

16.02 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF SECOND
ENQUIRY ON AGRICULTURAL
LABOUR IN INDIA

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Vellore):
Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Second Enquiry on Agricultural Labour in India (Vol. I—All India), laid on the Table of the House on the 21st December, 1960."

At the outset, I have to make certain observations regarding the agricultural labour problem in India. A perusal of the report of the second enquiry indicates that the position of agricultural labour has been almost the same from 1950 onwards. The report of the first enquiry covering the period 1950-51 was submitted some years earlier, and this report covering the period 1956-57 was submitted in 1960. From the two reports, it appears that the position of the agricultural labour is almost the same, if not worse. Evidently, the reason is that there is no organised sector for regulating agricultural labour so far as our rural economy is concerned.

It is admitted that India is pre-eminently an agricultural country, and that the people living in the rural areas are dependant only on agricultural work and nothing else. As stated in this report, the national income is about Rs. 11,000 crores, 50 per cent. of which is being contributed by agricultural labour. The rural area is about 70 per cent. of the country, and one-fifth of its population is the agricultural force. This indicates that this sector is not well-looked after. In industries, for example, there are labour unions and labour leaders, but agricultural labour is not organised, and it has to fend for itself.

We are all aware that agriculture is not a full-time job. It is only seasonal, and it varies from place to place, from State to State. Even in the same State there is different from place to

place. So, the problems presented by agricultural labour are complex.

The present report as well as the earlier one have not been able to give us complete data, and the actual data given by them as a result of sample surveys cannot be depended upon for formulating any concrete remedies to be adopted.

So far as this sector is concerned, labour is not organised and it is for the Government to see what best could be done. Our economy is based mainly on agriculture. Now, there is some change from agriculture to industry. In this transitional period or during this change-over from agriculture to industry, there are bound to be some problems and difficulties to be faced. So, agricultural labour is a problem that has to be looked into carefully. It cannot be taken as an isolated problem, unconnected with other problems. It is connected with the land problem and it is connected with food and agriculture. Therefore, it would have been much better if the Minister for Agriculture had also been present here, as also the Minister of Community Development and Co-operation. The Planning Commission might also be represented possibly. But, still, these 3 Ministers should have been present here to here the grievance and the remedies that might possibly be suggested by some hon. Members. I find only the Labour Minister is present here as if it is only his responsibility to look to the welfare of the labourers. As this problem is one which is pre-eminently connected with land and also community development, the Minister who has been asked to look into these sectors must have been present here. Leaving aside that aspect let me go into the present position of agricultural labour.

Let me first bring to the notice of the House the employment position. In the Second Five Year Plan, out of 3 lakhs—I speak subject to correction—of labour force for which they

hoped to find employment they were able to find only for 10,000. They have provided schemes now to find employment for about 7 lakhs of people in the next Plan. If in the previous Plan they could find employment only for 10,000 people out of 3 lakhs for whom they wanted to provide, I am not able to envisage how they would be able to find work for all these 7 lakhs of people. So far as his sector is concerned, unemployment ranges over millions, and, as such, this problem has got to be looked into with care and caution.

Let me read one portion from this book. On page 101, it is said:

"The employment position of casual agricultural labourers, who form the bulk of labour force, did not show improvement over the situation that obtained in 1950-51."

It appears that the position is almost the same as I stated in the beginning of my speech. You will be pleased to see that in 1950-51 the employment position was that these labourers had work on 275 days. As compared to that it is 237 days in 1956-57. That would indicate that it has gone down. As a matter of fact, they were able to get work for 273 days in 1950-51 and 1956-57 it has decreased to 237; that is, there is a decrease of 38 days. That indicates that there is something which has got to be remedied.

The national per capita income in 1950-51 was about Rs. 265/-. Let me read portions so that it may be clear. According to the Central Statistical Organisation's estimates the national income per capita was Rs. 291.5 for 1956-57. It says here that the per capita income of agricultural labour household in 1956-57 was 99.4 or about 34 per cent of the national per capita income. The corresponding figures for 1950-51 were Rs. 265 and Rs. 104 respectively. They say that it is relevant to note that the national income

estimates covering the entire population, both rural and urban, whereas the enquiry figures relate only to agricultural labour households in the rural areas. So, the per capita income of agricultural labourers is dwindling down and they are not able to get what they want and unless they can find some supplementary income for their livelihood it is not possible to help them. That is the position with regard to the income according to the report.

We have seen that during the last ten years the pressure on land is increasing because of the increase in population. I would refer hon. Members to page 9 of the same volume wherein they say that the disquieting feature of the Indian economy is the steady growth in the number of persons solely depending on agriculture between 1901—1951 and the proportion of people depending on agriculture to the total population increased from 70 to 71 per cent. They further say that from 1951, about 67 per cent of the population solely depended on agriculture for its livelihood. Thus it would appear that whatever expansion had taken place in the industrial sector has not been able to divert manpower from agricultural pursuits to any effective extent.

In 1951, 82 per cent of our people were rural and about 17 per cent, urban. In 1957, the corresponding figures are 81 per cent rural and 19 per cent urban. This indicates movement from rural areas. The urban area is very much, in spite of the incentive given to the people. This indicates that the population is increasing without proper increase in income. This problem, it is true, bristles with difficulty and it is not only the duty of Government but also the duty of everyone of us to see that these people are provided with enough employment. It is for this purpose that we have got these river valley projects. I will take Hirakud Dam as an illustration. Before that dam was constructed,

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy.]

people were having one crop; that area was rain fed. Subsequently, the dam was constructed for the purpose of providing them employment throughout the year; it may also be regarded as flood control measure. But people did not raise a second crop. They are satisfied with the first crop or the first crop yield is sufficient to meet all their needs.

16.15 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair]

The money spent on the dam was with a view to give work for the labourers. That purpose is not served. Proper utilisation of the facilities made available by the construction of the dam, namely raising of the second crop and thus providing employment in agriculture for people, should be insisted upon. The second crop should be raised. For the rest of the period, they may be lethargic or idle or they may not have enough work to eke out their livelihood. They must move from the place, but where? They must move either to an industrial place where their services may be required or to any other place where there is enough irrigation potential to raise crops. In Hirakud I do not think any such facilities are available. In that part of the country, namely, Orissa, the people are not very enthusiastic to utilise their manpower. Of course, I am subject to correction. The reason behind this is that either they are complacent with the present situation or are satisfied with the available produce. Therefore, I suggest that the Government should take upon itself the responsibility of seeing that labourers in this sector are gainfully employed throughout the year.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): There are higher water rates also.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: That may be true. It is for the Government to minimise or reduce it or to give any

other incentive so that they can get more produce to compensate the higher water rate that they are asked to pay. The Government cannot shirk their responsibility for finding jobs for the agricultural labourers. So far as the industrial workers are concerned, there is no worry, since they have a number of leaders and there are a number of unions to take care of them. But in regard to this agricultural sector, it is the most unorganised sector; it is not continuous, the work is seasonal. So, the Government must take upon itself the responsibility of finding out an all-round scheme of work for these labourers so that there may not be any wastage of human labour. The utilisation of manpower and the work on river valley projects must be so integrated as to see that the people are provided with enough jobs throughout the year. For the last ten years, as we see, from the two reports, the position of agricultural labourers is almost the same if not worse. A reading of the reports is also not very happy. The reports show that we are not mindful of the rural economy. This sector is the most neglected sector in our country. Agriculture has got to be regarded as an industry in the same way as we regard other industries. The Government should see that the manpower in this sector is not wasted but utilised to the fullest extent and all amenities must be provided.

I would now suggest some remedies to right the situation. In the case of small industries, Government give some concessions. For the initial period of a few years, there is no income-tax. All sorts of help are given to the industries. Some subsidies are also given to these industries. Why not the agricultural industry, which is the primary industry, on which we depend every day for food, be given all this help? You and I and all of us cannot get on and pursue our jobs unless somebody produces things for us to eat and live. We are sitting in an air-conditioned chamber, but we want something to eat. Who

produces the foodstuffs? It is that man living in the rural area, the people who spend their lives on the land, the people work on the land. Their land and their labour are inextricably mixed up in such a way that they cannot but pursue their occupation, and they must be given all help. We shall depend on them a great deal. Unless they do their work, we cannot maintain ourselves.

That is why, just as the industries are subsidised for an initial period, for the construction period till the plant is commissioned, and just as they are given many kinds of aid, agricultural industry should also be subsidised. Subject to correction, I may say that in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, there is some sort of subsidy for the agricultural sector. If not on the same model at least on the same criterion, and akin to that, why not something be done to see that these people are subsidised? In the case of sugar, the grower is subsidised so that he can produce more. Sometimes, there is slump and something there is scarcity. Only a portion of the agricultural sector, that is sugar, is behind helped. I want to see that the entire agricultural sector, irrespective of the fact whether it is a cash crop or a commercial crop or any other crop, is subsidised and helped. This is one of the remedies which I suggest. Government should take upon itself the responsibility of fixing some sort of subsidy for agriculture.

My second point is about the community development programme. I hope I will be pardoned if I say anything about this particular Ministry. It is a very delicate thing to say either for or against particular Ministry. If something is said in favour of the Ministry nobody will take any objection, but here I have much to say against it, the reason being that everything is not quite all right in this Ministry.

Madam, I come from the village side and I know how the community

development programme is being worked out, how the Extension Schemes and National Development Blocks are being worked there. I am not taking this opportunity to tell you all my grievances. As a matter of fact, we must take only the essence of it and not find fault with it. What I want to say is, the community development programme must also be co-ordinated in such a way as to see that the people have extra enthusiasm to work on their land. That is not there at present.

My next point is about the Minimum Wages Act. It is very difficult to apply the Minimum Wages Act to all industries, particularly to this agricultural industry. There are certain difficulties; I quite realise it. But very often the Ministers meet at State level, they meet at the Central level and other people connected with this industry also meet. They cull out their experiences, sometimes compare notes and sometimes gain something from the experience of others by such comparison. We are able to reach some sort of conclusions as a result of these various meetings and conferences. The Minimum Wages Act is being reviewed, I should say, once in three or four years or once in a year. Still the progress as regards the implementation of this Act uniformly in all the States is not quite happy. Unless the Minimum Wages Act is made applicable to all the industries uniformly as far as possible, with slight variations according to the locality or the place, we may not be able to get jobs for these people throughout the year. The reason is, as I have already stated, there is a relevancy between land and labour.

Unless the peasant proprietor is assured much ahead of the season that the price of a particular commodity will be such and such, he will not be able to put forth extra investment to produce more. They depend upon the seasonal variations and market values. Sometimes what happens is, they produce more, they do not get the proper price, they are unable to wait for long.

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy.]

they seek the assistance of these intermediaries who take away their entire produce for a song. They are forced to sell their produce like that because they have nothing else to fall back upon.

This is the primary industry in our country. This is the life-line of our economy. This is the only economy on which we can always depend. We need not depend upon foreign exchange as far as this industry is concerned. We have only to use our domestic exchange, and that is our own men. We must use our labour and produce more. Therefore, we should give an incentive to the peasant proprietors to invest more. I am not going to deal with the various reactions that arise out of it, but so far as these peasant proprietors are concerned they must be given an incentive to see that they invest more to get more produce. For that we must assure them of a fixed price for the commodity.

There will be some difficulty in fixing the price of a commodity much ahead of the season. I know the difficulties, but even then they can work out a reasonable price from the data that is available with them much ahead of the season. If only that is fixed and the peasant proprietors are assured of a reasonable price they will also give a correspondingly good minimum wage, if not more, to the labourers and also see that the labourers work for six to eight hours. We know how in the non-agricultural industries the labourers do not work for eight hours. They are, of course, there for eight hours, but their real work according to me will only be for four or five hours and for the rest of the time they will be either talking or just showing that they are working. Therefore, I would say that unless we fix the minimum prices for all the commodities much ahead of the season, we may not be able to achieve our targets. Since the proprietor or the landlord knows how many *kalam*s or maunds of paddy, ragi or jowar he will get out of his land, if the prices

are fixed before the harvesting season, he can know the value that he will get out of his land and, accordingly, he can pay to his labourers. So that, the labourers working in the fields will also get more money if the prices are fixed in advance.

As regards the difficulties which the Government might possibly encounter in fixing the prices, I will not listen to them for this reason that there is no use of giving explanations, the more you stand condemned for this reason that there is nothing wanting in the armoury of the Government for not being in a position to fix the prices, if they make an honest effort just as they have done in the case of cane-growers. The price of cane has been fixed with the result that the cane-growers are producing cane in large quantities. Likewise, this section has also to be looked into from that angle.

Lastly, I come to the psychology of the people. I find from experience that the labour class are of two types. There are the industrial labour who are guided by their union leaders. They agitate for their rights and they are able to get what they want. But the labour belonging to the unorganised sector are not able to get a decent wage. Though everyone of us, including the Government, sometimes say that the labour in this sector must not be ignored and they should not be neglected, they do not have proper advocates to plead their cause. Therefore, unless we change the psychology and see that these people are helped, nothing is going to come out of pious hopes.

We all are aware that the agricultural labour belong to the backward class. Backward people need not necessarily mean people who have no money. But I must say that there are certain sections of the people, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other backward classes, who always live only in the rural areas. They do

not know what an urban area is. Of late, there is some movement from the rural area to the urban area because they are enamoured of the glamour and the thunder and lightening of town life and the dazzling of town life and they want to have a change in their attitude and behaviour. But excepting a few people, about 10 to 15 per cent, who move from the villages to the urban areas, most of the people still continue to live in the villages and they have to be looked after by us.

These reports only help us in understanding the real position of the labourers. But the remedy suggested by that report is one of legislation. Legislation is not going to help. Land legislation and other ceiling legislations have been promulgated with a view to see that these people are helped. But ultimately what happened? The area that is now brought under cultivation is not much. Still, there are innumerable pieces of lands, lakhs and millions of acres, which are not cultivated. There is the Bhoodan movement. But what is the result of it? People have given lands which are useless as Bhoodan. How can such lands be utilised unless those lands are reclaimed and more money is invested in them? People who are charity-minded are only few in number. Only such people given good cultivable lands as Bhoodan. Most of the land given as Bhoodan are not land worth the name.

Taking all these factors into consideration, I am of the view that the agricultural labour should be brought on equal footing with the industrial labour. So, I only wish that the Government would give some thought to the suggestions I have made as regards the fixation of prices, minimum wages subsidy for this industry and diversification of other small-scale industries in the rural areas to supplement the income of the agricultural labour, because their income is only seasonal, and for the rest of the

year they have no means to supplement their income. I would request Government to see that these things are taken care of and the agricultural labour are helped.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Second Enquiry on Agricultural labour in India (Vol. I—All India), laid on the Table of the House on the 21st December, 1960."

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): Madam Chairman, the country and the Parliament had been waiting for this Report to be presented for quite a long time. I think it was somewhere in 1954 or 1955 that this Committee was appointed to go into the conditions of agricultural labour so that the Government would be able to plan the future programme for this huge mass of the people in our country who are something like 24 to 30 per cent of the rural households. After something like five years of study and collection of data the House was presented with the report at the flag-end of 1960.

This Report is certainly a very revealing document. It has highlighted the conditions of life of probably the most harassed and exploited class of people in our country. This Report has told us and has given a warning to the country that the condition of these people in all sectors of their life is deteriorating very fast and has to be taken note of in what are known as our developmental plans.

The first point that the Committee has made is the fact that the agricultural labour population without land has increased in percentage between 1950-51 and 1955-56 from 50% that polarisation is increasing fast, that even the little to 37% of the total agricultural labour; and that they probably had gone out of their hands, that the agricultural labour population which had probably

[Shri Nagi Reddy.]

an acre or two of land has now lost it in between those years. Therefore the result of it has been that amongst agricultural labourers with and without land the percentage of those without land has increased. I am sure if another enquiry is made in 1960-61—I hope if it is made, it will not take five years for them to present the report—and if its report is presented within a year or two, you will find that in these years there has been a greater increase in the number of households who have lost their land and, therefore, the percentage of agricultural labourers without land will certainly be more than what has been reported in the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report.

The second fact, which is very important, is that the number of unemployed days has increased. After all, the agricultural labourer gets only a seasonal occupation and that too at the most for probably one-third of the year, not more than that. The number of unemployed days was 110 days according to the Report, that is, on an average. I do not know how it can be. People who come from the villages, as I do, know that an agricultural labourer does not get work on an average for, say, 200 days. All the same, even taking it as true that the agricultural labourer has been getting employment for something like 200 and above number of days, according to the Report, we are told that the number of unemployed days has increased from 82 to 110 per year. That means, agricultural labourers without land have increased in number and the number of their employed days have decreased. What about their wages? The wages of agricultural labourers in these years have gone down from 109 naya paise to 96 naya paise of an average. Wages have therefore, quite naturally, the annual income drops. When we are finding that the national income in our country is increasing, the per capita income of the people in our

country is increasing on an average, it is a curious phenomenon to find that so far as the 24 per cent of the agricultural labour population or the rural population is concerned, their per capita income is decreasing and their annual income is decreasing and is a very serious matter. I should say that it is an explosive feature. If the Government is not capable of understanding this serious situation, I would not be surprised if, after this lethargy among the people who have been silent, too silent for the misery that they are undergoing, some day, it explodes like a volcano. The Government must take note of this very serious factor of decreasing number of days of work, and decreasing wages that is taking place.

Added to this, may I remind, here is another feature,—step after step, it is very logical—that the number of households in debt amongst agricultural labour families has increased from 45 per cent to 65 per cent and the amount of debt per family has increased from Rs. 47 to Rs. 80. Employment of child labour from 4.7% to 7.6 per cent has shot up. All these features point out to one very important factor that in our country, even after Independence, the feudal remnants that are living in our country are strong enough yet to control the rural economy. It is the feudal remnants and the feudal type of agriculture which has been developed in our country that has been the reason for stagnation in our agricultural production. It is the reason for the extremely miserable condition of the vast masses of people in rural areas. This, in general, is the condition of the people.

It does not end itself there. Of course, I do not want to quote from the report, because the report is so vast and I do not want to take the time of the House. The Government must also note one very important

factor that in the villages, agricultural labour is not free labour. He is not free. It is not like industrial labour selling his labour to anybody he likes. It is not so. Every one who lives in a village knows that an agricultural labourer in debt is indebted on his own, but completely, the whole of his family is indebted. A debt, once he incurs, is never repaid, it can never be repaid. I know of agricultural labour families who have been attached labourers in landlords' families. I myself come from a landlord family and I must be knowing what the condition exactly is. The grandfather, father and the child, one after the other, continuously are attached labourers in the landlord's house. I am sure that the son will hand over the legacy to his son unless the Government takes it into its head, not through community projects, not through national extension schemes, but through a very fundamental economic and social change, to break up this fundamentally nasty system that has developed in our country, due to the feudal legacy which is still surviving. Are you prepared to do it, is the question. Are we prepared to give that amount of independence, at least independence as a labourer? I am not talking of independence that one must become immediately a crorepathi or a lakhipathi. To talk of free education, to talk of educating every child in the country is almost an impossibility when you are facing an economic situation wherein the child is not free to go to school. Don't you see that? Can't we imagine that condition? Therefore, the increase in the employment of child labour which has shot up from 4.9 per cent. of the total labour to 7.6 per cent. is a phenomenon which only shows that the grip of the indebtedness which the agricultural labour has got into under the landlords is so heavy that they will not be able to get out of it. And I may say that the debt which the agricultural labour family is facing due to decreasing wages and due to the decreasing number of days of work is

also forcing them to go and mortgage their son into the landlord's house.

Added to this, we must also remember that there is another feature. At page 240, the *Third Five Year Plan* gives us an enumeration of land holdings of all sizes in our country, State-wise. If we look at these figures, we can see the contrast which is there so patent in rural life. It talks of only those people having some land; it might be one cent, or one acre, or two acres, or hundred acres or thousand acres.

Taking the case of Andhra, I find that 47.4 per cent. of the agricultural landholders holding not more than 2.5 acres of land each own only 7.9 per cent. of the total land. This category, I am sure, is mainly agricultural labour category; this cannot be anything else, and I am sure that they will not be able to survive on this small piece of land which they hold. While 47.4 per cent. of the agricultural holders hold only 7.9 per cent. of the land, here is another phenomenon that 0.4 per cent. of the landholders owning more than 100 acres hold in their hands 10.1 per cent. of the land. Or, to put it in much more concrete terms, if 47 per cent. of them hold 14 lakhs of acres in their hands, 0.4 per cent. of them hold in their hands 18 lakhs of acres. This is a feature which Government should understand. If they are prepared to go through the statistics which they have printed, probably hoping that nobody will go through them, if they are prepared to go through these things and try to understand the economy in the village today, and also understand how the grip of the people at the topmost level is capable of squeezing out the life of the lowest of the low in our country, then, they will come to a proper understanding as to what is to be done.

Immediately we shall be told, Therefore, we are thinking in terms of land reforms, and of changes in social and economic conditions; all

[Shri Nagi Reddy.]

these things are being done one after the other; you cannot do it in a flash. I can quite understand that nothing can be done in a flash. But are we doing it? Are we doing it in the way that we have accepted to do?

Take one very simple example. Take the case of the cultivable waste land in our country, which, we are told, runs to millions of acres. What has happened? Quite a good number of the agricultural labour families as a result of their extraordinary physical labour, have gone and occupied a bit of those lands, probably for fifteen or twenty years, and have been cultivating them, even paying penalties to Government year after year. But what are Government doing for those people? In my State, in the name of those lands having come under the Krishna Barrage scheme, in the name of those lands having come under the Nagarjunasagar project, in the name of those lands having come under the Tungabhadra High Level Canal scheme, Government are telling these people to vacate those lands, because they are going to auction them. It is a very serious problem. When we are having land reforms, we are evicting agricultural labour that has been occupying those lands for some tens of years, and who have made it cultivable land after immense physical labour. Today, Government are evicting them. What for? Their simple reason is this: "I have built this project, it has cost me Rs. 33 crores. Where am I to get that money? I must get that money out of the land that is going to come under this canal. You may have cultivated it, but the land is mine." So the Government automatically becomes the landlord, and not an ordinary landlord, but worse than a feudal landlord, because it is not prepared to give it to the agricultural labourer, it is only prepared to auction the land. When land is auctioned, who gets it except the biggest and the highest bidder? Shri N. R. Muniswamy said incentive should be given for better cultivation. Is this the way of giving incentive to

millions of people who are not less than 24 per cent. of the rural population?

Therefore, the first and foremost thing to do, which can be done immediately also, because the land is in the hands of the Government, it is not in the hands of private landlords, is to distribute and not auction these lands. It is in your hands. So, the first and foremost thing is to distribute the cultivable waste lands in the hands of the Government to these agricultural labourers who are either in occupation now, or who have not yet occupied.

Are they prepared to do it? Is there a categorical answer? I am sure there is none because year in and year out it has been a struggle going on in my State for keeping these lands which have been in the hands of the agricultural labourers. This is the case in Krishna district, in the case of the Nagarjuna project where even though the project has not yet been completed, Government is trying to evict them for the reason that the canals are going to come; not because they are in the way, but because with the canal coming the land will become valuable, and they cannot be certainly given that land. This is the argument of a *baniya*. I do not expect this of a socialist Government, unless the Government only calls itself socialist, while actually, inherently, its mentality is that of a *baniya*. One of these two things should be true.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): On a point of order, I may inform him that the Supreme Court has held that *baniya* is a contemptible term, and that it comes within the scope of defamation.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Shri Nagi Reddy: I withdraw it. If it is so, I have no objection to withdraw it.

Then there is the question of the Minimum Wages Act. It is a very important Act, and has certainly done some good so far as industrial establishments are concerned. I do not blame the Government alone for not implementing it. It is not so easy to implement it, I can understand that, but there is one way of implementing it. That is the way of educated, conscious political leadership. That is where I blame the leadership of the political parties of this country, including me and you. I do not escape the blame, because I know that I have myself not done justice, even though I am certainly doing and moving in that direction. That is because agricultural labour is vastly scattered. Have a movement for rousing the political, social and economic consciousness of the agricultural labourers, have an organisation for it, and much more important, have a brave leadership for it. Otherwise you cannot make a move.

I know of quite a number of villages, where it is difficult to enter without the permission of the head of the village. It is an impossible thing. Even the Prime Minister of the country will not be able to do it if he relinquishes his Prime Ministership and goes there as a Congressman. I can give him a guarantee of that. There is the famous village of Dorivalu, I did not want to name it.

What is happening? How are you going to implement the Minimum Wages Act there? It can be implemented if the political parties, without animosity among themselves when it comes to a question of implementing particularly such piece of legislation, act and move unitedly in the interests of the lowest class. There is a possibility. It can be done and it should be done. Are the Congress Party, the Government and the Opposition parties prepared today to take the oath that this should be implemented with the vigour and leadership which the nation requires? About the Communist Party, I am prepared to say that we are prepared to join hands with any-

one who is prepared to see that the Minimum Wages Act is implemented wherever it is not implemented. How can we expect the Tahsildar or the Revenue staff to do it? How can you expect the Village Munsif or the Village Karnam to do it? The Village Karnams are antagonistic to this Act. Therefore, no Act of this nature can be implemented by governmental power alone unless the party in power takes its own active workers to go into the field to implement it, and get the support and co-operation of other social workers and political parties. The agricultural labour must have an organisation of its own to fight for its rights and this minimum wage is one of the rights. Are you prepared to do that?

The third and the final thing is the question of land reforms. I do not want to enumerate them. We are told that land reforms are coming. I do not know when. But we have given so many exemptions. All those lands which are well cultivated and are under first class management will not be distributed. Who does not manage in a first class way today when the Government is giving millions of rupees as loans and grants to the landlords for the purchase of tractors and improved agricultural implements etc. and to make first class capitalist farms in the villages? The landlord class is taking advantage of the governmental machinery to make itself into first-class farming society so that its lands are not distributed.

Gardens will not be distributed. Lands under sugarcane cultivation will not be distributed. So, when we give up all these things, what happens? There is no land for distribution. Will Government appoint a committee to go into the working of the land reforms in the villages and see how far they have benefited the classes? Working of land reforms is not, after all, an ordinary thing. It is an economic and social revolution in the countryside.

Why are you not able to implement the land reforms? Because the reforms have innumerable loopholes. It

[Shri Nagi Reddy]

is impossible for anyone to get any piece of land from any State for distribution. The Land Reform measures instead of reducing concentration of land in the hands of landlords, I should say, has only increased the concentration in a different form. Nagi Reddy as the head of the family might have been owning 1,000 acres of land some three years ago. But he does not own them in his own name; he owns them in the name of his son or his wife or some other person. And, thus, he becomes exempted from the land reforms. The form has changed but the content remains the same; the concentration of land in our country has not changed. Therefore, I foresee that the result is going to be greater concentration in the hands of a few and greater increase in the number of agricultural labourers and greater misery to these people because you are not able to give them minimum social and economic conditions essential for their growth.

I can even tell you here that we are not going to break agricultural stagnation here that has taken place in the country. I hope Government will take this report in all seriousness and take into consideration the whole of the Indian rural life as it is and see that fundamentally unless we are prepared to change the whole structure of the economic situation in our village life, we will not be able to help agricultural labour. We will not be able to help it only through Community Development Projects or National Development Schemes or by having some schools opened here or some roads and houses built there and so on. I am sure the Government will take this up very seriously, at least after going through this report.

Finally, I would request the Government that we should not stop with the second enquiry. A third enquiry report should come. Let not that report come after the Third Plan is over and when you are on the anvil of the Fourth Plan. Let it come much earlier, before we prepare the Fourth

Plan so that the information will be useful for the preparation of the Plan itself.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This report, of it reveals anything, it reveals the miserable state of affairs that exist in the lowest levels of our rural society and it confirms the view that all our planned economic activities do not benefit the under-dogs in this country. We should congratulate really those who have prepared this report. This is the first authentic report which gives a very clear account of the effect of the economic policy of this Government. It would have made a very good comparison for us if the other committee which is to go into the distribution aspect of our national wealth in this country had made its report available. It would probably reveal how the real advantages and the real income that are increasing in this country more and more are going into the hands of a privileged few in our country. I think probably that the committee, after preliminary study, has come to the conclusion and their interim conclusions are such that if they are published that they will expose the entire basis of this Plan. Therefore, that report is being delayed. But this report is very depressing and painful. These people form 25 per cent of the rural population of our country. You cannot ignore such a vast mass people and build your plan saying that you are giving more emphasis to agriculture and you want to increase agricultural production and revolutionise village life. All these talks are mere talks on air and has no basis. Unless these 25 per cent of the villages people are looked after properly and have their pride of place in the society, things will not improve. My hon. friend who spoke before me has given quotations from the report to show how the actual condition of these workers has not only not improved but has become worse than what it was according to the previous report.

Who are these communities? They are the agricultural labourers; they are not only landless people. There are small land owners also. There are tenants and landless people; a large section of them belong to the backward communities who suffer not only from economic difficulties but from social disabilities as well. They are the real, under-privileged sections of our society. So, for any Plan what so ever, our first attention should have been devoted to this section, but we have completely neglected that section, as it revealed here.

17 hrs.

This report shows that the *per capita* income of an agricultural labourers household is 34 per cent of the national *per capita* income. In the previous report, the employment available to these people—the quantum of average employment available—was shown as 200 days. Now in 1956-57 it has declined to 197 days. About wages, it is better not to mention it. There is of course the Minimum Wages Act, but the third Five Year Plan itself describes how difficult it has been to enforce the provisions of that Act. The situations vary from place to place. It is a difficult and complicated problem no doubt. But I feel there has not been any systematic attempt to see that the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act are enforced.

About wages, the actual position or state of affairs is this; even if the entire family of an agricultural labourer works in a village, that family will not be able to get that much wage which a single industrial worker gets. As has been very rightly said in this report, in view of the general dearth of employment opportunities in the rural sector, any type of work at which the labourer can try his hands is good enough for him, whatever the remuneration it may be fetch.

What have we done to improve these conditions? Not only, are the

people more dependent on agriculture, but there is another aspect also. This report shows that whereas previously in States like Uttar Pradesh, Assam and Kerala, there was practically no child wage-earners, now, as a result of our planned activities, when more money is coming to the people, and when it is said that we are in a socialist pattern of society, child wage-earners are reported to be employed in all the States in 1956-57. This is the position, when we want to abolish child labour! So, I do not know what can be a better condemnation of this Government than the report itself.

Take housing. We are spending much money on housing. But I am really sorry to say that this money is being spent mostly in urban or semi-urban areas. The rural people practically get no benefit whatsoever. The real position is very well described here. What is the condition of housing?

“The village houses do offer some sort of shelter against sun and rain to dwellers but they have no latrines, no protected water supply and no public cleansing. Men and cattle live in close proximity; mosquitoes, and flies swarm; and rats about in the huts and hovels.....The interior of the house is generally clean, but the surroundings are dirty. The village pond is green with algae and is constantly polluted.....Public eating houses are uncommon, but an insanitary tea shop or coffee house is easily found.”

This is from a health report of the Government of India. This is the general condition of rural housing. It is insanitary and un-hygienic. The condition of agricultural labourers who belong to depressed classes and backward communities could reasonably be assumed to be much worse.

So, that is the state of affairs. Therefore, I would have thought that before we had planned for the Third Five Year Plan and the Plan allotments

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

were made sufficient attention was given to this aspect of the problem. I am not going into the question of negligence on the part of the Government in enforcing the provisions of this Act or that Act. It is a fundamental problem facing us now of a very serious nature.

If you see the Third Plan, they only give you some homilies. They say that in the First Plan they had said about settlement of agricultural labourers, protection against evictions etc. It has been found out that people in large numbers have been evicted from lands after the so-called land reforms legislation were passed in the different legislatures. In the Second Plan also they stated something about the development of this sector. What do they suggest in the Third Plan? They have devoted some pages for it, but there is no concrete suggestion which would show that the conditions of these people during the course of the Third Five Year Plan is going to be any better. The only thing that they hope perhaps is that because of the community development projects—we are talking this very much, that a new revolution has come, a new pattern has developed even though we know who has benefited—they would probably be able to a greater extent to improve the conditions of these sections of our people. Excepting this, I find nothing in the Third Plan which concretely suggests to ameliorate the conditions of these people.

The Deputy Minister of Planning and Labour and Employment (Shri L. N. Mishra): Which people, agricultural labour

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The people about whom we are discussing—are agricultural labour. This report itself has made a comparative study of the community development areas and the non-community development areas. The figures are there for the Deputy Minister to see—I won't read out the figures. Their conclusion is:

"It would appear from the above statement that there was

hardly any improvement in employment in the community project areas."

Therefore, the benefits will go to the landlords and to the great land owners. The benefits are actually going to them.

An hon. Member: No, No

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You may say no, but it has been revealed in the evaluation reports regarding Community projects, in the Third Plan of the Planning Commission and others. If you take pains to read them you will find that actually the benefits are not going to this section of the people.

Therefore, I charge this Government. There is no point in going on elaborating the miserable state of affairs of these people which have been so fully described and brought out in this report. I feel that the way we are proceeding and the callous manner in which we are neglecting this very vital sector of our rural society would ultimately lead us to the position that the entire rural life in this country will be completely at the mercy of the industrial sector and the capitalists.

17.10 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

That will be the total outcome, that will be the real state of affairs, when the Third Five Year Plan is complete. Therefore, I would have very much welcomed if, instead of a private Member giving notice of a motion and ours getting a couple of hours only to discuss it, the Ministry themselves have come forward to take the opinion of this House on this Report because it is not only, as I have stated and the previous speakers have pointed out, the economic point of view that has to be considered, for there are other aspects to this problem which will require the attention, co-operation and active support of various sections of our people. So, I would have thought that if the Government themselves

were serious about removing the miserable condition of these people, they themselves would have come forward to discuss this report and take the opinion of the House. They have not done that, and that shows how they are tackling this problem.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ch. Ranbir Singh. Hon. Members should be brief now.

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बात से न ही यह रिपोर्ट इन्कार करती है और न ही कोई और इन्कार कर सकता है कि इस देश का सब से ज्यादा कमजोर जो भ्रंग है वह एग्रिकल्चरल लेबर है और उसी को सब से ज्यादा बढ़ावा देने की जरूरत है। उसकी तरक्की के लिए चाहे हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार हो या प्रान्तीय सरकारें हों, सभी को बहुत ज्यादा ध्यान देना है।

यहां पर आज की बहस में यह साबित करने की कोशिश की गई है कि पिछली रिपोर्ट के मुकाबले में इस रिपोर्ट के हिसाब से तरक्की के बजाय तनज्जुली हुई है। लेकिन यह बात सही नहीं है। मैं उन दोस्तों को जो इस चीज को साबित करने की कोशिश करते हैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन के छन्दर माननीय श्री नन्दा जी ने बताया था कि यह जो फर्क है रिपोर्ट में, इसका कारण यह नहीं है कि उनकी तरक्की होने के बजाय घबनति हुई है बल्कि उसका कारण यह है कि पहली रिपोर्ट के छन्दर जितने कुनबे शामिल किये गये थे उनके मुकाबले में अब कम कुनबे शामिल किये गये हैं और जो कमी की गई है वह ऊपर के तबकों की की गई है, उनकी की गई है जिन की घामदनी पहले कुछ ज्यादा थी। इन लोगों को एग्रिकल्चरल लेबर की कैंटेनरी में से निकाल दिया गया है जब उनको उस गिनती से निकाल दिया गया है तो कुदरती तौर पर यह स्थिति बन जाती है। यह बात हिसाब में तो बिल्कुल सही उतरती है लेकिन असल में वह सही नहीं है। जिन की ज्यादा

घामदनी थी उनको निकाल दिया गया है और नीचे के जो घामदनी हैं जिन की घामदनी कम थी, उनको रख कर ही घीसत निकाला गया है जो कुदरती तौर पर कम निकलता है। हिसाब के मुताबिक तो यह चीज सही है लेकिन असल में सही इसलिए नहीं है कि कम्पेरिजन जो है वह पहले के मुकाबले में दूसरी चीज से है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह एक मोटी समझ की बात है कि इस देश के छन्दर हजारों मील लम्बी सड़कें बनी हैं और उन के ऊपर मिट्टी डालने का काम हुआ है और मेरे माननीय दोस्त बतायें कि यह काम बिड़ला जी ने किया है या बड़े बड़े जमींदारों ने किया है।

पर्यं वकं या मिट्टी डालने का जो काम है या सड़कें बनाने का काम है, या नहरें बनाने के सिलसिले में मिट्टी का जो काम है या लोहे के और दूसरे छोटे बड़े कारखाने बनाने के सिलसिले में जो इस तरह के काम हैं, उनको करवाने में जो करोड़ों रुपया खर्च हुआ है, वह सारे का सारा एग्रिकल्चरल लेबर के पास, उसके कुनबों के पास गया है। इससे धरदाज लग सकता है कि हिसाब किताब पेज करने का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है, वह जैसा मैं ने कहा हिसाब किताब के निहाज से तो सही है, लेकिन असल में सही नहीं है।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ जैसा और माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि उनकी हालत खयनीय है, शोचनीय है, और उनकी तरक्की करना बड़ा जरूरी है। कुछ मेरे भाइयों ने जमीन के बटवारे की बात कही है। वह भी इनकी हालत को मुधारने में मदद कर सकती है। यही कारण है कि हमारे देश में सीलिंग का कानून तकरीबन सारे प्रायों में बनाया गया है और उसको लागू किया गया है। इससे थोड़ी बहुत जमीन मिलेगी लेकिन असल में अगर इन लोगों की मदद करनी है और इनकी हालत में मुधार लाना है तो एक दूसरा ही काम आपको करना होगा।

[चौ० रणधीर सिंह]

कोई भी देश जो बढ़ा हुआ है, तरक्की किये हुए है, उसके अन्दर हमारे देश की तरह से ७० परसेंट आवादी खेती के ऊपर निर्भर नहीं करती है। एग्रिकल्चरल लेबर की तरक्की हो नहीं सकती है जब तक कि उन में से काफी को खेत से हटा करके उनका इनहसार किसी दूसरे धंधे पर नहीं किया जाता है। मेरी राय साफ है और आप भी इस बात को जानते हैं और दम रिपोर्ट में भी लिखा है कि उनको साल में कुछ दिन काम मिलना है और कुछ दिन नहीं मिलता है और जिन दिनों उन को काम नहीं मिलता है उन दिनों काम मिले। अब सवाल पैदा होता है कि कैसे काम हम इनको दे सकते हैं। जाहिर है कि घरेलू धंधे, छोटे धंधे, छोटे छोटे कारखाने देहातों में चला कर ही इनको काम दिया जा सकता है। इस सिलसिले में माननीय श्री मनुभाई शाह ने एक नोट सबमिटेड किया था जिस में उन्होंने तजवीज की है कि एक बोर्ड बनाया जाये और उस बोर्ड के पास तृतीय योजना में ढाई तीन सौ करोड़ खपया रहे और उस के साथ आल-इंडिया खादी एंड विल्लेज इंडस्ट्रीज कमिशन, हैंडीक्राफ्ट्स बोर्ड और इसी तरह की दूसरी संस्थाओं को जोड़ दिया जाये। इस बोर्ड का यह काम हो कि देहातों के अन्दर छोटी छोटी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट बनाई जायें, छोटे छोटे काम धंधे बढ़ाये जायें। अग्रजों के जमाने में आज से डेढ़ दो सौ साल पहले के हिन्दुस्तान के देहात के नक्शे को देखा जाये तो पता चलेगा कि इतनी बड़ी तादाद, जबकि जमीन बहुत काफी थी और जबकि जमीन के बारे में आज जो कानून है, वे नहीं थे, किसी के जमीन पर खेती करने में कोई बहुत ज्यादा कानून हायल नहीं थे, जमीन पर निर्भर नहीं करती थी। इस वास्तु खेत मजदूर की तरक्की करने का सही तरीका यह है कि अब जबकि गांवों के अन्दर छोटी छोटी सड़कें बन गई हैं, बिजली भी बहुत जगह पहुंच गई है, हज़ार दो हज़ार छोटी छोटी एस्टेट्स हम बनायें,

इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट्स हम बनायें, छोटे छोटे कारखाने लगायें, जिन में से कुछ बिजली से चलें और कुछ हाथ से चलें हाथ के धंधे जो हमारे कारीगर किया करते थे, वे करने की उनको सभी सहुलियतें देने की व्यवस्था की जाये। कुछ धंधे पिछले डेढ़ दो सौ सालों में देहात के कारीगर करते थे लेकिन अग्रजों ने उनकी कारीगरी को छड़वाया और कड़ियों के हाथ कटवाये। तो वह जो हमारा पहले समाज का नक्शा था उसको हमें रिहैबिलिटेड करना है।

मैं यह कहे वगैर नहीं रह सकता कि पिछले दो प्लान्स के अन्दर, पिछले दस साल के अन्दर, जो देहात की कारीगरी, हारल इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन, की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए था उतना नहीं दिया गया, देहात की इंडस्ट्रीज की तरक्की के लिए जितना ध्यान देना चाहिए था उतना नहीं दिया गया। और जब तक वह नहीं किया जायगा तब तक इस देश के अन्दर कोई भी लैंड रिफॉर्म करने से एग्रीकल्चरल लेबर की तरक्की नहीं हो सकती, कुछ हद तक हो सकती है यह मैं मानता हूँ।

मैं सोलिंग के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ, मैं उसके हों में हूँ। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि कानून बना कर एग्रीकल्चरल लेबर की मिनिमम वेजेज भी मुकर्रर करनी चाहिए और उस कानून को लागू करना चाहिये। लेकिन कानून के लागू होने से कोई यह समझे कि यह समस्या हल हो जायेगी और खेत के मजदूर की ग्रामदनी बढ़ जायेगी, तो वह थोड़ी बहुत बढ़ सकती है। लेकिन उसका असली हल वह नहीं है। असली हल तो देहात में कारखानों का बढ़ावा ही है और जब तक हम उसकी तरफ नहीं जायेंगे तब तक हमारी आने वाली रिपोर्ट भी ऐसी ही दिस को तोड़ने वाली होगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्रालय सरकार के ऊपर जोर डाले और ३०० करोड़ रुपये के साथ वह बोर्ड बनाया जाये और एक एक देहात के अन्दर छोटे और बड़े कारखाने बनाये जायें।

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I congratulate the authors of this document in that they have highlighted the problem of agricultural labour. It is a fact, as stated by the Government itself and the report presented to us in the Third Five Year Plan, that the nation has progressed in the last 12 or 13 years, considerably, and that the national income has gone up to a large extent, raising the standard to an extent that is felt in some of the urban areas. The income of the working class population today is on an average Rs. 100 to Rs. 120 as in Ahmedabad, Bombay, Madras and other places. It was expected that, in view of the large sum spent in the rural sector, in developing the rural economy, in developing agricultural operations and the improvements made in the expansion of Khadi and other village industries, the rural agricultural population would benefit to a large extent. It has been seen from the report that that has not taken place.

While the report says that some of the categories that were included in the 1950-51 enumeration have not been included in the present report and therefore, a proper estimation would not be what it apparently appears, it appears to me that the attention that the Government has to pay towards this problem has not been sufficiently paid. I say this for the simple reason that the number of hours of work has remained the same, the population of agricultural labour has increased considerably and child labour is being utilised, minimum wages are not being paid properly and some of the Acts like giving compensation and other things are not being applied to this sector. In a large country like ours, it would be difficult for any Government, with its meagre machinery, to implement them. Enough has been said on the floor of the House that there should be a large inspectorate appointed by the Government to look into these things. Even so, for the time lag that it takes, for the litigation that one has to go through, for the time it takes, we felt that the agricul-

turist himself should go to these people and lodge a complaint. In lodging a complaint of this type going a distance of 8 or 10 miles, he has to waste a whole day on which he could otherwise work and earn. Therefore, it is felt that the inspectorate should visit these places and take the complaints and look into the whole matter. None of these things has taken place. Now, the question arises as to what should be done. I can go into the details of the report, because I have read it throughly. But the main question is what should be done.

The problem again poses itself this way, namely whether we are going to industrialise the country and increase the employment potential that way and allow these people to suffer for another thirty, forty or fifty years before we catch up every individual and give him employment, or we are going to attend more to the rural sector and give some kind of employment which at least gives them a living wage at present, and tackle the larger industrial problems later.

These are the two questions which are being discussed by the economists, and by large, on account of the various situations in the country both inside and outside, and the trouble that we are facing in the border, and the threat of a cold war developing into a hot war at any time, industrialisation of the country rapidly is believed to be essential, and, therefore, we are investing quite a large sum of money in the basic industries and others. Even so, I would make it clear on the floor of this House that so far as the consumer industries are concerned, unless we immediately place some kind of embargo on their development in the urban areas and spread them into the village sector and give more subsidy for their development in the rural sector, we shall not be able to give any substantial amount of relief to this section of the population.

If we have got to tackle this problem, it is not in the political field. Some of the Members here have spoken that way. Actually, one Member, namely, Shri Nagi Reddy gave a chal-

[Dr. Melkote]

lence and said that if the Prime Minister, as an ordinary citizen, came to a particular village, he would not be able to go there. May I similarly give a challenge, namely, that these challenges have been accepted by us, that people have gone there, and that those villages, where my hon. friends say that they have got their hold, have voted against them in all these elections? So, what is the use of these challenges? If that was the factor which was operating, then, there would have been a majority of that group here in this House. But they are not there; they are not even a handful from that particular area from which they come, and still, they want to say these things on the floor of this House.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: It is Birla's money which has given you strength.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): And yours is the Russian money or the Chinese money?

Dr. Melkote: After all, people are not blind to facts. It is no use saying 'Birla's money' and all these things. We also know, and people inside the House also know. After all is said and done, we have got to take into consideration the actual condition of these workers. Something has got to be done. If that something has got to be done, as I said, then, we must take as many of these important industries like the consumer industries, and particularly food and cloth—because it is these two things that are consumed maximum in any country and it is these two industries which give the maximum employment—to the village sector. Secondly, there should be the development of more of these medium and minor-sized irrigation projects, not the big ones so much as these medium and minor ones, all over the country. Fourthly, as has been envisaged in the Third Five Year Plan, there should be an increase in the cottage and rural industries, and fourthly, there should be development of ancillary industries.

In regard to the development of ancillary industries, I would point

out that in India, even today, many of the big industrialists manufacture right from a pin up to a car in their own industrial concerns. Many of these things can be dispersed both in the backward areas and in the rural sector.

By developing these things, as has been done in Japan and Switzerland and Sweden, we should be in a position to give a large employment potential to these people. Along with the income from agriculture, if the agricultural labour can supplement it with some kind of wages through these industries, their income would go up, unemployment would go down and the condition would better itself.

This is such a large subject on which one would like to talk at some length. I had only wished that a larger number of Members were present here and the time were extended. With these few words, I place before the House my view that this is a matter worthy of consideration at the highest level, and a good deal of attention has got to be paid to it by Government, if any relief is to go to this particular sector.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बागबकी) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्नी में ने अपने माननीय बजुर्ग की बात सुनी और जब कभी भी गरीब लोगों के सवाल उठते हैं, चाहे वह खेत मजदूर की शकल में हों, चाहे हरिजनों और पिछड़ी जातियों की शकल में हों, चाहे योजना का सवाल हो, तो यह बहुत जबरदस्त तर्क दिया जाता है कि इसे राजनीति का प्रश्न नहीं बनाना चाहिए। अब मैं आपके द्वारा बड़े अदब से सरकार से जानना चाहूंगा कि आखिर यह राजनीति होती किस लिए है? अगर राजनीति और योजना गरीबों को नहीं उठा सकती तो हम कुछ भी कल्याण नहीं कर सकते। राजनीति में हम रहें और उसी राजनीति को हम गाली दें यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश में दो प्रकार के दुःख हैं—एक तन का और एक मन का। कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं जिन्हें केवल तन का दुःख है

तो कुछ ऐसे हैं जिन्हें पेट का दुःख है। लेकिन इन के अलावा कुछ लोग ऐसे भी हैं और जिनकी कि संख्या काफी है, जिनको कि तन और मन दोनों का दुःख है। अब यह कौन लोग हैं? यह हमारे गांवों में बसने वाले खेतिहर मजदूर हैं जोकि गांवों में बसी हुई जनसंख्या का २५ प्रतिशत हैं। उनकी आर्थिक और सामाजिक दोनों समस्याएँ हैं। वह कौन लोग हैं? वह हमारे हरिजन, आदिवासी और पिछड़ी जाति के लोग हैं। यह सब खेतिहर मजदूर हैं और यह खेतों में काम करते हैं। उनकी अवस्था दयनीय और शोचनीय है।

हमारे अनेक माननीय सदस्यों ने उनके सम्बन्ध में अपनी अपनी बातें रखी हैं। हम गांवों में उन के वरों को देखें, उनके कपड़ों को देखें और उनके भोजन को देखें तो हम यही पायेंगे कि शायद हिन्दुस्तान में सब से ज्यादा दुखी लोग ही हैं। उन के दुखों को हम कोई बयान नहीं कर सकते कि किना उन लोगों को दुख है। यह खेद और दुःख का विषय है कि पिछली दो पंच साला योजनाओं में इन के दुखों को दूर करने के लिए कुछ नहीं हुआ। अब तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना चल रही है। उस में कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट के अन्दर कुछ लोगों के वास्ते मकान बनवाये गये हैं तो कहीं पानी पीने के लिए कुएं बनवाये गये हैं। इन के अतिरिक्त उन की हालत में और कोई सुधार नहीं हुआ है। श्रीमान्, मैं चाहूंगा कि उनकी दशा में सुधार हो क्योंकि २५ मैकडा गांव की आबादी को यदि हम यह जाकर कहें कि हम पंच साला योजना चला रहे हैं और देश को तरक्की के रास्ते पर ले जा रहे हैं तो यह सही और अच्छी बात न होगी और न ही हमारे कंबल इतना कह भर देने से देश तरक्की की ओर जा सकता है।

आजकल की जैसी परिस्थिति है उसमें खेतिहर मजदूरों की अवस्था सुधारी भी नहीं जा सकती है। मान लीजिये कि आप भी न्यूनतम मजदूरी का कानून बना दें और मैं आपको बतलऊं कि उत्तर प्रदेश में

ऐसा कानून बना भी हुआ है लेकिन उस कानून को लागू नहीं किया जा रहा है। वह इसलिए लागू नहीं हो सकता है क्योंकि वे लोग गांवों में इस तरीके से फैले हुए हैं कि उनका अपना संगठन ही नहीं बन सकता है और न ही उनको संगठन बनाने में कोई सहायता मिलती है।

मेरे पास बहुत सी ऐसी मिसालें हैं कि जहां बेगार ली जाती है। बेगार के खिलाफ भी कानून बना हुआ है लेकिन बेगार अब भी उन में ली जाती है। मजदूरी उनको नही के बराबर दी जाती है—४, ६ या ८ घाने रोज बतौर मजदूरी के उनको दिये जाते हैं। लेकिन जो लोग उनसे बेगार लेते हैं या उन्हें कम वेतन देते हैं उनके खिलाफ कोई सरकारी मशीनरी काम नहीं करती और न ही उन बेचारों में कोई जागृति अथवा संगठन है जिसके कि द्वारा वह अपने अधिकारों को प्राप्त कर सकें। अनेकों मिसालें ऐसी हैं जिनमें गांवों में उन बेचारों से बेगार ली जाती है और बहुत ही कम मजदूरी दी जाती है और सरकार यदि चाहे तो उसके जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी अथवा बेगार के खिलाफ कानून हैं उनके मातहत ऐसे लोगों को जो उन कानूनों को तोड़ते हैं और जो गरीबों का शोषण करते हैं उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही कर सकती है लेकिन हम विधा में कुछ नहीं हो रहा है।

जहां तक अधिकतम मीमा निर्धारित करने का सवाल है मैं उसे बहुत पसन्द करता हूँ क्योंकि उससे गरीबों को जमीन मिलेगी और काफी राहत मिलेगी। जमीन के समुचित बटवारे के जरिये हम उन गरीबों और भूमिहीनों को जमीन दे सकते हैं। चाहे हम योजना की रिपोर्ट को देखें और चाहे इस एग्जीक्यूटिव सेबर इन इंडिया की रिपोर्ट को देखें या जहां भी कोई अथवा बहुत इस बारे में चर्चा हो तो यही चीज कही जाती है कि जमीन का बटवारा होना चाहिए। गरीबों और भूमिहीनों को जमीन देने से उनकी स्थिति सुधर जायेगी।

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

कहीं कहीं पर इस सम्बन्ध में कानून भी बना हुआ है लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह कानून किस तरीके का है। एक बड़ी भारी असमानता तो देश में यह पाई जाती है कि एक व्यक्ति के पास तो २४, २४ और २५, २५ हजार एकड़ तक जमीन होती है और दूसरी ओर हजारों और लाखों लोगों के पास गुजारे के लायक भूमि भी नहीं होती है। अब मैं श्री बिड़ला के लिए ही कहूंगा कि अनेक बिजनोर में उनके कई कई हजार एकड़ के बड़े-बड़े फार्म बने हुए हैं। वह एक करोड़पति और अरबपति आदमी हैं और न जाने कितने तो उनके कारखाने हैं। अब उस इलाके में बसे हुए खेतिहर मजदूरों की कैसी दुर्दशा होती है इसकी सहज ही में कल्पना की जा सकती है। जब तक इस तरह का कानून नहीं बनता और जब तक हम हर एक आदमी को और काम तौर से खेती मजदूरों को उनकी जमीनों न दे दें, कोई काम धन्धा न दे दें तब तक इस देश का कल्याण नहीं हो सकता है। हमें इसके खिलाफ भी कानून बनाना होगा कि कुछ बड़े बड़े लोग हजारों एकड़ जमीन पर कब्जा करके न बैठ जायें लेकिन वह बड़े खेद का विषय है कि अभी तक इस दिशा में कुछ नहीं हो रहा है।

जमीन की सीमांकन करने अर्थात् भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा निर्धारित करने सम्बन्धी कानून का जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश में बना हुआ है उसका कुछ नमूना मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर सीमा निर्धारण का कानून बना हुआ है कि ४० एकड़ जमीन एक परिवार जिसमें कि ५ व्यक्ति हों, रख सकता है। लेकिन उसके साथ प्राविजो यह लगा हुआ है कि अगर उस परिवार में पाँच पाँच में एक, एक कर के तीन सदस्य और बढ़ जायें तो ६४ एकड़ जमीन तक वह परिवार अपने पास रख सकता है।

इसके साथ ही उस कानून में जहाँ तक फेयरलैंड का सम्बन्ध है उस पर लगान के वास्ते एक आइटेरिया रखा गया है कि इतना लगान प्रति एकड़ होगा। वह डेढ़ एकड़ एक एकड़ के बराबर होगा। अगर उसमें कम होगा तो दो एकड़ एक एकड़ के बराबर होगा। इतना ही नहीं उसमें यह भी प्राविजन है कि बागात पर वह कानून लागू नहीं होगा चाहे जितने बाग उसके पास क्यों न हों। इस प्राविजो के रहने का नतीजा यह हुआ कि जब यह कानून बन रहा था तो उत्तर प्रदेश के बड़े बड़े जमींदार, ताल्लुकेदार और राजे, महाराजे बागात लगवा रहे थे। पटवारी और लेखपाल मुबारक रहें जिनके कि कारण उनको दरअसल बाग लगाने की भी जरूरत नहीं, खाली उनके रजिस्ट्रों में दर्ज हो जाय कि फलों फलाने के बाग लगवाये हुए हैं। बाग तो वन कलम से लगाने हैं और अगर उन के रजिस्ट्रों में वह दर्ज हो जाय तो फिर उनकी वह जमीन महफूज रहती है। इतने पर ही बस नहीं है उसमें यह भी लिखा हुआ है कि अगर कोई पाउल्टरी फार्म लगाये हुए है, मुर्गी फार्म लगाये हुए हैं तो उस पर भी यह कानून लागू नहीं होगा। यदि कहीं पह डेढ़री फार्म हो तो भी यह कानून वहाँ पर लागू नहीं होगा ऐसी जमीनों जहाँ पर कि फल बगैरह पैदा किये जाते हों उन पर भी यह कानून लागू नहीं होता। ऐसी भूमि जहाँ पर जड़ी बूटियाँ बगैरह लगाई जाती हों वहाँ पर भी यह कानून लागू नहीं होता। इन सब छूटों के रहते मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या जमीन का समुचित बंटवारा करने का और गरीबों और भूमि हीनों का जमीन देने का यही रास्ता और तरीका है? यह तो महज गरीबों को फंसाए और धोखा देने का रास्ता है अगर जमीन देने की तो सीधा सादा कानून बनाते जिससे कि भूमि-हीनों और खेत मजदूरों को जमीन मिल सकती।

खेतियर मजदूरों में दो तरह के लोग हैं— एक तो वह जो सीधे सीधे मजदूरी करते हैं और दूसरे वह जिनके कि पास दो या तीन बीघे जमीन है और जो कि उस खेत पर काम करके अपनी रोजी नहीं कमा पाते और मजदूरी करना चाहते हैं । दोनों किस्म के लोगों को मजदूरी करनी पड़ती है और दोनों की दशा दयनीय है । दो, तीन बीघे खेत जिनके पास हैं वह उस खेत में काम करके इतना पैदा नहीं कर सकते कि लगान भी दे दें और उनके बीज, मजदूरी, खाद और सिंचाई वगैरह का भी हिसाब पूरा हो जाये और खाली उससे उनका गुजर बसर नहीं हो पाता है । ऐसे लोगों के वास्ते चाहे वह केन्द्र की सरकार हो अथवा राज्य सरकारें हों यदि उनमें उनके वास्ते हमदर्दी की भावना है तो उनकी अलाभकर जोतों पर से लगान माफ कर दिया जाये तब जा कर उनको राहत मिल सकती है ।

इस रिपोर्ट में जिक्र है कि बंजर जमीनें पड़ी हुई हैं । सरकार को अन्न उपजाने की और खाद्यान्न की पैदावार बढ़ाने की बहुत फिक्र है लेकिन इन बंजर जमीनों को तोड़ने के लिए इन गरीबों को फौज में भरती नहीं किया जाता है । उनको पैसा देकर ऐसी जमीनों को तुड़वाया नहीं जाता है ताकि उन के ऊपर खेती बाड़ी की जा सके । ऐसा करने में दो फायदे हैं । एक तो अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ेगी और हमें बाहर से अनाज नहीं मंगाना पड़ेगा दूसरे देश में बेकारी दूर होगी ।

श्रीमन्, जमीन का कानून सब से गंदा कानून है और यह गरीबों को एक धोखा देने वाली चीज है । सरकार आज तक यह नहीं तय कर पाई है कि आखिर किसान है कौन । हकीकत यह है कि आज यह किसान नहीं है जो कि खेत में मेहनत करके अनाज पैदा करता है, आज किसान यह नहीं जोकि जमीन को तोड़ना है, पानी देता है या बीज देता है, किसान तो

वह माना जाता है जिसके कि लिए लेखपाल और पटवारी के खसरा और खतौनी के रेकार्ड्स में दर्ज हो जाता है कि वह हल चहा कर खेती करता है । असली किसान बल माना जाता है जिसके लिए लेखपाल और पटवारी अपनी कलम से रेकार्ड्स में दर्ज कर देते हैं कि वह खेती करता है । जब तक यह परिभाषा नहीं बदलती है तब तक उसको किसान नहीं माना जाएगा और उस वक्त तक न तो गरीबों की दशा सुधरेगी और न ही श्रीमन्, इस देश में अन्न की कमी को पूरा किया जा सकता है क्योंकि वह लोग जो कि बाकई में खेती करते हैं उनका उसमें कुछ हिस्सा नहीं होता है । केवल ५, ६ अपने प्रति दिन मजदूरी देने से उनका भूखा पेट नहीं भर सकता है । बाहरों में तो मजदूरों को रुपया अथवा डेढ़ रुपया मजदूरी मिल भी जाती है लेकिन मैं तो गाबों के खेत मजदूरों की बात कर रहा हूँ जहाँ कि उनको केवल ६ घाने या ८ घाने मजदूरी मिलती है । कभी कभी उनसे बेगार भी ली जाती है । अगर केन्द्र की सरकार या राज्य सरकारें चाहती हैं कि देश में अन्न की पैदावार बढ़े और उन गरीबों की दशा सुधरे तो जमीन का बटवारा इमानदारी के साथ होना चाहिए । अगर सरकार चाहती है कि उनकी दयनीय अवस्था में सुधार हो और खाद्यान्न की उपज देश में बढ़े तो फिर जमीन की मलकियत खेत मजदूरों को मिलनी चाहिए और खेत मजदूरों को अलाभकर जमीनों पर से लगान हटाना चाहिए । बंजर जमीनों को तुड़वाने के वास्ते सरकार की इन लोगों की एक फौज तैयार करनी चाहिए और उनको पैसा देकर बंजर जमीनों को तुड़वा कर खेती लायक बनवाया जाये और उनको उन पर बसाया जाय तभी देश में अन्न की उपज बढ़ सकती है । और उनकी अवस्था भी सुधर सकती है । खाली इस तरह के कानून से कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है ।

Shri L. N. Mishra: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have listened with in-

[Shri L. N. Mishra]

terest to this debate on the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report and I am glad to find that hon. Members of this House are so much concerned about the welfare of agricultural labour. Government too have been alive to the problem of agricultural labour and we also feel that we have still to do much to improve their plight. Hon. Members will find that in the Third Plan we have given special attention to the problem. We ourselves are not satisfied with what has been done so far for them. Shri Nagi Reddy made more a political speech than an objective one. He made special reference to the land reforms and said that we had not made any progress. I would request him to go through the Third Plan and see the progress made.

Shri Nagi Reddy: How much land has been distributed?

Shri L. N. Mishra: We lay stress on three or four things: abolition of zamindaris and intermediaries, consolidation of holdings imposition of ceilings and settlement of the surplus lands. Most States have gone ahead—almost all States—with legislations for abolition of zamindari. There has been consolidation of holdings in a number of States. So far as the imposition of the ceiling is concerned, the programme is going ahead in almost all the States. So far as the settlement of the landless people are concerned, our policy is clearly stated in the Third Plan and the States have made provision for Rs. 400 crores for the settlement of landless people on surplus land and we think that by the end of the Third Plan we would have made good progress in this respect also.

Shri Muniswamy and Shri Dwivedy also spoke at length and they came to the conclusion that conditions of the agricultural labour in this country had deteriorated, instead of improved. They said that Government had been only passive witnesses. Before coming to this conclusion, I will request these two hon. Members and others also to examine this report from two or three

points of view. The basic factors must be taken into account before you come to this conclusion. Firstly, the concepts and definitions in the Second report are different from those in the First report. We have taken income as the basis in the Second report while employment was the basis in the first. The first difference in the concepts used concerns the definition of agricultural labour. In the first enquiry, an agricultural labourer was one who was employed for wages in the process of crop production. An agricultural family labour was defined as one in which either the head of the family or 50 per cent or more of the earners reported agricultural labour as their main occupation. In the second enquiry, an agricultural labourer has been defined to include labour not only employed in crop production but also in other agricultural occupation like dairy farming, horticulture etc. An agricultural labour family was defined as one which derived a major portion of its income from agricultural wages. The concepts are not the same nor are the definitions. Therefore, there is bound to be two different sets of conclusions. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the conclusions of the second enquiry are conclusive. In the earlier report, retail prices were taken into account while in the second wholesale prices are being taken into account. In the first report in 1950-51, we must remember that the production of crop was at a low ebb; there was a decline by about ten per cent. The prices were also rising. In the period of the second report, 1956-57, production of crop was rising; it rose by about thirty per cent and the prices generally came down by 7½ per cent and agricultural prices, by about ten per cent. Therefore, there are bound to be two different conclusions. If we do not take these basic factors into account, we will definitely accept that the condition of agricultural labour has deteriorated in this country. But we feel that the condition of agricultural labour has not deteriorated. The impact of the Plan, specially of the various schemes of the community

projects and river-valley projects and other projects of the Plan has been felt by this section also and therefore we do not accept that the condition of agricultural labour in this country has deteriorated during this period.

Further, it is also not correct to say that agricultural labour has not improved during this period. I would like to catalogue a few grounds on which I say this. The general economic conditions of agricultural labour households without land—this category of households was strictly comparable—showed improvement. The average household income of these categories of households increased from Rs. 393 to Rs. 402 for casual households, and from Rs. 472 to Rs. 525 for attached households. Secondly, wage-paid employment of adult males increased from 218 days to 222 days, and that of women from 134 to 141 days. Thirdly, the increase in indebtedness was largely the result of increased borrowing for production purposes. What are the purposes of borrowing? The first purpose is production. In 1950-51, it was Rs. 10 and in 1956-57, it was Rs. 26. So, there is increased borrowing for production purposes. So far as consumption is concerned, it was Rs. 78 in the first period and Rs. 64 in the second period. For social purposes, it was Rs. 17 in the first, and Rs. 33 in the second.

Then I shall turn to the suggestions made by Shri N. R. Muniswamy for improving the plight of agricultural labour. I accept there is scope for it; there is reason for it and there is justification for it. The chapter on agricultural labour in the third Plan gives a catalogue of improvements which the Government have in mind in regard to the plight of agricultural labour. The Government is also aware of the problems of agricultural labour, and the second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee suggested certain measures which the Government should implement. We think they are wholesome and we want to follow some of the measures actively to improve the plight of agricultural

labour. I would now like to state a few of the improvements which the Government have in mind. Firstly, in view of the limited opportunities for employment of the agricultural labourers and prevailing under-employment for a part of the year, efforts will be made to provide employment facilities through the development of rural cottage industries. Secondly, intensive cultivation of existing lands and extension of cultivation to cultivable wastes will be undertaken in order to increase the employment opportunities for agricultural workers. Thirdly, a proper utilisation of rural manpower will be achieved through the various works projects in the third Plan such as irrigation, flood control, land reclamation, afforestation, soil conservation, road development projects, and other construction works. You know that we are taking up some pilot projects to improve the employment situation and we felt that these projects which are called labour intensive projects will go a long way to improve the situation and relieve the unemployment problem, so far as agricultural labour is concerned.

Shri N. B. Maiti (Ghatal): Is it from this year?

Shri L. N. Mishra: During the third Plan. Then, agricultural labourers are exposed to chronic indebtedness. Proper enforcement of the laws meant for giving relief from indebtedness will be ensured. Then, the Government of India have already set up a Central Advisory Committee on agricultural labour, and this committee will take a comprehensive view of all the problems of agricultural workers and suggest suitable remedies for ameliorating their conditions.

Mention was about the third agricultural labour enquiry committee. We will have a third Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee, and we have taken a decision on it. The work will start by 1962-63 and by the time the third Plan period is over, we will have the report from the third Enquiry

[Shri L. N. Mishra]

Committee. I believe that the third Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee is going to be more educative and more broad based, and that it will give a better picture of the situation and a more realistic picture too.

I believe, this is going to be an improvement on both the first and the second Agricultural Enquiry Committee.

Sir, the debate of the day has been very very fruitful and beneficial to both the sides. So far as the report of the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee is concerned, it is a good work and in certain respects it is a masterpiece also. But I will only say that it will not be fair to come to conclusive conclusions that the condition of agricultural labour in India has deteriorated because some of the figures that are given in the report are like this; we must look into some of the basic facts which I stated earlier.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, at the outset, I would like to express my grateful thanks to the many hon. Members who have participated in the discussion and also given concrete suggestions which are worth considering by the Government.

The hon. Deputy Minister was pleased to say that there has been a slight misunderstanding of the actual position of the agricultural labour. You will be pleased to see that our observation about the deteriorating conditions of the agricultural labour was based on the two reports given to us. After reading the two reports the impression that we gather is not very happy. I only said that the impression is not very happy, for this reason that there is not much improvement and, as a matter of fact, it is going somewhat from bad to worse. The first report had adopted a certain criterion. The second report adopted some other criterion. It is no fault of ours if they adopted two different criteria to find out the condition of the agricultural labour and suggest remedies to

improve their conditions. We are not to be held responsible for arriving at this conclusion because our conclusion is based on these two reports which have adopted two different criteria. Our conclusion will also be of a conclusive nature, and if we conclude that the condition is deteriorating it is not our fault, it is the fault of the premises that have been adopted by the two reports.

The hon. Deputy Minister said that in the first report they adopted income as the basis and in the second report they have taken employment. There was no reason for them to adopt two different criteria and come to different conclusions. So it was basically wrong on their part to have adopted two different criteria and arrived at different conclusions. So there is no mistake on our part to have arrived at this conclusion.

I am very happy to learn that our conclusions are wrong and according to the Deputy Minister the conditions are much better. I appreciate the position. The sample survey was not conducted all over the country. The sample survey, by the very nature of it, is meant only for a few villages, a few holdings or a few selected areas. If the conclusions we arrive at or the decisions we take on the basis of the data we collect are different from what the actual position is in the other areas where no sample survey has been conducted, we cannot be balanced for that. The reason is that the survey is not conducted all over India. If the survey is conducted all over India it may give a different impression altogether. It is all because of the sample survey that is conducted. There is bound to be some mistakes and some erroneous conclusions.

Therefore, let us have a third report. Let us have a report once in five years or even ten years, because this is supposed to be the primary industry of the country on which everybody depends. The rural economy has to be improved to see that the economy

**BUS-TRAIN COLLISION AT
 MADURAI***

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the half-an-hour discussion.

Shri Tangamanj (Madurai): The necessity for this half-an-hour discussion arises out of the answer given on the 11th August 1961 to Starred Question No. 405 regarding the bus-train collision at Madurai. I shall briefly explain the circumstances that led to this accident and also the reasons which prompted me to come forward with the demand for a half-an-hour discussion and I hope that the Minister will go into greater detail about the various aspects and see that justice is done to those people who suffered and that there is some check or some preventive measure is taken against this kind of collision in future.

In reply to my question, the hon. Deputy Minister of Railways, Shri Shahnawaz Khan, stated:

"At about 13:55 hours on 27-2-61 (and not on 22-2-1961) while train No. 187 Madurai-Rameswaram Down Passenger was on the run between Madurai East and Silaiman stations, a city bus collided with the train at an unmanned level crossing. As a result of this accident, 2 occupants of the bus died and eight others were injured seriously."

Here I shall say that out of the two people who died, one is a textile worker. He died, leaving five children and he was the sole bread-winner for that family. The other was a student who was travelling with his mother, and the mother witnessed the boy being crushed to death. Eight others were injured seriously. I had occasion to meet almost all these seriously injured persons and none of them was in a fit position to continue any avocation.

Then I asked whether any compensation has been paid to the families. The reply was "No, Sir". Then I wanted to know whether steps have

of the country as a whole is improved. For that reason I would request the new Enquiry Committee to adopt a criterion which we can understand.

As regards indebtedness the non-Deputy Minister said that the indebtedness is due to various causes, the purposes are different etc. It may be true. All the same, the agricultural labourer has to incur debts either for education of his children or for the wedding of his daughter or for his own second or third marriage—because he must have human power to improve his agricultural operations. For that purpose, he has to incur certain debts and these debts are of such a nature that he is not able to repay. Therefore, I would suggest that agriculture should be subsidised. Because, an agricultural labourer does not get employment all the year round. He is engaged only for 4 or 5 months and for the rest of the 7 months he has no work. Therefore, some ancillary industries should be started to help them, because they are already very much indebted.

Lastly, I come to intensive cultivation. The hon. Minister was pleased to refer to intensive cultivation. Evidently, he means scientific cultivation. Here people are owning only half an acre or one acre of land, or one or two bighas of land. We cannot have scientific cultivation or cultivation of the intensive type, because our agriculturists are not having large areas. Therefore, I suggest that people who are having small holdings of 1 or 2 acres or bighas of land must be given some sort of help. With these observations, I commend the motion for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Second Enquiry on Agricultural Labour in India (Vol. I—All India), laid on the Table of the House on the 21st December, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

*Half-an-hour discussion.