

if they were not apprehended under D.I.R., the whole defence effort of the Government would have collapsed? I may also cite the case of hon. Member, Shri Kishen Pattanayak who belongs to the Socialist Party who are not satisfied with the type of defence efforts that we are putting up. If anything at all, they can be called "ultra-defencists". He made a speech against the injustice of revenue officers in the collection of defence funds and he was hauled up before a court of law under D.I.R. and kept in jail without trial for several months until the Supreme Court could be moved and he could be released on bail. Do you mean to say that this is the way you are gearing up your defence efforts? Do you mean to say that if hon. Member, Mr. Kishen Pattanayak, was not arrested and kept behind the prison bars, your defence efforts would have collapsed? You are doing the things that you ought not to have done, and you are not doing the things that you ought to have done. That is why we want that the Emergency should be lifted. We do not trust this Government with the great powers that we have given to them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House is of opinion that the Proclamation of Emergency declared by the President on the 26th October, 1962 need not be continued any further and hence recommends to the Government to advise the President to revoke the same."

*The motion was negatived.*

15.05 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: LAND REFORMS

**Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:—

"This House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps by way of legislative and executive measures to bring about a thorough land reform including

transfer of ownership of land to the tiller, removal of rural indebtedness and provision of proper marketing facilities with price supports."

Sir, I have the honour and privilege of moving this Resolution before the House for its adoption. This is a question which is hanging fire for the last 17 years ever since we become free, particularly after the planned economic development took place. The Government and the ruling Party has been telling us that land reforms would be effected speedily. But I am sorry to say that much has not been done, not only that the land is not given to the tiller, not only that no better land tenure is brought in to effect production of agricultural goods, but something worse has been done during all these years. Landlordism and all its concomitant evil effects do continue to remain in all colonial and semi-colonial countries and we have nothing to boast of towards success in eradicating the same. No country which desires progress, which desires industrialisation, which desires production of goods, food, raw materials, clothing and other necessities for the people, can afford to neglect this task unless it does it at its own peril. In the past the feudal system might have served a progressive role once in history compared to its earlier forms of slavery and tribal despotism, but its continuance any further will only lead to our national ruin.

I submit that this feudal system must go for two main reasons. Firstly, it will enable the peasant, then the actual tiller to produce as much as the nation wants in foodstuffs and industrial raw materials and secondly it will usher in a new era of a different socio-economic order not only in the countryside but in urban areas. I say, remove the fetters of the peasant, encourage him by giving better implements, credits, fair price and marketing facilities, and he will solve much of the present crisis. He will enable you not to go in for alms, loans, PL-480s and what not. He will even save the nation's honour, stabilise its

[Shri Namblar]

economy and national defence and contribute to a well-contented population at home. The present rulers do not want to end this, though they know that there is truth in the demand of the peasant. They do not do it because they find that there is a selfish desire of the ruling Party behind this as many of them are connected with feudal lords or feudalism. Otherwise, such a phenomenal failure could not have taken place in this vital sector. The ruling Party talks tall about land reforms in season and out of season with no achievement whatsoever to their credit. In the First Five Year Plan itself, on the policy of land reforms, it is stated:

"The future of land ownership and cultivation constitutes perhaps the most fundamental issue in national development. To a large extent, the pattern of economic and social organisation will depend upon the manner in which the land problem is resolved."

These are not my words. They are the words of the very planners who wrote them. May I put a question that after 13 years of this statement how much land has been handed over to the tiller of the land, how much land has been taken as surplus from the landlords and how far has rural indebtedness been eradicated or brought down? In these answers lie the success or the failure of the implementation of the reform. I know that they will claim that they have removed zamindars and jagirdars and have brought more or less a uniform system of ryotwari land relations. By this process, I submit that they have only filled the coffers of the zamindars and jagirdars to the extent of about Rs. 450 crores, and I consider that this was nothing but a windfall to them who had no reason or rhyme to claim such huge compensation. But, on the other hand, what is it that has been given to the tiller? The tiller has not got the land, but he is to serve, instead of under the zamindar or jagirdar, under another new set of

landlords who have been created by such transfers. How did this lessen the burden of the actual tiller? The zamindars and jagirdars got windfalls, as I have already stated, and today, this amount of Rs. 450 crores of which Rs. 100 crores have already been paid and the remaining has been given in the form of bands—is being used by these zamindars for other purposes, to corner the national wealth and to bring much more money into the blackmarket.

Coming to the question of the land reforms that have been made with regard to the ryotwari system, excepting for the fact that there was a promise of land legislations and certain measures here and there in some States, nothing concrete has been done. I may quote the instance of the Kerala Agrarian Relations Act in this connection, the only Act of its kind which proposed to give substantial concessions to the tiller including ownership of land over and above the ceiling of 15 acres; that has been quashed by the Supreme Court. This has put a premium on having no effective legislation of this kind. Now, at least, after so much of agitation, and after waiting for seventeen years, Government have come forward to say that they will bring forward an amendment to the Constitution by way of the Seventeenth Amendment and they will remove the lacunae and see that these land legislations are put on the statute-book. They have taken seventeen long years for this purpose.

I may also quote the instance of the Madras Act which also promises something like land ceiling, but in effect, it has not brought any such advantage. In Madras, the land relations Act has been passed, placing the ceiling at 30 standard acres for individual holding, giving enough loopholes to extend it to 60 standard acres for bigger families. The exemptions given to sugarcane farming, sugar factories and the so-called efficiently managed farms etc. provide a sufficient means to

evade the ceiling. In the Madras State, landlords have made *benami* gift transactions in the name of public institutions, to evade the effect of ceiling. I would ask the hon. Minister, and I have asked the Madras Government as well, to tell us and the people how much land they have got by way of surplus after this legislation. But the Madras Government have not made a mention of it for the simple reason that they know that there is no, practically no, land to be taken in the form of surplus land, as sufficient time was given to the landlords to partition their land, write documents in the registrar's office and make *benami* transactions and do everything in a completely fool-proof manner so that no surplus land was left. This is exactly what has happened in Madras. and I challenge the Government whether my statement can be contradicted by the Madras Government or by the Planning Commission. This was deliberately permitted by Government, and the Madras Government knew that it was going to be so. Still, they gave enough time to do so. Similar is the case more or less with regard to the other States as well.

This is borne out by the fact that no land which has been taken has been distributed to the tiller in any State under the ceiling scheme. Let the hon. Minister tell us whether any land has been given to the tiller at all. I have gone through the book on the progress of land reforms, and I have searched and searched for statistics to show that the land has been given to the tiller, but to my utter dismay, I have found nothing there. If the hon. Minister could tell us, I shall be very happy to have the figures. Not only have these land reform legislations for passing on the land to the tiller not been satisfactorily enacted, but even with regard to the land tenure legislations, I can state that today, there is so much of uncertainty for the peasant that any day his land may be taken away. There is no question of more land for him or of his becoming the

owner of the land, but the danger is that whatever he has is being threatened to be taken away. Not only is there a threat of its being taken away, but in thousands of cases, the security in tenure is a misnomer, as he is actually only a tenant-at-will without any records; and large-scale evictions are taking place with the result that whatever land was given in the hands of the tenant is no more going to be with him. In thousands of cases, the civil courts go to the aid of the landlords as the tenants are unable to produce any record of rights. Tens of thousands of peasants have tilled the land till the other day, but they are now being thrown out as agricultural workers, thanks to the connivance of the officials of the Government and the way that our civil courts behave. This phenomenon is taking place throughout the country.

It was against this phenomenon that in the Madras State, in 1961, thousands of peasants rose and conducted a nation-wide or State-wide struggle wherein 15,000 peasants went to jail to record their protest. They want land ceiling to be brought into effect and the land to pass on to their hands. But, apart from the so-called land legislation which has been passed, to which I have already made a reference, there is nothing more concrete, and today I find that in various districts of the Madras State, such as Tiruchirappalli and Tanjore and in all wet areas, the lands are being taken away from the peasantry. The struggle presently conducted by the Andhra peasants against high taxes for *banjar* lands and proper land reforms has taken a State-wide character leading to the arrests of hundreds daily even today. I shall presently come to the question of how much *banjar* land is available in Andhra Pradesh and how this could not have been given, which will go to show that Government are not at all serious about land reforms. It is only for propaganda and as a vote-catching device that at the time of election they talk about land reforms, and afterwards, they support the landlords and the money-

[Shri Nambiar]

lenders who are behind these landlords. Even in the Planning Commission's proposal for land reforms, a lacuna was kept deliberately to help the landlords in the name of resumption for personal cultivation. This is an invidious way of limiting the scope of land reforms because the landlords want to utilise this lacuna in the name of personal cultivation to grab the land from the peasantry whenever it suits them. The Planning Commission should have taken steps to see that the advantage of this lacuna is denied to the landlords. I know of cases in Kerala, Madras, Andhra Pradesh and wherever I have got information from, that this lacuna has been utilised for the purpose of evicting the peasantry. With all this and with the history behind of seventeen years, and with the behaviour of the law courts, the land reform proposal of Government has been reduced to a mockery. It has been brought to a nullity, and it does not give any relief to the peasant.

Now, I would take up the question of giving cultivable waste land and fallow land to the peasantry. I find from the facts available in the progress report, that up to 1960, 7.8 million acres of cultivable waste land were distributed out of a total cultivable waste land of 54 million acres, besides 59 million acres of fallow land, coming to a total of about 113 million acres. Should it require 17 years for Government to distribute about 7 million acres out of 113 million acres? From the way that the bureaucracy and the Government are behaving in the matter of the distribution of the fallow land and cultivable waste land, it can be seen that the Government are absolutely so lethargic that they do not care to see that the land problem is solved in this country; otherwise, there can be no justification for this callousness.

I am giving you the figures. The principal States which account for the bulk of the uncultivated land other than fallow lands are as follows:

Andhra—8.1 million acres  
Assam—8.6 million acres

Bihar—2.7 million acres  
Bombay—11.2 million acres  
M.P.—18.4 million acres  
Madras—3.5 million acres  
Mysore—7.1 million acres  
Orissa—6.5 million acres  
Rajasthan—21.6 million acres  
UP—7.3 million acres

Out of these, they have distributed practically an insignificant portion. The sorry state of affairs is that Government even today have not got complete details as to where these lands are situated, how to bring them under cultivation etc.—leave alone the question of giving them to the tiller. As a result of the abolition of zamindaris and jagirdaris, the bulk of these lands have passed into Government hands. But Government say they have no records, they have no information, they are unable to utilise these lands. Can anything be more lethargic than this? It is most sorrowful that Government do not know where our land lies. They have not surveyed them, they have no facts and figures. If the Government is a government of the people, if it had any consideration for the poor peasantry and the landless, this Government would never have behaved like this and come forward and said 'we do not know the facts concerning the available waste land and cultivable land'.

What is the area sown in this country, all told? 322 million acres. What is the total area of the cultivable land and fallow land yet untapped? 113 million acres.

That means, one-third of the total sown area still remains untapped in spite of the fact that we have so much of manpower left in the country. With this manpower, if you utilise all this land, the food problem of the country could have been solved by this time and our dependence on imports from America under the blessed—and cursed—PL 480 would have ended, and we would not have had the menace of the American shadow over the food we eat. Any human being, any living human being, can be tamed and can be enslaved by giving food. We treat

dogs by throwing crumbs. The Americans want to treat us by throwing wheat under PL 480 and we run after it wagging our tail. Should we have come to this pass when we have so much land available in this country, when we have so much manpower at our disposal, when we had 17 years of political independence? I have no answer to give to this question. It is up to the ruling party to answer.

The Third Plan target of food production is 100 million tons by the end of 1965-66. But what is the achievement? In 1960-61, our production was 76 million tons; in 1961-62, it went up to 80 millions; in 1962-63 it came down to 78.7 million tons. They attribute the decline to failure of rain and such other things. This phenomenon is bound to happen in a country of such sub-continental proportions like ours. So we cannot take shelter under that. You should have explored other alternatives. Even granting that the process of decline is arrested, production is not on the increase to any considerable extent. I am afraid we may not be able to reach our target before the end of the Fourth Plan. The Minister and the Planning Commission must tell us and assure us that we will be able to reach the target by the end of the Third Plan. I challenge him, and I reiterate that they are not going to reach the target. If they can, I will go to the hon. Minister, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, with a bouquet in my hands—certainly. But I know that he is not going to achieve it because they are not moving in that direction.

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** Now he will not give bouquets.

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh):** I am not going to China.

**Shri Nambiar:** Why should that reference be made? I am born to India. I am an Indian. I have nothing to do with China. Let us look to ourselves.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Even after 47 years of communist rule in Russia, they are still importing food.

**Shri Nambiar:** Russia will look after herself, China will look after herself. I will look after myself and my country and my countrymen including the hon. Minister.

The annual increase in population is 2.4 per cent and the agricultural production is more or less stagnant, for the last several years, whatever may be the reason. Our food imports for the last 6 years are to the extent of Rs. 962.7 crores worth, that is, at an average of Rs. 150 crores per year. It was only the other day that the Minister of State in the Finance Ministry, Shri Bhagat, stated that Rs. 850 crores of Indian currency is held by the US in India, mainly the proceeds of sales under PL 480—which is about one third of the total money in circulation here. What else can be more ignominious than this? The total money in circulation is Rs. 3,000 crores, but about thousand crores of rupees are in the hands of the Americans here in India. They are holding it in our currency. But the hon. Minister said that 'we have got control so that the Americans may not be in a position to utilise it as they want'. That is no solace, no defence. The fact remains that we have got ourselves in India indebted to the extent of this huge amount of American currency, besides the foreign exchange in respect of which we are already indebted. We are paying interest on the foreign exchange that we get to the extent of 5.75 per cent, which only a money-lender of the American type will charge. If they wanted to help, they would not take 5.75 per cent interest. This is our miserable condition.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** How much interest does he want to pay?

**Shri Nambiar:** Now I come to the question of helping the peasantry to produce more. The Third Plan promised to secure reasonable and stable price to the producer taking into account the cost of production so as to

[Shri Nambiar]

give him sufficient incentive. But all that has been only on paper. As usual, the moneylender and the millowner take away the produce immediately after the harvest at a low rate and sell them later at a very much higher rate. Government are unable to stop this plunder by the middleman who takes away all the fruits of labour of the peasantry....

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is quorum.

Shri Nambiar: [There is enough quorum....

That is exactly the reason why we have today unfortunately high prices for foodstuffs. Exploitation of the agriculturist and lack of capital formation in that sector are due to lack of facilities for marketing agricultural produce so far as the agriculturist is concerned. Hundreds of crores of rupees which otherwise would go to the improvement of land are taken away by the millers and moneylender-cum-banias. Even the British ICS officers were well aware of the magnitude of the problem in those days. These problems have only become accentuated now. The old Royal Commission on Agriculture had to note that 'in no country are these differences (between the prices of producer and consumer) greater than in India where production is in the hands of a large number of petty cultivators who for the most part lack most the financial resources and the necessary storage to attempt any regulation of their selling in accordance with the state of market'.

At present, the market exploitation of the peasantry is widespread and well-knit in the country. A careful study of market behaviour would show that the moneylender-cum banias have the upper hand in the marketing of the village agricultural produce. The poor

peasant who borrows from the moneylender is obliged to sell his produce to the same person. His bargaining power is so limited that he sells a major part of his produce immediately after the harvest, at a least competitive price. This is corroborated by the findings of the Foodgrains Inquiry Committee.

When the tempo of the arrivals is down, the price goes up. Since the difference between peak and trough is wide, the magnitude of money involved is high. At the same time, the actual consumer is also not left out. As is our experience, the prices of the foodgrain go up. All this wide margin of profit is taken by the middleman. That is why the margin between the wholesale and retail prices of foodgrains remains so high.

15.30 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

Only the other day this was discussed. It was said that by fiscal measures, prices could be controlled. All fiscal measures have failed. Today, the wheat prices in Delhi are around Rs. 29; rice in Madras is selling at Rs. 75 per bag—the good variety; the coarse variety sells at Rs. 65 per bag. It was never so in the history of Madras State, except in the black-market days of 1942-43, world-war days, when the black-market price was this. The lack of holding power on the part of the producers and market fluctuation create hazards, especially of far-reaching consequences.

I do not want to take the time of the House. Even the Third Plan speaks of the extension of State trading in suitable directions. It is our experience that in the last decade, despite all the assurances, Government adopts a callous attitude to the whole affair of State trading in foodgrains, which is a long standing demand. The limited, partial, experience of State

trading in foodgrains was encouraging, no doubt. For instance, the Economic Survey of Indian Agriculture has correctly emphasised that it may be pointed out that the effect of changes in the net government supply to the market is stronger than that of the equivalent increase in production, as the latter is only partly reflected in the market supplies. State-trading in foodgrains alone is the remedy for something towards price-control.

I am concluding, Madam Chairman. Government should take steps towards land reforms and introduce State trading in a wider field. Only then the problem can be solved. Otherwise, if the food problem remains the same, if raw materials for our industries are not available, if our economies stagnate and we have to depend on outside help, it will bring us ruin. We are not against Government's measures in these matters, but we want the Government to take bold steps towards implementation of land reforms and not protect the feudal lords. If Government does not do that, people will have no go but throw out the Government. In these circumstances, I request that my Resolution may be accepted by the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** Resolution moved:

"This House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps by way of legislative and executive measures to bring about a thorough land reform including transfer of ownership of land to the tiller, removal of rural indebtedness and provision of proper marketing facilities with price supports."

There are some amendments.

**श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :**  
मैं प्रस्तुत करता हूँ :

"यह सभा सरकार से सिफारिश करती है कि पूर्णतया भूमि-मुधार करने

करने के लिये, जिन में जोतने वाले को भूमि का स्वामी बनाना, बिना मुनाफे की खेती (साढ़े ६ एकड़) का लगान समाप्त करना, पांच-सदस्यीय परिवार की बिना मशीन की सहायता खेती करने की क्षमता के तीन गुना से अधिक जमीन का भूमिहीनों में वितरण, ग्रामीणों की ऋणग्रस्तता को समाप्त करना और मूल्यों को गिरने पर सहायता देने के साथ-साथ विक्रय की समुचित सुविधाओं की व्यवस्था करना सम्मिलित है, विधान सम्बन्धी उपायों द्वारा तत्काल कदम उठाये जायें।"

**Shri D. S. Patil (Yeotmal):** I beg to move:

"That in the resolution,—

after 'rural indebtedness' insert—

"provision of adequate credit to the agriculturist."

**Mr. Chairman:** The Resolution and the amendments are before the House. **Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah,**

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni):** The Resolution moved by **Shri Nambiar** is not a new one.

**Shri Sheo Narain:** Madam Chairman, is there a list of speakers before you for this also? I am the only person who stood up but you called somebody who did not even stand up.

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** सभापति जी, यह प्रस्ताव बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है। अगर इस के लिये आध घंटा समय बढ़ा दिया जाये, तो इस के बाद आने वाला प्रस्ताव दो मिनट में पेश कर दिया जायेगा और इस में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होगी। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव के लिये आध घंटा समय बढ़ा दिया जाए।

**सभापति महोदय :** इस प्रस्ताव पर बोलने वालों का संख्या देख कर बाद में इस के बारे में फैसला करेंगे।

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:** After all, the Congress Party is in power and it is wedded to the principle of land reforms since its famous Karachi Resolution. The entire agricultural economy and social justice depend upon this. Mr. Nambiar has stated three points in this Resolution: immediate reforms for transfer of ownership of land to the tiller, removal of rural indebtedness and provision for proper marketing facilities with price support. The report of the Planning Commission on progress of land reforms says on page 249:

"The progress of tenancy reform as well as the imposition of ceilings on agricultural holdings will lead to a substantial increase in the number of small peasant owners..... Here it is proposed to review briefly the four main aspects of agrarian reorganisation, namely (1) consolidation of holdings, (2) land management practices, (3) development of cooperative farming and (4) development of cooperative village management as the objective towards which the village economy is to be reorganised."

We would review now how far our Government has succeeded in the last 16 years. We should not forget that this is a State subject and whatever be the wishes of the Centre, they have to be implemented by the State Government. Much headway has not been made by the various States in the implementation of land reforms. In several States laws on land reform have been enacted but there is justifiable criticism that the tiller of the soil has not become the owner. The feudal elements have circumvented the

laws and the position is just as it was before the laws. I do not know how far the Centre can ask the State Governments to reorganise the whole system. The land revenue machinery has also to be thoroughly rearranged and reorganised. Without reorganising the implementing machinery, no reforms will do good. The Central Government should discuss with the State Governments and see how effectively these land reforms could be implemented.

About rural indebtedness, the report of rural credit survey had recently been published. It says that in spite of our spending crores of rupees and pumping enormous amounts in the agricultural sector through community development, through co-operative societies, through panchayati raj, to the agricultural department, agricultural indebtedness has not been wiped off so far. On the contrary, agricultural indebtedness has increased. So far as the co-operative sector is concerned, I would just like to quote from the recent statement made by the Minister of Community Development. He said:

"Against a target of Rs. 512 crores set up by the State Governments for the supply of short and medium-term credit during the last year of the Plan, to co-operatives supplied Rs. 228 crores in 1961-62. The provisional figures for 1962-63 are Rs. 256 crores and the estimate for 1963-64 is Rs. 318 crores."

They say the progress is not up to expectation. They have stated several reasons. I can say that though the Government is expending enormous amounts by giving credit to the farmers, the amounts have not reached the farmers, the reason being that the land tenure system is so defective in the States and even to this day the tiller of the soil will not claim the ownership and will not be able to produce his *patta* to the credit society to

get the loans. The other defect is that the credit that is being given to the farmers is very much diversified,—there are three or four agencies operating—with the result that those who are in power, those who can wield some influence, could alone get the entire credit that is being given by the Government and not the ordinary peasant.

Therefore, the first thing that the Government should do, is all the institutional credit should be channelled only through one source. Unless that aspect is seriously tackled, no amount of credit which is being given to the farmers will remove their indebtedness nor will their production target go up.

**Mr. Chairman:** I request the hon. Member to conclude now.

**Shri P. Venkatasubbalah:** These are the main problems which I wanted to place before this House. But I would like to tell Shri Nambiar that this party is wedded to land reforms policy which is being pursued in all the States. My only request to Government is, wherever there are loopholes they should be plugged, and wherever the reforms have been done, where there are anomalies and where there are defects, they have to be remedied, and that land reforms should be brought thoroughly and exhaustively as immediately as possible.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shri Ranga. I request hon. Member to co-operate with me.

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** I do not know what our hon. friends have in their minds when they talk about land reforms. We thought, when we were initiating the movement against the zamindari system, that all land reform meant the abolition of the zamindari system and thereby getting the ownership of land conferred upon the peasants who are themselves cultivating the lands. So far as the ryotwari system is concerned, we wanted the tenants under the ryotwari pattadars to be given security of tenure over a

period of years: not that the tenants should become the owners. The ryotwari pattadars were the owners; their tenants should be given security of tenure over a period of five years, say, in six to 10 years, as was the case in Ireland and in so many other European countries, wherever there was tenancy legislation.

We wanted also the rents to be reduced and made reasonably low. When the pattadar wanted the land for his own cultivation, he must be free to resume the cultivable right over his land after giving one year's notice to the tenant. This is how land reform was understood then. It was that idea of land reform which was supported by the Congressmen as a whole, by the then Communists, by the then Congress Socialist Party and all other leftists as they were then known. It was that movement that led us not only in the three South Indian States which my hon. friend has mentioned, but also in all the States in India. I am glad to say that due to the inspiration given by Mahatma Gandhi and the dynamism provided by the leadership of the Congress Party, as it was then that we were able to get rid of the zamindari system in all the States. There is not one State now where there is zamindari or jagirdari system. So, there are no landlords.

Who are the people that we have now? It has become a fashion for my communist friends to go on saying that the peasants themselves who own 20 or 30 acres or even 2 or 1 acre are landlords. They style them as landlords and land monopolies. I know what they have done in Soviet Russia and also in China. Before that, let me say that it would be a bad day indeed for India....

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:** Are not those people who are having hundreds and thousands of acres now landlords?

**Shri Ranga:** In regard to those few big landlords in each village—there may be three or four in each village; probably in the Kurnool district, from where he comes, there are some—in

[Shri Ranga]

regard to those about whom my hon. friend seems to be worried, I might say that there is the land ceiling legislation. Whether it is right or wrong is another matter. Whether we approve of it or not is another matter. But it is a *fait accompli* and it is there.

My friend, Mr. Nambiar, has complained that quite a number of them indulged in benami transactions and so on. First of all, it was wrong on the part of Government to have questioned their right of ownership. Having done that, they have given the freedom to these people either to own their land in a joint family fashion or distribute it among all the coparceners within the family. They have distributed among themselves and prostrating before this law, they have brought themselves within the purview of the land ceiling legislation. If my hon. friend wants in the communist fashion to run after them, hunt them and drive them also into landless people, he is welcome to do it, but I am certainly not in favour of it.

So far as all those peasants are concerned, they have got to function within the land ceiling legislation and they are not expected to get more than Rs. 500 per month. My hon. friends are all so very keen that every industrial worker should be paid not less than Rs. 100 per month; i.e. Rs. 1200 per annum. That is the minimum. Regarding the maximum, according to their own INTUC rules, they admit anyone who earns up to Rs. 500 as a worker. A person is allowed to be treated as a worker if he gets an income of Rs. 500 a month. But so far as the peasants are concerned, they are to be treated as land monopolies, landlords and exploiters, merely because a few of them, may be three or four in any village who are the richest people there, would be getting Rs. 500 a month and not more, according to the land ceiling legislation, they are to be treated as landlords and land monopolies. I protest against this attitude and I am opposed to it.

Who is the tiller? According to my communist friends, only the agricultural worker would be the tiller and the others will not be treated as tillers at all. I question that. We accept them as tillers. At the same time, we treat the land-holding peasants—whether they are ryotwari pattadars or pattadars who have come into the erstwhile zamindari areas—as tillers of the soil.

These people are the owners today. Are we to dispossess them? If the Communists were to have their own way, they would have dispossessed them. They have done it in Soviet Russia, in China and other Communist countries. And, they would do it also in the name of the tiller. This is the game they are out for. Therefore, it is most necessary for hon. friends like Shri Venkatasubbaiah and various others, who come here representing the rural areas and who, at the same time, have got the wrong idea that the agricultural worker alone is the primary, the principal and the most sacred pleasant and all other people who have got their pattas, who are land holders, who are cultivating their own land are not as good people as the agricultural workers and therefore they must all be set aside and dispossessed.

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah: I did not mean that.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): You are giving a wrong interpretation.

Shri Ranga: I stand corrected so far as you are concerned. But one thing is clear, that all these self-employed, land-owning peasant owners have to be treated as tillers. They have been given land and their landholdings have to be respected. Their rights to their land have to be respected. That is not the attitude of the Communists. That is exactly the reason why I wish to warn my hon. friends on the Congress benches against...

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Your friend is sitting there.

**Shri Ranga:** I want to warn them against these Communists and I hope they would not walk into their trap.

Coming to the other question, my hon. friend said that in the name of personal cultivation they are evicting people. Where is the question of eviction. Here is a tenant. Is he an owner? According to the Communists he is an owner today and tomorrow he would be dispossessed. According to us these tenants are not owners. The ryotwari pattadar is the owner. The tenant is a gentleman who has been brought in to assist him in the work that he has to do. He is a tenant at will. Any time he may be removed. In order to protect him there was the tenancy protection legislation in most of the States. Especially, in the State of Madras, I may tell you, it was in 1953 that initiative was taken by Rajaji as the Chief Minister, to pass that legislation in the very same district where my hon. friend, Shri Nambiar, was operating. I do not know where he operates now. The tenants were protected there. Afterwards that legislation was extended to the whole of Madras State. Now in Andhra Pradesh also a similar legislation has come to be passed. It has come in many other States. Wherever it has not been passed, I would like it to be passed. We would have no objection to it. But so far as the ownership rights of the peasants are concerned, we must be very clear that so long as those people continue to cultivate their own land, take active interest in the cultivation of their own land and continue making the contribution that they are making today to our production, to our employment market, they ought not to be disturbed. Their rights should not be endangered in any way, and in every possible manner the States should take steps, by various means which have been suggested here by various hon. friends including the socialist friends, in order to strengthen them.

In conclusion, let me say that I stand for the abolition of land revenue from all these land-holding peasants.

The whole of it should go except for a nominal fee which would cover the expenses of keeping land records. They should also be given rural credit at rates which are not higher than those rates at which capital credit is being offered to industrialists. The banjar lands that are there with the Government should be distributed to the many landless people in the country. But it is indeed a treacherous move that is being made by our Communist friends by asking the Government to give away the land to the agricultural workers, only to be dispossessed from all those lands the next day our Communist friends come into power. The Communists wish to play this mischief and we are opposed to this mischief.

**Shri Muthu Gounder (Tirupattur):** Madam Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution moved by Shri Nambiar. I have heard the two extreme views, one from the Communist side and the other from the Swatantra side. I have also heard the view of my hon. friend from the Congress side. I find that all parties are for land reforms, land ceilings and similar things. As far as implementation is concerned, every party accepts that it has not been perfect or complete or as much as it was expected. Even the Government or the Treasury Benches accept that the implementation has not been up to the mark. They may say that they are doing something to implement it and it will be done in due course.

We are now reviewing the position of implementation of land reforms in this House through this Resolution. We see how implementation is being done from our own viewpoint. Shri Nambiar may be watching the implementation from the point of view of his party and Shri Ranga from the point of view of his party. As far as DMK Party is concerned, it is always for land reforms. We want reforms not only in land but in other spheres of society also so that we may achieve our object of a socialist society, but it should be by democratic methods.

While implementing the various land reforms, we should see to it that our

[Shri Muthu Gounder]

agricultural production is not affected in any way. Implementation of land reforms means land to the tiller, removal of rural indebtedness, provision of proper marketing facilities with price support and similar things mentioned in the Resolution. When we say land to the tiller, we have to define as to who the tiller is. Shri Ranga has clarified certain points and created some suspicions on the question as to who the tiller is. It is true that a tiller is one who tills, but there may be tillers owning many acres of land. Certainly, we are not going to implement the plans to suit the tastes of very big land owners who are owning hundred acres and more and employing 10 or 20 labourers and then exploiting the toils of the labourers. When we talk of land reforms and implementation of land reforms we mean the small peasant who tills his own land.

While introducing land reforms we have to take special care to see that there is no fragmentation of lands, which is a dangerous thing which we all want to avoid. It is more dangerous than the land being in a few hands. If there is fragmentation, agriculture may not be economic and it may not give enough to the farmer. Then we will have to go in for collective or co-operative farming and all other evils will come in its wake. Even in Russia, after so many years of experiment with collective farming and joint farming they have found that such methods will not give the desired results. In Russia it has been a failure and the result has not been up to the mark. So, if we also introduce so many land legislations, there will be fragmentation and we will have no other alternative but to resort to co-operative or collective farming. I think Shri Nambiar by introducing this Resolution and so many other resolutions, so far as land reforms are concerned, is slowly trying to take our agriculture to the status of Russian agricultural economy. In that case, we will not be able to produce

anything and we will be in the same position as Russia is.

Even in Russia, after so many years of experiments with cultivation, they had to take some lessons from some democratic countries, as far as land policy is concerned. Mr. Khrushchev has stated in a recent bulletin:

"...one should not stand aloof and shut oneself up in one's own shell. It would be foolish to study the achievements of foreign science for the simple reason that they have been scored in a capitalist economy."

Because they are not able to produce as much as Government wants, he even went to the extent of threatening them.

"If workers do not want to study or introduce anything new, if they find it too difficult to comprehend the achievements of science and practice, continue stubbornly to clutch at the old, these people should be removed and others put in their place....."

We have millions of wonderful people, millions of educated youngmen and women who are burning with desire to build a communist society. These people should be promoted."

16.00 hrs.

We are able to find out from all these things that these collective farms are not working properly. After 50 years of good work and good farming Russia still has to get foodgrains from America. Even this year they have to import foodgrains worth Rs. 250 crores. By this I do not mean to say that I want to support only Russia or be against Russia and Soviet policies. We have to take the good things whether they are from the Communists or from democratic States. As far as agriculture is concerned, we have to take any good thing that is there in any State.

We are able to see that New Zealand, Australia, America and Egypt are having the maximum yield per acre. Simply these reforms and ceilings will not do. We have to give incentives, prices and other things. Rural indebtedness is there still everywhere. On account of Shri Rajagopalachari's Agricultural Debt Relief Act a large number of debts were cleared at that time, but now they have grown. Even after so many years of block development schemes and other things agricultural debts are still on the increase. Unless we give some price incentives, there is no chance of the agriculturists getting good remuneration and a good income. We may give him loans from societies, through block development schemes, under any scheme of foreign loans or at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent as desired by Professor Ranga and as are given to other industrial companies; even then he should have the capacity to repay the loan. The agriculturist should have enough capacity and that will come only if he gets good remuneration out of his produce. That should be our motto and we should fight and work for that till the end. Then only we will be able to do anything to implement it; otherwise, implementation of land reforms will not take us anywhere, or to a healthier place than where we are now.

**The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Shinde):** Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend.

**Some Hon. Members:** Why?

**Shri Shinde:** I am going to explain it. But I rise to oppose the Resolution moved by Shri Nambiar.

**Shri Nambiar:** Therefore it has to be opposed.

**Shri Shinde:** I know, the points which have been incorporated in the Resolution moved by Shri Nambiar are very important and quite vital

from the point of view of increasing agricultural production.

**An Hon. Member:** Still you oppose it?

**Shri Shinde:** The hon. Minister will enumerate the various measures which have been adopted by the various State Governments to increase agricultural production *vis-a-vis* land reforms, rural indebtedness and availability of agricultural credit. But my objection to the Resolution is based on a point of principle. I do not think, Shri Nambiar, an intelligent Member as he is, is unaware of the Constitutional provisions of the Indian Constitution. I might draw his attention to the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. In the Seventh Schedule, List II—State List, entry No. 14 refers to agriculture, entry No. 18 refers to land, entry No. 28 refers to markets and fairs and entry No. 30 refers to money-lending and relief of agricultural indebtedness. Therefore all these matters which have been raised by Shri Nambiar are matters which come within the purview of the State Governments. In fact, the Indian Constitution has been framed with some democratic objectives in view. I think, the framers of the Constitution had quite valid reasons to include all these items in the State List. But as Shri Nambiar is a believer in a particular political philosophy.....

**Shri Nambiar:** I am prepared to amend the Resolution so as to make a recommendation to the State Governments.

**Shri Shinde:** In his Resolution he has suggested the taking of executive and legislative action. He has suggested that Parliament should take that action.

**Shri Nambiar:** I would say, "recommends to the State Governments".

**Shri Shinde:** Mr. Nambiar in his Resolution says....

**Shri S. S. More (Poona):** Madam, are we not discussing a Resolution which is *ab initio* illegal?

**Shri Shinde:** Mr. Nambiar is a strong believer in centralisation. He does not believe in federal constitution. We know how disastrous have been the results in Russia due to centralisation. They have a highly centralised State and we know how the centralisation in the Soviet Union has had disastrous effects on the agricultural production in that country. I might draw the attention of Mr. Nambiar to the fact that due to the situation that prevailed during the last 30 to 40 years in the Soviet Union, the agricultural production did not increase at all. In fact, I might quote Mr. Khrushchev himself. In one of his speeches of 27th June, 1962, he drew the attention of the agricultural workers in the Soviet Union to the fact that the agricultural productivity in the Soviet Union was one of the lowest in the world. He said that to produce 100 kg. of milk in the Soviet Union, they required 8.77 man-hours, while in the U.S.A. for producing the same quantity of milk they required 3.9 man-hours. Similarly, to produce 100 kg. of beef in the Soviet Union they required 42 man-hours while in U.S.A. they required 7.1 man-hours to produce the same quantity of beef. That shows that the productivity of Soviet agriculture was 2 to 6 times less than that of American agriculture in the field of animal husbandry.

Then, Madam, Mr. Nambiar has suggested that Parliament should arrogate to itself the subjects which have been entrusted to the State Governments for legislation and other measures. If the Centre arrogate to itself the responsibilities in respect of the agricultural production, the agricultural production would suffer to a great extent. I might refer to the agricultural productivity of the Soviet Union as compared to other countries. It is 66 per cent as compared to that of U.S.A., 77 per cent as compared to that of Canada and 35 per cent as compared to that of Sweden. The U.S.S.R.'s agricultural production is equivalent to that of Spain. The

House might be aware that Spain is one of the feudal countries and the Soviet agricultural productivity favourably compares only with that of Spain. So, my contention is that if Mr. Nambiar wants that the Central Government should assume to itself all these powers, then, I think, in India agriculture would not prosper or would not progress at all. In fact, during the last 10 years, especially after the Plan period, we know that there has been a substantial increase in agricultural production. We know that it is not adequate to our requirements. But that does not mean that there has not been any increase in agricultural production. During the first two Plan periods, our agricultural production has increased upto 35 to 40 per cent. That means it is anywhere between 3 to 4 per cent per annum. Even if we study the development of agriculture in different countries, we find that our agriculture is also developing. So, the measures which are being adopted by the Government of India and by various State Governments are, I think, in the right direction. As Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah has suggested, it may be that there might be some inadequacies and some defects in our approach and in our measures etc., but the Government of India are taking active measures to see that the various defects are rectified and the necessary progress is achieved in the field of agriculture.

**श्री रामसेवक यादव:** सभापति महोदया, श्री आनन्द नम्बियार ने जो संकल्प सदन के सामने रखा है, मैं उस का इस संशोधन के साथ कि साढ़े ६ एकड़ जमीन का लगान समाप्त हो और एक परिवार जिस में ५ व्यक्ति हों, बिना मशीन का सहारा लिये जितनी खेती करते हैं उस से तीनगुने से ऊपर वाली जमीन बिना भूमि वालों में वितरण की जाय, इस संशोधन के साथ मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

सभापति महोदया, समाजवाद के अन्तर्गत भूमिसुधार का एक ही अर्थ है कि जमीन जो सही मायने में खेती करते हैं, उन के हाथ में पहुँच जाय और यह उस जमीन के मालिक बनें। यह भूमि सुधार कानून की मंशा होती है और जब हम उसके बारे में बात करते हैं तो उस का यही अर्थ समझा जाता है। एक तरफ़ भूमि सुधार कानून के अन्तर्गत खेती करने वाले को जमीन मिले, यह सरकार की मंशा होती है। इस तरह के कानून बनते हैं। लेकिन साथ ही साथ सरकार और उस के नौकर इस कानून के खिलाफ़ भ्रमल करते हैं और उस को बराबर तोड़ते रहते हैं। मैं आप से निवेदन करूँ कि भारत सरकार के एक मंत्री ने राजस्थान में जाकर गैर कानूनी ढंग से जमीन हासिल की और उसके अदालत में मुकद्दमें चले और वहाँ उस राजस्थान सरकार के एक आर्द० ए० एस० अफसर जिन्होंने भी गैर कानूनी ढंग से जमीन हासिल की, वह सब चीजें एक अख़बार 'मरुचेतना' में छपीं। उस में सारे तरीक़े के संघर्ष चले। एक तरफ़ भूमि सुधार का यह उद्देश्य है कि जमीन किसान को मिले जो जोतता है और इसके बिलकुल ठीक विपरीत केन्द्रीय सरकार के मंत्री जमीन गैर कानूनी ढंग से हासिल करें और उस पर अदालत में मुकद्दमें चलें यह दोनों चीजें परस्पर विरोधी हैं और इस तरह से कभी भी भूमि सुधार होने वाला नहीं है।

जब भूमि सुधार की बात हम करते हैं, समाजवाद की बात करते हैं तो सगुण और निर्गुण का भेद करना जरूरी हो जाता है। समाजवाद और भूमिसुधार निर्गुण है.....

**श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) :** क्या मंत्री को अधिकार नहीं है कि वह भूमि हासिल करे और खेती करे ?

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** नहीं है जब त्यागी जी यह मान कर चलते हैं कि जमीन जोतने

वाले की है। अब मंत्री तो जोतते नहीं हैं, जमीन कलक्टर जमीन जोतते नहीं हैं फिर जमीन कैसे रखते हैं ? यह इस कानून की पहली मंशा के विपरीत जाता है। मैं तो त्यागी जी को यहां तक बतलाऊँ कि भूमि सुधार कानून में जब तक यह व्यवस्था नहीं होगी कि जो खुद अपने हाथ से खेती नहीं करता है वह जमीन नहीं पायेगा तब तक समाजवाद और भूमिसुधार की बात सरकार के लिये करना बेमानी है। हिन्दुस्तान की जैसी वर्ण व्यवस्था रही है उसमें तो हल की मूठ भी छुना कुछ व्यक्तियों द्वारा पाप समझा जाता है, जब तक इस भावना को बदला नहीं जायेगा और यह भावना नहीं पैदा की जायेगी कि सब से बड़ा किसान और मजदूर वह है जो रात दिन खेती करता है, तब तक आप चाहे जितना निर्गुण कानून सुधार को बात करें और चाहे जितने कानून आप यहां पास करें, कभी भी भूमि सुधार होने वाला नहीं है। तब तक यह दफ़ा नहीं बनता है कानून को कि किसान वहीं माना जायेगा जोकि स्वयं खेती करता है, वास्तविक भूमि सुधार देश में होने वाला नहीं है। जब तक खेती करने वाला जमीन का मालिक नहीं बनेगा तब तक आप को मंशा कदापि पूरी होने वाली नहीं है। जब तक आप इस निर्गुण समाजवाद और निर्गुण भूमि सुधार को साकार रूप नहीं देंगे तब तक कोई काम नहीं चलेगा। आप के इस निर्गुण समाजवाद और निर्गुण भूमि सुधार कानून का आज यह अर्थ है कि जमीन की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ी है और जो १५ करोड़.....

**श्री शिव नारायण :** माननीय सदस्य यह निर्गुण सगुण पढ़ा रहे हैं या लैंड रिफार्मस पढ़ा रहे हैं ?

**श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) :** सब कुछ पढ़ाना होगा।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** अब जो ककहरा भी नहीं जानते हैं उन को क, ख, ग, घ शुरु से सिखाना पड़ेगा।

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

16-13 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि जब तक इस को सगुण रूप नहीं देंगे तब तक कोई काम वहीं चलेगा। आज इस निर्गुण समाजवाद और भूमिसुधार का नतीजा यह है कि १५ करोड़ इस देश के आदिमियों का एक बार भी पेट नहीं भरता है। ६ लाख आदिमी बिना खाने मरते हैं यह निश्चित बात है कि जब तक भूमि सुधार की एक अधिकतम जोत की सीमा निर्धारित नहीं की जाती है तब तक इन की यह मंशा कि भूमिहीनों में खेती के लिए जमीन वितरण हो, यह मंशा पूरी नहीं होने वाली है। जब तक यह नहीं किया जाता है तब तक इस तरह के कानूनों का कोई मतलब नहीं हुआ करता है। और यह बेमतलब के हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि सारे देश के आंकड़े बतलायें राज्यवार, जहां जहां न्यूनतम या अधिकतम भूमि सीमा निर्धारित हुई है, कितनी जमीन हासिल हुई है, और कितने लोगों में बंटी हुई है। इस तरह के आंकड़े पेश करें। मैं अपना भय बतला दूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश में मिसाल दें जब सरकार और सत्तारूढ़ दल अधिकारियों के मन में यह होता है कि हम भूमि सुधार और समाजवाद को प्रचार के लिए इस्तेमाल करें लेकिन वह असली रूप कभी उसका न आने पाये तो इस तरीके के कानून बढ़े जाते हैं कि प्रचार के रूप में तो वह भूमि सुधार लगते हैं लेकिन वास्तविक रूप उनका भूमि सुधार नहीं होता। इस बारे में मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की एक मिसाल दिये देता हूँ। उस में एक ही खामी है कि किसान वह जो खुद खेती करे और दूसरों से जो खेती कराये वह भी किसान। दूसरी खामी यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में सीमा निर्धारण का कानून बना। ४० एकड़ जमीन एक परिवार में ५ पर और ६४ एकड़ अगर तीन आदिमी बढ़ जायें तो। ६४ एकड़ कम से कम। उस में अपवाद कितना पड़ा हुआ है? अपवाद यह है कि बाग पर यह कानून लागू नहीं होगा।

उत्तरप्रदेश में दो, तीन साल के अन्दर न जाने कितने बाग लग गये और न जाने कितने बाग पटवारियों के कागजात पर शलत दर्ज किये गए। यह है आपके भूमि सुधार कानून का नमूना। एक अपवाद तो यह है कि बाग पर यह लागू नहीं होगा। फिर जहां पर यह डेयरी फार्मिंग है उसमें भी यह कानून लागू नहीं होगा। अब नतीजा यह हुआ कि सब जमीन पर बड़े बड़े लोगों की डेयरी फार्मिंग हो गयी। एक अपवाद यह भी है कि जहां मछली पाली जाती है वहां यह कानून लागू नहीं होगा। फिर जहां फूल, पत्ते, दवादारु आदि की जड़ी बूटियां उगाई जाती हैं उस जमीन पर भी यह कानून लागू नहीं होगा। अगर इतने अपवादों के बावजूद भी किसी की जमीन सलिंग के अन्तर्गत आ जाये तो फिर यह भारत सेवक समाज, भूदान या सहकारिता है जो कि जमीन हड़प कर ले जाते हैं।

किसान को आप के भूमि सुधार कानून से जमीन मिलने वाली नहीं है। इसलिए अभी यह कहा गया कि मंत्री जी ने कहा कि यह तो सूबे का विषय है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्लानिंग कमिशन, यह जो योजना आयोग है यह रात दिन क्यों इस के बारे में विचार किया करता है और प्रचार किया करता है और क्यों यह भूमि सुधार के बारे में चर्चा करता है? अभी यह जो सत्तरहवां संशोधन विधेयक हो रहा है यह भूमि सुधार कानून को लेकर हो रहा है और फिर मंत्री महोदय इस दलके मंत्री हैं जिनकी कि सरकारें सारे सूबों में हैं और वह यह कह कर कि इसमें कानूनी अड़चनें हैं, कानूनी अड़चन की आड़ लेकर अपनी जिम्मेदारी से नहीं बच सकते हैं। अगर वह सही मायने में भूमि सुधार चाहते हैं कि किसान जमीन का मालिक बने तो यह-करें। दूसरे वह यह करें कि साढ़े ६ एकड़ की जमीन जिससे कोई मुनाफा नहीं होता है उसको कांग्रेस ने माना था। मैं कांग्रेस सरकार को यह याद दिलाना

चाहता हूँ कि जब तक साढ़े ६ एकड़ की जमीन से लगान को समाप्त करके किसानों को प्रोत्साहन नहीं देते, उनके पेट में अन्न नहीं डालते और उनको जमीन का मालिक नहीं बनाते, कहां से अन्न पैदा होगा ? क्या ऐसे लोगों से अन्न पैदा होने वाला है जो कि हल की मूठ को छूना तकनीक कार्य समझते हैं, पाप समझते हैं और जो रात दिन अनाज की गड़बड़ करते फिरते हैं ?

दूसरी चीज यह है कि एक सीमा निश्चरण करें और उससे जो अधिक जमीन मिले हम उसका शीघ्र और समुचित बंटवारा भूमिहीन किसानों में करें, इस मशौदन के साथ मैं मूल प्रस्ताव का अनुमोदन करता हूँ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no time now.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar (Fatehpur):** I move that the time be extended by half an hour for this Resolution, permitting Resolution under item 3 of the agenda to be just moved by the hon. Member.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is that the sense of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If the House agrees, I have no objection. But I think we have discussed the food situation already. Then the Food Ministry's Demands are coming up. Why extend the time?

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I am very happy that this Resolution was moved by Shri Nambiar....

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** What about my motion? The House is agreeable to extend time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. Half an hour more for this. Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** I rise to support the Resolution moved by Shri Nambiar. There are three ingredients to this Resolution. I believe the ruling party cannot in justice be opposed to any of these ingredients mentioned in the Resolution, because it has pledged itself not once, twice but on several occasions to conferring the ownership of land on the actual tiller or cultivator. That is one part. As regards the second, there also it has pledged itself to wipe out rural indebtedness in the country. The third part is about marketing facilities to the rural producers. It is easily said here that it is a State subject and so we have no jurisdiction to discuss it. Once the D.I.R. rules have been promulgated and are continuing, we can interfere with any State enactment, as there is this Emergency, war and everything. There is now no legal bar for this Parliament.

In some States, there are many land reforms Acts but I can safely say that after their implementation, zamindari and feudalism have been abolished but another class of bhoomidari has been created. There should be some limit to the owning of such persons having more than 100 acres. On account of the ceiling in U.P., I challenge the Government to tell me, how many acres of land in U.P. had been actually taken over and handed over to the landless labourer or other cultivators. I assure you—not a single acre. If the records of registration are inspected, for day and night registration has been going on at district headquarters to avoid the ceiling acreage. What about rural indebtedness? The present credit survey report reveals that all sorts of measures such as financing through co-operatives have not improved the position much; the rural indebtedness has increased. You have created so many middlemen. Take, for instance, co-operative societies. Reserve Bank lends money to them at the rate of 2

[Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar]

per cent per annum but when the money ultimately reaches the tiller through co-operative societies, it is as high as 10 per cent: in almost all the States it is 9 per cent. That is no relief? No facilities for irrigation, or fertiliser or even credit and finance are made available at the proper time so that the tiller can get over his hardships. He labours the whole day and regular exploitation is going on through the middlemen. I think it is a very innocent resolution; it actually mentions all these ingredients that the ruling party has pledged for, and for which the ruling party stands, and there should be no hesitation in accepting this resolution.

श्री शिव नारायण : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत के संविधान के अनुसार यह रेजोल्यूशन इस सदन में आना ही नहीं चाहिए था। कृषि एक स्टेट सब-जेक्ट है और इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस रेजोल्यूशन को यहां पर लाना गलत है।

लेकिन जहां तक किसानों से हमदर्दी का प्रश्न है, हमारी पूरी हमदर्दी उन के साथ है। मैं यू० पी० ने आता हूँ और हमारी यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट ने १९५२ में जमींदारी एवांशिन एक्ट पास कर के जमींदारी का एवांशिन किया, जमीन का बंटवारा किया और चकबन्दी कानून लागू किया। सरकार की नीति सही है और काम भी ठीक तरह से चल रहा है, लेकिन अगर कहीं गड़बड़ी है, तो वह बंटवारे में है। एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में गड़बड़ी है। लेकिन इस का जिम्मेदार कौन है? वकील, पढ़े-लिखे लोग, मिडलमैन और बुद्धिजीवी लोग। मैं ने २६ जनवरी को अपने यहां कहा था कि श्रमजीवी और बुद्धिजीवी, इन दो क्लासिज में लड़ाई है।

चकबन्दी में सारी गड़बड़ी और सारे झगड़े-फसाद के लिए बुद्धिजीवी लोग जिम्मेदार हैं। वहां पर घड़ाघड़ रिश्तत चल रही है और किसान खूब लूट रहे हैं। वहां पर कोई देखने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन इस सब के बावजूद यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि यह गवर्नमेंट लैंड रिफार्मज नहीं कर रही है। लैंड रिफार्मज हो रहे हैं और सीलिंग लगाई गई है।

माननीय सदस्य, श्री रंगा, यहां पर नहीं हैं। वह स्वतंत्र पार्टी के बड़े नेता हैं। मैं उन को बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां स्वतंत्र पार्टी के एक राजा साहब ने नियमों के विरुद्ध एक फ़र्जी दावा लगाया है। माननीय सदस्य, श्री रामसेवक यादव, भी यहां नहीं हैं। मैं भी उन के क्षेत्र से आता हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि वहां पर सारे श्रमरूढ़ के पेड़ लगा दिये गए हैं। ये मुल्क के वैल-विशर हैं! ये मुल्क के अन्न-संकट को हल करना चाहते हैं!

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सिद्धान्त गलत नहीं हैं, लेकिन हमारी मशीनरी कमजोर है। इस गवर्नमेंट ने सब से बड़ी भूल यह की है कि इस ने अंग्रेजों के जाने के बाद गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट्स कन्ट्रैक्ट रूलज को चेंज नहीं किया है, बर्ना अगर हमारी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन ठीक होती, तो देश में हमारी बदनामी न होती। इसी कारण हम ने जो नेक काम किये हैं, उनके लिए भी हम को बुरा कहा जाता है।

जहां तक कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का सम्बन्ध है, उसमें समाजवाद कहां है? उन के यहां श्रमीरी और शरीबी का बंटवारा नहीं है, केवल डिक्टेटरशिप है। उन के यहां तो यह हुकम दे दिया जाता है कि जा कर सड़क पाटो, पुल बनाओ।

डा० लोहिया, आज यहां पर नहीं हैं। उन्होंने एक टेंढ़ी बात कही थी। उस में मैं

नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज पब्लिक, प्रे-लिम्बे और जाहिल दोनों, अप-टु-डेट और किसान दोनों, यह कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस वाले औरों से अच्छे हैं—चोर हैं, बेईमान हैं, निकम्मे हैं, सब कुछ हैं, लेकिन औरों से अच्छे हैं। इस का मतलब यह है कि हम तो अच्छे हैं, लेकिन जो विरोधी लोग हम को गाली देते हैं, पब्लिक उन को नावदान के कीड़े समझती है। किसान के लिए हम काम करते हैं और किसान भी समझते हैं कि कांग्रेस सरकार ने अच्छे कानून बनाये हैं। लेकिन मिडलमैन गड़बड़ी करते हैं।

लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी अधिकारी कान खोल कर सुन लें कि एक बहुत बड़ी क्रान्ति इस देश में होने वाली है। फ्रांस में १७८९ में रेवोल्यूशन हुआ था। वही नवशा आज हमारे यहां दिखाई दे रहा है और अफसर और बुद्धिजीवी सब गड़बड़ी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। अगर उसी तरह यहां भी क्रान्ति होगी, तो बहुत मुश्किल हो जायेगी। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी को ठीक करना चाहिये।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह यहां पर बैठे हैं। वह भी किसान हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि वह बहुत बड़े तालुकदार नहीं हैं। वह किसानों के बहुत बड़े हमदर्द हैं और हमारी बातों को खुशी खुशी मानते हैं। मैं कांग्रेस का वह सदस्य हूँ, जिस ने सब से पहले गन्ने के दाम ढाई रुपये निश्चित करने के लिए कहा था और गवर्नमेंट ने उस को मंजूर किया। किसानों के हितों के संबंध में हम विरोधी दलों से पीछे नहीं हैं। नैशनलिज्म और सोशलिज्म हम जानते हैं। हम ने देश में समाजवाद लाने के लिए भुवनेश्वर में रेजोल्यूशन पास किया है। आज श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन ने गवर्नमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज किया। हम क्रिटिसाइज भी करते हैं और आगे भी बढ़ते हैं।

आज यह आवश्यक है कि सरकार की ओर से किसानों को पैसा दिया जाये, उन को

मदद दी जाये। फ़ारेन कंट्रीज से अन्न की भीख मांग कर काम नहीं चलेगा। इस देश के किसान काफ़ी अन्न दे सकते हैं। यहां पर अन्न की पैदावार बढ़ी है, घटी नहीं है। लेकिन गड़बड़ तो मिडलमैन और बनिये करते हैं, जो अनाज को जब चाहे खरीद कर ऊंची कीमतों पर बेचते हैं और इस प्रकार हम को तबाह करते हैं। अमरीका या आस्ट्रेलिया हम को खाना नहीं देगा। हिन्दुस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान का किसान ही हम को गेहूं और अनाज देगा, लेकिन उसको प्रोटेक्शन और मदद देनी चाहिये। वह अनाज देगा, पैसा देगा और हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा भी करेगा।

श्री वे० शि० पाटिल : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री नम्ब्यार ने जो संकल्प रखा है, उस संकल्प में जो मुद्दे उठाये गये हैं, वे बहुत महत्वपूर्ण हैं। यह स्टेट सबजेक्ट है या सेंट्रल सबजेक्ट है, इस विवाद में मैं पड़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ। विजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने जब इसको मान्य किया है तो हमें भी इस संकल्प में जो बातें महत्वपूर्ण हैं, उन पर जोर देना चाहिये और उन पर अपने सुझाव देने चाहियें। जो महत्व की बातें हैं उन पर प्लानिंग कमीशन ने विचार किया है और हमारी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को डायरेक्शन दिया था और कानून बनाने के लिए भी उन्हें कहा था। यह जो डायरेक्शन दिया गया था उसमें कहा गया था कि दूसरे प्लान को समाप्त होने के पहले ही जो भूमि सम्बन्धी कानून हैं, जो काम ह, वे खत्म हो जाने चाहियें। लेकिन खेद का विषय है कि कई स्टेट्स ऐसी हैं जिन्होंने इस पर जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था, उतना ध्यान नहीं दिया। वक्त बहुत कम है, इस वास्ते इस पर मैं अधिक कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं कुछ बुनियादी बातों की ओर ही आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ।

जमीन टैन्पोर के बारे में थर्ड फाइव ईयर प्लान के मिड-टर्म एप्रोजल में कहा गया है :

### [श्री दे० शि० पाटिल]

"Several States have not made the necessary legislative provisions. In some States where the provisions for conferring ownership rights exist, the implementation has not been uniformly effective."

सीलिंग आफ लैण्ड होल्डिङ के बारे में कहा गया है :

"In other States provisions concerning ceilings have yet to be enforced. At this stage, it is a matter of some urgency from the point of view of agricultural development to ensure speedy and effective implementation of the legislation which has been enacted."

दूसरा जो सवाल है वह इम्प्लेमेंटेशन का है। कई स्टेट्स हैं जहाँ पर इम्प्लेमेंटेशन हुआ ही नहीं है। इस पर हमारी तरफ से काफी जोर दिया गया है। भुवनेश्वर में जो कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन हुआ था, उसमें हमारे कामराज जी ने जो भाषण दिया था उसमें उन्होंने भी इस बात पर जोर दिया था। इस वास्ते मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इम रेजोल्यूशन को यहाँ पर पास करने की कोई आवश्यकता है। उन्होंने जमीन सम्बन्धी नीति और इम्प्लेमेंटेशन के बारे में कहा था :—

"हमारी जमीन सम्बन्धी नीति उस दिशा में जाने का एक सुन्दर उदाहरण है। हमने इस दृष्टि से कानून बनाये हैं कि किसान और सरकार के बीच में कोई मध्यवर्ती न रहे, भूमि पर कृषकों का स्वामित्व हो, जोत की एक सीमा नियत कर दी जाए, उचित लगान की व्यवस्था हो। हो सकता है कि इस कानून का कोई हिस्सा पूरी तरह अमल में न लाया जा रहा हो। यदि ऐसा हो तो प्रदेश की सरकारों को आग्रह करना है। उन्हें अपनी

कोशिशें दुगुनी करनी चाहियें जिससे किसानों के हित के लिए जो कानून बनाये गये थे वे उनका पूरा फायदा उठा सकें। यह उचित होगा कि हर एक प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी इसके लिए छोटी उपसमितियाँ बना दें। वे इन कानूनों की जांच करें कि ये कानून काफी हैं या नहीं तथा पूरी तरह अमल में लाये जा रहे हैं या नहीं और अपनी रिपोर्टें इस सम्बन्ध में अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी को भेजें।"

इससे स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि हम इस चीज को कितना महत्व देते हैं। यह स्टेट सबजैक्ट है या सेंट्रल सबजैक्ट है, यह महत्व की बात नहीं है। यह माना गया है कि यह एक महत्वपूर्ण सबजैक्ट है और केन्द्रीय तथा प्रान्तीय दोनों सरकारों को इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

जो एमेंडमेंट मैंने दिया है, वह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और इसका ताल्लुक सेंटर और स्टेट दोनों से है। मेरी एमेंडमेंट यह है :

"provision of adequate credit to the agriculturist".

मैंने चाहा है कि इसको सम्मिलित कर लिया जाए। इसकी क्या आवश्यकता है इस में वक्त न होने की वजह से मैं विस्तार में नहीं जा सकता हूँ और न ही कोई आंकड़े दे सकता हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि क्रेडिट देने की जो आज नीति आपकी है, चाहे वह सेंट्रल कर्ब हो या वह स्टेट्स के द्वारा दिया जाता हो, वह बहुत गलत है।

उसमें एग्रीकल्चरल ब्रायंस नहीं है, किसान का हित करने का भी उद्देश्य नहीं है। आपने

लोन देने का जो प्रोसीजर अपनाया हुआ है और जिन जिन को वे दिये जाते हैं, उनसे पता चलता है कि अधिकतर लोन जो बड़े बड़े काश्तकार हैं, उनको ही मिल सकते हैं और जो छोटे छोटे काश्तकार हैं, उनको नहीं मिल सकते हैं। उनको वे लोन नहीं दिये जाते हैं। जिनका लैंड पर अनरशिप नहीं है, उनको कर्ज नहीं मिलते हैं। किसान को सब प्रकार के ऋण देने की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। कर्ज पाने की योग्यता उत्पादन की सामर्थ्य पर न कि पूंजी और सम्पत्ति के स्वामित्व पर अनिवार्य रूप से आधारित होनी चाहिये। चूँकि समय नहीं है, इस वास्ते मैं इस पर अधिक रोशनी नहीं डाल सकता हूँ। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से रिक्वेस्ट करता हूँ कि वह इस पर विचार करें। हमारे मन्त्री महोदय इसमें बहुत दिलचस्पी रखते हैं, यह मैं जानता हूँ। वे अच्छे अच्छे मुझाव भी देते हैं और जब कोई अच्छे मुझाव रखे भी जाते हैं, उन पर विचार भी करते हैं। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे सेंटर से ऋण मिलने की बात हो या स्टेट से मिलने की बात हो, हमारी जो ऋण देने सम्बन्धी पालिसी है, उसको हमें पूरी तरहसे बदलना पड़ेगा। हमने भुवनेश्वर में कहा भी था :—

“Credit-worthiness should depend on the capacity for production and not necessarily on the ownership of assets.”

यह हमारी पालिसी होनी चाहिये। यह बुनियादी चीज है, जिस पर आपको विचार करना है। जब तक आप अपनी पालिसी को बदल कर उत्पादन के सामर्थ्य पर कर्ज देने की व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे तब तक किसान का भला नहीं होगा, तब तक हमारा उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा।

जहाँ तक प्राइस का सवाल है, वह सवाल भी अमरीका और रूस से गेहूँ मंगा कर हल नहीं हो सकता है। वह तभी हल हो सकता है जब हमारे देश में उत्पादन अधिक

हो और उत्पादन अधिक करने के लिए वह यह आवश्यक है कि किसान को अधिक से अधिक सुविधायें दी जाएँ, उसको अधिक से अधिक ऋण देने की व्यवस्था की जाए। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि किसान अधिक पैदा करे तो क्रेडिट वॉर्देनस के बारे में जो आपने नियम बना रखा है, उसको आपको चेज करना होगा।

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that this resolution has been moved in this House and so many hon. Members have expressed their sentiments in regard to land reforms, rural indebtedness, provision of adequate credit etc, as was just pointed out by Shri Patil, and also about proper marketing facility as was emphasised by Shri Sheo Narain. But I would also like the House to appreciate the measures that have so far been taken.

I want straightway to give an assurance here that our policy is to implement the wishes of this House. I do not want to say this with a view to hiding any fact, because as long as we are there in the Ministry we shall see that we give full effect to the sentiments that are expressed in this House.

Shri Nambiar said that even after 17 years of independence we are still depending on some countries and on PL 480 for our food. But I should like Shri Nambiar to find out the truth nearer his house, because after 47 years of Communist rule Russia even today is purchasing more food, in that country, of PL. 480 than we do, and his admirers—China—are looking throughout the world, even in our neighbouring country Burma, to purchase food for their hungry population. Anyway, I do not want to depend on their weaknesses. We shall do our best and we shall see that our farmers and landless labourers are given all facility so that we grow as much food in our country, food fibre and everything, as we can.

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

In regard to land reforms, you know that since 1937 when the Congress first formed the ministries in six States and later in seven States, we have been trying to do our best to do away with the intermediaries. In that effort the intermediaries, particularly the rajhas, maharajas, zamindars and all other types of intermediaries have been abolished in our country. In Gujarat 9·2 lakh tenants have acquired holding rights. In Maharashtra 15 lakh tenants have now got that right. In Rajasthan about 1·3 lakh tenants have acquired ownership. In Uttar Pradesh 15 lakh tenants have acquired direct relationship with the State. Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar said that not even one acre of land has been given to any landless person in Uttar Pradesh. I want to repudiate it here with full force. I know a little about Uttar Pradesh.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** Out of the surplus land that has been taken out as a result of the enforcement of ceiling, not a single acre has been distributed to the tiller.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I would like that a clear picture should be given to this House. I have seen the condition of UP for a long time and I know that in certain parts of UP a tiller had no right to dig any well or construct a house. Now they have got that right. If it is desired, I shall place the entire picture before the House for the benefit of Shri Nambiar, who was narrating the pitiable condition of the tiller. Even in Jammu and Kashmir, which is one of our northernmost States, 4·5 lakh acres of land have been given to those who did not possess any right on land. In Punjab 4·2 lakhs acres of land have been declared as surplus land.

**Shri Naval Prakhakar (Delhi—Karol Bagh):** What about Delhi?

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** The hon. Member comes from Delhi, which is a metropolitan city which is fast deve-

loping. I realise the difficulties of Delhi. He wants to see that Delhi develops. For that purpose, they are acquiring some land. I have heard him when he was speaking on the Land Reforms Bill in regard to Delhi. But that is a matter which can be viewed from the point of view of development of Delhi. We have progressively checked the ejection of tenants from the lands they are tilling and we shall see that it is fully enforced.

Then, Shri Nambiar referred to waste lands. I do not know whether he would like all waste land to be brought under plough. He said that about 38 crore acres of land is under plough and 113 million acres of land is still waste land which can easily be brought under plough. I think Shri Nambiar is familiar with the total acreage in India. I think our land acreage comes to over 102 crore acres and I am sure he will not be able to bring under plough the entire land. Because, if you are bringing all the waste land under plough, it will be at the cost of ruining agriculture because unless and until there is some forest in the country agriculture cannot thrive. In fact, the land under plough in India is much more than in many other countries of the world; the percentage is much higher. Therefore, there should be some balance between ploughed land and waste land. Of course, we would progressively like to see more waste land is brought under plough and distributed to the landless people.

With regard to culturable waste land, there is a Central scheme for surveying those areas at a cost of Rs. 69 lakhs. The survey has progressed in all States except Rajasthan and Jammu and Kashmir. In Rajasthan it is due to the introduction of the new canal. So, large areas of desert will be brought under plough. The distribution of about 50 lakhs acres of waste land is going to be

made amongst 7 lakhs of families during the Third Plan. We are having a Centrally sponsored scheme of Rs. 7 crores to effect this distribution programme.

The pattern of assistance for this scheme is; firstly, the cost of reclamation is shared equally with the State subject to a ceiling of Rs. 150 per acre of land allotted; secondly, for expenditure on resettlement proper Central assistance is given to the extent of Rs. 500 per family, 75 per cent is grant and 25 per cent is loan. Some of the land that is waste land we would like to be brought under forests.

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf** (Nominated—Jammu and Kashmir): Land policy is yet to be reoriented.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** As Shri Sham Lal Saraf knows very well, our national forest policy is that we should bring under forests about one-third of our total acreage.

About the land utilisation programme, there may be defects. I fully agree with my esteemed friend, Shri Saraf and it will be developed.

As regards rural indebtedness, there was a survey carried out by the Reserve Bank of India and they will soon publish the report. But so far as I have gathered, rural indebtedness has been linked with the value of the assets held by the rural people and it comes to about 7·8 per cent of their total assets. You know, Sir, the Rural Credit Inquiry Committee had done some survey about ten years ago and that Committee suggested that the Indian agriculturists would require about Rs. 1,250 crores *per annum* as credit for the purpose of production. This is a big amount. At that time the total credit that was provided by the co-operatives was only 3 per cent. It was about Rs. 23 crores in 1950-51 and now it has gone up from 20 to 25 per cent. In 1962-63 the co-operatives

provided credit to the tune of Rs. 256 crores as short-and medium-term credit. In 1963-64 we are hoping that it will be to the tune of Rs. 300 crores and next year about Rs. 400 crores. I do realise that this is an insignificant amount as compared to the total needs of our agriculturists, both landholders as well as landless and this is a thing which will have to be stepped up. There we will require the help of hon. Members also because co-operatives are now our accepted national vehicle for distributing credit as well as for supply. Until and unless we develop co-operative societies in each and every village of our country it will not be possible to meet fully the requirements of the agriculturists. I do not know in how many villages of his constituency Shri Nambiar has formed co-operative societies.

About marketing facilities, as you know, Sir, we have introduced State trading in one of our biggest agricultural produce—I mean, jute—and we have requested the Ministry concerned to purchase jute from the State Trading Corporation. They are doing that. In respect of other commodities also we will progressively introduce State trading. State trading and co-operative societies—these are the two things. But, at the same time, we do not want that there need not be any competition in the field; but I do say that some atmosphere must be created wherein the grower gets a fair price of his produce.

In this regard I might point out that support prices have been fixed for many important agricultural products. In the case of rice it is Rs. 42·87 to Rs. 78·35 per quintal; for wheat it is Rs. 40·19 per quintal. In case of jowar it is Rs. 22·78; white jowar—Rs. 24·12; about cotton, the floor price is Rs. 70 per candy and ceiling price is Rs. 945 per candy; about jute, it is Rs. 80·38 per quintal; as regards sugarcane, it was announced

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

only yesterday that the basic minimum is going to be Rs. 1:85 per maund. So, in this way, all these things are recent developments and we would like that our entire operation should be conducted in such a way that the agriculturists get a fair share of their labour. There, I think, Mr. Nambiar will co-operate and not sabotage their interests.

About marketing facilities we have 2500 wholesale markets throughout the country of which 1035 are regulated markets and we are increasing their number. Legislation has been enacted in all States except in U.P., West Bengal, Assam and Kerala. The U.P. Government has introduced recently the Bill and as regards Kerala and West Bengal, they are also drafting their Bills. In Kerala, I might say, Malabar area is already having regulated markets under the Madras legislation. But the regulated markets without grading will not be a hundred per cent success. The rationalisation of market charges has enabled our growers to get somewhere near Rs. 12 crores more than they used to get before and we would like that this figure must go on increasing everyday. Grading has been introduced in about 53 units and we would like that the number should go on increasing.

Then, Mr. Ram Sewak Yadav mentioned about holdings upto 6½ acres and that is a thing which is engaging the attention of several persons and this is being discussed at various platforms. (Interruption). If Mr. Ram Sewak Yadav stands on that, I am sorry to say that they are liquidating their own Party. I do not know whether they will stick to their formula.

**Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:** But that does not mean you should liquidate the tenants also.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** We will examine your suggestion if you keep your identity. I will be too happy if they get merged. Now, Mr. D. S. Patil has made a very good suggestion.

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा कि साढ़े ६ एकड़ से कम के खेतों पर से लगान हटाने का विचार हो रहा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें कितना समय लगेगा और यह निर्णय कब तक हो जाएगा ?

**डा० राम सुभग सिंह :** विचार नहीं हो रहा है। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने सगुण और निर्गुण के झंझट में पड़ कर समझने की शक्ति कुछ कम कर ली है। मैं नहीं चाहता था कि यहां मनुस्मृति के सिद्धान्त जारी रहें।

मैंने कहा था कि कई प्लेटफार्मों से साढ़े ६ या ५ एकड़ से कम के खेतों से रेवेन्यू हटाने की आवाज उठायी जा रही है। वातावरण बन रहा है, देखें यह कितनी दूर तक जाता है। है। लेकिन जो पार्टियाँ अपना अस्तित्व नहीं रखेंगी उनकी बात को ज्यादा महत्व नहीं मिल पाएगा।

Shri Nambiar said that the prices of foodgrains were going high. It is true that the prices have gone up, but there are about 55,000 fair price shops in our country, and in those shops, the grains are distributed at controlled prices. Even in Delhi, a bag of *atta* of about 2½ maunds is available for Rs. 39-6-0, but I do not know whether Shri Nambiar would prefer to use that for himself.

Then, the hon. Member did not show also any weakness in handling the problem. But he was very much eloquent in regard to overthrowing the Government. He said that unless and until we fell a victim or prey to his way of thinking, he would see that the Government was overthrown. But we are not as weak as Shri Nambiar has

imagined. I think that he need not get his inspiration from the fact that his biggest friend Mr. Chou En-lai wanted to overthrow the Government because he did not succeed in his nefarious objective. We shall organise this country in such a way that not only Mr. Chou En-lai but also Shri Nambiar may come to his senses.

**Shri Nambiar:** I am sorry that the hon. Minister has misunderstood me as saying that we are here to overthrow the Government or anything like that. Our purpose is not that. I have made it very clear in my opening speech that we are here to co-operate with Government in order to see that the people are fed properly, that maximum production is achieved and the landless labour or the agricultural workers are given land and also that the actual tiller gets the land back, which is unfortunately not being given to him today.

Then, I come to the point referred to by the hon. Minister saying that I am against any forests being raised etc., which is wrong. At page 23 of *Progress of Land Reform* it has been clearly stated:

"The total geographical area of India is about 811 million acres. Land-use statistics are available for about 721 million acres (1956-57), which are classified as follows:

	Million acres
Forest	126
Not available for cultivation	116
Other uncultivated lands excluding fallow lands	98
Fallow lands	59
Net area sown	322
	-----
	721"
	-----

Out of the 98 million acres of uncultivated lands excluding fallow lands, only 54 million acres have been calculated as being cultivable waste. If

we add to this the fallow land which is to the extent of about 59 million acres, the total comes to about 113 million acres. Therefore, these 113 million acres can be brought under cultivation, according to the Planning Commission's analysis. They say that:

"The extension of cultivation can, therefore, be possible only to areas which are classified as:

- (i) other uncultivated land excluding fallow lands; or
- (ii) fallow lands."

Therefore, 113 million acres are the area of the lands which can be brought under cultivation according to this report.

Coming to the other point relating to the import of foodgrains, which the Soviet Union has made after forty-seven years, I would submit that that is a point which the Soviet Union alone can reply to. That is not the premise of my argument and therefore, I am not traversing on it. But my point is that we have been importing foodstuffs every year during all these seventeen years of our Independence, to the extent of about Rs. 150 crores every year. I would like to know whether this can eternally go on and whether we can afford to do it. That is the short point which I have raised, but the hon. Minister has unnecessarily brought in China, Soviet Union etc. Anything that we mention here need not be the point of view of the Communist Party elsewhere. Therefore, let him not misunderstand what we have stated in that manner.

As for evictions, the hon. Minister has stated that things will be done in such a way that as far as possible there will be no evictions. But the point is that large-scale evictions are taking place in each State and the peasants are put to a lot of difficulty and they have to resort to satyagraha and such other forms of struggle. The

[Shri Nambiar]

hon. Minister must attend to this and see that these evictions are not allowed. Instead of land being granted to the tiller, whatever land is available is taken away from him. That is also a point which requires the immediate attention of the hon. Minister.

With regard to the removal of intermediaries also, the hon. Minister has given us a wrong picture. I have agreed that intermediaries in the form of zamindars and jagirdars have been removed, but the question is whether the land even in those areas has gone to the actual tiller.

17 hrs.

He says the title has passed to new people. The question is whether it has passed to the tiller. My contention is that it has not gone to the tiller. The tiller has not got the land. Instead, a new land-owning class has come in the way of the tiller. The tiller is still tilling it and paying the money to the new zamindar. It has only added to his sufferings.

Under these circumstances, I submit that my Resolution is quite in order. After all, we only recommend to Government to take certain steps. If he is agreeable and if the House agrees, instead of 'Government', we can say 'State Governments' so that it may be made very specific—"This House recommends to the State Governments to take immediate steps . . .". Whether the Central Government should bring in legislation or not is not the point. The point is that the State Governments must take measures—legislative and executive—to implement it. Therefore, in that way I am prepared to amend it, if it is agreeable. Once we agree to the principle, and to the practice of it also, there is no difficulty. Therefore, I request the House to agree to my Resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He is presenting it?

**Shri Nambiar:** Yes.

I am agreeable alternatively, also to the substitute resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Then I will put the substitute Resolution, amendment No. 1, to the vote of the House.

*The Substitute Resolution was put and negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does Shri D. S. Patil want to press his amendment?

**Shri D. S. Patil:** I seek leave of the House to withdraw it.

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now put the original Resolution to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"This House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps by way of legislative and executive measures to bring about a thorough land reform including transfer of ownership of land to the tiller, removal of rural indebtedness and provision of proper marketing facilities with price supports".

*The Resolution was negatived.*

17.03 hrs.

#### RESOLUTION RE: NATIONALISATION OF FILM INDUSTRY

**Shri R. G. Dubey** (Bijapur North): I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take steps to nationalise the Film Industry".

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He may continue the next day.

17.03½ hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Monday, March 9, 1964/Phalgun 19, 1885 (Saka).*