of the tea garden labour movement in the district of Darjeeling and I know the workers very well—if the Indian Planters really take the proper stand which is to their interests, which is to the interests of the labour and which is to the interests of Indian economy itself and try to get rid of the foreign vicious control, the British monopoly, then the workers will fully support them. With these words, Sir, I again say that immediately Government also can nominate two representatives of plantation labour on the Tea Control Board,

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras)  
: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid there are bound to be some legal difficulties if this Bill is made into law. As we know, Sir, this Tea Control Board is a corporate body with perpetual succession and a common seal with power to acquire and hold property and to contract, and shall

by the said name sue and be sued. Sir, under section 4 a certain number of people are to be nominated from certain provinces and we also find that four persons are to be nominated by the Central Government. We know, Sir, what part the officials play in all these committees. It is only the official members of the Committee who play a very great part in these committee meetings. If a particular official is nominated to the Tea Board and if that particular official is authorised to depute some other official, then in the meetings that person so deputed cannot come to an independent decision of his own. If any important subject comes up he will have only to say: "I shall take instruction from my boss; I shall consult him." That is naturally what happens. My own practical experience shows, Sir, in the districts we have so many committees—Food Production Committee and so many other committees—though it is only the highest official in the district who is expected to come to all these meetings, he generally deputes a subordinate officer. If it is a meeting where the Highways Engineer has to attend the meeting, he just sends the Assistant Engineer. It is the Chief Engineer of Electricity who is expected to come. But often these officers send their Assistant Engineers—even Supervisors some times. At the meeting when an important question arises these subordinate officers say: "We shall have to consult our bosses." They are unable to give their views. Also they often suffer from inferiority complex. So I feel strongly that if a particular official is nominated to represent Government on a Board, only he should always be present and he should not be allowed to depute another person. As I have already said, these people are not able to give their views. They always think that they should take instructions from their bosses and they suffer from a sort of inferiority complex in all these meetings. Sir, if you go through section 4 you find that "No act done or proceeding taken under this" Act shall be questioned on the ground merely of the existence of any vacancy in o

ny defect in the constitution of the Board." If one official is absent, then here are three other officials to represent Government and so absolutely no difficulty is going to arise. Further, Sir, we find that these officials so nominated can get into the Executive Committees; they can get into the *ad hoc* Committees and they can also get into the Standing Committees. I would put this question to the hon. Minister. If out of these four officers nominated by the Government, anyone gets into the Executive Committee can any delegation be made in that Executive Committee also? I fail to see how any member nominated by Government can delegate someone even for the Executive Committee, even for the Standing Committee or even for the *ad hoc* Committee. All these complications will arise if this amendment is made into law. Under section 13, we find some borrowing powers. "Subject to such rules as may be prescribed, the Board shall have the power to borrow on the security of the fund or any other of its assets for any purpose for which the fund may be applied." So the person who is nominated by the Government certainly will have to be responsible for the finances of the Board also and he has got powers to borrow on the security of the fund. So I cannot understand how in regard to such important functions a person nominated by the Central Government can further delegate his powers and instruct somebody else to represent him. I think this also goes against the famous maxim *delegatus non potest delegare*. Once a person is delegated he cannot further delegate and under this principle of law I do not think that a person nominated by the Government can further delegate and ask somebody else to be on the Board. That is my objection, Sir.<sup>1</sup>  
 SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):  
 While supporting this Bill, I would like to make only a few observations. Sir, some of the most important functions of the Central Tea Board are to fix the price of tea, allotment of export quotas and allotment of quotas which could be retained by the planters themselves.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : In i way customs duty also.

SHRI GOVINDA R E D D Y : Yes  
 thstoms duty also. Although t ey are not the final authorities in fixing these things, they are the advisory authorities to Government and Govern ment take their advice which is of a great technical nature. The Govern ment abide by their advice so much that the advice of the Tea Control Board will be, as a matter of fact, the policy of the Government. So in this matter it is very important that a balance should be maintained by the Government. There is much con viction in the tea industry. Most of the tea planters are Europeans while some are Indians. Just a few months ago, I was at Salem—actually at Yercaud—where there are tea estates and I happened to meet some Indian planters who said that there was a great deal of conflict in interest between the European planters and the Indian planters. Generally the Central Tea Board would necessarily, almost in every matter, preserve the interests of the European planters to the disadvantage of the Indian planters. Of course, I was a layman to this and therefore I did not go into details in the talk which I had with them. But this impression I got from the talk that there is a good deal of conflict between the Indian interests and the European interests. Generally European interests have al ways prevailed over the Indian interests in every decision that the Tea Board has been able to take in the past. Although the Government has a large representation in this Board, the Go vernment as was said by the hon. Member just now.....

SHRI RAJAGOPAL N A I D U : I am not honourable.

SHRI GOVINDA R E D D Y :  
 .....and I think by Mr. Tajamul Husain also, the Government deposes their officials. And by deposing the officials, the Government do not always realise the importance of the conflict that is involved between the different interests comprising the industry. As a matter of fact, they just depute

an ordinary official. That is not safeguarding the Indian planters and I would therefore urge for the consideration of the hon. Minister in charge of this Bill to see that men qualified to take part in the proceedings of the Board are deputed always so that they will be able to understand the problems and hold a balance between the conflicting interests.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar) : Sir, I am not interested in tea rior can I said to be.....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) : Not even in drinking it ?

SHRI K. B. LALL : ..... an expert in tea matters but as there seems to be a storm in the tea cup over this Bill, I want to make a suggestion to the hon. Minister. Some hon. Members,— of course, objection was taken to the use of the word 'honourable', at least we are honourable by courtesy— some hon. Members have said that this deputising persons would not be in the interests of the administration. Now, mostly the meetings must have been held in Delhi. And so there should have been no difficulty. But if all he meetings are held outside Delhi...

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI :  
 it Calcutta.

SHRI K. B. LALL : ..... then there is stronger reason. If the meetings are held outside, there may be some fear that in making such delegation of powers to men of their choice, they may show favouritism. Any person can be chosen according to the wish of the person who is being nominated unless there is some control over the choice. There is of course no formal amendment before the House, but if the hon. Minister agrees, he can provide that in the first instance, if the officer who is nominated is not able to be present at the meeting, he should in the first instance nominate his next in rank in office who is an expert in the subject, and if the next man is not an expert, then the one next to him in rank who may be said to be an expert in the subject, and so on. If here is such a provision, there will be

some check in the matter of nominating persons by the officer who has been nominated. Otherwise, if free rein is given to the man to nominate whomsoever he likes, I suppose there may be some loophole for exercising favouritism. The man has to travel to Calcutta. And, as you know, these days there is such a hue and cry, so much of howling, over the amount of travelling allowance drawn by officers. As a matter of fact, only few days back, in regard to the Bihar Government, it appeared that out of an income of Rs. 20 or 25 crores, Rs. 5 crores were spent on travelling allowance by officers. In such matters there should be some check on the person making a nomination so that there may be no favouritism. That is the only suggestion I have to make.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that even this minor amendment of the Tea Board Act has excited so much interest. The hon. Member from Madras, Shri Rajagopal Naidu, is rather perturbed that we might be doing something which is illegal and thereby vitiating the working of the parent Act. I can assure him that my colleague, the Law Minister, has got an excellent staff under him which is available for us to consult on all such occasions, and I am assured by them that there is no legal flaw here. Actually, if the hon. Member has a different opinion, we can only attribute it to the general reason that no two lawyers agree. For the time being, however, I must depend on the advice which I can get from our official advisers.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : Judges also differ.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY :  
Lawyers agree, but not philosophers.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: If anything goes wrong, I will take the responsibility for it. But it is a very small matter. In fact so much of legal acumen need not be imported into a very ordinary proposal, namely,

that if one official is not able to attend the meeting, another person may be deputed. Normally we should have asked the person to resign and then appointed somebody else. That entails the issue of a notification. The procedure is rather complicated. It is to avoid that procedure that we have suggested that another person may be deputed. And if my hon. friend Shri Tajamul Husain reads the import of clause 3, he will find that the manner in which such person can be nominated to depute would also be prescribed. It is not as if he would ask some Assistant in the office to go. After all, we take our responsibility with regard to the Central Tea Board very seriously. The four officials nominated are from the Commerce and Industry Ministry, the Finance Ministry, the Food and Agriculture Ministry and the Labour Ministry. Four Ministries send representatives. And I know that in the case of the Commerce and Industry and Finance Ministries, very high-placed officers go, who usually are persons of the status of a Joint Secretary. It is not a question of something being done without the Government knowing anything about it, or of something illegal being done. Actually, that is precisely what we are trying to avoid : any possibility of a delegation being illegal is sought to be covered by this amending Bill. And these *ad hoc* Committees, these Executive Committees—they will do nothing which will in anyway prevent Government from interfering, if Government want to. The hon. Member will realise that the chairman is appointed by Government.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : On a point of information, I would like the hon. Minister to let me know if it would be possible for the deputy who has been nominated by the official concerned to nominate his own deputy in case he himself does not find it possible to attend.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:  
No, it would not be possible. The one person who is nominated can suggest a deputy, and no other. It

[SHRI T. T. Krishnamachari.] cannot go on like a chain, ending up ultimately with the *chaprasi*. I can assure the hon. Member that that will not happen.

Sir, with regard to European interests, it is a recognised fact that 80 per cent, of the tea industry is owned by Europeans. European interests are there, and very possibly they do act in a manner which is prejudicial to Indian interests, and perhaps in some cases also prejudicial to the interests of the country. That leads me to the point raised by the hon. Member opposite, Mr. Mazumdar. I think I 'did deal with this question before. I This was envisaged at the time when I had not come into the picture. After I came into the picture, I had an opportunity of going into the matter, and before long Government would have to undertake a revision of the Tea Board Act. That is the position now. I gave the assurance that I would devote my personal attention to this j matter. Possibly, before long— I j cannot commit myself to the time— the question will be examined, and perhaps Parliament will be approached for a revision of the Act. When we do that, we will find out whether we can balance the various interests so that the net result will accrue to the benefit of this country and not to the benefit of any other country or to people belonging to any other country.

"With regard to labour representation, I may assure my hon. friend Mr. Mazumdar that at the moment we have three representatives nominated on behalf of labour. I quite agree that it is not adequate. But we have to wait for the time when we can recast the whole Act rather than do anything now. I do apologise for troubling the House with a very minor amendment of this nature, but, as I said, the action has been taken and this is found necessary, irrespective of anything that we may propose in future. Therefore, I hope the Houst will pass this amending Biil.

SHRI K. B. LALL : The hon. Minister has not said anything about the possibility of favouritism in the appointment of a deputy.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:  
I do not recognise that there is any favouritism. How then can I say anything about the scope for it ?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: May I know who are the labour representatives ? That is, are they representatives of the labour unions ?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:  
Yes. They have three representatives. The nomination is made by Government. One comes from South India, and two represent both Bengal and Assam labour.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : Only one submission, Sir. Suppose one of the four members is taken on the executive committee; can that person delegate on his behalf a subordinate officer to represent him on the executive committee also ? In that case, does not the hon. Minister think that section 8 also has to be amended so as to be in consonance with the amendment .to section 4 ?

SHRI T.T. KRISHNAMACHARI: If that contingency arises, we will look into it in future.. I am not prepared to face difficulties before they ac'^uilly arise. At the present moment I m ly say that if the representative of the Commerce and Industry Mir istry sends his Deputy Secretary or his colleague who is also a joint Secretary, that official could function in the *ad hoc* Committee or in the Executive Committee. If there is any legal difficulty and a further amendment is involved, we will come forward with a further amendment. But at the moment I am not prepared to anticipate all possible contingencies that may or may not arise in a matter which is perfectly simple and in which I think the consequences would not be quite so serious, as my hon. friend envisages.

MR. CHAIRMAN : .The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Central Tea Board Act, 1949, as passed by the

House of the People be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : As there are no amendments to the Bill, I put all the clauses—clauses 2, 3, 1—and the Enacting Formula and the Short Title together.

SHRI K. B. LALL : On a point of order. Yesterday also the Deputy Chairman put the whole Bill at one time. There may perhaps be no objections That is quite a different matter. But as a matter of procedure it may be quite possible that the House may oppose altogether one clause of the Bill and may support the other clauses. I therefore think that we should do it clause by clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I did enumerate the clauses. But if you have any objection, I am prepared to put it clause by clause.

The question is :

t

That clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

The question is :

That clause 3 stand part of the Bill,

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

The question is :

That clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I beg to move :

That the Bill be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

That the Bill be passed.

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA (Madras) : My point is, Sir, that here it is provided that if a nominated official on the Board is not in a position to attend any meet-

ings, he can depute in the prescribed circumstances. This phrase 'prescribed circumstances' is not a healthy sign. And under what circumstances he can depute one of his assistants should have been mentioned in the very Bill itself so that the House will have an idea of all those circumstances. Here it is said the circumstances will be prescribed under the rules. Instead of that, the circumstances should have been embodied in this Bill so that the House would have been in a better position to know under what circumstances such things will happen.

The question of a deputed person attending the committees' meetings does not arise because such committees are elected committees. A deputed man or somebody representing the original man can only serve on the Board and not work on other committees which are of an elected nature. So that does not arise at all. But Sir,—here the circumstances should be very limited, because that deputed person may attend no doubt and sit there but he is not expected to know in detail what his boss does. I hope the Government, in framing the rules, will take care that the prescribed circumstances will be very much limited so that the purpose of this can be greatly achieved and the Board can benefit by it. That is all, Sir.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : I am glad that the Minister has given, us at least some kind of assurance that he would look into the matter with regard to the replacement of British control in the Board or in the industry by Indian interests. That, Sir, is very essential because this is an issue to which the attention of the Government has been drawn not only by the consumers or the labour interest but also by the Indian Tea Merchants' Association. In fact, Sir, the *National Herald* of last year wrote an editorial strongly condemning the policies pursued by the British interests and it also pointed out that the international market, as far as Indian tea is concerned, is entirely in the control of the British interests. It also pointed out and very rightly so that when we are one of

[Shri B. Gupta] the biggest exporters of tea— perhaps next to China—there is no reason why the market of the Indian tea should be in London if really we want to have the control in our own trade. Unfortunately this national industry is an industry - which is owned and where huge British capital is invested. We know, Sir, that 51 crores of rupees are invested there. It is perhaps the biggest of the industries in which the British capital is invested.

Then there is also another very important point which has got to be taken into account and that is about the position of Indians in this industry. Now our interests will be there in the Committee Control Board. The persons in charge should be given very positive directions so that Indian employees are taken in high positions in these industries. So far the Europeans have made it their business to see that the Indians do not get promoted to high positions. Now this policy has been pursued deliberately for a number of years and unfortunately there has not yet been any material change in this respect even after August 15, 1947. Again, Sir, this is something which has got to be looked into and I do not see any reason why steps should not be taken even within the existing framework of things so that Indians could be immediately placed in important positions. It seems that high positions in that industry are almost barred to Indians and these are more or less monopolised by the younger sons of British imperialists who are good for nothing in their own country but come to this unfortunate land to find very very cushy employment. That has got to be stopped if the hon. Minister at all wants to protect the Indian interests and to promote them.

Then comes the question of acreage and other things. There again the British has practically the final voice. This thing we have to consider very seriously because what we need to bring under cultivation at the given point of time should be determined not by the promptings of the British

war economy, nor by the promptings of the Anglo-American international trade but fundamentally by the needs and requirements of our own economy. Unfortunately that is not so at present. Now, Sir, as you know, America and especially Britain have to import lot of tea. Now they are restricting their imports with a view to speeding up their war preparations. They are cutting certain imports like tea with the result that the Indian tea industry faces a certain amount of crisis on that account. In fact the U.S.A. deliberately restricted the import of very many articles including jute products by producing substitute commodities as paper bags and all that sort of things. In England during the last Budget I believe it was seen that they wanted to make some cuts in their imports. The consumption of tea was one of the items in the list. The ration quota of tea was reduced. Therefore, we are absolutely dependent on their whims and on their policies. As long as we remain tied under their international trade agreements it is very difficult for our industry to find its proper place in the economy of the world today. That is a very important factor. What we should do is that we should get out of the clutches of these Anglo-American imperialists and we should develop our trade with regard to these commodities with other countries like Soviet Russia. We can export our tea in exchange for certain other commodities, particularly machinery. Our tea industry is a foreign exchange earner. And so that industry should be so handled that we can earn foreign exchange which again we can utilise for bringing in machineries which we need so badly. Tea is so vital an industry that one cannot deal with it in a simple amendment or in a simple discussion. I request the hon. Minister to review the whole situation and to eliminate the hold of the Anglo-American imperialists with regard to this trade, with regard to the international money market and all that sort of things, that bear on the tea industry. I would request the hon. Minister to find out



ways and means or exporting our tea to other countries which have so far not been within our trade ambit so that we can buy certain other useful commodities in exchange from those countries especially machinery for the industrialisation of our country. Only then will there be a swing towards balanced economy. Otherwise we cannot progress. I hope these points will be considered.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:

Sir, in regard to the remarks of the hon. Member, Shri Venkatanarayana, I might assure him that nothing amiss will happen by the Government taking these powers. As he himself knows—he has been a legislator before he came here—this is the normal method of Government work. The rules cannot be anticipated here and there is no use burdening an enactment of this nature with rules that ought to be made under the powers vested under this Bill. I would like to give him the assurance that nothing amiss will happen.

With regard to the suggestions made by the other hon. Member, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I would assure him that all the facts he has mentioned will be taken into account when reviewing the tea industry with a view to reconstituting this Tea Board which controls this industry.

MR. • CHAIRMAN : The question is :  
That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

**THE CENTRAL SILK BOARD  
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952**

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND  
INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI):  
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move :

That the Bill further to amend the Central Silk Board Act, 1948, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

33 CSD

Sir, the Bill before the House is mainly intended to give power to the Government to nominate the Vice-President of the Silk Board. Incidentally, this opportunity was taken to amend section 4, sub-section (3), clause (c) so as to provide representation for this hon. House on the Central Silk Board. The reason why Government have come before Parliament for amending what looks like a very simple provision of the Act, viz., for taking powers to nominate the Vice-Chairman so far elected, is that the Ministry has been engaged in reviewing the work done by the Central Silk Board. I have, Sir, both in this House and in the other House promised that I would review the work of the various industries which have constituted Commodity Boards so as to see that the work that is done there could be for the benefit of the country as a whole and also of the particular industry concerned. I have examined the position of the silk industry, as this question was very forcibly brought to the attention of the Government by certain remarks made by the Tariff Board, when they were examining this question, that the industry did not present their case properly to them even though they were asked to do it. All that the Tariff Board could do was to recommend the continuation of the protection on the same basis till the end of the year 1952.

Now, the position of the silk industry is not very good. Various reasons are attributed by various interests for this. The raw silk producer thinks that, if raw silk is imported, his position will be jeopardised. The people who are engaged in the silk mill industry, feel that unless raw silk is imported because the local production of raw silk does not cover even half the needs of the silk mills, the industry has to close down. There is also the question of the falling off in demand owing to the general slump in the prices of all commodities, more so in the prices of textiles, silk, cotton and woollen and the like. In 1948 the Government thought that by creating the Central Silk Board under this Act, they would