

[Shrimati Maya Ray]

Before sitting down, may I urge upon the Government once more to pay attention to the suggestions that have been made so that we may feel that the time we have devoted to discussing this terrible problem, and may I say, a problem which has assumed horrifying proportions, has not been a mere waste of time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, has the hon. lady Member the leave of the House to withdraw her Resolution?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will put it to the House again.

Is it the pleasure of the House that Srimati Maya Ray be given leave to withdraw her Resolution?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think, the 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it—

I think there is a technical flaw there. If there is any objection to it, the House has to decide it.

I will again put it to the House.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East): Even if one Member objects, the leave to withdraw the Resolution cannot be given by the House. It will have to be put to the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I withdraw my objection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So, I take it that it is the pleasure of the House to give her leave to withdraw her Resolution.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

The Resolution was, by leave,
withdrawn.

17.03. hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: LAND REFORMS

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Palghat):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"This House calls upon the Central Government to recommend to all the State Governments to enact effective land reforms before the 26th January, 1973 through which the land monopoly of landlords is broken, all the exemptions are done away with and ceiling is fixed in such a way so that sufficient land is made available for distribution to the agricultural workers and poor peasants."

First, of all, I want to say that the notice given by me and what is in the Order Paper are different. I do not know why there is this difference. One portion of the notice given by me is taken away and it is the last portion that is given here. I do not know the reason. My notice was as follows:

"The House is of the opinion that the proposed land legislations and the Acts adopted by various State Governments with the object of distributing land to the tillers is proving another hoax. All recommendations made by various commissions have been watered down and the landlords allowed to resort to dubious methods to protect their interests. The House, therefore..."

From here only, it is given here. The first portion is left out. I do not know why the first portion is taken out. I do not know whether it is because I am not Jyotirmoy Bosu that this is removed. That is only what I have to say.

17.03 hrs.

[Smt. Sureshwar in the Chair]

As far as this Resolution is concerned, I am glad that it has come after discussing the Resolution on Unemployment. Unemployment is a problem and land reform is a solution for that problem. Though it will not be at complete solution, there will be some solution. If land is distributed and all the waste land fallow land, is taken and given, it would be a solution for the problem of unemployment.

First of all, as I said, my original resolution was one thing and the resolution given in the Order Paper is another thing. I do not know whether you will allow the original motion to be discussed or the motion that is in the Order Paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion as given in the Order Paper is to be discussed now.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: It may be recorded that the first portion of my motion, as I read out here, has been left out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: About that, whatever you have said has gone on record.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: This is a very important question. It is not only an economic problem but it is a social problem and a political problem. As far as the question of unemployment is concerned, a little solution of the unemployment problem can immediately be found only by enacting this legislation in the way in which we hope to have it that is, getting all the surplus land without exception, the waste land, the forest land, the fallow land and the cultivable waste land and immediately distributing it to the agricultural labour and, specially,— here is an amendment—to Harijans and Adivasis and other.

So, this is a very important question and I hope, Sir, you will allow as much time as was given for the resolution on Unemployment to this Resolution also.

The land reform today has become the landlord reform because it is turning the landlord into a capitalist landlord. I will explain how it has become a landlord reform. Before Independence, what was the object and the intention of the Congress leaders? What did they want? What was the slogan before Independence? From the Karachi Congress session onwards till we got Independence, what was the slogan? As a Congressman, I myself have got the experience that from 1830 onwards, when we went to the villages, it was the slogan of "Land to the tiller"; the slogan was that landlordism will be abolished completely without paying any compensation. It was that slogan that inspired lakhs and lakhs of people to come to the freedom movement and to fight for freedom. It was that slogan that inspired people like me to work in the Congress, to go to the villages and tell the people what freedom is. The spirit of land reform legislation as it was said by Gandhiji, as it was said by Jawaharlal Nehru, as it was said by the Kumarappa Committee has watered down today. In order to show that I want to refer to what they had said before.

Jawaharlal Nehru, in his Autobiography has said:

"Our national movement spread to the lower middle class and became a power in the land. Then, it began to stir the rural masses who were finding it more and more difficult to keep up as a whole even their miserable rock bottom standard of living."

Again, Jawaharlal Nehru, in his "Glimpses of World History" has said.

"The wind is blowing to the villages and to the mud huts where dwell our poverty stricken peasantry, and it is likely to become a hurricane if relief does not come to them soon:..."

"All our political problems and discussions are but the background

[Shri A K Gopalan]

for the outstanding and overwhelming problem of India, the land problem."

Then, there was a Resolution which was passed on abolition of Zamindaris in a conference held in Allahabad on April 27-28 1935 under the Presidency of Sardar Vallabhai Patel. The Resolution stated

"There is only one fundamental method of improving the village life, namely, introduction of a system of peasant-proprietorship under which the tiller of the soil is himself the owner of it and pays revenue direct to the Government without the intervention from any zamindar or any talukdar"

In 1937-39, the Congress High command set up a National Planning Committee under the Chairmanship of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to draw up a plan for national development.

In June, 1942, Gandhiji had an interview—this is very important—with Louis Fischer in which the following conversation took place. It is written in the Book, *A Week with Gandhiji*.

"What would happen to free India?" Fischer asked. "What is your programme for the improvement of the lot of the peasantry?" "The peasants would take the land", Gandhiji replied, "We would not have to tell them to take it; they would take it"

"Should the landlords be compensated?" Fischer asked.

"No", Gandhiji said, "That would be fiscally impossible", "You see", he smiled, "Our gratitude to our millionaire friends does not prevent us from saying such things. The village would become a self-governing unit living its own life".

"You feel then that it must be confiscated without compensation?" Fischer asked.

'Of course', Gandhiji agreed "It would be financially impossible for anybody to compensate the landlords"

J C Kumarappa Committee said that the Committee felt that, in the agrarian economy of India, there was no place for intermediaries and declared that land must belong to the tiller.

So, the whole question was that the land must belong to the tiller and not to the owner. There is a difference between 'owner of a land' who is far far away and who does not even see the land—not does not work in the land but also does not see—and the "man who tills the land". 'Land belongs to the tiller' is the slogan. In the ceiling legislation even after the Chief Ministers' Conference, it is said that there must be compensation. Here Gandhiji said, "No, it is not possible to pay compensation, we will tell the millionaires and the rich men that we cannot pay any compensation" I can understand paying compensation to those who have got small pieces of land and who will have no other means of livelihood when you take over the land from them. But paying compensation to the lakhur is against the spirit of this. I want to point out all these facts. What is the ceiling today? On whom are you putting the ceiling? If you are putting a ceiling on landholdings, you should go by the spirit of what was said before Independence, what we told the people was that land belongs to the tiller, "The land belongs to the tiller and to the owner" is different. So, today, the land does not belong to the owner. The land belongs to the tiller. The man who is able to till the land, the man who at least puts up some work in the land, the land must be given to him only. Is it in the ceiling? You should not go against the whole spirit of the Resolution that had been passed and the pronouncements that had been made before Independence by the Congress leaders, including

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhiji. Gandhiji definitely said, 'No, it is impossible for us to pay compensation'.

* Here we discussed about unemployment problem. With the money that you may pay as compensation, you can put up some small scale industries in the country and solve the problem of unemployment.

I have quoted what Gandhiji had said. If I say something about land reforms, that there should be no compensation paid, you might say, 'What is this man saying?' But Gandhiji definitely has said that land belongs to the tiller. You make a legislation saying that land must be given to the tiller, the man who tills the land or at least the man who stands and sees that somebody is tilling the land and manages the land; at least that thing can be made because there is unemployment in the country. There are some people having two or three acres of land—clerks and others who are working; if they have some land, we can understand. But what about those who are having thousands of acres of land? You have put from 10 to 50 acres—the ceiling; however less, whether you get it or not, I will come to that later. But is it not against the spirit of what the Congress preached before Independence? Is it not against the spirit of what we told the people before Independence? You mobilised them for independence, and after independence what you are doing is this! You are putting a ceiling on land-holdings; whatever is the ceiling, even 15 acres of land to a man who has got other means of livelihood, who can live happily even otherwise, who is a business-man why should he have that land? Give those 15 acres to 15 people, one acre each, so that they will be able to work on land.

So, my first point is this. In accordance with the spirit of the Resolutions, the old Congress Resolutions, what the leaders of the Congress then

said openly, it should be done. Gandhiji has definitely said that no compensation should be given because we have no money. So, we have to tell those millionaires and others who own land, 'We have no money; we cannot give you compensation', then take the land and give it to the tillers. This is the first point I want to make.

Before going into the effect of the land reform legislations I want to say this. When I said, 'landlord reform', Mr Shinde did not like it at all; he was noting something.

Now I would quote from the Congress Reports also. This is an extract from the Report—The Causes and Nature of Current Agrarian Tension, Ministry of Home Affairs, Research and Policy Division, 1969. This is a horrible report. This Report might have opened the eyes of the Government to call the Chief Ministers and say something. I will just read out the extract. The report points out that land reforms have not made any changes. I will quote some sentences that are given here. Here it is said.

"Secondly, the new technology and strategy having been geared to goals of production, with secondary regard to social imperatives, have brought about a situation in which elements of disparity, instability and unrest are becoming conspicuous with the possibility of increase in tension. Agrarian reforms which made an enthusiastic start immediately after independence have almost ground themselves to a halt. Not surprisingly, the consciousness of injustice and wide prevalence of land-hunger ..."

Then it says about 'Nature of Agrarian Tensions':

"The persistence of serious social and economic inequalities in the rural areas has given rise to tensions...."

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

"The agricultural workers have resorted to violence...."

Then, the report says what the position is in various States—Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and so on.

Then they speak about legislative measures. The first sentence is:

"On the negative side, there are several aspects to which little or no attention has been given by State administration. They are brought out in the paragraphs that follow:

No fixity of tenure to 82 per cent of the tenants."

About 82 per cent of the total number of tenants, mainly, in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Punjab, Haryana and West Bengal do not enjoy fixity of tenure. They are either tenants-at-will or subject to land-lord's right of resumption, or enjoy temporary protection only.

Here, I have to point out that even to-day, after the passing of legislation in Kerala, there are lakhs and lakhs of tenants who have no records of rights. It is the same in many places in India. We have raised this matter in the Parliament several times. I myself raised it. There are people who have no record of rights. They are tilling the land for the last 25 or 30 years. When the legislations are passed, the landlords go to the court. The Court asks, "Where is the record?" There is no record. I will show you that all the census reports say that the number of persons, the number of agricultural labour, in percentage, has risen from 1960 to 1971. What does it show? It shows that those who had a little piece of land, have lost their land. They have not got the land. Those who had the land before, they lost the land after this legislation also because when the legislation came, fixity of tenure must

be there and there must be some record that he is tilling the land. No record of rights has been taken in many States in India even after the Central Government has said like that. That is why here it is said that 82 per cent have no security of tenure.

Then, lastly, forcible eviction of tenants. Forcible ejections of tenants have taken place particularly in States where attempts are made to prevent evictions and ejections have taken place on a large scale under the guise of 'voluntary surrenders'. Certain States like Gujarat, Kerala, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Manipur and Tripura have made provisions for verification of surrender by revenue authorities. But these forcible ejections of tenants are there because the landlords are powerful. So forcibly they go there and the Police also help them or they go to the court and the court says, 'There is no record of right'. So they send the Police to eject them and so they are ejected. Even after the land-reform legislation, when it is implemented, transfers of land have tended to defeat the aims of legislation for ceiling. I want Mr. Shinde and the hon. Minister to note this. It is not what I say, it is your own Home Ministry which went to the villages, that says, and this was in 1969; and to-day in 1972 you may ask what is the position. Even in 1972, these things have not only not stopped.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAREB P. SHINDE):
On this, we have no difference of opinion.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: So, transfers of land have tended to defeat the very aims of the legislation for ceiling. There is no material change in the condition of agricultural labour.

The condition of agricultural labour has not changed materially and in some respects has worsened in spite of land reforms. I want to know this. In some cases, it has worsened. Not only it has not changed, in spite of land reforms, but the condition of agricultural labour has worsened. The incidence of unemployment is as high as 15 per cent. This is in respect of agricultural labour. The Minimum Wages Act is a dead letter. That is another thing, a very important thing. This is what the Government say, not I:

"As regards minimum wages to agricultural workers, a 'Diagnostic Study of Conditions of Rural Labour' made for the National Labour Commission comes to the finding that the Minimum Wages Act remains a dead letter because wages fixed 8 or 10 years ago have not been revised. Ruling wages in some cases are higher than the statutory wages. The rural labour is mostly ignorant of the Minimum Wages Act in agriculture and its provisions. While generally wage rates for peak seasonal operations are higher as compared to statutorily fixed minimum wage, the slack season wage rates in many cases require to be raised. There is hardly any machinery for effective implementation of the Minimum Wages Act in agriculture."

There is no machinery and that is the reason why they say it is not enforced. What is the conclusion? I have no time, so I would not go into all the details.

What is the conclusion?

"As of now, the land reform measures have not benefited the actual tiller in all cases. There is considerable concentration of ownership. Much of the land is cultivated in small holdings by tenants and share-croppers who lack security of tenure and who have to pay exorbitant rents."

2851 LS-11.

I do not want to go into details. The last paragraph is very important. That may be the reason why panels have been constituted, commissions have been appointed, the Chief Ministers have been called. They say:

"The problem, in other words, has to be tackled on a wide front effectively and imaginatively. Failure to do so may lead to a situation where the discontented elements are compelled to organize themselves and the extreme tensions building up with the 'complex molecule' that is the Indian village end in an explosion."

So, in many places, as far as the agricultural labour is concerned, their number has increased and the Minimum Wages Act is not implemented and there are struggles by the agricultural labour. Not only do they not get any help from the State Governments but they are attacked by the State Governments and by the Police in the name of law and order. I say, if there is any difference after the land reform legislation, the difference is that all the maladies that were there in 1969 are still there, and what the Study Group of the Home Ministry has said has only strengthened what I am saying.

I want to ask: after the panels and committees what is the agricultural labour percentage, the total number of workers? I want to say that instead of getting land, those who had land, have lost the land. I have got here the figures which are taken from the Government reports and from the answers to questions in Lok Sabha and so on. The figures are:

	1961	1971
Andhra	28.59	37.40
Assam	3.59	9.35
Bijapur	22.97	38.02
Kerala	17.38	30.68
Tamil Nadu	18.42	29.12

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

As far as the agricultural labour is concerned, with each census, the number is increasing. It is because even the small peasant who has got one cent or 50 cents or half an acre of land has been evicted and he has been thrown out and he comes into the category of agricultural labour

As far as the implementation of land reform measures is concerned, I will tell about that in a short time because the time is short. It is a total failure. One reason is that there are numerous exemptions given. You want to get as much land as possible. But is it possible to get so much land with so many exemptions? The amendment that was given by my friend, Mr Panigrahi, nobody will implement, and anybody thinks that it can be implemented, he is wrong because the land has already gone out of the hands. When you say that the Chief Ministers are meeting for this purpose, one meeting means that the landlords in the whole of India will make *mala fide* transfers . . .

SHRI ANNASAHIB P. SHINDE: Gopalanji, you have become too pessimist.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: Certainly not. I will tell my experience. My experience is what I say. If it is not so in other places, what can I say? I can say about my experience in Kerala. And then if it is not the case in other places, then I do not know.

The implementation of land reforms is a failure because of numerous exemptions. It has been pointed out that Kerala has 17 exemptions Madhya Pradesh—14, Maharashtra—7, Uttar Pradesh—20 and so on. Exemptions are available for plantations, sugarcane farms, operated by sugar-cane factories, orchards, mechanised farms, religious, charitable and educational institutions and trusts and co-operative farms. With all these exemptions, where will be the land for distribution? When you

say all these are exempted, where is the land? Everybody will have a school or build a college and put the land in the name of the college. Then there will be no land. All these exemptions have virtually made it impossible to get any land.

Then, there is evasion, there are transfers, etc. Take for instance Kerala. I will only go into that. A measure was passed in Kerala in 1958-59 when the Communist Ministry was there. What happened? After the legislation was passed the Ministry was pulled down. By whom, I should not say. So, there was no time for implementation. Time was not given. It was the first such legislation in India that was passed. It was a model legislation. But what happened? As Congress President the present Prime Minister created the liberation struggle and toppled it down and I do not want to go into that history. That happened in 1967. It was again passed by the Coalition Ministry. President's assent was got in 1970. After that the High Court struck it down. I want to ask this. Why was it not included immediately in the 9th Schedule? It was only after representation here in the Parliament, after saying so many things, that they have included in the 9th Schedule. When it was included what was the delay due to? That is why I have been saying that nothing will be done.

From 1958 to 1963 all the transfers which were made by the landlords were revalidated. The assent was given by the President in 1970. The assent was given to the Bill which was not included in the 9th Schedule. The Central Government said, you must change it, you must amend that, to revalidate all the transfers that have been made by the landlords from 1958 to 1963. In 1958 the Ministry was there and it passed a legislation. They could not implement it. They know, again some other Ministry will come, either this or that; so again the Bill will come and it will be implemented. Once it was accepted by the President. Then it was to be in-

cluded in the 9th Schedule. Then they told us, we will not allow unless you make an amendment. The State Government said, we will put this in the 9th Schedule, we want it. Only after this, the Central Government said, we have to revalidate these transfers from 1958 to 1963.

My friend the hon. Minister says that I am a pessimist. Sir, how can I be an optimist? How can I be optimistic? The State Government wanted this thing. The State Government passed this, the assent of the President was got. And yet this thing happened. That is one thing. And then, how much time is necessary for implementation? What was done by the Kerala Government? In the 1970 Bill it is stated,—there is a clause to this effect,—that after 3 months, if the necessary information regarding excess land is not given, the Government may impose a fine of Rs. 200 for the first time and after that for the lapse of every day a fine of Rs. 50 will be imposed. That is a very good thing. This is a good legislation which says, after 3 months, you must say, what excess land is there. If not, you must pay a fine of Rs. 200 on the very first day. If you persist, you must pay a fine of Rs. 50 for each day. We have made certain calculations about this. If the Government had fined, they would have got Rs. 35 crores, and there would have been no necessity for any other tax at all.

Was any landlord fined? Why were they not fined? Why did the Government not do it? Why did they not ask for the records? The Supreme Court did not strike it down. Why did they not ask for those land records? Why did they not impose fines, if called for? Instead of doing all that, they put me simply inside the jail, only because I pointed out all this. I entered into one land, I said, Travancore Maharaja has got so much of excess land. I am not taking the land; I am only just pointing this out. You must find out how

much excess land he has got. For that there was a *satyagraha*. It was only a *satyagraha* to find out whether anybody had excess land. We started that only to show that we think that this landlord or that landlord has got excess land. Our stand was this. If he has not got excess land, forgive us. But, if he has got that land, take that land. So, in this process, what happened? 2 lakhs of people were arrested. I was one. I was put inside the jail. I was put inside the prison under some charge. I argued my case myself in the Court. The magistrate in the end was good enough to say 'There is no charge at all.' I was released. I argued myself. I may tell you that I am not a lawyer. But commonsense made me think that what they did was wrong.

When they came to arrest me as Member of Parliament, I asked them: Under what section are you going to arrest me? They said: No section, we came to arrest you, because somebody has asked us to arrest you. I said: No, I will not come. You take me. If you tell the section, I will walk, otherwise you carry me. What happened? They just carried me. I do not want to go into the details about it.

I only want to convince my hon. friends about it. There is an Act. That Act says, you can fine half a dozen persons for not giving you a list of excess land. But when was it begun? It was begun, only when we began our own struggle. It was only after our struggle, after our agitation, that this was implemented.

I ask the Minister one question. Is any legislation necessary for giving the waste land, and fallow land? How much is there, do you know? According to the Government figure 2.58 crores acres of land are there, as per the 1970 figure. That comprises of fallow and cultivable waste land. And, why is it that this is not distributed? You can say that you have distributed something. But, even if one acre is left, can we not

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

ask: why is it left? Why is it not distributed?

Sir, when there is hunger in the country, when unemployment is increasing, when agricultural labour have no work also, when people are ready to work, why is it that the cultivable fallow land and waste land were not given to them? Therefore, for that also, struggle has to begin.

This is what happened in Kerala two months back. There was a thousand families who were occupying that land. You may call it by the name 'encroachment' or whatever other term you may like. They waited patiently for 25 years. They went into the land. They stayed there. They cultivated the land. Then, what happened? In the rain, they were driven out. Their huts were burnt.

Sir, let alone land reform legislation, should there not be some human consideration?

Now it is rainy season in Kerala. I have seen families with children of one year old and 8 months old; they are just standing on the road. They are sleeping on the roadside. I went and I saw them. This is what has happened.

So, even with this legislation, such transfers have been made. You would not get those lands. I say, land will be got only if you are very strict. Although there was a very good legislation, this is the experience. I do not think that land reform legislation will give what we want. It will not give what Gandhiji preached, what Nehru said, namely, land to the tiller,—what we preached to the people. Land to the tiller is a slogan which has been watered down today. Land is not given to the tiller. In the name of land reform, you are discussing today whether it is to be 10 acres or 15 acres or 50 acres. You are discussing whether it is to be irrigated land or unirrigated land and all that.

But, the only consideration should be this. Here is a man who has got so much land. All right. Find out whether he has any other means of livelihood. If that is so, no land will be given to this man. There is another man who has absolutely nothing. He has no ground to sleep on. To that man, land must be given.

But that is not the policy which the Government follows. I, as a congressman, suffered many years inside the jail; I went to the people and preached. I sincerely thought that even after 25 years of independence excess land has not been given to these people. Even the fallow land, the waste land and the forest land that is available today, is not given. What we find is only some Collector's order, to find out where the fallow lands are. I say, it can be found out within a month. They can ask the panchayats or the boards to find out and they will find out and this land can be given. But this has not been done even after 25 years of Independence. That is why I say that let a target be fixed, and let all the exemptions be removed, and let Government try to get as much land as possible and see that even after so much of delay, the land is transferred to the landless. Mr. John, the Revenue Minister was telling us that he was keeping a record of one thousand acres of land, but when he went to enquire about the land he was told by everyone that the land was in his hand. The landlords had given a chit saying that they had got excess land and the total was one thousand acres. But when the officials were sent to find out the thousand acres, each man told them that the land with him was only that portion which rightly belonged to him. The papers show that there is excess land. But where is the excess land? The excess land has been transferred to others. This is the whole truth and the experience at least in my state. I can say that perhaps that is the same position in some other states also. That is why I say

that if Government wants at least the remaining land to be given, they should fix up a target and remove all the exemptions and go ahead. I read in the press the other day that in Tamil Nadu about half a lakh of agricultural labourers and landless people round about Madras city had encroached on some land, but they were given that land and they were not driven away from that land. So, I would submit that those who are living on the land should be assured of that land. Mostly, they are Harijans and Adibasis, and we should see that they are assured of that land. In the Kerala legislation it has been said that 50 per cent must be given to Harijans. But I would say that if Government do not make any changes, then even the available amount of land which Government think today can be given will not be there available for distribution. I do not have much time at my disposal. Otherwise, I would have shown what each Chief Minister had said when the legislation was passed and how afterwards they had said that they were expecting about two lakhs acres, but actually when they went and inspected, they found only 40,000 acres. If we delay the whole thing by appointing these commissions and committees and having discussions, then there will be no land left and what will remain would only be an illusion. That is why I have said in my resolution that what has been done is a hoax and it has been a failure because of the bureaucratic machinery, and because of the unwillingness of the State Governments who have their own interests, some of whose Ministers also have their own interest to safeguard and because of the attempts on the part of the landlords and others who are eager to see that the legislation is not implemented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House calls upon the Central Government to recommend to all the State Governments to enact effective land reforms before the 26th January, 1973 through which

the land, monopoly of landlords is broken, all the exemptions are done away with and ceiling is fixed in such a way so that sufficient land is made available for distribution to the agricultural workers and poor peasants".

There are some amendments to this resolution. Hon. Members who want to move their amendments may do so now.

SHRI JHARKANDE RAI (Ghosi).
I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—
after "recommend" insert
"effectively". (1)

That in the resolution,—
for "landlords" substitute "land-owners". (4)

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH
(Pupri): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—
for "effective land reforms before the 26th January, 1973 through which the land monopoly of landlords is broken, all the exemptions are done away with and ceiling is fixed in such a way so that sufficient land is made available for distribution to the agricultural workers and poor peasants"

Substitute—

"expeditiously comprehensive legislation on land ceiling in the light of the guidelines drawn up by the Government of India on the basis of the conclusions of the Chief Ministers' Conference on land ceiling, held in July, 1972 and to take suitable steps for speedy and effective implementation of the legislation so that the surplus land can be distributed promptly among the landless agricultural workers and other needy agriculturists in accordance with the priorities fixed by the guidelines". (3)

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEYA
(Mandsaur): I beg to move:

That in the resolution,—

for “to the agricultural workers and poor peasants.”

substitute,—

“by December, 1973 among landless Harijans, Adivasis, agricultural labourers, poor peasants and military personnel”. (5)

MR. CHAIRMAN: These amendments are now before the House.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: As far as these amendments are concerned, may I say just now that I accept some of the amendments?....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can say that at the end. Now, Shri K. Suryanarayana.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA
(Eluru): Excuse me, Sir, I want to speak in Telugu.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(SHRI ANNASAHAB P. SHINDE):**
The Andhras have become very much conscious of their rights.

***SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA**
(Eluru): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am glad that Mr. Gopalan who was an erstwhile colleague of ours in Congress Party and who also went to jail with us, brought about his personal experiences far as the implementation of the land reforms are concerned in his State. There is no doubt in his saying that it is not enough if a party in power brings forth legislation. He reminded us that it is incumbent on any party which is in power whether it is DMK, CPI, Congress, to see that the implementation of these land reforms is done in the spirit in which the legislation is made. We are only successful in giving suggestions to the

Government in so far as the question of land reforms is concerned. The question of implementation is the responsibility of the Government. In this connection I beg to submit that several State Governments are facing several difficulties in implementation of these land reforms. I am also to state that the Centre is in a position to help the various Governments to implement these reforms successfully and should do so. It is not correct to think that we can eradicate poverty that is prevalent in thousands of villages in our country by passing laws for land reforms. We are mistaken. This is to only a method by which poverty can be eradicated to some extent. That is my submission

Therefore I would humbly like to submit to you that I also agree with the ideas and suggestions put forward by you. I would like to state that the land reforms should become a stepping stone for anybody to produce more. While we talk of reforms we should also think about the various inputs that are required for cultivation. It is a well known fact that the land we have is not enough. We find that several statistics which are not probably correct are being mentioned in election manifestos. The innocent people believe all these false figures and expect much from these parties. I beg to submit that these false figures result from the manipulation of village karanam. The fault does not lie either at the State Government or the Central Government. I congratulate the various State Governments as well as the Central Government which are trying to bring about land reforms. In this connection I would like to state that there are several big landlords who were given extensive tracts of lands by way of lease. They are enjoying the fruits of it. I have submitted several complaints to the State Government without any result. In my own district there are about 5 to 6 complaints of this nature pending before

the Government for the last two years. We all know that big zamindars are taking advantage of their influence in Government circles. Recently we had the delegates of Poland here. We understand from them that even in their country which is a even their country which is a socialistic country, the viable unit of land is about 50 acres. I therefore submit that the land reforms which we propose to carry out is only one of the means for the evolution of a socialistic pattern of society. We are agreed that the richest should not get concentrated in the hands of a few people. We must see that each citizen in this country has reasonable means of livelihood.

Shri Gopalan's party was in power in Kerala. It was found out even if the Government then wanted to distribute the land to the landless poor people, the land that was available was not enough. Every body in this country should abide himself with the progressive idea of land reforms. I am sorry that an effort is being made on the part of the opposition parties to state that there are some landlords and some vested interests who are against these land reforms.

It is very unfortunate that Mr. Indrajit Gupta while speaking on the Mulki rules problem said that some vested interests are behind that agitation which we see these days. He is not correct. He particularly named one community in that respect. His charge was that these vested interests are behind this agitation for separate Andhra region.

I can mention a leader of Shri Gupta's party whose father purchased land from a zamindar in a big measure. The zamindar had no right to sell that land. He is Mr. Rajeshwar Rao. He transferred the title of the major portion of that land to his family. He donated about 5 acres of land to the party and talks of socialism and land reforms. I therefore submit that we cannot make a people believe of hollow slogans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. Member please come to land reforms and the resolution. Let him not go into the Mulki rules now....

SHRI K. SURYAANARAYANA: In the name of land reforms, each and every time there are so many things said by my hon. friends in the name of landlords ...

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): The hon. Member is referring to persons who are not in a position to reply in this House, with regard to the charges that he is making **

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): **

MR. CHAIRMAN That word will be expunged from the proceedings, because it is unparliamentary.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA I would request my hon. friend to agree to an inquiry. Since he is saying like that I am prepared to stand an inquiry. Let him appoint a committee from his own party. If it is proved to be like that, then I am willing to apologise. Otherwise, he must apologise to me and to the House.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: The question is not whether he is the son of a landlord or not, but whether he has lands or not.....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: My hon. friends opposite are only saying all this, and Government are being criticised by them and they are always saying that Government is not siding with the agricultural poor but they are siding only with the landlords. That was why I mentioned the case of Shri Rajeswara Rao and his son. They are raising all these things just to cheat the public. Let them appoint a committee from their own party and please inquire into this matter. They can appoint somebody from their own party to inquire into the matter and let him go and see his family share.**

[Shri K. Suryanarayana]

Let him please excuse me for saying this. He is a friend of mine and I am also his friend....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the hon. Member come to the resolution. That word wherever it occurs will be expunged from the proceedings. Please come to the Resolution, and not deal with Mulki Rules, the Andhra Communist Party and so on.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I will follow your advice.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA rose—

MR. CHAIRMAN: When your turn comes, you can speak.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I accept his challenge.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Challenges may be hurled outside.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: We all work for the poor people. Every government is bound to work for the poor people. That is our slogan. Whatever be the complexion of the Government, it will always work for the poor people. That is natural.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: He is naming a person. Tomorrow it will be on the agenda. I will enquire from him and find out if he is stating a truth. He has said in the name of his wife and others, he has kept 2,000 acres.....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I did not say 2,000 acres. I said 30 acres.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: He said it is in the name of his wife....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: His father and all his family. They have migrated from the Guntur district to purchase 2,000 acres....

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Such aspersions cannot be made against a member of the CPI. It cannot be permitted. Tomorrow I should be allowed to clear this up. I will make enquiries and come with the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He can speak when his turn comes.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: I cannot speak about it now because I do not know the facts. I have to enquire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When his turn comes, he can reply to the arguments now made. That will also go on record. Why is he interrupting now?

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: Will conclude his speech.

*SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I therefore want to reiterate that it is not enough if we pass legislation here is also necessary that a supervisory machinery should be created to see that this legislation is properly implemented in its true spirit. I therefore submit that the subject of land reforms should be completely taken over by the Centre. With this I conclude my speech.

श्री श्रीगोबिन्द झा (जयनगर) : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने जो बात कही है, उसके बारे में मैं एक ही बात कहूँगा। जहाँ तक श्री० पी० घाई० का सवाल है, हम समझते हैं कि जो कोई भी हमारी कबनी धीर करनी में, हमारे एलान और व्यवहार में, फ़र्क को बतायेगा, वह हमारी मदद करेगा। श्री राजेश्वर राव हमारे सबसे ऊँचे नेता हैं। माननीय सदस्य ने उनके बारे में जो कुछ कहा है, उसके बारे में मैं जांच करके धीर तथ्यों को प्राप्त करके इस सदन में कहूँगा।

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: I did not mention the Party.

श्री श्रीगोबिन्द झा : माननीय सदस्य, श्री गोपालन, ने इस विषय की ऐतिहासिक पृष्ठभूमि को सदन के सामने रखा है। उसके बारे में कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं। इसलिए मैं उस इतिहास में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। सभी जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस देश के आम लोगों में उस समय गई, जब गांधीजी ने व्यक्तिगत रूप से कम्पारन के किसानों का नेतृत्व किया। उससे पहले किसानों का कांग्रेस के कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था। श्री गोपालन ने 1942 के बाद का जिक्र किया है कि गांधीजी ने लुई क्रिगर से कहा कि हम जमींदारों को बिना मुआबजा दिये जमीन को किसानों में बांट देंगे।

देश का सौभाग्य कहिये या दुर्भाग्य, आज देश में स्थिति यह है कि बड़े भूस्वामियों के प्रबन्धनों का उद्घाटन जनसंघ से निकल कर कांग्रेस में चला गया है। लोकसभा के पिछले चुनावों के बाद बड़े भूस्वामियों का बड़ा खिलाफ-बन्दे की पार्टी में चला गया

है। उन चुनावों में लोकहित-विरोधी नीतियाँ प्रचलाने के कारण जनसंघ धाँधे दक्षिणपन्थी दलों की हार हुई और उसके बाद बहुत से बड़े जनसंघी भूस्वामी भी कांग्रेस में शामिल हो गये। श्री बाजपेयी भले ही इस पर अफ़सोस करें, लेकिन आज स्थिति यह है कि पुपडी के सांभ्रदायिक कल्पे-धाम को कराने वाले वह जनसंघ भी झा बिहोर के मिनिस्टर हैं, जो कि 31 दिसम्बर, 1971 तक विधान सभा में जनसंघ के एम० एल० ए० थे।

यही कारण है कि जब भी भूमि-सुधार की बात आती है, तो कांग्रेस में बड़े बड़े भू-स्वामियों के प्रबन्धता भूमि-सुधार के उद्देश्य को भुला देते हैं। क्या भूमि-सुधार का उद्देश्य यह है कि ग़रीबों पर रहम किया जाये? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे ग़रीब नहीं हैं—वे हमारे धीर प्राप के पालनकर्ता और अन्नदाता हैं, जिनकी कमाई पर हम खिन्वा हैं। जो भी बड़ा भूस्वामी है, चाहे वह किसी भी परिवार का हो, मेहनत की कमाई से सैकड़ों हज़ारों एकड़ जमीन किसी की नहीं है, वह लूट की कमाई का नतीजा है, चाहे उस परिवार में मैं पैदा हुआ हूँ या कोई धीर पैदा हुआ हो। इस समाज व्यवस्था में के अन्दर अपनी ईशानदासी की मेहनत के कोई सैकड़ों एकड़ हासिल कर लेगा वह असम्भव है। इसलिए वह जोषक परिवार है। उसमें पैदा होने वाले का कुदूर नहीं है न आपका न मेरा। लेकिन वह परिवार सैकड़ों एकड़ या हज़ारों एकड़...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member may continue his speech next time. We shall take up the half-an-hour discussion now.