

(i) Appropriation Accounts (Civil) 1950-51 and the Audit Report, 1952, Part II.

(ii) Commercial Appendix to the Appropriation Accounts (Civil) 1950-51 and the Audit Report, 1952.

[Placed in the Library. See Nos. S-298/54 and S-299/54, respectively.]

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER SECTION 3 OF THE ALL-INDIA SERVICES ACT, 1951

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS AND STATES (DR. K. N. KATJU): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Notifications, under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the All-India Services Act, 1951:—

(i) Notification No. 3/1/54-AIS (II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Administrative Service (Recruitment) Rules, 1954;

(ii) Notification No. 3/4/54-AIS(II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Police Service (Recruitment) Rules, 1954;

(iii) Notification No. 4/1/54-AIS(II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Administrative Service (Probation) Rules, 1954;

(iv) Notification No. 4/2/54-AIS(II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Police Service (Probation) Rules, 1954;

(v) Notification No. 2/2/54-AIS (II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Administrative Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954;

(vi) Notification No. 2/3/54-AIS (II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Police Service (Cadre) Rules, 1954;

(vii) Notification No. 9/1/54-AIS(II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Adminis-

trative Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1954;

(viii) Notification No. 9/2/54-AIS (II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the Indian Police Service (Regulation of Seniority) Rules, 1954;

(ix) Notification No. 8/1/54-AIS(II), dated the 8th September 1954, publishing the All-India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954.

[Placed in the Library. See Nos. S-300/54 to S-308/54, respectively.]

PRESS RELEASE OF DEBATE ON BANK AWARD

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now come back to Mr. Sundarayya's Resolution.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Sir, before you pass on to the next item, I would just beg to draw your attention to a Press release by the Press Information Bureau of the Government of India on 3rd September 1954 regarding the debate on the Bank Award in this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dwivedy, please give the information to the Secretary. He will look into it.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: Sir, I only want to point out that there has been a significant omission of a substantial portion of the debate, which was very inconvenient for the Finance Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This need not be raised on the floor of the House.

RESOLUTION RE LAND REFORM LEGISLATION IN STATES—

continued

SHRI S. BANERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support

[Shri S. Banerjee.]

the Resolution which my esteemed colleague, Shri Sundarayya, moved on the 3rd September 1954. The Resolution reads thus:

"This House is of opinion that in order to guarantee the success of the Five Year Plan, the Central Government should recommend to all the State Governments that they should take immediate steps for the speeding up of land reform legislation in their respective States."

I must confess that this Resolution is a very simple, straight and moderate Resolution which Shri Sundarayya in his wisdom has tabled before the House and I am sure that the Government also in its wisdom will see its way to accepting this Resolution. The Congress stands committed to the acceptance of the Resolution. I will not take up the time of the House by placing before it the series of Resolutions passed by the Congress, the All-India Congress Committee and the Working Committee, but I will say only this that in May 1929, the All-India Congress Committee passed a Resolution to this effect: "In order to remove the poverty and misery of the Indian people and to ameliorate the condition of the masses, it is essential to make revolutionary changes in the present economic and social structure of society and to remove the gross inequalities." In those days, the Congress was even prepared for making revolutionary changes and now I find the Congress has conveniently forgotten those heroic days, of heroic traditions and is not even prepared to take to a reformist line of action, unless forced, which may disturb in the least the *status quo*. I shall point out again—I am quoting from page 90 of the "Land Reforms in India" published by the Indian National Congress, New Delhi—there was a conference of Chief Ministers, which Presidents of the Pradesh Congress Committees also attended, on 1st May 1950 and the Working Committee considered the recommendations of this conference. The Resolution of the

Working Committee runs as follows: "Agriculture will remain in a state of flux, so long as the structure and pattern of rural economy does not become clear and definite. It is, therefore, necessary to shorten the period of transition by expediting the abolition of Zamindari and Malguzari systems by paying compensation—mark the following two words—if necessary, in bonds." Here it stands clear that payment of compensation is not always necessary—if the Government thinks that payment of compensation is necessary, then compensation may be paid and in order that this payment may be optional, the first and the foremost duty of the Government is to amend article 31 of the Constitution, which stands in the way. That article of the Constitution stands in the way of the fulfilment of the Five Year Plan which has in view the progress of the country. Even Gandhiji, as late as June 1942—of course, the atmosphere then was pregnant with revolution because "Quit India" resolution which was passed on August 9, 1942 was already in the air—said like this.

12 NOON.

In June 1942, in the course of a conversation with him Louis Fischer, that great American journalist, asked as follows—I quote from that report, page 71 of the book already referred to:

"Should the landlords be compensated?"

And the clear answer was "No." On another day Louis Fischer asked a question:

"You feel then that it must be confiscation without compensation?"

"Of course", Gandhiji agreed. And what do we find today? The Congress has gone back upon its ideal. The Congress has conveniently forgotten what Gandhiji said then, although it swears by Gandhiji when it suits its convenience. The Congress had several promises uttered to the ear of the people only to be broken to the heart. That is the record of the Congress so far as land reforms are concerned.

The Resolution precisely demands—it demands nothing else—the speeding up of land reforms. For what? For the successful working of the Five Year Plan. Comrade Sundarayya, the other day, pointed out the details as to how the legislation with regard to land by the Congress Governments had so many loopholes, that through them the benefits that were supposed to accrue to the tillers of the land were lost to them. Those loopholes have got to be removed to the benefit of the tillers of the soil.

The other day my friend, Shri Mahanty, during the course of his speech, referred to the French Revolution. He said it created vested interests; he referred to the Russian Revolution. He said it also created vested interests. I agree with him that the French Revolution created vested interests, but the Russian Revolution did not create any vested interests at all. If it created any vested interests, they are the vested interests of the people, and the people's vested interests have always to be honoured and respected.

Sir, the Resolution is now before the House and I would ask the Government,—the Planning Minister is here, and I would ask him—simply to accept the Resolution. That would be an act of justice though belated and let justice, though belated, be done.

Let me refer to the most recent example of China. Shri Mahanty also referred to China. The land reforms in China ought to be an object lesson for us in India. In this connection let me refer to the latest Draft Constitution of the People's Republic of China. Article 13 of that Draft Constitution says:

“The State may in the public interest buy, requisition or nationalise land and other means of production in both cities and countryside in accordance with the provisions of law.”

If the Government of India has the wisdom to adopt this or any other similar provision by amending article

31 of the Constitution of India it will have steered clear of all the difficulties that, they think, stand in their way, and payment of compensation, which is now compulsory, will not be so. You remember, Sir, that I moved an amendment to the Constitution seeking to amend article 31, in a similar manner but the Government, in its wisdom, threw it out. But this Resolution is as moderate a resolution as it can be, and nothing should stand in the way of Government's acceptance of this Resolution except prestige, and I would beg of the Government not to allow this prestige to intervene but with a good grace to accept this simple and straightforward Resolution put forward by my esteemed friend, Comrade Sundarayya.

The All-India Congress Committee met at Agra on July 6 and 7, 1953, i.e., just a year back, and passed a resolution to the following effect:

“The pace of progress must, however, be quickened, more especially in regard to land reform and industrial growth.”

The Resolution also demands nothing more, nothing less—it only wants the Government to speed up land reforms. The Congress, Sir, is committed to the speeding up of these reforms. Why, then, should the Congress Government not accept this simple Resolution? They should accept for once at least a resolution moved by the Opposition, and show that they are amenable to reason and accept constructive proposals from the Opposition. If you can do that, you will rise in the estimation of the people. In your own interests and in the interests of the people concerned, I ask you to accept this very simple Resolution which has been so ably moved by my friend, Shri Sundarayya. Thank you.

श्री सी० एल० वर्मा (बिलासपुर
और हिमाचल प्रदेश) : उपसभापति
महोदय, जों प्रस्ताव श्री सुन्दरया जी ने

[श्री सी० एल० वर्मा]

पेश किया है उसमें कोई दो राय का सवाल पंदा नहीं होता। जहां तक कांग्रेस का सवाल है कांग्रेस ने लैंड रिफार्म का काम हर स्टेट में सबसे पहले अपने हाथ में लिया। रेजोल्यूशन में कहा गया है कि स्टेट गार्मेंट्स से सिफारिश की जाये कि वे लैंड रिफार्म का काम बहुत जल्दी अपने हाथ में ले। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है कि कौन सी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट है जिसने कि लैंड रिफार्म को अपने हाथ में नहीं लिया। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं आपके सामने हिमाचल प्रदेश को रखता हूं। हिमाचल प्रदेश की मिनिस्ट्री १९५२ में कायम हुई उससे पहले वहां चीफ कमिश्नर थे, कोई मिनिस्ट्री नहीं थी। मिनिस्ट्री ने सबसे पहला काम यह किया कि लैंड रिफार्म को अपने हाथ में लिया। जैसा कि आपको मालूम है कि पार्ट "सी" स्टेट्स में सेंटर की मंजूरी के बगैर लेजिस्लेशन नहीं कर सकते, हर एक बिल पहले सेंटर से ऐप्रूव हो कर जाता है। सबसे पहले अक्टूबर १९५२ में हिमाचल प्रदेश ने पंजाब टेनेंसी (अमेंड-मेंट) ऐक्ट, १९५२ इंट्रोड्यूस किया। इस ऐक्ट के मातहत जो जमीन का रेंट था उसको पहले के आधे से एक चौथाई किया। शायद श्री महन्ती ने यह कहा था कि आज तक किसी स्टेट में लैंड रेवेन्यू या जमीन का रेंट कम नहीं हुआ। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में १९५२ के ऐक्ट के मातहत यह निस्फ से एक चौथाई हुआ।

हां, यह बात ठीक है कि जो बहुत से ऐक्ट स्टेटों में केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास ऐप्रूबल के लिये आते हैं उनमें कुछ

देरी जरूर होती है, जिसमें से हिमाचल प्रदेश भी एक है। हिमाचल प्रदेश में एबालिशन आफ बिग लैंड स्टेट्स आर लैंड रिफार्म का बिल सबसे पहले २२ अप्रैल १९५३ को पेश हुआ और १७ जून १९५३ को पास हुआ। वह सेंटर से ६ महीने बाद कुछ अमेंडमेंट्स के लिये वापस गया, यानी सेंटर ने इस सिलसिले में ६ महीने ले लिये। अगर सेंटर उनको जल्दी से वापस कर देता तो शायद ऐसी हालत न होती। उसके बाद उन्होंने रीसेंटली जो बिल १९ अगस्त १९५३ को पास किया है वह शायद सेंटर के पास ऐप्रूबल के लिये आ गया है। इस प्रकार उस बिल के आने जाने में एक साल लग गया। अगर सेंटर इतना टाइम न लगाये तो यह सिलसिला बहुत जल्दी ठीक हो जाय।

बहुत सी बातें सीलिंग के सिलसिले में कही गयी। सीलिंग का होना बहुत जरूरी है। अगर हम सीलिंग मुकर्रर नहीं करते हैं तो बहुत सी जमीनें हम को नहीं मिल सकती। सीलिंग हर स्टेट में हालत के मुताबिक अलग अलग होनी चाहिये। मेरे ख्याल में सीलिंग रीजनल प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से होनी चाहिये जो हिल्ली एरियाज हैं उनमें सीलिंग हिल्ली एरियाज के मुताबिक होनी चाहिये जो प्लेन एरियाज हैं उनमें सीलिंग प्लेन एरियाज के मुताबिक होनी चाहिये और जो ज्यादा जरखेज एरियाज हैं उसमें सीलिंग जरखेज एरियाज के मुताबिक होनी चाहिये। हिमाचल-प्रदेश ने पिछली दफा अपने यहां सीलिंग दस एकड़ की रखी थी, मगर केन्द्रीय सरकार की सिफारिश पर वह फिर बदल दी गई है। इस लिहाज से अब बहुत कम जमीन मिल सकेगी जोकि लैंडलैस लेबरर को हासिल होगी।

इसके अलावा जहां तक मुझे इल्म है जो ज़मीने मर्जर के वक्त रूलर्स को दी गई थी उनके लिये यह शर्त थी कि रूलर्स उन ज़मीनों को अपने इस्तेमाल के लिये रखेंगे और उनको फरोस्त नहीं करेंगे। क्या मैं मन्त्री महोदय से पूछ सकता हूं कि क्या यह शर्त थी कि वे उन ज़मीनों को फरोस्त नहीं कर सकते? हिमाचल प्रदेश में यह हुआ कि जो ज़मीनें रूलर की अपनी थी उनको, इससे पहले कि यह एक्ट पास हो, फरोस्त कर दिया गया। इस प्रकाश जिस ज़मीन का कम्पेंसेशन उनको केवल ३० रुपया मिलता, उन्होंने उसका हजारों रुपया पाकेट में कर लिया। अगर यह था कि वे फरोस्त नहीं कर सकते थे तो मैं यह जरूर दरखास्त करूंगा कि वे ज़मीने वापिस होनी चाहिये। और जो ज़मीने लैंडलैस लेबर को मिली वाली हैं उनमें शामिल हो जानी चाहिये। इसके अलावा अगर वे फरोस्त कर सकते थे तो उस आमदनी पर जो रूलर्स ने कमाया है उस पर इनकम टैक्स लगाना चाहिये।

जहां तक माननीय सुदरैया जी ने कहा कि फाइव-इयर प्लान इस वजह से रुक रहा है कि ये स्टैप्स नहीं लिये गये, मैं यह समझता हूं कि ये स्टैप्स हर स्टेट में लिये गये और हर स्टेट में कामयाबी हो रही है। अगर वे लैंड रिफार्म्स न होते तो शायद हम अनाज का मसला हल नहीं कर सकते थे। आज अगर अनाज हमारे पास सरप्लस हो गया है तो इसी वजह से हो गया है कि बहुत सी रियासतों में जागीरदारी खत्म हुई लैंडलैस लोगों को ज़मीने मिली और टनैट्स को पूरा भरोसा हो गया कि अब ये ज़मीने हमारी हैं। इस प्रकार

उन्होंने ज्यादा काम करना शुरू कर दिया और उनमें ज्यादा अनाज पैदा होना शुरू हो गया। इसी वजह से आज अनाज हमारे पास काफी है और हमने फूड प्रॉब्लम साल्व कर ली है।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I should like with your permission to make a brief interruption at this stage. I was on the point of being taken in by the persuasive charm of the speech delivered by my hon. friend, Mr. Banerjee, but a suspicious bird that I am, I could discern that beneath the cloak of this persuasion and charm, there was something hidden inside which was all very sinister.

He gave us a catalogue of the broken promises of the Congress. Yes, Sir, yes. We were the breakers of law once; we are the breakers of promises now. This running of the administration has in its turn earned for us the fresh title of the breakers of promises. Even if you call us the breakers of promises, we are not ashamed of our record, and I can assure each and every hon. Member of the House that the Congress is honouring each and every promise that it gave to the people in its long record of seventy years from the Congress platform. The greatest of those promises was to free the country from foreign yoke and that promise, I beg to remind my hon. friend, Mr. Banerjee, we have honoured in its entirety. Could there be any other proof of our honouring our promises and of our not being promise-breakers?

Mr. Banerjee wants land reforms to be introduced and all lands to be taken possession of and distributed to the landless people without any compensation being paid to anybody. This is a thing which, I am sure, the Congress Government will never do. If my hon. friend—I may also say Comrade Banerjee—is fond of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he will find it in action more in India than in his adopted fatherland of the U.S.S.R. We

[Shri H. P. Saksena]
have in India the actual and the real dictatorship of the proletariat.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): How can there be any adopted fatherland in our case? You talk of adoption only in the case of childless people. When we have a mother of our own, why should we adopt any other country as our fatherland?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: That is my whole grouse. If only my hon. friends there would attach less importance to their fatherland by adoption than to their motherland by inheritance and by birth, there would have been no ground to complain of it.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Are you referring to the Chairman here? Every Member is supposed to address the Chair as "you".

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I would very much like to answer the interruption of my friend, Mr. Dwivedy, but it is very unintelligible to me. It is something which a man of my ordinary common sense cannot understand. I can only crave his indulgence, if I cannot answer him.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as has been suggested by several hon. Members even on the Congress benches, nobody can have any objection with the underlying principle in this Resolution. Land reform is very essential. The only question is whether it is advisable to recommend to the State Governments to take immediate steps for the speeding up of land legislation in their respective States. I may assure hon. Members that this Resolution does not cast any reflection on the States that they are not doing their duty. It is only a recommendation that more urgent steps may be taken and the amendment by Mr. Dwivedy gives a time-limit also. He has extended the time-limit from the word 'immediate' to the end of April 1957. That means there is a clear period of 3 years during which the State Governments may bring in legislation for speeding up this reform.

Sir, it is 7 years since India became free and during this period we admit that in certain States zamindari has been abolished. That was the first step but the real thing is that in our country apart from these zamindars and the big landlords, there are big patedars and unless and until the land from them is taken away and distributed among small tillers of land, the full benefit will not accrue to the peasants and this simple Resolution has been brought only to focus the attention of the public on the urgent need of this legislation.

I may say here that mention has been made of only 2 States but it does not mean that only those two States are the culprits and the rest of the States in India are all right. I may point out that mention was made of Hyderabad. I know that Hyderabad has not done as much as it should have done but it should not leave behind an impression that Hyderabad is the most backward State and has not done anything at all. There were jagir lands in Hyderabad and immediately after the police action all jagirs were abolished. The compensation that is going to be paid to these jagirdars is, I think, on the small scale side. Of course, if we could have done without giving them any compensation, it may not have been very advisable. The compensation that is being paid to the jagirdars is on the low scale but the problem in Hyderabad is of the big patedars. The big patedars who own 500 acres or above can be easily got rid of but it is the patedars who own land between, say, 30 and 100 acres who are the biggest obstacle. What are we going to do about that? There is a limited amount of land in this whole country and there is great land hunger. Every landless worker wants land. I know several hon. Members have pointed out that if you give one or two acres of land to the landless worker, he may not be able to till it properly because he may not have bullocks or implements or seeds.

You must have seen in the papers of today that Dr. Katju went to several villages and found that there is

co-operative spirit among the villagers. I am sure that if we give even 1 acre or 2 acres of land, naturally by force of circumstances the villages with small land will be driven to co-operative farming. He may try for one or two years to till his one or two acres of land but when he finds that the yield is small and he finds that there are certain other neighbours who are doing farming work on a co-operative basis and reaping good results out of it, naturally he will also think that why not he also join the co-operative farming system. Thus indirectly we help in solving another problem, i.e., consolidation of land holdings. By the method of legislation we have found that consolidation of land holdings has not progressed as rapidly as we would like and therefore if we try this method of giving land to every landless worker and persuading him that co-operative farming is very beneficial, I am very confident that in the near future it will be adopted by all landless workers. Sir, some time back the experiment of co-operative farming was tried in U.P. and it failed. The method of co-operative farming adopted in U.P. was defective and the cause of failure was the defective organisation of co-operative farming. There is nothing fundamentally wrong in co-operative farming. It can be very successful. Simply to point out the case of U.P. where in a few farms it was not successful is not the right method of approach. If by co-operative farming we mean that the land is pooled together and everybody thinks that the other man will till it and every peasant thinks that the other man will harvest it and the other man will manure it, naturally it will not be successful. We remember the old story of Birbal that he wanted everybody to put a bucket of milk and everybody thought that the other man was going to put a bucket of milk so why not put water into it and in the morning it was all full of water. Similarly in co-operative farming, if everybody thinks that the other man will do the work, naturally it will fail. What we mean is a proper type of

co-operative farming in which everybody does the work and is a paid worker. The farm will be managed by a managing committee selected by all the farmers who join the co-operative society and if the farm is managed just like an industrial concern where every worker gets his wages—here in this co-operative farming everybody who works will naturally get wages or a share in the produce or some such benefit—then that type of co-operative farming can be very successful. I know the Five Year Plan has expressed a pious wish that co-operative farming may become popular in the country. Expression of a pious wish will not be sufficient. What active steps have been taken by the Planning Commission and the Minister for Planning to introduce and implement that desire of co-operative farming?

Sir, the agricultural yield in our country is very low. The cause of it is fragmentation of land. We have got to reconcile these two opposite desires in our peasantry. One is ownership of land; everybody must have some land. On the other side of it we want bigger and greater production. These two can only be combined through the method of co-operative farming. That is the solution and in this Resolution the Central Government is asked to recommend to the States to bring in land reform legislations. We don't say a particular type of land reform legislation. We want not only the abolition of big landlords, not only the abolition of the big patedars, not only the distribution of land among the tillers of the soil but co-operative farming also.

Sir, if immediate steps are not taken and if this matter is delayed, it is possible that the public may take direct action. Before such a step is taken, by the people, it is very essential that State Legislatures enact laws and stop this tendency of disobeying laws. In Hyderabad, in certain parts of Telangana, it is a *de facto* thing that the land of big patedars had been occupied by the tillers of the soil, forcibly.

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

That is not a good thing and we do not want such things to happen. But such things can only be combated if we quickly bring in the necessary legislation. We should quickly enact laws and take the land from the big patedars and give it to the small landless workers so that everybody gets land. Acharya Vinoba Bhawe has approached this very important problem from a different angle. He has asked for voluntary distribution of the land, for voluntary giving away of some land by the big patedars. But, Sir, in the absence of legislation, even the land that has been donated has not been distributed among the landless workers. Prof. Ranga described yesterday how land that is being reclaimed can be distributed among the landless workers. Sir, I would suggest that with a time-limit fixed, the Government should consider this Resolution favourably and accept it.

Thank you.

SHRI T. R. DEOGIRIKAR (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, though I generally agree with the mover of this Resolution, that land reform legislation should be speeded up in the States, I am not in favour of any indecent haste in passing such legislation. I think the Central Government should lay down a policy for the guidance of the States in matters like this. The problem of land reform is so vast and so complicated that a wrong step would bring about disaster in our economy which is old, dilapidated, poor and worn-out. There is no wonder, therefore, that even the All-India Congress Committee, in spite of its sincerity and ardour is not yet in a position to come to a decision. Curiously enough, in all the writings and speeches of Mahatma Gandhi there is very little reference to this most important problem, except the few observations which were read out by my hon. friend some time back.

The object of land reform, according to me, is in the first place, the equitable distribution of land, with the object of removing unemployment;

secondly, the improvement of the land, its size, its structure, its fertility, its yield. Better seeds, more manure, water supply, contour bunding, leveling of land and mechanical devices, would certainly bring in more yield. In some places there are water-logged areas. These areas should be cleared of the water. In other places we find there is soil erosion and in still others plant diseases. They also ought to be eradicated. Therefore, before fighting for land reform, let us try to increase the produce from the land as much as possible. No land reform should be undertaken which will have adverse effect on the total production or yield from the land.

Coming to the vital question of redistribution of land, I would like to state that no ceiling should be fixed unless other factors are taken into consideration. The cultivated land in our country is 26 crore acres. The population that is wedded to agriculture is 70 per cent. of the total population or about 26 crores. There is, therefore, one acre of land available to an agriculturist, on an average. The double cropped area is only 13 per cent. or 3 crores and 60 lakh acres. Thus the average does not change much even with the addition of this double cropped area. This is the most miserable picture of our agricultural land. Sir, on an average, a family consists of five persons and the average holding in India is also 5 acres. This average is not the same in all parts of the country. In Bombay, for instance, the average is 11.7 acres. In the Punjab it is 10 acres and in certain parts of Madras, Bihar and West Bengal, the average is much below 2 acres. The average yield of food-grains per acre is 5 maunds, which is probably the lowest in the world. But this average also changes from State to State and from land to land. If the lands are irrigated and if the soil is rich, then the 5 acres of land will be sufficient to maintain a family. But if the land is not so fortunate, then even with 30 acres it will be difficult to keep the family going. I have given this background only to show how difficult it is to apply the same

principle everywhere, for fixing a ceiling. If at all a ceiling is to be fixed, I have two methods for consideration. In this connection I beg to suggest that the average national income should be the criterion or the basis of which this ceiling should be fixed. Sir, we know the average *per capita* income in India is Rs. 23 or I may say it is Rs. 115 per family of five persons. My suggestion, therefore, is that the ceiling should be so fixed as to ensure Rs. 1,380 per year per family unit. This should be the economic unit. According to this calculation, about 30 acres of non-irrigated land would be the ceiling.

To arrive at this ceiling, I have another method to suggest. The targeted consumption *per capita* in India is 7 maunds. For a family of five persons it will be 35 maunds. The expenditure for items other than food is 60 per cent. or one-and-a-half times the expenditure on food. This comes to 88 maunds and this is too little and the family will have only a marginal living. I, therefore, suggest that an additional 35 maunds should be allotted to the family to overcome unforeseen calamities like scarcity, flood, drought, pests and the like. Thus, in terms of maunds, it comes to 125 maunds, or 25 acres of non-irrigated land which should be the ceiling. From both these calculations, the ceiling comes to 25-30 acres. I have not taken other factors into consideration, such as fodder, etc., while suggesting this ceiling. I have not also given the ceiling so far as irrigated lands are concerned and so far as mixed lands are concerned. We can make some sort of arrangements if the lands are irrigated or if the lands are mixed. This is as regards ceiling.

There is another aspect of this question. From the facts given just now it will be seen that out of five persons, four are in a miserable plight. We may distribute the land in any way we like but let it be remembered that land alone will not be able to solve the problem of millions of our countrymen; that problem can

only be solved if we give supplementary work to the agriculturists in the rural areas. Let us, therefore, concentrate on that. For myself, I do not see any prospect of solving this problem in the near future. No doubt, with the progress of the Five Year Plan, there will be some improvement but I cannot assess what the proportion of that improvement will be.

In the meanwhile, I suggest, as an immediate measure, that Government should take into possession all holdings above 50 acres by giving reasonable compensation and by establishing village-wise co-operative ownership of such lands. It will certainly relieve the pressure of unemployment for the time being. Acharya Vinoba Bhave is working along those lines and our heads bow before him. His appeal is to the heart, to the human instincts and to the charitable disposition of man. I am certain he will give work and land to the workless and the landless. Even if there is excessive land in some parts of the country, there is shortage of land in other parts, looking to the population of those areas. In Travancore-Cochin, the proportion of landless labour is 700 per thousand and the pressure of population is 1,100 per square mile. In such areas we have no other alternative except to start industries, small, medium and big.

In the end, I would request the land reformers not to press for such measures as will ultimately result in adding to the number of the unemployed. We must work out our economy in such a way as to give work to the workless, land to the landless, always keeping in sight the all round standard which we are aiming at. Sir, I have done.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, to my mind, this Resolution is as innocent and as mild as anyone could possibly have made it and it certainly is quite unlike my friend who has moved it. The only exception that could possibly be taken to this Resolution will be that it implies a reflection on the State

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

Governments for delaying land reforms. As a matter of fact, the wording of this Resolution does not even imply that reflection. It only lays a particular emphasis on a certain problem facing this country; they may be doing certain things but we always feel that greater importance might be attached to a particular problem. So far as the Resolution is concerned, I do not think there is any reflection being cast on any of the State Governments but if it is taken to cast any reflection, I think it is not very far wrong to say that land reforms have been over-delayed in most of the States. As a matter of fact, I do not even know what these land reforms are. I have cared to study the land reforms that are being implemented or those that have been thought of by the different State Governments. They mean nothing excepting the abolition of the middlemen, the zamindar or the jagirdar. I doubt if anything much has been done beyond that. My complaint is that there has been no planning on this most vital problem which faces the country; except one or two problems, there is hardly any problem which requires greater attention and which demands our careful consideration than the problem of land reforms but I feel that there is hardly any plan at the all-India level. There is almost a hotch-potch going on in the different States, the different States doing different things. It is quite true that there will be special problems to be faced by the State Governments according to the local and regional conditions; it is true also that even in a particular State particular areas require particular treatment—that is a matter of detail—but so far as the important aspects of land reforms are concerned, they should certainly be tackled on an all-India level and all the important aspects of this problem should be examined, of course, in consultation with the States and a definite directive should be given to the States in this matter. This is a matter of very vital importance which affects millions and there are many points on which we may have to take a sort of

common decision. My suggestion, therefore, is that if we are to be effective, we must examine all the important aspects of this question on an all-India level; we must consult the States, discuss the matter with their representatives and then fix up a programme about the implementation of those agreed points. As I have already submitted, so far as the ceiling is concerned, it may have to be different in different States but have we come to the conclusion that we must have a ceiling? Have we come to the conclusion that we must have a sort of floor? Have we come to the conclusion that there should be land distribution on this basis? Have we come to the conclusion that there should be a co-operative basis in the ownership of land?

And if we have come to these conclusions what is our programme of implementation, how are we going to proceed in this matter? These are the most important problems which must be taken on an all-India basis.

Much has been said about compensation. There are certain people who are of the view that no compensation should be paid. There are others who think that it would be just contrary to the Constitution, the spirit in which we are working, the ideals and the principles which we have adopted. Well, Sir, my approach to this problem is very different. I think the question of compensation does not very much arise in this matter of land which certainly is national property. There is no question of nationalising the land; land is certainly a national property but I do not belong to that class who may go, with any hatred or malice, against the zamindar or the jagirdar. My approach to the zamindar or the jagirdar is that we must rehabilitate those people. They are as good citizens as any other citizen is. We must see their background. We must know their requirements. We know how they can be adjusted and then we have got to adjust them in the social life of our great country. As a matter of fact, Sir, I think these land

reforms will do greater good to the jagirdar than to anybody else. He is being taken out from a stagnant pool and he is being brought into a spring of life, into a stream of life and in bringing him to this system of life we will have to give him certain help. We will have to adjust matters and we will have to lend our assistance so that he adapts himself to the new conditions. Nothing beyond that can be claimed by anybody in this matter. But on the contrary, what you are doing is this. You are giving him just a little compensation and the result is, he will continue to live the same sort of life. He will not feel the incentive of going to a different type of life with the little compensation that he is getting. We want him to be an honourable citizen. In this connection nothing can be said more than what was told by the Maharajah of Jodhpur at the time of elections to the jagirdars and clerks by way of advice and this is what he said about himself also: "Let us rise to the level of the common man." I was very much impressed by this phrase and by the ideology, by the background by which he was inspired to say "Let us rise to the level of the common man." We must help our friends, the jagirdars, to rise to that level, to come to that active system of life, to adjust them, to give them help, to give them all assistance and to see that they are rehabilitated most honourably as honourable citizens of this country.

Now, Sir, in this connection I submit that very little has been done. Even these jagirdars who are being given compensation, who are being allowed to carry on as Khetihars are suffering under uncertainties. They do not know where they exactly stand. I was only recently reading a letter from a friend of mine—to show the uncertain conditions in which he found himself—who was just thinking of seeking some service somewhere because he did not know whether any ceilings were going to be fixed. He did not know whether he would be allowed to run a farm and maintain it himself or not. I do not know whether the Government has made up its

mind or not. At least, it should unfold its mind in the matter of fixation of ceilings and end this uncertainty. It is only this uncertainty which is responsible for all these evictions. Otherwise there would have been no evictions. Why should there be such evictions if, for example, every man knew that he could not have more than 200 acres of land under his own cultivation? In the absence of certain information thousands and thousands of people have been thrown out of lands. For this I simply accuse the Government of India; it is due to their lack of planning and the absence of clear thought. I do not know whether they know their own mind. At least they have not unfolded their mind about it. It is much better in the interests of everybody concerned that we know what we are going to do.

There has been a lot of talk about socialisation. Sir, it is my feeling that it is easy to talk about socialisation, and knowing our people as I do, I feel that until and unless you use steam-roller methods it would be absolutely difficult to bring about socialisation. Socialisation may be a very good deal. We may try to impart this idea to our people if we are to adopt this, but as a first step what I would suggest with regard to the new lands which are being brought under cultivation is this. You have big river valley projects. You have other minor irrigation schemes almost in each and every State. So quite a lot of fresh land is being brought under cultivation.

I would suggest that you make it almost incumbent on each State that in each district, rather in each tehsil they must reserve a particular area where you can give that land only on the basis that cultivation would be done on co-operative basis or on collective basis. Even in a place like the U.S.S.R., where they have this collective farming, in this idea of collective farming which is being doled out here, they found extreme difficulty. They had to face stiff resistance, and the resistance I can tell you in this

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]
country would be much more tremendous. Even if the methods which we may use may be comparatively milder it would be extremely difficult. But certainly you can educate the people. Certainly if in every tehsil, in every district you have quite a number of pieces of land brought under collective farming or co-operative farming where you can bring all the educated unemployed people and put them there, give them all sorts of facilities, plan out things for them, then you will be able to show by comparison what can be to the best interests of the people of that State.

I do not believe in hasty legislation, that is true. But what have you done so far? The real problems have not been tackled at all, except the elimination of the middle man. As a matter of fact, if you go to the villages you will find we have done one good thing definitely which is giving the agriculturists a moral stature. I do not deny that. I am not saying and I do not feel that the Congress Government is not earnest about it. I definitely think that the people, at least in the Centre, are earnest and sincere about it, but there is not the least doubt that they have not been able to do much. What have we done except that we have given a sort of moral stature to the agriculturists? Of course, that is a very important factor. It is a very important psychological factor that we have given by eliminating the jagirdar, by taking him away we have given a moral stature to the agriculturist. He feels that there is nobody above him, that he is as good a citizen as anybody else would be. That is very important, but so far as the material advantages are concerned, very little has been passed on to the agriculturist. The agriculturist, of course, if not more than before, suffers equally under the present system and the present regime. You possibly have no idea of the corrupt revenue administration you have got at the low level. The revenue administration at the higher level is not so corrupt, but it is certainly irresponsible and inefficient, but the

revenue administration at the low level, at the patwari level, is thoroughly corrupt and now he has taken the role of the jagirdars and until and unless you can do something about your administrative machinery and until and unless you take other steps which are very necessary about land reforms and which are vital and more important, these land reforms will be absolutely ineffective so far as the agriculturist and the peasant are concerned, and I wish that all these matters should be taken up and considered. There should be a definite plan on an all-India basis which the States might implement. They can go into the details varying according to the regional conditions and provide for them, but the all-important aspect, the common aspects must be considered and there must be a clear lead given to the country and everybody must know where he stands.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahesh Saran, you may begin in the afternoon.

The House stands adjourned and will meet again at 2-30.

The House 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 MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was really very agreeably surprised to find this Resolution moved by my hon. colleague, Mr. Sundarayya, because from the little that I have read about the views of his party regarding the Five Year Plan I have a feeling that it was always criticising and condemning it and thinking that it would achieve nothing. I am really very glad that he feels that a Resolution like this is necessary and that the Five Year Plan will be able to achieve a lot. I therefore congratulate him and I feel that

if he and his party change their attitude and help in the different schemes—the Community Projects, National Extension Schemes, Bhoodan Yajna and things like that—it will be very, very helpful and that the country will progress fast with their co-operation.

Now, Sir, this land question has been before the Congress and later before the Congress Government for a very long time. As a matter of fact, in the beginning all our agitations were in the hands of a few educated persons and in the Congress meetings—open sessions and the A.-I.C.C.—we used to pass pious resolutions. It was only when Mahatma Gandhi came in that the whole tenor changed and we found that the centre of gravity shifted from the educated classes to the uneducated people. Sir, we find that the land reform movement was started as far back as 1917 when Mahatma Gandhi launched the satyagraha movement in Champaran and later in Kaira in Gujerat in the same year. Then again we find that on February 11, 1918, a conference of kisan representatives was held at Allahabad for the first time and it was decided to start Kisan Sabhas and Shri Purushottamdas Tandon was elected its President. Through the efforts of Congressmen, 700 units of Kisan Sabhas were organised. This was the first time that the Congress thought of the kisans and the land question. In the same year at the Congress Session at Delhi a special provision was made for kisan representation at the Congress and 700 kisan delegates attended the Congress. Then, after the first world war, the Congress organisation under the inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi moved towards the villages and Congressmen championed the struggles of the kisans for the redress of their immediate grievances. The first kisan movement was witnessed in 1919-1920 in Avadh and our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, took up its leadership. In the non-co-operation movement, in 1921 the kisans joined Congress for the first time and I think that the success of the movement was because a large

number of kisan friends joined the movement. The Congress thenceforward realised that it must not only win freedom from foreign yoke but also from the exploitation of Indian landlords and capitalists. In fact, the problem of Indian freedom was directly linked up with the question of the emancipation of the peasantry. The demand for national freedom had to be integrated with the task of ending peasant exploitation. In later years the Congress passed resolutions after resolutions for the improvement of the lot of the kisans. From the time the Congress took up the reins in its hands it has tried to remove the intermediaries. The Rajahs and zamindars have gone and legislation in favour of kisans has been passed in most of the States.

Sir, I think the future generation of India will marvel at the great amount of land reform legislations introduced in India within a few years of independence. The continuous attention and alertness which have been exhibited by the different State Governments on the question of land reforms in spite of their numerous preoccupations is something amazing. The numerous reports and first-class studies on the land question which have tremendously enriched our agrarian literature under the inspiration of the Congress regime is something which the hon. the mover of the Resolution under discussion should study. Of course, quite a good idea can be had from the book 'Land Reforms in India' published by the A.-I.C.C., which has been referred to by another hon. friend of mine. He also quoted from it.

Now, the question is whether this Resolution is necessary, whether the Government is not vigilant, whether the Government is not taking all possible steps in connection with land reforms. If it had not been, if the Government was not anxious, if it was sleeping, then it was necessary to move a Resolution like this. I will quote a few passages and it will show how the Congress and the Congress

[Shri Mahesh Saran.]

Government are trying their utmost to bring in the land reforms as soon as possible. Of course, there are difficulties. As you know, Sir, sometimes when legislations are passed they are upset by the different courts and then there is delay. But within this short period, it is really amazing that we have been able to achieve so much.

As I was saying, the All-India Congress Committee met at Bangalore on July 13, 14 and 15, 1951, to which Shri Jawaharlal Nehru submitted a report as "a Prime Minister drawing his mandate from the Congress". Shri Nehru said: "From the social point of view, the biggest achievement has been the legislation in many States for the abolition of the zamindari system. Unfortunately, this was held up by an interpretation of the Constitution in the Courts and it became necessary to amend the Constitution to get over these difficulties. I trust that progress in this respect will now be rapid and there will be no further impediments." Shri Nehru said later in his Report: "As agriculture is the principal occupation of the great majority of our people, it must be the first concern of the State. The abolition of the zamindari system has been the first reform and this must be expedited. But it must be remembered that this by itself is no solution of the problem. Even before this abolition a very large proportion of land was self-cultivated. An addition to it, without any further reforms, will not help much. The small subsistence farm makes progress difficult. We have to think, therefore, and think soon, of other and further steps. There should be a diversion of a part of the agricultural population to other occupations."

Then the 57th Session of the Congress met at Delhi on October 18 and 19, 1951, and the Economic Programme Resolution of the Congress approved the Election Manifesto adopted by the Bangalore Session of A.-I.C.C. Referring to the land question, the Resolution said: "Land is the base of India's economy. The agrarian system should

be so organised that the fruits of labour are enjoyed by those who toil and land is worked as a source of wealth for the community. Some measures of land reform, notably the abolition of the zamindari and jagirdari system, protection of tenant cultivators, regulation of rents, the imposition of a ceiling on future acquisition of land and the fixation of minimum wages for agricultural workers have already been given effect to in many States. These should be extended and completed as speedily as possible, so that their full benefit reaches the masses."

Then, Sir, the All-India Congress Committee met at Calcutta on the 22nd and 23rd March 1952 to take stock of the situation and lay down the future line of action. The main resolution adopted by the Committee gave the following advice with regard to making the next advance in the agrarian sector:—

"While the nation must advance on all fronts, the immediate task is to complete the abolition of zamindari, jagirdari and like systems of land tenure, and thus further the agrarian revolution in India. The growth of productive industry must proceed side by side with this agrarian change and the realisation of the objective of full employment."

My submission is that all the time the mind of the Congress Government is fixed on this important problem which affects the masses and which affects the largest number of people in India. Now, Sir, I would submit that one of my hon. colleagues has referred to the portion which says that the pace of progress must further be quickened, more especially in regard to land reform and in the industrial field. Therefore, what I submit is that Government are very conscious of the fact that this should be so and their first concern, as I said, is towards land reform, and in these circumstances I feel that it is not necessary that a resolution like this should be passed. Well, it would have been quite proper if we had found that the Government

was sleeping over the matter, was doing nothing, was inactive or was dilatory. But, on the other hand, the Government is constantly at it and trying all it can to get progress made in this direction.

Now, Sir, those people who have been to different parts of the country and who have seen some of the work of the Planning Commission, the Community Projects and others, will realise what a great change has come over India. It has not yet spread everywhere, but wherever the project schemes are you do find the change—I went to Bastar recently—I saw the community project there, it is really wonderful—a great awakening has come over and people have been taught to depend upon themselves and to give voluntary labour to the schemes and make them a success. Land alone will not solve the problem. Land is, of course, necessary—there is no doubt about it—but land alone will not help. There are so many things connected with land. How to cultivate the land, how to get the manure, how to sell the produce and things of that sort have to be thought out and they are as essential as land. I sometimes feel that if we give land to these poor tenants, it will be a waste. They will be able to do nothing because they are so poor, they have no money, they have nothing to fall back upon. Therefore, they would require the help of the Government in providing manure, in providing them with bullocks, in providing them with ploughs and other things. And then, later on they would also require the help of the Government to get all the grain together and to sell it at a good price. All this is done in some of the community projects that I have visited and it has given a new zest to the people. I was surprised how those people—mostly they were scheduled castes and scheduled tribes—took to it very readily and felt happy about it. They managed their own affairs. There was not that old feeling of despondency—a feeling that they could never get out of the clutches of the money-lenders, a feeling that all the produce

will go to the zamindars. All that feeling has gone and there I found a new hope (*Time bell rings.*) and a new feeling that things were getting better. My submission, therefore, is that in these circumstances it is not necessary that this Resolution should be passed.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I speak in support of the Resolution. But I do not want to take much time of the House to dilate upon the various aspects of land reforms. Here the question is whether the Government of India will advise the State Governments to move fast to bring about essential land reform with a view to making the Five Year Plan a success. The second Five Year Plan, I understand, is intended for the purpose of speedier industrialisation of our country. For this purpose, Sir, any Government of any country whichever it might be which undertakes the task of industrialising the country will naturally have to depend on its own home markets. But what is the condition of our home market? It is a widely known fact, a historical fact, that our country is the most impoverished country in the world, impoverished due mainly to two important factors: firstly, exploitation by foreign capital, known as British capital; and secondly, exploitation of the peasantry by the landlords. When we talk about the home market, naturally we mean by it our own people, the peasantry who purchase the biggest amount of consumer goods. It is these people, the peasantry, who are today being impoverished, who cannot and who are not in a position due to that fact to purchase the necessary goods which would sustain their life. That is why we are demanding that land reform should be taken up immediately, as early as possible, without any hesitation, and that must be in the interests of industrialising the country as well as in the interests of increasing the purchasing power of the people. That is why we urge that the Government should immediately, without any hesitation, without any procrastination advise the

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]
State Governments to take necessary action.

Sir, the condition of our peasants, who play the main role of our home market, is very, very depressing. The majority of the peasants have no land of their own; nor are they people who will be able to eke out their living in other ways. I do not want to repeat certain cogent facts, at the same time indisputable facts, the hon. mover of the Resolution has very ably marshalled before this House. Yet there are certain points which I would like to mention. Innumerable cases of evictions and ejectments have been taking place, as though it has become the order of the day. Some hon. Members have opposed this Resolution as unwanted. Certain other hon. Members suggested socialisation or collectivization of land, etc. These friends who presume to be the supporters of land reform, or ceiling, and all that, in one way or the other, attempt to alienate attention from this important issue that immediate land reform has become the urgent social and economic necessity of the day. That is the real issue today. Everybody has said that he is aware of the fact that eviction of tenants is going on on a mass scale all over the country. Everywhere, at the same time, our Ministers make tall claims that they have been creating heaven for our peasants through their land reforms and abolition of zamindari and all such things. Sir, I should say that these claims are nothing but a hoax, because from my own experience, from the experience of Travancore-Cochin State, I can say that.

The other day when the hon. the Home Minister, Dr. Katju, was replying to the debate on the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, he referred to one Bill which is supposed to have been introduced in the Travancore-Cochin Assembly. That Bill is now in circulation, Sir, for eliciting public opinion. He said that it was very progressive; it was intended to put a ceiling on holdings of land, according

to the principles laid down by the Congress. But, in fact, Sir, that Bill in no way touches the actual problem. The land owners are kept intact and their rights over the land—the “Janmi” rights, that is the landlord’s rights—are in no way impinged by that Bill. All that the Bill does is to try to put a limit upon the tenancy holdings. Today, the tenants may cultivate forty, fifty, or hundred acres of land, as the case may be, under lease. Now, the Travancore-Cochin Government want to put a ceiling on that—not a ceiling on the holdings or on the rights of the zamindars, or the landlords. That right is kept intact. The Bill merely does this: a tenant is asked not to cultivate over certain limits as prescribed therein. Where he cultivates more land, he must surrender that excess land to the prescribed authority, so that the authority may distribute that land to the landless or other tenants. That is not the sort of reform that we demand. What we demand is that a tenant or a peasant should be allowed to enjoy what he creates out of his sweat and labour. Now, what he creates on the land by way of cultivation is being knocked off in the name of rent by a landlord who has never seen that plot of land. The landlord might never have touched a plough in his life. Such an absentee landlord, or a landlord who will never care to look at his land or fields, is receiving the right of ownership. That sort of land ownership, that sort of exploitation is a factor which very much decreases the purchasing capacity of the peasant. That is a curse on our society. That is why in order to make our industrialisation speedily successful, our people must be redeemed from the yoke of feudal landlordism in order to enable them to purchase what we create here, in our consumer industries. Then our industries will be in a position to develop very soon. I would like to ask the Government whether they mainly look to the foreign markets for their speedy industrialisation, or whether they look to their own home market. If they want to rely on the home market, for the real success of the

industrialisation of the country, according to the second Five Year Plan, then they should immediately take up the essential land reform and advise the State Governments to take action in that direction.

Secondly, Sir, with regard to eviction. Recently I had been to Bihar, in the month of May last. We had been invited to North Monghyr in East Bihar to study the situation arising out of a big movement of evictions of peasants from the land they cultivate. We visited 22 villages there, for example, the villages of Rajakpur, Tola Rajakpur, Nabakotti, Bihapur (Thana Bihapur), Mansi, Nangachia, Bhavanipur, Bochahi, etc. We found there tenants being evicted from their lands. I will cite one or two instances in this connection. In Rajakpur there were 140 families who used to cultivate 560 bighas of land legally owned by a zamindar. Now, all those peasants were evicted from those 560 bighas of land which they were cultivating. They have now nothing to fall back upon. They do not know how to earn their livelihood or get a square meal a day for themselves, let alone any other necessities for them. So also in other villages the same movement of evicting peasants is going on. It is going on on a mass scale. How can the industrialists or the Government rely upon such peasants who lost the sources of income for their market? That is why we say that the Government should take the necessary steps to stop all such evictions, and to restore those who have been evicted from their lands to their previous position.

Now, Sir, so much is said about ceiling. The ceiling must be that no landlord or janmi should have any rights over land beyond the fixed limit, over a limited acreage of land. The Government should see that the rent system is abolished and the peasants are given the right to cultivate their land and to enjoy what they produce. That is the land reform that we need today. Then and then alone shall we be able to help our industries and help the people of this country.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I did not want to take part in this debate. But having heard hon. Members on either side, I thought I could contribute a little to this important debate.

Sir, the contemplated land reforms legislation finds a place in the Five Year Plan. We had heard about this on various occasions during the sessions of the All-India Congress Committee at various places. Sir, in my opinion, what is urgently needed for our country is not the land reforms legislation but land management legislation. Sir, we find that provision has been made in the Five Year Plan both for the land management legislation as also the land reforms legislation. But it is very unfortunate that as much stress as is required to be laid upon land management legislation has not been laid, whereas much stress is laid upon the land reforms legislation. Sir, we find that zamindaris and jagirdaris are abolished. Then we have these big landholders, these small and medium-sized landholders, then we have, what is called, tenants-at-will, and then we have these landless workers. I need not say anything about zamindaris because zamindaris are completely abolished, and I am very glad about it. If zamindaris are not abolished in any particular State in India; it is high time, Sir, that the Government should intervene and see that those zamindaris are once for all abolished. There should be no middleman in between the tiller and the Government.

Sir, coming to the large-sized land holdings. I wish to say a few words about them. After all, we find that the percentage of holdings—I can give figures only for the Madras State—which pay a land revenue of over Rs. 250 is .2 only, and the percentage of those paying a land revenue of over Rs. 100 is .6. And the percentage of the area occupied by those landholders who pay over Rs. 250 as land tax is only 6.9. Sir, I fully agree with the previous speakers that such of those landlords as do not cultivate their lands directly—it is high time that the Government should see to it

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.]

that they—should be divested of their excessive property and their property distributed to the persons who do not own lands. But the question whether the ceiling should be 30 acres or 50 acres or anything above is a question 3 P.M. that is very important now.

Take, for instance, America. The normal average holding of an agriculturist in America is about 168 acres. In Denmark it is 40 acres. America where the percentage of the agriculturists in the population is only twenty is not only able to feed itself but is able to export food to outside countries, whereas in our country where the percentage of the agriculturists is about eighty, we are not able to feed ourselves and in many places even the agriculturists, even the very growers, are starving. That is the state of affairs in our country. That is why I say that what should be the ceiling, whether it should be thirty acres or fifty acres or two hundred and fifty acres, is not an urgent problem, because the percentage of such big holdings is very small. Supposing all the land in excess of the maximum that is fixed is taken away and distributed among the landless poor, how many thousands of agriculturists are going to be benefited? What will be the percentage of the landless workers who will be benefited? It will be negligible. We can think of it leisurely.

Now I come to the small and middle-sized land-holders. It is here that I want that the Government should wake up and introduce some sort of legislation. In Madras State the percentage of landholders who hold two acres and below is about 82. Their holdings are very uneconomic. What the Five Year Plan contemplates is to group these small holders together or run them on co-operative lines. For this, co-operative societies will have to be formed, and consolidation of holdings will have to be brought about. Government has so far done nothing to see that such co-operative societies are established all over the country. I find that at any rate in Madras State not much thought is being given to this aspect of land legislation. So far as the consolidation

of holdings on co-operative principles is concerned, I find that response is not at all good either from the officials or from the landholders who hold these small holdings. They are not prepared to group themselves, have a sort of joint cultivation and distribute the yield among the members after the crops are harvested. The Five Year Plan says that this is one of the ways to solve the problem of these uneconomic holdings.

Then, Sir, we have the cultivable wastelands which, according to the figures given by some hon. Member last week, are enormous. I was told, if I remember aright, that the proportion of cultivable wasteland to the land that is now being cultivated is two to one. Sir, in my own district, with a view to rehabilitating ex-Servicemen, an area of about 4,000 acres was cleared by using the most modern machinery for this purpose, like tractors, bulldozers, etc. Fine cultivable land to the extent of 4,000 acres in a very fertile area was cleared for the purpose of rehabilitating ex-Servicemen. Unfortunately the ex-Servicemen could not be rehabilitated there because probably they were not willing to be settled on land. Then it was decided that it should be given to the landless poor, but after some time it was decided that it should be given to the political sufferers. The decision was that the political sufferers should get the first preference, the ex-Servicemen the second preference and the landless poor the last preference. As a result of it, for the last seven years, out of these 4,000 acres originally intended for ex-Servicemen, nearly 3,000 acres has been lying fallow. That is the result of the changing policies of the Government. Then, Sir, I ultimately wanted to take advantage of it and tried to organise a co-operative society with a view to settling landless labourers thereby asking them to pay a share capital of Re. 1 each and by providing them with huts for the time being in order to enable them to settle there, but correspondence on the subject is still pending with the Government for nearly a year and a half. The Society has been organised but unfortunately the

Society has not been given possession of the land. Part of the area is in one taluk and the other part in another taluk and there is no co-ordination between the two tehsildars. As a result, the whole thing has been delayed for about one and a half years now. If that is the rate at which the Government is moving, what interest can they expect non-officials to take in the settlement of the landless workers on land? I dare say that the co-operative society which we tried to organise could easily have absorbed about 400 to 500 landless workers. Sir, I am told that there are so many areas in the country where land has been cleared for the purpose of rehabilitating ex-Servicemen. I am not worried about rehabilitating ex-Servicemen. I am only worried about seeing that this land—the beautiful land which has been cleared and in which anything and everything can be grown—is not allowed to lie fallow. That is the state of affairs in our country. I hope that the Government of India will see to it that something is done in this respect.

Then I come to the tenants at will. We have only to read the opinion of a Committee constituted by the Congress Government at Madras. The report is very important and deserves consideration. This is an extract from the Subramanyam Committee Report which has been quoted in the book "Land Reforms in India":

"On the question of the rights of tenants in the ryotwari areas, the Committee was of the opinion that the landlord and tenant system may be allowed to continue, subject to the regulation of the system in respect of fair rents, security of tenure, compensation for improvements, grounds for eviction and other related matters. There is no need to confer occupancy right on tenants in ryotwari areas. In future all leases should be for a minimum period of five years. In the case of virgin land which is to be reclaimed, or which has been newly reclaimed, however, the first lease should be for a minimum

period of ten years. The tenant should always have the option of terminating the lease by three months' notice expiring with a year of tenancy."

Then they conclude by recommending the following.

"The following alone should constitute proper grounds for the landlord terminating the lease during its currency:

- (1) Failure to pay rent within one month of the date stipulated in the lease-deed;
- (2) Commission of any act which is destructive or permanently injurious to the land;
- (3) Use of the land for any purpose other than agriculture;
- (4) Violation of any of the conditions of the lease-deed regarding the restrictions on the nature of the crop to be grown and similar conditions which are not repugnant to the statutory provisions governing tenancy;
- (5) Sub-letting of the land by the tenant;
- (6) The tenant being adjudged to be insolvent."

Then, Sir, dealing with the problem of redistribution of land and fixing a maximum size of holdings, the Committee recommended:

"There is no need to fix any maximum limit, *per se*, in the case of existing holdings, and expropriate the extents in excess of such maximum. In future no person should be allowed to acquire agricultural lands if he already has a holding carrying an assessment of Rs. 250, or so as to constitute a holding carrying more than Rs. 250 as assessment. In the case of joint families, separate allowance should be made for such branch of the joint family subject, however, to an over-all limit of a holding the assessment on which does not exceed Rs. 1,000."

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.]

Sir, this is the view of an important Committee, constituted by the Government of Madras. I shall only conclude by saying that it is only the land management legislation that is most important and that the Government should concentrate upon bringing together the small agriculturists who are holding small uneconomic holdings for purposes of joint cultivation. Unless this is done, I do not think that any land legislation will be of any use in our country.

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): Sir, the Resolution moved by the hon. Mr Sundarayya has succeeded in evoking a very interesting and a very useful discussion. I acknowledge this gladly. So far as the ideas, the intent and the spirit of the Resolution are concerned, basically there can be no disagreement but the Resolution poses questions of a type which cannot be answered by a simple 'yes' or a mere 'no'. It is not possible to accept this Resolution for the reason that a formal acceptance will create a very unfair position. Still I would like to explain later on and elucidate various questions and points that have been raised but I might, in fairness to the hon. the mover and those who have put forward amendments, state very briefly the reason why I am not prepared to accept the Resolution.

The operative part of that Resolution—I have got it before me—is that the Central Government should recommend to all State Governments that they should take immediate steps, etc. Now, if I accept the Resolution, the implication would be that the Central Government is not doing all this. This is contrary to facts. The hon. Mr. Mathur said that it will not be a reflection on the State Governments if we accept the Resolution. It is not the State Governments which are concerned in this part of the Resolution. It is the Central Government which is being asked to do something. The State Governments may not be

doing enough. I will come to that later on.

The amendments which have been moved make the position somewhat more difficult still. We are asked that these reforms should be completed on or before the 30th April 1957. I am one with all those Members who have pleaded for expediting the reforms but is it possible for any responsible Member of Government to agree to a proposition like this—that by the 30th April 1957 the entire range of reforms will have been accomplished and completed? The hon. Member here just now was telling us something about co-operative farming. That is just one illustration. There is land management, there is the question of joint village management—these are all integral parts of the land reform set-up that we have visualized. Is it possible to complete all that before 30th April 1957? There is the other amendment asking us to fix the floor. It is a very nice aspiration. The floor means a kind of standard holding, a minimum which will yield something in the nature of a decent living. Now, it will be a physical impossibility in the present circumstances of the country. Although, as I said, the approach and the intent are not such as we could object to, in the form in which the Resolution and the amendments stand, they render it impossible for us to accept them. I would like to say something more about the question of speeding up. What are we doing about it? The National Development Council—hon. Members know—is there and on that all the Chief Ministers of the States sit. That body considered the question of land reforms in December 1952 and October 1953. A very close discussion of the question of land reforms took place and conclusions were circulated to the States. The Food and Agriculture Ministry has written several letters to the States beginning with the one on the 19th August 1953, another in September 1953, another in April 1954 and another in May 1954. The Planning Commission has addressed several letters in May and July 1954 and in

these letters the urgency and the importance of the question have been brought home to the States. Apart from that, personal discussions occurred from time to time between us and the representatives of the States and we tried to see that action was taken quickly. Hon. Members will not forget that the keenest of all of us is the Prime Minister himself and he has made his keenness felt on every necessary occasion in a suitable form. So, to the main part of that Resolution—whether the Central Government is aware of its responsibilities, is conscious of its obligations and is trying to do its part—the answer is clear. Maybe that the results are not as satisfying as they should be. I may admit here that I am personally not quite satisfied with the results. They are not satisfactory in my eyes in respect of some areas and with regard to some particular directions, e.g., this co-operative farming. We have not been able to do as much as we should. There has been, as hon. Members have themselves tried to emphasize, the aspect of slowness of reform in certain areas but I am in contact with these areas and I know that in several cases there are special difficulties. All these difficulties are being overcome. These difficulties have in earlier stages related to legal and constitutional aspects. These difficulties concerned administrative aspects, administrative in the more specific and narrow sense of revenue administration which is so vital for the success of all these programmes and administration in general. There has been a great deal of strain on our administrative system and during these years, particularly when we had to grapple and cope with so many serious and great problems. Well, one can understand that things in this sphere may not have been done as well and as fast as we wanted them to be.

I have mentioned the special difficulties. I may mention the case of Hyderabad. Often, we had to discuss and examine numerous questions, difficult questions—economic, social and statistical—before we could come

to some conclusion as to what the ceiling should be. This question of agrarian reform is not a very simple matter. Agrarian reforms affect the village community which has a social fabric. Well, because reform will disturb the social fabric as it exists today, that is no reason why we should not go forward with necessary reforms. There may have to be dislocation. We have to face all that. But what we should be conscious of is the fact that it is a matter of complex social relations, of social forces, and those who are dealing with these situations may not be able simply to do at one step what they may be able to do more simply and more smoothly by taking two or three steps, and that is an important point. Let us view it as a process, or rather as a progressive process. Compare the conditions as they stood a few years back. Maybe that all the States have not come to the standard laid down by the Planning Commission. But have not they gone forward? Surely they have; and when we judge of an area we have to judge it not only in relation to what has been laid down by the Planning Commission but in relation to what was the position at an earlier time. After all, the Planning Commission's recommendations were finalised towards the end of 1952 and we are now judging the progress made in the country as a whole in the light of those recommendations. Particularly I think I should bring to the notice of hon. Members, when they are considering the important point of the Resolution, namely, the question of speeding up land reform, what has actually been done so far.

Sir, I need not be apologetic about what has been done or is being done. There is, as I said, slowness. There may not be sufficient progress somewhere. But what we in this country have been able to achieve in this short period is something immense, something striking. I need not quote foreign testimonials in that behalf. We ourselves know it, we feel it. But my attention has been drawn to a docu-

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]
ment—"Progress in Land Reforms"—a United Nations Document, and I shall just read out one sentence from it.

"The land reform measures recently enacted in India are quantitatively by far the most important of any surveyed in this report. They affect many millions of cultivators, and vast areas of land. They relate to a variety of different institutions."

Sir, this is the position. We have made remarkable progress in the matter of abolition of intermediaries. Nobody can deny that. And when we consider the magnitude of it, we find that it is almost half the area of the whole country that has been affected by this reform. We can imagine what will follow in the wake of it all, the administrative arrangements which it entails, the huge tasks that is all means. Well, it may be implementation has been lagging behind in some places. But the reason why I plead that we should not attempt to move too fast is this. There are these limitations. They will not disappear by themselves. We have to build up the administrative system, and particularly so in certain areas where there was nothing in existence before. Would it not be better to take one step and consolidate it? Otherwise, what is the use of it? What consolation is it to the people to be told that we have had so many laws passed? It is easy to do that. But if the implementation of it lags very far behind, that will create much more dissatisfaction. So I submit, it is not a matter of mere legislation. And to build up the necessary administrative structure and procedure takes some amount of time and the time that has passed so far is not, from that point of view, excessive.

As I was saying, we have done this much in the field of abolition of intermediaries. But some questions were raised by the hon. Member, the mover of the Resolution, regarding this very matter. He believes that there are certain defects and deficiencies in this respect. He gave instances of some

States where this has not been achieved.

He mentioned Rajasthan. Well, I believe developments there are also known to the hon. Member. A very small fraction of the work still remains to be done. His first objection was to the question of compensation.

Sir, I personally do not believe in the institution of private property to that extent that I would say that all property rights should remain intact, unaffected, and compensation should be paid for everything that is taken away from a citizen. That depends upon the evolution of ideas in a society. But it is true that as things stand today, our Constitution guarantees that where private property is taken over by the State, some compensation will be given to the owner, not necessarily at the market rate. This is the intention of the Constitution. If by any defective wording it has not been fully brought out, if it has led to difficulties, then the difficulties can be removed and I hope this will be done. But the point is that there has to be some compensation embodied in law, either in the form of principles or the quantum, and this need not be at the market rate at all. It will depend. In the case of these zamindars and jagirdars and their compensation, though the amounts look fairly big—Rs. 450 crores or so—when we relate it to what has been taken away, it will not really appear to be very large. And much of it has been paid to a very large number of small people. The man may be called a zamindar, but just by styling him zamindar, he does not really become big. I find that in the case of a very large majority the income is Rs. 60 per month or so, for the rental income amounts to a figure ranging from about Rs. 600 to Rs. 750. This class in U.P. will cover over Rs. 90 crores out of the total sum of about Rs. 130 crores which will be paid as compensation. This is, therefore, really a rehabilitation grant and not compensation in the true sense of the term.

I have some more information about compensation in the various

States. Compensation has ranged from three times the net income to fifteen times in Assam and ten times in some other States. It has been calculated in some areas that the proper and equitable proportion would be about thirty times.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAI VARGIYA (Madhya Bharat): Will the hon. Minister make a detailed statement about this because that will dispel much of the propaganda against compensation?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I do not believe that the hon. Member wants me to do it now.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAI VARGIYA: No, not now, but at some convenient time.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I will present the data before the House. Although we might have been quite happy if we could have avoided it reasonably, I do not think we should be very much haunted by this compensation. That matter is nearly over now so far as the jagirdars and zamindars are concerned.

SHRI S. N. MAHTHA (Bihar): Is it not a fact that this compensation is payable in a period of forty years and that it is also handed over in bonds?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Yes, Sir, that is an additional factor which makes the thing very much easier for the Government and a little difficult for people who have to receive it.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I pointed out about their rehabilitation and suggested that they should be rehabilitated. Now the hon. Minister almost seems to be saying that what is being paid is just for the rehabilitation of the people. It would be better if the hon. Minister could just clarify this point and satisfy us as to how the people are to be rehabilitated if the compensation is paid in forty instalments, and also how the people could be rehabilitated if the smaller people are paid less and the bigger people more.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, I will give the details later on. But my impression is that so far as the smaller people are concerned, the amounts are not spread over a long time. It is only where large amounts are involved that such a course is adopted. Ideas such as asking the people to put that money in public enterprises, etc., were also examined. The zamindars, whatever bad name they may have got in the past, have tried to adjust themselves to the new situation in a manner regarding which we should not have any complaint. They are part and parcel of this nation; we may have had to subject them to certain hardships in the interests of the larger good of the country, of a social order which we have conceived of but then they remain our brethren and, therefore, we have to deal with their problems with sympathy. We should not go on hammering this thing that they have cheated us or that they have got so much compensation. I do not hold any brief for them.

As regards Khudkasht, 40 lakh acres of land are held by 19 lakh zamindars in U.P. This does not present a spectacle of very large areas being appropriated out of the jagirs for personal cultivation. I may also point out that this has not led to any evictions because so far as the jagirdars are concerned, this land was not let out but was always under their direct cultivation. It has not led to those problems.

The hon. Member drew our attention to some defects in the implementation of the programme of abolition of intermediaries. I don't think those aspects to which he drew our attention are so formidable as to take away from the immensity of the work that has been done in this direction. Let us not belittle it. If there is a great thing done, if it moves forward in a big way, let us not belittle that ourselves. If something is done in a far off country and if we hear of it, then we laud it to the skies. We are very much worried and exercised about the land which may be resumed from the

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda]
 tenants, the right of a land-owner to let out land and to resume it. It was pointed out to me and I saw the Chinese law about this matter. That gives a considerable latitude in this respect. I do not want to quote it one way or the other; our problems are different and our conditions are different. We should take our work in its proper perspective. We are told that we have only abolished intermediaries, but the lot of the tiller has not improved, and he remains where he was. This is not so. It was pointed out by the hon. Member, Mr. Mathur, that his moral stature has risen. That is so. Also, the way is clear for his economic and social advance. In certain areas he has been immediately given all the rights and he becomes the owner and in certain others he has had to make some payments in order to get that position but his position is far superior to what it was before. In Punjab and PEPSU, the occupancy tenants have become full owners on a small payment. It is just one illustration. There is progress in respect of tenancy rights also.

There was some reference to the question of rents. Hon. Members said that rents were still high and yet Government claimed they had been reduced. I have got information with me which shows that in eight to ten States the rents have been reduced. In Bombay the rates have been reduced from 1/3 for unirrigated and 1/4 for irrigated to 1/6. Similarly, I have information about Madhya Pradesh also. The maximum rent was fixed at five times the fair assessment in 1953; it was not regulated before at all. In many places, there was no regulation at all. The maximum rent was reduced from 1/3 to 1/4 in Hyderabad.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: What about Tanjore? Could you give us the figures?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: There has been reduction; I will get the exact data.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: It is 60 per cent. to the landlord and 40 per cent. to the tenant. This is after reduction.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I know that; I do not say that this is quite fair or equitable and that it should not be further reduced.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: There has been recent legislation about Tanjore.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Regarding security, I believe I cannot say that the tenants have made their position secure all over the country. A considerable amount of work remains to be done in that direction. I hope, Sir, it will be done soon, but in a number of States steps have been taken for conferring occupancy rights and to have future leases for a far longer time, five to ten years. But this question of resumption of land from the tenants has been giving us trouble. There also provisions in the law are there to regulate that. Only those should resume who are *bona fide* agriculturists, who want it for cultivation, who have not got the minimum land themselves, and an effort is made to see that the tenant is also left with some land but the situation varies in different areas. There has been a lot of complaint about ejectments. Well, the news about ejectments has been disturbing. We have been trying to take action and we have succeeded in many places. In PEPSU something was done. In Punjab something is going to be done—an Ordinance to prevent ejectments and to restore those who were ejected. In Andhra, I believe, something similar is being done or has been done. So that, we are aware of this serious development and we are trying to take action about it.

I have just indicated the degree of progress that has been made. It is not that in all other directions nothing has been done. For example, in the matter of ceilings, two or three States have done something. We don't regard it as enough. In the matter of

land management we have to do much more. But in the face of what has actually happened to say that the Government is not serious about land reforms, does not attach importance to it, would be wrong, would not be fair. I do not want to waste the time of the House in an effort to prove that we attach importance to these land reforms. When I say "we" I mean we all and I know the mind of the Planning Commission, I know the mind of the Cabinet and I know the mind of the Prime Minister on this subject and we all regard land reforms as of crucial importance for the progress of this country. Something was said here that more than land reforms other things are important. May be. We should do that also. To expand the agriculturists' resources, manuring and bunding, all those are very necessary. Of course they don't dispense with reforms. I don't think there can be a greater incentive to more production than to make the man who tills the land secure in his position; he won't be disturbed; the fruits of his labour will not be taken away by anybody. Sir, this is the spirit in which we approach this problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I am sorry, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Is there any time limit, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Half an hour.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I have a lot of information to impart to the Members of the House. I will take another occasion, I will look to some suitable occasion in the future.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I would request, you Mr. Deputy Chairman, to allow him more time in your discretion so that we may get all the information—at least five minutes.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Five minutes won't help me.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: We are prepared to give as much time as you want.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is indulgent. Please go on.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I will briefly cover the ground. One charge particularly was that we have been hindering from here the progress in certain States, that in respect of Delhi we did not allow them to have ceilings, and Himachal Pradesh was mentioned in the same connection. Sir, the facts are that we, the Planning Commission and the Government, are committed to this policy regarding ceilings; I will explain it later on. How can we come in the way of any State. Delhi had not produced satisfactory proposals not enough to say "we will have ceilings." They had no data; they had no information; we wanted them to collect that. Regarding Himachal Pradesh they brought to us these proposals: 30 acres in Chamba and lands assessed to an annual land revenue of Rs. 125 in other areas. Well, that was there. Then afterwards they came with something else which made the ceiling variable, varying with the number of members in a family and the family also interpreted in a very vague and wide way. That was not a very reasonable position. So we said: "You go back to your earlier proposal." I am only explaining that we don't come in the way of any progress anywhere.

Now, Sir, I would rather come to a few very essential points about the policy that we pursue in this connection in the various areas and in respect of the various contentious points that arise. Before that one or two words about the question of time limit for example. I have explained that briefly, but I might just give this assurance that we are making an effort to get a phased programme in all the States and we will pursue that with vigour.

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

Regarding another point raised in the course of the debate, namely, the bringing about of uniformity in legislation, suggested as an amendment to the Resolution, and the giving of a lead in that direction, I may say, Sir, the lead is there, there is the Land Reforms Committee which is doing that and broad principles are laid down, but it is not possible to have rigid uniformity; it is not desirable either.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: As far as possible.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: As far as possible, yes. For example, regarding ceilings, can we say 30 acres everywhere? No. The quality of land varies. Certain principles have to be adopted. Conditions vary. Therefore absolute rigidity is not at all a thing which we should pursue in any rigid spirit.

Now, Sir, about the question of our policy I have been called upon by several hon. Members to state on behalf of the Government what our policy is: "Don't leave things in confusion, in doubt." Now generally it is the social philosophy of a Government which has to express itself in every sphere and in the matter of land also. Our ideas are briefly thus. We do not want any exploitation. Non-exploitation, social justice—that is not enough; we want social welfare also to improve the standard of living of the people.

We should give adequate employment. It should not be a static situation. It is to be a continuing progress; that is, the social organisation which we create, the agrarian system that we want to bring about must be related to our needs for rapid economic development. This point has been stressed by several Members but we have also to keep this in view that in doing all this we have to proceed in a democratic way, in a constructive way. We want a radical change but we do not want destructive changes. There is to be some continuity and for that pur-

pose certain adjustments have to be made. We want a co-operative organisation of agricultural production and of rural life. That is what we are aiming at. We want to see that the resources of the land and of man-power are put to the best use. It is the general approach. In practice, so far as the tiller is concerned, the implications are, no rents and no wage slavery. The tiller must have all the rights. If it is a small unit of land he must be the owner; if it is a large unit he may be a co-owner in a co-operative or in a village community.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: What is your policy regarding Vinoba Bhave's village ownership idea? Do you accept that?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I will come to that, Sir.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Coming to that is too much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You take your own time.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: We are with Vinoba Bhave in all that he is doing. We believe that what he has done has helped the Government immensely. What laws cannot do, he has done. He has created a climate, a good atmosphere. It is difficult to deprive a land-owner of a single acre of land, but now people surrender their land themselves willingly. That climate will create those conditions in which co-operative farming can take place.

Sir, I was explaining the position. I would like to steer clear of the words "nationalisation" and "socialisation." The position is that the unit of cultivation has to be such that it will yield the best return and in addition, the organisation should be such that it will be capable of lending itself to progressive development. I do not want to call it socialisation because I do not want to use big words. I personally believe that it is not a single owner holding an acre or two that is going to solve our problem. A village community has to take up the whole

land and all these people can be co-owners. This is my conception. But in the transition, maybe we have to do certain things, reduce rents, confer security, enable a tenant to acquire land by some right of purchase in an easy fashion through easy instalments, and all that.

The other point is, what are we doing to achieve this? And the question of ceiling has an importance here. We have a programme which within a reasonable period of time will bring us to this, that is, there will be an absolute ceiling. I find my hon. friend Prof. Ranga is not here. He said that the peasant proprietors should not be disturbed. All right; but what about the landless labourer? Should he not become a peasant proprietor also?

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): We do not stop the Government from helping the landless labourers.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, I was asked by hon. Members to state the policy regarding ceilings. There is this landless labourer. Now, we do not want the zamindars on the one side and we do not want the landless labourers on the other side. Then there are uneconomic holdings. They have also to be enlarged. Then, there is this other idea—the social justice idea—that there should not be too much disparity in a small village community. It is the approach regarding ceilings but it may not be enforced irrespective of conditions. The objectives are there. But what if a ceiling does not provide land enough for distribution? The answer of those who are bent on having a ceiling is that we should lower the ceiling. Our conception of a ceiling is this. In Hyderabad we thought of about Rs. 3,600 income to a family in a year. If very little land will be left out thereby then they will say, "All right, reduce the ceiling still further." But that is not the answer. I am not in favour of lowering the ceiling in that way because after all, is it the idea that all the people who are already on land and who are being born in the rural areas

are to be supported by the land there? It is not possible for land to give a reasonable standard of living to all those people. They will have to be moved away from the land and we have to think of that. That is why I am thinking of the village community as the unit. The village community will take responsibility for giving employment to all, putting them in various places according to the needs of the village. The surplus will go, well, to fill the needs which arise in an expanding economy. The question was raised—will it not bring down production? Sir, we do not want that production should be brought down. We have taken care about that. The provision is that if a farm was so efficiently managed that its splitting up is going to bring down production, we do not want to do that. Ultimately, that is not going.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Farm of what size?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: That is a matter of detail.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Size is most important.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, the test is there, that is, if the breaking up of that is going to lead to less production subject to an absolute limit of course.....

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): Will you encourage co-operative farming or not?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I have said it repeatedly that efficient farm may remain as it is now but why should it remain like that for all time? Why should not the village community have it? Why should it not be a co-operative? That is my view. All these things have to be done. Of course there are administrative limitations. We have got so many things to do under the Plan. Our officials are being called upon to render so many duties that we may not be in a position to take up these farms now and run them ourselves.

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

Even the village community may not be able to do it at present. This is the position regarding our attitude to the question of ceilings.

Then, there is the question of the floor. Of course, I have answered it indirectly a little before. We want that the person who tills the land should have sufficient land to provide him with a fair standard of living but for that purpose, as I said, there must be at least a minimum quantity of land with him. But if we try to ensure that, we will come up against an impossible position. Therefore although there is mention of it in the amendment, it may not be possible. Today I am being called upon to do two contradictory things—let everybody have land; let there be a floor to the land for everybody. If you calculate the number of persons who are to be provided with land and if you multiply that number with the quantity of land required for each person, I think possibly ten times the land we have in this country will be required for this purpose. That is the position regarding this question of floor which is mentioned in the amendment.

We have other ideas in the Plan—joint management and co-operative farming. It is all based on the proposition that if a nation wants to build up a social order free from exploitation, based on social justice it will have to be built as a co-operative structure and therefore we have stressed this aspect and we have given a picture of village life as based on joint village management which is an elastic idea.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Can the hon. Minister give the progress made in this respect by the Government?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, I confess that the progress in this respect has not been satisfactory.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: The progress made is nil.

4 p.m.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, I do not want to say 'nil'. I have got a list of States where the co-operative farming experiment has been made, in some successful, in some half-way. It is not nil.

Sir, these are the main lines of policy which we have embodied in the recommendations of the Planning Commission, which we are striving to implement, with different degrees of success. The reason may be that some more urgent, immediate questions possibly push out certain other programmes, which may be really of much greater importance; but at the moment, they do not receive the attention which they deserve and this co-operative farming is one of these.

Sir, finally, one word more. Why are the hon. Members asking me: "Cannot Government organise co-operative farming and enforce it all over the country?"

AN HON. MEMBER: Encourage.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: It is certainly not possible to enforce. It will have to be with the co-operation of all of us—the hon. Members here, myself and the people outside—who have to assist in that process.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: I am sorry co-operative societies are governed by statutes.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: I know they are governed by statutes. Co-operative societies are not built by simply a statute being there. The development of the co-operative spirit, the atmosphere, the training of the people who will carry out those tasks, those responsibilities, these are all required. Here it is a big co-operative task in the real sense, more than the legal sense. I know that several people do not know of their rights in respect of land reforms. I found that some people did not know that the rents had been reduced from one-third

to one-sixth. This is a question of enlightenment of the people, propaganda, all of us helping the people to know their rights, to enforce their rights. The hon. Member from the Opposition, Mr. Sundarayya, said that the officials were aligning with a certain class of people and, therefore, they did not look at the problem with that sympathy which the difficulties of these poor people warrant. Maybe it is true; it was true, at any rate. But events are changing and they will change completely to our satisfaction. Sir, I have done.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that there has been a long and useful debate on this subject, provided the Government takes note of it. Although they have rejected my Resolution, if they are prepared to accept my Resolution at least in practice, they will see that land reforms are speeded up.

Before I take up some of the issues that have been raised in this debate, I would like to make our position very clear. Shri Mahesh Saran has said that the Communist Party has changed its attitude as per the Resolution with regard to the First Five Year Plan. Our attitude has always been that the very basis of this Plan was wrong. No Plan can succeed without radical land reform, without the vested interests in the industries and banking being controlled, and the foreign capital in India confiscated and used for industrialisation. These three premises have not been accepted in the Plan and that is why the Plan is bound to fail. But if the Government is serious, even if the limited Plan is to serve as a panacea for our country's ills, even though limited, very unsatisfactory, even if they have to succeed in this Plan, the first and foremost thing they have to carry out is these land reforms.

Now, the hon. Minister has said: "How is it humanly possible to accept the amendment that all land reforms should be finished by April 1957?" This exactly is our charge against the Government. Sir, this Government has been in power for the last seven years

The Government has come out with a Plan and its progress for the last three and a half years. In the next three years at least we should be able to finish this radical land reform. But the Government says "No, we cannot do it. It is a fantastic proposition. We have got a phased time table. You must wait for it." I do not know, according to the phased time table, how many years they would take to finish these land reforms.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN (Uttar Pradesh): May I correct my hon. friend? Land reforms have been completed in the State of Uttar Pradesh. We have passed the Act called the Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act and have also passed other land reform Acts.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I am not yielding, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding to you.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: Sir, if I may interrupt, when I said that it would not be feasible to complete all land reforms by April 1957, I had in view the comprehensive picture of land reforms, including joint management, co-operative farming, and all that.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I shall come to that point presently. From 1947 to 1957, if ten years are not enough for the Government to achieve land reforms, if a ten-year period is not enough, I do not want to make comparisons, I cannot understand it. Just now, in China, they have done it in three years. Is a period of ten years not enough, especially on a crucial issue like this?

Now, many speakers have spoken about co-operative farming and land management, etc. Co-operative farming and other things may be a very good solution, provided first of all, you divide the land and see that landless labourers and those poor peasants who have got only very small

[Shri. P. Sundarayya.]

fragments of land get some land, so that they can cultivate the land and have at least one meal per day. Many speakers have pointed out that after all land is limited. Whatever the ceiling, if we take it and distribute all available land, how much land per head will it give? And they quoted China. They were unable to give more than half an acre, or even less, per head. Sir, I would like the hon. Members of this House to ponder over this question and not move again and again the question of fragmentation whenever the question of land distribution is taken up. What we ask for is one meal a day for each and every family. This is the minimum of justice that we are demanding. If they are assured of even one meal per day, then surely they can bargain with the richer landlords for their own rights. Today, with starvation running rampant, they are unable to get their rights. That is exactly the social justice which we want for the poor peasants. Some portion of the land must go to the landless labourers. Without that there is no future for our country. Sir, without land being given to the millions and millions of our landless labourers and small land owners, there is no question of co-operation. It is no use speaking about co-operation and land management. If you speak of co-operation now, it only means that you want co-operation of big landholders, you want land management of big land-holders, and you want nothing for the poor.

Sir, I would now like to deal with the question of ceilings. In any case, our Party does not want that the small jagirdars or small persons should not be given any rehabilitation. We do want them to be given rehabilitation. On the contrary, we find that the Government has been giving compensation to the big zamindars and big landlords who own lands and who have got accumulated properties. What we wanted was that you should not have paid any compensation to them. You

should have rehabilitated the poor people not only by giving them grants in the shape of money but also grants in the shape of land taken from the big zamindars and big landlords. You should have given lands to the small jagirdars and agricultural labourers. You should have given them as much land as they, with their families, were prepared to cultivate. Rehabilitation does not mean that you give them some pension and allow them to live like lazy lords. If they want to work in the field, give them land so that they can cultivate it themselves. Our principle about the ceiling is not to fix it at 30 acres or anything which is uniform. That is fantastic, that is absurd. We find varying conditions existing in our country. Various factors such as population, the type of crops that could be grown on different soils, rainfall, etc., have got to be taken into consideration. But taking all these things into consideration, there are one or two principles which we advocate. Firstly, the land ceiling should not be so high as not to leave any land or enough land to go round among the landless poor. In some areas it may be 10 acres, in some it may be 20 acres, or in some it may even be 50 acres. But the ceiling must be low enough so that some land is left to be distributed among the landless poor. But at the same time, that ceiling should not be so low as to affect a landholder who is cultivating it with his own family labour. We do not want a ceiling in terms of economy and in terms of all kinds of things, so that they can employ only wage labour without ever looking at the fields, and draw the benefit. Such kinds of ceilings we do not want. Our complaint is that you are not taking into consideration the interests of the landless poor. You should not fix a ceiling so high that the landlords cannot cultivate the land themselves or with their family labour or even with the seasonal labour.

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: What is the conception of 'a family' according to the hon. Member? Does he think.....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I have made my position very clear. We mean by the word 'family' the husband and the wife who can work, and their children. The moment their children become adults, it becomes a different question. I would certainly agree with the hon. Minister when he says that land alone—only the distribution of land—cannot solve our problems, cannot solve the problems of poverty and hunger. I agree that it alone cannot solve the problem of unemployment. Certainly, we do not want that all our people should, year after year, century after century, depend on land. But it is the basic step that will increase the purchasing power of our people and will help our industries to flourish. And our anxiety is that the Government should take this first step so that our country can march forward.

Sir, I would say only one word about Shri Vinoba Bhave's land gift movement. Yes, the Government would certainly claim that the *bhoodan* campaign launched by Shri Vinoba Bhave has made the hearts of our big landholders melt and they have given so much of their land. The Government themselves know, and the Congress President himself has broadcast the news, about the land donated by the Raja of Ramgarh, one of the biggest donors in this movement. What are the lands which he has given today? He has donated the lands which are in dispute. He has donated the lands which, under the Zamindari Abolition Act, have been taken over by the Government. Therefore he has given them. I can give you hundreds and hundreds of such cases that have happened in Hyderabad and in some other States. They have donated lands which cannot be cultivated, which are in dispute. Sir, if you consider that this is the change of heart which is going to solve our problems, you are entirely mistaken.

Then, Sir, another question has been brought again and again. They say: "It is no use thinking in terms of distribution, because it will reduce the

food production. Therefore, let us think in terms of manures, seeds, irrigation, and let us produce more because the food situation is bad; let us not do anything which will mean cutting down the food production." Sir, this kind of posing the issues is nothing but shirking the responsibility. Nobody wants our food production to go down. But if we think that only the big landlords, only those people who have got tractors, only those people who have got enough money, can produce more, then we are very much mistaken and we seem to be living in a fool's paradise. It is the poor peasants, it is the small landholders, it is the agricultural labourers, who with their sweat and blood and toil, produce more. Our country can never prosper unless they say: "Whatever fruit we produce on these lands, it shall be ours and our families shall have the first priority over it." Only if you guarantee these things, food production can increase. It cannot increase by all kinds of scientific theories and other things. (*Time bell rings.*) I am finishing, Sir. Our masses will not be able to take the advantage of scientific cultivation with their starving stomachs. And that is why although the Government has refused to accept my resolution, I want the Government to see that they implement the radical land reforms, not the so-called land reforms about which I have spoken in my opening speech, with all their loopholes and other things. It is a misnomer to call them land reforms. The real land reform will be an assurance or a guarantee given to the landless poor in respect of what they themselves produce. Implement those land reforms by 1957. If you do not do it, then naturally you will have to rue the day for denying this minimum social justice to our own people. Sir, with these words, I press my Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put the amendments to the vote first.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I have accepted Mr. Dwivedy's amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may have, but it is for the House to

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]
accept it or not. Mr. Dwivedy's amendment:

The question is:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'which should be completed on or before the 30th April, 1957, and for bringing about uniformity, as far as practicable, in such legislation'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Malkani's amendment:

The question is:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

'more specially to enable the tiller to be the owner of his holding and to fix a flooring of holdings in various States according to local conditions'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House is of opinion that in order to guarantee the success of the Five Year Plan, the Central Government should recommend to all the State Governments that they should take immediate steps for the speeding up of land reform legislation in their respective States."

(after taking a count) Ayes 13; Noes 31.

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A HIGH POWER COMMISSION TO REVIEW AND REVISE THE PAY STRUCTURE AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF ALL THE SERVICES UNDER THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move the Resolution standing in my name, viz.:

"This House is of opinion that the entire pay structure and the terms and conditions of service of all the services under the control of the Central Government should be examined, reviewed and revised, and that for this purpose a high power Commission be appointed with instructions to submit its report within six months."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN) in the Chair.]

Madam, there has been a general expression of dis-satisfaction against the pay structure obtaining in this country and particularly against the pay structure of the Central Government. Hardly any opportunity has been missed in this House as well as in the other House to give expression to such a feeling, and I am sure that, if a little study is made of this subject and if all the facts are examined, it will be found that the position of the Government in this matter is almost indefensible. It is not only unfair but they will find that it is to the detriment of the interests of the country at large. I will presently give certain facts and figures which, I am sure, will convince the House that there is an urgent need for examining this matter and for revising the entire pay structure at the Centre.

When I say this, I am not at all oblivious of the fact that only in 1946 a Central Pay Commission had been appointed and that an exhaustive report had been submitted by it—in fact the report is in my hands. I am also aware of the fact that some of the recommendations of the Pay Commission have not been implemented, and still if with all this knowledge in my possession I have ventured to move this Resolution, it is because it is expedient, as I hope presently to show to the House, in the larger interests of the country. It is absolutely impossible to deal with such a vast subject and touch on even some of the more important aspects of this problem within the space of half an hour. I propose therefore to take only