

14.37 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri Easwara Iyer: I beg to move

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 17th December, 1958"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 17th December, 1958"

The motion was adopted.

14.38 hrs

RESOLUTION RE COMMITTEE TO ASSESS PROGRESS OF LAND REFORMS IN THE COUNTRY—contd

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri Panigrahi on the 5th December, 1958, namely —

"This House recommends that a Committee consisting of 15 Members of Lok Sabha be appointed to assess the progress made so far in the matter of land reforms all over the country and to submit its report to the House as early as possible"

Out of 2 hour allotted for the discussion of the resolution, 1 minute has already been taken and 1 hour and 59 minutes are left for its further discussion today

Shri Panigrahi may continue his speech.

Shri Easwara Iyer (Trivendrum): May I make a submission? In view of the importance of this resolution, let us have three hours for this. Let the time be extended to three hours. In fact, in the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions, it was more or less agreed that if more time was required, it would be considered by the House

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Would it be possible when he himself has moved the motion and it has been adopted, that he should get up after one minute and say that it should not be adopted?

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella): We also said that

Shri Easwara Iyer: I expected others to say that

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. It does not look proper that Shri Easwara Iyer should ask for extension of time

Shri Easwara Iyer: I expected others to raise the point

Mr. Deputy-Speaker Let us see how we proceed

Shri Negi Reddy (Anantapur): There are so many things to be discussed under this resolution

Mr Deputy-Speaker: That is the difficulty. Therefore, we need not increase the time, because even 10 hours would not be enough

Shri Panigrahi (Puri) While moving the resolution for the consideration of the House I am reminded of a phrase by a famous British author who had once said that 'Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it'. The Planning Commission, the Ministers in charge of Planning, the Prime Minister, the AICC and the National Development Council every now and then are talking or rather discussing about the importance of land reforms in the economy of India. But the progress so far made in the direction of land reforms is not satisfactory

The Prime Minister has given more thought to this, and sometimes, he is very much outspoken on this subject of land reforms. I have come across some of his observations with regard to land reforms and their urgency in India.

As far back as 1949, Prime Minister Nehru in his address to the UPCC—in that year in China the Communist Party was coming to power—said

“In China the Communists were winning. The land problem there was at the root of it. Nearly 40 years ago, the Emperor was ousted. During 40 years, China was unable to evolve a land policy. The result was a dissolution of the Government. History showed that when a country solved the land problem, its difficulties decreased and other questions began to solve themselves.”

Again in 1954, after 5 years, in his address to the Congress Parliamentary Party, he said

“I am quite positive in my mind that there should be a ceiling on land and that the sooner it is brought about the better.”

Then, comparing the progress of land reforms in China and India, he said

“The Chinese example is similar to ours in the sense that there are a large number of people there too as we have in India, though, relatively speaking, they have more land. It is very difficult to say what advantages of land distribution they have got apart from the psychological, but it is very difficult to say how far they have solved the production question there and doubts have arisen whether their production has gone up or gone down.”

Recently, the Minister of Co-operation, Dr P S Deshmukh, had gone to China and after his return, he is advocating the adoption of the Chinese

method of paddy cultivation, as they have been advocating for 9 long years adoption of the Japanese method of paddy cultivation. He is quite satisfied that production in China has increased to a great extent. So distribution of land in China has not only provided a psychological satisfaction to the vast number of peasants in that country, but it has added to the material production of foodgrains, which we come to know in the year 1958.

This question of land reforms in India is being discussed again and again. Recently Prime Minister Nehru in his meeting with Acharya Vinoba Bhave has again declared that land must belong to the tillers, land must belong to the people, and the sooner the problem is solved the better for India. I was also looking through the AICC *Economic Review*. It has reported the discussions on land reforms in different sessions of Congress. In the Gauhati session of the Congress the matter was discussed and when one of the delegates from West Bengal moved an amendment at the Ajmer Session of the Congress for a two-year time-limit for fixation of ceilings on land holdings, the Prime Minister said

“Two years? India cannot afford to take so much time. Why should we wait for two years? It should be done immediately.”

The delegate who attended the Gauhati session of the Congress said that certain elements had entered the Congress to guard their vested interests, while Chief Ministers and Revenue Ministers came every year and listened to these demands as to why could not anything be done about land reforms. That is how all these years the discussions have been going on in the Congress and also in the Planning Commission. Recently, at its Hyderabad session the AICC again appointed another sub-committee to go into this matter. The sub-committee has to deal with this problem again.

[Shri Panigrahi]

I was looking into the First Five Year Plan programmes and their ends. In the First Plan, the aims with regard to land reforms have been specifically mentioned. It shows that the Planning Commission was seized of the matter. They have specifically mentioned five problems: (1) abolition of intermediaries between State and the tillers, (2) tenancy reforms to reduce rents, provide security of tenure and give tenants an opportunity to purchase the lands they cultivate, (3) fixation of a ceiling on land holdings and the distribution of surplus lands, (4) improvement of the condition of the agricultural workers, and (5) co-operative organisation of agriculture.

In September 1957, the Standing Committee of the National Development Council again reviewed the progress so far achieved in the direction of land reforms. They came to the conclusion that immediately the following decisions should be implemented by the State Governments, namely: (1) tenants should be given effective protection from ejection and from the so-called voluntary surrenders; (2) ceiling on future acquisition of land should be imposed in States where such actions had not already been taken; (3) legislation in regard to ceiling on existing agricultural holdings should be implemented speedily and States which have not yet enacted legislation should complete the legislative measure by the end of 1958-59.

The Planning Commission itself proposed that all the surplus land must be taken from the cultivators and distributed among the tillers by Government. These decisions have again and again been taken during the last 9 years, and I do not know what was the necessity for again appointing another sub-committee to go into these problems. The sub-committee was first of the view that the question of land reforms should not be allowed to hang on for any

longer period. But again the sub-committee's first draft was not accepted and now the time has been extended up to the end of 1959.

In May 1957 in a speech in this House, the Prime Minister expressed his dissatisfaction with the way the problem of land reform is being tackled in the country. He said:

"I agree with the criticism made by some Members that in a number of States land reform legislation has been slow, much too slow. It could be much faster and I hope it will be speeded up."

When the Prime Minister felt that the progress of land reforms in many of the States is slow, still another sub-committee has been appointed to go into them, and the time is extended. So nothing is done during the Second Plan period also.

This sentiment has been very well expressed by certain newspapers also which do not want that the Government should go ahead with land reforms or fix any ceilings on existing holdings of land. They will be very glad over this decision. They have said:

"When some years back, Mr Hanumanthaya of Mysore and Mr P R Deshmukh spoke against the proposal to impose ceilings on land holdings, theirs was a voice in the wilderness. It is a measure of the change that has come about in Congress circles that at the latest AICC meeting at Hyderabad, Mr C Subramanyam's sound advocacy of a pragmatic approach to the question of land reforms was boldly taken up by a number of others."

"If the acceptance of his amendment to the Committee's resolution on food production means anything, it could only be that there are now sober second thoughts on the proposal of land ceilings."

Reforms in the Country

It shows now that there is a sober section—I cannot say whether it is a sober section—but there is a second thought being given to the question of fixing ceiling to the landholdings. Not only this. This second thought is not going to do any good to the vast number of peasants in this country who want land for cultivation.

I would like to deal with the different aspects which come under this land reforms legislation. The Planning Commission decided to give fixity of tenure to tenants in different States. In different States, legislation has also been passed. I do not say that in many of the States legislation is not there. But, after the legislation passed, there was a review in Hyderabad with regard to the protection afforded to the tenants. Investigation was carried on by the Special Land Reforms Officer of the Hyderabad Government. According to that estimate, we now come to know that the total number of protected tenants recorded in the tenancy registers in the year 1951-52 were 2,11,436. In 1954-55, the third year of the land reform legislation passed in that part of the country, the total number of protected tenants found to be in possession of lands was 90,279. There was a decrease of about 57 per cent in the number of protected tenants in that part after the legislation was passed. That means a large number of tenants were evicted from their holdings by the landlords and the State could not come to their help.

What were the causes of this eviction? In a large number of cases, the tenants said that the landlords asked them to quit and they left the land. Again, the majority of tenants do not want to estrange their relations with the landholders on whom they depended for many things in their day to day life. Most of them thus left the land immediately they were asked to do so by the landlords. It is because the Planning Commission asked the State Governments—rather gave a direction to the State Governments—to provide a clause for per-

sonal cultivation—for ejection for personal cultivation by the landlords. In almost all legislation passed by the different State Governments, this clause is there. If a landlord wants to resume any land for personal cultivation he can evict a tenant, though he may be a protected tenant. This clause has added to the trouble and a large number of evictions has taken place because of this provision.

It was also found that 81 per cent of the total evictions were by undue influence. What was that undue influence? The landholder has, even today, got socially and economically the strongest influence in the countryside. Sometimes the revenue officers believe more the landholder than the poor tenants. The Special Land Reforms Officer has come to the conclusion that 57 per cent of the cases were under personal cultivation of the landholders and in 33 per cent of the cases it has again been leased out to third parties. Even the landholder who has evicted the tenant from the land has not taken possession of the entire evicted land under his personal cultivation. He has again leased it to third parties for cultivation.

Similar is the case in Bombay. In Bombay during the period between 1948 and 1951, the number of protected tenants declined from 17 lakhs to 13.6 lakhs—a decline of 20 per cent. The area held by the protected tenants during the same period decreased by 18 per cent. It was because this provision is there and the landlords availed themselves of this provision and evicted the tenants.

Same is the case with regard to Andhra and to my own State of Orissa. In Orissa a large number of cases of eviction are taking place even today. And, I know from my own personal experience that a Mahant of a certain estate all of a sudden, overnight, placed a deity in a village for worship and claimed 179 acres of land from the tenants for cultivation because he said that the land belonged to that deity. The villagers had no idea of the God the previous night; but, in the morning the God was

[Shri Panigrahi]

placed there and the Mahant claimed the land for cultivation. They were all evicted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: God is great only because you cannot comprehend Him. If He were known beforehand, He would not be God.

Shri S M Banerjee (Kanpur)
Otherwise, He would not have made us in His own image.

Shri Panigrahi: Now, with regard to ceiling on land, legislation is being attempted in different States. So far as Bombay is concerned, there is a provision that a protected tenant has been given permanent and heritable rights subject to the right of the landlord to resume an area up to 50 acres. In the legislation of almost all the States there is a provision as to the extent of land that a landlord can resume for his personal cultivation. But how many areas, a minimum of 2, 3 or 5 acres, that a tenant is allowed to retain is not there in any State legislation. So, when a landlord evicts his tenants he gives his lands to his brother, his son-in-law, a new-born babe and like that he can evict under almost any pretext. As I said in Bombay the right of resumption is given to the landlord up to 50 acres. Similarly in West Bengal under-ryots who have not acquired permanent rights and share-croppers on holdings less than 33 acres are liable to ejection on grounds of personal cultivation. Even share-croppers are not considered as protected tenants.

In Hyderabad all tenants who have cultivated land personally and continuously for 6 years become protected tenants and acquire permanent and heritable rights subject to the landlord's right of resumption. As per the legislation in some States the tenant is required to prove that he was in possession of the land for 6 years, and, in some other States for 12 years. And, he must be in continuous possession. But, in many of the villages the records are

not there and it is very difficult for a peasant to prove that he was in continuous possession without any break at least for 6 or 12 years. This added to the trouble of the peasant and the landlord evicts him as easily as he likes. Similarly, in PEPFU, for personal cultivation a landlord can resume an area equal to half the holding subject to a maximum of thirty standard acres. In Orissa it provides for the resumption of an area not exceeding seven irrigated and 14 unirrigated acres. The landlord in almost all the States has been given the right for personal cultivation. It adds to the trouble of the peasant. Secondly it is difficult on the part of the peasant to prove that he was in continuous possession for six or twelve years.

15 hrs.

These things are adding to the trouble and the peasants are surrendering the lands. It is called voluntary surrender. They are not voluntary surrenders. With regard to rents, the Planning Commission directed the State Governments to reduce the rents. Rents have been reduced in legislation only. In Orissa it is one-fourth, in Rajasthan it is one-sixth, in Bombay it is one-sixth and in Hyderabad, one-fifth and I am told that in Andhra it is half and in Madras it is forty per cent. Thus legislations have been passed to reduce the rent but the peasants are paying rent that they were paying before the Congress came to power. It is because they are not in a position to bargain with the landlords. Once our Prime Minister has said that all middlemen should be moved from the villages but today the position has worsened. The village middleman today is the *sarpanch* and he presides over the co-operative societies and he advances loans to the peasants. He gathers more during the time of elections. He has got his power in the village. The middleman is still a powerful element in the society in the countryside. It makes

it difficult for the peasant to fight against the landlord and to prove his *bona fides* and retain his possession of the land. Rents have been reduced by legislation alone. In many cases peasants are going into the contracts and agreements with the landlord with a view to get land for cultivation and then pay the old rent, half and half, which they used to pay.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 25 minutes, he ought to conclude.

Shri Panigrahi. I will finish in one minute. I want to say this with regard to agricultural labourer. If land is not given to them, things will become very difficult. Suppose no land is distributed, what will happen? I will request the Government to assess the culturable wasteland that now lies there in the different States. I came to know that in Kerala alone they have perhaps distributed or propose to distribute about seven lakhs of acres of such land. Why not they do it in different States in Orissa, Bihar or Bengal? I was told that such land came to about eight million acres. Why not they immediately direct the State Governments to distribute them to the landless peasants? I think the time has come when our Planning Minister should view these things seriously and direct the State Governments to take serious and effective steps so that land reform measures can be effected as soon as possible, at least during 1959.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion moved.

"This House recommends that a Committee consisting of 15 members of Lok Sabha be appointed to assess the progress made so far in the matter of land reforms all over the country and to submit its report to the House as early as possible."

Now, there are some substitute motions. Shri Bhakt Darshan is not here. Shri M C Jain

Shri M C Jain (Kaithal): I want to move.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But my fear is it is out of order. It would enlarge the scope of the Resolution. But he may speak. **Shri Bibhuti Mishra**

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Bagha): I beg to move.

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House expresses gratification about the land reforms carried out in the country so far and recommends that a Sub-Committee of experts be constituted immediately to enquire into the short-comings in the progress of land reforms and submit its report as soon as possible."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. Shri S M Banerjee. He wants to speak?

Shri S M Banerjee. The second amendment is very important, Sir. That is about the date. I beg to move.

That in the Resolution,—

- (i) after the word 'Lok Sabha' the words 'and Rajya Sabha' be inserted, and
- (ii) for the words 'as early as possible' the following be substituted:

by the 31st March 1959

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the Resolution and these amendments before the House. Shri Sarjoo Pandey is not here and so his amendment is not moved. We have to conclude at 4.30 (*Interruptions*). Even if we take it up to 4.59 I think I cannot accommodate as many hon. Members as seem to want to speak. Not more than one Member from one State can speak. I have got 12 names and five belong to UP and three to Bihar.

Some Hon. Members: It may be State-wise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One Member from each State

Shri Subman Ghose: Sir, I have been allowed 31 minutes today I do not insist upon that I will be very much thankful if I get one minute to move my Resolution

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I will give him one minute

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur) Sir, on a point of order This subject is in the State List It does not come in the Central or Union List or in the Concurrent List So, under the Constitution this subject cannot form the subject matter of discussion here *(Interruptions)*

Mr Deputy-Speaker. He has sent his name for speaking'

Pandit K. C. Sharma: May I read from the Constitution Sir? Entry No 18, State List

"Land, that is to say, rights in or over land land tenures including the relation of landlord and tenant, and the collection of rents, transfer and alienation of agricultural land, land improvement and agricultural loans colonization "

I beg to submit that the improvement or reform in the land system is comprehended by this provision and there is no other provision either in the Concurrent List or in the Union List which permits the legislation on land or in any way improvement of the land situation with regard to the tenants' rights

Mr Deputy-Speaker. But there is one Planning Commission under the Central Government which is in charge of it The substitute motion also refers to it It says that the Planning Commission should be asked to go into the question about the progress that has been made so far Would the hon Minister like to say anything on this?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: The Planning Commission can plan the resources of the country and can advise the State Governments with regard to land reforms but this House has no jurisdiction to advise or control or legislation with regard to land distribution or improvement

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The only thing wanted in the original resolution is that a body of Parliament may be constituted to make an assessment of the progress made so far in the matter of land reforms The resolution does not say that it should bring about this change or that change There was a substitute motion about the question of eviction of tenants in the name of Shri M C Jain I have already ruled that out of order Therefore, this question of assessment would be certainly within the scope of the functions of the Planning Commission I do not think there is any force in the point of order

श्री बिभूरी मिश्र उपाध्यक्ष महोदय ,
मैं अपना सबमटीच्यूट मोगन मूव करना हूँ
जो कि इस प्रकार है

"This House expresses gratification about the land reforms carried out in the country so far and recommends that a Sub-Committee of experts be constituted immediately to enquire into the shortcomings in the progress of land reforms and submit its report as soon as possible "

सरकार ने भूमि सुधार की दिशा में अब तक जो कुछ काम किया है वह बहुत ही सगहनीय काम है। सरकारी ने जमींदारिया समाप्त की और भूमि सुधार की दिशा में यह एक बहुत बड़ा काम उसने किया। इसके लिये कांग्रेस ने सदा से अपने करारी कांग्रेस अधिवेशन से लेकर स्वाधीनता प्राप्ति के समय तक बराबर इसके लिये जोर दिया कि जमींदारी प्रथा को हटाना चाहिये। सरकार ने जमींदारी प्रथा को तो हटाया लेकिन जिन जमींदारों की

जमींदारिया समाप्त की गई है, उन्हें अभी तक कोई मुआविजा नहीं दिया गया है। यह एक बहुत जबर्दस्त सवाल है और यदि सरकार मुआविजा देने की स्थिति में नहीं है जैसा कि मेरा ख्याल है तो सरकार को जो बड़े बड़े धनी भ्रादमी हैं, उनकी दौलत और सम्पत्ति का उसको मूल्यांकन कराना चाहिये और अगर उनकी सम्पत्ति बहुत ज्यादा है तो सरकार को यह साफ साफ कह देना चाहिये कि वह उनको मुआविजा देने के लिये लाचार है। बहुत से जमींदार, राजे और महाराजा ऐसे हैं जिनके कि पास काफी जमींदारिया थी और जिनके कि पास आज भी काफी जमीन है और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को उन्हें मुआविजा नहीं देना चाहिये। क्योंकि जो मुआविजे की रकम है वह माँके ५ अरब रुपये ही जाती है और अकेले मेरे बिहार प्रांत में मुआविजे की रकम कोई डेढ़ अरब के है और मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई भी स्टेट सरकार इतना मुआविजा देने को तैयार हो सकती है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्लानिंग कमिशन को हर एक राज्य सरकार को यह हिदायत देनी चाहिये कि जमीन की सीलिंग के साथ ही साथ शहरों में जिनके पास काफी दौलत और जायदाद हो, उनकी भी सीलिंग की जाय। तभी यह चीज चल सकती है। मैं देखता हूँ कि जमीन की सीलिंग तो आप करने जा रहे हैं लेकिन शहरों में जिनके पास काफी सम्पत्ति है, बड़े बड़े मकान हैं और जो मोटी तनख़ाहे पाते हैं, उनकी सीलिंग आप नहीं कर रहे हैं। बड़े बड़े पूँजीपति जिनके कि शहरों में कारखाने चल रहे हैं, उनकी सीलिंग आप क्यों नहीं करने? मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार ऐसा मोचती तो है कि उनमें ऊपर भी सीलिंग लगाई जाये लेकिन वह इसको बहुत धीरे धीरे करना चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं अपनी सरकार को गीता में भगवान कृष्ण द्वारा भर्जुन को दिये गये उस उपदेश की याद दिलाऊंगा जिसमें उन्होंने भर्जुन को

ललकार कर कहा था कि वह शस्त्र उठाये और क्षत्रिय का कर्म करे और धर्मयुद्ध में भ्रमसर हो। वैसे सब के दिमाग में यह चीज बैठ गई है कि आज के जनतांत्रिक प्रजातन्त्री युग में किसी के पास बहुत अधिक सम्पत्ति नहीं रहने पायेगी। इसलिये मैं कहूँगा कि आप जमीन की सीलिंग तो कीजिये लेकिन साथ ही उन लोगों के ऊपर भी यह सीलिंग लगाइये जो कि शहरों में रहने हैं, बहुत लम्बी-लम्बी तनख़ाहे लेते हैं और जिनके कि पास बड़े-बड़े मकान हैं और जिनके कि बड़े बड़े कारखाने आदि चलते हैं। जब आप दोनों पर सीलिंग लगायेंगे तभी आप चाय करेयें। अब इस देश के किसानों ने जिन्होंने कि इस देश के स्वाधीन कराने में महत्वपूर्ण भाग भूटा किया और स्वाधीनता प्राप्ति में अनेक कठिनाइयाँ झेली, उनकी जमीन की तो आप सीलिंग कर दें और शहर वालों को, धनिकों और मोटे-मोटे तनख़ाहदारों को त बरे, तो यह आपका उनसे साथ मराम प्रन्धाय होगा।

आपने जमींदारी प्रथा को तो हटाया लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिनको आपने मुआविजा नहीं दिया है, उन सबमें से कोई एक नीति निर्धारित होनी चाहिये और यह देखना चाहिये कि कितने भ्रादमी ऐसे हैं जिनको कि १ करोड़ या ५० लाख रुपये मुआविजा मिलने वाला है और साथ ही यह भी आपकी ख्याल रखना पड़ेगा कि क्या कोई भी स्टेट सरकार इतना मुआविजा दे सकती है। प्लानिंग कमिशन को इस बारे में मोचना चाहिये और उस अनुसार प्लान बरे और देश को आगे बढ़ाये।

मेरी समझ में इस समस्या को हल करने के लिये हमारे सामने दो रास्ते हैं। एक रास्ता तो वह जो कि सरकार हमको दिखा रही है और दूसरा रास्ता श्री विनोबा भावे का है। अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय जब श्री विनोबा भावे से मिले तो उन्होंने इस पर और देश के सामने पेश धन्य सवालियों पर उनसे

[श्री विभूति मिश्र]

विचार विनिमय किया। श्री विनोबा भावे और अन्य गांधीवादी लोगों का यह स्थाल है कि छोटी-छोटी जमीनों में लार्ज स्केल फार्मिंग की अपेक्षा अधिक पैदावार होती है। मैं भी इसमें उनके साथ सहमत हूँ कि उस किसान के पास जिसके पास १ एकड़, आधा एकड़ या एक चौथाई एकड़ खेती है, उससे बड़ा लार्ज स्केल फार्मिंग की अपेक्षा अधिक पैदावार होती है। मैं उन लोगों को जो कि लार्ज स्केल फार्मिंग के पक्ष में हैं, उनको चेलेज करता हूँ कि वह मेरे साथ गांव में चल कर खुद इसका आजमायें कि यह बात सही है कि नहीं।

दूसरी बात में इस मिलमिले में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप सारी जमीन का इकट्ठा करके लार्ज स्केल फार्मिंग करेंगे तो देश में बेकारी बढ जायेगी और देश के सामने एक ऐसी समस्या पैदा हो जायेगी जिसका कि आप सामना नहीं कर सकेंगे। इसलिये यह उचित है कि किसानों की आप हर तरह से मदद करें और उनका अधिक पैदावार करने में लिये प्रोत्साहन दें ताकि हमारा देश खाद्य के संबंध में आत्मनिर्भर हो जाय।

हमारे बिहार प्रांत में बटाईदारी कानून पार हो गया है। अभी जमीन की सीलिंग तय नहीं हुई है और नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि बहुत से गरीब कृषकों की जमीनें उनमें छीन कर उनको इजेक्ट कर दिया है। अब वे बेचारे उमथ खिलाफ कचहरी में जाकर लडे तो कहा मे लडे, मुकद्दमा वह लड नहीं सकते हैं और सबूत वगैरह दिखाना नहीं सकते हैं और नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि बहुत से गरीब व्यक्ति बेजमीन हो गये हैं। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार जमीन को बटाई कानून के साथ साथ जमीन को सीलिंग कर दे और जमीन की सीलिंग के साथ साथ यह जा बड़े राज महाराजा और सम्पत्ति वाले हैं, उनकी भी सीलिंग कर दे।

जो जमीन है उसका रेट अभी तक ठीक से तय नहीं हुआ है। कहीं १ पया बीघा रेट है तो कहीं पर १० रुपये बीघा रेट है तो कहीं ऐसी अनैकनॉमिक होल्डिंग है जिसमें कि किसान पैदावार करते और कमाते कमाते मर जाता है लेकिन उस जमीन का रेट पूरा नहीं दे पाता है। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि अनैकनॉमिक होल्डिंग्स का रेट माफ कर देना चाहिये। इस संबंध में कांग्रेस के विभिन्न सेशन में आवाज उठाई गई और फैजपुर कांग्रेस अधिवेशन में इस आशय का एक प्रस्ताव पार किया गया जिसमें यह कहा गया कि अनैकनॉमिक होल्डिंग्स का रेट कम होना चाहिये।

इसके अतिरिक्त लेड रिफार्म्स के मिल-मिले में इस चीज के ऊपर भी सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये कि किसान लोग अत्यधिक कर्जों के भार में दबे हुये हैं और कर्जों का भार इतना अधिक है और वे इतने अधिक उमके नीचे दबे हुये हैं कि किसान लोग उमको दे नहीं पाते हैं। एनालिस कमिशन को हम सबध में भी सोचना चाहिये कि आज की अवस्था में आखिर किसान यह कर्जा देगा तो कहा से देगा। इसलिये सरकार को इस तरह का एक आदेश निकाल देना चाहिये और जो उनके ऊपर पहले के कर्ज लदे हैं उनको माफ कर देना चाहिये तभी किसान कुछ चैन और राहत की साम ले सकेंगे।

यह हर्ष का विषय है कि हमारी सरकार किसानों के बारे में सोचती रहती है और पूज्य बापू जी तो सदैव ही किसानों के लिये सोचते रहते थे और आज भी हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू किसानों के हित के लिये सोचते रहते हैं। लेकिन मैं यहाँ पर एक बात जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि कल ही एक प्रस्ताव आया था जिसमें गन्ने का दाम बढ़ाने की भाग की गई थी और वह माँग उचित भी थी। अब १३ पये ६ आने ती

Reforms in the Country

चीनी के ऊपर केन्द्रीय सरकार और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट टैक्स लेती है और १४ रुपये ६ आने किसानों को देते हैं। अब आप ही मोर्चिये कि इस १४ रुपये ६ आने में किसानों की कार्टेज और दूसरी चीजें भी शामिल रहती हैं जब कि ६ रुपये और कुछ आने वे पूजीपति जो चीनी बनाते हैं वे गन्ने में लेते हैं, तो ऐसी हालत में किसानों की बेहलरी कैसे होगी। अब सरकार को किसानों की उपज से काफी आयदनी होती है। केन्द्रीय सरकार को टी और जूट पर जो बह टैक्स लगानी है उसमें काफी इनकम होती है और इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि आप किसानों को इतना प्रोत्साहन और मदद दें जिससे कि वह अपनी जमीन का मुधार कर सकें।

शुभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने अहमदाबाद में कहा कि ११ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन ऐसी है जिसका कि बटवारा हो सकता है तो मैं कहूंगा कि इसमें हमारी सरकार को जल्द से जल्द कदम उठाना चाहिये। जितना कदम उठाया है मन्नीषप्रद है, लेकिन इतना कदम उठाने में काम नहीं चल सकता। इसलिये हमको सीधेता करनी चाहिये। श्री नन्दा जी तो गांधीवादी हैं, वे गांधी जी के साथ रहे हैं। गांधी जी रात दिन परिश्रम करते थे, कभी रात में दो घंटे सोते थे कभी तीन घंटे, और मात्रे तीन बजे से तो रोज उठकर काम करना शुरू कर देते थे। यदि हम इतना परिश्रम नहीं करेंगे तो हमारा देश आगे नहीं बढ़ेगा। इसलिये प्लानिंग कमीशन को जरूरत है कि देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये भूमि सुधार के लिये अच्छे खाद, अच्छे बीज, कर्जा और पानी का इन्तिजाम करें। इन सारी चीजों को किये बिना भूमि सुधार नहीं हो सकता। सरकार को अब इस काम को और आगे के लिये नहीं छोड़ना चाहिये। कांग्रेस कार्य समिति ने कहा है कि इस काम को सन् १९५६ के अन्त तक खत्म कर देना चाहिये। लेकिन इसके इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में समय लगेगा। असल झगडा तो इम्प्लीमेंटेशन का

ही है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि सरकार को जल्दी से जल्दी कदम उठाना चाहिये और भूमि सुधार का ऐसा खाका दुनिया और हिन्दुस्तान के मामले रखना चाहिये जिसको लोग समझ सकें और काम में लायें।

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): This resolution is a very simple one, and I wish that the Ministry or the ruling party which has not so far accepted, or agreed to act upon the land reforms, will at least accept or agree to review the position which we have so far achieved. The history of land reforms in our country is the most disconcerting history that we have known so far. I do not think any reform has had so many ups and downs as this land reform has had. The reasons for that are very evident so far as I am concerned.

The change in the Congress or the ruling party's membership and the influence that is growing within it, of the landlords, in the past few years have been responsible mainly to almost scuttle the whole scheme of land reforms. Both the first Five Year Plan and the second Five Year Plan have very clearly and definitely given a kind of correct understanding of the necessity of land reforms and yet, after ten years of rule, we find the ruling party discussing very seriously whether land reforms should ever be implemented or not, whether land reforms are going to increase the food production or not, whether land reforms are really going to democratize the nation's democratic structure or not. I am really surprised at the way in which this Government which talks of the socialists' pattern of society on the one hand, refuses to implement land reforms even in the minutest form on the other.

Shri M P Mishra (Begusarai):
Land reforms of your conception

Shri Nagi Reddy: Off my conception, of course. Of course, the Congress has not accepted the land reforms of the conception of the Planning Commission for the very simple reason that the ruling party has refused to implement them, except in tall talk, and I should almost say that they have accepted it in words just to deceive the people on the question of the progress of the country.

Shri M. P. Mishra: Kerala Government

Shri Nagi Reddy: Yes, the Kerala Government started it six months ago. But the Congress Government has been there for ten years. I would like them to search their hearts, and see whether they themselves have done anything towards the proper implementation of their own programmes. Therefore it is that I am appealing to the Congress party and to the leaders of the Congress party, the rulers of the Congress party, that they should at least search their hearts and come out in the open. If they are not ready to implement the land reforms, let them tell the country so in the open. "We are not prepared to implement the land reforms." But let them not again deceive the people by telling them that they want to implement the reforms but yet they want some time to do that, as if ten years were not enough.

I should like to remind the Congress that the Karachi Congress had given a programme which is not yet implemented till this day. It was in 1929 that the Karachi Congress told the country that if we had to improve production, these reforms will have to be carried out. I would like to ask how far we have achieved. Even in regard to tenancy legislation, we have not achieved anything even though there might be here and there a few reforms just on the statute-book. Talking loud or enacting a law are by themselves not enough. To implement the measures with the very same seriousness with which we bring in the law is also a necessity.

I would like the rulers to review the whole position of their tenancy laws and see whether anything tangible has been implemented, and if it is not implemented, see why it is not implemented. If it has yet to be implemented, they must see how it has to be implemented. Our Prime Minister has told the country quite a number of times that the implementation of tenancy law is the most important and immediate necessity for the country. We know that in my own State where the tenancy reform has been passed, 50 per cent of the produce goes to the tenant as against the recommendation of the Planning Commission. But then the Planning Commission's recommendations are all scuttled and thrown overboard. That is the general rule of the party in power. We know also that immediately when the tenancy law was passed, hundreds of thousands of tenants have been thrown out of the land. Do we not know that in our country which has a large number of illiterates, the tenants do not have the rights in writing? Do we not know that in our country which is illiterate and which has had a feudal set-up till yesterday, the tenants do not have the protection unless the Government comes forward to give them protection not only in law but through the administration?

I should like to know in how many cases the Government in any State has taken into its head to see that even the limited reforms that the State has passed have been implemented and to what extent the administration has been useful to the tenants who have been suffering. Therefore the Government must understand the difficulties of the poorer classes in the country.

We have been talking in the House quite a number of times of incentives to production for the bigger people, the monopolists. Incentive is the watch word which is used for greater production. We have been using the word incentive for the sake of millionaires. I would like to know what

is the incentive that we have given to the man in the street, the man who actually tills the land, the man who goes into the fields day and night. Yet, except a few sympathetic words and crocodile tears which we see here now and then, nothing tangible has been done.

Let us take the question seriously. Land reform is a big thing. To distribute the land of the landlord might be a very difficult problem. But after ten years of rule, have we tried seriously to distribute even the cultivable waste land which is in the hands of the Government? Has at least any serious trial been made? Of course, a trial has been made, and I very well remember that the Congressmen who had been to jail have been getting land enough in my own State, and the lands of the agricultural labourers have been naturally taken away from their hands to provide land for the sake of Congressmen who had suffered so much during the days of the satyagraha and struggle for freedom. Except that type of distribution which has taken place during these ten years, what has been done?

I would like the Congress Government to review the position of the past so many years and see how much of the cultivable land which is in the hands of the Government has been distributed up to this day. Therefore it is that I request the Government to accept this very innocuous resolution.

Let us review the whole position and see at least after ten years where we stand, how we should act and also know the way in which we should proceed. This hazy way is not the proper way. Now, a new argument has begun within the Congress party as to why people should come and ask for the distribution of land when you are not prepared to distribute the wealth in the cities. That is a great question, and that is put as though those people who are against the distribution of land now are immediate-

ly prepared to see that all the industries are socialized and that all wealth which is in the hands of millionaires is pooled for the interests of the country. I wish they are really serious about it and fight for it seriously. But they are not.

Is it not a fact, and do they not understand that no industrial revolution in any country has ever been successful unless there has been land reform first? Is it not a fact that every industrial revolution has been a revolution for the sake of the formation of capital and that the formation of capital can never take place properly unless there is land reform first? Is it not a fact that consumers' capacity to purchase in our country can be increased only after the distribution of land? Is it not a fact that to democratise the life of the people within the villages, land reform is the most essential thing? How many times I have seen with my own eyes agricultural labourers not allowed to exercise their democratic right of voting! Comrade Gopalan, who was with me in the days of the elections in Andhra, has seen how in my own district agricultural labourers have been thrown back from the polling station by the magic wand of the power which the landlord holds within the village. A few days back, in my district, in Kadiri taluk, a landlord actually put out the two eyes of a tenant simply because the tenant would not come forward and act upon his orders. Unfortunately, the tenant happened to be a Harijan. So, the landlords' hold over the villages can be curtailed only if there is land reform.

Some people ask, what is Kerala doing? I might say that in Kerala the Tenancy Act has not only been passed, but also implemented. There the administration is not on the side of the landlords; it is on the side of the tenants who are illiterate, who have no rights in this country and who cannot justifiably fight for their rights without the help of the Government from behind. There the cultivable

[Shri Nagi Reddi]

waste lands are being distributed even within a year of their coming to power. But after ten years of power, there is not a single Congress State where they have seriously started to distribute these lands. There is not a single Congress State where they are thinking seriously of the implementation of the land reforms.

Therefore, I request the Congress Ministry to accept this resolution and place it on record. Let us review the whole position and see that justice is done in the interests of the poorer classes of the country, so that we may march forward towards the socialist pattern of society.

Shri Vasudevan Nair. Mr Deputy-Speaker, there is full agreement on one question between all the parties in this country between this side of the House and the other side and that is that we are in a mass. We are facing very serious difficulties. Our plan is in a crisis. Agricultural production is very low. After ten years of freedom we have to import foodgrains from other countries worth hundreds of crores of rupees every year. Really we are in a vicious circle.

From the beginning of our national movement, it was accepted by all parties and sections of our people that the only way of progress for our country, which is mainly agrarian, is that of basic land legislation. But what has happened to those promises made by the ruling party? I do not wish to go over the ground covered by the previous speakers so efficiently. I would like to call the policy enunciated by the ruling party as a go slow policy. The recent decision of the AICC at Hyderabad to appoint again a sub-committee to go into the details of the problem and to examine whether fixation of ceiling on land is after all a good and healthy measure that will help to increase production, again shows that the ruling party is dodging the issue. I do not know whether it is deliberate or not. Perhaps the

leadership is forced to take such decisions to dodge this issue.

But the result is clear. After ten years of freedom, no State in our country has succeeded in implementing any kind of basic land reforms. In the last session, in answer to a question, our Planning Minister was pleased to state that in almost all the States, Governments are contemplating on land reforms. This is really a strange kind of contemplation. They are contemplating on the land reforms and the necessity of fixation of ceiling for nearly 10 years! Most of the States are continuing that contemplation. But fortunately, from papers we understand that the Congress Working Committee has very recently come to a decision that before 31st December, 1959 throughout the whole of this country, all Governments should implement land reforms, including fixation of ceilings on the present holdings.

I agree that in certain States in India, measures were taken to fix ceiling of land on future holdings. But in the present decision of the Congress Working Committee, it is stated that steps should be taken to fix ceiling on land as far as the present holdings are concerned. But I have a fear and I would urge upon the hon. Planning Minister to find a way out. We all know that our landlords are very clever. They have taken this signal from the decision of the Congress Working Committee that at least after all these dodgings, deliberations, go slow policy, etc., this ceiling is going to come in some form or another, because of the pressure from millions of peasantry in this country and the strength of the democratic movement, that reform is going to come. There is no doubt left in my mind that by the time the State Governments take steps to fix ceiling on land, there will be absolutely no land left, because already the landlords have taken the signal that "Before 31st December, 1959, there is going to be ceiling on land; so be prepared!" I do not say

*Progress of Land
Reforms in the Country*

that this decision is deliberately meant for that, but the result is that all kinds of manipulations will be there. There will be all kinds of division and transfer of land, so that when the law comes into effect, there will be practically no land left for fixing the ceiling.

What are we going to do to prevent this eventuality? I think some hon. Members referred to the fact that this is a subject mainly concerned with the State Governments. I would urge upon the Planning Minister at least to think about this problem, consult the Law Ministry to bring forward some kind of legislation, if possible in this House, or to advise the State Governments to resort to some kind of preliminary legislation to prevent this eventuality. Otherwise, what is the use? We have had experience in the past. The Planning Commission itself has pointed out that even though fixity of tenure was there in many States, though land legislation was there to that effect, nearly 57 per cent. of the tenants in the whole of this country were evicted, in spite of the fact that many States went ahead with land legislation. The Planning Commission has recommended that all these cases should be re-examined and the land should be given back to them. Now my appeal to the Minister is this. Even if the Central Government or the ruling party or many of the State Governments are not prepared to go ahead boldly in this direction, they should at least allow those States which are prepared to do something in the matter to go ahead. I refer to this because I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister—he may not know it—that the Kerala Legislative Assembly has passed the Jenmikaram Abolition Bill. It is a simple Bill and that Bill has come before the Central Government for the President's assent, I think eight months or a year back. That Bill is still sleeping in the files of the Central Government for the last one year and we hear that there is an objection from the Home Ministry that this Bill cannot be given assent, because as a result

of the Bill certain religious institutions, which are at present having certain income, will be deprived of a part of the income after 8 years when compensation will be paid. That was the view taken by the Home Ministry of the Government of India. I do not know about the Planning Commission. The Home Ministry have asked the State Governments to see to it that the present income of these religious institutions should be the very same. They should assure that those incomes remain the same for all time to come. How are the State Governments going to solve the land problem when this is the attitude taken by the Central Government?

So my request is that the Home Ministry or the Planning Commission should reverse this decision, if there is such a decision. Because, the other Bill that is before our State Assembly is a comprehensive agrarian reforms Bill. Now there is no use our State Government, or for that matter any State Government, passing any such legislation if this is going to be the attitude of the Central Government, so far as land reforms are concerned. Let the Government abolish this go-slow policy and let them allow others to pass ahead, if they are not prepared to do that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are there any Members from Madhya Pradesh or Madras? I find there are none. So, I will call a Member from Mysore.

Shri Thimmalah (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes): During the past 10 to 12 years we have talked very much about land reforms and the land problem. After the advent of independence what the Congress did was that they abolished landlordism, jagirdari and vested interests to some extent. Now we feel that we have not moved very briskly in the direction of land reforms. We have told the masses that land reforms would be introduced and the tiller of the land will become the owner of the land. Now, after ten years, we are still shouting that the tiller of the land should become the owner of the land. I may not be

[Shri Thimmaiah]

wrong when I say that in our country if the masses were educated enough to understand the promises given by the Government or the party, I do not think today the party in power would have been returned to power, because their promises to the masses are yet to be implemented, our promises are yet to be fulfilled.

I am one of those who belong to the landless labour. I do not belong to a family of landlords. I have seen with my own eyes a lot of labourers, landless labourers, who are being exploited by the landlords without any mercy. There are still lots of people in this country who are beggars, who have got no employment, who are not getting even the work of a labourer. Our country being mainly agricultural, our Government should have thought of first solving the problem of land and giving something to the people, as something is better than nothing. In China, for instance, they did it. Of course, their method was different. But, all the same, they did it within a short time and now they have no problem like ours.

We have to distribute land to the people who deserve it, people who want to till the land. I know that will lead to fragmentation and sub-division and will impair production of food. But people cannot understand these things, because a majority of them are uneducated. Of course, I for myself can very well understand that fragmentation will harm production.

In Japan, for example, every family is getting two acres of land. There the production has not decreased. Their standard of life has not decreased. They have adopted intensive cultivation and have increased the production of foodgrains. Why not we do it here also? Here in the ryotwari areas if a family has got three acres of land, both the husband and wife work in the field. They bring the manure and do all sorts of work and get an increased yield. In the bigger estates the landlord, because he is a

rich man, only invests some money without taking any personal interest in cultivation. So the yield is very much less there. Therefore, I am not prepared to accept the view that land reforms will hamper production and the production will go down.

For the past ten years we have been telling the labour that land will be given to the tiller of the land. Even if the production is bound to go down, still, as we have found remedies for other evils, why not we find something for this also? Why should we not be a little more generous and kind to the poor people who are tilling the land? After all, we must remember that a majority of people are poor. Now we speak of socialistic pattern of society. What is socialistic pattern of society? Is it to compare our life to that of an American richman? Are we to have the maximum standard of living like a richman in America? I do not object to that. We must strive to achieve that standard of living. But, in the existing circumstances, we have to think of our own brethren, who are poor and ignorant. We will have to give them something. We cannot go back on our promises.

Of course, I do not say that we should arbitrarily distribute the land without any regard to the principles of natural justice. Now what have we done for the tiller? We have not done anything. But, thanks to the Government, they are now taking it up seriously and they are going to introduce some reform. About those reforms a talk is going on that they do not want to put a ceiling on existing holdings and that they want to put a ceiling on future acquisition. But there is no land to acquire at all. To tell you the truth, all the land is monopolised.

What these people, who have got big estates of land, say is that the standard of life will go down. How can the standard of life go down? Is a man depending only upon land as his main profession? I am an M.P., who does not own land. There are so many M.Ps. without land. So, what differ-

ence does it make? His standard of life will not go down to the extent of land I do not have land. At least, all his land will not be taken away. His standard of life will be there. Therefore I say that ceiling on the existing land will have to be kept to some extent. I do not say that you distribute the land to everyone and whoever does not deserve it. I want you to see that a man, who can till the land, must get it. I also say that the ceiling on existing land is necessary and is indispensable under the existing circumstances of the country. If you want to enthuse the masses of this country, if you want to see that the masses feel that they have got something and that they are getting something and if you want to see that a new spirit is inculcated in the masses, you will have to give land to the common men and satisfy them.

Lastly, there is another argument advanced by our friends, who have got large estates of land and that is, "Why are you bothered about the ryots?" They use the word "ryoti." I only use the word "ryot" to define the poor peasants and not the big landlords. They say, "Why are you bothered about the land-owners? Why do you worry about their ceiling? Why don't you put a ceiling on those who have lots of money in the banks?" Of course, I am also one of those who believe in ceiling on personal income. But we discussed the same Resolution of ceiling on income and the House decided that in order to give for some time an incentive to produce more wealth in the country ceiling on personal income is not necessary. Nevertheless, we have got a certain ceiling on the personal income of people. What is the industrial policy of our country? The very industrial policy of the country to some extent is a sort of a ceiling on the monied people of this country. The private sector would have opened all these three steel plants and would have earned crores of rupees. But today Government have undertaken these three plants and the Government is opening them. It is in the public sector which belongs to the

people. All these taxes, i.e., wealth-tax, expenditure tax and such other taxes, are ceilings on personal income. We are in a way putting a ceiling on personal income also. Therefore, I submit in all humility that Government should come forward seriously with land reforms and that they should introduce them as early as possible.

Shri M. C. Jain: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, though I do not subscribe to the remedy suggested by the hon. Mover of this Resolution to solve this vital problem, I congratulate and thank him for drawing the attention of this House and through this House of the whole country to this vital problem. I do not subscribe to the remedy because the Resolution says that a committee of this House be appointed to assess the progress so far made. I fail to understand what the committee will do. The assessment, so far as I know, has not only been made but is being continuously made. There is the report of the Planning Commission on the review of the First Five Year Plan. Then there is the note by the hon. Planning Minister himself which was circulated in September, 1957.

In this very connection my neighbour, Shri Mishra, has given notice of a substitute motion. He says that the House feels gratified for the progress already made in this regard. I cannot subscribe to this Resolution. The House cannot at all feel gratified for the progress so far made with regard to land reforms. How can the House feel gratified if the Planning Commission itself is not gratified and if the hon. Planning Minister himself is not gratified? In this connection I may be allowed to quote briefly from the reports of the Planning Commission as well as from the note of the hon. Planning Minister. Here, on page 320, para 12, the Planning Commission says

"Apart from delays in undertaking legislation needed for the protection of tenants and variations in the rights offered to them in different States, frequent

[Shri M. C. Jain]

changes in detail in the legislation which was enacted and the complex rules which followed the legislation tended to some extent to defeat the objects of land reform. In many of the tenancy laws resumption was permitted only on grounds of personal cultivation, but owing to difficulties of definition, no less than that of enforcement, it would appear that considerable resumption of land took place. Sometimes this took the form of so-called voluntary surrenders. Although the area which a land-owner could resume was limited, in several States demarcation between the resumable and the non-resumable areas did not take place within a prescribed period so that the security afforded to the tenant remained incomplete. The experience of the First Five Year Plan emphasises the importance of efficient administration of land reform legislation and of informed and well-organised public opinion in every local community."

Generally speaking, this did not happen.

This is what the Planning Commission says.

Similarly, the note circulated by the hon. Planning Minister himself says the following regarding this very problem, i.e., the problem of enforcement:

"In several States land reform measures have been enacted slowly and without adequate arrangements for administration. Both the pace and the content of such measures are affected to a large extent by social and political pressures and conflicting attitudes. It is not surprising in these circumstances if many gaps are left and the law by its own inherent weakness, apart from administrative difficulties, fails to serve the object fully. In a large number of States tenancy reform laws have had to be continuously

amended from time to time as they were found either ineffective or unsatisfactory"so on and so forth.

Therefore, when I say that—so far as the assessment is concerned, it is already there—the main problem is as to what can be done now and how can the policy enunciated in the Second Five Year Plan with regard to land reforms be implemented.

In this connection I want to emphasise two aspects of the problem. One is the problem of ejected tenants and the other problem is that of the ceiling. In the short time at my disposal I do not want to raise the problem of reasonable rent because the problem of fair rent is connected with the security of tenure. When there is no security of tenure, whatever the law may be, there cannot be fair rent. Therefore, I am concentrating only on two aspects, i.e., the problem of ejected tenants and the problem of ceiling.

Even these two problems are interconnected. So far as the problem of ceiling is concerned I find that doubts are being created with regard to this though already the policy is clear. The Planning Commission wants it. The Government has decided that there should be a ceiling on land, yet I heard ominous voice, raised against this policy. Even sometimes hon. Ministers of the Government and some important Congress leaders, apart from other rightist parties in the country, raised their voice—and sometimes a very strong voice—against this policy. However I am thankful that the sub-committee recently appointed by the All-India Congress Committee has come to a definite conclusion that there will be ceiling and that they have fixed a time limit.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is another committee which is going to be appointed.

Shri M. C. Jain: Of course, I want to emphasise that a sufficient period

has already elapsed and now that the committee has taken a final decision, there will be no more delay. So far as those people are concerned, i.e., those who raised their voices against ceiling, their main arguments are that there should be ceiling on other incomes also, i.e., non-agricultural income. They say that if there is ceiling on land, there will be less production. So far as ceiling on other incomes is concerned, I entirely agree with them and I want to emphasise that unless this Government decides to have ceiling on other incomes, i.e., urban income, industrial income and income in other sectors, there will be this constant bickering and bitterness that one sector only is affected.

16 hrs.

I am glad that even in this regard, though our Prime Minister sometimes back resisted this move, and objected to it, yet, there is a step further now and our leaders, high up, are thinking of fixing a ceiling on other incomes also. Why I have mentioned this point here is because, I feel that unless there is a clear policy and a clear implementation of the policy, i.e., side by side simultaneously, we fix the ceiling on other income, it will be very difficult to implement this policy. Therefore I plead that if we want to implement land reforms or to amend the laws and to effectively implement them, we must fix a ceiling on other incomes also.

There is also another question involved, that is, loyalty to our principles. Unless we are loyal to our principles, we cannot enforce or implement these policies. In this connection also I cannot do better than quote Shri Dhebar who has written a very beautiful article in the Congress Economic Review of Feb 1958. He says with regard to the land problem.

"Let us take the problem of land. Have we been able to abolish the fear of evictions from the mind of the tenants? The

farmer, wrinkled and worried, is eagerly waiting for the title to the land on which he, and perhaps his old father, have spent a lifetime of toil, sweat and tears. His is a claim for bare justice. He wants stability. There are other interests, however. He who labours must have the first claim. Here is a test of our loyalty to the values of a new way of life. There is similarly a demand for application of ceilings. This is necessary in the country's interest apart from being just. We fumble for solution. It is not that the solutions are not there. There is lack of clarity, neither on the subject matter nor on the solution, but on the basic issue of 'basic loyalty'.

Therefore, it is a test whether we are loyal to our ideals. With all the emphasis at my command, with all the humility, I say to the Planning Minister that the time has come when we should show our loyalty to these ideals. Where are our ideals? There are several organisations including the Congress. Here, we have tenants. The tenants are there, the landlords are there, labourers are there; employers are there. There is a continuing conflict of interest. How can any organisation, how can any party progress further when this conflict is continuously there?

Because of shortage of time, I cannot make other points. I plead, if this vital problem is to be solved, the Government and the top leadership will have to take a firmer attitude and if anybody is found who is not loyal to the ideal, there must be some punishment for that. If that attitude is adopted, I feel that this problem will be solved.

श्री जगदीश प्रवर्षा (बिल्हौर)

उद्योग महादय, सदन के सामने भूमि-सुधारो के सन्बन्ध में जो प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है, उस पर कई माननीय सदस्यों ने अपनी विचार व्यक्त किये हैं। इसमें कोई

[श्री जगदीश शर्मा]

सन्देह नहीं है कि हमारे देश में जहाँ धीर श्रमिक प्रमुख समस्याएँ हैं, वहाँ एक प्रमुख समस्या भूमि सम्बन्धी है। इस देश की लगभग नब्बे प्रतिशत जनसंख्या भूमि पर—खेती पर—ही निर्भर है। स्वतंत्रता प्राप्त करने के पश्चात् कई राज्य सरकारों ने प्रयत्न किये कि भूमि सम्बन्धी कुछ कानून बनाये जायें धीर कुछ राज्यों ने कानून बनाये भी, लेकिन यह तथ्य है कि इस सम्बन्ध में जितनी सफलता मिलनी चाहिये थी, वह प्राप्त नहीं हुई। जब देश पराज था, तब यह कहा जाता था कि इस देश में जब तक जमींदारी प्रथा कायम रहेगी, तब तक कमी भी भूमि का ठीक सुधार नहीं हो सकता, क्योंकि जमींदार लोग किसानों से अधिक लगान लेते हैं और उनकी बेदखलिया करते हैं, इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त की जाए। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की बात कहता हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश में जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त हो गई है, लेकिन उस समय की प्रमुख समस्याएँ, अर्थात् अत्यधिक लगान लेना और बेदखलिया करना, आज भी ज्यों की त्यों बनी हुई हैं। जब वहाँ जमींदारी प्रथा कायम थी, तो राज्य सरकार किसानों से सोलह करोड़ रुपये रेवेन्यू के लेती थी। जमींदारी समाप्त होने के बाद उनका लगान कम होना चाहिये था, लेकिन वह सोलह करोड़ से बढ़ कर बाईस करोड़ हो गया है, जिसका परिणाम यह है कि आज किसानों में भूमि-सुधार के प्रति कोई उत्साह शेष नहीं रह गया है और उन्हें उसमें कोई आकर्षण नष्ट नहीं आता है। जहाँ तक बेदखलियों का सम्बन्ध है, उन में भी कोई कमी नहीं हुई है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब बेदखलियाँ जारी हैं और अत्यधिक लगान लिया जा रहा है, तो फिर चाँद भी कानून बनाये, उससे कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है। उत्तर प्रदेश में आज भी अस्ती प्रतिशत जोतेँ अलाभप्रद है।

जब किसान को इस पेशे से कोई लाभ नहीं होता है, तो नैतिकता की दृष्टि से वह उचित नहीं है कि उनसे मालगुजारी बसूल की जाए। जब उनको आमदनी ही नहीं होती तो फिर मालगुजारी किस चीज की? इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार सिद्धान्त रूप से इसको स्वीकार करे कि जिन प्रदेशों में जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त हो गई है, वहाँ लगान के बदले मालगुजारी की जाती है, वहाँ अलाभकर जोतों से मालगुजारी लेना समाप्त कर देना चाहिये। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, उत्तर प्रदेश में अस्ती प्रतिशत जोतेँ अलाभकर हैं। यह कहा जा सकता है कि अगर मेरे सुझाव को क्रियान्वित किया गया, तो जो राजस्व इकट्ठा होता है, वह बहुत कम हो जायेगा। कुछ करोड़ रुपये कम हो सकते हैं, लेकिन उस कमी को आप बड़े बड़े लोगों से, सरकार मिल-मालिकों से पूरा कर सकते हैं, जिनकी तरफ़ करोड़ों रुपये बकाया पड़े हैं। अगर सरकार इस सुझाव पर अमल करेगी, तो इससे किसानों में चेतना प्राप्त होगी कि स्वराज्य मिलने से हमको सुख प्राप्त हुआ है।

इसके बाद मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बेदखलियों को रोका जाना चाहिये। अन्य राज्यों की तरह उत्तर प्रदेश में भी सरकार ने इस आशय के कानून बनाये, लेकिन उसमें सफलता नहीं मिल रही है। हमको देखना है कि वहाँ बेदखलिया होने का मूल कारण क्या है। जिन माननीय सदस्यों का गाँवों के जीवन से सम्बन्ध है, वे जानते हैं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में सब के छोटा रेवेन्यू आफिसर—जिसको पहले पटवारी कहते थे और जिसको अब लेखपाल कहा जाता है—इन बेदखलियों की जड़ है; अगर बेदखलिया कराने के लिये कोई उत्तरदायी है, तो वह इन लेखपालों का भ्रष्टाचारी वर्ग है, जो कि गाँव गाँव में मौजूब हैं। जिस जमीन को कोई किसान दस बीस सात

से जोतता धाया है, उसको दूसरे के नाम चढ़ा दिया जाता है और जब कोर्ट से सूचना मिलती है, तब ही किसान को मालूम होता है कि उसके खिलाफ बेदखली का मुकदमा दायर किया गया है। उत्तर प्रदेश में जो भी किसान चाहे, वह धाठ धाने दे कर जिनसे वार खतीनी ले सकता है—जो जमीन वह जोतता है, उसका एबस्ट्रेट रिकार्ड ले सकता है। मैं चाहता हू कि निश्चित रूप से राज्य सरकारों को यह आदेश दे दिया जाय कि लेखपाल भ्रान्तवार्य रूप से और निष्पक्ष, वर्ष में दो बार हरेक किसान परिवार को उसकी खतीनी दे, जिससे उसको मालूम हो जाए कि जो जमीन हम जोतते हैं, उस पर हमारा हक है और हमारा नाम चढ़ा हुआ है। अगर ऐसा किया जायेगा, तो आज जो हजारों मुकदमे बेदखलियों के कचहरियों में चल रहे हैं, वे बन्द हो जायेंगे। आज तो स्थिति यह है कि किसान को मालूम भी नहीं पड़ता है और खेत दूसरे के नाम चढ़ जाता है। इसलिये राज्य सरकारों को इस तरह का आदेश दे देना चाहिये।

श्री सिद्दासन सिंह (गोरखपुर)
किसान अब भी ले सकता है।

श्री जगदीश अचरथी वह वालेन्टरी है, भ्रान्तवार्य रूप से नहीं है। मैं चाहता हू कि उसको भ्रान्तवार्य कर दिया जाए, ताकि इस प्रकार की बेदखलियों से और मुकदमेबाजी से किसानों को छटकारा मिल सके। जिस प्रकार कल्ल, डकैती और अन्य मुकदमों में प्रथम सूचना रिपोर्ट भन्त तक—सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक—काम में आती है, उसी प्रकार पटवारी या लेखपाल झूठ सच जो कुछ भी अपने कागजों में लिख देता है, वही आखिर तक काम आता है। मेरा सुझाव है कि, राज्य सरकारों को यह आदेश दिया जाए कि किसानों को भ्रान्तवार्य रूप से और निष्पक्ष खतीनी वर्ष में दो बार उपलब्ध की जाय, ताकि बेदखलिया कम हो।

आज भूमि की सब से बड़ी समस्या अधिकतम और न्यूनतम जोत कायम करने की है। अगर हम देश में सचमुच सच्चा और वास्तविक समाजवाद कायम करना चाहते हैं तो हमको धन और धरती की अल्पतम और अधिकतम सीमा निर्धारित करनी पड़ेगी। उत्तर प्रदेश के विषय में मैं कहना चाहता हू कि हर एक ऐसे किसान परिवार को कम से कम सवा छ एकड़ भूमि मिलनी चाहिये, जिसमें पांच व्यक्ति हो। अधिकतम सीमा तीस एकड़ से अधिक न रखी जाये। इस तरह उन हजारों किसान परिवारों और खेतियार मजदूरों को भूमि मिल सकेगी, जिनके पास कोई भूमि नहीं है। स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के समय जिनके पास पहले ही हजारों एकड़ भूमि थी, उन्होंने और एलाटमेंट करवा कर अपनी जमीन और बड़ा ली है। बड़े बड़े लोग सुरसा की तरह जमीन पर अपना कब्जा बढ़ा रहे हैं। जब अल्पतम और अधिकतम जोत निश्चित कर दी जायेगी, तब हम समझेंगे कि हमारे देश में सच्चा समाजवाद कायम हो सकता है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इन सुझावों को केन्द्र के मंत्री राज्य सरकारों के पास भेजें, जिससे कि हम भूमि सम्बन्धी सुधारों को कर सकें।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat) West Bengal is a standing example of the ingenuity of the ruling Congress Party in so formulating land legislation that landlords can keep their land holdings intact, because in West Bengal we have got a prescribed ceiling, and yet today this very Congress Government which originally said that they were going to have four lakhs of acres for distribution today says that it has not got more than 16,000 acres. This is the position. One cannot but ask what has happened. Is it that really landlords did not have any land? Not at all.

I come from a constituency in the Sunderbans where we had landlords owning 1,000 or 2,000 bighas of land, and today you will find in those areas

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

that this land has been divided up, *mala fide* transfers have taken place, so that the son, the daughter-in-law, the child that is born, the child that is yet to be born, have all been registered and the land has been distributed, and we find there is hardly any land which is available for distribution to the landless. These landless peasants went to Sunderbans and not only cleared the jungles fighting with snakes and tigers—Sunderbans was famous for its tigers—but actually tilled that land, and now they have been thrown out, thousands and thousands have been evicted.

Not only that. This is more interesting. The ingenuity of our landlords is, I think, limitless. They have entered what is known as the B Form, that is in respect of the land which is to revert back to Government. Some of them have done it in the meantime landless peasant refugees came to buy land. The landlord thought "I may get bonds or I may not get bonds in so many years. Let me sell by the backdoor some land to the refugee and he can get a loan. Then I can even sell this land which I have entered in the B Form to Government." You will find that transactions have taken place and money has been taken by the landlord. Now Government says to the refugee "This is our land how can you take it?" The refugee is asked to go to the civil court and fight it out, with the result he loses his land and also his money. The landlord gains. He will gain finally from the Government again, on top of that, by getting bonds or whatever the money is.

Not only that. A very interesting case came to my notice only the other day. We talk so much of co-operatives and joint stock companies, we say that we must have big farms in order to be able to have more production. Especially my Punjab friends are always talking about it. The other day I went to my constituency and

there I came across a very ingenious method by which the landlords are trying to overcome the land legislation, taking advantage of the fact that co-operatives and joint stock companies are exempted from the ceiling. I believe the Palchoudhury Estate—I do not want to say whether our Member here herself is a member of that particular trust or not—in Radha Nagar in Sunderbans have about a thousand bighas of land. They have formed it into a charitable trust. They have one temple somewhere in Nadia to which they pay money for some pooja. It was found that in the whole year they pay probably Rs 100 or Rs 135 for pooja and so many thousands are credited to the Lloyds Bank. When we go to the Minister, he says, "This, of course, is true. We also have got information, but what can I do?" It is a charitable trust covered by religious.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai) Tinge

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.

"religious tinge", as my friend says. This has resulted in the landlord being empowered today to throw out so many of the landless sharecroppers, who were there. They have been evicted, their houses have been burnt down, litigation after litigation is going on.

Next door to it is a company. One Shri Mukerjee has started a fishery and agricultural joint stock company. His wife, his daughter, his son, his relations, his *nab*, all are members of that. Now, the joint stock company cannot be touched.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad)
What about the unborn one?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The unborn one may be there, I did not check up.

In this way, this joint stock company also has been able to keep the land. In the last two years eviction has been so thoroughly carried out that now you will not find a single

Reforms in the Country

sharecropper there Hundreds of bighas of land are there Government says "What can we do? You go to a civil court" Is it possible for the sharecropper, the landless peasant, to go to court? It is not possible In spite of ceilings, this question of completely by passing land reforms is there in our State We have pleaded again and again that let there be an ordinance banning evictions for a period, and then give lands to each one of these persons, and after that, you decide In the States where there are no ceilings at present people have already started dividing up the land, transferring it or selling it, with the result that by the time you impose ceiling, there will be no land available for distribution

The other point is that actually it is not the poor that get it, it is the rich who get a little more Again, who is going to buy that land except those who have got some money? I am pleading this question when it has come to the forefront because there are sub committees, set up by the Congress, and they have also advocated that land will have to be distributed but it is better to give it to those who have less lands than to the landless We have always been talking about the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who are landless But unless we do something to give some land to them, how can we change their social and economic status? However much we may talk about it unless we give them even the smallest bit of land for their use which they can till it is no use

We say that they must increase production But how is it possible unless land is first distributed to them? Even a small bit of land will give the landless man a power to fight against the landlord, against the usuary and against the various pressures, that are there in society in the villages particularly After that we can get them together under co-operative societies, and give them State help, then they can go in for intensive cultivation Then,

we can give them all sorts of help; then, they can produce more That is the way to increase production

Lastly, I would say a word about the question of trying to get back the land by illegal transfer A number of evictions have already taken place, unless Government do something in this matter by giving some sort of legal aid, quick legal aid and cheap legal aid, in order to enable the peasant to fight his case, it is no use passing resolutions, and it is no use saying that illegal transfers and resumptions should be nullified, and that the land should be given back to the peasant It is not possible for the peasant to fight for long in the civil courts

In our State, after the tremendous peasant movement, we have been able to get for the sharecropper a bigger share in the produce of paddy, and we have actually implemented it through some sort of *bhaqchows* or sharecropper boards, where the sharecropper and his representatives and the landlord and his representatives are there In front of the agricultural officer who is given a semi-judicial position, the decision is taken Some sort of thing like this must be set up in the villages, in the districts, in the taluk headquarters so that the peasant is able to get back the land taken away by illegal transfers It is no use merely putting ceilings, unless we are really sincere about giving some land, even a small bit of land, we shall not be able to circumvent the ingenuity of the landlord

श्री गणपति राम : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैं बन्नी सरकार का जो आदर्श है श्रीर जिसको उसने अपने सामने रखा है ध्यान में लाता हू तो मेरा हृदय गद्गद हो जाता है लेकिन जब मैं उसकी कार्यशीलता को देखता हू तथा उसकी तरफ ध्यान देता हू तो मेरा दिल बैठ जाता है। सरकार कहती है कि हम जनकल्याणकारी राज्य की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं, हमें राम राज्य यहाँ स्थापित करना चाहते

[श्री. गणपति राम]

हैं लेकिन उस उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति के लिये जो कदम उठाये जाते हैं वे बहुत ही असन्तोषजनक हैं।

मुझे आश्चर्य और दुःख होता है यह देख कर कि आज जब कि देश का किसान जो कि सब को रोटी देता है, उसके बाल बच्चे झच्छी रोटी खा सकने में असमर्थ हैं, वह मजदूर जो कपड़ा तैयार करके लोगों के तन डकता है उसका तन कपड़े के बगैर रहता है और जाड़े के दिनों में वह ठिठुरता रहता है, वह मजदूर जो दूसरो को मकान बना कर देता है, और उनको रहने का साधन पंदा करता है जो दूसरो को घट्टालिकार्य बना कर देता है वही दिल्ली शहर में सड़को पर सोता है और अपना वक्त गुजारता है। इस तरह से किस तरह राम राज्य की स्थापना हो सकती है।

हम सब एक जिम्मेदार पार्टी के सदस्य हैं और हमारे ऊपर आज देश को बनाने अथवा देश को बिगाड़ने की जिम्मेदारी है। जहाँ तक भूमि सुधार की समस्या का सम्बन्ध है, उसको करने का हमने वचन लिया हुआ है और हमने कह रखा है कि हम इसको कर के रहेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारा सब से पहला काम यही होना चाहिये कि हम भूमि की जो समस्या है उसको हल करे। इस वचन को दस वर्ष लिये हुये हो गये हैं और मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज भी इस सदन के अन्दर कोई भी इसके सम्बन्ध में हम बिल नहीं ला सके हैं। मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में सब से पहले भूमि सुधार कानून पास हुआ था। लेकिन जब मैं उस कानून की कार्यशीलता को देखता हूँ तो मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि भूमि सुधारो के नाम पर, किसानो को, शिकमीदारो को जमीनों तो दी गई थी लेकिन मुकदमा चला करके, इज्जतान सूट चला करके ६० प्रतिशत और ६५ प्रतिशत खेत उनके हाथों में से निकाल लिये गये हैं। मैं

दूसरे प्रदेशों की बात नहीं करता हूँ क्योंकि मैं उनके बारे में अधिक नहीं जानता हूँ। जहाँ किसानो को पहले बटाई पर खेत मिल सकते थे, शिकमी पर खेत मिल सकते थे और जहाँ पहले वे अपने बच्चों का सालान पालन कर सकते थे, उनको रोटी दे सकते थे, आज उनकी हालत बदतर है, यह कहने में मुझे जरा भी सकोच नहीं है। उत्तर प्रदेश के भूमि सुधार कानून का हम बड़े गर्व के साथ रिकॉर्ड देते हैं लेकिन हमारा ध्यान उस तरफ भी जाना चाहिये कि जो उसमें कमिया रह गई हैं उनको दूर किया जाये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप सर्वे कर और देखें कि क्या हाल हुआ है कितनों के खेत वापस ले लिये गये हैं, कितनों के पास हल नहीं रह गये हैं, कितनों के पास जानवर नहीं रह गये हैं इत्यादि।

मैं सरकार से यह भी प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वह खुद भूमि सुधार सम्बन्धी कानून लाये। अगर वह ऐसा नहीं करती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई शर्म की बात नहीं है अगर आज इस सदन के अन्दर कोई प्राइवेट मेम्बर अपनी तरफ से रेजोल्यूशन लाता है और उसको सरकार मान लेती है। सरकार को स्वयं ही आगे आना चाहिये और ऐसा कोई कानून हम सदन के समक्ष पेश करना चाहिये। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि आज किसान के नाम पर अगर अप्पोजिशन की तरफ से कोई गम्भिर मूल्या बढ़ाने के नाम पर रेजोल्यूशन आता है उसको मान लिया जाये और हम उसको शान और शोक के साथ अप्पोज करने के लिये तैयार हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार भी शान के साथ भूमि सम्बन्धी कानून यहाँ लाने की कृपा करे और इस काम में वह प्रगती हो।

आज कहा जाता है कि भूमि के ऊपर कोई सीलिंग नहीं होनी चाहिये और पहले सम्पत्ति के ऊपर सीलिंग लगनी चाहिये।

Reforms in the Country

में इस सम्बन्ध में यह प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों की यह दलील है उनको यह दलील नहीं देनी चाहिये। सब से पहले भूमि पर सीलिंग होनी चाहिये और उसके बाद सम्पत्ति पर भी लग सकती है। कम से कम प्राप पहले एक चीज पर तो सीलिंग लगने दें और फिर दूसरी चीज पर भी सीलिंग लगाने के बारे में सरकार से प्रार्थना की जा सकती है और सरकार से कहा जा सकता है कि सम्पत्ति का भी विकेन्द्रिकरण किया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्राज की सरकार कभी भी इसको करने में पीछे नहीं रहेगी।

हमने शपथ ले रखी है कि हमें अपने देश में सोशलिस्टिक पेटर्न प्राप सोसाइटी की स्थापना करनी है। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार कभी भी पीछे नहीं रहेगी और हर बात में प्रागे ही रहेगी। प्राज जनता की यह प्रावाज है कि भूमि जोतने वाले के पास जानी चाहिये, भूमि उसी के पास रहनी चाहिये जो उसकी स्वयं काश्त करता है, भूमि उसके पास नहीं रहनी चाहिये जो भूमि पर पाव नहीं रखता है, जो कभी हल नहीं चलाता है, जो कभी बँल को भूसा नहीं देता है और जनता की इस प्राग को पूरा करना प्रापके लिये प्रावश्यक है।

प्राज हम देखते हैं कि जो पार्लियामेंट में बैठे हुये हैं, वे अपने नाम पर सैकड़ों एकड़ जमीन रखे हुये हैं, जजिज, वकील, बड़े बड़े बिजिनेसमैन, बड़े बड़े प्रैक्टिशनर्स इत्यादि हजारों और सैकड़ों एकड़ जमीन अपने नाम पर रखे हुये हैं और किसी को बटाई पर दे देते हैं या शिकमी काश्त पर दे देते हैं ताकि वे उसका उपयोग कर सकें। अगर इस तरह की ब्यवस्था बनी रही तो हमारा जो उद्देश्य है उसको हम भूल जायेंगे।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्राज जब हम प्रावाज लगाते हैं कि हम देश के उन पिछड़े वर्गों में से हैं जिनके पास सम्पत्ति नहीं है या सम्पत्ति कम है, जिनको कम

तनक्याह मिलती है, जिनके रहन सहन का दर्जा बहुत नीचा है और उनकी हालत में सुधार होना चाहिये तो मैं चाहूँगा कि इस दिशा में ठोस कदम उठाये जायें। प्राज सदन के सदस्य यह प्राग करते हैं कि जो सी रूपये से कम पाने वाले सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, उनकी तनक्याहें बढ़ाई जायें, तब हमको यह भी प्राग करनी चाहिये कि जो भूमिहीन किसान हैं जो कि मजदूरी का काम करते हैं उनको वे वेस्ट लैंड्स जो सरकार के पास हैं, जो प्राम समाजों के पास हैं, वे सबसे पहले उन्हीं को दी जानी चाहिये। इसके साथ ही साथ मुझे यह कहते हुए हिचक नहीं है कि प्राज भी भूमि दान में जितनी भूमि मिली हुई है उसको सरकार किसानों को नहीं दिला पाई है। सरकारी रिक्वाइर्ड में तो हो सकता है कि वह जमीन प्रा गई हो लेकिन उनको मिली नहीं है। सरकार को प्रागें प्राना चाहिये और भूमिहीनों को जमीन देनी चाहिये। हमारी सरकार बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को उनकी इंडस्ट्रीज के लिये प्रोटैक्शन देती है, उनकी खातिर एक से एक नया बिल लाती है, एक से एक प्राच्छा बिल लाती है, इंडस्ट्रियल फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन की स्थापना करती है ताकि बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्टों को लाबो और करोड़ों रूपया कर्ज दिया जा सके, तो क्या गरीब किसानों के लिये उसे हाउसिंग ग्रांट नहीं देनी चाहिये, उनको अपनी खेती में तरक्की करने के लिये पैसा नहीं देना चाहिये? उनकी भी यह इच्छा है कि उनके बच्चे प्राच्छी तरह में पढ़े लिखें, उनके प्राम भी प्राच्छे घर रहने के लिये हों, अपनी बीबी के लिये प्राच्छे कपड़े खरीदे, सम्म्य नागरिकों की तरह में रहें। जब उनको हम ये चीजें मुहिया कर देगे तभी राम राज्य यहा सही मानो में स्थापित हो सकेगा, तभी वे इसका मजा ले सकेंगे।

Shri Tangamani: As you have given me only five minutes, I shall be as brief as possible.

[Shri Tangamani]

Many of the previous speakers have already referred to the recommendations of the Planning Commission, and how far they have been applied in the respective States. As you know, the Planning Commission recommended that the maximum rate of rent should not exceed 1/4th for wet lands and for dry lands. But we find in Tamil Nad that they are 40 per cent and 33-1/3 per cent. If the recommendation is seriously applied, it will be at least some relief to the peasants. What we now find is that the tenant will have to establish his tenancy. Large-scale evictions are taking place now. I know there is a movement in *Trichinopoly and Madurai districts* on this very issue. In this connection, I can mention without any fear of contradiction that the one State where there is no eviction and where the law has been strictly observed is the State of Kerala.

The next point is about ceiling. Much has been said by previous speakers on this issue. Madras is one of the States where there has not been any legislation about ceiling. In this connection, I would like to mention that the Planning Commission has fixed three 'family holdings' as the maximum ceiling for a particular family. But I find in the draft Bill, which is now going through the Andhra Pradesh Assembly, that the Planning Commission itself has accepted 4½ 'family holdings'. So either they must revise their old policy or stick to the 3 'family holdings' formula, that is, the same thing must continue.

The third point is this. The Planning Commission has recommended that village panchayats should be associated with the maintenance of land records and implementation of land reforms. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Planning how many States have so far taken any steps for associating various village panchayats in this matter. I

know for a fact that the Kerala Government are going to do it and they are improving upon this also.

Then there is the question of *inam* lands and also lands belonging to *Devasthanams*. Regarding this question, the Janmi Bill has been passed in Kerala. But for the past one year, assent has not been received although in such cases, Bills passed when the previous Government was in office for reducing the finances of the temples were assented to. I do not know why this Bill is not being assented to so far as Kerala is concerned. Another set of lands allied to these are the *Sripatham* lands which belonged to the Maharajas. Now the ownership of these lands has been transferred to the tenants.

Coming back to Tamil Nad, I would like to say this. The Mover of the Resolution, Shri Panigrahi, pointed out how there are large numbers of landless labourers in this country. I believe the figure he gave was 6 crores. Now, distribution of land to the landless is a very important thing. It has been accepted by the Planning Commission also. But what is it that we find in our own experience? I know that in my own constituency there were 6 peasants for whom 7½ acres were to be distributed. Two years ago the then Tehsildar said that proper *patta* would be given to them. But after the lapse of two years, five persons have not received their allotment. So it is only on paper. Whenever it is sought to be implemented, there is a lot of delay in actually giving the lands to the landless peasants.

One more point and I shall conclude. The Panel had recommended to the Planning Commission for giving top priority to land reform because they were anxious to raise the standard of living of the people, and also to expand the internal market instead of depending on foreign markets. If we really expand the internal market by giving more money

to the landless labourers and the peasantry, which form the majority of the population of this country, we will be taking the correct step

Another reason for which land reform was wanted was to see that there is more production. An additional reason for land reform is that the actual cultivating peasant must have more incentives. These are laudable objectives and should be achieved. I request the Minister to see that proper directives are issued by Government to State Governments to implement this programme.

श्री ना० नि० पटेल उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
बम्बई को तो बिल्कुल समय नहीं मिला

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय जितना वक्त था
उतना शकमीय कर दिया गया।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) डिप्टी
स्पीकर साहब, मुझे सिर्फ पाच मिनट दे दिये
जायें।

सरदार इशबाल सिंह (फोरोजपुर)
दे दिये जायें पाच मिनट किसानो को भी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय. मेरी जेब से तो
कुछ जाता नहीं, मगर यह तो बेइन्साफी
होगी।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह : अभी तक जितने
दोस्त बोले हैं, मही मानो मे जमीन से उनका
कोई वास्ता नहीं है।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : (बाह्य दिल्ली-रक्षित-
अनुसूचित जातिया) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
दिल्ली को भी तो कुछ समय मिलना चाहिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon
Minister

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha)
May I ask a question for clarification?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him be-
gin and after sometime if any doubt-
ful points arise, he might ask

Some Hon. Member. rose—

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry
there is no more time. The hon
Minister

The Minister of Labour and Em-
ployment and Planning (Shri Nanda):
A question was raised in the course
of the discussion on this Resolution
whether this House—Parliament—
was really in a position, in terms of
the Constitution, to take up a discus-
sion on such a subject, and you gave
your ruling. Really at such a stage, a
question of this kind need not arise.
Both Houses of Parliament have
been discussing the subject of land
reforms frequently and on several
occasions reports regarding progress
in the matter of land reforms have
been placed before this House and
have been discussed.

The question today in the context
of the terms of this Resolution really
does not touch the whole policy re-
garding land reforms. In that matter,
we find to our great gratification dur-
ing the discussion in the course of
the last two hours or so that the Mem-
bers have not taken a party line, the
discussion has cut across all party
divisions and there is practically un-
animity in the House regarding both
the aims of land reforms and the
sense of urgency about completing
them as quickly as possible. Only I
would have been happier still if some
of the friends—just a few—had not
given it a kind of a party complexion.
It was represented as if we were
having some second thoughts about it
and mention was made of certain
comments and observations in the
Press which were not very favour-
able to a progressive attitude and a
progressive policy in the matter of
land reforms. I must make
it clear and I do not think I
need elaborate that point at all
because it has been acknowledged by
the Mover of the Resolution himself
and by several other hon friends that
the Planning Commission the Prime
Minister and all of us who are con-
cerned with this matter have expres-

[Shri Nanda]

sed our keenness about it and we are no less anxious about very quick progress in this direction than anybody else. That position remains. I wish he had not brought up this question of contrast between one particular State and other States. I want to take up that point immediately in order not to destroy that character of unanimity so far as this big programme in the country is concerned, the programme of land reforms.

Mention was made of one State that it had gone ahead and done more than any other State in the country and also that it was being prevented from going ahead in some important and essential matters, and that delays are occurring here and when one State is prepared to go forward, why come in its way.

The position in this State is this. We are glad that they want to have land reforms. They want to change the pattern of land tenures and introduce other progressive features and the proposals which have been incorporated in the Second Five Year Plan which also found a place in the First Five Year Plan. That is very good. But, it will be wrong to assume that no other State has done that much. I can produce information about various States. Some of them have lagged behind, some of them have gone ahead and some of them have done very much better in certain respects. It is not a uniform position and no conclusion can be drawn that the Congress party wanted to halt the progress in spite of the fact that the Planning Commission had made certain recommendations which are accepted and some other friends are really very much more eager to do the right thing.

It has been pointed out that we are appointing committee after committee and we are continuing to discuss this matter. Then, they say there has been a committee recently appointed by the Congress. I believe and I do not have any other feeling in the matter and I agree with the hon. Members who say so, but they also should appreciate

the fact that these various steps taken, the appointing of committees, are a measure of our own keenness about it—our anxiety about it—and they are a test of the sincerity regarding doing something quickly about land reform and doing something substantial.

I shall take up the other aspect as to why things are not moving as fast as they could, because I agree that both in the matter of legislation and in the matter of implementation there are defects and deficiencies. There has been, I should acknowledge immediately, in certain areas and in certain parts, not sufficiently quick progress, both in terms of legislation and also, much more so, in regard to enforcement and implementation. But when it was asserted that the Planning Commission's recommendations were thrown out—those were the words used—I should say it is not true. The Planning Commission's recommendations have been accepted. But, maybe in certain cases because of special conditions, they have not been carried out fully. It is necessary to remember that the various elements in the plan have not been put to a very rigid framework. There is only a broad approach that has been very well understood. Therefore, room for various committees arise. There may be delay or refuse to carry out the main, essential principles of it, in the spirit in which these recommendations have been conceived. There is no question of any go-slow. But there has been a certain amount of slowness, it cannot be denied. I shall deal with it a little later.

But in connection with this plea that we should not come in the way of a certain State going forward more speedily than others if it wants to do so I may say this. Particular reference was made to a Bill passed by that State Legislature regarding *Jenmukaram*. The facts are that it is somewhat important but it does not really touch any basic feature of land reform. Those tenants have got full security, they are paying a definite

limited rent to Government, certain payments are being made to other people. There is no question of any divergence and it is not as if the Home Ministry took a different view from the Planning Commission. They were of the same opinion that while no distinction and discrimination has to be permitted regarding the implementation of land reforms and the provisions of the law so far as religious places are concerned. The tenants of those lands should have full security and their rents should be brought down in the same way as in the other cases. But there was just one safeguard introduced with regard to the net income realised by these institutions. After all those fares, expenditure, etc., may be assured to those institutions.

Shri Punnoose: May I ask a question? In the case of a private landlord, when the rent is fixed and if his income is decreased, he is to suffer for it. But the hon. Minister just now has said, if I heard him rightly, that with regard to religious organisations the income should be the same, that is the minimum fixed rent. The rent may be lower but the total income to the religious institution must be the same. That means the Government Treasury must give the difference between the fair rent and that income.

Shri Nanda: It is also very well appreciated that the net income which may be assured to these institutions cannot be on the basis of those rack-rents, high rents. So, in calculating what is due, we have to take into consideration this thing. Any reduction in rents is only on that new reduced basis and the income will be calculated on that basis. But that is a different matter. The Government may make the payment. After all in the case of abolition also the compensation is being given. This is really some kind of compensation on a reasonable basis in order that those institutions may continue to function. The hon. Member may have some views about religion which I may not share. In this country millions of

people have certain sentiments about these matters and they would like their religious services to be carried on.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): May I explain? I think the Minister has not fully understood what this *jennmikram* Bill is or what are the changes to be brought about. It is not a question of religious festivals or the amount being stopped or anything like that. Instead of the Government collecting the rent and giving it they have said that it must stop. Compensation may be given to the owners and the right of the land may be vested as far as the tenant is concerned. There may be a mutually agreed reduction in the rents. If the rents are so fixed, there may be a reduction in the income but as far as religious festivals and other things are concerned they have to see certainly that the other expenses are curtailed. There is no question of this interfering with any religious ceremony.

Shri Nanda: I think Sir, the hon. Member need not have taken the trouble of giving all this information. He may have more details of the position there, but I know the basic facts, the essential facts. I know them because we have discussed them with the Chief Minister and other representatives of the State very recently. The question is really not such a difficult question. A certain amount of income has to be assured to them, and on that I think very nearly we have come to some kind of a common understanding also. There is nothing very much secret about these things. As I said, these things are being discussed and I do not think there should be any great delay about this Bill.

Sir, I would not like to take up the little time that I have in discussing the details of one State or the number of questions that have arisen about several other States.

Shri Punnoose: Sir, I would like to seek some clarification on a very basic question.

Reforms in the Country

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the hon. Minister conclude, and after that he may put his question. The hon. Minister should not yield so readily.

Shri Nanda: Possibly, Sir, that also helps a little.

Now, I want to take up the substance of the motion and to give my answer in a few words, because it does not need any very great lengthy exposition of the policy regarding land reforms which, very happily for all of us, has been an agreed policy of all sections of this House and also, I believe, the bulk of the people of the country. Therefore, there is no need for me now to defend that policy. It is an agreed policy, and it is a very important subject. Therefore, the interest of this House and the discussion are welcome. It is important because the whole of our economy, the economic development of the country, as all of us have fully realised, rest very much more than possibly was realised at some earlier stages on the progress of rural economy. So it is not simply a question of social justice. That also is involved because in the matter of the claims of the people of the rural areas this also must be acknowledged that there is an issue involved of social justice.

The rural areas are much worse off than the other areas. In the rural area, again, there are large disparities, and at the bottom stand the agricultural worker, the landless labourer. Therefore, both from the point of view of social justice and in order to create a sound basis for our future economic plans and for our programmes of development these things have to be done.

Land reform is not conceived in that very narrow sense of doing a little distribution in order that somebody may have a little more land and somebody may have a little less. It is conceived more in a comprehensive way as an approach to making the rural economy more dynamic in order that it can provide a very sound foundation for our whole programme of development in the country.

Therefore, Sir, these is the institutional aspect of it. Those who have not got land, well, they should have it. We have said that the tiller of the land has to be made the owner of the land in the interests of the community because otherwise he has no incentive. He has to be placed in direct relation with the State in order that the assistance that is to be provided may be channelled properly to him. All these things are understood.

It is not simply a question of the tiller becoming the owner of the land. We are going further. It may be that the idea of the tiller being the owner also, possibly, become out-dated. It is the village community which is responsible for all the resources, for the effective utilisation of man-power and every inch of land there in order that they may have the largest measure or volume of production, the fullest employment and also that there may be as little disparity as possible. All these aspects are there. Therefore, we are moving towards a pattern, an institutional framework in the rural areas, which will enable us to have all these results. From that point of view we are viewing the problem, and therefore, it is a matter of common interest to all of us that these things are done quickly and that we go ahead in all parts of the country as soon as possible. On this, we agree.

Regarding the question that was raised about legislation and then about its implementation, let me say a few words. So far as legislation is concerned, it cannot be assumed, as has been pointed out by some hon. Members who spoke, that nothing has been done. While we may express our dissatisfaction and discontent with the pace of progress, all of us want it to be much more brisk than it has been. Yet, let us recognize the facts and not lose sight of the fact that there has been during these years considerable progress in several States. The States have gone ahead with practically all the elements in the proposals regarding land reform. Abolition of

intermediaries is practically universal now in this country, all over

Regarding the question of security to the tenants, there also, legislation exists all over. There is the question of crop sharers or share-croppers, to which the hon Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, referred. That question is there.

Therefore, some questions remain to be resolved. By and large, legislation has proceeded along these lines in the States which have taken up this matter, and a number of them have taken up this matter. It has proceeded on these lines—the abolition of intermediaries, security for the tenant, etc. In that security, the question of resumption is really a part of that policy and programme itself. When we are told that some of the land is being taken away from the tenants, it is part of that policy in the sense that some of the landholders themselves are not very, very big people.

The basic fact in this country is that the holdings are very small. In several States the majority of persons who hold land and pay just possess below five acres or so, many landholders themselves are in that position. They have a small bit of land, they have leased it out. To deprive them entirely of that privilege of being able to cultivate the land because, for some reason and for some time they have not found it possible to cultivate the land, was not considered really a very equitable arrangement. Therefore, provisions were made in the law that under certain safeguards and certain restrictions—of course it has to be below the ceiling—the tenant should have some land left to him except in cases where the landholder has only a basic holding or something like that. So it was on a balancing of considerations and the interests of all the parties that a scheme was evolved and was incorporated in the Plan. There have been certain variations from State to State, regarding this question—it is pressing this matter of feelings—and all the elements of legislation, but there is no

difference about security subject to certain rights of resumption.

An Hon Member: They are not secured.

17 hrs

Shri Nanda: I am coming to the question of implementation later on. There is no difference about that. Regarding ceilings also, a certain amount of difference of opinion has arisen but the Planning Commission and the Government and, I believe, all those who are concerned with this matter have now come to the conclusion that there is to be no further controversy about it. It will have to be taken as an accepted fact that ceiling will be applied not only on future, but also on existing holdings. The necessary legislation regarding ceilings and other matters will have to be put on the statute-book by the various State Governments, by the end of 1958. That has been accepted.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore) Is it on all fronts, or only on the agricultural front?

Shri Nanda: We are only dealing with land reforms at the moment. I shall answer this further. I believe all of us will agree that social justice has been said in hackneyed phrases to be indivisible. So it cannot be that we bring about certain radical reforms in the rural areas for the rural community and leave some other owners of big properties and vested interests untouched. That can never be the idea. I am sure that a climate is going to be created by the reforms in this sphere which is going to create pressures and social implications which cannot be evaded.

It is also true that nothing has been done so far in the other sphere also. Judging from what appears in newspapers about the severity of taxes and all that one would easily see that in ten years something has been done in various directions.

[Shri Nanda]

17-02 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Regarding the rest of the States where legislation has not so far been passed, as hon. Members know, it is a question of time, and not a very long time at that. But the enforcement part is the really more difficult part. Some of the reasons for the slow progress must be appreciated, when we look at the question of land reforms. It is not a simple thing. It is a complex issue and there is conflict of interests in the social structure in the rural areas. But we must understand that things which have arisen in the course of centuries may take some time to be changed completely. We are talking of a decade. It is true that in that decade some substantial progress has been made. But these things have to be done peacefully keeping in view the fact that we do not want the existing production to go down. We cannot afford that. We are not in a position to take recourse to certain ways which might have the effect of creating such a kind of imposition of force which may not really lead to any useful results immediately.

Moreover, we have a democratic tradition to maintain and democratic institutions to preserve. With all these limitations, we have to function. Several States have changed from zamindari system to ryotwar system. We have not got the whole paraphernalia, the structure, which could enable them to carry out all these new things. These things take time. There were some honest differences of opinion whether ceilings would really increase production or not and things like that. All that is over now and the question of implementation is there. The conditions in the rural areas and the social situations also come in the way. Government passed legislation and possibly they did not make fully all those arrangements which were necessary for the purpose of efficient administration. These are things which Government alone cannot do. Government have their part, a very important part. They may

set up the necessary administrative machinery for this purpose. But within the community itself, people have got a part to play in it. We could not blame the Government alone for certain things not being done. All of us have to co-operate and combine so that the underdog of the rural area comes into his own and his rights and his claims are conceded to him.

This is the picture of the situation. I realise I am taking your time and I must finish. The motion was that we should have a committee. All that I have said shows that since there is no difference of opinion regarding the aim of the land policy and regarding the kind of legislation that we should have the only question that remains is certain details of implementation. How is a committee going to help us in this matter? That is my point. There is a clear unanimity about the essential purpose of land policy and the way in which it has to be brought about. In certain States things are going on fairly well. In some States in certain respects it has slowed up. These are not things which a committee is going to deal with any great advantage.

So, I am making a suggestion that in addition to the apparatus we have already—we have got a committee in the Planning Commission, namely, the Central Land Reforms Committee, which considers all matters arising in the various States like legislation etc. In addition to that, we may now start looking at this matter in another way. We had a Panel for the Second Plan and that Panel did very good work. It had its sub-committees and very good valuable material could be obtained in the course of the work of the sub-committees and the reports of those committees are very useful documents. I suggest that instead of waiting for any length of time we may set up those Panels in which Members of Parliament could be associated, and we may start work on the land reform question soon in that manner. That will be a very useful way of handling the issue.

Shri Panigrahi: When do you propose to set up this committee?

Shri Nanda: Very soon, without any loss of time. I thought that would give more productive results

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi) I want one clarification. What about the policy of the Planning Commission with regard to providing every family, either rural or urban, more especially rural, with a homestead? Of course, distribution among the agricultural people is very difficult, rather impossible. But what about people in the rural areas getting homesteads?

Shri Nanda: That question is also dealt with in the recommendations and the report. This is one of the recommendations. It is very essential that facilities should be extended to everybody subject, of course to availability of land

Shri A. K. Gopalan. May I have a clarification? The Second Five Year Plan has recommended that the maximum rate of rent should not exceed one-fourth or one-fifth of the gross produce. In some States 50 per cent or 60 per cent of the land belongs to religious institutions. If according to the recommendation of the Planning Commission they have to be reduced to one-fourth or one-fifth, then certainly there will be a reduction in income. If there is a reduction in income, as far as religious institutions are concerned, and that it cannot be done in that way, then certainly 60 per cent of the peasants will not come under this reform, because according to the Planning Commission there must be a reduction of rent. In some of the States it may not be so in all the States—most of the land belongs to the religious institutions. In such cases, if the rent cannot be reduced, I want to know the policy. This difficulty has arisen in some of the States. Unless the Planning Commission or the Government says that this is the policy that there should be no reduction at all in the incomes

then 60 per cent of the peasants will not have the benefit

Shri Nanda: I do not want to say anything specific about this particular case now because we are discussing that with the representatives of the States. But generally the position is that there cannot be anything sacrosanct about the claims of those institutions in terms of money if a reduction has been brought about because of reforms which brings down the income for others also. That is my personal attitude. But in this specific case I cannot say that

Shri Subiman Ghose (Burdwan): My Resolution follows this. I was allotted 31 minutes but that cannot be available today. So, the hon. Deputy-Speaker said that I will get one minute to move my Resolution.

Shri Panigrahi. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was very glad that the hon. Minister of Planning made all his efforts to meet the points that we raised here during the course of the discussion, but I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister did not try to throw light on those very essential points which we raised. There was no question of asking us to see whether we agreed on the policy or not. So far as the policy of land reforms is concerned, I am quite sure, as the hon. Minister has said, that there is unanimity. But the question came up with regard to its implementation and that a part of the implementation of the policy was not being done in two of the States. That is what we wanted to bring to his notice.

I brought to the notice of the hon. Minister five points for consideration. One was whether the Planning Commission was going to give any directive to the State Governments that for a certain period there shall be a ban on all kinds of ejection of tenants.

Shri Nanda. It has already been done.

Mr. Speaker: It has already been done. That is what the hon. Minister says.

Shri Panigrahi: In my own State, ejectments are going on.

Mr. Speaker: Whoever hon. Member finds that there is a different state of affairs than what the hon. Minister has stated will draw his attention. He will send him a chit.

Shri Panigrahi: I drew his attention.

Mr. Speaker: Persons in the Press Gallery would fall on our heads if they lean on the balcony. I have repeatedly given instructions that they ought not to peep over the House. I will have to withdraw the Press Gallery Cards issued to those persons. It is a disgrace.

Shri Panigrahi: I also suggested that peasants, who are now holding uneconomic holdings, say, between 1 to 5 acres, should also be exempted from land reforms. All kinds of transfers and partitions are taking place before Government is going to fix any ceiling on land. Some of the hon. Members from this side also suggested that transfers are taking place even in the names of children who are not yet born and who are still in their mothers' wombs. Would the Planning Commission advise the State Governments to take such measures to see that such illegal partitions and transfers do not take place, if it helps in implementing the measures which the Government propose to fix so far as ceiling is concerned. Then there is the question of exempting certain lands from ceilings. Certain States are exempting certain farms which they call as efficiently managed farms. They give a handle to the landlord to say that an 100-acre farm is also an efficiently managed farm. In this way they are also getting exempted from the provision.

We submitted these points for the consideration of the hon. Minister.

but I am sorry to say that no light was thrown on them.

Shri Nanda: May I take one minute more to answer that.

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish them once for all.

Shri Panigrahi: But in view of his assurance that the Government is proposing to set up a committee very soon to go into all these problems and also that representatives from all parties of this House are going to be associated with this Committee, I would like to withdraw my Resolution. But I hope that this assurance will be implemented very soon.

Shri Nanda: I am very grateful to the hon. Member for not pressing the Resolution in view of the suggestion that I made that we might pursue this matter in the Planning Commission through the panels which did very good work in relation to the Second Five Year Plan. Regarding efficient farms and other things, I did not take up each single item for the same reason that since we are going to have a full discussion there, I need not take up the time of the House now. The efficient farm matter which the hon. Member has brought up, has been discussed at length in the report itself. It is not that any farm, 100 acres or whatever the size, may be excluded. There are several conditions that it must be a compact farm; there must be a lot of investment in it and by its splitting it has to be first assured that there is going to be fall in production. Even if it is a well managed farm, with investment and all that if no fall in production need be apprehended as a result of its splitting, it does not claim any exemption, it does not merit any exemption.

Mr. Speaker: What about the amendments?

Shri Bhubti Mishra: I withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Bhakt Darshan. He is not here. He does not press.

శ్రీ Central Control of all Public Service Commissions in the Country 1956 Co-operative Sugar Factories in Andhra 652

శ్రీ S. M. Banerjee withdraws. శ్రీ Sarju Pandey.

The amendments were, by leave withdrawn.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

17.17 hrs.

CENTRAL CONTROL OF ALL PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONS IN THE COUNTRY

శ్రీ Subiman Ghose (Burdwan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following Resolution.

"This House is of opinion that all the Public Service Commissions, whether Union or State, should be under the Government of India holding analogous position like that of the Supreme Court and High Courts and suitable legislation be brought forward to amend the Constitution accordingly"

Mr. Speaker: There is no time. Hereafter, at the end of a session, I do not want any work in that session to be taken over. This will be the normal practice during the session. Let us not tie our hands. Many things may happen. More important things may happen. In this session I have made an exception. This will be the rule. Whatever happens, a similar opportunity will be given only during the session: not to carry over to the next session.

• శ్రీ T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam) Am I to understand that Resolutions of this nature, half discussed, will not be discussed in the coming session?

Mr. Speaker: As far as possible, let them finish in the session.

శ్రీ T. B. Vittal Rao: Sometimes it is most possible.

Mr. Speaker: Sometimes, it will go over to the next session. Normally I would not like to give an opportunity of this kind merely to keep it alive. I do not want to stand in the way of the ballot.

This matter, the hon. Member may continue next session.

17.18 hrs.

*CO-OPERATIVE SUGAR FACTORIES IN ANDHRA

శ్రీ Viswanatha Reddy: (Rajampet) Sir, permit me, at the very outset, to express my pleasure and sense of gratitude to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, and particularly to the hon. Minister, Shri A. P. Jain, who took such a lot of interest in the progress of the Andhra Sugar factories and but for whose very sympathetic and understanding attitude, I think, the progress would not have been even this much.

Having said this, I am sorry that I am not able to say the same thing about other connected Ministries.

Mr. Speaker: I would urge that hon. Members, whoever has a half-an-hour discussion, may appraise the situation. All hon. Members do not know what exactly is this. Therefore, he may place the points that he wants to place before the House which require elucidation and then he may develop his argument. What is it that he wants to place before the House?

శ్రీ Viswanatha Reddy: This is only a preliminary remark that I was trying to make.

I would like to trace briefly the progress of the four Andhra sugar factories which are sponsored in the co-operative sector. These sugar factories were formed, at least the societies were formed, as early as 1955. Ever since their formation, any num-