

Misra, Shri S.D.  
 Mitra, Dr. P.C.  
 Mookerji, Dr. Radha Kumud.  
 Mujumdar, Shri M.R.  
 Mukerjee, Shri B.K.  
 Nagoke, Jathedar U.S.  
 Naidu, Shri Rajagopal.  
 Narayan, Shri D.  
 Narayannappa, Shri K.  
 Nihal Singh, Shri.  
 Onkar Nath, Shri.  
 Pande, Shri T.  
 Parikh, Shri C.P.  
 Pattabiraman, Shri T.S.  
 Pawar, Shri D.Y.  
 Pheruman, Sardar D.S.  
 Pillai, Shri C.N.  
 Podar, Shri R.A.  
 Puri, Shri M.L.  
 Pushpalata Das, Shrimati.  
 Pustake, Shri T.D.  
 Raghu Vira, Dr.  
 Raghubir Sinh, Dr.  
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.  
 Ranawat, Shri M.S.  
 Ranga, Prof. G.  
 Rao, Shri Rama.  
 Reddy, Shri Channa.  
 Reddy, Shri Govinda.  
 Saksena, Shri H.P.  
 Sambhu Prasad, Shri.  
 Sarwate, Shri V.S.  
 Savitry Nigam, Shrimati.  
 Seeta Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati.  
 Shah, Shri M.C.  
 Sharda Bhargava, Shrimati.  
 Sharma, Shri B.B.  
 Shetty, Shri Basappa.  
 Singh, Babu Gopinath.  
 Singh, Shri Kartar.  
 Singh, Shri R.K.  
 Sinha, Shri R.B.  
 Sinha, Shri R.P.N.

Sobhani, Shri O.  
 Sumat Prasad, Shri.  
 Surendra Ram, Shri V.M.  
 Tajamul Husain, Shri.  
 Tamta, Shri R.P.  
 Tankha, Pandit S.S.N.  
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.  
 Thacker, Shri P.B.  
 Thakur Das, Shri.  
 Thanhliira, Shri R.  
 Venkataraman, Shri S.

NOES—24

Arman Ali, Munshi.  
 Banerjee, Shri S.  
 Deshmukh, Shri N.B.  
 Dhage, Shri V.K.  
 Dwivedy, Shri S.N.  
 George, Shri K.C.  
 Ghose, Shri B.C.  
 Gour, Dr. R.B.  
 Gupta, Shri B.  
 Imbichibava, Shri E.K.  
 Kakkilaya, Shri B.V.  
 Klshen Chand, Shri.  
 Manjuran, Shri M.  
 Mazumdar, Shri S.N.  
 Misra, Shri C.G.  
 Narasimham, Shri K.L.  
 Narayana, Shri P.V.  
 Rajah, Shri H.D.  
 Rath, Shri B.  
 Raut, Shri R.B.  
 Reddy, Shri C.G.K.  
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.  
 Sundarayya, Shri P.  
 Surayanarayana, Shri K.

The Resolution was adopted by more than two-thirds majority.

#### THE INDIAN TEA CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE  
AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T.  
KRISHNAMACHARI) : MR. Deputy Chair-  
man, I move:

That the Bill further to amend the Indian  
Tea Control Act, 1938, as passed by the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

House of the People, be taken into consideration.

Sir, the measure falls into two parts. One is clause 2 of the present Bill. It vests Government with powers to terminate the tenure of the Indian Tea Licensing Committee and arrange for fresh election. The other, which falls under clause 4 of this Bill, seeks to give legislative sanction to a practice now being followed in regard to replantation of tea by substitution of areas where existing plantation has suffered. As regards the first part the position was that ever since this Tea Licensing Committee was constituted as far back as 1938 it remained stationary. There has been no reconstitution. That is because various tea interests had to elect members of this Committee and during the war time it was not possible to hold elections. Therefore section 3 of the original Act was amended in 1943 allowing the members of the Committee to hold office for the duration of the Act. Sir, now the duration of the Act is up till 1955. Under the present circumstances it is inexpedient to allow the Tea Licensing Committee to continue in view of the fact that now the elections can be held. Therefore it is proper to have the Committee reconstituted and that is why this particular clause 2 is put into this Bill.

With regard to the other question, we are now operating under the International Tea Agreement and all the tea producing countries are parties to the agreement. Under this agreement during the period of its currency, i.e., upto 1st April 1955 the area under cultivation may extend to 2 per cent. of the permissible tea acreage. And there is a provision for licences to be given by the Tea Licensing Committee in respect of additional acreage. Section 26 of the Act requires a permit from the Tea Licensing Committee if tea has to be planted on land only by way of extension. As I said in my opening remarks that though there is no statutory obligation in order to

see that plantations do not exceed two per cent. for the whole year, permission is asked from the Tea Licensing Committee for replantation and permission is generally granted. But it is now found desirable to make a statutory obligation rather than one by means of convention whereby permission is sought. So the position is that in regard to section 26 there is no virtual departure from the existing practice. But we are going to give legislative sanction to the practice that is now being followed and which is very necessary. That is some sense happens to be the provision of this amending Bill.

Sir, with your permission I submit that I can anticipate certain criticism that might emanate from certain hon. Members of this House in respect of the International Tea Agreement to which we are parties and the operation of that agreement. Sir, it has been voiced in the other House and I am sure it will be voiced here too in respect of satisfaction of this Tea Agreement. To any such individuals who might consider that this agreement has not worked satisfactorily, Sir, I would submit that is not within the scope of this particular amendment. We are parties to this agreement until March 1955. So any remarks that may fall from the mouths of hon. Members who are interested in this matter would influence the Government in regard to the steps that are to be taken after the period of the expiry of this agreement. But so far as we are signatories to this agreement and we accepted the agreement, it would not be fair that we should not implement the terms of that agreement. And surely no hon. Member of this House will suggest that this Tea Licensing Committee should go on without being reconstituted as it has gone on right from 1938. On that I think there would be no point of dispute at all. And as regards the matter of policy, hon. Members will do well to urge their own point of view and it will be for Government to follow their inclinations at the appropriate time.

Sir I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :  
Motion moved:

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tea Control Act, 1938, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal) : Sir, the hon. Minister has anticipated some criticisms which may be levelled from this side of the House. I take that this presumption is correct.

Though this is really an amending Bill, still some remarks regarding the International Tea Agreement itself must be made. Before I make my submission, Sir, regarding this amending Bill, I would submit that the International Tea Agreement is not only working unfairly but it is working practically to the detriment of the Indian interests because it is a well-known fact that Indian tea industry is dominated by British monopolistic interests and it is those interests that control this industry starting from the point of production, finance, transport, distribution, storage and auction in London etc., and through all these operations the whole domination is working in a manner which is quite detrimental to the Indian interests and in this connection the Indian interests have voiced their protest against this International Tea Agreement on more than one occasion. I think even recently on the floor of the other House some remarks were made. And, actually, on this point I can say, Sir, that the domination of foreign capital in one of the vital sectors of our economy, *i.e.*, the tea industry—that there is unanimity among the Communists, the I.N.T.U.C. and also Indian planters. Then about the working of the agreement, I shall give one example. East Africa is not a party to the International Tea Agreement. But the British monopolistic interests who have gardens here have got gardens in East Africa also and they have gone into production. In the name of the International Tea Agreement, crop acreage is being restricted here, but the same monopolistic interests that are controlling the major portion of the industry here are taking advantage

of the fact that East Africa is not a party to this agreement and are growing tea there in an unrestricted manner.

Sir, I shall refer to a particular case here and I will request the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry to investigate it. Recently, as I mentioned it the other day also, a memorandum on the tea industry was submitted by the Bengal Trade Union Congress and in that memorandum this aspect of the tea industry has been exhaustively dealt with and there is one particular case which, with your permission, I am going to read :

“While the same company—Amalgamated Tea Estate Co. Ltd.—has their estate, in India, Pakistan and Ceylon, has recently planted tea in East Africa too which is already yielding crop. Please note that the Managing Agents, James Finlay, who one of the estates in Assam has been declared as un-economic holding and getting special privileges, are also the proprietors of holdings and estates in E. Africa. This is a position which we hope the Commission will take note of.”

So, this is about the International Tea Agreement.

Coming to crop restriction, it is being followed against the interests of Indian planters. There may be licensing but I do not think that this Licensing Committee should continue as it is. This amendment also is not going to improve matters, because if the members of the Licensing Committee are elected, how will they be elected ? They will be elected from the tea interests, the planters' associations are dominated by the British. The Indian Tea Association is completely dominated by them. So, even if the members of the Licensing Committee are elected, that will not alter the position. That amendment is not going to make any radical change in the present state of affairs. I would suggest that, if the hon. Minister is really concerned about the welfare of the Indian interests, some steps should be taken to see that the Indian interests get more representation on the Tea Licensing Committee.

Another suggestion also I would like to make here. Before bringing this amendment, it would have been

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

far better to have gone into the whole question of the tea industry which is also engaging the attention of the Government and to have consulted the representatives of the tea garden labour. The Finance Minister gave an assurance the other day that the representatives of tea garden labour will be consulted. The assurance has come late but still it is welcome. But I should like to say that instead of only consulting the representatives of tea garden labour, what is really necessary is the constitution of a tripartite Committee including the representatives of tea garden labour to go into the whole question and review the position. This amendment also should be brought only after that, because only then we shall be able to see and decide how this monopoly foreign interest can be controlled. If the hon. Minister is not prepared to take over these interests, at least let him see what steps he can take to control and curb these interests and see that Indian interests are given a fair chance.

Before I conclude, I would say that the Licensing Committee, as it is constituted, should not be allowed to function. This amendment is not going to improve matters. It is not going to make any radical change. Steps should be taken to see how the Licensing Committee can be made representative of Indian interests. I would also say that the Licensing Committee should also include representatives of tea garden labour.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Next to Assam, the tea industry is a very big industry in Madras State. About 50,000 acres or so are under tea cultivation. Now, I am glad that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, our Industry and Commerce Minister, has agreed that a revision of the International Tea Agreement is necessary. The monopolistic tendency especially of the British people in this country are sapping our vitality and the conditions of labour in these areas are far from desirable. But what is the profit, what is the distribution of dividends

that these companies are giving? Glance through the balance sheets of these companies during the last ten years and that will tell you the figures. You will find that it is all at the cost of the consumer in India as well as outside. The real issue, so far as we are concerned, regarding the monopolistic trade of the Britisher in this country is, what is the check we are having on them in regard to the limitation or extension of the area of tea cultivation, what is the control we are exercising over them? The second point is with regard to the nomination for the Board. Even this amendment, "Members nominated or elected under sub-clause (1) shall hold office for such period as may be prescribed" is very vague. You cannot be more vague than this. What is this prescription? And how will you see that the interests of the Indian people are protected? Therefore, when you give power to the Government, they should lay on the table the truth about the past. We would know then what they are intending to do.

With regard to the tea itself, look at the way, the miserable way in which the Indian consumer is treated. As I told you this industry is a monopolistic industry especially of the British looters in this country. The high-grown tea as it is called, the Nilgiris tea as it is called, is never put on the market in this country, is not allowed to be consumed by the Indians. What is consumed by them is the dust, dust that is the refuse of the tea industry. The first quality tea, the high-grown tea grown at 9000 ft. and above goes to foreign markets. That is the way a thing that is produced in our own land is being utilised. We take the dust. "Remember man that thou art dust and unto dust thou shalt return." That is what Christ said, and the British swindlers in our country are teaching us more often than not, that dust is our ultimate destination. I would suggest to the Minister, to think over this matter carefully. He should see that the amendments are such that they would protect the Indian interests and make the British swindlers feel that this is a nascent industry

of ours, the produce is grown in our own country and that we must have the full benefits of that produce.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : I would like, Sir, some definite information. I think it would be open for our Government to give notice of our intention to get this International Tea Agreement reconsidered, whether it is six months' notice or one year's notice I do not know, but long before the stage is set for the next conference, where these international interests gather and try to come to the next agreement, they begin to prepare the ground for it. I would like to know that steps our own Government propose to take in order to protect the interests of Indians in regard to this industry. Before they go to that conference, I hope they will keep in mind the observations made, well-informed observations, by some of our friends in regard to this matter and the manner in which our interests have suffered and have been allowed to suffer during the last so many years.

My hon. friend Mr. H. D. Rajah was complaining that we get only dust and somebody else gets the substance. It would not matter provided we get proper remuneration for what we export to other countries. In England too they were exporting some of their best things abroad in order to get good exchange while themselves being content with goods of inferior quality. But here our difficulty has been that we have been obliged to be satisfied with tea of inferior quality on our side while at the same time not being able to get as good a price as we should for our own tea. One of the friends of our hon. Minister—Mr. Goenka—used to make a big complaint of it and rightly so that our tea was being sold for very much less than it could have been sold for. It would have fetched much higher price but because we were bound by this agreement and also the market was being controlled by these British interests, which were interested here as well as in the consuming centres, our tea was being sold for very much less and in that we were losing. I would like my

friend the Minister to make a thorough-going study of the manner in which this International Agreement has worked and find ways and means by which we may possibly improve our position in the international market and improve the conditions of our own growers.

Thirdly, there is some conflict between the big growers and the smaller growers of tea. It was in order to arm the Government with powers to protect the interests of the smaller growers that they were given the power to nominate certain Members and I would be glad if Government would take sufficient care to see that proper representatives of the smaller growers are nominated when the time comes for the reconstitution of this Board.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the amending Bill seems to be very innocent, rather the hon. Minister in charge has tried to make it look as innocent as possible, but it is not the body content of the amendment but its effect that is most dangerous. So far as the prospect of Indian tea is concerned, we know that practically the Indian Tea Industry is controlled by the industrialists who made a monopoly trading field in order to make money and send it to their own country. This Board has about 14 members and there is no suggestion in the amendment to change the character of this Board so as to give the representatives of the Indian interests any dominant position but it leaves this Committee as it was before and only one suggestion is there that this Committee should be reconstituted at periods which will be prescribed by the Government. The second amendment is that according to the International Tea Agreement certain modifications in the Act shall be made so that this Committee will have the supervisory authority to increase the area of tea plantation by 5 per cent. till 1955 and to replace the areas under cultivation by 2 per cent. annually. Sir, this International Tea Agreement has fixed up a cultivation area of about 6 to 7 thousand lakh acres and we find that by honouring that agreement the area under tea cultivation

[Shri B. Rath.]

is not going to be increased and secondly by accepting the first amendment also, the character of this Committee is not going to be changed. So this amendment is not going to improve the condition. If this industry is to survive, if India has to maintain its dominant position in the world market, then very careful consideration, in the national interest and not being influenced by Commonwealth interests, has to be given to this.

What do we find now? We find that practically the Indian tea planters are groaning because of the dominant position of the British tea planters. We find that the working class in tea plantations are suffering because it is the foreign interest which, our Government is very careful to consider and not the interest of the Indian masses. These are the two aspects that are not being taken into consideration by the Government. So I say that this amendment is not going to improve matters nor is it going to make the tea industry survive.

Really it is a very intriguing subject and needs very careful consideration. If we are to make our tea industry survive, I have a suggestion to make in that connection. That is to keep clean off this International Tea Agreement. I want that the Government of India should take immediate steps so that this International Tea Agreement comes to an end. What is this agreement? It is an agreement between the producing and the consuming countries. Who are the producing countries—India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Ceylon. Of course, Indonesia includes all the islands round about there. And now, who are the purchasing countries? They are the United Kingdom which dictates to our Finance Minister to keep in tune with their monetary policy, and the United States and other countries. The United Kingdom not only controls our trade, but also puts all kinds of obstacles in the way of the industrial development of this country. Another purchasing country which is trying to surpass the United Kingdom in controlling the world market is, as I said, the United

States. Another buyer is Australia and another New Zealand. There are some other countries which are also buyers. With these countries we have entered into this International Tea Agreement which controls the area of tea cultivation in different countries. The Indian Tea Licensing Committee also controls the areas which the tea planters can cultivate year by year. Now, what is this Tea Agreement? It is an agreement between these purchasing and selling countries, an agreement between the financial wizards and the low developed and the erstwhile colonial countries which even now depend for their development on these same financial wizards. It is an agreement between the countries of one half of the world known for their greed, for their territorial expansion and for their trade dominance, and the countries which were suffering under these very nations and which are suffering under their domination even now. And countries which are outside this orbit of this International Trade Agreement cannot purchase the commodity that we produce. To put it concretely, we cannot sell our stuff to a country which may offer us favourable terms. We cannot sell our commodity to Eastern Europe or the U.S.S.R., because the International Trade Agreement on tea does not allow us to do that. We are not free to sell our goods to the best buyer in the world market. That is acting as a bar to our trade development and so I say this should be nullified as quickly as possible.

My second point is that by adhering to this agreement we find that the conflict between the Indian planters and the British planters who are still here is ultimately transferred to the shoulders of the Indian working classes who are working in these tea estates. What are the interests of the British planter? His interest is to get more money and more profit. And how do these planters manage to do that? You find that the price of tea in the London market where it is at present being auctioned is fettered by certain stipulations and thereby the price of tea auctioned there cannot go beyond a

certain level. That is how the Government of the United Kingdom has decided. And the United Kingdom Government which was subsidising tea in 1951 for the consumer countries has gradually and practically withdrawn the subsidy now. Part of this burden has been placed on the consumers themselves by an increase of price and part of it has been transferred to us by reducing the ceiling price of tea in the auction market. Thereby, what is happening? The British planters who are now dominating in India, practically control over 86 per cent. of the gardens here, they sell their tea at a lower price because the ceiling at London has been fixed lower and as the dealers they sell it at a much higher rate to the British consumers. The auction rate at London is much below the rate at which the consumer in London gets it. Therefore, the interest of the British planter is also served. By selling it at a lower rate at the auction he evades paying more tax to the Government of India and also less duty to the Government of India, and as sellers or the dealers, they extract more money from the consumers. So India suffers in two ways. She has to pay more for the tea and also loses her legitimate share of the duty. Even the little tax that the planters are asked to pay they want to avoid paying now. And the Indian planters who are not very rich and who came into the field only during the last 25 years or so and who started mostly by purchasing gardens from Britishers which had almost become unfit for cultivation, they are in a deplorable condition. These are points which I would earnestly request the House and the Government to take into consideration.

Another aspect of the question is that while the British planters themselves are trying to make as much profit as they can from these countries through the Tea Agreement, they want to force down the area of cultivation here and they are starting plantations in South Africa where because of the Government that is ruling there, they think they can exploit African labour to the same extent that they were doing till a few years back here in India. They could

reap huge profits by limiting the area in this country and by limiting the export from this country. They want to supplement by starting plantations in East Africa. They have come into this International Tea Agreement to limit export of Indian tea and limit Indian Tea plantations but keep the African supply free for foreign market. Sir, these things must be taken into consideration. This amendment is really not going to improve matters. By amending the clause relating to the constitution of the Indian Tea Licensing Committee what does the Government want to do? The Committee, the Indian Tea Licensing Committee, had existed for the last so many years and now the Government wants to prescribe a period for which the Committee should remain and after which it would be reconstituted. The prescribed period depends upon the will of the Government and Government might change. It may be for five years, ten years or fifteen years. I do not think much improvement could be done by these amendments to the Bill and that is why I don't support this Bill.

SHRI B. P. AGARWAL (West Bengal) : Sir, I have to make a little submission before the hon. Minister replies.

Sir, when these Bills and measures are circulated to the Members of this House, very little time is left between the circulation and consideration of the measures in this House. They concern many vital interests, many important interests of trade and industry. I think, Sir, it will be better if such measures, as soon as they are introduced in the Lower House, are also circulated to the Members of this House so that they may be in a position to consult their constituents and get their advice. This Bill consists of many important things and it has not been possible for Members to consult their constituents. It is very difficult for the Members. The other day also some Members expressed the same view in this matter and I think, Sir, if the solution of mine is accepted, it would lead. ....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is the Bill as passed by the House of the People.

SHRI B. P. AGARWAL : Before that even if it could be circulated in the Bill stage, it would be helpful.

[ SHRI H. D. RAJAH : At least, there must be some time lag between the introduction of the Bill and the starting of discussion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : These things are circulated immediately they are received from the Lower House. This particular Bill was circulated on the 17th.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar) : What do you mean by 4 days ? You cannot go to your constituency within four days.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, may I ask for two assurances from the Minister ? One is that no British national shall be eligible for election or nomination to the Indian Tea Licensing Committee and the other is that representatives of the plantation labour will be included in these Tea Licensing Committees. These two very constructive suggestions, I hope, would receive his consideration.

SHRI M. MANJURAN (Travancore-Cochin) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, as mentioned from this side these amendments although supposed to be innocent are not so. This Act originally came into force in 1938 when the British were in power in this country. Tea is a commodity that is mainly used by every man from the lowest member of the working class to the highest in this country and this amendment wants to restrict the production of a commodity that is in so much general use. Ordinarily, the kind of dust that Mr. Rajah was mentioning, used to cost 5 annas per pound before the war. It is now costing over Rs. 2. We are speaking of the increase in the living cost and tea is a thing which is consumed by the working class people to a great extent. What is restriction on

tea cultivation going to do for them? This is an international agreement which is concerned with international factors, but what about national considerations ? This question should have priority in a place where the cost of living has increased and the real wage obtained by the working class is being reduced from day to day. The price of tea has increased from 5 annas a pound before the war to about Rs. 3 and sometimes even more. National interest had never been our consideration while going into international obligations. This has resulted in imperialism parading in this land in the guise of internationalism. Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it has been said "It is now considered necessary for the purpose of ensuring strict observance of our obligations under the International Tea Agreement....." Well, Sir, how many Nations come into this agreement ? 'International' is a big word. The countries participating could have been specified by the hon. Minister ; he should also have given an idea to us as to the limited sphere in which it operates. This agreement is not international but is confined to a few nations—as my hon. friend on this side said a few colonial countries and a few imperialist countries. Imperialism wants to ride roughshod over us with the same strangulations they had adopted earlier, by controlling our production. That is, what this amendment is finally going to get for us. We have entered into an international agreement for suffocating our people, for suffocating our production. While it is being made out that more and more production is the only salvation for this land, where are we going by restricting production ? It is against every canon of a deficit country. We are not producing anything more than is required and of all things tea the least. When a working class man has to pay about Rs. 3 for a pound of tea for which he was paying annas five before the war, why should we restrict the production of tea now ? It only leads to the perpetuation of the monopoly of over 80 per cent. of the tea interests that is today in the hands of British Imperialists



in this land. It is a camouflage for the British people still remaining here with their hands very tight on our necks. It is the Congressmen and it is the hon. Members on the other side who have always been claiming to have fought the British. But here is the British man in disguise, but you would not fight against him now. This is going to restrict production. It is against our national interests; it is against everything that we consider sacred for the people of this country. Apart from the big people, it affects the working class; it affects the common man. In fact this restriction on the production of tea—a commodity whose price has increased about 10-12 times in the course of ten years—affects every individual in this land. This is not going to be of any benefit to this nation; on the contrary it is going to be of considerable advantage to the Britishers whom we have been fighting all along and whom we now find coiling in this country with hidden motives and methods of operation which I am not able to find out and expose clearly. But I think the Commerce Minister himself will be able to tell us because of his long association with British firms. The original Bill came up in 1938 and now in 1952 when we are supposed to be independent we are being called upon to approve the restrictions. This is going to strangle our financial interests and the interests of the common man, especially of the working class man who has been groaning under the increasing prices. This amendment particularly with regard to the restriction on tea production in this country is against the interests of this nation. And as has been very reasonably suggested, this amending Bill should have been brought before the Members of this Council and the House of the People after opinion from the legislatures of the States which will be affected by this Bill, had been elicited. It is just taking us by surprise. Here is a Bill—a very nice one, a small one, innocent one, and then you ask us to vote for it. We know even Congress members will not vote for it if they know the deep implications, if they know that the British

people are going to strangle our production. When our national interests are involved, international obligations should be nothing for us, because the interests of our nation, the interests of our people should be greater than everything else and if we cannot maintain that, there is no use of all these Acts and Bills and Amendments. It is all mere farce. So we want to know what definite advantage is going to be derived by this restriction on tea production, whether it will not perpetuate the monopoly of the Britishers, whether the common man is not going to be affected by this restriction of production, because tea is a commodity which goes into his daily life. So, Sir, if sufficient time is given for the consideration of all these aspects, even Congressmen will oppose it tooth and nail because it is against the interests of every man in this land. So I oppose this amendment.

12 noon.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH :

خواجہ عنایت اللہ : ڈپٹی چہر میں

صاحب - اس چہوتے سے بل پر ایویشن ممبرس نے اتنا شور مچایا کہ مجھے مجبوراً ان کے جواب کے لئے چلند ملت اس ہاؤس کے ضائع کرنے پڑ رہے ہیں -

اس بل کے متعلق کہا جانا ہے کہ انڈین ٹی پلانٹرس (Indian tea planters) اور ٹی انڈسٹری (Tea Industry) کو اس سے کوئی فائدہ نہیں پہنچ رہا ہے - یہ بل بیکار ہے اور اس سے ہلدوستانی چائے پیدا کرنے والوں کو کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہوگا - مجھے تعجب ہوتا ہے - جو لائسنسنگ کمیٹی (licensing committee) کے وقت بلی تھی اس کی شہنشاہیت کو ختم کہا جا رہا ہے - وہ کمیٹی جس کی عمر اس بل

[Khwaja Inait Ullah.]

کے آخر تک انگریزوں نے مقرر کر دی تھی یعنی جس پر ہمیشگی کو ایک مہر لگا دی تھی اس شہنشاہیت کو ہم اس قانون کے ذریعہ ختم کر رہے ہیں اور ہم اب یہ پاس کر رہے ہیں کہ وہ کمیٹی جو انگریز پسنڈ لوگوں نے بنائی تھی اب اسے ہم ختم کر رہے ہیں اور اس کے لئے ایک قانون بنا رہے ہیں۔ جب ہم اس شہنشاہیت کو ختم کر رہے ہیں تو اس بل کی مذمت کرنا اور یہ کہنا کہ یہ بل کچھ نہیں کر رہا ہے ٹھیک نہیں ہے اور مجھے اس پر تعجب ہوتا ہے۔ ایک کمیٹی جو انگریزوں نے ہمیشہ ہمیشہ کے لئے بنائی اس کو ہم ختم کر رہے ہیں۔ آج ہمیں ہوش آیا ہے۔ ہمیں سوچا ملا ہے۔ ہمیں ہندوستانوں کو فائدہ پہنچانے کا خیال آیا ہے اور ہماری گورنمنٹ نے اس کمیٹی کو ختم کیا اور اسے ختم کرنے کے بعد کمیٹی کے لئے نو مینیشن اور الیکشن (nomination and election) رکھا ہے اور ہمیشہ ہمیشہ کے لئے نہیں بلکہ وہ بدلتا رہے گا۔

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore) :

श्री सी० जी० के मे (सुर) रेड्डी : खत्म तो नहीं किया ?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH

خواجہ عنایت اللہ : آپ کا مطلب

اس سے ہے۔

“shall hold office for such period as may be prescribed”

یہ بات ضرور ہے کہ جو ہلدستان میں تھی پلانٹرس (tea planters) میں ان میں میجاریٹی (majority)

انگریزوں کی ہے اور جو کمیٹی میمدرس آئیں گے ان میں شاید ان ہی کی میجاریٹی آئے لیکن اس سے ڈرنے کی کیا بات ہے؟ اس میں ہے Members “nominated or elected” تو شاید انگریز تو نامزد نہیں کریں گے نامینیشن تو ہماری گورنمنٹ کرے گی۔

مسٹر راجہ نے ایک بات کہی ہے جسے کہ مہرا دل بھی مانتا ہے کہ اس بل میں یہ ہے “For such period as may be prescribed” گورنمنٹ کو ایسی باتوں کو ذرا صاف کر دینا چاہیئے۔ پہلے “for ever” تھا اور یہاں اس پیریڈ (period) کا وقت بھی نہیں معلوم ہے۔ اس لئے میں اپنے آنریبل منسٹر سے درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ ہاؤس کو بتائیں کہ “For such period as may be prescribed” میں کیا ہم لوگ اس سیشن کا پورا زمانہ سمجھ لوں یا آنے والی پارلیمنٹ تک کا زمانہ سمجھوں یا جسے اور کمیٹیاں سال دو سال کے بعد جیسی حالت ہوتی ہے اسی حالت کے ساتھ بدلتی رہتی ہیں اسی طرح یہ کمیٹی بھی بدلے گی اور نئی کمیٹی بنے گی۔ میں مسٹر راجہ کے اس ساجیشن (suggestion) کے ساتھ ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ کو پارلیمنٹ کو ان چیزوں کے متعلق اطلاع دینی چاہیئے اور بتا دینا چاہیئے یہ بہت اچھی بات ہے کہ آپ ہمیشہ ہمیشہ والی کمیٹی کو ختم کر رہے ہیں اور ایک نئی کمیٹی بنائیں گے لیکن اس

کہتی کی بھی کچھ مدت ہونی چاہئے -  
 میں ان دوستوں سے جو سمجھے رہے ہیں  
 کہ اس بل میں کچھ نہیں کہا گیا ہے  
 ان سے کہوں گا کہ وہ لوگ ہر کام کو اسی  
 طرح کرنا چاہتے ہیں جس طرح سے میں نے  
 الہدین کے چارج کا قصہ پورا کیا تھا کہ فوراً  
 ایک لیٹمپ رکڑا اور محل بن گیا -  
 ہندوستان ایک بڑا ملک ہے - اسے ابھی  
 آزادی ملی ہے اور ہم ہر چیز کو آہستہ  
 آہستہ اور ترتیب کے ساتھ ٹھیک کر رہے  
 ہیں جو کام بھی ہم سانسے وار اور ترتیب  
 کے ساتھ کریں گے وہی ٹھیک اور پکا ہوگا  
 اور اگر ہم بزنس سوچے سمجھے ایک دم سے  
 کسی کام کو کریں گے تو وہ پورا نہیں ہوگا -  
 شاید پرانے زمانے کے قصے اور کہانیوں میں  
 ایسا ممکن تھا لیکن آج کل کے زمانہ میں  
 تو ہر کام کو بلحاظ سے شروع کرنا ہوگا اور  
 تہی عمارت بنے گی - میرا خیال ہے کہ  
 ٹی پلانٹیشن (tea plantation) کی  
 ترقی کے لئے یہ املڈمنٹ (amendment)  
 ہماری پہلی اپنٹ ہے اور اسی بنیاد پر  
 ہم ایک اچھا محل بنائیں گے - جتنی  
 شکایتیں ہمارے دوستوں کو ہیں کہ انگریز  
 یہاں بہت ہیں، ورکرس کو پھسے نہیں  
 ملتا اور چائے اچھی نہیں ملتی - یہ سب  
 باتیں آہستہ آہستہ ٹھیک ہو جائیں گی  
 اور جیسے ہم اور سب کام ترتیب وار کرتے  
 جا رہے ہیں اسی طرح اس کو بھی کریں  
 گے اور یہ املڈمنٹ اس ترتیب کی پہلی  
 اپنٹ ہے - ہمیں امدد ہے کہ یہ سب  
 چیزیں آگے بڑھتی جائیں گی اور اس امدد  
 کے ساتھ اتنی درخواست بھی انریبل منسٹر  
 سے ہے کہ "For such period as may be prescribed"  
 "be prescribed" کے متعلق بھی کچھ  
 روشنی ڈالیں گے -

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI :  
 Mr. Deputy Chairman, I thought when  
 the first speech started with the hon.  
 Member opposite, Shri S. N. Mazumdar,  
 I had practically heard from him  
 all that could be said on this subject.  
 It may be, politically, the hon. Member  
 and I do not see eye to eye, but speaking  
 from a purely personal point of  
 view—not as Minister for Commerce  
 and Industry—I cannot say that I did  
 not agree with what he said, and I can  
 tell him that my mind worked much  
 the same way. I thought having  
 struck that note, other hon. Members  
 of this House would have accepted his  
 lead in the matter and not said anything  
 more. I quite agree that the position  
 of the tea industry today is such that  
 our own interests—Indian interests—  
 have to be considered in the light of  
 the existing circumstances. I am aware  
 of the fact that while India, Pakistan,  
 Ceylon and Indonesia were originally  
 parties to the agreement, they have  
 started this industry in those countries,  
 and if they proceed apace, well, the  
 whole question will have to be reviewed  
 from that point of view. I quite  
 concede that we have a preponderance  
 of foreign interests in this trade and we  
 must examine the position to see how  
 far those interests are affecting our  
 economy as a whole and the future of  
 our tea industry. These are matters  
 which I think my hon. friend Shri  
 Mazumdar very pertinently pointed  
 out, and if that had been the only  
 speech made, I could have given him  
 the assurance that I shall go into this  
 question as to which is the appropriate  
 agency to make the investigation and  
 thereafter enable the Government to  
 review the position. He was also right  
 in pointing out that while we are tak-  
 ing powers to reconstitute the Licensing  
 Committee, the character of the Com-  
 mittee would remain much the same,  
 because the character of the Committee  
 as envisaged in section 3 of the original  
 Act still remains. That also is a matter  
 which will have to be considered.  
 After all, the Tea Licensing Committee  
 is not so important as the Tea Control  
 Board, for which there is another  
 Act. I do not want to take the time of  
 the House over what is comparatively

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

not a very big issue at the moment. The issues that were raised relate to the original proposition, not to this amendment. I am unable to give the assurances that my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wants us to give. Those assurances look very simple, but I am certain by this simple proposition he wants me to put a noose round my neck and give it over to him. I say : "No ; nothing doing. We are not quite so innocent as all that." But I do appreciate, and I say it once again, the very pertinent remarks that were made by an hon. Member who knows the tea trade, as I am informed. His approach is one which I can appreciate, and I am trying as far as possible to see that views like his, which are expressed not because he belongs to any political party but because he is an Indian, can be accommodated to the extent that it is possible for us to do.

Sir, I quite agree that the Tea Agreement, in the light of the present contest, may not be quite as favourable to India as it once had been. I cannot accept the proposition of my hon. friend from Malabar that we can consume all the tea that we produce. We cannot. We have to export it. And, Sir, the countries that import tea from us form a valuable link in the tea industry. It may be that some things that they do may not be favourable to us. If they withdraw subsidies, it might affect us. But it does not always mean that they will do something purely to affect us : it may be due to their own economic position. These are all factors which one has to investigate. Now, Sir, **we are n**ot in the same position as the Government of India were in 1938. We are an independent Government. Notwithstanding all the volumes of rhetoric and eloquence, reasonable and unreasonable, rational and irrational, relevant and irrelevant, that came from the Opposition, we are an independent Government who can choose our own method of improving our tea industry. At the same time it does not mean that all of a sudden one can go and break an international agreement. We cannot do anything of the kind. We have got to find out

how we can bring about a revision of the agreement, and, if revision is not possible, how we can give notice to the parties that we propose to go out of the agreement. We must examine all these questions also with a view to seeing how they will affect our economy. I can only assure the House that the matter will be considered by us. My hon. colleague the Finance Minister has received several representations recently, some of them in relation to reduction of exports, and some of them with regard to the general condition of the tea industry. I have received a lot of representations. It is a matter which we should sit down and consider. But at the moment we want to reconstitute the Tea Licensing Committee. My friend asked what the period would be. We have said, "such period as may be prescribed." There has been criticism on the floor of this House and in the other House as well that the position of the Tea Licensing Board is not satisfactory, and we will prescribe only the minimum period. We cannot hold elections every six months. It will certainly take a year or more to find out exactly where we stand. Quite possibly we will make it an annual election until such time as we amend the Act ourselves.

With regard to section 26, there was hardly any need for this ado, because, as I said, that is the existing practice which we seek to legalise, because we do not want to break the agreement so long as we are party to it. When we do not want to be party to it, we will tell them : "We are going out of it." I do not think there is any departure from existing practice. Nor is it a question of putting another rope round our necks and giving it over to British imperialism, which seems to be a hobgoblin for many people in our country even now. The British have gone, and gone for good.

I would again say that excepting the point made by one speaker who appreciated the position, the remarks of the other hon. Members have no relevancy to this Bill. This Bill by itself would make the existing position no worse ;

it may make it better. But by restoring the old position I am not making any concession as regards representation so as to alter the complexion of the Licensing Committee. For that, I may have to come with an amendment of a much wider character.

Sir, I move.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR : Why not defer this Bill ?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : It does not suit us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tea Control Act, 1938, as passed by the House of the people, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted,

Clauses 2, 3, 4 and 1 and the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI : Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

That the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

### THE RUBBER (PRODUCTION AND MARKETING) AMENDMENT BILL, 1952

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

That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

Sir, this is a very simple measure. This is in response to a demand from the Madras Government that instead of one member of the Rubber Board which the Madras Government now nominates, they want the representation to be increased to two. And in

20CSD

framing the amendment the Government of India have taken care to see that one of the two shall be a non-official. There is nothing behind this. It is a very simple measure, and it is brought merely because the Madras Government felt that they would like to have more than one member there and the Government of India felt that it was reasonable.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

That the Bill further to amend the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

BABU GOPINATH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) :

बाबू गोपीनाथ सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में मुझे कुछ निवेदन करना है। प्रिंसिपल एक्ट (principal Act) के सेक्शन चार की ओर मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस बिल में जब आप इंडियन रबर बोर्ड (Indian Rubber Board) के संगठन के सम्बन्ध में विचार करेंगे तो आप देखेंगे कि वहाँ १४ प्रतिनिधि पूंजीपति वर्ग के हैं, सरकार के ९ प्रतिनिधि हैं और श्रम वर्ग के केवल ३ ही प्रतिनिधि हैं। अर्थात् जब कि इस में १४ प्रतिनिधि मालिकों के हैं, तो केवल ३ प्रतिनिधि मजदूरों के हैं। पूंजी वर्ग के लोग इस बोर्ड में भाति भाति रूप में आते हैं। कहीं से यह प्रोड्यूसर्स (producers) के नाम से आते हैं, कहीं से ग्रोअर्स (growers) के नाम से आते हैं, कहीं प्लान्टर्स (planters), एक स्थान से यूनाइटेड प्लान्टर्स के नाम से और कहीं मैनयूफैक्चर्स (manufactures) के नाम से आते हैं। फिर कहीं डीलर्स (dealers) के नाम से आते हैं और कहीं प्रोड्यूसिंग इंडस्ट्री (producing industry) के नाम से आते हैं।