

tampered with, but if we read the provisions of clause 6, we will find that that system has been retained with certain limitations.

Properly speaking, this Bill must again be referred to the country for eliciting public opinion. We have now interfered with one provision of law, and I am quite certain that we are not being fair in dealing with this aspect of the law without giving a proper chance to the people to give expression to their opinions.

As it is, we find in clause 6 that the daughter is given equal share with the brother. This is a commendable provision indeed. But we have to have certain assumption to give this equal right to the daughter. Just as in the case of the Estate Duty Bill, we have to assume for all practical purposes that a particular man's property was carved out as though a partition took place just before his death, for the purpose of giving a certain share in that property to the State, so also here as though the man was divided from the joint family property, we have to take his share into consideration. I can understand that for the purpose of taxation, we have to assume several things, but so far as a question of law is concerned, to assume certain things in this way is not proper. I would say that we have to adopt some other feasible method by which we can still give an equal share to the daughter without infringing any of these provisions.

In the Minutes of Dissent, which I have gone through, I find some illustrations have been given by some hon. Members of the Joint Committee. According to these, an undivided son who happens to continue to stay with the father till his death gets much less than what he is entitled to, because the daughter sometimes gets more share and the divided son gets an extra share but the man who continues to live with him—with the father—till his death, gets much less than what he is entitled to. Somehow or other this anomalous position will have to be rectified. We should adopt some course by redrafting the entire provisions in clause 6 of this Bill with this end in view.

So far as the hon. Members who had appended Minutes of Dissent were concerned, they were not in a position to suggest a plausible, if not a workable, formula by which this object could be

achieved, without making any discrimination between the divided son, undivided son or the daughter. In the absence of any such method, the present method might, in all probability, be adopted; until and unless during the course of the clause by clause consideration, some amendment is made by which we could achieve this object, the present method might be adopted with this exception that the undivided sons should in all probability get share equal to those of the other brothers.

Then I come to the question of the limited estate of the widows who have been given certain rights in a retrospective way. Today, some of the widows are having a limited interest, but after the passing of this Bill, the limited estate will turn into an estate where they will have an absolute right.

Mr. Chairman: It is 5-30 P.M. now. The hon. Member might continue tomorrow. We will take up the next item of business.

CEMENT

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed the half-an-hour discussion on points arising out of answer given on the 10th April 1956 to Starred Question No. 1303 regarding cement, I would like to say that some hon. Members are very desirous of taking part in this discussion. The signatories to the notice given by Shri V. P. Nayar, are Shri Kamath and Dr. Rama Rao; then the further names are Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri Nambiar and Shri Bansal. I would propose that if Shri Nayar takes 10 minutes and at least 10 minutes are given to the hon. Minister, these signatories may take two minutes each and thus we will be able to arrive workable proposition. I do not know what time the hon. Minister would require.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): It can be done even in 3 minutes; it all depends upon what information the hon. Members want. As far as I am concerned, I can finish in any time you give me.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): I would suggest we resort to the old procedure that questions may be put before the Minister replies to the discussion.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to adopt that procedure. First of all, Shri Nayar will either put questions or make a short statement as he likes and the other Members, who have joined in the notice, will

[Mr. Chairman]

put questions and only after that I will request the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): I am raising this discussion to focus the attention of this House on certain matters relating to the cement industry at present. The discussion has become all the more important, in view of the Prime Minister's statement on industrial policy this morning, in which I find that the cement industry is not included even in the second schedule, detailing the spheres of activity wherein Government is supposed to take more and more progressive control.

Our progress in the second Five Year Plan will very much depend upon the availability of cement at the proper time and at proper prices. Today, as you find, Sir, there is a far shorter supply than what is demanded by the projects and therefore a prosperous black market. It is said that the target of the first Five Year Plan is almost fulfilled, and that the installed capacity of the industry is being worked up to the full. That is, probably, the reason why Government think that the private sector has behaved very well, and, there is, therefore, no case for nationalising the industry or even for Government stepping into the industry by opening up new factories.

The cement industry is very vital to construction and the progress of the Plan and to leave it to the private sector is not merely regrettable or lamentable but it is unpardonable. What do we find in the cement industry? There were 23 or 24 factories . . .

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Twenty-seven.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am referring to the time when the Tariff Commission made an enquiry. At that time, out of 23 factories, you find that 11 factories were controlled by single body, the Associated Cement Company, which has really built up a Cement Empire in India. Besides these 11 companies which they bought up the Patiala Cement Company and they have also control of distribution of 75 per cent. of the cement produced in India through their subsidiary, of which they hold the entire shares, the Cement Marketing Co. of India.

Let us hear it from the horse's own mouth. This is what Dr. Hattiangadi, one of the chief executives of the ACC says. I am reading from page 93—Nov. Supplement of the *Journal of Industry and*

Trade issued by the Commerce and Industry Department of the Government of India.

"The total production potential of all the companies put together is 45 lakh tons annually—of which the A.C.C.'s potential is, roughly 26 lakh tons."

Not less than 55 per cent. is controlled by this company.

Apart from that, I give here some figures of the profits which the A.C.C. has made. I think, it is time that Government steps in. I find that while the A.C.C. has a paid-up-capital of Rs. 12.67 crores, their gross profits in 1947, was Rs. 86.96 lakhs, in 1954, it jumped up to Rs. 2.57 crores. If we take the net profits, in 1947, they had only Rs. 33 lakhs; in 1952, it was Rs. 1.16 crores, in 1953, Rs. 1.19 crores in 1954, it was Rs. 1.34 crores. I am taking it from the Investors' India Year Book of 1955, which, I suppose the hon. Minister will not contradict. I am unable to give further figures because the Commerce Ministry and the Finance Ministry, whom I contacted several times yesterday and today, could not provide me with 1955 figures. This is the sort of control which has grown, and Government say, by the end of the next five years, we will have 16 or 17 factories more. I am reliably informed that out of the 16 or 17 permits given for starting new factories, 4 or 5 will again go to the A.C.C. Cement is such a vital necessity for dam projects and other works of construction and many of our State Government works and Central Government works are often held up for want of cement.

As is usual, the Tariff Commission makes an enquiry with the so-called experts and after the enquiry is made, they report that the price which is now allowed is not proper but they must be given some more prices. The price which is now allowed to these companies is high, of course, and 5 or 6 high-cost manufacturing units have been given special rates. But what is the cement price today? It was Rs. 84 or Rs. 85 in 1947 and 1949, f.o.r. destination, packing and everything inclusive. Today the price is more than that. Although Government may say that it is only Rs. 71 or Rs. 75 actually the consumer has to pay more; there is the excise duty of Rs. 5; in this quarter, a sum of Rs. 13-4-0 or Rs. 13-8-0 has been allowed as the packing charges. So, what we find today is

that as the cement industry makes more and more profits, as the industrial capacity is worked more and more and as the production of cement has recorded an increase, the price of cement also goes up. Correspondingly, is there a uniform policy for the deal which they give to the labour?

If the Commerce and Industry Ministry does not have any figures, I am giving the figures from the Labour Ministry bulletins. I find a very appalling state of affairs prevailing among the labour engaged in the cement industry. Their actual wages vary from—I am sorry I am rushing through—about Rs. 35 at Bhadravati to Rs. 62 and 65. On the one hand, the Tariff Commission says that the Associated Cement Company and the Digvijay Cement Company, with which my hon. friend, Shri G. D. Somani, who unfortunately is not here, is connected, must necessarily have such and such a price.

I was surprised to read in the Tariff Commission's Report that not merely did they recommend a price on current expenses but they also said that for future rehabilitation and future investments on enlargement of the capacity for production, the Government have to allow for the price being charged by the present manufacturers. But the Government have hit the future deal, and I am glad that they did not allow that recommendation to be taken advantage of by the manufacturer. On the one hand, the Tariff Commission says that in view of the difficulty of manufacturing cement and in view of the country's demand, the private capitalists have to be encouraged. They have a ceiling on the price. What is the distribution arrangements? Why is it not possible for the Government to take over the distribution of cement, cement being such a vital requirement for almost every work on the construction side. This is an industry on which 35,000 people depend directly. If you take into account the number of persons who are indirectly employed by this industry, the overall employment potential of the cement industry is something which we do not know. Actually, according to my computation and calculation, it roughly works out that 1 per cent of the national income must be attributed to the cement industry. It is not a small industry, which can be kept out from State control. If the private industry had behaved well, I would have certainly not argued for

some more control at this time. What I find from the Tariff Commission's Report is that Government was very keen, or rather the Tariff Commission was very keen on assuring a minimum price. What have they done after that? Any man with any sense in his cranium would have understood that we are following the First Five Year Plan with a Second Five Year Plan and that during the Second Five Year Plan we will step up our construction and production, for which cement will be very essential.

Why is it that the cement magnates did not start to make the country self-sufficient? They wanted to keep supplies insufficient. Government had to force them and had to ask them to do this. Now they say that the target is 11 million tons. In this morning's paper I found that my hon. friend, Shri Krishnamachari, is trying to impress upon the Planning Commission that the target of 11 million tons fixed is rather too low and that we should have 13 or 14 million tons. I wish him well. But along with this, the Hindustan Times publishes the news, which disturbs me very much—they almost forestalled the Minister's answer to this discussion—and they stated that in all probability the cement price will be increased further by Rs. 10 or Rs. 20. Something like that I found and it disturbs me to find that in regard to such an industry which, I need not repeat, everyone of us knows as vital for the national construction, Government is still fighting shy. The manufacturing aspect alone has been considered. The labour aspect has been completely neglected, ignored. There is no uniform wage structure. Dearness allowance, bonus, all these vary from place to place. I cannot understand why it should be so. There is a uniform price for cement regardless of the manufacturing cost. Only five units are exempted. One factory pays one-fourth, another one-sixth and yet another one-eighth and the Digvijay company of Shri G. D. Somani paid only one-twelfth in 1952 as bonus. Why not have a uniform policy. Does this uniformity apply only to capital? Does it not apply to the miserable conditions of the workers in the cement industry? There have been struggles about this. In the factory at Kottayam, which is given a special price of an additional Rs. 12/- above the ceiling, there have been glorious struggles after struggles. But none of these will be conceded by the cement industry.

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

I want to put some questions and I would request him to give some answers. When we have achieved the target of eleven or twelve million tons fixed in the Second Plan, what is to be the precise share of the Associated Cement Company? What is to be the share of the Dalmia group of companies? They are having pincer hold or an octopus grip on the cement industry—these two companies. Are we going to allow this monopolistic hold to continue? Should we do so especially when we are in the path of a socialist society about which the opposite side talks always these days.

How many mills will spring up, if at all, in the public sector which Government may contemplate? I think the Government will have to revise its policy in respect of the cement industry very soon. Why should the Government give sanction for these companies? We know that, for several years, they have been taking undue advantage. Why is it not possible for the Government to bring down the prices? There is no case that the raw materials cost more suddenly or that the wage bills have shot up. They have reaped huge profits. I have got the *Investors' Encyclopaedia* here and I find from that that there is no cement company which runs at a loss. Shri Somani's company has made a profit of about Rs. 10 lakhs last year.

I would also ask whether it is not time for the Government to make cement available at cheaper rates to the common man by some sort of controlled distribution instead of leaving it to the freedom and caprice of a particular company. When they provide for a uniform price, should they not adopt a uniform policy about the wages of workers, dearness allowance, housing facilities, etc.? In Andhra only sixteen per cent of the workers are provided with housing facilities by the company; in other places the percentage ranges from fifty to sixty. We are not satisfied even with that. This is one of the points on which I would like the hon. Minister to give a categorical answer. I am sorry that I had to rush through and yet could not finish all important points.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I am glad that the Commerce and Industry Ministry does not disclose any complacency at all in this matter. The replies given on the floor of the House as well as the speech of the hon. Minister in answer to the past discussions, indicate the same attitude. The problem has to be viewed from two aspects—the long-term and the

short-term aspects. The situation has to be met on a long range basis so that the present shortage may not repeat after the period of the Second Plan. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us as to how far he has succeeded in inducing the Planning Commission to accept his target. It is freely stated that the target that the Commerce and Industry Ministry has in view is sixteen million tons. I would also like to know whether the Government would follow a policy of liberal licensing without putting restrictions such as economic marketing, zone etc. in the matter of granting sanction for setting up new factories.

I would also like to know why, as has been stated by Shri V. P. Nayar, 'cement', which has been included in the 1948 resolution as one of the items for central regulation and control, has been omitted from Schedule B, in the new Industrial Policy statement, although some other items included in that list such as fertilisers and machine tools, are seen in Category B. I would like to know whether the Government will step in, in case the target is not possible to be achieved by the private sector.

Another aspect on which I would like to be enlightened is this. According to reports, 44 units would be there by about 1960-61, but in some of the States the position would be stationary. The position in 1950-51 is still continuing as regards Travancore-Cochin. There is only one unit there. Even in 1961, according to the present estimate, there would be only one unit in Travancore-Cochin. I would like to know whether there is any scope for expansion in that State.

With regard to the short-term remedies, I would like to be enlightened on the point as to how much quantity of cement Government intends to import immediately. I would also like to know, which would be the distribution machinery for that cement.

Then again, I would like to know whether there will be any pool-price, because the imported prices will be much higher than the production price in India.

It may also be indicated as to whether there will be any stricter supervision with regard to the allotment and disposal. Although we are in short-supply and although there are complaints that cement is not available, plenty of cement is available in the black-market. One reason for that, according to me, is that proper

supervision is not maintained with regard to the disposal of stocks allotted for each category of work. For example, for all government works a separate quota will be given. I am told that these days contractors take up sometimes works after bidding very low. When they are asked as to how they bid so low, they say: "We can make it up in cement". 'Cementil kandukolam' is what is generally stated by contractors in our place. Therefore, I would like to know whether proper supervision will be maintained in the matter of disposal of stocks in the various categories and whether cement at economic prices would be available for the consumers. I would like the House to be enlightened on these aspects.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very healthy sign that the demand for many things in the country, including that for cement, is increasing very fast. Arising out of that, I would like to know from the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry, the views of Government on the following points.

Sir, our present capacity is about 4.7 million tons. It has been reported that the Minister is impressing upon the Planning Commission to raise the capacity to 16 million tons by the end of the Second Five Year Plan. I want to know, the manner in which he has planned to develop this increased capacity of 12 million tons within the course of five years and whether any sizable applications have already come which give hope to the hon. Minister that this big target will be reached?

Then, it is reported that our transport will not be adequate to the task. It is said that even if we produce all this cement, our transport will not be able to carry it to the consuming centres. May I know if the Ministry has been giving any thought to the question of regional distribution of the new factories that will be set up so that the strain on the transport system may be less and, for that purpose, have any investigations been made as to the sites where lime-stone is available near or in the States where consumption of cement is the highest at present? If that is so, may I know whether a scheme for regional distribution of the new factories has been prepared?

My friend Shri Thomas asked about pool-price. I also have the same question to ask of the Commerce and Industry Minister. I would like to know if he is

having any scheme of differential prices in view under which, if a pool-price is adopted, the Government will be charged a lower price and the private consumer will be charged a higher price?

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareilly Distt.—East): We must know the black-market prices also.

Shri Bansal: I have only one more question. In view of this increasing consumption of cement and the shortfall which is bound to be there, has Government given thought to the revival of our age-old industry that is pursued in the villages? In our villages people use lime kankars and turn them into slaked lime. That used to meet a lot of local demand and I remember that in my village our own house was built out of the indigenous lime and it used to be so strong that although the rafters of our roof were burnt down while a burglary took place, the roof itself stands there as it was ten years ago. So, I would like to know from the Minister whether any thought is being given, for the interim period, to tide over this difficulty and to develop this local indigenous industry.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I might tell you that when cement is mixed with sand and concrete and water, certain chemical action takes place—

Shri V. P. Nayyar: Then only it becomes concrete.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:—and perhaps more heat is generated. You have to pour water in order to see that the mixture sets. My friend on the opposite side is capable of generating heat without any such external aids. I was expecting that my hon. friend would be taking Government to task for what might be called the present maldistribution of cement and the high prices that are charged, etc. But my hon. friend always goes to fundamentals. So, he went to the fundamentals in regard to the manufacture, labour cost, location, ownership and all that sort of thing which must be a different subject altogether.

The only thing is that he is very disappointed about the industrial policy statement and feels that it had not given any indication of nationalisation of cement. There is nothing, as the Prime Minister put it, to prevent us from starting cement factories during the next five years or even thereafter. But it is not one

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]
of the industries where we are giving high priority for Governmental interference.

Several questions were asked and I will make an attempt to answer them within the short period at my disposal. One fact that was mentioned was about the question of shortages. I support some hon. Members asked why we have faced suddenly this shortage and why nothing was done by Government to prevent it. I have got here a table showing the demands from industry, Government and from all people who consume cement, over a period of years, quarter by quarter. I do not think I need weary the House by taking it through all these years. In regard to the demand for cement during the third quarter of 1955—it is fairly near—the demand was 580,000 tons per month. That takes you to a little over 6 million tons a year. That was a time when we had more or less completed our target of somewhere about 10 million tons production, and 12 million as capacity. In the first quarter of the current year, the demand rose to 830,000 tons per month. That takes you to about 10 million tons a year. In the second quarter it is 901,000 tons. So, the demand has occurred with such rapidity that it is almost impossible for us to take note of this demand and provide against it. After all, it takes about 18 months to two years even to expand a cement factory.

In this connection, I would like to tell the House that in August, 1954, when I mentioned that our target for steel production should be 6 million tons and our target for cement production should be in the region of 10 million tons, many people in this country thought I was as usual being extremely rash. The only trouble today is that we are thinking in terms of a target of 16 million tons of cement. I feel that our target of 16 million tons will not be adequate at the end of the Plan period. In an expanding economy, however wise you might attempt to be and however bold you might be, the demand overtakes any provision that you make.

In regard to the future, as the hon. Member seems to know, we have already licensed a number of units which in the aggregate is expected to have a capacity of 12.1 million tons by the end of the Plan period. But, capacity is not always what is produced; there might be a little short-fall. Today the production has touched the 5 million mark and I expect by the first quarter of 1957, i.e. about

this time next year, we shall be able to produce about 7½ million tons of cement and within 9 to 10 months, we would probably reach the 9 million mark. So, there is a possibility of our augmenting our present supplies by about 4 million tons in about two years, or rather, in 1 year and 9 months from now. That is the best that we can possibly do in the circumstances.

The hon. Member asked whether the Planning Commission has decided to raise the target to 16 million tons. The discussions are going on. It is not that the Planning Commission is averse to raising the target; the real trouble is whether we will be able to carry the cement that is made and also the raw materials that are necessary for the factories. Here the railways come in. The point raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Bansal, in this connection is relevant. Yes, we have already looked into this problem from a regional point of view so as to ensure supplies quickly and also to minimise the railway movement and cross-movement. We are examining the matter further in order to see how best we can make it more efficient. But, regionalisation is not possible always, because the availability of limestone and coal does not always coincide with the demand in that region. We generally take the availability of limestone as the main factor and allow cement factories to be established where limestone is available, providing for the carrying of coal and also for the carrying of the finished material.

In this connection, Mr. Thomas has raised the point whether Travancore-Cochin would have more than one factory by the end of 1961. It is rather difficult to say anything about it, considering the fact that the Travancore-Cochin factory now is the highest cost unit that we have. They complain even now that the price allowed to them is not adequate, although they have a certain amount of advantage in regard to freight. It is not a question of our not wanting to provide Travancore-Cochin with a factory, but it is a question of certain difficulties. May be the factory may expand, but even then it would have certain economic disadvantages coming against its further development.

My hon. friend, Mr. V. P. Nayar, wanted to know what would be the share. I have not got the break-up, but undoubtedly the A.C.C. share will increase. It is a public company with a fair amount of control over it and we

can lower the price, if we need to. If we do not want any expansion, the price can be lowered. We are allowing a certain amount of elbow-room in the price structure in order to allow them to expand. When it is a public company like the A.C.C., I do not think there is much difficulty in Government exercising any control. But, the point mentioned by Mr. Thomas is not correct. The very fact that we have taken cement from List II does not mean that we do not want to control it. All industries of any reasonable size will be controlled and those industries have gone into the third category. When it comes into the third category, it does not mean that Government will not enter that field. They might, but it is not one that they will necessarily enter into.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Many things have been included in the B category.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No; if my hon. friend looks at it more carefully or ask questions at the proper time, he will find that category B has been chosen very carefully, so that Government might acquire a certain key position in those industries in times to come; maybe 5 years; maybe 10 years.

6 P.M.

My hon. friend Shri Bansal raised the question of limestone availability. I have mentioned that one of the factors in deciding the location of a plant is the availability of limestone. I have asked my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources and Scientific Research to get a correct assessment of the total limestone availability in this country and also explore the possibilities of new areas. We have a certain amount of data available from the information collected by these companies. I have also offered to place it at his disposal. He has promised to take this matter in hand.

I would like to end my answers by making a statement. We have now decided to take over a large measure of control over distribution because we have to tide over a period of two years certainly, and perhaps even more, when stricter control over movement will have to be maintained, and perhaps some imports will have to be made.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Is it because the Government are convinced that there is very rampant blackmarketing?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Our actions do not proceed from conviction; we leave convictions to others. Because,

we feel it a call of duty. It is not a matter of individual conviction.

Shri V. P. Nayar: So, there is no blackmarketing?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Any way, the decision has been made. The State-trading organisation that we are setting up will take over control over distribution in the same way as it is being done in the Iron and Steel organisation. The imports will be canalised through this organisation. Distribution will be arranged in such a manner that distribution will be reasonably efficient. But, at the same time, we will have a fair amount of control over it without spending much money on it. That is necessary.

So far as pricing is concerned, if I produce 16 million tons of cement and I find that the demand does not tally with my production, I will undoubtedly reduce the price. So long as I am not able to produce the cement which is co-terminous with the demand or in excess of the demand, I am afraid, the price mechanism is one of the ways by which we inhibit the demand. We are not prepared to drop it because merely of sentimental considerations.

Shri V. P. Nayar: That is the socialist pattern.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Socialism is a different thing. To my hon. friend, socialism means totalitarianism. To me, socialism means doing service to the people in the best possible way. I do not propose to have a metaphysical discussion with my hon. friend. Mine is a living world in which I have to act and serve and not talk on metaphysics. The question of pricing will be decided according to the nature of supply. My hon. friend is wrong when he says that merely because we have fixed the price at Rs. 71, that is the price: you have Rs. 71 plus to exercise some kind of control in regard to freight. Freight will be coming into our hands and that would enable us perhaps to serve the people better. We are thinking in terms of one equalised price. To the extent that it is possible for us to reduce the prices from time to time in relation or in proportion to the supply available, Government will certainly do it. So long as we do not have the supplies, one of the ways by which we can inhibit demand is to raise the price. I think that is the technique that would be increasingly followed by the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

Government in regard to those articles which are in short supply, because we do not want an inflationary spiral to go on.

A question was raised by my hon. friend about lime. A short-term arrangement might be made by the State, but I have no facility to do it. In any event I expect that within 1½ years I should be able to supply a fairly large quantity. If necessary, I am prepared to import whatever quantity is necessary for urgent purposes. All that I say is we will try to serve the public who need cement, particularly the small man who need it for building a house, the poor people in the villages. And we shall try as far as possible to see that some kind of control is maintained on distribution. I do not say it will be fool-proof, but still the loopholes will be mitigated to the extent that is possible, having in view the fact that the Central Government will have to act very largely through the State Governments. That is a major decision that Government has taken and I have taken advantage of my hon. friend's raising

this query in this debate to inform the public that very soon we shall be able to announce the arrangement by which the State Trading organisation will take control of the import and distribution of cement.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): One question. Are Government aware of the fact . . .

Mr. Chairman : No, no. No further question. The time is over. Already we have taken five minutes more.

Shri C. K. Nair: Will Government see to it that the distribution part of it at least is entrusted to co-operatives?

Mr. Chairman : This is more a suggestion than a question, which the hon. Minister will take note of.

6.07 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Tuesday the 1st May, 1956.