

[Shri K. Damodaran.]
 been implemented large holdings have been allowed to be held by big proprietors under various excuses. Big landlords were allowed to escape the ceiling clauses, to divert their lands into plantations, orchards, temples, Mutts, sugarmills, etc. They were allowed extensive areas in the name of well-managed farms. They were allowed to make dubious transfers and keep their property intact.

Land reform enactments were passed in most of the States. But genuine measures to abolish all forms of feudal exploitation, of exploitation of one class by another, as the Kumarpappa Committee put it, to confer ownership of land only on those who personally cultivated land and to set up agricultural producers' co-operatives, etc., as the Agrarian Reforms Committee of the Congress itself demanded, are conspicuous by their absence in these various enactments. In most cases they are nothing but tenancy legislations and not genuine land reforms. In some cases they have even gone backward. The new Act passed by the Kerala Legislature is an example. Even the limited security of tenure won by the tenants through struggles and sacrifices during the thirties under the British Government have now been taken away, and the landlords have been given the right to evict the tenants and resume the land. Even security of tenure is denied to the peasant. Some hon. Members are not satisfied even with this. They want more right for the landlord, more fundamental right as they call it, because according to them the landlords' right to hold and acquire property is a fundamental right sanctioned by the Constitution.

Thus, Madam, the Land Reforms Acts passed by the various Legislatures cannot be said to be radical or basic because they do not go far enough. They do not seek to abolish the remnants of feudalism completely and thoroughly. Conferment of ownership on the actual tillers of the

soil is still resisted. Eviction of tenants continues. Harijans and other agricultural workers do not get land. They have not been given the land that was promised to them. It is true that the upper strata of the peasantry and even the landlords have been benefited by these Acts but the bulk of the peasantry and the agricultural workers have not been benefited.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue later. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty minutes past one of the Clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the Clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE) in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE): There are two Messages.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

(1) THE PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963.

(2) THE SLUM AREAS (IMPROVEMENT AND CLEARANCE) AMENDMENT BILL, 1964.

SECRETARY: Madam, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

(1)

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Wednesday, the 3rd June, 1964, adopted the annexed motion in regard to the Prevention of Food Adulteration (Amendment) Bill, 1963.

2. I am to request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha in the said motion, and also the names of

the members of Rajya Sabha appointed to the Joint Committee may be communicated to this House."

Motion

"That the Bill further to amend the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 33 members, 22 from this House, namely:—

- (1) Shri K. L. Balmiki.
 - (2) Shri Sonubhau Dagadu Baswant,
 - (3) Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda.
 - (4) Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
 - (5) H. H. Maharaja Pratap Keshari Deo.
 - (6) Shri Shiv Charan Gupta.
 - (7) Shri Prabhu Dayal Himatsingka.
 - (8) Shri Tulshidas Jadhav.
 - (9) Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath.
 - (10) Shri C. M. Kedaria.
 - (11) Dr. Mahadeva Prasad.
 - (12) Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal.
 - (13) Dr. G. S. Melkote.
 - (14) Shri Gokulananda Mohanty
 - (15) Dr. D. S. Raju.
 - (16) Sardar Ranjit Singh.
 - (17) Dr. Sarojini Mahishi.
 - (18) Dr. C. B. Singh.
 - (19) Dr. P. Srinivasan.
 - (20) Shri U. M. Trivedi.
 - (21) Shrimati V. Vimla Devi, and
 - (22) Dr. Sushila Nayar.
- and 11 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee; that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 11 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

(2)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Amendment Bill, 1964, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd June, 1964."

Madam I lay the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Amendment Bill, 1964, as passed by the Lok Sabha, on the Table.

THE CONSTITUTION (SEVENTEENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964— Continued

SHRI K. DAMODARAN: I was saying that the land reform Acts that have been enacted so far do not go far enough and that even the small mercies granted to the tenants and peasants, small peasants, remain only on paper. Laws enacted ten years, twelve years and fourteen years back have not yet been implemented due mainly to the pressure of the land-owning classes and the feudal elements on the various State Governments and also due to the complacency of the Central Government and the Planning Commission. In many cases the reactionary land-owners took protection under some loopholes legal loopholes. These Legal-loopholes are now sought to be plugged by the Bill before us. So, in spite of the inadequacies of the land reform