

## RAJYA SABHA

Friday, 22nd November, 1957

The House met at eleven of the clock,  
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

### RESOLUTION ON THE CO-ORDINATION AND EXPEDITIOUS IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORMS PROGRAMME.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh):  
Sir, I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that the progress of the implementation of the land reforms programme embodied in the Second Five Year Plan is slow and haphazard and recommends to Government to take immediate steps to co-ordinate and expedite the implementation of the programme."

Sir, today when it is pointed out that even after the Second Five Year Plan we shall be short by nearly 10 per cent, in our foodgrain requirements, the importance of land reforms and agrarian reorganisation cannot be overstressed. In the Second Five Year Plan itself, it has been stated:

"Among these, measures of land, reform have a place of special significance, both because they provide the social, economic and institutional framework for agricultural development and because of the influence they exert on the life of the vast majority of the population. Indeed, their impact extends much beyond the rural economy."

So, in the present context, the necessity for quickly implementing the land reforms, as they are embodied in the Second Five Year Plan, cannot be overstressed. But unfortunately, the practice so far has been not to take into consideration the experience of the First Five Year Plan in implementing these land reforms. In the review of the First Five Year Plan itself, it

75 RSD— 1.

has been very specifically mentioned that as far as the implementation of the tenancy legislation is concerned; as far as the implementation of the ceiling on holdings is concerned, it is very unsatisfactory. I may be permitted to quote from the Review of the First Five Year Plan itself. It has been very clearly stated on page 321:

"The enforcement of provisions for the reduction of rent has presented several difficult problems. The difficulties encountered are similar to those that hinder the enforcement of provisions for security of tenure. It is well known that rent regulation cannot be effective unless it is accompanied by security of tenure. It has also been observed that regulation of crop-share rents is difficult to enforce."

There, it has also been mentioned:

"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 lands took place. Sometimes this took the form of so-called 'voluntary surrenders'."

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. Naturally, we expect the Government to take into consideration the experience of the First Five Year Plan and to take more efficient steps to achieve the ideals that have been laid down in the Second Five Year Plan. It is only a few days ago, *i.e.* on the 19th November, on the Table of the other House, a bulky statement of 17 pages was laid stating the various measures that are being taken in the different States as far as land reforms are concerned. In spite of its bulkiness, nowhye has it been specifically mentioned in it that the mistakes, that were committed in the earlier legislations, are being

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] remedied and speedier social justice is being meted out to the different strata of the peasantry. I quote from no less a person than the hon. Minister of Planning himself about the effectiveness of the measures so far pursued as far as these policies are concerned. The hon. Mr. Nanda himself has stated in the September 15 issue of the A.I.C.C. Economic Review:

"The policy of imposing ceiling on existing holdings has also been widely accepted. However, there is considerable hesitation in implementing it as shown by the slow progress. The legislation for ceiling on existing holdings has been enacted in a very few States and even where it has been enacted, enforcement has generally made little progress."

It is not the opinion of the Members of this side or the Communist "Tarty, but of the Planning Minister himself. He has very categorically stated that very slow progress has been made as far as land reforms, tenancy reforms and imposition of ceilings on holdings are concerned. In spite of this admission, I fail to see any quick steps or proper measures on behalf of the Central Government to ensure speedy and proper implementation of land reforms.

Let me now examine point by point how these measures are very haphazard and very slow; and at the present rate of progress will not only not achieve the ideals embodied in the Second Five Year Plan but, if delays occur, the very opposite will happen due to this procrastination. Though in many of the States the so-called ejectment or eviction has been legally prohibited, there are so many loopholes in the legislation, that the purpose of stopping the ejectments has hardly been achieved. On the other hand, wherever this legislation has been enforced, even the so-called protected tenants are being evicted on a very big scale. We have the example of our own State, Hyderabad. There,

we are supposed to have a fool-proof legislation in this matter. In spite of the fact that legislation has been enacted, in spite of the fact that a category of protected tenants has been brought into being statutorily, in practice, between the years 1951-52 and 1954-55 no less than 57 per cent, of the protected tenants were evicted from an area of 59 per cent, by the landlords. For this also I quote from the A.I.C.C. Economic Review of August 15, 1955:

"In 1951-52 there were 2,11,436 protected tenants over the whole of Hyderabad State having in their possession 26,75,960 acres. Unfortunately in 1954-55, the number of protected tenants came down to 90,279 and the area held by them came down to 10,95,319 acres."

That is to say, 57 per cent, of the protected tenants were evicted from 59 per cent, of the land. This in a State where the tenants are supposed to have been given a Magna Carta in the matter of tenancy rights; this in a State where they are supposed to have brought about a bloodless revolution through legislation only; this in a State where model tenancy legisla-ion is supposed to have been enacted.

Then, Bombay seems to have fared no better. The findings of the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics which was asked to conduct a survey into the working of the Bombay Tenancy Act are in no way favourable to the Government. They are not, in any way, creditable to the Planning Ministry or to the local Government.

In their concluding remarks they say:

"The main facts brought out by this investigation are, firstly, the extensive resumption and changes of tenants that took place even after the enforcing of the Act showing that the protection given to the tenants could not be effective in practice;

iecondly, a more or less normal market in land showing that the provisions for promoting the transfer of lands into the hands of the tillers were not quite effective; and thirdly, an almost complete absence of any signs of lowering the share and cash rents or of any changes in the tenancy practices."

And in conclusion they say that, "For all practical purposes the Act did not «xist." Sir, in that State also, where model tenancy legislation is supposed to exist nearly 50 per cent, of the protected tenants were evicted. This is how the tenancy legislation is working in Bombay which is supposed to give fixity of tenure to the tenants.<sup>1</sup> In other places too, the picture is net at all satisfactory. In U.P. and Bengal where these things are supposed to be a bit better, as far as the tenants are concerned, there also, 'Sirdars' are not given any security of tenancy. The Adhivasis' who are supposed to be given the permanent tenure rights, are not in practice enjoying those rights. In U.P. the proper land records do not exist. What has been conferred by law is taken away in another shape by the pull of the local landlords and patwaris because of lack of proper records. So even in U.P. where the model legislation is supposed to be in existence, hundreds of thousands of tenants are evicted— Adhivasis' who are supposed to be picture in other States is no better. If this is the state of things in such States where there is legislation and where protection is supposed to be given to tenants we can perfectly understand, Sir, what will be the state of tenants and peasants in other States where even such legislations do not exist? So, in spite of the very good ideals which we have proclaimed in the Second Five Year Plan, the same state of things continues and the eviction of tenants and the tenants becoming agricultural labourers is becoming a common process; and unfortunately the Government of India is not able to intervene in such

matters. That is the state of tenancy legislation.

Then, Sir, if we take up the question of imposition of ceilings, it has become a sort of chimera;—a mirage. Of course, in words every State Government and every one agrees today that there should be a ceiling. They come and say, "My dear friends, we also support ceilings, and ceilings must be there." But as far as the question of implementation is concerned, they impose such restrictions and they put the ceilings so high and they leave so many loopholes that actually in practice no land is left as far as redistribution is concerned. And every landlord goes scot-free in the form of benami transfers and other things. This is how they are in favour of ceilings. Everybody today concedes that without proper imposition of ceilings, without redistribution of land, the basic problem of our economy cannot be solved and the basic progress that is needed cannot be achieved. That, of course, everybody concedes but theoretically. But when it comes to the question of practice, so many loopholes, are left in the legislations that are enacted, that very little land is going to be there after ceilings are imposed. So far very few States have enacted laws for the imposition of ceilings on the existing holdings. Only in one district in Telangana they sought to impose this kind of a ceiling. There the Government published the statistics that 92 thousand acres were going to be left for distribution, but when it came to the question of actual implementation, the acreage for distribution they say, was only six thousand. The Revenue Minister has announced in the Legislative Assembly recently that only 6 thousand acres in that district is going to be taken over by the State, because that is the only land that is left with the substantial landholders. What has actually happened Sir, when the Government are announcing that they are going to impose ceilings on the existing holdings, one thousand and one subterfuges are resorted to by the

[Shri V. Prasad Rao]

landlords to circumvent the provisions of ceilings. As far as the district of Khammameth is concerned, what happened was, that when the land census was taken, 592 substantial landholders were supposed to have more than 92 thousand acres surplus which was to be taken over by the State. But actually when Clause 53C was sought to be implemented and the dates were fixed for the taking over of the surplus land, the Hindu Mitakshara system was taken recourse to and everything was distributed not only to the born children but to the unborn children also. I can give one example. One landholder was having more than 500 acres of land and he had distributed almost all his land holdings to six of his children who were below 12 years. His wife happened to be pregnant and he also gave one share to that unborn child so that he could avoid the ceiling. That is how 92 thousand has *come* to 6 thousand. The same state of affairs is now going on in Andhra also. When Government called for statistics that whoever had got more than 20 acres, should inform the Government of his holdings, immediately in every town registration stamps worth lakhs of rupees were purchased and thousands of benami transfers took place. What I mean to say is, that unless this business of benami transfers is checked, unless this process of benami fragmentation by the landlords is stopped, nothing is going to come out of the ceilings and only pious wishes will remain. As far as the distribution of land to agricultural labour is concerned, so much has been said about it in the Second Five Year Plan and so much about it has also been stated by the Panel on land reforms. I think the hon. Planning Minister has himself said that in very few States the ceiling has been imposed, and where-ever it has been imposed, actually very little work has been done. So, Sir, unless immediate steps are taken to check the activities of the landlords and to see that these benami transfers and *mala fide* transfers are stopped

and reversed, very little would come out of it. About these *malafide*-transfers, the Panel on land reforms has categorically stated as follows:

"It has been brought to our notice that anticipating imposition of ceilings, substantial owners are making benami transactions in favour of near relatives and friends to bring their holdings within assumed limits. If such transfers are allowed, they will defeat the very object of imposition of ceilings. We would therefore recommend that any transfer or lease, made after a given date, should be disregarded in determining the surplus area."

Unless these steps are immediately taken, nothing would come out of this whole business of imposition of ceilings, because no land will be left over and above the ceilings to be distributed to the agricultural labour.

The other day I was talking with a State Congress President and he stated that he was not much concerned as to how much land was available for distribution to the agricultural labourers but only with the fixation of a formal ceiling. What good would this do if no land is left for the agricultural labourers? The very purpose of the imposition of ceiling on land is to bring about a radical reorganisation in the rural economy and in the life of the agricultural labourer—the village poor. Their economy can be improved only if they get a stake in the country so that their energies and their resources can be brought is not only for the improvement of the rural economy but also to get a real and suitable base for the development of our country as such. Sir, if this state of things is allowed to continue, I am afraid the very purpose of the imposition of the ceilings would be defeated' by the fragmentations that are taking place, not only in Andhra but also in other States.

There is another provision for the consolidation of holdings or for stopping the fragmentation of holdings below a particular level and this thing;

is being implemented with a great deal of gusto in many of the States but in my opinion this is putting the cart before the horse because this consolidation of holdings can take place in an effective manner only after the redistribution of land has taken place. The village poor do not believe in the professions of the landlords and naturally they see in this move of so called consolidation of holdings the landlords' efforts to enhance their own interest. This is how recently in U.P. they were trying to enforce the consolidation of holdings. The poor agricultural labourers had to oppose such a move. I see from the Press reports that a number of revenue officials were also booked for corrupt practices in this connection. In this question of giving fixity of tenure to the peasantry and of imposing ceilings on land holdings the first thing that should be done is the redistribution of land. If this is not done then the very purpose for which ceilings are to be fixed on land will be defeated.

The co-operatives can be considered only in the context of the land reforms. Taken out of the context, if these co-operatives are tried to be pushed in, it will only result in frustration. That has exactly been our experience during the First Five Year Plan. When we were discussing the Warehousing Corporation Bill our Food Minister correctly pointed out about the difference between China and India and said that this had been a success in China because the whole thing had been done on the background of the redistribution of land and co-operative societies in the agricultural field can become successful in no other background. Unless the doubts of the peasants are allayed and unless the peasants are assured that the land is theirs, they have no stake in joining the co-operative societies. If co-operative societies are formed without having recourse to the redistribution of land, naturally the peasants see in such a move, the game of the landlords to dominate them in

other ways and through devious means. So unless we give top priority to this programme of land reforms, I am afraid we will not be able to generate the necessary enthusiasm to make our Second Five Year Plan a success. Unless the 75 per cent, of the rural population is mobilised, unless their enthusiasm is mobilised for the successful implementation of the Plan, the present shortage of food grains cannot be overcome and we cannot achieve the proposed increased targets. The very Plan, so far as the agricultural sector is concerned, will not succeed.

So, immediate and effective steps should be taken to stop the ejection of all sorts including that of sharecroppers. Unless this is done no amount of talk about securing the land for the tillers would help. As has been stated in the Second Five Year Plan itself, reinstatement of the tenants should also be considered. This should cover cases for the last two years, *i.e.* 1955 also. Unless effective and immediate steps are taken to stop the *malafide* transfers by these landlords, nothing would come out of this ceiling; on the other hand, it will only result in the eviction of the tenants and nothing more. So, immediate steps should also be taken by the Centre to see that these *malafide* transfers are stopped.

The ceiling to be imposed should not be on the holding of a person as such, but for the family as a whole, since for agricultural purposes the family is the unit. In regard to this, the Panel has made a very good suggestion as to how the calculation should be made. So far, the Central Government has not come out, though it promised that it would do so by the end of November, with an announcement about the size of the holding. I request that immediate steps be taken to determine the extent of the family holding and also to fix the holding per family and not per individual.

The next thing is about the associa-

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] tion of popular representatives at all levels. Unless this popular association is there in the implementation, nothing much would come out of it. The experience of the First Five Year Plan itself has shown that in spite of statutory guarantees, very little came out of the Plan because the landlords had got themselves entrenched into good positions in the village economy and in the village social life. Unless the people—the peasants themselves are associated with the process of implementation of these reforms, nothing much would come out of it in spite of all the laws on the Statute Book.

Then, Sir, I suggest the appointment of a high power committee by the Centre to expedite and co-ordinate the efforts at land reforms in all the States. Naturally, the States take different stands and they try to implement the Five Year Plan in different ways. There will, thus, be no uniformity; there will be different kinds of implementation which will, of course, be to the detriment of the peasants unless the Centre takes a helping hand in this. I feel, Sir, that a high power committee should be appointed by the Centre in order to co-ordinate the efforts of the different States and also to see that the land reforms programme as embodied in the Second Five Year Plan is effectively implemented. Thank^ you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"This House is of opinion that the progress of the implementation of the land reforms programme embodied in the Second Five Year Plan is slow and haphazard and recommends to Government to take immediate steps to co-ordinate and expedite the implementation of the programme."

SHRI T. BODRA (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I heartily support the Reso-

lution of Shri Prasad Rao, requesting the Central Government to come to the aid at this crisis. I have got my bitter experience of the State of Bihar when the Land Reforms Act was put into force and various other acts which were enacted in respect of ceilings on holdings as well as regarding consolidation of holdings. For its correct implementation a Land Reforms Commissioner was also appointed. During the last 10 years if the Congress Government has done anything good, it was only in this respect that the landlords and zamindars were abolished and the agriculturists and the rural people have some sort of relief so far as exploitation was concerned. But no sooner the zamindars and landlords were done away with, another type of landlords came up in as much as people who had lots of money in their banks went out and purchased the far flung lands of the landlords and according to the Land Reforms Act whatever sale deeds were transacted since 1951 in the law courts, they were declared valid with the result that people in my State who had money purchased 200, 300 and 400 acres of land. The real purpose of the "Government was to allocate at least 10 acres of land to each cultivator so that he can put in the best of his labour, money and pains to grow as much food crops as possible, not only to maintain himself and his family, but also to help towards the food problem of the whole country. But in the course of these 10 years in spite of these land legislations the net result is that the common cultivator has become more and more poor than what he was previously. When the Bihar Government went out to enforce this ceiling of holdings, they had a huge protest from their own members specially the Congress Members. In a House of 318, no less than about 200 were Congress Members and most of them, about 70 per cent, had lands of more than 200 acres for each family. So there was a huge hue and cry and the ceilings could not be put into effect till now, mostly because of the fear that if they lose the sympathy-

and support of the Congress Members in the Legislative Assembly, perhaps the whole Ministry will fall down. Nevertheless people are still hoping against hopes that the ceilings on holdings will be put into effect and the rural people will at least get 10 acres of land for each family.

So far as consolidation of holdings is concerned, this is a piece of legislation which is not liked by the people themselves, the cultivators, nor the people who have more than 200 or 300 acres of land. Specially in hilly parts of the country like Chota Nagpur & Santal Parganas it is not possible to put into effect this consolidation, of holdings. There the lands are of four classes—Class 1, 2, 3 and 4. There are rains about 50" in this part of the country and we get crops from Class 1 lands only, but in a year like 1957 when there is drought conditions, we can expect crops only from class 3 and 4 lands. So it is not possible to have consolidation of holdings in the hilly parts of the country and the people who have learnt land reclamation and engineering by way of nature and through their own natural insight say it is their confirmed opinion, that unless a peasant has classes 1 to 4 at different places according to the topography of the country, it is not possible for him to raise crops especially when there is want of irrigation facilities and when one has to depend on rainfall every year. Then under the guise of these reforms many of the vital land tenancy acts which especially the Adivasis had been enjoying are being attacked today. The House knows that there are 40 lakhs of Adivasis in Bihar, about 30 lakhs in Orissa, about 16 lakhs in Bengal and about 50 lakhs in Madhya Pradesh. From times immemorial they had their own sort of republics. The lands belonged to the village community. They had their *Pahmai*, *MaMoi*, *Bhuihari* and *Gairdhi* lands. They had their *Korhar* right to reclaim lands within their village boundaries. They had set apart lands

for the maintenance of widows and orphans and for the burial of the dead who cannot afford to have the burial ceremony. They had their inherent right to set lac in the trees in the jungles and collect beedi leaves for commercial purposes and to sell stones etc. Now under the Land Reforms Act the Government have come and attacked all these well-established customs, usages and the tenancy laws of my region with the result that these people are groaning and getting dissatisfied because they find that the lands which once belonged to the village community and which they enjoyed to the best of their action and the rights that they had in the process of reclamation are being deprived of. I must submit to this House that because of all this dissatisfaction, in the years 1901 to 1903 there was a rebellion in my part of the country against the British people against the Zamindars and the Missionaries. Similarly in the Santal Parganas also there was a rebellion because they found the land tenancy acts much to their disadvantage. The result was that the British Government came out with a solution and a survey and settlement was prepared and the Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act was enacted in 1908. Since 1908 till 1950 the Adivasis had their own way of life and their way of tenancy laws and the disputes which they used to decide in their own Panchayats. But after 1950 again the dissatisfaction is growing and especially because the people are backward, illiterate and ignorant, under the guise of these land reforms, especially in Bihar, Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, the small holdings which will be almost less than 10 acres, are still getting less and less and they are becoming a landless class of labourers. So while I support my friend, I would appeal to the hon. Minister for Planning and the Central Government to come to their aid in this matter so that the States do not take advantage of the ignorance, illiteracy and other backwardness of the people and at the same time stop the benami transactions

[Shri T. Bodra.] and other illegal transactions and also stop people who are having more than 100 acres of land and ensure to the best advantage of the Government.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, the main problem at present before the country is food. The Second Five Year Plan will not succeed unless we can solve this food problem. If we go on importing foodgrains from foreign countries at the rate at which we are importing, our foreign exchange position will always be serious. Therefore, when we are considering this Resolution, let us examine it from the point of view of whether proper efforts are being made by the Planning Commission to increase food production in our country or not, and whether a resolution of this type is going to help us to increase production of food in our country or not.

I have heard the speaker who preceded me pointing out that every family should have 10 acres of land; but you know that in 1911 the population of that part which is now 'India' was only about 20 crores and today it is 40 crores. Now it is exactly double that population. Therefore, if there were certain lands given to Adibasis in those areas in 1908 we should realise that the situation now has completely changed in 1951 and in 1957. The population of India has doubled and the food production has not doubled. The result is that during the First World War we were exporting foodgrains from our country; but now we are the biggest importers of foodgrains. It is very easy to say things and to create a feeling among the peasant classes that each family should have 10 acres of land and it is also easy to give statistics and quote figures to show that there are so many people who have got 200 acres and above and so if you take away their land and distribute it among all the people, you will have plenty in our country. But we forget that we have got only 25 crore acres

of land in our country and that even with the best of efforts at reclamation of fallow lands you will not be able to get more than a total of 30 crore acres of land in our country.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): And there are seven crore families.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The rural population is about 32 crores and in that rural population of 32 crores, you have to leave aside some people who are doing non-agricultural work. Even then there are at least six to seven crores families. This, in fact, is the problem. I would be very glad if every family could get 10 acres of land. Indeed I would like to go a step further and promise them 20 acres each. But where is the land going to come from? We have only 25 crore acres of land at present, with a possibility of its going up to 28 crores. But there are six to seven crore families and the result is that even if there is a perfectly even distribution of this land, we can never have more than four to five acres per family. There are a number of rural families, agricultural families in our country who have got 10 to 15 acres and when that is the case, when some families have 10 to 15 acres, naturally a very large number of families will have less than 4 to 5 acres, that is to say, some 2 or 3 acres of land each.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: In Eastern Uttar Pradesh there are families with only half an acre of land.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: My hon. friend is trying to support my argument by quoting a still smaller figure; but I am quite content to say that they have only 2 acres of land. So my contention is this. The proposer of the motion pointed out that in Andhra there are protected tenants possessing 29 lakh acres of land, and that some 50 per cent of it has gone. He did not mention that Andhra Pradesh has got three crore acres of land. That means, that the protected tenants occupy only 10 per cent of



that land. Of that 10 per cent of the land some 50 per cent, that is to say, only 5 per cent of the land is in dispute. You must consider the whole thing in right perspective. Just giving large numbers and confusing the mind by saying that nothing is being done will not solve the problem.

Our problem is a difficult one. We do not have enough land; and fragmentation of the land and giving just 2 or 3 acres without providing the cultivator with suitable facilities for agriculture is not going to increase our food production. You should go in for proper utilisation of the land. The cultivator should have a pair of healthy bullocks. That is very essential. He should have some money for the seeds and some money for fertilizers. All this is necessary. In spite of all these facilities, he has today to look to the skies for proper rainfall at the proper time and in proper

quantities. There should be neither shortage or excess of it. In either case his lot would be a hard one. Therefore, there has been in our country a movement for *gramdan* and a movement for co-operative farming. I think the topmost priority should be given to it. It is not a question of dividing the land among the landless and giving each one or two acres and then subsequently thinking of merging them into co-operative societies. Instead of that, I would request the Planning Minister to see that if there is any land which he gets from the landlords, in particular from the absent landholders, all that land should not be distributed but should be converted into co-operative societies, owned and managed by the landless labourers.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): He will not get any land, don't worry.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, it is all right for propaganda purposes. I can also stand up and say, "Kill the landlords and you will have plenty of land." Sir, the problem is not one of big landlords. The big landlords have

disappeared. Of course, the sooner they have disappeared the better. The problem now is of the small landlords. We should not really call them landlords, for they are peasant proprietors, owning some 15 to 20 acres. That is the problem. If you take their overall figure, out of the 25 or 28 crore acres of land, you will find that the whole problem about these absentee landlords or these displaced landlords does not amount to more than one connected with 4 to 5 per cent, of the total land. Of course, if you mention a figure of one million acres of land, it makes a great figure and it attracts immediate attention. But even ten million acres of land is only 4 to 5 per cent of the total area under cultivation. Our aim is higher and bigger food production and that is only possible if we adopt modern methods of agriculture and modern methods of producing food-grains. If we go on with the old methods with one or two acres of land, a lame bullock or possibly a hired or lent bullock, or say a pair of bullocks, then we cannot solve this problem. We will have this chronic shortage of foodgrains and we will continue to be beggars in the world, begging for our food from all the countries and sending our Ministers for arranging for foodgrains from foreign countries. The Second Five Year Plan will not be successful. I feel sometimes that we are trying to get a sort of propaganda value by just mentioning the Five Year Plan and then raising the hopes and passions of the illiterate masses in our country. Of course, they have got nearly 70 per cent, of the votes and we want their votes. This House and the other House can only exist if they continued to vote.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The illiterate, masses don't read our speeches.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: But let us approach them on the proper lines and let us place before them the correct ways of thinking. We should tell them that we are thinking of the co-operative movement. That is our

[Shri Kishen Chand.] only solution. We request the Planning Minister and the Planning Commission to remember that the days of option are gone. The Planning Commission's report suggested that the ultimate objective is co-operative farming, and it should come slowly and gradually and on a voluntary basis. That was the idea in the Plan. I think the times have changed and we shall have to go in for compulsion and establish that sort of co-operative societies where people are paid. It is not a sort of contribution or voluntary service; but it is something like an organised industry. A co-operative society on the lines of an organised industry in which every owner of the land is a shareholder and there is a common effort on a paid basis. It may look a new idea. It has been tried in other countries and found successful. They call it the State Farms. Well, we will not call them the State Farms, but they will be Co-operative Farms.

And, therefore, I support this Resolution to the extent that it recommends to Government to take immediate steps to co-ordinate and expedite the implementation of the programme. The optional clause in the Second Five Year Plan, where it is suggested that the co-operative societies should come in on an optional basis, should be changed to compulsion because I feel that this is the only solution.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): Sir, as one who has spent a major portion of his life to agrarian agitation, and also as one who has started tenancy organisation since 1920 for land reforms with the ultimate object of abolition of zamindari system, this Resolution has a lot of attraction for me. My hon. friend has complained about the slow progress of the land reforms in the Second Five Year Plan. I would partly agree with him. He goes further and says the Plan programme is haphazard. I do not know how and why this has been stated by my friend when his party accepted in full the Second Five Year Plan pro-

gramme and when his party itself has declared that that would be the basis of field work.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We have accepted the Plan, but not the lack of implementation of it.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I am delighted. Planning within the ambit of the Constitution and leaving land reform to the autonomous States of India, to me, are not very happy aspects. I would rather feel that there is a certain amount of contradiction which is bound to be there, because different States, in India today, have different per *capita* landholdings and land space. Let me illustrate the case of Assam where you have more space, more land area available *per capita* than you could think of in a State like Travancore-Cochin or a State like West Bengal or for the matter of that the State of Bihar minus the Ranchi division. With this difference in landholding?, per capita land available for the people, what is it that you have to plan? I have a serious complaint against the Planning Commission because you leave the entire planning to the State and within the ambit of the Constitution they have to proceed. Well, each step of land reform is being checked by proceedings in the High Courts and the Supreme Court. Hence the delay. The Government of Bihar were the pioneers in the field and there were halts and stoppages at each step, at each stage. What are you going to do? You have to think for yourself whether amendment of the Constitution is necessary or find the time cure for the difficulties. Therefore, there is no use complaining against the State Governments or against anyone else. Each one is anxious. For myself I do not want these land reforms to be delayed.

Then, my hon. friend representing Bihar, specially I believe Ranchi division, has put up a claim on behalf of his friends, the Adivasis. I sympathise with him. But what is to be

done? He claims ten acres per family. If you have to think of a system of land reform by which each family is ensured of ten acres, I think, you have to take away, more lands and dispossess more people than you could confer benefits. I would appeal to my friend only to have mathematical calculations of the available land area that we have in India. Therefore, the land reforms problem is a difficult one. It presents a difficulty which is insoluble in itself. The only possible course that has been devised is co-operative farming; land consolidation. I do not understand what is meant by land consolidation. Nothing has yet been done in this regard, I admit. But I do not know what it is. How are you going to consolidate? Are you to dispossess people, dislodge people, the holders, when people are anxious and waiting to see that they get some land space? Go to a mofussil, It is probably the virulent type of propaganda carried on by my friends, land distribution per *capita*, as if the same is done in Russia or elsewhere in any of these communist countries.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Russia has eight million square miles.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Russia has about eight million square miles? Russia has got the widest extent of land space, 93 lakhs of square miles for a population of 20 crores. "That you do not find in India. You hardly have one-eighth of the land space. My friends should plead with their friends in Russia to allow some of our people to go, settle and cultivate those waste lands lying uncared for; instead they are carrying on an agitation in the countryside for *per capita* distribution of land. *Per capita* distribution has now been the bone of contention in the countryside. And if this misery -vpere to occur to this country, I think my hon. friends will have to share njiore than anyone in this. Therefore, there is no use pleading for any acreage. No one could make sure of any acreage for anyone. Therefore, the position is, we have to find some method by

which we could induce the people to take to co-operative cultivation. Unfortunately, very little has yet been done in this regard. People who are very vocal and most vociferous, I would appeal and beg of them to go and devote themselves solely to this; to make themselves sink in this act of agricultural co-operative farming and thus set an example. I would also appeal to my hon. friend, the Minister of Planning, to make agricultural co-operative farming attractive to the people. Looking into the records I find that since 1948 conferences of Ministers of the Union and the States have been resolving that cooperative cultivation and farming should be taken up. What has been the result? The result is very little, nothing. I was going through the pages on the results of Co-operative N Farming two days back, and I must tell you that so far as my State is concerned, the facts revealed therein are not correct. The report of the Study Group published by the Planning Commission is not correct regarding Orissa.

DR. R. B. GOUR: If the cart is placed before the horse, the result is obviously going to be bad.

12 NOON

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: I do not know how you are saying that.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You want cooperative farming without land reforms first.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: Sir, I am always feeling that the Planning Commission is missing buses on each occasion. Having made this serious allegation, it is for me to illustrate how it is so. Sir, according to me the first step in this direction should have been taken regarding Co-operative Farming when the Jagirs and Inam villages were taken over by Government. Legislation was in the first place undertaken by State Governments with the full knowledge of the Union Ministry of Agriculture, as also> with the full knowledge of the Plan-

[Shri Biswanath Das.] ning Commission, and tenancy rights were conferred on the cultivators of the Inam and Jagir villages. There are some tens of thousands of such villages in India, and you find in every district some 5 or 6 hundred such villages. I have a right to ask the Planning Commission why they did not think of introducing co-operative cultivation in these villages retaining tenancy rights in themselves, *i.e.*, in the Government, of the State so that they could have easily undertaken tenancy legislation without appealing to anyone. I looked into the Evaluation Report published by the Planning Commission. It is stated that the State Governments' position is that they appeal to the people and the people are unwilling. Why did you leave a thing which you had in your hand? You had the tenancy rights to enforce and carry out co-operative farming in those particular villages. With State aid and help you could have shown the benefits that accrue from cooperative cultivation so that people could see for themselves co-operative cultivation at work and the resultant benefits. That bus was missed.

The second bus was again available and that was also missed. What is the second bus? The Evaluation Report says that about 26 to 28 lakh acres of land were available from land reclamation by State and Union agencies. Most of these were waste lands, some of these jungle clearance lands. There were no tenancy rights on them. Why did you not start co-operative cultivation in such lands just to demonstrate the benefits of co-operative farming? The second bus was also missed and tenancy rights were created in these lands.

Sir, I want the Planning Minister and also the Planning Commission to note that there is yet a third and probably the only bus available, and that is the *Gramdan*. From *Gramdan* about 3,600 villages in all States of India are available, and most of these

are *khas*. These poor people had given all the lands they had. Now Vinobhaji has a responsibility to demonstrate to these people the benefits of *Sarvodaya*. But Vinobhaji himself should not be left alone in this. Sir, I would appeal to the Planning Minister and also the Agriculture Minister, and equally also to the Finance Minister and above all to the Prime Minister, to see that no efforts are spared in this regard and all money necessary for the purpose is provided to make these *Gramdan* villages successful units of co-operative cultivation.

Sir, I have a special suggestion to make in this regard. It is no use parties talking big and loud. India is an independent country, from 1947 India is a Republican State. It is an independent Union. Therefore, instead of talking big things and carrying on unnecessary propaganda, let us devote ourselves to this task, let each party be called upon to join, let the Government of India undertake to finance the experiments.

(Time bell rings.)

I will take only a minute or two. Let Panditji and Vinobhaji invite all parties to take a number of villages, say 150 or 200, in specific areas and carry on experiments on co-operative farming according to their own views or ideologies or programmes so that the country will have the benefit of different experiments, so that no one could complain of want of finance. Sir, I am also aware of one fact, namely, that our Communist friends, I believe, specially the Travancore-Cochin Ministry, have little faith in co-operative cultivation. If they have faith in collectivisation, let them also take some villages and show us the benefits of collectivisation. Let us have the results of the experiment so that the people may see. I make this suggestion for what it is worth.

I am thankful to you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity to make

these observations, and I resume my seat.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON (Kerala): Sir, thanks for small mercies, the Communist friends have at least said that the land reform programme in the Plan has been good. As has been said by my friend Dr. Gour, they have admitted this long ago. Thanks again for small mercies, but I cannot agree with them that it is because of want of earnestness on the part of the Government that the implementation of those schemes has not been possible yet. As my friend Mr. Biswanath Das said, it is almost an insolvable problem, and the conventions and rights which have been followed for generations cannot be done away within a day, and necessarily the thing has to be done a little bit carefully. My friend has not shown in what way the schema is haphazard, but in the nature of things it is inevitable that one has to go carefully in a matter like this. I do not want to speak much about the scheme, but I was provoked to speak when Mr. Prasad Rao said that the Provincial Government has done anything to protect the tenants from eviction or to give them their proper rights. It is wrong to say that the Provincial Governments have not done anything. As early as 1929 the Madras Government had brought a tenancy legislation. In the district of Malabar where evictions were rampant, and because of insecurity of tenure and heavy rents which led to various disputes and troubles there, as early as 1929 the Malabar Tenancy Act was passed by the Madras Legislature. The Congress Government in 1950 amended the Malabar Tenancy Act and practically gave permanency of tenure to all sorts of tenants and made eviction almost impossible. That was further improved in 1952 by the Madras Legislature which made practically eviction of any form of tenant impossible there. You might say that, theoretically, there was a provision there that the landlord could evict a tenant for his own purpose of cultivation or maintenance. Even that was only in theory because it was definitely mentioned there that

it was only when he had no other means of existence or livelihood, that he could evict a tenant. Eviction was impossible there. What have the Communist Government done in Kerala for the last five months in the matter of land reforms?

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): You will hear.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: Yes, it might be something heard, but nothing done. Nothing has been done nor is it proposed to be done there. They have made an eye-wash by the issue of an ordinance, the Anti-eviction Ordinance, which was practically of no use because eviction was not possible. There was in the Malabar District or in the former State of Travancore-Cochin, a tenancy legislation which had almost made eviction impossible and rents were reduced to the barest minimum in both the places.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: May I know if the hon. Member denies that early in the beginning of this year, 13,000 cases were pending in courts in Malabar for evictions?

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: There may be. Those were cases which were almost impossible, as I said; evictions were well-nigh impossible. People might file cases and the cases would be dismissed because evictions were impossible. They came out with an-eye-wash ordinance that no eviction was possible. All right; so far so good. But what have they done? It is open to them to implement the scheme. They have done nothing except saying so many things, by giving newspaper interviews, that there would be a ceiling on land. But have they done something? When the Communist Government took over, there was a raid or trespass upon Government lands and private lands by Communist underlings. The Minister admitted in the Legislative Assembly that 5,000 people trespassed upon Government lands and occupied them and it was impossible for the Government to evict them.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: We are not going to deny that.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: About a thousand acres of forest land belonging to private people was entered into by the Communists. The police instituted cases against the trespassers, but the Government withdrew those cases because the people who trespassed were Communists. What have they done instead in Kattampalli in Canna-nore? There, about nine acres of land belonging to the Jail Department were surrendered to the Revenue Department for assignment to landless people. Unfortunately, eight or nine Harijan families went and squatted there, built small houses there. The entire might of the Kerala Government came to evict those Harijans from those *puramboke* lands. They have been evicted on the ground that they are trespassers. There was the connivance of the Government when those people trespassed Government forest lands. This is what the Communist Government has done and an attempt now to rehabilitate those nine Harijan families who have been evicted is being made with all the force of the Government. Those people were lathi charged and tear gas was used against a procession which wanted to object to or protest against the eviction of the poor Harijans. This is what the Communist Government has done. Let them be very serious in their action before they begin to advise other people.

This is what I have to say, Sir.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I would have rather kept silent, but "the speech of my hon. friend on the Opposition Bench from Bihar has made it necessary for me to speak, because "that speech may give rise to certain misconceptions that we, in Bihar at least, have been lagging behind and have not been implementing in a proper fashion and with proper speed, those land reforms set as an ideal "before the country by the Planning Commission. I might inform the House, Mr. Chairman, that Bihar, or for the matter of that, the Presidency

of Bengal, has had a very advanced tenancy legislation from the year 1885 onwards, when the Bengal Tenancy Act was passed. Rights which were conferred on the tenants in Uttar Pradesh and the neighbouring States in the year 1937, had accrued to the peasantry and tenantry of Bihar in the year 1885. Rents were fixed. There was a provision for fixing or reducing rents in suitable and proper cases and a right of occupancy had been given which meant that anybody who cultivated for a year or even for a day the private lands of a land-owner with his consent got the occupancy right and he could not be evicted in any case whatsoever. In the year 1937, when the Congress Government came to power in Bihar, we improved upon that legislation, conferred occupancy rights on many tenants and made eviction more difficult. We amended Section 112 of the Bihar-Bengal Tenancy Act which was then known as the Bihar Tenancy Act. After that amendment, hundreds and thousands of acres were put through a new process of fixation of rent and rents were reduced. We did not stop at that. Bihar was one of the few States which took the lead in abolishing the Zamindari system. The compensation that was allowed to landlords by that legislation was of so meagre a character and nature that, out of the interest that would accrue to them from the amounts that they would receive from the Government, they would be getting hardly one-tenth or one-fifteenth of the income that they were getting as landlords. Thereafter, as Shri Biswanath Das has already said, hurdles were put in the way. Rather they were not put in the way, but they arose because of the particular Constitution that we have adopted. The High Court came in the way; the Supreme Court came in the way and this Zamindari abolition was delayed for several years. But after the Constitution had been amended, the matter went through, and the Government of Bihar took steps to introduce ceiling on land by legislation. Elections intervened. The old Assembly went out and a new Assembly came in, and that Bill

lapsed. But the Bihar Government have expressed their determination to introduce afresh legislation for ceiling on land. By legislation evictions have been made impossible in Bihar. If you see the Statute Book of Bihar, you will find that at least one-third or one-fourth of the legislation passed by the Bihar Assembly has to do with land reforms, because Bihar, though it is supposed to be a highly industrialised State, is still mainly an agricultural State.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

After the abolition of Zamindari, it was found that there were many so-called tenants or peasants owning vast areas of land, 200, 400 and 500 acres and a few individuals who owned 10,000 acres. In the very nature of things, it was not possible for them to cultivate all the lands that they owned and they had been subletting them for cultivation to the peasantry or tenantry. Under the old law, the peasantry or tenantry had no protection against the exorbitant rates or eviction in such cases.

But as soon as the Congress Government came into power in 1946 and thereafter, they introduced legislation fixing a reasonable rent even in the case of such holdings, that is holdings held by actual cultivator under some person who was till the abolition of Zamindari considered a tenant or Raiyat. These are the great achievements which go to the credit of the Bihar Government. My friend, Mr. Bodra, catalogued some of the miseries or grievances of the Adivasis. The Adivasis have their grievances but it is not only the Adivasis who have all their grievances, it is the non-Adivasis of Bihar who also have their grievances and they will have their grievances for sometime to come; because India is a poor country, we still mainly rely on land for our sustenance. It has not yet been industrialised. The pressure on land is so great that whatever measures we may adopt, I can say that at least for 20 years to come, in

spite of all that we do, the people who have to rely on land cannot be assured of, what is considered to be by modern standards, a happy and affluent life. Therefore, if the grievances are there, the grievances are shared by the Adivasis in common with the non-Adivasis. The Adivasis as such have no distinct or separate grievances. And I may inform this House that not only today, even from the times of the British people there has been a law, which lays down that nobody, who was not resident in those areas could purchase land there, could own land there. Whatever land is owned there, whatever land is held there, is held only by the residents of those areas.

SHRI T. BODRA: What is the position today?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Even today. That law has been there, I think for more than 50 years and the Congress Government have made that law and its implementation more and more effective. In the circumstances, if the grievances are there, the grievances arise out of conditions which cannot be helped, which no human agency in the present stage can undo. There are many non-Adivasis who have been settled there for a century. They have also grievances and unless that area is fully industrialised, unless people are absorbed by industries and commerce, I think that the grievances of the Adivasis will be there but all the same, I can assure this House ...

SHRI T. BODRA: It will remain a colony of Bihar.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Adivasis are as much Biharis as we are. I am a Patna-division man in Chota Nagpur, you are a Chota Nagpur man in Patna.

SHRI T. BODRA: We are not Biharis.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: There are so many laws for the special protection of the Adivasis. They have been coming down from the past and the

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] Congress Government instead of slashing all those protections have added to those protections. I, therefore, feel that my hon. friend should have no grievances on the ground that the Adivasis have been picked up for some disadvantageous or discriminatory treatment. If they suffer, they suffer along with the other people. Sir, I may again assure this House that the State of Bihar has been doing all that is possible to achieve in the way of land reforms and I am sure before the term of the present Assembly of Bihar, the present Government of Bihar is over, all that is practicable and practically feasible of achievement shall be achieved in Bihar. Thank you, Sir.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose this Resolution on certain grounds. I am in sympathy with it but what I am going to say is this. Our food problem is very urgent. We are supposed to be a predominantly agricultural country but we are going round the world with a begging bowl for food. That must be stopped as early as possible. That is the problem. And another problem is that every year 5 to 6 million mouths are being added to the already large population of our country. These are the two problems which we have to face and all our remedial legislation or remedial actions must be governed by these two main considerations. I find that what has been done is very little really. This is robbing Paul to pay Peter. Nothing has been done properly. Supposing you displace landlords, the jagirdars and inamdars and distribute their land. Already jagirdars are not cultivating anything. The cultivators are different. You make the cultivators permanent tenants, still there is that sense of ownership of a small piece of land and I may tell you that people have fought for only one guntha, that means 11 ft. x 11 ft. of agricultural land and up to 3 courts. You are creating among the people, who had no sense of

ownership, a sense of ownership and if hereafter, you want to have some pooling, it will be impossible. So, you must take courage in both hands, if you at all want to do something as quickly as possible. The Government must take courage. They must say, "No, we want the food problem to be solved, therefore, at least every village will be pooled together." Whatever the rights are they will be taken notice of and in the total yield every man might get something according, to his rights for his food and so forth and the rest will be sold by Government and the proceeds paid to the tenants proportionately. Otherwise, nothing is going to happen. On the contrary, I am afraid that you may create this sense of ownership. The result will be fight in the courts or in the streets or on the roads. Nothing will happen. At present what is happening is,—my knowledge is confined only to Bombay and particularly to Maharashtra and the Konkan—a person who is a servant in Bombay, a Government servant, has three or four acres of land there. Now the tenant, had become a permanent tenant. This man used to get before that about one-third of the produce or sometimes; half. Now there is no legislation but it has been given as a directive that one-sixth of the produce will be paid to the landlord and I may tell you that even that one-sixth is not being paid at all. The result is that most of the tenants' are producing less than they used to do formerly. Suppose, he was producing 3 khandies and paid 1½ khandies to the landlord. Now he pays nothing except the Government assessment and therefore he produces only two khandies and half and not more. That won't do. You must produce 4 khandies instead of 3 khandies and for that Government should not depend upon voluntary things: Our people, for centuries, are not used to do anything voluntarily. Therefore courage must be taken in hand and you must be more or less a dictator in this matter. All must pool, at least the village must pool together. Otherwise, how are you going to have a pair of bullocks? You must have



fertilizers, you must have scientific ploughing and all that costs money which only Government can supply; co-operative societies can supply. But unless there is co-operation of these people and unless you educate them there will be no real improvement. Otherwise there will be fight.

Somebody was talking about transfers. How are you going to stop transfers? I do not know. I am sure there must be *mala fide* transfers but how are you going to stop them under the law? The courts are there. The High Court is there. You cannot go to Supreme Court because the money limit is put. What I am saying is you must think 20 years ahead and you will see that unless you take practically absolute powers compelling people to pool, nothing will be done.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my main object in participating in this debate is just to pose certain problems, just to draw the attention of the Planning Commission and the Central Government to certain problems that have been thrown up in the course of the attempts which are being made in my part of the country, in Kerala, to grapple with this question seriously. I shall not enter into the peculiarities of the land tenure system there because of lack of time and if I do not explain the facts fully, it will just be confusing the issue. So I shall confine myself to touching on certain aspects of the problem as we experience it in Kerala and which have a general bearing on the problem of land reforms in India. I have just five points in that connection to make. But before that, there has been some reference made to what has already been done by the Government in Kerala.

My esteemed friend, Shri Madhava Menon, has used some words which he may have to regret afterwards. Now he said that all along there has been tenancy legislation in Madras and Malabar which is now part of Kerala. Formerly it was part of Madras. I do not deny that. There

was some legislation, but as I pointed out to him, at the time the present Government in Kerala assumed office, in one district of Malabar, there were 1,300 eviction cases pending in the civil courts. That was the state of affairs there. Well, Sir, we do claim that the Communist Government has stayed all those evictions. At least these 1,300 people got the benefit in one particular district alone. So, just to say that it is an eyewash may be quite all right as a propaganda piece of work, but it will not go down among the people of Kerala. They know what the Communist Government is doing for them. We have stayed those evictions. On that score at any rate the Kerala Government can claim that they have done something substantial. He cannot deny it.

Then, Sir, the second thing is regarding distribution of land which is available. Now in Kerala the position was that there was some considerable acreage of forest land and what we call revenue purambokes, and during the grow more food campaign those things were given on short term leases and other things. But then there was no attempt made during all the years of the previous Ministries to distribute land on some reasonable basis. Now as soon as our Government, the Communist Government, came into office there, they, I think on April 15, within a few weeks of their assuming power came out with Government proceedings laying down rules for the immediate and prompt distribution of these lands.

SHRI K. MADHAVA MENON: Have you done it till now?

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: If we have not done it, I will tell you the reason why. Well, Sir, in those proceedings the extent of land to be distributed was clearly marked, the priorities were clearly laid down and the machinery was clearly set up. We did not consider it to be an insoluble problem, but we knew that it was a difficult problem. It was a human problem also. And we wanted the co-operation of all the

Shri Perath Narayanan Nair: political parties there including the co-operation of the party to which the hon. Member, Shri Madhava Menon, belongs. Well, Sir, we wanted committees. Of course, the Revenue Officer was there for those guiding principles, and in every *taluk* we wanted to set up those committees so that they could do it and so that these charges of favouritism and all sorts of things may not be made. And now in such areas where we have got this co-operation, things are being done, land is being distributed and forest lands have been surveyed. In Kattampally, Trichur and Kottayam it has been done,

(Interruptions.)

I have got the co-operation of my friends including the Congressmen in certain areas. But in certain other areas we have not got that co-operation. Now, Sir, this whole distribution is a long and laborious process and the land hunger is so much that unless we recognise certain principles and unless we mobilise the co-operation of the people, we cannot do it. When you say that it is just a propaganda, well, it will not go down among the people. It is all right to say that here.

(Interruptions.)

In our proceedings of April 15, we said that trespasses and unauthorised occupations up to that date will be enquired into at a later stage .....

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras): On a point of order, Sir. When he says "we said", does he mean the Communist Party of Kerala or the Government of Kerala?

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: The Communist Government of Kerala in which some of us are interested as partymen. That is how I put it. I am not authorised to speak here on behalf of the Government of Kerala. But as a partymen I know the principles which govern that Government. I claim to know that and only I can speak on that basis. Any-

way, we laid down the principles, and then we also gave an effective warning that anything after that would not be tolerated. (Interruption.) I would request the House to bear with me for some few minutes because let us not look at this essentially a national task of grappling with this problem from a narrow point of view or a party point of view. In Kattampally what actually happened was that out of these nine Harijans seven had their own abodes, which were guaranteed under the proceedings of the Government. (Interruption.) Sir, this is the attitude, when we are actually working out this problem, which the Congress Party is adopting although it has accepted the Planning Commission's principles.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, I want one clarification .....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Now I want the House to know that in the distribution of this land certain basic principles have been worked out, priorities have been fixed and machinery has been set up. If Shri Madhava Menon or even the Planning Commission can suggest to us some better method than we have adopted, the Communist Government will be the first to accept it. Instead of that, Sir, this is the attitude which the Congress party in Kerala and other parties in Kerala adopt towards this earnest and serious attempt to tackle this problem. Well, you have the evidence of it in their speeches. He has referred to Communist hirelings. I am thankful to him for the small mercies because we were bandits before, we were *goondas* before. But this is admitted to be a very serious and complicated problem and when we invite the co-operation of the people, not in words, Sir, but in Government proceedings ..... (Interruption.) I will leave it there.

(Interruptions.)

That is all right. We are working there on the most democratic of principles which you will do well to copy. I shall not be provoked into a digression like that. You will have occasion to know more about the things at Kattampally and other places. You will also have occasion to know how things are being managed by responsible leaders of Congress opinion in that part.

In grappling with this problem, there is the question of the small owner and the small tenant. It is a human problem and you cannot solve this on the absolute rights of property or even on questions of socialism and other things. The pressure of land in my part of the country, Kerala, is so great that probably, a number of small owners, for historical reasons, have been obliged to give possession to others. When we have to tackle this land problem, this question of the large number of small owners and small tenants also comes to the fore. We have made some draft provisions and they are, I understand, under examination by the Planning Commission and the Central Government. The Planning Commission has appointed a certain three man commission which is applying its mind to this question. I just want to bring to their notice one or two things about the way in which we are attempting to solve this problem of the small owners, I mean owners whose income is less than Rs. 3,000 per month. If we say that we will go on fixing a fair rent thus reducing their present income by our proposals, then naturally the immediate question that arises is about the quantum of compensation that we have to pay. We have suggested that in certain areas, taking into consideration the comparative position of the tenants and the owners, if the tenant is more - 'fortunately placed then there should be the right for the small owner to jressm-ie the land. In cases where it is not possible, we say that certain rehabilitation arrangements must be made and in certain other cases,

taking into consideration the position of the tenants, we have said that some compensation is to be paid if the small tenant is in any way dispossessed even of a certain section. We are approaching the problem in this realistic manner. Then we have the Dewaswom and Church lands. If we reduce these things, then the cry of 'religion in danger' comes in and the other political parties also take advantage. Why I suggest is this. What are we to do about this? If we implement this fair rent provision in regard to temple lands, then naturally the incomes become low. The expenses for these big festivals etc. have all been exaggerated already and are bloated. If we solve this problem in a realistic manner this cry comes in. What I suggest is that if the Planning Commission can lay down certain proposals through which we can raise the social consciousness of the people, proposals which have the blessings of the Planning Commission, it will go a long way to determine the attitude of even the Congressmen there.

Now comes the question of encumbrances. Reference has been made to mala fide transfers and other things. Encumbrances have been added of late through the Co-operative Banks and other Banks also. In the face of these difficulties we are not just sitting back. We are, on the other hand, trying to solve the problem. In the draft proposals, I think, there are certain provisions there and I would request the Planning Commission to apply its mind to the proposals. What is the machinery? The old huge administrative set up is there, the Land Tribunals, the Compensation Officers, etc., etc., but this procedure has got to be simplified and a simple apparatus is required to push through the whole thing. We are trying our level best to work it out and we really want to associate everyone, even the other political parties. We have made certain suggestions and we will welcome any suggestions made for this purpose;

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUSHI (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I never thought that this Resolution would reach today and I confess that I had not applied my mind to it at all but, having heard some of the arguments advanced here, I would like to make a few observations.

First of all, I agree with the mover that the progress of land reforms is haphazard but for entirely different reasons. I do not claim to understand the land problem because I have no land of my own and I do not have to tackle any problem with regard to it. I am not wedded to any theory at all. After all, the land reforms are done with a particular purpose and if that purpose is served, any solution is good enough for me. I am only concerned with the results. Only recently I had an occasion to go to Gujrat, to Anand District, which is a very rich agricultural districts, where there was a great deal of dissatisfaction against Government because of the new land laws. I do not know whether it was justified or unjustified. I am only stating the facts as they are. Land is given to the tillers and an economic holding is supposed to be 4 acres of irrigated land whereas people used to have more land. Land is given to the tillers and a ceiling has been put on the holding but if that reform has been done with a view to better production, unfortunately that result has not been achieved and whatever it is achieved so far, has not been very encouraging. The small owner of today, when he was a tenant, used to get all the help regarding fertiliser, bullocks, etc., from his landlord. Now, of course, the Government agency may be there but somehow the tiller is not able to procure all the necessary things and he cannot get the results which he used to have before. The land reform has led to fragmentation. After all, as Dr. Kane said, the land problem is being tackled only for increasing the food production which is very

acute. As he said, we are now going about with a begging bowl to so many countries and we have so many more mouths to feed every year. I agree with him because whatever land is there is not going to increase even by an inch. Supposing all the land is distributed, then, every one will get not even one acre and so, the problem is not going to be solved. We have got a growing population and so many more mouths to be fed and the feeling is that new law leads to the fragmentation which retards—the progress of Grow More Food Campaign. In theory it may satisfy somebody or the other—one party or the other—but fragmentation is not in the interest of the Grow More Food Campaign. So far that is the case. The production may improve, but so far wherever the fragmentation has taken place, the growing of food crops has not increased and we require more and more food for our growing population. We are abolishing the landlords but then we must replace it with a better system which gives some tangible result. We should show more successful working in cooperative farming as Mr. Kishen Chand put it. My friend, Shri Biswanath Das said that the Government should have taken the land and given it for tilling and showed how the co-operative farming could be done. I agree with that view that if the Government had done that, then they would have seen to it that these people get the fertilisers, bullocks and machinery that they want and they learn exactly how to work a cooperative farm and then the land could have been divided but at the moment once the sense of ownership is created, to ask them to take to cooperative farming becomes rather difficult.

Somebody mentioned about the success of China. But I think in spite of their drastic reforms, they are not doing very well. Only yesterday in the House, the Prime Minister said so when some Members interrupted him.

There was mention of Russia also but Russia has enormous land and even there for the co-operative farming they had to resort to coercive process which we are not prepared to do, because we are a democratic Government although some sort of coercive process will be required to enforce the law.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is democratic coercion.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: The compensation has been fixed but hardly people are getting it. It is not the fault of the tenants who get lands. How can they give compensation as they have no money to pay? So it is a question of dissatisfying that person who is getting the land as well as the person who was owning the land. If the Government had taken the land and had turned it into co-operative farms or even if this Bhoodan movement is turned into cooperative farms that may produce better results than what results are being achieved today. Somehow the co-operative farming has not become very popular or successful and the result is that the sense of ownership is created and they want to cling to that land. They don't want to merge with somebody because they have no habit of doing that. Let us not become dogmatic about one system or the other. I am not wedded to any system. If the Communist system works well, let us adopt it and if the Congress system works well, let us adopt that. Even in Kerala when they wanted to give protection to tenants they have very little land, as it is said here—the same problem is: all over India—so they could not divide it adequately. They could not satisfy the hunger of land of people.

I agree with Mr. Madhava Menon when he said eviction is impossible and so, how to get compensation? That was the complaint even in Anand District that I had visited. I don't want to say much but the distribution of the land is for one pur-

pose, that is, to grow more food. If it grows more food by distributing the land, by all means let us do it but if it does not grow more food and it retards the growth, there is something wrong somewhere. There is the human problem also. I agree with the speaker who said that with every land reform or land question the human problem is involved. Here this question is not being discussed dispassionately. It is one party against another party and claiming this party did well and that party did not do well. That is a very wrong spirit to exhibit. I hope that this question will be tackled in a different way. I don't know what the Government is going to do, whether they are going to accept or reject this Resolution. The solution should not be in terms of this method or that method but should be found with a view to encourage growing of more and more food. That is all that I have to say.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Resolution has been brought by my friend Shri Prasad Rao from my State; it would have received my full support if it had not the tinge of political propaganda and if it had in addition a sympathetic and constructive approach to the land problem.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You pass the Resolution and reject the propaganda.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: So far as the first part is concerned, I am happy that at least on principle, the Congress and the Communist and the whole country is agreed that land should be for the tiller, that there should be a ceiling and so far as possible, without affecting the food production the land should be distributed. That is a great achievement in the sense that the whole country is supporting those ideas. But as another Communist friend, I mean Shri Nair spoke, apart from the fact relating to Kerala, which I am neither in a position to accept or contradict,

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.] I think he has given certain things which indirectly modify this Resolution itself. He said "if they have not been able to do in Kerala," and that shows that when responsibility is placed on your shoulder, how cautious and careful you are in saying and doing-things, "it is because it is a social problem, or it is a human problem. There are practical difficulties", he said ...

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is why evictions have been banned?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes and those persons belonging to the Party have been given lands. Let us not look at it in that party outlook. What I say is, if my hon. friend Mr. Prasad Rao had said "Well, Sir, this ideology is accepted. Why is the implementation slow? Let us sit down and consider and devise measures and means through which we can implement it etc." then I would have been the first to support.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is what he said.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No. The implication and the idea is that the Central Government as well as the State Governments are not doing their jobs seriously, have not taken to their heart and are not implementing it as they ought to have done it. If he says in unequivocal terms that the Central Government and the States are doing their best but on account of the inherent difficulties, intrinsic difficulties, the matter has not been pushed forward, I am with him.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The difficulty is that the hon. Member has not read Mr. Nanda's statement given to the A.I.C.C. itself.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: My hon. friend can take advantage of the statistics and statements here and

there bereft of the context and view things in his support.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY"  
(Mysore): When it suits him.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: What I say is, leave them aside. This is really a very serious problem. The land problem relates to thousands of people because we are an agricultural country so far, and to tackle it on constructive lines would be in the best interests of the country and not to agitate it for propaganda's sake. For the sake of saying 'We (Communists) distribute lands' my friend Shri Rao also said that "We want at least 10 acres for each person etc."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you take more time?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then, you can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2.-20 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, when we rose for lunch, I was referring to that part of the hon. Member's speech which referred to the division of land. Sir, I need not dilate on it but, as has been pointed out, it is obvious that we have an agricultural population of approximately over 25 crores and a limited quantity of land which is also approximately about 25 crores of acres. It is practically impossible to see that everybody who is in the agriculture field now gets land. Again this should not be a measure which would adversely affect production. This kind of distribution would not help the attainment of a decent

standard of living for agriculturists. Similarly, Sir, when we have fixed the ceiling, obviously we, as a democratic country, should act up to the democratic principles and we should pay certain compensation. There may be some difficulty in that direction. Similarly, Sir, we are governed by law and there is a system of law courts and there may be cases where, in view of the interpretation of certain laws, the matter may be taken to the courts. So, these are some of the real difficulties that one has to face and, with an honest effort, let us try to solve the problem. My learned friend from the other side, Mr. Nair, appealed, so far as Kerala is concerned, to the other political parties to join hands with them in regard to this problem of land. May I, Sir, with your permission, on behalf of the Congress, assure him that in the whole of India, the Congress Party is prepared to sit with the other Parties and try to evolve measures which would really solve the question of land and the agriculturists in the most equitable and in a realistic manner. I have no doubt that even the Government will welcome this suggestion and will co-operate with them in this matter.

There have been a few things said about Telangana and the Andhra State also. I am happy again, Sir, that the hon. Member on the side opposite has accepted that so far as Telangana is concerned, progressive and advanced measures have been taken in this direction. I am sure he will agree with me that under the Chairmanship of Shri M. Narsing Rao, the question of the tenancy reform has been dealt with thoroughly and, if I may say so, it has been solved to a great extent satisfactorily. So far as the question of eviction is concerned, I can quote number of orders where it has been definitely announced that there will be no eviction and whenever cases of eviction have been brought to the notice of the Government, proper steps had been taken in that direction. Now, so far

as the Andhra Government is concerned, I am sure an honest effort is being made in the direction in which Telangana has given a lead and I am sure that with the co-operation of all concerned, it will not be long before we come to some definite and concrete solution of this most difficult and intricate problem.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You are assuring on behalf of wrong people.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Congress people and everybody, I am sure, will welcome it.

Now, Sir, it is not the occasion to go into the details but, before I sit down, I would say that if real implementation of the policy laid down by the Planning Commission is to be achieved then I think the direction and the inspiration given to us by that great Faqir of the land, Acharya Vinobhaji who has shown the right way to solve this problem, should be taken note of and followed. In respect of Bhoodan also, Telangana was the first which drew his attention and, not only drew his attention, but cooperated with him in large measure. In that spirit of mutual love and affection, in that spirit of constructive statesmanship, in that spirit of taking everybody with you in order to solve the difficult question, we should move and, if we move in that direction, I have no doubt that not only this problem but even greater and more difficult problems will be solved.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI PURNA CHANDRA SHARMA (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, with regard to this Resolution of Mr. Rao, I endorse the first part of it but I cannot agree with him in regard to the second part wherein he mentions about the haphazard way of proceeding about in regard to the question of land reforms. I agree with him that progress has been slow. In fact, unless this progress is accelerated, the problem of food in this country can-

[Shri Puma Chandra Sharma.] not be solved. Of course, no reference had been made in the terms of reference to the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee as to whether land reforms had any bearing on the shortage of food. But, though this was not one of the terms of their reference, the Committee have said in their remarks that they could not bypass the question of land reforms. They have said:

"In almost every State we were told that uncertainty about land reforms was affecting productive effort. The announcement about the intention to institute land-reforms without setting up the proper machinery for implementation has deterred the bigger land holders from investing in improvement of land. At the same time, this hesitancy of the big land holders is not compensated by greater interest on the part of the tenants because unless the tenants actually benefit from the implementation of the reform measures, they do not have either the will or the means to invest more on land. The development of land resources is, therefore, suffering. In our opinion the State Governments should proceed expeditiously with enacting the necessary legislation for land reforms and, what is more important, following it up with effective implementation. This should indeed contribute to the growth of agricultural production in the country."— *Page 116 of the Report.*

The Planning Commission is very vitally interested in the matter of food production. But to have more food, unless the land goes to the actual agriculturist, there cannot be any increase. In the last few years there have been many legislations in different States and there have been ceilings fixed, but to no purpose. After the ceilings have been fixed, the excess land has gone to very few of the bona fide agriculturists. My hon. friend, Mr. Rao, has enumerated certain instances where the lands have

been distributed among the children of the same family. Because the land has not gone to the actual agriculturist, the production has not increased. Agriculturists are not in plenty in the country. The actual, bona fide agriculturists are only about 30 per cent, of the population, although we say in our records that about 92 per cent, of the population are depending on agriculture. If the land actually goes to the bona fide agriculturists, there is no doubt that production will increase and double in this country. This is one of the most vital problem which has got to be solved, as early as possible, if we want to accelerate production of foodgrains.

Now, Sir, there is another proposal made by the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee, to import about two million tons of paddy or wheat from outside this country. I doubt whether this would be sufficient. If that were sufficient, certainly we have already enough. In this country of 380 million population, according to the present census figure, ten maunds for each man on the average, we require only 130 million tons of paddy or wheat for the entire population. Out of the required 130 million tons we are advised to import only two million tons. And if that is all that is to be imported from outside can we not increase this production and much more within the country to the extent of two million tons, by accelerating the land reforms and by sincerely trying to get what the actual agriculturists can produce? From my own personal experience, I have found several cases in which wherever the lands have gone from middleman to the actual agriculturist, production has gone up ten times. If the land is no longer kept in the hands of these landholders, the land reforms will bring about the necessary extra production and more. Rather, we will be in a position to export foodgrains outside India. At least from that point of view, apart from the question of individuals who have lands, if the land reform scheme comes into operation.



the country will be self-sufficient in | no time.

Now, Sir, about this fragmentation of holdings, much has been talked about. If the fragmentation comes to very small areas, the co-operative movement can come and help in there. It is true that in some places talks of co-operatives have gone ahead. But the actual land is not there to be found, to be brought under the co-operative system. I have had some personal experience of co-operative farming. I have been associated with co-operative farming and I know how the production could be increased and how it benefits so many poor families with small holdings. Anyway, where there is no land, the question of co-operatives does not come in. But where there are small fragments, this co-operative movement can help a lot, to bring all those small holdings under one cultivation and thereby increase production as well as that no land is left uncultivated. I do not agree so far as it says that the progress has been haphazard. The progress has been slow no doubt; but it is not haphazard. Continually, progressively something is being done in every State to bring about land reforms. But the progress is slow. If it is slow, then the problem of food cannot be solved within sight. But if we can accelerate it, we can expect to help these plans at the present moment.

Thank you.

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the question of land reforms is very complicated and there are many aspects of it. I think there are two important parts which could be separately taken. First and foremost is tenancy legislation. I think that this is today the most important part of it. Unless the land is owned by the cultivator or held on reasonable terms, there would be little incentive for him to work hard. Therefore, I am for tenancy legislation being pushed through, and pushed through vigorously and quickly. If,

as the mover has said, there has been delay, it is certainly unfortunate. In certain States action has been taken, but even then there have been delays and difficulties. Tenants sometimes have been unjustly evicted and thus difficulties have been caused. Therefore, all this must be looked into. But in spite of all that we may be doing, unless the small holders or the tenants are helped co-operatively, in some way, we cannot increase our production very much. There has been much talk about increasing food production. If that is the aim, certainly even more important than merely giving land to the tiller is the expediting of the co-operative movement. I am not speaking for co-operative ownership of land. It is not easy, nor quite necessary. What we want in this country are service co-operatives. That is to say, in the matter of credit, marketing and so on, substantial assistance has to be given to the cultivator so that he may be able to put forth his best efforts and also be able to make a decent living out of land. For this, we require a good deal of effort by the State Governments. The Central Government cannot do much, but the State Governments can do a lot. More than that, the local bodies especially, the panchayats are the most important in this matter. Unless this is done. The object of increasing food production cannot be secured.

The other point is about ceilings. Some justification can be found for imposing a ceiling on landholdings. But what are the objectives, let us see. First of all, it is mentioned that it is to help in solving unemployment; secondly, that it would enable landless labourers to get land; and it is also mentioned that it may help in increasing food production. Now, we may take some of these. The hope that unemployment can be solved by this is not very much justified, if we mean by unemployed those who have been at school. Educated people want to take up sedentary occupations, I do not think that those can be served this way, because very few of them, so far as I know, want land. They

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.] may like to be landowners, but few of them want to do physical labour. But there are the landless labourers and the large numbers of them want land, and we must make an effort to give them. For this purpose the first effort must be to use the waste land in Government's hands. There is plenty of it in many parts of the country. Such land can be distributed by Government; uncultivated land owned by persons can also be taken. In many countries in Europe, Governments have been taking away such lands. In parts of India also, many big landlords leave lands uncultivated. Ceilings have to be imposed in those parts of India where land thus remains uncultivated. In the part of the country where I come from most of the owned lands are cultivated. But in Malabar area there is a large acreage of uncultivated lands which Government can acquire and allot to the cultivators. This must be done urgently. I find that some steps are being taken in this connection by the Kerala Government. Also, if there are badly cultivated lands, provision must be made for their better cultivation, or such lands may be acquired by Government.

Thus, the most urgent thing is not the imposing of ceilings. I also think the principles governing the imposing of ceilings on holdings have to be carefully looked into. What is the idea behind the ceilings on holdings? Is it for curtailing the income of persons? If so, there should be ceilings on all incomes. What about the incomes from industries? You cannot apply ceiling to agriculture alone. This would mean that able people, enterprising people, people who are ambitious will not go into agriculture. You cannot then get for agriculture in India the type of people that have gone into agriculture in England or Germany or in America. At any rate, for the money crops we want fairly large holdings. Even in the case of rice, in the case of cereals generally, if you really want to increase produc-

tion, you have to make the best use of land. In that case you require large holdings, it would not be economic otherwise. Thus, even for increased food production, we require fairly large holdings. In the case of tea, coffee, coconut, etc., which are really industrial crops, much larger holdings are required. If you limit the size-of the holdings, ambitious persons, adventurous persons will not come-into the industry at all. So, it is a very complicated issue. In these circumstances, if the Planning Commission has not been able to carry out much in the matter of fixing a limit on the present holdings, I do not think we can blame them very much, because it is a very complicated matter. Throughout the world this has been found difficult. In our country where many problems have to be tackled, in this matter, it would take longer time.

The most important thing today, therefore, is to give land to the tiller and give him ample aid so that he may be able to properly cultivate the land and work hard. Secondly, we must also give land to the landless labourers, and for that purpose we can take over all uncultivated land, whether it is owned by people or is lying as waste land. Then, for the future, if it is the desire of the country that there should be a limitation on incomes, we must apply that principle to all vocations. There are big industrialists and high-placed business executives who are drawing large salaries. What about them? If you really want enterprising people to go into agriculture, we have to enable them to earn a decent income. Tax them by all means. There is Income-tax. There are also the wealth tax and the expenditure tax. Therefore, it is a very complicated issue, and so in regard to ceilings particularly on present holdings, it is not possible to go very rapidly. But all the same, if the objective is to give land to the landless, by all means let us go ahead with that. There is no necessity for us to hurry in regard to the other aspect, and on that point I do not

think we can blame the Planning Commission. What is the basis of a family holding. The idea is to fix ceiling at so many times the family holding. On that point again, even in my own State, even in Madras, you will find that to fix a family holding is an absolute difficulty. It depends on the area, the kind of land, the kind of crop and so many other considerations. There are several such difficulties, and there is no reason why there should be any hurry in this matter

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. E. JOSHI)  
in the Chair]

Sir, all these things are very complicated. They require more a local study than all-India comparisons which are useless in the matter. In every part of India you require a local expert to go into this matter, and he will take some time in fixing what is the size of the holding which produces the largest result. In the case of certain types of lands the most economic holding will be of a certain size. It is very difficult to arrive at a fixed principle. Take, for instance, the cultivation of ginger. It will be impossible to fix what will be the optimum holding or the most economic holding. I do not think that anything has been done in this direction so far. If you merely say "give him the minimum holding", in the case of commercial crops, particularly, it is a complicated issue. In certain areas in Kerala, for instance, the mere fixing of a ceiling on present holdings will be a most dangerous issue. I would advise the Government to go slow on that.

Sir, I completely agree with the mover that on the question of giving land to the landless and giving ownership to the tiller we must go very rapidly, but on the other issue we cannot blame the Planning Commission. They have to take advice and go into the matter fully. It will take time. I do hope that the House will agree to that part being modified.

3 P.M.

سید مظہر امام (بہار) : جناب  
وائس چیمبرمین صاحب - یہ ریزولوشن  
جو ہمارے دوست مسٹر راؤ نے پیش  
کیا ہے اس پر کافی بحث ہو چکی ہے  
اور اب میں اس پر ہاؤس کا زیادہ  
وقت نہیں لوں گا - مگر میں ہاؤس  
سے یہ ضرور کہنا چاہوں گا کہ اگر یہ  
ریزولوشن منظور کر لیا گیا تو فائیدو ایر  
پلان کے جتنے پروگرام ہیں جتنے آئٹم  
ہیں ان کے متعلق بھی اسی طرح کے  
ریزولوشن لائے ہوں گے - اس ریزولوشن  
میں ہمارے دوست نے یہ نہیں بتلایا  
کہ لینڈ ریفارم کس طریقہ سے کیا جائے  
اور نہ اس کا کوئی طریقہ گورنمنٹ کے  
سامنے رکھا اور نہ کوئی پروگرام بنایا -  
انہوں نے صرف یہ کہا کہ اس چیز کے  
متعلق سرکار کی پالیسی بہت سلیو ہے  
اور کام بہت سلیو طریقہ سے ہو رہا ہے -  
تو آپ کے سامنے سوال یہ ہے کہ کام  
جلدی نہیں ہو رہا ہے کام تیزی سے  
ہونا چاہیئے - اگر فائیدو ایر پلان کے  
تمام آئٹمز پر اس طرح کے ریزولوشن  
یہ ہاؤس پیش کرنے لگے کہ کام جلدی  
کیا جائے تو یہ ایک اہم سوال اٹھتا ہے  
کہ یہ سب چیزیں گورنمنٹ خود  
کریگی یا ہاؤس کو کرنا ہے اور کس کام  
کو جلدی کرنا ہے کس کو جلدی نہیں  
کرنا ہے اور کس کام میں کیا دقتیں  
ہیں - بہرحال میں اس ریزولوشن کے  
اصول سے مخالفت نہیں کرتا لیکن  
جس فارم میں یہ ریزولوشن رکھا  
گیا ہے اس کی ضرور مخالفت کرتا

[سید مظہر امام]

ہوں اور یہ چاہتا ہوں کہ اس ریڈولیشن کو پاس نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ یہ ایک اصول کا سوال ہے جسے میں نے ہاؤس کے سامنے رکھا ہے۔

اس ریڈولیشن نے بارے میں دوسری بات یہ کہی جا رہی ہے کہ صاحب زمین کی ایک سیلنگ ہونی چاہئے۔ ہمارے دوست نے کہا کہ اگر سیلنگ ہوگی تو اس سے پروڈکشن بڑھے گا۔ جو ریمل کاشتکار ہیں ان کے پاس کافی زمین ہے یا ناگاتی ہے یہ ایک ایسی بحث ہے جو آسان نہیں ہے۔ میں اپنے دوست کا جسکا تعلق کمیونسٹ پارٹی سے ہے یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ پولینڈ اور ہنگری میں کس طرح ڈسٹری بیوشن آف لینڈ کیا گیا۔ دنیا کے سامنے یہ رپورٹ موجود ہے کہ وہاں ڈسٹری بیوشن آف لینڈ کیا گیا لیکن اس کے بعد پروڈکشن کم ہو گیا۔

डा० राज बहादुर गोड़ : वैंसा ग्राम मत कीजिये ।

سید مظہر امام : اب سوال یہ

ہے کہ کتنی زمین ڈسٹری بیوٹ کی جائے۔ کتنے ایسے لوگ اس ملک میں ہیں جنکو لینڈ کی ضرورت ہے اور کتنی سیلنگ مقرر کی جائے۔ ابھی تک اس ملک میں یہ ڈسٹری بیوٹ نہیں ہوا ہے کہ کس پارت میں ایکو نامک ہولڈنگ کتنے ایکڑ کی ہوگی

جس پر ایک آدمی کہا ہی سکے اور اپنے فیملی کی پرورش کر سکے۔ یہ ایک بڑا اہم سوال ہے اور اس لئے پلاننگ کمیشن نے یہ کہا ہے کہ اسٹیٹ اپنے لحاظ سے خود اس بات کو ڈیسائیز کریں کہ ان کے یہاں کیا موقع ہے اور کتنی سیلنگ ہو سکتی ہے۔ یہ بات بڑی آسانی سے کہی جا سکتی ہے کہ دس ایکڑ یا پانچ ایکڑ کی سیلنگ ہونی چاہئے لیکن پانچ ایکڑ کی سیلنگ ہونے کے بعد بھی دوسرے جن کے پاس کوئی زمین نہیں ہے یہ کہہ سکتے ہیں کہ جس کے پاس پانچ ایکڑ زمین ہے کوئی وجہ نہیں کہ اس کو پانچ ایکڑ زمین ملے۔ بلکہ صرف ایک ایکڑ ملنی چاہئے۔ آپ کہتے ہیں کہ ہم پروڈکشن کے خیال سے یہ چیز چاہتے ہیں لیکن میں یہ کہوں گا کہ اگر آپ پروڈکشن کے خیال سے یہ چاہتے ہیں ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ جو سرمایہ دار ہیں جو روپیہ خرچ کر سکتے ہیں ان کو آپ بلائیے ان کو مزد دیجئے ان کو ساری آسانیاں بہم پہنچائیے اور ان سے یہ کہئے کہ جن زمینوں میں کچھ پیدا نہیں ہو رہا ہے جو فیلو لینڈ ہیں ان کو کالٹیویٹ کریں تب ملک کی پیداوار بڑھ سکتی ہے۔

یہ بھی دیکھنے کی بات ہے کہ اس ملک میں کتنی زمین بھکاری پڑی ہوئی ہے۔ قریب ایک چوتھائی

زمین فیلو لینڈ ہے جسکو ہم آباد کر سکتے ہیں لیکن وہ آباد نہیں ہو رہی ہے سچو ایک دو بیگمہ زمین آباد کرنا چاہتے ہیں ان کے سامنے سب سے پہلے سوال یہ آتا ہے کہ ایک جہوز بیل کہاں سے آئے ہل کہاں سے آئے اور اتنا روپیہ کہاں سے آئے جس سے وہ زمین آباد ہو سکے۔ اگر ایک ایک دو دو بیگمہ زمین بانٹ دی جائے تو ٹھیک ہے بہت اچھی چیز معلوم ہوتی ہے مگر پروڈکشن کا جہاں تک سوال ہے وہ اس سے بڑھ کا یا نہیں یہ کہنا مشکل ہے۔ میں آپ کے ذریعہ اس ہاؤس کو اور گورنمنٹ کو بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج جو ایک ایک دو دو بیگمہ زمین کے کاشتکار ہیں وہ اپنی زمین بٹائی پر دے کر کارخانوں میں جا کر کام کر رہے ہیں کیونکہ ایک یا دو بیگمہ زمین پر وہ اپنی گذر بسر نہیں کر سکتے۔ اس پلندہ گٹھا یا ایک دو بیگمہ زمین پر وہ زمین نہیں سکتے ہیں اس لئے وہ اس زمین کو کسی دوسرے کے حوالے کر کے چلے جاتے ہیں۔ اگر دس دس گٹھا زمین آپ بانٹ دیتے ہیں تو دیکھئے میں یہ اچھا معلوم ہوگا کہ بہت سے لوگوں کو زمینیں مل گئی ہیں لیکن اس سے ملک کا پروڈکشن بڑھ گا یا گھٹے گا یہ ایک بڑا اہم سوال ہے اور اس کا فیصلہ کرنا ہے۔ اس کے بعد دوسری چیز یہ ہے کہ میکانائزڈ طریقہ سے ہمارے ملک

میں پروڈکشن نہیں بڑھ سکتا۔ مہری سسٹم میں ایسی کوئی صورت نہیں ہے جس سے ٹریکٹر کے ذریعہ ملک کا پروڈکشن بڑھے اور اگر کوئی ایسی صورت ہے تو میں اپنے دوستوں سے کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ گورنمنٹ سے کہیں کہ جو فیلو لینڈ ہیں ان کو وہ آباد کرے۔ اس وقت کروڑوں ایکڑ زمین ہمارے ملک میں موجود ہے مگر اس کی طرف کسی کی نظر نہیں جاتی ہے کوئی اس کی طرف دیکھنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہے کیونکہ اس میں اخراجات کا سوال ہے۔ تو پہلے آپ اس زمین کو آباد کیجئے تب دستری بیوشن کی طرف آئیے ورنہ یقیناً جائیے کہ ان چیزوں سے ملک کی پیداوار کھٹ جائے گی اور کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہونے والا ہے۔

آخر میں میں یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ اگر ملک کے پروڈکشن کو بڑھانا ہے تو اری گیشن کو پرائیویٹ دیجئے۔ سب سے پہلے اری گیشن کا انتظام کیجئے اور ہر جگہ کھروں سے، ٹیوب ویل سے یا الیکٹرک سے پانی پہونچائیں۔ میں ایک چھوٹے کاشتکار کی حیثیت سے کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ اگر صرف یہی ایک کام کیا جائے تو ملک میں قبل پروڈکشن ہو سکتا ہے۔ اس لئے اس وقت سب سے بڑی ضرورت یہ ہے کہ اری گیشن کو تمام کاموں پر ترجیح دی جائے اور ہر جگہ پانی پہونچانے کا انتظام کیا جائے خواہ اس کے لئے

[سید مظہر اسلم]

باندھ بیٹوانے پڑیں یا نہریں نکلوانی پڑیں - اور اگر آپ یہ کہیں گے تو یقین جانئے کہ ملک کا پروڈکشن بڑھ کر رہے گا - اگر یہ نہیں کہا گیا تو سیلنگ سے یا دستوری بیوشن آف لینڈ سے کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہو سکتا کیونکہ زمین ایک آدمی کے ہاتھ میں رہے یا دو آدمی کے ہاتھ میں رہے اس سے پروڈکشن کا مسئلہ حل ہونے والا نہیں ہے - اس سلسلہ میں میں یہ بھی کہوں گا کہ اگر بڑے سے بڑا کاشتکار بھی اپنی کوئی زمین پرتی رکھتا ہے تو گورنمنٹ کو یہ حق ہے کہ وہ اس زمین کو لے لے اور لینے کے بعد دوسروں کو دیدے - مگر سوال یہ ہے کہ ملک میں ہمیں اور آپ کو اس بات کی کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ جو زمین آباد ہے اسے آباد رکھ دیا جائے اور جو زمین غیر آباد ہے اسے آباد کیا جائے اور اس کی طرف لوگوں کو لگایا جائے - اس سے ملک کا پروڈکشن بڑھے گا - یہ دوسری بات ہے کہ کتنی زمین کس کے پاس رہے اس سلسلہ میں میرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ خود آپ پلاننگ کمیشن کی پالیسی کو تسلیم کر رہے ہیں کیونکہ آپ کے ریژولیشن میں یہ بات نہیں ہے کہ جو پلاننگ کمیشن کی پالیسی ہے اس کو ہم تسلیم نہیں کرتے - آپ تو صرف یہی چاہتے ہیں کہ جلدی کی جائے - اس سے یہ ظاہر ہے کہ جو

پلاننگ کمیشن کی پالیسی ہے اس کو آپ ان انڈیکٹڈ نسلیم کر رہے ہیں - اس لئے ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں اس ریژولیشن کی مخالفت کرتا ہوں -

† [سید ماجرہ امام (بیہار) :

جناب وایس چیئرمین سائیڈ، یہ ریزولوشن جو ہمارے دوست میسٹر راج نے پیش کیا ہے اس پر کافی بھڑک چکی ہے اور اب میں اس پر ہاؤس کا بڑا وقت نہیں لوں گا۔ مگر میں ہاؤس سے یہ جرح کرنا چاہتا ہوں، کہ اگر یہ ریزولوشن منظور کر لیا گیا تو فاڈر ایمر پلان کے جتنے پروگرام ہیں، جتنے ایڈٹس ہیں ان کے متعلق بھی اس طرح کے ریزولوشن لائے جائیں گے۔ اس ریزولوشن میں ہمارے دوست نے یہ نہیں بتلایا کہ لینڈ ریفارم کس طریقے سے کیا جائے اور اس کا کوئی طریقہ گورنمنٹ کے سامنے رکھا جائے اور اس کا کوئی پروگرام بتایا۔ انہوں نے صرف یہ کہا کہ اس چیز کے متعلق سرکار کی پالیسی بہت سست ہے اور کام بہت سست طریقے سے ہو رہا ہے۔ تو آپ کے سامنے سوال یہ ہے کہ کام جلدی نہیں ہو رہا ہے؛ کام تیزی سے ہونا چاہیے۔ اگر فاڈر ایمر پلان کے تمام ایڈٹس پر اس طرح کے ریزولوشن یہ ہاؤس پیش کرنے لگے کہ کام جلدی کیا جائے تو یہ ایک بڑا سوال اٹھتا ہے کہ یہ سب چیزیں گورنمنٹ خود کرے گی یا ہاؤس کو کرنا ہے۔ اور کس کام کو جلدی کرنا ہے کس کو جلدی نہیں کرنا ہے؛ اور کسی کام میں کیا دیگت ہے۔ بھرہال میں اس ریزولوشن کے اصول سے مخالفیت نہیں کرتا، لیکن جس فارم میں یہ ریزولوشن رکھا گیا ہے اس کی جرح مخالفیت کرتا ہے اور یہ چاہتا ہے کہ اس ریزولوشن کو پاس نہیں ہونا چاہیے۔ یہ ایک اصول کا سوال ہے جسے میں ہاؤس کے سامنے رکھتا ہوں۔

† [ Hindi transliteration.

इस रैजोल्यूशन के बारे में दूसरी बात यह कही जा रही है कि साहब जमीन की एक सीलिंग होनी चाहिये। हमारे दोस्त ने कहा कि अगर सीलिंग होगी तो इससे प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा। जो रियल काश्तकार हैं उनके पास जमीन काफी है, या नाकाफी है, यह एक ऐसी बहस है जो आसान नहीं है। मैं अपने दोस्त को जिनका तालुक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से है, यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि पोलैंड और हंगरी में किस तरह डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन ऑफ लैंड किया गया। दुनिया के सामने यह रिपोर्ट मौजूद है कि वहाँ डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन ऑफ लैंड किया गया, लेकिन उसके बाद प्रॉडक्शन कम हो गया।

**डा० राज गहादुर गौड़ :** वैंसा आप मत कीजिये।

**सैयद अब्दुल इमान :** अब सवाल यह है कि कितनी जमीन डिस्ट्रीब्यूट की जाय ? कितने ऐसे लोग इस मुल्क में हैं जिनको लैंड की जरूरत है और कितनी सीलिंग मुकर की जाय ? अभी तक इस मुल्क में यह डिजीजन नहीं हुआ है कि किस पार्ट में इकनामिक होल्डिंग कितने एकड़ होगी जिस पर एक आदमी खा पी सके और अपनी फैमिली की परवरिश कर सके। यह एक बड़ा अहम सवाल है और इसलिये प्लानिंग कमीशन ने यह कहा है कि स्टेट अपने लिहाज से खुद इस बात को डिमांड करे कि उनके यहां क्या मौका है और कितनी सीलिंग हो सकती है ? यह बात बड़ी आसानी से कही जा सकती है कि दस एकड़ या पांच एकड़ को सीलिंग होनी चाहिये। लेकिन पांच एकड़ की सीलिंग होने के बाद भी दूसरे जिनके पास कोई जमीन नहीं है, यह कह सकते हैं कि जिसके पास पांच एकड़ जमीन है कोई बजह नहीं कि उसको पांच एकड़ जमीन मिले। बल्कि सिर्फ एक एकड़ मिलनी चाहिये। आप कहते हैं कि हम प्रोडक्शन के ब्यास से यह चीज चाहते हैं लेकिन मैं यह कहूंगा कि अगर आप प्रोडक्शन के ब्यास से यह चाहते हैं तो जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो सरमायादार हैं जो रकबा खन

कर सकते हैं उनको आप बुझाइयें, उनको मदद दीजियें, उनको सारी आसानीयां बहम पहुंचाइये और उनसे यह कहिये कि जिन जमीनों में कुछ पैदा नहीं हो रहा है जो फैंलो लैंड है, उनको वह कल्टीवेट करें तब मुल्क की पैदावार बढ़ सकती है।

यह भी देखने की बात है कि इस मुल्क में कितनी जमीन बेकार पड़ी हुई है। करीब एक चौथाई जमीन फैंलो लैंड है जिसको हम आबाद कर सकते हैं लेकिन वह आबाद नहीं हो रही है। जो एक दो बीघा जमीन आबाद करना चाहते हैं, उनके सामने सबसे पहले सवाल यह आता है कि एक जोड़ी बैल कहां से आये, हल कहां से आये और इतना रकबा कहां से आये जिससे वह जमीन आबाद हो सके। अगर एक एक दो दो बीघा जमीन बांट दी जाय, तो ठीक है, बहुत अच्छी चीज मान्य होती है, मगर प्रोडक्शन का जहा तक सवाल है वह आसानी से बढ़ेगा या नहीं, यह कहना मुश्किल है। मैं आप के जरिये इस हाऊस को और गवर्नमेंट को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो एक एक दो दो बीघा जमीन के काश्तकार हैं वे अपनी जमीन बटाई पर देकर कारखानों में जाकर काम कर रहे हैं क्योंकि एक या दो बीघा जमीन पर वे अपनी गुजर बसर नहीं कर सकते। दस पंद्रह गन्ना या एक दो बीघा जमीन पर वे रह नहीं सकते हैं। इसलिये वे इस जमीन को किसी दूसरे के हवाले करके चले जाते हैं। अगर दस दस गन्ना जमीन आप बांट देने दें तो देखने में यह अच्छा मान्य होगा कि बहुत से लोगों को जमीन मिल गई है लेकिन इससे मुल्क का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा या घटेगा यह एक बड़ा अहम सवाल है। और इस का फैसला करना है।

इसके बाद दूसरी चीज यह है कि कैसे नाइजड तरीके से हमारे मुल्क में प्रोडक्शन नहीं बढ़ सकता। मेरी समझ में ऐसी कोई सुरत नहीं जिससे ट्रैक्टर के जरिये मुल्क का प्रोडक्शन बढ़े और अगर कोई ऐसी सुरत है, तो मैं अपने दोस्तों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि

[संयद मज्हर इयाम]

आप गवर्नमेंट से कहें कि जो फैंलो लैंड हैं उनको वह आबाद करें। इस वक्त करोड़ों एकड़ जमीन हमारे मुल्क में मौजूद है, मगर उसकी तरफ किसी की नज़र नहीं जाती है; कोई उसकी तरफ देखने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। क्योंकि उसमें अस्तराजात का सवाल है। तो पहिले, उस जमीन को आबाद कीजिये, तब डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन की तरफ आइये। वरना यकीन जानिये, कि इन चीजों से मुल्क की पैदावार घट जायेगी और कोई फ़ायदा नहीं होने वाला है।

आखिर में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर मुल्क के प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाना है तो इर्रिगेशन को प्रायटी दीजिये। सब से पहले इर्रिगेशन का इंतज़ाम कीजिये और हर जगह कुओं से, ट्यूब-वैल से या इलैक्ट्रिक से पानी पहुंचाइये। मैं एक छोटे काश्तकार की हैसियत से कह सकता हूं कि अगर सिर्फ यही एक काम किया जाय तो मुल्क में डबल प्रोडक्शन हो सकता है। इसलिये इस वक्त सब से ज्यादा बड़ी ज़रूरत यह है कि इर्रिगेशन के तमाम कामों पर तर्जी दी जाय और हर जगह पानी पहुंचाने का इन्तज़ाम किया जाय। ख़ाह इसके लिये बांध बनवाने पड़ें या नहरें निकलवानी पड़ें। और अगर आप यह करेंगे, तो यकीन जानिये, मुल्क का प्रोडक्शन बढ़कर रहेगा। अगर यह नहीं किया गया तो सीलिंग से या डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन आफ़ लैंड से कोई फ़ायदा नहीं हो सकता। क्योंकि ज़मीन एक आदमी के हाथ में रहे या दो आदमियों के हाथ में रहे इससे प्रोडक्शन का मसला हल होने वाला नहीं है। इस सिलसिले में मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अगर बड़े से बड़ा काश्तकार भी अपनी कोई ज़मीन परती रखता है, तो गवर्नमेंट को यह हक़ है कि वह उस ज़मीन को ले ले और लेने के बाद दूसरों को दे दे। मगर सवाल यह है कि मुल्क में, हमें और आपको, इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि जो ज़मीन आबाद है उसे आबाद रहने दिया जाये और जो ज़मीन गैर-आबाद

है, उसे आबाद किया जाय और उसकी तरफ़ लोगों को लगाया जाय। इससे मुल्क का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ेगा। यह दूसरी बात है कि कितनी ज़मीन किस के पास रहे। इस सिलसिले में मेरा यह कहना है कि खुद आप प्लानिंग कमिशन की पॉलिसी को तसलीम कर रहे हैं, क्योंकि आपका रैजोल्यूशन में यह बात नहीं है कि जो प्लानिंग कमिशन की पॉलिसी है, उसको हम तसलीम नहीं करते। आप तो सिर्फ यही चाहते हैं कि जल्दी की जाये। इससे यह जाहिर है कि जो प्लानिंग कमिशन की पॉलिसी है, उसको आप इन्डायरेक्टली तसलीम कर रहे हैं। इसलिये इन अल्फाज़ के साथ मैं इस रैजोल्यूशन की मुखातिफ़ करता हूं।]

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI S. N. MISHRA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, some hon. Members might feel a little surprised at my having to reply to the debate as I was not present during the early part of it. But I would like to assure the House that my esteemed senior colleague, the Minister of Planning, was present during that part and he took copious notes and I have got myself acquainted with them. So, when I am attempting to reply to the debate, there is no element of rashness in my approach.

Sir, having acquainted myself with all that has been said in the House on the subject, I must say straightaway in the very beginning that we, in the Planning Commission, or for that matter, in the Government of India, very much welcome the sense or urgency and vigilance which has characterised the debate today, as also the criticisms which are likely to help us in the realisation of our objective. Indeed, this field of land reform is so vital that any delay or indecision, particularly at this stage, should be inexcusable. References have been made, during the debate, to the very serious food situation which confronts the country. Sir, I would very much like to commend the approach the hon. Members have brought to bear



upon the subject. In fact, the whole gamut of land reforms should be geared to this objective before the nation, which is of the utmost importance and which is priority No. 1—maximum food production. Prof. Kane said something about the galloping speed at which the population of the country was increasing and, therefore, he laid stress on stepping up food production. Indeed, Sir, we, in India, at the moment find ourselves in the midst of a peculiar race—the race that is going on between production and reproduction in this country and unless production wins this race, there is no salvation for us. So, I find that, essentially, on the whole, the perspective in which this problem has been viewed is very sound. Maybe, in some respects, in some places, there might have been some slowness; maybe, in some places, there might have been some lack of co-ordination. But I would like to submit that, on the whole, there has been considerable progress in this field. In fact, where you find that there has been some delay or lack of co-ordination, you will find at the same time, in juxtaposition, a sense of expedition and remarkable progress. It is a peculiar kind of amalgam that you find in every State—I should say—in most of the States an amalgam of progress and of slowness too. So we find this jostling together of the two elements but the overall picture, as I have submitted, Sir, is one of progress on the whole. I would not like to weary this House with a number of details with which the hon. Members are already familiar but as an evidence of this progress. I would like to refer to some of the 'realists' who have been advising us to hasten slowly in this respect, as also to some of the hue's and cries that have been raised by vested interests. Therefore, Sir, you would find that on the whole it seems that we have been moving at a satisfactory speed. But there are friends of course, who are not trained in this technique of revolution and particularly Indian revolution which is cloaked by the remarkable adaptability of the Indian people. Sometimes its sig-

nificance is lost upon some of the hon. Members. As a very eminent journalist pointed out some time back about the character of the Indian revolution that it spreads like an oilstain, smoothly and pervasively. Similarly our Indian revolution seems to be spreading like an oilstain and so if its significance is sometimes lost on the hon. Members who are not trained in this kind of technique, I am not surprised. Indeed, Sir, a very gigantic revolution . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: We are not trained in the technique of landlordism.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The test is coming as to who is trained in the technique of landlordism. We shall very soon find it out. Indeed, Sir, a gigantic revolution, I have no doubt a revolution which would infuse new life at the grass roots is necessary in India and this can come about only through land reform, revolutionary land reform because the land system, if I may say so, is the very lung of the Indian economic system and there is no doubt that for ages this lung has been in the grip of a fell disease. It has been recovering at a remarkable speed but all the same, the character of the disease has always to be borne in mind. Having said that, Sir, I feel probably the hon. Member, the mover of the Resolution, would be all the time looking askance at me that I have not made any respectful reference to him. But all that I am speaking about certainly relates to him. So I would hasten to say that some of the anxieties and impatience of the mover of the Resolution, not of course his Resolution, would have considerable sympathy from us, that is from the Government, if the mover was concerned less with making political capital out of it than with the progress of land reforms. Sir, thereby I don't think that I am laying myself open to the charge of deliberately slighting his contribution to the debate. That is in fact far from my mind but it would be agreed on all hands that his whole approach has been coloured

[Shri S. N. Mishra.] with a political tinge. There is indeed, Sir, a world of difference between the approach to which the hon. Member subscribes and the approach which the country has adopted through the First and the Second Five-Year Plans in respect of land reforms. We see land reform as an integral part of the reconstruction and development of the country. We recognise that an agrarian structure in which the tiller is not the master and in which the conditions and the tenures are such that cripple him and his productive energies are not good and that they must be scrapped as soon as possible. We seek a social order—probably my hon. friend opposite would also like to vie with us—based upon social justice and equality of opportunity and therefore, it is our first and foremost concern to see that all the vestiges of the past which seek to cripple the productive energies of the vast masses of the Indian humanity must be done away with. And in fact this is the pith and marrow of the whole conception of the land reform that we have in our mind. But, Sir, we do not want to make land reform as a means to exploit this or that kind of discontent, but to solve the land problem in a basic way. There we differ from our hon. Members.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think that lesson you have to give to Kerala Congressmen, not to us.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I was saying that there is no doubt that it is a matter of great importance and it is right that the House should have taken this early opportunity to discuss this subject. I had earlier submitted that in the First and Second Five Year Plans, we have laid great stress on this from a basic point of view because, as some of the hon. Members have suggested during the course of the debate, it is a basic pre-requisite for agricultural development. And that is what has been pointed out also by the Ashoka Mehta Committee Report although it

was not one of the terms of reference of that Committee. It acquires an added sense of urgency, particularly at this juncture when we have to import substantial quantity of food-grains from outside. So, Sir, this subject we have to consider from this point of view and with this urgency. And particularly the fact that uncertainties should prevail in the rural economy at the moment is certainly a matter of concern as it has been to the Ashoka Mehta Committee. They have pointed out that wherever they went they were always told about this sense of uncertainty that prevails. It has been said that in some places there has not been proper co-ordination. They have said that where the laws have been passed for preventing evictions from lands they have not been followed up with imposition of ceilings and other like land reforms, and therefore there has been some distress. That has also been pointed out by the Ashoka Mehta Committee.

But having said all this I would like to refer to the provisions of the Constitution in regard to the responsibilities that are resting with the State Governments in this matter. The State Governments are responsible for bringing about legislation and implementing it. That is so very well known to the hon. Members. The Government of India, of course, in consultation with the State Governments have formulated a national policy. They are trying to see both through the Planning Commission and the Central Committee on land reforms that the broad principles and the main directions of policy are observed by the State Governments, and they offer assistance by way of advice and all that in this matter. But to do anything further in this matter and impinge upon the jurisdiction of the State Governments is indeed something which militates against the Constitution. Therefore, Sir, the hon. Members have to point out to us—and indeed we would be very grateful to them if they do—in what directions it is, that the Central Government or the Planning Commission are expected to

act in this matter so that there might be in their view a speedier implementation of the land reform measures

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think the hon. mover has suggested that the Planning Commission should appoint a high-powered committee at this level to see . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I am coming to that. Now, Sir, the hon. mover has suggested the formation of a high-powered committee. I was telling you just now that we have got a Central Committee for land reforms, and whom does it consist of? It consists of the Minister of Home Affairs, the Minister of Defence, who was then the Minister without Portfolio, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Co-operation and the Members of the Planning Commission. Can you suggest, Sir, a much more high-powered committee than this? There is already this body in existence. And then the National Development Council, which is the supreme economic body of the nation, reviews the progress of land reforms from time to time. Indeed we would have been very grateful if there was a concrete suggestion from the hon. Member about the committee that he had in his mind. If such a committee would have been really helpful, I would have been glad on behalf of the Government to accept that suggestion straightaway. But I do not find the exact contours of the suggestion that he is making.

Now, Sir, there are one or two other considerations which the hon. Member would do well to bear in mind while considering this subject. The other consideration is that we cannot have that degree of uniformity in this matter of land reforms as some hon. Members would like to suggest mainly because the historical conditions differ in different States. There are different conditions, different kinds of pressures of population and varying scope of alternative opportunities, and therefore, there cannot be that kind of

dead uniformity so far as the progress of land reform is concerned. The measures are bound to vary, and it is in fact the SDirit and intent of what we are doing. The State Government's have to conform to the broad principles of the national policy which have to be adapted to the conditions and circumstances in the States.

And then, Sir, the second thing that the hon. Members should bear in mind is that the measures of land reform are not only of radical consequence for giving increased status and opportunity to a section of the Indian people but at the same time also for bringing down and reducing the status and opportunity of some other section of the people. Now, Sir, so far as we are concerned, we want to bring about the whole process by persuasion and goodwill. That is the major difference between us and the friends opposite. And therefore in this context it is necessary that we must have this thing always in our mind.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The hon. Minister says that he wants to do it by persuasion and goodwill. Does it mean that there will be no penal clauses in the land legislation?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Of course, the laws which are accepted by the Legislatures are expected to contain penal clauses. So, Sir, in such circumstances and with such considerations as I have urged the House to bear in mind, the legitimate question to ask in this context, is whether the Government of India have omitted to do anything which we should have done. That is the main thing. The hon. Members have to point out what exactly they would like us to do. I shall come to the assessment of the situation also. Of course, I shall come to the points made by the hon. Members later. But I would like to put squarely before the hon. Members that this is the issue which they can really put before us and they can take us to task if they find us omitting certain duties which we must do by the nation.

[Shri S. N., Mishra.]

Now, Sir, coming to the Resolution proper, on its analysis we find that it falls into two distinct parts, one, if I may call it so, the preamble part of it, and the another the operative part of it. The preamble part of the resolution says firstly that the land reform is slow, and secondly that it has been haphazard, and so the operative part naturally follows that it should be expedited and co-ordinated. Instead of slowness there should be expedition and instead of haphazardness there should be co-ordination. These are the only suggestions that are made. The Resolution architectonically, i.e., from the point of view of structure, is very well built, and it puts very clearly what are the things sought to be done. Sir, it would be better if I undertake a sweeping account of all that we have done, to examine whether it justifies the kind of adjectives which the hon. mover of the Resolution has been constrained to apply, and that is whether really the progress of land reform has been slow and haphazard.

Now, Sir, as I said earlier, I would not like to weary the House with many details with which it is already familiar. But even so, in a sweeping perspective let us view the whole thing. First, there is the problem of the abolition of intermediaries. Probably some hon. Members might say that we have always been harping upon this achievement which has already been made. That the intermediaries have been completely done away with in the whole of India is well known. But this is a matter of great historic significance. It has been said that we are all subscribing to the philosophy of landlordism. Now here is the system of landlordism which has been wiped out of existence all over India. (*Interruption*). And, Sir, this has been done in a very peaceful manner; with persuasion and goodwill, although it is true that in some small areas there are some minor tenures still existing. But they are, comparatively speaking, in very insignificant areas. But the pro-

blems now—and the State Governments seem to be seized of them—are those of the post-abolition period and they are no less tremendous in their implications. There is this problem, for instance—probably hon. Members over there would look askance at it—the problem of payment of compensation—a word which hon. friends probably cannot swallow down their throat. But there is this big problem of payment of compensation. Take for example this problem of paying compensation to the petty intermediaries who have not been left with any alternate means of occupation. They have no land to fall back upon and I think, their number must be very vast, taking the country as a whole. This perhaps is taking time and this is being done rather slowly. But this is one of the problems of the post-abolition period, and then there are other problems of the building up of the administrative machinery, revenue machinery etc. which take time. Take for example the State from which I hail, the State of Bihar. Formerly in between a subdivision and the police station there was no revenue machinery worth the name. So that in these drought conditions if I had to go and register anywhere that some people were dying of hunger in a particular area, it would have to be done in a police station. And you know what a police station is meant for. But that was the condition which existed before.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Probably that is why starvation deaths are not reported.

- SHRI S. N. MISHRA: No, now it has all been built up remarkably well. So this revenue administration had to be built up and a training programme for a vast number of people had to be undertaken. There were also some other problems, the problem of preparing the records of rights and all that, which are of basic importance.

Secondly there was the problem of tenancy reforms. Some hon. Members have pointed out that tenancy reforms

are not working out quite well. They have indeed very relevantly quoted in this connection, some of the survey reports. One survey was conducted in Hyderabad and another survey was conducted by the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics <« the State of Bombay.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

This problem of tenancy reforms comprises three aspects. Security of tenure is one; the second is the fixation of fair rent and the third the right of ownership. Without going into wearisome details, I would submit that so far as legislations are concerned, you can take it that most of the States have taken necessary action in regard to them. The States, however, in this respect, fall into two categories. Some States have already passed comprehensive legislations for conferring upon the tenants security of tenure. But there are some other States in the other category which have undertaken some interim measures to stay ejectments and are now taking steps for jomprehensive legislations. But il is to a certain extent true that some of the legislations are not working out to their full intent. There administrative difficulties come in and those difficulties cannot be overcome overnight. We have to consider and deal with the training of personnel, the preparation of the records of rights and so forth. All that takes time. In the first group, about which I said that they have undertaken comprehensive legislations, are Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Delhi, West Bengal, Hyderabad area and Bombay. They have done quite well. In the other group come Madras, Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Kerala.

Now about the surveys to which the hon. Members have referred. One survey was conducted with the assistance of the Research Programme Committee in the State of Bombay and now that survey has revealed some very disappointing aspects of the implementation of the land reform.

They require to be looked into very seriously. If the findings are found to be correct—of course, they are, as the enquiry was conducted by a group of experts whose competence nobody can dispute—the effects of these legislations are being nullified in some cases, it is true, by inadequate, administration.

Next I come to another aspect of tenancy reform and that is the fixation of rent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Only two more minutes? I did not know about the time-limit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is half-an-hour.

DR. R. B. GOUR: We have got ample time, Sir.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I did not know about the time limit, otherwise I would have „ .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have half-an-hour for the Government's reply.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Now, with regard to the fixation of rents, I was going to submit that they have been regulated in most of the States. In fact in some of the States they are less than what has been recommended in the Plan, such as in the States of Bombay and Rajasthan. In some others the rates compared to the recommendations of the Plan might be high. All the same there has been a considerable reduction. In this respect also some steps are required to be taken and I think the States concerned are seized of this matter very seriously.

Now comes the ownership rights— the third aspect of tenancy reform. In some States all tenants have been brought into direct relationship with the State. Take for instance the State

[Shri S. N. Mishra.] of Delhi. There the tenants have been brought into direct relationship with the State. Similarly in the case of Uttar Pradesh. There are some other States for which the National Development Council—its Standing Committee—made certain recommendations recently so that the ownership right might be conferred upon the tenants as soon as possible, because it has been found that optional rights are not being exercised by the tenants. They find some difficulty in doing so.

Next I come to the third point which, I think is uppermost in the minds of hon. Members—the imposition of a ceiling. Sir, this principle of ceiling, as hon. Members have pointed out, has been accepted not only in the Second Five Year Plan but it was accepted in the First Five Year Plan also. But it is not only a question of accepting it in principle. We have not stayed at that. Considerable progress in this direction has also been made and in fact a number of States have already passed legislation in this regard. Take for instance the State of West Bengal, the States of PEPSU, Jammu and Kashmir, Hyderabad, Himachal Pradesh and to a certain extent, the Punjab also..

So far as the future acquisition of land is concerned, in most of the States ceilings have already been imposed. All these State Governments are now taking administrative action to implement the ceilings which have been imposed in terms of those legislations. Here I would like to point to some of the suggestions which have been made in the Standing Committee of the National Development Council in this respect at its last meeting in September. The Standing Committee of the National Development Council said that all those States which have passed legislations for the imposition of ceilings should take administrative action in order that they are implemented during the course of the next three years. That is to say, the administrative arrangements have to be streamlined so that

these legislations are implemented during the course of the next three years. In the case of those States which have not undertaken legislation in this respect, it was suggested by the Standing Committee of the National Development Council that they should finalise their legislations by 1958-59. So a time limit has also been fixed for that purpose and that indicates seriousness on the part of the Planning Commission, the Government of India and, in fact, on the part of all the States, because the Chief Ministers of all the States are on the Standing Committee of the National Development Council.

There are many other details into which I would have liked to go into for putting before the House what the progress has been in respect of land reform. Even at the risk of repetition I would like to say something because all these are contained in so many documents that we have been producing and sometimes we have been laying them on the Table of the House in reply to questions. It may not be proper for me to refer to what happened in the other House, but it was only some six or seven days back that we laid on the Table there a kind of a statement of the progress that we have made in every field. Even at the risk of repetition I have to do it, because I have to set out the whole thing in a kind of right perspective. Looking at this in this way, how could anybody say that the progress has been slow or has been haphazard? In fact look at this from the angle of the seven years that have passed since the Constitution was adopted, from the year 1950 to the year 1957. Our agrarian system has been substantially altered during the course of the seven years if you look at all the measures of reforms that have taken place in the sphere of land.

DR. R. B.. GOUR: But without fetching anything to the landless.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: That is a very good point of which the hon. Member has reminded me. I would say some-

thing about the resettlement of the landless labour. In fact in this context of land reform, many other things also come in to which references have been made, as for example, co-operative organisation, consolidation and also, as the hon. Member has suggested just now, about the resettlement of landless labourers. The mover of the Resolution said in the beginning that in Hyderabad the surplus from the imposition of ceiling on land has been almost negligible.

DR. R. B. GOUR: From 92,000 acres it has come down to 6,000 acres in one district.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It was his submission that although in the beginning it was stipulated to be of the order of 92,000 acres, now it, is only 6,000 acres.

MB. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 92,000 for the whole State?

DR. R. B. GOUR: In one district

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: That is what he says. We don't know what exactly is the position. In fact we will have to consult the State Government about this but we also had some idea about this reduction in the surplus land available as it was reported to us that there have been some spurious transfers and partitions as a result of which less land has been available. We have addressed the State Governments in this respect and they have been asked to review the transfers that have taken place so far and the matter is being considered by them. So far as this matter is concerned, the hon. Member should take it that this is being considered by the State Government. It was pointed out by the mover that so many tenants have been ejected and nobody seems to be shedding any tear over them. I would like to say in this connection also that the Standing Committee of the National Development Council in its last meeting has suggested that there should be a

review of all the voluntary surrenders or the ejectments that have taken place during the course of the last 3 years. So this also has been considered very seriously by the supreme national body. I was going a little away from the main point the hon. Member had mentioned about the landless. The National Development Council in its standing committee meeting in September also made some very significant suggestions about the resettlement of landless labour. You would probably recollect that it was only yesterday or the day before that during the course of a question, I replied that the Standing Committee of the Council has suggested, subject to consultation with the State Governments, that 300,000 families of landless labourers should be resettled on lands which would accrue as result of the Bhoodan, Gramdan and imposition of ceilings. That is indeed a big enough task, 300,000 families of landless labourers to be resettled on land. Here I would probably think it apposite to make a reference to what the hon. Member Shri Biswanath Das said about Gramdan movement and the assistance and help that the Government should accord to it. This Gramdan movement is considered by the Planning Commission and the Government indeed as a movement of great significance and you know that all the Ministers of the Central Government and the State Governments who had assembled at Yelwal in Mysore promised support and encouragement to this movement. And the Standing Committee of the National Development Council in its meeting in September also decided that there should be a Board set up in every State for advising on the resettlement of landless labourers and these Boards should include leading non-officials. They have also suggested that there should be a National Advisory Board, a body at the national level, which would include again some non-official workers. You also know that the Ministry of Home Affairs and may be, the Ministry of Agriculture, have rendered assistance to the Gramdan movement in Koraput

[Shri S. N. Mishra.]  
 district in Orissa and also in the State of Bihar and they are considering other proposals for assisting the Gramdan movement. So, from the side of the Government I am here to assure the House that we are going to do all that is necessary to be done for encouraging this Gramdan movement. DR. R. B. GOUR: All that is a State subject in the final analysis.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The Gramdan movement is a national movement in a sense. So I would now come to the conclusion which would also be a brief resume in a sense) to convince the House that we are doing all that is necessary to be done within the limitations imposed on us by the Constitution. My conclusion from all the analysis that I have attempted to place before you is that at the highest national level, that is, at the level of the Central Government and the Planning Commission, we have indeed done all that is necessary to expedite and we are doing all that is necessary to expedite the implementation of land reforms with a sense of urgency. As an instance as I told you, the Central Committee is always reviewing the progress that is taking place. The Planning Commission always reviews it and places before the National Development Council which reviews it and suggests the steps that should be taken. Recently you would remember that the Agriculture Ministers Conference in Srinagar only about six weeks back, I think, made certain recommendations in regard to this. They said that land reform should be implemented very speedily so that the peasants might give undivided attention to production.

So, in all these high national bodies, this thing is seriously considered and serious attention is paid. I do not quite understand what are the other steps, within the limitations of the Constitution, that the hon. Members would like us to take. In fact, my

conclusion is that if these suggestions which have been made by the National Development Council are going to be implemented by the State Governments, as they are bound to be, because all the Chief Ministers of the States are on the Council, then we are going to have indeed a very great measure of success. In fact, we hope that we would be able to implement the policy of land reform as set out in our Second Five Year Plan but, Sir, to say that, is not to mean that we are very much and completely satisfied with every aspect of the implementation of land reform. There are many matters which we are constantly following up with the States.

With these words, Sir, I would thank the hon. Members, I would not take any more time, for having thrown so much light on the subject and to the extent it would be possible for us to follow their suggestions, we would certainly do that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You oppose the Motion?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I, therefore, in view of what I have stated, oppose the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is neither slow nor haphazard and so you oppose the Resolution.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The reply will be given by Mr. Prasad Rao.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Excuse me, Sir. Last time also, after Shri Datar spoke, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was not called upon to reply. You allowed the debate to continue. There is time and the House need not adjourn now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the Government have replied.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Last time, after the Government reply, Members



spoke. I think there is nothing wrong ' in it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar desh)-. Is this regular, Sir? If this is done now, it should be done always. I do not think it is in accordance with the rules.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In fact, I looked all round. You did not stand up. You are setting up a very toad precedent.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am sorry, Sir. It is not that. Last time also I immediately after Shri Datar, Shri Bhupesh Gupta was not asked to reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will have to call upon the Minister to reply again.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You can do it. I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will be setting up a new example.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Minister ' has intervened in the debate. He has not replied. The reply is to be given by my friend, the mover. He has just intervened in the debate. That is the position and some other Minister could reply. There is no such rule that the debate should close immediately after Minister's speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. There is no objection. I am allowing you.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Ch lir-man, during the debate on this Resolution moved by my colleague, Shri Prasad Rao, whatever might have been some of the inconvenient remarks that may have passed on from that side to us, on the whole, Sir, we were glad to learn that there is a sort of awareness on the necessity of land reforms irrespective of certain dissenting notes here and there. Even in spite of that, there is

awareness and there is also a certain anxiety as to why the progress of the land reforms is not satisfactory. I think, Sir, some hon. Members here have tried to attach some motives to the Resolution that we have moved, some motives as to the spirit with which we have moved this Resolution. I think, Sir, the only motive that prompted us to move such a Resolution in this august House is the one that is given in the Review of the First Five Year Plan on page 320. This Review of the First Five Year Plan says, on page 320, paragraph 12, "that the experience of the First Five Year Plan emphasises the importance of efficient administration to land reform legislations and of informed and well organised public opinion in every local community." This is the motive that has prompted us to move such a Resolution. We want an efficient machinery to implement the laudable aims of land reform that the Planning Commission has placed before the country. We want the awareness of public opinion and we want that the public should be made aware that there are certain agencies in the country; that there are certain difficulties in the approaches of certain State Governments that are in the way of speedy implementation of the aims of the Second Five Year Plan, the aims of the Planning Commission, in regard to land reforms. That is the only motive that prompted us and I do not think, Sir, anybody could criticise us for that matter. It has been said in this House that we had a motive, a political motive behind, a political motive of agitation, of propaganda, of misplaced criticism, etc. All sorts of things were said. I do not think, Sir, there was any such politics in our approach but there certainly was politics in this charge against us. So far as we are concerned, we have got any number of platforms for political agitation, for political propaganda thanks to the Congress Party. They give us so many opportunities by their doings to criticise them and completely decry them. They have given us so many opportunities in so many places. But

[Dr. R. B. GOUT.]

that is not the point that we are concerned with here. This is not a problem on which we can take up that sort of a cheap quarrel with the Congress Party. That was never our approach. We do not have need to go on hunger strikes to attract audiences for our speeches. That is not the position here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the Congress Party here.

DR. R. B. GOUR: When they attacked us, they did not say or use the name of Mr. Prasad Rao or Mr. Gour. They said that the Communist Party wanted to use this as a political opportunity. That was not our motive at all. It is a misreading of our motives. I am sorry, Sir, that the hon. Minister's performance today has done a little disservice to this country. I am sorry to say this, because the motive with which the Planning Minister wrote a strong note and circulated it to the Members of the Congress Party, the desperateness with which he wrote a very strongly worded article in the A.I.C.C. Economic Review, and that spirit has been toned down in the reply that he gave just now. Instead of making our country aware of the difficulties in the way of the implementation of the programme, he has tried to inculcate a spirit of complacency in the country by the speech that he has just now delivered

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: That was farthest from my mind.

DR. R. B. GOUR: He says that many things have been done. Even the things that have come to light from the State of Bombay have been tried to be belittled by him. He says, somewhere, in some place, some distress is there, some lacunae are there. Some other hon. Member said that because there are law and law courts in this country there are difficulties but these difficulties are there not because of law and law courts but

because of lack of laws and lacunae in laws. The difficulty is that you want land reforms but you give advance notice to landlords to evict the tenants. You want to have ceilings but then you give advance notice to the landlords to parcel out their land and distribute it amongst their relatives or sons born or unborn. Sir, to my mind comes an incident which happened long long ago in the old Hyderabad State when there was no democratic set up there. There was some sort of a Council and one solitary member of that Council happens to be a member of the Cabinet in the present Andhra Pradesh. He said that there should be a land reform legislation in this State. Government said, "All right, there should be land reforms" and so they had a law on tenancy reform and circulated it for discussion and opinion amongst the public. The landlords simply evicted all, widows and everyone included, and overnight grabbed all land. In fact, large scale landlordism in Telangana dates not from the beginning but from the recent days when such a legislation was circulated in advance which enabled people overnight to amass vast lands. Similar things are happening even today in the democratic set up now. A law is passed but lacunae are left out. Several instances could be given of such happenings wherein it was pointed out in the Legislature itself that such and such lacunae are there and that they will be utilised later on but these lacunae were deliberately left out. May I draw your attention and the attention of the hon. Minister to a thing that happened in old Hyderabad. This is public record and is to be found in the Assembly proceedings of the Legislature. The hon. Revenue Minister said in the House, "Land reform does not mean giving land to you, distributing land to the landless." This means that you will have land reforms wherein the landless peasants will have nothing to do and there will be no land left for them. Well, that kind of an approach is there. I do not say that the Planning Commission

is doing it otherwise they would not have produced this Report. I do not say the Central Government is doing this sort of thing. I say that there are elements in the country, either in the State Governments or in the people, who are trying to water down these things, sabotage these things, and make use of lacunae sometimes even creating lacunae. This is the one aspect that has to be considered very seriously. If nothing can be done because the Constitution is in the way, if nothing could be done by the Central Government because of this difficulty, then let us at least expedite and intensify the awareness on the part of the people to see that such a thing does not happen. Let us at least do that. Let us not inculcate a spirit of complacency.

There is one more point which I would like to take up and that relates to the question of co-operatives. Here I agree with Dr. Thomas. I might inform the hon. Members here and the hon. Minister that cooperatives have failed sometimes even in China. What is it that the Chinese Government has criticised? What is it that Mr. Chou-En Lai has criticised? They created multi-class co-operatives; in which the rich peasants, the middle peasants, the poor peasants, those who newly obtained land and so on were clubbed together in one cooperative society. In such a society, naturally the big vested interests dominated. And the persons who recently got land, the poor and the middle peasants got disgusted with the cooperative. In this case also, you will have to see that you put together poor people who are like-minded, who have like interests, so that the co-operatives really function and so that the cooperative spirit really develops. 4 P.M. otherwise, animosities develop from within the co-operatives. That is the experience of China. We are not suggesting, we do not have the sort of nightmare that without these co-operatives the production of foodgrains will suffer.. Nothing doing. We want co-operatives for

assisting the peasant for marketing, for credit, for so many other things. Therefore, let us be absolutely clear on this point. Let us not go and tell—just like our friend wio just now said—that the co-operatives will immediately increase the production. These might even defeat the very purpose for which the co-operative is created. I entirely agree that it is a very difficult problem; it is a very complicated problem. In the cross section of peasantry we have got multiple type of interests; multiple type of attitudes. The hon. Shri Akbar Ali Khan's was a solitary voice who said that he would co-operate with the sentiment. I wholeheartedly respond to that call from him. But unfortunately I think there are elements in his own party who would not like to respond as he has done. Nevertheless, the point that we want to drive home, the spirit in which we are moving this Resolution, the spirit in which we are trying to approach this House is one of real, serious approach towards this problem. The progress of the land reforms has been slow, not because anything lacked here, not because anything lacked in the Parliament, not because anything lacked in the Planning Commission, but because as the First Five Year Plan Review itself says, certain difficulties are there at the State-level and against those difficulties popular awareness has to be generated and generated at a very high speed.

Now, I cannot go into the details of how things have been sabotaged, as my friend has posed, as my friend, Theodore Bodra also spoke. Therefore, I most humbly request you and the House not to misread the motives behind our Motion. I would earnestly like to appeal to you. Of course, I would like to excuse those quarters which want deliberately to mislead, because it is their job. They have to do it; otherwise they cannot exist. But I want the hon. Ministers of the Planning Commission not to do it, because they know what we mean by land reforms. They knew in the

[Dr. R. B. Gour.] panel discussion, they knew in the Planning Commission's Consultative Committee, they knew to what extent Communists are serious, to what extent Communists want to cooperate, to what extent communists want to expedite this matter. They know it. Therefore, I do not expect this from them. That is why . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We are glad, that you have the greatest faith in the Planning Commission.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think of all the political parties only the Communist party has it, if I may say so. With these words I wish to conclude my speech. Thank you.

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** श्रीमन्, मुझे इस प्रस्ताव को पढ़कर यह समझ में नहीं आता, कि इसमें लैंड रिफार्म से क्या अभिप्राय है। अभी गौड़ साहब ने जो भाषण दिया उसमें यह अभिप्राय निकलता है कि शायद वे समझते हैं कि लैंड रिफार्म के काम को अंदरपाउंड कर दिया है। (कोलहल) लेकिन इतना ही हम लोग समझ पाते हैं कि उनके लैंड रिफार्म का अभिप्राय यह होता है कि गांवों गांवों में पंचायत कायम कर दी जाय और किसी का कोई व्यक्तिगत अधिकार जमीन के सम्बन्ध में न रह जाय। ग्राम समाज ही जो कुछ चाहे उसका प्रबन्ध करे और मजदूरी की दर में जो कुछ किसी को दे दे वह तो उसका ही बाकी सब उनका ही। यह उन लोगों का लैंड रिफार्म है। और कोई लैंड रिफार्म जो किया जा रहा है, चाहे वह कांग्रेस की तरफ से किया जाय, चाहे समाजवादियों की तरफ से किया जाय, उनकी सम्मति में वह सब डिफार्म है, रिफार्म नहीं है। लेकिन, श्रीमन्, दिक्कत यह है कि ये जितने हमारे लायक दोस्त अपोजिट में बैठे हुए हैं, लोग इन प्रस्तावों पर चाहे जो विचार व्यक्त करते हों, लेकिन न लोगों

में से बहुत कम ऐसे हैं जिनका खेती से सम्बन्ध रहता हो। मेरा खयाल है, इस सदन में २३२ या २३४ जितने भी सदस्य हैं, उनमें से पांच या दस आदमियों को छोड़कर, खेती में किसी का सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

**डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ :** खेती में न हो, लेकिन खाने में तो है।

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** लेकिन खाने में है दूसरों की कमाई, चाहे वह पाप में मिली हो, चाहे लूट कर मिली हो, चाहे डाके की कमाई हो। दूसरों की ही कमाई खानी है, अपनी कमाई आपको खानी नहीं है।

**डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ :** यह तो आप करते हैं।

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** जो नहीं, मैं जमींदार तो हूँ नहीं, मैं तो किसान हूँ। लेकिन आज कोई जमींदार भी किस बात का जो पांच रुपये का माल उधार ले या दस रुपये का माल उधार ले। अगर आप उसे जमींदार समझते हैं तो आपकी जमींदारी बनी रहे।

चुनाचे, मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है, कि मेरे लायक दोस्त इस तरह से मुझे डिस्ट्रैक्ट (Distract) करते रहेंगे। लेकिन मैं उनसे जानता यह चाहता हूँ कि रिफार्म के मानी क्या होते हैं। हर जगह मोशन रिफार्म हम सुनते हैं—लैंड रिफार्म, इंडस्ट्रियल रिफार्म, एग्रीकल्चरल रिफार्म। But what is reform nobody knows. कहावत है, जिसे अंग्रेजी में मने पढ़ा था, लेकिन उसे मैं हिन्दी में कहूंगा—“भगवान् मेरी रक्षा से रक्षा कर दे तो दुश्मन से मैं अपनी रक्षा कर लूंगा”। क्योंकि दोस्त जो दुश्मन की शक्ति में बन कर आते हैं . . .

**डा० राज बहादुर गौड़ :** यही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ कि कांग्रेस के अन्दर दोस्त हैं जो सेवोटार्ज कर रहे हैं।

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** मैं भी यही कह रहा हूँ, घबड़ाइये नहीं। आप तो हैं दुश्मन। न तो आपको जमीन से मतलब न जमींदारी से मतलब, न किसी किसान से मतलब। आपका सिर्फ मतलब यह है कि किसी तरह से उनको चकमें में डाल कर अपने पजे में कर लो और उनसे कहो धूल चूसो। यह आपका अभिप्राय है। यह आप कर सकते हैं। इसके लिये मैं आपको बधाई देता हूँ।

(Interruptions.)

लेकिन दुख यह है कि आप रिफार्म के मानी नहीं समझेंगे। अगर मेरे लायक दोस्त गांवों में यह कहते फिरें, और इस बात की शपथ लें, कि हम तुम्हारी गांव की सभी जमीन इकट्ठी कर लेंगे लेकिन किसी की अपनी जमीन एक इंच भी न रह जायेगी, तुम लोगों को सब की अपनी जमीन दे देनी पड़ेगी सरकार को, और सरकार जो कुछ तुमको इनायत करके खाने पीने के लिये दे सकेगी दिया करेगी, तो मेरा ख्याल है कि मेरे ये लायक दोस्त हमारे साथ कभी दूसरी मर्तबा सदन में अपने दल का कोई मेम्बर नहीं भेज सकेंगे। और अगर वे एक भी मेम्बर इस सदन में क्या उस सदन में क्या, भेज सकें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनके लिये बड़ी तारीफ की बात होगी। लेकिन आप तो उनसे जाकर यह कहेंगे कि तुमको कांग्रेस के राज्य में क्या मिला? तुमको मुसीबत है, तुमको खाना पीना नहीं मिल रहा है, तुमको कोई चीज नहीं मिल रही है, तुम कमाते हो और दूसरे खाते हैं। वे समझते ही नहीं कि खाने वाले तो ये हैं मुफ्त में। आप गांवों में करते क्या हैं, कोई भी कार्य करते हैं? उनसे क्या लेते हैं, पैसा लेते हैं, उन्हीं के मत्थे खाते भी हैं। देहात वालों के घर कोई सहाब बाहर से आते ह तो आम तौर से अच्छा खाना खिलायेंगे, चाहे घर में सत्त भी न खाते। लेकिन उनके लिये दूध, दही मगायेंगे। उन्हीं से चन्दा लेना और उन्हीं का ढोल बजाना यह आपका काम है। लेकिन यह रिफार्म जो

उनका है उसके विषय में आप उनको नहीं समझायेंगे। मुझे यह कहना पड़ेगा कि कुछ हद तक हर पार्टी का यही हाल है। हमारे सूबे में लैंड रिफार्म बिल पास हो चुका है। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश का रहने वाला हूँ...

SHRI ABHIMANYU RATH (Orissa):  
There is no quorum, I suppose.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: There is enough quorum to talk about. We are more than 25.

हमारे समाजवादियों का कहना है कि कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग चलेगी नहीं। हमारी प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का कहना है कि कुल जमीन इकट्ठा कर के बांट दी जाये किसानों में। लेकिन सवाल यह होता है कि बांट देने पर किसान एक बीघे भर का मानिक भी न रह जायेगा। अगर जमीन बराबर बराबर बांट दी जाय तो फिर पूछिये वह बंचारा किसान, उसके पास क्या रह जायेगा कि वह एक बीघे या दो बीघे जमीन पर खेती कर के अपनी जिन्दगी उसमें व्यतीत कर सके। अगर वह कमा कर कुछ पैसा बचाये तो भी दो, चार एकड़ जमीन खरीदने की भी उसको इजाजत नहीं है। तो फिर कोई कहाँ तक खेतीबाड़ी पर मरेगा।

हमारी कांग्रेस की तरफ से बहुत दिनों से रिफार्म किये जा रहे हैं। हम कभी बड़ी दिक्कत में पड़ जाते हैं जब हम देखते हैं कि सन् १९४० से रिफार्म हो रहा है, सन् १९४० में लैंड रिफार्म का काश्तकारी कानून पास हुआ था, उसके बाद सन् १९५१-५२ में जमींदारी अधालिशन हुआ और यह भी रिफार्म की एक बड़ी कड़ी मजिल थी और उसको द्वारा जमींदार बेदखल कर दिये गये, उनको मुआवजा दिया गया। वह मुआवजा अभी भी बसूल हो रहा है, कुछ का मुआवजा बसूल होने में ४० वर्ष लगेंगे। उसमें से कुछ

[श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा]

अहलकारों को भी देना पड़ता है और मिलता मिलता कुछ नहीं है। मगर किसानों की हालत सुधारने और लैंड रिफार्म के बारे में ढोल पीटने से कुछ नहीं होता। जब समाज-वादी आयेंगे तब वे अपने वादों को . . . .

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** कांग्रेस पार्टी का क्या हाल है ?

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** कांग्रेस पार्टी का हाल ठीक है। उसकी पालिसी क्लियर है। आज कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में डिफरेंस हो गया है। रूस, चीन या दूसरे देशों की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टियां एक ही तरह की चीज नहीं रह गई हैं।

SHRI ABHIMANYU RATH: I hope the hon. Member knows that there are four Congress parties in one province.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Therefore you have the consolation that there are four Congressmen also.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is demo-crarcy.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Yes, that is democracy.

लेकिन आज किसान की हालत के बारे में किसी को कोई परवाह नहीं है। किसानों से कोई यह नहीं पूछता है कि तुम अपनी जमीन के इंतजाम के बारे में क्या सोचते हो, उनसे पूछने वाला कोई नहीं है। किताबों को पढ़कर और दूसरी चीजों की नकल करके या दूसरे देशों में जाकर, वहां से दावत खाकर लौटने पर लोगों को कुछ विशेष रूप से ज्ञान हो जाता है और उसके आधार पर वे यहां के लोगों को बतलाने लगते हैं कि ऐसा होना चाहिये और ऐसा करना चाहिये। कुछ समय पूर्व श्री पाटिल साहब जो मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं, चीन गये थे और उन्होंने वहां के बारे में

एक रिपोर्ट दी है। मुझे ख्याल नहीं है कि पाटिल साहब ने खेती देखी होगी या वे कभी गांव गये होंगे।

AN HON. MEMBER: He is an agriculturist.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: I stand corrected.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): He was a Member of the Planning Commission.

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** तो मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है कि अगर हमें लैंड रिफार्म करना है और किसानों की मृसीबत दूर करनी है जिससे कि वे सुख और शान्ति में रह सकें तो इस काम को करने के लिये एक कमीशन होना चाहिये, जो इन सब बातों के बारे में सोचे। इस के साथ ही साथ वह किसानों से सम्मति ले, अच्छी खेती करने वाले लोगों से राय ले, कि इस सम्बन्ध में क्या प्रबन्ध किया जाय जिससे खेती एक अच्छी इंडस्ट्री हो सके। खेती हमारे देश की सब से बड़ी नेशनल इंडस्ट्री है। कहने के लिये तो है। और आमदनी भी सब से ज्यादा इसी से होती है। आधे से ज्यादा नेशनल आय हमारी खेती से प्राप्त होती है। फिर भी एक इंडस्ट्री के रूप में इसके बारे में न कभी गवर्नमेंट ने या अपोजीशन वालों ने व्यवहार करने का कभी ख्याल किया और न इसके बारे में कोई ऐसी बात सोची जिससे कि इस चीज को इंडस्ट्रियल शक्ल में ले जाते। हमारे गौड़ साहब और उनके दोस्त बातें तो बहुत कहते हैं लेकिन जो ठिठोरा पीटते हैं वह काम कुछ नहीं करते।

(Interruptions.)

मेरे कहने का अभिप्राय यह है, कि इस प्रस्ताव को लाकर देश में लैंड रिफार्म होने की सम्भावना नहीं है। लैंड रिफार्म करना है, किसानों की दशा सुधारनी है, तो इस तरह के प्रस्ताव से नहीं हो सकती है। हमारे देश में ७५ प्रतिशत लोग खेती पर निर्भर करते हैं, उनकी आय को बढ़ाने के लिये, आपको

नये-नये तरीके बतलाने चाहियें। लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि नित्य नये कानून बनाये जाते हैं जिससे मुकदमों-बाजी ही बढ़ती है। इस तरह से लैंड रिफार्म होने का नहीं। हमारे मूबे में बारह, चौदह वर्ष पहले लैंड रिफार्म हुए, जमींदारी गई, सब कुछ हुआ, लेकिन रेवेन्यू और माल के मुकदमे इतने ज्यादा बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं, कि जिसकी कि हद नहीं। एक एक इंच जमीन के लिये किसान मारा जाता है। आप पूर्वी जिले में चले जाइये, वहां के लोगों की आजीविका भूमि पर आधारित है, वे लोग जमीन के लिये मूखे हैं। जमीन के लिये वहां पर कत्ल, बलबे, फौजदारी और मुकदमों-बाजी होती है। आज आप किमी कोर्ट में चले जाइये आपको १० या १५ हजार मुकदमों के फरीक मुवकिल और मुहरिर दीड़ते मिलेंगे। इसके बाद चकबन्दी आई जो एक परेशानी की चीज बन गई है। इस तरह किताब में तो किसानों के लिये ये चीज रिफार्म हो गई मगर उससे किसानों का नई नई मुसीबतों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** रिफार्म तो हुआ है।

**श्री ब्रज बिहारी शर्मा :** यह ऐसा रिफार्म हुआ है, कि लोगों की मुसीबत हो गई। कागज में तो ये रिफार्म आ गये हैं। गौड़ साहब को इस तरह की रिफार्म की बात करने से पहले इस चीज को सोच लेना चाहिये था कि हमारे देश में किस तरह का रिफार्म होना चाहिये जिससे कि हमारे देहातों में जो किसान बसते हैं उनकी दशा सुधरे और उनकी आय बढ़े। जिस तरह से वे अपनी पार्टी की बातों की डंके की चोट से धोषणा करते हैं, उसी तरह से उन्हें किसानों को भलाई की बातों को भी, जिसको कि हमारे देहात के किसान समझ सकें, प्रकाशित करवायें। उसके बाद वे उनके लिये लड़ें तो ठीक भी मालूम होता है। गोलमोल बात कहकर लोगों को धोखे में डालने की बात मेरी समझ

में नहीं आती है और न यह कोई अच्छी बात है।

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in fact I expected from the hon. Deputy Minister a sober appraisal of the programme, and the progress of land reforms so far, but instead he has indulged, unfortunately, in some pious platitudes and political diatribes against the Communists. The whole tone of his speech was this: "In fact Government of India has done and is doing what all it can do. It is only these Communists who can never appreciate the orderly progress, who are not able to see the real progress in this regard. They are the villains of the piece. As far as we are concerned what more do you expect us to do? The National Development Council has done its duty and the State Governments have passed the legislations for the implementation of the ceilings." This is the tone in which the hon. Deputy Minister has in fact spoken which, I have to confess, I did not expect from the Government. In fact, that is not the tone that was adopted by the hon. Planning Minister himself while addressing his own party. He fully understood the gravity of the situation and with humility he said that the progress had been very slow. But now the hon. Deputy Minister has taken objection to the characterisation that so far the implementation has been slow. At the cost of repetition let me again read the points that have been mentioned by the Planning Minister, Mr. Nanda, to his own party, in the A.I.C.C. Economic Review. He has stated :

"The policy of imposing ceiling on existing land holdings has also been widely accepted. However, there is considerable hesitation in implementing it as shown by the slow progress. The legislation for ceiling on existing holdings has been enacted in a very few States and even where it has been enacted, enforcement has generally made little progress."

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] That was the opinion of the Planning Minister in addressing his own party. But here we are told, "everything that is possible is being done. What else do you expect us to do? You suggest if you can, some steps. The Constitution is there, we cannot do anything beyond that." Sir, this sort of attitude leads nowhere except to smug complacency which, I am afraid, will not be conducive either for the implementation of the Plan itself, or for the speedy and orderly progress of our country about which my hon. friend has talked too much. I have pointed out earlier in my speech, with all the humility at my command, that there have been so many lacunae—not that there have not been any changes—and so many lapses, that the very purpose for which many of these laws have been made is being defeated. I have made an earnest and fervent appeal to the Government to see that these lacunae and loopholes are plugged. Instead, it is said that "Everything is being done; it is only that the Opposition or the Communists are not able to see the progress that is made." It is unfortunate; I term it as nothing but unfortunate. Actually, is it a fact? Does the claim that everything possible is being done stand any scrutiny? If an impartial survey is made into the land reform laws that have been made in the States, it would be clearly proved that, in fact, the tenancy problem has not been solved; but the tenants are, of course, dissolved by not giving any land or security to them. The hon. Deputy Minister just now referred that a 17-page big statement was laid on the Table of the other House on the 19th. I have very carefully gone through that statement. After seeing that, it has become quite obvious that, actually, very little protection has been given to the tenants. It is not to make political capital out of it that I am saying this or asking you to do something—something urgently.

Actually, some help is urgently needed for the tenants and it should be done by the Government immediately. The sources from which I quoted are

not Communist sources. As far as the Hyderabad Government is concerned, it is actually the evaluation done by the Land Commission, of which my hon., friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan, has said so much. Where the tenancy legislation is supposed to be fool-proof, there itself, as I have quoted, 57 to 58 per cent, of the tenants have been evicted. If that is the state of that State where the tenancy legislation is supposed to be fool-proof. Sir, it is very easy to imagine what would be the condition of tenants in other States where actually no survey has been so far conducted. So, it does not behold a Deputy Minister here to claim that everything possible has been done; that big progress has been achieved.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I said that these lapses have to be looked into. They are very serious things. I have already said that these lapses revealed by the surveys have to be looked into and all the loopholes in the legislations have to be plugged.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: But, what does he say? An enormous progress has been made in all the fields and only certain lapses are there. They must be plugged. These loopholes are such as to defeat the very purpose of the legislation. That is the point which I wanted to urge from the beginning.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We are now seized of that.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: As for the security of tenure, fixation of rent and the right of ownership—about these three things also—the hon. Minister has specifically said that much has been done. In regard to the security of tenure, of course, I have quoted copiously from Government sources themselves, wherever survey reports are available. Unfortunately, There are no survey reports for the other States; but had there been survey reports other than those for Hyderabad and Bombay, it would have been revealed . . .



SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I would like to inform the House that, under the Research Programmes Committee, we have now constituted a Committee of Direction which would guide technical and objective assessment of land reform. So, we are going to have such an assessment by University and research institutions all over the country. But we are not shirking it. In fact, we are very anxious.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am glad to note the information and the House also will have an opportunity to discuss that report.

Then, about fixing of rent, the hon. Deputy Minister has said just now that rent has been fixed. Of course, we do not deny that rent has been fixed by legislation. But, Sir, wherever rents happen to be lower than the prevailing ones, unfortunately, that law is not being implemented. Again, we have to take recourse to the same source of report. I can quote straightaway. Even our Planning Minister himself says as for the implementation of this fixation of rents:

"In 14 out of the 16 districts investigated, it was discovered that the provisions of the Act relating to the fixation of the maximum rent had made no effect whatever."

This is what the Planning Minister actually says while reviewing the Evaluation Report that was made by the Gokhale Institute. So, from my own experience, I can say that, in the Hyderabad State, it did not have much effect. I do not deny that it has not been statutorily fixed. But because of the socio-economic conditions that are obtaining in the villages, it has not been properly implemented. Our complaint, our quarrel, with the Government is that popular committees, with popular will, are not associated in implementing these things. As has been pointed out specifically by the Panel on Land Reform, the village panchayat or some other form of

75 RSD—4

popular committee should be associated in implementing this programme. Our complaint is that it has not been done and implemented by the State Governments. It has been left only to the most rigid sort of administrative mechanism.

About the right of ownership also, I have dealt with it in my first speech.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: There are some States, I think, where the village panchayats have been associated and particularly, in my State, they are now co-operating in some aspect of the work of land reform. In the matter of revenue collection particularly, they have done a remarkable work and in other constructive activities too, which are connected with land reform.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I thank the hon. Deputy Minister for the information and note that the State from which he comes has progressed. But, so far as my knowledge goes, in our part in South India, village panchayats have not been associated as far as land reforms are concerned.

DR. R. B. GOUR: They have been formed ? «

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Whether they have been formed or not . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am not going to repeat, Sir.

Some other hon. Members, for instance, Prof. Kishen Chand and others, mentioned regarding co-operative farming. I find there is no contradiction between the imposition of ceilings and the formation of co-operative societies. But, hitherto, our experience in India has been that, without a proper redistribution of land, co-operatives have not succeeded. That is what our previous Evalua-

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.] tion Report and the report which has been circulated to us yesterday, themselves point out. My friend, Dr. Raj Bahadur Gour, has pointed out the example of China and our official delegation that has visited China and has also stressed about the success of the co-operative movement in China. They very clearly pointed out that the co-operative movement did succeed in China because it was preceded by a land reform. So, with all respect, may I point out to my hon. friends who are here, that in order exactly to see that the co-operative movement flourishes, this land reform programme, especially that of the land distribution, should be expedited as early as possible? This is apart from the production question. Of course, the question of production itself has been gone into by the Panel on Land Reform. It has been very clearly and specifically stated in the Report of the Panel on Land Reform that:

"In our view, the fall in agricultural production is likely to result not so much from the small size of the land of these newly created landowners as from the lack of other instruments of production besides land, such as bullocks, seed, manure, etc. If land is distributed and these people are expected to look after themselves, then certainly, there is a considerable danger of a fall in production. On the other hand, if these things can be found, the likelihood of a substantial increase in production cannot be excluded..... Thus, the risk of a fall in production can only be for the temporary period in which these arrangements have to be made. But thereafter, production is likely to increase progressively and substantially."

That is the opinion of the experts on the Panel on land reform appointed by the Planning Commission. It is not for argument's sake that I am pointing this out. But the important

consideration is to bring about a basic change in the structure of our rural society so that permanent progress can be made in our rural economy. I do not say that by simply distributing the land, the production is going to increase. But it is going to lay a firm basis and foundation for the future increase of the agricultural production and for the success of the co-operative movement.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I want to understand whether you have laid down a basis that it is only the distribution which can lead to the development of co-operatives.. Otherwise, I would like to suggest to the House that the Standing Committee of the National Development Council has suggested that 3000 experiments in co-operative farming should be conducted during the plan period for this purpose and for that necessary arrangements should be made.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I perfectly agree with you that this is necessary for the complete success of the co operative movement..... One word more. The hon. Deputy Minister has repeatedly said: "What can we do? It is only State Governments *tft&t* are coming in our way. We cannot do anything more than passing resolutions in the National Development Council". He also stated about the resettlement of the landless. Let me remind the hon. Deputy Minister that yesterday itself, in answer to a question in this House, it has been stated by the Home Minister that no steps so far have been taken as far as resettlement is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your Resolution also does not say what steps the Government ought to take.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: My point is if the Constitution comes in the way of proper implementation of this, why you are . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your Resolution does not mention anything It is as vague as . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: If we make it concrete, they will oppose it all the more.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: If we can make it concrete, what will be the fate of it? Anyway, if the Constitution is in the way of making progress of land reforms, what comes in the way of amending the Constitution?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: It was not in my mind that the Constitution is acting as an impediment in this respect.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Constitution never came up in the discussion.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press the Resolution?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I do press the Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

"This House is of opinion that the progress of the implementation of the land reforms programme embodied in the Second Five Year Plan is slow and haphazard and recommends to Government to take immediate steps to co-ordinate and expedite the implementation of the programme.."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Members in whose names the other resolutions stand are not present. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 25th November, 1957.

The House then adjourned at thirty-five minutes past four of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 25th November 1957.