

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur): Sir, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Under what Rule?

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** Under Rule 376. The hon. Finance Minister asked the permission of the House to move a Bill and the permission was granted. But he did not move the Bill and he walked out.

**Mr. Speaker:** He moved the Bill.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** By the time he could rise to move the Bill, Shri-mati Renu Chakravartty got up and started speaking. He did not move the Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is on the record?

I am told that he introduced the Bill.

13.20 hrs.

MOTION RE: DECONTROL OF CEMENT—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up the following motion moved by Shri S. M. Banerjee on 3rd December, 1965, namely:—

"That this House takes note of the statement of Minister of Industry on decontrol of cement, laid on the Table of the House on the 18th November, 1965."

The hon. Minister has to speak. Then I will ask Shri Banerjee to reply.

**Shri Priya Gupta** (Katihar): The time may be extended.

**Dr. Ranen Sen** (Calcutta East): Sir, some of us could not get time on the last day to speak on this.

**Mr. Speaker:** They will kindly appreciate that some speeches have been made on this motion and if I extend the time and this session is concluded, the Government shall have no opportunity to reply to the criticism that

has been made and only a one-sided version would go and the facts would not be known to the public.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Sit tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** Therefore the Minister is anxious that his reply might be heard. Under these circumstances it is not possible to give more time to other Members . . . (Interruption).

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): Even after the Minister's reply you can permit some Members to speak . . . (Interruption).

**श्री मधू लिमये** (मुंगेर) : मुझ को क्या कभी बुलायेंगे ही नहीं ? तीन-चार बार मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ, लेकिन आप ने बुलाया ही नहीं है। दूसरों को पांच-पांच बार बुला चुके हैं।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय** : ये बहुत नाराज हो रहे हैं, इनको पत्ते बुला लेने दीजिये।

**श्री मधू लिमये** : इतना गुस्ता आप मेरे ऊपर क्यों करते हैं ? कभी बुलाते ही नहीं है मुझ को।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय**, बड़े मेहनत करने के बाद हमारा यह सूती मिलों के बारे में श्रीर छोटनी के बारे में प्रस्ताव मंजूर हुआ है। मैं आप से पहले यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस तरह की कार्रवाई चलेंगी, ता यह जो मेरा प्रस्ताव है यह खत्म हो जायेगा। आप देखें कि इस सत्र में हम ने अष्टाचार का मामला, विजिलेंस का मामला का मामला लिया, उसको हम ने अग्रग छोड़ दिया सिमेंट का मामला ले लिया, उसको अग्रग छोड़ देंगे। अब सूती मिलों का मामला ले लें ता उसको भी अग्रग छोड़ देंगे। सरकार जब अपनी कार्रवाई का रपट पेश करती है तो ये जो अग्रे मामले हैं इनको जल्दी खत्म क्यों नहीं करती है। आज नहीं तो कल या परसों अगर इन पर कार्रवाई की जायेगी

तो मेरा खयाल है कि चर्चा पूरी हो पायेगी। मंत्री महोदय जवाब नहीं दे पाते हैं तो यह सारी बात हो जाती है। हमारे इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में बड़ा धन्याय हो रहा है। इस सत्र के प्रारम्भ से मैं कांशिश कर रहा हूँ कि इससे ऊपर बहस की जाये। आखिरी दिन रखा गई है और उसके बीच में धनी नये नये निवेदन आयेंगे, ध्यान आयेंगे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह जो लाखों मजदूरों का सबाल है, इसके बारे में मौका ही नहीं दिया जायेगा ?

श्री के० बे० मालवीय (बस्ती) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, . . . .

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (बिजनौर)  
रून पेश कीजिये, मालवीय जी।

श्री के० बे० मालवीय : जो मामला विचाराधीन है, उसी के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है कि समय नहीं इस वास्ते दूसरों को मौका नहीं दिया जा सकता है और मंत्री जी भी जवाब देना चाहते हैं। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है तो रिप्लाय गी बात रह जायेगी। मैं बड़े प्रदब से प्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि यह मामला बहुत गम्भीर है। हम में से बहुत से माननीय सदस्य यह समझते हैं कि यह एक गुरुप्रान है, इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी का कम्प्लीट डिबियेशन है और यह दोना दानिस्ता किया जा रहा है। इसका प्रबेले मंत्री महोदय ने नहीं किया है बल्कि गवर्नमेंट ने बहुत विचार करने के बाद किया है। सारी गवर्नमेंट ने बड़ी गम्भीरता से विचार करने के बाद इसको किया है। हमें इस पर बड़ी गम्भीरता से विचार करना है कि क्या यह जो डिक्ट्रोल की पद्धति शुरू की जा रही है यह शुरूपात नहीं है हमारे साथे इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रोजोल्पूशन से डिबियेट करने की ? इस पर हमें बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार करना पड़ेगा। अगर यह चीज हो जाती है तो इस विषय में हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि क्या करें और क्या न करें।

श्री Surendranath Dwivedy: On that point also I would suggest that if the Minister feels that he must give a reply, let him reply and after that you may permit speeches because the final reply is by the Mover of the Motion. So, some more speeches should be permitted even after the Minister makes his speech.

श्री Priya Gupta: I will take only two minutes.

घ्राप चले जायेंगे और डिप्टी स्पीकर माहब आ जायेंगे। वह "घ्रांडर घ्रांडर" करेंगे, "सिट डाउन, गिट डाउन" करेंगे। तब हमें मौका नहीं मिलेगा। रोज ऐसा ही होता है।

Mr. Speaker: It is not fair. I am seeing it since the morning that reflections are being cast on me, the Deputy-Speaker and everybody.

श्री Priya Gupta: It is not a reflection.

Mr. Speaker: This infection is spreading.

श्री Priya Gupta: I am sorry; please do not misunderstand.

Mr. Speaker: Now he is continuing.

श्री त्रिय गुप्त : घ्राप हमारे मालिक है। घ्राप भी न कहें तो किस को कटें।

श्री Bhagwat Jha Azad rose—

श्री Surendranath Dwivedy: What is your decision? Would you permit the discussion even after the Minister's reply?

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear the Minister.

श्री Sonavane rose—

Mr. Speaker: When I call the Minister, another Member stands up who had not stood up earlier. What can I do? If it goes on like this, there will be no end to it.

The Minister of Heavy Engineering and Industry in the Ministry of Industry and Supply (Shri T. N. Singh): Sir . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We thought, you had called the Parliamentary Affairs Minister.

संवार तथा संसद्-कार्य-मंत्री (श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह) : सुबह से मैं देख रहा हूँ कि एक के बाद दूसरा माननीय सदस्य खड़ा हो कर चर्चा में भाग ले रहा है । मुझे बड़ा दुख होता है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कपूर प्रापका नहीं है ।

श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह : एबनोल्यूटली कपूर नहीं है । साढ़े बाईस घंटे का जो टाइम एवाटिड था और जिस को हाउस ने एप्रूब भी किया था, उसको देखते हुए जितनी घाइंट्स रखी हैं, उसके मुताबिक काम होता तो जो बिजिनेस है वह नहीं रहता, वह करी घोर नहीं होता । मैं क्या करूँ ? प्राप वहाँ से टाइम एवाट करते हैं, हाउस उसका एप्रूब करता है, बिजिनेस आता है और वहाँ टाइम एक्सटेंड हो जाता है, बार बार हो जाता है । उसके बाद प्राप कहते हैं कि अब क्या उपाय है । साढ़े बाईस घंटे जो हाउस ने टाइम एवाट किया है, उसको देखते हुए प्राप एक एक प्रॉपर्टी का देख लें और मैं चेलेज करता हूँ कि अगर हाउस उसको कनफाइड करता, उसी टाइम में उसको खत्म करता जितना उसके लिए एल.टिड था ताँ एक भी घाइंट करी घोर न होनी । प्राप समय भी बढ़ा देते हैं, फिर कहते हैं कि रखा क्यों है ।

श्री हरि बिठ्ठु कामत : जीरो घावर का क्या करें ?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The boot is on the other leg.

Shri T. N. Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that this very important question was discussed in this

House at some length. It may be that it is not possible within the short time at our disposal to go at length, in greater detail, and see that other Members get an opportunity to participate in the discussion.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, before you leave the Chair, we want to know your decision.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I have asked him.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Will this continue or what?

13.26 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri T. N. Singh: In any case, I must say that I had been expecting much criticism but I find that the criticism that I have come across up till now has been of a very constructive nature except in one or two cases.

This question of control and decontrol has been raised as if it were a matter of doctrinaire approach as such. I can say in the very beginning that there should be both control and decontrol in our economy without in any way violating the basic principles of a socialist society . . . (Interruption) or in any way affecting the Industrial Policy Resolution . . . (Interruption). All these years, for well nigh 15 years, we have had a planned economy with a great measure of success, I say, and yet the beauty of all our effort has been that it has not been a dogmatic approach. We have taken a practical, flexible approach and have adjusted ourselves to the situations as they arose. Now what is the situation?

Shri K. D. Malaviya: What is a dogmatic approach and a doctrinaire approach? I know, Government is taking excuse behind dogmatic approach. This is quite nonsense . . . (Interruption).

Shri T. N. Singh: So, what is needed is just to consider what the position is generally, how we have been

going. Under our whole approach we have got a certain sector which is mostly to be taken care of by, what is called, the public sector. There is another large field which is left to the private sector according to our Industrial Policy Resolution which this House has accepted and endorsed on many an occasion. Under that the mechanism of attracting investments in the private sector is the normal mechanism accepted all over the world so far as private sector effort is concerned, namely, they have got to have some encouragement, some basis on which they can invest, that their shares will have a subscribability in the market because nobody can find the entire capital for any individual concern howsoever big he may be; by and large he has to depend on, what is called, public subscription of the shares which are put in the market for open subscription.

We have watched the progress of the cement business and I may say that I am deeply disappointed with the investments in cement which have been very slow, even tardy, with the result that many important public sector projects and many of our efforts meant for the well-being of the people are being handicapped. What happens if cement is not there? Irrigation works get delayed.

**Shri K. D. Malaviya:** Produce more cement.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** Exactly that is the point. Therefore you must have more cement production. In order to have cement production so far it has been a private sector effort. It has not succeeded to that extent. We are still in the midst of the Third Plan and we thought we should have investments from the public sector to make good what the private sector could not do. We have done that to a certain extent but nobody thought that there would be a war on our frontiers. I hope this House and the country would realise what great economic handicaps we are suffering from and what we have to fight. We have to

fight the economic problem and various other problems; we have to face them. It is no use saying that we should do this or that. One has to take decisions maybe hard or difficult decisions, but they have to be taken if the economy has to be kept going. (interruptions).

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad** (Bhagalpur): Will the Minister assure us that, after decontrol, production will increase and the economy will be all right?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Sári T. N. Singh:** I feel that, in this context, we have tried a number of methods and I find that the time has come when, in addition to whatever we can do from the public sector, we should allow the private sector to play its part. But what has been done? Every time there is the price fixation. We have said that this is the Tariff Commission's job. What is the directive which this House has accepted; every one has accepted that this should be a directive to the Tariff Commission. What is that? It is that there should be a capital return of 10, 12, 14 per cent on an average, i.e., about 10 to 12 per cent in ordinary cases and a higher return in special cases. That is the formula for the Tariff Commission price fixation. It is this which has been operating in the case of cement also. But because it was a commodity of general use, we felt, Government pleaded, that the return in other industries need not be a standard for this also. Somehow we found that the investment costs went up and, therefore, more capital was not being attracted. I may say another thing also. We cannot have it both ways. We want to have indigenous machinery manufactured. We are doing that, but the indigenous machinery costs more than the imported machinery. We cannot afford it. Time and again people have come to me to allow imports of machinery. But I said that it could not be allowed even though the indigenous machinery is costlier. We have done even this

[Shri T. N. Singh]

much. But all these factors have resulted in a slow rate of investment. So they could have gone to the Tariff Commission. Even now there is a claim pending before us, according to the Cost Accountant, for a rise in cement retention prices. (*Interruptions*). We looked into it and said that there was need for revision of the retention price. At the same time we wanted to be sure that there should be a higher investment rate in the cement industry. From that point of view it became necessary that we should examine the whole question. We examined it. I am saying with all the sincerity at my command that it is not possible for the private sector to carry on the programme, to find the necessary capital to plough back in the industry, in the present system. They have got to be provided. Therefore, in regard to money also, I would not. (*Interruptions*). . . I am going to find the money from the public sector also. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri K. D. Malaviya:** Give them money, if you like.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** Why don't you give them loan? Give them *ex-gratia* grant, but why at my cost. why should you impose jizya tax on me to fatten the fattened?

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I think it is fair and proper that I should be allowed to speak. It is very unfair to interrupt me every now and then and I strongly protest against members getting up and shouting every time. I wish there is some consideration for the person who speaks. It is not the way they should behave. I can also claim to be very enthusiastic and in the matter of public sector or private sector . . . (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I feel that we have gone into the whole costing question. We felt that there should be at least a return upto 12 per cent. Suppose we had done it, what would

have happened? They would have got the profit and paid it as dividend. That will not be good. So we felt that we should give them a reasonable surplus but we should see that it is not frittered away in other ways. This is exactly what we have been doing. Unfortunately I did not have the occasion to open the debate. Of course, the statement was there; it was enough. We have said that we are working on the entire procedure. But without seeing the whole point, without listening to us, some members have indulged in unnecessary and unjustified criticism. Every one wants, and there is common unanimity in the House, that whatever surplus is there, according to a formula for return on capital, should be allowed or should necessarily go into investment. This is the objective which every one wants to achieve. What have we done here? We have stated that it would not be allowed to go as dividend and then we have been working out the details. This is the position that has been reached.

In order to ensure that the net resources which would be generated by the forthcoming increase in the price will be available for ploughing back for expansion or, in effect, utilised for the purpose for which they are intended, the cement industry will have to assure us that such resources will be specifically earmarked and not used for any other purposes. Accordingly, each manufacturer will credit the net resources from price increase into a separate account and withdrawals from such accounts will be made only for meeting expenditure on expansion. Details regarding the operation of these accounts are even now being worked out. We have already got a Development and Research Fund in the cement industry. That is a thing which cannot be operated without government knowing about it. This is what we should do. I say that this decision, which has been taken, has been taken at the correct time; it has been taken for the correct purpose.

It is going to result in higher cement production. With whatever experience I have in this and with all the sincerity that I can command, I say that we cannot claim that, in all cases, our controls have been an unmixed success; there have been failures; there have been defects. Here are some people. They are also Indians. They can also claim to be patriots. They assure us that they will try to play the game, that they will do it. I want to take them at their words. I am one of those people who believe that every Indian citizen, if he is honest minded, should be given a chance. Here is the whole industry, the entire Association. Every one of them has come and talked to me and has given me the assurance. Then in order to safeguard that these funds are not used otherwise, they are not being allowed to increase the dividend. I have restricted all these things and only after this, this arrangement has been made. We have got the experiences . . .

There should be some order in the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** To whatever section of the community they may belong, if they want to abide by this arrangement, this is the best opportunity. I have had full-fledged discussions with members of this House and the other House in the Consultative Committee. There the only thing that was suggested was that the procedure should be worked out in regard to distribution. That is what we are doing.

I have already said that the procedure is being worked out. Instead of waiting for that procedure, some hon. members have been unfair in criticising it; one member has not hesitated to use words which should not have been used in this august House and if I try to make out my case, there are people who stand up and would not permit me to proceed. How can a democracy function if one side goes on

saying something and the other side is not allowed to speak.

Therefore, while protesting strongly against the way in which this subject has been dealt with, I would like, however, to point out—while I am saying this, I do not claim to be one who can forecast things—that the way the cement industry is going, and it is going to go, as I feel it, you will find that in another year and a half, there will not be a shortage.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** If that be so, then that is all right, and we would welcome this.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I can tell you this much. Of course, we shall not be flush and rich . . .

**Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur):** Let him not make rash promises.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** 'Going to go'? I hope it will not take a long time in going. 'Going to go' means something different.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** Already the trends are better.

**Shri Nath Pal:** Let not the hon. Minister make rash promises.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I may tell the House that I have received representations and complaints against this not from the common man, but from the big cities and from the big-houses people. Let me tell you this frankly. They probably think that they have so far been able to get a number of things for their houses which they may not get now. Houses with eight or ten storeys are being built by them. Are we going to advocate their cause? I have never lived in these big houses. I have been born in rather humbler surroundings. I would, therefore, submit that these causes need not deter us. This kind of propaganda need not influence us in such matters. After all, we have never claimed, and nobody has ever said, that it will be hundred per cent a controlled commodity; nobody has said the other thing also that it will always be in the public sector.

[Shri T. N. Singh]

Then, there is one other thing that I might say. I thought that in industry, particularly in the heavy engineering sector, we would be able to push through investments. I have had great ambitions. I myself came from the Planning Commission and I had my visions, and I thought that I could do it. But I never knew that this Pakistani invasion would upset many calculations. There are people who want to strangle us on the basis of foreign exchange. That is happening. In every way, investment is being throttled. These are the difficulties under which we are suffering.

If for some reason, those who produce the machines and those who produce cement, and others come together and make this offer to us and say 'Give us a chance, we shall deliver the goods', I think that it is our duty to give them a chance, after having assured ourselves that they will be able to do so. I have no inhibitions in this regard. I am really very sorry that all kinds of unnecessary and undesirable imputations should have been made which should never have been made. Nobody is going to be caught in any trap, any dirty trap; I am saying this because all kinds of things have been said..

I do not know how it is possible. There will be ways....

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** We had nothing personal against the hon. Minister, when we raised this question. We were only attacking the policy.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** There may be different ways of approach to a solution of the problem. We may differ on them. But we must not attack one another in this House.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** There was no attack on the hon. Minister personally. It was against the policy.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I say that having assured ourselves that investment goes in the right channel.....

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : यह मापकी पार्टी का भ्रन्दरूनी मामला है ।

**Shri T. N. Singh:** ..and having assured ourselves that there is the right amount of surplus available, which is very necessary, we have taken this decision. What is the use of assuring ourselves that all the surplus will be invested if we do not provide an adequate surplus? There were people in our midst who suggested a smaller rise and something smaller. But I felt personally that it should neither be very large nor very inadequate. Supposing we have got a programme that about Rs. 10 or 15 or 20 crores of investment will be made per year, then that much surplus should be made available. After all, the surplus will become available after a year. Only for four years we have got the surplus available in this Plan period. But people have been calculating on the basis of five years. All kinds of misleading calculations have, therefore, been made and quoted here. Even though I was sitting here, I had no intention to interfere or disturb any hon. Member who was quoting wrong figures when he was speaking; I went on listening to hon. Members and I thought that I would be given some opportunity at last when I could try to explain the correct position.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the procedure. It had been suggested in the consultative committee that the Members of this House or Members of the legislatures should be associated. I have some hesitation in associating the members of the legislatures in the distribution mechanism right up to the district and village level. But that can be examined. Personally, my advice will be that they should not be associated with it. Therefore, what we have said is this. After these details are worked out,—because these matters of detail in regard to the operational methods, banking, accounting etc. are still being worked out—and I am in a position to place

a little more detail, I intend to call some Members to discuss the procedure. Let us not then quarrel about the policy itself, accepting whatever policy has been decided upon, let us discuss what the proper procedure should be. I have already promised that, and hon. Members know it, and we are going to discuss it also. As soon as we are free, we shall have a discussion on the procedures to be adopted; the assurances of the mill-owners also are to be fully considered and we shall see how far we can rely upon them and further what safeguards we should have in order to see that really investment does take place.

So far as I am able to see the things, by and large, I have heard the discussion, and I feel that apart from some criticisms against me which I shall try to forget, generally, the objectives have been as follows. Firstly, let us assure ourselves that the thing reaches the remotest corner possible within the resources of cement available; secondly, it does not matter if for all that is available, the consumer has to pay for the time being something higher, provided it is not very highly unconscionable and provided that the amount goes in for investment in the same industry. These are the two objectives which we should aim at.

I may tell you that I have told the industrialists and the association people that 'I am giving you chance; I do not want to give this chance for more than a year.' I have also made it clear to them 'If you fail and you say that the Government distribution machinery is very defective, corrupt etc. etc. then we would see what should be done'. I have told them also, 'I am holding you to a period of trial, and you try to do it; if you fail after one year, then for all time to come, the private sector distribution mechanism will have been damaged'.

Therefore, I appeal to the House to accept this proposal in the spirit in which it is made. I think that it

is a good proposal. It is desirable that we should give a chance to a set of people who are after all, not aliens, when they tell us that they will be able to deliver the goods, and we also assure ourselves of the fact that their assurances would be fully observed and we take certain powers and authorities to ourselves also in that regard; after having ensured these things, let us give them the chance to distribute.

I think that it is all wrong to say that the STC should get involved in this. It should not. If it does, then there would be diffusion of responsibilities. I feel that there should be no diffusion of responsibilities. I am very clear on that point. I do not want the STC to come into this picture at all. Let the employers or the manufacturers take the full responsibility. Having agreed to take that responsibility, they must be fully responsible for their success or failure. I do not want them to have any excuse later on and say that the STC or some other agency was interfering. After all, it is one year's trial. I shall come before this House after one year with whatever has been happening, and certainly, the valuable advice of this House will certainly be fully cared for, looked to and implemented as far as is practicable and possible.

I have nothing else to say except to appeal to this House to accept this measure or this proposal in the spirit in which it has been brought forward.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** I would like to ask two questions of the hon. Minister . . .

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There can be no questions now. The time allotted for this is already over.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** I would beg of you to give me permission to put only two questions. Earlier when the Speaker was in the Chair he had said that we could put the questions after the hon. Minister's speech was over; but then I had pointed out that

[Shri Priya Gupta]

the Deputy-Speaker when he is in the Chair may not allow it, but the Speaker had said that the Deputy-Speaker would allow . . .

**Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur):** The Speaker had said that he would permit the questions at the end.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If the House wants, I have no objection.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** The Speaker had promised that he would give me permission to put two questions. You may kindly go through the record and you will find that what I am stating is correct.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall allow only one question.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** In the sub-division of Katihar in Bihar, not a single bag of cement has been made available to a poor common man, to meet his necessities for repairs or erection of a mosque or a temple or a church or for construction of tombs over coffins of his parents, schools for childrens' education and ring wells. May I know whether after the decontrol of cement, the price of cement will be beyond the reach of the common, poor man and it will all flow towards the capitalist for hoarding, and whether Government have examined it?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member is supporting the hon. Minister.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** The hon. Member is aware that I am also a man from the village. For getting a bag or two of cement, I think people are paying already much more than the normal price.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** My second question is this. Government has in this case made a clear departure from the accepted policy of control of essential items in short supply. Cement is an important item for the

society. In view of the Government's decision that when essential commodities are in short supply, when production is less and consumption more, they would have control—as shown by their decision to reintroduce rationing—is not the present policy of decontrol of cement which is an essential commodity a departure from the accepted policy of Government?

**Shri T. N. Singh:** There is no departure.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** Very good  
बहुत जल्दी एमैट हो गया इस मामले पर।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** According to the speech of the hon. Minister, it appears that Government want to adopt a flexible approach or an elastic approach and not confine itself to a dogmatic approach. Even today in the *Statesman* there is an article by one of the eminent journalists, Inder Malhotra . . .

**Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar):** Question should be short.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He is replying to the debate.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I hope after five years or four years people reach the stage of maturity.

Even in that article, he has mentioned that some of the Congress members are not convinced about the correctness of Government's decision. What will be the real position. I am not wedded to control. I am the last person to support control, if control brings miseries to the people. But if decontrol opens the floodgate of corruption, blackmarketing and high prices, I am definitely of the view that control is better.

What will be the position in our country after decontrol? I am told that the All India cement manufac-

urers' association never wanted decontrol. In their letter of August 1965 to the hon. Minister—I would request the hon. Minister to lay it on the Table if it is convenient—they demanded a price increase, but they never wanted that cement be decontrolled. So if the All India cement manufacturers' association did not want it, if people in general had no knowledge about it, if the Members of this House are horribly divided on this issue—there is no unanimity among us on this issue—what was the fun in decontrolling and having an experiment with the progress of our country?

I want the hon. Minister to kindly consider this. If decontrol results in blackmarketing, hoarding or more prices, what will be his position. In that case, with all my respect for the hon. Minister, I would urge upon him that the only remedy for him will be either to shift his seat from that side to this place and join the Swatantra Party, as suggested by Shri Mathur, or he should resign gracefully and peacefully.

**An hon. Member:** Why?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Because nobody wanted this decontrol. Production is limited. Internal consumption has increased. If we are wedded to socialism, if we are really progressing towards socialism, naturally there will be more consumption of cement to cope with the needs of the growth of industry, construction of buildings and so on. Consumption will be much more in the country. But when the production is limited, when supply is limited and demand is much more, naturally with this decontrol and a free hand given to the cement magnates, the country will not get anything out of it.

I would therefore request the hon. Minister to reconsider his decision. What is the guarantee given by these industrialists that the increase which has been given to them will be

ploughed back for expansion of capacity. STC is out of the picture today. They have given a free hand to the industrialists.

So I would request the hon. Minister to give a second thought to it and consider whether decontrol is in the larger interest of the country and the well-being of the nation or it will be in the interest of the select few who are holding the country to ransom.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

“That this House takes note of the statement of the Minister of Industry on decontrol of cement, laid on the Table of the House on the 18th November, 1965”.

*The motion was adopted.*

13.56 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193 RE  
CLOSURE OF TEXTILE MILLS ETC.

**श्री मधु सिन्घे (मुंगेर) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन के सामने प्रस्ताव रखना चाहता हूँ कि सदन इस वक़्त जा सूती मिलों बन्द हो रही हैं या बन्द होने का ख़तरा पैदा हुआ है और अन्य कारख़ानों में तथा इंजीनियरिंग कारख़ानों में भी व्यापक पैमाने पर छुटनी हो रही है इसके सम्बन्ध में विचार करे।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Where is the Commerce Minister? He should be here now.

**The Minister of Heavy Engineering and Industry in the Ministry of Industry and Supply (Shri T. N. Singh):** I am here.

**The Minister of Labour and Employment (Shri D. Sanjivayya):** I am here.