

of those figures? May I also know as to how far the legislation we pass is applicable to the States?

**SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE :** Sir, State Governments are responsible entities. I do not see any reason, unless there is some mistake, to disbelieve the figures furnished by them. As the hon. Member himself is aware, Land is a State subject and we have to rely on the assessment of State Governments in regard to these matters. But our effort has been to try to evolve a national consensus and expeditious implementation of the same.

**श्री मनसिंह वर्मा :** क्या माननीय मंत्री कृपया स्पष्ट रूप से यह बतलाने का कष्ट करेंगे कि जितनी भूमि आपा बतलाई है कि शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शिड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स वालों को दी गई है, उसमें से कितनी भूमि पर वास्तविक रूप से उनका कब्जा हुआ है क्योंकि मेरी अपनी जानकारी यह है कि भूमि कागज पर तो दे दी जाती है पर कब्जा उतका हाता नहीं है। अनेक प्रान्तों के इस प्रकार के उदाहरण हमारे सामने हैं। और दूसरी बात यह कि जितने भी वेस्ट लैन्ड पड़े हुए हैं, जो दिखलाया गया है, इसमें क्या कहीं भी किसी प्रान्त में सरकारी तौर पर, को-ऑपरेटिव बेसिस पर, खेती करके लैन्डलेस को उसमें लगाने का कोशिश की है क्या ?

**SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE :** There may be case where possession may have been disputed but the exact figures of how much land is under dispute is not available but my assessment is quite a substantial portion of the land distributed is not under dispute as far as possession is concerned. As far as cooperative farming is concerned, we have been trying to encourage it but I must say that so far the progress of the cooperative farming has not been encouraging but as far as our support to the cause and to the basic approach to the problem is concerned, we have been taking the position that a large number of farmers being small farmers, ultimately from the point of view of economy, cooperative farming is a very desirable direction in which farming activity in this country needs to be reorganised.

#### AMERICA'S SHARE OF CONTRIBUTION TO I. L. O.

\*635. **SHRI M. K. MOHTA :** †  
**SHRI KALYAN ROY :**  
**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :**

Will the Minister of LABOUR AND REHABILITATION be pleased to state :

(a) whether the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to the news item published in the "Economic Times" on September, 10, 1970 under the caption "ILO Crisis; Indian Labour Perturbed" on the refusal of the United States to contribute its share to the ILO affecting the World Labour Body's assistance to developing countries and its plan to solve growing unemployment problem there; and

(b) if so, whether Government have made any protest to the United States for its move to withhold its contribution to the Organisation; and if so, the results thereof?

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BISHWA NATH ROY) :** (a) The Government of India are aware of the fact that the U. S. Government has withheld \$3.8 million out of its assessed contribution to the budget of the I. L. O. for 1970 thereby seriously affecting some of the Organisation's programmes.

(b) No, Sir. However, the Government of India's views on the subject have been informally conveyed to the U. S. authorities both at Delhi and in Washington.

**SHRI M. K. MOHTA :** May I ask the Minister if it is a fact that out of the ILO's total contribution of nearly 30 million dollars the US contribution amounts to about 25 %, that is, 7½ million dollars and that so far the entire contribution has been withheld? If so, how would the ILO's finances be managed? What is the share of the country in the total budget of the ILO now? May I know whether the contribution is likely to be raised and if so, exactly what is the total burden on the country's foreign exchange resources due to the membership of the ILO? What is the advantage that we derive by the member of the ILO because it seems we do not derive any advantage for the money we are paying?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri M. K. Mohta.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** It is true that the US contribution is 25% and for the latter part of 1970 their contribution has not been made and if it is unduly delayed till the latter part of 1971, there is likelihood of many programmes of the ILO being upset but we hope the contribution from the US would be forthcoming. We have conveyed our views and we hope that the US Government will reconsider the matter about their contribution. About our contribution, we have to pay 2.6% and I do not agree with the Member. We have derived advantage from the ILO. After all it is an international standard setting organisation all over the world in the field of labour. It is true that from the regular programme of the ILO amounting to 10% we may not get much benefit but from the UNDI Fund we are getting many projects which are to our advantage.

**SHRI M. K. MOHTA :** Is it a fact, as has been alleged in some quarters, that the American withdrawal is due to Communist infiltration into the ILO? with the result that ILO has become the hotbed of a controversy between the two great powers, and keeping in view India's stand in such international matters, namely, that of non-alignment, would the Government consider that it is better for us to withdraw from the ILO altogether and not get involved in this controversy, whether there is communist infiltration or capitalist infiltration or anything like that?

**SHRI BHAGAWAT JHA AZAD :** Well, Sir, the proceedings of the US Senate, where it was decided to withhold the contribution, indicate that they had the fear that there is infiltration of communism in the ILO, and in this particular case it was the appointment of Mr. Astapenko as the Assistant Director-General, for matter arising out of which the contribution was stopped. But I think that the two powers, the USA and the USSR, have co-existed for the last sixteen years in the ILO and have been able to solve whatever different points of view they might have had on different subjects, and the ILO has been able to contribute to the various countries in the world in many labour fields, and, therefore, there is no question of our withdrawal from the ILO. Rather we would like to strengthen this organisation and help it in labour standards being set. So far as these two countries are concerned, they have co-existed in the past and we hope they will continue to co-exist

and will contribute to the welfare of labour in the world.

**SHRI KALYAN ROY :** I think the hon. Minister would agree with me that it is one of the most shocking examples, the United States attempt to control dominate and dictate to this world body with its contribution to it. Is it not true that because of the US refusing to contribute now, practically all the programmes meant for the under-developed countries have been paralysed and the meetings of committees, like the Committee on Work on Plantations, Seminar on Occupational Safety, Regional Seminar on International Labour Standards, have been postponed? Now, in view of this American attempt to scuttle the ILO on the ground of appointment of a Soviet as one of the Assistant Directors, does the Minister agree that the time has come for India to take it up in the ILO and take the necessary steps so that America is not in a position to dictate to this world body and also, if necessary, expel it from the ILO?

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** Sir, in reply to the first part of the question I may say that there is likelihood of the ILO programmes being affected, and also—as the hon. Member said giving the names of some committees—meetings of some industrial committees were not held as scheduled because of the fear that if the contribution is not forthcoming the programmes may have to be curtailed. But, as I said, in the ILO, it is not only the USA and the USSR who are members, it has on its rolls a majority of the nations of the world, and they all sit together, discuss and decide. It is neither the USA nor the USSR but all.

**SHRI KALYAN ROY :** I asked whether the time has not come to protest against America's action . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Let him answer the questions. His answer is continuing.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** I am replying exactly to that point. I am saying that the ILO has got not only the USA and the USSR as its members but the entire world. Majority of the nations in the world are there and there is therefore no question of either of these two trying to bamboozle others or to ride roughshod over the majority there. It is a democratic organisation where, in spite of the differences between these two nations or

other nations, decisions are taken by democratic processes, and I hope, in this case—as I have said—the USA will reconsider its decision and will try to continue to contribute to the ILO.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** He has spoken of the democratic nature of the ILO. May I know, Sir, what democratic methods are followed in this country—number one—in selecting the delegations on the side of labour, to the ILO meetings and ILO Conferences? I should like to know in what manner the selection is democratic. Secondly, I should like to know whether it is not a fact that some of the good recommendations of the ILO are still not being implemented.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** We are one of the few countries in the world which have ratified a large number of ILO Conventions. Therefore, it should not be presumed that the Government of India is not following the ILO Conventions...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** On a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Let him finish. I will call you again.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** I am now replying to the second part. I have replied to the first part. It is about how the labour delegation from this country is selected. I think this does not arise out of this question. This is about the non-payment of the USA's contribution to the ILO. This question about how the labour delegation from India is selected does not arise.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** This is very material, because the USA's participation and their pressure on the ILO leads to certain decisions or it influences the decision of the Government in the matter of selection of delegates to the ILO. Therefore it has some bearing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** I think the Minister is right. It does not arise out of this.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** If you agree, I also agree. Regarding my other question it was not whether the Government of India has ratified the largest number of ILO decisions. My question was whether it is a fact that some of the good decisions of the ILO have not been implemented in India. It may be that the Government may implement the largest number and yet it may be that some

of the good decisions remain to be implemented. The Government should tell us which are the decisions which they have not implemented.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :** As I said, the Government of India is one of the few countries which are adhering to the largest number of Conventions. I do not know which good one the hon. Member has got in mind. If he will tell me, I shall try to look into it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Next question.

#### INTEGRATED DRY LAND DEVELOPMENT

\*636. **SHRI R. P. KHAITAN :** Will the Minister of FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to state the details of the loans and grants provided to the various States under the Scheme for the Integrated Dry Land Agricultural Development (State-wise) during the last year?

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA) :** A statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [See Appendix LXXIV, Annexure No. 88]

**श्री आर० पी० खैतान :** मंत्री जी ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है उससे यह मालूम होता है कि कुछ स्टेटों को खास कर आठ नौ स्टेटों को दिया गया है और बाकी स्टेटों को नहीं दिया गया है। जैसे कि बिहार और आसाम ऐसी स्टेटें हैं जिन को नहीं दिया गया है, तो उनको न देने का क्या कारण है। किस बेसिस पर यह अलाटमेंट किया गया है।

**श्री जगन्नाथ पहाड़िया :** श्रीमन्, यह तो 1970, 71 का हमने बतलाया है। फोर्थ फाइव ईयर प्लान में और भी राज्य सरकारों के प्रोपोजल्स आ रहे हैं और उनको भी सिलेक्ट किया जायगा।

**श्री आर० पी० खैतान :** मैंने पूछा कि आठ नौ स्टेटों को दिया गया है। और स्टेटों को न