

211,31 'NS2

NS3-5

ii

Wednesday, 5th November 1952.

	PAGES
I Questions and Answers	179-203 275-276
II Translation of speeches in the Assembly	203-204
III Government Bills—	
(1) The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952—cont.	204-235 236-249
(2) The Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	250-274
IV Programme of business of the House	235-236

Thursday, 6th November 1952.

I Questions and Answers	277-304 377-386
II Translation of Questions and Answers	305-306
III Non-official business—	
Resolution re Economy and Efficiency in Administrative Machinery.	306-376

Friday, 7th November 1952.

I Questions and Answers	387-404 442-443
II Adjournment of the House on Fridays for Muslim prayers	405
III Government Bills—	
(1) The Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 cont.	405-419
(2) The Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952	419-420
(3) The Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952	420-424
(4) The Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Co-ops (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952)	424-428
(5) The Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952	439-440
(6) The Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952	441
IV Government Motions—	
(1) Rule under section 17(1) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxa- tion Act, 1931	429-436
(2) Amendment and rule under section 17(1) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948	436-439
(3) Business of the House—Motion for change in the order	439, 441

Monday, 24th November 1952.

I Condolence Resolution on the death of Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar	445-447
II Questions and Answers	447-472 501-513
III Messages from the Council	472
IV Government Bills—	
(1) The Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952	473-486
(2) The Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952.	486-487
(3) The Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952.	488-500
V Papers placed on the table of the House	50

iii

Tuesday, 25th November 1952.

	PAGES
I Questions and Answers	515-551 622-624
II Adjournment Motions—	
(1) Hunger-strike of workers of Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode	552-554
(2) Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast on the Andhra Province issue	554-557
III Food and famine conditions in the State—Request for a debate on.	557-558
IV Government Bill—	
The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952)—cont.	558-621 625-652

Wednesday, 26th November 1952.

I Swearing-in of a new Member	653
II Questions and Answers	653-684
III Motions for the Adjournment of the business of the House—	
(1) Eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district	685-687
(2) Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	687-690
IV Motion for transaction of official business on a non-official day	690-692
V Government Bill—	
The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952)—cont.	692-761
VI Paper laid on the table of the House	761

Thursday, 27th November 1952.

I Privilege Motion re incorrect answer to a question	763-764 864
II Questions and Answers	764-789
III Adjournment Motions	789-796
IV Government Bill—	
The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952—cont.	796-863

Tuesday, 2nd December 1952.

I Questions and Answers	865-897 975-981
II Programme of sittings of the House	898
III Adjournment Motion re Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
IV Government Bill—	
The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952)—cont.	899-974

MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THIRD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Volume V (Nos. 1 to 11).

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Monday, 3rd November 1952.

	PAGES
Personnel of the Government of Madras	i
Principal Officers of the Madras Legislative Assembly	ii
List of Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly with their consti- tuencies	iii-xii
I Questions and Answers	1-29
II Disqualification of a member (Sri Saka Venkata Rao)	29-30
III Announcement by the Hon. Speaker—	
(1) Panel of chairmen	30
(2) Messages from the Governor	30-31
IV Leave of absence to a member (Sri Kumaraswami Raja Bahadur). .. .	31-32
V Government Resolution re Handloom Industry	32-81
VI Papers laid on the table of the House	81-82

Tuesday, 4th November 1952.

I Questions and Answers	83-107 176-178
II Request for a debate on famine and food conditions in the State. .. .	107
III Disqualification of a member (Sri Saka Venkata Rao)—cont. .. .	107-108
IV Government Resolution re Handloom Industry—cont.	108-148
V Government Bill—	
The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	148-175
VI Papers laid on the table of the House	175

Wednesday, 3rd December 1952.

	PAGES
I Questions and Answers	983-1008
II Rules governing Adjournment Motions	1008-1010
III Adjournment Motions—	
(1) Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer.	1010-1011
(2) Havoc caused by the cyclone	1011-1013
(3) Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks	1013-1014
IV Government Bills—	
(1) The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952— cont.	1014-1079
(2) The Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952	1079-1083

PERSONNEL OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

SHRI SRI PRAKASA.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS.

- 1 THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI, *Chief Minister.*
- 2 THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY, *Minister in charge of Medical and Health.*
- 3 THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM, *Minister in charge of Finance, Food and Elections.*
- 4 THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMY NAIDU, *Minister in charge of Religious Endowments and Registration.*
- 5 THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI, *Minister in charge of Public Works.*
- 6 THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO, *Minister in charge of Education, Harijan Uplift and Information.*
- 7 THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER, *Minister in charge of Prohibition.*
- 8 THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO, *Minister in charge of Industries and Labour, Motor Transport, Settlement of Ex-servicemen, Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and Civil Aviation.*
- 9 THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA, *Minister in charge of Agriculture, Forests, Veterinary, Animal Husbandry, Fisheries and Cinchona.*
- 10 THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI, *Minister in charge of Local Administration.*
- 11 THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NALCKER, *Minister in charge of Land Revenue.*
- 12 THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR, *Minister in charge of Courts and Prisons and Legal Department.*
- 13 THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI, *Minister in charge of Accommodation Control.*
- 14 THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO, *Minister in charge of Rural Welfare, Commercial Taxes and Scheduled Areas.*
- 15 THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA, *Minister in charge of Co-operation and Housing.*

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS.

Speaker.

THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI.

Deputy Speaker.

SRI B. BHAKTHAVATSALU NAIDU.

Panel of Chairmen.

1. SRIMATHI THAMMA KOTAMMA REDDI.
2. SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN.
3. SRI P. THIMMA REDDI.
4. SRI C. KANDASWAMI.

Secretary to the State Legislature.

SRI R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR, B.A., M.L.

Joint Secretary to the State Legislature.

SRI G. V. CHOWDARY, LL.B. (Lond.), BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant Secretary to the Assembly.

SRI T. HANUMANTHAPPA, B.A. (Hons.), B.L.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WITH THEIR CONSTITUENCIES.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
1 Adikesavalu Naidu, K.	.. Chandragiri.
2 Adityan, S. T.	.. Tiruchendur—General.
3 Ahmed Kutty, C.	.. Kottakkal.
4 Aiyyanar ..	.. Nilakottai—Reserved.
5 Anandan, L.	.. Kallakurichi—Reserved.
6 Anantha Pai, T.	.. Udipi.
7 Anjaneyulu, G.	.. Bandar.
8 Antony Peter	.. Manapparai.
9 Anthony Pillai, S. C. C.	.. Choolai, Madras City.
10 Appala Naidu, K.	.. Srikakulam—General.
11 Appalaswami, Bojja	.. Amalapuram—Reserved.
12 Appa Rao Bahadur, Rajah Meka Rangayya.	Nuzvid.
13 Appu, A.	.. Chevayur.
14 Aranganathan, K.	.. Gingee.
15 Ari Gowder, H. B.	.. Nilgiris—General.
16 Ardhanareswara Gounder	.. Edapadi.
17 Ardhanari, T. S.	.. Tiruchengode—General.
18 Arumugam R. S.	.. Tirunelveli—Reserved.
19 Arumugam, S.	.. Tiruchengode—Reserved.
20 Arumugam, S. R.	.. Tiruppur—Reserved.
21 Arumugam, V.	.. Tiruchendur—Reserved.
22 Arunachalla Mudaliar, A. J.	.. Gudiyatham—General.
23 Atchannaidu, T. C.	.. Cheepurupalle—General.
24 Audinarayana Reddi, Y.	.. Rayachoti.
25 Ayyaru, A.	.. Jayankondan—Reserved.
26 Balakrishnan, V.	.. Pudukottai.
27 Balanarayana Reddi, K.	.. Proddatur.
28 Balarama Reddi, A.	.. Kalahasti.
29 Bapaiah Chowdary, M.	.. Bellamkonda.
30 Bapanna Dora, K.	.. Bhadrachalam—Reserved.
31 Bapanayya, G.	.. Divi—Reserved.
32 Bapu Naidu, P.	.. Yellamanchili.
33 Basivi Reddi, D.	.. Penugonda.
34 Bhakthavatsalu Naidu, B.	.. Arkonam.
35 Bomman, K. H.	.. Nilgiris—Reserved.
36 Chadayan, M.	.. Malappuram—Reserved.
37 Chandra Chudamani Deo	.. Vyricherla—Parvatipuram.
38 Chandra Ramalingaiah	.. Divi—General.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
116 Krishna Rao, The Hon. Sri Dr. U. (Minister).	Harbour, Madras City.
117 Krishnasamy Ayyangar, P. S. ..	Manamathurai.
118 Krishnasamy Padayachi, V. ..	Bhuvanagiri.
119 Krishnaswami Naidu, R. ..	Edirkottai.
120 Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur (Raja of Karvetnagar).	Puttur.
121 Kune Rao, M.	Chintalapudi.
122 Kunhan, E. T.	Ponnani—Reserved.
123 Kunhi Muhamed Shafee ..	Perintalmanna.
124 Kunhirama Kidav, P. ..	Perambra.
125 Kunhirama Kurup, C. ..	Quilandy.
126 Kuppuswami, R.	Madukarai.
127 Kuttikrishna Nayar, The Hon. Sri K. P. (Minister).	Kozhikode.
128 Lakshmana Das, L.	Pathapatnam—General.
129 Lakshmana Kandar, C. ..	Salem—Rural.
130 Lakshmana Narayana Reddi ..	Peñukonda.
131 Lakshmanaswamy, M.	Kankipadu.
132 Lakshmayya, D.	Mangalagiri.
133 Lakshmi Narasimham Dora, R.	Tekkali.
134 Lakshminarasa Raju, B. ..	Narasapur—General.
135 Lakshmipathy Naicker, K. S. ..	Ottanchattram.
136 Latchanna, G.	Sompeta.
137 Madanagopal, V.	Vedasandur.
138 Madhavan Nambiar, K. ..	Mattanur.
139 Mahalingam, N.	Pollachi—General.
140 Malakondayya, K.	Ongole—Reserved.
141 Mallayya, T.	Adoni—Reserved.
142 Mangala Gounder, M. P. ..	Palni.
143 Manickasundaram, M.	Karur—General.
144 Manickavelu Naicker, The Hon. Sri M. A. (Minister).	Polur.
145 Manickam, P. G.	Nambiyur—Reserved.
146 Manjaya Shetty, Y	Coondapoor.
147 Marimuthu, M.	Tanjore—Reserved.
148 Masilamani Chettiar, A. K. ..	Vellore—General.
149 Menon, K. B.	Trithala.
150 Mogral, M. S.	Kasaragod.
151 Mahamed Salih Maraikayar ..	Arantangi.
152 Moidu, K.	Badagara.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
153 Mookiah Thevar	Periakulam—General.
154 Mottaya Kudumban	Mudukulattur—Reserved.
155 Mounaguruswamy Naidu, N. ..	Udamalpet.
156 Muni Reddi, M.	Hosur.
157 Munisami Pillay, M. S. ..	Dindigul.
158 Munuswamy Gownder, P. M. ..	Uddanapalli.
159 Murthy Raju, Ch. S. R. V. P. ..	Tadepalligudem.
160 Muthiah Chettiar, Raja M. A. ..	Tiruppattur (Ramanathapuram).
161 Muthiah Pillai, C.	Sirkali.
162 Muthu, V.	Periyakulam—Reserved.
163 Muthukumaraswamy	Nannilam—Reserved.
164 Muthukumaraswamy Naidu, T. D.	Tirukkcoilur—General.
165 Muthuramalinga Thevar, U. ..	Mudukulathur—General.
166 Muthuswami, A.	Tirukkcoilur—Reserved.
167 Muthu Thevar, B. R. M. ..	Nilakottai—General.
168 Nadimuthu Pillai, V.	Pattukkottai.
169 Nagabhushanam, G.	Rayadrug.
170 Nagan Gouda, The Hon. Dr. R. (Minister).	Hospet.
171 Nagarajan, V. R.	Villupuram.
172 Nageshwara Rao, G.	Razole—General.
173 Nagi Reddi, T.	Anantapur.
174 Nalla Gounder, P. S.	Gobichettipalayam.
175 Nallasamy, B. K.	Bhavani.
176 Nallasivam, K. R.	Kodumudi.
177 Nanjappa, O. A.	Harur—Reserved.
178 Narasa Raju, K. R.	Ramachandrapuram.
179 Narasimha Rao, N. V. L. ..	Guntur.
180 Narasimha Reddi, P.	Rajampet—General.
181 Narayana, Kavali	Srikakulam—Reserved.
182 Narayana Kurup, M.	Ottapalem.
183 Narayana Nambiar, M.	Hosdrug.
184 Narayana Nambiar, T. C. ..	Taliparamba.
185 Narayanappa, S.	Kalyandrug—General.
186 Narayana Raju, D.	Undi.
187 Narayanasamy, M.	Ongole—General.
188 Narayanasamy Naidu, G. ..	Aduturai.
189 Nataraja Mudaliar, R. A. ..	Kalasapakkam.
190 Neeladrirao Reddi, Asi	Ichapuram.
191 Pakkirisami Pillai, S.	Perambur, Madras City.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
39 Chellapandian, S.	Cheranmahadevi.
40 Chellathurai, P.	Tiruvadanai.
41 Chenchurama Naidu, N.	Kandukur—General.
42 Chengam Pillay, O.	Ponneri—Reserved.
43 Chidanandam, V.	Badvel.
44 Chinnakaruppa Thevar, S.	Melur—General.
45 Chinnama Reddi, P.	Chittoor—General.
46 Chinnasami Naidu, C.	Vadamathurai.
47 Chinnathambi Thevar	Alangulam.
48 Chinnayya V.	Tirumayam—Reserved.
49 Chitrambalam, G. Dr.	Srirangam.
50 Chokkalingam, P.	Ambasamudram.
51 Chokkalingam Chettiar, AR. A. RM.	Karaikudi.
52 Darmalinga Nayakar, V.	Cheyar.
53 Dasarathan, D.	Wandiwash—Reserved.
54 Dasaratharamaiah Naidu, D.	Rapur.
55 Deivasigamany, S.	Kancheepuram.
56 Dharmalingam, M.	Tiruvallur—Reserved.
57 Doraikannu, M.	Tiruttani—Reserved.
58 Doraiswami Gounder, A.	Harur—General.
59 Elaya Pillay, V. T.	Kallakurichi—General.
60 Elumalai, T. P.	Saidapet—Reserved.
61 Fernandez, W. J.	NOMINATED.
62 Gajapathi Raju, P. V. R. (Raja of Vizianagaram).	Vizianagaram—General.
63 Gajapathi Reddy	Ponneri—General.
64 Ganapathy, T.	Palavoor.
65 Gangappa, M.	Bellary.
66 Gangayya Naidu, B.	Madugole.
67 Gopala Gounder, V.	Melmalayanur.
68 Gopalakrishnaiah, Vavilala	Sattenapalle.
69 Gopalakrishnan, P. K.	Nattikka.
70 Gopalakrishna Reddi, P.	Gudur.
71 Gopala Menon, N.	Ponnani—General.
72 Gopalan, K. P.	Payyanur.
73 Gopalan Unni, K. C.	Mannarghat.
74 Govindan, G.	Paramakudi.
75 Govinda Rao, K.	Anakapalle.
76 Govindasamy Nayagar, A.	Vikravandi.
77 Govindaswamy Naidu, V.	Tiruvallur—General.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
78 Gunnayya, P.	Cheepurupalli—Reserved.
79 Hanumantha Rao, M.	Repalle.
80 Hanumantharaya Gounder, A. K.	Vaniyambadi.
81 Indrayya, Ch.	Tanuku.
82 Ishwara, K.	Puttur—Reserved.
83 Jagannatham, H. M.	Vellore—Reserved.
84 Jagannathan, M.	Tindivanam—Reserved.
85 Jayarama Reddiyar, S.	Aruppukottai.
86 Jeevanandam, P.	Washermanpet, Madras City.
87 Joseph, G.	Amartalur.
88 Kaliannan, T. M.	Rasipuram.
89 Kalyanasundaram, M.	Tiruchirappalli (North).
90 Kandasami, C.	Mannargudi—General.
91 Kandasamy Gounder, P.	Velapady.
92 Kandasamy Padayachi, M.	Ulundurpet.
93 Kandaswami Gounder, S.	Pennagaram.
94 Kannan, V. K.	Arni.
95 Kanaran, C. H.	Tellicherry.
96 Karuthiruman, P. G.	Nambiyur—General.
97 Kasireddy, S.	Darsi.
98 Kattimuthu	Vridhachalam—Reserved.
99 Kempai Gounder	Mettupalayam.
100 Khadir Sheriff, S.	Ranipet.
101 Kolkebil, S. S.	Brahmawar.
102 Kondayya, G. C.	Atmakur.
103 Koran, O.	Alathur—Reserved.
104 Kosalram, K. T.	Satankulam.
105 Kotaiah, P.	Chirala.
106 Koti Reddi, K.	Cuddapah.
107 Kotra Basavana Goud	Kudligi.
108 Kotamma Reddi, Srimathi Thamma.	Prattipadu.
109 Krishna Ayyar, V. R.	Kuthuparamba.
110 Krishnam Raju Bahadur, Raja V. V.	Tuni.
111 Krishnamurthy Gounder, D.	Krishnagiri.
112 Krishnamurthy Rao, B.	Punganur.
113 Krishnan, R.	Alathur—General.
114 Krishna Rao, K.	Nellore—General.
115 Krishna Rao, Y. V.	Bhadrachalam—General.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
192 Padmanabha Raju, K. V. S. ..	Alamanda.
193 Padmaprabha Gounder	Wynaad—General.
194 Pais, L. C.	Mangalore.
195 Palaniandi, M.	Ariyalur.
196 Palaniappan, R. M.	Tirumayam—General.
197 Palanimuthu	Perambalur—Reserved.
198 Palanisami, N. K.	Uthukuli.
199 Palaniswami Gounder, The Hon. Sri V. C. (<i>Minister</i>).	Tondamuttur.
200 Palanisami Gounder, V. K. ..	Koilpalayam.
201 Panchaksharam, S.	Arcot.
202 Pandian, R. S. K.	Sankaranainarkoil—General.
203 Paramasivam, N.	Perambalur—General.
204 Paramasivam, N.	Vridhachalam—General.
205 Parameswaran, B.	Madurantakam—Reserved.
206 Parameswarappa, S.	Siruguppa.
207 Pattabhi Rama Rao, The Hon. Sri S. B. P. (<i>Minister</i>).	Pamarru.
208 Pentannaidu, M.	Pathapatnam—Reserved.
209 Periasami, M. P.	Namakkal—Reserved.
210 Potha Raju, T.	Vijayavada.
211 Prabakara Choudary, C. ..	Rajahmundry.
212 Pulla Reddi, C.	Nandikotkur.
213 Pundarikakshacharyulu, P. ..	Honjaram.
214 Radakrishnan, S.	Panruti.
215 Raghava Mudaliar, E. L. ..	Tiruppattur.
216 Raju, D. K.	Srivilliputtur—General.
217 Rajachidambaram, P. B. K. ..	Lalgudi.
218 Rajagopal, N.	Manachanallur.
219 Rajagopala Gounder, P. R. ..	Dharmapuri.
220 Rajagopala Rao, K.	Gudivada—General.
221 Rajam Ramasami, C.	Mylapore—Madras City.
222 Rajan, P. T.	Cumbum.
223 Rajaram, K.	Tirumangalam.
224 Rajeswara Rao, M.	Kovvur—Reserved.
225 Raju, K. T.	Erode.
226 Rama, T. K.	Madurai (South).
227 Ramabhadra Raju, N.	Amalapuram—General.
228 Ramabrahmam, D.	Palmaner.
229 Ramachandran, M. R.	Tirupporur.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
230 Ramachandra Rao, P. S. ..	Kovvur—General.
231 Ramachandra Reddiar, A. ..	Tiruvannamalai—General.
232 Ramakrishna Ayyar, N. ..	Saidapet—General.
233 Ramakrishnan, K.	Palghat.
234 Ramakrishna Reddi, B. ..	Kavali.
235 Ramalingam, S.	Tanjore—General.
236 Ramalinga Reddi, H.	Adoni—General.
237 Ramamurthi, P.	Madurai (North).
238 Ramamurthy, K.	Golugonda—General.
239 Rama Rao, G.	Gudivada—Reserved.
240 Rama Rao, N. V.	Burugupudy.
241 Rama Rao, P.	Tiruvur.
242 Rama Rao, V.	Kanchikacherla.
243 Ramasami, V. V.	Virudhunagar.
244 Ramasamy Doss, K.	Koilpatti.
245 Ramasamy, K. V.	Namakkal—General.
246 Ramasamy, Thota	Peddapuram.
247 Ramasamy Kander, N. C. ..	Chengam.
248 Ramasamy Mudaliar, V. K. ..	Uthiramerur.
249 Ramasamy Naidu, S.	Sattur.
250 Ramasamy Padayachi, S. S. ..	Cuddalore—General.
251 Ramasamy Thevar, A.	Tiruchirappalli (South).
252 Ramesam, K. V.	Chodavaram.
253 Rami Reddi, A.	Duggirala.
254 Ramiah, K.	Jammalamadugu.
255 Ramiah Choudary, K.	Udayagiri.
256 Ranga Rao, K.	Chilakaluripet.
257 Ranga Reddi, P.	Cumbum..
258 Rangasamy Naidu, P. S. ..	Tiruppur—General.
259 Rangasamy Gounder, R. ..	Paramathi.
260 Rangasamy Reddiar, P. ..	Turaiyur.
261 Rathina, Gounder, N.	Aravakurichi.
262 Rathinam, A.	Cuddalore—Reserved.
263 Rathinaswami Pillai, P. ..	Omalur.
264 Ratnaswami, A. M.	Gudiyatham—Reserved.
265 Sahajananda, A. S.	Chidambaram—Reserved.
266 Sambandam, A. M.	Triplicane, Madras City.
267 Sambandam, K. R.	Mayuram—General.
268 Sambasivam, A.	Talavasal.
269 Samia Koorayar, G.	Saliamangalam.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
344 Vema Reddy, K. V.	Kadiri.
345 Veniah, S.	Nellore—Reserved.
346 Venkaiah, K.	Ponnur.
347 Venkatakrishna Rao, C. ..	Kakinada—General.
348 Venkata Jagga Rao, R. ..	Pithapuram.
349 Venkata Kurmi Nayudu, K. ..	Bobbili.
350 Venkataramaraju, Alluri ..	Razole—Reserved.
351 Venkataramiah, N.	Narasaraopet.
352 Venkata Rao, Sri Saka ..	Kakinada—Reserved.
353 Venkata Setty, K.	Dhone.
354 Venkatasiviah, P.	Vinukonda.
355 Venkatasubba Reddi, M. ..	Koilkuntla.
356 Venkatasubba Reddi, O. ..	Madurantakam—General.
357 Venkatasubba Reddi, T. N. ..	Ghattu.
358 Venkatasubbayya, P.	Rajampet—Reserved.
359 Venkatasubramaniam, A. ..	Kaikalur.
360 Venkatayya, N.	Markapur.
361 Venkatesha Sholagar, P. ..	Nidamangalam.
362 Venkateswarlu, Pillalamarri ..	Jaggayyapet.
363 Venkatnarayana Dora, K. ..	Saluru.
364 Venkatrama Ayyar, S.	Adirampatnam.
365 Venkatramaiah, A.	Tenali.
366 Venkatramana Gowda, K. ..	Puttur—General.
367 Venkataswami Reddi, P. ..	Venkatagiri.
368 Venkataswamy Naidu, The Hon. Sri K. (Minister).	Thousand Lights, Madras City—General.
369 Venugopala Gounder, M. ...	Tindivanam—General.
370 Venugopalakrishnaswamy ..	Kadambur.
371 Victoria, J. L. P. Roche ..	Tuticorin.
372 Vinayakam, K.	Chingleput.
373 Virupakshayya	Kollegal.
374 Viswanatham, Tenneti	Visakhapatnam.
375 Viswanathan, K. R.	Jayankondan—General.
376 Yellamanda Reddi, G.	Kanigiri.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THIRD SESSION OF THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTED UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Monda', 3rd November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Government servants and Peace Committees.

* 1 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Government servants and others to whom Government Servants' Conduct Rules apply are not allowed to join, or associate with friends of the Soviet Union or with Peace Committees as per rules in vogue;

(b) whether there is any rule that Government servants or others to whom Government Servants' Conduct Rules apply should not read magazines from Soviet Union and China or magazines or books friendly to Soviet Union and China; and

(c) whether it is a fact that Government servants and those to whom Government Servants' Conduct Rules apply have been warned that affixing signature to the Berlin Peace Pact would involve termination of service?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) & (c) Government servants to whom Conduct Rules apply are governed by these Rules and it is expected that they will abstain from political agitation of all kinds especially in conjunction with persons not in Government service. This would apply with greater force to matters involving foreign policy. The organizations and movements referred to in clauses (a) and (c) are believed to be of this nature.

“(b) There is no such ban.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:—“అర్యా, పంచరాత్రాల మధ్య విశ్లేషణ ఉండాలి, స్నేహభావ ముండాలి అనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము పరిగణిస్తున్నదా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“స్నేహభావముతో ప్రపంచము ముందుకు సాగిపోవాలంటూ రాజకీయము అనే కారణముతో దీనికి ఆటంకము పెరుగుతున్నదనే విషయము మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసునా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“If it is a fresh question, notice, Sir.”

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
270 Sangam Naidu, P. ..	Palakonda.
271 Sanjivayya, The Hon. Sri D. (Minister).	Kurnool—Reserved.
272 Sankaranarayana Menon, V. ..	Pattambi.
273 Sankara Reddi, The Hon. Sri N. (Minister).	Kurnool—General.
274 Sankara Varma Raja, E. K. ..	Nadapuram.
275 Sankarayya, B. ...	Kovur.
276 Sannasi, T. V. ..	Karur—Reserved.
277 Santhappa, K. ..	Kalyandrug—Reserved.
278 Sattyannarayana, G. ..	Eluru.
279 Satyanarayana Dora, H. ..	Narasannapeta.
280 Satyanarayana Reddi, P. ..	Anaparti.
281 Seetharamiah, D. ..	Madanapalli.
282 Seethi, K. M. ...	Malappuram—General.
283 Selvaraj, P. ..	Vilathikulam.
284 Senapathy Goundar, A. ..	Dharapuram.
285 Shaker, M. G. ..	Nanguneri.
286 Shanmuga Rajeswara Sethupathi, The Hon. Raja Sri (Raja of Ramnad) (Minister).	Ramanathapuram.
287 Shanmugham, K. ..	Kandukur—Reserved.
288 Shanmugam, T. ..	Sriperumbudur.
289 Shetty, The Hon. Sri A. B. (Minister).	Karkal.
290 Siddanna Gowd, R. ..	Madakasira.
291 Sirasappa, Ijari ..	Harpanahalli.
292 Sivaprakasam, V. S. ..	Melur—Reserved.
293 Sivaraj, N. ..	Nagapattinam—General.
294 Sivarami Reddi, N. ..	Kamalapuram.
295 Sivasankara Reddi, G. ..	Hindupur.
296 Sivashanmugam Pillai, J. ..	Thousand Lights, Madras City—Reserved.
297 Somasundara Goundar ..	Wandiwash—General.
298 Somayajulu, C. V. ..	Srungavarapukota.
299 Somayajulu, S. ..	Tirunelveli.
300 Soundaram Ramachandran, Dr. T. S.	Authoor.
301 Sridharan, K. T. ..	Cannanore.
302 Sri Krishna, V. ..	Bapatla.
303 Srinivasulu, K. ..	Dharmavaram.
304 Srungaram ..	Chittoor—Reserved.

Serial number and name of member.	Name and class of constituency.
305 Subbaraj, A. S. ..	Uthamapalayam.
306 Subba Raju, B. ..	Bhimavaram.
307 Subba Reddi, K. ..	Palnad.
308 Subba Reddi, M. ..	Nandyal.
309 Subbaraya Goundar, A. K. ..	Kangayam.
310 Subbarayudu, C. ..	Tadpatri.
311 Subbiah, A. K. ...	Mannargudi—Reserved.
312 Subramaniam, The Hon. Sri C. (Minister).	Coimbatore.
313 Subramania Gownder, K. S. ..	Mecheri.
314 Subramaniam, M. P. ..	Attur.
315 Subramania Pillay, I. K. ..	Tenkasi.
316 Subramania Nayakar, M. ..	Sholinghur.
317 Suryachandrarao, P. ..	Alampuram.
318 Suryanarayana, K. ..	Bheemunipatnam.
319 Suryanarayana Raju, Raja Sagi.	Payakaraopeta.
320 Suryanarayana, G. ...	Vizianagaram—Reserved.
321 Suvarna, N. N. ..	Mulki.
322 Swaminathan, R. V. ..	Sivaganga.
323 Swayamprakasam, S. ..	Papanasam.
324 Syamsundra Rao, P. ..	Narasapur—Reserved.
325 Thangavelu, R. ..	Tiruvannamalai—Reserved.
326 Thangavelu, P. ..	Musiri.
327 Thiagaraja Pillay ..	Nannilam—General.
328 Thimma Reddi, P. ..	Pileru.
329 Thinakaranasami Thevar ..	Sedapatti.
330 Thirumurthi, P. K. ..	Pollachi—Reserved.
331 Uppl, K. ..	Tirur.
332 Urkavalan, P. ..	Sankaranainarkoil—Reserved.
333 Vadivelu ..	Nagapattinam—Reserved.
334 Vagheesam Pillay, G. ..	Chidambaram—General.
335 Vaikunta Baliga, B. ..	Panemangalore.
336 Vaikuntam ..	Srivilliputtur—Reserved.
337 Varadachari, K. ...	Tiruttani—General.
338 Varadan, T. R. ..	Kumbakonam.
339 Varadarajulu Naidu, Dr. P.	Salem Town.
340 Veerabhadram, M. ..	Paravada.
341 Veeranna Padal, K. ..	Golugonda—Reserved.
342 Veloo, A. ..	Mayuram—Reserved.
343 Velukkan, C. ..	Wynaad—Reserved.

[3rd November 1952]

Export of rice from the Krishna district.

* 2 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government have taken any action to prevent exports of rice from the Krishna district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ No. Under the New Food Policy, movement of rice by private trade from Krishna district to other areas included in the same zone is not restricted and the Government do not propose to restrict such movements. Movement of rice by private trade from the district to areas outside the zone is, however, restricted and steps have been taken to prevent such unauthorised movement. But, as regards Government stocks, exports to other needy districts both within and outside the zone are being made only after providing for the requirements of the district.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ కృష్ణా జిల్లాలోని అనంతరం ధాన్యము ఎంత ఎగుమతి అయిందో మంత్రిగారు తెలియజేయగలరా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice please.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ ఆ జిల్లాలోని ధాన్యానంతా ఎగుమతి చేయడంవల్ల, అక్కడి చౌకడిరాలకు ధాన్యము సరిగా సైక్లెకాక ప్రజలు పడుచున్న ఇబ్బందులు ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలుసునా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మొట్టొకటా లోని ధాన్యాన్ని ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకుగాని ఇతర జిల్లాలకుగాని ఎగుమతి చేయడాన్ని నిషేధించారా ? ”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ On a point of information, Sir. I want to know why hon. Members who used to talk in English are now talking in their provincial languages.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I cannot compel members to speak in English.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ But, we are not in a position to understand them, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Members are putting questions and the Ministers are asking for notice. Why should the hon. Member bother about further questions? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ In regard to Mr. Venkateswarlu's question, I want notice, Sir.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, may I know when the Hon. Minister asks for notice, whether he has understood the substance of the question? (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari : ‘ You speak in English ’.) I speak in English. I represent a very big Opposition consisting of all sections. I want the Hon. Minister to understand the substance of the question and if he

[3rd November 1952]

wants notice, certainly he is welcome to do so. But, on the ground of language, let him not say ‘ Notice ’. The Hon. Minister knows our language and it will help us if he understands the question and gives a reply.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am sorry I cannot help it; I have to answer as I have done. If I want notice for a question, I think, it is not desirable to give the reasons why I want notice.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ In view of the explanation given by the Hon. Chief Minister, I have no further question to put.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ నా ప్రశ్నకు నోటీసు అడగడానికి ముందు నేను ఏమి ప్రశ్న చెబానో మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసునా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Is the hon. Member putting a question or making a speech? ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ On a point of information, Sir, ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ప్రతి ప్రశ్నకు నోటీసు ఎందుకు అడుగు తున్నారో సమాధానము చెప్పలేదు. నేను చెప్పనది ఏమిటంటే, మా ప్రశ్నను అర్థం చేసుకొని బదులివ్వడానికి ప్రభుత్వం కావాలంటే మాకేమి అభ్యంతరంలేదు. అలా కాకుండా మా ప్రశ్న ఏమైనది గమనించకుండా నోటీసు కావాని చెప్పడం మా ప్రశ్నను నిరాకరించినట్లువుతుంది. అందువల్ల మా ప్రశ్నల అర్థం చేసుకోకుండా, ప్రతి ప్రశ్నకు నోటీసు కావాలని అడగడం సరియైన ఒడ్డుకొందని తెలియ జేస్తున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ If the opportunity given for obtaining information during the interpellation hour is deliberately used for a totally different purpose, we are entitled to similar tactics on this side. I want notice for every question which I do not understand.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“ కనம் తலைவர் அவர்களே, இப் பொழுது என்னுடைய ஆந்திர நண்பர்கள் தெலுங்கில் கேள்விகள் கேட்க s.m. சின்றார்கள். அதிலிருந்து ஒரு விஷயத்தை நான் தெரிந்து கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். அவர்கள் கேட்கும் கேள்விகளிலிருந்து இப்பொழுது ஆந்திர மாகாணம் ஏற்பட்டு விட்டதா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member is not asking any question.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I ask whether the Hon. the Chief Minister is right in using the term ‘ tactics ’? May I also ask him whether he is aware that the right of putting questions is a right conferred on every Member by the Constitution and that it is not an abuse of the right simply because the Members put questions in their own languages? Is he not aware that there was a Chief Minister of this Province who made it a point to speak only in his mother-tongue? May I ask him whether he will concede that it is not an abuse of the right but an exercise of the right? If the Hon. Ministers do not understand the question, they are at perfect liberty to say that they do not understand, but they are not entitled to use the word ‘ tactics ’.”

[3rd November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I beg to be pardoned. The word 'tactics' conveys a definite meaning in the English language. Tactics can only be what one is entitled to use. I do not deny the fact that tactics are lawful, that their use does not make any breach of law. The object of an interpellation is to obtain information and we must accommodate one another. Why I call it 'tactics' is that the object is not the obtaining of information, but pursuance of a definite programme or decided plan to make the work of the Assembly more difficult in order to obtain another lawful object."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am very sorry I have to protest. The questions were asked with a view to obtain information."

MR. SPEAKER:—"But the Members know English."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"That is true. But the Hon. Chief Minister is going into another field of enquiry and saying that it is used for an ulterior purpose. The only purpose in putting questions in one's mother-tongue or in any other language is to elicit information."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I would ask the Leader of the Opposition whether this is not the first time that the proceedings have taken this turn and he had better think over whether what I have said was right or wrong."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I inform the Hon. Chief Minister that this is not the first occasion that Members have attempted to speak in their own languages and request him to revise his opinion?"

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ విషయములో ఒక చిక్క explanation ఇవ్వవలసిన వంటి అవసరమున్నది కాబట్టి నేను ఈ విషయాన్ని చెప్పదలచు కొన్నాను. ఇక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఇప్పుడే కాకుండా ఇంకా ... ఈ కూడా తెలుగులో ప్రశ్నలు వేస్తున్నటువంటి విషయము ఇక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి అధికారపరంగానైనా తెలుసును. ప్రశ్నలను అర్థము చేసుకోవడానికి translators ను పెట్టవలసిందని మేము అడిగాముకూడా. మరియు ప్రశ్నలకు ప్రభుత్వము ఇచ్చేటటువంటి జవాబులు అర్థం కాకపోవడంచేత తిరిగి ప్రశ్నలు వేయలేకపోయే పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడు తున్నది."

"ఈ సందర్భంలో అందరు సక్రమంగా ప్రభుత్వపరిపాలనా విధానంలో చాలాగా లాభే ప్రతి ఒక్కరికి అర్థమయ్యేట్లుగా ఏర్పాట్లు చేయడం అవసరము ఇప్పుడు ప్రశ్నలు మొదలగు అన్ని విషయాలుకూడా ఇంగ్లీషులో ఇస్తున్నారు. తెలుగుకూడా ఇంగ్లీషులోనే ఇస్తున్నారు. ఇటువంటి పద్ధతి మార్పుచెందవలసిన అవసరమేర్పడినది. కనుక ప్రశ్నలకు ప్రభుత్వ పద్ధతిని మార్చి అందరికీ అనుకూలంగా ఉండే పద్ధతి ఎన్నుకొని వారని ప్రభుత్వమును కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. Member is not putting any question."

[3rd November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"I will put the question at the end."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may put the question straightaway."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—"On a point of order, Sir. I wish to draw the attention of the Chair to rule 40 of the Assembly Rules according to which no discussion shall be permitted at question-time in respect of a question or of any answer given to a question."

Prosecutions under Foodgrains Control Order.

* 3 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether after decontrol of foodgrains any orders have been issued in connexion with prosecutions already sanctioned regarding transport of paddy and other grains without permit when there was Foodgrains Control Order in force; and

(b) if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) Yes.

" (b) The instructions are that all cases dealing with offences against the Movement Control Orders in which the value of goods involved is Rs. 100 or less (at the controlled retail rates), should be withdrawn, provided the offence is not deliberate and the accused is not a regular blackmarketeer, and excepting also cases where the Collector considers it undesirable to withdraw the case, for valid reasons."

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA:—"May I know whether any instructions have been issued by the Government to the Judicial Magistrates to be sympathetic and lenient in their judgments on food control offences?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"We do not issue any instructions to the Judiciary."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"May I know the position in respect of offences in which the value of goods involved is slightly above Rs. 100?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Marginal cases are always considered on their merits."

Drainage scheme for Tenali.

* 4 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state what the estimated cost of the drainage scheme for Tenali is?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"The estimated cost of the drainage scheme for the Tenali Municipality is about Rs. 30.39 lakhs to install and about Rs. 63,100 per annum to maintain."

[3rd November 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ స్కీము ఆచరణలో పెట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వము ఏమైనా నిర్ణయానికి వచ్చినది? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Changes in the Panchayat Act.

* 5 Q.—SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Cabinet Sub-Committee set up to go into the Panchayat Act suggested any changes in the Act; and

(b) if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ (a) Yes.

“ (b) The report of the Cabinet Sub-Committee is a confidential document.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ అయ్యో, రిపోర్టు ఉన్నది అని చెప్పతూ ఇప్పటికే ఎన్నికలు పెడుతున్నారు. ఏటిమిడ కమిటీవారు ఏమి సిఫార్సులు చేశారు. తెలియజేయడం ప్రభుత్వంవారి విధి కాదా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ అది confidential document కాబట్టి చెప్పటకు వీలులేదు.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ అసిఫార్సుల కనుగుణంగా చట్టాన్ని మార్చడానికి సవరణలు యీ సభనుంచి ప్రవేశపెడతారా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ అవస్థి కూడ Cabinet ముందు ఉన్నాయి.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ When do the Government propose to hold elections for the panchayats? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ ఈ నెల 15 వ తేది నుంచి ఆరంభమవుతుంది.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Have the Government launched on any scheme for the reorganization of the existing panchayats as they have already become obsolete? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ Reconstitution is beginning on the 15th of November.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మేజరు పంచాయితీలను, మైనరు పంచాయితీలను విడిచి, మైనరు పంచాయితీలలో చేతులు ఎత్తేటటువంటి ఎన్నిక పద్ధతిని పెట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వము నిశ్చయించిందా? వ్యతిరేకంగా ప్రణాళిక బడినది. ఇది నిజమేనా? అయితే ప్రజలు ఈ పద్ధతిపట్ల చ్యుతిరేక అభిప్రాయాలు వెలిబుచ్చుతున్నారనుక ఈ పద్ధతిని ప్రభుత్వము అనుసరిస్తుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ We are only following the old system.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Has the Sub-Committee made any recommendation with regard to the point raised by Mr. Venkateswarlu? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member will please repeat the question.”

[3rd November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ వెంకటేశ్వర్లుగారు చెప్పిన విషయాల సబ్ కమిటీనా ఏమైనా ఆలోచనకు తీసుకొని వచ్చారా? ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఇది సబ్ కమిటీవారి సందర్భించిన విషయము కాబట్టి ఎంతైనా సమాధానమడుతున్నాను ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ It is a matter for the Cabinet.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ Are the changes contemplated in the Panchayats Act major or minor in nature? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The changes may be major as well as minor.”

Second trips by motor buses.

* 6 Q.—SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) how many buses are permitted to run a second trip in the different districts in the State of Madras; and

(b) whether there is a proposal to withdraw permission for the second trips and give permission for more buses to ply instead?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) The Government have fixed the minimum and maximum mileage a bus can be permitted to do per day at 100 and 160 and the transport authorities allow as many trips as are necessary within these limits. It may be that buses do a second and even a third trip. Beyond this it may be difficult to collect statistics for the question asked.

“ (b) The answer is in the negative.”

SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH :—“ ప్రశ్న వేస్తే నా, ను. ఈ పద్ధతి 11-20 అమలలో ఉండడ వల్ల బస్సులు, కాన్స్ట్రుక్టు చేశ రోడ్లకు 14 గంటలు నిలిచేయడం కొనుక్కుట్టి సంగతి నిజమేనా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ Is it a fact, Sir, that the Government intend to stop the plying of Government buses from Madras City to the mufassal stations? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The Government have not yet decided that question, Sir.”

Headquarters Hospital, Badagara.

* 7 Q.—SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state whether there is a proposal to acquire any new site for the extension of Badagara Headquarters Hospital in Kurumbranad taluk, North Malabar?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ The answer is in the affirmative.”

[3rd November 1952

SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP :—“ Is it not a fact, Sir, that the hospital is terribly overcrowded and that there is no accommodation for the patients? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Yes, Sir. The local Hospital Welfare Committee is offering to put up a 17-bed shed, for which purpose land is proposed to be acquired.”

Expenditure on the community projects.

* 8 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) how much money is to be spent on each one of the community projects;

and (b) how much of that amount is to be spent on salaries;

(c) how many of the staff are Indians and how many are foreigners?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“(a) Rs. 65 lakhs.

“(b) The expenditure on personnel is not likely to exceed 9 per cent of the total expenditure.

"(c) There will be no foreigners in the staff. It is not expected there will be any need to employ foreign experts."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VANKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ 65 లక్షల
రూపాయలలో ఆ మొదటికాపండి వచ్చే సకాయము ఎంతో చెప్పగలరా.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“నా ప్రశ్న విచక్షుండనే notice అని చెప్పుతున్నారు.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Does the hon. Member want to repeat his question? ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“I will repeat the question. నా ప్రశ్నను repeat చేస్తే తెలుసుకుంటాను. ఈ 65 లక్షల రూపాయలలో ఆమెకాల్ల పనులకు ఎంత శాతంలో చెప్పగలరా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Notice, Sir.”
SRI T. VISWANATHAM

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, what is the amount of American aid out of this Rs. 65 lakhs for each project? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The ascertainment and allocation of American aid for each project would be difficult. The expenditure in foreign currencies for all the projects will be met through allotments from the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Fund ' A '. For approved schemes in respect of projects which are loanable or self-financing, necessary funds will be provided as loans by the Central Government. In respect of other schemes approved,

3rd November 1952]

they are divided between the Central and the State Governments. Now, from this, the hon. Member may gather what he wishes to gather with respect to each project. But it is not possible to allocate foreign aid for each project. The expenditure in foreign currencies will be met through foreign aid."

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the officials have been appointed by the Public Service Commission or appointed according to the whims and fancies of the Government? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is another question on the agenda, and the hon. Member may wait for it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister said that there were no foreigners. Have the Government got any technical experts from foreign countries? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Not in this State as far as I know. I should not say about other States or the Centre. But the question is about this State, and the answer to it is ‘ No ’.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ Sir, is there any machinery of popular control for supervising these projects? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ There is the Central Community Projects Administrator.”

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் டி. விசுவனாதம், ஆந்திர தேசத் தலைவர், இந்திலிஷிலேயே கேள்விகள் கேட்கிறார். ஆனால் அவரடைய நண்பர்கள் ஆந்திர தேசம் வேண்டுமென்று ஆந்திர பாஷையில் பேசுகிறார்கள். அதனால் எனது நண்பர் கனம் விசுவனாதம் அவர்கள் ஆந்திர மாகாணம் வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்களா ?”

MR. SPEAKER :—" Order, order. I now pass on to the next question."

Executive officers under the Community Project Scheme.

* 9 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have appointed any persons as Project Executive Officers of the Community Project Schemes; and if so, their names and their special qualifications to guide, initiate and suggest rural development;

(b) whether the appointments are made under the budget provision head 'M' on page 85 of the Demands for Grants and Budget Estimates for 1952-53;

(c) whether the prior approval of the U.S. Embassy has been obtained for appointing these persons; and

(d) what is the remuneration and conditions of service of these persons?

[3rd November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“(a) The following officials and non-officials have been appointed as Project Executive Officers for the Community Project Scheme :—

Officials—

Sri M. G. Balasubramanian, I.A.S., Sub-Collector, Penukonda, Anantapur district.

Sri N. Krishnaswami, B.A., B.L., Personal Assistant to the Collector of Madurai.

Sri G. Simhadri, B.A., District Supply Officer, Tenali, Guntur district.

Non-officials—

Sri M. Bapineedu, B.Sc. (Cornell), M.S.A. (California).

Sri N. S. Varadachari, M.A., B.L.

Dr. (Mrs.) Soundarām Ramachandran, M.B.B.S.

“The Project Executive Officers were selected with reference to their suitability for the work involved in consultation with the Administrator of Community Projects, New Delhi. In the case of the non-officials, their long proved service in constructive work was taken into account. They have now undergone a course of training at the All-India Centre where the persons selected and appointed by this Government obtained the commendation of experts there in the most laudatory terms, especially the non-officials.

“(b) Yes, Sir.

“(c) No, Sir. It is not necessary.

“(d) The officials are drawing pay in the grade to which they belong and in addition a special pay of Rs. 200 per mensem each. They are governed by the service rules applicable to their category. Sri M. Bapineedu and Sri N. S. Varadachari are receiving a consolidated salary of Rs. 900 per mensem each. Dr. (Mrs.) Soundarām Ramachandran is working as Honorary Project Executive Officer and no salary or honorarium is paid to her. The non-official appointees have been appointed on contract for three years subject to the usual terms and conditions.”

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN :—“May I know, Sir, the number of persons from the backward community appointed as Project Executive Officers under the Community Projects Scheme?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY :—“Sir, do all the Community Project Executive Officers know the regional language of the area to which they are appointed? If not, is it not better to appoint officers who know the regional language of the people of the project area?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“As far as I can understand, we took care to appoint those who knew the language of the region.”

[3rd November 1952]

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“Sir, may I know whether any Assistant Officers have been appointed to work under these Officers, and, if so, to which area they have been appointed?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ‘మూల్య నిష్ఠా’ ప్రాజెక్టులకు నిర్వహణాధికారులను నియమించుటకు ప్రభుత్వం వారు, ఇతర ప్రభుత్వ శాఖలలో ఉద్యోగులను ఆపవాదాలకు గురికయి వారిని ఎన్నుకున్నారు. ఈ విషయం ప్రభుత్వ వారికి తెలుసా? శ్రీ సి.కామరాజు సలహా ఎంతైనా తెలుసు కున్నారా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I really want notice, Sir.” (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I am very glad to hear the 11.30 Hon. the Chief Minister saying just now that he really wants a.m. notice. Hereafter when he wants notice really only, let him say, ‘Notice.’”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I say that to people who really speak in Telugu.” (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“May I know whether the Hon. the Chief Minister is aware of the fact that all the non-officials chosen by him as Community Project Executive Officers belong to a particular alignment in the political life of this State?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I think, Sir, that it is a wrong interpretation of facts. These officers who have been chosen as Project Executive Officers are eminently fit for the work on which they have been put and, as I have already observed, we have received proof of it apart from our own opinion. As regards the suggestion made that they belong to some particular alignment in the political life of this country, I think that it is unfair. (After a pause.) The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition belongs to the same alignment.” (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I do not, Sir. (Laughter.) Is the Hon. the Chief Minister aware that there are equally competent constructive workers who do not belong to that particular alignment and may I know why the Government did not extend their vision a little beyond that particular group?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“In Sanskrit logic there is what is known as *Asoka vanita nyaya*: Why was Sita put under the Asoka tree and not under any other tree? She had to be put under some tree and it was an Asoka tree, and the same question would arise wherever she was placed.” (Laughter.)

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“The Hon. the Chief Minister was saying a little while ago that special skill and expertness were displayed by the Executive Officers of the Community Project

[3rd November 1952]

Schemes, to deserve laudatory terms. What were the special skill and expertness displayed by those persons in the few months when the Project Schemes have been worked?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What I said was, 'They have now undergone a course of training at the All-India Centre where the persons selected and appointed by this Government obtained the commendation of experts there in the most laudatory terms, especially the non-officials.'"

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"Is it not desirable to hold a competitive examination for the appointment of non-officials as in the case of recruitment to services?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The question will arise when we replaced these people."

Filariasis in Kasaragod town.

* 10 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state what steps the Government have taken to check filariasis in Kasaragod town?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"Since November 1950 the Panchayat Board, Kasaragod, is working a scheme for the control of the disease. The Government are giving a one-third grant for the scheme."

Administration of the Guntur District Board.

* 11 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the remarks in 1949-50 report on local boards administration to the effect that "the administration of all district boards was fair except that of Guntur which was not up to the mark"; and

(b) the steps taken by the Government to bring the administration of Guntur District Board up to the mark?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—" (a) The remarks referred to were made by Government in the consolidated report issued by them on the working of local boards in the Madras State for 1949-50.

" (b) The remarks were intended for the district board to take note of and improve its administration. The administration of the district board for the next year, viz., 1950-51, has been characterised by Government as 'fair.'"

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"May I know what were the main defects pointed out in the report regarding the administration of the district boards?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Notice, Sir."

3rd November 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ఈ రిపోర్టు ప్రకారం గంటూరు జిల్లా బోర్డులో వచ్చిన లోపాలు ఏమిటి?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Notice, Sir."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"Has the administration of the district board improved after the Government brought this to its notice?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"It has improved and so, the remark made about it this year is 'fair.'"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know who was the President of the District Board in 1949-50 and who was the President on the date on which the Government passed the remark?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Notice, Sir."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అయ్యో, జిల్లా బోర్డు అభ్యర్థుల ఎంపికలో కూడా మార్పుకొని తెలియదా? దానికూడా సాక్షులు ఉంటారా?"

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"I am not aware who the previous President was. So, I want notice of the question."

Craft Instructors of Aided Secondary Schools, Tanjore.

* 12 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation from the Craft Instructors of Aided Secondary Schools at Tanjore that their salary be increased from Rs. 40; and

(b) whether it is a fact that their salary was ordered to be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 30 instead of increasing?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) A representation was received from certain Craft Instructors employed in aided secondary schools in Tanjore district asking for a revision of their scales of pay.

" (b) The Craft Instructors in question were not fully qualified and pending the question of organizing a short training course for them, they were allowed a fixed pay of Rs. 30 per mensem."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—"జిల్లా బోర్డార్గాల్ నడతప్పడం కొనసాగిస్తే లోకల్ లో అవార్డులు పెట్టే సర్టిఫికేట్ వాళ్ళి ఇంకా పోతు అవార్డులకు యోగ్యత ఉంటే సమస్య ఉంటే సర్కార్ లో కలెక్షన్ కు ఉంటుంది అని చెప్పండి."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"I regret I have to ask for notice of the question."

[3rd November 1952]

Panchayat board elections in South Kanara district.

* 13 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) when the Government propose to hold panchayat board elections in South Kanara district; and

(b) whether the Government propose to conduct elections to panchayat boards, by show of hands?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“(a) The Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards who is the election authority for panchayats, expects to commence elections to panchayats in districts including South Kanara, by about the middle of November 1952.

“(b) Yes, only in the case of Class II panchayats.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“Sir, in view of the fact that the mode of elections will determine the good or bad future of the panchayats, will the Government seriously reconsider the question and see that the elections are conducted by secret ballot and not by show of hands?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“The elections to the panchayats are overdue. All panchayats are more than fourteen years old. The intention of the Government is to conduct the elections as quickly as possible and we can do it only by this method. Or else, it may take two years or even more to conduct the elections.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“The Hon. Minister said, ‘All panchayats are more than fourteen years old’. Five or six months more will really not matter when there is a general demand, as I see from the question put by the hon. Member opposite, from all sides of the House for conducting elections by secret ballot. Therefore, will the Government reconsider this matter and issue a direction that the elections should be held by secret ballot?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“The method proposed also is not new. It is an old one by which elections were conducted. I do not think there is any danger in conducting the elections as we have proposed.”

SRI T. NAQT REDDI:—“గ్రామ పంచాయితీలకు ఎన్నికలను చేపట్టే పద్ధతిపైనే జరుపడలవామని వారల్లో వోటింగు పద్ధతిపై, హక్కు భగవ్యమం చేయవలసి ఉంటుంది మంత్రిగారు తెలియజేశారు. కాని చేయలేక పద్ధతివ్యాసా ఎన్నికలు జరిపినట్లయితే గ్రామాలలో విద్యమలు, కోట్లాదిమంది పెరుగుతాయని, అందు పట్ల గ్రామశాంతికి భంగం సంభవించుకోక, గ్రామ ప్రజలు ఎంతోవ్యయ ప్రయాసలు లాను గావలసి వస్తుందని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియదా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“I think we can come to a conclusion only after the elections are over and got before that.”

[3rd November 1952]

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“It will be much better that we do not hold these elections, if we are not prepared to conduct them by secret ballot because the entire future of the panchayat administration will depend on the first elections that are held to the panchayats.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member is making a speech. He should put it in the form of a question.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“May I request the Government to seriously reconsider their views and see that either they postpone the elections or have them conducted by secret ballot?”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that according to our Constitution, elections should be held only by secret ballot and that in case they conduct these elections by show of hands, they will come across legal difficulties?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“I think that applies only to Assembly elections. We can have our own method for conducting elections to panchayats and municipalities.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“అగ్లా, గత మంత్రివర్గంలో స్థానిక పరిపాలనా శాఖామూలముగా ఉన్న శ్రీ పండ్లమూలీగారు, పంచాయితీ చట్టాన్ని పాసు చేసే సందర్భంలో, కొందరు సభ్యులు ఎన్నికలను రహస్య వాల్ వోటింగు పద్ధతివారం జరుపవలసిన సమరాలు ప్రతిపాదించినపుడు ఆయన వారి కోరికను మన్నిస్తామని హామీ ఇచ్చారు. ఆ వాగ్దానం గురించి ప్రస్తుత మంత్రివర్గంవారు మరిచిపోయారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“I request notice of the question.”

SRI P. SYAMA SUNDARA RAO:—“అగ్లా, స్థానిక స్వపరిపాలనా శాఖామూలము పెనుగొండవచ్చినప్పుడు మేనరు పంచాయితీలకు రహస్య వాల్ వోటింగు పద్ధతిపై ఎన్నికలు జరిపించవలసినదని ప్రజలు కోరగా ఆయన అట్టి పద్ధతిపై హామీ ఇచ్చి ఖర్చు అవుతుందని మనవిచేశారు. వారే నిడదవోలులో ప్రశ్నిస్తూ, ప్రజలు వయోజన వోటింగు హక్కును సక్రిమంగా వినియోగించుకొనే స్థితిలో లేరని (అంటే రహస్య వోటింగులోని విలువ ప్రజలకు తెలియదని) తెలియజేశారు. ప్రభుత్వంలో భాగ్యశక్తిల మంత్రులే ఈవిధంగా వేర్వేరు అభిప్రాయాలను వెల్లడించడంవల్ల ఇందులో ఎంతోకలమందని ప్రజలు భావిస్తున్నారు. దీనికి మంత్రిగారు విమని సమాధానం చెబుతారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“I am told, among 11-40 a.m. other things, that the elections must be conducted quickly and soon and that the other methods suggested, will be very costly. Even then, secrecy will not be maintained, because many of the ballot papers are brought back and put into the ballot box by others.”

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMY:—“రహస్య వాల్ వోటింగు పద్ధతివలన కూడా వోటింగును, రహస్యంగా జరుపుట సాధ్యకరమవులేదని, అనేక మంది వారల్లో చేతులు బయటకు తెచ్చి వేస్తున్నారని మంత్రిగారు కలదిచ్చారు. అందువల్లనే రూల్స్ మూర్తీ చేయవలసినదా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

[3rd November 1952]

ഇതരം സംഭവങ്ങളിൽ അനുകൂലമല്ലാത്ത സംഭവത്തിൽ അതിന്റെ ആദ്യ ഘട്ടം രാജൻ തയ്യാറാക്കുന്നതിനാൽ അതരം കററകൾ ന്യായമായ ശിക്ഷ നൽകണം എന്നും ചുമത്തിയതുകൊണ്ട് നൽകാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് തയ്യാറാകുമോ ?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I have not understood the question. But, I might say that, if it is a question of compensation which was last referred to, I have already stated that it is difficult now after three years to say with any degree of certainty what really was the case and what the truth was. I don't think there would be any justice or utility in taking up the matter now."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—"ഇതര, സാർ, ഈ വോട്ടോ, കാര്യങ്ങൾ കണ്ടുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുക, ഗ്രന്ഥകളും വേലിയും തകർന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഇതരം തെളിവുകൾ വെച്ച് അന്വേഷണം നടത്തുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ആരോട് ചിലപ്പോൾ ആരോട് നൽകുകയോ ചെയ്യുകയോ ചെയ്യുന്നതിനാൽ അതരത്തിലുള്ള അന്വേഷണത്തിന് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് ചുമപ്പുണ്ടോ ?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I thought I heard a good speech."

(Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar desired to show a photograph to the House.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"This is not the time for it."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"As hundreds of houses were either set on fire or destroyed and lakhs of rupees worth of properties looted by the police or goondas, have not the Government got any responsibility to make an enquiry about these grave incidents? If so, why do the Government hesitate to appoint an enquiry committee to go into the question?"

"May I also ask the Government whether they have received any memorandum from the peasants and people whose houses were destroyed or property looted, stating that compensation should be given to them by the Government? If so, what action have the Government taken or propose to take in the matter?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"The hon. Member is repeating the allegations made in the original question. I have already answered the charge. The substance of my answer is that on the one hand the police suspect that the persons who went underground pulled down the small thatched huts in order to counter the allegations of grave crimes made against them and on the other allegations are made that the policemen pulled them down. It is difficult now after three years to say with any degree of certainty what really was the truth. Sir, if the question is repeated, I have only to repeat the answer."

11-50 a.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"In view of the admission made by the Hon. the Chief Minister that he was not able to say what the truth was and in view of the fact that here are people ready to prove the case, are the Government going to institute an enquiry into the matter? This is a very simple thing."

3rd November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Not quite so simple, if it is also remembered that it was three years ago that the thing occurred."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"ఈ പ്രశ്നకు ముఖ്യ మంత్రిగారిచ్చిన సమాధానം చాలా അസంతൃప్తికരంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ కేసుకు సంబంధించిన వాస్తవ విషయములను తెలుసుకొనుటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టి ప్రయత్నము చేయదలచినట్లు కనపించలేదు. నేరాలను బుద్ధిపూర్వకంగానే ఇతర రాజకీయ పక్షాలపై మోపటానికే ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నట్లు తోస్తోంది. ఎవరు నేరం చేశారు అనే విషయము వాస్తవ విషయాల రుజువు చేయుటకు మేము సంసిద్ధంగా ఉన్నాము. ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఇప్పటికైనా అന്వేషణ జరుపుటకు పూనుకుంటారా అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"On the one hand, there was loot, murder and arson. On the other, there was police action. In between, a few small huts were pulled down. The Government are not prepared to hold an enquiry into this matter which occurred three years ago."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister, because the incident occurred, just three years ago and because so much evidence is forthcoming, whether it will not be useful to institute an enquiry? Will the Government think of holding an enquiry?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"If the Leader of the Opposition persists in restating the case, I can only persist in restating my difficulty. Even in matters where such incidents occurred last year, it is difficult to find any useful result. Three years ago, this took place. Both sides are interested, each in its own assertion and allegation. Oral evidence has to be taken now after three years. The Government are not prepared to have such an enquiry."

Purchase of Soviet and China publications by libraries.

* 16 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Director of Public Instruction has circularised to all libraries as get or expect Government grants that they should not get any journal or book from Moscow or Peking or any journal or book that gives a truthful picture of Soviet Union or China; and

(b) whether grants to libraries and educational institutions as get journals or books of the type mentioned in clause (a) have been stopped; and if so, their names?

THE HON. DE. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) No.

" (b) Does not arise."

[3rd November 1952]

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“కొన్ని రైబరీలవారు సోవియట్ పుస్తకములను తెప్పించుకొనడమున Director of Public Instruction గారికి తెలుపుకొనగా, ఆయన ఆ పుస్తకాలు కొనిపెట్టే మేకు గ్రాంటులు రావని చెప్పిన మాట నిజమేనా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“I want notice. But the present procedure is that it is not considered necessary to maintain a list of periodicals and journals so far as public libraries and reading rooms are concerned. They are permitted to purchase these in conformity with the rules under the Madras Public Libraries Act which is in force now.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“గంటూరు, నెల్లూరు జిల్లా లలోని కొన్ని రైబరీ సస్టెంలవారు సోవియట్ పుస్తకములను జాబితాలలో చేర్చి విద్యా శాఖాధికారుల ఆమోదానికి పంపినా సందర్భంలో, అట్టి పుస్తకములను జాబితాలలో నుండి తీసివేయడం గ్రాంటులివ్వమని తెలిపేట్లు ఫిర్యాదులేమైనా వచ్చాయా ? వచ్చినట్లయితే ఏమి చర్య తీసుకున్నారు.”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“What the hon. Member has referred to is not in accordance with the procedure and rules now in force.”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—“ప్రభుత్వం ఆ విధంగా ఉత్తరువులివ్వలేదని మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. రైబరీలు పుస్తకములు తెచ్చుకొనుటలో ఆధికారులు ఎట్టి అభ్యంతరాలు తెలుపరాదని ఉత్తరువులు జారీచేస్తారా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“I have already stated that rules under the Madras Public Libraries Act are in force and followed; these can be found at page 3 of the rules under the Act.”

Representations from the ryots of Bapatla.

* 17 Q.—**SRI D. LAKSHMAYYA** (on behalf of Sri V. Sri Krishna): Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representations regarding the compensation offered to the ryots of Bapatla for the lands acquired for the Agricultural College (Experimental Farms);

(b) whether it is a fact that the owners have not yet taken the amounts as a protest against the rate of compensation awarded to them; and

(c) whether the Government are reconsidering the matter to see that adequate compensation is paid at the market value to the poor ryots affected by this acquisition?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) Some ryots of Upperapalem village, Bapatla taluk, represented to Government in August last year that they might be paid compensation for the lands acquired by Government for the Agricultural College at the rate of Rs. 5,000 per acre. They were informed that they might make their representations to the Land Acquisition Officer.

[3rd November 1952]

“(b) The Sub-Collector, Ongole, ordered payment of compensation to the ryots on 23rd November 1951. An amount of Rs. 10,247-1-2 was paid to the ryots in February 1952 and the remaining amount of Rs. 31,910-15-0 has been deposited in the Sub-Court, Bapatla, under section 31 (2) of the Land Acquisition Act, as the parties concerned wanted the matter to be referred to the Court.

“(c) If the ryots are not satisfied with the amount of compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer which is based on the market value of similar lands, they may request the Land Acquisition Officer to refer the matter to the Court under section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act and the Land Acquisition Officer will refer it to the Court. Hence the Government cannot reconsider the question of compensation.”

Resolutions passed at the Andhra Desa Libraries Conference.

* 18 Q.—**SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a copy of the resolutions of the 28th Andhra Desa Libraries Conference; and

(b) if so, the action taken by them on the resolutions?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) No.

“(b) Does not arise.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“పుస్తక భాండాగారాలపథాన జరిగిన తీర్మానములను నమనించి అవసరమైన చర్యలు తీసుకొనుటకు ప్రభుత్వం ప్రయత్నిస్తుందా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“The sabha must have sent the resolutions but as a matter of fact they have not been received by the Government. In the circumstances, the hon. Member may as well expect that the sabha will immediately communicate them to the Government who are always ready to receive and consider them.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“గంటూరు నల్ల జరిగిన తీర్మానములు ప్రభుత్వానికి అందలేదని మంత్రిగారు తెలియజేశారు. మంత్రిగారు ఆ సభకు హాజరయ్యారా ? అయితే వారికి తీర్మానములేమి తెలుసా ? వాటిని చర్చించుకొనుటకు ఉద్వేగిస్తున్నారా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“The hon. Member is referring to resolutions which have not been received. But I have resolutions the Government have received from the Library Authorities Conference held recently. They are under consideration and this information I am giving voluntarily to show the attitude of the Government.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ఆ సభకు మంత్రిగారు హాజరయ్యారా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“లేద.”

[3rd November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ కొన్ని మార్పులైన సభలు జరిగినప్పుడు వాటి తీర్మానములు ప్రభుత్వమునకు అందనప్పటికి ప్రతికలలో ప్రచురింపబడ్డవియుములబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము వారు తీసుకోవడంలా ఏట్లా ఆభ్యంతరమునా ఉన్నదా ? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ నాకు తెలిసినంతవరకు Sir, I am sorry, Government . . . ”

SRI PILLAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఉద్యోగం పాతుంది. ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, the hon. Member is interrupting me. The Government generally follow resolutions that are published from time to time. But I do not know the date of the particular conference and no papers are before the Government with reference to that. ”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ ఆర్య, మద్రాసు సౌర గ్రంథాలయ శాస్త్ర మనే పుస్తకం ప్రచురించబడింది. దానిలో తైలరీలు వాటికి సచ్చిన పుస్తకములను కొనే హక్కును కలుగజేస్తూ నిబంధనలున్నాయి. అయినప్పటికి దివ్యశాఖవారు జాత్యం కలుగజేసుకుంటున్నారు. Director of Public Instruction నిరంకుశాధికారంనుంచి తైలరీలకు కొంత స్వేచ్ఛ కలుగజేయవలసిన గ్రంథాలయసభలలో సూచించబడింది. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వవారు విచార్యలు తీసుకోవలసినదాదాయదేసి చెప్పగలరా ? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to. If he is referring to the resolutions passed by the recent Library Authorities Conference in the Andhra, they are under consideration. ”

Complaints against the ferry contractors of Malabar.

* 19 Q.—**SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the Government have received complaints from the public that ferry contractors of Malabar are collecting excess fares from passengers and not observing the rules regarding the display of notice of rates, etc.?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ No. ”

Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles.

* 20 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—
(a) whether the Government propose to take up the Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles; and

(b) what help the Rayalaseema Development Board proposes to extend to it?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) No, Sir.

“ (b) The Rayalaseema Development Board is unable to give any help to the mill. ”

[3rd November 1952]

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ రాయలసీమలో ఉన్న పరిశ్రమలు ఏకా కొద్ది. అసలు లేవనేమాదా చెప్పవచ్చు. ఉన్న ఈ ఒక పరిశ్రమ (తిరుపతి ప్రీసి వాసా టెక్స్టైల్స్) మూసివేయబడే పరిస్థితిలో ఉన్నది. రాయలసీమకు సహాయము చేయవలెనున్నామని చెప్పే ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఈ పరిశ్రమను స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని నిర్వహిస్తుందా ? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Notice, Sir. ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ పరిశ్రమను తీసుకోవడానికి ప్రభుత్వంకు ఎంత డబ్బు అవసరమా చెప్పగలరా ? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Notice, Sir. ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The answers to the other questions will be printed in the proceedings. ”

12 noon.

[Question No. 21—Answered on 6th November 1952.]

Suspension of the rationing of yarn on the card system.

* 22 Q.—**SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether the rationing of yarn on the card system has been suspended for three months in the Madras State from July 1952 allowing the weavers to purchase their requirements from retailers and wholesalers as they like?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Yes, Sir. The period of suspension has since been extended up to 31st December 1952. ”

Price of rice in Tanjore district.

* 23 Q.—**SRI C. KANDASAMI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state what steps the Government propose to take to check the upward trend in the price of rice in the Tanjore district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ In order to check the rise in prices in the districts, the Collectors, including the Collector of Tanjore, have been given full discretion to open fair price shops wherever and whenever necessary. The Collectors have also been instructed (i) to be on the watch to find out cases of cornering of stocks by merchants and to requisition them; (ii) to open more fair price shops in areas where prices show a tendency to rise abnormally; and (iii) to keep adequate stocks in the fair price shops for issue to the consumers at the prescribed scale, when demanded. ”

House-rent allowance to municipal staff.

* 24 Q.—**SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Municipal Council of Tenali has passed a resolution offering to pay house-rent allowance to its staff including the menials;

2nd November 1952

(b) whether the Government have passed orders sanctioning the payment of the house-rent allowance excluding the menials; and

(c) if so, why they have excluded the menials?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :— (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) House-rent allowance is not admissible to the menials because the emolument of this class of servants is fixed with reference to the prevailing market rates of wages for the particular type of work.

Committee constituted under G.O. Ms. No. 2488, Education, dated 28th September 1948.

* 25 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Committee constituted under G.O. Ms. No. 2488, Education, dated 28th September 1948, still continues to exist;

(b) if so, the names, and nationality in the case of non-Indian members of the committee as they exist now and their cultural attainments;

(c) whether copies of the two letters alluded to in G.O. Ms. No. 2488, Education, dated 28th September 1948, as having been received from the Director of Public Instruction will be placed on the table of the House; and

(d) the amounts spent on the committee, the headings of the articles written by the members, the amount paid for each article as from 1st January 1952 to date and the names of the recipients?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :— (a) to (d) The Committee has been wound up from 1st October 1951.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Expenditure on Hosur Livestock Research Station.

* 26 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) what the recurring and non-recurring expenditure of Hosur Livestock Research Station is;

(b) what steps, if any, are taken by the research station in popularizing the results of the experiments conducted;

(c) whether there was any other designation by which the present Hosur Livestock Research Station was known previously and what was the recurring and non-recurring expenditure incurred when it had the other name;

2nd November 1952

(d) whether the dairy section and the livestock research station are run on a commercial basis or as an experimental measure without reference to cost;

(e) what is the number of cattle at present maintained in the livestock research station and whether they are all necessary; and

(f) what is the acreage of cultivable dry land and wet land in the Hosur Livestock Research Station and what extent of dry and wet land is required to maintain the cattle for the purpose of the Research Station?

A.—(a) The expenditure incurred for the Livestock Research Station during 1951-52 is as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.
Non-recurring	30,572	8	1
Recurring	5,16,585	8	8

(b) The results of the experiments conducted at the station consist in the production of breeding bulls of superior quality and training given to the students of the B.V.Sc. Course, Veterinary and Livestock Inspectors Course and to the officers of the department in Post-Graduate Course. The breeding bulls produced are utilized for the benefit of the public interested in breeding work by sale and by stationing them in studs for giving services to their cows. The experience gained by the trainees at the livestock research station enables them to put their knowledge in practice for the benefit of the public in matters relating to management of cattle, fodder crop production, silage making, etc.

(c) The farm was called previously as the Central Cattle Farm, Hosur. The total expenditure during 1928-29 when it was known by this name was Rs. 1,818-5-2 non-recurring and Rs. 86,360-3-0 recurring.

(d) The farm including the dairy section is not run on a commercial basis but for experimental purposes and the cost is limited to the amount required to maintain the stock in good health and productivity.

(e) The number of cattle maintained at present is 1,405. Primarily they are kept for experimental and research purposes. But the number also includes surplus animals and animals which are not suitable for breeding purpose. They are kept for being sold or auctioned periodically.

(f) The area of cultivable dry land is 1,210.19 acres and wet land is about 4 acres. The extent of dry and wet land required depends entirely on the type of work done at the farm. At least two to four acres of land is required to maintain an animal in optimum health.

[3rd November 1952]

Number of jenmi pattadars in Malabar district.

2 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of jenmi pattadars in each taluk of Malabar district with the name of the jenmi and the assessment in each case?

A.—The particulars required by the hon. Member are not available. Nor is it possible to compile them, as their compilation will involve much time and labour.

Birth control clinics in the State.

3 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the State Government have directed its officers in the Public Health department to carry on propaganda about the Malthusian theory and whether there are any population-control clinics in the State of Madras, carrying on work connected with the theory and practice of population control; and, if so, where and how many; and

(b) whether the World Health Organization contributes any money towards the work of the State Public Health Department in general and for the work in clause (a) in particular?

A.—(a) The State Government have not directed so far the officers in the Public Health department to carry on propaganda about the Malthusian theory.

There are two birth-control clinics in this State under the State control—one in the Government Hospital for Women and Children, Madras, and the other in the Tuberculosis Institute, Egmore, Madras.

(b) No contribution towards this work is received by the Public Health department of this State from the World Health Organization.

The World Health Organization has been extending help to this Government in carrying out certain Public Health schemes, for instance, the Anti-malaria Demonstration Project at Wynaad in Malabar district. But the assistance usually rendered by the World Health Organization is in terms of personnel and equipment and not in cash. No contribution is received from the World Health Organization towards the work connected with Family Planning.

Expenditure on "Internal security measures".

4 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the details for expenditure in 1950-51 on "internal security measures" of Rs. 50,498 appearing on page 389 of the Budget Estimates for 1952-53;

[3rd November 1952]

(b) the details for expenditure in 1951-52 of Rs. 28,132 appearing on page 389 of the Budget Estimates for 1952-53 on "internal security measures"; and

(c) the details for budget demand for Rs. 4,000 on "internal security measures" for 1952-53 included on page 389 of the Budget Estimates for 1952-53?

A.—(a) The following are the details of the expenditure incurred on internal security measures in 1950-51:—

(1) Krishna district—

RS.

(i) Pay of Upper Division Accountant sanctioned in Krishna district treasury to attend to increase of work as a result of Hyderabad Police Action ...	1,490
(ii) Repairs to jeeps and lorries lent to Hyderabad Government during Police Action ...	6,741
(iii) Hire charges for three lorries requisitioned during Hyderabad Police Action ...	11,570
(iv) Compensation for five jeeps acquired and handed over to Hyderabad Government during Police Action ...	18,462

(2) Guntur district—

(i) Expenditure incurred on maintenance of jeeps used for law and order purposes ...	9,804
(ii) Cost of new jeep supplied to Revenue Divisional Officer, Guntur, for law and order purposes ...	12,074

(3) Other items—

Expenditure incurred in connexion with security measures at Tungabhadra Project ...	111
Total ...	60,382

The difference between the above total and the amount shown in the budget is due to recoveries made in the same year from the Hyderabad Government in respect of some motor vehicles supplied to them at the time of the Police Action.

[3rd November 1952]

(b) The following are the details of the expenditure of Rs. 28,132 incurred on "internal security measures" in 1951-52:—

	RS.
(1) <i>Krishna district</i> —	
(i) Pay of Upper Division Accountant sanctioned in Krishna district treasury to deal with increase of work as a result of Hyderabad Police Action ...	1,475
(ii) Compensation for lorries and jeeps requisitioned during Hyderabad Police Action ...	15,357
(2) <i>Guntur district</i> —	
Expenditure incurred on maintenance of jeeps used for law and order purposes.	5,591
(3) <i>Anantapur district</i> —	
Hire charges for lorries requisitioned in connexion with Hyderabad Police Action ...	5,709
Total ...	28,132

(c) The following are the details of the budget demand for Rs. 4,000 in 1952-53:—

	RS.
Maintenance of jeeps of Guntur district used for law and order purposes ...	4,000

** Issue of permits for bus-routes.*

5 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) the present procedure adopted for issuing permits to bus-routes; and

(b) the names and number of bus-routes so far sanctioned under the present procedure, districtwise?

A.—(a) The Government and the Transport Authorities follow the procedure laid down in the Motor Vehicles Act and the rules made thereunder in the matter of grant of stage carriages permits.

(b) Enormous labour will be involved and I do not think that the benefit of the knowledge gained will be commensurate with the time and labour involved.

[3rd November 1952]

Reversion of certain Deputy Collectors, Tahsildars, etc.

6 Q.—SRI K. ARANGANATHAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the total number of Deputy Collectors, Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars who stood reverted on 15th August 1952 and their period of service?

A.—The information required is not readily available. The collection of the same by a reference to all Collectors and the Board of Revenue involves much time and labour.

Deputation of nurses for higher training in the United Kingdom.

7 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government deputed nurses for higher training in the United Kingdom during 1950-51 and 1951-52; and

(b) if so, the number of Harijans, Scheduled Tribes, Christians, Muslims and Backward Class people among them?

A.—(a) & (b) No nurses were deputed for higher training in the United Kingdom during 1950-51 or 1951-52.

Number of labour cases treated in the Government hospitals.

8 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of labour cases treated during 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 in the Government hospitals in the State; and

(b) the number of—

(1) successful cases; and

(2) unsuccessful cases during each year in the State?

A.—(a) 1949—189,069.

1950—193,510.

1951—196,257.

Figures in respect of the year 1952 will be compiled only in 1953 and are not therefore available.

(b) Figures in this respect are not available.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—DISQUALIFICATION OF A MEMBER (SRI SAKA VENKATA RAO.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"With your permission, Sir, I want to ask for some information in respect of one Member of this House Sri Saka Venkata Rao who was returned from the Kakinada constituency. Last time we remember there was a communication to you from the Election Commission, and the Member was not able to participate in the proceedings of this

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [3rd November 1952]

House. Subsequently the High Court decided the question and gave a judgment in his favour. May I know, Sir, whether he is now entitled to sit here and whether the Hon. Speaker is in possession of the fact and the judgment, and whether the Government have conveyed a copy of the judgment to the Hon. Speaker to enable you to allow the Member to sit in the House and participate in the proceedings of this House?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have not received any information."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know what the Government have been doing with regard to this?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I understand, Sir, the Election Commission has taken leave to file an appeal against the judgment. That is the position. (Interruption.) We had our own opinions but the Election Commission has taken leave to appeal against the judgment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am not going to allow a debate on this matter."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ఇంకా నా నాల్గవ ప్రశ్న వచ్చినప్పుడు పంచాయితీ జూర్టు ఎలక్షనులను గురించి, ఆక్టోబర్ 24న గురించి, అరగంట చర్చకు సావకాశం యివ్వవలెనని అడుగగా, యింకను అవకాశము లేదు. ఈ విషయములో చాలా ముఖ్యమైన విషయములు చర్చించవలసి యున్నందున, యీ పంచాయితీ ఎలక్షనులను గురించి చర్చకు అరగంట సావకాశం యిస్తే, సభ్యులయొక్క అభిప్రాయాలను తీసుకొనుటకు అవకాశం ప్రాముఖ్యముగా, అరగంట చర్చకు అవకాశమివ్వమని పూర్వయోచనముగా కోరుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am not able to understand what he says. Let the hon. Member put in writing what he wants to say. I shall then consider his point."

III.—ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE HON. SPEAKER.

(1) PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have to announce to the House that under rule 15 of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, I have nominated the following Panel of Chairmen for the Third Session:—

- (1) Srimathi Thamma Kotamma Reddi.
- (2) Sri R. V. Swaminathan.
- (3) Sri P. Thimma Reddi.
- (4) Sri C. Kandasamy."

(2) MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have to announce to the House the following messages, dated the 24th October 1952, from the Governor:—

'In pursuance of Article 207, clause (1) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby give my

[3rd November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

recommendation to the introduction in the Madras Legislative Assembly of the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, and in pursuance of clause (3) of the said Article, I also recommend to that Assembly the consideration of the said Bill'.

'In pursuance of Article 207, clause (3) of the Constitution of India, I, Sri Prakasa, Governor of Madras, hereby recommend to the Madras Legislative Assembly the consideration of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952.'

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"On a point of order, Sir, I wanted to refer to this earlier but I forgot. In the list of papers placed on the table of the House, I see item (15) refers to the Report of the Select Committee on the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952) and the annexures thereto and the proceedings. I want to know whether after the Committee has reported, the report should not be presented to the House formally by the Government."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of the rules here. If the Government want to drop the Bill, they need not present the report to the House. In the Centre only I think, they have the rule that the report should be formally presented to the House. Here if the Government want to drop it they can do so. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition will remember that such a thing happened here previously also. However, if he wants further information, I shall go into the matter and let him know afterwards if he gives notice."

IV.—LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO A MEMBER (SRI KUMARASWAMI RAJA BAHADUR).

SRI K. RAJARAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'That, under rule 11 of the Madras Assembly Rules, leave of absence be granted by this House to Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar, for a period of one month from the date of his absence.'"

SRI N. RAMAKRISHNA AYYAR:—"I second it, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member has written to me asking for leave of absence for a month. I hope the House agrees."

The motion was carried.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"On a point of order, Sir. I gave notice of an adjournment motion. No mention of it has been made by the Hon. Speaker."

MR. SPEAKER:—"When the hon. Member met me in my room and presented it to me I told him that it was out of order." (Sri Narayana Kurup rose in his seat.)

[3rd November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order. When the Chair is on its legs, the hon. Member should resume his seat. When he gave the motion to me, did I not tell the hon. Member that it was out of order and that I won't take it up here?"

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—"గవర్నమెంటువారి తరపున తయారుచేయించినటువంటి రివార్డు విదేశ సభ్యులముందు ప్రకటించవలసిన అడుగుగా అట్లుచేయుటకు ఏమిలేదని ప్రభుత్వంవారు అంటున్నారు. అటువంటివస్తువుల తాపసభ్యులపై తమరు చేయబడ్డ చర్యలనుగూడ ప్రకటించవలసిన అడుగులు ప్రభుత్వానికి అవసరంగా ఏ మాత్రము హక్కు లేదని చెప్పుకున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am not able to follow the hon. Member. Let the hon. Member put in writing whatever he wants and hand that over to the Secretary. I will have it translated so that I may know what it is that the hon. Member wants."

V.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION RE HANDLOOM INDUSTRY.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"Sir, I have given notice of the following resolution to be moved at the meeting of the Assembly to-day. I beg to move—

'This House emphatically supports the view of the Government of Madras that in order to provide a stable market for the important and widespread Cottage Industry of Handloom Weaving in which, in this State alone 4½ millions of men and women subsist, the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees should be reserved to the Handloom Industry and that mills and power-looms should not be permitted to weave such dhoties and sarees. This House is further of opinion that the Central Government should take steps to make available for the Handloom Industry sufficient quantities of yarn, and in respect of counts of 40 and below, yarn spun out of Indian cotton so as not to burden the Handloom Industry with the higher price of imported cotton.'

"Sir, I do not think anybody in this House will oppose this very reasonable resolution. It is a common fact well known to everybody and to every Member of this House from whatever constituency the Member may come that the handloom weavers are in a very serious state to-day. Hon. Members are also aware of the fact that next to agriculture, the handloom industry gives work and livelihood to the next largest number of men and women in this State of ours. I need hardly assure you Sir, and through you this House that I have had occasion in the course of my tours to see the very serious plight of the handloom weavers. They have no work. They have no wages. They are unemployed. Starvation is staring them in their faces. In some cases, as I heard with great regret, there have been even selling of children to make their living. It is a sorry spectacle of which everybody should take pity and unanimously try to do something for these unfortunate men and women. I need hardly say that this handloom industry is a very ancient cottage industry in our State. For thousands of years this cottage industry has flourished, has

[3rd November 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

given employment to millions and millions of men and women, and the products have brought us a name not only in our own country but also from abroad. But unfortunately things have deteriorated now. To-day there are about 29 lakhs of looms in our country, and in our own State we have nearly 8 lakhs of looms. Roughly if we take it that four to five people rely on one loom there is not the slightest doubt that 4½ million souls, are dependent upon the handloom industry for their living. I daresay the same conditions exist in other States as well. But let us now consider the state in which handloom weavers exist in our own State.

"Now let us briefly consider what is the cause of their plight. The most important factor is that there is no sale of the handloom cloth to-day. Not only in the Co-operative Societies but in many of the shops dealing in handloom cloth, handloom cloth worth crores and crores of rupees are now available. They are remaining unsold. What exactly is the cause of this? I may not be very wrong in saying that this is due to the inroad of the mills upon our handloom cloth.

"I won't be wrong if I say that the mills which now occupy an important part in our national economy, so to say, pinched from 12-10 P.M. the handloom weavers the patterns and that they with the subsidy, with the protection and with all the help that Governments give dominate the economic field in our country and have driven the handloom weavers into the background. Another factor which must be taken into consideration is the increased cost of production. That is due of course to the increased price of cotton with the consequential increase in the price of yarn to which I shall refer later. There is also no external market. In 1949, 51 million yards of our cloth were exported to foreign markets. In 1951, 39 million yards were exported to foreign countries. This year the position is much worse. Not even half that amount has been exported. What are the causes? It is said that the foreign markets are absent because there is no demand. I shall not say this is completely right but I must point out that due to lack of transport, due to ban on export, due to competition from the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan, due to protective duties imposed by Burma, Indonesia and Ceylon and due to the fact that our handloom cloth is banned in Pakistan while mill goods are freely permitted—due to all these factors, the position of the handloom industry has become a very sorrowful one. It should be noted that whereas our handloom products are not allowed to go to Pakistan, 620 million yards of mill goods are permitted to go to Pakistan. I am mentioning this only just to show the partiality that is shown to the mill industry and the step-motherly treatment that is being given to the handloom industry.

"What are the remedies to solve these difficulties? They can be classified under two heads, i.e., short-term remedies and long-term remedies. The following short-term remedies are suggested:—

(1) To create an export market and to facilitate the sending of handloom products to foreign countries, and

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

[3rd November 1952]

(2) To send trade delegations to other countries to find out what patterns of our cloth are very popular and to find out the reasons for the present unfavourable foreign market so far as handloom goods are concerned.

(3) The reduction of the sales tax on the purchase of handloom goods and the removal of the excise duty may lessen the plight of handloom weavers to some extent.

(4) The Government must purchase only handloom cloth. In fact we are already doing that.

(5) Propaganda on behalf of the handloom weavers is also a matter which we are already doing.

(6) Hon. members might have seen in the papers the suggestion to levy a cess on mill cloth. It is expected that by doing so, five to six crores of rupees would be got in the whole of India.

All these remedies would no doubt go to ease the plight of the handloom weavers to a certain extent but they will not solve the difficulty of the handloom weavers on a permanent basis.

"What are the long-term plans? I say, reservation of patterns may be one method. If we increase the range of patterns, we will help the handloom weavers. We should also reserve production of certain varieties to the handloom weavers only. Hon. Members may be aware that this Government have been putting forth to the Central Government that we should reserve for the handloom weavers the production of bordered dhoties and coloured sarees. Naturally when we put forward these proposals, there were fears expressed in some quarters that if such a protection was given, then it would upset the economy of our country, and there was also the likelihood that the people of our country will go unclothed. The argument was that the handlooms in our country produced only 170 to 180 million yards of sarees and dhoties while the mills produced 1,700 million yards. The question put therefore, was 'How could this gap be bridged'. The clamour that we would have a shortage if such reservation was allowed to the handloom industry was raised. Facts and figures to support this view were given by persons holding responsible positions both in this State and also outside. The figures they quoted were not absolutely correct and inasmuch as they were given by persons holding responsible positions, I must point out the answer to them. In our own State we produce roughly about 1,500 to 1,700 million yards of cloth annually and for the whole country the figure may be roughly about 4,000 to 5,000 million yards. Therefore we can see that when we produce about 5,000 million yards without any particular variety being reserved for us, the fear that if reservation is made thousands of our people would go unclothed, is really baseless. We are allotted for our own civilian consumption about 2,600 million yards of cloth. Out of this handlooms can roughly make 1,400 million yards of cloth. I am giving this figure from the Indian Cotton Textile Industry's Centenary Volume which is a very responsible publication. Dr. Amalsad, our well-known textile expert and who was responsible for

[3rd November 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

building up the handloom industry in our State says that we can produce even 1,600 million yards annually. The Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society which, as all hon. Members may be aware is a very important organization of weavers, has given the figure that roughly a weaver can produce seven yards a day or 175 yards for a month of 25 days. That is 2,000 yards per annum. We have roughly about 2.9 million or 29 lakhs of handloom weavers. We are certain that the 2,000 million yards that is necessary to clothe our people can be easily woven by our weavers. Our figures are simple enough. Multiply 2.9 million by 2,000. We get more than 5,000 million. That is to say, with our existing handlooms we can easily produce more than 5,000 million yards of cloth sufficient to clothe the whole of India. The President of the Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society has also questioned the reported statement that if reservation is made for the handloom industry the people of India will not be clothed. His argument is this: 'Even now when yarn is given only for ten days, we produce 100 million yards. If yarn is given for thirty days, in the co-operative field alone we shall be producing about 250 to 300 million yards. The co-operative department is only a small portion of the whole handloom industry of the State. If we are given reservation we are sure that 3,000 to 4,000 million yards could easily be produced.' I think that is really a very convincing argument. Now my friend Mr. Kotiah, whom everyone in this House knows and whom we consider a fairly good expert on this subject, has in one of his statements said that the 28 lakhs of handlooms in India would produce 5,000 million yards if the Government supplied 1.25 lakhs bales of yarn to the handlooms. I shall go further. Acharya Vinobha Bhave for whom we have the greatest respect even though some differ from him in certain matters has made a statement on this subject, which is worthy of consideration. He said there are 25 lakhs of trained weavers. If each weaver makes only four yards a day (the actual figure is seven yards but let us take the underestimate of only four yards) the total quantity of cloth produced in 170 days is 1,700 million yards, which is the required quantity. Still we have 190 days left and we can utilise that period for weaving more provided we are given sufficient yarn. Thus we see that if certain varieties of cloth are reserved for handlooms, our people would never go unclothed but they would be sufficiently clothed.

"Then, Sir, comes the question of yarn. All along, the difficulty has been that our handloom weaver used to purchase his yarn at a great cost. The reason is not due to us. We, the Government of Madras, have no hand in the fixation of price of cotton, in the fixation of price of yarn or in the distribution of yarn and therefore it is that while the cotton price is fixed every month the price of yarn is fixed only once in three months and therefore we see the anomaly that while the price of cotton goes down the price of yarn, though it does not go up, continues to remain stationary and never comes down. Now, some people have said, 'why not we compel all mills to produce all yarn with Indian

12-0
P.M.

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [3rd November 1952]

cotton? A very reasonable request. They have also said, 'why not we give all the yarn produced in our own State to the handloom weavers in our State?' It is true that all the 30 and odd mills that we have got in our State are spinning mills and only two or three are weaving mills. But there is an agreement; we send all the yarn produced to the common pool and out of that we take about 26 per cent. Well, the argument in favour of this is difficult to beat, for, those in authority say, 'If Madras want to reserve for themselves the yarn produced in their State, what will others in other States say if they ask for other controlled commodities?' It is but fair that there must be give and take between the surplus and the deficit States, and yarn being surplus in Madras State and deficit in other States, Madras State should not grudge to give some of its yarn to other States'. But, in our State the handlooms work on different counts; the higher counts of 60, 80 and 100 being of fine quality are meant for rich people and we have no objection if the Government of India compel the mills to make their yarn out of Egyptian or American cotton; it does not matter even if the cost of production goes up due to the import duties because it is only the rich people that wear fine varieties. Usually the poor man wears coarse cloth. Therefore, all the yarn of counts of 40 and below that is supplied to the handloom weavers for the manufacture of coarse cloth should be made out of Indian cotton. Only then will the price of yarn go down and only then will the cost of production of handloom cloth go down.

"Now, people have asked me a question, and I am sure they have asked every one of my colleagues, 'What will the mills do if you take away a huge area of their production?' Well, they can still manufacture finer qualities of clothes and dhotis without border and white sarees. We are not objecting to it. We have made a reasonable request that only bordered dhotis and coloured saris should be reserved to the handloom weavers. There are friends who frighten us by saying that people will buy white mull, cut it into pieces and wear them as dhotis. Well, we are not objecting to it. It is their look-out. They also say, 'What is there to prevent finer counts of white sarees being taken out of the State to other States, dyed there and sent back?' That is pure smuggling and we can only tell the mills, 'Please make all the shirtings you like, all the coatings you like, all the bed sheets you like and all the towels you like; only don't make bordered dhotis and coloured saris'. It may be that Malabar weavers will be affected by this to a certain extent because their handloom bed sheets and towels have got a good market. I can assure the Members that their towels are nicer and look better and foreign markets want more of their towels. But according to this resolution they can get as much yarn as they want. Therefore, Sir, our request for reservation of bordered dhotis and coloured saris to the handloom industry is very reasonable. There is another point I want to say. The bogey of the consumer is always put before the people; 'if you prevent the mills from manufacturing bordered dhotis and coloured saris, then you are asking the consumer to pay more for the handloom cloth'. Well, I will give a few figures

3rd November 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

to show why we need not be afraid of that bogey. Coarse handloom cloth costs four annas a yard to produce and the poor man in our country wears it. My information is that similar cloth made in a mill costs five annas a yard. I am taking this information from the Handloom Weavers' Co-operatives' Report. If the handloom weavers get all the yarn they want and if all the yarn that is given to them is made out of Indian cotton, the cost will be appreciably diminished. There is one point I wish to tell you in this connection. To-day all yarn that is sent from the spinning mills to the weaving mills is at a considerably cheaper rate. But, for all the yarn that the spinning mills give to the weavers, the weavers have to pay something to the middle man also. This is one of the reasons why the handloom cloth is costlier. This is another instance where, I shall say, favouritism and partiality are shown to the mills. If the same facilities are given to the handloom industry and if yarn is supplied to the weavers directly from the mills, I daresay that the handloom weavers can produce cloth at as cheap a rate as the mills. It should not be forgotten that the handloom cloth lasts longer and after all, will not the citizens agree to pay a little more for patriotic reasons for the handloom cloth and alleviate the sufferings of millions of weavers who are to-day on the streets with nothing to eat? Let us go from district to district and I need hardly say that the problem of handloom weaver is as acute as the famine, the only difference being it may be more acute in one district and less in another. I felt therefore that the problem of handloom industry should be tackled at all levels.

"Sir, I am indeed very glad that I have been given an opportunity to place the resolution before the House and I must on this occasion—I do not know whether it is appropriate or correct—pay my tribute to the Hon. the Chief Minister who has been the biggest advocate of handloom industry and who has been tackling this problem with the Centre. I can only say that he requires our good wishes and support in approval of this resolution. Sir, it does not require big speeches and as this is a very small measure, I commend the resolution to the House and ask the Members to vote for it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion before the House is—

"This House emphatically supports the view of the Government of Madras that in order to provide a stable market for the important and widespread cottage industry of Handloom Weaving in which, in this State alone 4½ millions of men and women subsist, the weaving of all bordered dhotis and coloured saris should be reserved to the handloom industry and that mills and powerlooms should not be permitted to weave such dhotis and saris. This House is further of opinion that the Central Government should take steps to make available for the handloom industry sufficient quantities of yarn, and in respect of counts of 40 and below, yarn spun out of Indian cotton so as not to burden the handloom industry with the higher price of imported cotton."

As there are a number of amendments, I will ask the hon. Members to formally move the amendments. Then the motion as well as the amendments will be before the House for discussion."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"Sir, I beg to move—

"Add at the end the following:—

"This House is also of opinion that since the existing handlooms in Malabar are such that they cannot utilize

[Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar] [3rd November 1952]

the advantage of the proposed measure of 'reservation' to the full, the Government shall take necessary steps to help the industry to install suitable looms and other help to those of the handloom owners who actually deserve it, so that the existing unemployment and the consequent hardships be eradicated to some extent."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Sir, I second the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar."

AN HON. MEMBER :—" Sir, we have not received the amendments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" They are being circulated now."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Sir, I beg to move—
Add at the end after the words "imported cotton" the words "and also to reduce the price of the yarn."

Add at the end the following :—

"This House is also further of opinion that the Central Government should immediately constitute Purchasing Boards for handloom clothes and find ways and means to see markets for the handloom clothes and urgently take steps to open gruel centres wherever it is necessary in Madras State out of the Central Relief Fund so as to save the life of so many unemployed weavers."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, I second the amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

Add the following at the end :—

"This House is further of opinion that the Central Government and the Government of Madras should take steps to make available for the Handloom Industry yarn at production price."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, I second the amendment."

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—" Sir, I beg to move—

Add the following words :—

"As a first charge on the total production of yarn in the country"

after the words "quantities of yarn" in the second sentence of the resolution."

SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI :—" Sir, I second the amendment."

3rd November 1952]

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Sir, I beg to move—

Add the following at the end :—

"This House also recommends to the Government that steps should be taken—

(a) to take over the entire accumulated stock by the Government for disposal;

(b) to order the clothing needs of hospitals, Government offices, Local Boards, Municipalities, Railways, etc., from the handloom production;

(c) to allot a sum of Rs. 2.0 crores as was in practice prior to 1947 for granting subsidy to Handloom Industry, every year until the Industry regains prosperity; and

(d) to ban imports of all foreign textile goods."

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :—" Sir, I beg to move—

In the second sentence after the words "Yarn spun out of Indian cotton" add the following :—

at prices which prevailed in 1947."

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The amendments are all being circulated. 12.30 p.m.
The main motion as well as the amendments are now before the House. The Hon. Minister will reply to the debate to-morrow after lunch time. That is the agreement that has been come to."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I just want to suggest that the difficulty pointed out with regard to the circulation of the amendments might be overcome by the fact that to-day the discussion might go on in general terms, which are well understood, and to-morrow any particular points may be mentioned with reference to the amendments, if necessary."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The amendment are now being circulated."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" In that case, all right. I thought perhaps we might finish before lunch time to-morrow; but whatever has been agreed to already, I have no desire to depart from."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I fix fifteen minutes for each Member. As I said, the Hon. Minister will reply to the debate to-morrow after lunch time."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH : "అధ్యక్షా, అంధ దేశంలో చేనేత పరిశ్రమ ఒకనాడు ఉన్నత స్థితిలో ఉండి, ఈనాడు క్షీణదశలో ఉంటున్నది. ఈనాడు యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు వివిధంగా జీవనం గడుపుతున్నారో తెలుసుకోవాలంటే, వాళ్లు యీ రోజులలో తిండికి తిండి, కట్టుబాటికి గడ్డ లేక, అనేక వాళ్లకు తానై కాలం గడచినట్లున్నట్లు, వారు ఆ వాళ్ల పడలే వాళ్లు

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [3rd November 1952]

యితర ప్రాంతాలకు వెళ్తున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు : బొంబాయిలో textile mills లో ఉన్నటువంటి కూలీలు అందరు గుంటూరు, తెలింగాణ మొదలగు ప్రాంతాలనుండి వెళ్లివచ్చారు. ఈనాడు ఇక్కడ పనిలేనందువల్ల, యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల యీ వృత్తివదలి పోతున్నారు. దీనికి కారణం ఏమనగా నూలు సప్లయ లేకపోవటం, తయారైన గుడ్డుకు అమ్మకం లేకపోవటం. నూలుకు ధర రోజురోజుకు పెరిగిపోతున్నది. అంతకన్నా ప్రధానమైనటువంటి విషయము ఒకటి ఉన్నది. మిల్లలలో తయారైనటువంటి నూలుకును, చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములవల్ల తయారైనటువంటి గుడ్డుకును వ్యత్యాసము గమనిస్తే, చేనేత గుడ్డు ఖర్చు కాకపోవటానికి కారణం బోధపడుచున్నది. యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల హెచ్చు ధర పెట్టి, నూలుకొని గుడ్డును తయారుచేయలేని కారణంచేత, యీ చేనేతవారికి బీదన భృతి జరగక కుటుంబపోషణకే చిక్కుకున్నది. ఈ చేనేతవారి కుటుంబములు ఒక రోజు, రెండు రోజులు, మూడు రోజులు వరకూ పన్నులు చేస్తూ, చివరకు వారు చేనేత వృత్తిని మార్చుకొని వ్యవసాయం మొదలగు కూలీలతో చేసుకునేవారుగా మారుతున్నారు. ఈ చేనేతవారు ఈ దుస్థితికి రావడము నకు కారణము యీ నూలు ధర విపరీతముగా పెరగడమువల్లనే. ఇండియాలో ఉన్నటువంటి textile మిల్లలవారు తమకు ఉత్పత్తికి అవకాశమిచ్చి అందరు తమకు ప్రాధాన్యం యివ్వాలని అన్నారు. కాని యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు చేనేత గుడ్డులను మిల్లుగుడ్డుల పోటీనుండి రక్షించుటకు తెచ్చినటువంటి తీర్మానమును విలపించే విషయంలో కొన్ని సవరణలకు లోబడి బీదపరచుచున్నాను. ఆ సవరణలన్నియు ప్రభుత్వంవారు స్వీకరించాలి. అవన్నియును విశదపరచుటకు నాకు time కొద్దిగా ఉన్నందున యిప్పుడు వివరించలేకున్నాను. కాని యీ తీర్మానమును నేను విమర్శించక తప్పదు. మొదటిది, నూలు తీసుకొనివచ్చి యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు నష్టమువచ్చే విధముగా పంపిణీ చేస్తున్నారు. యీ నూలు సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా పంపిణీ చేయించి, యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు నష్టమువచ్చే విధముగా యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు నష్టమువచ్చే విధముగా పంపిణీ చేయించి, సహకార సంఘాలను చిన్న చూపు చూస్తున్నారు. అటుల కాకుండా సహకార సంఘాల ద్వారా వినియోగం చేసినప్పుడే, యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు అన్యాయము జరుగకుండా ఉంటుంది. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వంవారు ముఖ్యంగా గమనించాలి. అనేకమంది వ్యాపారస్తులు మాష్టరు వీవర్లు యీ నూలు control ధరలకు కొని, blackmarket లో హెచ్చు ధరలకు అమ్మతూ, ఉన్న కారణంచేత, యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల యంత హెచ్చు ధర పెట్టి కొనలేక పోతున్నారని. అందుచే చేనేత పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధి నెలకొనలేదు. అందువల్ల యీ నూలు పంపిణీ సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా పంపిణీ చేయించియెడల యీ పారిశ్రామికములకు న్యాయం జరుగుతుంది. 40 నెండు నూలు 40 నెండు పెగానే అందుతున్నదిగాని లోపుది అందడం లేదు. యీ పంపిణీ విషయంలో ఉన్న నిర్బంధాలన్నియు తొలగించాలి. అప్పుడే యీ పరిశ్రమ బాగు పడుతుంది; పారిశ్రామికముల వృత్తి, ఉద్యమము సాగించి జీవించగలుగుదురు.

“రెండవది, చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములవల్ల తయారయ్యే గుడ్డు నలభై నెండురు అంతకు తక్కువగా ఉంటున్నది. మిల్లలనుండి ఇందుకు కావలసిన నెంబరుగల నూలు సప్లయ కావడం లేదు. ఇవిగాక అన్నిరకాల రంగులుగల వీరలు, వివిధ వార్డులుగల ధోవతులు యీ పారిశ్రామికములచేత తయారుచేయించి, గట్టువాలు ధరకు, నష్టముచి ద్వారా హామీ యివ్వవలెను. యిటువంటి వీలును కలుగజేయుటకు సహకార సంఘాల పూనుకొంటేనేగాని పారిశ్రామికములకు సహాయము చేయ వీలండదు.

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] 3rd November 1952]

“మూడవది, ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములచేత తయారుచేయించబడ్డ వీరలు, ధోవతులు సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా తయారుచేయించి అమ్మించుటకు హామీ యివ్వవలెను. యీ రంగు వీరలు తయారుచేయుటలో మన మైదాను రాష్ట్రము మొదటిదిగావున్నది. నూలు చాలినంత యిస్తే, యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల బట్ట ఉత్పత్తి యెక్కువ చేస్తామంటున్నారు. ఆ కోరిక మన్నించి అట్లు సహాయము చేయనియెడల యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు చాలా ప్రమాదము కలుగుతుంది. యీ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వం పూనుకొని చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల తయారుచేసే బట్టను అమ్మటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు హామీ యివ్వాలి. వీరు తయారుచేసే గుడ్డు గణానికి ధర విపరీతంగా పెంచితే, కొనేవారికి కష్టంగావుంటుంది. కొనుగోలుదారులను వారి తాహతులను నునక్కులో ఉంచుకోవలెనని చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములను యీ సందర్భంలో నేడుకుంటున్నాను. వచ్చాక నూ. 0-6-0 ల వంతున కరువునివారణ స్క్రీముగా చేనేతవారికి హామీ యిస్తామని, ఆ విధంగా పనిచేస్తే, నెలకు ఒక్కొక్క కుటుంబానికి రూ. 15 లు వస్తుందని, ఆ విధంగా పనిచేయడంపై రాయల్ ప్రతాపిక ఒకటి నెలన రద్దుచేస్తున్నారు. దీనివల్ల కుటుంబం జరగదు. ఇట్లుగాక నెలకు సరిపోయే నూలు అయినను యిస్తే ఉత్పత్తి యెక్కువ చేస్తామంటున్నారు. యీ విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములను ప్రోత్సహించాలి. ఇట్లు నూ. 0-6-9 వంతున హామీరేటు యిచ్చిన యెడల నెలకు రాబడి ఒక్కొక్క కుటుంబానికి రూ. 15 లకు మించి రానేనివారే అంగీకరిస్తున్నారు. ఈ స్పెషల్ డిస్కంట్ వారి కుటుంబపోషణ జరుగదు. ఈ రూ. 15 లతోనే నాలుగు అయిదుగురు వందే కుటుంబం యెట్లు జీవించ జరుగుతుందో ప్రభుత్వం వారు అలోచించాలి. కాబట్టి ప్రతి కుటుంబానికి సరిపోయేటువంటి నూలు సప్లయ చేయించినయెడల వారి జీవనస్థూనకు అవకాశము ఉంటుంది. దేశం అంతటను యేనానూ గుడు వచ్చి మాట్లాడిననూ అధికోత్పత్తి అధికోత్పత్తి అని అంటున్నాడు. అధికోత్పత్తికి అవకాశం కల్పించకపోతే, తయారైన వస్తువులు అమ్ముడుపోకపోతే అధికోత్పత్తి ఎట్లు చేయగలరు? అందువల్ల ఎవ్వధమైనటువంటి అధికోత్పత్తి చేయటానికిని, యీ నూలు సరఫరా తగ్గిపోవటమువల్లను యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల తిడిలేక మంతుల మాది పోతున్నారు. యీచేనేత పరిశ్రమను ప్రభుత్వమువారు ముందుకు తేగలిగితే యీ కార్మికుల ఆంకోశన తగ్గుతుంది. ప్రభుత్వమువారు వారికి సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా, తన సహాయముచేసి గుడ్డులను తయారుచేయించి, అమ్మించినట్లయితే, ఏ యొక్క జీవనభృతి బాగుపడు తుందని నమ్మకముతో వెళ్తున్నాను. వీరికి యీ నూలు సరఫరా తగ్గిండువల్ల వీరుచాలా నిరుత్సాహులయ్యారు. వీరికి కొనుగోలు శక్తిగూడ పూర్తిగా నశించింది. ఇటువంటివారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు తగు సహాయముచేసి యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమను వృద్ధికి తెచ్చేస్తేగానీ, యీ పరిశ్రమ బాగుపడదు. ఈ రక్షణలో కలంకారీ నేర్పందుకు తగిన వసతులు కల్పించాలి. ఖద్దరుకు మాదా అవకాశం 12-40 యివ్వవలెను. ఈనాడు పల్లెటూరు అనేకులు యిది ఒక కుటీరపరిశ్రమగా ఎంచి ఖద్దరు తయారు చేస్తున్నారు. యిది యిప్పుడు చాలా హిసస్థితిలో ఉన్నది. కాబట్టి యీ చేనేతవారిచేత ధోవతులు, వీరలే కాకుండా ఖద్దరు పర్శిమ గూడ జతపరచి అధికార పరిశ్రా సహాయం చేయాలి. ఖద్దరును పోషించ కంఠం కట్టుకొని, కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం అధికారానికి వచ్చి, దాని రక్షణ అంటూ తెచ్చిన నియమ నిర్బంధాల మూలంగా ఖద్దరు పరిశ్రమ విస్తరించే బదులు దీనించిపోయింది. కావలసినవారికి నూతన ఖద్దరు ఉభయదం కష్టం అయిపోయింది. యీ విషయములో మన రాష్ట్రములో అనేకమంది అధికారికలిగినవారు కలరు. ఈ ఖద్దరు పరిశ్రమలో చేయి కార్మికులని అభివృద్ధి చేయుటకు అవకాశములు అనేకములు ఉండి చేయలేకపోతున్నారు. ఖద్దరు నష్టముకునూడా రక్షణ యిచ్చి, దానిని ఈ నియమనిర్బంధాల కాదనండి

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [3rd November 1952]

వదిలించి ఖద్దరు గ్రామ పరిశ్రమగా కుటీర పరిశ్రమగా మన గలుగునట్లు ప్రభుత్వం సహాయం చేయాలి. ఖద్దరుకుండు గుడ్డలకు రక్షణ ప్రత్యేకంగా యివ్వాలి. యీ విషయమే ప్రభుత్వమువారు గమనింపగలండులకు కోరుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము వారు యిప్పుడు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమువల్ల చేనేత కార్మికులు యేదో సహాయము కాగలదని చాలా ఆశపడుతున్నారు. వీరికి నూలు సరిఫరా సక్రమంగా జరగకపోయినందున, వారికి జీవనభృతికి వచ్చే ఆదాయము చాలనందున, కుటుంబ పోషణకుగాను వారి యొక్క మగ్గులను తాకట్టుపెట్టుకొన్నవారుకూడా అనేక మంది గలరు. ప్రతిపాదులలో మగ్గులు చూడు, నాలుగు రూపాయలకు తాకట్టుపెట్టి, అది వదిలివేయలేక వదులుకున్నవారున్నారు. యీ మగ్గులు మాప్తురు వీవర్లు యితరులకు యిచ్చి, ఆ నూలు తాము వీసుకొని లాభాలు గడించుచున్నారు. వీటి ఫలితంగా యీ చేనేత కార్మికులు, యీ చేనేత వృత్తి వదిలిపెట్టి వ్యవసాయకూలీలుగా మారియున్నారు. అందువల్ల చేతలా చేనేత పరిశ్రమ అనేది లేకుండా పోయే స్థితి దాపరించే ప్రమాదం కూడా కనిపించుచున్నది. యీ గత అయిదు సంవత్సరములనుంచి యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమను సమర్థిస్తూ ప్రేమతోచూచి, మిల్లు యజమానులను ప్రోత్సహించి యున్నారు. వీరి వృత్తిని సరిగ్గాజేసి మిల్లు యజమానులను ప్రోత్సహించుకు న్నాయులు కాదు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికుల ప్రోత్సహించుటకు అవకాశము యీ తీర్మానముద్వారా యిప్పించగలరని కోరుతున్నాను. చేనేతవారికి 20 వ నెంబరు నూలును విరివిగా సప్లయ చేయించవలెను. పూర్వముంచి వీరు యీ వృత్తివల్లనే బ్రతుకుతున్నారు. వ్యవసాయవృత్తికి పోవడం అంటే, వీరిని నిరుద్యోగులను చేయడం, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలలో అధిక సంఖ్యాకులుగా చేరి పోటీలు పెంపడమవుతుంది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానము నివారణయోగ్యము చేయక పోయినట్లయితే, అది వృథాగా కాగితముమీదనే వున్నదవుతుంది. ఇందుకుగాను ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ పరిశ్రమకు తగిన protection యివ్వవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ పరిణామ గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో హేమలత textile mill ఒకటి ఉన్నది. దాని నూలు అంతయు సహకార సంఘముల కివ్వకుండా వ్యాపారస్తులకు మాప్తురు వీవర్ల ద్వారా వడకం చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ వ్యాపారులు ఆయా గ్రామాలలో అమ్మకుండా మద్రాసు వచ్చి లాభాలకు రహస్యంగా చేరవేసి కొంగ మాన్యేట్టులో అమ్మకొనుచున్నారు. దీనినే చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు అధిక ధరలకు కొని నేయచూ కట్టవస్తాల పావుచున్నారు. కాబట్టి సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు ప్రభుత్వం వారు తగినంత వాణ్యత వహిస్తూ కావలసిన protection మాలలో యివ్వడం కాకుండా యీలాంటి మిల్లుల నూలును చేనేత సంఘాలద్వారా సరాసరి అందించాలి. సహకార సంఘాలలో చేరనివారి సంగతి మాకేమి వస్తుదంటే లాభంకాదు. అందరికీ అన్ని సౌకర్యాలు కలిగించి సహకార సంఘాలలో చేరేటట్లు చూడాలి. ప్రభుత్వమువారు తగినంత ధన సహాయము చేయాలి. యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు ఎటువంటి protection లేని కారణముచేత దెబ్బతినుచున్నది. తాకట్టుపెట్టుకున్న మగ్గులను వదిలించి, మరల అమలులో పెట్టించవలెను. మా సరైనవల్లి తాలూకాలో అనేక మగ్గులు పనిలేకుండా ఉన్నవి. నూలు సరిఫరా కానందువల్ల వీటికి అడ్వాన్సు ఇవ్వబట్టింది. వారివల్ల తయారుచేయబడే గుడ్డను ప్రభుత్వమువారి అమ్మించే విరాట్టుచేయవలెను. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారు హామీ యిచ్చుటకు పూనుకొనవలెను. ప్రభుత్వము యిచ్చే హామీతోగూడా సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు తయారుచేసే గుడ్డను నేయించి, అమ్మించినట్లయితే యీ పరిశ్రమ దెబ్బతినిపోనీ సావకాశము ఉండదు. ఈ అవకాశాన్ని వ్రస్సేరించుకొని చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు బంకం ఉద్యమాన్ని నిర్మించి యీ యివ్వవలగల సౌకర్య

[3rd November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

లయినా ఉంటే దాన్ని పూర్తిగా పొందగలాలి. ప్రభుత్వము వారు తగిన సహాయము యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు చేసి, గుడ్డయొక్క quality ని improve చేస్తే, మిల్లులతో పోటీకి తయారుకాగలదు. మిల్లులలో 40 నెంబరుకు తక్కువ నూలుకు పని ఉండదు. అందువల్ల యీ చేనేతవారికి జీవకోపాధికి తరుగు ఉండదని నా దృఢస్మృతము. రాయలసీమలో అనేక చోట్ల చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు అనేకమందికి మగ్గులు వున్నవి. వారికి పని లేనందున యీ మగ్గులు వృథాపడివున్నవి. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము వారిని కోరే ముఖ్యమైన విషయమేమిటంటే యీ చేనేతవారికి సహకార సంఘాలద్వారా తగు ధనసహాయము, నూలు విరివిగా సరిఫరాచేయించి, ప్రభుత్వ హామీతో గుడ్డను తయారుచేయించి అమ్మించే యెచ్చుచేస్తే యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులయొక్క కష్టాలు తగ్గడమే కాకుండా వారి జీవకోపాధిని కాపాడవలెనని నిర్వహించ చేయవలగునని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతూ, యీ తీర్మానమును నేను చెప్పిన సభ్యులకు లాబడి బలపరుస్తూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

SRI E. L. RAGHAVA MUDALIAR :—“ శాసనసభాపతిగారికి !
నమ్రత తేజశ్చితిలే మిగిలిన పురాతనమైన ఇర్రావతి తోటలలో ఉన్న
వివశాయము; మరెవ్వరైనా కైకతొట్టెలో నెలకొనినట్లుగా, నమ్ర
నాగరి నెలకొనినట్లుగా మిగిలిన నెలకొనినట్లుగా ఉన్న

AN HON. MEMBER :—“ Why not speak in English? ”

SRI E. L. RAGHAVA MUDALIAR :—“ No objection. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the two ancient industries in our country are agriculture and weaving. These two industries, though very ancient, and though they have had much of lip sympathy in the past from many previous Governments, have not received substantial help, and not much of help worth the name has been done to these two industries. I am glad that at least this time, the Government have come forward with a proposal to substantially help the weaving industry. Sir, the weaving industry has a wide reputation throughout this country and throughout the world. Members of this Assembly who live in places where these weavers live in large numbers will realise their condition just at present. Even in the so-called famine-stricken Rayalaseema district, the condition of the people is not so bad as the condition of the weavers. It is very difficult for them to get yarn for weaving, and such quantity as they get is not enough for weaving, even for ten days in the month. And that yarn which they get is got only at a greater cost than the yarn which is given to the composite mills. The composite mills get the yarn at a cheaper rate, because they are not liable to sales tax and other taxes. Therefore, the cost of production by the mills is cheaper than cost of production by handloom; when handloom cloth is thus costlier, naturally, the weavers are not able to compete successfully with the organized industries, such as the Ahmedabad Mills and the Bombay Mills. It is no wonder, therefore, that the wage that the handloom weaver gets is not even a living wage. Considering all these circumstances and the actual plight to-day the handloom weaver is in—which I am sure every Member of this Assembly realises—I earnestly appeal to all to support this resolution wholeheartedly.”

(Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar rose to speak.)

[3rd November 1952

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Does the hon. Member want to speak in Malayalam? ”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ Yes, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ If the hon. Member wants to speak in Malayalam, let me say that we have not got a Malayalam reporter to-day; such members as want to speak in Malayalam are requested to send a copy of their speeches to the office.”

12-50
p.m.

0 * SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ മനസ്സായ സഭാനാഥനവർ കളെ, ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് സാമ്രാജ്യവാസികളുടെ ക്രൂരമായ അക്രമങ്ങളെ ചെറുത്തു നമുക്കു മഹത്തായ ദേശീയ പ്രസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ ലക്ഷ്യം ഏറ്റവും കോടികളെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ ക്ഷാമസുരക്ഷയായ സേവനങ്ങളും മാത്രം വളർത്തുന്ന നമുക്കു നേയ്ക്കു വ്യവസായം അന്വേതകർമ്മമായിരുന്നു. ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ കഠിനമായ അനുസ്മരണവും ദേശീയ വ്യവസായത്തിലേപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള തൊഴിലാളികൾ പട്ടിണിമരണങ്ങൾക്കും വിപ്ലവത്തിനും നരകയാതകനകൾക്കും വിധേയരായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇന്നു കൈയ്ക്കുത്തറി വ്യവസായം ചെന്നെത്തിയിട്ടുള്ള നാൾക്കാലത്തിൽനിന്നു അതിനെ സംരക്ഷിക്കുവാനും ദരിദ്രനായ നമ്മുടെ നമുക്കു നാട്ടുകാർക്കു ചുമത്തിയ വിപുല നഗ്നത മരക്കുവാൻ തുണിക്കൂടും കിട്ടുന്നതിന്നു സാധ്യത ഉണ്ടാകുവാനും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഗുരവേലം വിജയകരമായി സംഗ്രഹിക്കപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ളതു വ്യക്തമാണ്. എന്നാൽ വൈകിയവേലയില്ലെങ്കിലും ഇതു വ്യവസായത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചും അതിലേപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുള്ള തൊഴിലാളികളെക്കുറിച്ചും ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ചിന്തിക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങിയിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നതിനെ ഞാൻ സ്വാഗതം ചെയ്യുന്നു.

“രോഗങ്ങളെ മരുന്നാക്കുന്നതുപോലെയുള്ള ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ഈ പ്രമേയം നടപ്പിൽ പരികയാണെങ്കിൽ കൂടി മലബാറിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേടത്തോളം ഏറ്റവും അപ്രാജ്ഞാതികരെന്നും പറയുവാൻ എനിക്കുശേഷം മടിയില്ല. മലബാറിൽ കൈത്തറിയിൽക്കെട്ടുന്നതു കുട്ടിത്തം, കോട്ടിത്തം, ദവൽ എന്നിവയാണ്. ഇവ അവിടെ പണയുന്നതു 33 വരെയുള്ള മദ്യത്തലിലാണ്. സാരിയും കോത്തിയും ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനാവശ്യമായ 42-53 വരെയുള്ള മദ്യത്താൾ അവിടെ വിൽക്കുന്നു. മലബാറിൽ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായത്തിന് ലേക്ട്രിട്ടിട്ടുള്ള ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരിൽ ഭൂരി പക്ഷവും ഇടത്തരക്കാരാണ്. 5-20 വരെ മദ്യത്താൾവെച്ചു മാത്രമുള്ള സാധാരണക്കാരിയെന്ന്. ഇവരാണ് ഭൂരിപക്ഷം. പ്രമുഖ സാധാരണക്കാരിയെന്ന് മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു വ്യത്യസ്തമായി. മലബാറിൽ ഫാക്ടറി അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിലാണ് കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായം പ്രധാനമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. മലബാറിലെ പ്രത്യേക പൗരസ്ഥിതി പരിഗണിച്ചു പ്രത്യേക നിവാരണമാർഗ്ഗം കണ്ടേ മതിയാകൂ. ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ ഉന്നയിച്ച റിസർവ്വേഷൻ നടപ്പിൽ പരികയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിന്നാവശ്യമായ ഉപകരണങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിന്നു മറ്റും അത്യാവശ്യമായി വേണ്ടുന്ന പണം ചെലവാക്കുവാൻ ഇന്നത്തെ സർക്കാറുപയോഗിച്ചു പോന്നിട്ടുള്ള ചെറുകിട ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരുടെ കയ്യിലില്ല. ഗവണ്മെന്റനെ പ്രത്യേക പരിഗണനയിൽ പറയും മറ്റു സാഹചര്യം ചെയ്യേ മതിയാവുമല്ല. അല്ലാത്തപക്ഷം ഒരു പ്രമേയം നയ്ക്കുകി സ്വായം ക്രിസ്തുമതയടയക്കാരെമാത്രം. ഈ വ്യവസായം തകരുന്നതിനുള്ള അടിസ്ഥാന കാരണമെന്താണെന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ആലോചിച്ചിരിക്കുമല്ലോ. നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിൽ ചർക്കുകൾ വാങ്ങേണ്ടുന്നവർ ആരെങ്കിലും അങ്ങളിൽ 90% വരുന്ന തുകിക്കാരാണ്. ഇവർ തുണി വാങ്ങാത്തതു് അതിനോടടുത്തു വൈരാഗ്യംതോണ്ടല്ല. പിന്നെയും അവരുടെ വാങ്ങാൻ കഴിവു് (purchasing power) പാതാളത്തോളം താണുപോയിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നു താണു്. ക്രൈസ്തവരുടെ തുകിക്കാരുടെ ക്രീണതശക്തി വർദ്ധിച്ചിരിക്കാതെ, അവരുടെ കയ്യിൽ പണമുണ്ടാക്കാതെ, ഒരിക്കലും വ്യവസായത്തെ പുരോഗമിപ്പിക്കാതെ, അവരുടെ അക്രമപരമായ വാഗ്ദാനം പാട്ടത്തോളം ഇന്നത്തേതിൽനിന്നും പകർത്തിയെങ്കിലും കറയ്ക്കു എന്നു ഒരു വിദൂര പരിഷ്കരണമല്ല. ഇന്നു ഇവിടെ ചെയ്യേണ്ടതു മാത്രമാണു്. നായും പകലും അദ്ധ്വാനിക്കുന്ന തുകിക്കാരനു മിതമായ ആവശ്യത്തിന്നുവേണ്ട അന്നവും വസ്ത്രവും വാങ്ങുന്നതിന്നു കഴിവുണ്ടാക്കത്തക്ക അഭ്യന്തരകമ്പോളം ഉണ്ടാക്കാത്ത എല്ലാ പരിഷ്കാരവും വെറും വഞ്ചന മാത്രമാണു്.

“മലബാറിലെ 50,000 തോളെ അരികൾ ചിറക്കൽ. അധികിൽമാത്രം ഇതിലെ
ചേർന്നിട്ടുള്ള, $\frac{1}{2}$ ലക്ഷത്തോളം വരുന്ന കുടുംബങ്ങൾ പട്ടിണിയിലാണ്.”

3rd November 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

സമിതി കഴിഞ്ഞ 8 മാസമായി ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ അടിക്കടി പെടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. ഇതു പരിഹരിക്കുവാൻ ഒരു ചെറുവരുതലോളം വാങ്ങാത്ത ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ നയം പ്രതിഷേധാർഹവും കുറവുമാണ്. മലബാറിൽ കണ്ണൂർ, പാലക്കാട്, കോഴിക്കോട് മുതലായ പ്രദേശങ്ങൾ കോളന ബാധിച്ച പ്രദേശങ്ങളായി ഗവണ്മെന്റുതന്നെ പ്രഖ്യാപിച്ചിരിക്കുകയാണ്. പട്ടിണി കിടക്കുന്ന തൊഴിലാളികളെയാണ് ക്ഷാമവും തജ്ജന്യമായ കോളനയും ബാധിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്. അടിയന്തരമായ വൈദ്യസഹായത്തിന് പുറമെ സൗജന്യ ഭക്ഷണം കഞ്ഞിവില്പനകൾ കേന്ദ്രങ്ങൾ വുറക്കും ഉടൻ അനുവദിക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കും. മലബാറിൽനിന്നും ഈ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായം സംരക്ഷിക്കുന്നതിന് പല പ്രധാന നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങളും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് സമർപ്പിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. സാമ്പത്തിക കച്ചവടത്തിന് രക്ഷ നേടുവാൻ തൊഴിലാളികളെ ക്ലേശപ്പെടുത്താതെതന്നെ ഉല്പാദനചിലവു ചുരുക്കുവാൻ എക്സ്ട്രിമൽ റെഗിമിൻനിന്നും ശ്രമം കൊടുക്കുക. കേന്ദ്രീകൃതമായ ചായം മുക്കൽ കേന്ദ്രങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാക്കുക, വിപണന നികുതിയിൽനിന്നും ഈ ചരക്കുകളെ ഒഴിവാക്കുക, കിട്ടിക്കിടക്കുന്ന ചരക്കുകൾ ഏറ്റെടുത്തും, അയ്ക്കുന്നവയ്ക്ക് സബ്സിഡി നൽകിയും വിദേശകമ്പോളം ഉണ്ടാക്കുവാൻ പരിശ്രമിച്ചും മറ്റും പ്രവർത്തിക്കണമെന്ന തൊഴിലാളി സംഘടനകളും ജനപ്രതിനിധികളും പലവുമെ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടും അവ പരിശോധിക്കുവാൻതന്നെ കൂട്ടാക്കിയിട്ടില്ല. യുക്താണുതീർമാവുന്നതിനുമുമ്പ് അടിയന്തരമായും മലബാറിലെ ആയിരമായിരക്കണക്കിളുള്ള തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു അടിയന്തര രക്ഷനൽകിയും വ്യവസായത്തെ സംരക്ഷിച്ചും ഗവണ്മെന്റ് അതിന്റെ ഈ വ്യവസായത്തോടുണ്ടെന്ന പുറയുന്ന സ്റ്റേറ്റ് ഫാക്ടറിപ്പുക്കുന്നില്ലെങ്കിൽ ഈ പ്രദേശം ഒരു ഭൂമിത്തുറമൻ മലയാളിയിരിക്കും. മറ്റു ഉപക്ഷേപങ്ങളെ പിന്തുണയ്ക്കുന്നതോടൊപ്പം ഞാൻ എന്റെ ഉപക്ഷേപം അംഗീകരിക്കുന്നതിന്നും ഈ സഭയോടടുത്തിരിക്കും."

* **SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU** :— “అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి సమస్య గురించి ఇక్కడ చర్చ జరుగుచున్నది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు చేసేత కార్మికుల విషయంలో చాలా ప్రత్యేక శ్రద్ధహిస్తున్నట్లు చెప్పుతున్నారు. దానిని నేను కాదనడంలేదు. అయితే ఈ విషయంలో వారు వెంటనే చేయవలసిన ముఖ్యమైన కనులు కొన్ని వున్నవి. ఇప్పుడు మన రాష్ట్రములో చేసేత కార్మికులకు ఈ దుస్థితి రావడానికి కారణమేమిటో ఇప్పుడు దీనిలో ఎంత blackmarketing జరుగుచున్నదనే విషయము రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియకపోవచ్చును. కాని ఈ విషయాలు వారి వోటినుకు తీసుకువచ్చినాగూడా ఈ blackmarket ను ఈనాటికైనా సరే అరికట్టగలుగుతున్నారా అంటే అదికూడా లేదు. ఆలాంటుప్పుడు మనము కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఈ విషయమున వొత్తిడిచేయడంకూడా అవసరమైయున్నది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు వెంటనే ఈ blackmarket ను అరికట్టి, తక్షణం నూలు ధర తగ్గేటటువంటి చర్యలు తీసుకొంటేనేగాని చేసేత కార్మికుల పట్ల వారి బాధ్యతను నిర్వహించిన వారనుడికు వీలులేదు. అందువల్ల వెంటనే ఎక్కడెక్కడైతే blackmarket జరుగుచున్నదో, దానిని అరికట్టడానికి మన ప్రభుత్వము వెంటనే పూనుకోవాలి. ఈ రీతిగా చేస్తేనే మనము కొంతవరకైనా పరిస్థితులు చక్కబెట్టినవారవుతాము. ప్రస్తుతము నూలు ధర విపరీతంగా ఉంది. 1947 వ సంవత్సరంనుంచి అంచనా వేసుకొని cotton, నూలు ధరలు పోల్చి చూచుకొన్నట్లయితే, ఈనాడు నూలు ధర కొద్ది రెట్లు అధికంగా ఉందని గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. ఈ నూలు ధరలు హెచ్చడానికి కారకులైన నూలు మిల్లు యజమానులపట్ల ధరలు పెంచకుండా చేయుటకు మన రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం వినిచేస్తూ ఉంది అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు అనేక చోట్ల ఉపన్యాసాలు చేస్తూ యుంటారు. వారి ఉపన్యాసాలను ప్రతి ఒక చోట నేను జాగ్రత్తగా గమనించుచున్నాను. కాని ఒకచోటైనా సరే వారు విపరీతంగా పెరిగియున్నటువంటి ఈ నూలు ధరలను తగ్గిచేట్టువంటి సూచన చేయకుండా ఉండడం కనుకోవలసియున్న విషయము. కనుక వారికి నా విజ్ఞప్తి యేమిటంటే, వారికి ఆ మిల్లు యజమానులంటే ఉన్నటువంటి పలుకుబడిసంతా వినియోగించి వెంటనే నూలు ధరలు తగ్గేట్లు చేయవలెను. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ కార్యమును తేలికగా చేయ

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [3rd November 1952]

వచ్చును. చేనేత కార్మికులకు సహాయము చేయుటకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము పైగూడ వొత్తిడి అవసరమే కావచ్చు కాని మన చేతులలో ఉన్నటువంటి మన బాధ్యత అయినటువంటి ఈ మిల్లు యజమానులవై వొత్తిడిచేసి ధరలు తగ్గించేపని ఎందుకు చేయుటలేదో నాకు ఆరంభ కావడంలేదు. మెట్ట తాలూకాలలో చూసినట్లయితే, అక్కడ 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు నూలు వంచలు, చీరలు కూడ ఈ రోజున అమ్ములేక పోతున్నారు. ఎందుకనగా వారి కొనుగోలు శక్తి పూర్తిగా పడిపోయింది. ప్రజల దగ్గర డబ్బు లేకుండా, అస్యవసరమైన గుడ్డులుకూడ కొనలేకపోతున్నారు. కనుక ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తిని అభివృద్ధిపరచవలసిన బాధ్యతకూడ ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఉన్నది. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము దీనికి పూనుకొనవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. దీనికి తోడు వారికి ఇతర పన్నులుకూడా వేసినచో ఆ శక్తి పూర్తిగా నశించి మార్కెట్లో లేకుండాపోతుంది అనేటటువంటి economy సిద్ధాంతాన్ని గూడా గుర్తించవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. కనుక మన మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విషయాలన్నీ గుర్తించి, కేవలం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము మీదనే ఆధారపడకుండా, ప్రజలయొక్క దృష్టిని కేవలం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమునకు మరల్చకుండా మన ప్రభుత్వపు బాధ్యతను ముఖ్యముగా నిర్వహించవలసియుంటుంది. కేవలం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వముదే బాధ్యత అని అనిదానికి వీలులేదు. ఇదివరకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము సహాయముచేస్తుందని ఆశించిన చాలా విషయాలు విఫలమైనవి. అదేవిధంగా చేనేత కార్మికుల విషయము కూడా విఫలమైందనే విషయాన్ని మన ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించి ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని తీసుకొని వచ్చిందని చెప్పవచ్చును. ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని అంగీకరిస్తూ మన రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వమునకు కొన్ని అత్యవసరమైనటువంటియు మన ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క బాధ్యత అయినటువంటియు కొన్ని సూచనలు చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది గనుక దీనికి కొన్ని సవరణలు తీసుకురావలసినవచ్చినవి. 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు నూలు చీరల విషయంచూసి నట్లయితే, ఇవి చాలా చోట్ల ఎక్కువ ధరలకు అమ్ముడం జరుగుతున్నది. వీటినికూడ కొనలేకుండా వున్నారు. ఈ 20, 30 నంబరు నూలుకూడా చాలాచోట్ల దొరకడం లేదు. 60 నంబరు నూలు కావలసినచోట, 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు నూలు సరఫరాచేయడం, 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు కావలసినచోట 60 నంబరు సరఫరాచేయడం జరుగుతున్నది. తరువాత ఈ నూలు blackmarket లో అమ్ముడం జరుగుతున్నది. ఈ విషయాలన్నీ చేతికగా పరిష్కారం చేయడానికి అవకాశమున్నప్పటికీ కూడా ఇదివరకు మన రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము దీనికి పూనుకొనకుండా ఉన్నందుకు విచారిస్తున్నాను.

“మరొక విషయాన్ని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. సౌత్ ఆఫ్రికాకు నెల్లూరు జిల్లా నుండి, చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోని కాళహస్తి నుండి ఒక రకమైనటువంటి గుడ్డ ఎగుమతి అవుతున్నది. ఈ సరఫరాకు వెల్లారాంవారిని విజేంట్టుగా చేసినారు. వారికే ఈ విషయములో monopoly అంతా ఇచ్చారు. ఈ విషయంలో వెల్లారాంవారు చేసేటటువంటి అన్యాయము ఇంతా, అంతా అని చెప్పడానికి వీలులేదు. వీరుచేసే అన్యాయాలవల్ల, చేనేత కార్మికులు నానాబాధలుపడి గుడ్డ నేయడానికిగూడ విముఖత జెందుతున్నారు. వారికి కట్టపడి పనిచేసినదానికి కూలిగూడ గిట్టదు. కనుక ఈ వెల్లారాం గుత్త బాధ్యతాన్ని ఈ పద్ధతిని వెంటనే రద్దు చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. కనుక మన మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విషయమున వెంటనే చర్య తీసుకోవలసియున్నది. ఈ మార్పులన్నీ వెంటనే ఆచరణలో పెట్టవలెను. ఇప్పుడు మన ప్రభుత్వము ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని సమర్థించుటకు ఉంచి వారి అభిప్రాయాన్ని అడుగుతున్నారు. కాని ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారు చేయవలసిన ముఖ్యమైన కొన్ని పనులుచేస్తూ కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వముపైనగూడ వొత్తిడిచేస్తే చాలా బాగుంటుందని, అప్పుడే చేనేత కార్మికులపట్ల మన ప్రభుత్వపు బాధ్యతను నిర్వహించినట్లవుతుందని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి

[3rd November 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

చేస్తున్నాను. అందువల్ల నేను చెప్పవలసినవిమిటంటే, మనము వెంటనే ప్రధానమైనటువంటియు, మనము చేయవలసినటువంటియు కొన్ని పనులుచేస్తేనే చేనేత కార్మికుల సమస్య కొంతవరకు గాకపోయినా కొంతవరకైనా పరిష్కారము చేయడానికి అవకాశముంటుందని నేను మన ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తీసుకొని వస్తున్నాను. సౌత్ ఆఫ్రికాకు గుడ్డ ఎగుమతి ఆయ్యే విషయంలో ముఖ్యంగా ఈ వెల్లారాం గుత్త పద్ధతిని రద్దుచేసి మరో ఏదెన్నీద్యారా ఈ సరఫరా జరిపించవలసిందని కోరుచున్నాను. ఈ మార్పు చాలా అవసరమైనటువంటిది. అల్లు గాకపోయిన, అక్కడ కార్మికులకు ప్రత్యేకముగా కొద్ది పౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది.

“ఈ సందర్భమున చెప్పవలసినటువంటిది మరొక విషయమున్నది. ఈ రోజున 1 p.m. విదేశాలనుండి గుడ్డ దిగుమతి అగుచున్నది. ఈ దిగుమతి పద్ధతినికూడ ఆరికట్టాలని మన రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. మన దేశములో తయారుచేస్తున్నటువంటి గుడ్డ అమ్ముడుపోక ఉన్నప్పుడు విదేశాలనుండి గుడ్డ దిగుమతి చేయవలసిన అవసరమెందుకో తెలియడంలేదు. అంతేకాకుండా మన దేశమునుంచి ఇతర దేశాలకు గూడా ఎగుమతి అగుచున్నది. దీనిని ఆపుదల చేయడానికి ఏమి చర్య తీసుకొంటున్నదని మన ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయాన్ని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వపు దృష్టికి తీసుకురావలసియున్నది. కనుక మన దేశములో చేనేత పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధి పొందవలెనంటే, చేనేత కార్మికుల ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితి అభివృద్ధి పొందవలెనంటే, విదేశాలనుంచి దిగుమతి లేకుండా మన చేనేత పరిశ్రమకే ప్రాముఖ్యతనిచ్చి దీనిని అభివృద్ధిపరచవలసియున్నది. ఈ విషయాలన్నీ మన ప్రభుత్వపు దృష్టికి తెస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయమున కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వముపై వొత్తిడి చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. ఇటీవల కండిడ్ నెక్రూ ఒక ప్రకటనచేస్తూ చీరలు, దోవతులు చేనేతవారికి కేటాయించినంత మాత్రాన ప్రయోజనములేదు, అది సాధ్యమయ్యే వనిగాదు అని అన్నాడు. ఈ అభిప్రాయాన్ని పూర్తిగా ధృవీకరిస్తున్నాము. చేనేత కార్మికులంతా కోరుతున్నటువంటి ఈ కనీస సహాయాన్ని కూడా చేయజాలకపోతే కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వముపై మన ప్రజానీకానికి చాలా అవిశ్వాసము, అసంతృప్తి క్రబలుతుంది. మరియు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము కేవలం పెట్టుబడిదారు విజేంట్టుగా బట్టల మిల్లుల విజేంట్టుగా తయారగుచున్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. అయితే కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి ఈ ఒక్క విషయాన్ని సూచించినంత మాత్రాన ప్రయోజనములేదు. మనకు నూలు తగినంత సరఫరా అగుటకు ఏ రకమైన చర్యలు తీసుకోవలెనో అవి తీసుకోవలెను. కనీసము 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు నూలు ఎక్కువ సరఫరా చేయడమున్నూ, దానితో తయారయ్యేటటువంటి చీరలు, దోవతులకు, మార్కెటు వి విధంగా కల్పించగలమనే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించి అందుకు తగు చర్యలు తీసుకోవలసియున్నది. 20 నంబరు, 30 నంబరు నూలు ప్రత్యేకంగా ప్రభుత్వం ఎక్కువగా సరఫరా కావడంలేదు. నూలు ధరకూడా విపరీతముగా పెరిగి పోతున్నది. అమెరికానుండి cotton రావడంవల్ల ఈ పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది. అమెరికానుండి ఏమి వచ్చినాకూడా, దానికి ఎక్కువ విలువ ఇవ్వబడుచున్నది. క్రేష్టరావు మంత్రిగారు అమెరికా సినిమాలనుగూడ పొగడుతున్నారు. మంత్రివర్గము ఈ విపరీతమైన అమెరికన్ cotton ధరను ఆరికట్టడానికి, దానిని తగ్గించడానికి ఏమైన కృషి చేస్తున్నారో అది అడుగుతున్నాను. మనము చేయవలసిన పనులు చాలా ఉన్నాయి. కేవలం ఒక తీర్మానాన్ని ప్రవేశపెట్టి మా బాధ్యత తీరిపోయింది అని అడం సరియైన పద్ధతికాదని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈ తీర్మానము అవసరమే కాని దీనితోపాటు మన ప్రభుత్వము చేయవలసిన కనీస కార్యక్రమమైనా అమలు పెట్టవలసి వానికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. లేక పోయినట్లైతే, మన ప్రభుత్వము తమ

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [3rd November 1952]

నున్న బాధ్యతను నిర్వహించుకుంటూ, కేవలం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని బయటపెడుతూ, తప్పు అంతయు వారిపైనే మోపి, తమ కర్తవ్యాన్ని కప్పి పుచ్చినట్లవుతుంది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు తిరుపతిలో మాట్లాడేటప్పుడు వివేచన సమస్యలు చెప్పారుగాని, తిరుపతిలో ఉన్నటువంటి నూలు మిల్లును ప్రభుత్వము స్వాధీనము చేసుకొని దానిని ఎందుకు కడిపించకూడదు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. నూలు ధర తగ్గి సరిగా సరఫరా కావలెనంటే, ఇటువంటి పనులు చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. కొన్ని లక్షల రూపాయలతో ఈ మిల్లును తీసుకొని ప్రభుత్వము నడపవచ్చును. రాయలసీమ అంటే రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఇష్టముతో మాట్లాడుతూ యూటూరు అని చెప్పుచున్నారు. నిజముగా వారికి రాయలసీమమీద ప్రేమ ఉన్నట్లైతే కనీసము ఈ నూలు మిల్లుల అభివృద్ధినినే చేసి కట్టినా మనకు ఈ నూలు సమస్య పరిష్కారమవుతుంది. అటువంటి అవకాశాలన్నప్పుడు ఈ ప్రభుత్వము ఎందుకు ఈ మిల్లును తీసుకొని నడపకూడదు అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఒక వేళ ప్రభుత్వము తిల్లింగుకు మొదలగువాటికి డబ్బులేదని అంటారేమో, అయితే అందుకు తిరుపతిలో దేవుని డబ్బు చాలా ఉన్నది గదా, దానిని వాడవచ్చును. దేవుని డబ్బు సరిగా వెచ్చించుటకు ఇంతకంటే శుభ కార్యము లేదు అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. చేనేత కార్మికులకు నూలు సరైచేసి వారికి జీవనోపాధిని కల్పించేటటువంటి శుభ కార్యముకంటే, తిరుపతి దేవుని దుడ్డు సర్వీసియోగము చేయడం మరొక శుభ కార్యము ఉండదు.

“తరువాత ముఖ్యముగా నా సవరణ విషయము చెప్పి దీనిని సభ్యులందరూనూ, ప్రభుత్వమునూ అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. Production రేటుకే నూలు ప్రజలకు అందేట్లు చేస్తూ, వాటి ధరలు ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తికి అందుబాటులో ఉండేట్లు చేయవలెను. కొనుగోలుశక్తి ఈ నాడు ప్రజలలో క్షీణించిపోతున్నది. ప్రజలు గడ్డలు కొనుగోలేక పోతున్నారు. అందువలన రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి హితవర్తము తమపాలుకుబడిని వినియోగించి గడ్డల మిల్లుల యజమానులచే production రేటుకే నూలు చేనేత కార్మికులకు ఉప్పించవలెననే నా సవరణను అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను. ఈ విధంగా చేసినప్పుడే, మనము చేనేత కార్మికులకు కొంతవరకు గాకపోయినా, కొంతవరకైనా సహాయము చేసినవారవుతాము లేకపోయిన మన బాధ్యతను కప్పిపుచ్చినట్లవుతుంది. కనుక ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support wholeheartedly the resolution brought before the House by the Hon. the Minister for Industries, Hon. Dr. Krishna Rao. I must confess I am no expert on questions relating to the handloom industry but I believe there can be no two opinions on this question. It has been an indigenous trade which has been developed for centuries and has earned the reputation from all quarters in the world. But in the recent past this trade has fallen on evil days and it is but proper that the Government should think of reservation of certain kinds of cloth for the industry so as to give it some breathing time to prolong and regain its life since it is fast dying. My friends on this side have been reiterating the fact that due to the fall of this industry, there have been certain instances of starvation deaths, but friends on the Government side will not admit that there has been any death due to the fall in this trade. All I wish to state with regard to this question from our side is that we are giving unequivocal and unambiguous support

3rd November 1952 [Sri K. Vinayakam]

for the motion brought by the Hon. the Minister for Industries. Sir, an impression has been going round in our State that only the Hon. the Chief Minister of our State is interested in this industry. To be plain, Mr. Speaker, even though the resolution has been moved in this House by the Government, I wish to submit that the entire population of our State is interested in this subject. I want to impress upon the Hon. the Finance Minister that they could not arrogate to themselves the privilege that they alone are interested in this trade. May I, in this connexion, point out to you, Sir, that other States also like Bombay, Bengal, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh apart from our State are interested in this kind of reservation being made to the handloom industry, but the trouble is that the Governments of those States are not so bold as ours and they are not prepared to embark upon this kind of bold adventure and that is the reason why this trade has been getting step-motherly treatment? It is because they are timid and they fear that the Central Government will be offended if they express their views freely as our Government are now trying to do. I would even request the Government that in addition to these two reservations, we should provide for further reservations in respect of towels and bed-sheets and these should also be reserved to the handloom industry. I would request our patriotic friends on the other side, if they could not persuade or force or compel their womenfolk or even their relatives to wear khaddar, as they are doing, at least let them persuade them to wear handloom cloth. Instead of preaching, let the first action come from their side and they must convince their friends and relatives and they should persuade them to take to handloom cloth and thus see that this trade does not come to an untimely death. In the end, I wish to point out that for all Government requirements, like the purchase of cloth for their servants, for chaprasis and peons, they must purchase only handloom cloth and not khaddar because the wearers of khaddar very well know that it is not suitable for being made into a certain type of dress. I wish the Government would take a bold step and they should not under any circumstances yield though it might be a matter of conflict between the State Government and the Central Government.”

* SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it is a happy circumstance so far as I am concerned that I should have this opportunity of speaking upon this subject because it is not only dear to me but also near to me. I represent a constituency in which there are more than 25,000 handloom weavers who have been feeling for a long time that they are on the verge of extinction. At a time when yarn was in short supply they suffered from the blackmarketing indulged in by not only private wholesalers but by retailers and even by co-operative societies which came into existence like mushrooms as soon as yarn became a coveted commodity in the State and huge frauds and wrongs have been perpetrated during the time when yarn was in short supply and even when the yarn position became better on account of the removal of certain restrictions, the lot of the weaver has been

1-10
p.m.

[Sri K. Varadachari] [3rd November 1952]

found to be one which is creating an apprehension in the State and society that a very useful section of it is about to go to rack and ruin. The handicaps under which the weavers are suffering are many but the chief of them is that the cloth made by them is not capable of being marketed and that it is not able to give a margin to the weaver for his sustenance. If the cloth produced by him is to be sold, it has to compete with cheaper commodities, and the weaver on account of the present cost of yarn is unable to produce cloth which could be marketed and which would also give him a margin. During all this period of travail, during the last four or five years, the weaver community, though faced with a crisis, has not been able to think of measures to survive this ordeal. In spite of all these troubles and difficulties, they have not been able to take to hand-spinning and they neglected to think in terms of producing their own yarn and make their living through handspun yarn at a time when the yarn position was bad. And now that the yarn position has improved owing to the lifting of certain restrictions, it is much more difficult for them to think on those lines. This is only a passing remark of mine. Though I am not an authority on the subject, I have had occasion to deplore that the whole community of handloom weavers in the State displays a very unenterprising characteristic and they stick to the patterns of cloth, either sari or dhoti, which their grandfathers used to weave and these patterns alone they would continue to weave and only now they are taking to new patterns and they are adapting themselves to changing times and changing requirements of society and that has been another cause of the decline of this industry.

"Now, Sir, all those causes have contributed to the grave crisis in this very valuable, useful and ancient cottage industry and it is threatening to extinguish the whole community. This can be removed only by a bold stroke of statesmanship, a drastic provision for their survival out of this crisis. It is only men of high stature, of vast imagination and great courage that could sponsor a proposal of this kind. It is really very fortunate that our leader, Sri Rajagopalachariar, has been able to put forward this proposal. I do not say that it is an original proposal he has made. This proposal has been in the minds of people for a very long time but it needed a man of great courage and statesmanship to put it forward seriously for the consideration of the Central Government.

1-20 p.m.

"Sir, I would say nothing against the Central Government but the atmosphere surrounding our Government at the Centre is not very congenial to a very sympathetic consideration of the proposal we have got on hand to-day. In spite of the fact that lakhs and lakhs of weavers are going to their grave due to actual starvation for want of work with nothing to fall back upon, the Central Government are still saying that they are considering the proposal and that they have formed a High Power Committee to consider this matter, which is a simple proposition. It does not admit of any such High Power consideration at the hands of the Central

3rd November 1952] [Sri K. Varadachari]

Government. They have to accept this only provision for the relief of the whole community of weavers not only in this State but also in the whole country.

"You may remember, Sir, that the mill-owners had to be cajoled and coaxed into making all varieties of dhoties and sarees at a certain time, a critical time, in the cloth position of our country. No doubt, we thanked them for having undertaken the task of producing dhoties and sarees at a time when we wanted. But now a much larger section of the people depend mainly, for their sustenance, on this cottage industry and at this time of crisis we are simply making another request to the mill-owners by asking them, in the interests of the millions and millions of poor weavers who are starving to-day, to stop producing certain varieties of cloth which can be usefully produced by the handloom weavers. The mill-owners cannot have a grouse against this proposal. It is a very reasonable proposal, a proposal that does not seriously affect them at all and does not involve either stoppage of their production or the incurring of huge loss in their trade. There is nothing of the sort. Except to grab more profits, nothing else can stand in the way of the mill-owners accepting the proposal now being made on behalf of the whole people of this State, perhaps the whole country. It is still open to the mill-owners to produce cloth of certain specified varieties in the higher counts. For instance, they can even produce dhoties and sarees of more than 40 counts. Therefore, the most important thing for the welfare of the handloom weavers is to see that no cloth, either dhoti or saree, is manufactured by the mills on counts below 40. If this proposal is accepted by the mill-owners, it is well and good and in the absence of agreement, if the Central Government are willing to impose a ban on the manufacture of varieties that are required by the handloom industry, the handloom weavers can be saved. If this minimum provision is not made in the interests of the handloom weavers, the whole community of poor handloom weavers will be totally extinguished.

"Sir, handloom cloth is, in any event, a better and more durable stuff than mill cloth. Everybody needs it. It will be a misfortune to us if there is any opposition to a proposal of this kind by any section of society or any administration that is interested in the welfare of this community. Sir, sufficient steps have not been taken by the Government to educate the weavers in the rural areas to weave new varieties of cloth to suit the needs of present-day requirements. With these few words, I wholeheartedly support the resolution before the House and, I am sure, that no section of the House will have anything to say against this very valuable, important and reasonable proposal contained in the resolution."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have to announce to the House that from to-morrow onwards (4th November 1952) the House will sit from 10-30 a.m. to 1-30 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. The House will not sit on Saturdays and Sundays.

"The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m."

[3rd November 1952]

(After lunch—2-30 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Mr. Ramesam may now speak.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fear there is no quorum.”

(The bell was rung and after a short time there was quorum.)

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution tabled by the Government for reservation of the items proposed in the resolution. As already said, by several hon. Members before me, this is a long-felt help for the handloom industry, and particularly so in this State. Sir, I have some connexion with the handloom industry for the last five or six years. In almost every conference held in the district of Visakhapatnam and in the neighbouring districts, resolutions were passed that there should be some reservation of particular kinds of cloth for the handloom industry so that that industry might thrive. Now that the Government have been pleased to table this resolution, I heartily commend it for the support of all sections of the House. In so doing, I want to bring to the notice of the Government certain things which also they should do. For instance, it is a matter of common knowledge that in all co-operative societies which deal in handloom goods, huge stocks of cloth are locked up unsold as the weaver-members of those societies are suffering from want of proper markets for their products. I, therefore, appeal to the Government and the other Members of the House to immediately see that these stocks are disposed of as early as possible. If necessary, Government should subsidise this cottage industry by themselves purchasing these stocks, finding a suitable market for them and thus disposing of these unsold stock of goods. Because of lack of marketing facilities, an enormous amount of capital is already locked up, and thereby handloom industry is not able to prosper. So, this is one way in which Government can come to the rescue of the handloom industry.

“ Another thing I want to mention is that in the matter of distribution of yarn there is great hardship felt by the societies. The importers are authorized to distribute yarn to these societies. Under this sort of distribution, several societies do not get their initial quota of yarn allotted to them. In fact the yarn supplied to them is hardly sufficient for one member to last even for one week! Many a time it has been brought to the notice of the Government that unless more yarn is supplied to the weavers it is not possible for them to get on with their profession. Therefore I appeal to the Government that in the matter of reservation of yarn to be allotted to weavers' co-operative societies, a very large percentage of yarn should be allotted for the benefit of the weaver-societies as a whole in this State.

“ Then I wish to bring to the notice of the Government another difficulty experienced in the matter of distribution of yarn. For instance, in the matter of colour yarn, there are several dyeing factories which are not doing any profitable business. Government

[3rd November 1952] [Sri K. V. Ramesam]

should come to their aid, so that they can produce coloured yarn at a cheaper price and thereby enable the weavers to weave sarees and dhoties at a cheaper cost.

“ One other thing I wish to bring to the notice of the Government is that the yarn is supplied to these societies at a very high cost. Thereby it is not possible for these handloom weavers' societies to compete with the mills. Particularly the price of yarn, in the counts of 60s to 80s, is very high, and so it is not possible for the weaver members to compete in the open market with mill goods. So I request Government to see that these societies are supplied with yarn at a cheaper rate so that the finished goods may readily find a ready market.

“ Another handicap under which handloom industry is suffering to-day is that the weavers are all very poor people and so their method of weaving has not improved at all. It is the same old way of weaving practised for the last several decades. So there should be a technical institute opened in order to give training to weavers in improved methods of weaving. These institutes should be opened all over the State so that when the reservation comes into operation these weavers may be in a position to compete with others and ultimately cater to the needs of the people.

“ I, therefore, support heartily this resolution, and I also want that this reservation should be extended to silk weaving also. I do not find any reference to silk weaving in this resolution and I want this resolution should be suitably amended to cover silk weaving also, so that silk weavers also may get the benefit of this reservation. With these words, I support this resolution.”

* SRI B. K. NALLASWAMI :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே : இந்த தீர்மானத்தை ஆதரித்து நான் சில வார்த்தைகள் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். பல வருஷங்களாகவே கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டுதான் வருகிறார்கள். நான் இருக்கக் கூடிய தொகுதியில் சுமார் 8 ஆயிரம் கைத்தறியாளர்கள் இருக்கின்றனர். நான் வசிக்கும் இடத்தைச் சுற்றிலும் கைத்தறியாளர்களுடைய வீடுகள் அமைந்திருக்கின்றன. இன்றையதினம் அங்கே எந்த வீட்டில் பார்த்தாலும் நாடாச் சப்தமே கேட்காது. அவர்களது பிழைப்பு ரொம்பவும் பரிதாபகமான நிலைமையிலிருக்கிறது. அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டத்தை நீக்குவதற்காகக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட சர்க்காருடைய நிவாரணத் திட்டம் கூட நல்ல முறையில், அவர்களுக்கு மிகவும் சாதகமான முறையில், வேலை செய்யவில்லை. சுமார் எட்டாயிரம் தறிகளில் ஒரு நூறு தறிகளுக்கே நிவாரணத் திட்டத்தின்படி வேலைகளைக் கட்டி யிருக்கிறது. சுமார் 2,664 ரூபாய்கள் தான் நிவாரணத் திட்டத்தின் கீழ் எங்கள் தாலுக்காவில் இருக்கக் கூடிய அத்தனை தறிகளுக்கும் கிடைக்கிறது. தறி ஒன்றுக்கு மாதத்திற்கு 12 ரூபாய்கள் தான் நிவாரணம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது. காரணம் போதிய நூல் சப்ளை செய்யப்படாததே தான். மற்ற வர்கள் நிலைமை இதைவிட பரிதாபகமாக இருக்கிறது.

“ இரண்டாவதாக நூல் சப்ளை வாங்குவதற்கு போதிய பணம் அரசாங்கம், கூட்டுறவு செண்ட்ரல் பாங்கை கொடுக்கும்படி சிபார்சு செய்தாலும் கூட செண்ட்ரல் பாங்கு நெசவாளர் சொசைடிகள் விரும்புகிற அளவிற்குப் பணம் கொடுக்க முன் வரவில்லை. ஆகையால் இன்று சர்க்குருக்குறைந்த விலைக்கு, ஏன் நஷ்டமான விலைக்குக் கூட, பல சொசைடிகளில் விற்று வருகிறார்கள். ரிசர்வ் பண்டு போதுமான அளவு இருந்ததாலேயே சொசைடிகள் இன்று வேலை செய்துகொண்டுவருகின்றன. இந்த நிவாரணத் திட்டத்தின்கீழ் ஏற்பட்ட

2-40
p.m.

[Sri B. K. Nallaswami] [3rd November 1952]

நஷ்டம் கூட இன்னும் அரசாங்கத்தாரால் ஈடு செய்யப்படவில்லை. அந்த சொசைடிகளுக்கு தற்பொழுது போதுமான உதவி செய்யப்படாவிட்டால் அவைகள் வேலை செய்வது மிகவும் கஷ்டமாக இருக்கும். இந்த நிவாரணத்திட்டத்தின் கீழ் ஏற்பட்ட நஷ்டத்தை உடனடியாக கொடுத்தால் கூட இந்த சொசைடிகள் ஓரளவு வேலை செய்வதற்கு உதவியாக இருக்கும்.

“இப்பொழுது ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய போட்டி இயந்திர சக்திக்கும், மனித சக்திக்கும் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் பெரியதோர் போட்டியாகும். மில் துணிகளுக்கும், மி. பூலைக் கொண்டு கைத்தறிகளில் நெய்யப்படுகிற கைத்தறி துணிகளுக்கும் மார்க்கெட்டில் போட்டி இருக்கிறது. இந்த நிலைமையைச் சமாளிக்க ரொம்ப தீவிரமான, அவசரமான, சட்டத்தை ஏற்படுத்தினால் முடியுமே தவிர இல்லையெனில் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு தினம் தினம் ஏற்பட்டு வருகிற அவல நிலைமையைச் சமாளிக்க முடியவே முடியாது.

“உதாரணமாக இப்பொழுது சாயச் சேலைகளையும், வேஷ்டிகளையும் கைத்தறிகளுக்குத் தான் என்று ஒதுக்கி, மில்கள் இதை உற்பத்தி செய்யக் கூடாது என தடை விதிக்க வேண்டுமென மத்திய சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளும் தீர்மானமொன்று சபையின் விவாதத்திற்கு வந்திருக்கிறது.

“இந்தத் தடையை விதிக்க மத்திய சர்க்கார் சம்மதித்து விட்டாலும் கூட இது எவ்வளவு தூரம் உண்மையாகவே நம்முடைய நெசவாளர்களுக்கு நிவாரணம் அளிக்கும் என்பதை நாம் இப்பொழுது சிந்திக்கவேண்டிய விஷயமாக இருக்கிறது. காரணம் இன்று மில்களில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படுகிற அச்சடிக்கப்பட்ட வாயல் புடவைகளைத்தான் பெரும்பாலோர் உடுத்திக் கொள்வதைப் பார்க்கிறோம். மேலும் printed sarees என்பதாக மில் துணியில் பல கலர்களை அச்சிட்டு அதை உடுத்திக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது சாயச் சேலையை உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடாது என்னும்பொழுது இவைகள் எல்லாம் சாயச்சேலை ரகத்திலிருந்து தப்பித்துக் கொண்டு விடுகின்றன. உதாரணமாகப் பாருங்கள். மலபாரில் சாயச்சேலையைக் கட்டிக்கொள்ளுகிறவர்கள் மிகவும் குறைவு. கோளம் போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ளவர்கள் வெள்ளை மில் துணியைத்தான் சேலையாக அணிந்து கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். அது அங்கே வழக்கமாக இருந்து வருகின்றது. ஆகையால் வெறும் சாயச் சேலையை மாத்திரம் தறிகளுக்கு ஒதுக்கவேண்டுமென்று தடை விதிப்பதால் உண்மையாக தறிக்காரர்களுக்கு நிவாரணம் ஏற்படாது என்ற அபிப்பிராயம் இருந்து வருகிறது. மில் ஜவுளி உடைகளின் அக்ல அளவைக் கூட 40"க்கு மேற்படாமல் குறைத்து அதற்கு மேற்பட்ட அளவு துணிகளை நெய்யக்கூடாது என தடை விதித்து விட்டால் கைத்தறிகளுக்கு சரியானதோர், தகுந்ததோர், பாதுகாப்பு அளித்ததாக முடியுமென எங்கள் தொகுதியிலுள்ள பல நெசவாளர் சங்கங்களில் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“ஆனால் இந்தச் சட்டம் புதியதானதோர் ஆபத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து விடுமோ என்று நான் அஞ்சுகிறேன். மில் துணியைவிட கைத்தறித் துணி விலை அதிகமாகிவிட்டால் மில் துணியையே உபயோகித்து வந்த மக்கள் புடவை, வேஷ்டி கட்டிக் கொள்வதை விட்டு மில் துணிகளில் பைஜாமா டிராயர் போன்றவைகளைத் தரித்து கொள்ள ஆரம்பித்து விடுவார்களோ, அதனால் நமது நாட்டில் கலாசாரத்தில் மாறுதல் ஏற்பட்டு விடுமோ என்பது தான் என் கவலை.

“ஆகையால் இப்பொழுது மத்திய அரசாங்கம் விதிக்க இருக்கும் (செஸ்) தீர்வையை, எந்தந்த ரகங்களை உற்பத்தி செய்யக் கூடாது என்று தடை செய்து விடுகிறார்களோ, அதைத் தவிர மற்ற துணிகளுக்கும் விதித்து, அதாவது கைத்தறித் துணிகளுக்குப் போட்டியாக என்றும் வராத நிலைமையில் அனுசூலங்களைச் செய்து கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதோடு மில் துணி விலையையும், கைத்தறித் துணி விலையையும் ஒழுங்குப்படுத்தி இரண்டும் ஒற்றுமையாக வேலை செய்து இரண்டு தொழிலும் ஒன்றாக நன்றாக வேலை செய்யுமாறு சர்க்கார் ஏற்பாடுகளைச் செய்யவேண்டும். ஆகையால் இந்தத் துறையில் கவனம் செலுத்துவது

[3rd November 1952] [Sri B. K. Nallaswami]

ரொம்ப நல்லது. இப்பொழுது சாயச்சேலை, வேஷ்டிகளை கைத்தறிகளுக்கு ஒதுக்க வேண்டுமென்ற தீர்மானத்தைப் பற்றி நாம் விவாதிக்கிறோம். இந்த சிபார்சை மத்திய சர்க்கார் விவாதித்து, அப்படியே அதை ஒப்புக் கொண்டாலும் கூட உடனடியாக நெசவாளர்களுக்கு நிவாரணம் கிடைக்குமெனத் தோன்றவில்லை. இப்பொழுது என்னுடைய தொகுதியில் பலர் விஷவித்துக்களை உண்டு தற்கொலை செய்து கொண்டிருக்கின்றனர். நிலைமையை சமாளிக்க சர்க்கார் உடனடியாக ஒரு அவசரச் சட்டத்தை கொண்டுவந்து அவர்களைக் காப்பாற்ற வேண்டும். குறிப்பாக என்னுடைய தொகுதியில் வேலை கிடைக்காது பல பேர்கள் பட்டினியால் இறந்து விடக்கூடும் என்பதை வருத்தத்தோடு தெரிவிக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அவர்கள் நிலைமையைக் காக்க முதன்மந்திரி அவசர நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இதை ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the weavers as well as the friends of the weavers are thankful to the Government for the plight of the weavers has after all drawn the attention of the Government here. It is, however, a miserable thing that the Central Government are not able to realise the misery of the weavers. That certain counts of yarn and certain varieties of cloth should be reserved for the handloom weavers and certain other varieties should be reserved for the mills is an agitation going on for many years. Professor Ranga, the originator of the All-India Weavers' Congress, and Sri P. Kotiah, who have been working at it and starting this Weavers' Congress in the States have made this an All-India agitation. They tried their best and we now see the fruits of their efforts here. The mover of this resolution, the Hon. Minister for Industries and the author of the resolution, our Chief Minister, deserve our congratulations, and I hope the Ministries in other States will join hands with the Madras Ministry and make out a strong case and thus compel the 'mill Government'—the Central Government. The Government here is a 'handloom Government' but there is a 'mill Government' at the Centre! Otherwise, how could these mills influence the Central Government or put any difficulties in the path of this move on the part of this State Government? It is a laudable thing that our Government have taken this move and the Central Government ought to thank them for it; but, on the other hand, they have taken a wrong stand. Sir, from the consumer's point of view, it is the price of the cloth that is his first concern. How is it that with such heavy capital investments, the mills being situated in towns and cities and with such a high cost of production, the mill cloth is selling cheaper than the handloom cloth? It is a mystery. I had been reading certain books and I had also been hearing from certain people who are my friends and who are in the handloom and mill industries that the Government are giving special preference, protection and aid to the mill industry and the handloom industry has been thoroughly neglected ever since the Britisher came to this country. After all the Government are now able to see how a crore of people in this country and nearly about 5 million people in this State have been suffering. Just as the other Members who spoke previously were saying, I would also add that the State Government must take a strong stand on this issue even if there is a threat from the Central Government.

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [3rd November 1952]

"Sir, if the price of yarn could be reduced, the handloom cloth could very easily stand the cut-throat competition of the mill cloth. People are talking about the high price of cotton. It is a wrong thing because, if you compare the price of a ton of cotton and the price of a ton of yarn, the price of cotton is nowhere in the picture. After the controls came into being the mills producing cloth and the mills producing yarn have had a monopoly trade and the handloom industry had suffered its worst only after the controls came into effect. We had all kinds of people whose duty it was to stamp the prices of yarn as well as of cloth. They were influenced, bribed and forced to become corrupt and all kinds of prices were stamped on the mill cloth and yarn. This is how the handloom cloth was not able to stand the competition of the mills. Now that the Government have taken up this question, it is not enough to merely send a resolution. What I would suggest is that a committee of experts should be set up to enquire thoroughly into the working of the mill industry and the handloom industry. Then alone we will be able to visualise how the handloom industry had been suffering in this country."

"Sir, while moving this Resolution, the Hon. Minister for Industries, laid very great stress on the marketing of this cloth. I feel, Sir, the mill cloth as well as the handloom cloth that are being produced at present are not enough to meet the needs of our population. I also feel that if we are really interested and the State as well as Central Governments are also interested in seeing nakedness off this country and that every person in this country is properly clothed, there is enough demand for cloth in this country itself. It is the price of cloth that makes the poor man go with less yardage of cloth than he really needs. Prices could be very easily reduced if protection could be given to the handloom industry and the handloom industry could then very easily meet the competition from the mill industry. Thus we could save the handloom industry and the millions of people employed in this industry in this country. Thank you, Sir."

2-50
p.m.

JANAB K. K. MOHAMED SHAFEE:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, മമ്മണപ്പെട്ട തൊഴിൽ-വ്യവസായ കാര്യമന്ത്രി അവതരിപ്പിച്ച ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. നമ്മുടെ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലിലേപ്പെട്ട ജീവിതം നയിക്കുന്ന 45 ലക്ഷം ജനങ്ങളെ ഗൗരവമായി ബോധിപ്പിക്കുന്ന ഒരു പ്രശ്നത്തിന് പരിഹാരം നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന പ്രസ്തുത പ്രമേയത്തിൽ മുഖ്യമായി രണ്ടു സംഗതികളാണ് അടങ്ങിയിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഒന്ന് കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർ ഉല്പാദിപ്പിക്കുന്ന ചരക്കുകൾ വിറ്റഴിക്കാൻ കഴിയാതെ നില്ക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിയും പരിഹാരം നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന പുരമേയത്തിലെ ആദ്യഭാഗം—അതായത്, ഈ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിലെ 45 ലക്ഷത്തോളം നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു മാത്രം സാരിയുണ്ടാക്കിയും നെയ്ത്തുണ്ടാക്കുന്ന അവകാശം കയ്യാളിക്കാരുടെ കയ്യാളിക്കാണെന്നു നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന ആദ്യത്തെ ഭാഗം—കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തു വ്യവസായത്തെ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അവസ്ഥയിൽനിന്നും രക്ഷിക്കുവാനുള്ള പ്രായോഗികമായ ഒരു നിർദ്ദേശമാണ് ഇതെന്നു പറയുവാൻ എനിക്ക് സന്തോഷമുണ്ട്. ഇതിനെതിരായി മിൽവ്യവസായികൾ കറേയ്ക്കറെ പ്രക്ഷോഭിക്കുന്നു. നടത്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. മിൽവ്യവസായികൾ, വളരെ വേഗത്തിൽ തൊഴിൽ നൽകണമെന്നു വാസുവമാണ്. പക്ഷെ ഈ സമയത്തിൽ അവർ നടത്തുന്ന പ്രക്ഷോഭം നിമിത്തം ഇന്ത്യാ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് ചിന്താകുഴപ്പമുണ്ടാകുന്നു. നമ്മുടെ മുഖ്യമന്ത്രി ശ്രീ സി. രാജഗോപാലാചാരി ഈ വിഷയകുരുതി സിദ്ധിച്ച ആദ്യവ്യവസ്ഥയ്ക്കു യീരവമായ നിലകൊണ്ടു ഭോത്തിയും സാരിയും ഉണ്ടാക്കു

[3rd November 1952] [Janab K. K. Mohamed Shafee]

ന്നതിനുള്ള അവകാശം കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർ മാത്രമായി വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തിന്നു മതിയായി സ്റ്റേറ്റിന് മാത്രമല്ല സ്റ്റേറ്റിന്നു പുറത്തും വമ്പിച്ച ആനുകൂല്യമുണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ട്. വാസുവത്തിൽ മതിയായ ഒരു നിർദ്ദേശം സിദ്ധിക്കുക എന്നതിൽ വളരുന്ന വഴി കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ നെയ്ത്തു വ്യവസായത്തിന്നു മതിയായ രക്ഷ നൽകുവാൻ ഇന്ത്യാ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കടം കഴിച്ചു കൂടാത്തതാകുന്നു.

"പ്രമേയത്തിലടങ്ങിയിട്ടുള്ള രണ്ടാമത്തെ നിർദ്ദേശം കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർ മിതമായ വിലയ്ക്കു നൂൽ ലഭിക്കുവാനുള്ള ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടുകൊണ്ടുള്ളതാണ്. ഈ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിലെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾ പറ്റുന്ന തരം നൂൽ കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർ കിട്ടുവാൻ സാധിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള നിർദ്ദേശം വളരെ പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട ഒന്നാകയാൽ ഇന്ത്യാ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് അതും അടിയന്തരമായി സിദ്ധിക്കുക പ്രവർത്തിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. നെയ്ത്തുകാർക്ക് നൂൽ വിറ്റു ചിലവായ്ക്കുള്ളതും, ആവശ്യമായ നൂൽ മിതമായ വിലയ്ക്കു വേണ്ടത്ര കിട്ടേണ്ടതും കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തിൽ ഏല്പിച്ച തൊഴിലാളികളുടേയും വ്യവസായികളുടേയും അടിയന്തര രക്ഷയ്ക്കു ഉടനെ അംഗീകരിക്കേണ്ടതായ നടപടി കഴുകുന്നു."

"എന്നാൽ മലബാറിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുടത്തോളം ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട വ്യവസായകാര്യ മന്ത്രിയുടെ പ്രമേയത്തിലടങ്ങിയ നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങളും വളരെയൊന്നും ഗുണകരമായിത്തീരുന്നില്ലെന്നു വ്യക്തമാക്കി എനിക്ക് ചൂണ്ടിക്കാണിക്കേണ്ടതുണ്ട്. മലബാറിലെ നെയ്ത്തു കേന്ദ്രങ്ങളിലൊന്നായ ചിറക്കൽ താലൂക്കിന്റെ പല ഭാഗങ്ങളും ഇന്ത്യയിലെ ഏറ്റവും സമ്പന്നമായ പ്രവിശ്യകളിലൊന്നായ എറണാകുളം ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞു സാരിയും ഭോത്തിയും നെയ്ത്തുണ്ടാക്കുന്ന അവകാശം കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർ ലഭിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് മലബാറിലെ കൈത്തറിനെയ്തു വ്യവസായത്തിന്നു വലിയ രക്ഷ കിട്ടാൻ പോകുന്നില്ലെന്നാണ്. ഭോത്തിയും സാരിയും 54 ഇഞ്ച്, 58 ഇഞ്ച്, 48 ഇഞ്ച്, 42 ഇഞ്ച് വരെ വീതിയിലാണ് നെയ്തേണ്ടത്. മലബാറിലെ കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ 57 ഇഞ്ച് മുതൽ 36 ഇഞ്ച് വരെ വീതിയുള്ള വസ്തുക്കൾ നെയ്യാവുന്നതാണ്. അധികം കോട്ടിങ്ങും കുട്ടിങ്ങും തുറച്ച മുതലായവയാണ് സാധാരണയായ നെയ്തുവരുന്നത്. അതിനാൽ മലബാറിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് കൈത്തറി നെയ്ത്തുകാർക്കു കരാശം സംഭവിച്ചു അവിടെത്തന്നെ പ്രസ്തുത വ്യവസായത്തെ രക്ഷപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നുള്ള അവിടെ ഉല്പാദിപ്പിക്കുന്ന ചരക്കുകൾക്കു അന്നത്തെ വിപണനയുണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനും, ചരക്കു കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ ഇടയുണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനും തക്കതായ നടപടികൾ എടുക്കുകയാണ്. അതിന്നു അവർ ഉല്പാദിപ്പിക്കുന്ന ചരക്കു ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ നിന്നു വാങ്ങണം. അതിനായി ഒരു Purchasing Board ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ നിന്നു ക്രമീകരിക്കണം. കൂടാതെ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായത്തിന്റെ പ്രതിനിധികൾക്കു അടങ്ങിയ പ്രതിനിധി സംഘങ്ങളെ വിവിധങ്ങളിലേക്കു കമ്പോളങ്ങൾ വിചലമായ തോതിൽ കണ്ടുപിടിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യണം. ഇങ്ങനെ കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ നെയ്തുകൊണ്ടു വരുന്ന വസ്തുക്കൾക്കു തക്കതായ കമ്പോളവും വിപണനവും ഉണ്ടാക്കിയാൽ മാത്രമേ മലബാറിലെ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായത്തിന്നു ഫലപ്രദമായ ഒരു ആശ്വാസം ലഭിക്കുകയുള്ളൂ. അതോടെ ആവശ്യമായ നൂൽ വേണ്ടതുപോലെ, മിതമായ വിലയ്ക്കു നെയ്ത്തുകാർ കിട്ടുവാൻ സാദ്ധ്യമാക്കേണ്ടതും അനുപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നതായ ആവശ്യമാകുന്നു."

"മലബാറിൽ നെയ്ത്തു വ്യവസായികൾ നടത്തുന്ന നെയ്ത്തുശാലകൾക്കു പുറമെ കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ നെയ്ത്തിൽ ഏല്പിച്ച ജീവിതം നയിക്കുന്ന മറ്റൊരു ജനവിഭാഗമുണ്ട്. പ്രധാനമായും തോൽമുണ്ടും മറ്റും നെയ്തുന്ന ജനവിഭാഗമാണ് അത്. അവരെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുടത്തോളവും ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ആശ്വാസനടപടികൾ എടുക്കണം. അവർ നെയ്തുകൊണ്ടു വരുന്ന ചരക്കുകൾക്കു ശരിയായ കമ്പോളമുണ്ടാവുകയും, അതിലുപരിയായി അവർ ആവശ്യമായ നൂൽ, മിതമായ വിലയ്ക്കു, അവർക്കുവശ്യമായ തരങ്ങളിൽപ്പെട്ടത്, കിട്ടുവാൻ മാറ്റമുണ്ടാവുകയും ചെയ്യണം. ഈ വിഷയങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടപ്പെട്ടവർ മതിയായ പരിചിന്തയും നല്ലേണമെന്നും കരുതുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു കാര്യം കഴിക്കുന്ന കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ നെയ്തു തൊഴിലാളികളുടേയും, കയ്യാളിക്കാൻ നെയ്തു വ്യവസായികളുടേയും അവശതകൾക്കു പരിഹാരം വരുത്തേണ്ടെന്നും അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുകയും പ്രമേയത്തെ ഞാൻ ശക്തിയായി അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു."

* **SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—**"అధ్యక్షా, చేనేతవారి సమస్యను గురించి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం వారు ప్రధానముగా చరచడం ఒక ముఖ్యమైనది. చేనేత వారికి ప్రజాపాలన వారి సమస్యను చాలా అన్యాయం జరుగుచున్నది. ఈ చేనేత

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [3rd November 1952]

మూలా చేనేతకర్మకు చాలా అనాదిసిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న పరిశ్రమ. బ్రిటిషువారు తొలగిపోయిన తరువాతనేనా ఈ పరిశ్రమకు కొంత ప్రోత్సాహ మియ్యబడుతుందని చేనేత పారిశ్రామికుల నీతిగతులు చాగుపడతాయని అనిచాము. కాని ఈ లోక నిరాశగో. అయింది. కాంగ్రెస్ వారి పరిపాలనలోనూడా చేనేతవారికి తగిన సమహాయాలు. కలుగజేయబడలేదు. చేనేతవారి పరిస్థితి నానాటికి దుర్భరమై పోతోంది. ఈ నాటికైనా ఈ ప్రభుత్వం మేల్కొని చేనేతవారికి కొన్ని సమహాయాలు చేయగో. తనా కేంద్రప్రభుత్వాన్ని అభ్యర్థించబూనడం, అందుకుగాను ఈ లిప్తానాన్ని యీ శాసన సభలో ప్రవేశ పెట్టదలవడం అభినందింపవలసి ఉన్నది.

“ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమలో చేనేతపరిస్థితి మరి దుర్భరంగా ఉన్నది. అసలే కరువు కాటకాలకు అలవాటైన రాయలసీమలో చేనేతవారికి జీవనభృతి సంపాదించు కొనుటకు అస్కారము లేకుండా ఉన్నది. ఒకవంక చాల్సినంత నూలు దొరికక, రెండవ ప్రక్క దొరికిన కొద్దిపాటి నూలుతోనైనా వారు తయారుచేసిన వస్త్రాలు అడ్డుడు పోక వారు ఎన్నోభాదలకు గురి అవుతున్నారు. నా నియోజకవర్గములో ఎందల కుటుంబాలకు జీవనోపాధి లేకుండా పోతుంది. నానాటికి హారు దిగజాల పోతున్నారు. తినుట కేమిలేక క్రమేణా చనిపోయిన సందర్భాలు కూడా ఎన్నో ఉన్నాయి అకలి చావులున్నాయని ప్రజాసంస్థలు, ప్రజా ప్రతినిధులు ఎంత మోర పెట్టుకున్నా ప్రభుత్వంవారు అలకించరు. అకలి చావులేవని, అంతా స్వకమంగానే ఉన్నదని వారు ఎక్కుమాటలుతూనేఉంటారు. నానాటికి చేనేతవారు ఇండ్లలోఉంటే చెంబు తప్పేలాకూడా అడ్డుకుంటున్నారు. ఈ పరిస్థితులను తగుపరచడం చూస్తేనా అవ సరం. అధమం కొన్ని రకములైన వస్త్రాలు, అనగా, వీరలు, పంచలు మొదలైన వాటిని, చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు ప్రత్యేకించవలెనని ప్రభుత్వం కోరడంకొంత మెరుగ్గా. కాని ఇంతమాత్రంతోనే సంతృప్తి చెందుటకులే చేనేతవారికి ఏమంత సహాయపడనట్లు కాదు. ప్రస్తుత పరిస్థితులలోకూడా, చేనేతవారు తయారుచేసేకొద్దిపాటి వస్త్రమైన సరిఅయిన ధృవలకు అడ్డుడుపోక ఎంతోగుడ్డ విడుదలకావడంలేదు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో చేనేతవారికి వీరలు, పంచలు నేయుట కేటాయింపులతోబాటు, ఈ వస్త్రాలను విదేశాలలో అమ్ముటకు తగిన సదుపాయాలూ కలుగజేయాలి. విదేశాలలో ఉన్నవందల ఓసంబడికలు చేసుకోవలసిఉన్నది. విదేశాలలో ఈ వస్త్రాలనాణ్యతగనించి ప్రచారంకూడాచేయించవలసియున్నది. ఈ విషయములగురించి ఈప్రభుత్వంవారు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియజేయాలి. నేడు చేనేతవారికి సంబంధించిన విషయములపై ప్రజాభిప్రాయము ఏవిధంగా ఉన్నదోగుర్తించాలి ప్రజాంధోళనను గమనించాలి. కేంద్రప్రభుత్వం ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి తల ఒగ్గేటట్లు చేయాలి. అవసరమయినట్లయితే కేంద్రప్రభుత్వంవారిపై ఒత్తిడితెచ్చుటకు ఈ ప్రభుత్వంవారు వెనుదీయకూడదు. ఈ విషయమే పార్టీ విభేదాల ససకే రావవసరంలేదు. చేనేత సహకార సంఘాలకు కూడా వస్త్రం విడుదలకానందువల్ల చాలానష్టం సంభవిస్తోంది. ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమాలోని స్టానేటీలు ఎంతో నష్టాన్ని భరించవలసివచ్చింది. ఈ నష్టాన్ని భరించలేక కొన్నికొన్ని సంఘాలు ఊనివేయవలసినపరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి. ఈ సంఘాలలోని సభ్యులకు చందాలు తెల్లించేకత్తికూడా ఉనాడులేదు. అందువల్లకూడా ఎన్నోస్టానేటీలు వాటంతట వేహనిపోతున్నాయి. ఈ విషయంలోకూడా ప్రభుత్వంవారు సహాయపడ వలసినదని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను.

“అంకేశాకుండా ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఉద్యోగించే వస్త్రాలను, అనగా ఆశుశ్రుతిల
లోను, ఇతర కార్యాలయాలలోనా వాడుకచేయు బట్ట వంతను చేసేత వస్త్రాంగా ఉండు
నట్లే చూడవలసినదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అంకేశాక తమస్వందిశికాదా చేసేత

3rd November 1952] [Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi]

పప్తా)ల్నే ధరించునట్లు సలహా ఇవ్వగోర్రాను. చేనేతవారిస్థితిని పరిశీలించినచో విషయంలో ఎవరికి ఎట్టి అభిప్రాయభేదాలులేవు కాబట్టి రాజీయ కారణముల ప్రసక్తి తీసుకొని గానుండా, ఆస్తి హర్షిలవాడు విక్రమభావంతో ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరచి, మేము చేసిన సవరణలను అంగీకరించవలసివదని కోరుతూ ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI P. JEEVANANDAM :— “ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தச் 3 p.m சனப முன்னால் இருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை தமிழ்நாடு கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர் சம்மேளனத்தின் தலைவர் என்ற தோரணையில் நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். அதை வரவேற்கும்போது இப்பொழுது முக்கியமானதெனக் கருதப்படும் இந்தக் கைத்தறிப் பிரச்சினையில் 5½ ஆண்டுகளாக சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்தாதிருந்து, இன்றைக்கு இந்த தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பது உண்மையிலேயே மகிழ்ச்சிக்கரையது என்பதைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். குறிப்பிடும்போதே, ஒரு நிலையான மார்க்கட் ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும் என்பது சர்க்காருடைய கருத்து. அந்த நிலையான மார்க்கட் கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலுக்கு ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டுமானால், வேஷ்டி, புடவை இவைகளை மில்லில் நெய்ய அனுமதிக்கக்கூடாது. அவைகளைக் கைத்தறியில் நெய்யவேண்டும் என்கிற ஒரு பிரேரணையை சர்க்கார் நம்முடைய முன்னால் வைத்திருக்கிறது.

“அதற்குப் பின்னால், இந்தக் காரியத்தை அமுல் நடத்துவதற்காக போதுமான நூல் கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளருக்கு மத்திய சர்க்கார் கொடுக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். மேலும், உள் நாட்டில் உற்பத்தியாகிய பஞ்சைத்தான் வாங்க வேண்டுமென்றும், அப்பொழுதுதான் விலை குறையும் என்றும் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இந்த யோசனை உடனடியாக அமுலுக்கு வரக்கூடியதா? மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தை நிர்வகிப்படுத்தி, மத்திய சர்க்கார் இணங்கி, கைத்தறியின் மூலமாக வேஷ்டி, சேலை இவைகளைச் செய்யவேண்டும், அதற்குப் பின்னால் இது ஈட்டேறும் என்கிறார்கள். அதற்கு எவ்வளவு நாளாகும்? அதோடு, இந்த உத்தேசம் இருக்கிறதே, கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு நிலையான மார்க்கெட்டை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டுமென்ற உத்தேசம், அதை நான் மார்வேற்கிறேன். நிலையான மார்க்கெட்டை ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும், 8 லக்ஷம் தறிகள் காப்பாற்றப்பட வேண்டும், 45 லக்ஷம் கைத்தறியாளர்கள் காப்பாற்றப்படவேண்டும், அவர்களுடைய இன்றைய நிலைமை துயரக் கதையாக இருக்கிறது என்று தொழில் மந்திரி சொன்னபோது, உண்மையாக நம்முடைய உள்ளங்களெல்லாம் உருகின. இம்மாதிரியான நிலைமையை மாற்றியமைக்கக்கூடிய முயற்சியில் இந்தக் கட்சியார் அந்தக் கட்சியார் என்று இல்லாமல் இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய 5½ கோடி, 6 கோடி மக்களும் இன்றைக்கு இதில் ஈடுபடக் கடைமப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதை நாம் ஒத்துக் கொள்ளும்போது உருவாகக் காரியம் நடைபெறுவதற்கு நம்முடைய சர்க்கார் சில யோசனைகளைக் கவனிக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் விரும்புகிறேன். அது தான் என்னுடைய திருத்தத்தின் நோக்கம்.

“முதலாவதாக, உள்நாட்டுப் பஞ்சை உபயோகப்படுத்தவேண்டும் என்று கூறினால் மட்டும் போதாது. இன்றைக்கு உள்நாட்டுப் பஞ்சின் விலை எப்படி இருக்கிறது? வெளிநாட்டுப் பஞ்சின் விலை எப்படி இருக்கிறது? 40-ம் நெம்பர் நூலை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால், உள்நாட்டுப் பஞ்சுக்கு ரூ. 26 விலை. வெளிநாட்டுப் பஞ்சுக்கு ரூ. 46 விலை. இதை மறக்கக் கூடாது. சர்க்கார் இந்த முக்கியமான திருத்தத்தை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதாவது எந்த ரகப் பஞ்சாயிருந்தாலும் 1947-வது வருஷத்தில் நூல் என்ன விலையில் இருந்ததோ அந்த விலைக்கு நூலைக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்று உடைய சர்க்கார் வற்புறுத்தப்பட வேண்டும். அதற்கு இந்தத் திருத்தம் மிக அவசியமென்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஆகையால், இந்தத் திருத்தம் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட வேண்டும்.

“எந்தவிதமான வேஷமையும் புடனவையும் மார்க்கெட்டுக்கு வந்தாலும் சாதாரண மக்கள் வாங்கத் தகுந்த நிலைமையில் இல்லை. அதன் விளைவு

[Sri P. Jeevanandam]

[3rd November 1952]

குறைய வேண்டும். குறைந்தால்தான் மக்கள் வாங்க முடியும். கைத்தறி நெசவுப் பிரச்சினை ஒரு மிகப் பெரிய பிரச்சினையாகும். 45 லட்சம் பேரைப் பொறுத்த பிரச்சினை மட்டுமல்ல. புடவையும் வேஷ்டியும் எல்லா மக்களுக்கும் தேவையான ஒரு பிரச்சினை. பொதுமக்கள் இன்றைய தினம் வாங்கும் சக்தியை இழந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படியிருக்குமபோது, மார்க்கெட்டில் மில் துணிகளும் அந்நிய நாட்டுத் துணிகளும் இதைவிடக் குறைந்த விலையில் இன்றையதினம் கிடைக்கும்போது, கைத்தறித் துணிகளின் விலை அவைகளின் விலையை விட அதிகம் உயர்ந்திருக்கும்போது, அதை வாங்குவதற்கு யாரிடம் வாங்கும் சக்தி இருக்கிறது? அதிக விலை கொடுத்து கைத்தறித் துணிகளை வாங்குவார்கள் என்று எண்ணுவது யதார்த்தத்தை, நடைமுறை உண்மையை விட்டுவிடுவதாகுமென்று அஞ்சுகிறேன். ஆகவே, 1947-வது வருஷ விலைக்கு நூல் விலையைக் குறைக்க வேண்டும்.

“இன்றைக்கு இருக்கும்படியான நிலை என்ன? 10, 12 கோடி ரூபாய் பெறுமானமுள்ள கைத்தறித்துணி வாங்குவாரில்லாமல் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. சொசைடியில் 2 கோடி ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் பெறுமான துணி தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. தனிப்பட்ட முதலாளிகள் கம்பெனிகளிடம் 10, 12 கோடி ரூபாய் பெறுமானமுள்ள துணி தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. இதை யெல்லாம் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டு பார்த்தால், இந்தத் துணிக்கு செலாவணி எப்படி இருக்குமென்று கவனிக்க வேண்டும். அதற்கு வழி காண வேண்டும். சர்க்கார் அந்தப் பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். சர்க்கார் கைத்தறித்துணி முழுவதையும் வாங்கி, குறைந்த விலைக்கு விற்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் தேங்கி இருக்கும் சர்க்கு விற்பனையாகும். மேற்கொண்டு இதொழிலுக்கு ஊக்கம் ஏற்படும் என்பதை நான் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“இரண்டு மூன்று நாட்களாகப் பத்திரிகையில் படிக்கிறேன். ஸ்ரீவில்லி புத்தூரிலிருந்து கை நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களைச் சேர்ந்த 100 பேர் கொண்ட ஒரு ஜதா சென்னையை நோக்கி வந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறது. ஸ்ரீவில்லிபுத்தூர் தமிழ் நாட்டில் கைத்தறித் தொழில் நடக்கும் ஒரு பெரிய கேந்திர ஸ்தானமாகும். அங்கு உற்பத்தியாகும் துணி, காடா, மல், மட்டராக வேஷ்டி, மட்டராக புடவை இவைகளையெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் வாங்கி, குறைந்த விலையில் விற்க ஏற்பாடு செய்தால், அந்தத் தொழிலுக்கு மிகவும் உபயோகமாக இருக்கும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக, கைத்தறிக்கு ‘ஸ்டேபிள் மார்க்கெட்டை’ உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டும் என்பதாகும். உள் நாட்டு மார்க்கெட் என்றும் வெளி நாட்டு மார்க்கெட் என்றும் இரண்டு விதமான மார்க்கெட்டுகள் உண்டு. கடந்த 5½ ஆண்டுகாங்கிரஸ் ஆட்சியில் கைத்தறித் துணியின் வெளிநாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டுகளுக்கு தான் போட்டு விட்டார்கள். ஜப்பான் துணி, அமெரிக்கா துணி, பிரிட்டிஷ் துணிகளைவிட, மலையாளத்தில் நெய்யப்படும் கைத்தறித் துணிகள் வெளிநாட்டில் இன்றும் வரவேற்கத்தக்கதாக இருக்கிற தென்று தொழில் மந்திரி எடுத்துக் காட்டினார். மலையா, பர்மா, சிலோன், மத்தியக் கிழக்கு ஆசிய நாடுகள், தென்னாப்பிரிக்கா இன்றைக்கும் நம்முடைய கைத்தறித் துணியை வாங்கத் தகுந்த நிலைமையில் நம் துணி இருக்கிறதென்று நான் வலியுறுத்த விரும்புகிறேன். வெளி நாடுகளில் இந்தத் துணிக்கு நிலையான மார்க்கெட் இருக்கும்படி செய்ய மத்ய சர்க்காரை நாம் நிர்ப்பந்தப்படுத்தவேண்டும். மத்திய சர்க்கார் பண்ட மாற்று முறையில் நம் ராஜ்யத்தில் உற்பத்தியாகும் துணியை வெளிநாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டில் விற்கக்கூடிய செளகரியத்தைச் செய்து கொடுத்தால், துணி நிறைய விற்பனையாக முடியுமென்று உங்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்பட வேண்டுமென்றால், இன்றைய நிலை மாற வேண்டும். மத்திய சர்க்காரும் இராஜ்ய சர்க்காரும் சண்டை போட்டுக் கொண்டிருந்தால், இந்தப் பிரச்சினைக்கு ஒரு நிலையான பரிகாரத்தைக் காணமுடியாது. இன்றைக்கு இருப்பது அப்படியிருக்கிறது. இதே மாதிரி குழந்தைநிலையில் இருந்தால் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்க முடியாது. இதற்குத் தக்க முறைகளை கைக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். நம் நாட்டில் இந்தத் தொழில் நசிந்து வருவது காப்பாற்றப்படவேண்டும்.

3rd November 1952]

[Sri P. Jeevanandam]

“ரயான் திட்டத்தை அங்கீகரித்திருக்கிறது ராஜ்ய சர்க்கார். அந்த திட்டப் படி மான்யம் கொடுத்து எல்லா தறிகளையும் சொஸைடிகளின் கீழ் சர்க்கார் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறதா? ஒரு லட்சத்து சொச்சம் தறிகளுள்ள சேலம் ஜில்லாவில் 1,700 தறிகள் சொஸைட்டிகளில் அனுமதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. திருநெல்வேலி ஜில்லாவில் சுமார் 40,000 தறிகள் இருக்கின்றன. அவற்றில் 1,000 தறிகளை அனுமதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. இப்படித் தான் எல்லா ஜில்லாக்களிலும் அனுமதித்த தறிகளைக் கூட ‘நீங்கள் முன் பணம் போடுங்கள், பின்னால் நாங்கள் தருகிறோம்’ என்று சொல்லும்படியான நிலையில் சர்க்கார் இருந்தால், இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்க முடியுமா என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய எல்லா தறிகளையும் ரயான் திட்டப்படி சொஸைடிகளில் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும். கைத்தறிச் சரக்கை வாங்குவதும் அந்தச் சரக்கை விற்பதும் கூட்டுறவு சொஸைட்டிகளின் மூலம் நடைபெற ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். அதற்கு சர்க்கார் மான்யம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் உள்நாட்டில் நிலையான மார்க்கெட்டைக் கொண்டுவர முடியும்.

“மத்திய சர்க்காரிடத்தில் கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளருக்காக நாம் 3-10 ப.ம. போராடுகிறோம். அப்படிப் போராடுகிற மாகாண சர்க்கார், தம்மால் முடிந்ததை கைத்தறிக்குச் செய்துவிட வேண்டுமல்லவா? ராஜ்ய சர்க்கார் கைத்தறித் துணிக்குப் போட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய விற்பனை வரியை ரத்து செய்ய வேண்டும். மில் துணிக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய வரியை விட கைத்தறித் துணிக்கு போட்டிருக்கும்படியான விற்பனை வரி அதிகம். மில் நூல் கைத்தறித் துணியாகி, மக்களிடையே விநியோகம் செய்யப்படுவதற்குள் நான்கு நான்கு கட்டங்களில் (ஸ்டேஜ்களில்) பல இடத்தில் விற்பனை வரி விதிக்கப்படுகிறது. இதை உடனடியாக ரத்து செய்ய வேண்டும் மாகாண சர்க்கார்.

“நீண்ட கால திட்டம், குறுகிய கால திட்டம் மூலம் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்க வேண்டுமென்று தொழில் மந்திரி கூறினார். பஞ்சத் தால் எல்லோரையும் விட அதிகமாக பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிற கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர் ஊர் ஊராகக் குடி பெயர்ந்து ஓடுகிறார்கள். பங்களுக்கும் மைசூருக்கும் ஓடுகிறார்கள். பஞ்சத்தினின்றும் பிழைக்க தங்கப்பத்திரா அணைக்கட்டுக்கு ஓடுகிறார்கள். உலகப் பிரசித்திபெற்ற பட்டுத் துணிக்குப் பேர்போன காஞ்சிபுரத்தில் வேலை கிடைக்காமல், வேலை தேடிச் சென்ற இரண்டு வத்திப்போன தொழிலாளிகளை விழுப்புரத்தில் சந்தித்தேன். என்னைப் பார்த்து அழுது கொண்டே, இந்தப் பக்கத்தில் கிராமத்தில் வேலை இருக்கிறதென்றதனால் போகிறோம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டே சென்றார்கள். சேலத்திலிருந்து எத்தனையோ நெசவாளி குடும்பங்கள், ஆண்கள், பெண்கள், குழந்தை குட்டிகளுடன், விழுப்புரத்தின் வழியாக தஞ்சாவூருக்குப் போய் நிலத்தில் கூலி வேலை செய்தாவது பிழைக்கலாம் என்று ஓடுகிறார்கள். வடித்த கஞ்சித் தண்ணீராவது கிடைத்தால் போது மென்று தெருத் தெருவாக கையேந்தித் திரிகிறார்கள். சேலத்திலுள்ள ஒரு நெசவாளிக் குடும்பம் 5 மாதக் குழந்தையை 2 ரூபாய்க்கு திருப் பத்தூரில் சமீபத்தில் விற்ப்புக்கு வந்தது. நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுவதும் இப்படியிருக்கிறது. இந்தத் தொழிலாளிகளை ஊரை விட்டு ஓடாமல் தடுத்து நிறுத்த வேண்டும். அவர்கள் அந்தந்த ஊரிலேயே இருக்கும்படிச் செய்ய வேண்டும். பிச்சை எடுக்கும் நிலை ஏற்படாமல் அவர்களுக்கு ஆங்காங்கே கஞ்சித் தொட்டிகள் ஏற்படுத்தி, கஞ்சி வார்க்கப்பட வேண்டும். சர்க்கார் மான்யம் கொடுத்து அவர்களை சொஸைடிகளுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட வேண்டும். சொஸைடியில் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கக்கூடிய துணியை உடனே சர்க்கார் வாங்கிக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். கைத்தறி நெசவாளிகளின் கஷ்டங்களை போக்கி அவர்களுக்கு நிவாரணம் அளிக்க மாகாண சர்க்காரும் மத்திய சர்க்காரும் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. உள்நாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டிலும், வெளி நாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டிலும் நம்முடைய கைத்தறித் துணியை விற்கமுடியும். கைத்தறித் துணியை ஆதரிப்பதற்காகவே நாங்கள் இருக்கிறோம், குடிசைத் தொழில்களை அபிவிருத்தி செய்வதற்காகவே நாங்கள் இருக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லக் கூடிய தேசிய பரம்பரையில், மகாத்மா காந்தி அவர்களுடைய பரம்பரையில் வந்திருக்கிறோம், என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்பவர்கள் அதிகாரம்

[Sri P. Jeevanandam] [3rd November 1952]

கைக்கு வந்த பிறகும், கைத்தறி அழிவதைக் கண்டும் இன்று அன்னிய துணிக்குத் தடை விதிக்கவில்லை. சுதந்திரம் கிடைத்து நாங்கள் பதவிக்கு வந்தால் அன்னிய நாட்டுத் துணியை பிடிக்கிறீப்போம் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டிருந்தவர்கள் இன்று அதிகாரம் கைக்கு வந்தும் அதை நிறைவேற்றவில்லை. இன்று உள் நாட்டில் நம்முடைய கைத்தறித் துணி மார்க்கெட் அந்நியத் துணி இறக்குமதியால் அழிந்திருப்பது நினைவில் இருக்குமேயானால், சென்ட்ரல் கவர்ன்மென்டைக் கொண்டு அன்னிய நாட்டுத் துணிகளுக்குத் தடை விதிக்கும்படிச் செய்யவேண்டும். உண்மையிலேயே இந்தக் கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு இன்றைய நிலைமையில் புத்துயிர் அளிக்க விரும்பினால் உடனடியாக அன்னியத் துணிக்குத் தடை விதிக்க வேண்டியது அவசியமாகும்.

“அன்னிய ஜவுளிக்குத் தடை, 1947-ல் இருந்த விலக்கு நூல் விலையைக் குறைப்பது, வெளிநாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டுகளில் நம் கைத்தறித் துணிக்கு பண்டமாற்று முறையில் விற்பனை ஏற்படும்படிச் செய்வது, இவைகளையெல்லாம் செய்யும்படி சென்ட்ரல் கவர்ன்மென்டை நிர்ப்பந்தப் படுத்தவேண்டும். இந்த முயற்சியில் எல்லோரும் ஒன்று சேரவேண்டும்.

“இன்று நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலையில், இந்தத் திருத்தங்களை அவசியம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு, தொழில் மந்திரி கொண்டு வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய தீர்மானத்தை மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கு அனுப்பி, 45 லக்ஷம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கும், 8 லக்ஷம் தறிகளுக்கு வேலை கிடைப்பதற்கும் வேண்டிய முயற்சிகளைச் எடுத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை அணுகும்போது, யதார்த்த நிலையை முன்னால் வைத்து, நாட்டில் இருக்கும் பிரத்யட்ச நிலையைக் கவனித்து, தொழிலாளிகளுடைய நிலையையும், தறி முதலாளிகள், கம்பெனி முதலாளிகள். சொஸைடி, உள் நாட்டு மார்க்கெட், வெளி நாட்டு மார்க்கெட், மாகாண சர்க்கார் கடமை, மத்திய சர்க்கார் கடமை இவ்வளவையும் கவனித்து, நம்முடைய சர்க்கார் தான் செய்யக்கூடிய காரியங்களைச் செய்து, மத்திய சர்க்காரை எல்லோருடைய ஒத்துழைப்போடும் நிர்ப்பந்தப்படுத்தினால் இதைச் சாதிக்க முடியும். இந்தத் தீர்மானம் நடைமுறையில் 45 லக்ஷம் பேர்களுக்கும் நன்மையளிக்கக் கூடியதாக இருக்கும். இந்தத் திருத்தத்தையும் அங்கீகரிக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தோடு தீர்மானத்தை வரவேற்கிறேன்.”

* SRI T. ANANTHA PAI :—“Mr Speaker, Sir, we are very happy that the Hon. Minister for Industries has given us an opportunity for discussing this important subject on the floor of the House. As a matter of fact, as things stand, I did not think that a discussion over this subject would be necessary at all. When the Hon. the Chief Minister made a suggestion to the Central Government that, in the interests of the handloom industry, dhoties and coloured sarees should be left as an exclusive monopoly of the handlooms, we took it for granted that that suggestion would be accepted. It was not expected that there would be so much ideological conflict over that issue. The people on the whole welcomed the idea because they thought that ‘here was a long awaited solution to the problem which has been confronting us as seriously as the famine, as the Hon. Minister put it correctly.’ Many suggestions have been given to improve matters, namely, that the Government should meet all their requirements by purchasing the handloom cloth that has been accumulating, that the Government should subsidize this industry by trying to give them cheaper yarn and that the Government should find out markets for them, etc. But I do not think that these suggestions offer a permanent solution to the problem.

[3rd November 1952] [Sri T. Anantha Pai]

“If we look at the opposition to this suggestion, it has come mostly from people who hold that the handloom industry has no future place in this country. It comes from people who believe that handlooms do not deserve to exist and they should be replaced by the mill industry very soon. As a matter of fact this problem of the handloom industry has not been felt so severely during the war years when the demand for cloth was very high and when the mill industry could not meet it. Now that the war is over and that the mills are able to produce enough cloth, it can be easily said, ‘why should anybody produce handloom cloth, at all?’ This handloom industry should be replaced by some other suitable cottage industries which will employ all the people who are engaged in it at present.’ But, I am afraid, it is not possible to do it. More than any other industry, the handloom industry has been engaging lakhs and lakhs of people all over the States in the country, particularly in South India. ‘That overnight the handloom industry could be replaced by some other cottage industry’, I think, is merely a dream. It is necessary for us to understand that in a big country like ours, handloom industry could be complementary to the mill industry. We know that, among the Indian industries, the textile industry is, perhaps, one of the largest and best organized, mostly with Indian capital, engaging Indian labour and all the profits going to the Indian share-holders. Naturally the textile industry has looked to the Government for giving protection against foreign competition. We cannot also afford to neglect the interests of this industry. But at the same time we have to take into consideration the fact that it cannot replace handloom industry altogether except at a great danger to all the people of this country. For one thing, handloom industry has been one of the valuable industries organized on a cottage basis in this country. There are also looms driven by electrical power organized on a small scale in this country and I hope that in course of time most of the handlooms would switch on to the use of electricity so that the efficiency of production could be increased. As has been made clear, one out of every ten families in this State is depending for its livelihood on this handloom industry and it is not possible to neglect it. I think it becomes a patriotic duty of every person in this country to see that this industry is sustained, and is given all the encouragement and kept going.

“For one thing, the main objection to handloom cloth has been that if a certain monopoly is created, if only handlooms are allowed to manufacture dhoties and sarees, it may be that the common people, the poor people, would be deprived of the use of the mill cloth which would have been cheaper. Recently, the President of the Indian Merchants’ Chamber has given expression to a feeling similar to this. But then the Indian mill-owners made an appeal to the Government all these years for protection because they did not want cheaper cloth to come from abroad. If the consumers’ interests mattered most, there was no question of protection and cheaper cloth should have been allowed to be imported and allowed to compete with the products of Indian mill industry.

[Sri T. Anantha Pai] [3rd November 1952]

But the Indian mill industry was given protection and the consumers' interests were not taken care of, though that should have mattered very much and that this instead the consideration that weighed with the Government was an industry built with Indian capital—and it deserved to be built up—because it engaged thousands of people as labourers. Similar arguments could be applied easily so far as the handloom industry was concerned.

“Sir, to-day the time has come when some definite demarcation has got to be made between the sphere of activities of the mill industry and the handloom industry. They have to work complementary to each other. And even highly industrialized countries like Japan, we are told, are trying to meet the local requirements with handloom cloth, reserving all the mill cloth for export. No country, however highly industrialised, has neglected its handloom industry. It may be they have improved upon it; it may be that the quality of the stuff made by their handlooms is far superior than what the mills are producing. In the circumstances, I think, it is but proper that every protection has to be given to the handloom industry by accepting the suggestion that has been made, namely, that sarees and dhoties should be exclusively reserved to the handloom industry. The result may be that the people may have to pay a little higher price for the dhoties and sarees manufactured even by handlooms. But even granting that each family may be called upon to pay Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 extra every year, when you take into consideration lakhs and lakhs of people who are kept going as a result of this, I think the results achieved would be really worth this attempt.

“Recently, the Central Government have proposed to constitute a Handloom Board. A suggestion has also been made that a cess may be levied on all the mill cloth at some rate. It is estimated that they may be able to collect six crores of rupees by this and that the money could be utilized for the development of the handloom industry. But, I think, this may not keep the handloom industry much. This may not be necessary at all, because if monopoly in the manufacture of dhoties and sarees is assured, I think the handloom industry must be able to stand on its own feet.

“Of course, there is also the other consideration. The handlooms will not be able to function without an adequate supply of yarn from the mills and there again it is the responsibility of the Government to see that this is ensured because unless there is a continuous and good supply of yarn, controls may have to come again to see that the handlooms are provided with sufficient quantities of yarn. To-day because the handlooms have to depend on the supply of yarn made out of foreign cotton, they have to pay a much higher rate than for Indian cotton yarn. So, with the increased prices of yarn they are not able to manufacture cloth which would be able to compete with the mill industry. As it is, the handloom industry is handicapped on account of all these various factors. If at all we are interested in seeing that this cottage industry is kept going, and it continues to feed lakhs and lakhs of people not only

[3rd November 1952] [Sri T. Anantha Pai]

in this State but all over the country, I feel the mill industry may have to make some little sacrifice and agree to the manufacture of everything else except bordered dhoties and coloured sarees which could be left to the handloom industry. I do not agree that it must be for a specified period of one year or five years, because if at any stage the Government feel that the step taken is not good, it should be open to the Government to go back upon it. It is necessary to impress upon the Central Government that the development and maintenance of the handloom industry by rendering to it this help is imperative and that this State is very much concerned with it.”

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട സഭയിൽ 3-30 p.m. കാര്യത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്ന പ്രമേയത്തെ പൊതുവിൽ ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിൽ ഇനിയും പല സ്വതന്ത്രതകളും ഉൾക്കൊള്ളിക്കേണ്ടതു അത്യാവശ്യമാണെന്നു രേണു കയറാമെന്നു ഞാൻ രണ്ടു ദേശാതികൾ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തിനവതരിപ്പിച്ചു. ഈ ദേശാതികൾ സഭമുമ്പാകെ ഞാൻ വെക്കുകയും ആയത് പ്രശ്നത്തിന്റെ ഗൗരവം കാണുവാൻ മനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി സഭയിൽക്കൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

“നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിലുള്ള ടെക്സ്റ്റയിൽ മില്ലുകൾക്ക് ലോകത്തിൽ മുന്നും സ്ഥാനമാണുള്ളത്. എന്നിട്ടും തുണിയുടെ ക്ഷാമം നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിലുണ്ട്. ഈ മില്ലുകൾ അടിച്ചുപിടിച്ചെടുത്താണ് ഞാൻ എതിരല്ല, അനുകൂലംകൂടിയാണ്. പക്ഷെ ലക്ഷക്കോപലക്കം ജനങ്ങളുടെ ജീവിതമാർഗ്ഗമായ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായത്തിന് പ്രത്യേക രക്ഷ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് നൽകണം എന്നു മാത്രമേ ഞാൻ പറയുന്നുള്ളൂ. കൈത്തറിക്ക് ഇന്നും നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്ത് ഒരു സ്ഥാനമുണ്ട്. കരയുള്ള സാരിയും ഭോഷയും കൈത്തറിക്ക് നീക്കി വെക്കണമെന്ന അഭിപ്രായത്തോട് പണ്ഡിറ്റ് ജവഹർലാൽ പോലും പരിപൂർണ്ണമായി യോജിക്കാത്തതിലൂടെ ഈ പ്രമേയമിവിടെ പാസ്സായാൽ തന്നെ അതു നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തിക്കൊടുക്കാൻ വലിയ പരിശ്രമം ആവശ്യമാണ്. ഈ പ്രമേയം ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നാൽ പ്രശ്നങ്ങൾ അവസാനിച്ചുവെന്നു സംസ്ഥാന ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കരുതുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ഈ പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതായിരിക്കും നല്ലത്. ഈ വൈകിയ അംഗീകാരത്തിലൂടെ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഈ കൈത്തറി പ്രശ്നത്തിന്റെ ഗൗരവം മനസ്സിലാക്കിയതു നല്ലതന്നെ. ഒരു പ്രമേയമിവിടെ പാസ്സാക്കി എല്ലാ കുറുപ്പുകളും കേന്ദ്ര ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽ ചുമത്തി കൈത്തറിക്കുതക്ക ഉപകരണങ്ങൾക്ക് ഒരു പരിഹാരവുമുണ്ടാകാതെ ഈ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഇതുവരെ ചെയ്യുന്നതുപോലെ കയ്യുകെട്ടി ഇരിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിന്റെ ഫലം ഭയാനകമായിരിക്കുമെന്നു ഞാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ കാൽപ്പെടുത്തുന്നു.

“ഗവണ്മെന്റ് പക്ഷത്തുള്ള ചില പ്രാസംഗികങ്ങൾ തന്നെ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി തൊഴിലില്ലായ്മയായ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികളെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള പട്ടിണിമരണങ്ങൾ സംഭവിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു. നമ്മുടെ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രി പറഞ്ഞു നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികളെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള അമ്മമാർ കുട്ടികളെ വില്ക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങിയെന്നു. ഇതിൽപരം ഈ രാജ്യത്ത് ഇനിയും സംഭവിക്കാൻ എന്താണ് ബാക്കിയുള്ളത്.

“മലബാറിലെ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ കഥയെന്നു എടുത്തു നോക്കിയാൽ മതി. അവിടുത്തെ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ ദയനീയനിലയെക്കുറിച്ചു—വ്യവസ്ഥയെക്കുറിച്ചു തെളിയിക്കുകയും കണ്ടുണ്ടു തവണ ഞാൻ ഈ അസംബ്ലി മുമ്പാകെത്തന്നെ സംസാരിക്കുക ഉണ്ടായി. പക്ഷെ നമ്മുടെ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന് പ്രശ്നങ്ങളുടെ ഗൗരവം കാണുവാനുള്ള ഒരു മറുപടിയില്ല. ഇന്നും മലബാറിലെ തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഈ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ കീഴിൽ അനുഭവിക്കുന്ന നരകയമനകൾ കണ്ടുകൂടി ഈ സഭമുമ്പാകെ വെക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നു. എത്രയോ തൊഴിലാളികൾ നാടുവിട്ടു കഴിഞ്ഞു. എത്രയോ തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഭിക്ഷയെടുക്കുന്നവരായി മാറി. എത്രയോ തൊഴിലാളികൾ പട്ടിണി കിടന്നു. തൊഴിലാളികൾ സംബന്ധം ആകെ നശിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞു, രാജ്യം ചാനലായിത്തീർന്നു. ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കൊണ്ടുവന്ന രായൻ പദ്ധതി മലബാറിലെ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികളെ ഒരു വിധത്തിലും സഹായിക്കുകയില്ലെന്ന് ഗവണ്മെന്റിനറിയില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്ന പദ്ധതിയും മലബാറിലെ തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് മുമ്പാകെ യാതൊരു ഫലവും ഇല്ലെന്നില്ല. കാരണം മലബാറിൽ ഉണ്ടാക്കിവന്ന കൈത്തറിക്കുതക്ക പ്രകൃതി

[3rd November 1952]

[illegible]

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ Sir, I rise to congratulate the Minister for Industries on having brought this resolution at a

3rd November 1952] [Sri S. Deivasigamany]

“ I come from Kancheepuram. The population of Kancheepuram comprises more of handloom weavers than others. I can say without fear of contradiction that about 90 per cent of the people there are engaged in the handloom industry. If one goes along the streets of Kancheepuram, he will find haggard faces, sunken cheeks and more or less empty bellies. The handloom weavers are practically starving. As a result of starvation, they fall an easy prey to fever, scabies and leprosy and other diseases. We have been trying to find out how best we can help them. Some time ago the Government said that they would help them by providing them with work and thereby enabling them to earn at least one rupee or so per day. That scheme did not work properly and it was not a success. Now the Hon. Minister for Industries has come forward with this resolution. I am sure the implementing of this resolution will give a lot of help to the handloom weavers. I do not know what the response of the Centre will be to this resolution. Much depends on the attitude that the Centre may take. In many respects we are subservient to the Centre and it is a great drawback. I am glad that the Hon. Chief Minister is now alive to this fact and is trying to bring round the Centre and impress upon them that they cannot ride rough-shod over us in many of these matters. I only wish that the Centre will see the justice of this demand and render us all the necessary help. I am glad to support this resolution which has been so ably moved and explained by the Hon. Minister for Industries.”

*SRI S. NARAYANAPPA:—“చేనేత పరిశ్రమనుగురించి ఇప్పటికి ఆసక్తి మొదలై పర్వత జరుగునా. తీర్మానాలుచేస్తూ ప్రభుత్వానికి విజ్ఞప్తులు పంపుతూ చేనేతపారిశ్రామికులు విసుగుపెరిచియున్నారు ఇప్పటికికూడా చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు ఒక పాటకూడా తిండిలేక నాలుగుగోజుల గూడా సురక్షితంగా జీవించటానికి ఏలలేకుండా ఉన్నారు. యీ పరిశ్రమనుగురించి ఎన్నో పార్లు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి నోటాలు పంపుకున్నారు. అందులో ముఖ్యంగా నూలుసరఫరా మిల్లు యజమానులనుండి పథకరద్దాలను తప్పించి స్థానిక సహకారసంఘాలద్వారా చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు అందేటట్లుగా చేయవలయును. ప్రత్యేక చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు కావలసిన రంగులు పొకధరలకు అదనంగా యిప్పించుటకు విన్నపాలు స్వీకరణగా కలిగించాలి. ఇంకను ఇతరదేశాలనుండి హెచ్చుధరలుపెట్టి దిగుమతిచేసి తయారుచేయబడిన నూలుకు హెచ్చుధరపడుతున్నది. ఈ అధికధర పొవలయునన్న యీదేశంలోపండి ప్రత్తిద్వారా నూలును తయారుచేయించి పంపకానికి ఆమలుజరుగవలయును. అప్పుడు నూలుధరలు క్రమముగాతగ్గును. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం రంగు మీరలను అందుబోవకులను చేనేత కారికి ప్రత్యేకించి, మిల్లుల పోటీనుండి కొంతవరకు యీ పరిశ్రమను రక్షించడానికి యీ శాసనసభలో ప్రత్యేకంగా యీ తీర్మానమును తీసుకొనివచ్చినందుకు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అభినందించుచున్నాను. చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు రాష్ట్రంలో కాలా ఆతురతతో ప్రభుత్వం వారిపై యేదో సహాయం జరుగుతుందని ఉత్సాహంతో వేచియున్నారు. మిల్లు యజమానులను ప్రభుత్వాలు ప్రోత్సహించి చేయటకు పనిలేక కాపకపడుచున్న చేనేత వారిని నిర్లక్ష్యము చేయబడినారను అభివృద్ధియనున ప్రజలతో తొలగించుటకు

[Sri S. Narayanappa]

[3rd November 1952]

వంటనే రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం తన కార్యాయములకు చేనేత గడ్డల సరఫరా అయ్యే టక్కు విరామము చేయవలసియగును. చేనేతవారివద్ద ఎక్కువగా నిల్వలున్న చేనేత గుడ్డలు విడుదలయ్యే మార్గాలు కల్పించవలయును. చేనేత మిల్లు పోటీచే అనుభవించుచున్న కష్టములను, వాటిని నివారించి, చేనేత పరిశ్రమను రక్షించవలయునని యిటీవలనే రాయల సీమలో పర్యటించిన భారత ప్రధాని పండిట్ నెహ్రుగారికి ఆనంతపురం జిల్లా చేనేత పరమున విజ్ఞప్తి చేసినాము. చేనేతగడ్డలు విడుదలకు విదేశాలలో మార్కెట్టు సంపాదించకోరబడినది. ప్రస్తుతం భారత ప్రభుత్వంవారు మిల్లు బట్టలపై సుంకము విధించి తద్వారా లభ్యమయ్యే ధనముతో చేనేతవారికి సహాయము చేయ తలపెట్టిన ఈ చర్యను అభినందించుచున్నాను. నూలు సరఫరా విషయములో చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నది. అట్టి అన్యాయము జరుగకుండా ప్రభుత్వంవారు తగు చర్యలు తీసుకొని నూలు పంపిణీ విధానములో మార్పులు తీసుకొనివచ్చి సహాయము చేయ మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. తర్వాత యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానాన్నిబట్టి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు సహాయము శాశ్వతముగా జరుగుతుందని నాకు నమ్మకము విశ్వాసము లున్నది. ఈ చేనేతవారికి ఆధునిక పరికరములు యిప్పించే సహాయము చేసి, మార్కెట్టులో సరఫరా ధరలు విర్రవంజుట చేయవలయును. నూలు ధరల తగ్గించాలి. చేనేతవారికి నేల పొడుగున పని కల్పించుటకు కావలసినంత నూలు సరఫరా చేయించాలి. శాశ్వత రక్షణ నిమిత్తం నిపుణులతో మాడిన ఒక సంఘాన్ని నియమించి చేనేతవారికి నూలు సరఫరా సక్రమంగా పంపిణీ అయ్యేటట్లు చేయించి, యీ పారిశ్రామికములకు జీవనము సాఫీగా జరిగేటట్లు ప్రభుత్వంవారు విరామము చేయించాలి. అంతేకాని మనము తీర్మానం చేసి అంతటితో పూరకుండిన చేనేతవారి కష్టములు తొలగవు. ఈ తీర్మానానుసారము కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వముతో సంబంధించి తీవ్రమైన కృషి పల్పి, తీర్మానము అమలులోనికి తీసుకురావచ్చే కృషి చేసేగాని, చేనేతవారి ఆకలి బాధ, పనిలేని తనకు తీరవు. మిల్లు యజమానులు యీనాడు చేయచున్న మాయా పాయమువల్ల లక్షలాది చేనేత కుటుంబములు అన్న మా రామవంద్రాయుని ఆందోళన పడుచు, ఆవేదన పడుతున్నారు. మాటికి నూడే కర్రపై చాతపడు చేనేతవారి పొట్టలు మాడ్చి, మిల్లు యజమానులు సంపాదించుచున్న లాభాలను తగ్గించి, చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు లక్షలకొద్దల పడ్డతూలు అమలుపరచి, చేనేతవారిని వారి అడుగంటుచున్న పరిశ్రమను నిలబడవలయునని కోరుచున్నాను. పొట్టుకు గుడ్డకు అపవధపడేటటువంటి యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల ఆందోళన దేశంలో అమితముగా విర్రవీయున్నది. దేశములో యీనాడు యీ సమస్య దేశ సమస్యగా అందరు గుర్తించగలిగినారంటే నిజంగా ప్రజానాయకులు చేనేత సంఘాలు, కాంగ్రెసు సంఘాలు చేసిన కృషియని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ప్రజాపరిచాలన రాష్ట్రములో జరుగుచున్నది. ఎన్నో సంవత్సరాలుగా యీ విషయంలో చేసినటువంటి కృషి ప్రయత్నాలువల్ల యీనాడు శాసన సభలో చేనేతవారి రక్షణకోసం resolution తీర్మానరూపంలో తెచ్చి యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు సహాయము చేసి వారి జీవనము సక్రమ పడతులలో జరిగేటట్లుగా ప్రయత్నం చేసి, వారికి జీవన శృతి కలుగచేసే ప్రయత్నం రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం యీనాడు తలపెట్టినందుకు మిక్కిలి అభినందించుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యముగా శ్రీ కాజాజీగారి ప్రయత్నం పొగడదగియున్నది. కాజాజీ కృషి ఫలితంగా చేనేతవారు, యింకానుండయిన ముఖ్యజీవనము గడుపుగలరని నా విశ్వాసము. అదియనుకూల రాష్ట్ర కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాలు తీవ్రమైన కృషి చేసి యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమను కడకు ఆరు మాసములలోపల రక్షించే పద్ధతి అమలులోనికి తెచ్చి, చేనేతవారిని యీ దుస్థితి నుండి తొలగించి రిండికి, బట్టుకు కరువులేకుండా చేతనిండే పని కల్పించుమరని ఆరించుచున్నాను."

[3rd November 1952]

SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ప్రస్తుతము చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములు 3-50 p.m. ఎదుర్కొనుచున్నటువంటి చిక్కులు సంభవించడం ఇదే మొదటిసారి కాదు. భారత దేశంలో వివిధ ప్రాంతాలలో చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములు ఈలాంటి చిక్కులను పడేపడే ఎదుర్కొనుచుండుటవల్లన, మన దేశమున బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యముపోయిన తరువాత ఈ చేనేతపారిశ్రామికములు ఆనేక చిక్కులను ఎదుర్కొనడంవల్లన, ఆనేక సభలలోనూ, అనేక సమావేశాలలోనూ మన శాసన సభలోనూ, పార్లమెంటులోనూ కూడ ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల సమస్య ఒక ప్రధానమైనటువంటి సమస్యగా పరిగణించబడుచు భారతదేశము ముందుకు, ప్రజల ముందుకు వస్తున్నది. ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కారము చేయడం గురించి మనము ఈనాడు ఆలోచిస్తున్నామంటే దీనికి తాత్కాలిక ఉపశాంతి ఏలా కలుగజేయవలెనో విషయాన్ని మనము ఆలోచిస్తున్నామని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఎందుకనగా ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు శాశ్వత రక్షణ, ప్రశాంతి కలుగవలసినట్లే, ఏదో ఆర్థికాభివృద్ధితోపాటు ఇతర ఉపవృత్తులవారియొక్కయు, రైతాంగముయొక్కయు ఆర్థికాభివృద్ధిగూడ కలుగజేయవలసి యుండుంది. ఇతర ప్రజలందరికీగూడ కొనుగోలు శక్తి పెరిగినాడే, ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారము కాగలదు. కనుక ఈ విషయాన్ని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొనే మనము కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి తగిన సహాయ చేయవలసిన అగత్యమున్నది. మనదేశములో ఉన్న రైతాంగముయొక్క, అనగా నూటికి 80 మందిగా ఉన్న ఈ రైతాంగముయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి పెరిగినదే ఈ చేనేత ఉపవృత్తులు కానివ్వండి, తదితర ఉపవృత్తులు కానివ్వండి, ఏ ఉపవృత్తులూకూడా బాగుపడ జాలవనే విషయాన్ని గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఈ ఉపవృత్తులవారియొక్క జీవనాధారము, వారి వృత్తియొక్క అభివృద్ధి అంతయు ఈ రైతాంగముయొక్క ఆర్థిక పరిస్థితిపై ఆధారపడియున్నది. ఈ నాడు పదార్థముల వినియోగము ఉత్పత్తి పెరిగి లేనటువంటి పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడి ఆర్థిక సంక్షోభాన్ని మనము చూస్తున్నాము. ఈ సంక్షోభము తొలగించాలంటే, ఈ ఉపవృత్తుల వారికి శాశ్వత రక్షణ కలుగజేయాలంటే, ప్రస్తుత స్థితిలో ఉన్న రైతాంగముయొక్క సమస్యలను, వారివ్యవసాయ సమస్యలను పరిష్కరించినప్పుడే, ఇవి చేయగలుగుతాము. అప్పుడే ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికముల సమస్యనుగూడ శాశ్వతంగా పరిష్కారము చేయగలుగుతాము. ఈ రోజున మన దేశంలో గుడ్డ ప్రజలకు చాలినంత ఉండినప్పటికీ కూడ ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తి క్షీణించి యున్నందున వారు గుడ్డలను కొనలేకపోతున్నారు. అందుకనే ఉన్న గుడ్డకూడ అమ్ముడు పోకుండా ఉండి పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో, చేనేత పారిశ్రామికములకు మనము ఇప్పుడు చేయదలచుకొన్న ఈ సహాయముతో వారి సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారం కాజాలదు. ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి పెంచడంద్వారానే ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కారము చేయవలసియుండుంది. కనుక, ఈ కొనుగోలు శక్తిని పెంచడంతోపాటు, మనదేశమునకు గుడ్డ ఎంత అవసరమున్నది, ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తిని ఎంతవరకు పెంచవలసియుండుంది, ఎంతవరకు ప్రజలకు కావలసిన గుడ్డను తయారు చేయగలము, ఎంత సరఫరా చేయగలము అనే టటువంటి విషయాలన్నీ గమనించి వీటిని సవ్యమైనటువంటి ఒక plan ద్వారా పనిచేసినప్పుడే ఈ సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారము చేయగలుగుతామని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. కనుక ఈ నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించు చానిని సభ్యులందరు ఆమోదించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను—

‘Add the following at the end of the resolution :—

“This House also strongly recommends that the steps suggested above are temporary and the permanent solution

[Sri K. Venkaiah] [3rd November 1952]

for the problem of Handloom industry, the other handicrafts and trade lies in increasing the purchasing power of the peasantry, constituting 80 per cent of the population through proper agrarian reforms and in a better co-ordinated plan between supply and demand and the supply through the mills and handicrafts." " "

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஆமோதிக்கும் தோரணையில் ஒரு சில வார்த்தைகளைச் சொல்லலாம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். இது கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட ஒரு வரம் என்றே சொல்ல வேண்டும். இது மூலமாக அவர்களுக்கு ஓரளவு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கப்பட்டு வருகிறது. அதற்காக திரு. ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரியார் அவர்கள் மத்திய அரசாங்கம் வரையிலும் இதைப்பற்றி வாதாடி ரொம்பக் கஷ்டப்பட்டு இதைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார். இருந்தாலும்கூட அதில் சில திருத்தங்கள் இருந்தால் நன்மையாக இருக்கும் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். இந்த நிலையில் நூலை விநியோகம் செய்யும் விஷயத்தில் பல வருஷங்களாக சரியான முறையை அவர்கள் கையாளவில்லை என்றே சொல்லவேண்டும். சேலத்தில் 100-ம் நம்பர் நூல் வேண்டும் என்று கோடால் முதலில் அவர்களுக்கு தவறுதலாக 60-ம் நம்பர் நூலை அனுப்புகிறார்கள். மறுபடியும் இதைப்பற்றி reminder அனுப்பும்போது 40-ம் நம்பர் நூலை அனுப்பிவிட்டு 100-ம் நம்பருக்கு உபயோகித்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இந்த மாதிரியான முறை முற்றிலும் மாறவேண்டும். சரியான முறையில் யார் யாருக்கு எவ்விதமான நூல் வேண்டுமோ அவர்களுக்கு அந்த நூலைத்தான் கொடுக்க வேண்டும். நூலை விநியோகிக்க சொசைட்டிகளுக்கு அனுமதி கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அவர்களும் அதை சரியானபடி விநியோகம் செய்யவில்லை. இதை அதிகாரிகள் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். எப்படியாகிலும் கொடுக்கும் நூலை வாங்குவதற்கும் தறிகாரர்களுக்கு கையில் பணம் இல்லை. அவர்களுக்கு இரண்டு மூன்று வருஷங்களாகக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டு வரும் நூல் அவர்களுக்கு மாதத்தில் 10 அல்லது 15 நாட்களுக்குத்தான் போதுமானதாக இருந்து வந்தது. அதனால் மாதத்தில் பாதி நாட்களுக்கு அவர்களுக்கு வேலை இல்லை. அதனால் அவர்களிடம் இப்பொழுது கொடுக்கும் நூலை வாங்குவதற்கும் பணம் இல்லை. இந்த நிலையில் அவர்கள் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு கிரெடிட் சொசைட்டியிலிருந்து கடன் கொடுத்து உதவி அதை இன்ஸ்டால்மெண்டாக வசூலிக்க திட்டம் வகுக்க வேண்டும். அவ்விதம் செய்தால் இன்னும் நன்றாக இருக்கும் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன்.

“இத்துடன் மீன் பிடிப்பவர்களுடைய நிலையையும் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு சரியான வலை பின்னுவதற்கு வேண்டிய நூல் கிடைப்பதில்லை. நெசவாளிகளை முக்கியமாகக் கருதுவது போல் இந்த மீன் பிடிய்பவர்களுக்கும் அதைப் போலவே அவ்வப்போது நூல் கிடைக்கும்படியாகச் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த மாதிரி செய்தால்தான் அவர்களும் தங்களுடைய குடிசைத் தொழிலை சரியானபடி செய்ய முடியும். முக்கியமாக நெசவு தொழிலாளர்களுடைய நிலையை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளும்போது வேஷ்டியைப் பற்றிதான் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. கூரை நாட்டுச் சேலை, சேலம் சேலை, காஞ்சேரம் சேலை என்றெல்லாம் அந்தந்த ஊர்களின் பெயரில் நல்ல சேலைகள் என்று வழங்கப்பட்டு வருகிறது. அவைகளெல்லாம் மில்லிலிருந்து உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படும் சேலைகளினால் பாதிக்கப்படுகின்றன. ஆகையால் சில ரக புடவைகள் கைத் தரிக்காகவே ஒதுக்கப்பட்டால், கைத்தறி நெசவாளருக்கு அதிக சலுகைகள் கொடுத்ததாக உண்டாகும் என்பது என்னுடைய நோக்கம் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டு இத்துடன் நான் நிறுத்திக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

4 p.m. *SRI M. CHADAYAN :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, ஸ்பீக்கரிடம் Handloom
 (கைதாசு) நெய்யாட்டிக்கும் கையாணிக்குரிய அது வண்ணங்களைக் கூடுதலாகக் கொண்டு
 மூலம் அவற்றுக்குத் தகுந்தவற்றை நெய்யாட்டிக்கும் சிறிய உற்பத்தியாளர்களுக்குப் பரிகாரம்

3rd November 1952] [Sri M. Chadayan]

നിയമസഭയിൽ അവാതരിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ പോകുന്ന പ്രമേയങ്ങൾ ഞാൻ ബലമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഞാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽപ്പെടുത്തുന്നത് മലബാറിൽ കോടിക്കണക്കായ ഉറപ്പികളുടെ തുണിച്ചുകൊടുക്കൽ കെട്ടി തുടർപ്പുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് വിദേശങ്ങളിൽ കയറ്റിറങ്ങിയവരോടു സൗകര്യങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ചെയ്യുകയോ കയും അല്ലാത്തപക്ഷം ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കൈക്കൊള്ളുന്നതിൽ വിചലം വാടി നല്ല വിചലം മരിക്കുന്നതിൽ വിൽക്കുകയോ ചെയ്യാത്തപക്ഷം ആയിരിക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് ഇനിയും പ്രവൃത്തിയിലൂടെ കടുപ്പമേറിയതും. മലബാറിൽ ആയിരിക്കണമെന്ന് നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികൾ അഞ്ചര മാസങ്ങളായി തൊഴിലില്ലാതെ വളരെ കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്നു. നെയ്ത്തുതൊഴിലാളികളുടെ കഷ്ടപരിഹാരണത്തിനായി പി. ടി. ടി. സൊസൈറ്റി പൊതുനന്മയിൽ നിന്നാണ് ഇപ്പോൾ ധനസഹായം ചെയ്യവരുന്നത്. അവരുടെ തൊഴിലില്ലായ്മ പരിഹരിക്കുവാൻ വേണ്ട മലബാർ കലക്ടർ വളരെ പരിശ്രമിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ആയതുകൊണ്ട് പത്തും പതിനഞ്ചും മറ്റുങ്ങളോടുകൂടി കഴിയുന്ന നെയ്യുതൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് അവർക്കു മേൽ, സാരി മുതലായവ നെയ്യുന്നതിന്നു ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ധനസഹായം ചെയ്യും, ചെറിയ കൈക്കൊള്ളുന്നവരെ പ്രോത്സാഹിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയം നിയമസഭയിൽ പാസ്സാക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ മനസ്സിലാക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു."

* **SRI A. J. ARUNACHALAM :** “கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது விவாதத்தில் இருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை நம்முடைய முதன் மந்திரி அவர்கள் முயற்சியினால் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டதைப்பற்றி நான் மனப்பூர்வமாக வரவேற்கிறேன். நான் ஒரு நெசவாளி என்ற முறையிலும், நான் ஒரு நெசவாளியின் குடும்பத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவன் என்ற முறையிலும் இந்த மாகாணத்திலுள்ள நெசவாளர்களுடைய சார்பாகவும் மனப்பூர்வமாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் நம்முடைய அரசாங்கத்தின் பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொண்ட பிறகு சில நல்ல தீர்மானங்களைக் கொண்டு வந்து அவைகளையே மற்ற மாகாணங்களும் பின் பற்றும் முறையில் வழி காட்டி இருக்கிறார்கள் என்ற பெருமை நம் மாகாணத்திற்கு இருக்கிறது. இந்த நிலையில் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் தெர்யமாய் உணவு கட்டுப்பாட்டை இந்த மாகாணத்திலிருந்து எடுத்தார்கள். அதையே மற்ற மாகாணங்களும் பின்பற்றியது. இந்த யூனியனில் மூலம் முடுக்குகளிலெல்லாம் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக் கொண்ட முயற்சியை பின்பற்றி வருகிறார்கள். அது போன்று இன்றும் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் நிலையை உணர்ந்து இன்றையதினம் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பதோடு ஏற்கனவே அவர் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தோடு போராடி குறைந்த பட்சக்கோரிக்கையாகிய கவர் சேலை, கரை வேஷ்டி இந்த இரண்டையும் இந்தக் கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்க வேண்டும், அவைகளை மில்களில் உற்பத்தி செய்யக் கூடாது என்ற சிபார்சையும் ஏற்கனவே செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அவர் செய்கின்ற முயற்சியும் அவர் செய்கின்ற சிபார்சும் வெற்றியடைய வேண்டும் என்று இந்த நெசவு தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கும் பல லட்சக் கணக்கான கை நெசவு தொழிலாளர்களும் அவர் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட முயற்சி இந்த இந்தியன் யூனியன் பூராவும் வெற்றி பெற வேண்டும் என்று இந்த தேச மக்கள் பூராவும் எதிர்ப்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த முயற்சியில் இந்த மாகாணம் மட்டும் அல்ல இந்த யூனியன் பூராவிலுமுள்ள நெசவாளர்கள் இந்த நன்மையால் பயனடையப் போகிறார்கள் என்ற பெரும் நம்பிக்கையுடன் இதை எதிர்ப்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே அவர்களுடைய முயற்சி வெற்றி பெற நாம் ஆண்டவனை பிரார்த்திக்க வேண்டும்.

“நூல் விவரணைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தும் அதிகாரம் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் கையில் இருக்கிறது. அந்த அதிகாரம் மாநாண் அரசாங்கத்தின் கையில் இருந்திருக்குமேயானால் ஊனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் அதற்கு அன்றைய தினமே ஒரு சட்டம் இயற்றி இருப்பார்கள். அந்த அதிகாரம் நம் கையில் இல்லாததால் இப்போது நாம் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தைக் கொஞ்ச வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. அந்த அதிகாரம் அங்கே இருப்பது இந்த மாநாண் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு மாறுதல் அடையவேண்டும். அதற்கு வேண்டிய வரிகளையும் நமது ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுவார்கள் என்ற

[Sri A. J. Arunachalam] [3rd November 1952]

நம்பிக்கையும் நமக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த விஷயமாக இந்த மாகாண மக்கள் அவ்வளவு பேருக்கும் அவரிடத்தில் நம்பிக்கை இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே அவர் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட முயற்சிக்கு இந்த சட்டசபையிலுள்ள எல்லா கட்சி அங்கத்தினர்களும் ஏகமனதாக அங்கீகாரம் அளிக்கிறார்கள். அவர் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட முயற்சிக்கு இந்த மாகாணத்தில் பெரிதும் ஆதரவு இருக்கிறது என்பதில் ஐயமில்லை.

“சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, அடுத்தபடியாக கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய முயற்சியும் அவருடைய சிபார்சும் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் தொழில் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் வந்தபோது அவர் செய்த பிரசங்கத்தையும் பெரும் பாலோர் படித்துமிருப்பார்கள். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த கலர் புடவைகளையும், வேஷ்டிகளையும் கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொன்னபோது அது எப்படி கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்க முடியும் என்று மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் அமைச்சர் சொன்னதும் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். அவைகளை கைத்தறிக்குக் கொடுத்தால் இந்த மாகாணத்தின் மக்கள் எல்லோரும் நிர்மாணமாக இருக்கக் கூடிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டுவிடும் என்றும் அவர் சொன்னார். அவ்விதமே கைத்தறிக்கு அவைகளை எவ்விதம் கொடுக்க முடியும் என்று அவர் ஒரு இடத்தில் பிரசங்கம் செய்திருக்கிறார். கனம் திம்மா ரெட்டி அவர்கள் பேசும்போது கூட இப்பொழுது சென்னையில் நடக்கும் அரசாங்கம் நெசவு தொழிலாளருக்கு அனுதாபம் காட்டும் ஒரு அரசாங்கம் என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தில் தொழில் இலாகா பொறுப்பை ஏற்றிருக்கும் தொழில் அமைச்சர் அவர்களுடைய பிரசங்கமானது வெகுவாக வருத்தத்தைக் கொடுக்கும் நிலைமையை உண்டாக்கியிருக்கிறது. அது வருந்த வேண்டியதாகவும் இருக்கிறது. இந்த ரகங்களை கைத்தறிக்குக் கொடுத்தால் மில் தொழிலாளர்கள் நசித்துப் போய்விட மாட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் பட்டினி கிடக்கமாட்டார்கள். மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் அமைச்சர் பேசியது அவர்களுக்கு (அந்த மில் காரர்களுக்கு) வகாலத்து வாங்கிப் பேசியதாகத்தான் தோன்றுகிறது. மற்றும் அவர் களுடைய நன்மையைக் கருதித்தான் பேசியதாகத் தோன்றுகிறது. அவர் பேசியது நெசவாளர்களின் நலனைக் கருதிப்பேசியதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. அவருடைய பேச்சைக் கேட்டு நெசவு தொழில் செய்யக்கூடிய அவ்வளவு பேர்களும் வருத்தம் அடைந்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை. இத்தகைய மனப்பான்மையுள்ள அமைச்சரின் மனம் மாறுதல் அடைவதற்குத்தான் இங்கு இந்த தீர்மானம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதை அனுசரித்து அதற்குப் பிறகு துணிகளை உற்பத்தி செய்கின்ற பல மில்காரர்கள் எல்லோரும் சேர்ந்து பம்பாயில் இன்று இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் ஒரு அறிக்கை கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதிலிருந்து நமது ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட முயற்சியை அவர்கள் விரும்பவில்லை என்று தெரிகிறது. ஆனால் கைத்தறிக்காரர்களின் மேல் அவர்களுக்கு இரக்கம் இருக்கிறது என்றும், அனுதாபம் இருக்கிறது என்றும், உண்மையில் அவர்கள் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள் என்றும், ஆனால் இந்த ரகத்தை அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது என்றும், கைத்தறிக்காரர்கள் நெசவு செய்யக்கூடிய ரொம்ப நைசான சில ரகங்களை அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டுமென்றால் கொடுக்கலாம் என்றும் கைத்தறிக்காரர்கள் அவைகளை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் யார் பணக்காரர்களோ அவர்கள் அவைகளை உபயோகிப்பார்கள் என்றும், இந்த ரகங்களை அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுத்தால் மக்களுக்குவேண்டிய தேவை அனைத்தையும் அவர்களால் உற்பத்தி செய்து கொடுக்க முடியாது என்றும், ராஜாஜியின் முயற்சிக்கு ஆதரவு கொடுக்க முடியாது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய சிபார்சை அங்கீகாரம் செய்யாமல் அதற்கு மறுப்புக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதை இங்கிருக்கும்பலர் தெரிந்து கொண்டு இருப்பார்கள் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். அது எப்படி இருந்த போதிலும் இன்று ரொம்பவும் நல்லது. அவ்விதம் ஒதுக்கிக் கொடுத்தால் இந்த கைத்தறியால் புள்ளி விவரத்துடன் நமக்கு எடுத்துக் காட்டினார். அதைப் பார்க்கும்போது 1939-ம் வஷத்திலும் அதற்கு முன்பாகவும் மொத்தம் நம் நாட்டில் 600 கால் பங்கு குறைந்து விட்டது. அதாவது 450 கோடி கஜம் துணி உற்பத்தியாக

[Sri A. J. Arunachalam] 3rd November 1952]

இருக்கிறது. இந்த 450 கோடி கஜத்தையும் யூனியனிலுள்ள 29 லட்சம் தறிகளில் மூன்றில் ஒரு பாகம் உற்பத்தி செய்யமுடிந்தது. இப்பொழுது தறி 1-க்கு 25 நாள் கொண்ட மாதம் 1-க்கு 175 கெஜம் வீதம் வருஷத்திற்கு இரண்டாயிரம் கஜம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டாலும் சற்றேறக்குறைய 250 கோடி கஜம் துணிக்கு அதிகமாக உற்பத்தி செய்து கூடுமானவரையில் மக்களுக்கு துணிப்பஞ்சம் இல்லாமல் செய்ய முடியும். அதற்கு வேண்டியவர்கள் இப்பொழுது நெசவு தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதற்கு வேண்டிய திறமை நெசவாளிகளுக்கு இருக்கிறது. அதைப்பற்றி புள்ளி ரூபமாக இன்று காலையில் கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக் காட்டி இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த புள்ளி விவரங்களைத் தெரிந்து கொள்ளாமல் இரண்டு மாதங்களுக்கு முன்பு இங்கு வந்திருந்த மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் சரியான கணக்குக் கொடுக்காமல் இந்த புள்ளி விவரத்தையும் தெரிந்து கொள்ளாமல் தவறான புள்ளிவிவரத்தை கொடுத்திருந்தார்கள். அது ரொம்பவும் வருத்தத்துடன் கவனிக்கவேண்டிய விஷயமாக இருக்கிறது.

“இப்பொழுது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் தீர்மான 4-10 மாண்பு ஒரு குறைந்த பக்க கோரிக்கையைக் கொண்டதாகும். கலர் சேலை p.m. நூற்றுக்கு இரண்டு சதவிகிதம்தான் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படுகிறது. ஒன்றும் அதிகமில்லை. ஆனால் கொள்கையளவிலே அரசாங்கம் இதுவரையில் கைத் தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலுக்கு எந்தவிதமான சலுகையையும் காட்டியதில்லை. போதிய உதவியையும் செய்ய முன் வந்ததில்லை. கைத்தறித் துணிகளுக்கு டிஸ்கன்ட் இருந்ததால், நெசவாளர்களின் முயற்சியாலேயே இந்நாள் வரை அரசாங்கத்தின் கவனம் இல்லாவிட்டாலும்கூட நசித்துவிடாமல் இருந்து வந்திருக்கிறது. ஆனால் மில் துணிகளின் போட்டி மிக அதிகமாக ஏற்பட்டு கைத்தறிக்கு போதுமான நூல் சப்ளையும் கிடைக்காமல் போன போது அரசாங்கம் உதவி செய்யத் தவறியதின் காரணமாகவேதான் இன்றைய தினம் அந்தத் தொழிலில் ஒரு நெருக்கடி ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது. நெசவாளர்களின் நிலைமை மிகவும் பரிதாபகரமாக ஆகிவிட்டது. அந்தத் தவறைத் திருத்தி கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கைத்தறிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு காட்ட முன் வந்ததற்காக சந்தோஷப்படவேண்டிய நிலையிலே நாம் இருக்கின்றோம். கைத்தறித் தொழில் மிகவும் புராதனமானதோர் தொழில். ஒரு காலத்தில் வெளி நாடுகளிலெல்லாம் தனக்கு நிறைய மார்க்கெட்டை வைத்துக்கொண்டு மிக உன்னத நிலையில் இருந்து வந்த தொழில். பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக அந்தத் தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டுள்ள நெசவாளர்கள் இன்று பட்டினியால் வேலை கிடைக்காமல் இறந்துபோகும் ஒரு அவல நிலையிலே அந்தத் தொழில் நசித்துப்போக விடக்கூடாது. அதற்கு நிச்சயமானதோர், நிரந்தரமானதோர் உதவியைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்துடனேயேதான் தைரியமாக இந்த நடிவடிக்கையை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதில் சந்தேகமேயில்லை. அவருடைய நடவடிக்கையை நாம் எல்லோரும் மனப்பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கக் கடமைப்பட்டவர்களாக இருக்கிறோம்.

“அதோடு மற்றொரு விஷயம். இப்பொழுது கலர் சேலை, வேஷ்டி இரண்டையும் மாத்திரம்தான் கைத்தறிகளுக்கு ஒதுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. கோருகிறோம். ஆனால் இதற்கு முன்னேயே கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் சங்கம் களம், மாகாண கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் மகாநாட்டிலும், வேறுவிதமான தோர் தீர்மானம் அடிக்கடி நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டு வற்புறுத்தப்பட்டு வந்தது. அதாவது கைத்தறித் தொழிலுக்கு நிரந்தரமானதோர் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க விரும்பினால், 40 அங்குலத்திற்குமேல் 54 அங்குலம் வரையிலுள்ள வேஷ்டியோ, சேலையோ வேறு எந்த ரகத் துணிகளானாலும் அதை கைத்தறி களுக்கென்றே ஒதுக்கவேண்டும். 40 அங்குலத்திற்குக் குறைவான ரகத் துணிகளை வேண்டுமானால் மில்கள் உற்பத்தி செய்யலாமே தவிர 40 அங்குல அகலத்திற்கு மேற்பட்ட துணிகளை மில்கள் கூடாய் மூலம் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடாது என்று தடை விதிக்கவேண்டுமென்ப தாக மத்திய அரசாங்கத்திடம் கேட்டுக்கொண்டே வந்தோம். ஆனால் இன் றைய தினம் நம்முடைய கோரிக்கை மிகவும் குறைந்த பக்கமானதுதான். கலர் சேலைகளையும், வேஷ்டிகளையும் மில்கள் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடாது என் தடை விதிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக மத்திய சர்க்கரை கேட்டுக்கொள்ளினோம். மில்கள் கலர் சேலைகள் உற்பத்தி செய்வது மிகவும் குறைவு. ஆனால் வேஷ்டி

[Sri A. J. Arunachalam] [3rd November 1952]

டிகள் அதிகம் உற்பத்தியாகிறது. இருந்தாலும்கூட கைத்தறிகளை நம்பி இந்த நாட்டில் வாழும் தொழிலாளர்கள் எவ்வளவு பேர்கள், மில்களை நம்பி வாழுகிறவர்கள் எத்தனை பேர்கள் என்று நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். நம் முடைய யூனியனிலே ஒரு கோடி நெசவாளர்கள் கைத்தறிகளை நம்பி வாழ்கிறார்கள். அதைப்போலவே இந்த யூனியனிலே இருக்கக்கூடிய எல்லா மில்களிலும் சேர்ந்து வேலை செய்யக்கூடியவர்கள் 6 லட்சம் தொழிலாளர்கள் தான். அந்த 6 லட்சம் பேர்களும் கூட முழுக்க முழுக்க நெசவுத் தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டவர்கள் அல்ல. நெசவுத் தொழிலில் சில மில்கள்தான் செய்கின்றன. அதுவும் பம்பாய் மாகாணத்தில் (ஆமதாபாத், ஷோலாப்பூர் மில்கள்) அதிகமாக நெசவுத் தொழிலை நடத்தும் மில்கள் இருக்கின்றன. ஆகையால் உண்மையில் நெசவுத் தொழிலில் ஈடுபட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிற தொழிலாளர்கள் சுமார் 50 ஆயிரம் பேர்கள்தான். இந்த 50 ஆயிரம் பேர்களுக்கு எப்படியும் வேலை கிடைக்கும். இவர்கள் அதிகமாக சேலை, வேஷ்டி போன்றவைகளை உற்பத்தி செய்வதால் ஒரு கோடிக்கு மேற்பட்ட நெசவாளர்களின் வாழ்க்கை மிகவும் பாதிக்கப்படுகிறது. சென்னை சர்க்காரும், மத்திய சர்க்காரும் இந்த ஒரு கோடிக்கு மேற்பட்ட கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் தீர்ப்பு என்ன வழி செய்வது என்பதைப்பற்றி யோசிக்கவேண்டாமா? யோசித்து நிச்சயமாக நிரந்தரமானதொரு பரிகாரம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு அளித்தால்தான் சீரழிந்துபோன அவர்களது வாழ்வை முன்னேற்றும் அடையச் செய்யமுடியும்.

“இந்த மாகாணத்தில் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் படும் கஷ்டங்களை யெல்லாம் எடுத்து, இந்தியப் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் சென்னைக்கு வந்திருந்தபொழுது கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் சார்பாக ஒரு தூதுகொண்டியாகச் சென்று சொன்னோம். அன்றைய தினம் நம்முடைய கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களும் அங்கேயிருந்தார். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர் படும் கஷ்டங்களை எல்லாம் நீக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், அவர்களுடைய பரிதாபகரமான நிலைமையை மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் உடனடியாக நெசவாளர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது பரிகாரம் செய்துகொடுக்கவேண்டும். குறிப்பாக கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கோரியிருக்கின்ற குறைந்தபட்ச சிபார்சுகளையாவது அங்கே நாம் செய்வதின்படி எங்கள் குறைகளைத் தீர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டோம். பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் நாங்கள் சொல்லியவற்றை மிகவும் அனுதாபத்தோடு கவனமாகக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டார். பதில் எதுவும் சொல்லவில்லை. அதற்குப்பிறகு நம்முடைய கோரிக்கைக்கு மத்திய அரசாங்கம் எந்த முடிவையும் தெரிவிக்கவில்லை. அவர்களுடைய முடிவு என்னவென்பது தெரியாமலிருக்கும்பொழுது இப்பொழுது சட்டசபையின் ஒரு தீர்மானமாக அதே கோரிக்கைகளைக் கொண்டுவந்து சபையில் நிறைவேற்றி மக்களால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட எல்லாப் பிரதிநிதிகளின் அபிப்பிராயங்களையும் சேர்த்து தெரிவிக்க நம்முடைய தொழில் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே மில் முதலாளிகள் சற்று கவனித்து கைத்தறியாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து தாங்களே கொஞ்சம் விட்டுக் கொடுக்க முன்வரவேண்டும். அப்படி எந்தவிதத் தேயிலீலை, உதாரணமாக நாம் ஒன்றைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். கவனிப்பவர்கள் இன்று மில் நூலைத்தான் உபயோகப்படுத்திக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். நூலை உற்பத்தி செய்யும் மில்கள் தம் நாட்டில்தான் மிகவும் அதிகமாக இருக்கின்றன. நம் மாகாணத்திலேதான் நம்முடைய தேவைக்கும் மிக அதிகமான நூல் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படுகிறது. ஆனால் சென்ற வருஷம் சட்டசபையில் ஒரு தீர்மானம் செய்தபொழுது நம்முடைய மாகாணத்திற்கு 29 கம் அன்றோ, இன்றோ நம் மாகாணத்தின் கோரிக்கையை சரியாகக் கவனிக்கவேயில்லை. 15, 17 ஆயிரம் பேல்களையே அனுப்பி வருகிறார்கள். 1945-ம் வருஷ அடிப்படையிலே நம்முடைய மாகாணத்திற்கு 22,510 பேல் இல்லாததால்தான் நம் மாகாணத்து கைத்தறியாளர்கள் தங்களுடைய வெள்ளிநாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டுகளை இழக்க நேரிட்டது. நூல்சப்ளை மாதிரம் சீர்க்க இருந்திருக்குமானால் இப்பொழுது நடக்கும் உற்பத்தியைவிட இரண்டு மடங்கு அதிகமாக உற்பத்தி செய்து மற்ற மேல்நாடுகளுக்கும் ஏராளமாக

3rd November 1952] [Sri A. J. Arunachalam]

அனுப்பி வந்திருக்கமுடியும். அரசாங்கத்தின் சரியான உதவியில்லாததால்தான் கைத்தறித் தொழில் நசித்துப் போய்விடுமோ என்று அஞ்சும் நிலைக்கு வந்துவிட்டது. ஆயினும் இப்பொழுது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் லேசில் அந்தத் தொழில் நசித்துவிட அனுமதிக்கமாட்டார்கள். தன்னாலான எல்லா முயற்சியையும் செய்து, இடைஞ்சல் செய்வோர்களையும் திருப்திபடுத்தி அவர்கள் கொள்கையை மாற்றிக் கொள்ளும்படி செய்து தான் பிடித்த காரியத்தை நிறைவேற்றிக்கொள்ளும் பேராற்றல் படைத்தவர். ஆகையால் கைத்தறித் தொழிலுக்கு அவரால் நிச்சயமாக ஒரு பரிகாரம் கிடைக்குமென நாம் எல்லோரும் தைரியமாக நம்பலாம். மற்ற மாகாணங்களுக்கு வழிகாட்டியாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அவர்கள் தைரியமாகக் கொண்டுவந்திருப்பது எல்லா மாகாணங்களிலுமுள்ள நெசவாளர்களுக்கு மிகவும் மகிழ்ச்சியை அளிக்கக்கூடியதாக இருக்கும். அடுத்தபடியாக மில்கள் நூல் சப்ளை செய்யும் விஷயத்தில் ஒரு விஷயத்தை அவர் கவனிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். குறிப்பாக இன்றைய தினம் மில்கள் நூல்களை உற்பத்தி செய்கின்றன. நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேண்டப்படாத நூல்களான 260, 360, 44, 50 நம்பர் நூல்களை அவர்கள் ஏன் உற்பத்தி செய்யவேண்டுமென்று எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. அம்மாதிரி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேண்டப்படாத நூலை அவர்கள் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடாது என தடை விதிக்கலாமென்றால் அந்தத் தடையை விதிக்கக் கூடிய அதிகாரத்தை மத்திய சர்க்கார் தன்னிடமே வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த அதிகாரத்தை சென்னை சர்க்காரிடம் மத்திய சர்க்கார் கொடுத்துவிடவேண்டும். நம் மாகாண சர்க்காரிடம் அதிகாரத்தை அவர்கள் கொடுத்தால்தான் கைத்தறிகளுக்கு வேண்டிய ரக நூல்களையே மில்கள் உற்பத்தி செய்யவேண்டுமென உத்திரவு போட சென்கரியமாக இருக்கும். ஆகையால் இச்சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் மில்களைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அதிகாரத்தை மாகாண சர்க்காரிடமே கொடுத்துவிடவேண்டுமென மத்திய சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். நமது மதிப்பிற்குரிய ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இத்துறையிலும் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டும்.

“அதோடு நூலை உற்பத்தி செய்கின்ற மில்காரர்களுக்கு ஒரு சலுகை கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது. அவர்கள் உற்பத்தியாகிற நூலில் 50% தங்கள் இஷ்டம்போல் கப்படுகிறார்கள். வேண்டுமாயினும் விற்றுக்கொள்ளாமென்று வசதியிருக்கிறது. அவர்கள் இவ்வாறு விற்றுக்கொள்ளும்போது என்ன செய்கிறார்கள் என்பதை நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அவர்கள் நெசவாளர்களின் நன்மையைக் கருதி தாராள மனப்பான்மையுடன் நடந்துகொள்வதேயில்லை. நெசவாளர்களுக்கு மிகவும் அவசியமாக ஒரு ரக நூல் வேண்டியிருந்தால் அவர்கள் உயர்ந்த விலையை உடைய ஒரு ரக நூலில் இவ்வளவு பேல்கள் எடுத்துக் கொண்டால்தான் இந்த மட்டரக நூலில் இவ்வளவு நூல்கொடுப்பேன் என்று தடை செய்கிறார்கள். நெசவாளிகள் அந்த உயர்ந்த ரக நூலை வாங்கித் தான் ஆகவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அவனுக்கு அதனால் உபயோகமில்லாவிட்டாலும் உபயோகமான நூலை வாங்குவதற்காக அவன் அதை வாங்கி நஷ்டமடைகிறான். இது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். ஆகையால் சர்க்கார் உடனே இதில் கவனம் செலுத்தி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய நூலை சப்ளை செய்ய வேண்டுமே தவிர அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டாத நெம்பர் நூலை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமென அவர்களை பலவந்தப்படுத்துவதை நிறுத்தவேண்டும்.

“நெசவாளர்களுக்கு நிரந்தரமாக வேலை கிடைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்க வேண்டுமானால் இப்பொழுது நம் மாகாணத்திலுள்ள மில்கள் எல்லாம் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு எந்த ரக நூல் வேண்டுமோ அதைத்தான் உற்பத்தி செய்துகொண்டேயிருக்கவேண்டும். மில்கள் அதையே உற்பத்திசெய்து கெண்டிருக்கும்படியாக சர்க்காரும் கண்காணித்துக்கொண்டே வரவேண்டும். அம்மாதிரி அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது செய்யாததினால்தான் இன்றைய தினம் நெசவாளர்களுடைய நிலைமை மிகவும் பரிதாபகரமானதாக ஆகிவிட்டது என்பது வெட்டவெளிச்சமாகத் தெரிகிறது. ஆகவே நெசவாளர்கள் விரும்புகின்ற நூல் பேல்களை மாதிரம் அவர்களுக்கு எப்பொழுதும் கிடைத்துக் கொண்டு இருக்கும்படி சர்க்கார் கவனித்துப் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். ஆகையால் நம்முடைய அரசாங்கம் இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே மத்திய அரசாங்கம் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிற மில்களைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தி அதிகாரத்தை

[Sri A. J. Arunachalam] [3rd November 1952]

மாகாண சர்க்காருக்கு டெலிகேட் பண்ணும்படி செய்து, பின் மாகாணத்திலுள்ள மில்களையெல்லாம் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உபயோககரமான நம்பர் நூல்களையே உற்பத்தி செய்யும்படியாக கட்டுப்படுத்தி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய நூல் எப்பொழுதும் கிடைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கும்படி செய்ய வேண்டும்.

“ நம்முடைய இந்தியா சர்க்காருக்கும் வெளிநாட்டு சர்க்காருக்கும் ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்படுவது உண்டு. அப்படி ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்படும்போது ஒரு லக்ஷம் ரூபாய் பெறுமான இந்தியாவில் உற்பத்தியாகக்கூடிய ஜவுளியை பர்மா சர்க்கார் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதற்குப் பதிலாக பர்மா தேசத்தில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படும்படியான பொருளை நாம் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்ற ஒப்பந்தம் செய்கிறது உண்டு. அந்த ஒப்பந்தம் செய்கின்ற காலத்தில், இதுவரையில் நடந்துவந்த துரதிருஷ்டவசமான நிலையைப் பாருங்கள். மத்திய சர்க்காருடைய கண்ணுக்கு, அதாவது மத்திய சர்க்காரை நடத்துபவர்களுடைய கண்ணுக்குத் தெரிவது மில் ஜவுளி தான். ஒப்பந்தத்தை நிறைவேற்றுகின்ற காலத்தில், மத்திய சர்க்காரில் இருப்பவர்கள் சில மில் முதலாளிகளைக் கூப்பிட்டு, ‘ ஒரு லக்ஷம் ரூபாய்க்கு மில் ஜவுளி அனுப்புங்கள் ’ என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ஆனால், கைத்தறித் துணி அனுப்பப்படுவதில்லை. இதுவிஷயமாக இதற்கு முன்னால் பல தடவைகளில் சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன். நெசவாளர்களும் அடிக்கடி சொல்லிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். ஒப்பந்தம் செய்கின்ற காலத்தில் ஒரு லக்ஷம் ரூபாய்க்கு மில் ஜவுளி அனுப்பவேண்டும் என்றால், 50 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய்க்கு கைத்தறி துணியென்றும், 50 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய்க்கு மில் துணி என்றும் ஒரு ஏற்பாடு செய்துகொள்ளவேண்டும். அல்லது 25 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய்க்கு கைத்தறித்துணி, 75 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய்க்கு மில் துணி என்றாவது ஒரு ஏற்பாடு செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். இம்மாதிரி கைத்தறித் துணியும், மில் துணியும் நீங்கள் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று ஒரு ஒப்பந்தத்தை அவர்கள் செய்துகொண்டிருப்பார்களேயானால், கைத்தறித் துணிக்கு ஓரளவு கிராக்கி வந்திருக்கமுடியும். துரதிருஷ்டவசமாக மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தார் கையாண்டு வந்த வழிகளினாலும், அவர்களுடைய ஒரு நிலையற்ற கொள்கையினாலும், நம்முடைய கைத்தறித் தொழில் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதனால் கைத்தறித் துணிக்கு வெளி நாட்டு மார்க்கெட் போய்விட்டது என்பது நன்றாகத் தெரிகிறது.

“ நம்முடைய ராஜ்யத்தில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படும் கைத்தறித் துணி பெரும்பாலும் பர்மா, சிலோன், லையாம் முதலான நாடுகளுக்கும், பாகிஸ்தானுக்கும் சென்று கொண்டு இருந்தது. இப்பொழுது அந்த நாடுகளுக்கும் செல்லாமல் செல்லாமல் தடைபட்டுவிட்டது. நம்முடைய நாட்டிலே உற்பத்தியாகும் துணிகளுக்கு வெளிநாட்டிலே நல்ல கிராக்கி இருந்துவந்த காலத்திலே, வெளிநாட்டிலிருந்து அதிகமாக ‘ ஆர்டர் ’ கிடைத்துவந்த காலத்தில், மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஒரு உத்தரவு பிறப்பித்தார்கள். அதாவது, நம் நாட்டில் உற்பத்தியாகும் துணிக்கு நம் நாட்டில் தேவையிருக்கிறது. ஆகையால், அதை வெளிநாடுகளுக்கு அனுப்ப அனுமதி கொடுக்கமாட்டோம் என்று தடுத்தாவிட்டார்கள். மத்திய சர்க்கார் விதித்த தடையுத்தரவின் காரணத்தினால் நம் நாட்டுக் கைத்தறித் துணி வெளிநாட்டு மார்க்கெட்டுகளையெல்லாம் இழக்க நேர்ந்தது. இன்று கைத்தறித் துணி அதிகமாக தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. கைத்தறித் துணியை வாங்குவாரில்லாமல் பல கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய் பெறுமான துணி விற்பனையாகாமல் நின்றுருக்கிறது. அதற்கு என்ன பரிகாரம் என்று கேட்டால், ‘ இப்பொழுது வேண்டுமானால், எவ்வளவு துணி வேண்டுமோ அவ்வளவு ஏற்றுமதி செய்யுங்கள் ’ என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இந்த நிலை எவ்வளவு விசித்திரம் என்பதை நீங்கள் கவனிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“ நண்பர் ஜீவானந்தம் அவர்கள் இதை ஆதரித்து வெகு அழகாகப் பேசினார்கள். அதே நேரத்தில், கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் மூலமாக இந்தத் தறிகள் அத்தனையையும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால், அரசாங்கம் இந்த நிலையில் நம்முடைய கூட்டுறவு இயக்கத்திற்கு பெரிய உதவி செய்து வருகின்றது. அவர்களுடைய உதவியினால்

[Sri A. J. Arunachalam] [3rd November 1952]

தான் இன்றையதினம் சென்னை மாகாண கைத்தறி நெசவு சங்கத்திலே 215,000 தறிகள் இருக்கின்றன. 1,132 நெசவுச் சங்கங்கள் இணைக்கப்பட்டு இருக்கின்றன. அதோடு இன்னும் எவ்வளவு நெசவாளர்கள் வந்தாலும் அந்தக் கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளத் தயார். தடை ஏதும் கிடையாது. யாதொரு தடையுமில்லாமல் மாகாண நெசவு சங்கத்தார் செய்து கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். 13 ஆண்டுகளாக வடாற்காடு நெசவாளர் பிரதிநிதியாகவும், சென்னை மாகாண கைத்தறி நெசவாளர் சங்கத்தின் டைரக்டராகவும் நிர்வாகப் பொறுப்பில் இருந்துவருவதனால் நான் இப்பொழுது அவர்களுக்கு சொல்லவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

“ அடுத்தபடியாக நம்முடைய நூலினுடைய விலை குறையவேண்டுமென்று பலரும் அடிக்கடி பேசிவருகின்றோம். ஆனால், விலை நிர்ணயம் செய்கின்ற பொறுப்பு மாகாண அரசாங்கத்தின் பொறுப்பல்ல. மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தின் பொறுப்பில் இருப்பதால் அடிக்கடி நூல் விலை குறைய வேண்டுமென்று பல தீர்மானங்களை அனுப்பிவருகிறோம். ஆனால், நூல் விலை குறையுமேயானால் மேற்கொண்டு குறைந்த விலையில், மில் துணியை விட குறைந்த விலையில் கூட, மில் துணிக்கு கூடுமானவரையில் சரியான விலையில், நாம் கைத்தறித் துணியை உற்பத்திசெய்து, மக்களுக்கு சப்ளை செய்யமுடியும். ஆகவே, நூல் விலை மேலும் குறையவேண்டும்.

“ 1939-ம் வருஷத்திற்கு முன்னால் 40-ம் நெம்பர் நூல் ஒரு கட்டு ரூ. 4-12-6-ஆக இருந்தது. இன்றையதினம் வெளிநாட்டு பஞ்சு விலை ரூ. 38-3-0-ஆக இருக்கிறது. அதே ரகம் இந்திய பஞ்சாக இருந்தால் அதற்கு ரூ. 24-ஆக இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே, இன்றைக்கு ஐந்து மடங்கு இன்னும் விலை அதிகமாக இருப்பதனால் கைத்தறித்துணி மில் துணிக்குக் கொஞ்சம் அதிகமாக விற்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.”

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I 4-30
move the amendment standing in my name, namely:— p.m.

“ The words “ a stable ” in line 2 of the resolution shall be omitted, and after the words “ dhoties and sarees ” at the end of the first sentence, insert the words “ for one year ”.”

Sir, I want to bring to the notice of this House certain weaknesses in this resolution. This resolution claims that the measures proposed will provide a stable market for the handloom industry. But here there is a side-tracking of the issue. The handloom industry in our country is facing a crisis—rather has already faced a crisis—because the purchasing power of our people has tremendously gone down. It is quite natural that our national products face a crisis when the people are not in a position to buy them. This is not a phenomenon in our country alone. It has been so in China. In China, during the Kuomintang regime, that is before 1st October 1949, the handloom industry was almost ruined. Now we find in the People's China that the handloom industry is preserved. Now the industry there is flourishing. The purchasing power of the people has been brought to a higher level by the introduction of land reforms there. The majority of the people who buy cloth, especially in an agricultural country like ours, are the peasants. If the peasants are ruined, naturally the industries in our country also will go to ruin. Therefore, Sir, the real solution for saving our handloom industry and other industries is to bring in land reforms here and now which will give land to the actual tiller. Unless the Government do that, we will not be helping the handloom industry. All other methods will at best

[Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan] [3rd November 1952]

be only temporary measures. The Hon. Minister Dr. Krishna Rao in his speech moving the resolution was claiming that this was not a short-term solution of the problem, but that it would be a permanent solution. I completely disagree with him. I want the Government to realize that they would be fooling themselves if they do not seek the real solution and look into the questions involved in the problem. Sir, this resolution does not ban foreign goods. It bans only the mill goods produced in India. It bans our own mills from producing coloured sarees and bordered dhoties. By simply banning our own mills from producing these two varieties of cloth, we will be simply clearing the ground for foreign goods to be dumped into our country. We should beware of this danger, and the Government should take steps to see that foreign goods also are banned in our country. I want to bring to the notice of this House the amendment of Comrade M. Kalyanasundaram wherein he definitely says that foreign goods should be banned in our country. Our country is a poor country and an agricultural country, and is not highly industrialized. Therefore, we will always be facing a crisis in our national industries. The handloom industry had been the pride of our country for long, and it also gave employment to lakhs and lakhs of our people. Now it is a fact that the industry is almost ruined, and if we do not wake up to the dangers and take immediate steps to save it, the industry, which had been the pride of our country for centuries, will extinguish itself. Therefore, as a temporary measure, we are prepared to accept this. If our Chief Minister is very serious about this matter, let him implement this resolution by banning all the mill goods of these two varieties and also foreign goods in our State, and within one year we will be able to know the results. As an experimental measure alone, we can accept it and not as a stable measure as claimed in the resolution. Therefore, no one should be over-enthusiastic about this resolution. Does this resolution give a permanent solution to the crisis in the handloom industry? Does it give solace to lakhs and lakhs of handloom workers so that we should over-enjoy? No, Sir. No one should be overjoyed about the measures proposed in this resolution. We should awaken to the dangers in it. Unless the Government accept the amendment from the Opposition for the banning of foreign goods also, and consider the measures proposed in the resolution only as temporary, and adopt them for one year as proposed in my amendment, we will be disillusioned later. I warn this Government against this disillusion about the measures proposed in this resolution. We can take immediate steps to implement the measures proposed in the resolution. They should also carry on agitation to see that the Central Government implement the proposals, only as an experiment and as a temporary measure. The real solution to the problem lies in raising the purchasing power of the people by giving land to the tiller and enabling him to purchase certain goods. This will pave the way for industries to flourish. As long as our country remains an agricultural and de-industrialized

[3rd November 1952] [Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan]

country, there can be no solution to the problem of unemployment. The question is mainly based on the problem of unemployment—unemployment among weavers. There is unemployment among coir workers in Alleppy and Shertalai and in certain parts of Malabar. Thousands of coir workers are unemployed. What has the Government done to solve the problem of these coir workers? How to solve the problem facing them? The only solution for all these problems is the bringing in of land reforms and the industrialization of our country. Meanwhile we have to adopt certain short-term measures. In regard to other industries and other problems also, we have to take steps only as a temporary and short-term measure, and not as a stable and permanent measure. Therefore, in the amendment I moved I have suggested the deletion of the words 'a stable' in line 2 of the resolution and the addition of the words 'for one year' at the end of the first sentence. Because, the words 'a stable' in the resolution are meaningless. The measure proposed in the resolution will not bring in a stable market for the handloom industry. A stable market for the handloom industry can be brought about by the methods proposed in the amendment of Comrade Gangayya. Again, Sir, this measure can only be a temporary one. Therefore, I request the House to unanimously accept my amendment which seeks to insert the words 'for one year' at the end of the first sentence. That means, it is only as an experiment that we can accept the measures proposed in the resolution, Sir, with these words, I resume my seat."

* SRI C. H. KANARAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, കൈത്തറി നെയ്യ് ഇക്കാര്യം ഒരു വലിയ നാട്ടിനെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള ഒരു കടുത്ത പ്രശ്നമാണ്. ഇത് നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെയും കഴിഞ്ഞ കുറേക്കാലമായി ആ പ്രശ്നത്തിന് ഏതെങ്കിലും തരത്തിൽ പരിഹാരം കാണേണ്ടതിലേക്കു പല സമയങ്ങളിലും പ്രയത്നങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതിന്റെ ഫലമായി ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ ഇപ്പോഴെങ്കിലും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ കണ്ണു തുറന്നുവെക്കുന്നു. ആൻ എന്താക്കുന്നു.

4-40 p.m.

"ബഹു. മന്ത്രിയുടെ പ്രമേയം ഒരു കണക്കിനു സ്വീകരിക്കാവുന്നതല്ലെങ്കിലും അത് പ്രശ്നത്തിന്റെ യഥാർത്ഥത മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു എനിക്ക് ബലമായ സംശയമുണ്ട്. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ മറച്ചുപിടിക്കാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് വിശേഷിച്ച് ഹൂണയും ഉണ്ടാവുന്നില്ലല്ലോ. നാട്ടുനഗരങ്ങളിലും വാടക തുണിയാണ് ഇന്ത്യയിലാകെ ഉല്പാദിപ്പിക്കുന്നതെന്നു കണക്കാക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. എല്ലാ ജനങ്ങളും ആവശ്യത്തിനു മാത്രം ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നവെങ്കിൽ അതെന്നും മേൽക്കാണിച്ച തുണി മതിയായില്ലെന്നു എല്ലാവർക്കും മനസ്സിലാക്കാം. ഉല്പാദനം അധികമായിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ജനങ്ങളുടെ ദാരുണമായ കച്ചവടം മുന്നോട്ടു കൊണ്ടുവരികയാണ്. അപ്പോൾ തുണി വാങ്ങാൻ ജനങ്ങളുടെ കയ്യിൽ പണമില്ലെന്ന നിഗമനത്തിലാണ് നമ്മുടെ കൈത്തറി വ്യവസായപ്രശ്നത്തിന്റെ യഥാർത്ഥ രൂപം തിരിച്ചറിയേണ്ടതാണ്. മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർ, നമ്മുടെ കൈത്തറിയിൽ കിടമത്തെയും യഥാർത്ഥപ്രശ്നമെന്നതും അതുകൊണ്ടു സമീകൃതമായിട്ടും ഉല്പാദിപ്പിക്കുന്നതും കൈത്തറികൾ നൽകിയ കൊണ്ടു മാത്രം വലിയ ഗുണമൊന്നുമുണ്ടാവാൻ പോകുന്നില്ല. കൈത്തറിപ്രശ്നത്തിന്റെ ശാശ്വത പരിഹാരവുമല്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു കൈത്തറികൾ നൽകിയ കച്ചവടത്തെ പരിഹരിക്കപ്പെടുമെന്നു വാദിക്കുന്നത് കേവലം വിഡ്ഢിത്തമാണെന്നു ആൻ പറയും.

"ജനങ്ങളുടെ ദാരുണമായ കച്ചവടം വർദ്ധിക്കുന്നതെങ്കിൽ ഉടൻതന്നെ കൈത്തറികൾ വരുത്തിയേ തീരൂ. കൈത്തറികൾ കൂടിയിൽ സ്ഥാപനങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണം. എന്നാൽ മാത്രമേ ഉല്പാദനം വർദ്ധിക്കുന്നവയായാണെന്നു കരുതേണ്ട. അവന്റെ സംസ്കാരികത്വത്തിൽ ദൈവത്തോടു കൈത്തറികൾ വർദ്ധിക്കുന്നതാണ്."

[Sri C. H. Kanaran]

[3rd November 1952

പലിടുകയെന്നതാണ്. അപ്പോൾ കൈത്തറിത്തുണികൾ ഇവിടെത്തന്നെ കമ്പോളം കണ്ടെത്തുവൻ കഴിയും. പ്രമേയത്തിൽ പറഞ്ഞുകാണുന്ന പരിഹാരം താൽക്കാലികം മാത്രമാണ്.

“ഇന്ത്യയിൽത്തന്നെ നെയ്യുന്ന തുണി ഇവിടുത്തെ ജനങ്ങളുടെ ആവശ്യത്തിനുപോലും മതിയാവുകയില്ലെന്ന് പറഞ്ഞുവെല്ലോ. അപ്പോൾ വിദേശവസ്ത്രങ്ങൾ ഇവിടെ ഇറക്കുമതി ചെയ്യാൻ അനുവദിക്കുന്നത് കടുത്തുരസ്സായമല്ലേ. നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിലെ കൈത്തറി ഞ്ഞിത്തരങ്ങൾ വിറ്റഴിക്കാൻ വിദേശമെങ്കിലും കണ്ടുപിടിക്കാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുന്ന നാം വിദേശവസ്ത്രങ്ങൾ ഇറക്കുമതി ചെയ്യുന്നത് തടയേണ്ടതല്ലേ? സ്വദേശി വസ്ത്രപ്രസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ പേരിൽ നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിൽ ആയിരക്കണക്കിന്നാളുകൾ പോലീസ്സുകാരുടെ മർദ്ദനമനുഭവിക്കേണ്ടിവന്നിട്ടില്ല. മന്ത്രിമാരുടെ ശോഭിമാനം ഇന്നെവിടെപ്പോയൊളിച്ചുവെന്നാണെന്നിട ചോദിക്കാനുള്ളത്. ഇന്നാട്ടിലെ ആയിരമായിരം ദേശാഭിമാനികളുടെ ന്യായത്തിന്റെ ഫലം വിദേശവസ്ത്രങ്ങൾക്കു ഇവിടെ മാങ്കറുണ്ടാക്കിക്കൊടുക്കുവാൻ മരുമാധ്യമങ്ങളെ വരുത്തുകയാണോ ഇതുകൊണ്ടുവെച്ചും. സ്റ്റേറ്റു ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഉടനടി വിദേശവസ്ത്രങ്ങളെ ഇന്നാട്ടിലേക്കിറക്കുമതി ചെയ്യുന്നത് തടയുവാൻ കേന്ദ്ര ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ സിദ്ധ്യസിക്കണം. റെക്കൺട്രിപുൾ നത്തിനടിയിൽനിന്നായി പരിഹാരം കാണാവുന്ന വഴികളിലൊന്നാണത്.”

“റൂബിന്റെ വില ഇനിയും കുറയുവാനുള്ള ചക്കണമില്ല. വില കുറയുവാൻ മുൻപാൽ കള്ള നിങ്ങൾക്കെന്തു കെട്ടി നിർബന്ധിച്ചിരുന്നു. വിദേശത്തുനിന്നു കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന റൂബിനാണ് വില അധികമെന്നു കാണുന്നു. അധികവില കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ നാമെന്തിനു അന്യനാടുകളെ ആശ്രയിക്കണം. ചുരുങ്ങിയ വിലക്കു ആവശ്യത്തിനുള്ള റൂബ് ട്രെക്കന്റിക്കാക്കു കിട്ടുവാനാകാതെ നടപടിയാണ് ഗവണ്മെന്റുണ്ടാക്കിയ ഏകദേശം. റൂബിന്റെ വില കുറയുന്നില്ലെങ്കിൽ ഇനിയുടെ വിലയും കുറയാൻ പോകുന്നില്ല.

“സാരിയും മോങ്ങിയും നെയ്യുറങ്ങി കണ്ടുകാലകാരും കൈത്തറകളിൽ വിളക്കുകൾ തുടങ്ങി മലബാറിലെ കൈത്തറ നെയ്ത്തുകാരെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു കേന്ദ്രം യാതൊരു ഗുണവുമില്ല. വീതി കുറഞ്ഞ കട്ടിത്തൂക്കം കോട്ടിത്തൂക്കം വെച്ചുകൊടുത്താണ് അവിടെ സാധാരണയായി ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നത്. വീതികൂടിയ തുണിയെത്താളുണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള കഴിവ് അവിടെത്തെ കൈത്തറക്കാരികൾക്ക്. അപ്പോൾ കണ്ടുകാലകാരും മലബാറിലെ കൈത്തറവ്യവസായത്തിനൊരിക്കലും ഉത്തേജകമല്ല എന്നു ഇതുകൊണ്ട് വ്യക്തമാവുന്നുണ്ടല്ലോ. വീലിൽ ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന കെട്ടികൾ കൈത്തറയിൽ വിറയ്ക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്യുന്നതല്ലേ.”

4-50
p.m.

SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO :—“ఈ లిక్కానాన్ని నేను ముఖ్యంగా బలవరచేటప్పుడు కొన్ని సవరణలను చెప్పవలసియున్నది. అయితే యీ లిక్కానాన్ని బట్టి చూడగా చేనేత పార్శ్వశ్రామికులకు తగినంత సహాయం జరుగునని కనబడుతుంది. కానీ, వైకి ప్రభుత్వం యీ లిక్కానం తెచ్చినారేకాని, అసలు అవరణలో పెట్టగలరా లేదా అని సందేహించవలసియున్నది. ఎందుచేతనంటే ఈ ప్రభుత్వము సామాన్య ప్రజాసేవకును ఎటువంటి భావము చూపుచున్నది. ఈ ప్రభుత్వము యీ పార్శ్వశ్రామికులయందు చూపుతున్న అనాదరణ గత అయిదు సంవత్సరములనుండి తరీక్షించిన అందరికి బాధ పడుతూనేయున్నది. అయితే యీ లిక్కానము ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎంతవరకు అవరణ మార్గముగా చేయగలుగుదురో చూడవలసియున్నది. యీ లిక్కానంవల్ల యీ చేనేత పార్శ్వశ్రామికులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు యిచ్చేటటువంటి సహాయము ఎంతవరకు ఉండగలదో చూడవలసియున్నది. అంతేకాదు; చేనేత పార్శ్వశ్రామిక సమస్య ఒక్క కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి సంబంధించినదని చెప్పటకు వీలులేదు. అయితే యీ విషయములో ఎవరిది ఎంత బాధ్యత అని అలోచించవలెను. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వం కూడ తగిన బాధ్యతవహించవలెను. పూర్వము చేనేత కార్మికులు గ్రామాలలో నూలుసరఫరా తగినంత ఉన్న హోతులేత వారు గ్రామములూ వారు నేసినటువంటి విట్టలు అమ్మకాని చేయించగలిగారు. యిటీవల ప్రభుత్వ విధానంవల్ల, యీ నూలు సరఫరా

3rd November 1952] [Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao]

తెచ్చినందున చేనేతవారికి సరిపాయ్యే నూలు లభించనందున, యీ పరిశ్రమ పూర్తిగా దెబ్బతిన్నది. ఈ నాడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమునుబట్టి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము యీ చేనేత కార్మికులకు ఉచిత మైనటువంటిస్త్రీ, స్వక్రమమైనటువంటిస్త్రీ, విధానముపెట్టి వారికి నిజంగా సహాయము చేస్తారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. యీ తీర్మానమువల్ల చేనేత కార్మికులకు జీవనభృతి శాశ్వతముగా కలుగుతుందని ప్రభుత్వము తెచ్చినను, యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ విషయములో ఎంతవరకు చర్య తీసుకుంటుంది అని అలోచించవలెను ఈ ప్రభుత్వం నిజంగా యీ పేద ప్రజలీకం యెడల కరుణార్ధి హృదయముతో వారి జీవనము సక్రమముగా జరిగే యేర్పాటు చేసుందా అని అనుమానం.

“చెరుకు ఉత్పత్తి విషయములో చూడండి. పంచదార మిల్లు యజమానులు చెరుకు తండించి స్వత్యేచేసినటువంటి రైతులకు యింతవరకు డబ్బు సరిఫరా చేయలేదు. వారు యీ డబ్బు రానందున భూములుగూడా కుడుపుపెట్టినసంగతి అందరకు విశదమే. యీ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వంవారికి పిటిషనులద్వారా తెలుపుకున్నప్పటికీగూడా యింత వరకు అతి గతి లేకుండయున్నది. అయితే యిదేనా పేదరైతులపడ పేద ప్రజా నీకముపడ యీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు చూపే అదరణ అని అడుగుతూవున్నాను. దీన్నిబట్టి ఈ నాడు యీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు యీ చేసేత చారిత్రామికులయొడ ఎంత నిర్దయ చూపుచున్నారో బోధపడగలదని చెప్పుచున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member will continue his speech to-morrow. The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. to-morrow.”

The House adjourned to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Tuesday, 4th November 1952.

VI.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. G.O. No. 1947, Revenue, dated the 7th July 1952—Amendments to rules framed under Section 26 of the Madras Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923.
2. Amendment to the Malabar Tenancy (Determination of Fair Rent and Preparation of Record of Rights) Rules, 1951 [Laid under section 54 (3) of the Malabar Tenancy Act, 1929].
3. Answer to the Assembly starred question No. 221 (889) answered on 25th July 1952 regarding the Special Armed Police Units in West Godavari district.
4. Answer to Assembly starred question No. 222 (916) answered on 25th July 1952 regarding the Special Armed Police Units in West Godavari district.
5. Amendments to Madras Motor Vehicles Rules [Laid under section 133 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939]—
 - (a) G.O. Ms. No. 2195, Home, dated 18th June 1952.
 - (b) G.O. Ms. No. 2396, Home, dated 3rd July 1952.
 - (c) G.O. Ms. No. 2532, Home, dated 14th July 1952.
 - (d) G.O. Ms. No. 2799, Home, dated 2nd August 1952.
 - (e) G.O. Ms. No. 2811, Home, dated 2nd August 1952.
6. Report of the Committee appointed to enquire into the shooting incident in Salem Central Jail on the 11th February 1950.

[3rd November 1952]

7. *The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance IV of 1952).*

8. *The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Amendment Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance V of 1952).*

9. *Madras Ordinance IV of 1952, as amended by Madras Ordinance V of 1952.*

10. *The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection (No. 2) Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance VI of 1952).*

11. G.O. No. 1720, L.A., dated the 26th August 1952, regarding notice for fresh elections to seven divisional seats in the Corporation of Madras.

12. G.O. No. 1752, L.A., dated the 30th August 1952, stopping of elections for seats reserved for Anglo-Indians in the elections to the municipal councils.

13. G.O. No. 1964, L.A., dated the 6th October 1952—Modification of orders passed in G.O. No. 1752, L.A., dated the 30th August 1952, in respect of seats reserved for Anglo-Indians in the elections to the Coimbatore Municipal Council.

14. G.O. No. 1993, L.A., dated 9th October 1952, regarding cancellation of orders issued in G.O. No. 1752, L.A., dated 30th August 1952.

15. *The Report of the Select Committee on the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952) and the annexures thereto and the proceedings.*

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 4th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. the Minister for Education is not keeping good health. So, questions on to-day's agenda relating to his Department, viz., questions * Nos. 21 and 47, will be taken up to-morrow."

Ventilation of grievances of Government officers through Legislators.

* 26 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a rule that Government servants or their relatives or friends should not approach members of the Legislative Assembly or Council to have their grievances redressed through the Legislature; and

(b) whether instructions have been issued to heads of departments that they should victimise people who try to get their grievances redressed by approaching—

(1) Members of the Legislature who belong to the Ministerialist group; and

(2) Members of the Legislature who belong to the Opposition?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a) According to rule 24 of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, which are as old as the Government of India Act of 1935, Government servants should not bring or attempt to bring any political or other outside influence to bear upon any superior authority for the furtherance of their interests.

" (b) It is a fact that Government will view with serious displeasure any attempt on the part of a Government servant to influence his or her superior authorities in any manner. Any grievance which the Government servant wishes to be removed must be brought to the notice of the superior authority concerned in the prescribed manner wherein there is ample provision for obtaining justice. To permit officials to approach members of the Legislature would result in unequal opportunities and unfairness besides general demoralization in the services. Any attempt to obtain such influence is therefore considered wrong. The superior authority is

* Answered on 6th November 1952.

[4th November 1952]

authorized in such cases to issue notice and after following the prescribed procedure, order the withholding of promotion unless the Government servant proves his innocence."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:—"1935 వ సం॥ నాటి ఇండియా ప్రభుత్వం చట్టం రద్దయినదని, ఇప్పుడు నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం తయారుచేయబడినదని, దానిలోని fundamental rights ఇవ్వబడినాయని గవర్నమెంటువారికి తెలుసునా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I would like to have notice, Sir."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"1935 వ సం॥ నాటి చట్టం రద్దయింది కనుక దాని ప్రకారం తయారుచేయబడ్డ conduct rules ను రద్దుచేసి నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం ప్రకారం కొత్త service rules తయారుచేయటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆలోచిస్తున్నారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The existing rules are quite good."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"నూతన రాజ్యాంగ చట్టం తయారుచేయబడింది. దాని ప్రకారం కొన్ని వ్యక్తి సత్వాలు కలుగజేయబడ్డాయి. వాటి ప్రకారం ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు వారికి కలుగు ఇబ్బందులను ప్రజాప్రతినిధులకు తెలుపుకొనుట నిశ్చయించబడిన ప్రభుత్వంవారు రాజ్యాంగ విధులను నిరాకరించినవారు కాదా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The influence of Members of the Legislature was much less in the old days than now. At the present moment, the rules are more necessary."

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDER:—"Is the Government of India Act, 1935, still in force?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Government of India Act is not in force now, but the rules of that time are in force."

SRI G. V. K. RAO:—"ఈ అసెంబ్లీని రాజ్యాంగవారసులు ఒక పాదాక్షిపాదము చేయడంతో ఈ నిజమైన ప్రజాస్వామిక సంస్థగా నిర్వహించడం దలచారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am sorry, Sir, I have to ask for notice."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"ప్రభుత్వంవారు తమ క్రింది ఉద్యోగులకు ఇబ్బందిని అర్జీలను దర్యాప్తు చేస్తారని న్యాయా న్యాయాలను విచారిస్తారని మంత్రులు చెప్పారు. కాని ఇది వాస్తవ పరిస్థితులకు భిన్నంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ క్షేత్రంలో ప్రభుత్వం అనే ఆపికా గుఱుస్తూ ఎన్ని కార్యాయములు సెనా డిఫ్ మినిస్టరు గురించి అర్జీలు ఇస్తున్నా వ్యతిరేకములు చెబుతూ ఉన్నాయి. అటువంటి సందర్భంలో ఆతడు తనను గురించి శాసన సభ్యులద్వారా ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియజేయగూడదని మంత్రులకు ముతనా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am sure, Sir, that the hon. Gentleman, who is asking the question, has not listened sympathetically to what I have said in

[4th November 1952]

answer to the primary question. If only the hon. Gentleman will go home and consider my answer, I am sure he will be satisfied with the position."

DR. K. B. MENON:—"Sir, the answer of the Hon. the Chief Minister is rather elastic. Does it prevent hon. Members from bringing to the notice of the Government any irregularities that may prevail in different offices? Will that lead to penalization of any of the employees of the Government?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"No, Sir. That will not lead to penalization and it is not considered wrong. But the penalization is in respect of any particular official trying to get pressure put on Government in his particular interest."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"శాసన సభ్యులు మంత్రులు నూతన ఉద్యోగుల కోట్లను కూడా సంపాదించి ఎక్స్ పేన్ వారే. అటువంటి సందర్భంలో ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు తమ ఇబ్బందులను గురించి శాసనసభ్యులకు తెలియజేసుకొనకుండా చేయడం విరుద్ధం కాదా?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, what the hon. Member asks is this. In taking the particular position, do the Government realize that the Members of the Legislature including the Ministers are persons who have been returned on the votes of the Government servants also? Are they not entitled to represent the grievances of the Government employees?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"In democracy it is a question of balance of expediencies as to how far Government servants who are also voters should be entitled to exercise their political position and power in favour of their own personal interests. Everything considered, the present rule is good and I would beg of hon. Members to let it stand. It is, in their own interests, good; it is, in the interests of the Government servants, good; it is, in the interests of the Government as a whole, good."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"In a case where an employee is victimised wantonly by his immediate superior officer and by his higher officer also, what is the way in which he can get justice done to him?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If victimisation is assumed and can be proved, there are plenty of ways by which he can get justice done to him."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI:—"Will a Member of the Legislature be in order if he brings cases to the notice of a Minister or a Head of a Department, if he is convinced that a gross injustice has been done to an employee or employees?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If there is any irregularity in the administration, it is open to Members of the Legislature to bring it to the notice of the Government

[4th November 1952]

and to press for correction. But in the interests of a particular Government employee who approaches a Member, Government do not approve of the power and position of Members of the Legislature being utilized by the particular person. The position is perfectly clear."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Will it be conceded by the Hon. the Chief Minister that, if there is a gross injustice done to any person within the jurisdiction of his Chief Ministership, it will be right for us to draw his attention to it and, if so, where we are convinced and where the facts show that injustice has been done to a Government servant, may I know why we are prevented from drawing the attention of the Government to it and why it is confused with and considered as exerting political pressure? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There are Courts, for instances, and a Court is bound to deal justice to parties before it. Would it be right for a Member of the Legislature to go to the Court and use his own judgment and discretion and position to convince the Judge that a particular party's case is right and another's is wrong? The answer is obvious. Now, I submit that every decision in the administrative departments, with reference to particular interests or particular employees, is a matter of judicial discretion, and interference is not right, because, as I said very clearly, it will lead to unequal influences with various persons and it will be unfair to the other employee who gains or loses. These are positions which I want hon. Members to consider. It is not an infraction or detraction of the rights, duties and privileges of Members of the Legislature, but it is only to prevent unfair advantage being taken of relationship or approachability or intimacy."

10-40 a.m. **SRI T. VISWANATHAM** :—" May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether he is not mistaken in comparing the position of the executive with that of the judiciary? Because, in the case of the executive, there are several matters done behind the scenes without the knowledge of the parties concerned, whereas everything is done openly in the case of Courts. Therefore, will the Hon. the Chief Minister concede that the Members of the Legislature have got a right to draw the attention of the Government to any particular injustice when it comes to their notice, just as they have got a right to draw the attention of the Government to any other difficulty and that this should not be mistaken as exerting 'political pressure' ? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This is, I submit, a vast field for discussion. I have said enough. My hon. Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, might take into account the fact that if Members of the Legislature are approached, they are approached not publicly, but privately by the Government servant concerned. The points are not exhausted always, and there will certainly be injustice if interference is allowed. There will be confusion besides

4th November 1952]

injustice and general loss of confidence in the Government as also in the Legislature. But the point that is particularly raised is that in the one case it is the judicial and in the other case it is not judicial. I submit, Sir, that every decision is a judicial decision and when an officer says that A is entitled to promotion and not B, it is as much a judicial decision as any other."

Representations received from the scavengers of Tanjore Municipality.

* 27 Q.—**SRI S. RAMALINGAM** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations have been received by the Government from the scavengers of Tanjore Municipality who were discharged from service for taking part in the strike of March 1948; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken or propose to take thereon?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" (a) & (b) A petition addressed to the Chief Secretary was received. A copy of the petition had been sent to the Municipal Commissioner also. So no action was taken as the petition was not addressed to Government through the proper channel and it was expected that the Commissioner would initiate action on any matter requiring Government's intervention."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" தஞ்சை நகரத்திலிருந்து நகர சுத்தித் தொழிலாளர்கள் பெருவாரியாக வேலையிலிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்டு மூன்று வருட காலமாக வேலையில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிற விஷயத்தை சர்க்காருக்கும், சர்க்கார் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மேலதிகாரிகளுக்கும் பல மனக்கள் மூலம் தெரிவித்திருந்தும் இது வரைக்கும் எந்தவிதமான நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கவில்லையென மந்திரி அவர்களே இப்பொழுது செல்லுவதால் இனி மேலாவது உடனடியாக தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் யோசிக்குமா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" I am not able to understand the question, Sir."

Supersession of the Yellamanchili Panchayat Board.

* 28 Q.—**SRI P. BAPU NAIDU** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Yellamanchili Panchayat Board in Visakhapatnam district has been superseded;

(b) if so, why;

(c) whether the Government have received any representation stating that the supersession was unjust; and

(d) if so, the action taken thereon?

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“(a) Yes; by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, under the powers under Section 48 (1) of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950, delegated to him by Government.

“(b) The step was taken as the panchayat had in as many as nine instances, exceeded or abused the powers vested in it under the Act.

“(c) Yes.

“(d) Government have called for a report from the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards on receipt of which the representation will be examined and suitable orders passed.”

SRI P. BAPU NAIDU :—“నాకు ఇంగ్లీషు తెలియదు.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Sir, the hon. Member Sri Bapu Naidu says that he cannot understand English.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“If the Hon. Minister will agree to translate his answer in Telugu, I have no objection.”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“(a) అవును. పంచాయతీ చట్టం సెక్షన్ 48 (1) ప్రకారం I.L.B. కి దఖలుపరచబడ్డ అధికారాల రిక్వెస్టును పరిశీలించింది.

“(b) ఆ పంచాయతీ బోర్డు తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో అధికారం దుర్వినియోగం చేయటం వల్ల ఈ చర్య తీసుకోబడింది.

“(c) అవును.

“(d) గవర్నమెంటువారు రిపోర్టు ఆడిగన్నారు. అది అందిన తర్వాత దానిపై ఆర్డరు పాస్ చేస్తాము.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“పంచాయతీ బోర్డును ఎప్పుడు రద్దు చేశారు. గవర్నమెంటు, దానికి అనుకూలంగా లేని లోకల్ బోర్డులను సూపర్సెడ్ చేయడం ఇక ముందైనా మానుకొంటుందా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“I have no information as to the date when it was superseded. I think the Government have to exercise their power, whenever a panchayat goes wrong.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“As per the representation made by the Panchayat Board, can we expect that the Inspector of Local Boards will conduct an enquiry?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“A report has been called for from him. He will certainly enquire and report.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“In cases of supersession, is it the policy of the Government to immediately hold elections and hand back the panchayats to the people?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“Supersessions are made with a time-limit and within that time-limit, elections will be held.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“పంచాయతీ బోర్డు రద్దు చేయబడిన తరువాత ఎన్ని రోజులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారికి representation వచ్చింది. Representation చేయబడిన తరువాత, ఎన్ని రోజులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు చర్య తీసుకున్నారు. వారు ఆడిగిన రిపోర్టును Inspector of Local Boards ఎప్పుడు పంపించారో తెలియజేస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“Soon after any representation is received, we call for a report and the officers take sometime to go and enquire into the matter and submit a report. So, I cannot give all the dates now.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“మంత్రిగారు సమాధానం చెబుతూ తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో పంచాయతీ బోర్డు అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేయటం వల్ల దానిని రద్దుచేయవలసివచ్చినదని సమాధానం చెప్పారు. ఈ తొమ్మిది సందర్భాలలో నిజంగా పంచాయతీ బోర్డువారు అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేశారా లేక అధికారులే అధికార దుర్వినియోగం చేశారా అనే విషయాలు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఖరీదైన చేసిన తరువాతనే ఆ ఆర్డరును ఖాయపరచడమో, నిలుపుదల చేయడమో మంచిది కాదా అని మంత్రిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“The Government will certainly go into the matter in detail. But, I want notice to give information.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆర్డరు పాసు చేసే వరకు లోకల్ బోర్డు ఇన్వెస్టిగేటరు చేసిన ఉత్తరువులను నిలుపుదల చేయరాదా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“Stay may be granted in certain very good cases and on very good grounds.”

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“నాకు నిజంగా ఇంగ్లీషువారు. తెలుగు మాత్రమే తెలుసు. కాబట్టి తెలుగుతెలిసిన మంత్రిగారు సమాధానం తెలుగులో చెప్పవలసిన స్పీకర్ గారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. అప్పుడే నేను సస్టిమెంటరీ ప్రశ్నలు వేయడం సాధ్యమవుతుంది.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“The hon. Member says that he does not know English at all and that if the answer is given in Telugu he will be able to put supplementary questions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“How is it possible? There are other hon. Members also who do not know English at all. Is it possible to translate all the answers in all the languages?”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I do not want to come in the way of your decision, Sir. The hon. Member has taken the trouble of putting an interpellation and he is ignorant of English. So, if the Hon. Minister knows Telugu, he may translate his answer in Telugu, otherwise he need not.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“There are Tamilian and Malayalee Members also. If I accede to the request of the hon. Member now, then they also may want translations in Tamil and Malayalam.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I have only put my point of view before you, Sir.”

10-50 a.m. SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Did the Government consider the question of staying action in the matter of supersession in this particular case? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The Government examined the question when the representation was made and they did not feel that a stay was necessary in this matter.”

Installation of a calendering machine in Rayalaseema.

* 29 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation has been received by the Government regarding the installation of a calendering machine to facilitate the operations of weavers in Ravalaseema;

(b) if so, what is the proposal of the Government in the matter; and

(c) what is the probable expenditure to be incurred on such installation?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) No, Sir.

" (b) & (c) Does not arise."

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA :—“ In view of the acute depression in the sale of handloom goods, will the Government consider the desirability of installing a calendering machine in Rayalaseema in order to give a sort of encouragement to the handloom weavers so that they may be able to get their goods calendered to suit the present market and to invite the attention of the consumer to such goods? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Ban on Telugu play "Mundadugu".

* 30 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether there is a ban on the performance of " Mundadugu " drama (Telugu); and if so, why?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ The drama was banned in 1946 because the Government considered that it was defamatory in nature.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఈ నాటకాన్ని మహామర్మత్రులుగూడా ఒక నాడు చూచి ఇది చాలా కానుకపని స్ట్రీఫీక్షన్లుగూడా ఇచ్చిన విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా.”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"A separate question may be put, Sir."

4th November 1952]

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ ബഹു മന്ത്രി അപകിത്തികൾ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന പരമ്പരയെക്കുറിച്ച്. ആകാശം അപകിത്തികൾ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന പരമ്പരയെ കുറിച്ചുവെക്കുമോ ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN N. IR. :—“നാട്ടിനക്കകം.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Is the Hon. the Minister for Law aware of the fact that the drama was put on boards in the immediate presence and under the patronage of the Finance Minister of the day ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ I am not aware, Sir.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ On the basis of whose reports did the Government ban the drama? ”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR.—“The Collector's recommendation was considered in this matter.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“വേറെ വല്ല നടപടികളും ഈ സ്റ്റേറ്റിൽ നിശ്ചയിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടോ? ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഏതൊക്കെയാണ്?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“ഉയർന്ന വേതനം ലഭിക്കാൻ ഏതെങ്കിലും വ്യവസ്ഥ.”

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN:—“നടക്കങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി മിഡിപ്പറയൻ പൊലീസ് റിപ്പോർട്ടുകൾ എടുക്കുമുണ്ടോ?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ Police report is also called for.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“കൊള്ളക്കാരായ ബ്രിട്ടീഷ് സാമ്രാജ്യവാദികൾ ജനറൽ കെ. ഡച്ചറിന്റെ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ അഖിലൻ പർവ്വതത്തിൽ വെച്ചു നമ്മുടെ ആയിരക്കണക്കിലുള്ള ജനങ്ങളെ കശാപ്പുചെയ്യുകയും 1931 ഡി. മലബാർ മാപ്പിള ലഹരിയെന്ന പറയപ്പെടുന്ന കഷിക കലാപത്തിൽ ഏകദേശം 1000 കണക്കിൽ കൂടിക്കാറെ കശാപ്പുചെയ്യുകയും നടക്കുമ്പോഴായിരിക്കട്ടെ കിരീടങ്ങളെ, സൂര്യ ചക്രങ്ങൾക്ക് അപകീർത്തികരമാകുമായിരിക്കാം; വക്കൽ അയ്യപ്പൻ നമ്മുടെ സാക്ഷി അപകീർത്തികരമാകുമോയെന്നു് ഞ്ഞു. മന്ത്രി പറഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം ?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—“That does not arise here.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ సాటికాన్నీ నిక
 ధింజడం జిల్లా కలెక్టరుయొక్క రిపోర్టును ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని తేలికానది ప్రభ
 త్వము సహాధానము చేప్పారు. కాని ముఖ్యము, వివిధస్థానాల్లా మంత్రి, అడ్డక
 కాళా మంత్రి మొదలగువారు స్వయముగా చూచి, ఆ సాటికం కానిందని అధివంధి
 చిన తరువాతనూడా దీని విషయమై జిల్లా కలెక్టరుయొక్క రిపోర్టుమీద ఆధారపడి
 దీనిని నికధింజడమునేది సరియైన వద్దలి అని ఇచ్చుటకే ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆను
 కొంటున్నారా?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"A separate question may be put."

Ban on Telugu play "Mabhoomi".

* 81 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether there is any ban on the performance of " Mabhoomi " drama (Telugu) and if so, why?

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"Yes. The drama was banned in 1948 because the Government considered that it was defamatory in nature and was likely to corrupt the persons present at the performance."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"The Hon. Minister said that he will take the police report into consideration to ban the drama. Does the Hon. Minister think that the cultural development of the country, by means of dramas must depend on the police reports about them?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"The Government also will examine it. I had occasion to read the translation of this drama and I am also of the opinion that it is likely to corrupt the persons present at the performance."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—"ఈ నాటకాన్ని నిషేధించడం తొలగించడాన్ని గురించి అలాచింతడానికి విమత ఆచార్యులకు ఉన్నదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"A separate question may be put."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"The Hon. the Minister was pleased to say that he read the translation and that he was also of the opinion that those who read it would be corrupted. May I know what the implications of the word 'corruption' are?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"As is shown in the Oxford Dictionary." (Laughter.)

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—"మా భూమి" నాటక ప్రదర్శకులను కూడా నేనుకంటే ముందు ఎంతవరకు వెదికినారన విషయాన్ని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"A separate question may be put."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"With reference to 'as shown in Oxford Dictionary', may I ask the Minister when he referred to the Dictionary and how he has connected the meaning given there with the sense in which he has used the word 'corruption' now? What are the relevant portions he has referred to as corrupting?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"I have not used the word 'corruption'. I refer to the Oxford Dictionary as and when occasion arises."

SRI V. SRIKRISHNA :—"కృత్రిమమును ప్రాప్త పొందుటకు వంటి నినిమా ప్రదర్శకులనుగూడా అనుమతిస్తున్నటువంటి ప్రభుత్వము ఇటువంటి నాటకాలను తొలగించుటకు అవకాశమిస్తుందా?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"A separate question may be put."

[4th November 1952]

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—"దీనిని translation వేషమువంటి version ను వదిలివేసి ముద్రాణము చేస్తారు. అటువంటి తర్జుమా కావాలి ఈ ఆనెంట్ సభ్యులందరికీ కూడా circulate చేస్తారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"A separate question may be put."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—"గణ్యత సంస్కారములగురించి వివిధ వ్యవస్థలను తయారుచేయుటకు వేదికలుకూడా ఏర్పాటుచేయవలసిందిగా, గాంధీజీగారి పరిశోధనలను గణ్యత సంస్కారములగురించి వివరములు తెలియజేయుటకు ఒకటికంటే ఎక్కువగా ప్రచురించుటకు గౌరవ మంత్రిగారు ఏర్పాటుచేసినారా?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—"ఇటువంటి వ్యవస్థలు గాంధీజీగారి గ్రంథాలలో ఉన్నాయి."

Water-supply scheme for Jaggayyapet.

* 32 Q.—**SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned the investigation of a water-supply scheme for Jaggayyapet; and

(b) if so, when and how far it has progressed?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"(a) & (b) In December 1949, the Government sanctioned the investigation of a water-supply scheme for Jaggayyapet Panchayat, Krishna district. The investigation was taken up in 1951-52. At present the field work is in active progress and the investigation is expected to be completed shortly."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"దీనిని investigate చేయడానికి మాకు సూచనలు వచ్చేటట్లు చేతే, ప్రభుత్వము, దాని ప్రగతిపై పట్టుకుంటే, ఒక్కోసారి ఇది సరిగా investigate చేస్తున్నారా అని అలా అడగడం ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకొంటున్నదా?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"Notice, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Will the Government enquire into the cause of the delay in investigation?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"There will be no delay. Additional staff has been appointed in April 1951 after which the investigation has been taken up and this scheme has been given the second place in the Northern Circle Non-municipal Urban Water-supply Scheme."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"ఈ స్కీము ప్రభుత్వము ఎప్పుడు తీసుకొని ఆవరణలో పెట్టడానికి సాధ్యమవుతుందో తెలియజేయగలరా?"

SRI R. LAKSHMINARASIMHA DORA :—"Are there schemes investigated in Srikakulam? If so, have Government taken them up?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"A separate question may be put."

[4th November 1952]

Report of the Committee on the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive.

* 33 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether a fact-finding commission was appointed to enquire into and report on the working of the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive and if so, whether the Committee submitted its report; and

(b) whether a copy of the report will be made available to the members of the Legislature?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“(a) A Committee composed of a Judge of the High Court and a Member of the Board of Revenue has been appointed by Government to review the working of the Scheme of Separation for the purpose of eliminating administrative difficulties, if any, in the working of the scheme. The report of the Committee has not yet been received. Meanwhile, interim recommendations made by them are attended to.

(b) Yes, if desired, but not before the preliminary examination is over and the printing is done.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I heard the Hon. the Minister for Law say that certain recommendations were made—interim recommendations—and acted upon by the Government. As they have already been implemented, may I know what those recommendations were?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Such as the repair of certain court-houses, addition to court-houses and such other minor matters which are urgent though they may look unimportant in a big House like this.”

11 a.m. SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“Sir, if the report of the Committee is favourable, will the Government introduce the Separation Scheme in the rest of the districts without any exception?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“Sir, I am not aware of the contents of the report and so I am not able to answer the question.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“Fact-finding commission అనేది ఏమిటి? దీనిని ఏమి చేయమని నిర్దేశించారు? దీనిని ఏమి చేయమని నిర్దేశించారు? దీనిని ఏమి చేయమని నిర్దేశించారు?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“Sir, if the hon. Member had listened to my answer he would not have put this question. It was done for the purpose of eliminating administrative difficulties, if any, in the working of the scheme. It is not a fact-finding committee.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—“May I know, Sir, whether the scheme would be extended to Tanjore district?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“We will examine it.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“జాడిషియరీని ఎం పూర్తిగా నుండి separate చేయడానికి ఏక మిస్టరు ఫ్యాక్ ఫిండింగ్ కమిషన్ మాట నిజమేనా? Fact-finding commission ను influence చేసినమాట నిజమేనా?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“A separate question may be put.”

SRI N. N. SUVARNA :—“May I know, Sir, whether this scheme of separation of the judiciary from the executive will be extended to South Kanara this year?”

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“It will be decided after the report is received.”

Representations from the Burmah Evacuees' Association, Yellamanchili.

* 34 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report from the Burmah Evacuees' Association, Yellamanchili, pointing out maladministration in the Indian Evacuees' and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society of Yellamanchili, Visakhapatnam district; and

(b) if so, the action taken so far?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“(a) Yes, Sir.”

“(b) The matter is under examination of Government.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“May I know, Sir, how much time this examination will take?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“Reasonably short time, Sir.”

Government Hospital, Munagala.

* 35 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the year in which the Government Hospital had been sanctioned in Munagala, Nandigama taluk;

(b) where it was located;

(c) whether it was made permanent; and

(d) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) The Government sanctioned the provincialization of the Local Fund Hospital, Munagala, as a permanent measure with effect from 1st January 1949.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I hope my Hon. Colleague will forgive me if I intervene. The question is taking a different turn. I submit it is wrong for the hon. Members to assume that searches are wrong. If searches are made maliciously for the purpose of disgusting or annoying, they are wrong. But if a search has to be made, the search has to be made and mostly it has to be made thoroughly. If a person secrets something in a place where it has to be searched for, it has to be done. The question therefore is whether the search is malicious or honest and justifiable. Government cannot afford in the case of prisoners to give up searches.”

[4th November 1952]

in the Madras City or in the mufassal, if employed in Madras City, they are eligible for Madras House Allowance when the house rent actually paid by them is in excess of 10 per cent of their emoluments, if the house is unfurnished, or 12½ per cent if furnished. The amount of the allowance will be the actual excess over 10 or 12½ per cent of the emoluments, as the case may be, subject to certain maxima prescribed in rule 13 on pages 7-9 of the Madras Manual of Special Pay and Allowances, Volume 1, extract of which is placed on the table of the House.

"(b) The rent payable for houses allotted under the Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1949, is the rent demanded by the house owner or the fair rent fixed by the Rent Controller, as the case may be, irrespective of the pay of the employee.

"(c) No."

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—" In view of the high cost of living, will the Hon. Minister consider the desirability of extending the grant of house-rent allowance to Government employees who are residing in big towns, though not in municipalities? "

THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—" A separate question may be put."

Non-confirmation of certain non-gazetted officers in the Revenue Department in Malabar district.

* 39 Q.—JANAB KUNHI MUHAMMAD SHAFEE: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of non-gazetted officer in the Revenue Department in Malabar district with a service of 15 years or above who are not yet confirmed;

(b) the number of such officers in each grade; and

(c) the reasons, if any, for their non-confirmation in general.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) 11 (eleven).

"(b) Lower division clerks	...	...	...	6
Upper division clerks	...	...	...	3
Deputy Tahsildars	...	...	...	2

"(c) The earliest of the existing vacancies arose on 16th April 1943. In 1945, orders were passed that no vacancy which has to be reserved to be filled by War Service Candidates and which occurred on or after 1st April 1943, should until further orders, be filled by the appointment of approved probationers already in service. In 1947, final orders were issued for filling up the substantive vacancies. The Collector then reported the number of vacancies that remained to be filled and the persons to be confirmed to the Board of Revenue.

* Printed as Appendix on pages 176-178 infra.

[4th November 1952]

for instructions on certain points, and orders thereon were issued by the Board in June 1951. The Collector thereupon took up the question of confirmation and the vacancies will be filled up soon. It is however pointed out in this connection that the persons awaiting confirmation will be confirmed in their turn with retrospective effect from the dates at which the vacancies arose and the delay in passing the formal orders of confirmation will not adversely affect the interests of the persons concerned."

Annual grants given to the Madras State Co-operative Union.

* 40 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Government give any annual grant to—

(1) the Madras Provincial Co-operative Union, Madras;

→ (2) Andhra Desa Co-operative Union, Rajahmundry; and

(3) The Tamilnad Co-operative Federation, Coimbatore; and if so, the amount and the purpose for which the grant is made?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Two different annual grants are given by the Government to the Madras State Co-operative Union—

(1) An annual grant, being the subsidy to meet the cost of the non-official lecturers of the mufassal Co-operative Training Institutes, at Tanjore and Coimbatore, is distributed to the Institutes through the State Co-operative Union. The amount of the grant varies from year to year in accordance with the cost of emoluments paid to the lecturers by the Institutes in the time-scale of their pay and other allowances. A sum of Rs. 6,200 was granted for the year 1951-52. This grant made to the Coimbatore and Tanjore Institutes is in lieu of the free services of departmental officers to work as lecturers in the other training institutes.

(2) An annual grant, being subsidy towards the pay of the Manager-cum-Associate Editor of the Madras Journal of Co-operation, is paid to the State Co-operative Union. This amount also is based on the actual cost of the Manager-cum-Associate Editor. A sum of Rs. 3,750 was paid to the Union for 1951-52.

Annual grants are not given to the Tamilnad Co-operative Federation, and Andhra Desa Co-operative Union."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" ఈ ఉపకారము స్థాయి కో-ఆపరేటివ్ యూనియన్లకు యిచ్చబడుచున్నది. గ్రామీణ విభాగములో ప్రభుత్వ విభాగాన్ని ఆదుట చేసుకొని ఉన్న యిచ్చిందా? లేక వారు స్వతంత్రంగా నిర్వహించుకొంటారా? లేక అంతకు ఉపకారానికి యిచ్చిందా, అలాగైతే, ఈమంది అంశాదేశక సహకార సమితికి ఎందుకని యిచ్చబడుచు లేదు."

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ఈ మదరాసు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ మూనిసిపాలిటీ మదరాసు రాష్ట్రములో సహకార ఉద్యమాన్ని ప్రచారం చేస్తున్నది. కాబట్టి ప్రత్యేకంగా తమిళ దేశానికి, ఆంధ్ర దేశానికి అని యివ్వడం లేదు.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఏ భాషలో ప్రచురించబడతాయండి?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“అది ఆంగ్లములోనే ప్రచురించబడుతుంది.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“Is there a Co-operative Union for Malabar? If there is not one, will the Government consider the desirability of starting one?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“I cannot answer at the moment. If the hon. Member gives me notice, I will.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“The Hon. Minister stated that the journal was being conducted only in the English language. In view of the fact that the aim of the co-operative movement is to spread the movement so that it could reach the illiterate masses in the villages, will the Hon. Minister consider the desirability of publishing the journal in the different regional languages?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“There are journals both in Tamil and in Telugu, Sir.”

A new bus-route on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road, Malabar district.

* 41 Q.—**JANAB KUNHI MUHAMED SHAFEE :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations were made to Government to sanction a route for a new bus service on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road in Malabar district; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

11-20
a.m.

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) & (b) There was no representation and there was no proposal to start a bus service on the Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road. But there was a representation and a proposal for introduction of a new bus route from Pattambi to Anakkayam via Perintalmanna and Tirurkkad and it was rejected by the Road Traffic Board as the road was supposed to be unfit for lorry traffic. This was the position on the 29th February 1952. On 31st August 1952, the Malabar Trade Union Council represented to Government that they wanted a new bus route from Anakkayam to Perintalmanna. The remarks of the Central Road Traffic Board are awaited in this matter.”

JANAB KUNHI MUHAMED SHAFEE :—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that a bus route was sanctioned between Perintalmanna and Anakkayam and that buses were plying for some months?”

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“It is, so far as I am aware, a new bus route and the matter is being examined by the Central Road Traffic Board as to whether the road is fit and the bridges are safe.”

Direct recruitment of Deputy Collectors.

* 42 Q.—**SRI G. RAMA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether there is any proposal with the Government to abolish the present system of direct recruitment for Deputy Collectors?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“No.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“అకు, వక్క తెలియని పిల్లకాయలను పెద్ద పెద్ద ఉద్యోగాలకుగా ప్రభుత్వం వారు నియమిస్తున్నారు. అందువల్ల కోర్టులో న్యాయం జరిగడం లేదు. అట్లు అర్థం చేసుకొనలేకపోతున్నారు. అనుభవము లేనవ్వ కారు కనడటం లేదు. చాలామంది అనుభవము, తెలివితేటలుగల ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగులు పైకి రావడానికి వీలుకాకుండా చేస్తున్నారు. కాబట్టి యాభిధానంగా కాకుండా మరేమైనా మార్పు చేస్తారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“నోటీసు యివ్వాలి.”

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—“Sir, many Deputy Collectors in service are direct recruits. May I ask, Sir, whether it is not advisable for the Government to stop direct recruitment for a period of two years and give a chance to those who are already in service?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The Government have now decided to recruit one directly and two by promotion.”

Weavers' Co-operative Societies and the exemption from the levy of audit fees.

* 43 Q.—**SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Government are in receipt of the resolution recently passed at the meeting of the general body of the Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society, Limited, Madras, requesting the Government to exempt the Weavers' Co-operative Societies from the levy of audit fees at least for the year 1951-52, and if so, the action taken thereon by the Government?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“The Government have since perused the resolution and it is under examination.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“Sir, pending the decision in the matter, will the Government direct the head of the Co-operative Department to stop collection of audit fees for the year 1951-52 from the Weavers' Co-operatives?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“If the Government decide accordingly, they would certainly instruct the Registrar to stop collection of audit fees.”

[4th November 1952]

Number of Weavers' Co-operative Societies formed exclusively for Harijans.

* 44 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state the number of Weavers' Co-operative Societies that are formed exclusively for the Harijans in the State?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—"There are 64 Weavers' Co-operative Societies formed exclusively for Harijans in the State."

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—"Will the Government consider the question of organizing Weavers' Co-operative Societies exclusively for the Harijans in Proddatur and Jammalamadugu taluks in view of the large number of Harijan weavers in these two taluks?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—"If any such proposal comes we will certainly consider."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—"How many such societies are functioning in the district of South Arcot?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may put a separate question."

Collection of excess water-tax from the peasants of turmeric fields in Krishna Western Delta.

* 45 Q.—SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether twice the usual water-tax was collected for the year 1951-52 from the peasants of turmeric fields all along the West Bank Canal of Krishna river; and

(b) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) & (b) The turmeric ayacut in the Krishna Western Delta has been specified and the list of lands included in the turmeric ayacuts was published in the *Guntur District Gazette* on 20th June 1947. Only the usual water-rate is charged in the case of the lands included under the turmeric ayacut. In the case of other lands not included in the ayacut, penal water-rate ranging from 1½ times to twice the usual water-rate is being charged for irrigation of turmeric. In Tenali taluk, cultivation of turmeric on poramboke lands in fasli 1361 was charged at twice the usual water-rate."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"మంత్రిగారు ఇంతవరకు రెండు సార్లు సెక్షన్లలో సమాధానం ఇచ్చారు. కనుక నా ప్రశ్నను కాగా అర్థం చేసుకోని సమాధానం ఇవ్వాలని అభిప్రాయం. ఆయనకు అలాంటి పనులు తోటలకు నీరు అడిగితే దీక్షించుటలో సప్లయ్ చేయవలసిన బాధ్యత లేదంటున్నారు. ఇదవరలో ఇప్పుడు మాత్రం నీటి లెక్కకు రెండు రెట్లు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. అసలు చాలాకాలంనుండి ఆయనకు అలాంటి భూమికి నీరు సప్లయ్ అవుతున్నట్లున్నది. కనుక ఆ భూమిని ఆయనకు అలాంటి రేటు వేయరా?"

[4th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"A definite ayacut is reserved for turmeric cultivation. Regarding the question of extending the turmeric ayacut, if the hon. Member makes any specific representation it will be examined and looked into."

Nutritive value of the diet supplied in jails.

* 46 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Health Department has examined and analysed the diet supplied in jails regarding its nutritive value; and

(b) if so, what its report is?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—" (a) & (b) The Health Department has not examined and analysed the diet supplied in jails regarding its nutritive value. The jail diets, were however, analysed by the Director of King Institute, Guindy, in 1950 and he reported the approximate caloric values of the various kinds of diet given to prisoners, per day, to be as follows:—

1 Class I Rigorous imprisonment.	Vegetarian ..	3,820 calories.
2 Class I Do.	Non-vegetarian.	3,152 do.
3 Class I Do.	Undertrials..	3,031 do.
4 Class II Do.	Rice diet ..	2,763 do.
5 Class II Do.	Mixed diet..	2,741 do.
6 Simple imprisonment.	..	2,418 do.

The Jail Reforms Committee which recently went into the question of the adequacy or otherwise of the various kinds of diet given to prisoners in jails, with reference to their nutritive value, has observed that the scales of diet prescribed for the prisoners of the different classes and for the convict patients in hospitals are generally satisfactory and adequate."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"ప్రభుత్వం వారు యిటీవల జైల్లో యిస్తున్నట్టి ఆహారపదార్థాలను పరిశీలించుటకు Director of Public Health గారిని నియమిస్తారా?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"A separate question may be put, Sir."

SRI B. SANKARAYYA:—"జైల్లో బియ్యము మొదలగు యివర ఆహార పదార్థములు అన్నీ కలిసి 18 టన్నుల వరకు యివ్వాలని రూపు భిక్షము. అలాగే జైల్లో ఉండే చాలా sub-jails లో కూడా పది టన్నులు మాత్రమే ఇస్తున్నారని మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసా?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"A separate question may be put, Sir."

[4th November 1952]

Number of fishing tanks in Hosur Livestock Research Station.

* 48 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) how many tanks are attached to Hosur Livestock Research Station;

(b) whether the concerned authorities have taken steps to develop fisheries in the tanks in question; and whether the authorities at any time auctioned the tanks for fishing; and

(c) whether they are doing so now; and if not, what is happening to the fish in the tanks that are attached to the Research Station?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) Five tanks, viz., Kalkeri, Appa Reddi, Poonapalli, Jeegoor and a small portion of the foreshore of the Karnoor tank are attached to the Livestock Research Station, Hosur.

“(b) Yes.

“(c) Due to failure of monsoon during the last five years, most of the tanks were completely dry, on many occasions resulting in the loss of foundation stock of fish. During these periods whenever there were rains and there was water in the tanks a small number of fish was developed and they were caught when the tanks went dry and the fish thus collected were sold departmentally.”

Capital punishment in Pudukkottai Division.

* 49 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was no capital punishment in Pudukkottai State before merger;

(b) whether capital punishment was introduced in Pudukkottai after merger of Pudukkottai State with Madras State and the date of its introduction; and

(c) the number of executions from Pudukkottai State (Division) since the introduction of capital punishment in Pudukkottai Division of Tiruchirappalli district?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“(a) There was no capital punishment in Pudukkottai State before merger.

“(b) The laws of Madras State were made applicable to Pudukkottai with effect from 1st April 1949. Consequently capital punishment was not excluded with effect from the same date.

“(c) One.”

[4th November 1952]

Transfer of foresters within a circle.

* 50 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether there are standing orders to transfer foresters from one division to another division and from one district to another district.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Under the Special Rules for the Madras Forest Subordinate Service, the Conservator of a Forest Circle is empowered to transfer foresters from one division to another within the Circle, which comprises of three or four districts.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“In view of the small salaries drawn by the foresters, will it not be advisable for the Government to pass standing orders restricting transfers within the district itself?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The matter will be considered, Sir.” 11-30 a.m.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—REQUEST FOR A DEBATE ON FAMINE AND FOOD CONDITIONS IN THE STATE.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I want to ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether he will be prepared to allot two days for the discussion of the famine and food conditions in this Province, in view of the very acute scarcity conditions, particularly in the dry areas of almost all the twenty-four districts.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“I will consider the suggestion, Sir.”

III.—DISQUALIFICATION OF A MEMBER (SRI SAKA VENKATA RAO)—cont.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Another matter, Sir. Yesterday, I raised the matter regarding Sri Saka Venkata Rao. I believe an appeal to the Supreme Court does not operate as stay of the judgment of the High Court. May I request the Speaker that summons may be issued to him and that he may be allowed to participate in the proceedings of this House?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“I want to remind hon. Members and the Leader of the Opposition of Article 192 of the Constitution. I have written to the Governor and I am awaiting his reply. If the hon. Member is sitting here in the House, he is doing so at his own risk and I cannot now prevent him from doing so.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I think it was after a reference to the High Court's judgment . . .”

MR. SPEAKER :—“But I have not received a copy of the judgment; I have not also received a reply from the Governor.”

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Have not the Government taken care to get a copy of the judgment, Sir?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I have applied for a copy of the judgment, Sir; but I have not yet received it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no difficulty in the matter at all. There is the decision of the High Court, and the Election Commissioner wants to test it in the Supreme Court also, because it is a matter of principle that is involved. Leave has also been given by the High Court. What the Leader of the Opposition said is quite right, that the appeal does not act as stay by itself. The member can remain here until the matter is decided."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"But no summons has been issued to the Member."

MR. SPEAKER:—"As I said, I have not received a reply from the Governor, as to how the matter has been decided. Until I know definitely, how can I ask the office to issue summons?"

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ప్రధాన మంత్రి గారినుండి సరియైన సమాధానముకొరకు ఆడుగుతున్నాను. శాసనసభ్యుడైన సాకా వెంకట్రావుగారు తన యొక్క risk మీద శాసనసభలో కూర్చోవచ్చునని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుతున్నారు. కాని యొక్క attendance register లో వారి పేరు ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారి కేబినెట్లో నేనీయవచ్చును. ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన ప్రకారం వెంకట్రావుగారి పేరు రిజిస్టరులో వ్రాయించినట్లయితే వారియొక్క risk మీద సభలో కూర్చోవటానికి సిద్ధంగా ఉన్నారు."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member put it in writing and send it on to me; I shall examine that."

IV.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION RE HANDLOOM INDUSTRY—cont.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The next item is the debate on the handloom industry. The hon. Member Sri Venkatajagga Rao will now continue his speech. I have reduced the time-limit for each Member to ten minutes."

*SRI B. VENKATA JAGGA RAO:—"అభ్యయే, మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము వారు చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్యయొక్క వాఙ్మత యావత్తూ కూడా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము వైసే ఉన్నట్లు, తమకు ఎవ్విధమైన వాఙ్మత లేనట్లుగా కూర్చుని చూస్తూన్నదని నేను అంటున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే తమ వాఙ్మతకూడా మన రాష్ట్రములో ఎంతైనా తృప్తిపడుకూడా వారు ఎవ్విధమైనటువంటి వాఙ్మత తిసుకోకుండా ఉంటున్నారని నేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఎక్కడ అయితే, వివిధ ప్రాంతాలలో నేనే చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములను పెంచుగా భ్రమిస్తున్నారో ఆయా ప్రాంతాలలో చేసేత సహకార సంఘాలు ఏర్పాటుచేయడానికి యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు వెనుకడుగు వేస్తున్నారని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. విప్రప్రంతాలలోనైతే చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములను పెంచుగా ఉన్నారో ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో తప్పకుండా చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక co-operative societies స్థాపించవలసిందిగా ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా యొక్క చరిత్రను బట్టి చేసేత పారిశ్రామికముల co-operative societies లో

[4th November 1952] [Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao]

share భనము వెల్లించి పేరుదార్లుగా చేరుటకు అవకాశము లేకుండా భస్మారని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. వివేకంగా యీ చేసేత పరిశ్రమ వారి దుర్బర స్థితికి వచ్చి చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములకు జీవనభృతి తగ్గిపోయినందువల్ల వారు share భనమును కట్టలేకుండా యున్నారు. అందుచేత ప్రభుత్వమువారి యీ share భనమును వెల్లించి యీ co-operative societies యొక్క లాభమును పొందేటట్లుగా వారిని చేర్చించవలసిందిగా నేను మృదయపూర్వకముగా ప్రభుత్వము వారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అసలు యీ చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్య పూర్తిగా తీర్చవలసినట్లు ముఖ్యంగా యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు వీరికి కేటాయింబ దలచిన చీరలు, దోవతులు మొదలైనటువంటి వాటిని కేటాయించినంత మృతముననే యీ చరిత్ర తొలగదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా మన రాష్ట్రంలో నూటికి ఎన్నభేమందిగల సామాన్య ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయి తగ్గింది అంటే యీ ప్రజానీకముయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిందని తెప్పక తప్పదు. అందువల్ల యీ చేసేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా పైకితీసుకొని రావటానికి అవకాశములేకుండా ఉన్నదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు వీరియొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని పోగుచేయడానికి ప్రయత్నించవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ జీవన స్థాయి పెంచుచు చేయడానికి మన ప్రభుత్వము వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణలను ప్రవేశ పెట్టవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అంటే, మన రాష్ట్రములో పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములవద్ద వందలొడ్డి ఉన్నటువంటి ఎకరాల భూమిని తీసుకొని వ్యవసాయభూమిలు, కేద రైతాంగానికి అలాగా ముఖ్యంగా వి మృతముకూడా భూమి లేనివారికియిచ్చి వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణ చేయవలెను. ఈ విధంగా ఈ వేద ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని పెంచినాడే ఈ చేసేత కార్మికులయొక్క సమస్య తీర్చడానికి అవకాశము లివ్వవలసిన మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే రెండవ ప్రపంచ యుద్ధమునకుముందు ఈ చేసేత కార్మికులయొక్క స్థితిగతులకు ఈ యుద్ధానంతరము వారికి తృప్తి స్థితిగతులకు చాలా తేడా వచ్చియున్నది. ఆ రోజులలో ఒక్కోక చేసేత పారిశ్రామికము నేల ఒకటింటికి సుమారు ముప్పది రూపాయలు తెచ్చుకుంటూ ఉన్నాడు. ఈ డబ్బుతో ఆ రోజులలో తన కుటుంబ పోషణ సుఖముగా జరుపుకొనగలిగియున్నాడు. ఎందుచేతనంటే అలాడు భాగ్యము బాగా ఒకటింటికి అయిదు, ఆరు రూపాయలు ఖరీదు పెట్టి కొనుగోని మిగతా ఒక్కోముతో తన కుటుంబ ఖర్చులు ఖరీదుకొనగలిగియున్నాడు. అటువంటిది ఈ యుద్ధము తరువాత ఈ రోజులలో భాగ్యము బాగా ఒకటింటికి సుమారు 30 రూపాయలనుండి 35 రూపాయలవరకు పెరిగియున్నది. ఈ నాడు ఈ వారి శామికుడు తెచ్చుకున్న ముప్పది రూపాయలు ఒక్కో లియ్యమునకు మాత్రమే ఖర్చు అయితే తన కుటుంబమునకు కావలసిన యితర ఖర్చులు మొట్టమొదటగా ప్రభుత్వమువారి గమనించవలసినవి కోరుతున్నాను. అందుచేత ఈ చేసేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా తీర్చవలసిన వాఙ్మత ఈ ప్రభుత్వము వారిపై యున్నదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ వాఙ్మత వహించకుండా అది కేవలము కేంద్రప్రభుత్వముదే అయి యున్నదని చెప్పడమనేది ఈ మీద ప్రజానీకాన్ని మభ్యపెట్టడమునకు పురమికాలేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అందుచేత ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేసేత పారిశ్రామికముల అందరికీ చేయవలసినంత సహాయము చేయటము ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారి వాఙ్మత వహించినయడల మిగిలినవిషయములను కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుట న్యాయము అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేసేత వారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు కేటాయించదలచిన చీరలు, దోవతులు కేటాయించినంత మృతముననే, ఈ సమస్య తీరు. వీరికి కావలసినంత నూలు సరఫరా చేయించవలసినట్లుంది. అంతేకాకుండా నూలు ఖరీదు నూటికి యాభైవంతులు తగ్గింది వీరిని పైకి తీసుకువచ్చి యడల వీరు ఈ పరిశ్రమను వృద్ధికి తెచ్చుకొని జీవించగలరు. అంతేకాదు

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [4th November 1952]

వీరికి భాగ్యములను సహజమైన కౌశలములు లేకుండుటకు అందేటట్లు చూడవలెను. ఇటువంటి వాళ్ళకు మన ముద్రాను ప్రభుత్వమువారు సహించి, మిగిలినటువంటి విజయములకు కౌశలము ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరే విజయములూ అందరు కలిసి కృషిచేయు అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల ఈ విల్లును తప్పకుండా ఆమోదించగలరని నా విశ్వాసము. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన బిల్లును నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా బలపరుస్తూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రవేశపెట్టిన ఈ బిల్లులోని ముఖ్యద్దేశానికి నా ఆమోదాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు నాన్నీ సమగ్రంగా చేయాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో కొన్ని సవరణలుకూడా ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. చేనేత పరిశ్రమ భారతదేశంలో అనాది సిద్ధంగావచ్చును కుటీర పరిశ్రమ. లక్షలాది ప్రజలకు ఇదే జీవనాధారముగా ఉండి ఉండినది. నేడు యీ పరిశ్రమ అత్యంత క్షీణిస్తున్నది. పరిస్థితులకు లోనుకావలసివచ్చింది. చేనేత కార్మికులు కడుపు చేతపట్టుకొని భిక్షువలెనే జీవించిన దుర్గతి సాధించింది. అంధ్రదేశంలో ఎక్కడ పేద కుటుంబాలవారికి జీవనోపాధి కల్పించే ఈ వృత్తి నేడు వివాదాస్పదమైపోయింది. ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమలో నేడు చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు పడుతున్న యిబ్బందులు విషాదపూరితంగా ఉన్నాయి. చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోని కాళహస్తి, మదనపల్లి, వాయిల్ పాడు తాలూకాలోను, అనంతపురం జిల్లాలోని ధర్మవరం తాలూకాలోను, కడప జిల్లా, పులివెందుల, జమ్మలమడుగు, రాజంపేట తాలూకాలోని చేనేత ప్రజలుపడే వాధలు కర్ణాటకానికి వోరు రావలసివచ్చింది. వారికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం చేసిన మేక్లిమీ లేవు. సాంకేదాయ సిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ నేడు అధోగతిపాతాళాన ఉన్నది. నాటివరకూ ప్రభుత్వానికి కనువిప్పుకాలేదు. విదేశీ ఒకవిధంగా ఈ ప్రస్తుత బిల్లును కానన సభ ఎదుటికి వచ్చింది. అది కొంతవరకు మెరుగైనది సంతోషిస్తున్నాను. కరువుకాలంలో అలమటిస్తున్న రాయలసీమలోని ఈ పరిశ్రమ నికర కొంతవరకైనా కొలుకొనాలి అంటే ప్రభుత్వంవారు వారికి ఉదారంగా జీవనభృతి ఋణాలివ్వాలి. వారిసంత నూలు సరఫరాచేసి వారికి పనికల్పించాలి. ఆ నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. అందుకు సబ్సిడీలు యివ్వాలి. గ్రామ గ్రామాలలో ఉన్న చేనేత కార్మికులను ముసంఘటితపరచి సహకార సంస్థల అందుకాటులోనికి తీసుకొనిరావాలి. వారి జీవితాలకు ఒకదారి, తెన్ను చూపించాలి. ప్రస్తుతం చేనేత కార్మికులు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ సొసైటీలకు చేరుకోవడానికి తెల్లించుకోలేని అభ్యాస పరిస్థితిలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ పేర్ల వారిని ప్రభుత్వమే వారికిగాను తెల్లించాలి. వారిసందరను సహకార సంఘాలలో సభ్యులనుగా చేసి తగినంత పని కల్పించి జీవనభృతిని సుపాదింపుకోటానికి వారికి అవకాశం కలుగజేయాలి. ముఖ్యంగా చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు ఈ దేశంలో బ్రతకాలంటే దానికి మిల్లు పోటీలేకుండా చేయాలి. యాంత్రికమైన మిల్లు పరిశ్రమ అనుగతంగా ఈ దేశంలో ఉన్న కుటీర పరిశ్రమను కబళించిచేయకుండా చూడాలి.

11-40 a.m. “చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దిగవారి పోటీందని ఒకవంక చెబుతున్న ఈ ప్రభుత్వం నేటికీ చూడాలి. అప్పుకపు పన్నును ఆ పరిశ్రమపైరుద్దడం అన్యాయంకాదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈమే చేయవలసిన వై సహాయకార్యాక్రమాన్ని చేయకంతవరకూ కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క నిజాయితీ ఋణాశ్ర కాదు. లక్షలాది ప్రజలు ఆధారపడివున్న ఒక కుటీర పరిశ్రమ కొనసాగిపోతే ఉన్నానూడా దానిపైన పన్నుధారం తొలగించలేదంటే నిజంగా ఆర్థికపక్షపాతి వస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వ నిజాయితీని శంకింపజేసే వస్తోంది. ఈ పన్నును ఇప్పుడైనా రద్దు పరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.

4th November 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

యధానంతరకాలంలో చేనేత పరిశ్రమ తిన్న చెబ్బనుంచి తట్టుకోవడం అంత సులువైన పనికాదు. ఈ అయిదాకేండ్లుగా చేనేత కార్మికులు కష్టాలుపడిపడి కడకు తమకున్న దంతాకూడా విక్రయించుకున్నారు. ఈ నాడుకొరికిన కొద్దిపాటి నూలుతో నైనా తయారుచేసిన వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోక వికరీత దుస్తులతో పడినారు.

“అంతేకాకుండా చేనేత పరిశ్రమను విదేశీ మిల్లు వస్త్ర వ్యాపార పోటీనుంచి రక్షించవలసిన వాధ్యత ఈ ప్రభుత్వమీద ఉన్నది. మన దేశంలోని ఇంగ్లీషు మిల్లు యజమానుల పాలసీని కేంద్రప్రభుత్వం అనుసరిస్తున్నది. వీరి పోటీనుండి చేనేత పరిశ్రమను రక్షించాలంటే చేనేతకీచే మగ్గల నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. ఇందుకై నూలుకు సబ్సిడీ యివ్వాలి. విదేశాలనుంచి తెచ్చు ధరలకు ప్రతిని ఖరీదైన నూలులను తెప్పించి వాటిని చేనేతపరిశ్రమపై వేయరాదు మిల్లు యజమానులు నూలు ధరలను పెంచకుండా చూడాలి. ముతకనూలును దేశవాళీ ప్రతినినే తయారు చేయాలనే నిబంధనను ఉంచాలి. ఒకవంక దేశీయ పరిశ్రమ దిగజారిపోతూవుంటే బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదుల ట్రైల్ మిల్లు పరిశ్రమలను ప్రోత్సహించడం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి తగినదని అని గుర్తుకులేవాలి. నూరు, నూటయ్యారై సంచత్సరాల బ్రిటిష్ పరిపాలనలో మన దేశ చేనేత పరిశ్రమ ఎంతో చెబ్బింది. కాంగ్రెస్ వారు అధికారానికి వచ్చిన తరువాతనైనా దానికి అదరణ చూపబడుతుందని ఆశించిన వారికి ఆశాభంగమైంది.

“అంతేకాకుండా మన చేనేతవస్త్రం ఈనాడు అమెరికా, జపాన్, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోలేకుండా ఉన్నది. ఎంతోకాలంగా చిత్తూరు జిల్లా, కాళహస్తి తాలూకాలో తయారుచేయబడే పట్టమార్కు గుడ్డ దక్షిణాఫ్రికాకు ఎగుమతి చేయబడుతూంది. ప్రస్తుతం జపాన్, అమెరికా, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రంతో అప్పటి పోటీ సంభవింతుటవల్ల మన బట్టకు కొనుగోలు తగ్గిపోయింది. అలాగే బర్మాకు మన రాష్ట్రం నుండి పంపబడుతుండిన చేతిగుడ్డల యెగుమతి నూడా పడిపోయినది. 1920 వ సంవత్సరంలో మన రాష్ట్రంనుంచి బర్మాకు ఎగుమతి అయిన చేతిగుడ్డలతో ప్రస్తుతం పంపబడుతున్న సరుకును పోల్చిచూచినట్లు మనకు మాటికి 70 వంతులు తగ్గిపోయిందని ఋణాశ్ర కాదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వ ఎకనామిక్ ఎన్వైజర్ డాక్టర్ సమరాజుగారే అంగీకరించారు. ఈ విషయాలన్నీటిని ప్రభుత్వం గమనించాలి. విదేశాలలో మన చేనేత వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోటానికి అవసరమైన సమపాయాలన్నీటిని కలుగజేయాలని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వం తెప్పవలసివుంది. అంతే కాకుండా విదేశ వస్త్రాల దిగుమతులనుకూడా అరికట్టవలసిన ఆగత్యం ఉంది.

“చేనేత వస్త్రానికి ప్రోత్సాహమివ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వం హృదయపూర్వకంగా వని చేయాలి. ముందుగా ప్రభుత్వ శాఖలలో అవసరమైన వస్త్రాలు చేనేతవిగానే తుడు నట్లు చూడాలి. ఇందువల్ల ఈనాడు మురిగిపోయివున్న చేనేత వస్త్రం విడుదల అవటమేకాక ఇతరులుకూడా చేనేత వస్త్రాన్ని కొనుగోలుకు ప్రోత్సాహం కలుగుతుంది. చేనేత బట్టలకు ఒక పెద్ద మార్కెట్టు తద్వారా జరుగుతుంది.

“చేనేత పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధి కావాలంటే, విదేశ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోవాలంటే ఆ పరిశ్రమ యాంత్రికముగా అభివృద్ధి చెందవలసివుంది. తక్కువ ఖరీదుతో ఎక్కువ గుడ్డను ఉత్పత్తిచేసే విధముగా యంత్రం అభివృద్ధి చేయబడాలి. కార్మికుని సృజనాత్మక శక్తిని సక్రమంగా వినియోగించుకోవాలి. అతనికి సంకల్పకరిమైన మూలకొలుకునట్లు చూడాలి. అందుకుగాను ఒక ప్రత్యేక పెన్సికల్ కమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయాలి. ఈ విషయము క్షేత్ర లిసుగోవలసి ఉంది.

[Sri D. Seetharamiah] [4th November 1952]

“அந்நியர்களின் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு 40-ம் நெம்பர் வரையிலும் நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்துவிட்டால் போதாது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் பல விஷயங்கள் கவனிக்கப்பட வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் சொன்ன உபதேசத்தை இன்றைய தினம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் கடைப்பிடித்து வருகிறார்கள். அதாவது ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் மாடு தின்னும் புண்ணாக்கையும், பருத்திக்கொட்டையையும் மக்கள் சாப்பிட உபதேசம் செய்தார். புண்ணாக்குத் தன்பவர்கள் யாராவது இருக்கின்றார்களா என்று சொன்னால் அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் தான்.

‘Add the following at the end:—

“This House also recommends to the Government that the following measures be taken in addition:—

- (a) to absorb all handloom weavers into co-operative societies, paying the share capital in famine-affected districts such as Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, etc.,
- (b) to abolish sales tax on the sales of handloom cloth;
- (c) to grant subsidies to this industry by subsidising the yarn price till it regains stability;
- (d) to ban all foreign imports of textile goods;
- (e) to use handloom cloth in all departments of the Government, so that the large stock may be consumed by the Government; and
- (f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost.”

*SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR:—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ சீதாராமையா அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற திருத்த பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்து சில விஷயங்கள் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர் விஷயத்தில் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இப்போதாவது கண் திறந்ததே என்று நினைத்து மிகவும் சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன்.

“சென்ற தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் பெருவாரியாகத் தோற்றதற்குக் காரணம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய வயிற்றெரிச்சலை அரசாங்கம் கொட்டிக் கொண்டதுதான். அதன் காரணமாகத்தான் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் இந்த காங்கிரஸ் அரசாங்கத்தை எப்படியாவது மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்று காங்கிரசுக்கு எதிர்ப்பாக வாக்களித்தார்கள் என்பது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரிந்துதான் நெசவாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கொஞ்சம் கவனம் செலுத்தியிருப்பதாக நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

“இன்றைய தினம் சேலத்திலிருந்தும், கோயமுத்தூரிலிருந்தும் குடும்பமாக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகின்ற கூட்டத்தைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஊர் ஊராக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிற கூட்டத்தார் யாராக இருக்க முடியுமென்று சிந்திக்கின்றபோது அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான் என்ற முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டிய நிலைமையாக இருக்கிறது. அந்த நிலையில் குடும்பம் குடும்பமாக, ஊர் ஊராக பட்டினி ஊர்வலம் வந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள், அவர்கள் யார்? அவர்கள் தான் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள். அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குத்துமாக ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய இந்த தீர்மானம் வரவேற்கத்தக்க விஷயம்.

4th November 1952] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

“கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு 40-ம் நெம்பர் வரையிலும் நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்துவிட்டால் போதாது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் பல விஷயங்கள் கவனிக்கப்பட வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் சொன்ன உபதேசத்தை இன்றைய தினம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் கடைப்பிடித்து வருகிறார்கள். அதாவது ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் மாடு தின்னும் புண்ணாக்கையும், பருத்திக்கொட்டையையும் மக்கள் சாப்பிட உபதேசம் செய்தார். புண்ணாக்குத் தன்பவர்கள் யாராவது இருக்கின்றார்களா என்று சொன்னால் அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் தான்.

“குறிப்பாக தென் ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் என்னுடைய தொகுதியாகிய விக்கிரவாண்டியில் ஏராளமான கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் புண்ணாக்கைத் தான் உண்ணவேண்டிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு கிராமத்தில் மக்கள் ‘நாங்கள் நான்கு மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’, இன்னொரு கிராமத்தில் ‘நாங்கள் ஐந்து மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’ என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்வதைக் கேட்கிறோம். இந்த நிலைமைக்குக் காரணம் என்னவென்றால், என் தொகுதியில் அரிசி கிடையாது, சோளம் கிடையாது என்ற நிலை இருக்கிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பட்டினியாக இருந்து கொண்டு எப்படி துணி நெய்யமுடியும்? உணவுப் பஞ்சத்தை முதலில் நீக்கவேண்டும். அடுத்தபடியாக, நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்துவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது. நம் நாட்டில் விளையக்கூடிய பஞ்சானது வெளிநாட்டுக்குப் போகாமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். வடநாட்டிலிருந்து தென்னாட்டுக்கு இறக்குமதியாகும் பம்பாய், ஆமதாபாத் மில் துணிகள் வராமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்படி வடநாட்டிலிருந்து மில் துணிகள் இங்கு வருமேயானால், அதற்குப் பணம் கொடுப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக கைத்தறி துணிகளையே நாம் திருப்பி அந்த வடநாட்டுக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்ற விஷயத்தை வலியுறுத்திக் கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.

“மேலும், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் மாதம் முப்பது நாட்களுக்கு வேலை 11-50 செய்வதற்குப் போதிய வேலையில்லை. வேலைக்குத் தகுந்த கூலியும் அவர்களுக்குக் கிடைப்பதில்லை. இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருப்பது அவர்கள் கண்களைத் துடைப்பதுபோல் இல்லாமல் உண்மையாகவே அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்கு வேண்டிய வழிவகைகளைச் செய்வது அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமை. மில் துணி குறைந்த விலைக்குக் கிடைக்கிறது, அழகாகவும் இருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் மக்களுக்கு மில் துணிகளின்மீது கண்ணோட்டம் போகிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறைகளை உண்மையிலேயே தீர்க்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தோடு இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அரசாங்கம் கொண்டுவந்துருக்குமேயானால், இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அபூர்வ நடத்துவதற்கு உண்மையிலேயே நல்ல அபிப்பிராயம் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்குமேயானால் அரசாங்கம் கைத்தறித் துணிக்கு வேண்டிய தூலின் விலையைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய நிலைமையை உயர்த்தவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் துணியின் விலையைக் குறைத்தால் தான் எல்லா மக்களும் வாங்குவார்கள்.

“காந்திஜியின் திட்டங்களிலேயே மிக முக்கியமானது கதர் திட்டம். எல்லோரும் கதரைத்தான் கட்டவேண்டும் என்ற உபதேசம் செய்துவந்தது போல கைத்தறித் துணியைத் தவிர வேறு துணியை கட்டக்கூடாதென்றும் அரசாங்க உத்தியோகத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய கீழ்த்தர சிப்பந்திகளுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படும் துணி கைத்தறித் துணியாகத்தான் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் வற்புறுத்தி ஒரு உத்தரவு போடலாம்.

“அந்த நிலையில், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை நிலையை உயர்த்தவேண்டியது அவசியம். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய நிலைமை உயர்ந்தால்தான் நாடு உயரும். ஆகவே, அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குத்துமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றிவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது.

“இந்த நாட்டிலிருந்து வடநாட்டுக்குப் போயிருக்கிற டி.டி.கே. அவர்கள் நம் நாட்டை அடகு காட்டி ராஜாஜி அவர்களை எதிர்த்துப்போராடினார்கள். அவர்கள் மனப்பான்மையைத் திருத்தவேண்டியது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar] [4th November 1952]

கடமையாக இருக்கின்றது. ஆகவே, டி.டி.கே. போன்றவர்களுக்கு மில் முதலாளிகளுடன் தொடர்பு இருக்கமுடியும். ஆனால், கைத்தறி நெசவாளிகள் அதிகமாக வாழ்கின்ற பிராந்தியத்தைச் சேர்ந்த சேலத்திலிருந்து ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்ற காரணத்தினால் சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் தென்றாகாடு ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் போக்க வேண்டியது சர்க்காரின் கடமை. அவர்கள் வேலையில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் தென்றாகாடு ஜில்லாவில் ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிகவேலு நாயக்கர் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்தபோது செஞ்சிக்கும் வந்திருந்தார். அவருடைய கூட்டத்திற்கு ஜனங்களை எப்படிக்கூட்டினார்கள் தெரியுமா? பெண்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் சேலக் கஷ்டத்தைப்போக்க மந்திரி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்றார்கள் என்று ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று கூப்பிட்டார்கள். அதை நம்பி அரை நிர்மாணமாக துணியில்லாமல் பெண்கள் ஓடிவந்தார்கள். கட்டத்துணி இல்லையென்று அப்பொழுது கதறி விட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் பிண்ணுக்கைத்தின்று வயிறு உப்பிவிடுகிறது என்று மந்திரியிடம் முறையிட்டனர். மேலும் கட்டத் துணியில்லாமல் என்ன செய்யமுடியும்? இந்தப் பஞ்சத்தை அவர்கள் எப்படித் தீர்க்கப் போகிறார்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை. பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் அத்தனை போகனும் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான். அவர்களில் அனேகமாக பருத்தி உற்பத்தி செய்கின்றவர்களும் இருக்கின்றார்கள். நம்முடைய நாட்டுக்காகவே நாங்கள் பாடுபடுகிறோம். நம்முடைய நாட்டு மக்களுக்காகவே நாங்கள் ஒவ்வொரு காரியமும் செய்து வருகிறோம், ஒவ்வொருவரும் நாட்டுக்காக உழைக்கவேண்டுமென்று உபதேசம் எந்த தேச பக்தர்கள் செய்தார்களோ அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது அதைச் செய்ய வேண்டிய காலம் வந்துவிட்டது. ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் குறைகளை அறவே போக்கி அவர்களுக்கு நல்லது செய்வார்களே யானால் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய கெட்ட பெயர் நீங்கும் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு எனதுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Government not only on behalf of the handloom weavers, but also on behalf of the people of this State on having tabled a resolution favouring the reservation of dhoties and sarees exclusively for the handloom industry, particularly at this opportune time. Sir, this resolution has given an opportunity for this House to express its opinion regarding the future of the handloom as well as the textile mill industry in the country and it is also providing a rare opportunity to the people of this State to understand the merits of the case of the handloom weavers.

“The resolution raises several fundamental issues including firstly, whether there is competition between the mills and the handlooms; secondly, whether the handloom industry requires protection against the competition of the textile mills, if it is admitted that competition exists between the mills and the handlooms; thirdly, what shall be the nature and form of protection to be given to the handloom industry; and fourthly, what will be the effects of providing protection to the handloom industry on the textile mills and also on the consuming public.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“Sir, coming to the issue of competition between the textile mills and the handlooms, it is an admitted fact that there is keen

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [4th November 1952]

competition between them. Handlooms in ancient times were supplying the entire clothing requirements of the country; but to-day they are not allowed to produce even one-third of the entire clothing requirements of the country, because of the fundamental change in the structure of the handloom industry. Formerly, handloom weavers were getting yarn from every family, to which they were returning the cloth in turn; but to-day they are made entirely to depend upon the textile mills for their main raw material, viz., yarn. By taking this advantage of the entire dependence of the handlooms for yarn on the mills, the mills, with the active help, continuous support and protection of the Government, have encroached into the field of cloth production and have to-day covered two-thirds of the total production of cloth in the country. Thus, the textile mill industry has deprived millions of handloom weavers of their ancient hereditary and honest profession. Now, what more proof is necessary to show that the textile mills are not only competing with the handlooms, but also contemplating the complete extinction of the handlooms? In fact, the competition between the textile mills and the handlooms was long ago admitted. In this connexion, I wish to quote the findings of the Tariff Board appointed in the year 1932. The Tariff Board in their report on the cotton industry in 1932 wrote that ‘the mills for whose assistance duties were levied, have benefited more from them and therefore have become better able to fight the handloom industry.’

“At a later stage, the Government of India in their resolution, dated the 25th January 1941, appointing a Fact Finding Committee (Handlooms and Mills) stated—

‘The problem of safeguarding the position of the handloom industry and at the same time reconciling the conflicting interests of the handloom and the mill industries has been under the consideration of the Government of India for the last few years and has been raised more than once at the industries conferences.’

They have also asked the Fact Finding Committee ‘to compare the nature of the products of the handloom industry in each area surveyed with the corresponding mill products and to find the nature of the competition between the two. The Fact Finding Committee found out that there was competition between textile mills and the handloom industry and definitely stated—

‘In sarees, competition is most serious in counts 20s to 40s. Even in higher counts there has lately grown powerful mill competition. In the case of dhoties the direct mill competition is in respect of medium counts and in gungahes, shadars, shirtings and coatings also mill competition of a serious nature has developed.’

In the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a Standing Handloom Committee to go into the question of the competition of textile mills with handlooms and to suggest measures for the effective protection of the handlooms against the competition of the mills. The Committee in their resolution stated—

‘The Committee are emphatically of the opinion that it is necessary to afford to the handloom industry a permanent measure of protection—

(a) by the imposition of an excise duty on the products of the mill industry; and

(b) by the reservation of a suitable field of production for the handloom industry.’

12 noon.

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [4th November 1952]

Finally in the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a sub-committee but unfortunately with a predominant representation to the textile mills, to go into the question of reserving certain fields of production of textiles exclusively for the handloom industry. The principle of reserving certain fields of production of cloth for the handloom industry has been accepted by the Sub-Committee, and the Government in accordance with the Committee's recommendation have reserved certain varieties of cloth exclusively for the handloom industry. But that was a nominal reservation because most of the varieties reserved for the handloom industry were already the complete monopoly of the handloom industry and therefore, the handloom industry could not derive any material benefit from the reservation which was made in 1949 and hence the need to extend the field of reservation to the handloom industry.

Coming to the issue why the handloom industry requires protection against the mill competition, I would like to say, that if the mills in the country had confined themselves mainly to spinning as they did in the past, the question of giving protection to the handloom industry would not have arisen at all. But they did not rest content with spinning alone and they have taken up weaving of cloth and have captured a larger portion of the internal cloth market and have thus deprived the handloom weavers of their honest means of livelihood. So, there is an urgent need for providing protection to the handloom industry. It is an admitted fact that still two crores of people are clinging on to the handloom industry in the fond hope, that the Government would not before long give them adequate protection against the competition of the mills. It is, therefore, for the Government to consider how long they can afford to neglect their duty towards the suffering millions of handloom weavers in the country. The mere supply of yarn to the handloom weavers cannot solve their problems. The Government must secure a stable and an assured market for the handloom products and with that purpose in view, they will have to reserve certain fields of production of textiles for them. There are two more important considerations for giving protection to handloom industry. One is that the handloom industry can absorb many more unemployed people besides the 20 millions who are already engaged in it and secondly, it eliminates the conflict between capital and labour and also banishes the growth of the present Communist trends which is but the necessary consequence of the exploitation of labour by capital. The handloom weavers therefore have every right to demand from their Government to safeguard their industry against the competition of the mills. Because the mechanical set-up of the powerlooms in the mills, which can conveniently work with more than two treadles and two healds, is best suited for production of twills, drills, satins and similar other varieties, the handloom weavers are urging that the production of dhoties and sarees should be reserved to them. The mechanical set-up of the handloom, which generally works with two healds, is best suited for the production of the dhoties and sarees. There is no use in asking weavers to produce what they

[4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

cannot produce. I would like, in this connexion, to make a few remarks on the statements made by mill-owners on the question of the reservation of dhoties and sarees to the handloom industry. They tried to scare away the public by telling them that the handlooms cannot produce the required quantity of sarees and dhoties and the price of the handloom cloth will be prohibitive. With regard to the production capacity of the handlooms from my own experience I can say, that from 7 to 8 yards of cloth can be easily produced in a working day of eight hours on a single loom and on this basis 2,000 yards can be produced on a single loom in a year and if we take into account the fact that 29 lakhs of looms are working in the country, they can easily produce 5,800 millions of yards of cloth provided the Government make the mills to afford a plentiful supply of yarn for the handlooms at reasonably reduced rates. With regard to the cost of production of cloth by handlooms, the propaganda of the textile mills is not only incorrect but also misleading. It is an admitted fact that the handloom weaver is paying 25 per cent extra over the cost price of the yarn and it is not therefore the fault of the weaver if his cloth costs more and is 5 to 10 per cent higher than the price of a similar cloth produced by the mills. Far from that, it proves that the cost of production of handloom cloth is cheaper than the cost of production of cloth in mills.

"Sir, in this connexion I wish to quote a relevant portion from the memorandum submitted by the Madras Provincial Handloom Weavers' Congress, Nidubrolu, to the Prime Minister of India on 1st April 1950, about the high costings of cloth in mills—

12-10 P.m.

"As per the costings given by the Textile Commissioner, Government of India, Bombay, in his No. TCSI/CYC-CP, dated the 29th January 1940, the ultimate cost of production of cloth in mills ranges between 6 and 7 annas and even more in some cases per a knot (8,400 yards) of yarn. The lay man knows and calculates only the cost of the actual weaving on the speedy power loom. He does not know how much more the mills will have to spend in the form of (a) interest on capital, (b) depreciation on machinery, buildings and fixtures (c) Insurance charges, (d) Fuel or power charges, (e) Taxes, (f) Establishment including labour and cost of management, (g) advertisement and other trade charges. When the cumulative effect of all these items is taken into account the ordinary man will be surprised to know that a yard of even plain cloth is now produced on a handloom at less cost than on a power loom in a mill. This feature explains why less efficient mills are given additional margins of profit by permitting them to sell their products direct to consumers."

"I also wish to point out that the newly-started textile mills are being given adequate protection against the competition of the efficient mills. Firstly, they are exempted from the levy of all taxes. Secondly, they are allowed to sell their products directly to the consumers, thus allowing them to make a profit of more than 6½ per cent an efficient mill can earn.

"Sir, the Bombay Mill Owners' Association have also suggested that the handlooms should confine themselves to the production of artistic and costly cloth required by the richer classes of the people. It is a fact that some of the handlooms had and have been confining themselves to the production of artistic and costly fabrics required by the richer classes of people, but the percentage of the costly and artistic fabrics formed about 2 to 3 per cent of the total

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah] [4th November 1952]

production of the handloom cloth. Therefore, they cannot afford any adequate protection to all the 29 lakhs looms working in the country. The secret in the suggestion of the mill-owners, is that mills with their mechanical set-ups, are not suitable for producing any artistic or costly fabrics.

"With regard to the distribution of yarn, it was stated in the resolution, that adequate quantities of yarn should be made available to the handloom industry. But I want to make it clear that, under the existing distribution scheme brought into force in the year 1945, the composite and the weaving mills are allowed to draw their requirements in full as a first charge on the total production of yarn and the balance is first shared by hosiery knitting factories, the fishermen, and other miscellaneous consumers, and the balance if any left is being distributed among the handloom weavers. I, therefore, like to stress that Government should see that the handloom industry gets adequate quantity of yarn from the mills, and for this purpose they must see that the full requirements of the handloom industry shall be met as a first charge on the total production of yarn in that country. That is the only solution for getting adequate quantities of yarn for the handloom industry.

"With regard to prices, both the Government and the mills have done great harm to the handloom industry. Though the price of cotton has been going down from the beginning of this year, the Government have been trying to maintain a high level of yarn prices to the best advantage of the mills and to the detriment of the handloom industry. In fact when the price of cotton per candy was Rs. 250 on 30th June 1949, the price of the following counts of yarn was as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
20s	3	12	0	per 10 lb.
40s	5	4	0	Do.
60s	7	6	0	Do.
80s	11	2	0	Do.

Now, the cost of cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 and the cost of yarn is as follows:—

	Rs.	A.	P.	
20s	19	0	0	per 10 lb.
40s	24	10	6	Do. (If spun out of Indian cotton.)
	44	14	0	Do. (If spun out of admixture of foreign cotton.)
60s	57	4	6	Do.
80s	72	15	6	Do.

This clearly indicates that there is no relation between the actual cost of cotton and the ex-mill price of yarn. Therefore, there is the imperative need to reduce the price of yarn at least in proportion to the fall in prices of cotton.

[4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

"Sir, I wish to say a few words about control on cotton. At present, the Indian cotton is the cheapest cotton. In the world market, the price of cotton per candy is not less than Rs. 1,700. But here the price of Indian cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 only. Therefore, the mills are exporting Indian cotton to foreign countries to fetch more profits and importing cotton into the country and dumping finer counts of yarn with high prices on the handloom industry. Also, the quantity of coarse yarn produced in the country is being exported to countries like Ceylon, Burma, Siam where hitherto handloom cloth was being sold. Thus the mills are making profits by exporting cheap cotton and yarn and, at the same time, they are dumping high-priced yarn on the handloom weavers. The matter must be looked into and the Government should see that yarn at a reasonable price is made available to the handloom industry."

* Dr. T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN :— "கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தக் கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலானது, உணவு மனிதனுக்கு எப்படி அவசியமோ அதுபோல் இதுவும் அவசியம் என்று உணர்ந்து இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இது ஒரு ஜீவாதாரத் தொழில் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்த சமயத்தில் கைத்தறி நெசவுக்குப் பேர்போன நம்முடைய சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் இந்தக் கிளர்ச்சியை உண்டு பண்ணினது ரொம்ப நியாயம். இதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்தே கொண்டு வந்து, கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேலை கொடுப்பதற்கும், அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரம் உயர்வதற்கும், அவர்கள் நன்றாக காலட்சேபம் பண்ணுவதற்கும் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை இந்த சபையில் இந்த நேரத்தில் கொண்டு வந்தது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானது. இதில் அவசியமான குழப்பத்தைப் புகுத்தி கருத்து வேற்றுமைகளையும், மன வேற்றுமைகளையும் கொண்டு வராமல் இதை ஏக மனதாக நிறைவேற்றினால் பெருமைக்கு உகந்ததாக இருக்கும்.

"இந்த சமயத்தில் இதைப் பற்றி இன்னும் சில விஷயங்களைச் சொல்ல 12-20 விரும்புகிறேன். புள்ளி, விவரங்களைப் பற்றி எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். P.M. அதைப் பற்றி அதிகமாகச் சொல்ல வேண்டியதில்லை. ஆனால் நாம் எந்த மனப்பான்மையுடன், எந்த ஸ்தித்தியுடன் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமென்றதைப் பற்றி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மட்டில் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். நமக்கு முன்னால் எதிர்காலத்தில் பயங்கரமான பஞ்ச காலம் இருக்கிறது. மனிதனுக்கு உணவும், உடையும் வேண்டும் என்பது மட்டும் அல்ல, இப்பொழுது திராத வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் என்ற பிரச்சினையை எவ்வளவு தூரம் சமாளிக்கப் போகிறோம் என்ற ஒரு மகத்தான பிரச்சினை இருக்கிறது. அதை நீக்குவதற்கு என்ன இருக்கிறது என்பதை ஆலோசிக்கும்படி என்னுடைய சகாக்களை நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த விஷயத்தில் அவசியத்திற்கும் மேலான அதிகப்படியான ஜனங்களுக்கு வாழ்க்கைக்கு வேண்டியதை மட்டும் கொடுக்க முடியாது. குடிசைத் தொழிலுக்கு அதிகமான மூலதனம் இல்லாது ஏழை மக்களுக்கு வருவாய் கிடைக்கக் கூடிய தொழில் இந்தக் கைத்தொழில் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்தக் குடிசைத் தொழில் ரொம்பவும் புராதனமானது, இதில்தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற கோடிக்கணக்கான நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். யாதொரு மூலதனமும் இல்லாது வெறும் கருவிகளைக் கொண்டுள்ள தொழில் ஒன்று இருக்கிறது என்றால் அது இந்தக் கைத்தறித் தொழில் தான். இதை நாம் ஆதரிக்கும் முன் இதையொட்டி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மனதில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதற்கும் ஒரு தேவை வரும். ஒன்பதை ரூபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இப்பொழுது கைத்தறி தொழில் எப்படி சர்க்கார் கணக்கான மக்களுக்கும், குடும்பங்களுக்கும் வாழ்க்கை வகி அளிக்கிறது என்பதைப் போலவே கதரும் அளிக்கிறது என்பதை இந்த சமயத்தில் குறிப்பிடாமல் இருக்க முடியாது. கதர் நெசவு என்று

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [4th November 1952]

వృద్ధి పరస్పర సహాయమునైన, అర్థిక పరిస్థితిపై ఆధారపడియుండుంది, అసగ *inter-dependent* గా ఉండుండున్నమాట. కనుక ఒక చేనేత వారికామితులకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వము అని అనుకొన్నంతమూలమున వారికి అది నిజమైన రక్షణ కాజాలదు. ఏమి తీర్పు చికిత్సలుకంటే సరకును కొనుక్కోనేవారు లేకపోయినప్పుడు, వారి సమస్య ఎటు పరిష్కారమగునో అలాచించుకొనవలసియున్నది. అందుకనే దేదవారికీ, భూమి లేనటువంటి వారికీ భూవస్థి కలుగజేసి వాళ్ళభూములను సాగులోనికివచ్చునట్లు తగు విచ్చాట్లుచేసి ఆ విధంగా వారి అర్థిక స్థితిని అభివృద్ధిపరచి వారి కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెంచేటటువంటి సమూహాయము గురించి ముఖ్యముగా ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించినట్లుయితే, అప్పుడే ప్రజలందరిలో ఒక భాగమైనటువంటి ఈ చేనేత వారికామితులకు నిజమైన రక్షణ, నిజమైన *guarantee* కలిగిన రోజు ఏర్పడగలదు. కనుక ఈ అర్థికవిధానాన్ని వాగులేయాడానికి తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకోవాలి, అందుకు కొన్ని ప్రాతినిధ్య పైకటువంటి మార్పులు ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టాలి. కనుక కేవలము ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని అనుసరించినంత మాత్రాననే వారి సమస్య తరిమిపోతుందేమో. ఇది కేవలము ప్రభుత్వ వారిదేనుంది. అందుకల్ల దీనితోపాటు మిగతావర్కములపై తీసుకోవాలని ప్రతిపాదించిన సభ్యులను మౌనపర్చుము అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుకూ ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని విలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I join hon. Members of this House who have paid tributes to the Hon. Chief Minister for the sincerity with which he is trying to relieve the distress of the handloom weavers. But beyond that, I am afraid, I cannot say much in favour of the resolution before the House. It seems to me that it is a counsel of despair. This House is at its wit's end to find a suitable solution. It is true that this resolution, when given effect to, will relieve the distress of the people concerned to some extent. But it will do so, not without affecting the interests of the people at large. For hereafter the people will have to pay more for their clothing. That has been admitted by the Hon. Minister for Industries himself in his speech. Besides that, we will be restricting the freedom of the people, which freedom has been curtailed to a large extent already in other ways. And then, aesthetically, it will put the hands of the clock back. I believe there are many members here who share my views, but few of them dare speak on this subject on the lines I have suggested, lest their speeches should be misconstrued as unsympathetic towards handloom weavers. I may say again that this measure will relieve the distress of the handloom weavers to some extent for some time; but it will not work in the long run.

“ I have not got any well-thought plan to solve this problem at the moment, but what strikes me at present is that we can relieve the distress of these people by adopting other measures than the one which is being taken into consideration to-day. Among the other measures, I suggest that we should supply the weavers with powerlooms; and where the weavers are concentrated in particular areas, we should erect mills for them. In other cases, I suggest that they be settled on land. Besides these suggestions I would request the Government to absorb them in their departmental works as far as possible and to make an appeal to others to employ

[4th November 1952] [H. B. Ari Gowder]

them. I am sure the Government, and particularly, the Hon. Chief Minister, must have considered deeply the pros and cons of this resolution. But at the same time I cannot help expressing the view that has not been expressed by other Members. I think I am right in suggesting that this resolution be not given effect to, but that other suggestions may be tried. I am sure there will be quite a number of suggestions which may strike the Hon. the Chief Minister himself, if he takes a little more time to think over this problem; and it may be possible for other hon. Members of this House also to make other suggestions, if they are given time. I therefore suggest that this resolution be not rushed through.”

* SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have to state that this resolution is a most commendable one; because, it relates to a very large section of the population of our State. Sir, we have seen before our eyes in the streets, may, even at the doorsteps of our house, streams of workless handloom weavers going about for their sustenance. This House is aware that their condition is most miserable. There are also other sections of people not merely in this State but in other parts of India also who are undergoing untold misery and a lot of hardship on account of other reasons. But it will not be possible for any of us here to-day to analyse the causes thereof in the limited time given to us. Further I have to speak here only on the handloom weavers' problem. In this connexion I would even pay a tribute, even though I am sitting on the opposite side of the House, to our Chief Minister for the untiring and relentless effort that he has taken to see through this problem.

“ Then, Sir, I would like to say something about the economics of handloom cloth and how the handloom cloth has got to be pushed through for the welfare of the handloom weavers in our States. In my humble view, it is not merely a question of helping the handloom weavers but it is also a question of helping ourselves. We have been accustomed for a very long time in the recent past to wear only mill clothes. We, at least some of us, have been attacking the capitalists and the machinery system but, on the other hand, we have been practising only those things which we want to put down and which we want to attack. We should have long ago taken to handloom cloth. In my view, most of us neglected this aspect. It is high time that at least now, when we have heard their cry, we should go to their succour. Let their cry not become a cry in the wilderness. This move is the most humanitarian help that has been rendered to the weavers by this Government at this stage.

“ As regards the economics of handloom cloth, an interesting article has been written by Mr. Lobo Prabhu in one of the current issues of the *Madras Information* which we are all getting free from the Government. I had occasion to go through that article with earnestness and I studied it closely. It discloses how the economics of handloom cloth goes about and how a solution of this problem would not only go to the help of the handloom weavers

[Sri V. R. Nagarajan]. [4th November 1952]

but would also help ourselves. While I am speaking on this subject, I am also reminded about a lesson that I learnt while I was a student of economics in the B.A. class in the St. Joseph's College, Tiruchirappalli, where, I remember, my tutor taught me the economics of handloom cloth even as it was imagined and taught to us by Mahatma Gandhi. Handloom cloth is a matter of life and death for our own people and we cannot afford to neglect this problem. We have almost solved it and let us hope, Sir, in the name of God that this solution would be a lasting solution for those people who have been affected most. Thank you, Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I also rise like my colleagues in the House to congratulate the Government and to support the resolution. There is not much to say unless one indulges in repetition. A very good case was made out by the Hon. Minister for Industries and there is very little to add to it. My only regret is that this move was not taken up by the Government sometime ago, for some distress could have been saved and some suffering on the part of the handloom weavers' families could have been avoided, if timely steps had been taken by the Government. It is not too late. I do not believe in the hackneyed expression 'better late than never' for sometimes 'late' is as bad as 'never'."

"I would like to place one or two facts before the Government. In the first place, I do not take this measure merely as an effort to relieve distress but take it also as an effort to revive and give a new life to our decaying and decadent cottage industries. The handloom industry and textiles in general received a set back on the advent of the British and the textile industry never received the kind of support that it is receiving to-day from the Government. We stand for large scale industrialization, for it is only through large scale industrialization that it is possible for us to relieve unemployment, but in the circumstances that are obtained now in our country like lack of finance, dearth of technical skill and general backward conditions, it may not be possible to have a large scale industrialization immediately. The only way out or the immediate way out is to resort to the resuscitation of our arts and crafts and thereby relieve some amount of congestion in the labour market. I am therefore wholeheartedly supporting this move and I would even suggest that the Government should pick up other cottage industries that deserve to be supported, for it would help us not only to revive our cottage industries but would, as I said, relieve the congestion in the labour market. My colleagues from Malabar have underscored the difficulties that the handloom weavers in Malabar labour under and their inability to take full advantage of the help that the Government are offering. My advice to the handloom weavers in Malabar is that as soon as possible they should readjust their looms in such a way as to make production of dhoties and sarees possible. There are a number of weavers' co-operative concerns in Malabar and it ought not to be difficult for them to get help from the Government in order to achieve this."

4th November 1952] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

"There is, Sir, only one more fact which I wish to place before the Government and which has not received sufficient stress in this House, viz., the interest of the consumer. I do not believe in giving a *carte blanche* to the producers in a society constituted as it is to-day. Since the producers are only guided by the profit motive, there will be a tendency towards consolidation and control of prices. The reason why the handloom weavers are not able to compete with the mill-owners is because of the difference in price between the handloom cloth and mill cloth. Now, when we create monopolistic conditions and when the weavers are able to control the market, they are likely to dictate prices to the consumer. This should be avoided. The Government should, as and when they try to implement the resolution, bear in mind the interests of the consumer and see that the prices do not shoot up to such an extent that it will be difficult for the consumer to meet his demands. This is all that I wish to say. I thank you, Sir."

* SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am glad that a Government resolution has for the first time received so much support and has been acclaimed with such enthusiasm. I wish that in other subjects too there is such unanimity from all parts of the House unless it be so controversial as to provoke opposition. This is a subject where we need be afraid that the Central Government may not come to our aid in seeing that the resolution is implemented. But my apprehension is that the opposition will be more from the vested interests who are interested in seeing that this resolution is defeated or its effect is nullified than the opposition from the Central Government itself. With the pull that our Hon. the Chief Minister has got with the Central Government, I am sure, he will be able to make the Central Government agree with the reasonableness of our request to reserve the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry. In this connexion, we have got to face the opposition to this proposal from the vested interests. When I say, 'opposition from vested interests', I mean 'opposition from mill owners'. Their business and profits will be affected if a reservation of this kind with regard to the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees is made and, I am sure, they will not take this resolution lying down and will give a good fight to the Government. I request the present Government and our revered leader to see that the vested interests do not score a point over us through the Central Government."

"From my own enquiries and the representations that have been made to me, I learn that in some districts—one or two districts at least—towels are being exclusively manufactured, that in some districts weavers are interested only in manufacturing dhoties and that in some districts only in sarees. If towels are not included among the items to be reserved for weaving by handloom weavers, the handloom industry in one or two districts mainly interested in the manufacture of towels will be hurt. Therefore, I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to modify it."

[Sri S. Panchaksharam] [4th November 1952]

resolution under discussion to include towels also to be reserved along with bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry.

"There is also an apprehension in the minds of people that even if the Central Government accept our resolution and give effect to it and the vested interests also reconcile themselves to the present situation, the mill owners may try to manufacture white sarees of a cheaper variety on a very large scale and dump them on the market and make the poor people go in for cheaper white sarees, in which case, the effect of this resolution will be nullified. There is also a similar apprehension with regard to the reservation of bordered dhoties also. Nowadays there is a move on the part of handloom industry to manufacture borderless dhoties which we find are being sold by street hawkers and in shandies. If mills begin to manufacture mulls on a large scale and sell them cheaply, then also the purpose of this resolution, namely, to help the handloom industry will be defeated. I request the Government and the Hon. the Minister who moved the resolution to see that such attempts to manufacture plain mull and white sarees by mill-owners are not made.

"The feeling in the country is that the proposal of the Central Government to levy a cess of three pies per yard of mill cloth is not enough to ameliorate the lot of handloom weavers and the rate of levy must be raised. The rate of levy must be many times more than the one now proposed if it is really going to make it possible for the handloom industry to compete with the mill industry successfully.

"Besides, Government also must make attempts to remove the ban on the export of handloom goods from India imposed by Governments in Ceylon and Burmah. The lungis manufactured in our parts have got a great demand in Ceylon. But the Government of Ceylon insists that we should purchase a portion of Ceylon lungis in return for their purchasing our lungi. Government should make attempts to remove bans of this type imposed by other countries. I also endorse the proposal made by my learned friend Sri Arunachalam that whenever our Government enter into agreement with other countries with regard to the sale of mill-goods produced in our country, they should include a provision in the agreement compelling them to take a portion of our handloom goods also. With these words, I support the resolution."

* **SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM** :—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். இருந்தாலும் அதில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அபாயகரமான கருத்துக்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது என்பதற்காகத்தான் நான் சில திருத்தங்களை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன். நம்முடைய நாட்டில் கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து நம் நாட்டிலுடைய மின்னொளியில் வளர்ச்சி என்ற தப்பான கருத்தை இந்த தீர்மானம் மூலமாக பரப்பும் ஆபத்து இருக்கிறது. நம் நாட்டின் கைத்தறிக்கும் மில் தொழிலுக்கும் பொதுவான ஆபத்து இன்றைக்கு எது என்றால் இங்கு இருக்குமதி செய்யப்படும் அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளியும், மட்ட ரக ஜவுளியும் தான். என்னுடைய இந்த அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி இருக்குமதி செய்யப்பட்டதோ அன்றே இந்த நாட்டின் தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டது. அவைகள்

[4th November 1952] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

இந்த தொழிலை நாசம் செய்வதோடல்லாமல் நம் நாட்டின் இளைஞர்களின் நாகரீகத்தையும் நாசம் செய்கிறது. "முந்தேகு" போன்ற நாடகங்களை தடைசெய்யும் இந்த மந்திரி சபை நிர்வாண பெண் படங்களை துணியில் அச்சப்போட்டு அந்த துணியை தரித்துக்கொண்டு இந்த நாட்டில் இளைஞர்கள் திரியக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் அந்நிய நாட்டு துணி இருக்குமதியை அனுமதிப்பது நமது நாட்டிற்கு அவமானமல்லவா என்று கேட்கிறேன். நமது நாட்டின் நாகரீகத்தை இழிவு படுத்துவதாலும், நமது தொழிலை சீர்குலைப்பதாலும், அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி துணி இருக்குமதி செய்யப்படுவதை தடை செய்யவேண்டும். அதற்காக நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தை கொண்டு வந்து பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

"இரண்டாவதாக நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படவேண்டும் என்ற நோக்கம் இருப்பதாக இந்த தீர்மானம் கூறுகிறது. இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் நிலைமையில் கைத்தறிக்கு எவ்விதம் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும் என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். நிலையான மார்க்கெட் வேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கு இரண்டு வித வழி செய்யப்படவேண்டும். ஒன்று கைத்தறியில் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடிய மட்ட ரகத் துணியை உபயோகப்படுத்தக்கூடிய பெருவாரியான விவசாய பெண்களும், ஆண்களும்—இப்பொழுதுதான் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு துணிக்குமேல் மறுதுணி வாங்க முடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்களே—மலிவாக கிடைக்கும்படி செய்யவேண்டும். மேலும் அவர்களின் வாங்கும் சக்தியை பெருக்கவேண்டும். விவசாயிகள்தான் பெரும் பாலும் கைத்தறி துணிகளை உபயோகப்பவர்கள். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும்.

"1947-ம் வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பாக, அதாவது நமக்கு சுதந்திரம் கிடைப்பதற்கு முன்பாக, இந்த தொழிலுக்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் நமது மாகாணத்தில் மட்டும் ஒதுக்கி வைக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. இப்பொழுது அந்த மானியம் நிறுத்தப்பட்டு இருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது வர்ணப் புடவைகளை ஒதுக்கி வைக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ஆனால் வர்ணத்தின் விலை பத்து மடங்கு உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. வர்ணப் புடவைகளுக்கு மலிவாக வர்ணம் கிடைத்தால் புடவைகளை குறைந்த விலைக்கு கொடுக்க முடியும். ஆகவே வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது வர்ணத்திற்கு இறக்குமதி ரேடி போடப்பட்டு வருவதால் அதன் விலை அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்க முடியாவிட்டாலும் கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்கும் வர்ணத்திற்கு மட்டும் சப்ளிடி கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் அதற்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் ஒதுக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் முன்பு இருந்தது போல் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் இந்த திருத்தத்தை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

"அதோடு மாகாண சர்க்கார் மத்திய சர்க்காரை கட்டுப்படுத்த இந்த 1 p.m. தீர்மானத்தை கொண்டுவரும்பொழுது, தாங்களாகவே என்னென்ன நடவடிக்கையெல்லாம் எடுக்கலாமோ அவையெல்லாம் எடுத்தார்கள் என்று நாம் சிந்தித்து பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

"இந்த மந்திரி சபை அதிகாரத்திற்கு வந்த பிறகு ஒரு ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி நியமிக்கப்பட்டது. அந்த ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி சில சிபார்சுகளைச் செய்துள்ளது. அதில் முக்கியமானது ரயான் ஸ்கீம் என்று நெசவாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து எல்லா இடங்களிலும் கோவாப்பேரடிச் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும் என்பதாகும். அம்மாதிரி எத்தனை சொசைடிகள் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டது. ஏற்படுத்தப்படாவிட்டால் ஏன் ஏற்படுத்தவில்லை? ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கிற சொசைட்டிகளையும் கூட ஏன் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பயன்படுத்திக் கொள்ளவில்லையென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மந்திரி விசாரணை செய்யும்படி நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். சர்க்கார் உத்திரவு போட்டிருந்தும் கூட அதிகாரிகள் இந்த கோவாப்பேரடிச் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்காக சர்க்கார் கொடுக்கவேண்டிய 25 ரூபாய்களை நெசவாளர்களை முன்னாடி போட்டு கொள்ளவேண்டும், அப்புறம் தாங்கள் தருகிறீர்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதோடு கூட அதில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப் படுகிற சர்க்காருக்கு யெல்லாம் விற்பனைசெய்து கொள்வதற்கு அந்தந்த ஸ்தாபனங்களே பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்ப பயமுறுத்தல்கள். இதனாலே சரியாக அவைகள் இயங்குவதில்லை. சர்க்கார் நெச

[Sri M. Kalyanasundaram] [4th November 1952]

வாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து செய்யக்கூடிய முடிவுகள், திட்டங்கள் எல்லாம் அனுபவத்தில் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உண்மையாகவே பயன்படுகிறதென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நன்றாக ஆராய்ந்து சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். சர்க்கார் நினைப்பது போல அவர்கள் எடுக்கும் எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் இப்பொழுது நெசவாளர்களுக்குப் பயன் படவில்லையென்பதை நான் மந்திரி அவர்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக சர்க்கார் இலாக்காக்களுக்கு தேவையாகும் துணி களையெல்லாம் கைத்தறி துணியாகவே வாங்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக உத்திரவு போடுவது நம்முடைய மாகாண சர்க்காரின் கையில்தான் இருக்கிறது. அம்மாதிரி செய்யவேண்டுமென கைத்தறி தொழிலாளர்கள், சம்மேளனமும், சங்கங்களும் அடிக்கடி சர்க்காரிடமும், மந்திரிமார்களுடமும் வற்புறுத்தி வந்திருக்கின்றன. சர்க்கார் குறிப்பாக போலீஸ் இலாகா, வைத்திய இலாகா, ஜெயில் இலாகா போன்றவைகளில் தேவையாகும் துணியெல்லாவற்றையும் கைத்தறி துணிகளாகவே வாங்க வேண்டுமென்று உத்திரவு போட்டுவிட்டால் கைத்தறிகாரர்களும் அந்த ரகத் துணியை நிறைய உற்பத்தி செய்வார்கள். முழு மூச்சுடன் தறிகள் வேலை செய்ய ஆரம்பித்தால் அத்தொழில் கொஞ்சம் முன்னேற சாதனமுண்டு.

“இன்னொரு யோசனையையும் மந்திரி சபையின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவர நான் விரும்புகிறேன். சர்க்கார் இலாகாவில் கிராமத்து வெட்டியான் முதல், சீப் செக்ரடரி வரையில் நிறைய சிப்பந்திகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரி சர்க்கார்களில் இருக்கிற சிப்பந்திகள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறித் துணிகளைத்தான் வாங்கவேண்டுமென்று ஒரு மாதச் சம்பளத்தையாவது கடனாக கொடுத்து அவர்கள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறி துணிகள் வாங்கும்படியாக ஏன் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாதென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். கைத்தறிகாரர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வது போலவும் ஆகும், சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகளுக்கும் நல்லது செய்ததைப் போலவும் ஆகும்.

“இம்மாதிரியாக பல நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் தான் உண்மையில் நம்முடைய மந்திரி சபை கை நெசவு தொழிலுக்கு ஊக்கம் அளிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற கருத்துடையதாக இருக்கிறதென்று எல்லோரும் நம்பமுடியும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இந்தமாதிரியான தீர்மானத்தின் மூலம் பிரசார லாபம் கிடைக்கும் தவிர கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு எந்த விதமான பரிகாரமும் ஏற்படாதென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். இத்துடன் என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மாகாணத்திலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் சென்ற நான் கைந்து வருஷகாலமாக மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்தான். அவர்கள் எனக்கு முன் பேசிய நண்பர்கள் சொன்னமாதிரியாக பின்னாக்கு, கத்தாழை முடியாமல் செத்தார்கள் எத்தனை எத்தனையோ ஆயிரம்பேர்கள். இப்பொழுதாவது மீதமுள்ள நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய வேண்டுமென்பதாக நமது முதன் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் செய்த இந்த முடிவை நான் ரொம்பவும் மகிழ்ச்சியோடு வரவேற்கிறேன். வேஷ்டி, கலர் கேஸ் போன்ற இவைகளின் உற்பத்தியை தனியாக கைத்தறி பிட்டுச் சொன்னது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களே தான். ஆகவே யார் சொல்வாரென்றால் வாயிலிருந்தே வந்த இந்த பிரேரணையை கடைசி வரையிலும் ஒரே எண்ணமாக இருந்து நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கவேண்டிய பொறுப்பும் அவர்களுடையதுதான். இதுவிஷயமாக எவ்வளவு இடைவிடாது, முட்டுக்கட்டைகள் ஏற்பட்டபோதிலும் அதை வெற்றிகரமாக

[4th November 1952] [Sri T. Shanmugam]

முடிப்பது ராஜாஜியின் பொறுப்பாகும். இதில் கட்டாயமாக மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது முட்டுக்கட்டை போடத்தான் செய்யும். ஏனென்றால் மத்திய சர்க்காரை நடத்துபவர்கள் Mill Owners. அந்த மில் முதலாளிகள் தங்களுக்கு நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டுவிடுமென்று எண்ணும் போது இதை எப்படி ஆதரிப்பார்கள்? ஆகையால்தான் ராஜாஜியின் யோசனையை ஒப்புக் கொள்ளமாட்டார்கள். பல தடைகளையும் இதற்கு உண்டாக்குவார்கள். அப்படி ஏதாவது ஏற்பட்டால் நமது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் டெல்லிக்கே நேராகப்பேய் நேருஜி அவர்களுடன் பேசி இந்த காரியத்தை வெற்றி கரமாகக் கட்டாயம் முடித்தே தரவேண்டும். வெற்றி கிடைக்காவிட்டால் நாம் என்ன செய்யவேண்டும் தெரியுமா? மத்திய சர்க்காரின் பிடியிலிருந்து நாம் கட்டாயமாக விலகி கொள்ளவேண்டும். அப்பறம் மத்திய சர்க்காரின் கீழ் இந்த மாகாண சர்க்கார் வேலை செய்யவே கூடாது. தனச் சுதந்திரத்தை ஏற்படுத்திக்கொள்ள முயல்வேண்டும். பர்மா, கிஜோன் போல தனித்து இயங்கி நம் மாகாணத்திற்கு வேண்டிய நன்மைகளை நாமே அவர்கள் கையை எதிர்பார்க்காமல் செய்து கொள்ளக்கூடிய தனி சுதந்திரத்தை நாம் அடைந்து விடவேண்டும். அப்பறம் எதற்காக மத்திய சர்க்காரில் ஒரு நாளாவது இருப்பது என்பதை நாம் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்களின் நெருங்கிய நண்பரான பெரியார் ஈ.வே. ராமசாமி அவர்கள் தமிழ் நாடு, தனித் திராவிட நாடு என்பதாக வெல்லாம் கத்து கத்தென்று கத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“நீங்கள் சபையின் முன்னுள்ள subject-ஐ பற்றியே பேசுங்கள்.”

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“நான் இங்குள்ள Subject-ஐ பற்றித் தான் பேசுகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் திராவிட நாடு என்று சொன்னாலும் சொல்லட்டும் அல்லது சென்னை நாடு என்றோ வேறு ஏதாவது பெயரை வைத்துக் கொண்டோ சொல்லட்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை மில் முதலாளிகள் நிறைந்த மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளாவிட்டால் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கும் நமக்கும் தொடர்பே வேண்டாமென்று ஒரு தனி ராஜ்யத்தை அவர் ஸ்தாபித்து விடவேண்டும். இலங்கையைப் போல பர்மாவைப் போல நாமும் நம் மாகாண மக்களுக்கு பல நன்மைகளைச் செய்து கொண்டு சுதந்திரமாக வாழலாமே. ஆகையினாலே கடைசியாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிப்பதோடு இக்காரியத்தை நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எப்படியாவது வெற்றிகரமாக நடத்திக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக, நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

SRI W. J. FERNANDEZ :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, the need for the preservation of the handloom weaving industry in the national economy of the country has long been recognized. Spinning mills have been protected against foreign competition in order to ensure production in India of the large requirements of yarn by the handloom weavers. As there is considerable unemployment prevailing at the present time among the handloom weavers in the State, it is but right that the handloom industry should be protected against the competition of weaving mills. The Hon. the Chief Minister has urged the Union Government to prohibit weaving mills from producing bordered dhoties and coloured sarees. Such reservation, in the opinion of several eminent Weaving Specialists whom I have consulted, will not help to solve to any appreciable extent, the problem of unemployment and under-employment of a vast magnitude in this country. The State Government will before long have to seek further protection in order to help the weavers in the West Coast and other places, possessing narrow widths of looms and accustomed to weave coloured shirtings and suitings.”

[Sri W. J. Fernandez] [4th November 1952]

"Sir, time is not far off when home markets in all classes of fabrics will have to be reserved for the handloom weavers and weaving mills shall have to limit their production to the extent to which they find an export market.

"The days of profit-making by mills have gone and the hour has come for the preservation of the life of the handloom weavers, irrespective of all the theories of economics of handloom cloth. The State Government should straightaway appoint a Standing Advisory Committee of Legislators, weaving experts, marketing officers and businessmen and organize the handloom weaving industry on its technical, commercial, economic and social aspects so that the consumers will have no justifiable complaint of being deprived of cheap mill cloth.

"Handloom production can be compared favourably with powerlooms provided the cottage industry is organized with a proper technical perspective. The Co-operative Department has made rapid progress in recent years in eliminating the sowcars and bringing the weavers into the fold of Weavers' Co-operative Societies. No time should now be lost in rendering the handlooms a commercial weaving machine and this can only be achieved by making the spinning mills a link of the weavers' co-operative societies and serving in a proper technical manner for rendering the handlooms, vastly more productive than at present and reducing the cost of production to the utmost possible extent. Mere agitation, or a vote of this House, will not convince the Union Government that the State has done all that is necessary for organizing the handloom industry on a commercial footing before asking for reservation."

* SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ లిక్కానము మాకు సంపూర్ణమైన సంతృప్తిని కలుగజేయకపోయినప్పటికీ చేనేత కార్మికులను కొంతవరకైనా సహాయపడుతుందని భావిస్తూ దానిని విలపిస్తున్నాను.

“భారతదేశంలో ఎంతో కాలంగా ఉన్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ బ్రిటిష్ పాలనా కాలంలో పెక్కు ఇబ్బందులకు గురైంది. బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఈ పరిశ్రమను ఎప్పుడూ నిరుత్సాహపరుస్తూనే వుండేవారు. వారి దేశంలోని మిల్లు యజమానులకు లాభం కలుగజేయడం ఎట్లా అనే వారు ఆలోచించేవారు. ఈ కారణాలచేత చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దెబ్బతింది. కారణాంతరాలవల్ల బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు మన దేశాన్ని వదిలిపెట్టారు. భరిపాలన కార్మిగ్లై వారి హస్తగతమైంది. ఆయినప్పటికీ గత 150 సంవత్సరాలుగా బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఎట్టి విధానాలను అనుసరిస్తూ ఉండేవారో అట్టి విధానాలనే కార్మిగ్లై పాలకులుకూడా అనుసరించారు. మంత్రులు మారారు. మంత్రివర్గాలు మారాయి. వాటిలోవారు చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను చాగువరచే ఉపాహుకూడా మారుతూవచ్చాయి. ఒక మంత్రి ఉపాధి మరొక మంత్రి ఉపాధి పొత్తులిస్తేది కాదు. చేనేత కార్మికులను రాజకీయ జూడంలో పాచికలుగా ఉపయోగించుకుంటూ కార్మిగ్లై గోత్రములు ప్రయత్నించారు కాని వారికి నిజంగా చేసిన సహాయమేదీ కనుపించదు. ఈనాడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు పాత పంథాలు త్రొక్కరని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.

[Sri G. Anjaneyulu] [4th November 1952]

“ఇక చేనేత సహకార సంఘాలన్నాయి. వాటి స్థితిగతులకూడా అధ్యక్షాం గానే ఉన్నాయని చెప్పవలసి ఉంది. ఎన్నో లోపాలు, వాటిలో కనుపిస్తున్నాయి. రాజకీయంగా ఒత్తిడివల్లకూడా కొన్ని సహజులు దెబ్బ తింటున్నాయి. ఈ సహజు లానికి మధ్యవర్తులు, పెట్టుబడిదారులు చేరుతున్నారు. రోజురోజుకు వారి ప్రాబల్యం పెరిగిపోతుంది. కష్టించి పనిచేసే చేనేత కార్మికులకు అవి అంతగా ఉపయోగపడలేని స్థితిలో ఉన్నాయి. నూలు దొరకక కార్మికులకు పని కరువైంది. నేయడైన గుడ్డలకూడా సరియైన ధర రావటంలేదు. సరుకు విడుదల కానందువల్ల లక్షలాది గజాల గుడ్డ నిలిచిపోయింది. ముఖ్యంగా మా బండర్ తాలూకాలోని పెదనవంటి ముఖ్య కేంద్రాలలో చేనేత కార్మికులు వివరీతమైన బాధలకు గురౌతున్నారు. విశ్వ మగ్గాలు నూరు మగ్గాలతో పని చేయించే వ్యాపారులుకూడా గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక, దివాళాతీసే స్థితిలోకివచ్చారు. అందుచేత చేనేత కార్మికుని గోలుకకి పూర్తిగా నశించింది. నిత్యావసర వస్తువులను కొనుటకైనా వారి కేనాడుపోయిపోయింది. గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక చేనేత కార్మికులు బాధలుపడుతుంటే గత కార్మిగ్లై ప్రభుత్వం వారిని నానా హింసలపాలు చేసింది. దిన విత్యావలైనా సంపాదించుకోలేని స్థితిలో చేనేత కార్మికులు వారి పిల్లలకు వదులు ఎలా చెప్పించుకుంటారు. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగుల బిడ్డలకు ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయవలసినదని చేనేత కార్మికుల బిడ్డలకూడా ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయవలసినదని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ఈ ప్రాంతాలలోని చేనేత కార్మికులకు ఈనాడు ఎట్టి ఆధారంలేక మాలినాని చేసుకొనవలసిన అవస్థ ఉంది. పిస్తలు, పెద్దలు, స్త్రీలు, పురుషులు, అనే వ్యత్యాసం లేమీ లేకుండా అందరూ కడుపు చేతబట్టుకొన మాలి ననులకై దేవులిస్తున్నారు. ఈ విషయాలను నేను ఋజువు చేయగలను. దానికితోడు వీరి వ్యక్తమ భవనాల చేతిలో నికి పోతోంది. దానిని ఆరికట్టాలి.

“మరొక ముఖ్య విషయం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. చేనేత పరిశ్రమ యధాస్థితికి రావాలంటే దానికి కొన్ని ప్రత్యేక రకములవస్త్రాలను కేటాయించాలి. వాటిని మిల్లులు తయారుచేయకూడదని నిశ్చయించాలి. 20, 40 లోపు నెంబరు మాట్ల అనే తేడాల్తోలేకుండా చేనేత వ్యక్తమకు ప్రత్యేకించాలి. వీరిలకు భోజనములకు మిల్లులు తయారుచేయడం అవుచేయించాలి. ఈ నెంబరు మాట్లను సరైన ధరలకు చేనేత కార్మికులకు సహకార సంఘాల ద్వారా సరఫరాచేయించాలి. చేనేత కార్మికులందరూ సహకార సంఘాలలో చేరుకోవలసిగా చూడాలి. అవసరమైన సహకార్యాలలో నేరు కేపిటల్ను ప్రభుత్వమే యివ్వాలి. మగ్గానికింత చొప్పున ఊడ భృతి ఋణాలు యిచ్చి చేనేత కార్మికులను ప్రోత్సహించాలి. ప్రతిష్ట కోల్పోయిన కార్మిగ్లై సంస్థను పునరుద్ధరించవలసినదే సంకల్పంతోకాక, నిజముగా చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను వక్కబెరుడుతున్న వ్యవస్థాపకార్థంగా కృషి సల్పవలసినదని అయిన నను తిరిగి కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక ముఖ్యమైన విషయం గురించి మనవి చేస్తాను. ఈ కాసన సభలో వరు భావలవాడున్నాడు. జరిగి భావ మరొకరికి బాధపడదు. ప్రజాస్వామికి విధానం జయ్యకదం కావాలంటే అయినవంటి లిక్కానములను, సభ్యులు మాట్లాడేభావ మంత్రులకు అర్థం కావాలంటే వరిపాలన మాత్ర భావలోనే జరిపాలి. నేడు మంత్రులు ప్రసంగించేది మాకు తెలియదు. మేము ఏమి చెబుతున్నామో, వాటికి అర్థంకాదు. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఒకరి అభిప్రాయాలు మరొకరికి తెలియకుండాను ప్రాప్తమౌతున్నాయి. నిజమింతవరకైనా అగత్యం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు అనువాదకులను రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు త్వరలో విచ్చాము చేస్తామని ఆశిస్తున్నామో వీరితో విరుమిస్తున్నాను.”

[Sri T. S. Ardhanari] [4th November 1952]

அரசாங்கம் இதைச் செய்யமுடியாது. அது மத்திய சர்க்கார் செய்யவேண்டிய காரியம். மத்திய சர்க்காரை நாம் கேட்கிறோம். அதற்குப் பின்னால் அங்குள்ள மந்திரிகள் கூடி விவாதிக்கவேண்டும். அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய மில் முதலாளிகளை ஆலோசனை கேட்கவேண்டும். இன்னும் பல சடங்குகள் நடந்த பிறகு அமுலுக்கு வரும். (நேரம் முடிந்துவிட்டதென்பதைக் குறிக்க ஸ்பீக்கர் யூனியன் அடித்தார்) இன்னும் கொஞ்ச நேரத்தில் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன், சிறிது அவகாசம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

“கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களிடம் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கக்கூடிய ஜவுளியைக் கொள்முதல் செய்து, மலிவான விலையில் மக்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் விநியோகம் செய்யாமல் இருந்தால் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கமுடியாது. இன்றைக்கு தாஞ்சிபுரம் தொழிலாளர்களும், சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களும் கஞ்சித் தொட்டிகளை எதிர்நோக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பட்டினியைப் போக்கிக்கொள்வதற்கு நாடு பூராவும் பிச்சை எடுப்பதற்கு மனைவி மக்களோடு புறப்பட்டு விட்டார்கள். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றினால்மட்டும் அவர்களுடைய குறைகளைப் போக்கிவிட்டதாகச் சொல்லமுடியாது. ஆகையால், மாகாணத்தில் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கின்ற ஜவுளி பூராவையும் சர்க்கார் கொள்முதல் செய்து மக்களுக்கு குறைந்த விலையில் விநியோகிக்கவேண்டும். அதனால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய நஷ்டத்தை சர்க்காரே ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். கொஞ்சமும் சிந்திக்காமல் பொதுவாக எவ்வளவோ பணத்தை சர்க்கார் விரயம் செய்கிறது. கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை சர்க்கார் வீண் விரயம் செய்கிறது. ஆனால், நம் நாட்டு குடிசைத் தொழிலாளியை கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு உரண்டு கோடி ரூபாயாவது சர்க்காருடைய பட்டெட்டிலிருந்து செலவு செய்யாவிட்டால் அது மிகப் பெரிய தவறு என்பதைச் சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

“சென்ற கட்டையைக் கூட்டத்திலேயே கைத்தறி நெசவாளருக்கு உதவி செய்வதற்காக சொஸ்டியில் எல்லோரையும் மெம்பர்களாகச் சேர்ப்பதற்கு நாங்கள் முயற்சி செய்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டது, மூன்று மாதங்கள் ஆகிவிட்டது. திருச்செங்கோட்டில் 31-ந்தேதி கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் விஜயம் செய்திருந்தபோது சொஸ்டியில் எல்லாத் தொழிலாளர்களையும் சேர்க்கவில்லை என்று சொன்னபோது, அவர் சொன்னார், “அது என்னவென்று குற்றம் இல்லை, சொஸ்டியின் குற்றம்” என்று. ஆகவே, இன்றைக்கு கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்காக ஒரு திட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தால், அந்தத் திட்டம் சரிவர நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டதா இல்லையா என்று பார்க்காமல் ஒரு மந்திரி மூன்று மாத காலமாக இருந்தது உண்மையிலேயே கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இழைத்த ஒரு பெரும் தொடுமை என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஆகவே ஜனங்களுடைய நன்மைக்காக இயற்றப்படும் திட்டமானது சரிவர நிறைவேறுகிறதா இல்லையா என்பதைப் பரிசீலனைசெய்து பார்ப்பதற்குக்கூட அவர்களுக்கு நேரம் இல்லையென்று சொன்னால், அது நெசவாளர்களை ஏமாற்றுவதாகும் என்று எண்ணுகிறேன். தவறு ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு, அந்தத் தவறு எங்குண்டிருக்கலாம், சொஸ்டியிலுடையது என்று சொல்லக்கூடியது இருக்கிறதே அதைப்பற்றி நான் உண்மையாகவே வருந்துகிறேன். இந்தத் தவறுக்குக் காரணமாயிருந்த மரகாண சொஸ்டி ரிஜிஸ்டார் அவர்கள் மீது இந்த சர்க்கார் கண்டிப்பான நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். அப்பொழுதுதான் உண்மையாகவே மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்ததாகும்.

“பொதுவாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரி அவர்களுடைய மந்திரி சபை, உண்மையாகவே கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு சேவை செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற உணர்ச்சியோடு, நல்ல அபிப்பிராயத்தோடு, கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட தீர்மானம் என்று நான் நம்பிய போதிலும்கூட, அதே சமயத்தில் இது ஒரு விளம்பரமாக இருக்கவிடக் கூடாது என்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m.”

[4th November 1952]

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take more than two or three minutes. I am rising only to state that I generally support this resolution. There was some criticism to the effect that this was no solution at all. The hon. Member representing the Nilgiris—General criticized the proposals somewhat very severely. I am not going into the defence portion of it for, I believe that the sponsor of the resolution will meet all the criticisms. I was only anxious to see how it would affect the low-income groups if they were compelled to purchase only handloom varieties in case they happened to be more costly than clothes available in the immediate neighbourhood at a lesser cost. But I believe the restriction of the reservation to bordered dhoties and coloured sarees solves the problem to a great extent. While I do not say that I am able to foresee all consequences fully, yet I support the resolution. If in the light of experience it is found that consumers are put to any difficulty, I hope the Government will do the needful. I hope that this ancient cottage industry in which are involved several lakhs of people who have given to the world the finest patterns of weaving and earned a reputation for their skill from the entire world, will get the support which is necessary. Logically speaking, those who believe exclusively in scientific progress and machinery may not be able to support it. Also, those who believe in khadi may not be able to support entirely handloom which is run on mill yarn. But there are bound to be cases where logic ceases to apply in life and other values count and I believe this is one of those cases. Lakhs and lakhs of families have been wedded to this profession of handloom weaving. It has been their hereditary profession for centuries, a profession which has earned for India a worldwide reputation. In such a case I believe that logic should cease to apply and we must have different values of life. It is in this spirit that I support the resolution wholeheartedly.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful on behalf of the Government that support has been expressed from all sections of the House in the manner in which it has been done. The manner in which my hon. Friend Sri Viswanatham gave his support particularly delights me. This resolution has been discussed for a day and a half. It is natural that the warm unanimity that marked the support in the earlier stages of the debate gradually waned down towards the end of the debate into a somewhat critical attitude. When we discuss a thing for a pretty long time, it is natural that we seek to find differences rather than agreements as we proceed. I was not, therefore, surprised to hear Mr. Ari Gowder say that this was a desperate appeal. He expressed his doubts about the wisdom of the proposal. Mr. Fernandez also spoke in a somewhat critical strain. But on the whole, taking the various sections of the House as they have been offering support or criticism on the various matters that come up before them, the unanimity with which support has been given to this resolution is certainly most marked and significant.”

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

“ My Hon. Colleague the Minister for Industries opened the debate with a very lucid exposition when he moved the resolution. I do not think he left out any important points and nothing is gained by mere repetition. He has put the case very clearly and concisely. The main thing to be remembered, as was observed by Mr. Viswanatham just now, is that it is not merely a problem of the textile industry or whether one form of machinery should be used to produce cloth or another form of machinery. It is not merely an economic problem. As I said more than once in this connexion, it is a problem of great human interest and value. Let us take, for instance, whether we should support cinemas or dramas. Much can be said in favour of the drama, much can be said in favour of the cinema. There is a conflict between the two. There is no doubt that the cinema has driven the drama out of the society so to say. But yet one may take a very detached view about such a problem. It may be that ultimately the drama will be found to be the better thing. It may be that the larger scope which the cinema has may make it more valuable to society. But it is not as if millions of families are involved in those fields; a few families are engaged in them. But here is an industry involving not a few families but millions of families. Making a most conservative estimate, the number of men, women and children depending on the handloom industry to-day as well as in the past and for a considerable time in the future until some unknown or unexpected industrial revolution takes place in our country, is fifteen millions. I am speaking of India as a whole. Fifteen million souls are involved in this handloom industry. Let me remind statisticians that this equals the entire population of Australia and is one and a half times the population of Canada. Any problem of occupation or profession which involves so many numbers is not merely a matter for statistical research or things of that kind, but it is one which calls for considerations of the greatest human importance. Out of this total population of weaver families, we have in our State alone $4\frac{1}{2}$ million souls to be looked after. Four and a half millions can easily be the population of one of the moderate-sized countries in Europe. So, even the population involved in our own State is large enough to attract other considerations than what seem to be moving industrialists at the present moment. If we do not consider it as the problem of a large population or of a very large number of human units, let us merely look upon it as that of a corps of skilled workers who are available in the country. Let us look upon it only as a problem as to how to deal with the skilled man-power that we have to-day in our country in this regard. Let us understand and let us realise that this large body of skilled workers are not doing national service under any compulsion of law or for an agreed rate of payment by way of wages, but they are doing it as a traditional occupation and are most willingly engaged in it. This labour force excluding all dependants and counting only the principal worker in each case comes to one million workers in our own State. It is one million skilled workers excluding the dependants, assistants and the like. Here, therefore, we are dealing in our State—concentrating only on our State—with one million workers

3-10
p.m.

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

of a very skilled type. What shall we do with them? Shall we simply tell them, ‘ You are in a dying occupation, and therefore we do not bother about you. The rights and wrongs of this conflict be on your own head; do what you like with it ’? It will be impossible to take up that attitude. If we take an all-India account of it, it would come to six million skilled workers—a corps of skilled workers. Let us remember—though it has been often said, we are likely to forget—that the skilled workers engaged in the handloom industry are more than twice the total number of workers in all other organized industries in our country. The number of workers engaged in the handloom industry is more than twice that of those engaged in other industries, textile, steel and everything included. We have really to grasp the quantum of this problem, and we have also to remember the inescapable fact that this huge man-power cannot change over to any other occupation. They have no lands. They cannot take to agriculture. They cannot find the wherewithal for it, the land for it, or the knowledge for it, or the habit for it, or even the tendency towards it. They cannot change over the habit which for generations they have acquired in this particular craft. Let us also remember that it is not mere unskilled labour. It requires early training. Skill in this craft is acquired from childhood, boyhood or girlhood. When we think of this man-power at our disposal, the importance of the problem can be realised. Ladies and gentlemen in the South do not require to be educated by me in this regard. But I am sorry to find that the problem has not been properly grasped in other quarters, and that is why I am repeating all this from this forum, so to say. We should also grasp the fact that whatever may be the reaction on other sections of the community by way of incidence, those sections of the community cannot carry on with their business or with their civic or political or family life if, round about them, six millions of people are in distress and difficulty. It is easy to make a calculation and say that the consumer would not like to pay 2 annas more for a yard or 1 anna more for a yard. Yes, the consumer may have to pay. But what happens to the consumer if there are 15 million unemployed people in India? What happens to the consumer if there are 5 million unemployed people, men, women and children, not having anything to live upon in this State? Can life go on with so much unemployment around us? Therefore, it is necessary to see the size of the problem. It is necessary to see the consequences of our present policy about it and our allowing the conflict to go on. If, therefore, we are able to grasp all these things, we cannot say then all that had been said. It is not a mere case of comparison of mill production with other forms of textile production. But it calls for different considerations of a much deeper import. And this is what I have been appealing for all the time. And why do I come before this House with this resolution? We can achieve nothing by a resolution here. But we can achieve this, i.e., we can show to the Government of India what the representatives of all sections of the communities here in the South feel about this matter and how public opinion has been formed here and has shaped itself here

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

without any steamroller agitation or anything of that kind. Of its own accord it has shaped itself. Human sympathy has shaped it. It is nothing else. If, therefore, we pass this resolution, we pass it in the hope that it will make an impression on those who have the power to order the arrangement of things in our country in this regard. If, for instance—I am putting it in another form—some of my friends will pardon me if they do not like the form, because I am putting it in that form for the purpose of impressing it on other people than those who are here—if, for instance, by any historical accident we discover on a visit to China that there the new Government had set up, on a nation-wide scale, handlooms, each costing only Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 worth of capital investment in simple machinery, and each one of these handlooms producing about 5 yards of cloth per day as against privately owned powerlooms each one of which costs Rs. 1,200 for installation and that the handloom industry spread all over China was producing 4, 5 or 6 yards in each house, and all the handlooms together produced 1,500 million yards, and that as and when more yarn is issued to them they would produce twice that quantity, we would have hailed it as a great discovery and a revolutionary discovery at that. What happens here? We have it here as it is. We have it here in every house. We have it in a million houses in our States, and in 6 million houses throughout India. We have a simple machine. If it is a pit loom with shuttle throwing, it costs Rs. 20 to Rs. 30. If it is a wooden frame loom, without digging a pit to sit over, it costs Rs. 50 to Rs. 60. The weavers have them. We have not distributed them. We have not given money for them. The men have got these already, and they are producing yards of cloth. They can produce not five yards but more yards per day if we only allow them. If we have got them already here, what is the sense in ignoring them and in depending upon the textile industry for producing our cloth and making it difficult for the handloom in refusing to make an arrangement by which the conflict could be avoided, and a stable market secured for this handloom industry? I submit that we have to exercise our imagination. The very thing that we have here, had we discovered in any other country as a result of a new enterprise, we would have welcomed as a great advance in human ingenuity and human endeavour. But when we have it here already, we are really ignoring the position. It has been observed by many visitors when they had been to China—many visitors have gone there—that 2½ million rural workers had been brought together to make a river project. Two and a half million rural workers were brought together to make a river project, and our visitors have gone into ecstasy over the discovery, and very rightly. This is not very different from that. The difference is that the thing here is already there, whereas they have brought it there for the first time. If, from that point of view, the resolution is looked at, the importance of our resolution will be appreciated by those who are not in very close touch with this matter. The visitors who went to China observed with admiration that 2½ million workers were brought to a particular river project. Also they have said that

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

this labour was not slave labour or conscripted labour. It was more or less voluntary. What is the labour here that I am referring to? It is not only voluntary, but it comes out of their hearts. It is traditional. It has been in their lives for generations, not voluntary merely for one man but voluntary for generations."

(Sri M. Hanumantha Rao rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"The Hon. the Chief Minister has not yielded."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, if we 2-20 p.m.
really contemplate and grasp the magnitude of the manpower which is engaged in the production of cloth already in our country, we can realize—my point is this and probably this is the information that is wanted by the hon. Gentleman—we can realize the tragedy of assuming that this industry must perish. That is the point that I wish to make. Very many people begin with a notion that this industry must perish and, therefore they ask, 'What is the good of allowing it to languish in this manner for any while?' They think, 'Let us allow the conflict and speed up or accelerate the conflict rather than try, by some blood transfusion, to maintain a perishing industry.' That is wrong. We cannot hand ourselves over to the tender mercies of the textile industry as a change for the better in this respect. The short-sightedness of this policy is, in my humble opinion, tragic. Powerlooms consume electricity, fuel, and all kinds of materials whereas these handlooms have not demanded and will not demand anything from us except yarn at a fair price which the weavers are willing to pay and which they will put into the product and turn over when they have a market. All that they are asking for is an easy market without a conflict. They do not even ask for subsidy. These handlooms are located in the houses of the workers, employing only the labour of their own family. It is a great decentralised industry which would really serve to maintain the texture of our rural life and not create slums in the towns along with the problems of housing, health and sanitation, with which Governments are unable to deal satisfactorily. At present, the handlooms are employed only for less than half of their full capacity. As was explained, if they produce bordered dhooties and coloured sarees to the fullest extent possible, they can produce the whole quantity which now the mills and the handlooms taken together produce. There is no question, therefore, of any risk or failure in total production.

"The proposal, which this Government have been pressing and which they have asked this House to support, is a very moderate one. There is already—let it be remembered—a good stock of mill cloth in the States. Even if we get this reservation, there is already in all the States a good deal of stock of mill cloth. That stock is lying with the wholesalers and retailers and will act as a buffer in any case. As and when the Government take steps to place an adequate quantity of yarn at the disposal of handlooms and at prices which may be deemed fair, handloom production will

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

certainly go up, if there is any truth in the laws that govern human nature and economics. There are many who maintain that handloom products have a longer life and attractive features. The real difficulty in the way, therefore, of the prosperity of the handloom industry is the fact that the price of foreign cotton enters unduly into the yarn supplied to the handlooms and that the weaving mills, as was pointed out by many speakers, have an advantage in this respect, and that there is a continual conflict in the market between the one product and the other which is priced just a little lower in order to throttle the other commodity's chances.

"Now, there is a vague fear, which was expressed concretely by one speaker, that the handloom weaver and his marketing organisation will put up prices if there is no competition between the handloom products and the mill products. It is forgotten, in this connection, firstly, that numerous weavers compete with one another and they are so poor and so numerous that no effort by way of cornering will succeed. The internal competition is so great that ultimately the weaver will have to be satisfied, as he is now, with a fair subsistence wage and the cost of the material. The only thing that he wants is that the subsistence wage should not be reduced, and that is all that we ask for in this Resolution. Secondly, the mills, on the other hand, can and will certainly turn to the production of substitutes, if production of coloured sarees and bordered dhoties is taken away from them. This has been pointed out by some speakers by way of detraction of the present Resolution. No doubt the Resolution will not create a paradise for the weaver. There is the likelihood of the textile mills producing substitutes of all kinds for the cloth which has been reserved to the handloom industry, if this Resolution should be given effect to. That is true, on the one hand, but on the other, it answers the argument of risk. There is the well-known substitute for it. As we all know, people belonging to the older generation here know—we were ourselves, our fathers and our uncles were all using, what was called, mull, i.e., white cloth, which they cut into pieces according to the sizes they wanted. The handloom dhoties were discarded by many and this white cloth, cut into pieces, was used by fashionable people, who thought they looked very nice in that dress. Now they may not think so, but that was the view then. The same thing may happen again if there is any undue rise in the price of handloom cloth and the consumer finds any difficulty. What will happen is that the mills will sell substitutes of cloth fairly easily and nobody will go naked and anybody will find it difficult to clothe himself and even to clothe himself tidily. There may be a change-over to a new custom. People, who wear loose dhoties, may wear tailor-made clothes like bush-shirts and bush-coats. If that happens, we need not regret it. There will be advancement in cleanliness and tidiness of clothing and at the same time, the handloom weaver will not feel that it is a conflict that has killed him, but will take it as a change in manners, and sartorial fashions. The psychology will then be totally different from the present psychology of being stifled under mere market competition. If all of us take to rice or to wheat or change over to a

4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

new form of diet, the merchants will not object. But if there is a different kind of rice or a different kind of wheat in the market, which stifles the traditional occupation of the people here, then comes the psychology of distress, and that is what we do not like and wish to prevent by means of this Resolution.

"Then, again, the offer of money bonuses and stipends is in the air. Anything is welcome. We are poor and, if money is given, it won't do for us to say 'No'. But I hope that the Government of India which will offer that money, whatever it may be, will tell us what to do with it so that it may be usefully spent. I for one cannot imagine what to do with the share of Madras. It may be a crore of rupees. But what shall we do with it? How shall we help the weaver with it? Shall we put it into the General Budget and bridge the financial gap a little bit? What shall we do with that money to help the weavers? It may be a caricature, but I feel that it would be like the tiger asking the lamb to lick the former before the latter is to be eaten. Will the three pie cess which we get from the mills reduce the production of mill cloth which is to be my conflicting and throttling agency. It is dangerous to earn some money from that which is going to throttle us to the extent that we get it. It is like trying to use the drink revenue for doing propaganda against drink. As I get more money, I get foolish and would want to get more and more money and yet more money, and I would then rather like the drink revenue to go up than go down. In the same manner here, if we get a cess from the mills, unless the cess is a deterrent one, it is no advantage. If, for instance, all the hon. Members of this House agree and we have the legal power to impose a big duty on all mill-made dhoties and sarees which come into this State and if it is a deterrent duty, then I can understand the use of it. If it is a mild cess and it just tickles the mill-owners and if that cess is paid to the handloom weavers here, then it will serve no useful purpose whatsoever. What we want is a completely protected market, let it be clearly understood, in a defined field. We have not asked for too much and this defined field is a substitutable field. It is not like a man giving up a thing altogether. If a defined field is reserved for the handloom industry, there will at the same time be a vast field outside. Here is a case where he who wants to have a particular commodity and cannot get it in one field can go in for a substitute in the other. We want a protected market in a defined field for the handloom industry. The assurance of this reservation must be clearly recognised not only by the weavers, but by the intermediaries, the consumers, the retail goods agents and everybody else. Then there will be a feeling of confidence and a feeling of security and well-being in the millions of handloom weaver families, which would help not only those families, but the entire population. This vast volume of skilled man-power requires this little encouragement and security and given these, they would prove to be one of the finer elements in our society. Most of us know the conditions obtaining in the millions of weaver families. The literacy of weaver families is higher than that of the families of other workers. Their industry and civic loyalty are greater.

3.30
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[4th November 1952]

only we give a little encouragement and security, the man-power will be an exceedingly valuable asset in our civic life. The mills can easily afford this and they will lose very little. That is the point which does not seem to have been fully recognised by those gentlemen who do not like our resolution. The mills can very easily afford to produce a little less than they do now, even though that should become necessary. I don't think it will be necessary. The mills do not stand in need of a particular market, namely, bordered dhoties and sarees. They can produce an infinite variety in bulk. They have a huge market. Not only that. They have a great and expanding market in Asia with a powerful organisation to help them in marketing their products. These are the conditions under which the Government of Madras have been pressing on the Government of India to accept this policy and for which we ask your help through this Resolution.

"The mental background behind the opposition to this proposal is the erroneous conviction that the handloom industry is an industry that should perish. Let us not assume things in that way. It is shocking to see intelligent men, patriotic citizens talking in terms of destruction or the extinction of the occupation of millions of families, each family consisting of more than two persons working at this craft. Whatever may be the prognosis in the economic sphere, we must take it as our present obligation to keep under fairly prosperous conditions these five million souls in Madras State alone. It is our duty to guard against the extinction of any particular wide-spread occupation. As long as these people are willing to work in their own homes with a little turnover, our bounden duty is to help them to carry on their normal honest work. Once upon a time, the East India Company, and later the British Parliament supported a commercial policy in the later 18th and the earlier decades of the 19th centuries. They carried out a policy by which India became subservient to the industries of Great Britain. Their policy was to make the Indian people grow raw products in order to supply materials for the looms in the factories of Great Britain. Now, I refer to this not as a mere stale Anti-British platform matter, but to point out that it is exactly the same policy that is now being pursued or sought to be pursued by the textile mills in India and their friends. They want the handloom weavers to perish and cotton to be grown. That is what they want. We cannot abandon millions of skilled artisans and leave them to the tender mercies of the textile industry. Some propaganda is now being conducted on behalf of the mill industry. The cry of the consumers' interest had been raised in the past and it has been raised now also. But I may tell this House that no consumer-interest can be really protected by allowing six million families in India to perish. This should be clearly understood.

"Sir, much talk is heard about improving the organisation, as if faulty organisation were responsible for the distress of the weavers. It has been mentioned by some hon. Members who do not see eye to eye with us that we should improve the weavers' organisations and the like. Now, it is no use trying to hide the obvious, namely, the conflict between the handlooms and the mills.

[4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

by reference to the defects in the handloom weavers' organisation. Let me remind the hon. Members that, as was pointed out by my Hon. Colleague while moving the Resolution, co-operative society organization in Madras has reached a high degree of efficiency. Two lakhs and thirty-five thousand weavers have been brought under registered co-operative societies and about twice that number are associated with many weavers' associations. But this cannot solve the problem of marketing as against the competition of mill products. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies hesitates to take more members into co-operative societies. Why does he hesitate? The moment he takes them in as members, he has to supply them yarn and production will go up and the accumulated stocks will increase. He is more vociferous than anybody else in urging the creation of a definite market. It is suggested that the Government should purchase these products. What can the Government do after buying them unless people will buy them, unless we have a definite market wherein these products could be sold? Difficulties arise not because of the defects in the handloom weavers' organizations, but because of the conflict with mill products. If we make the reservation, then it is the duty of the Government of the State to look into these matters also. It is only if we create a market, these co-operative societies can flourish and grow and absorb more and more weavers.

"The position with reference to yarn has been already explained. Hon. Members who have studied this subject closely have spoken on this aspect. We have said in the Resolution that the entire yarn that is needed for producing the cloth which we want to be reserved should be made available thereafter for the handloom weavers at a fair and reasonable price. The reason for this is that the conflict itself has resulted in the extra and higher price of foreign cotton being thrown as a burden on the handloom industry. We want that this should be avoided and so we have introduced a definite clause in the Resolution to that effect.

"Sir, I have studied the amendments that have been moved. Many of them are good and are intended to improve the administration in this State. They do not really form part and parcel of the issue of policy behind the present Resolution. The present Resolution is, so to say, a battle for the creation of a market. As for other things, they have to be and will be considered by the Government. I would like hon. Members to remember that if these amendments are introduced in the present Resolution, the result will be confusion of issues and it will make our difficult battle more difficult. We must go with clear issues and it will be the duty of the Government to see that what is necessary is done in the other respects referred to. We have asked for a fair price for the yarn supplied and we shall certainly demand adequate quantities. There is nothing to be gained by introducing words such as a 'first charge on the total production of yarn in the country' as was demanded by hon. Member Sri Kotaiah.

"My communist colleagues in the Assembly, I may be permitted to say, are suffering from an inherited complex in favour of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

machine products. They cannot easily get out of that, though they are wonderfully alert and flexible in many matters. They find a certain difficulty in changing over from the creed of machine production. Hence they have brought in a number of amendments in spite of their full support to the main principle of the resolution. They have concentrated on what this Government have not done and what this Government are not going to do and things like that. They have said that the purchasing power of the people should be raised; that the disease is there and not in the conflict of the mill industry. This is a totally wrong conception. The conflict of the mill product with the handloom industry is a reality, a very great reality, and it has got to be got over. As regards the purchasing power of the people, it affects everything and how can we increase the purchasing power if we allow six million families in India to be unemployed! Suppose we take Madras. There are one million families here. If we allow them to be unemployed or so employed that they cannot sell the product of their profession, how can we improve the general purchasing power? Sir, this talk about increasing the general purchasing power by making agrarian reforms and the like has nothing to do with the present problem before us. There is no use mixing it up simply because, so to say, we have inherited certain complexes and ideas in respect of different subjects. I have no objection to these ideas. But they should not be brought into a discussion of this kind. Here happily I find, whatever the causes may be, that all sections of the House have given support to this resolution and I think that it is a great gain for those who have to struggle in this matter. I say 'struggle' because, I confess, Sir, the battle has been very difficult. The Government of India, though they have understood the position, find a certain conservative difficulty in making a big change of this kind by accepting a proposal of protection in this regard."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"What is the opinion of the Tariff Board?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I may say that not only the Tariff Board but every one including the Planning Commission appreciates our position. The difficulty, however, is one of taking a step. Such difficulties are natural. In the old days, when the mill industry of India had to struggle against the foreign mill industry importing goods here, there was protection and that protection was given by the British Government then. It was enjoyed all the time by the mill industry here and we should keep that example in mind in an internal matter like this. I am, therefore, grateful to the House for the support it has given to Government. Let it be understood that I am claiming no originality for this proposal. My name (Rajagopalachari Garu) came up in many Telugu speeches. I am claiming no originality in this matter. All that I want is that the handloom weavers should be saved from distress by being given a little help in their own self-endeavour. The mills enjoyed great protection for a long time at the cost of the consumer, as all people know. I am certain, I may say, that if there had been no unfortunate controversy raised over

[4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the matter, I could have brought the industrialists to agree to this very reasonable proposal. I have not much doubt in the matter because mill industrialists have got a wide field. They can look after themselves and it is possible to bring them round. But it has become difficult just now on account of the developments that have taken place. I can assure the mill industry in the course of this debate that it will not stand to lose anything if the industrialists concede what we have asked for now.

"I hope, Sir, that the amendments will not be pressed, for the main reason that I have given, namely, that it will complicate the issue and make it difficult to go through and it may also weaken our case because specious arguments can be put forward such as 'You have not set your house in order; you have not done this; you have not done that and you have not helped them this way or that way'. Let us understand one another. I want that the duties of this Government should be separated from what we are asking now at the hands of the Government of India. Let us do what we have to do. Let us discuss and do what we must do immediately, namely, to secure the primary thing—this particular reservation—and when we get this reservation, the Government will be at the disposal of this House for discussing whatever other measures may have to be taken. Let us not confuse the issue with amendments of this kind. I hope, Sir, therefore, that my Friends will not press their amendments and give unanimity a wrong turn, so to say, of difference of opinion and that this resolution will get through with the same unanimity that it obtained at the beginning of this debate. The main policy has to be presented to the Government of India. That is what we have to press for.

"Sir, there was some reference to certain points such as import of foreign products and the like. Let me give facts. The total import for the whole year in this State of Madras of foreign cloth is 200 bales at the present moment. This import does not affect the present question at all. The figure is nothing and the cloth is mostly imported for the making of umbrellas.

"Reference was made to sales tax. The sales tax on handloom products is one and a half pies or one-eighth of an anna per rupee at a single point only. But the tax on mill-made cloth is quarter anna per rupee, multipoint. Let us not draw a red herring across the trail here. It has nothing to do with the present question. And as for Khadi, there is no tax. That is well-known.

"I think, Sir, I have dealt with the amendments and as my Hon. Colleague is not going to speak after me, I make the appeal that the amendments may kindly be withdrawn and that this resolution may be left to its fate without any confusion of issues." (Loud cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"Is any hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?"

(All the movers of amendments except Sri P. Kotaiah declined to withdraw their amendments and their amendments were put to vote.)

[4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also of opinion that since the existing Handlooms in Malabar are such that they cannot utilise the advantage of the proposed measure of 'reservation' to the full, the Government shall take necessary steps to help the industry to instal suitable looms and other help to those of the Handloom owners who actually deserve it, so that the existing unemployment and the consequent hardships be eradicated to some extent. (Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiyar.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

Add at the end after the words " imported cotton " the words " and also to reduce the price of the yarn ".

Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also further of opinion that the Central Government should immediately constitute Purchasing Boards for handloom cloth and find ways and means to secure markets for the handloom cloth and urgently take steps to open gruel centres wherever it is necessary in Madras State out of the Central Relief Fund so as to save the life of so many unemployed weavers. (Sri K. P. Gopalan.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House is further of opinion that the Central Government and Government of Madras should take steps to make available for the Handloom Industry, yarn at production price. (Sri P. Venkateswarlu.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that steps should be taken—

(a) to take over the entire accumulated stock by the Government for disposal;

(b) to order the clothing needs of hospitals, Government offices, Local Boards, Municipalities, Railways, etc., from the Handloom production;

(c) to allot a sum of Rs. 2 crores as was in practice prior to 1947 for granting subsidy to Handloom Industry, every year until the industry regains prosperity; and

(d) to ban imports of all foreign textile goods. (Sri M. Kalyanasundaram.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

[4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

" The words " a stable " in line 2 of the resolution shall be omitted, and after the words " dhoties and sarees " at the end of the first sentence insert the words " for one year ". (Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan.) " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end of the resolution :—

" This House also strongly recommends that the steps suggested above are temporary and the permanent solution for the problem of Handloom industry, the other handicrafts and trade lies in increasing the purchasing power of the peasantry, constituting 80 per cent of the population through proper agrarian reforms and in a better co-ordinated plan between supply and demand and the supply through the Mills and handicrafts. (Sri K. Venkaiah.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the amendment of hon. Member Mr. Jeevanandam to vote. The question is— 3-50 p.m.

" In the second sentence after the words " Yarn spun out of Indian Cotton " add the following :—

" at prices which prevailed in 1947. " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Kotaiah pressing his amendment? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" If the Madras Government will press for adequate supplies of yarn for the handlooms I will not press my amendment. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment or not? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It means he is withdrawing the amendment. I hope the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment. "

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Seetharamiah withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" I press the amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that the following measures be taken in addition :—

(a) To absorb all handloom weavers into co-operative societies paying the share capital in famine affected districts such as Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, etc.;

[Mr. Speaker] [4th November 1952]

- (b) to abolish sales tax on the sales of handloom cloth;
- (c) to grant subsidies to this industry by subsidising the yarn price till it regains stability;
- (d) to ban all foreign imports of textile goods;
- (e) to use handloom cloth in all departments of the Government, so that a large stock may be consumed by the Government; and
- (f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Now I will put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

This House emphatically supports the view of the Government of Madras that in order to provide a stable market for the important and widespread cottage industry of handloom weaving on which, in this State alone 4½ millions of men and women subsist, the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees should be reserved to the handloom industry and that mills and power looms should not be permitted to weave such dhoties and sarees. This House is further of opinion that the Central Government should take steps to make available for the handloom industry sufficient quantities of yarn, and in respect of counts of 40 and below, yarn spun out of Indian cotton so as not to burden the handloom industry with the higher price of imported cotton."

The motion was carried unanimously.

V.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL*, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

"Sir, in this connexion I may as well make a resume of the circumstances under which this matter is coming up here. Hon. Members are aware that on the 28th August 1952, the Governor promulgated the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Ordinance, 1952. Shortly thereafter, in order to remove certain doubts which had arisen in regard to some details, the Government issued an Amendment Ordinance on the 5th September this year. Later on, to ensure the validity of these Ordinances, the Government repealed them and re-enacted the provisions thereof by a fresh Ordinance issued on the 1st of October 1952, after obtaining instructions of the President in pursuance of proviso to Article 213, clause (1) of the Constitution. The Ordinance was intended to ease the strained relations between the mirasdars and the tenants and

* Published in the Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary, dated 24th October 1952

[4th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

also between the mirasdars and the customary farm-labourers called 'pannaiyals'. There was also reason to believe that out of fear of impending land reform, several mirasdars had refused to renew lease agreements with their usual tenants and had displaced them, either bringing in new tenants or cultivating the land by farm labour. The Ordinance will cease to operate on the expiration of the six weeks from the re-assembling of the legislature and it is therefore necessary to replace it by a regular Act of the Legislature. The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Bill, 1952, accordingly reproduces the provisions of the Ordinance with such consequential changes as are rendered necessary by reason of the replacement of the Ordinance by an Act. The Bill provides for the reinstatement of the cultivating tenants who were evicted by landowners either in favour of some other tenant or in favour of his own pannaiyals, that is, his farm-labourers. The Bill also provides for five years' security of tenure for the tenant and prescribes a machinery for settling disputes. It also provides a machinery for enquiring into the dismissal of farm-labourers and for their restoration on just and equitable terms if the dismissal was wrongful. Provision has also been made in the Bill for the fixation of minimum terms for the payment of 'waram' and lease rent and also minimum wages that shall be paid to agricultural labour. The Bill thus seeks to remove the causes of friction that have led to agrarian crimes and disturbances in the Tanjore district and which if allowed unchecked may lead to serious deterioration in agricultural production. Therefore, Sir, I move that the Bill be taken into consideration at once."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely:—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members:—

'(List of names to be furnished later.)'

"Sir, my reasons for moving the amendment are these. The Bill embodies a principle which in my opinion is going to be a permanent measure. Of course the Ordinance was meant to meet an emergency. But the legislation is going to be permanent. Not only that, from all parts of this State there has been a demand that the main principles of the Bill should be extended to the other areas in the State if it were to be passed into law. Here, Sir, I may say on behalf of the Opposition, that all of us wholeheartedly agree with the principle that the sub-tenants, who go under the name of tenants and who have no title of the soil, the cultivators of the soil, should have a right of permanent tenure. To the extent that this Bill offers them protection,

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [4th November 1952]

at least for five years, we are wholeheartedly in agreement with the principle of the Bill. But, Sir, it does not mean that we agree with every clause in it. Many clauses may have to be improved in so far as they affect the persons who are depending on the land and who have got interest in the land.

"I may here also draw your attention to the fact that the Government themselves have had to improve the Ordinance twice. Not only that. After publication of the Bill, the Government had again to bring forward certain amendments. It may be said by the Government that they have introduced only new amendments in order to meet new criticisms and therefore a reference to the Select Committee is not necessary. But, I submit, Sir, there were many memoranda, many representations, many objections—published in the newspapers also—discussing the various aspects of the legislation. I submit, in regard to a legislation of this kind which is going to be a permanent feature, it should be made a general convention in this House that the Government should never come forward with a motion that it should be taken into consideration at once. But, only that it may be referred to a Select Committee. It is not like a Bill which the Hon. Minister Sri Sankara Reddi is going to move just to extend the life of the District Boards. Here there are principles and there are various parties concerned; and here is a case where we have to go into the detailed provisions of the Bill and also the language of the provisions. It might also be said: 'As the case is very urgent and the Government have placed this measure before the public for more than four to five weeks there is not much necessity for a Select Committee. Even then I submit there is necessity for a Select Committee to go into the details of the Bill, because there are several clauses which we may like to improve. But I may just remind the House, in the Select Committees which were appointed on the taxation Bills, as a matter of fact, although on certain fundamental principles there has been no agreement, with regard to other clauses in the Bills there was plenty of give and take, we understood each other and we did improve the measures. The Opposition co-operated with the Government and the Government co-operated with the Opposition in the matter of improving several clauses of the Bills so as to see that the tax-payer was not unduly harassed. Therefore, in regard to this measure also there will be necessity to give and take and to improve several of the clauses. After all the clauses of the Bill cannot be considered in detail and the implication cannot be understood in detail on the floor of this House, where we cannot have any 'across the table discussion'. It is a well-known fact. I, therefore, urge on all these grounds that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I want once more to assure the Government that we do not want to delay the passage of the Bill. I would suggest that the House might even fix a date before which the Select Committee might give its report. We are prepared to sit and work day and night if necessary to produce a report before the date fixed by the Government. I do not ask for a long time to consider the Bill in the Select Committee.

4th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

"But, I say no Member of the House would like the Bill to be 4 p.m. passed without going into the Select Committee because the Bill affects the interests of not only several millions in Tanjore district, but in other districts also because one of the clauses in the Bill says that by notification the Bill could be extended to the other districts as well. There are amendments and demands coming and memoranda have been presented to the Revenue Minister and other Ministers. The possibility is there that the Bill might be extended to other parts of the State also. Therefore, I say that the Bill merits careful consideration by a Select Committee. Therefore, I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. When my amendment is put to the vote of the House, Sir, I shall submit the names of the members of the Select Committee."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"I second the amendment moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir.")

MR. SPEAKER :—"The original motion as well as the amendment is before the House for discussion."

* SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on this important measure with mixed feelings. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Viswanatham, said, I do welcome the principle on which this Bill has been brought forward. The measure is a very important one, though it is applicable only to Tanjore district at present. After I come here, I find several of the Members of this House belonging to other districts have not paid any attention to the various clauses of the Bill because it is applicable only to Tanjore.

"As hon. Members may be aware, Tanjore is a big district. It is a surplus district in the whole of South India. We cannot expect the same customs and usages prevailing in Tanjore district to prevail in other parts of our State. Although we agree to the principle of the Bill, as Mr. Viswanatham has said, the manner in which the Bill has been prepared, the method of application, the time at which the Bill has been introduced and the time at which the Ordinance was promulgated—all these have wrought many difficulties in the Tanjore district. One who reads the main provisions of the Ordinance, cannot fail to understand that the Bill had been drafted by those who are completely ignorant of the customs and usages which are prevalent in Tanjore district. The Bill is an important one and I shall have to deal with it in detail. I request hon. Members to try to understand what I say, so that when the Bill is extended to other districts, there will not be much difficulty in practice.

"Sir, in Tanjore district, there are three distinct systems prevailing to-day. They are, viz., the pannai, the waram and the lease systems. These three systems are exclusive of one another. Waram is one thing. Tenancy is another. Pannai is altogether different. In various parts of the district (Tanjore) each one of the systems is prevalent. Where the pannai system is in operation, the tenancy system is absent; and the lease system is not available

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

where the waram system is prevalent. As I said already, all these three systems are quite different from one another and there is a distinction from one another and no identity between the customs and usages of the people under these three systems.

"So far as the Ordinance as well as this Bill is concerned, they try to impose only one particular system in the whole district, the system being the tenancy system. Only the tenancy system and not the pannai or the lease system is sought to be introduced. Therefore, I say it is bound to create difficulties in Tanjore district because the people of Tanjore have three distinct systems of which I have made mention earlier. On the face of it, when we look at the Bill it is quite clear that the Bill confers a great boon on the big mirasdars in Tanjore district. At the same time it will create difficulties for the small mirasdars and the poor tenants. I shall explain how.

"Prior to this Ordinance, under the pannai, waram and the lease system, the landowner was responsible for maintaining cattle manure and other capital needed for the cultivation of his particular plot of land and even there the lease-holder or the lessee or the waramdar looked to the mirasdar for providing them with all facilities required for the cultivation of the land. Now under this Bill the whole responsibility has been taken away from the mirasdar or landowner (by whatever name you may call it) and transferred to the tenant and that too at a time when the tenant is well-nigh unable to find all the facilities for the proper cultivation of the land. This Ordinance was issued at a time when the cultivation season had already commenced, when the tenant was in difficult circumstances to find out the necessary cattle and manure needed for cultivation and at a time when feelings between mirasdars and tenants had become strained due to the mirasdars refusing to lend money to the tenants to improve the fertility of the land by providing them with proper manure, cattle and necessary seedlings. When such was the tension, this Ordinance was issued. Naturally it created still more difficulties.

"I said previously that this Ordinance has conferred a boon on the big mirasdars. The question may well be asked as to why I say so. I shall reply. It is because the responsibility for the proper upkeep of the cattle, the manure and the capital necessary for proper cultivation of the land has now been transferred to the poor tenants who are finding it very difficult to make both ends meet. If I am permitted to say, I can even say that this Ordinance has converted the mirasdars into zamindars. Whereas prior to this Ordinance, the owner was obliged to remain near his land to supervise the cultivation, now he can as well remain in a far-off place and yet demand 60 per cent of the net produce. For instance, a mirasdar may reside at Madras and demand 60 per cent of the produce from the tenants. That is the privileged position to which this Ordinance has elevated the big mirasdars. At the same time we should not forget the sorrowful plight to which the tenants have been driven.

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] 4th November 1952]

"In the preamble to the Ordinance, it is stated that relations between the mirasdars and the tenants so far as Tanjore is concerned has become strained. The Hon. Revenue Minister also referred to this agrarian tension while moving this Bill. The Ordinance has been there for the last two months. What miracle has it produced? The agrarian tension has not been toned down. On the other hand, we find the Revenue Courts set up under the Ordinance flooded with applications from the tenants as well as the mirasdars. So, Sir, the displacement of tenants exists only in certain taluks and not in the whole of the district. For instance, in Tanjore, Pattukkottai, Arantangi and Papanasam taluks, displacement of tenants is not at all existing and from the applications filed before the Conciliation Officers, we can very well ascertain that the trouble was about the share of the produce and not about the displacement of tenants; applications under clause 6 of the Bill are very rare and on the other hand, applications under clause 13 of the Bill are many. In certain places though the relationship between the landlord and the tenant was cordial, now because of the Ordinance the relationship has become strained. My only point is that conciliation might have been more effective in certain places than the Ordinance itself. Now that the Bill has been introduced, the mirasdars and other landowners who have 2 or 3 velis say that they are greatly affected. The real agriculturist families who cultivate the land with their own labour and certain pannaiyals can certainly cultivate 2 or 3 velis to the best advantage of the country. But the people who are now working in one veli say, 'whether we work in one veli or two or three velis, the work is the same.' Therefore these tenants also claim the same rights as are given to the tenants who work in two or three velis. How are we to reconcile these two classes of people? Sir, there is another class of landlords, the absentee landlords. The Subramaniam Committee's report and the Raghavendra Rao Committee's report both say that there is no such class in Madras State as absentee landlords. When we accept this statement, nobody can be considered to be one-not knowing agriculture. But the point is that there are people who own one veli of land and who are at the moment engaged in other professions and not on the spot. They live elsewhere. Now, the benefit of this Bill must be extended to those who work on lands of one veli or less.

"Let us take another instance. A landowner gives his land to a tenant in whose ability and straightforwardness, he has got confidence. But the sons of the tenant may not like to be tillers again and they may like to pursue some other profession. In these cases they should not be burdened with the responsibility of tilling the soil. According to the Bill, a 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' is a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person. It means that, if a tenant dies leaving behind him a minor girl or a minor son, that minor girl or

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

minor son is given the right to possess the land; they may not be in a position to cultivate the land and even when they become majors they may not be willing to be tillers of the soil and they may take to some other profession. In such cases, the land has to be resumed by some other tenant or the owner of the land must be allowed to cultivate the land. There is yet another class of people. Suppose I am a landowner and I have given my lands to a tenant for cultivation as I happen to be a lawyer. At certain stage, I may like to go back to my land and become the tiller of the soil. Therefore, Sir, in such cases also there must be provision for the landowners to resume the land. Even if the landowner is not willing, his son may be willing to cultivate the land and he must be permitted to resume the land. Therefore, to meet all these points sufficient provision must be made in the Bill.

"There is another point I want to say. According to the Bill, 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another. . . . But, 'pannaiyal' means any person engaged by the landowner or by the cultivating tenant. So, only a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family is included in the definition of 'cultivating tenant' and not the pannaiyal. Therefore, pannaiyal also must be included in the definition of 'cultivating tenant', i.e., the definition must be: 'a cultivating tenant or tenant means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family or that of his pannaiyal.

"Sir, there are certain other people who are neither landowners nor tillers of the soil; they are middlemen; this class of middlemen is very powerful. It is well known, Sir, that in Tanjore district, there are very many big mirasdars and devasthanams owning 400 or 500 or 1,000 acres. A particular person becomes the lessee of a particular mirasdar or devasthanam; he does not cultivate the land himself; he leases them out to so many small tenants who are not recognized as tenants. In this Bill there is absolutely no provision preventing these middlemen from becoming cultivating tenants. There are many of these middlemen in Tanjore district, because the mirasdars and the devasthanams have no confidence in the tillers of the soil and they depend on the middlemen for the payment of rent and not on the actual tillers. This is the system that is now obtaining in many places of Tanjore district. Therefore, Sir, there must be sufficient provision in the Bill to prevent these middlemen from taking advantage of this Bill.

4-20 p.m. "Another important matter in respect of which there is no provision in the Bill is the punja land. In the Tanjore district, punja lands are peculiar; Tanjore district punja lands are quite different from punja lands elsewhere in the State. The punja lands in other places are not so valuable as punja lands in the Tanjore district, so far as I know the position in some of the other districts. Punja lands that lie along the Cauvery banks are more

[4th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

valuable than nanja lands, because in those punja lands, the tenants are in the habit of growing cash crops like plantains, betels, tobacco, etc. The usual custom in these cases is that the tenant pays the normal rent to the landowner, but the tenant must be on the soil all the twenty-four hours of the day and then only he will get the full benefit out of the soil. In fact, the landowner need not pay any attention at all to the cultivation in these cases. He is paid the normal rent. But the tiller of the soil has to be on the soil all round the twenty-four hours; even during nights he will have to work. Naturally therefore, according to the system prevailing there, the major portion of the produce is taken away by the tenant, and the landowner takes only the normal rent. But now, according to the provisions of this Bill, the major portion, i.e., 60 per cent, is to go to the landowner, and so the owners of punja lands are quite happy over this Bill and it is the tenants who will be put to enormous difficulty. I submit therefore that some suitable provision should be made in order to see that the tenant who is there on the soil all the twenty-four hours of the day is allowed to reap the full benefit of his labours.

"The next point I wish to refer to is this: At present exemption is given to lands less than one veli. Supposing a man with one veli of land leases it out to a particular tenant saying that the land belongs to him and he is in enjoyment of the property. The tenant naturally is not expected to verify the title deeds or the extent. This has been the case up to now; but under the provisions of this Bill, the landowner can go to the Conciliation Officer and say 'I am entitled only to six acres and five cents, and not more than that; the rest of the land belongs to the temple, or to my wife or to my minor children' and so on. He may even produce evidence to show that it is the case and claim that the whole extent of the land should be exempted. In such a case, even the tenant may be the same person and yet the land may be said to belong to more than one person. I therefore suggest that the relevant clause of the Bill should be suitably altered; otherwise, many tenants will be put to considerable difficulties by the landowners, who will naturally take advantage of the present provisions.

"Another important aspect of the Bill I wish to refer to is this: At present, Conciliation Officers have been appointed whose duty it is to interpret the various provisions. Such officers mostly have been drawn from the Revenue Department. I doubt very much whether they are able to understand the provisions. We are told that the Civil Procedure Code is applicable to such cases. We all know that the Civil Procedure Code has been differently interpreted by different Courts—the munsif's court, the sub-court, the High Court and in some cases even by the Privy Council. When such is the case, ordinary officials drawn from the Revenue Department who have been appointed as Conciliation Officers, cannot be expected to give a correct interpretation of the provisions. Especially when we are told that the revenue court's authority is final, my submission is that there should be some tribunal or some other

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [4th November 1952]

appellate court in order to check errors in the decision—which is but natural. There must be some authority to be appealed to in case of irregularities or hasty and wrong decisions by the revenue courts. Even for the posts of Conciliation Officer, persons who have got a legal knowledge may be appointed.

“ One other matter about which I find there is no provision in the Bill is : We say that the cultivating tenant should get the profit; but sometimes the cultivating tenant is himself a middleman; he may himself be a big landowner and naturally he will engage a pannaiyal to do the work and will cease to be a cultivating tenant himself. I therefore suggest that in order to cover such cases, some extent must be fixed. For instance, we may say that a man with his wife and son can cultivate 5 or even 10 acres. If we do not limit the extent, the family cannot cultivate the land properly. Supposing a person owns 20 or 30 velis of land and he comes under this Bill as a tenant in order to get the benefit of the land. In the natural course of events, we cannot expect that particular person to cultivate the land properly and we cannot expect him to produce the best results possible. That is why I say, if we limit the extent, the total production in the country will increase and it will be more than what it is to-day. One result of this will also be that the middleman's activities will be restricted and the number of people who are actually on the land will increase.

“ When we deal with the Bill clause by clause, I am quite sure we will come across many such practical difficulties. The relationship between the landowner and the tenant has already become strained and by no stretch of imagination can we take it that the old good relationship will be restored. At the same time, I really congratulate the Government on their having promulgated the Ordinance. It is a good step towards land reform and it is in that view that I congratulate the Government. One is however led to think that the tenant is being enabled to enjoy certain benefits only for a period of five years—in other words, that security of tenure is given for five years—and that this may be an attempt on the part of Government to postpone land reform for ever. If that should be the case, then I submit this is not at all a reform worth having. If, however, this is going to be a step in the direction of a thorough land reform, I am quite sure everybody will welcome it—not only in the Tanjore district, but throughout the country. I understand that people even outside our country are watching us, watching how this measure is going to work. In that aspect, this is a very important measure. We have already hastened this measure by means of an Ordinance. I therefore request the Government now not to rush it through, since it has been introduced in this House in the form of a Bill. This must be allowed to go to a Select Committee where every clause should be thoroughly examined. If it goes to a Select Committee, it can go through the clauses one by one and various necessary alterations may be made in order to overcome some practical difficulties which I have just now mentioned and which other speakers also may mention. As I said, Sir, this is an important step towards land reform, and in case this measure

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

is to be extended to the whole of this State, we should see to it that it is a measure which will give real benefit to the tenants. In that view, Sir, I appeal to the Government to agree to the amendment that this may be sent to a Select Committee.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ On a point of information, Sir. 4-30
May I know whether the Government are going to accept this p.m.
amendment or not and also may I know the time allotted for the discussion of the Bill? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Before I know the mind of the Government, I shall not be in a position to say whether the Government are going to accept the amendment or not. So far as the Chair is concerned, the Chair will allow more time so that the Government might judge from the trend of the speeches what they could do best.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ We will try to hear a little more before we come to any definite conclusion upon that question.”

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with very great pleasure that I rise to support the measure brought forward by the Hon. the Minister for Revenue in regard to the relationship between the landowners, I may call them the ryots or mirasdars, and the tenants of the Tanjore district. I submit that it was a timely measure that was brought by our revered Rajaji; it was a time when there was a loud clamour in the district of Tanjore about mass evictions. It was reported on the floor of the House by several hon. Members of the Opposition and even by some hon. Members on this side of the House, particularly some Harijan Members that there were tens of thousands of evictions by rich mirasdars and matadhipatis in Tanjore district. There was a loud clamour about that and when I had occasion to refute it, I did it in a way though I had not the hardihood to refute it wholesale because it was true to some extent but not to the extent that they made it out to be, which was exaggerated by several hon. Members of the Opposition. At a time when there were evictions, say about some thousands, I might even put it at some hundreds, not in all the taluks of the district—there are eleven taluks in the district but in three or four taluks, I think, Shiyali, Mayuram, Kumbakonam and some portions of the other taluks—I may say to the credit of my Constituency and to the Revenue Division from which I come, there is absolutely no such trouble. I mean Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks and I will even tack on Tanjore from which my hon. Friend Sri Swayamprakasam comes—this trouble seems to have arisen some years back and as a result of it there was the Mayuram agreement. But in 1952 when troubles started, I remember distinctly that the Tamil Nad Congress Committee deputed Sri B. Venkataraman, M.P., the Congress Labour leader, to visit the affected areas. Accordingly Sri Venkataraman in the company of Sri Narayanaswami Nayudu, who in season and out of season has been voicing the feelings and grievances of the tenants of the district on the Congress side toured

[Sri S. Venkatrama Ayyar] [4th November 1952]

the affected areas and they found out the actual position obtaining there and they promptly reported the facts to the T.N.C.C. At a time when the matter was being discussed on the floor of the House at the instance of the hon. Sri Narayanaswami Nayudu and several of us, we acquainted our revered Rajaji with the situation in the district and he at once assured us that he would look into the matter very closely and bring forward some suitable legislation. Of course, he did not mention about an Ordinance or about a Bill; he assured us that he would bring forward some legislation and try to ease the situation so that the food production may not be affected and the relationship between the ryots and the tenants may not get strained, because Tanjore district is a district which supplies food to the other districts and strained relationship between the tenants and the ryots should not be allowed to continue. It is in that background that the Ordinance was promulgated by our Chief Minister and hon. Members may remember that just on the eve of the promulgation of the Ordinance, our Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. the Finance Minister happened to tour Tanjore district. With great strain of old age, our Chief Minister came to Tanjore and he went to Tiruturaipundi and almost all the affected areas including Tiruvarur and if only some of the Members here who are on the other side been there they would have seen the large congregations and witnessed the enthusiasm that prevailed wherever the Hon. the Chief Minister addressed meetings, meetings of not only mirasdars but of meetings attended by tenants in thousands. Tiruturaipundi, hon. Members must know, is famous, I may even call it, notorious as the stronghold of the Opposition parties, but even at that place, in Tiruvarur, in Shiyali, large congregations assembled to greet him, not only for greeting and respecting our leader but also they welcomed the Ordinance. In Tanjore when he addressed a mass meeting of the mirasdars, several representations were made to him about several difficulties that arose as a result of the enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance and he said that he would look into them and try to rectify them. He wanted to establish cordial relations between the mirasdars and the tenants so that the food production will not be affected. Some mirasdars pointed out that they were not given any share of the catch crops as they are called — we commonly call them உஞ்சை and பூசை; hitherto they were getting half out of it but they were not allowed anything under the Ordinance. Immediately the difficulty was pointed out, he understood the position and he has remedied it and he has awarded forty per cent to the mirasdar and sixty per cent to the tenants and he has also put a limit upon the portion of the land to be cultivated so that the tenants may not put the entire stretch of land under catch crop in order to get greater benefit. There were certain other difficulties pointed out by mirasdars as well as by tenants and he has said that the difficulties would be remedied.

4-40 p.m. Sir, so far as this Bill is concerned, it clearly gives fixity of tenure. There is some sort of opposition from mirasdars on the ground that though the Government have done away with the

4th November 1952] [Sri S. Venkatrama Ayyar]

intermediaries by abolishing the zamin and inam estates and converting them into ryotwari lands, they want to create some sort of occupancy tenure in the ryotwari land. This is the representation that most of the mirasdars in Tanjore district have made. I may submit for the information of the hon. Members and for the satisfaction of the mirasdars in my district that it is not so. It is only a sort of tenure for a period of five years on the distinct understanding that they should pay, regularly and promptly without any delay, the *varam* due, that is 60 per cent as is provided in the Bill, to the mirasdars. So long as the mirasdar gets it, he must naturally remain satisfied. Of course if there is no payment, there are other penal provisions in the Bill to look after such cases. So much so, it is not a question of creating another sort of tenure in the ryotwari land. The very principle underlying the abolition of zamin and inam estates is that there should be no intermediaries and there should be one uniform tenure in the entire Madras State and that tenure is ryotwari tenure.

"As has been referred to by my hon. Friend, Mr. Swayamprakasam, it is a fact that in Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks there are not many applications before the Conciliation Officer as is provided in the Bill. But, at the same time it must be understood that Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks comprised about 90 per cent of zamin and inam villages which have been converted into ryotwari tracts after the passing of the Estates Abolition Act. Just before the passing of that Act, there was the Tenants' and Ryots' Protection Act which gave protection against eviction to the tenants who were cultivating the private lands of mirasdars. Even that Act came into force when tenants were about to be evicted by inamdars. By virtue of that Act which was passed by the last Congress Ministry, tenants could not be evicted so long as they were paying the rent due to mirasdars. Now that the Zamindari Abolition Act is in force, there is no necessity for that Act also. What is obtaining in Pattukottai and Arantangi taluks is that in most cases there is cordial relationship existing between tenants and mirasdars. If there is trouble, applications either on behalf of tenants or mirasdars will be filed before the Conciliation Officers. Therefore, there is no point in saying that the Bill has no effect, so far as some taluks of Tanjore district are concerned. The Bill is concerned mainly with the root cause of the matter, viz., that there is some strained relationship between tenants and mirasdars in Tanjore. We are not concerned whether it is in the C.M.P. area or in the old delta area. Sir, the prosperity of several other districts in the Madras State completely depends upon the prosperity of the Tanjore district. If the relationship between mirasdars and tenants is cordial and if food production is speeded up in Tanjore district, there will be prosperity in other districts also. And it is only in view of that and also finding that the relationship is strained and also in view of the insistent representations made by Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu, myself and Congress legislators from Tanjore district, the Hon. Chief Minister assured us that he would bring forward some suitable legislation and this Bill is the result of such a representation.

4th November 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

కాబట్టి అక్కడనే అత్యవసర పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడాయనే సిద్ధాంతము వి మాత్రము సబబుగావని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఒకచోట గొట్టుకొని తల పగుల గొట్టుకొంటున్న మాత్రాన, అక్కడ ఒకచోటనే అత్యవసర పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది అని అనుకోవడం చాలా పొరబాటు. ఆ ఒక్క జిల్లాలో ఈ Ordinance అమలుచరువుకున్నందుకల్లా, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో భూభామందులకు ముఖ్యముగా జామీందార్లకు యివంటి పరిస్థితి మీకు కూడా రాబోతున్నదని తెలుపునూ, నుండుగానే వారిని హెచ్చరిస్తూ, వారికి ఒక line clear ఇచ్చినట్లుగా అవుతుంది. మీకు కూడా ఈ విల్లు ఇకముందుకు వర్తింప బడుతుంది. కనుక ఈ లోగా మీరు స్వల్పకాలి మీ హక్కులు మీరు గట్టిపరచుకోండి అనే ఒక హెచ్చరిక చేసినట్లుగా ఇది పరిణమిస్తున్నది. దీనివలన ఇతర ప్రాంతములలోని జామీందారులు, భూభామందులు, రైతులను భూమునుండి తొలకొట్టి వారిహక్కులను గట్టిచేసికొనుటకు వారికి ఒక మంచి అవకాశ మిచ్చినట్లుండుదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ ఇక బిల్లులోని వివరములను పరిశీలించినట్లుగా లే, ఖాఖామందులకు, ఖామి 4-50
p.m.

4-50
p.m.

“ ఇక బిల్లులాని వివరములను పరిశీలించినట్లయితే, ఘాభామందులకు, ఘామి
దున్నేవాడికి మధ్యన ఒక విజింట్లవర్గము ఉన్నట్లుగా బోధ పడుతున్నది. ఈ మధ్య
వర్గము ఎందుకున్నదో, ఘామి ఆదాయములో వీరికి భాగ మంతో, వీరు చేయవలసిన
కాధ్యతలేమిటో, నా బుద్ధికి తోచినంతవరకు, నేన గ్రహించగలిగినంతవరకు నాకు అర్థము
కావడము లేదు. ఈ మధ్యవర్గానికి భాగమంత, వీరు చేయవలసిన విధులు ఏమి
ఈ మధ్యవర్గము ఇకముందు కూడా ఉంటుందా లేదా అని స్పష్టముగా చెప్పబడలేదు.
ఈ విషయాన్ని regulate గా వదలేశారు. ఇక ఈ బిల్లులో రైతుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వ
డానికి ఏమి చేసినారంటే, దున్నే రైతులకు ఆ ఘామిని దున్నేందుకు 5 పిండ్లవరకు
హక్కు ఇవ్వబడినది. ఈ హక్కును అంగీకరించుటకు మీకు ఎంతవరకు అభ్యంతరము
లేదు. కాని, ఈ బిల్లులాని మిగతా అంశములు గమనించినట్లయితే, ఈ Ordinance
ను మిరాసీదార్ల Ordinance అని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఎందువల్లనంటే, మిగతా అంశ
ములు చాలా భాగము మిరాసీదార్లకు సహాయకరముగా ఉన్నది. ఘామి ఆదాయ
ములో కూడా అధికభాగము వీరికి చెందునట్లు నియమింపబడినది అక్కడ మిరాసీ
దార్లు రైతులనుండి బకాయాలు వసూలుచేయడానికి, వారిని నానాబాధలు పెడుతూ
నానా తగాదాలు కల్పిస్తూ, పోలీసులవద్దకు కోర్టులకు వెళ్తుంటే, వివో కృత్రిమ కార
ణాలతో వారిని ఘాములనుండి తొలగించడానికి నానాశయత్నాలు చేస్తూ
అంతోళనపడుతూ యుంటే, అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వము ఈ Ordinance జారీచేసి మీకు
మీరు అంతోళన పడకండి, ఒక 5 సంవత్సరాలు మాత్రము మీరు ఓపిక పట్టండి, తరు
వాత తరతరాలేదు. ఘాముల ఆదాయములో కూడా మీకు ఎక్కువ భాగాన్ని అయి
దంటే మాకు భాగాలు ఇస్తున్నాము. కనుక ఈ అయిదేండ్లలో మీ రేమి ఇందులో
బోధ్యము కలుగజేసుకోకండి అని చెప్పుతున్నారు. ఇందులో ఒక tenancy 5 పిండ్ల
fixation తప్ప tenant కు యరేవిధమైన protection, రక్షణ కనకడం లేదు.
కనుక ఒక tenancy 5 పిండ్లు fixation అన్న మాత్రాన ఇది Tenancy Protection
Bill అని అనుపించుకొన తగదు. ఇందుకు ఐదులు దీనిని Tenancy and Mirasidars
Protection Act అని అనడం ఎక్కువ సబబుగా ఉంటుందని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. తమ
కాత, ఆదాయములోని అయిదింటి మాకు భాగాలు ఘాభామందులకు చెల్లింపవలసి
నది కూడా అన్యాయముగా ఉంది ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వము నియమించినట్లుగా
మొదట ఇన్వం కమిషన్ రిపోర్టును, ఘామి దున్నే వారికి 50 పర్సెంటు ఉండాలి అని
అన్నారు. ఘాభామందులకు 45 పర్సెంటు చెందేట్లు అనకాక మిక్చర్ అంశమైన

[Sri G. Latchanna] [4th November 1952]

ఇచ్చట న్యాయముకాదని అన్నారు. ఈ మాదిరి ప్రభుత్వము తాము నిర్ణయించినటువంటి ఈ సుబబిక్కు కమిటీయొక్క రిపోర్టును ఒక ప్రక్కన ప్రకటిస్తూ, రెండవ ప్రక్కన ఈ Ordinance జారీచేస్తూ, అయిదింటి మూడు భాగాలు అదాయము మిరాసిదార్లకు ఇవ్వబడెనుట అశ్చర్యంగా ఉంది. ఇది tenants కంటే మిరాసిదార్లకే సహాయకరముగా ఉంటున్నది కాబట్టి ఇది Mirasidars Protection Bill అనునకాని Tenancy Protection Bill కాదని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ప్రస్తుత ప్రకారముగా వేషినట్లు principle వైన tenancy ఇన్ని విల్లని fix చేయ ఒక అంశము తప్ప మిగత అంశాలన్ని tenants కు ప్రతిపూలముగా ఉన్నాయి. రైతులకు, మీకు 5 విండ్లవరకు గ్యారంటీ ఇచ్చినాము. ఈ అయిదేండ్లు మీరు బాగా ఉన్న కొని వండించుకోండి అని చెప్పతూ, మిరాసిదార్లకు ఈ 5 విండ్లు మీరు ఓరిక వట్టండి. ఇందులో మీరు ఏ జోక్యము చేసుకోవద్దండి, మీరు అంకోశపడ అక్కరలేదు అని ధైర్యము వేపుతున్నారు. అందువలన దీనిని తప్పకుండా ఒక నెలకుకమిటీకి వేసి, వారు వృథా కాలయాపన చేయకుండా, ఈ శాసనసభ సమావేశము ముగియ లాగానే ఈ నెలకుకమిటీవారు అన్ని విషయములు తుదిగా పరిశీలించి అందులోని మంచికెల్లలు తెలియచేసేట్లు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇది Ordinance కాబట్టి ఇది త్వరగా Bill గా జారీ అగునట్లు చేయవలసి యుండునని, లేకపోయిన ఇది ప్రభుత్వంకాదని, రాజ్యాంగానికి విరుద్ధమనే కారణంతో ఈ Ordinance ను యథాతథంగా Bill గా మార్చుకుండా, వెంటనే ఒక నెలకుకమిటీని నియమించి వారు విమర్శము కాలయాపన చేయకుండా దీనిని పరిశీలించి దీనిలోని మంచికెల్లలు తెలియ చేసేట్లు చేయవలెను. కనుక దీనిని నెలకుకమిటీకి refer చేయడం ధర్మమని, విధి యని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను."

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when I stand to speak on this Bill, I am reminded of an experience which I once had on the Calicut railway station platform. I saw a porter cleaning the frontage of the First and Second-class Waiting Room, a few feet in width right across the platform. Immediately he had done his job, the dust and leaves from the remaining portion of the platform were blown over this spot and the whole thing became dirty again. After one or two more attempts he gave up the job. When I think of this legislative measure I am reminded of that porter who wanted to clean the frontage of the First and Second-class Waiting Room without cleaning the whole platform. Sir, the Government seldom tackle the problems at their very root and the measures they adopt are patchy and superficial. Let it be remembered that time is the essence of reform. The same reform which may satisfy the people to-day may not satisfy them to-morrow. It is not as if we are unable to diagnose the disease but we are not bold enough to apply the remedy. Sir, there cannot be any two opinions as to what our urgent problem is. This is what the authors of the Draft Five-year Plan have observed:

"In its significance the land problem overshadows all other problems. In the measure in which a satisfactory answer can be found to this problem, the economy as a whole will advance."

Do the Government bestow on this important agrarian question the attention which it deserves? Our experience is otherwise.

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup]

Thousand and one excuses are trotted out either to evade or to postpone the problem. The same old hackneyed arguments advanced by the foreigners are advanced in a less convincing manner, nay, it has become the fashion of the Government—that-be to paint those who advocate radical agrarian reforms as 'pink', if not 'red'. Even such disciples of Gandhiji as Dr. Kumarappa are looked upon with disfavour because of their views on agrarian questions. I do not know what the Government would say about Vinobhaji and his new movement. Certainly, veiled attacks are already appearing and, I believe, the time will not be far off when he will be accused of preparing the ground for a Communist upheaval. I can only repeat the warning which he has given. He says:

"It is not the persons who advocate agrarian reforms and land distribution that invite communism but those who oppose them."

"Sir, this Bill which is before us, is a typical example of a half measure. Now, what are the fundamentals of a tenancy question? It is nothing but fixity of tenure and fair rent. Does this Bill, in any way, find a satisfactory solution for these two important questions which are implied in any tenancy problem. We are to-day in advancing times. The meaning of ownership or proprietorship is itself changing. This is what the Agrarian Reforms Committee has stated: 'The idea of proprietorship in which the owner could use or misuse land as he likes is incongruous with the economic and social needs of our times.' Certainly, it is an accepted notion that land is a social property. Ownership or proprietorship has been described as a bundle of rights. Can anyone to-day who is claiming interest in the land claim to possess all the bundle of rights which go to make up the proprietorship or ownership? Certainly not. To-day the sticks from the bundle, as we call it, are distributed among various interests and to the extent they are distributed, the conception of that absolute ownership becomes difuted or weakened. Therefore, Sir, any Bill which tackles the question of tenancy must give weight to this new conception of proprietorship or ownership of land. But, Sir, nothing of that kind we see in this Bill before the House.

"Sir, I said that the most fundamental thing about tenancy is fixity of tenure. I have not used the word 'occupancy' and that too with a purpose. By fixity I only mean that so long as the tenant is in possession and so long as he pays his dues to his landlord he should not be disturbed from his possession. It was stated by the Hon. Minister when he introduced the Bill that this Bill conferred on every tenant five years period for his lease. Sir, Sri Raghavendra Rao, the Special Officer who was deputed by the Government to consider the land tenure problem in Malabar had made an important observation with regard to 'short-term leasing'. He observes, 'The yield of land depends on the interest taken by the cultivator. No cultivator will take sufficient interest in land unless he is sure of holding it without unnecessary disturbances by the landlord. A short-term lessee is not interested in making any improvement on the land or in adequately manuring it.' He again says, 'Eviction or threat of eviction is the main

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [4th November 1952]

cause of the trouble of the tenant. From this scare no tenant is safe. Nothing like this is adopted in this Bill. The five-year period can never commend itself to any tenant. Sir, it is no consolation for one who is condemned to the gallows that the execution will take place after the lapse of a few days. It is only a cruel mockery. With the sword of Damocles, namely, eviction after five years, hanging over his head, the tenant will never rest in peace and he will never improve his land. This point has been repeatedly stated by all those experienced people who had been appointed to consider our agrarian question. It has been observed more than once that you can never have optimum result from land unless a tenant is given fixity of tenure. Sir, especially in a deficit State like ours, these questions are of interest not only to the tenants but also to the State as well.

Then, Sir, I am coming to the question of fair rent. Under the Bill three-fifths of the produce has been fixed as the landlord's share. The authors of the Draft Five-Year Plan have considered this question of fair rent and they have made this pertinent observation regarding this: 'Depending upon contribution towards cultivation to be met by the landlord, ordinarily the rent exceeding one-third value of the produce of unirrigated land and one-fourth in the case of irrigated land may be construed to be excessive.' Even the Subramaniam Committee Report have only recommended in some cases half and half and in other cases 60 and 40 per cent to the tenant and the landlord respectively. Under this Bill the tenant is entitled to only 40 per cent of the produce and the Bill also provides that all the expenses of manuring, etc., should be met by the tenant.

I do not want to take a long time. I have dealt with only two main principles, namely, fixity of tenure and fair rent, in regard to both of which the Bill is lamentably lacking to provide relief for the tenants. I support the Motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. I hope that the criticisms made in this House will be taken due note of by the Select Committee if the Bill goes to it. I further hope that this Bill is but a prelude to far-reaching agrarian reforms in this State. It is certain that there cannot be peace or prosperity in this State or in this country unless we are able to satisfy the land-hunger of the masses to the extent to which it can be done. Sir, this is not the time for persons who want temporary results or tactical achievements. We want statesmen who act with courage and vision and who will plan to-day for to-morrow. The question before us is whether we are destined to have such leadership.

5-10
p.m.

* SRI L. C. PAIS:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Bill and oppose the idea of the Bill being referred to a Select Committee. The reason is simple. It will delay matters. This legislation is long overdue. It is said that the man who gives quickly gives twice. The cultivating tenant has suffered far too long and now that Government have come forward with a wise measure, let there be no postponement of relief. My grievance against the Bill is of a somewhat different kind. I find from sub-clause (2) of

4th November 1952] [Sri L. C. Pais]

clause 1 that this Bill shall be deemed to have come into force in the whole of the district of Tanjore on the 23rd August 1952 and that it shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras, on such date as the Government may, by notification, appoint. This is somewhat disappointing. I do not understand why a relief of this kind which is bound to improve the lot of the cultivating tenant in ryotwari areas should be restricted in its scope only to particular areas like Tanjore and the districts round about Tanjore. Speaking for and on behalf of South Kanara I may say that we have been agitating for tenancy legislation for the last several years. We began our agitation in 1946 and during Prakasam's regime we almost got it, but just then the Ministry went out of office. Subsequently we renewed our agitation during O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar's time and there was practically a direction from him to the Revenue Minister to go on with this legislation. There was a similar direction during the regime of Kumaraswami Raja. In spite of our efforts, relief to the cultivating tenants in South Kanara is being postponed from time to time. My plea is simple. Let the benefit of this legislation be not confined to particular districts or particular areas but be extended to all cultivating tenants in all ryotwari areas. I perfectly realise that having regard to diversity of tenures the incidence of tenures not being alike in all ryotwari areas; it may not be easy for Government to bring in one comprehensive legislation touching the entire ryotwari area. Knowing these difficulties what we have been pressing before the Government is just this minimum. Pending introduction of comprehensive legislation—you may take your own time for it—you bring in what is known as interim or stay legislation, preventing eviction of tenants and I may add, eviction of good tenants who are paying their rents regularly and in time. Now what is the objection to bringing this kind of interim legislation? So far as South Kanara is concerned, there are not less than 1,000 evictions a year—evictions through Court and evictions out of Court. Even the eviction suits during the last two or three years are about 800 a year. I am, therefore, entitled to ask whether a case has not been made out for introduction of interim legislation with a view to prevent evictions through Court.

“ Clause 10 of the Bill, says—

“ No cultivating tenant shall be evicted except as provided in section 6, or unless:

(a) he has failed to pay rent within one month of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed, within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village; or:

(b) he has done any act which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon; or:

(c) he has used the land for any purpose other than agriculture; or:

(d) he has not used the land; or:

(e) he has committed any offence under any law relating to the revenue or to the management of the land or to the cultivation of the land or to the improvement of the land or to the welfare of the cultivators or to the interests of good cultivation.”

I am sure that the Minister will not the benefit of it to this one class but extend it to other areas also. Legislation may be brought in, if necessary, on the model of the Bill.

[Sri L. C. Pais] [4th November 1952]

Control Act. Supposing a landlord really desires the land for his own cultivation certainly he must have it. But, as long as the landlord does not require the land for his own purpose and as long as the tenant is paying the rent regularly, I ask, is there any reason why the tenant should be deprived of the land in his occupation. I wish to bring to the notice of the House that in South Kanara there is a particular tenure known as the Chalgeni tenure. It is really tenancy at will. The tenant executes a lease deed every year in favour of the landlord. The tenant, as a matter of fact, is on the land for several generations and yet every year he is made to execute a lease deed. And what is the lease deed he is asked to execute? It is a printed form. It is worthwhile to understand what are the terms of this lease deed. It deals first with the description of the property and everything which the tenant may have done by the sweat of his brow by labour, etc., such as buildings, trees, fields and all and everything that is found on the property is included in the lease. An excellent device. The tenant is estopped later on from contending that they are his improvements. The next clause says, 'I have no right to make improvements without your written permission' and if I do any improvements without such permission, I have no right to claim their value.' When the matter goes to Court, here is a ready argument—the tenant has contracted himself out of his customary right to receive compensation for the value of the improvements made by him.

"I ask whether, in these circumstances, it could be said that the tenant has got security of tenure. Do you expect him to produce more food, and when our object to-day is to improve the condition of the common man what have we done so far, to improve the lot of the cultivating tenants? We are bringing in big schemes like Community Projects in the villages. Success of these schemes depends upon the degree of support we get from the tenants also. I ask again whether there is sufficient incentive left in the tenant to work out these big schemes and to work out the various Grow More Food schemes. The Grow More Food campaigns have so far failed because Government have not been able to enlist the sympathy of the cultivating tenant on its side. The lease lastly says that no notice to quit is necessary and at the end of the year the tenant automatically has to go out unless, of course, he is kept on for another year.

"As I said, Sir, I have been pressing this matter before the Government for the last six years and it is a matter of absolute regret that the Government have not been bestowing any attention, so far as South Kanara is concerned. My submission to the Government is that when they think of Tanjore and the districts that surround Tanjore—we do not certainly grudge relief being given to them—let them think of districts and areas where tenants have no security of tenure. When relief is sought to be given to tenants in Tanjore, let it not be denied to other tenants. Every time we ask for relief, we are told that the Government are bringing in regular tenancy legislation, and the latest argument is

[Sri L. C. Pais] [4th November 1952]

'We are doing something in Tanjore; let us watch and see how it works.' Does it mean that relief to other areas is going to be indefinitely postponed. The indifference that is displayed and the invidious distinction that is shown are creating havoc in the countryside. I may point out in this connection, that when the Malabar Tenancy Act was last amended, they took care to remove 32 villages out of South Kanara and tack them on to the Malabar district. By doing so relief was sought to be given to these 32 villages. What about the remaining villages of South Kanara? A common man is entitled to ask why this distinction between district and district and between parts of the same district. My last submission to the Government is that this useful piece of legislation may be extended to South Kanara also without further delay."

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—"Sir, in supporting the amendment I want to say a few words on the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Bill. It is really a great boon to the agriculturists as a whole. Here, the agriculturist means the cultivator. For the past so many years he was not given any security of tenure. The tenant can only occupy the land for a year and afterwards he has to receive the lease. But now under the Bill five years tenure has been given and so he can produce more on the land, because he is sure that the lands are with him during the period and he can do something more than what he was doing in past. Therefore, this Bill confers a great relief to the cultivator.

"There is no provision in the Bill to cover lessees who have taken on long-term leases, i.e., leases for three, five or six years, lands belonging to maths and the Endowments Board. When the Hon. the Chief Minister came to Shiyali, I met and asked him as to what he was going to do with such long term leases. He replied that there was no use in having middlemen and that the system of middlemen should be ended. Lessees are ready to cancel their leases provided they are given a remission of 10 per cent this year. From next year onwards, maths and endowment lands could be leased directly to the cultivator.

"The responsibility of manuring the land is left to the tenant. He has no capital and, therefore, he cannot afford to manure the land. If the land is left without manure, the soil will lose fertility. There must be a provision to the effect that the mirasdar can manure the field and recover the cost of the manure from the tenant. If this is not possible, one-fourth of the extent of the cultivable lands may be reserved for the growing of catch crops and the remaining three-fourths extent may be reserved for the growing of green manure. If this is done, the fertility of the soil will be maintained intact.

"So far as catch crops are concerned, the produce can be divided equally between the mirasdar and the tenant as is the customary right.

5-20
p.m.

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [4th November 1952]

"The mirasdar is forced to execute a lease deed. It is true that a lease agreement cannot stand in a court of law unless it is embodied in a legal document. The tenant as well as the mirasdar must affix their signature to the lease deed. Then only there will be mutual understanding between them. If the tenant is not made to sign in the lease deed, the object of this Bill will not be achieved.

"As regards the wages payable to pannaiyals, two alternatives are provided. Wages can be paid either according to the terms of the Mayuram agreement or according to the two-marakkal system prescribed in the Bill. The pannaiyals do not know whether they will be paid under the Mayuram agreement or under the alternative system provided in the Bill. The existence of two systems will create confusion and will not benefit the pannaiyals. Many hon. Members of this House who have not read the Bill may not know the details of the Mayuram agreement. Under that agreement, pannaiyals get daily wages at one marakkal and women labourers at $\frac{2}{3}$ marakkal. For kalavadi they will be paid $\frac{1}{7}$ of the gross produce. They will also get manakkollais according to custom. Mayuram agreement is good and can be followed. Under the two-marakkal system provided in the Bill, a pannaiyal will get employment only for three or four months in a year and for the rest of the year he will have no employment. At the rate of 2 marakkals a day, the wages come to 5 kalams a month. The mirasdar can get the work done by hired labourers for 3 or 4 kalams and there will be no tendency to have a pannaiyal. Then there is no use in passing a Bill for the protection of pannaiyals.

"If the land-owner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer, he may be called upon to pay to the pannaiyal compensation not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 150, whichever is less. In factories and firms, only three months' pay is given as compensation to the staff. The compensation payable by the land-owner may be reduced to three months' wages or Rs. 75.

"Under this Bill the Government want to give substantial help to the cultivator. The cultivator is born in debt, lives in debt and dies in debt. No provision is made to relieve his indebtedness. In 1937, the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari placed on the Statute Book the Madras Agriculturists Debt Relief Act. This Act relieved the indebtedness of the mirasdar, so also we must do something and at once to relieve agricultural indebtedness. Then only the cultivators will derive some benefit and we will be justified that we have done something effective to help them.

"Most of the farm labourers have built their houses on the house-sites of their landlords. If a labourer ceases to work on the panna of his landlord, he is evicted from the house-site. He is forced to quit the house. Just as we have given security of tenure for five years to each tenant, we must also give protection against eviction from the house-site.

"In almost all the places, communal lands like pasture lands and threshing floors are converted into house building sites. In

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] 4th November 1952]

Courtallam there was a communal land which was used by the villagers as threshing floor and pasture land for grazing their cattle. Now a house building society has taken up the land for the construction of houses. If such common lands are taken away for other purposes, there will not be pasture lands for the agriculturists to graze their cattle and they will suffer. So, the existing pasture lands and other communal lands must be kept intact.

"With these words I resume my seat."

* SRI S. THINAKARASWAMY THEVAR :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் 5-30
அவர்களே, இங்கு வந்துள்ள இந்த தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசர சட்டத்தை p.m.
நான் ஆதரிக்கிறேன். ஆனால் அதில் சில முக்கிய விஷயங்களைப்பற்றி
சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. உதாரணமாக இந்த தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசர
சட்டமானது பெருத்த அளவில் நமது முதல் மந்திரி அவர்களால்
செய்யப்பட்ட ஒரு அவசர சட்டம். இது மிகவும் போற்றத்தக்க விஷயம்.
நல்ல சமயத்தில், நல்ல முறையில் எதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதை உரிய
சமயத்தில் நல்லமுறையில் செய்திருக்கிறது என்பது பற்றி நமது மதிப்பிற்குரிய
முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நாம் மிகவும் பாராட்டுவேண்டும்.
அதிலுள்ள சில ஷரத்துக்களைப் பார்க்கும்போது இன்னும் அதிகமாகக் கூட
செய்திருக்கலாம் என்பது எனது அபிப்பிராயம். உதாரணமாக மதுரை
ஜில்லா திருமங்கலம் தாலுகாவை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் புராதீனமாக,
சுமார் 100 வருஷ காலமாக ஒரு மாதிரியான முறையில் விவசாயம் நடந்து
கொண்டிருக்கிறது. நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் ஒரு வழக்கம்
நடைமுறையில் இருந்துவருகிறது. அந்த மாதிரியான வழக்கத்தை
இப்பொழுது உங்களுடைய ரூபகத்துக்குக்கொண்டே விரும்புகிறேன்.
அங்கு என்ன விளைச்சல் விளைந்தோ அதில் சரிபாதி பாகம் நிலச்சுவாந்
தாரும் சரிபாதி பாகம் குடியானவனும் எடுத்துக்கொள்வது என்ற ஒரு
வழக்கம் சுமார் நூறு வருஷகாலமாக நடைமுறையில் இருந்துவருகிறது.
அந்த பிராந்தியம் ஒரு வரண்ட பிரதேசம், மானுவாரி பிரதேசம், நீர்
பாசனம் கிடையாது. ஏக்கேச விளைவு. நாவேந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு
தடவைதான் விவசாயம் நடக்கும். அந்த மாதிரியான மானுவாரி பிர
தேசத்தில்கூட இப்படி விளைச்சலில் சரிபாதி எடுத்துக்கொள்வது என்ற ஒரு
முறை இருந்துவருகிறது. அதைப் போலவே இப்பொழுதும் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு
வருகிறார்கள். அங்கு அப்படி இருக்கும்போது நீர்பாசனம் உள்ள காவேரி
பாசனத்தில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 40 சதவிகிதம் விவசாய குடியானவனுக்கும்
60 சதவிகிதம் நிலச்சுவானுக்கும் என்று ஏற்படுத்தி இருப்பது மிகவும்
போற்றத்தக்கதுதான். எங்கள் தேசத்தை ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்த்தால் விவசாயம்
செய்யும் குடியானவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம்
என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

"அது மாதிரம் அல்ல. எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் விவசாயம் செய்யும்
காலத்தில் முதலாளிகள் விவசாயம் செய்யும் குடியானவர்களுக்கு
தாசனமாகப் பணம் கொடுத்து உதவுகிறார்கள். அத்துடன் உரம், செடி,
தக்க-உதவியும் செய்து வருகிறார்கள். அது மாதிரம் அல்ல. தண்ணீர்
இரைக்கும் காலத்தில் குடியானவனுக்கு தண்ணீர் இரைப்பதில் எவ்வளவு
செலவாகிறதோ அதில் பாதிச் செலவை நிலச்சுவான் கொடுத்து உதவி
வருகிறான். இந்த முறை எங்கள் பிராந்தியத்தில் நடந்துவருகிறது என்பதை
இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இவ்வித நிலைமை
இருக்கும் பிராந்தியத்தில்கூட நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கு இவ்வளவு சலுகை
கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. எங்கள் ஜில்லாவைப்போலத் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா குடி
யானவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் கொஞ்சம்கூட தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம்.
பெரிய நீர்பாசன பிராந்தியத்தில் அதிலும் காவேரி தீரத்தில் இவ்வளவு
கொடுப்பதுபோதாது. இன்னும் தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம். இப்பொழுது
நிலச்சுவான்களுக்கு 60 சதவிகிதம் கொடுப்பதைக் கூட பண்பட்ட நிலைமையில்தான்
தான். 40 சதவிகிதம் கொடுப்பது என்பது பாராட்டுவேண்டியதில்லை.

[Sri S. Thinakaranaswamy Thevar] [4th November 1952]

என்னெனில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு எவ்வளவு சலுகை செய்யவேண்டுமோ அவ்வளவு சலுகையும் செய்யப்படவில்லை. இன்னும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 50 சத விதிக் கூட கொடுக்கலாம். இப்பொழுது ஜனங்களிடத்தில் ஆர்வம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. 1,000 ஏக்கர், 500 ஏக்கர் என்று பூமி தானம் கொடுக்கும் மனப்பான்மை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் பூமிதான் இயக்கத்தின் நிலைமையை ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்த்தால் இன்னும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு தாராளமாகக் கொடுக்கலாம் என்றே தோன்றுகிறது. இப்பொழுது ஒரு பெரும் மிராசுதார் சுமார் நூறு ஏக்கர் நிலம் கூட கொடுக்க தயாராக இருக்கிறார். அவ்விதம் இப்பொழுது ஜனங்களுடைய மனம் மாறி இருக்கிறது. இந்த மாறுபட்ட சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் இவ்விதம் கொடுப்பது என்பது சரிதான். இந்த மாதிரியான ஒரு நல்ல திட்டத்தை சர்க்கார் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பது போற்றத்தக்க விஷயம்தான். பெருமைக்கு உகந்த விஷயம். இது இந்த இந்தியா சரித்திரத்திலேயே சரித்திர பிரசித்தி பெற்ற விஷயம்தான். இது பிற்காலத்தில் புகழ் பெற்று விளங்கும்.

“இன்றைக்கு எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் நடந்துவரும் ஒரு விஷயத்தைப் பற்றி சொல்ல வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. எங்கள் பிராந்தியத்தில் தோட்ட விவசாயம் இருக்கிறது. அங்கே குடியானவர்கள் கிணற்றிலிருந்து தண்ணீர் இரைத்து விவசாயம் செய்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் இரைத்துதான் பச்சளம் செய்யவேண்டும். வேறு பாசன வசதி கிடையாது. அப்படி செய்யும் விவசாயத்தில் குடியானவன் மூன்றில் இரண்டு பங்கும் முதலாளி மூன்றில் ஒரு பங்கும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். இந்த அவசர சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் மட்டில் இருக்கட்டும். அது எங்கள் ஜில்லாவிற்கு வந்தால் அதனால் குடியானவர்களுக்கு அதிக நஷ்டம்தான் ஏற்படும். குடியானவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு ஏற்படும். முதலாளிகளுக்கு சாதகம் ஏற்படும். எந்த பிராந்தியத்தில் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் ஏழைகளுக்கு சாதகம் ஏற்படுகிறதோ அங்கே இதைக் கொண்டுவந்தால் போதுமானது. குடியானவர்களுக்கு எங்கே அனுசூலம் ஏற்படுகிறதோ அங்கே இதை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வரலாம். இந்த சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை விட்டு வேறு எந்த ஜில்லாவிற்கும் விஸ்தரிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் அங்குள்ள நிலைமையை கீழ் விசாரித்து புனர் ஆலோசனை செய்து விஸ்தரிக்க வேண்டும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். இத்துடன் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

5-40
p.m.

*SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது சபையின் முன்பாக விவாதத்தில் இருக்கும் சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச வேண்டியது முக்கியமாக இருப்பதால் அதைப் பற்றி பேச விரும்புகிறேன். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள விவசாயிகள் பண்ணையாள்கள் சம்பந்தமாகக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட இந்த ‘பில்’ லானது விவசாயிகளுக்கு குறிப்பாக ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு அவர்களிடமிருந்து நிலத்தை மாற்றிக் கூடாது என்று ஒரு அம்சம் இருப்பது மிகவும் வரவேற்கத்தக்க அம்சம் தான். நமது ராஜ்யத்தில் விவசாயிகளுக்கோ அல்லது பண்ணையாள்களுக்கோ பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக் கூடிய எந்த சட்டமும் இது வரைக்கும் கொண்டு வரப்படவில்லை. முதன் முதலாக இப்பொழுது இங்கு கொண்டு வந்திருக்கக் கூடிய இச்சட்டம் எதிர்க்காலத்தில் நில சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தைக்கொண்டு வரக்கூடிய முறையில் இது இருக்க வேண்டும் என்பது தான் என் நோக்கம். நடைமுறையில் இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தில் பல இடையூறுகள் இருக்கத்தான் செய்கிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்தக் கூடிய முறையில் எந்த நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தாரோ அது சரியான முறையில் நடைபெற முடியாமல் பல இடையூறுகளில் நடைபெற்றுக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தினால் சென்ற வருஷம் நிலத்தை உழுது கொண்டிருந்த தவண்பிடுருந்து நிலத்தை மாற்றப்பட்டிருந்தால் அதை திருப்பிக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. அதற்கு கன்சிலியேஷன் ஆபீஸுக்கு 30 நாட்களுக்குள் மனு செய்துகொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் கிராமவாசிகளுக்கு சரியானபடி சொல்லாததின் காரணமாக பல இடங்களில் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றப்பட்டவர்கள் மனு செய்துகொள்ள வசதி இல்லாமல்

[4th November 1952] [Sri S. Ramalingam]

இருந்திருக்கிறது. இது சர்க்காரின் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு நன்றாக தெரிந்திருக்கும் என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். கிராமவாசிகள் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தை படித்தோ அல்லது பத்திரிகைகளில் வாசித்தோ, அவசரச் சட்டத்திலுள்ள விஷயங்களை தெரிந்து கொள்ளக் கூடிய நிலைமையில் இல்லை. ஆனால் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் விவசாயிகளின் நலனுக்காகவென்று கருதிப் போட்டம்கூட தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலிருக்கக் கூடிய எல்லா கிராமவாசிகளுக்கும் சரியாக எடுத்துச் சொல்லாததின் காரணமாக பல இடங்களில் நிலத்தைப் பறிகொடுத்த விவசாயிகள் இன்று சர்க்காருக்கு அப்பீல் செய்துகொள்ள முடியாமல் போய் விட்டது. அவர்களுக்கு எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் இதனால் ஏற்படவில்லை. இந்த விஷயம் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். இதைப் பற்றி போதுமான அளவு பிரசாரம் செய்யவில்லை. பத்திரிகைகளில் சரியாகப் பரகரம் செய்யப்படவில்லை. ஒன்றிரண்டு பத்திரிகைகளில் வெளி வந்திருந்தும், விவசாயிகள் எல்லோரும் படித்தவர்களாக இல்லாததால் அது பலருக்குத் தெரியாது போய்விட்டது. மேலும் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தின் கீழ் நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களால் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்டு அனாதாவாக வெளியே இருக்கும் குடியானவர்கள் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு மனுச் செய்து கொண்டு தங்களுடைய குறைபாட்டை நீக்கிக் கொள்ளலாமென்று இருந்தாலும் கூட அம்மாதிரி விண்ணப்பம் போடும்போது நிலத்தின் சர்வே நம்பர் போன்றவைகளைக் குறிக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் கிராமங்களிலுள்ள குடியானவர்கள் சர்வே நம்பரைப் போய் கேட்கும்போது கர்ணங்கள் கொடுக்க மறுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதைப்பற்றி ஜில்லா அதிகாரிகளுக்கு எடுத்துச் சொல்லியும், ஜில்லா அதிகாரிகள் கர்ணங்களுக்கு சர்வே நம்பர் கேட்க வருகிறவர்களுக்கு சர்வே நம்பர் கொடுக்க மறுக்கக் கூடாதென்று உத்தரவு போட்டும் கூட பல இடங்களில் கர்ணங்கள் வேண்டுமென்றே தரமுடியாது என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தமாதிரி அவசரச் சட்டம் வருவது அவர்களுக்குக் கொஞ்சம்கூட பிடிக்கவில்லை. எப்படியாவது இதனால் ஏற்பட விரும்பும் நன்மைகளை அழித்துவிட வேண்டுமென்றேதான் அவர்கள் சர்வே நம்பர் கொடுக்க மறுக்கிறார்கள். அதனால்தான் குறிப்பிட்ட தவணைக்குள் விவசாயிகளால் சர்க்கார் கன்சிலியேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு விண்ணப்பம் போட்டுக் கொள்ள முடியாமல் போய்விட்டது. இதை சர்க்கார் நன்கு கவனிக்க வேண்டும். இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய விவசாயிகளின் நிலைமை சர்க்கார் போடும் உத்தரவுகளை தாங்களாகவே படித்துப் புரிந்து கொள்ளவோ, அல்லது நகரங்களுக்குச் சென்று யாரிடம் கேட்டால் முழு விவரமும் கிடைக்கும் என்று நகரங்களுக்குப் போகவோ, பிறகு மனுக்கள் போட்டு கடைசிவரை கோர்ட்டு மூலம் போராடவோ முடியாத நிலைமையிலிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் அரசாங்கமே அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய எல்லாக் காரியங்களையும் இந்தத் துறையில் செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டுமே தவிர ஏதோ கண் துடைப்பு வேலையாக யாருக்கு நிலம் வேண்டுமோ அவர்கள் கன்சிலியேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு மனுச் செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லிவிட்டது மிகவும் சரியாகாது. அதனால் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கொஞ்சம்கூட நன்மை ஏற்படவேயில்லை.

“இதில் இன்னொரு முக்கியமான விஷயமிருக்கிறது. சென்ற வருடமும் அதற்கு முந்திய வருடமும் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்டவர்கள் அப்பீல் செய்து கொண்டால் நிலத்தைத் திருப்பித் தந்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று சட்டமிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் 1946-47-ல் இந்த மாகாணத்தில் விவசாயிகளின் இயக்கம் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட போதும், அதற்குப் பிறகு ஸ்ரீ சுப்பிரமணியம் கவிபு தன்னுடைய விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்த யாதாஸ்தை சமர்ப்பித்த போதும், அதற்கும் முன்பாக J. C. குமாரப்பா இந்த மாகாணத்திற்கு விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்தம் வேண்டுமென்று ரிப்போர்ட் சமர்ப்பித்தபோதும், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிராசுதார்கள் ரொம்பவும் தந்திரமாக வாரத்திற்கே, குத்திக் கொண்டு நிலத்தை விட்டுவிடாமல் சொந்தப் பண்ணை என்ற பெயரினாலே வேலை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஏதாவது சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டம் வந்துவிடுமோ என்ற அச்சத்தினால் அவர்கள் ரொம்ப ஜாக்கிரதைதான் இப்படிச் செய்துகொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். இப்பொழுதும் கூட அவர்கள் வாரம், குத்தகையென்று விடாமல் சொந்தப் பயிச்செய்ய

[Sri S. Ramalingam] [4th November, 1952]

என்ற முறையில் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதன் காரணமாகவே தான் திருத்தரைப்பூண்டி தாலுகாவில் ஒரு பகுதி, பாபநாசம் தாலுகாவில் ஒரு பகுதி இவைகளில் இருக்கும் குடியானவர்கள் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு எந்த விதமாகவும் அப்பீல் செய்து கொள்ளமுடியாமல் போய்விட்டது. இதையும் சர்க்கார் நன்கு கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“உடுத்தபடியாக ஒரு முக்கியமான விஷயம். இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக உள்ள நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிகளுக்குச் செல்லுபடியாகாது என்று கண்டிருக்கிறது. அதனால் பல கிராமங்களில் மிகவும் சிக்கலான நிலைமை இன்று ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இன்றைக்கு எனக்கு இரண்டு தந்திகள் வந்திருக்கின்றன. தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் வயலூர் கிராமத்தில் சுமார் நூற்றுக்கு மேற்பட்ட விவசாயிகள் கைது செய்யப்பட்டு சிறையில் அடைக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்று தந்தியில் கண்டிருக்கிறது. ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவாக நிலமுள்ளவர்களின் நிலத்தைப் பயிரிட்டுக் கொண்டிருந்த அவர்களுக்கு அவசரச்சட்டப் பிரகாரம் தங்களுக்கு கூலி வேண்டுமென்று கேட்ட தின் காரணமாக இன்று சிறையிலிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் பக்கத்தில் வேறு ஒரு விவசாயி ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிடம் வேலையி லிருப்பதின் காரணமாக அவசரச்சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் வாரம் பெறுகிறான். கூலியை அடைகிறான். ஆனால் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக நிலமுள்ள நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிடம் வேலை செய்கிறான் என்பதற்காக சர்க்கார் அளித்திருக்கும் எந்த சலுகைகளுக்கும் உள்ளாகாது மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறான். வாரம் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தால் இவனுக்கு 40 சதம் கிடைக்காது. பண்ணைவேலை செய்தாலும் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி கூலியும் கிடைக்காது. ஆனால் இரண்டு ரேக்களும் செய்யும் வேலை ஒன்றுதான். அதே போல் ஒரு நிலச்சுவாந்தாருக்கு ஒரு கிராமத்தில் ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட நிலத்தையும், மற்றொரு கிராமத்தில் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவான நிலத்தையும் வைத்திருந்தால் அவர் ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட கிராமத்தில் விவசாயிக்கு சட்டப்பிரகாரம் கூலியும், ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவான கிராமத்தில் அதைவிட மிக குறைவான கூலியையும் கொடுத்துவர வசதியிருக்கிறது. ஒரே வேலையைச் செய்பவரிடம் இம்மாதிரி ஏற்றத்தாழ்வு இருப்பதின் காரணமாகவே தான் இன்று பல இடங்களில் பல சிக்கலான பிரச்சனைகள் எழுந்திருக்கின்றன. தகரறு ஏற்பட்டபிறகு இதில் அதிகாரிகளும் ஒன்றும் செய்யமுடியவில்லை. ரெவுயூ போர்டாரும் சரியாக நடந்து கொள்ளமுடியவில்லை. இடையே போலீஸ்காரர்கள் புதுந்து தங்கள் யதேச் சாதிகாரப்படி நடத்திறார்கள். ஏழைகளைப் பிடித்து அடித்து தண்டித் திறார்கள். விவசாய இயக்கத்தை நசுக்க லாத்காரத்தை உபயோகப்படுத்து கிறார்கள். பல இடங்களில் இம்மாதிரி நடந்திருக்கின்றன. இன்றைய தினம் எனக்கு வந்த தந்திகளில், கணபதி, காசீம், இருதயசாமி போன்ற தேமூர் கள் கைது செய்யப்பட்டு லாகப்பில் கையெலும்பு முறியும் வரை அடித்து நொறுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சர்க்காரின் அவசரச்சட்டம் சரியான முறையில் அமையாததின் காரணமாக இன்று பல புதிய புதிய பிரச்சனைகள் எழுப்பியிருக் கின்றன. நிலச்சுவாந்தாரிகள் விவசாயிகளை நீக்குவதற்கு பல ஷரத்துக்கள் சட்டத்தில் சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. விவசாயி நிலத்திற்கோ அல்லது பயி ருக்கோ குந்தகம் விளைவிக்கக்கூடிய முறையில் நடந்து கொண்டால் அவனை வெளியேற்ற வசதியிருக்கிறது. விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்ற ரெவுயூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு அதிகாரமிருக்கிறது. இம்மாதிரி பல குறைபாடுகள் இருப்பதை சட்டத்திலிருந்து நீக்கவேண்டும்.

“குறைபாடுகளைச் சொல்லிக் கொண்டே போனால் நிறையச் சொல்லலாம். ஒவ்வொரு ஷரத்தாகப் பார்த்தால் பல இருக்கின்றன. இவைகளையெல்லாம் நீக்கி சட்டத்தை நல்ல முறையில் ஒழுங்கான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே பயன்படத்தக்க முறையில் நாம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்றால் நன்றாக ஆலோசனை செய்து விவாதிக்க வேண்டும். அது இந்தச் சபையில் முடியாது. ஆகையினால்தான் எனது நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ தென்னேட்டி விஸ்வநாதம் பிரேரேபித்த திருத்தத்தின்படி இந்த உசோதாவை ஒரு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்பவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளு கிறேன்.”

4th November 1952]

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heartily support the motion for referring the Bill to a select committee for the reasons which I shall presently submit to the House. Immediately after the promulgation of the Ordinance, there was a wave of agitation from one end of the State to the other that the tenants should have security of tenure in every district. At the same time there is apprehension in the minds of land-owners that their interests are adversely affected. Therefore, this Ordinance has created, as I submitted already, apprehensions in the minds of land-owners and tenants who are likely to be evicted under the ordinary law. So, after this Ordinance, in every district, particularly in areas where the zamins have recently been abolished, there is any amount of agitation for the extension of the principle of giving security of tenure to the tenants cultivating lands. In inam villages also there is this agitation. In the Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam districts, there are numerous inam villages whose tenures are quite different from those that are in vogue in Tanjore. There the tenants are put to any amount of difficulties by the various land-owners and inamdars. Consequently several ryots held conferences in all the districts appealing to the Government to declare once and for all fixity of tenure for the tenants so that the object of the present legislation to step up production might be achieved even in the remote and northernmost districts of our State. If the Bill is good, the extension of the principle and the provisions of this Bill to all the districts also will be good. In that case, I submit that the conditions prevailing in other districts will have to be taken into consideration, before the principle and provisions of this Bill are extended to other districts, because I find that there is any amount of divergence in the matter of pay- ment of wages, payment and collection of rents, payment of rents, etc. So, unless the views of hon. Members who have got special technical knowledge of the conditions that are prevailing in districts to which the principle of this Bill may be extended at some time or other, are taken into consideration, I am afraid a uniform policy cannot be adopted. In the interests of the tenants as a whole, the principle of giving fixity of tenure is acceptable. But so far as payment of rents and payment of wages and other things are concerned, I submit that there should be an expert committee to go into details of the various problems confronting the land-owner, the tenant and the agricultural labourer. In our parts we do not find three-fifths of the yield being given to any land-owner. There about 50 per cent of the produce is generally given to the land-owner. Therefore, if this principle of Tanjore tenancy legislation is extended to our parts, the tenants there will be certainly put to great loss. There is also a method, a sharing system, by which only half the produce will be taken by the land-owner and half will be taken by the tenant. There are other modes of payment of rent also in those areas. Therefore, what I submit is that unless those conditions are specifically understood by the Government—that can be achieved only by referring this Bill to a select committee of this House—I am afraid that this legislation will not help in any way to relieve the distress that is now the common

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [4th November 1952]

feature of the tenants throughout those parts. Therefore, I request the Government to consider this aspect of the problem. I say this because there is a provision in the Bill to the effect that this legislation may be extended to other districts at any time by a simple notification in the gazette. Extension of this legislation to other parts of this State is sought to be made by notification in the gazette. There is great need for studying the conditions obtaining in the various districts, particularly in Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts, where so many types of tenures are in vogue. There are different types of leasing out lands and different methods of payment of rents. These things have to be studied by hon. Members who have specific knowledge of the conditions of those places and, therefore, I appeal to the Government and other hon. Members of this House to accept the motion to refer the Bill to a select committee of this House."

* **SRI R. S. ARUMUGHAM** :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சை குத்தகைதார பண்ணையாள் சட்டத்தை கனம் ரெவின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறதை நான் மிகவும் மனப்பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். எல்லா தொழிலாளிகளுக்கும் பாதுகாப்பு உண்டு. ஆனால் ஒரு விவசாயியை எந்த நேரத்திலும் திடீரென்று நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றிவிடலாம் அல்லது என்னவேண்டுமானாலும் செய்யலாம். அவனுக்கு எவ்வித பாதுகாப்போ, எந்த விதமான சட்டமோ கிடையாது. முதல் படியாக இப்பொழுது இந்த சட்டசபை மூலமாக இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறதைக் குறித்து நான் மிகுந்த சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். விவசாயிகள் பாடுபட்டும் பட்டினி கிடக்கிற நிலையில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே தவிர, வேறொன்றுமில்லை. உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்பவனுக்கு உணவிலில்லை. உரிமையிலில்லை. இப்பொழுதுதான் ஒரு சிறிது மாற்றம் வருகிறது. அந்த நிலையிலே விவசாயிகளுக்கு இது ஒரு வரப்பிரசாதம் என்றுதான் சொல்லவேண்டும்.

“இது இப்பொழுது தான் முகலாவது வந்திருக்கிறது. இதிலே சில குறைகளோ குற்றங்களோ ஏதாவது இருந்தால் அதைத் திருத்திக்கொள்ளலாம். அதற்காக குழப்பமோ சச்சரவோ செய்யவேண்டிய அவசியம் இல்லை.

“இப்பொழுது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது. 1947-48-வாஷத்திலிருந்து பல விவசாயிகள் அங்கே நீக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது பாதுகாப்பு இல்லைதான். அந்தநிலங்களை அந்த நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்களே சாகுபடி செய்துவருகிறார்கள். சொந்தப் பயிராக எவத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த நிலங்களையெல்லாம், 1947-48-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து எந்தெந்த விவசாயிகளை நீக்கினார்களோ, அவர்களுக்கு, அடுத்தவருக்கு குத்தகைக்கு விட்டிருப்பதை விட்டுவிட்டு, சொந்தப் பயிர் வைத்திருக்கிறதை, அந்த விவசாயிக்கு கொடுத்தவிடலாம் என்ற நிலைமை ஏற்படுத்தினால் சந்தோஷமாக இருக்குமென்று நான் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அது மட்டுமல்ல; ஒரு நிலச்சுவாந்தாரின் அவ்வளவு நிலத்தையும் அவரே பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாமென்ற நிலை இருக்கிறதென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். ஆனால், ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட அளவு இவ்வளவு நிலம்தான் பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக்கொள்வது என்று இருந்தால்தான் நல்லது. இல்லாவிட்டால் எல்லா நிலத்தையும் பண்ணை நிலமாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு, கூலி ஆட்கள் மூலமாக வேலை செய்யமுடியுமென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். இதனால் விவசாயிகள் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள்.

“இந்த சட்டம் எல்லா நிலச்சுவாந்தாரையும் கட்டுப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே இருக்கவேண்டியதுதான். அப்படி இருந்தால்தான் சண்டை சச்சரவு ஏற்படாமல் இருக்குமென்று நான் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

4th November 1952] [Sri R. S. Arumugam]

‘உழுதுண்டு வாழ்வாரே வாழ்வார்மற் றெல்லாத் தொழுதுண்டு பின்செல் பவர்.’

என்ற பாட்டு இருந்ததே தவிர, அந்தப் பாட்டின் கருத்துப்படி இருக்கவில்லை. எதிர்மாராக இருக்கிறது. நாடு நன்ம் அடைய விவசாயி மதிக்கப்படவேண்டும். சங்கடம் இல்லாமலிருக்கவேண்டும். தஞ்ாவூரில் மாத்திரம் தான் இந்தச் சங்கடம் இருக்கிறதென்பது இல்லை. மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களிலும் இந்தச் சங்கடங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அனைத்து இடங்களில் ‘எலிக்ஷன்’ நடந்து கொண்டதான் இருக்கிறது. அதை உடனே தடுக்கவேண்டும். மேலும் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் இதை அமுல் நடத்தி அந்த ஜில்லாவில் இது சரியான முறைக்கு வந்தபிறகு, வாரம் முதலியன விவசாயிகளுக்கு அதிகம் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய அளவில் செய்து எல்லா ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் இந்த சட்டத்தை உடனடியாகக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“ஆனால், இதுவரையிலும் எந்தவிதமான பாதுகாப்பும், எந்த விதமான காவலும் இல்லாது எந்த நேரத்திலும் வெளியே போகச் செய்யலாம் என்ற நிலை இருந்ததை மாற்றி அவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளித்து, சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக நாம் வழக்கு கோருவதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்து கொள்வதற்கு அனுசூலமாக இந்த சட்டத்தை இந்த சட்டசபையில் கொண்டுவந்த நமது ரெவின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும் நமது தலைவர் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கும் என நன்றிபெறத் தெரிவிக்கிறேன். முதலாவதாக ‘தலைமைப் பதவியை ஏற்கும்போது, இரண்டு காரியங்கள், அதாவது ‘சமூகம்’, ‘விவசாயம்’ இந்த இரண்டையும் நான் கவனிக்கப்போகிறேன் என்று ராஜாஜி சொன்னார்கள். அந்த முறையிலே இப்பொழுது விவசாயத்தைப்பற்றி அக்கரை எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களைப் பற்றியும், நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய பாதுகாப்பைக் குறித்தும் காலையிலும் இப்பொழுது விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய தொழிலாளர்களின் நற்கூல ஆரம்பம் என எண்ணுகிறேன். இந்த அளவிலே ஒரு நல்ல சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்பதைக் குறித்து சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். இன்னும் இதில் ஒரு சில குறைகளும் இருக்கின்றன. எல்லா நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்களையும் இந்த சட்டம் கட்டுப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே செய்வது, மேலும், 1947-48-ம் வருஷத்தில் நீக்கிய விவசாயிகளை பழய நிலங்களைப் பயிர் செய்வதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்வது, விவசாயிக்குக்கிடைக்கும் வருமானப் பகுதியைக் கூட்டுவது போன்ற காரியங்களெல்லாம் இன்னும் இருக்கின்றன. அதையெல்லாம் செய்வார்கள் என்ற நம்பிக்கையைத் தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு எனது மனப்பூர்வமான ஆதரவையும் தெரிவித்து எனது பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Wednesday, 5th November 1952.”
The House then adjourned.

VI.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

- (1) G.O. No. 2408, Public (Services), dated the 10th October 1952, excluding the post of part-time Medical Officer, Madras Electricity System, from the purview of the Madras Public Service Commission. [Laid on the table in accordance with Article 320 (5) of the Constitution.]
- (2) G.O. No. 1075, Rural Welfare, dated 25th September 1952—Amendment to Madras Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948.

[4th November 1952]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 38 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 4th November 1952, page 100 supra.]

EXTRACT FROM THE MADRAS MANUAL OF SPECIAL PAY AND ALLOWANCES, VOLUME I.

Class IV.

13. The following rules shall regulate the grant of allowances under the Madras House Allowance Scheme to Government servants employed in post in Madras City, provided that they actually reside in the City:—

(1) The allowances granted under these rules are 'Compensatory allowances' within the meaning of Fundamental Rule 44 and other rules bearing on the subject.

(2) The scheme will not apply to Government servants, the minimum pay of whose time-scale or whose graded or fixed pay is Rs. 60 or less, and will be restricted to the following classes of Government servants, whether they draw a special pay or not:—

(a) Government servants belonging to a regular cadre of a service normally liable to be employed either in Madras City, or in stations in the mufassal, who, if employed in the City, draw the scale of pay of the cadre in force in the mufassal; and

(b) Government servants who, though not liable to be employed in the mufassal, draw pay in a scale in force both in the City and in the mufassal:

Provided that in either case they are not occupying free of rent quarters either built or rented for them by the Government or have not been granted house-rent allowance in lieu thereof.

NOTE.—(1) House allowance will not be admissible to the incumbent of a post in the City merely on the ground that the pay sanctioned for the post corresponds to the pay of some post in the mufassal. The duties of the posts must be comparable and doubtful cases should be referred to Government for decision.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rule (2), the officers specified under Class IV in Appendix I in Volume II of this Manual will not be eligible for house allowance.

(3) The allowance will be admissible only when the house-rent proper actually paid by a Government servant is in excess of 10 per cent of his emoluments, if the house is an unfurnished one, or 12½ per cent, if the house is a furnished one. The amount of the allowance will be the actual excess over 10 or 12½ per cent of the emoluments, as the case may be, subject to the following maxima:—

Group.	Class of officers.	Maximum limit of monthly house allowance.
(1)	(2)	(3) RS.
GAZETTED OFFICERS.		
I.	All Government servants whose total emoluments excluding compensatory allowances exceed Rs. 1,000 ..	100
II.	Government servants, not included in Group I, the minimum pay of whose time-scale or whose graded or fixed pay is not less than Rs. 350 ..	75
III.	All Government servants not included in Groups I and II.	50

APPENDIX

4th November 1952]

Group.	Class of officers.	Maximum limit of monthly house allowance.
(1)	(2)	(3) RS.

NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.

IV. Government servants in the City drawing an actual pay exceeding Rs. 150 per mensem who otherwise satisfy the conditions of Madras House Allowance 25

NOTE.—(1) Government servants drawing pay not exceeding Rs. 150 per mensem will draw the new house-rent allowance sanctioned in G.O. No. 78, Finance, dated 8th February 1947 and G.O. No. 732, Finance, dated 28th July 1948.

(2) For the purpose of this sub-rule, the term 'emoluments' will be interpreted as in Fundamental Rule 45-C, but will exclude any compensatory allowance and the term 'the house-rent proper actually paid' will be interpreted in accordance with instructions issued from time to time.

(3) The maximum limit of monthly house allowance for Subordinate Judges employed in posts in Madras City will be Rs. 75 (G.O. Ms. No. 1176, Finance, dated 2nd November 1951).

(4) The sanctioning authority may grant a reduced house allowance or refuse to grant a house allowance if it is satisfied that the Government servant is occupying an unnecessarily expensive house. The sanctioning authority shall consider in each case whether the Government servant could have obtained suitable accommodation at a rent lower than that actually paid, and the allowance granted shall in no case exceed that admissible on the basis of the lowest rent for which, in the opinion of the sanctioning authority, the Government servant could have obtained suitable accommodation.

(5) Heads of departments are empowered to sanction the allowance in respect of officers and subordinates under their control, except in cases where the person stays in a hotel and pays a consolidated rate for boarding and lodging.

The Chief Electrical Inspector to Government shall exercise the powers of a head of a department in respect of the officers and subordinates working under him. The allowance to the Chief Electrical Inspector to Government will be sanctioned by the Chief Engineer for Electricity. The power to sanction Madras House Allowance to officers and subordinates under the control of the Director of Public Instruction may be exercised by the Deputy Director of Public Instruction (Personnel) subject to such general instructions as the Director of Public Instruction may lay down for the Deputy Director's guidance. A copy of such instructions should be communicated to the Accountant-General. The power to sanction Madras House Allowance to the Deputy Directors including Deputy Director (Personnel) shall, however, remain with the Director of Public Instruction.

[4th November 1952]

(6) Claims for Madras House Allowance should be supported by a certificate from the Government servant concerned in the following form:—

"Certified that the house allowance claimed by me for the month of _____ is in accordance with the rules governing the Madras House Allowance Scheme and that the rent due for the month aforesaid has been paid to the landlord."

Heads of departments shall verify the fact of actual payment of the rent by directing the recipients to produce their house rent receipts at least once a year.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 5th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. Minister for Education is not keeping good health. So, the questions on to-day's agenda relating to his department, namely, questions Nos. 21 and 47, will be taken up to-morrow."

Rules under Article 166 (3) of the Constitution.

* 51 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether rules under Article 166 (3) of the Constitution have been made; and

(b) if so, whether a copy of the same will be placed on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a) & (b) Yes. Sir. Rules for the transaction of Government Business have been made in exercise of the powers conferred by Article 166 (3) of the Constitution. They are intended for official use in the Secretariat and are treated as confidential and cannot be placed on the table of the House."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, may I know whether the fact that the Constitution prescribes that the rules shall be made does not also imply that the rules cannot be treated as confidential?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The mere fact that an Act has to be done under the Constitution, I respectfully beg leave to believe, does not imply that it must be treated as public. For instance, the Governor has to do certain things; the Ministers have to give advice and so on. We need not assume that everything is to be treated as public and not confidential. I think we should follow the present practice."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"ప్రస్తుతం ఆమెలు ఉన్న ప్రాక్టీసు, నేలం వాత 1935 వ సం॥ ఆర్డు ప్రకారం ఉన్నందువల్ల కొంత వట్టిగాను ఉన్నప్పటికీ కొంత ప్రాక్టీసును ఆచరణలోనికి తీసుకొని రావడంకోసం ఈ సందర్భం ప్రభావము తీసుకు గుర్తిస్తారా?"

[5th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The entire Constitution, if the hon. Gentleman will study it, is very much like the 1935 Act.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I draw the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to the language of Article 166, clause (3) of the Constitution? The rules relate, I submit, only to business other than that in respect of which the Governor is by or under this Constitution required to act in his discretion. In other words, these rules are in respect of business which is not the concern of the Governor. May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether he will concede the point that the public have got a right, in their dealings with the Ministry and individual Ministers, to know what the rules of business are, whom they should approach for a particular matter, and what rights and remedies they have, and that it is a constitutional right and that, therefore, the rules cannot be treated as confidential?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The point urged by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will be duly examined. But I am afraid that if any such thing is insisted on, there will have to be two sets of business rules. To-day there is only one set. It is quite possible that we may have a public set of rules and another for internal discipline and the like. The matter will, however, be examined.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—“When the Constitution itself is public, how could the rules, which arise from it, be secret?”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

Representations from the Government servants regarding house rent allowance.

* 52 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received representations from the Government servants at Hosdrug in South Kanara district requesting the Government to extend the concession of house rent allowance to Hosdrug; and

(b) if so, whether any and what steps the Government have taken in the matter?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The question is under the consideration of the Government.”

Co-operative cattle breeding societies, Cuddapah district.

* 53 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the scheme of improving livestock by organizing cattle-breeding co-operative societies in Cuddapah district is considered by the Government to be a success;

[5th November 1952]

(b) the number of such societies started in Cuddapah district;

(c) the breed of stud bulls that were used in these societies to improve the local country stock;

(d) the number of improved bull-calves and heifers that were reared in each society;

(e) the pecuniary benefit that was derived by the members in each society; and

(f) the total expenditure incurred on account of this scheme by the Government so far?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“(a) Yes, Sir.

“(b) Ten co-operative cattle-breeding societies were started in Cuddapah district.

“(c) Nine societies have stud bulls of Ongole breed and the remaining one is having Hallikar breeding bull.

“(d) The calves are not reared by societies but by the cow owners. Up to June 1952, the ten stud bulls purchased by the societies rendered 814 services which resulted up to now in the birth of 262 bull calves and 178 heifer calves of improved strains.

“(e) Since no regular trade of the young ones of the improved strains was carried on either by the societies or by their members it is not possible to determine the quantum of pecuniary benefit derived by the members of the society.

“(f) An expenditure of Rs. 35,732 towards the scheme has been incurred by Government so far.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“Will it not be more useful to entrust the supervision of these societies to the Livestock Inspectors, Stockmen-Compounders and the Director of Animal Husbandry, who are technically qualified, than to the Senior Inspectors and the Additional Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies who are non-technical men?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“The matter will be considered, Sir.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN:—“Will the Government be pleased to state how many such cattle-breeding societies are there in the State as a whole and how many of them are in Malabar?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO:—“* 54 Q.—Will the Government be pleased to state—

“(a) whether the Government are considering the possibility of organizing cattle-breeding co-operative societies in the districts of Malabar and Cochin?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“A separate question may be put.”

[5th November 1952]

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—"Will the Government consider the proposal to open a Cattle Research Station at Cuddapah instead of having several cattle-breeding societies strewn all over the district?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"That is a different matter, Sir."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Does the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture know Telugu?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Yes, Sir. That is why I answered the question."

Munagala Estate Enquiry Committee.

* 54 Q.—**SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether Sri Gottipati Brahmaiah and four others were appointed as an Enquiry Committee by the Government to go into the dispute between the Zamindar of Munagala and the peasants in his estate during September 1947;

(b) if so, whether the Committee submitted any report;

(c) what were the recommendations contained in that report;

(d) whether these recommendations have been implemented and, if not, what are the steps the Government have taken in the matter; and

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to place a copy of the report on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) Yes, in October 1947.

" (b) Yes.

" (c) The recommendations of the Committee were—

(i) that the terms of the Brahmaiah Award be enforced by an executive order;

(ii) that all lands, etc., of the ryots, which should have been returned to them as per the award, should be returned to them early together with mesne profits and the loss and damages incurred by the ryots under several items of the award; and

(iii) that a Special Officer be appointed for this purpose.

" (d) The Government considered that with the taking over of the estate under the Abolition Act, the problems raised would in due course get solved.

" (e) The Government do not consider that any useful purpose will be served by placing a copy of the report of the Committee on the table of the House."

[5th November 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"మంత్రిగారు జవాబు 10-40 తెలుగు జమీందారీ రద్దు చట్టం అమలుకువచ్చిన తరువాత చాలా సమస్యలు పరిష్కార అయ్యాయి. కాని వాస్తవానికి అవిధంగా జరుగలేదు. విసుగుపడలేకే ఈ చట్టం రద్దు చేస్తుందని ఆశించబడినో ఆ సమస్యలు అభివృద్ధిగానే ఉండి పోయాయి. అంతేకాకుండా ఈ విషయమై చేయబడిన బ్రహ్మియ్య అవార్డు ప్రకటించబడలేదు. దానిని ప్రభుత్వవారు ప్రకటించి అమలు జరుపుటకు పూనుకుంటారా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"As far as I could understand the question, it will take some time for the implementation of the taking over of the estate under the Estates Abolition Act."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ అవార్డు 1947 వ సంవత్సరంలో ఇవ్వబడినప్పటికీ ఇంతవరకు అమలు జరుగబడలేదు. ఇంకెన్ని సంవత్సరాలు దాని అమలు కోసం వేచి ఉంటుంటే మంత్రిగారు చెప్పగలరా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"It will not take a very long time, Sir."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"In view of the reply given by the Hon. Minister that the Brahmaiah Award was recommended to be enforced by an executive order, may I know what are the points that are implemented and are to be implemented?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Let me have notice, Sir."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ఈ అవార్డుకు ఇచ్చిన పది గతంలో అందరావట్టి కాంగ్రెస్ కమిటీ ఉపాధ్యక్షులుగా ఉన్న బ్రహ్మియ్య గారు అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో దీనినింకా confidential (రహస్యం) అనిచెప్పడం ఎందుకల్లా? చెబుతారా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Notice, Sir."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"మునగాల ఎస్టేటులో జరిచి ఫలసాదు మిచ్చే రైతుల భూములను చాలాకాలంగా ఆ జమీందారు ఆక్రమించుకొని భండటంవల్ల ఆ భూములను తిరిగి రైతులకిప్పించుటకుగాను బ్రహ్మియ్య అవార్డును సాధ్యమైనంత త్వరలో అమలుపరచుటకు మంత్రిగారు వాగ్దానం చేస్తారా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I am just trying to pick up Telugu. When such long questions are put for answer, I am frightened and am not able to understand them."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Will the Government explain why the Brahmaiah Award, which should be a public document, has been kept as a confidential one till to-day?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"No useful purpose will be served by publishing it."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ప్రజలకు సంబంధించిన ఈ రాజ్యాంగవిషయం, ప్రజలకు తెలియజేయటం ఎందుకు బహిరంగపరచరాదు? దానిని రహస్యంగా ఉంచుకోవడం ఎందుకు?"

[5th November 1952]

టెంపరరీ అంతర్గత మేమో ప్రజలు తెలుసుకొన లేవలసివచ్చినట్లు ప్రభుత్వం ప్రజలకు తెలుసు అని పాపాలు పుట్టే సావకాశమున్నది. అందువల్ల ఆ ఆపార్టును ప్రకటించి సాఫ్ట్ మేన్ త్వరలో దానిని ఆవరణలో పెడతారా అని మంత్రిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ I want notice for answering the question.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Is it not a fact that the Brahmaiah Award is for the benefit of the peasants and if so, may I know why that should not be made a public document? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ I have already answered that question, Sir.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ ఈ ఆపార్టును ప్రకటించినందువల్ల కలిగే ప్రయోజనాలేవి లేవని మంత్రిగారు చెబుతున్నారు. ఆ ఆపార్టులోని అంశములేమో, అవి తన తండ్రికి ఉపయోగపడుతామో నిర్ణయించుకునేది ప్రజలు కాని, ఇప్పుడైనా ఆ ఆపార్టును ప్రకటించే విషయమే అలాచిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Notice, Sir.”

Alleged death of Chivakula Sesha Sastri of Bapatla.

* 55 Q.—SRI K. VENKAIAH: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the late Mr. Chivakula Sesha Sastri of Bapatla was arrested and taken into Police custody on 8th May 1950;

(b) whether the mother of Mr. Sastri wired to the then Home Minister on 9th May 1950 that her son had been arrested and taken into custody by the Police and that he might be saved from them;

(c) whether the mother also gave a petition to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Bapatla, on 8th or 9th of May 1950, stating that her son had been arrested and that he might be saved from the Police and taken into his own custody;

(d) whether the said Sri Sesha Sastri was shot dead by the Police on 12th May 1950 and, if so, whether the Government have made any enquiry into his case; and

(e) the action taken on the representations of his mother referred to in (b) and (c)?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ (a) It does not appear that the alleged arrest in May 1950 took place.

“ (b) & (c) No such telegram is traceable.

“ (c) On 8th May 1950 the Stationary Sub-Magistrate received a petition from the mother of Sesha Sastri. He forwarded the petition to the officer-in-charge of the Bapatla Police Station.

[5th November 1952]

“(d) From the beginning of 1950, some terrorists in Guntur district embarked on a campaign of violence and conducted raids in villages and police stations committing murder, loot and arson. On the night of 11th/12th May 1950, the Inspector of Police, Chirala, who was camping at Uppalapad received information that about 30 terrorists were taking shelter in a tope nearby with the intention of conducting a raid. He proceeded to the spot with a party of policemen and surrounded the tope. On seeing the police party, the terrorists flashed a torch light and opened fire on them. The Police party returned the fire. In the exchange of fire, five terrorists died on the spot. One of these was identified as Chivakula Sesha Sastri who had been underground for 12 months.

“The Joint Magistrate, Ongole, enquired into the incident on 12th May 1950. As the result of his enquiry it appears that he was satisfied that the police party opened fire in exercise of the right of self-defence and that their action was justified.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“ 1950 వ సంవత్సరం మే 8-తేదీన ఉప్పలపాడంలో శివశాస్త్రిని నిర్బంధించి భట్టాకర్పాలం పోలీసు స్టాంపుకు తీసుకొనిపోయి అక్కడ ఒక లావీకి కట్టి తిప్పి నాలుగు రోజుల తరువాత కాల్చి చంపి నట్లు నేను విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయమే పట్టి విచారణ జరుపుతారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ I am grateful for the story tendered on behalf of the communists or terrorists or whoever they may be; but I am not prepared to hold an enquiry about an incident that took place in 1950.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO:—“ ఈ encounter లో పోలీసువారి కెవ్వరినైనా గాయపడినా, ప్రమాదాలుగాని సంభవించాయా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ The hon. Member is cross-examining me as if I had been a party to the incident.” (Laughter.)

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ మే 8 వ తేదీన తన కుమారుడు నిర్బంధించబడినట్లు శివశాస్త్రి తల్లిగారు మున్సిఫ్ కు పిటిషన్ దాఖలు చేసినట్లు తెలుసుకొన్నాను. అయితే శివశాస్త్రిగారు 11 వ తేదీ రాత్రి ఈ సంఘటనలో ఎలా పాల్గొన్నారు ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ This is an argument which I cannot answer. As I said, we must hold an enquiry if at all, and any argument is of no use on this occasion.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ May I know whether there is the petition, dated 8th May 1950, from the mother of Sesha Sastri wherein she had made a statement that her son was under arrest? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ I have already stated that on 8th May 1950, the Stationary Sub-Magistrate received a petition from the mother of Sesha Sastri and he

forwarded the petition to the officer-in-charge of the Bapatla Police Station and that no such telegram as mentioned in the question was traceable now. If as a matter of fact the man was killed afterwards, there is nothing inconsistent in that."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“శేషశాస్త్రీ గారిని 8 వ తేదీన నిర్భంధించి నట్లు ఆ గ్రామములోని వారి కంఠంకు తెలిసినట్టదే. కాని పోలీసువారు 11 వ తేదీన జరిగిన కార్వలూ శేష శాస్త్రీ చనిపోయినట్లు ప్రధాన పోలీసుగారు తెలుసున్నారని దీనిలోని సత్యా సత్యాలను తెలుసుకొనుటకుగాను ప్రభుత్వంవారు ధనర్యకారణ చేస్తారా అని అడుగుదున్నాను ?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The question is again repeated in effect that I should hold an enquiry or the Government at present in office should hold an enquiry about the incident in 1950. I have already stated my difficulty. It is impossible to hold any enquiry with any useful purpose. As a matter of fact, there were offences committed after 1950 by friends of the gentlemen on the other side which have ended in their imprisonment and I am letting them out now."

10-50 a.m. SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"If it is true as the hon. Members allege, that this person was shot in the open, is it not open to them to file a private complaint?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"They have reserved it till 1952." (Laughter.)

Number of estates taken over in Chittoor district.

* 56 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of estates which have been taken over by the Government in Chittoor district; and

(b) the estates which have not yet been taken over with reasons thereof?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a)
Presumably the Member wants to know the number of the
Zamindari estates as well as the under-tenure and inam
estates which have been taken over under the Abolition Act
in the Chittoor district. The total number of such estates
taken over in Chittoor district is 521.

" (b) The information is not readily available with the Government."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—“ప్రస్తుతము చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలో, ముఖ్యంగా కాకతీ, రాజాకా, మదునేరు రాజాకాలో ఉత్పత్తివంటి డొన్నేట్టును యింకా స్వల్పకము చేసుకొనలేదు కాబట్టి యీ డొన్నేటుదాగు యీ ఘాటువలననే రైతులకు తొలగించబడున్నా. సాచ్చి శిస్తులు వసూలు చేయబడున్నా. అందు తప్పది. ఇందువల్ల ఈ రైతులు అనేక బాధలకు గురికావలసి వచ్చింది గనుక ప్రతి కష్టుమకారు మెరుగే ఈ విషయములో అధికారులు అవగతుండా ఉత్తరప్రభువు వారి చేతా కా?”

5th November 1952]

h November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"It is a long question but I will give a short answer. It will be considered."

At the time the Government were

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—“Are the Government aware that on account of the delay in taking over estates, the landlords are resorting to illegal evictions, exactions and other illegal collections prohibited by the Zamindari Abolition Act?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I am not aware, Sir."

Number of officers of Government drawing one thousand rupees and above.

* 57 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of officers and heads of departments who were drawing Rs. 1,000 per mensem and above during the year 1951-52; and

(b) the amount that is being spent on them in the form of various allowances?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“(a) 198 Officers.
“(b) Rs. 3 lakhs (including special pay and dearness allowance).”

(b) Rs. 3 lakhs (including interest).
 SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“మన రాష్ట్రము
 యొక్క పరిస్థితులను పరిష్కరించుట కొరకు ప్రస్తుతము ఒక కమిషన్ ను
 ఏర్పాటు చేశారు. దీనివలన ఉద్యోగముల కేటాయింపు, తగ్గించుట, సమంజసముకాదని
 ప్రకటనలు వారిస్తున్నవా?”
 SUBRAMANIAM:—“I have no answer to

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I have no answer to give."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"In view of the slender finances of our State, will the Government think it desirable not to have officers drawing above a thousand rupees in our State?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ It is rather a difficult suggestion to carry out at present.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—"What is the lowest salary drawn by an N.G.O.P?"

DR. K. B. MENON:—
N.G.O.P.”
THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“I want notice.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:— I want to know whether the Government are aware of the fact that the various allowances of the various categories of the Government employees are not being revised for a long time. I want to know whether the Government are aware of the fact that the various allowances of the various categories of the Government employees are not being revised for a long time.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Dearness allowance, house-rent allowance and in some cases car allowance also."

Sri A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ சூயிசு குடியிருப்பவர்களுக்கு மனம் போன போக்குவரத்தில் பிற்பட்ட இனத்தவர்கள் எவ்வளவு பேர் என்று கணம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூறுவார்களா ? ”

சுயமனம் வாய்நூல்களில் பிற்பட்ட இனத்தை
கனம் நீதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் உதவாரா? ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The hon. Member may give notice of a
separate question.”

[5th November 1952]

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN:—“Various allowances” என்பதில் பரிசீலனை என்னும், 3-ம் அலுவல் என்று gazetted ஆபிசர் களுக்குத் தரப்படுகிறதா? அப்படித் தரப்படுகின்ற அது அல்லவா?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“எனக்குத் தெரிந்தவரையில் பரிசீலனை அலுவல் ஒருவருக்கும் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—“Answering a former supplementary question, the Hon. the Minister for Finance said that it would be difficult to reduce the salaries. When do this Government propose to effect all round retrenchment?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“I do not know whether my Friend suggests retrenchment or cut in pay. If it is cut in pay, we are actively considering the question.”

Alleged death of Rajagopal Naidu in Police lock-up.

* 58 Q.—**SRI T. VISWANATHAM:** Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 15th July 1952, from Srimathi N. Govindammal of Periyakuppam village in Tiruvallur taluk was received by the Government complaining about the death of her husband in Police lock-up at Katpadi Police Station on 2nd June 1952; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) Yes.

“(b) Prior to this representation the Additional District Magistrate, North Arcot, held an inquest over the death with reference to the Standing Orders on the subject. A copy of his Proceedings* is laid on the table of the House showing conclusively that the death was due to natural causes. On the face of it there was ground for some suspicion. I therefore went through the papers, evidence recorded, post-mortem certificate and Chemical Examiner's certificate and satisfied myself that the Additional District Magistrate's conclusions were fully justified.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I ask whether the Hon. the Chief Minister is aware that in the extract of the death report the entries as regards the cause of death and the place of death are different from what are stated in the answer. Here is a certified death report extract in Tamil and I would ask my Friend Mr. Nagarajan to read it.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Before it is read, may I submit that it is no use? A question has been asked and I have now answered it. To read an extract from a village munsif's register is neither an answer to my answer nor is it of any use.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN:—“For the Tahsildar, somebody has signed the extract.”

* Printed as Appendix on pages 275-276 infra.

[5th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“It cannot be disposed of in such an easy way. In the paper placed on the table of the House

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“On a point of order, Sir. Information has been asked of me about a death. I have given the result of an inquest held by a Magistrate, a First-class Magistrate, of the Division. I do not think we should proceed with a further enquiry now, reading from a village munsif's report.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister whether he can reconcile what he has read out with the entry in the village munsif's register regarding this death (a certified copy of which is available here) stating that the death was due to the beating by the Police at the police station?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“If the Leader of the Opposition examines closely what the extract referred to is, he will find that it is an extract, which is certified to be a true copy. That is number one. That it is a true copy, I do not deny. But true copy of what? It is a true copy of the entry which the village official makes in his register as soon as any death takes place and is reported to him, whether it is due to natural causes—cholera or small-pox—or anything. The family which is responsible to give the information goes to the village official and gives the information. The village munsif has no authority to change the information. He must write what is told him. It is of no use to compare that with a magisterial enquiry.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I draw the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to the fact that in the paper laid on the table of the House, it is written that the cause of death is not known? But the answer read by the Chief Minister was that death was due to natural causes whereas in the certified extract of the village munsif's report, it is stated that death was due to beating by the Police. I am asking the Chief Minister how he will be able to reconcile these various discrepancies and whether he believes that it is likely that a village munsif is capable of writing a report that the death was due to beating by the Police unless it was true.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I am sorry that my Friend is carrying on a discussion over a definite conclusion arrived at an inquest held by an Additional First-class Magistrate of the district. His proceedings I have placed on the table of this House. The proceedings are the proceedings of the First-class Joint Magistrate of the district. He says it was due to natural causes. The particular natural causes was not known and it makes no difference whatsoever. I wish he had read the proceedings and then put questions. I would ask him to read the whole of the proceedings.”

Recoveries of subsidies advanced under well subsidy schemes.

(c) if so, the action taken thereon?

" (c) The Collector's proposals are under consideration by Government."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Yes, Sir. I will go into the aspect of the question put by the hon. Member."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Yes, that is being considered in every district on representations made."

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMY :—“ సర్పిడి స్పీక్కుకొంద యివ్వవల
సిన యొక్క ములకుగాను యింకా అనేక కాయాకాలం యిచ్చవందన, యింకా ఎంత
తరలో ఎన్నో జరుగుతుందో ప్రభవ్యమువారు చెప్పగలరా ? ”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ ఈ కట్టించిన మొత్తాన్ని క్రమవ్రతువారు నిర్ణయించిన తేదీలోగా కట్టకపోయినందున, క్రమవ్రతువారు అధిముగా యెత్తున penalties విధిస్తున్నారా? ”

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—“ రాయలసీమలో గత మూడు సంవత్సరములునుంచి కమరు తెంటూ, ఈ సంవత్సరము కూడా కడులు తొప్పి, రాబట్టి, రైతులు ఎక్కువీ పావులు త్రగ్గించి పట్టవటానికి 1954 సంవత్సర అధివరకు, అనుమతి పాతా ? ”

JANAB KUNHI MUHAMED SHAFEE:—"Sir, will the Government consider the desirability of extending the concessions to the Malabar district?"

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“கேணிகள் வெட்டுவதற்காகக் கெடிகப் படுகிற தொகையில் எவ்வளவு பருதி உண்டாயிற் கேணிகள் வெட்டுகிறவர்களிடம் போய்ச் செலுகிறதென்பதை கமாம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்லுவார்களா?”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that in spite of the representations made by the agriculturists of Chingleput district that rains have failed and that the wells have not yielded enough water, even then the Revenue department officials are forcing the agriculturists to pay back the subsidies?"

Sri K. ARANGANATHAN :—“ பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்ட தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் தண்ணீர் காணப் பிறகாக இப்பொழுது மிகவும் அதிக ஆயுதமாகக் கிணறுகள் வெட்ட வேண்டியிருப்பதால், அங்கேயுள்ள மக்கள் அதிகமாகப் பணம் செலவு செய்து ஆயுதமாக கிணறுகளை வெட்ட வேண்டி இருப்பதால் அரசாங்கம் அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகமாக கிணறுகள் வெட்ட மானியம் கொடுக்குமா ? ”

[5th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I do not know whether it is allowed under the present rules. If any specific representation is made, the Government will examine that."

SRI KANDASAMI GOUNDER:—"கிணறுகளை மராமத்து செய்வதற்காக தக்காவி கடன் கொடுப்பார்களா வென்று வினியு மந்திரி அவர்களை நான் கேட்கிறேன்?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"கொடுத்தது கொண்டுதான் இருக்கிறார்கள்."

SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIAR:—"கிணறுகள் வெட்ட மானியம் கொடுக்கும்படி இதுவரை அடி ஆழம் தண்ணீர் கிணற்றில் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். கால நிலை ரியில்லாததினால் குறிப்பிட்ட அளவு ஆழம் கிணற்றில் தண்ணீர் இருப்பதில்லை. அப்படிப்பட்ட சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் மானியமாக வாங்கிய பணத்தை திருப்பித் தந்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதனால் வவச யிகளுக்கு ரொம்பவும் கஷ்டமாக இருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்ட சந்தர்ப்பங்களில் கொடுத்த மானியத்தை திருப்பிக் கேட்காதுக்கு ஏதாவது ஏற்பாடு செய்வார்களா என்று மந்திரியை நான் கேட்கிறேன்."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I am glad the hon. Member paraphrased the question of the hon. Member from Chingleput. I think that is a matter for consideration."

SRI S. RAMASWAMI NAIDU:—"Sir, will the Government consider the question of waiving the recovery if the well has been dug to the requisite depth as demanded by the rules?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"If the well is dug to the required depth, then no problem will arise."

Retrenchment in the Anamalais Plantation.

* 60 Q.—**SRI T. VISWANATHAM:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Government have received a representation from the Anamalais Plantation Workers' Union protesting against the retrenchment of workers in the Government Cinchona Plantations?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Yes, Sir. The petition has been referred to the Director, Cinchona department, whose reply is awaited."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"When was the petition received, Sir?" (Laughter.)

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"I do not have the information with me here. As soon as the report is received I will place it before the House."

[5th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister has enquired whether this is a long-standing matter and whether the department has been receiving several petitions from the Union for a very long time and may I ask whether the Hon. Minister would take immediate steps to get the information and do the needful?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Yes, Sir."

SRI A. M. RATNASWAMI:—"How many were retrenched in the Anamalais Plantations and what are the grounds on which the workers were retrenched?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"As soon as the report is received from the Director I will be able to give the information."

Assignment of tank beds to political sufferers in Guntur district.

* 61 Q.—**SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many tank beds were assigned to political sufferers in Guntur district;

(b) whether the Government have received any representations from the people of the areas concerned requesting for the cancellation of the orders in view of the difficulties caused by such assignment; and

(c) what steps the Government propose to take in such cases?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) The Government have no information regarding the exact number of tank-bed lands assigned to political sufferers, but about 60 cases of assignment of lands to political sufferers in the Guntur district involved assignment of tank-bed lands.

" (b) No representation has been received by the Government direct. In certain cases, representations have been received by the Collector for the cancellation of the assignments made.

" (c) In some cases, the objections were overruled, as the tanks were either silted up or as the extents left for use as 'Tank' were found to be sufficient. In certain cases, the Collector made personal inspection and as the tanks were found useful and well-maintained, the temporary grants previously made were cancelled. Some cases are pending in Civil Court. A few objection petitions are pending enquiry."

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—"గుంటూరు జిల్లా, తన్నాడు తాలూకాలో ఉన్న ట్యాంకులకు భూములను ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాజీయం వాటినిగా మార్చినందున, ఈ రాజీయం వాటినిగా మలచు వాటినిగూర్చి, సమాచారం?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Notice, Sir."

[5th November 1952]

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో, గుంటూరు కు మూడు మైళ్ళ దూరములో ఉన్న గోల్లమూడి గ్రామంలో గుంటూరు ఉత్పత్తిపట్టణ అయిదారుమైళ్ళ దూరమునందు ప్రజలు మంచి నీళ్ళకు ఉపయోగపడే చెరువు తవ్వారు నాగేశ్వరరావు మాజీ శాసనసభ్యుని, పొన్నూరులో అలాగే ఉపయోగపడే చెరువు తవ్వారు సుబ్బయ్య, అరుణా రావులనే మాజీ శాసనసభ్యులకు యిచ్చారు. ఈ విధంగా చెరువులు, కొరువులూ పూర్వీకాలను నేరగానే అక్రమవ్యక్తులకు అవలంబించాయి, యిటీవల కూడా జిల్లా కలెక్టరు పట్టాభివ్యుటం 2010-11. ఆయనవంటిది విద్యుత్తు బిల్లి తీసుకుపోతారా? అనే సాక్ష్యం.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“That question is also covered by the general answer, but for the specific question I am not in a position to give an answer.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అయ్యో, గుంటూరు తాలూకా తాడికొండ ఫిర్కా శాఖమూరు గ్రామములో ఒక పెద్ద చెరువులోని మంచి నీళ్ళ గ్రామములకు ఉపయోగపడుతూ ఉండగా యిందుకు ఇనుముగా, తెనాలి తాలూకా గుడివాడ శాఖరస్తుపైకలువంటి ఒక రాజీయ తాధితులకు పానుకు యిచ్చియిస్తుండవన, ఆయన అందులో చెట్లు వస్తేరాలను వెంచి గ్రామములకై వేసిక చెట్లును వాంకి ప్రయోజనం లేకుండా చేస్తూ అమ్ముకొని ధన వేరెంచుకొనడం, అటు నీరు లేకుండా చేయడం గ్రామ ప్రయోజనపు పాం తాను అనుభవించడం జరుగుతున్నది అనే విషయము నిజమేనా?”

11-10
a.m. **THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER** :—“If the hon. Member makes a representation in English and not in Telugu, I will go into the matter, Sir.”

SRI K. RANGA RAO :—“గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో నరసరావుపేటలోకూడా, నేడ వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు దున్నుకొనేటటువంటి భూములను వేలూరులోని రాజీయ తాధితులకు ఇస్తున్నారు. దీనిని వెంటనే ఆపివేసి నేడవారు వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు ఆ భూములలో వ్యవసాయము చేసుకొనుటకు అవకాశమిస్తారా తెలియ్యా దిరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“నాకు సరికా తెలియలేదు, చూస్తానంటే.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“If the tenants are cultivating abandoned tank-bed lands is there any objection to giving permanent pattas in their names?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“If the tanks are abandoned ones, I think there will be no objection to giving permanent pattas; but I am not sure of the position.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I heard the Hon. Minister saying to an hon. Member that if he made a representation in English and not in Telugu, then he would consider the matter. Does the Hon. Minister mean that hon. Members cannot make even representations in Telugu? I thought the difficulty was only in regard to supplementary questions.”

5th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“That was not my point, Sir. If the hon. Member makes a representation in English I would pay greater attention and personally go into the matter.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“Are the Government aware of the fact that grants are given to political sufferers of lands which are used only for purposes of thrashing floors thereby depriving a large number of agriculturists in the villages of their use?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“If the hon. Member brings any specific instance to my notice and if it is true, I will certainly cancel the grant, Sir.”

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM :—“Are the Government still continuing to give lands to political sufferers or have they stopped the policy of giving concessions once and for all?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“There is no top priority for giving lands to political sufferers as before. Now first priority is given to landless poor and then to political sufferers and ex-servicemen, etc. There is a particular order in regard to the grant of lands.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“ఈ రాజీయ తాధితులకు భూములు ఇచ్చే విషయములో తరస్థితులు వారి విషయించి ఎన్నో జోక్యాలు. ప్రభుత్వమునకు వచ్చి నప్పటికీ, ఇంకా ఏమీ శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోకుండా ప్రభుత్వము అలస్యము చేస్తున్నది. ఇలా కూరింకా కొడవూరు విషయము నాకు తెలుసును. ఎందుకు ఆ విధంగా ప్రభుత్వము అలస్యము చేస్తున్నారో మౌలికము నెలదియ్యగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The matter that the hon. Member has referred to is now under the active consideration of the Government.”

Model Agricultural Farms.

* 62 Q.—**SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS**: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to start model Agricultural Farms in each district?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“No.”

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—“Is it not desirable to have model farms for each district in order to educate the agriculturists in the new methods of agriculture and thus increase production?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“We are doing demonstrations in new methods and better methods of cultivation on ryots' own lands and it is felt that it is better to have Government farms called 'model farms'.”

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—“I want to know whether all the farms which have started working are working at a loss or profit.”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Registered model farms in each taluk were started some time ago during the

[5th November 1952]

grow more food campaign with the idea of educating intelligent agriculturists in the new methods of increasing production and to intensify grow more food campaign. About Rs. 250 was spent in each farm. But that has been abandoned now. Except for the above expenditure, the Government was not in any way concerned with the loss or profit of these model registered farms."

Food value of gruel.

* 63 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have sent a sample of milo and gruel given in the gruel centres to the Food Analyst of the Health Department for finding out its food value and its calorific effect?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The answer is in the negative."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"Sir, ప్రస్తుతము ఇస్తున్న మిలంట్ గ్రెల్ చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది. అదిగాక ఆ గ్రెల్ లో పిండివంశ చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల గ్రెల్ ని ఇంకా ఎక్కువ ఇస్తూ, గ్రెల్ లో పిండివంశ బాప్టింజుటోరకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నిస్తుందా? ఇంకా విషయము ఏమంటే, గ్రెల్ కేంద్రాలలో గ్రెల్ త్రాగేటటువంటివారు పనికూ చేయవలసియుండునని ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టికము తెలుస్తున్నది. కాని ఇప్పుడు ఇస్తున్న గ్రెల్ లో వారికి పని చేసే శక్తి కలుగును Health Department వారి అధికారమునున్నదా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The Government have passed orders for stiffening the gruel. They have also ordered that 'chatnis' should be given. As far as the nutritive value of the gruel is concerned, I understand that milo and other grains which are added on to the gruel (I do not remember them exactly) are more nutritive than rice."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఇప్పుడు ఇస్తున్న మిలంట్ ఈ గ్రెల్ దానికంటే అధికమయినా, ఈ గ్రెల్ లో ఉన్న nutrition value ఎక్కువ చేయడానికే రష్యా నుంచి వచ్చినట్లుగా భావించినా దీనిలో కలిపేటట్లు ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించినట్లు ప్రకటించి ఉండవచ్చు. ఈ విషయము ఏమేనా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The question as I understand, Sir, is whether the new Russian gift has been utilized in order to raise the nutritive value of the gruel that is now given. The answer is that the gruel now supplied is adequately nutritive and the gifts of the Russian friends as well as the gifts from other countries will be utilized whenever necessary. There is no particular point in suggesting that the Russian gift alone is particularly nutritive." (Laughter.)

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—"ఈ గ్రెల్ విషయము ఎన్ని నిర్ణయాలు ఎంత పిండి కలిపాలని ప్రభుత్వము వారు నిర్ణయించారు?"

5th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"There is a certain proportion. For every measure of milo, I think about one-fourth or half measure of pulses is added. I do not exactly remember the recipe."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"నేను అడిగిన ప్రశ్నను ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చాలా చమత్కారముగా సత్ప్రయోగానికి ప్రయత్నము చేశారు."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"చమత్కార ప్రశ్నకు చమత్కార బదులు."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"రష్యానుండిగాని, అమెరికానుండిగాని ఎక్కువ మంది వచ్చిన ధాన్యాన్ని అయినా పోనీ, గ్రెల్ లో nutrition value ఎక్కువ చేయడానికిగాను ఇందులో కలిపడానికి ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించినట్లు ప్రకటించి ఉండవచ్చు. ఇది నిజమే, ఈ వద్దటిని ఎన్నిచోట్ల, ఎక్కడెక్కడ ఉంచు జిల్లాలన్నారని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am grateful to the hon. Member for having added America to Russia now. It makes no difference. (Laughter.) Our own grain has all the nutritive value that is necessary and we are taking due steps in the matter on the advice of men who are competent to give advice."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN:—"May I know, Sir, how the Russian rice smells?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"According to the political texture of the person smelling it, Sir." (Laughter.)

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Joking apart, I want to put a serious question, Sir. Is the hon. Minister aware of the fact that when the Prime Minister of India visited Rayalaseema recently, the gruel supplied in the gruel centres was made sufficiently attractive so as to give the impression to the Prime Minister of India that the gruel supplied was good even though it was not really the case on other days?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"This is exactly an illustration of the question which if asked, rules require not to be put because it amounts to an 'insinuation'."

Development of the Port of Beypore.

* 64 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation relating to the development of the Port of Beypore on the West Coast; and

(b) whether the Government have under consideration any plan for the development of the Port of Beypore?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—" (a) Yes.

[5th November 1952]

"(b) The State Port Officer has submitted certain proposals for improvements to the Port. The Special Officer appointed by the Government of India has also made certain recommendations. These can be considered only after a hydrographic survey of the Port which is proposed to be taken up in the near future, has been completed."

11-20 P.M. SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"In view of the fact that Kozhikode, the only port for Malabar, is not very useful during the south-west monsoon, will the Government expedite the consideration of the matter?"

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—"As I already said, Sir, the matter is under consideration."

Disafforestation in Repalle taluk.

* 65 Q.—SRI V. SRI KRISHNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Government have received any application recently from the residents of Kothapalem, Repalle taluk of Guntur district, requesting the Government to disafforest an area of 800 acres in Block 2 of the Reserve Forest of the said village and assign the same for cultivation; and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Yes, Sir, the matter is under consideration."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"అక్కడ వంశంకోటి ఎకరాల భూమిని అరణ్యముగా ప్రకటనకు నిర్ణయించింది. కాని అది ఒక ముక్కనుండలేని భూమి రిజర్వ్, అలాంటిప్పుడు ఆ భూమిని సాగు చేయగలిగేటట్లు చేయడానికి ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, దాని ప్రక్కనే ఇర్రిగేషన్ canal ఒకటి ఉన్నది. దాన్ని ఉపయోగించుకొని 2 వేల ఎకరాల భూమిని సాగులోకి తీసుకొని రావచ్చుననే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము గమనించి దానిని చేపట్టడానికి సాగుకు ఇస్తారా?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Yes, Sir, the matter is being considered."

Rice content of the ration in Upland and Delta areas.

* 66 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how many ounces of rice are given per head per day in Fair Price shops in (1) Upland areas; (2) Delta areas of Krishna district; and

(b) if there is any disparity between the two areas, the reasons for it?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) Four ounces in Upland areas and eight ounces in Delta areas.

"(b) The population drawing ration from ration shops in the deltaic areas are mostly agriculturists or agricultural labourers connected with the production of paddy who are accustomed to consume rice as their main diet. But people

[5th November 1952]

in the Upland areas, where millets rather than rice is the important crop, are accustomed to take more of millets. In July 1951, when rice stocks were low it was ordered that the rice content of the ration should be reduced to four ounces, in the case of card-holders in the Upland areas of the surplus districts, while it should be retained at eight ounces for card-holders in the surplus areas, the balance to make up 12 ounces in both cases being given in the shape of wheat or milo. The same rice content of the ration is being continued even after decontrol."

SRI V. RAMA RAO:—"Upland areas లో కూడా కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో వేరుశనగ, కందులు కొద్దిగా ఉంటాయి. అలాగే కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో కూడా వరి పండించి పరిధావ్యము అనుభవించవచ్చును. ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో కూడా వరి పండించి పరిధావ్యము అనుభవించవచ్చును. కనుక అలాంటి వారికి కూడా వేరుశనగ, కందులు ఇచ్చినట్లే 8 పౌండ్ల రేషన్ ఇవ్వబడుతుందా?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Notice, Sir."

Opening of a Rural Dispensary at Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk.

* 67 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the action taken on a petition to start a Rural Dispensary at Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk, Cuddapah district, submitted by the M.L.A., Rajampet, some time back?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"The President, District Board, Cuddapah, has been asked to consider the question of opening a non-subsidized rural dispensary at Obilivaripalli in Rajampet taluk."

High Level Canal of Tungabhadra.

* 68 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether this Government have recommended to the Central Government about the inclusion of the scheme of High Level Canal of Tungabhadra in the five-year plan and when;

(b) if so, whether any reply has been received either from the Union Government, Delhi, or the Planning Commission; and

(c) what is the probable estimated cost of the said scheme?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—" (a) The Planning Commission was requested in December 1951 to include this scheme in the Supplementary Five-Year Plan.

"(b) No final reply has been received.

"(c) Rupees nine crores."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"High Level Canal ఎక్కడ ఉంటుంది? ఎక్కడ ఉంటుంది?"

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—"The latest figures are that it would irrigate about two lakhs of acres."

[5th November 1952]

SRI N. MAHALINGAM:—“Is the work on the High Level Channel in Mettur proceeding, Sir?”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister is aware that the original design was that it would irrigate about 6 lakhs of acres?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“There are so many plans and estimates prepared on different occasions. I do not know to what plan or estimate the hon. Member is referring.”

Coconut research station at Chowghat.

* 69 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to establish a coconut research station at Chowghat or anywhere else in Malabar; and

(b) if so, the stage where it stands now?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“(a) There is no proposal at present to establish a coconut research station at Chowghat or anywhere else in Malabar.

“(b) The question does not arise.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—“As coconut is a very important commercial crop earning dollars for this country, will the Government consider establishing such a farm in Malabar?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“That coconut is a very important commercial crop is well-known and is realized by the Government. There are two research stations in Nileshwar and another is maintained by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Immediately there is no proposal to start another farm in Malabar.”

Appointment of clerks in the Co-operative Weavers' Societies.

* 70 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Co-operative Weavers' Societies are asked to adopt a model by-law whereby the sanction and appointment of clerks in these societies requires the prior approval of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies; and

(b) whether societies of handloom weavers which delay in adopting or refuse to adopt the by-law in clause (a) are penalised or victimised?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—“(a) The answer is in the negative.

“(b) Does not arise.”

[5th November 1952]

Exemption of “Delahaye Mobile” vans from Motor Vehicles Taxation.

* 71 Q.—SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether the Delahaye Mobile motion picture vehicles belonging to American Consulate-General at Madras are exempted from payment of motor vehicles tax?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Yes, the vehicles of the American Consulate-General have been exempted.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—“Was this exemption given as per any direction or instruction from the Central Government or was it due to any request from the American Consulate-General?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Sir, two factors are considered in giving exemption. Firstly, they must be purely educational and cultural in nature. Secondly, the foreign Consulates must give similar privileges to our vehicles in America. If these two conditions are satisfied, we give exemption.”

New Thermal Station at Kadiri.

* 72 Q.—SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the survey for the construction of a Thermal Station at Kadiri in Anantapur district has been finished; and

(b) if so, why it has not been taken up for execution?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The scheme is under the consideration of the Government.”

SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI:—“Is it not necessary that the Government should take up immediately the execution of irrigation and electrical schemes in Rayalaseema as soon as they are ready, in order to keep the area away from the periodical famines to which it is exposed?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“Immediate steps are necessary in all parts of the State, Sir.”

Lockout in Malabar Mampuram Tile and Clay Works.

* 73 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether the Government have received any representation regarding the lockout in Mampuram Tile and Clay Works in Malabar and if so what action has been taken?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“A representation was received from the Mampuram Tile and Clay Works Labour

[5th November 1952]

Union, Munniyur (South Malabar) regarding the matter. The question was examined and the union was informed that the Government cannot do anything as the factory has been closed owing to heavy losses incurred by the management. The union was also asked to advise the workers to seek remedy from the Labour Appellate Tribunal at Bombay under section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950, as an appeal is pending before that Tribunal."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"Will it not be advisable for the Government to advise the management to pay unemployment salaries to the workers since the case is before the Appellate Tribunal?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"Sir, it was agreed that the management should pay at the rate of Rs. 25 per mensem from the date of the Interim Order of Stay until disposal of the appeal irrespective of the results. Later, owing to losses the management refused to pay this. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, we cannot prevent any management from closing down the factory for want of funds."

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Government were satisfied with the financial position of the company and did they conduct any enquiry or did they depend upon merely the representation of the management?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"No, Sir. Our Labour Officers made enquiries and were satisfied that the management closed down the factory for want of funds."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Can any management close down the factory when there is an appeal pending before the Tribunal under the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act? If it is so, is it not an illegal lock-out and if so, what is the action the Government propose to take?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"The hon. Member is right that non-implementation of ordinary provisions of the law is wrong. But, whenever the lock-out is done for want of funds, the only remedy is an appeal to the Appellate Tribunal before which this case is pending."

Executive officers of village panchayats.

* 74 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is an approved list of trained executive officers of village panchayats; and

(b) if so, why, when and by whom that list was prepared?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—" (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

[5th November 1952]

"(b) A waiting list of trained candidates for appointment as Executive Officers of panchayats is maintained in order to fill up the vacancies occurring in the service of Executive Officers.

"When the applications are received from candidates for appointment as Executive Officers, suitable candidates are selected by Government or by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards and deputed for Executive Officers' training except in the case of employees of local bodies. On the completion of training the names of candidates are included in the waiting list.

"The Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards prepares and maintains the list."

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—TRANSLATION OF SPEECHES IN THE ASSEMBLY.

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of 11-30 information. In order to facilitate hon. Members from the a.m. different regional areas in the State to follow the discussions in our Assembly . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member cannot suddenly rise at Question hour to make a new suggestion. If he wants to say anything, he may put it in writing, and then I will consider. Is it a point of order that he wants to raise?"

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"It is nothing but a point of information. You allowed me to ask for the information and I am asking, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"What is it that the hon. Member wants to ask?"

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"Nothing but that I want to have some information, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"But he seems to be reading something."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"No, Sir. In order to facilitate the Members from different parts of the State to follow the discussions and the deliberations of this Assembly, so that they can discharge their duties properly and promptly by their electorates, may I request the Government and the hon. Speaker to do justice to all by providing a modern apparatus such as is used in all international gatherings by which speeches can be simultaneously translated in all the languages for the benefit of the legislators, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. the Chief Minister would like to say something on the matter."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I do not want to enter into a discussion. I do not think that we can dispose of a matter like that in this manner."

[5th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I submit that it is not merely for disposal? We want Government to consider it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Government will be delighted to do everything if money were available. A machine won't translate, and so we must have translators. The machine may be modern, but the price will not be moderate." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"As regards the question of providing translators, I may submit we have got reporters for the regional languages here; but there is some difficulty felt with regard to Malayalam speeches. I understand a Malayalam reporter is not available here; I can quite understand if he is absent for a day or two; but if it is a question of there being no Malayalam reporter at all, may I ask the Government to make immediate arrangements to provide Malayalam reporters, as otherwise it will be doing great injustice to the Malayalam Members of this House?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"For the present, one of our English reporters who knows Malayalam is taking down the Malayalam speeches."

Sri P. Venkateswarlu rose in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Whatever the hon. Member wants to say, let him first put it in writing and send it on to me, and then I shall allow him to have his say."

"We now proceed to the next item, the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill."

III.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

(1) THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952—cont.

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"అధ్యక్షా, తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలుదారుల, పాల్వేర్ల రక్షణార్థం ఒక అర్జీ నెన్నను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ప్యాను చేసి, దానిని కాపనంగా మార్చుకున్నాడు. ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొనివచ్చినందుకు నాకు సంతోషంగానే ఉన్నది. అయితప్పటికీ ఇట్టి కాపనాన్ని ఆంధ్ర దేశంలోని కొలుదార్లకూడా వర్తింపజేయక సోషల్ కోఆర్డినేషన్ అథారిటీని కలిగించినది. తంజావూరు అర్జీ నెన్నను చూడగానే ఆంధ్ర దేశంలోని కొలుదారులకూడా తమ రక్షణకుగాను అట్టి బిల్లు తీసుకువచ్చి ఆంధ్ర కాదు. కాని ఎందువల్లనో ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని రైతులకు కూడా తగినంత శ్రద్ధ చూపలేదు. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో పరిస్థితులు ఎక్కువగా రాష్ట్రంలోని ఇతర జిల్లాల పరిస్థితులకూడా అవిభేదంగా ఉన్నాయి. అన్ని చోట్ల ఖాస్వాములు కొలుదారులను ఇబ్బందులపాలు చేస్తున్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా తంజావూరు అర్జీ నెన్నను వచ్చిన తరువాత ఖాస్వాములు ఇంకను దౌర్జన్యంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నారు. అనేకమంది ఆహారక రైతులను ఖాస్వాములు ఖాములనుంచి తొలగించి వేస్తున్నట్లుగా మారు అర్జీలు వస్తున్నాయి. కొలుదారుల హక్కులను కాపాడే కాపనాన్ని రాష్ట్రమంతటకు వర్తింపజేయగా చేయకపోయినట్లయితే ఎంతోమంది రైతులు ఖాములనుంచి తొలగించబడే అవకాశం కలుగుతుంది. ఖాస్వాములు ఈనాడు రైతులవద్దనుంచి సహజంగానే

[5th November 1952] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

కొమ్మ భాగాన్ని వసూలు చేసుకుంటున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వం చూచి, రెండవ పంటలో కూడా వారు కొమ్మ తీసుకుంటున్నారు. రైతుకు వ్యవసాయ పెట్టుబడులైనను గిట్టుకాదు కావడం లేదు. ఇక వేరు వ్యవసాయం చేసే కనీసం పశువులను మేతగా గడ్డి నైవా మిగిల్చుకొనిపోవడం చేసే వారిని అనేకమంది రైతులు నిస్సహాయం చేస్తున్నారు. ఖాస్వాముల ఆధిపత్యం రైతులకు పీడింపజేస్తుంది. ఇట్టి పరిస్థితులలో ఆరాచక పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడక తప్పదని గుర్తించ గోరాను. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో మిరాసీ విభాగం ఉన్నట్లుగానే ఆంధ్ర దేశంలో రైతావీ విభాగం అయిపో ఉన్నది. అనేక ఖాస్వాములు తమ ఖాములను కొలుకిచ్చి ఇతర తిరిగివచ్చిన కొలుదారులను అంతకాకుండా ఎందరు, వేల ఎకరాల ఖామిగల ఖాస్వాములు కొలుదారులను చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పెడుతున్నారు.

"ఈ ఖాస్వాములతోబాటు ఈనాడు దేవుళ్లకూడా ఖాస్వాములుగా తయారయ్యారు. ఉదాహరణకు కొన్ని విషయాల గురించి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ జిల్లాలోని రేపల్లె తాలూకాలో మట్లపూడి అనే గ్రామం వున్నది. ఆ గ్రామంలోని 70 ఎకరముల ఖామి క్రిష్ణా జిల్లా బందరులో వున్న దేవునికి చెందివున్నది. ఆ ఖామి ఎంతోకాలంగా రైతులు ఎకరానికి ఒక రూపాయ ఇస్తు వెళ్లిస్తూ వ్యవసాయం చేస్తున్నారు. ఆ రైతులు దాదాపు వంశపారంభ్యంగా ఈ ఖామిని దున్ను కొనుక్కు ఈనాడు ఆ ఖామి వ్యవసాయానికిగాను పాటపెట్టబడి ఇతరులకు ఇవ్వబడుతుంది. ఇంతకాలం ముందు 70 రూపాయలు ఇస్తు వెళ్లితే ఖామికి ఈనాడు పోటీపెట్టి 3,500 రూపాయలకు, స్వంత పొలం నాలుగైదువందల రుకరాలంతే వున్నదే సాగుచేసుకోలేక పాటపెట్టిన గ్రామకరణంగారు ఎరొక ఖాస్వామి పాటపాడారు. ఈనాడు రైతులవద్దనుంచి ఇంత కొమ్మ మిగిల్చి వసూలు చేయక తప్పని బంధు దేవులు వెళ్ళిపోతే ఏమో తెలియదు.

"అదేవిధంగా పొన్నూరు దేవుడు భావనారాయణస్వామి వద్దకొండు వందల ఎకరాలగల పెద్ద ఖాస్వామి. ఈ ఖాములలో కొన్ని ఇదివరలో బంజరులుగా ఉండేవి. ఎంతోకాలంగా కష్టించి కొందరు రైతులు వాటిని సాగుచేసికొని వెళ్ళారు. ఇంతకాలంగా కొద్దిమాత్రపు ఇస్తు వెళ్లించినారు. ఆ ఖాములను సాగుచేసుకొని వెళ్ళారు. కాని ఈసాగు ధర్మకర్తలు పోటీపెట్టి దివాజిల్లు కట్టివేసికొని బహిరంగంగా పోటీపెట్టి పాటపాడిస్తున్నారు. పాట పెంచారు. ఈ విధంగా దేశాలయే ఖాములను ఎంతోకాలంగా సాగుచేస్తున్న రైతులను ధర్మకర్తలు తొలగించివేస్తున్నారు.

"అదేవిధంగా ఖమ్మ తాలూకా, జూపూడి గ్రామంలోవున్న రోమక రాధిక మిశ్రా తిరుమలమూడూ స్థానికంగా ఉండి కాళికొలను, పోలెన పెంజులకు పోటీ పెట్టి తిరుమల ఉన్న 110 ఎకరముల ఖామిని ఇదివరలో సాగుచేస్తున్న జిల్లా రైతులకు తొలగించి వేసారు. పోలెను శాఖవారుకూడా ఆయనకే సహాయపడ్డారు. రైతులను ఈ విధంగా ఖాస్వాములు ఇబ్బందులపాలు చేస్తూఉంటే ప్రభుత్వంవారు దీనిని తీసికొని తీర్మానం పెట్టుకున్నా సహాయపడుటలేదు.

"ఈ ఖాస్వామి తాలూకాలోని అంతటా గ్రామంలోవున్న రైతులు, ఖాముల వంశాల పోలెముల ఖామిని సాగుచేస్తున్న ఖాస్వామిలేని వ్యవసాయ మేలేలు చిరకాలంగా కొలుకుచేసుకుంటుంటే వారిని తొలగించేందుకు ఆ ఖామికి ఖాములకు ఇబ్బంది ఎక్కువగా తేనాటిలో పీడించు స్వల్ప చేసుకుంటూ దున్ను సహాయంకోసం

[Sri V. Sri Krishna] [5th November 1952]

అసామికి అండబెట్టి పోలికు సిబ్బందిని పంపింది ప్రభుత్వం. ఈ విషయాన్ని గమనించినట్లయితే ఈ ప్రభుత్వం భూస్వాముల ప్రభుత్వంగా లేక కార్మిక, కర్షకుల ప్రభుత్వంగా చెలిపోతుంది.

“అదేవిధంగా రేపల్లె తాలూకా, అడవులదీవి గ్రామ కరణంగారి నివయం చూడాలి. ఆ కరణంగారికి ఏడు వందల ఎకరముల భూమి ఆయన తక్కువగానికి 600 ఎకరముల భూమి ఉన్నది. ఈనాడు వారు ఈ భూములనుండి ఇదివరలో పాగు చేస్తున్న రైతులను తొలగించివేసి స్వంత వ్యవసాయంచేయ ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు. అందుకుగానూ 14 జతల దున్న పాతులనుకూడా కొంటున్నారని వినిపింది.

“ఇటువంటి విషయాలను ఎన్నింటినైనా వివరించవచ్చు. కొలదారులకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వడం ఈ ప్రభుత్వం యొక్క ఉద్దేశమైనట్లయితే వారు తంజావూరు ఆర్టికెల్స్ లో అంగీకరించిన సూత్రాలను ఇతర జిల్లాలకుకూడా వర్తింపజేయాలి. లేనిచో అనేక మంది అమాయకులైన రైతులను భూస్వాములు బలవంతంగా భూములనుంచి తొలగించి వేస్తారు. ఈ కమిషన్ ను సకలమంగానూ, సకాలంలోనూ పరిష్కరించవలసిన ప్రభుత్వం వారిని కోరుతున్నాను. రాష్ట్రంలో వివిధ ప్రాంతాల్లో విభిన్న తాసంబంధాలున్న కారణంగా ఒక సమగ్రమైన బిల్లును తయారుచేసేదిమితమే ప్రతిపక్ష నాయకులు ఒక select committee ని ఏర్పాటుచేయవలసినిదిగా కోరి ఉన్నాను. వారి ప్రతిపాదనను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

11-40
a.m.

* **SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY**:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting the Bill before the House I wish to observe that though it is intended exclusively for the benefit of agricultural tenants and farm labourers of Tanjore district. I as a representative of a district other than Tanjore, namely, South Kanara, am impelled to say a few words in view of the importance and significance of the Bill as a step towards the agrarian reforms in this State. I may be permitted to say that the present Bill is long overdue. I am however glad that at least the present Government under the leadership of one of the greatest statesmen of our country, the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachariyar, has brought forward this Bill which has really brought hope and happiness to a large section of the peasantry of our State. It has really created a sort of joy in the minds and kindled a ray of hope in the hearts of millions of peasants of the State. As I have already submitted, though the Bill is intended to deal with conditions in the district of Tanjore, there is a clause in the Bill which provides that the provisions of the Bill may be extended by notification to other areas in the State. When there is such a provision in the Bill and when there is a great demand by the people for a Bill similar to the one which we are now discussing on the floor of the House, I do not see any reason why the Government should hesitate and delay the extension of the provisions of the Bill to other parts of the State. No doubt, Sir, there may be some practical difficulties in extending the provisions of the Bill to the entire State. It may not be possible nor practicable to apply all the provisions of the Bill to the entire State; for example, the provisions of clause 8 of the Bill concerning the rate of rent cannot apply to other districts because the rate of rent varies from district to district. But there are other provisions of the Bill like the provisions with

[Sri Y. Manjaya Shetty] 5th November 1952]

regard to the eviction of tenants, which can be conveniently applied to all the districts of the State without any exception. In this connection, I can safely say that except clauses 8, 11 and 12 of the Bill all other clauses may be applied to the entire State without any difficulty but of course with such minor amendments as may be necessary. In the district of South Kanara from which I come, there is a growing feeling among the people, especially among the peasants that the Government has done nothing to redress their grievances in spite of their long-standing demand and agitation. They want a tenancy legislation which aims at fixation of fair rent and which grants security of tenure. Though various responsible organizations of South Kanara district and also Members coming from that district have been agitating for a legislation to prevent the eviction of tenants, I am sorry to state that the Government has not taken any step in that direction. I understand, Sir, recently that no less a person than the President of the Karnataka Provincial Congress Committee, Sri Nijalingappa, has met our Chief Minister and represented to him about the urgent necessity of bringing forward a legislation for preventing eviction of tenants in South Kanara district. I understand from the press that the Hon. the Chief Minister was kind enough to consider his request. To a question put by me in the last session of the Assembly calling for information about the number of eviction suits pending in the various courts of South Kanara, the Hon. Minister for Revenue was kind enough to state that it was about 1,000. Out of this huge number, I would submit that about 50 per cent represents suits filed against tenants who have no arrears of rental to pay. These suits are filed by the landholders either to harass the tenants or to know down the valuable improvements effected by them or to make the tenants pay higher rates of rental. Such being the state of affairs, I would appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister as well as to the Hon. the Minister for Revenue to apply such of the provisions of the Bill as apply to eviction of tenants to the district of South Kanara and thus save the several thousands of families who are suffering untold hardships for want of such a legislation.

“Sir, the Bill, as it is, seems to be defective only in one sense. The Bill confers security of tenure only for a period of five years. According to the Bill, at the end of the fourth year the landholder or mirasdar can issue notice of eviction to the tenant and ask him to vacate the land in his possession at the end of the fifth year. My submission is that the general trend of opinion is in favour of granting security of tenure for tenants for all time to come provided they pay rent promptly and regularly as fixed by the Government and provided the lands held by tenants are not necessary for the personal use of either the landlord or any of his family members. The period of five years, as fixed in the Bill, is too short and I feel there would not be any love, enthusiasm or incentive for the tenants to grow more food or to improve land because they are not sure of their position after the lapse of five years. Under these circumstances, I would request the Government to make necessary amendments in the Bill so that there may

11-50
a.m.

[Sri Y. Manjaya Shetty] [5th November 1952]

be security of tenure for tenants for all time to come. With these observations and with a personal request to the Hon. Minister for Revenue to apply the provisions of the Bill at least with regard to eviction of tenants, to South Kanara district, I support the Bill. Thank you, Sir."

* SRM G. C. KONDAYYA :—“అధ్యక్షా, తంజావూరు అర్థి నెస్సు లెట్టుకు
మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు ముఖ్యంగా వ్యవసాయ కూలీలలో ముఖ్యమైన యీ కొలుదార్ల
విషయం ప్రస్తావించాల్సివుంది ఆ బిల్లును వొక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే
యివ్వడం వర్తింపజేయాలి అర్థిగావలసి వేదు. ఎందుచేతనంటే యీ తంజావూరు
జిల్లాలో ఉన్న మిరాసీదార్లందరు కొలుదార్లను యే విధంగా బాధించి యిచ్చింది తెట్టు
కున్నారో ఆ విధంగానే దేశమంతటను అనగా మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రముంతటను భూస్వా
ములు మిరాసీదార్లు మొదలగువారందరు యీ కొలుదార్లను యీ అర్థి నెస్సు వచ్చిన
తర్వాత బాధలు పెట్టుట కారంభించినారు. ముఖ్యంగా యీ తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో
అర్థి నెస్సువచ్చిన తర్వాత కొలుదార్ల రక్షణగల్గటానికి భూస్వాములయొక్క యు
కొలుదార్లయొక్కయ హక్కులను కాపాడుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఈ అర్థి నెస్సును
తెచ్చియున్నారు అన్ని ప్రదేశాలలో అనగా అంద్ర జిల్లాలో దాదాపు డెల్టా
విరియాలలోగాకుండా నాకొ డెల్టా విరియాలలోగాక యీ భూస్వాముల విధానంలో
కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణవచ్చే తాగుంటుందని నా అభిప్రాయము కాని తంజావూరు
జిల్లాలో యీ అర్థి నెస్సును అమలు జరిపే తర్వాత అక్కడి కరిస్థీకులను గమనించి
యీ బిల్లును ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రవేశపెట్టినపుడు ప్రభుత్వ విధానం యేమిటో తెలు
కొనవలసివచ్చును. కొలుదార్లకు మిరాసీదార్ల వీలసంస్కరణ ౧౮౮౦ క్కాలములు
అగువరకు ప్రభుత్వమువారి తెలివిలేదులు ౧౮౮౫వేడు. ఈ అర్థి నెస్సు యితర జిల్లా
లకుగూడ వర్తింపజేస్తారని భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లకు దొర్లనవ్వకుండా తోలించుటకు
ప్రయత్నాలు జరుగుచున్నది. అందువల్ల యీ బిల్లును కొలుదార్ల రక్షణకొరకుగాను
దేశమంతటను పెట్టుకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరుకు మాత్రమే పెట్టుటం అర్థిలేని
వాదము ఎందుచేతనంటే యీ కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణ గల్గటకు యీ భూస్వామ్య
విధానము రాష్ట్రంలో అమలువుచున్నది కాన రాష్ట్రమువంతటను వర్తింపజేయుట
ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. అంతేగాక యీ బిల్లులోని కరిస్థీకులు దూచినపుడు కేవలం
అంధజాతికి వర్తింపజేయకపోవటం చూస్తే కాలయోచన జేయుట కేవలం నేనధి
ప్రాయపడుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలోనే వోకమాట చెప్పవలెను. రాష్ట్రంలో
కొలుదార్లు భూస్వాములకు వంటలో కొన్ని చోట్ల వాలుయివున్నది. కాని అంధ
దేశంలో కొలుదార్లు భూస్వాములకు సగానికి సగంగాని యంకా జాస్తిగాగాని
యివ్వన్నారు. మా ప్రాంతాలలో సగానికి సగంపాలు ఇంటున్నది. అందువల్ల
రాష్ట్రముంతా యీ బిల్లును అనువర్తింపజేసినపుడు కొలుదార్లకు భూస్వాములకు ౧౦
హక్కులను పూర్తిగా అలాచించవలసివచ్చును. కొలుదార్లు భూస్వాముల కివ్వవలసిన
పాళ్లు యేయే జిల్లాలో యింతేత యిస్తున్నారో గమనించవలసియున్నది. కొన్ని చోట్ల
సగానికి సగంతుంటే మరికొన్ని చోట్ల కొలుదార్లకు మూడువంతులు భూస్వాములకు
నాలుగువంతులు, పుంతేలు పుంతును వంతుకుంటున్నారు. రాష్ట్రముంతటను యీ బిల్లు
అమలజరిపే విషయంలో యేయే జిల్లాలో యేయే కరిస్థీకులున్నారో అలాచించి కొలు
దార్లకు న్యాయమైన హక్కులు అనగా భూస్వాములకు రెండు వంతులు, కొలుదార్లకు
మూడువంతులు ఇవ్వవలసిగానే రాష్ట్రముంతటను కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణ కల్గించు బిల్లును
ప్రభుత్వం లేవాలి నా అభిప్రాయము. అప్పుడే కొలుదార్లకు న్యాయం కలుగును.
ఈ విషయంలో యీ బిల్లుకు యంకా కొన్ని చ్చాణాలు చేర్చవలసియున్నది. ౧౯౧౫-౧౬

5th November 1952] [Sri G. C. Kondayya]

యములన్నియు పరిష్కరించుటకుగాను సభ్యులు సూచించియుండిన కమిటీలో రివిన్యూ ఆఫీసియల్స్ వేకే. సక్రమమార్గాన యీ బిల్లు తేగలరని నే సభివాయ పడుచు న్నాను.

“తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో యీ ఆర్థి నెన్ను పెట్టుకొనే యీ స్వాములు స్వంతమతా లను ప్రారంభించి కొలుదార్లను తొలగించి, భూములను స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని ప్రభుత్వం వారు కొలుదార్లకు యేకా కీర్తి హక్కులను అదనంగా కలుగజేస్తారను ఖచ్చితమో అర్థితమవేరే మిక్కుటగాలేకుండా భూములను భార్యలవేర్లతోను తక్కువ ఇతర బంధువులవేర్లతోను విక్రయములుచేసి ప్రభుత్వం లేవలచు బిల్లునుండి తప్పించుకొనజాచు చున్నారు. కొలుదార్లు భూములను కొలకు తీసుకొని అనేక సంవత్సరములుగా అనుభవించుచున్నారు. ఎన్నో సంవత్సరాలుగా కొలు అనుభవించుచున్నటువంటి యీ కొలుదార్లను దౌర్జన్యంగా తొలగించుట అనేది అన్యాయమని ప్రభుత్వవారిని గమనించ గోరుచున్నాను. అనేకులగు భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లకు కొలునామాలుగాని యే యితర పుత్రులుగాని వ్రాసియివ్వకుంటూ, కొలుదార్లకు హక్కు యేర్పడాలదను దురు ద్దేశముతో ఓరలేగా భూములను కొలకు చేయించుకొనుచున్నారు. ఎంతోకాలము నుండి కొలువున్న కొలుదార్లునుగాని, కొలువున్న లేకున్న అనుభవించుచు, కొలచేయ చున్న కొలుదార్లను దౌర్జన్యంగా తొలగించుటమనేది చాల అన్యాయము. అందువల్ల యీ భూస్వాములకు కొలుదార్లకు సరియైన హక్కులు యేర్పడుటకు అవసరమైన క్లాజులు యీ బిల్లులో చేర్చబడియున్నది. భూస్వాములు సరియైన హక్కులు కొలు దార్లకు యీయకూడదని ఖచ్చితపడుచున్నారు. వీరు తమ భూములను కొలుదార్లకు విడిచి యేయే దేశాలలో వెళ్లియున్నారు. ఈ ఆర్థి నెన్ను భయానక యిప్పుడు తిరిగి వచ్చి భూములను స్వాధీనంచేసుకొనుచున్నారు. కొలుదార్లకు చాల అన్యాయం జరుగుచున్నది. ఇదివరలో భూస్వాములు యేరువులుగూడా కొలుదార్లకు యిచ్చు చుండెడివారు. ఇప్పుడు ఆ ప్రకారం ఎరువులు యిచ్చుట మానివేయుచున్నారు. భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను పెట్టు బాధలు అనేకములున్నవి. భూమిలేని కారణం చేత కొలుదార్లు అన్యాయంపొందుచున్నారు. భూస్వాముల అన్యాయ స్వాధీనాలవల్ల కొలుదార్లు నష్టపోకుండా రక్షణ యివ్వవలసియున్నది. కేవలం తంజావూరు జిల్లా లోనికాక రాష్ట్రమంతటను యేర్పాటుచేయుటకు కోరుచున్నాను ప్రత్యేకంగా నాకే నెలెక్టు కమిటీని వేసి అవసరకారణాంతరముచేయకుండా ఈ బిల్లును ఆమలుపరచ వలెయిదని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* SRI C. MUTHIAH PILLAI :—“கனம் சபா நாயகர் அவர்களே, 12 noon.
தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிலே பல பகுதிகளில் ‘எலிக்ஷன்’ இல்லையென்று
கருதப்பட்டு, கன்வல்லியெஷன் கோர்ட்டில் அதிக கேஸ்கள் இல்லாததனால்
இப்பொழுது அவசரமாகச் செய்யவேண்டியதில்லையென்று சிலர் நினைக்கிறா
ர்கள். இந்த அவசரக் சட்டமானது இரண்டு மாதங்களுக்கு முன்பு வந்திருந்
தால் மொத்தம் எவ்வளவு நபர்களுக்கு எலிக்ஷன் ஆய்நுக்கிறது என்பது
புரியும். ஜலம் வந்து சாகுபடி ஆரம்பித்த இரண்டு மாத காலத்திற்குப்
பின்பு அதற்குள் மத்தியதர பட்டாதார்கள், வரையில் அவர்கள் சமரச
மாகத் தீர்த்துக்கொண்டதால் கன்வல்லியெஷன் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அதிகமாகக்
கேஸ்கள் வரவில்லை. அப்படியிருந்தும் என் தொகுதியாகிய சீர்காழியில்
750 கேஸ்கள் தாவா செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. 750 கேஸ்களில் 550
நபர்கள் வரையில் திரும்ப நிலத்தைப் பெற்றிருக்கின்றனர். இந்த 550
நபர்களும் குறைந்த பட்சம் 1,500 ஏக்கரா வரையில் இரண்டு மாதங்களைச்
சாகுபடி செய்யமுடியாமல் நிலங்கள் தரிசாகக் கிடந்தனவென்பது தெரிய
வரும். கீழ்க்கண்டவர்களுக்கு தக்கதெடுத்ததில் நிலம் கிடைத்திருந்தால் சாகுபடி
ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கலாம். விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஐந்து வருஷ உறுதி அளித்
திருப்பதற்கு அதிக ஆதரவு இருப்பதனால் இந்த சட்டத்தை நான்
மனம் பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.

[Sri C. Muthiah Pillai] [5th November 1952]

மேலும், இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு சில ரயத்துக்களுடைய மனப் பாண்மை எப்படியிருக்கிறதென்பதை நான் கொஞ்சம் விளக்கிக் கூற ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு மிராசதாரர்கள் சில சில சூழ்ச்சிகளைச் செய்து இருந்து ஆண்டுகளாக இருந்த கடனை வசூலிக்க முயற்சி செய்கிறார்கள். பரம்பரைப் பழக்கம் என்னவென்றால் பழைய கடன்களை ஒவ்வொரு வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பு அவ்வப்போது கொடுத்ததாக எழுதி வாங்கிவருவதுதான் வழக்கம். அதேபோல அவர்களுக்கு பிடிக்காத விவசாயிகளை கடன் பாக்கி கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லி கோர்ட்டில் கேஸ்கள் தாபா செய்து அதன்மூலம் அவர்களை நிலத்திலிருந்து நீக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்கிறார்கள். இதற்காக எனக்குத் தோன்றக்கூடியது என்னவென்றால், குறைந்த பட்சம் மாயவரம் அக்ரிமெண்ட் செய்துகொண்ட காலத்திற்கு முன்பு உள்ள கடனை தள்ளும்படி செய்யவேண்டுமாய்க் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இதை கவனிக்காவிடில் வருகிற அறுவடை காலத்தில் அதிக கிளர்ச்சி ஏற்படக்கூடும் என்பதை நான் வற்புறுத்திக்கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.)

“மேலும் விவசாயிகள் குடியிருக்கும் மனைக்கட்டுகளை பரம்பரையாக அனுபவித்து வரக்கிறார்கள். அதில் தென்னை முதலான பலன் தரக்கூடியவைகளை வளர்த்து அதில் கிடைக்கும் சொற்ப லாபத்தையும் அடைந்து வருகிறார்கள். இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு அதற்குப் பகுதி கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென நினைப்பதன் செய்ய ஆரம்பித்திருப்பது பல இடைஞ்சல்களைத் தருவது. ஆதலால் விவசாயிகள் குடியிருக்கும் இடத்திற்கு மட்டும் பகுதியில்லாமல் குடியிருக்கவும், ஆதாயத்தையும் அடையவேண்டுமெனச் செய்ய வற்புறுத்திக்கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதாவது பரம்பரையாக இனமாக அனுபவித்து வந்த பஞ்சை நிலங்களுக்கு பகுதி வசூல் செய்யாமல் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று சட்டத்தில் வற்புறுத்தவேண்டும்.

இப்பொழுது வாரச் சாகுபடியாளருக்கு நாற்பது வாரம் அதாவது 2/5 பங்கு என குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதில் அவர்கள் விதை சாகுபடி சிலவு, எருவிடுதல், வாய்க்கால் வெட்டுதல், நிலத்தைச் சீர்திருத்தல் இவைகளைச் சேர்க்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. நடைமுறையில் ஒரு நாள் 3-1/3 ஏக்கர்தான் சாகுபடி செய்யமுடிகிறது. அதாவது குருவை இருபோகமும் சம்பாவும் சேர்த்து சாகுபடி செய்தால் நூறு கலத்திற்குமேல் 120 கலத்திற்குமேல் விளைவு கிடைக்கிறது. இதற்கு அவர்கள் வரும் பூராவும் கவனிக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அவர்களின் பங்கு ஏன் தாலுக்காவில் நாற்பது கலத்திற்குமேல் ஐம்பது கலத்திற்குக் கீழ் கிடைக்கும். இதில் செலவு விதை எட்டு கலமும், காலத்தில் சாகுபடி செய்ய சிலவு எட்டு கலமும், எருவிடுதல் பத்து கலமும், ஆக 26 கலம் சிலவாகிவிட்டால் மீதி 14 கலம்தான் கிடைக்கும். ஆதலால் எருவிடுதலான ஒரு பகுதியை ரயத்துக்களிடம் ஒப்படைக்கவேண்டும். இல்லாவிடில் பொருளாதாரம் இல்லாத விவசாயிகள் எருவிட வசதியில்லை.

“பிறகு பண்ணையான் சாகுபடி செய்யும் விஸ்தீரணத்திற்கு அவனுக்குக் கிடைக்கும் வீதம் வரவேண்டும் என இருக்கவேண்டும். 6-2/3 ஏக்கருக்கு கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என இருந்தால் சாகுபடி செய்யாத விஸ்தீரணத்திற்கும் கேட்டு பல இடத்தில் கிளர்ச்சி ஏற்படும். மாயவரம் அக்ரிமெண்ட் ஒன்றை போதுமானது. அதன்படி இருந்தால்தான் பூரா நாட்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு வேலை கிடைக்கும், இரண்டு மரக்கால் கொடுப்பதாக இருந்தால் பஸ் ர ஒற்றுபையில்லாமல் வேலை கிடைப்பதில்லை; அவர்களுக்கு அதிகப் படியான சலுகை காட்டமாட்டார்கள். பண்ணையில் எந்த விஸ்தீரணம் சாகுபடி செய்கிறார்களோ அந்த விஸ்தீரணத்திற்கு மட்டும் பங்கு கிடைக்க வேண்டுமென்று கண்டிப்பாக ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். சாகுபடி செய்த கிளர்ச்சி செய்து நடைமுறையில் இருப்பதை நன்றாகக் காணலாம்.

“மேலும், மனுக்கள் தாக்கல் செய்வதற்கு கொஞ்ச காலம் தள்ளிக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் அம்சம் தெரியாததால் சிலர் மனுக்களை தாக்கல் செய்யமுடியாமல் காலம் கடத்திவிட்டார்கள். அதற்கு அனுசூலமாக அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் காலத்தைத்

[Sri C. Muthiah Pillai] 5th November 1952]

தள்ளிக்கொடுக்கவேண்டியது அவசியமாக இருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது ரயத்துக்கள் வாரச்சீட்டுகளை எழுதிக்கொடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் அவகாசம் வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். அதற்கும் காலம் தள்ளிக்கொடுக்கவேண்டும். மேலும் ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டில் விசாரணைகளை விசாரிக்க மனுதாபா மட்டிலும் அனுமதித்து விசாரணையை நடத்தவேண்டும். அப்படி விசாரணை நடத்தும் போது விசாரணையை அடிக்கடி தள்ளிவைக்கக் கூடாது. உடனடியாக யனுக்களை விசாரித்து தீர்ப்பளிக்கவேண்டும். பண்ணையாட்கள் வார சாகுபடி செய்யவிரும்பினாலும் வாரசாகுபடியாளர் பண்ணையாளாக விரும்பினாலும் அதை ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டார் அங்கீகரிக்க சட்டத்தில் இடமளிக்க வேண்டும்.

“மேலும் அதிகமான நிலங்களை குத்தகை எடுத்திருப்பவர்கள் அதாவது ஆயிரம் முதல் ஏக்கர் நிலத்தைக் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்திருப்பவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது சட்டத்தில் ஒன்றும் சலாவில்லை. அவர்களை நான் ஆதரிக்க வில்லை. அவர்களுக்கும் இந்த அவசரசட்டத்தினால் பாதிக்கும்படியான கூடுதலான அளவை ரயத்துக்கள் பகிர்ந்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

“கடைசியாக இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் அமுலுக்கு வந்த பிறகு கிளர்ச்சிக் காரர்கள் வாரத்திற்கு ஒரு நாள் விடுமுறையேண்டும் என்றும் ஒரு நாளைக்கு எட்டுமணி நேரம்தான் வேலை செய்யவேண்டும் என்றும் சொல்லிவருகிறார்கள். அதன் மாதிரி தப்பான கிளர்ச்சிகள் நடக்காமல் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டும். குடியு னவர்கள் நாற்பது கலம் தெல்லை எடுத்துக் காண்டு பாக்கியை களத்தடியிலே போட்டுப் போகும்படியாக கிளர்ச்சி செய்து வருவதால் தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். இந்த விதமான கிளர்ச்சி நடந்து கொண்டுவருகிறதை சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவராமல் இருக்க முடியாது.

“இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மையை அளிக்கக்கூடியதாக இருக்கிறபடியால் இதைக்கொண்டு வந்ததற்காக முதன் மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கு என் நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப் 12-10 பொழுது சபை முன்பு வைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா குடிபயானவர்கள், பண்ணையாளர்கள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட வேண்டுமென்று கனம் விசுவநாதம் அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்த தீர்மானத்தை ஆதரித்து சில வார்த்தைகளைக் கூறலாம் என்றிருக்கிறேன். டொதுவாக அரசாங்கத் தரப்பிலேயே இதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட வேண்டுமென்பதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுவார்கள் என்று நான் நினைத்தேன். ஏனென்றால் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை அடியேன் எதிர்க்கும் மனப்பான்மையில் யாரும் இல்லை. இற்கையில் இதில் சில அபிவிருத்திகள் செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற பிரச்சினையில்தான் இந்த தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. காலம் கடத்தவேண்டுமென்ற அடிப்படையில் இதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணத்தில் இந்த தீர்மானத்தை கொண்டு வரவில்லை என்பதை அரசாங்க தரப்பில் தெரிந்துகொள்ள வேண்டும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக இதுவரையில் பேசி இருக்கக் கூடிய பல கனம் அங்கத்தினர்களில் குறிப்பாக எங்கள் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து வந்திருக்கக் கூடிய கனம் அங்கத்தினர் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் அவர்கள் பேசும்போது நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றப்படுவது பிரமாதமாக ஒன்றுமில்லை என்றும் வெறும் கூச்சல் போடுவதாகத்தான் இருக்கிறது என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். சில இடங்களில் சுமார் 20,000 பேர்களுக்கு மேல் என்று மிகைப்படுத்தி குறிப்பிடப்படுவதாகக் கூறுகிறார். சில இடங்களில் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருப்பதைக் கண்டால் ரொம்பவும் வருத்தப்பட வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. அவ்விதம் நிலைமை இருக்கும் போது அவர் இவ்விதம் சொல்லி இருப்பதைக் கண்டால் அவருக்கு சிரமங்களில் அதிக பழக்கம் இல்லை என்றே நினைக்கவேண்டியதாக

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [5th November 1952]

இருக்கிறது. இன்றையதினம் சட்டபூர்வமாக அநேக கன்சிலியேஷன் ஆபிசர்கள் வந்தும் இன்னும் அங்குள்ள விஷயங்களைத் தெரிந்து கொள்ளவில்லை. ஆனால் உண்மையில் பார்த்தால் பல லட்சக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியவரும். விவசாய சங்கங்கள் மூலமாக இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை எடுத்துச் சொல்லியும் இன்னும் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவில்லை என்பது கண்கூடாகத் தெரியவரும். இதைப்பற்றி கனம் முத்தய்யா பிள்ளை அவர்கள்கூட தன்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தில் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறார். அதாவது இன்னும் நூற்றுக்கணக்கான விஷயங்களில் தீர்ப்பளிக்கப் படவில்லை என்றும் அதைப்பற்றி உத்தியோகஸ்தர்கள் கவனம் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவில்லை என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். எங்கள் பக்கத்தில் பத்தாயிரக் கணக்கான விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். இவ்வளவும் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு தெரியும்போதே இவ்விதம் நடந்து கொண்டு வருகிறது. இதை சமாளிப்பதற்காக கனம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தை பிறப்பித்திருக்கிறார்கள்.

“நேற்றையதினம் கனம் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் இதைப் பற்றி பேசும் போது இதில் நல்ல அம்சங்கள் இருக்கிறது என்றும், அதில் சில திருத்தங்கள் செய்ய வேண்டியது அவசியம் என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்பட்ட குழப்பத்தினால் அங்கே ஒரு நிரந்தர பரிகாரம் தேடவேண்டும் என்பதற்காக இதைக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். இந்த சட்டத்தின் பிரியாம்பின் (Preamble) நோக்கத்தை எடுத்துக் கொண்டு பார்த்தால் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக் கூடிய நிலைமையின் காரணமாக, ஒரு நிர்ப்பந்தத்தினால் இது கொண்டு வரப்பட்டது என்பது தெரியவரும். வெற்றியைப் பொறுத்து வேறு எந்த ஜில்லாவில் இதற்கு டிமாண்டு இருக்கிறதோ அங்கே யெல்லாம் இதை விஸ்தரிக்கப்படும் என்றும் தோன்றுகிறது. இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் ஆளும் கட்சி விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மை செய்ய வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணத்தில்தான் இதைக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றால் இந்த சட்டம் பல வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்பாகவே கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்க வேண்டும். இது சம்பந்தமாக தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 1943-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்தே சுமார் பத்து வருஷங்களாக பெரிய போராட்டங்கள் நடந்து வந்திருக்கின்றன. அதுவும் இந்த மாகாண மக்களினகவனத்தைக் கவர்ந்திருக்கிறது. ஏற்கனவே ஏற்பட்ட இந்த சிக்கலைத் தவிர்க்க அரசாங்கம் இம்முறையில் அக்கரை காட்டுகிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியும். அந்த அடிப்படையின் காரணமாகவும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் விசேஷமான சம்பவங்கள் ஏற்பட்டதன் காரணமாகவும் இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் அனுபவத்தைப் பார்த்துக் கொண்டு மாகாணம் பூராவும் இதைக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தை முதலில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. எந்த நோக்கத்துடன் கொண்டு வந்தாலும் சரி, அரசியல் கட்சி இதன் மூலம் செல்வாக்குத் தேடிக் கொள்ளலாம் என்ற நோக்கத்துடன் கொண்டு வந்தாலும் சரி, அதைப் பற்றி பிரசாரம் செய்வதில் யாதொரு ஆட்சேபணையும் இல்லை. எந்தக் கட்சியாக இருந்தாலும் தன்னுடைய செல்வாக்கைப் பெருக்குவதற்கு பிரசாரம் செய்ய வேண்டியதுதான். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்பட்டுள்ள விவசாய தகராறுகளை நீக்குவதன் பொருட்டுதான் இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தின் வெற்றியை முறியடிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற தொனியில் நான் சொல்லவில்லை. யதார்த்தமாக எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டும்.

அடுத்தபடியாக இன்று நிலப் பிரபுக்களுக்கு ஏதாவது நன்மை செய்தால் அது விவசாயிகளை பாதிக்கும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மை செய்தால் அது நிலப் பிரபுக்களை பாதிக்கும் என்ற ரீதியில் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை எழுப்பக் கூடாது. சட்டத்தை பரிசீலனை செய்யும் போது இந்த தேசத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய பெரும்பகுதி மக்களின் மதிப்பு என்ன, தேசத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய பொருளாதார நிலைமை என்ன, தேசத்திலுள்ள வாங்கும் சக்தி என்ன, தேசத்தின் பெரும்பகுதியாயுள்ள விவசாய மக்கள் எந்த நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள், ஜனநாயகம் எந்த நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறது

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [5th November 1952]

கிறது என்பவைகளை முதலில் ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். பிறகு விவசாயிகளுடைய பொருளாதார நிலைமை பாதிக்கப்படுகிறதா என்பதைப் பௌதீகமாக வைத்துக்கொண்டு இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை பார்க்கவேண்டும். எவ்வாறாக பாதிக்கும் என்ற கண்ணோட்டத்தில் பார்க்கக்கூடாது என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“அடுத்தபடியாக இன்றுள்ள அரசியல் நிலைமையில் பொருளாதார நிலைமையில் இது யாரை பாதிக்கும் என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள 80 சத விசதம் உள்ள விவசாயிகளின் நிலைமை என்ன என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இவைகளை யெல்லாம் யோசித்து நாட்டில் சுபிட்சத்தையும் அமைதியையும் நிலைநாட்ட இந்த சட்டம் பாதுகாக்கும் நிலையில் ஏற்படவேண்டும். உண்மையாகவே இந்த சமுதாயத்திலுள்ள நில பாதியை முறைகளை கவனித்து அதற்குத் தக்கபடி இந்தச் சட்டத்தை அமைக்கவேண்டும்.

“இதைப் பற்றி பல நாட்கள் சொல்லிக் கொண்டு போகலாம். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசர சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி நேற்றையதினம் பேசிய போது கனம் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் குறிப்பிட்டார், கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த அவசர சட்டத்தை செய்து விட்டு தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் சுற்றுப் பிரயாணம் செய்த போது பல லட்சக் கணக்கான ஜனங்கள் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களைப் பார்க்க வெகு ஆவலாக வந்தார்கள் என்று. வாஸ்தவம். ஒரு பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் பிரதேசங்களில் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்யும் போது ஜனங்கள் அவரைப் பார்க்க ஆவலாக இருப்பது உண்மையே. அதில் ஒன்றும் விசேஷம் இல்லை. அதற்கு மாறாக கனம் சி. சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள், கிசான்கள் கூட்டத்திற்கு வரக்கூடாது என்று தடுத்துவிட்டார்கள் என்று குற்றம் சாட்டினார்கள். அப்படி ஒன்றும் நடைபெறவில்லை. மந்திரிகள் வரும்போது அவரைப் பார்த்து நாங்கள் பட்டினி கிடக்கிறோம் என்பதை எடுத்துக் கூற வேண்டும் என்று தான் நாங்கள் சொல்லுகிறோம். அவர்களும் சொல்லுகிறார்கள்.

சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக் கொண்டு பார்க்கும்போது சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபார்சின் சில பகுதிகளை இதில் சேர்த்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை மறுக்க முடியாது. ஆனால் அதிலுள்ள சில முற்போக்கு பகுதிகள் விடப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. மற்றும் பல பிரச்சினைகளைத் தொடரவே இல்லை. கனம் முத்தய்யா பிள்ளை சொன்ன மாதிரி தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு இவை அவசியமானது என்பது எங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். இருக்கும் கடனாகவும், கடன் வசதிகளுக்கும், மனைக் கொல்லை முதலியவைகளுக்கும் இதில் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்க வேண்டும். அந்த மாதிரியான பிரச்சினைகளையே எடுக்கப்படவில்லை. விவசாயிகளைப் போல் பண்ணையாட்களையும் குடியிருப்பு நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக் கூடாது என்று சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக செய்யப்பட்டிருக்க வேண்டும். இதைப் போன்று பண்ணையாட்களும் ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு குடியிருப்பு நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக் கூடாது என்று பாதுகாப்பு அளித்திருக்கவேண்டும். அப்படி இல்லாவிட்டால் நாளைக்கு மிராசதாரர்களுக்கும் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் சண்டை ஏற்பட்டு இதே பிரச்சினை மறுபடியும் எழலாம். அதனால் குழப்பம் ஏற்படலாம். அதைப் பொறுத்தும் இப்பொழுதே செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

“காலத்திற்குத் தகுந்தபடி நிலச் சீர்திருத்த மாறுபாடுகள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்க வேண்டும். மிராசதாரர்களும் காலத்தையொட்டி தங்கள் கொள்கைகளை மாற்றிக் கொண்டு விவசாயிகளுக்கு எல்லா சௌகரியங்களையும் செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கவேண்டும். ஆனால் இப்பொழுது யாரோ விவசாயிகளைத் தூண்டி விடுகிறார்கள்; அதனால் தான் அவர்கள் இம்மாதிரி குழப்பத்தை உண்டு பண்ணுகிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இது தவறு. விவசாயிகளை யாரும் தூண்டிவிடவில்லை. இன்னும் உண்மையைச் சொல்லப் போனால் விவசாயிகள் எப்பொழுதும் தன்னை யார் அவமானச்

12-20
P.M.

[Sri C. Kandaswami]

[5th November 1952]

படுத்தினாலும் தன்னை அவமனப்படுத்துகிறான் என்பதை உணராமல் இருக்கக்கூடிய அப்பாவிகள். அவர்கள் யாராலும் தூண்டிவிடமுடியாத நிலைமையில் இருப்பவர்கள். வெகு சலபத்தில் அவர்களை ஆத்திரம் அடையச் செய்ய முடியாது. இருந்தாலும் கூட மிராசுதார்கள் செய்யும் அக்கிரமங்களை அவர்களாகவே உணர்ந்து அதைப் பொறுக்கமாட்டாமல் தங்கள் உரிமைகளைப் பாதுகாத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று உள்ளத்திலே குமுறிக்கொண்டிருந்தார்கள். சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி போன்றவைகளை நியமித்ததால் தங்கள் குறைகள் தீர்க்கப்படுமென்று அவர்கள் எண்ணி இந்தமட்டும் சம்மா இருந்தார்கள் என்பதை நாம் உணரவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இன்னும் எத்தனையோ பெரிய மாறுதல்கள் எல்லாம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கவேண்டும். பண்ணையாட்களுக்குக் கடன் கொடுத்துவிட்டு, அதற்காக சீட்டுகளை எழுதி வாங்கி வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிற மிராசுதார்கள் கடனுக்காக இன்றைய தினம் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் தொந்தரவுகள், இடைஞ்சல்கள் சொல்லமுடியாது. இது போன்ற கொடுமைச் செயல்களை வெல்லாம் நாம் தடுக்கவேண்டும். உண்மையாகவே விவசாயிகளின் நலனுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் பெரிதும் பயன்படத்தக்க வகையில் நடைமுறையில் சாத்தியமாகும் வகையில் கொண்டு வரப்படவேண்டுமென்று நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஒன்றைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். குடிவார பாத்தியதையை ஐந்துவருஷத்திற்கு உத்திரவாதம் அளித்திருப்பதை இன்னும் 10 வருஷங்களாக உயர்த்திக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளத் தயாராயிலே. ஏனென்றால் இன்னும் ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்குள் எத்தனையோ எத்தனையோ பெரிய பெரிய மாறுதல்கள் ஏற்பட்டு விட்டன. விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்தம் இன்னும் வெகு வேகமாக முன்னேறக் கூடும். ஆனால் ஒன்று மாத்திரம் உண்மையானது. குறைந்த பட்சம் குடிவார பாத்தியதையை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டியது அவசியம்தான் என்றாலும் அது உடனடியாக அமுலுக்கு வரவது சாத்தியமில்லை என்பதால் இன்னும் அது வருஷத்திற்கு வந்து குறைந்தபட்சமாக குடிவார பாத்தியதை உரிமையை அளிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி சிபார்சு செய்திருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் 40 சதவிகிதம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு வாரம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆனால் சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி ரிப்போர்ட்டில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 55, 60 சதவிகிதம் வாரம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது பற்றி ஒரு வித பெருத்த கிளர்ச்சி தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலே இன்றைய தினம் நடக்கிப்போயிருக்கின்றன. மாகாணங்கள் நடத்தப்படுகின்றன. சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலிருக்கக் கூடிய நிலங்களின் தரத்திற்கு ஏற்ப முதலில் 55 சதவிகிதம், 45 சதவிகிதம் என்றும், பிறகு 60 சதவிகிதம், 40 சதவிகிதம் என்றும் இரண்டு வார அளவுகளைப் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இப்பொழுது சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபாருசுப்படி நாம் நடக்கவில்லை. குறிப்பாக தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இன்றைய தினம் 16 சதவிகிதத் திலிருந்து, 40 சதவிகிதம் வரை வார விகிதம் அமுலில் இருந்து கொண்டு ஜில்லாவிற்கு அவைகளையெல்லாம் கணக்கில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளாமல் வாரம் வாங்கிக் கொண்டிருந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கு இப்பொழுது 40 சதவிகிதம் கிடைக்கும்பொழுது சந்தோஷம் அடைவான். அது நியாயமானது என்று எல்லோரும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுவார்கள். ஆனால் இதற்கு முன்பே 40 சதவிகிதம் வங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கும் ஒரு விவசாயிக்கு இதனால் நீங்க வசதியில்லையென்பதை நாம் எல்லோரும் கவனித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டியது அவசியமாகும். இதனால் பல இடங்களில் புதிய கிளர்ச்சி ஏற்படும் போலிருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் இதையும் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக் கொண்டு இந்தச் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தமாக வேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். அந்தந்த இடத்திற்குத் தகுந்தபடி பல்வேறு வார விகிதங்களை நாம்

[5th November 1952]

[Sri C. Kandaswami]

ஏற்படுத்தமுடியாது. ஏற்படுத்தினாலும் அதை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வருவது சாத்தியமான காரியம் அல்ல என்பதை நான் உணர்வேன். இருந்தாலும் கூட நியாயமானதை, சாத்தியமானதை நாம் செய்ய மறுக்கவும் கூடாது. ஆகையால் இதைப் பற்றி நாம் நன்கு யோசிக்கவேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். குறைந்தபட்சமாக எல்லா விவசாயிகளுக்கும் ஓரளவு லாபம் கிடைக்கத்தக்கவகையில் இந்த வார விகிதத்தை நாம் நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டியது அவசியமென்பதை நான் எடுத்துக் காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்டவர்கள் ரொம்பவும் குறைவு தான். பலர் மிக அதிகமாக மிகைப்படுத்திக் கூறுகிறார்கள். தவிர கர்விலேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்குப் போடப்பட்டிருக்கும் விண்ணப்பங்களைப் பார்த்தால் பெரியும். அவர்கள் எண்ணிக்கை மிகவும் குறைவு தான் என்று கூறினார், ஸ்ரீ வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் அவர்கள். அவர் சொல்லியதிலிருந்து அவருக்குச் சரியான விவரங்கள் தெரியாது. ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று அவர் ஒன்றும் பார்க்கவில்லையென்பது தெரிகிறது. (தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள், விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய உரிமைகளைப் பெறுவதற்காகப் போராடுகிறார்கள், கிளர்ச்சி செய்கிறார்கள் என்பதற்காக பல்லாயிரக் கணக்கான விவசாயிகளை பண்ணைகளிலிருந்து விலக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். பெரிய பண்ணை மிராசுதார்களால் அவர்களுக்கு இழைக்கப் பட்டிருக்கும் தொந்தரவுகள் பலவாகும். சென்ற ஸ்ரீ குமாரசாமிராஜா அவர்களுடைய மந்திரி சபையினால் விவசாயிகளின் இயக்கங்களையெல்லாம் டீசக்குவதற்காகக் கையாளப்பட்ட அடக்கு முறைகள் பற்றியெல்லாம் உங்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் நன்கு தெரியும். ஓயிர்க் கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் சிறையில் அடைக்கப்பட்டார்கள். சிறையில் சித்திரவதை செய்யப்பட்டார்கள். மண்டை நெறுங்கும்படி அடிக்கப்பட்டார்கள். கைகால்கள் முறியும்படி தொறுக்கப்பட்டார்கள். அந்தக் காலங்களில் போலீசார்களின் உதவியைக்கொண்டு, பலவந்தமாக விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றி அவர்களுடைய நிலங்களையெல்லாம் வீக்கித்துக் கொண்டு, இன்றைய தினம் சொந்தப் பண்ணையென்ற முறையில் வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்) ஸ்ரீ வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் ஒவ்வொரு கிராமங்களுக்கும் சென்று பார்த்திருந்தால் இந்த உண்மையை உணர்ந்திருப்பார்கள் என்று நான் நம்புகிறேன். ஆகையினாலேதான் கடந்த 4, 5 வருஷங்களுக்குள் பண்ணை நிலங்களாக மாற்றப்பட்ட எல்லா நிலங்களையும், அதற்கு முன்னால் பயிரிட்டிருக்கொண்டிருந்த விவசாயிகளிடமே திருப்பிக் கொடுக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். அதுதான் ரொம்பவும் நியாயமானதாகும். போலீஸ்காரர்களின் உதவியைக்கொண்டு பலாத்காரமாக நிலத்திலிருந்து விரட்டப்பட்டு இன்றைய தினம் நிராதாவாக இடங்கால விவசாயிகளுக்கு மிகவும் உதவியாக இருக்குமென்பதை உங்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் சுட்டிக்காட்ட விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக பழைய பாக்கிகளைப் பற்றி ஸ்ரீ முத்தையா பிள்ளை அவர்கள் நன்கு சொன்னார்கள். அது முற்றிலும் உண்மை. இன்றைய தினம் நீங்கள் பெரிய பெரிய பண்ணைகளில் போய் பார்த்தால், அந்த பண்ணைகளின் மிராசுதார்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கடன் கொடுத்ததற்காக பாண்டுகள் நிறைய எழுதி வாங்கி வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அறுவடைக்குப் பின் ஏதோ பணம் கொடுத்து, கணக்கைத் தீர்த்து, விவசாயிகளால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியாதபடி ஏதோ ஒன்றை எழுதி கையெழுத்து வாங்கிக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். தான் கையெழுத்துப் போடும் பத்திரத்தில் என்ன எழுதியிருக்கிறதென்பதை அறிந்து கொள்ளாத விவசாயி கைபொப்பம் போட்டு பாண்டு எழுதிக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறான். இம் மாதிரி கலியாணத்திற்கு கொடுத்த கடன், மாடு வாங்கக் கொடுத்த கடன் என்று விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கடன் கொடுத்ததாகப் பத்திரங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அதை வருஷம் செய்ய மிராசுதார்களுக்கு உரிமையிருக்கிறது. இது சம்பந்தமாக சம்பந்தம் பார்க்கத் தொண்டைமான் என்பவர் பழைய பாக்கிக்காக நிலத்தை விட்டு விவசாயிகளை அப்புறப்படுத்துவது சரியல்ல, போர்ட்டு மூலமாக தாக்கல் செய்து பணத்தைத் திரும்பப் பெற முயற்சிக்கலாம் மென்றார். ஆகையினால் இனிமேல் என்ன விதமாக மிராசுதார்கள்

[Sri C. Kandaswami]

[5th November 1952]

விவசாயிகளின் மேல் பழி வாங்கும் படலத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கப்போகிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியவில்லை. ஆகையினாலே சர்க்கார் உடனடியாக, கடைசி வருஷத்தில் கொடுக்கவேண்டிய பாக்கியை மட்டும் குறிப்பிட வேண்டுமே தவிர, பழைய பாக்கிகளையெல்லாம் கொடுத்தால்தான் நிலமென்று இருக்க விடக்கூடாது. பழைய பாக்கிக்காக நிலத்தை விட்டு அப்புறப்படுத்தாமல் நாம் சட்டத்தின் ஷரத்துக்களில் நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டும்.

“அது மாத்திரமல்ல; நிலங்களுக்கு எருப் போடும் பொறுப்பும் இன்றைய தினம் விவசாயிகளைச் சேர்ந்ததாக இருக்கிறது. இதனாலும் பல சிக்கல்கள் உண்டாகின்றன. ஒரோரு பிரதேசத்தில் ஒவ்வொரு மாதிரியாக உரம் போடப்படுகிறது. ஒரு இடத்தில் சாம்பல் போடுகிறார்கள். மற்றொரு இடத்தில் பசுந்தான் போடுகிறார்கள். இம் மாதிரி பலதரப்பட்ட பழக்க வழக்கங்கள் நடைமுறையில் இருப்பதை நாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். அதோடு மிராசதார் தன்னுடைய நிலத்திற்கு நூறு ரூபாய்க்கு உரம் போட வேண்டுமென்பான். ஆனால் விவசாயியினால் 25 ரூபாய்க்கு மேல் போட போட முடியாது. அவனது நிலமையிருக்கும், ஆகையினால்தான் இவ் விஷயத்திலும், எவ்விதத் தகராறும் உண்டாகாதபடி பழக்க வழக்கங்களுக்குத் தக்கபடி ஒரு போட்டுக் கொள்ளலாமென்ற நிலைமை இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று இந்த சபையில் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக மொத்தக் குத்தகைதாரர்கள் இருக்கக் கூடாதென ஸ்ரீ முத்தையா பிள்ளை கூறியதை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். குத்தகைதாரர்களை ஒழிப்பதற்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் அதிகமாக உதவ வேண்டுமென நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“குறிப்பாக தேவஸ்தான நிலங்களையெல்லாம் நேரிடையாக குடியான வர்களுடமே குத்தகைக்குக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமே தவிர, மொத்தமாக ஒரு பெரிய குத்தகைக்காரரிடம் விடக்கூடாதென்பதாக சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி யும் கூறியிருக்கிறது. ஆகையினாலே, இங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய அற நிலைய இலாகா மந்திரி அவர்களும் இனிமேல் தேவஸ்தான நிலங்களை யெல்லாம் சிறிய சிறிய பகுதிகளாகப் பல விவசாயிகளிடம் சாகுபடிக்குக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இன்றைய தினம், தான் எல்லா நிலங்களையும் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டு, தான் கொள்ளை கொள்ளையாக சம்பாதிப்பதோடு மட்டுமல்ல; தான் அவர்கள் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கும் அக்கிரமங்கள் கொஞ்சம் நஞ்சமல்ல. கடவுள் நிலத்தை குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டு, கடவுள் அம்சமான, வாயில்லாப் பூச்சிகளான விவசாயிகளை அவர்கள் பண்ணும் சித்திரவதை கொஞ்ச நஞ்சமல்ல. கட்டி வைத்து அடிக்கிறார்கள், கற்பழிக்கிறார்கள். உடனடியாக இந்த அக்கிரமங்களையெல்லாம் நிறுத்தியாக வேண்டும். அதனால்தான் தேவஸ்தானம், மடங்கள் இவைகளின் சொத்துக்களை தனிப்பட்ட ஏழை விவசாயிகளிடம் சாகுபடிக்குச் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். ஏழை பங்களானான விவசாயிகளுக்கு உதவி செய்தால் அதுதான் தான் ஒருவருக்கு ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட அளவு ஏக்கருக்கு மேல் கோயில், போட்டு நிர்ணயம் செய்பவேண்டும். ஆகையினால் அதிக பசும் ஒருவர் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலம் ஏற்பாடு செய்தாக வேண்டுமென்றும் நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக நான் இன்னொரு விஷயத்தை இங்கே சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். அதாவது சர்க்கார் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கும் அவசரச் சட்டம் எந்த முறையில் அமுலாக்கப்பட்டு வருகிறதென்பதை நாம் பார்க்க வேண்டும். கடந்த மூன்று மாத காலமாக இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் பார்த்து பிறகு நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட பல ஆயிரக் கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு விண்ணப்பம் செய்து கொண்டார்கள். சிலர் வெற்றியும் பெற்றார்கள். அதிகாரிகள் அந்த விவசாயினிடம் நிலத்தை

5th November 1952]

[Sri C. Kandaswami]

ஒப்படைக்க வேண்டுமென தீர்ப்பு அளித்தும் கூட, விவசாயி பேப்பரில் தன்னுடைய அதிகாரத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டானே தவிர நடைமுறையில் அவனால் அந்த நிலத்தை இன்னமும் நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களிடமிருந்து பெற முடியவில்லை. பசியால் தவிக்கிறான். அவசரச் சட்டத்தை மிராசதார்கள் சட்டை செய்யவேயில்லை. அதேபோல அதிகாரிகளின் தீர்ப்பையும் லக்ஷியம் செய்யவில்லை. பழைய மேல் சபையில் அங்கத்தினராக இருந்த வலி வலம் தேசிகர் இன்றும் விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து விரட்டிக்கொண்டு தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். நான் தாராளமாக அதை ருசுப்பிக்க முடியும். அவருக்குப் பாதுகாப்பாக இன்று போலீஸ் படைகள் விவசாயிகளின் மேல் எவப்படுகிறது. ஆகையால் தீர்ப்பை வைத்துக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளின் என்ன செய்ய முடியும். ஆகையினால்தான் நடைமுறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நியாயம் வழங்க, வழங்கிய நீதியை அமுல் நடத்த, அத்தியாவசியமான காரியங்கள் எல்லாவற்றையும் சர்க்கார் செய்தாக வேண்டும்.)

“அடுத்தபடியாக சிறு மிராசதார்களுக்கு சலுகை காட்டுவதற்காக ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைந்தவர்களுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்திலிருந்து விலக்கு அளிக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறது.

“ஆனால் சென்னை கோட்டையில் வேலை செய்கின்ற சூமாஸ்தாவுக்கு ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைந்த நிலம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து, அவன் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி வாரமோ, கூலியோ, கொடுக்க மறுத்தால், நடைமுறையில் அது நியாயமா? அல்லது அவனுடைய நிலத்தைச் சாகுபடி செய்ய யாராவது முன் வருவார்களா? அவனுடைய நிலம் தரிசாகக் கிடக்க வேண்டி நேரிட்டாலும் நேரிடும் தவிர, பக்கத்து மிராசதாரிடம் சட்டப்படி கூலி வாங்கும்போது இவனிடம் குறைந்த கூலிக்கு யாரும் சாகுபடி செய்ய முன் வரமாட்டார்கள். ஆகையால் ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவானவர்களுக்கு விதி விலக்கு அளித்து, சலுகை காட்டுவதாக நினைப்பது தவறு. அந்தச் சட்டம் நடைமுறையில் நிறைவேறுது. அதற்கு நேர் மாறாக அப்படி செய்வதுதான் நியாயமாவென்றும் பார்க்க வேண்டும். ஒரு பண்ணையானுக்கு துரதிருஷ்டவசமாக ஒரு வேலி மிராசதாருக்குக் கீழ் வேலை செய்யக்கூடிய நிலமையேற்பட்டால் அவனுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தால் கொடுக்கப்படும் சம்பளம் கிடைக்காதென்பது பெரும் அநீதியாகும். அது அதர்மமாகும். அதனால்தான் இதை மாற்ற வேண்டும்.

“கடைசியாக நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்வதெல்லாம் இந்தச் சட்டம் வர வேற்கவேண்டியதுதான். ஆனால் குறைபாடுகள் நிறைய இருக்கின்றன. பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி பரிசீலனை செய்யவேண்டிய பிரச்சனைகள் நிறைய இருக்கின்றன. அவைகளை இப்படி சபையில் விவாதம் செய்து தீர்க்க முடியாது. ஆகையால் கனம் முதலமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இதன் முக்கியத்தை உணர்ந்து இதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்ப வேண்டுமென்று நண்பர் தென் னோட்டி விஸ்வநாதனின் திருத்தத்தை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

*SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU:—“மதிப்பிற்குரிய உப 12:30
தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தச் சட்டம் ஏன் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது? எப்படிச் p.m.
கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது? கிளர்ச்சியின் காரணமாக எனச் சிலர் நினைக்கிறார்கள். கிளர்ச்சியின் காரணமாகவே இது கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருந்தாலும், சர்க்கா ருடைய முதல் மந்திரி அவர்களைத் தவிர வேறு யார் இன்றையதினம் இதை கொண்டுவந்திருந்தாலும்கூட அவருடைய சர்க்கார் கவிழ்த்திருக்குமென் பதை அங்கத்தினர்கள் நன்கு புரிந்து கொள்ளவேண்டும்.

“தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா மிராசதார் என்றால் அவர்கள் சுலபமாக விட்டுக் கொடுக்கின்ற ஆட்கள் அல்ல என்பதையும் தெரிந்துகொள்ளவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராசதார்கள் தான் இன்று அகில இந்திய சர்க்கார் என்றாலும்கூட அது மிகையாகாது. இன்று இருக்கக்கூடிய பிரசித்தி பெற்ற பத்திரிகைகள், பிரசித்திபெற்ற மனிதர்கள், ஹைகோர்ட் ஜட்ஜ் கள்கூட, எங்களுடைய ஜில்லாவின் மிராசதார் வர்க்கத்தைச் சேர்ந்த வர்கள். இவர்களுக்கு விரோதமாக ஒரு காரியத்தைச் செய்வது சாதாரண மனிதர்களால்கூட முடியவே முடியாது. அவர்களுக்கு விரோதமாகச் செய்வது

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [5th November 1952]

தென்னாற்காடு அத்தற்கு ஒரு துணியும் தெரியமும் இருக்கவேண்டும். சமீபத்தில் சட்டம் வந்தவுடன் எல்லா பத்திரிகைகளும் என்ன செய்தன? இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்திற்கு விரோதமாக, இந்த சர்க்கார் கவிழ்ந்தாலும் சரி, மிருசுதார்கள் உரிமைகளில் தலையிடக்கூடாது என்று எழுதிவந்தன. ஆனால், சற்று புன்சிரிப்போடு, ஓரிரண்டு தினங்கள் பொறுத்து அந்த எதிர்ப்பையெல்லாம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் சமாளித்தார். கிளர்ச்சி எங்கும் எல்லாவற்றிற்கும் இருந்துகொண்டுதான் இருக்கும். கிளர்ச்சியைப் பார்த்து ராஜாஜி சர்க்கார் பயந்து ஏதோ செய்துவிட்டதென்றால் அதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ளமுடியாது. அவர் அனுபவம் அப்படியல்ல. முன் ராஜாஜி மந்திரிசபையில் கடன் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதா கொண்டுவந்தபோது எந்தக் கிளர்ச்சி இருந்தது? அந்த சமயத்திலும் எதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதை அவர்கள் செய்தார்கள். எப்போதும் உழவர் கிளர்ச்சி இருந்தது. கட்சிக்கு வெளியேயும் கிளர்ச்சி இருந்தது. கட்சிக்கு உள்ளேயும் கிளர்ச்சி இருந்தது. நல்ல எண்ணத்தோடு, இதைச் செய்துதான் ஆகவேண்டுமென்று நிலைமை பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டவுடனே சட்டத்தைச் செய்தார்கள். இதைத்தவிர, எங்கள் ஜில்லாவின் சமுதாய அமைப்பில் இதுமாதிரியான ஒரு சட்டமும் செய்யமுடியாத அளவுக்கு நிலைமை இருந்தது. பெரிய நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களின் ஆதிக்கத்தால், பெரிய மிராசதார் என்றால் யார்? எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் 33 சதவிகிதம் நிலத்தைக் கடவுளை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார் என்பது உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். என ஜில்லாவில் கடவுள்தான் பெரிய மிராசதார். அந்தக் கடவுளுக்கு அடுத்தபடியாக இருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள் பண்டார சந்திகள் என்று இரண்டொருவர் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களைல்லாம் 50 ஆயிரம், 60 ஆயிரம், 70 ஆயிரம் ஏக்கர் நிலத்தைக் கையில் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருப்பவர்கள். அவர்களுக்கு விரோதமாக யாரும் சித்தனாகச் செய்யமுடியாது. ஏனென்றால், அது சிலத்திற்கு விரோதமாகிவிடும். அதைத் தொட்டால் சிவ சொத்து; அழிந்து விடுவார்கள் என்றுகூட சொல்லப்பட்டது. அதையெல்லாம் எதிர்ப்பதென்பது சாமான்ய காரியமல்ல. பண்டாரசந்தி இந்தச் சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் மாத்திரமல்ல, மேலே டில்லி சர்க்காரில்கூட செல்வாக்கு வைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பவர்கள். காந்தியடிகளோடு உழைத்த பல காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்குக்கூட காந்தியடிகளுடைய அஸ்தி கிடைக்கவில்லை. ஆனால், திருவாடுதுறை பண்டாரசந்தி அவர்களுக்கு அது கிடைத்ததென்றால், அவர்களுடைய அபாரமான அரசியல் பலம், வைதிக பலம், நில பலம் எவ்வளவு என்பதையும், அவைகளைக்கொண்டு அவர்கள் எதையும் சாதித்துக்கொள்ளக்கூடிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதையும் நாம் தெரிந்துகொள்ளவேண்டும். இவர்களையும் இன்றையதினம் பாதிக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டம்.

“ஏற்கனவே, பல்லக்கில் ஏறினவர்கள் இன்று நவீன காலத்தில் பல பல காரிகளை வைத்துக்கொண்டு தங்களுக்கு யாரும் விரோதமாக நடந்து கொள்ளாமல் இருக்க என்ன செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதிகமான பலத்தை அரசியல் ரீதியிலும், வைதிகத்திலும், வைத்துக்கொண்டு, கடவுள் பக்கத்தில் இருக்கின்றோம் என்று நினைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற இந்த மனிதர்களுக்கு விரோதமாக ஏதாவது செய்வதென்றால் அது முடியவே முடியாது அவர்கள் எதைச் செய்தாலும்கூட அதை யாரும் எதிர்த்து ஒன்றும் செய்ய முடியாமல், அவர்களால் நீதியைகூட விலை கொடுத்து வாங்கமுடியும். அவர்களுக்காக வாதிடக்கூடிய சிலர், ‘அவர்கள் குற்றமே செய்யாதவர்கள். அவர்களுக்காக விலை உடை தரித்தவர்கள்; அவர்களை யாரும் எதிர்க்கக்கூடாது; எதிர்த்தால் இந்த உலகத்தில் மாத்திரமல்ல, மேல் உலகத்தில்கூட அவர்களுக்குக் கேடுதல் ஏற்படும்,’ என்று பயமுறுத்தக்கூடிய ஆட்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள்; செய்வதென்பது முடியாத காரியம். நினைத்திலே 33 சதவிகிதம் கடவுள் பக்கத்தில் இருப்பவர்களைச் சேர்ந்தது என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். செய்வதென்பது முடியாத காரியம். நிலத்திலே 33 சதவிகிதம் கடவுள் பக்கத்தில் இருப்பவர்களைச் சேர்ந்தது என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். இவர்களைக் கொண்டுப்பவர்கள். பெரிய பெரிய மிராசதார்களைவிட இந்தக் குத்தகைதாரர்கள் எல்லா வகைகளிலும் சக்தி உடையவர்கள்; பத்திரிகை பலம், அரசியல் பலம் எல்லாம் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்கின்றது. அதைத்தவிர

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [5th November 1952]

அவர்கள் சொந்தமாகச் செய்யமுடியாத காரியம் கிடையாது. ஆனால், இந்தப் பக்கத்தில் உழவர்களைப் பார்க்கும்போது, அவர்களை எதிர்க்கக்கூடிய சக்தி இவர்களுக்கு கிடையாது. கச்சேரியில் அவர்களுக்கு எதிராக நின்றால் தலைகுனிவதைத்தவிர வேறு ஒன்றும் எதிர்த்து வாதாடுவதற்கு சக்தி இல்லை. தங்களுடைய சொந்த மனவியை மிராசதார் அடிக்கின்றபோது கூட அதைப் பார்த்துக்கொண்டு சம்பா இரப்பானேதவிர, எதிர்த்துப்போது தெரியும் வருவதில்லை. கண்ணெதிரிலேயே மனவியை அடிக்கும்போது ரோஷம் அடையாமல், உலகம் தோன்றிய காலத்திலிருந்து இன்றுவரை மிராசதார்களுக்கு அடங்கி உழைத்து வருகின்றன. தன்னுடைய சொந்த மகன் அடிக்கப்படும்போது, அந்த விவசாயி பரிதாபத்தோடு பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருப்பானேயல்லாது வேறு ஒன்றும் செய்யமாட்டான். அவனுடைய மனதிலே நொந்துகொண்டதேயில்லை. அடிக்கம் ஒரு கை, அணைக்கும் ஒரு கை என்று தனக்குள்ளே சமாதானம் செய்துகொண்டு, மிராசதார் கொடுப்பதை வாங்கிக்கொள்வான். ‘நெல்லு முகத்திலே நெருப்பு, சோற்று முகத்திலே சிரிப்பு’ என்ற பழமொழிப்படி நெல் கேட்டால், சோறுவார். உழும்போது உழவன் உற்சாகமாக வேலை செய்யவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக மகிழ்வார் களத்தில் இருக்கின்ற நெல் எல்லாம் வீட்டில் வந்து சேரவேண்டுமென்று நினைக்கும்போது நெருப்பாவார். அந்தச் சமுதாயத்தில் ஒன்றும் தெரியாதவரை உழவர்களை வளர்த்திருக்கிறார்கள் அந்த மிராசதார்கள். சமுதாய கட்டுப்பாடு இவ்வளவு தூரம் இருந்ததை உடைத்தெறிந்து இன்று ஒரு சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருப்பதால், அவை நாம் வரவேற்கவேண்டும். நிலமுடையவரை யாரும் எதிர்க்கமுடியாது. இப்படிப்பட்ட ஒரு சட்டத்தை எந்த சட்ட நிபுணரும் செய்யமுடியாது. இன்றைக்கு இருக்கின்ற நிலைமையிலேயே இம்மாதிரி ஒரு சட்டத்தைச் செய்திருக்கக்கூடிய பிரதமருடைய துணியையும், நல்லெண்ணத்தையும் நாம் பாராட்டி இதை நாம் வரவேற்கவேண்டும்.

“இந்த வாரம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு போதுமானது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக நான் இதை வரவேற்கவில்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் உழவனின் தேவை பூர்த்தி ஆகிவிட்டதென்றும் இதுவே போதுமானது என்று நினைத்தும் இதை வரவேற்கவில்லை. கொலம்பஸ் அமெரிக்காவைக் கண்டுபிடித்தான். அவனைப் பாராட்டுகிறோம். அவன் சென்ற பாய்மரக் கப்பல் இப்பொழுதும் போதுமென்று சொல்லமுடியுமா? உழவர்களை முதல் சட்டம் என்ற முறையில் இதை வரவேற்கிறேன். இதவரை விவசாயிகள் நன்மைக்கு ஏதும் செய்யமுடியாமல், யாரோ ஒரு சிலர் சிறைக்குச் சென்றோ, பிரச்சனம் செய்தோ, கிளர்ச்சி செய்துகொண்டிருந்ததைத்தவிர, காரியத்தில் ஏதாவும் நடக்கவில்லை. ராஜாஜி சர்க்கார் அவர்களால்தான் இந்தக் காரியத்தை ஓரளவு எதிர்க்கமுடிந்தது. இன்றையதினம் நிச்சயமாக இதைத் தொழிலாளர்கள் வரவேற்கின்றார்கள். இன்றையதினம் கூலி கிடைக்காவிட்டாலும், அதற்காக அவர்கள் எம்மானிட்டம் கோபித்துக் கொள்ளாது குளத்திலுள்ள மீன், நண்டு முதலியவைகளைப் பிடித்து ஆகாரமாக உண்டு உயிர்வாழ்ந்தார்கள். எது கொடுத்தாலும் அதை ரொம்ப சந்தோஷமாக ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளக்கூடிய தொழிலாளர்கள் இன்று எங்காவது இருக்கிறார்களென்றால் அது தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்கள்தான். அவர்கள் திருவது என்பது ஒரு படி என்றால் அதுதான் அபாரமானது என்பது அவர்களுடைய எண்ணம். தரவியல் கணியோ பணத்தையோ அவர்கள் திருடிவிடுவார்கள் என்று காலம் எதுவும் அவசியமில்லை. பெரிய இரும்பு வேலி தேவையில்லை. ஆயிரம் ஆயிரம் கலம் நெல்லை ஒரு திறந்த வெளியில் போட்டு, ஒரு சேலித் கோயிலைக் கோடுபோட்டு, ஒரு குறி வைத்துருப்பார்கள். அதற்கு இவ்விதம் காலம் நாட்பாமையாக இருப்பான். சமுதாயக் கட்டுக்கோப்பைக் காரணத்தால் இந்தத் தொழிலாளர்கள் நெல்லைத் தொட்டக் கூட மாட்டார்கள். தொழிலாளர்களுக்குக் கொடுப்பதைத்தான் அவர்கள் கூலியாக வாங்கிக்கொண்டுவார்கள்.

“கடவுளுக்கு எல்லாம் பங்காளன் என்றும் புகழாண்டவரான இவ்வுழை உழைக்கின்றான் என்று தஞ்சை ஜில்லா கடவுள் பங்காளன் பாசுக்களாக ஆழிப்பவர்களை எக்கா நினைக்கின்றார்கள்.”

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [5th November 1952]

யனிக்கிருார்கள். சமுதாயக் கட்டுக்கோப்பில் உழைத்து உழைத்து வந்த விவசாயிகள் இன்னும் உழைத்துக்கொண்டே இருக்கின்றார்கள். கடவுளுக்குப் பக்கத்தில் இருக்கின்றவர்கள் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளுபவர்கள் இன்று அதர்ம வாதிகளாக இருந்துகொண்டு, தங்களுடைய நிலையை உயர்த்திக் கொள்ள பல அக்கிரமமான வழிகளில் ஈடுபட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கடவுளுக்கு ஒன்றும் பணி செய்யவில்லை; கடவுளுடைய நிலத்தில் உழைக்கின்ற ஏழைகளுக்கும் ஒன்றும் நன்மை செய்யவில்லை. இன்று அவர்கள் வரி வசூலிப்பவர்களாகத்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். இன்றைக்கு ஒரு நிலம் ஐயர் கையில் இருக்கும், நாளைக்கு ஒரு நாயுடு கையில் போகும், பிறகு முதலியாரிடம் போகும், பிறகு யாராவது பிள்ளைக்குப் போகும். இப்படி நிலம் பல மிராச்தார்கள் கைகளில் மாறிக்கொண்டே இருக்கும். ஆனால், உலகம் தோன்றிய மூன்றாம் நாள் ஜாம்பவான் பிறந்தார் என்றால், நான்காவது தினத்தில் பிறந்த உழைவர்கள் இன்றைய தினம்வரை பூமியில் உழைத்து வருகிறார்கள். நாகரீகம் தோன்றி மனிதன் நிலத்தில் உழைக்க ஆரம்பித்ததிலிருந்து உழைவர்கள் நிலத்தைப் புண்படுத்தவதையே ஒரே நோக்கமாகக் கொண்டு, அன்றையத் தினத்திலிருந்து இன்றைய தினம்வரை வாழ்க்கை நடத்துகிறார்கள். மிராச்தார்கள் மாரிக்கொண்டே இருந்தார்கள். ஆனால், உழைவர்கள் இடம் மாறியதே இல்லை. நிலத்தில் பிறந்தார்கள். நிலத்தில் மடிக்கின்றார்கள். நிலத்தைப் புண்படுத்திய அன்றிலிருந்து இன்றுவரை அந்த நிலத்திலேயே உழைத்தவர்கள் யாராவது இருக்கிறார்களென்றால் அவர்கள்தான் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்கள். ஆனால், இவர்களுக்கு நிலத்தில் உரிமையில்லை.

“கனம் ரெலின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்கள் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் சுற்றுப் பிராயாணம் செய்துவிட்டு வந்த பிறகு அங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய அந்த செழிப்பையும், கொழிப்பையும் பார்த்து சந்தோஷப்பட்டார்கள். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை இவ்வளவு வளம்பொருந்திய பிரதேசமாகச் செய்வதற்குக் காரணம் யார் என்றால் அவர்கள் தான் எங்கள் ஜில்லா விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்கள்.

‘தொட்டால் கை மணக்கும்

சொன்னால் வாய் மணக்கும்

வாய்மையல்லாம் தீர்த்தம் . . .

என்பதாகவெல்லாம் எங்கள் ஜில்லாவின் வளத்தைப் பாடுவதற்கு, சிலேன் தோட்டத்தை வளப்படுத்திய இந்தியர்களைப்போல, மலேயா நாட்டை வளப்படுத்திய இந்தியர்களைப்போல தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளே யாகும். இந்தியர்கள் தென்னாப்பிரிக்காவைப் பொன்னாடாக்கினார்கள். சிலேனாவில் நம் தொழிலாளர்கள் சென்று காட்டை அழித்து கழனியாக்கினார்கள். ஆகையால், அங்கே வாழ்வதற்கு அவர்களுக்கு உரிமை வேண்டுமென்று கோருகிறோம். ஆனால், சொந்த நாட்டிலே விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்கள் சமுதாய ரீதியிலும் அரசியல் ரீதியிலும் புறக்கணிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள். வளத்தை உண்டாக்கியவர்களுக்கு வாழ், வசிக்க உரிமையில்லை.

13-40

p.m.

“தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் கடவுளுக்கு எதிரிடையாக, இவ்வளவு நாளாக இருந்த அடிமைத்தனத்திற்கு எதிரிடையாக, சமுதாய ரீதியில் விவசாயிகளை அடக்கி ஒடுக்கி மதத்தின் பெயரால் அவர்களைப் படுகுழியில் அமுக்கி வந்த கடவுள் பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கு, எதிரிடையாக, ஒரு சட்டம் செய்வது என்றால் அது சாமான்யமான காரியமல்ல. அதைச் செய்வதற்கு மிகவும் துணிச்சலான ஒரு தலைவர் வேண்டும். அதைச் செய்வதற்கு மிகவும் தைரியமானதொரு தலைவர் வேண்டும். தைரியமும், துணிச்சலும் மிக்க நம் மாபெரும் தலைவர் ராஜாஜி ஒருவரால் தான் சட்ட ரீதியாக இதைச் செய்ய முடிந்தது என்று எண்ணும்போது நான் பெருமைப்படுகிறேன். இதை யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாது. சென்ற மந்திரி சபையில் அங்கம் வகித்த ஸ்ரீ காளா வெங்கட்டராவ் அவர்களை நான் எங்கள் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள ஒவ்வொரு இராஜமத்திற்கும் அழைத்துச் சென்றேன். ஒவ்வொரு சேரிக்கும் அழைத்துச் சென்று விவசாய மக்கள், விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்கள் இன்றைய தினம்

[5th November 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu]

அனுபவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிற கஷ்டங்களையெல்லாம் எடுத்துச்சொல்லி, தேரிடையாகவும் காட்டி, உடனடியாக அவர்களைக் காப்பாற்றுவதற்கு நீங்கள் ஏதாவது ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னேன். அவரும் ஏதேனும் செய்யவேண்டுமென்றும் விரும்பினார். ஆனால் அவர்கள் சுற்றுப் பிரயாணத்தை முடித்துக்கொண்டு சென்னை வந்தவுடன் அவரால் ஒன்றுமே செய்யமுடியவில்லை. செய்வதாக அவர்கள் மக்களுக்கு வாக்களித்ததும் என்னியதும் உண்மைதான். ஆனால் இங்கே இருக்கிற அதிகார வர்க்கத்தினரை அவரால் சமாளிக்க முடியவில்லை. இங்கே இருக்கிற தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராச்தார்களின் குட்டிகளான உயர் பதவிகளிலுள்ள அதிகாரிகளை இவரால் திருப்பி, விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மையைச் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லி சமாளிக்க முடியாமல் போய்விட்டது. துணிச்சல் இல்லாமற் போய்விட்டது. அப்படியே ஏதாவது அவர் செய்ய முயற்சித் திருந்தால் மேலதிகாரிகள் சீறுவார்கள். ஜில்லா அதிகாரிகள் கர்ஜிப்பார்கள். பத்திரிகைகளோ, சர்க்காரே கவிழ்க்கூடிய நிலையிலே இவர்களைத் தாக்கு தாக்கு என்று தாக்கி எழுதியிருக்கும். ஏனென்றால் இங்கெல்லாம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராச்தார்களின் குழந்தைகள் தானே பதவி வகித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அங்கே தஞ்சையில் சுய புத்தியற்ற, தைரியமற்ற, ஆண்மையற்ற, எதிர்ப்பைச் சமாளிக்கும் திறமையற்ற உழைவர்கள் கதிகலங்க அடிக்கப்பட்டார்கள். ஆனால் இன்றைய தினம் நமது மதிப்பிற்குரிய ராஜாஜி எதிர்ப்பைக்கண்டு அஞ்சாதவர். உருட்டலுக்கும், மிட்டலுக்கும் அசைந்து கொடுக்காதவர். ஆகையினால் தான் இவரால் இந்த சட்டத்தை வெற்றிகரமாகக் கொண்டு வரமுடிந்தது என்று நான் நிச்சயமாகக் கருதுகிறேன்.

“தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள் மிக்க பொறுமையானவர்கள். இன்றைக்கும் அதிகாரிகளின் அருகில் போய் நின்றால், அவர், ‘சே எட்டி போடா’ என்றுலும் கோபித்துக்கொள்ளாது கை கட்டிக் கொண்டு அப்பாற்போய் நிற்கக்கூடிய பரம சாதுக்கள். பண்ணையில் அவன் அடிமையாக வாழையடி வாழையாக உழைத்து வந்த நாள் முதல் இன்றைய வரைக்கும் அவனுக்குத் தன் மானம் என்பதே கொஞ்சம்கூட இருந்ததில்லை. ரோஷம் என்பது அவனுக்கு உபயோக கிடையாது என்று நாம் சொல்லிவிடலாம். ஆகையால் சமுதாயத்தை உடைத்து, கட்டுப் பாட்டை தகர்த்தெறிந்து, பழக்க வழக்கங்களைச் சிலை பின்னப்படுத்தி ஒரு அவசரச்சட்டத்தை ராஜாஜி கொண்டு வந்ததின் காரணமாக தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்வில் ஒரு புது சகாப்தம் தொடங்கி விட்டது. விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்வில் புதியதொரு மறுமலர்ச்சி ஏற்படுவதற்கு வித்தாணன்றியாகவிட்டது என்பதற்காக நான் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள எல்லா தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளின் சார்பாகவும் கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜிக்கு நன்றியைத் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் சில மாறுதல்களைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்பதாக சில நண்பர்கள் பேசினார்கள். அதைப்பற்றி நான் சிலவற்றைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் இன்றைய தினம் அமுலில் இருக்கிற வாரம் என்பது, பெரும் பாலான வேறு ஜில்லாவாசிகளுக்குத் தெரியாது. அம்மாதிரி தெரியாததின் காரணமாகத்தான் எனக்கு முன் பேசிய சில நண்பர்கள் மிராச்தார்களுக்கு ஒரு முதலியவைகள் போடுவதற்குச் சில சலுகைகள் அளிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாகப் பேசினார்கள். எங்கள் ஜில்லா மிராச்தார்கள் தங்கள் ஆதிக்கியத்தை வைத்துக் கொள்வதற்காக, விவசாயிகளை என்றைக்கும் அடிமைகளாக வைத்துக் கொள்வதற்காக தன்னுடைய செல்வத்தைப் பெருக்கிக் கொள்வதற்குப் பக்கலாடாக விவசாயிகளை உபயோகித்துக் கொள்வதற்காக, இந்த வார முறையை உண்டு பண்ணியிருக்கிறார்களே தவிர, ‘விவசாயிகள் பிழைத்துப் போகட்டும், அவர்கள் நன்றாக வாழட்டும்’, என்ற நல்லெண்ணத்தால் அல்ல என்பதை முதலில் நாம் எல்லோரும் நன்றாக உணர்ந்து கொள்ள வேண்டும். ஒரு மிராச்தார் தன்னுடைய நிலத்தில் பெரும் பகுதியைத்தான் சொந்தப் பண்ணியில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளுவார். சில நிலங்களை ஆளுக்குக் கொஞ்சமாக வசூலித்திருப்பித்தான் கொடுத்திருப்பார்கள். இந்த நிலங்களை வசூலித்திருந்த பூட்டிக்கொண்ட விவசாயிகள் தனக்கு கொடுக்கப்பட்ட நிலத்தில்

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [5th November 1952]

கூட முதலில் உழக்கடாது. மிருசுதார்கள் பண்ணைக்காக வைத்திருக்கும் நிலத்தில் வேலை செய்து விட்டேதான் பிறகு தன் னுடைய நிலத்தை சாகுபடி செய்யவேண்டும். அவன் கொல்லையில் இருக்கும் எருவையும் பண்ணைக்கு வைத்திருக்கும் நிலத்திலேவேண்டும். இது மாதிரியாக பண்ணையில் இருக்கும் தன்னுடைய நிலங்களை சாகுபடி செய்வதற்கு ஆள்பலத்தை இனாமாகத் தேடிக்கொள்வதற்காகத் தான் இந்த வார முறை எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டது. அதோடு கூட மிருசுதார் வீட்டில் ஒரு நல்ல காரியமாலும், கெட்ட காரியமாலும் இந்த வாரக்காரர்கள் அவர் வீட்டில் னையைக் கட்டிக்கொண்டு நிற்கவேண்டும். ஊருக்குப் போவதாக இடந்தாலும் சரி, ஊரிலிருந்து அவர்கள் வீட்டுக்கு யார் வந்தாலும் சரி இந்த விவசாயிகள் அவர்கள் சாமான்களைத் தூக்கிவரச் செல்லவேண்டும். ஆக இப்படியாக கூலிக்கு பணம் கொடுக்காமல் ஆட்களை நியமித்துக் கொள்வதற்காகத்தான் இந்த வார முறை எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்படி தன்னுடைய வருமானத்தை செலவின்றி பெருக்கிக் கொள்வதற்காக மிருசுதார்கள் இம்முறையை ஏற்படுத்தினார்களே தவிர, 'எழை விவசாயிகளிடம் மாடு இருக்காதே, கன்று இருக்காதே. அவர்களும் தான் கொஞ்சம் நன்மையை அடையட்டும்; சுகமாக வாழட்டும்,' என்ற நல்லெண்ணத்தால் அல்ல என்பதை சபையிலுள்ளோர் முதலில் புரிந்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். உங்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும், சின்பாட் என்ற மாலுமியின் சகை. போனாலு போகிறதென்று நடக்கமுடியாமல் உட்கார்ந்திருந்த ஒரு கிழவனை அவன் தோளில் எடுத்து வைத்துக் கொள்ளப்போய், அவன் தன் ஆகாரத்திற்காக அங்கு போ, இங்கு போ என்று விறட்டியதோடு கூட தன் கால்களால் இவன் கழுத்தையும் நெறித்த கதை; அதைப் போல தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிருசுதார்கள் விவசாயிகளின் கழுத்தில் ஏறி உட்கார்ந்துகொண்டு தங்கள் லாபத்தை, தங்கள் வருமானத்தைப் பெருக்கிக் கொள்வதுடன் கூட அவர்கள் கழுத்தையும், வாழ்வையும் மரியாதையையும் நெறிக்கிறார்கள்: நசுக்குகிறார்கள், நசுக்குவதையோ, நெறிப்பதையோ அந்த விவசாயிகள் உணரமுடியாத வகையில்; சமுதாய கோட்பாடு, கட்டுப்பாட்டுக்கு அடங்கிய விவசாயிகள் இன்றைக்கும் தன் னுமான் உண்டு. எஜமான் வீட்டுப் பண்ணை உண்டு என்ற நிலைமையில்தான் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறான். அப்படி பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக அடிமைப் பட்டு வந்த விவசாயிகள், 'எந்தை தந்தை தந்தை தந்தை தம் மூத்தப்பன் ஏழ்படிதால் தொடங்கி வந்து வந்து வழி ஆட்செய் கின்றோம்,' என பணியாற்றிவரும் விவசாயிகள், சமுதாய ரீதியில் நசுக்கப்பட்டு வந்த விவசாயிகள், மதக் கட்டுப்பாடுகளின் மூலம் அழுத்தப்பட்டு வந்த விவசாயிகள் முன்னேற்றுவதற்காக கனம் ராஜாஜி சட்டம் கொண்டு வந்ததற்காக நான் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள் சார்பாக அவருக்கு நன்றி தெரிவிக்கக் கூடமைப்பட்டுள்ளேன். தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களுக்கு ஒரு விழிப்பை உண்டு பண்ணி, அவர்களுக்குத்தக்க பாதுகாப்பையும் இந்த சர்க்கார் கொடுக்க முன்வந்தது வருங்காலச் சந்ததிகள் எல்லாம் வாழ்த்தவேண்டிய தொரு மகத்தான செய்கையாகும்.

"இப்பொழுது சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது. சட்டம் எந்த முறையில் அமுல் நடத்தப்படுகிறதென்பதை நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அதனால் எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் இல்லையென்பதாகப் பலர் ரொம்பப் பரிதாபகரமாகப் பேசுகிறார்கள். வாரம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 40 சத விதம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்னும்பொழுது மிருசுதார்களிடையே பலத்த கூக்குரல் கேட்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் நானும், மணலி கந்தசாமியும் மிருசுதார்கள் இல்லை. மிருசுதார்களாக இருந்தால் நாங்களும் அவர்களுடன் சேர்ந்து கொண்டிருப்போமோ என்னவோ? இவ்வளவு நாளாக அனுபவித்து வந்த செளகரியங்களில் கொஞ்சம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு விட்டுக்கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அவர்கள் கூச்சல் போடுகிறார்கள். விவசாயிகள் கிளர்ச்சி செய்ததின் காரணத்தை அவர்கள் உணர்ந்திருந்தால் அவர்கள் இப்படி எதிர்ப்பு மகாநாயகன் நடத்தவேண்டிய அவசியமிருக்காது.

"இன்றைய தினம் விவசாயிகளின் நலனைக் கருத்தில் கொண்டு சர்க்கார் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தைக்கொண்டு வந்தார்கள். இருந்தாலும் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள், சர்க்கார் என்ன நோக்கம் கொண்டிருக்கிறதோ அதை

[5th November 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu]

நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கிறார்களா என்று பார்க்கவேண்டியது அவர்களை நிர்வகிக்கும் அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமை. குறிப்பாக சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் விவசாயிகளை அனுதாபத்தோடு பார்ப்பதேயில்லை. அவர்களுக்குச் சலுகை காட்டுவதேயில்லை. பணமுடையவர்களிடம் தான் செல்வாக்கு உள்ள சீமான் களிடம் தான் அவர்கள் கருணையோடு மரியாதையோடு நடந்து கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். மிருசுதார்கள் ஒன்று சொல்லி விட்டால் அதவே அவர்கள் வேதவாக்கு. ஏனென்றால் அவர்களை நம்பித்தானே இவர்கள் அங்கே வாழ்கிறார்கள். பொருளாதார வசதியுள்ள, பணத்தைப் பக்கபலமாக உடைய மிருசுதார்களுக்குத்தான் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் உதவியாக இன்று இருக்கிறார்களே தவிர, எழை விவசாயிகளின் சார்பாக அவர்கள் உதவி செய்யும் மனப்பான்மையே கிடையாது என்பதை நாம் எல்லோரும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளத்தான்வேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்த பிறகு எங்கள் ஜில்லாவுக்கு விஜயம் செய்த முதல் மந்திரிக்கு எவ்வளவு ஆர்வத்துடன் எங்கள் ஜில்லா மக்கள் வரவேற்பு அளித்தார்கள் என்பது உங்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். மடை திறந்து விட்டாற்போல அவர்களது மகிழ்ச்சி எல்லையைக் கடந்து நிற்கிறது. ஆகையினால் இப்பொழுது அந்தச் சட்டத்தை சரியானபடி அமுல் நடத்தப் போட்டிருக்கின்ற சமரச அதிகாரிகள் சமரச மனப்பான்மையுடன் இரு சாரரிடமும் நடந்துகொள்ளவேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும்.

"அப்பொழுதுதான் விவசாயிகள் சட்டத்தினால் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் சலுகையை பூரிணமாக அனுபவிக்க முடியும். சமரச அதிகாரிகள் சட்டத்தில் கண்ட விஷயத்தை மனச்சாட்சிக்கு விரோதமில்லாமல் நடத்தி வைக்க வேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். நடு நிலைமை வகிக்கவேண்டிய சமரச அதிகாரிகள் சரியாக நடந்துகொள்ளவில்லைபென புகார்கள் வந்து கொண்டே இருக்கின்றன. அவர்கள் மனப்போக்கிலும் சீர்திருத்தம் வேண்டும்.

"உருந்து பயர் எல்லாம் விவசாயிகளுக்கே சொந்தம் என்பதை மிருசு தார்கள் வலிமையாக எதிர்க்கிறார்கள். இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 40 கலம் வாரம் என்று தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா பூராவுக்கும் ஒரே மாதிரியாக இருப்பதை எதிர் தரப்பிலுள்ளவர்கள் எதிர்க்கிறார்கள். ஏனென்றால் இந்தச் சட்டத்திற்கு முன்பே அவர்களுக்கு சில இடங்களில் 40 கலம் கொடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இதனால் லாபம் இல்லையென்பது உண்மைதான். (என்னைக் கேட்டால் உருந்து பயிரில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 60 கலமும், மிருசுதார்களுக்கு 40 கலமும் கொடுத்தால் போதுமென்று தான் நான் சொல்வேன். எருவையெய்திலும் மிருசுதார்கள் 60 வீதம் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். இருந்தாலும் இருக்கக் கூடிய நிலவரங்களையெல்லாம் ஒட்டி ராஜாஜி கொண்டுவந்திருப்பதை ஆதரிக்கிறேன். இந்தச் சட்டமே சரியாக அமுல் நடத்தமுடியாதபடி செய்ய மிருசுதார்கள் போலீஸ்காரர்களின் உதவியைக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளுக்கு மிகவும் தொந்தரவு அளித்து வருகிறார்கள்.) சமரச அதிகாரிகள் கும்பகோணத்தில் ஓரளவு சரியாக நடப்பதாக அறிகிறேன். மாயவரத்தில் கோவில் நிர்வாகிகள், பண்பா சந்நதிகள் ஆட்சிக்கு உட்பட்டே நடப்பதாகவும், நன்னிலத்தில் அடியோடு மோச மென்றும் புகார்கள் வருகின்றது.

"குறிப்பாக அணியமலை, பாஸ்கரராஜாபுரம் போன்ற கிராமங்களில் பல மல சிறிய மிருசுதார்களின் நிலங்களை எல்லாம் பெரிய மிருசுதார்கள் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டு தனக்கு உருந்து பயறு எதுவும் வேண்டாமென்று எழுதிக் கொடுத்தால்தான் உன்னிடம் நிலத்தை ஒப்படைப்பேன் என்பதாக விவசாயிகளிடம் எழுதி வாங்கிக்கொண்டு அக்கிரமங்கள் செய்ய ஆரம்பித்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்ற செய்தி எனக்குக் கிடைத்திருக்கிறது. இன்னும் பல இடங்களில் இம்மாதிரியாக நடக்கிறார்கள். முதலிலேயே நிலத்தை விவசாயி களுக்குக் கொட்டிக்கு விட்டு, யார் உருந்து பயறு வேண்டாம் என்று எழுதிக்கொடுக்கிறார்களோ அவர்களிடம் அவ்வாறே எழுதி வாங்கிக்கொண்டு நிலம் கொடுத்து வருவதாக அறிகிறேன். இம்மாதிரியாக வெள்ளம் நடக்காமல் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டியது நம்முடைய பொதுப்பணியும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு சொந்தமாக உணர்ச்சி கிடைக்கிறது.

"என்னதான் உருந்து பயறு மிகவும் உன் தனக்கே உரிசுருக்கெனவேண்டும் உனக்கே நாம் ஆட்செய்வோம்."

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [5th November 1952]

என்பதாக விவசாயிகள் பண்ணையாரிடம் அடிமையாகவே இருக்கிறார்கள். பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக அடிமைப்பட்டு, சமுதாய ரீதியில் கட்டுப்படுத்தப் பட்டு சாகுபடி செய்து வந்த விவசாயிகள் இன்னமும் பழைய மனோபாவத்தை விட மனமில்லாதவர்களாக பண்ணையார் சொல்வதையே வேதவாக்காக அவர் சொல்கிறதற்குக் கட்டுப்பட்டு, அடிமைப்பட்டு நடக்கத் தயாராக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் பண்ணையார்களிடம் பட்டிருக்கும் கடன் நிறைய இருக்கிறது. இவைகளையெல்லாம் நீக்கி அவர்களை விடுவித்து, சுய மரியாதையோடு, சுய உணர்ச்சியோடு அவர்கள் வாழ்க்கை நடத்த நாம் ஏற்பாடு செய்வது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும்.

12-50
p.m.

“நாம் சட்டம் செய்கிறோம். அதை அமுல் நடத்துவது அதிகாரிகளின் கையில் தான் இருக்கிறது. மேட்டூர் அணை திறந்தாலும் வாய்க்கால் தலைப்பு மூடியிருந்தால் வயலின் கண்ணீர் பாயுமா? பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு விவசாயிகளுக்கும் நன்மை ஏற்படக் கூடிய முறையில் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்த வேண்டும்.

“இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு வந்து பார்த்தால் உங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். மிருசுதாரர்கள் ஒரு சீட்டு ஒன்றில் எதையோ எழுதி வைத்து பத்திரத்தில் குறிப்பாடச் செய்து கடன் கொடுத்ததாகப் பத்திரத்தில் எழுதி வாங்கிக் கொண்டு விடுகிறார்கள். மிருசுதாரர்களிடம் என்ன கடன் வாங்கியிருக்கிறோம், பத்திரத்தில் என்ன எழுதி இருக்கிற தென்பது அவனுக்கு தெரியாது. என்ன எழுதி இருக்கிறதென்று கேட்டு விட்டால் அடுத்த வருஷம் அவனுக்கு அந்த நிலம் கிடைக்காது. அதனால் அவன் ஒன்றும் கேட்கவும் மாட்டான். பத்திரம் எப்படி எழுதப்பட்டிருந்தாலும் சரி அவன் அதில் கையெழுத்துப் போட்டுக் கொடுக்க வேண்டியது தான். இப்படி பழம்பாக்கிக்காக ஏராளமான பத்திரங்கள் மிருசுதாரர்கள் இன்றைய தினம் எழுதி வைத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

“அதோடு கூட தை மாதத்தில் அறுவடை முடிந்த அன்றைய தினமே அடுத்த வருஷத்திற்கு நிலப் போட்டி ஆரம்பமாகிவிடுகிறது. ஆண்டானும், சாய்பானும் மிருசுதாரர்கள் வீட்டு கம்பக் காலே சுத்திச் சுத்தி வந்து கொண்டிருப்பார்கள். அவர்கள் வீட்டு மாட்டைக் குளப்பாட்டுதல், கன்றுக் குட்டியைப் பிடித்துக் கட்டுதல், ஏஜமானர் வேஷ்டியை துவைத்தல், பள்ளிக்கூடத்திற்குப் போகும் குழந்தைகளுக்குக் கறிகாய்கள் அனுப்புதல், சமாசாரங்களைக் கொண்டு செல்லல், பரங்கிப் பிஞ்சு, பூசனிப்பிஞ்சு வினி யோகம் இவைகள் ஆற்றில் தண்ணீர் வந்து வாய்க்காலில் தண்ணீர் விடுமட்டும். சாகுபடி வேலை ஆரம்பித்த பின் யார் அதிக குத்தகைக்கு ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுகிறார்களோ, யார் குறைந்த வாரத்திற்கு வேலை செய்ய ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுகிறார்களோ அவர்களுக்கு நிலம் விடப்படும். ஏஜமானரின் சொந்த விருப்பப்படி. அதை ஏனென்று யாரும் கேட்க முடியாது. என்னிடம் ஒரு புகார் வந்திருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது கும்பகோணத்தில் உளுந்து பயறு இல்லாமல் நிலத்தை குத்தகைக்கு ஒப்புக்கொள்ள திருவிசு குத்தகைக்குக் கேட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கும்பொழுது அதில் ஒரு விபீஷணன் கொல்லப்பட்டதாக அம்மாளிடம் சென்று உயர்ந்த குத்தகைக்கு உளுந்து பயறு இல்லாமல் நெல் அளப்பதாக சொல்லி சிபார்சு தேடியதாக அறிகிறேன். இப்படியெல்லாம் நடக்கும் சமுதாயக் கட்டுப்பாட்டைத் தான், வருஷ காலத்திற்கு.

“சட்டத்தினால் பிரயோசனம் ஏற்படாமலிருக்க மிருசுதாரர்கள் இன்றைய தினம் பழம்பாக்கிக் கணக்குகளைக் கொண்டு வந்து ஏழை விவசாயிகளை விடாவிடுகிறார்கள்: மிரட்டுகிறார்கள். மிராசுதாரர்கள் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளிடம் சங்களுக்கு இருக்கும் செல்வாக்கை உபயோகப்படுத்திக் கொண்டு அணியமலை, பாஸ்கராஜபுரம், சாத்தனூர், வண்ணக்குடி, முள்ளக்குடி, முதற்கட்டை இந்த கிராமங்களில் அதிகாரிகளிடம் இருக்கும் தொடர்பு காரணமாக உழவர்களுக்கு மேல் வழக்கு எடுத்து வருகிறார்கள். வாங்காத கடனுக்கு அவர்கள் வாங்கியிருப்பதாக பொய் பத்திரங்கள் வைத்திருக்

5th November 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu]

கிறார்கள். அதனால் தான் சட்ட ரீதியாக விவசாயிகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்த கஷ்டப்படுத்த ஆயிரம், இரண்டாயிரம் கொடுத்து சட்ட நிபுணர்களை வைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கெல்லாம் கடன் நிவாரணம் அளிக்க நாம் முயல்வேண்டும்.

“இந்தச் சட்டம் நல்ல சட்டம் தான். இருந்தாலும் எல்லா மாறுதல்களையும் ஒரே நாளில் கொண்டுவர முடியாது என்பதை நான் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். பொறுத்துப் பார்த்து பல திருத்தங்களை இதில் நாம் நாளாவட்டத்தில் செய்தாகவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்திருப்பதே தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள பல விவசாயிகளுக்குத் தெரியாது. அவர்கள் பத்திரிகைகள் படிக்கத் தெரிந்தவர்கள் அல்லர். ரேடியோவும் கேட்பது கிடையாது. அவ்விதம் கேட்பதற்கும் ரேடியோ எல்லா கிராமங்களிலும் கிடையாது. அவர்களுக்குச் சட்டத்தினால் ஏற்படக் கூடிய நன்மைகளையும், உரிமைகளையும் எடுத்துச் சொல்லவேண்டியது நம்முடைய கடமையாகும். அதற்குப் போதுமான அவகாசம் கிடையாது. முப்பது நாட்கள் தவணையில் உழவர்கள் இதை புரிந்து கொண்டு செயலாற்றி விடுவார்கள் என்று எண்ணுவது நம்மை நாமே ஏமாற்றிக் கொள்வதாகும். இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் காலத்தைக் கூட்டிக் கொடுத்திருக்கவேண்டும். ஏதோ தகராறுகள் இருக்கும் இடங்களில் தான் இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி கொஞ்சம் உழவர்கள் தெரிந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். மற்ற இடங்களில் நிலைமை அப்படியில்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றியது ரொம்பவும் குறைவு தான். கன்விலேஷன் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அனுப்பப் பட்டிருக்கும் மனுக்களிலிருந்து இதைத் தெரிந்து கொள்ளலாம் என்று ஒருவர் பேசினார். ஆனால் அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் அநீதிகளை நாம் மதிப்பிட முடியாது. ஸ்ரீ மணிலி கந்த சாமி சொல்லியதைப் போல பல இடங்களில் சமரசமாக மிருசுதாரர்கள், விவசாயிகள் தகராறுகள் தீர்க்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஆகையினால் இன்றைய தினம் சமாதானம் எப்படி அந்தப் பிரதேசங்களில் செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிற தென்பதையும் சர்க்கார் ஆராயவேண்டும். சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்த முடியாமல் இருக்கும்படியாக அங்கு இருக்கும் மிருசுதாரர்கள் வேலை செய்து வருவார்கள். அவர்கள் இந்தச் சட்டத்திலிருந்து தப்பித்துக் கொள்வதற்கு வேண்டிய சக்தியும், திறமையும், பலமும் உள்ளவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள்.

“பல இடங்களிலே விவசாயிகளுக்கு வாரம் கொடுக்கும்பொழுது நல்ல நெல்லையே கொடுப்பது கிடையாது. போரடி நெல்லைத் தான் கொடுக்கிறார்கள். மறுத்துக் கேட்டால் அடுத்த வருஷம் அவனுக்கு நிலம் கொடுக்கமாட்டார்கள். நெல் அளக்க எங்கள் ஜில்லா மிருசுதாரர்கள் மூன்று வித மரக்கால்கள் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஒன்று கூலி மரக்கால். அது முத்திரை அளவு மரக்கால் விட 25 சத விதம் குறைவாக அளக்கும். இரண்டாவது களத்து மரக்கால். இது அளவு மரக்கால் விட 1½ மடங்கு பெரியதாக இருக்கும். மூன்றாவது தான் முத்திரை மரக்கால். கூலி மரக்காலால் தான் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு போரடி நெல்லை அளந்து கொடுப்பார்கள். களத்து மரக்காலால் தான் விவசாயிகளிடமிருந்து வாரத்தைப் பெற்றுக் கொள்ளும்போது நல்ல நெல்லை அளந்து வாங்கிக் கொள்ளுவார்கள். வியாபாரிக்கு நெல் விலைக்குப் போடும்பொழுது மாதிரம் முத்திரை மரக்காலே உபயோகப்படுத்துவார்கள். போரடி நெல்லையும் அளவு குறைந்த கூலி மரக்காலால் ஏன் அளந்து கொடுக்கிறார்கள் என்று எந்த விவசாயியாவது கேட்டு விட்டால் அடுத்த வருஷம் அவனுக்கு நிலம் கிடையாது. ஊரை விட்டே அவன் குடும்பத்தோடு ஓட வேண்டிய நிலைமை தான் அவனுக்கு ஏற்படும். அப்படிப்பட்ட தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிருசுதாரர்களின் உருப்புப்படியிலிருந்து விவசாயிகளை விடுவிக்கத்தான் இன்றைய தினம் இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது. இந்தச் சட்டப் பிரகாரம் விவசாயிக்கு 40 சத விதமும், நிலச்சவானுக்கு 60 சத விதமும் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நிர்ணயிக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறது. உரம்போட்டு வெள்ளாமை செய்தால் விவசாயிக்கு ஒன்றுமே மிஞ்சாது. அவனுக்கு 16 சதம் வாரம் கட்டியவந்தால் பெரிய பாடாக இருக்கும். அதனால் தான் என்னைக் கேட்டால் 60 சத விதம் விவசாயிக்கும், 40 சத விதம் நிலச்சவர்

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [5th November 1952]

னுக்கும் கொடுத்தால் போதுமானது. அதே போல உளுந்து பயிரில் 60 சத விசை உழவனுக்கும், சவானுக்கு 40 சதமும், எருச்செலவி, சவானுக்கு 60 சதமும், விவசாயிக்கு 40 சதமும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்றும் ஏற்பாடு செய்தாக வேண்டும். மேலும் உளுந்து பயிரில் தான் விவசாயிக்கு லாபம் கிடைக்கும். ஆகவே நிலத்தில் எந்தப் பயிரை போடலாமென்ற உரிமையையும் விவசாயியிடமே கொடுத்து விடவேண்டும். நிலத்தில் எந்தப் பயிர் போடவேண்டுமென்ற உரிமை நிலச்சவானுக்கும் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்பதாக எதிர்ப்பக்கத்திலுள்ளவர்கள் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதை ஒப்புக்கொண்டால் விவசாயிக்கு எந்த விதமான நன்மையும் ஏற்படாது. பழைய நிலமையிலேயே இருக்கவேண்டும். ஆகையினால் தான் விவசாயிகளிடமே அந்த உரிமையைக் கொடுத்துவிட்டால் விவசாயி நன்றாக வேலை செய்து உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவான். உணவுக் கொள்முதலுக்கு என்று நாம் வெளி நாட்டுக்கு 180 கோடி ரூபாய்களை அனுப்பி வருகிறோம். அவையும் நின்றுவிடும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு விவசாயம் செய்ய போதுமான பணத்தையும் நாம் கொடுத்து உதவி செய்ய வேண்டும். இவ்விதம் நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்து நாட்டை நல்ல நிலைக்குக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

“என் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு மட்டும் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும்? மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் ஏன் கொண்டுவரக்கூடாது? என்று எதிரிலுள்ள பல பேர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். தமிழ் நாட்டின் நெற்களஞ்சியம் எனப் பெயர் பெற்ற தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள பிராசுதாரர்களின் கட்டுப்பாட்டை உடைத்து, பழக்க வழக்கங்களைச் சிதைத்து, சமுதாய கோட்பாட்டைப் பிளந்து, ஒரு சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்துவிட்டால் அதை மற்ற இடங்களுக்கு தேவைப்படும்போது விஸ்தரிப்பதில் கஷ்டமிருக்காது என்று தான் முதலிலேயே இந்த ஜில்லாவிற்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. ராஜாஜியைத் தவிர வேறு யார் இதைக் கொண்டு வந்திருந்தாலும் அவருடைய சர்க்கார் மறுதினமே கவிழ்ந்திருக்கும். ஆகவே எந்த இடத்தில் கொண்டுவருவது கஷ்டமோ எந்த இடத்தில் கொண்டுவருவது அவசியமோ அந்த இடத்தில் கொண்டுவந்து குறித்து சந்தோஷப்பட வேண்டும்/ இதைப்பற்றி ஸ்ரீ குமரப்பாவிடம் நான் நேரே சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன். அப்போதைய பிரதம மந்திரி ஸ்ரீமான் ஓ. பி. ராமசாமி ரெட்டியாரிடம் இது மாதிரியான விவசாய சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தை உம்மால் கொண்டுவர முடியுமா? கொண்டு வந்தால் உம்முடைய சர்க்கார் மறுதினமே கவிழ்ந்துவிடாது? என்று கேட்டேன். அதற்கு நான் துடுக்காகப் பேசுவதாக பதிலளித்துவிட்டார். இன்றையதினம் உண்மையைச் சொல்கிறேன், இந்தச் சட்டத்தை அவர் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென நினைத்தாலுங்கூட அவரது மந்திரி சபை அன்றே கவிழ்ந்திருக்கும். ஏனென்றால் அவ்வளவு பண பலமும், சமுதாய பலமும் படைத்தவர்கள் தஞ்சை பிராசுதாரர்கள். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்படக்கூடிய அனுபவத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் இதை இந்த சர்க்கார் விஸ்தரிக்க உத்தேசித்திருக்கிறது. அப்படியே செய்யவும் செய்வார்கள். ஆகையால் அதைப்பற்றி நாம் கவலைப்படவண்டியதில்லை. கடைசியாக இன்னும் சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு முடித்துவிடுகிறேன்.

“கோயில் நிலங்களை அனேகம் பேர்கள் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் திருநெல்வேலியிலிருந்தும், பொள்ளாச்சியிலிருந்தும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான பணத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வந்து நிலத்தை இங்கே குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இவர்களால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு இழைக்கப்படும் அநீதிகள் கொஞ்சநஞ்சமல்ல. தங்கள் காரியத்தைச் சாதித்துக்கொள்ள இவர்கள் சென்னை செக்ரடேரியட்டுக்கு குட்பகோணத் திலிருந்தே பரங்கி டெலிபோனில் பேசுகிறார்கள். அதிகாரிகள் காஸ்டமோ கள் முடிவு செய்யப்பட்டு வருகின்றன. விவசாயிகள் எவ்வளவு மனுக்கள் போரடிக்கொண்டாலும் கவனிக்கப்படுவதில்லை. விவசாயிகளை ஆதரிக்கும் அதிகாரிகளையும் மேலதிகாரிகள் ஒரிடத்தில் இருக்க விடுவதில்லை. குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்து நஷ்டப்பட்டவர்களுக்குப் பரிகாரம் வேண்டும். விவசாயிகளின் அனைத்தையும் ரத்து செய்யவும் வேண்டும். கோவில் மனை

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [5th November 1952]

களிலிருந்து குடிக்களை அப்புறப்படுத்தாமலும், அவர்கள் கொல்லியில் வைத்த மரங்களை வெட்டாமலும் பாபத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். மனைக் கட்டுகளைப் பிரிப்பதை உடனடியாகத் தடுக்கவேண்டும். பழைய குத்தகை பாக்கிகளுக்கு ஒரு முடிவு செய்யவண்டுமென்று தான் நேற்றைய தினம் என்டெனமென்ட் மந்திரி கண்டு பேசினான். அதற்குப் பரிகாரம் செய்ய கூடிய சீக்கிரம் இம்மாதக் கடைசியில் தஞ்சை வரப்போவதாக என்டெனமென்ட் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கூறினார்கள். இவ்ரு சர்க்கார் உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டும். ஆகவே, உடைசியாக இந்த விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்தச் சட்டத்தை எல்லா ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் கொண்டுவர ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். பரிட்சார்த்தமாக தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் முதன் முதலாக இதைக் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பதைக் குறித்து பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்களைப் பாரட்டி கணம் ரெவீனியு மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் இந்த மசோதாவை நான் மனப்பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.”

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—“I am fixing a time-limit of ten minutes for each hon. member to speak.”

*SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM:—“கனம் உபதலைவர்கள் அவர்களே, 1 p.m. புதிய சட்டம் வந்ததற்குப் பின்னால் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிலே என்ன ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது, நமது மாகாணம் பூராவும் ஜனங்களுடைய மனதில் எப்படியிருக்கிறதென்று பார்த்தால், குறிப்பாக தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் அது ஒரு பெரிய விழிப்பை உண்டுபண்ணியிருக்கின்றது. ஆனால் அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய பிரச்சனைகள் சகலவற்றையும் இந்தப் புதிய சட்டமானது தீர்க்கவில்லை. அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய பிரச்சனைகளைப் பற்றி இங்குள்ளோரில் சிலர் தெளிவாகப் பேசினார்கள். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலே அவசரச் சட்டம், உண்மையிலேயே அது ஒரு பிற்போக்கானதாக இருந்தாலும், அதில் பல குறைபாடுகள் இருந்தாலும்கூட, இவ்வளவு நாட்களாக யாரும் செய்யாமலிருந்த, இன்று ஆட்சியில் இருக்கின்றவர்கள் இதைக் கொண்டுவந்து இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே, அதைப் பாரட்ட வேண்டும்.

“இந்தப் பிரச்சனையிலே தலையிடுவதற்கு முன்னால் ஆட்சிக்கு வந்தவர்களெல்லோரும் உண்மையிலேயே பயப்பட்டார்கள். காணம் என்னவென்பதை நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். இந்தப் பிரச்சனையில் தலையிட்டால், நண்பர் சொன்னதுபோல, மாகாணத்திலுள்ள அத்தனை பிராசுதாரர்களும் சேர்ந்துகொண்டு சர்க்காரைக் கவிழ்க்கக்கூடிய அபாயம் இருந்தது. அதையெல்லாம் எதிர்த்துக் காரியம் செய்யக்கூடியவர்கள் அப்பொழுது இல்லாமலிருந்தார்கள். அதற்கு பின்னால் நீண்டதோர் கிளர்ச்சி மாகாணம் பூராவும் மிகவும் கடுமையான முறையில் நடந்தது. அதன் காரணமாக சபையில் பேசியவர்கள், அதாவது இந்த தஞ்சாவூர் அவசரச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றி பேசியவர்கள், நான் உள்பட, ஸ்ரீமான் கந்தசாமி உள்பட, ஸ்ரீமான் நாராயணசாமி நாயுடு உள்பட, எல்லோரும் ஒரே காலத்தில் சிறையில் இருந்தோம். அதற்குப் பின்னால், அதாவது 4 வருஷங்களுக்குப் பிறகு இந்தச் சட்டம் வருகிறது. இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் குறைபாடுகளையெல்லையென்று ஒரு சாரர் வாதிடுகிறார்கள். இந்தச் சட்டத்திலே குறைபாடுகள் உள்ளன. சாதாரணமாக சட்டம் தெரிந்தவர்கள், விவசாயத் துறையில் பழக்கம் இல்லாதவர்கள், அல்லது வெறும் அனுதாபிகள் யாரும் உணர்ந்து கொள்ளமுடியாது; அறிந்து கொள்ளலாம், தெரிந்து கொள்ளலாம். புரிந்துகொள்ளலாம்; உணர்ந்து கொள்ளமுடியாது. அந்தத் துறையில் நேரடியாக விவசாயம் செய்பவர்கள், அல்லது அவர்களுடைய தினசரி வாழ்க்கையில் தொடர்பு உள்ளவர்கள், அவர்கள் தான் உணர்ந்து கொள்ள முடியும். அந்த முறையில் பார்க்கும்போது பல குறைகள் இருக்கின்றன. அந்தக் குறைகள் தீர்க்கப்படவேண்டும். திருத்தவதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் இதை Select கமிட்டிக்கு விடவேண்டுமென்று கோருவதன் நோக்கம்.

“ஆரம்பத்தில், நமது மாகாணத்தில் ஒரு ஜில்லாவில் சட்டம் செய்யப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இப்படிப்பட்ட சட்டமானது இந்த மாகாணம்

[Sri K. R. Nallasivam] [5th November 1952]

பூராவுக்குமே நிறைவேற்றப்படவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இந்த டாக்டர் ணத்திலுள்ள பிரச்சினைகள் எல்லோரும் எப்படியாகிலும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தி லிருந்து தப்பித்துக்கொள்வதற்கு வழிகள் கண்டுபிடிப்பதற்கு சந்தர்ப் பம் கிடைத்துவிடும். உடனடியாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை திருத்தத்தோடு மாகாணம் பூராவும் கொண்டுவந்தாகவேண்டும்.

“எங்கள் ஜில்லாவை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா விலுள்ள ஃன்னை யடிமை முறைபோல கோயமுத்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலும் இந்த ஃன்னை யடிமை முறை பல ரூபங்களாக இருக்கிறது. ஏறத்தாழ கோயமுத்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலும் ஃன்னை யாட்கள் மிராச்தார்களால் கொண்டுவர யாக நடத்தப் படுகிறார்கள் என்பதை அங்கு நேரில் சென்று பார்த்தால் புதிது கொள்ள முடியும். ஆகையால் உடனடியாக இது மாகாணம் பூராவும் வரவேண்டுமென்று திருத்தங்கள் கொண்டுவரப் படவேண்டும். மிராச்தார்களுக்கும் குடியாவர்களுக்கு முள்ள உறவு நிலை கெட்டுவருகிறது. உறவு நிலை கெடாமல், சகஜமான முறையில் இவர் ஆனால், சபீபத்தில் வீடுபாஜி அவர்களின் பிரதிநிதியாக ஸ்ரீ சங்கர ராய் தேவ் அவர்கள் தமிழ் நட்புரங்கு சுற்றுப் பிரயாணம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கின்ற அவர்கள் பூதான யக்குத்திரு நலம் கேட்குகொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள். இந்த ஆட்சியில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அட்சிபைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் பலர் அந்தக் கமிட்டியில் அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். ஆனால் சமீபத்தில் அவர்—சோமவந்தானில் என்று நினைக்கின்றேன்—நிலம் கேட்ட போது ஒரு அங்குலம் நிலம் கூட கிடைக்கவில்லையென்று சொன்னார்கள். அந்த ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து கூட பலர் கேட்டால் சிறையில் இருந்திருக்கின்றார்கள். ஆனால், அப்படிப்பட்டவர்கள் இருக்கின்ற இடங்களில் நிலம் கிடைக்கவில்லையென்று சொன்னால், உண்மையாகவே மிராச்தார்கள் மனதில் மாறியிருக்கிறது என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். அவர்கள் மனதில் கொஞ்சக்கூட மாற்றம் ஏற்படவில்லை. சமீபத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஓட்டைகளை மீளும் மேலும் தங்களுடைய சாதகத் திற்குப் பயன்படுத்திக் கொள்ளப்பார்க்கிறார்களே யொழிய, மேலும் மேலும் விவசாயியின் நசுக்குவதற்கு இவர்கள் முயற்சி செய்கிறார்களே தவிர, சட்டத்தினால் இருக்கக்கூடிய அந்த நன்மைகளை உத்தேசித்து, ஏழைப்பார்களாக அவர்கள் இன்றும் மாறிவிடமாட்டார்கள் என்பது இந்த வினோபாஜி அவர்களுடைய இயக்கத்திற்கு ஒத்துழைக்காததிலிருந்து நன்கு தெரியவருகிறது.

“இவையெல்லாம் வைத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும்போது உடனடியாக அதி சீக்கிரமாக இந்தச் சட்டத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய சிறு சிறு குறைகளை நீக்குவதோடல்லாமல், இன்னும் பலவிதமான பிரச்சனைகள் விவசாயிகளுக்கு இருக்கின்றன, அவைகளைல்லவற்றையும் பிரச்சனைகள் நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் அவசியம். இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் சம்பந்தமாக முட்டை அடி எடுத்து வைத்திருக்கிறோம். இதில் தப்பு அடி போட்டுவிடக்கூடாது. இப்பொழுது தப்பு அடி வைத்துவிட்டால் பின்னால் கட்டும் ஏற்படும் ஆகையால் உடனடியாக நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யவேண்டும்.

“இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்தவுடனே விவசாயிகள்-மிராசுதாரர் பாதிக்கப்படாமல் நல்ல முறையில் உற்பத்தி அதிகமாகுமென்று உறவு பார்த்தார்கள் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள். ஆனால், சட்டத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய குறைபாடுகளின் காரணமாக உற்பத்தி அதிகரிப்பதற்குப்பதிலாக குறைந்திருக்கிறதென்று நம்புகிறேன். சட்டத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய குறைவுகளை வைத்துக்கொண்டு அங்கிருக்கக்கூடிய இருக்கக்கூடிய குறைவுகளை விவசாயிகளை மாற்றிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் தினசரி அதிகாரி அமைப்பு இருக்கின்றதே, அது அனேகமாக மிராசுதாரர்களுக்குச் சாதகமாக இருக்குமென்பதைப் பத்திரிகை வாயிலாக தெரிந்து கொண்டிருக்க முடியும்.

(At this stage Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.)

5th November 1952] [Sri K. R. Nallasivam]

“ இந்த அவசர சட்டத்திலே பல திருத்தங்கள் செய்தாகவேண்டும். உதாரணமாகச் சொல்லப்போனால், இரண்டு வாரங்களுக்கு முன்னால், அந்தப் பிரதேசத்திலே காங்கிரசில் சேவை செய்து, அங்கு ஒரு விவசாய இயக்கம் நடத்தக்கூடிய பிச்சை அவர்கள் வீட்டைச் சுற்றிலும் மிராசுதார்கள் எவ்வளவு கொடுமைகளைச் செய்ய முடியுமோ அவ்வளவு கொடுமைகளையும் இழைத்து வருகிறார்கள். இந்த நண்பர் சபீபத்தூல் விண்ணப்பம் கொடுத்து எல்லோரிடத்திலும் கொண்ணூர். இதை ஏன் குறிப்பாகச் சொல்லுகிறேனென்றால், அவர்களுக்கே அந்த கதியென்றால் சாதாரண நிலையிலுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு அங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களை நீங்கள் நன்றாக உணர்ந்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். எதிர்க் கட்சியிலிருந்து சொல்லப்படுகின்றது என்ற எண்ணத்தோடு பார்க்காமல் மனிதாபிமானத்தோடு பார்க்கவேண்டும். அந்த எண்ணத்தோடு பார்த்தால் திருத்தங்கள் அவசியமென்று உணர்ந்து கொள்ளலாம். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவை செலுத்தக் கமிட்டியின் பரிசீலனைக்கு விட்டுவிடவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—: ఆధ్వర్యము, ఈ Tanjore Ordinance విషయంలో పెట్టుబడిదారులను, ధనవంతులను, భూస్వాములను బలపరచడమే కాకుండా రైతాంగముయొక్క సమస్యను ఎదుర్కొన్నందుకు చాలా సంతోషిస్తున్నాము. దీనిని support చేసి వారిలో నేనకూడ ఒక్కడిని. అయితే ఈ సందర్భమున ఒక విషయము చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈ Ordinance ను తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు ప్రభుత్వము ఇప్పుడు తీసుకునివచ్చుటను ప్రధాన కారణాన్ని గమనిస్తే, ఈ ప్రభుత్వము marxism సిద్ధాంతాన్ని అనుసరిస్తున్నట్లున్నది. ఎక్కడైతే classes struggles ఉన్నచో, వర్గపోరాటము, కలహము ఉంటామో అక్కడనే వాని దృష్టిని కేంద్రీకరించేట్లున్నది. ఇప్పుడైతే వర్గకలహము, class troubles ప్రారంభమవుతాయో అప్పుడే తగిన చర్యలు తీసుకొంటామనే ఈ విధానము వారి ధర్మకర్తృత్వ సిద్ధాంతానికి వ్యతిరేకముగాయున్నది. దీని ఫలితంగా, అన్నిచోట్ల ఈ వర్గ పోరాటాలు classes struggles బయలుదేరుతాయి. ఇది ఈ వర్గపోరాటాలకు దారిదీసినదవుతుంది. మన రాష్ట్రములో జరిగిన ప్రాంతాలలోకూడ ఇదేమూరి సమస్యలు ఉండివచ్చుటకీకూడా, వాటిని గమనించక Tanjore లో కలహము బయలుదేరవని గమనించక ఆక్రమణ మూత్రము ఈ Ordinance ను ప్రవేశపెట్టుట సుయోగపరికాదు ఈ Ordinance యొక్క ప్రధాన సిద్ధాంతములు ఆశయములుబట్టి ఇది అన్నిచోట్లకు వర్తింపజేయవలసియంటుంది. Tanjore విషయములూని ప్రత్యేక పరిస్థితులుగలదని ఆ జిల్లా పరిస్థితులు తెలిసినటువంటి మిత్రులు చెప్పుతున్నారు. కనుక ఆ విషయముగలదని నేను చెప్పదలచుకోలేదు. కాని దీనియొక్క ప్రధాన ఆశయములుబట్టి చూచినట్లయితే, మన రాష్ట్రములో ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోను చాలా చోట్ల ఇటువంటి సమస్యలున్నవి. కనుక రాష్ట్రములో అన్నిచోట్లకూడ దీనిని అమలు జరుపవలసియంటుంది. జమీందారీ areas కు సంబంధించినంతవరకు, జమీందారీ రద్దు చట్టము వచ్చిన తరువాత, యీ జమీందారీల క్రింద ఉన్నటువంటి భూమిపైనే వారికి హక్కు పోయినది. ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో sub-tenancy వ్యాప్తుకొమ్మని చెప్పారు. అది అప్పటికి అంగీకరించవలసినవిషయమే. అయితే జమీందారీ areas లోనే మిగిలిపోయి ప్రాంతాలలో tenancy విధానము ఉన్నది. ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో మూడవవాడు, అయిదవవాడుకూడా sub-tenant గా ఉండే అవకాశమున్నది. కాని ముఖ్యముగా పాలముదున్న వాడికే ఆ పాలముమీద హక్కుఉన్నదనే ప్రధాన సిద్ధాంతాన్ని సరిగా అవరణలో పెట్టలేకున్నారు. ఈ సిద్ధాంతాన్ని అవరణ సాధ్యంగా చేస్తేనేగాని ప్రచూరించవలసివుంది. ముఖ్యంగా ఆర్థిక దేశములూని రైతాంగ విధానాన్ని అలాచిస్తాము. ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో అనేక సంతకర్త

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [5th November 1952]

ములుగా తరతరాలుగా అనేక కుటుంబాలు భూమి దున్ని పనిచేస్తున్నప్పటికీ కూడా యీనాడు భూస్వాములు, యీ దున్నేవానికి ఎక్కడ భూమిపైన హక్కు కలుగుతుందో అనే భయముతో వీరిని పొలాలలో ఉండకుండా వెళ్లగొట్టేస్తున్నారు. తరతరాలుగా యీ పొలాలలో దున్నుకొంటూయుండి వీటిపైన ఆధారపడి జీవనంచేసే కుటుంబానికి అనేక కుటుంబాలను యీ నాడు వెడలగొట్టేస్తున్నారంటే ప్రభుత్వము ఏమి చేయలేకుండా ఉన్నారు. ఈ వీర రైతాంగము ఎవరితో చెప్పుకోగలదు. భూస్వాములు ఎన్ని దొడ్డస్వాములేనీ, ఎన్ని బాధలు పెట్టవచ్చుటకీ కూడా యీ వీర రైతాంగానికి ఎవరు సహాయము చేయవలసింది. ఈమధ్య వారిని భూమినుండి వెడలగొట్టిన తరువాత భూమి దున్నేవానికి భూమిమీద హక్కుగలదనే శాసనము అమలులో వచ్చినప్పటికీ కూడా అవివరకే భూమినుండి వారిని వెడలగొట్టితూ కూడా కాబట్టి, దానిపైన వాకి హక్కులేకుండా అయిపోతుంది. భూస్వాములందరు దొడ్డవ్యయముతో యీ రైతుకులీనింత వెడలగొట్టి, అనుకూల సూక్ష్మములు కలుగజేసికొనితరువాత, యీ శాసనము వచ్చినాడ వాకి ప్రయోజనముంది. కనుక యీ యామి దున్నేవానికి భూమిపై హక్కు అనే శాసనాన్ని అమలు జరుపడంలా retrospective effect ఇస్తేనేగాని ప్రయోజనముంది. మరియు యీ చట్టాన్ని రాష్ట్రముంతటా సర్వ వ్యాప్తంగా అమలు జరుపవలసియున్నది. ఇ.వ.ర.ల Debt Co. ordination B.II వచ్చినప్పుడు దీనియొక్క ఆశయము వీర రైతాంగాన్ని ఆపులబాధనుండి తొలగి చడమే అయినప్పటికీ దీనివల్ల వీరవాంకెవరికి ప్రయోజనము కలుగలేదు. అంతా పెద్ద పెద్ద రైతులు, భూస్వాములు, ఏ మార్గాడిలవద్ద అప్పు తీసుకొన్నటువంటివారికే ఇది ఉపయోగపడింది. గాని సామాన్య రైతులకేవలకే మేలుకలుగలేదు. కనుక యీ tenancy protection విధానములో అటువంటి లోపములు రాకండా వీర రైతాంగముంతా దీనివల్ల ఉపయోగపడవలెంటే దీనిని రాష్ట్రముంతటా సర్వవ్యాప్తంగా అన్ని చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేసి retrospective effect అమలు జరుపవలసియుండును. రెండవ విషయమేమంటే ఇ. అమలు జరుపుటలో భూమియొక్క ఆదాయములో ఎంతభాగము రైతుకు ఉండాలి అనే విషయములోగూడ ఇందులో న్యాయము జరుగలేదు. శ్రీమందారీ, ఈనాందారీ hereditors కువీరము హక్కు మేలువరము హక్కు అని tenancy-rights ఇచ్చాయి అయితే యీ చట్టములో రైతుకు ఒక ఏ సంవత్సరములరకే protection ఉన్నదిగాని, ఏ సంవత్సరములయిన తరువాత ఏమి ఆచ్రుతుండనే విషయము తెలుపబడలేదు. ఈ ఏ సంవత్సరములయిన తరువాత పాళ్లను వెళ్లగొట్టడం తప్పు మరేమికాదు. మిరాజిదార్లు వీటిపైన కోర్టుద్వారా వేదీలుకెట్టి వెళ్లగొడతారు. ఈ వీర రైతులు ఎక్కడ సంవత్సరములనుండి తరతరాలుగా సాగుచేస్తున్నటువంటి భూమిని వదలిపెట్టి జీవనాధారములేకుండా వాడు పని విర్వడుతుంది. ఈ చట్టము ప్రకారము యీ చట్టము అమలులో వచ్చేటప్పుటికి ఎవరు భూమిని దున్నుతుంటే వారికే ఆ భూమిపై హక్కు విగ్నముతుందిగాని అంతవరకు ఎక్కడ సంవత్సరములుగా భూమిపై పనిచేస్తుండిన వీరరైతు కు ఏమి ప్రయోజనముంది. ఈ చట్టము మిగతా ప్రాంతాలలో అమలు జరిపేలోపల యీ రైతు ను వెళ్లగొట్టుంటారు. ఉదాహరణకు నాకు తెలిసినట్లుగా మా ప్రాంతంలో ఒకే దేవుణి మానవు భూమి ఉన్నది. ఈ భూమిని ఒకరినుండి మరొకరు యీలాగు కొంతమంది ఒకరికిచ్చాత ఒకరికి మారినది. అటువంటి కఠినిలో ఈ Act రాగానే, వీరిలో ప్రతి ఒక్కరు నాకా సీకా ఈ భూమిమీద హక్కుని పోరాడవలసియున్నది. దున్నేవానికి భూమి అనే సిద్ధాంతముపైన ఈ చట్టమును అమలుజరుపులోగానే భూస్వాములు, వారి భూమిని సాగుచేస్తున్నటువంటి వీర రైతాంగాని లేనిపోని వేదీలు పెట్టుకొని వారిని భూములనుండి తొలగించి వెళ్లగొడతారు. కడపట ఈ భూమిపైన ఎవరిది హక్కు అనేది విచారణకు వచ్చినప్పుడు యీ భవిష్య

[5th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

భూస్వాములు పోలీసులను అధికారులను తమ పరిముచేసుకొని వారి హక్కును దృఢపరచుకొంటారు. ఈ tenants ఏలాటి support ఉండదు. వీరికి పోలీసులుగాని యితర ఆఫీసులుగాని సహాయముచేయరు. కనుక tenancy protection కొరకు తంజావూరులో tenants కు యీ రక్షణ యిస్తామంటే సంతోషమేకాని దీనివల్ల తక్కిన జిల్లాలో tenants కు రక్షణలేకుండా పోతుంది. వీరిని ముందుగానే వారు సాగుచేస్తున్నటువంటి భూములనుండి వెడలగొడతారు. అటువంటిప్పుడు యీ వీర రైతులకు ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో ఏమి సహాయము లేకుండా పోతుంది. కనుక tenants కు ఇవ్వదలచుకొన్న యీ సహాయాన్ని సగము చేతితో ఇవ్వకుండా మృదయ పూర్వకముగా పూర్తిగా ఇచ్చి అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింపజేస్తూ, retrospective effect తో వీర రైతులకు వారి దున్నుకొంటున్న భూములపై హక్కును కలుగజేయవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను. Retrospective effect ఇచ్చేందుకు ఏదో ఒక సంవత్సరమును నియమించి అనగా 1943 అనండి, 1944 అనండి లేక స్వరాజ్యము వచ్చిన రోజునుండి అనండి తేదా కాలాను ఉధ్యమము ప్రారంభించిననాటినుండి అనండి, 1943 వ సంవత్సరము అనండి ఏదో ఒక సంవత్సరము, లేదని నియమించి అప్పటినుండి భూమి దున్నేవారికే హక్కు ఇచ్చేటట్లు విర్యాతుచేయవలసియుండుట ధర్మము, న్యాయముకూడాను. లేకున్న ఈ చట్టముయొక్క ప్రధానాశయము సరివేరదు కనుక ఈ మంత్రివర్గాన్ని ముఖ్యముగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని నేను కోరుచున్నాను. ముగిగా, ఎవరైతే ఇప్పుడు పాలము దున్నుచున్నారో, పాళ్లను భూస్వాములు మరి హక్కులు ధృఢపరచు: నేడుకు వెడలగొట్టే పుగిలి విర్వడుతున్నదికాబట్టి, యీ చట్టాన్ని ఒక Tanjore జిల్లాకే కాకుండా అన్ని చోట్లకును ఇటువంటి సమస్యలున్న అన్ని ప్రదేశములకును వర్తింపజేయవలెను. ఆయా ప్రాంతాలలో తగాదాలవచ్చిన తరువాత మేము చూస్తాము రెప్పుని అని ఇతటిలో ఊరకుంటే ప్రయోజనము లేదు. ఇప్పటికే అనేక చోట్ల యీ చిక్కులు విర్వడ్డాయి. ఇప్పుడు తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రము ఈ Act ను వర్తింపజేసేటట్లుయితే ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని భూస్వాములూ తా మేలుకొని రైతులతో వేదీలు పెట్టడద్వారా తగాదాలు ఇంకా విషమిస్తాయని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. తరువాత మరొక విషయమున్నది. ఇందులో disputes, తగాదాలు వస్తే వాటికొరకు conciliation officers ను నియమించారు అయితే దీనివల్ల ప్రయోజనములేదు. ఎస్టేటు లాండ్స్ విషయములో Inam Commission Officer లను పేరారు కాని దానివల్ల ప్రయోజనములేదన్నారు. కనుక conciliation officer లకు తోడ్పడడానికి ఒక presiding officer ను నియమించి, ఈ conciliation officer ను ముగ్గురిని నియమించవలెను. వాగుంటుంది. ఎందుకనగా ఈ ముగ్గురును, ఒకడు tenant తరపునను, ఇంకొకడు మిరాజిదారు తరపునను, మూడవ అతను గవర్న మెంటు తరపునను ఉండి వాటివారి కక్షగా ప్రత్యేక శ్రద్ధతీసుకొనగలడు. అప్పుడు presiding officer న్యాయముగా పుగిలితులను సరిగా గ్రహించి తీర్పుచెప్పడానికి అవకాశముండుంది. లేనిచో విద్రేవ ఒక తగాదా విషయము వచ్చినప్పుడు tenant తన విషయాన్ని తన హక్కును చెప్పకొనవలసిపప్పుడు ఆతనికి ఇతర సహాయములేకపోతే, తన points ను చెప్పి దృఢపరచలేని స్థితిలో ఉంటాడు. అప్పుడు అది చాలా అన్యాయముగా పరిణమింపవచ్చు.

“కనుక నై విషయాలన్ని గమనించి ఈ చట్టాన్ని మొత్తము రాష్ట్రముంతటా సర్వ వ్యాప్తంగా అన్ని చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేసి, ఇందులో న్యాయముగా పుగిలితుల ఎంత భాగముందాలి అన్న విషయముకూడ నిర్ణయించవలసియుండును. న్యాయమైన దృక్పథముతో చూచినచో, లే, పాలము దున్నేవారికి రెండు భాగములున్ను, భూస్వామికి ఒక భాగమున్ను ఇచ్చుట సమంజసముగా యుండుంది. పాలముమీద కట్టకడి పని

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [5th November 1952]

చేసేవాడు కాబట్టి దున్నేవానికి రెండు వంతులు ఇచ్చట న్యాయము. కనుక ఈ సూచనను గుర్తించి ఈ చట్టాన్ని మదరాసు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తంగా రాష్ట్రమంతటా సర్వవ్యాప్తంగా ఆమలు జరపాలని, కూలీలకు wages రక్షణ ఇచ్చి, దున్నేవానికి భూమి అనేటటువంటి వారి హక్కును కాపాడే విషయాన్ని దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని విషయాలన్ని సరిగా పరిశీలించే నిమిత్తము దీనిని Select Committee కి పంపించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ”

JANAB MOHAMED SALIH MARAIKAYAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் மிராசதார்கள், குடியானவர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டு வந்த சிளாச்சியை நிறுத்தவேண்டியதின் பொருட்டு நமது மதிப் பிற்குரிய தலைவர் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை நல்ல சந்தர்ப் பத்தில் கொண்டு வந்திருப்பதை நான் மனப்பூர்வமாக ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.

“இந்தப் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தில் மூன்று பிரதான அம்சங்கள் பொருந்தியிருக்கின்றன. முதலாவதாக இரு சாரர்களிடையேயும் மகசூலை பிரித்துக் கொள்ளும் வாராநிர்ணயம்; இரண்டாவதாக விவசாயிகளுக்குத் தொழிலில் ஊக்கம் உண்டுபண்ணுவதற்காக ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு தன்கனிதமிருந்து நிலத்தை மாற்றமுடியாது என குறைந்த பக்க உத்தரவாத மளித்தல்; மூன்றாவதாக பண்ணையாட்களின் சம்பளம், கூலியை நிர்ணயிப்பது.

“குறிப்பாக அந்தாங்கி தாலுகாவானது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் ஒரு பாகமாக இருந்த போதிலும், தூதிரஞ்சுவசமாக நமது சர்க்காரால் நீர்ப் பாசன வசதிகள் செய்துகொடுக்கப்படாமலிருப்பதால், மழையை நம்பியே விவசாயம் செய்ய வேண்டிய நிலைமையில் இன்றைய தினமும் இருந்து வருகிறது. வருண பகவான் மோசம் செய்து வருவதன் நிமித்தம் எங்களுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றிய கவியையும் கிடையாது. இச்சட்டத்தில் கண்டிருக்கும் மூன்று வித பிரச்சனைகளும் எங்கள் தாலுகாவில் இல்லை. ஆனதால் இந்த மூன்று அம்சங்கள் கொண்ட தஞ்சை ஜில்லா பண்ணையாள் சட்டமானது எங்கள் தாலுகாவிலும் அமலாக வேண்டுமென்றால் வருண பகவான் மழையை வரவிடக் வேண்டும். அல்லது நமது சர்க்கார் நீர்ப் பாசன வசதிகள் அந்தத் தாலுகாவிற்குச் செய்துதரவேண்டும். இதில் எது நடக்கப் போகிறதோ யென்று எங்கள் தாலுகா வாசிகள் ஆவலாக எதிர்பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

“குறிப்பாக இன்றைய தினம் ஒரு விவசாயியின் குடும்பத்திற்கு வேண்டிய வசதிகளையும், விவசாயத்திற்கு வேண்டிய உழவு மாடு, உரம் போன்ற சகல வசதிகளையும் செய்து கொடுத்து ஒருவனை நிலத்திலே வேலை செய்ய வேண்டுமென டீட்டுக் கொள்ள வேண்டிய யிருக்கிறது. இல்லாவிட்டால் அவன் பயிர் செய்வதை விட்டு ஓடிவிடுகிறான். ஆகையினால் நான் மிகாதவர்கள் அவனுக்கு வேண்டிய எல்லா செளகர்யங்களையும் செய்து கொடுத்து அவனை ஓடவிடாமல் வேலை செய்து கொண்டிருக்கும்படி பார்த்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டிய யிருக்கிறது.

“மூன்றாவதாக பண்ணையாள் முறை போன்ற வழக்கம் அந்த தாலுகாவில் கிடையாது. பண்ணையில் நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களால் பயிர்ச் செலவு அதிகமாய்ச் செய்யப்படுவதில்லை. அப்படிச் செய்தாலும் அந்த சாகுபடியை இந்த விவசாயிகளே செய்து கொடுத்து அதற்கு வேண்டிய எல்லா செலவுகளுக்கும் அந்த மிராச்தார்களிடம் அளந்து கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். ஆகையினால் அந்தத் தாலுகாவின் விவசாயத்திற்கு மிகவும் பிரதானமான பாசன வசதிபை உடனடியாக செய்து கொடுத்து இந்தச் சட்டத்தை அங்கு அமுல் நடத்த வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“வாரச்சீட்டுச் சம்பந்தமாக பழக்கத்துக்கு விரோதமாக சட்டத்தில் சொல்லப் பட்டிருப்பதை திருத்தி இரு சாரமும் சேர்ந்து வாரச்சீட்டு யெழுதி சர்க்காரில் தாக்கல் செய்யும்படி இருக்கவேண்டும். அந்த வாரச்சீட்டை தாக்கல் செய்யும் காலத்தை நீடிக்க வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

5th November 1952]

* **SRI S. VEMIAH**:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the principle of Bill that is now before this House. At the same time I also support the amendment moved by Sri Viswanatham. The public opinion is in favour of extending the provisions of this Bill to all the districts in the State. Hence, my submission is that the title of the Bill itself should be changed to cover the entire State. In other districts also, similar difficulties are being felt by almost all labourers and also by landlords. I can quote several instances to show that a similar situation exists in other districts also. For instance, in one village, Anantabatla Kandrika in the Nellore district, 99 suits have been filed by the police and landlords against poor peasants who are physically in possession of the land for the last 60 or 70 years. In another village, Kalambatla Kandrika, 94 cases are being launched against poor peasants. Also in another village, Ayyavarla Kandrika, 34 families of peasants are being harassed by landlords. This is how poor peasants are being harassed and much injustice is being done to them. Sir, I visited the Kalambatla Kandrika on 30th October 1952 and I found there that cattle belonging to 94 families of peasants are not allowed to graze and section 145 is being enforced in favour of landlords and I noticed several defects in the proceedings of the Subdivisional Magistrate, viz., in one survey number, 84 acres are mentioned and in another survey number, 30 acres are mentioned and yet in another survey number, no mention is made of the number of acres. Even if there is no section 145 in force, the police are not allowing their cattle to move about. Therefore, to avoid all these difficulties, my humble submission is that the provisions of this Bill should be extended to other districts also. With these words, I resume my seat."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m."

(After lunch--3 p.m.)

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the speeches from all sides of the House, it is clear that the principles of the Bill are generally welcomed. Here and there they have suggested amendments. Sir, as hon. Members desire that the Bill should go before a Select Committee, I, with your permission, move the following motion either as a separate motion or as an amendment, and I leave it to you and the Leader of the Opposition."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If it is a separate motion, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has to withdraw his amendment."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am willing to withdraw my amendment. But I think the Hon. Minister can move his motion as an amendment to his original motion."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Sir,
I wish to withdraw my original motion and move the following

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [5th November 1952]

motion for the constitution of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses under rule 116, sub-clause (i) of the Madras Assembly Rules, to consider the above Bill:—

That the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained in setting up of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses consisting of 28 members to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (19 members from the Assembly and 9 members from the Council) with instructions to the Committee to submit its report to this House on or before the 22nd November 1952 and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee:—

- (1) The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
- (2) „ M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
- (3) „ K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
- (4) Sri K. Rajaram.
- (5) „ C. Muthiah Pillai.
- (6) „ G. Narayanaswamy Naidu.
- (7) „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
- (8) Janab Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.
- (9) Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam.
- (10) „ L. Lakshmana Das.
- (11) „ T. Viswanatham.
- (12) „ C. Kandaswami.
- (13) „ P. Venkateswarlu.
- (14) „ S. Swayamprakasam.
- (15) „ V. Gopala Gounder.
- (16) „ T. Lakshminarayana Reddi.
- (17) „ K. R. Nallasivam.
- (18) „ V. P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
- (19) „ V. Balakrishnan.’ ’

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I take it that the hon. Revenue Minister has the leave of the House to withdraw his original motion and to move his present motion for a Joint Select Committee. (After a pause.)

“ I want to know whether hon. Members want a further discussion of this Bill, on this new motion.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Sir, a few Members who have already given their names may not be disappointed.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ The discussion may continue till 4 o'clock.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The motion before the House is—

‘ That the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained in setting up of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses consisting

5th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

of 28 members to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (19 members from the Assembly and 9 members from the Council) with instructions to the Committee to submit its report to this House on or before the 22nd November 1952 and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee:—

- (1) The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
- (2) „ M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
- (3) „ K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
- (4) Sri K. Rajaram.
- (5) „ C. Muthiah Pillai.
- (6) „ G. Narayanaswamy Naidu.
- (7) „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
- (8) Janab Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.
- (9) Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam.
- (10) „ L. Lakshmana Das.
- (11) „ T. Viswanatham.
- (12) „ C. Kandaswami.
- (13) „ P. Venkateswarlu.
- (14) „ S. Swayamprakasam.
- (15) „ V. Gopala Gounder.
- (16) „ T. Lakshminarayana Reddi.
- (17) „ K. R. Nallasivam.
- (18) „ V. P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
- (19) „ V. Balakrishnan.’

“ Now, the motion as well as the amendment are before the House.”

IV.—PROGRAMME OF BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Sir, I request the Hon. the Leader of the House to give the programme of this House for the information of the Members.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Sir, as desired by the House, we have referred the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, to a Joint Select Committee. As the Council has been summoned to meet on the 17th instant, the earliest time by which we will be getting the Members of the Council nominated for the Joint Select Committee will be 17th. We would require at least 3 or 4 days to submit the report and that is why we have fixed 22nd as the last date for submission of the report by the Joint Select Committee. In consultation with the leaders of parties and also the Members of various groups, we have come to a decision that the Assembly should adjourn on the 7th instant and reassemble on the 24th instant. I hope it will suit the convenience of all the Members.”

[Sri G. Samia Koorayar]

[5th November 1952]

தஞ்சாவூர் அவசரசட்டம் ஒரு நல்ல அறிவு. நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்வதற்கு தடையாகவிருக்கும் அரசியல் சாசனத்தின் ஷரத்துக்களை பார்விலிமண்டில் திருத்தச் சட்டம் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று நமது பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் மத்திய சர்க்காருடன் சண்டை போட்டு இதை வெற்றிகரமாகக் கொண்டு வர வேண்டுமென நான் கேட்டு கொள்ளுகிறேன். இப்பொழுது விவசாயச் சீர்திருத்தத்தை மிகவும் அமைதியான முறையில் கொஞ்சமான முறையிலேயே கொண்டு வந்திருந்த போதிலும் கூட இதற்கு ஏராளமான எதிர்ப்பும் இருக்கிறது. இந்த எதிர்ப்பு இதற்கு ஏன் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறதென்பது தான் எனக்குப் புரியவில்லை. நிலம் உழுகிறவர்களுக்குத் தானே சொந்தம். ஆனால் இன்று நகரங்களிலே ஆயிரக்கணக்காக பணத்தைச் சேர்த்துக் குவிக்கும் டாக்டர்களும், வக்கீல்களும், வியாபாரிகளும் தாங்கள் சம்பாதிக்கும் பணத்திற்கு அப்படியே நிலத்தை வாங்கிப் போட்டுக்கொண்டு வந்தார்கள். இப்பொழுது இந்தமாதிரியாக சீர்திருத்தம் வருகிறதே என்றவுடன் இதை எந்த இடத்தில் கொண்டுபோய் விடுமோயென்ற அச்சத்தில் இதை ஒரே மூச்சாக எதிர்க்கிறார்கள். உழுகிறவன் தனக்கு சொந்தமாக நிலம் இருக்க வேண்டும் என்று நினைப்பதில் தவறு ஒன்றுமேயில்லை. பெரும்பாலோர் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று தான் எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற இந்தச் சட்டத்தை பக்கபலமாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு இப்பொழுது ஏமாற்றுவது ரொம்பகாலத்திற்கு முடியாது. அதை நன்றாகப் புரிந்து கொண்டு காலத்திற்குத் தக்கபடி அவர்கள் நடந்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். அப்படி நடக்காததினால் தான் எதிர்ப்பு. லமாயிருக்கிறது. சமீபகாலத்தில் நடந்த பொதுத் தேர்தலிலிருந்து பிரதமசுமாமக அதை உணர்ந்து கொண்டிருப்பார்கள் என்று நான் நம்புகிறேன். அப்படியிருந்தும் இனியும் அவர்கள் முட்டுக்கட்டை போடுவார்களேயானால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு விட்டுக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்ற மனோபாவம் அவர்களுக்குக் கொஞ்சம் கூட இல்லையென்பது தான் புலனாகும். (சமீபத்தில் எங்கள் தொகுதியில் பாபநாசத்தில் மிராசுதார்கள் மகநாடு ஒன்று நடந்தது. அந்த மகநாடு டில் ஒருவர் மன்னார் குடி, நீடாமங்கலம் போன்ற இடங்களில் கம்யூனிஸ்டுகளின் தொந்தரவு இருந்ததினால் அங்கு தான் இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கவேண்டும். இங்கு எல்லாம் இது வந்திருக்கவேண்டிய அவசியமேயில்லை, என்பதாகப் பேசினார். ஆனால் நாங்கள் எல்லாம் இந்த இடங்களில் கம்யூனிஸ்டுகளுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்காமல் விவசாயப் பெருமக்களை அமைதியாக இருங்கள், உங்களுக்கு வேண்டிய சௌகரியங்களைச் செய்து வருகிறோம் என்று சொன்னதால் தான் இந்த இடங்களில் தகராறு எதுவுமே கிடையாதே தவிர நாங்கள் குறுக்கிடாமல் இருந்திருந்தால் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா பூராவுமே குழப்ப நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும். காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் வரட்டும். அமைதியான முறையில் உங்கள் குறைகளை எல்லாம் நீக்கி வைக்கிறோம் என்று விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களை நாங்கள் தடுத்து வந்ததின் காரணமாகத் தான் இன்று உங்கள் இந்தத் தாலுகாக்களுக்கு வந்திருக்கவேண்டாமென்று பேசுகிறார் கணா என்று நான் எண்ணுகிறேன். எப்பொழுதும் நான் எதையும் சமாதானமாகவே தீர்த்து வைக்க விரும்புவேனே தவிர சண்டை தகராறு போன்றவைகளில் நான் எதையும் இழுத்துக் கொண்டு போய்விடமாட்டேன். அதனால் தான் கம்யூனிஸ்டுகளின் பேச்சைக் கேட்டு குழப்பத்தை உண்டு பொருட்டு நாங்கள் அமைதியாக இருக்கும்படி விவசாயிகளுக்குப் போதித்துக் கிடையாது. கம்யூனிஸ்டு தத்துவத்தின் லக்ஷியங்களிலும் கொள்கைகளிலும் தான் எனக்கு பயம் அதிகம்.)

3-20
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ நீங்கள் பில்லைப் பற்றி மட்டும் பேசுங்கள்.”

* SRI G. SAMIA KOORAYAR :—“ ஆகையினால் நான் என்ன சொல்லுகிறேன் என்றால் பலாத் காரத்தில் இறங்காமல் சமரசமாக அதை செய்ய விவசாயிகள் இருந்த காரணத்தினாலே தான் அந்தத் தாலுகாவிற்கு இன்று இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது தான். சட்டத்திலே ஒருவருக்கு இவ்வளவு

[5th November 1952]

[Sri G. Samia Koorayar]

நிலம் தான் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று திட்டம் செய்யவேண்டுமென பலரால் பேசப்பட்டது. அதுமிகவும் நியாயமானது. ஆனால் உயர்ந்த பக்க அளவு நிலச்சுவாந்தார் ஒருவர் இவ்வளவு தான் நிலம் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமெனவும் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கவேண்டும். அப்படியிருந்தால் தான் அது எல்லோருக்கும் நிரந்தரமானதோர் பரிசாரத்தைக் கொடுக்கும். சென்ற நான்கைந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு முன் J. C. குமாரப்பா கமிட்டியும் இதைத்தான் வற்புறுத்தி இருக்கிறது. அதோடு காங்கிரஸ் மகாசபையும் நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யவேண்டுமென்பதாக பல தீர்மானங்கள் செய்திருக்கிறது. அதன் அடிப்படையில்தான் இன்று இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இதில் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் கீழ்ப்பட்ட மிராசுதார்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இருந்தாலும் ஒரு வேலிக்கு மேற்பட்ட வரிடம் ஒரு குடியானவன் 40% வாரம் வாங்கும்பொழுது ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைந்த மிராசுதார் என்பதற்காக அவருக்கு யார் 40% சதவிகிதத்திற்கு குறைந்து வார பரிச்சலவுக்கு ஒத்துக்கொள்வான் என்று தான் தெரியவில்லை. அதைப் பல விவசாயிகள் எதிர்க்கிறார்கள்.”

* SRI S. VADIVELU :—“ கனம் அக்ராசனாதிபதி அவர்களே, இந்தத் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா குடியானவர்கள் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதாவைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விடவேண்டுமென்று நண்பர் விசுவநாதம் அவர்கள் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிற திருத்தத்தை ஆதரித்துப் பேசுகிறேன்.

“ தஞ்சை ஜில்லா அவசரச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்ததே கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள்தான் என்று நேற்று எனக்கு முன்பு பேசிய பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள். யார் இந்த நாட்டின் நன்மைக்காக சட்டம் கொண்டு வருகிறார்களோ அதை நாம் அனைவரும் வாழவேண்டியதுதான். இருந்தாலும் இன்னொன்றையும் மறக்கக்கூடாது. (அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 1943-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய நியாய கூலிக்கு போராடி வந்தார்கள். ஊப்பால் குப்புவும், சிவராமன், இரண்யன் போன்ற அரும்பெரும் தலைவர்கள் இதற்காகப் போராடி உயிர் நீத்தார்கள் என்பதையும் இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ அதுமட்டுமல்ல ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் முட்டியில் உத்தியால் அடிப்பட்டு, ஆயிரக்கணக்கான பெண்கள் கற்பழிக்கப்பட்டது ஒரு படி. நெல்லுக் காக, ஆனால், அந்த நெல் இப்பொழுது கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தில் இருந்தம்கூட கொடுப்பது இல்லை மிராசுதார்கள். ஆனால் உடனடியாக இந்தச் சட்டம் போட்டு ஒரு மாத காலமாகியும் இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் கொடுக்க மறுத்து வருகிறார்கள்.

“ ஒரு வேலிக்கு உள்பட்ட மிராசுதார்களைக் கட்டுப்படுத்தாது என்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது இந்த சட்டம். 5 வேலி, 10 வேலியுள்ள மிராசுதார்களும், 2, 3 வேலியுள்ள மிராசுதார்களும் ஒரு கிராமத்தில் இருக்கலாம். அதில் 50 ஆட்களுக்கு சட்டக்கூலியும், பாக்கி இருக்கிற ஆட்களுக்கு குறைந்த கூலியும் கொடுத்தால் விவசாயிகள் வாழ முடியுமா?

“ இந்த ஒரு வேலிக்கு உள்பட்ட மிராசுதார்கள் இந்தச் சட்டம் என்னை கட்டுப்படுத்தாது என்று சொன்னால் பாக்கி இருக்கக்கூடிய அந்த கிராமத்திலே உள்ள மிராசுதார்கள் நியாய கூலி கொடுப்பார்களா என்று நாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். இப்படி சொல்லும்போதுதான் கிராமங்களில் கலவரங்கள் நடைபெறுகிறது. ஆகவேதான் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மை கிடைக்கக் கூடிய வகையில் வழி செய்தாகவேண்டும் இல்லையென்று சொன்னால், அங்கே எத்தனை ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் பாதிக்கப்படும் என்று நாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“ அதோடுகூட, இந்தச் சட்டத்திலே ஒரு குடும்பத்திற்கு ஒரு வேலி நிலத்தை ஒரு ஆணும், ஒரு பெண்ணும் சாகுபடி செய்து அதில் தன்னுடைய 7-ல் ஒரு பங்கை பெறவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆனால், ஆள் வேலை செய்துவிடலாம். நடவான் இந்த ஒரு வேலி நிலத்தையும் நட முடியாது. காரணம், ஒரு வேலி நிலத்திற்கு சுமார் 200 நடவான் நட

[Sri S. Vadivelu] [5th November 1952]

வேண்டும். ஆகவேதான் வேலை செய்ய முடியுமா என்று சபை யோசிக்க வேண்டும். ஒரு ஆண் வேலை செய்தாலும் நடவு காலங்களில் ஒரு பெண் அந்த ஒரு வேலை நிலத்தில் நடமுடியாது. அந்த ஒரு வேலை நிலத்தில் நடவு நடுவதற்கு உபரி ஆட்கள் எவ்வளவோ வைக்கவேண்டும். கண்டு முதலில் 7-ல் ஒரு பகுதி பண்ணையாள் அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டதில் இருந்தும் கூட உபரி ஆளுக்கு களவடி கொடுத்துவிட்டு கொடுப்பேன் என்று சொன்னால், நிலைமை அன்றைக்கு இருந்ததைவிட இன்றைக்குப் படு மோசமான நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறதென்பதை இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத் திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“இன்னொரு விஷயம். இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் வந்தபிறகு ஒரு மரக்கால் கூலி கொடுக்கிற காரணமாக பரம்பரை மனைக்கட்டுகளில் இருந்துவந்தவர்களை உங்களுக்குச் சொந்தம் இல்லை,” தென்னை மரங்கள், வாழை மாங்கள் வைத்து பயிரிட்டுக் கொண்டுவந்த மனைகள் ‘உங்களுக்கு இல்லை’ என்று சொல்லி பல கிராமங்களில் பல விவசாயிகள் வெளியேற்றப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“அந்த நிலைமையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே மனைக்கட்டுகளுக்குப் பூரண உரிமை இருக்கும்படி சட்டத்தில் வசதி செய்துகொடுக்கப்படவேண்டும்.” இல்லையென்றால், பல ஆயிரக்கணக்கான ஹரிஜன மக்கள் தெருத்தெருவாக பிச்சையெடுக்க நேருமென்பதை சபை கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“பட்டுஜெட் விவாதத்தின்போது ஒரு விஷயத்தைக் குறிப்பிட்டேன். அதுவது ஜேழை ஈசனார் சிதம்பரம் பிள்ளை பண்ணையில் 15 ஹரிஜன விவசாயிகளுடைய வீடுகள் பிரித்தெரியப்பட்டு கொளுத்தப்பட்டன என்று. அது விஷயமாக இன்றைய வரையிலும் என்னதான் நடந்திருக்கிறது. அதைப் பற்றி சர்க்கார் என்ன காரியத்தைச் செய்திருக்கிறதென்பது ஒன்றும் தெரியவில்லை. ஆனால் இன்று வரையிலும் அந்த 15 வீடுகளையும் கட்டிக் கொடுக்க இந்த அவசரச் சட்டப்படி, சமரச அதிகாரி தீர்ப்புக்கு மிராசுதாரர்கள் ஒத்துழைப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. பல இடங்களில் பழைய பண்ணை ஆட்களையே வைத்துக்கொள்ள மிராசுதாரர்கள் மறுக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி மறுக்கும் அந்த மிராசுதாரர்களிடமிருந்து நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்வதற்கு என்ன சட்டம் இருக்கிறதென்பதை சட்ட சபை கவனிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

“பண்ணையாட்கள் சரியானபடி வேலை செய்யவில்லையென்று கூலியை பிடி முதல் செய்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் மிராசுதாரர்கள் பண்ணையாளுக்கு பல திங்குகள் விளைவிக்கின்றார்கள். நியாயமான கூலி கேட்டால், அதைக் கொடுக்க மறுக்கும் மிராசுதாரர்களைக் கட்டுப்படுத்த சட்டம் வேண்டும். ஆகையால் நல்ல முறையில் இதற்கு சட்டம் செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“வாரம்தார்களுக்கு 100-க்கு 40 கலம் என்று சொல்லும்போது ஆயிரக் கணக்கான வாரம்தார்கள் வாழ்க்கை பாதிக்கப்படும். இதற்கு முன்பதாக 100-க்கு 50 என்றும், 40 என்றும் பல இடங்களில் பல ரகமான நிலைமை ஏற்படவே இருந்து வருகின்றன. ஆனால், இந்த அவசரச் சட்டங்களில் வாரம்தார்களை பாதிக்கும் என்பதையும் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டி சிபார்சில் சொன்னபடி முதல் நெம்பர் நஞ்சையில், 55 சாகுபடிக்காரனுக்கும், 45 மிராசுதார்களுக்கும் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தோடு கூட சேர்த்துக்கொண்டால் நலம் என்று கருதுகின்றேன்.

“இரண்டாம் நெம்பர் நஞ்சைக்கு நூற்றுக்கு 60 கலம் சாகுபடிக்காரருக்கும், 40 கலம் மிராசுதார்களுக்கும் கொடுக்கப்படுவதற்குப் பதில் இந்தச் சட்டம் 100-க்கு 40 என்று வந்திருக்கிறது. இந்தக் குறைபாடுகளை நீக்க வழி காணவேண்டும்.

“உண்மையாகவே இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள பஞ்சத்தைப் போக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் ஒரு கண் துடைப்பு வேலையாக இல்லாமல்,

5th November 1952] [Sri S. Vadivelu]

பெருமாள் பெத்தபெருமாள் ஆனமாதிரி இல்லாமல், நல்ல முறையில் இந்தச் சட்டம் திருத்தியமைக்கப்பட்டு அமல் நடத்தப்படவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் நூற்றுக்கணக்கான, ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் வாழமுடியாது. உண்மையிலேயே உழைவனுக்கு நிம்மதி கிடைக்கவேண்டும். அவன் உரிமையோடு வாழவேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்யாவிட்டால் இந்த நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய பஞ்சம் தீரமுடியாது. மக்கள் செளக்யமாக வாழமுடியாது. பழைய நிலைமையேதான் மறுபடியும் ஏற்படுமே தவிர சமூகமான உறவு நிலை ஏற்படமுடியாது.

“பல இடங்களில் மிராசுதார்களைக் கண்டு விவசாயிகள் நடு நடுங்கு கின்றார்கள். மிராசுதார்களைக் கண்டு பயந்து வாழ்கின்றார்கள். வடிவலம் தேசிகர் 3,000 ஏக்கர் சொந்தமுள்ள நிலச்சுவாந்தார். பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக ஹரிஜனங்கள் கட்டி வைத்து அடிக்கப்பட்டு, ஒரு பர்லாங் தூரம் மிராசுதார்களைக் கண்டு, பயப்படவேண்டிய நிலையில் உயிர் வாழ்கிறார்கள். கேட்கத்தக்கற்ற நிலையில் ஹரிஜனங்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள்.

“இந்த ஆண்டில் அவர்களுக்கு கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் அவசரச் சட்டத்தின் காரணமாக 6½ ஏக்கர் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டதற்கு தேசிகர் கொடுக்காததால் 11 நாள் ஸ்ட்ரைக் நடந்தது. மித்திரன் பத்திரிக்கையில் எழுதப்பட்டது, கம்ப்யூனிஸ்டுகள் தூண்டுதல் செய்யப்பட்ட ஸ்ட்ரைக் என்று எழுதப்பட்டது. விவசாயிகள் நியாயத்திற்காகப் போராடினார்கள். இது கம்ப்யூனிஸ்டுகளினால் தூண்டிவிடப்பட்ட பலாத்காரம் என்று பறைசாற்றப்பட்டது. அது உண்மை அல்ல. பண்ணையாட்கள் 15 மா. சாற்றப்பட்டது. அது உண்மை அல்ல. பண்ணையாட்கள் 15 மா. 1 வேலி என்று 11 நாள் ஸ்ட்ரைக்கு பின்னால் Revenue Court நியாயப்படி எதிர்பாருங்கள் என்று சப்-கலெக்டர் சொன்னார். குருவை அறுவடை ஆகட்டும் என்றும் சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால் Revenue Court-ல் சட்டத்தில் கண்டுள்ளபடி கூலி கேட்க தீர்ப்பளிக்கப்படாமல் மிராசுதாருக்கு சாதகமாக Sub-Collector தீர்ப்பு சொன்னார்கள்.

“ஆனால் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் இதுவரையிலும் என்ன நிலைமையில் இருந்துவருகின்றார்கள் என்பதை சர்க்கார அங்கத்தினர்கள் சிந்திக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். இன்றைக்கு அவர்கள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராசுதார்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நியாயமான முறையில் செய்யத் தவறினார்களானால், உண்மையிலேயே இந்தப் பஞ்சத்தைப் போக்கமுடியாது. ஆகையால் நியாயமான அடிப்படையில் இதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கின்றேன்.

“இங்கு ஒரு சட்டம் போடப்பட்டது என்று சொன்னால், அதை அமல் நடத்தும் அதிகாரிகள் நியாயமான முறையில் விவசாயிகளிடம் நடந்து கொள்வதில்லை. விவசாயிகளிடம் இந்தச் சட்டம் பலனை அளிக்கிறது. மிராசுதார்களுக்கு உடந்தையாக நூற்றுக்கணக்கான பெடி ஷன்களில், போலீஸ் அதிகாரிகள், கலெக்டர் முதற்கொண்டு, சமரச அதிகாரிகள் வரையில் மிராசுதார்களுக்கு சாதகமாகத்தான் நியாயம் வழங்கப்படுகிறதென்பதை மனப்பூர்வமாகச் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். ஆகையால், உண்மையிலேயே இந்த நாட்டிலுடைய பஞ்சத்தைப் போக்க வேண்டுமென்றால், மக்களின் பசியைப் போக்கவேண்டுமென்றால், நீங்கள் நல்ல முறையில் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு நியாயம் வழங்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்கின்றேன்.”

* SRI MUTHUKUMARASWAMI :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே வணக்கம். இப்பொழுது இந்த தஞ்சை ஜில்லா பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு சட்டம் கொண்டு வந்ததைப்பற்றி நான் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள விவசாயிகளுடைய சார்பாக என்னுடைய நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன். எனக்குத் தெரிந்த வரையில் இந்த விவசாயம் ஏற்பட்ட முதற்கொண்டு இன்று வரைக்கும் அதற்கு ஒரு சட்டமும் ஏற்பட்டது இல்லை. ஆயிரம் ஆயிரம் ஆண்டுகளாக ஒரு பழக்க வழக்கத்தின் பேரில் 25, 30 என்று கொடுப்பதாக இருந்தது. சட்ட ரூபத்தில் இவ்வளவு கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று இது வரையில் ஏற்படவில்லை. அந்த ஒரு வரம்பிற்குக் கட்டுப்பட்டு

[Sri Muthukumaraswami] [5th November 1952]

இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்ததற்கு கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்கு என்ன நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த சட்டத்தில் லாபம் இருக்கிறதோ நஷ்டம் இருக்கிறதோ என்பதைப் பற்றி பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் கூறி இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அதில் முக்கியமாகத் தோன்றுவது எது என்றால் ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு விவசாயியையோ அல்லது பண்ணையானையோ நீக்க முடியாமல் இருப்பது தான் மிகவும் மகிழ்ச்சிக்குரிய காரியமாகும்.

அதோடு கூட சட்டத்தில் 1951-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து நிலத்திலிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்ட பண்ணையாளோ அல்லது விவசாயியோ மறுபடியும் நிலத்தை உழுவதற்கு பாத்தியம் கொண்டாடலாம் என்று அதில் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படி 1951 என்று இருப்பதை இன்னும் இரண்டு மூன்று வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்னால் தள்ளி 1948 லிருந்து எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் இன்னும் இன்னும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கும் பல விவசாயிகளும் பண்ணையாள்களும் நலன் பெற முடியும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். சாகுபடி செய்வவனுக்கு கண்டு முதல் ஆவதில் 40 வாரம் என்றிருக்கிறது. அதாவது ஒரு வேலிக்கு அதிகமாக வைத்து இருக்கும் முதலாளிகளிடமிருந்து கிடைக்கும். அவ்விதம் பெறுவதற்கு இந்த சட்டத்தில் உரிமை இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இன்றைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு வேலிக்கு அதிகமாக சற்றேறக்குறைய 200 மிராசுதாரர்கள் தான் அதன்படி இருப்பார்கள். ஆனால், ஒரு வேலிக்குக் கீழ்ப்பட்டவர்கள் ஆயிரக்கணக்கானவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரே குடும்பத்திலுள்ள இரு சகோதரர்களில் ஒருவர் இரண்டு வேலிக்கு மேல் இருக்கிறவரிடம் வேலை செய்துவிட்டு மற்றொருவர் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவரிடம் வேலை செய்தால் முதல்வனுக்கு வாரம் 40 என்றும் கிடைக்கிறது. இதில் உழைப்பு சம்பந்தமாக இருவருக்கும் ஒரே வேலிதான். ஆனால் வரும்படியில் வித்தியாசம் இருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் நிரந்தரமாக வேண்டும். எல்லோருக்கும் 40 என்று செய்திருந்தால் நல்லதாக இருக்கும் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

“விவசாயி தான் விவசாயம் செய்யும் நிலத்திற்கு உரம் முதலியவைகள் போட்டுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்றிருக்கிறது. சாதாரணமாகச் சொல்வது போல் பயிர் செய்கிறவனுக்கு ‘உழுதவன் கணக்குப் பார்த்தால் உழக்குக் கூட’ மீதாது என்பதுபோல் அவனுக்கு ஒன்றும் கிடைக்காது. சீக்காழி குறைய 16 கலம் தான் மிச்சப்படுகிறது என்று குறிப்பிட்டார். எரு முதலியவைகளுக்கு அவன் செலவு செய்து விட்டால் அவனுக்கு மிச்சமே இல்லை. ஆகவே எரு முதலியவைகள் போடுவதை மிராசுதாரர் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளும்படியாக சட்டம் செய்தால் அது நன்றாக இருக்கும் என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

“விவசாயம் செய்யும்போது விவசாயிகளுக்குத் துணியாக இருந்து பயிர்களுக்கு தண்ணீர் பாய்ச்சி காவல் பார்க்கிறவர்களுக்கு ஒன்றுமே இந்த சட்டத்தில் இல்லை. நட்ட பயிர்களை காப்பது செய்தும், மாடுகள் அழிக்காமல் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் உதவியாக இருக்கும் தலையாரிகளுக்கு இதில் ஒன்றுமே நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கும் என்ன கிடைக்கவேண்டும் என்று ஏனென்றால் சாதாரணமாக ரயிலவே நலமாக இருக்கும். செய்கிறவர்களை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் அங்கே வேலை பார்க்கும் watohman அதைப்போலவே விவசாயம் என்பதற்கு ஒரு சட்டம் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டுக்கிறது. சம்பந்தப்பட்ட எல்லோருக்கும் என்ன விதிகாசாரம் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று நிர்ணயிப்பது நலம் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

3-40 P.M. “இன்று கோயிலுக்குச் சொந்தமான ஆயிரக்கணக்கான ஏக்கர் நிலங்களை 200, 300 மைலுக்கு அப்பாலிலிருந்து வந்து குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அந்த கோயிலின் நிலங்களில் பரம்பரையாக உழுது

5th November 1952] [Sri Muthukumaraswami]

பயிர் செய்து வந்த விவசாயி போய்க்கேட்டால் ஜாமின் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ஆனால் 200, 300 மைலுக்கு அப்பாலிலிருந்து வந்திருக்கக்கூடியவர்களை நம்பி அவைகளை குத்தகைக்கு விடுகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் ஏன் அவ்விதம் இங்கு வந்து குத்தகைக்கு எடுக்கிறார்கள் என்றால் அவர்கள் அந்த நிலத்தில் வேலைசெய்யும் விவசாயிகளை வைத்துக் கொண்டு வேலை வாங்கி பணம் சம்பாதிக்கலாம் என்று அவர்கள் அவ்விதம் வந்து குத்தகைக்கு எடுக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அதே விவசாயி போய் கேட்டால் ஜாமின் கொடு என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். இது நியாயமா? இதை சர்க்கார் கவனித்திருக்கக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். ஆகவே கோயில் நிலங்களை அந்தந்த ஊரில் குடியிருக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் பண்ணையாள்களுக்கும் கொடுக்கலாம் என்று ஒரு சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தால் நலமாக இருக்கும் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

“பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு மனைக்கொல்லை என்று சொல்லப்படுகிற ஒரு தனியான சொந்தமாக நிலம் விடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. சில இடங்களில் 40 குழிகள் என்றும், சில இடங்களில் 50 குழிகள் என்றும். சில இடங்களில் 75 குழிகள் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. வருஷம் பூராவும் பாடுபட்டுவிட்டு அவன் சொந்தமாக அனுபவிக்கக்கூடியது அந்த 40 அல்லது 50 அல்லது 75 குழி நிலம் தான். அதைக்குறைந்த பட்சம் 75 குழிக்குக் குறையாமல் கொடுத்தால் அவர்களுக்கு லாபகரமாக இருக்கும் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

“பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு கூலி நிர்ணயம் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். வயது வராதவர்களுக்கு முக்கால் மரக்கால் என்று சட்டம் சொல்லி இருக்கிறது. பெண்களாக இருந்தால் மான்யம் உழங்கப்படவில்லை. அரை ஆளாகவோ அல்லது முக்கால் ஆளாகவோ இருந்தால் அவனுக்கு மனைக்கொல்லை என்ன என்பதை நிர்ணயம் செய்யவில்லை. அதைப்பற்றி நிர்ணயம் செய்ய வேண்டும்.

“கடைசியாக விவசாயிகள் அந்த நிலத்தில் பயிரிட்ட பயறு, பருப்பு வகையராகக்ளை பூராவும் அவனே எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. அதைக்கண்டு தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள எல்லா மிராசுதாரர்களும் வருந்துகிறார்கள் அவர்களுக்கும் ஓரளவு சிறிது பாகம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஏனென்று கேட்டால் நான் நிலத்தில் விளையும் உருந்து பயரை தான் அனுபவிக்காமல் அதையே வெளியில் வாங்குவது என்றால் அது பரிதாபகரமான விஷயம். ஆகையால் ஓரளவு அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“இதையெல்லாம்விட முக்கியமான ஒன்றை சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த விவசாயத்தில் சிக்கல் ஏற்பட்டு சற்றேறக்குறைய 6 அல்லது 7 வருஷம் இருக்கும் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். அவ்விதம் 6, 7 வருஷமாக ஏற்பட்ட சிக்கலை நீக்குவதன் காரணமாக நமது மதிப்பிற்குரிய ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த சிக்கலை போக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தோடு இன்று இந்த சட்டத்தை இயற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதை மிகவும் வர வேற்கிறேன். அதைவிட ஆயிரம் ஆயிரம் ஆண்டுகளாக இருந்து வரும் இந்த தீண்டாமையை ஒழிக்க ஏன் இன்னும் கங்கணம் கட்டிக் கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதை மிகவும் வருத்தத்தோடு சிந்திக்க வேண்டும். அதை நமது ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் அவருடைய காலத்திலேயே செய்து முடிப்பார்கள் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“இந்த சட்டம் வந்த இரண்டு மாத காலத்தில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நடக்கும் சம்பவங்கள் என்ன என்று பார்க்கும்போது சட்டம் இயற்றி விட்டார்கள், பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் சட்டப்படி கூலி கிடைக்கும் என்று இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இந்த சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு கூட தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் அநேக மிராசுதாரர்கள் பொறுத்தமட்டில் இந்த சட்டம் எட்டு அளவில் இருக்கிறதே யொழிய கூலியைக்கொடுக்க முடியாது என்றும், பக்கத்து ஊரில் அதைக் கொடுக்கிறார்களோ அதைப் பார்த்துக்கொண்டுதான் கொடுக்க முடியும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். குறிப்பாக எனது தொகுதியில்

[Sri Muthukumaraswami] [5th November 1952]

சட்டத்தில் குறிக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கூலியை கொடுக்கவில்லை. அப்படி கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று நானும் முன்பு துயக்கஜி பிள்ளை அவர்களும் பேசிய சொல்லப்பாடு அவர்கள் சுயநலமிகளாக இருப்பதால் கடுகடா தனியாக உத்தரவு அனுப்பினால்தான் நாங்கள் கொடுக்க முடியும் என்று சொல்லி விட்டார்கள்.”

SRI V. GOPALA GOUNDAR:— Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is intended to provide certain improvements in the agrarian conditions prevailing in the district of Tanjore. A mere reading of the Bill shows that the principles embodied in it are very grave. Of course, the provisions of the Bill as they stand at present, need some improvement or amendments. The hon. Members who spoke before me, especially those who have been returned from the Tanjore district, suggested useful amendments to the provisions of this Bill. As far as I can say, I am not aware of the prevailing conditions in the Tanjore district but a provision has been made in the Bill that it can be extended to other places, if necessary, by a notification of the Government. Because of this, I feel bound to say something about the provisions of this Bill. A mere look or a mere perusal of the Bill would show that protection is extended only to the pannaiyals and tenants and the interest of the landholder is not thought of. What I have in mind is that the interest of the landholder is not assuredly guaranteed in the Bill. Of course, the object of the Bill also appears to be to secure an effective improvement in agricultural production. Every one knows that Tanjore is the storehouse of foodgrains for South India. Every one of us should therefore be very careful in enacting a measure touching the agricultural production of that district. The giving of protection only to pannaiyals and tenants will not improve the situation unless we guarantee that the landlords' position and their interests will not also be affected. In this Bill, there is no mention about this, and that is why in some of the conferences held by the mirasdars and in the appeals sent by them to the hon. Members of this House they have expressed the feeling that they were doubtful about their interests being safeguarded under this Bill although they agreed with the general principles of the Bill and that the provisions in the Bill would be useful to put down the kisan trouble that had been going on for the last several years in their district. They had therefore suggested certain improvements or amendments which have been voiced forth by the hon. Members who spoke on this Bill before me. I hope all these suggestions will be considered by the Select Committee which is to be constituted for this purpose and that necessary amendments would be made so that the landlords may not have any apprehensions in their minds regarding their interests.

“Generally speaking, the Bill is said to be for the purpose of providing a certain amount of protection for the pannaiyals and tenants of Tanjore district. But, so far as we in South Arcot are concerned, we do not know what is meant by ‘pannaiyal’. We have no pannaiyals in our district. The whole system is foreign to us. We do not know what are the obligations and the liabilities attached to the pannaiyal system.

[Sri V. Gopala Goundar]

“It has been provided in the Bill that it shall come into force 3.00 p.m. in any other area in the adjoining districts like South Arcot, North Arcot, Tiruchirappalli as the Government may notify. Suitable amendments should be made in the Bill so that it may not be difficult for us later on to interpret these terms like ‘pannaiyal’ in so far as our districts are concerned. In our districts terms like ‘varamdar, lease-holder, etc.’ are only used.

“In this Bill we find terms like ‘landholder, rent, fixity of tenure, etc.’ are being used. These terms are not applicable to lands under ryotwari system but are only applicable to estate lands. When these terms are used, the implications of law involved in these terms should be interpreted by tribunals presided over by judicial officers. It has been stated in the Bill that the Revenue Courts shall be presided over by officers not below the rank of Revenue Divisional Officers and that no Civil Court shall entertain any suit or other proceeding to set aside or modify decisions passed by any Revenue Court or Conciliation Officer. I submit that it is just and proper that a Tribunal should be appointed for every district and that tribunal should be presided over by a judicial officer, both in the interest of landlords as well as tenants and pannaiyals. The Revenue Divisional Officers who will be asked to preside over the Revenue Courts and Conciliation Officers who are not well versed in law may not be able to interpret the terms mentioned in the Bill, in a judicial way. Therefore, I hope that the Select Committee that will be constituted for this Bill will consider this question and recommend the formation of judicial tribunals.

“I do not propose to discuss the various provisions contained in this Bill as I hope the Select Committee which will go into the matter will see that suitable amendments are made to the various provisions in the Bill so that when this Bill is extended to other districts like Tiruchirappalli, South Arcot, the tenants and landholders there may not be affected.

“Sir, the main amendments moved relate to the definition of the term ‘cultivating tenant’ and the division of produce between the landowner and the cultivating tenant, the varamdar and the landholder and so on. I am not aware of the prevailing conditions in the district of Tanjore and therefore cannot say much about them. I think, it is but proper that the suggestions thrown out by the Members of the Assembly coming from the district of Tanjore should be taken into account. Generally speaking, this Bill is a very good piece of legislation and will certainly help to put an end to the kisan trouble existing in Tanjore district for a number of years.

“We have not had any kisan trouble in our district of South Arcot, and there may not be any necessity for this Bill when it becomes an Act to be extended to our district. In fact, when the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue visited our district, he was presented with memoranda stating that the provisions of this Bill, if passed into law, should not be extended to our district (South Arcot).

[Sri V. Gopala Goundar] [5th November 1952]

I feel that the provisions of this Bill need not be extended to our district as at present the conditions prevailing in our district are quite different from that in Tanjore district."

*SRI K. RANGA RAO:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, యీ ఆర్డినెన్సును తీసుకొని వచ్చిన తుదేశంపల్ల మన రాష్ట్రంలోవున్న కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణకల్గించుటయు జరిగింది. ఇప్పటికే, అనగా బిల్లు అమలులోనికి రాకపూర్వమే, కొలుదార్లకు 40 శాతములు, భూస్వాములకు 60 శాతముగా పంట అనుభవించుట జరుగుచున్నది. ఇదేవిధంగా కొన్నిచోట్ల జరుగుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ బిల్లును కొలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు తీసుకొనవచ్చినందుకు నేను ఆశించిందించుచున్నాను. కానీ కొలుదార్లు పాలు పెంచబడలేదు. రెండవది యీ బిల్లు తీసుకొనవచ్చి కొలుదార్లకు పాలేళ్లకు భూస్వాములకు మధ్యగల హక్కులు నిర్ణయించుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు గుర్తించునట్లు గానాడిన వారిని అక్షరించిండుచున్నాను. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనున్న సామాన్యమైన కొలుదార్లను భూస్వాములు దౌర్జన్యముగా తొలగించుచున్నారని కొలుదార్ల ఆందోళన పోరాటములద్వారా ప్రభుత్వమువారు వారి హక్కులను కాపాడుటకు యీ బిల్లు తెచ్చిన దుకు కొలుదార్లు చేసిన కృషిని, ఆశించిందించుచున్నాను. ఈ వట్టం వచ్చిన సర్వాత రాష్ట్ర పరిస్థితులుమానవి. అనేక భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను తరిమి వేయుచున్నారు. భూస్వాములుగానున్నవారు కొలుదార్లమీద దౌర్జన్యంపాించి వారిని తొలగించుచున్నారు. అనేక సంఘర్షణలుగూడజరిగి ఒక్కరినొకరు చంపు కొనుటగూడ జరుగుచున్నది. ఉదాహరణకు, మా గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో సర్పాళాపురేట తాలూకాలో కొప్పరపాలెం గ్రామంవున్నది. ఇందలి యీనాందార్లు పూర్వంనుండి, అనగా సుమారు 50 ఏండ్లనుండి, కొలుదార్లచేత కొలుదార్లను తొలగించి భూములన్నిటిని స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని అట్లుటకు ప్రయత్నించుచున్నాడు. కొలుదార్లను తొలగించుటపెద్ద యెత్తున గుంటూరు జిల్లాలోని పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములు, యీనాందార్లు, ఆగ్రహరికులు, జమీందార్లు సాగిస్తున్నారు. అందువల్ల యీ బిల్లును గుంటూరు జిల్లాకున్న ఇంకా రాష్ట్ర మంతటను అమలు జరుపవలసిన అవసరం ఎక్కువగావున్నది. ముఖ్యంగా యివ్వే సామాన్య రాలనుండి కొలుకు యిచ్చియున్న యీ భూస్వాములు, తంజావూరు ఆర్డినెన్సు రాగనే కొలుదార్లను ఆక్రమంగాను దౌర్జన్యంగాను సంఘర్షణలు జరిపి ప్రభుత్వ స్థానికోద్యోగుల మద్దతుతో తొలగించివేయుచున్నారు. భూస్వాములు భూములను స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని స్వతంత్రమంతటయుకొటమీద తేక కొత్తకొలుదార్లకు యీయటమో లేక అమ్మివేయటమో జరుగుచున్నది. సర్పాళాపురేట తాలూకా కాపూరనే గ్రామంలో కొలుదార్లు మార్చబడిన ఫలితంగా ఒక పెద్ద సంఘర్షణ జరిగి అందులో నరుక్కొని నలుగురు చని పోవుటగూడ జరిగినది. ఈ వట్టం అప్పటికే అమలులోవున్నచో యిటువంటివి జరిగి వుండేవిగావు భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లమీద దౌర్జన్యంపాడేవారు కాదు. శాశ్వతంగా యీ రాష్ట్రంలో కొలుదార్ల రక్షణకల్గి మటకు రాష్ట్రమంతటా వర్తింప జేయాలని నేను కోరుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలో యీ బిల్లును కొలుదార్ల హక్కులను కాపాడుటకు వారి రక్షణకొరకు నెలకు కమిటీనివేసి పూర్తి పరిశీలనచేయించితే చున్నాను. పాలేళ్లకు భూవసతిలేకపోవుటచే భూస్వాములు పాలేళ్లను సరిగాచూచుట లేదు. వారిని మనుష్యహక్కులుగా గూడ చూడరు. పాలేళ్లను బానిసలుగాచూచు చున్నారు. భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను అణగారెక్కి యీరకంగా బానిసలుగాజేసి భూములను కొలుకు జేయి మకొనుచున్నాడు. పాలేళ్లకు జీతములుగూడ సరిగా యిచ్చుటలేదు. ఈనాడు యీ ఆర్డినెన్సుపేచ్చి కొలుదార్లను పాలేళ్లను రక్షించుటకు గాను ప్రభుత్వం సరికల్పించియున్నట్లు చెప్పుచున్నది. ఈ ప్రాథమిక సూత్రాన్ని

[Sri K. Ranga Rao] 5th November 1952]

ప్రభుత్వం యీ ఆర్డినెన్సుద్వారా గుర్తించి శాశ్వతంగా కొలుదార్ల హక్కులను కాపాడి అన్యాయాలు మానుకము 50 శాతం మాత్రమే గలందులకు ప్రభుత్వంపాలిసి కోరుచున్నాను.

‘ముఖ్యంగా గుంటూరు కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో పాలేళ్లను కొలుదార్లను అమానుషంగా చూచేటటువంటి భూస్వాములున్నారు. కొలుదార్ల హక్కులు సక్రమంగా నిర్వచించుటకున్నూ, పాలేళ్లకు జీతములు సక్రమంగా యివ్వగలందులకున్నూ, బానిసత్వంనుండి తొలగించుటకున్నూ ప్రభుత్వము కృషిచేయాలని హృదయపూర్వకంగా కోరుచున్నాను. వై జిల్లాలో ప్రభువులన సాగుచునేయున్నది. అధికారంచేస్తున్న భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లపై దౌర్జన్యంచేయుటకు చూడగలందులకు ప్రభుత్వంవారి బాధ్యతవహించ వలసియున్నది. పాలేళ్ల కనీసవేతనాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించగలందులకు పాలేళ్లకు కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణ యివ్వగలందులకు, ప్రభుత్వం తక్షణం చర్యతీసుకోవాలి. ఈ రోజులలో పూర్వకాలంకన్న నూటికియివ్వే కుటుంబాల వ్యవసాయకౌశలం ఎక్కువ గానున్నాడు. ఈ కుటుంబాలకు శాశ్వత జీవనభృతి యెర్పరచినచోగాని రాష్ట్రంలో శాంతివుండదు. భూస్వామ్య పరిష్కరించుడను. అందుకాగాను ప్రభుత్వంవారు త్వరలో యీ ఆర్డినెన్సు రాష్ట్రమంతటను అమలుపరుపగలందులకు కొలుదార్ల విధాన మును సక్రమమార్చుమున పరిష్కరించ చర్యతీసుకొందురని నమ్ముచున్నాను.’

* DR. K. B. MENON:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was more inter- 4 p.m. ested in speaking on the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Now that it has been accepted. I only wish to stress the suggestion that he made of referring to Select Committee all important Bills that are brought before the House. He said that that should be a tradition of this House. I fully support that suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that it would be a very fine gesture on the part of the party in power always to refer important Bills to Select Committees. It would inspire a certain amount of confidence in the Opposition and it will also lead to a thorough discussion and examination of the details of every Bill in the Select Committee. That was my experience in the Select Committees that were appointed in the last session. I commend this to the Hon. Chief Minister and I hope that he would do it.

“ Now, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the Bill that is presented before the House. (The Bill is unsatisfactory, to say the least. It is rather a halting, half-hearted and a half-way-house measure. Somehow or other, all the Bills that are introduced in various Legislatures in our country on important subjects like land reform, unfortunately, are belated. When changes that are overdue are not made in time, it leaves dissatisfaction behind. That was our complaint during the days of the British. We have not in any way changed in that respect. I do not know why? But it is so. Take the Hindu Code Bill, for example, which was passed in the Union Parliament. Coming nearer home, the Malabar Tenancy Act that was passed, which gave no satisfaction either to the tenant or to the janmi. The same with the Bill that is before the House today. It gives satisfaction only to a very few and it gives dissatisfaction to many. I do not know why. I do not know whether it is because those who are in power have not the

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [5th November 1952]

imagination to grasp the gravity of the situation and to mark the tendency or the trend of the times. Or knowing it, have not the courage to act on it. It needs courage to anticipate the times and to pass legislation. Our Chief Minister certainly showed a high grade of courage and vision when he took a definite decision on decontrol. It is the wish of very many in this House, I am sure, that he would, before the life of this House is over, pass sweeping legislations with regard to land reforms which would more than meet the demands of the times.

"Sir, land problem is not merely a problem peculiar to our country. It is a problem of the world. It haunts particularly the peoples of industrially backward countries, like parts of Asia and of Europe. That was the reason why sweeping changes were brought about in Burma, in Kashmir and in Egypt. Why did those countries bring about these land reforms? Was it because of the land hunger? I do not believe in land hunger. Land hunger is only the result of a certain economic condition. It is the direct result of unemployment. It is because the people of the country are driven from pillar to post and are unable to feed themselves that they look to mother earth as the last source of their sustenance. The changes, unless they are brought about, they have nowhere to go. There is no land hunger in a country like England, where there is not enough land to go round, because there is sufficient employment to meet the demand. In a country like India, industrialization on a big scale is not possible because of our lack of capital, our dearth of technical skill and our general backward condition. And the only way we can solve the problem of unemployment in our country is by redistributing the land, by dispossessing the vested interests of their unwanted possession and distributing it among those who need it. It takes courage to do it and I hope that our legislators would do it with courage and with conviction. The argument that is put forward that these changes would help to prevent the spread of radical doctrines of the Socialists and the Communists. I do not believe, is a very strong argument. I do admit that the doctrines or the ideas that are spread by the Socialists or the Communists do serve as an added incentive towards these reforms, but I do not believe that these reforms should be effected in order to prevent the spread of these ideas. Unemployment and the product of unemployment, namely, poverty, are problems that should be solved in spite of the Socialists or in spite of the Communists. They are problems in themselves which are unhealthy symptoms in any society. There is nothing so revolutionary as an empty stomach. Our leaders should realize that and bring about changes that would meet the demands of the times. I even suggest that these reforms should not only be not belated, but these reforms should even anticipate and should be a step in advance of the times. I hope the Select Committee that is appointed would remember these facts and make sufficient radical changes in the proposed Bill and then present it to this House."

4-10 P.M. MR. SPEAKER:—"Does the Hon. Revenue Minister want to reply to the debate?"

5th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Not necessary, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:—"There are some slight changes in the Motion. The Joint Select Committee will consist of 29 Members instead of 28, in the list of Members of this House to be selected to serve on the Committee, the name of Sri T. Lakshminarayan Reddi has been substituted by the name of Sri A. Rathinam and the number of Members from the Council has been increased from 9 to 10, as the number of Council Members has to be half of that of the Assembly Members. I will put the Motion as amended to the vote of the House. The question is—

(That the concurrence of the Legislative Council be obtained in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both Houses consisting of 29 Members to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (19 Members from the Assembly and 10 Members from the Council) with instructions to the Committee to submit its report to this House on or before the 22nd November 1952 and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee:—

- (1) The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
- (2) " M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
- (3) " K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
- (4) Sri K. Rajaram.
- (5) " C. Muthiah Pillai.
- (6) " G. Narayanasami Naidu.
- (7) " Y. Manjaya Shetty.
- (8) Janab Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.
- (9) Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam.
- (10) " L. Lakshmana Das.
- (11) " T. Viswanatham.
- (12) " C. Kandaswami.
- (13) " P. Venkateswarlu.
- (14) " S. Swayamprakasam.
- (15) " V. Gopala Gounder.
- (16) " A. Rathinam.
- (17) " K. R. Nallasivam.
- (18) " V. P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
- (19) " V. Balakrishnan."

(The motion was carried.)

[5th November 1952]

(2) THE MADRAS DISTRICT BOARDS (AMENDMENT) BILL^a, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

"The term of office of the present members of all the district boards except Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam expires on 1st December 1952. But the revision of the Madras Legislative Assembly rolls, which are used for district board elections also, has yet to be completed and according to the present arrangements it is likely to be ready only by the end of February 1953. The possibility of the printed copies of these rolls becoming available only at a later date has also to be taken into account by way of caution. Consequent on the abolition of seats for Muslims, Indian Christians, etc., the strength and the electoral circles of each of the district boards has to be revised after duly consulting the respective district boards. This work would also require some time.

"The Madras Legislative Assembly rolls after they are ready have to be rearranged on the basis of the revised circles and the rolls so rearranged have to be published as the electoral rolls of the district board. It may be stated in this connexion that the municipal elections will continue up to the end of November 1952. The panchayat elections which will begin in the middle of November 1952 are expected to go on for the first few months in the year 1953. Simultaneous elections for both the panchayats and the district boards would dislocate the administrative machinery and inconvenience the candidates who may desire to contest for both and the clash of both the elections has therefore to be avoided. In the result with a view to observe all the formalities statutorily imposed, and to avoid clash of elections to panchayats and district boards, the extension of the term of office of the members of all the district boards except Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam by one year up to 1st December 1953 is proposed.

"The normal term of office of the existing members of Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam District Boards will expire only on 20th December 1953."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

'That the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'

Let the hon. Members move their amendments formally. Then the motion as well as the amendments will be before the House for discussion."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words "at once" substitute the words "six months hence from to-day".'

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I second the amendment."

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 15th October 1952.

[5th November 1952]

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Sir, I move—
'That the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952, may be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.'

"I am not moving my other amendment."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—"I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion as well as the amendments are before the House for discussion."

* SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose this Bill and support the amendment that in the place of 'at once', the words 'six months hence from to-day' be substituted. As the new electoral rolls for the Madras Legislative Assembly which are to be adopted for district board elections are not ready, it is suggested that the life of the present term of office of the members of the district boards except the district boards of Visakhapatnam and Srikakulam be extended for one year more. This is not a just ground. The reason for this Bill is to retain in office the present undemocratic members of the district boards for one more year. Elections to municipal councils have been held and elections to panchayat boards are going to be held shortly on the basis of the existing electoral rolls. If the revised rolls are not ready, surely elections to district boards should have taken place on the basis of the existing rolls. The Government have trotted out a lame excuse. The ruling party wants to keep in office the heads of district boards for one more year perhaps for their selfish ends. I am afraid that no member of this House who is democratically minded will support such a suggestion. Elections have taken place for municipal councils.

"The old municipal councillors and the Chairmen before they vacate office in a couple of days have managed to distribute money as soon as possible, even though there was the clear fact of new councillors having been elected. The district board is a bigger field for more mischief and the ruling party giving the undemocratic heads of the district boards a lease of life for a year is most dangerous. We are definitely opposed to such a state of affairs. Even if by a show of hands this party is able to give a lease of life for one year, I am sure the present undemocratic district board members cannot win the favour of the electors. That is a definite fact. It is our duty to see that this kind of arbitrary keeping in office of a set of people is not allowed. Hence I oppose this Bill. It is strange that the Hon. Minister for Local Administration puts forth another argument that the division into wards and all the rest of it takes time. This is lame excuse that he is giving. The whole thing behind this Bill is that somehow or other the present district board members should be kept in office. I bring before the House the charge that has been made against the President of the East Godavari District Board. The state of affairs in East Godavari is not all right. I presume that that is the state of affairs in most places. Are we to allow this state of

4-20
p.m.

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [5th November 1952]

affairs in district boards to continue for one year more? This is the question before us now. We cannot allow this state of affairs to continue. There is every opportunity available to conduct elections and to elect persons in whom the people have confidence. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I fix ten minutes for each hon. Member. The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah will now speak."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“ఆధ్యక్షా ప్రస్తుతము జిల్లా బోర్డుల ఎన్నికల పాత పద్ధతిపై ఎన్నో బద్దాయి. ఈ పద్ధత వయోజన వోటింగు అమలుకావచ్చినది. దీనితోటి మార్పులు వస్తాయని చెప్పారు. సూతన రిజర్వ్ ఎన్నికలపై ఇది కొంత అడుగునకదాయి. ఆ ఎన్నికల ఫలితాలను చూచి వీటి విషయములో ఉన్న చిక్కులు సర్దుకొంటాయని ఆలోచిస్తున్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా ఇది ప్రజాస్వామికమని ఒప్పుకొన్నప్పుడు, Indian రాజ్యాంగములో ప్రధాన సిద్ధాంత మైనటువంటి వయోజన వోటింగును తప్పని సరిగా అనుసరించవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రపంచమంతా గ్రహించి చెప్పుచున్నది. మనమంతాకూడా చెప్పుతూనే యున్నాము. ఇప్పుడు మనదేశంలో వయోజన వోటింగు ఇచ్చాము అంటే, దానితో ప్రజలకు పూర్తిగా అధికారాన్ని ఇచ్చామునాట. అయితే దీనివల్ల ప్రభుత్వము నకు కొంత చిక్కు ఏర్పడినట్లు తోచుచున్నది. ఈ చిక్కులలోకుండా చేసుకొనుటకు ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డులు తీసివేసేవిషయము ఆలోచిస్తే ప్రధానమంత్రి ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డులను ఉంచవలసిందే అంటారు. స్థానిక పరిపాలనాకాళామంత్రి తాలూకాబోర్డులు ఉండాలి అంటారు. కాని ఎన్నికల విషయముచూస్తే, వీటి ఎన్నికలు సరిగా జరగడంలేదు. కొన్ని నియోజకవర్గాలలో వోటింగులేదు, చేతురెత్తి ఎన్నుకోవడం ఒకచోట, నిలబడి ఒకచోట, balloting ఒకచోట ఈవిధంగా వివిధ రకాలుగా యున్నది. ఈవిధంగా ఒక సరియైన క్రమము పద్ధతి లేకుండా ఒక్కొక్కచోట ఒక్కొక్క విధానము అనుసరించుట సరికాదు. జిల్లా బోర్డు ఎన్నికలు న్యాయంగా జరగాలంటే, వయోజన వోటింగు పద్ధతిని వెంటనే ఇది జరిపించండి. ప్రస్తుతమున్న జిల్లా బోర్డు At ప్రకారమే జరిపించండి. లేదా ఏదైనా మార్పులు తెస్తామంటారా, ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డుల At ను మొత్తంగా మార్చివేసి, ప్రజలకు, ఈ కారణాలవల్ల ఇది మార్చవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ విధంగా మార్చవలసియుంటుంది. మీ ఆభిప్రాయాలను తెలియజేయండిని ఆడగండి. ఈ విషయంతో ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టి దానిని గుర్తించి మార్పులుచేయండి. ముందు బొబ్బిలి రాజా మినిస్టరుగా ఉండినప్పుడు తాలూకా బోర్డులను రద్దుచేసి జిల్లా బోర్డులను మార్చాలన్న ఆభిప్రాయముతో నియోజకవర్గాలు సర్కిలు చిన్నవైన కొలది వివాదాలు, పెట్టు డిక్యువ అభివృద్ధి జిల్లా బోర్డులను రెండుచేశారు. ఇవన్నీ అయిపోయే పంచాయితీ బోర్డులున్నాయి. బడి ఎన్నికలలో secret balloting పెట్టకుండా, చేతులు ఎత్తడం, నిలబడి వోటుఇయ్యడం జరుగుచున్నది. ఈ పద్ధతులన్నీ చాలా అభ్యర్థులకు భయపడుతూ, వారికనుకూలంగా వోటు ఇయ్యవలసిన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడు నుంది. ఈమదిరి బలవంతంగా వోటు ఇయ్యకమే కాకుండా వారిమీద ఎన్నో కష్టపూర్వకాలు మోపబడతాయి. కనుక మీరు నిజంగా ప్రజలకు వోటింగు హక్కు ప్రజాస్వామ్య సిద్ధాంతాల సనుసరించి ఇవ్వవలెమంటారా, అయితే వారికి స్వయంసర్పయం చేసుకొనేందుకు అనుకూలంగా secret balloting పెట్టి ఎన్నికలు జరపవలసియుంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు అటువంటిపరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది కాబట్టి,

[5th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

ఈ secret balloting ఇవ్వకతప్పదని, అయితే దీనినుండి తమకు రాబోయే ప్రతి హల పరిస్థితులను సరిదిద్దుకొని వాటిని ఎదుర్కొనుటకు నియోజకవర్గాలలో కొన్ని మార్పులు తీసుకోవచ్చే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో ఈ ఎన్నికలను జరపుటలో కాలయాపన చేస్తున్నట్లు స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. నియోజకవర్గాలలో కొన్ని మార్పులు వచ్చాయని అందుకని నియోజకవర్గాలలో కొంతమార్పు చేయవలసియున్నదనే నెపముమీద ఈ ఎన్నికలను వెనుకకు నెట్టివేస్తున్నారు. అంధప్రతికూల సూతన రాజ్యాంగం ప్రకారం నియోజకవర్గాలు ఈ విధముగా విభజించేముందే ఆక్కడి అభ్యర్థులను నిర్ణయించుకొని వారి కనుకూలంగావుండే పద్ధతిన నియోజకవర్గాలు నిర్ణయించారని అంధ ప్రతిక సందేశమును వ్రాసింది నాకు జ్ఞప్తికివస్తున్నది. ఇప్పుడు నియోజకవర్గాలను ఎందుకు మార్చుతున్నారంటే, వి సభ్యుణ్ణి ఏ నియోజకవర్గాలలో నిలబెట్టలే, వివిధంగా ఎన్నికలలో నెగ్గగలడు, ఆ నియోజకవర్గాలలో పరిస్థితులు అనుకూలంగా చేసినందుకు ఆ నియోజకవర్గానికి ఆతనికి అనుకూలంగా ఉండే ఏమే గ్రామాలు చేర్చితే సరిపోతుందనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో ఇప్పుడు నియోజకవర్గాలలో ప్రభుత్వము మార్పులు తెస్తున్నదని చెప్పుచున్నారు. కనుక ఎన్నికలను ఈ నెపముతో వెనుకనెట్టుతూ, ఈ లోకల పరిస్థితులన్నీ సర్దుకోవచ్చుననే ఆలోచిస్తున్నారు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వము పలుచూరు status quo అని చెప్పుతూ యుంటారుకాని, కొన్ని అభివృద్ధి నిరోధకవర్గాలను ప్రయత్ని స్తూ యుంటారు. కనుక నేను చెప్పవది విమంలే, మీరు ప్రజాసమ్మతంగా పోవాలంటే ఇప్పుడు ఉన్న జిల్లా బోర్డుల అట్ట ప్రకారమే ఎన్నికలు వెంటనే జరపండి, లేదా అట్టను మార్చాలంటే, మొత్తము అట్టవంతా పూర్తిగా మార్చివేస్తూ ఈ విషయములో ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టి, ఆ ప్రకారం చేయండి. ఇప్పుడు ఎన్నికలేమీ జరపవలసిందే. దీనివల్ల ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకొనే అవకాశముండుంది, ఎన్నికలలో ప్రజలు వారి స్వయంసర్పయం ప్రకారము ఎవరిమీద వారికి నిజముగా విశ్వాసమున్నదో వారిని ఎన్నుకొనేందుకు వారికి అవకాశముండాలి. ఇప్పటికే ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డు ఎన్నికలు చాలా అలస్యమైనవి. కనుక ప్రజలు వాటికి విశ్వాస మున్నటువంటివారిని ఎన్నుకొనే అవకాశము ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. ఏ మార్పులు తెచ్చినా ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని కనుగొనవలసి యుంటుంది. బ్రిటిషుపరిపాలన పాయి ప్రజాస్వామ్యము వచ్చినతరువాత, ఒక్క శాసనసభ్యులకు మాత్రమేకాదు అధికార ముండవలసివది. సురేంద్రనాథ్ బెనర్జీ “Democratic Swaraj” అనే ఒక పుస్తకములో జిల్లా బోర్డులకు సర్వాధికారాలు ఉండాలి. పోలీసుమీదను, అగ్నికవిధానము మీదను తదితర అన్ని విధానములయందును, అయిన జిల్లాల పరిపాలనా పద్ధతుల యందును వీరికి సర్వాధికారముండాలని చెప్పినాడు. కనుక మీకు ఏ మార్పులు తీసుకు రావాలన్న ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని రాబట్టుకొనుట అత్యవసరము. కనుక మీరు చేయవలమకొన్ని మార్పులను ప్రజల యెదుటపెట్టి, మీరు ఆ విధంగా propose చేస్తున్నందుకు కారణాలు తెలుపుతూ, ప్రజాభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకోవలసిందని కోరుతూ, ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను.”

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM:—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I support the motion of the Hon. Minister for extending the term of the district board members. The reasons the Hon. Minister has given are very convincing. They are very real. It is necessary that there should be sufficient time for making proper arrangements for election of panchayat boards which are innumerable. I, as one who is well acquainted with rural conditions (and every hon. Member also knows), know that there will be lot of troubles when

4-30
a.m.

[Sri G. Nagabhushanam] [5th November 1952]

panchayat board elections take place, and that a good deal of police bandobust will be required. If the district board elections should take place at the same time when panchayat board elections are held, there will be confusion. We have very creditably conducted the last elections to the State Assemblies and Parliament. Even international critics stated that 18 crores of people who went to the polling booths and have exercised their franchise, without any trouble, and that elections went on peacefully. We have won international admiration. Therefore, it is necessary that we should conduct our elections in a peaceful manner. Hon. Members speaking from the opposite side are interested in creating confusion and trouble in our country. Therefore, they are opposing this motion which is a realistic and practical one. There are difficulties in the maintenance of law and order. If we take the present police strength into consideration, it is highly inadequate and insufficient to meet the present demands. We have not increased our police strength. Our revered leader C. Rajagopalachari on the other hand has disbanded the special police force at Bellary and six hundred people have been sent home. Hence, we have a limited number of policemen to meet the demand. Hon. Members who are sitting on the opposite are interested in creating confusion and disorder and that is the reason why they say that extension of time should not be given. Our object is to maintain peace, law and order. Therefore, Sir, it is necessary that there must be sufficient time at the disposal of the Government."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of order, Sir. 'Disorder' అనే మాట Parliamentary అర్థాన కాజో తెలుపగోరాను."

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—"Disorder is not an unparliamentary word. The hon. Member Mr. Nagabhushanam will continue his speech."

SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM:—"I have not used any unparliamentary language, and I do not know why the hon. Member is so angry with me. I am only stating the facts."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"On a point of order, Sir. I have given notice of an amendment to the Government motion. The hon. Gentleman on the other side made reference to me and said that those who moved amendments to the Government motion"

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—"This is not a point of order. The hon. Member will please resume his seat."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"But you have not listened to me completely. You may please"

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—"It is not a point of order. The hon. Member cannot argue it with me once again."

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM:—"Sir, I submit that extension of the period is necessary for the Government to conduct

[5th November 1952] [Sri G. Nagabhushanam]

peaceful elections, as they did in respect of the elections for the State Assembly and the Parliament. We have won international reputation regarding those elections. I submit that panchayat board elections are taking place in the rural areas for the first time in the history of India. It is necessary that the Government, responsible to the people, must take proper precautions and make arrangements for police bandobust. For all these things, the Government require police and other officers. Therefore, when panchayat board elections take place, it is not wise and practical to conduct district board elections also. It will only lead to confusion. The suggestion that the time asked for will be utilized for the purpose of putting in members who are very convenient to the Congress party, is really very reprehensible. On the other hand there are practical difficulties. Particularly, when we have abolished the seats for Muslims, Christians and Anglo-Indians, we have to make re-adjustment of the constituencies. We have to re-allocate the constituencies, and for re-allocation we require time. Therefore, the Government certainly require time to observe all formalities and conduct these elections properly. It is not possible to do things all too quickly. Sir, I support the motion of the Hon. Sri Sankara Reddi."

SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, జిల్లా బోర్డులకొరకు పొడి గించు ఉద్దేశంతో తెచ్చిన ఈ బిల్లును నేను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును ప్రతిపాదించు దిన్నూ గౌరవనీయులగు మంత్రిగారు ఇచ్చిన కారణాలు చాలా అసంతుష్టి కరంగా ఉన్నవి. జిల్లాబోర్డు ఎన్నికల గడువును పొడిగించుటను సమర్థిస్తూ మంత్రిగారు వోటర్ల జాబితాలు సవరింపబడలేదని, వాటి సవరణకు మరింత కాలము వడుతుందని చెప్పారు. కర్నూలు జిల్లాకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు వోటర్ల లిస్టులు సవరింపబడ్డాయి. ఆ విధంగా ఇతర జిల్లాలలో చేయబడకపోవడం ప్రభుత్వలోపమే కాని వేరుకాదు. ప్రభుత్వం ఆలక్ష్యంచేసి ఎన్నికల గడువును పొడిగించడంవడం, ప్రజావిశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయిన జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంటుల అధికారాన్ని హెచ్చుచేయడం ఎంతమాత్రం సమర్థనీయమైన విషయంకాదు. అంతేకాకుండా ఇప్పుడున్న జిల్లాబోర్డు సభ్యులు 1949 వ సంవత్సరములో వోటింగు హక్కుల నూటికి 10, 12 మంది ప్రజలచేతనే ఎన్నుకొనబడినారు. కాని నేటి పరిస్థితులు వేరు. వయోజన వోటింగు హక్కు ప్రజలకు దఖలు చేయబడింది. ఆ హక్కును వినియోగించుకొనేవారు గత సాధారణ ఎన్నికలకు తమ ప్రతినిధులను ఎన్నుకొన్నారు. నేడు కాంగ్రెసుకు ప్రజలలో ఎంత శుభకుబ్ధి ఉన్నదో మంత్రిగారికి తెలియనటువంటి విషయంకాదు. కాంగ్రెసువారు ప్రజల ఆదరాన్ని కోల్పోయినారు. నేటి జిల్లా బోర్డు అధ్యక్షులలో చాలామంది ఎన్నికలలో ఆపజయం పొందారు. ప్రజావిశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయిన అట్టివారిని యింకను అధికారములో పొందారు. ప్రజావిశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయిన అట్టివారిని యింకను అధికారములో ఉంచడమనేది ప్రజాస్వామ్య సిద్ధాంతాలకు విరుద్ధంగాదా అని ధర్మపన్నులను వల్లించే రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను. జిల్లాబోర్డులపరిపాలన ఈ నాడు సక్రమంగా కొనసాగుచుబడుతుందే. ప్రజలు నేటి పరిస్థితులకు విసిగి వేస్తారు. ప్రభుత్వాధికారులు కూడా అట్టి అభిప్రాయంతోనే ఉన్నారు. ఈ మధ్య మా కర్నూలు జిల్లా బోర్డు పరిపాలనగురించి సగిడ్డిస్తూ జిల్లా కలెక్టరుగారు కూడా అట్టి అభిప్రాయాన్నే వెల్లడించారు. అయినప్పటికీ అటువంటి జిల్లా బోర్డుల కాలాన్ని కూడా పొడిగించుటకు కారణం ఏమిటి? ఎవరూ కాంగ్రెసు గోత్రీకులు నేడు జిల్లా బోర్డు అధ్యక్షులుగా ఉండుటే దీనికి సాక్షుడై ఉండవచ్చు."

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi] [5th November 1952]

“జిల్లా బోర్డులు నెరవేర్చవలసిన విధులలో విద్యావిషయం ముఖ్యమైనది. అందులోను ముఖ్యంగా ప్రాథమిక విద్యాపాఠశాల విషయంలో జిల్లా బోర్డులు నిర్వహించే పాతకాలు నిర్వహించవలసిన నిబంధన ఉన్నది. కాని, రాయలసీమలో ఎక్కడ గ్రామాల జనాభా 200 లు, 300 లు మాత్రమే ఉంటున్నా అనేక గ్రామాలలో పాతకాలు లేక ప్రజలు చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పడవలసివస్తుంది. ఈ విషయమై జిల్లా బోర్డులు ఎట్టి సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయలేదు. అంతేగాక ఉపాధ్యాయులకు జీతము లను కూడా జిల్లా బోర్డులు సకాలంలో ఇవ్వలేకుండా ఉన్నాయి. మా జిల్లాలో ఉపాధ్యాయులలో రెండు, మూడు నెలలుగా జీతాలులేవు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఉపాధ్యాయులు వివిధంగా చదువు చెప్పగలరో ప్రభుత్వంపారు గుర్తించగోరను. అంతేగాక జిల్లా బోర్డులు సరిగా జీతాలు ఇవ్వకపోయినను, ఉపాధ్యాయులను, పంతుల్యులను, పంతులయ్యలను ప్రెసిడెంటుగారు ఆయన ఇష్టానుసారంగా ఒక చోటినుంచి మరొక చోటుకు transfer చేస్తున్నారు. కొద్దిపాటి జీతంతో కాలం వెళ్ళుచుపోతే నానాబాధలు పడుచున్న ఉపాధ్యాయులను వీటికి మాటికి బదిలీలు చేసి వేధించడం దురన్యాయమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. దీనికి తోడుగా జనరల్ ఎన్నికలలో కాంగ్రెసువారికి సంభవించిన ఎన్నిక ఫలితాలవల్ల, జిల్లా బోర్డు అధ్యక్షులు, తమకు వ్యతిరేకంగా వోటుచేశారని అసమానించిన ఉపాధ్యాయులను ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులపాలు చేస్తున్నారు. వారిని జిల్లాలోని దూర ప్రాంతాలకు బదిలీలు చేస్తున్నారు. కాంగ్రెసువారు చేస్తున్న ఈ దురన్యాయాలను ఇప్పటికైనా కట్టిపెట్టించాలి.

“విద్యా విషయంలోవలెనే రోడ్ల విషయంలో కూడా జిల్లా బోర్డుల పరిపాలన చాలా లోపభూయిష్టంగా ఉన్నది. 1941 వ సం॥ సందికొట్టుకునుంచి సంద్యాలవద్దను మూడు, నాలుగు లక్షల రూపాయలు వెచ్చించి మట్టి రోడ్లు వేశారు. ఈ పని సంవత్సరములలో అది చాలా పాడైపోయింది. అయినప్పటికీ దానికి సరి అయిన మరమ్మత్తులు లేవు. ఇలాగే అనేక విషయాలలో జిల్లా బోర్డులు లోప భూయిష్టంగా నిర్వహించబడుతున్నాయి. జిల్లా బోర్డు సభ్యులు, అధ్యక్షులు ప్రజా విశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయారు. వారు ఈనాడు ప్రజలకు ప్రాతినిధ్యం వహించగల సరిలేరు.”

4-40 THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“Sir, the points p.m. that are being raised by the hon. Gentleman Sri Pulla Reddi are not relevant to this subject. He is speaking on the general administration of the district boards.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I submit that a Bill which seeks to prolong the life of the district boards invites criticisms on all the aspects of local administration and, therefore, all the remarks made by the hon. Member are relevant.”

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member Sri Pulla Reddi may continue his speech.”

SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—“జిల్లా బోర్డుల ప్రస్తుత పరిపాలన చాలా లోపభూయిష్టంగా ఉన్నదని, నాటి కాంగ్రెసు పాలకులు ప్రజా విశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయినారనే నా నిశ్చితాభిప్రాయము. ఈ విషయం శంకర రెడ్డిగారికి అంజుడి కలిగింది ఉండవచ్చు. జిల్లా బోర్డు పరిపాలన గురించి ఆయనకు తెలియవట్టి విషయంకాదు.

5th November 1952] [Sri C. Pulla Reddi]

వెంటనే ఎన్నికలు జరుపవలసిఉన్నదని, ఈ బోర్డు అధ్యక్షులను ఇంకెంత మాత్రం అధికారంతో ఉంచరాదనే విషయాలు ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి చేదలచేవాటిని తెలియ జేస్తున్నాను.

“గత ఆరు సంవత్సరముల పరిపాలనా ఫలితంగా కాంగ్రెస్ పలుకుబడి కోల్పోయింది. ఈ పోయిన ప్రతిష్ఠను తిరిగి సంపాదించుకొనే ఉద్దేశంతోనే జిల్లా బోర్డుల గడువు పెంచటానికి ఈ కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వం ఈ ఎత్తు ఎత్తింది. కాంగ్రెసు వారి పాలన ఇంక కొంతకాలం సాగనిచ్చు తలంపులో చేయబడిన కుట్రయే ఇది.

“అంతేకాకుండా minority లను సరిఅయిన ప్రాతినిధ్యం ఇచ్చు విషయంలో కూడా ప్రభుత్వంపారు అలోచించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. నిజమైన ప్రజాస్వామిక సూత్రాలను ఈ ప్రభుత్వం అనుసరించదలచిట్లయితే ఈ బిల్లును ఉపసంహరించుకొని వెంటనే ఎన్నికలు జరుపవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, the presentation of this Bill to-day is a surprise to many hon. Members. From the recent speeches of the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration, people were expecting the coming into being of new taluk boards and the abolition of district boards. But it is surprising that the Government should take a decision to postpone the elections to district boards. Sir, there are a lot of doubts about the administration of the district boards. They seem to be different governments under one Government. There are districts like Krishna and Guntur which get nearly half a crore of rupees or even more as income and there are other districts like Chittoor which get Rs. 10 lakhs or Rs. 12 lakhs. From this it can be seen that the requirements of the districts are the same but that the income varies from district to district. Why should there be this sort of difficulty? As and when the work of the district boards is taken over by the Government, the work regarding education can very well be handed over to the District Educational Officers and there will be no need for the existence of the district boards, as we see, because except the president and the vice-president, there is nobody moving about in the districts for the sake of administration. The members of the district boards meet once in a month or two, only to receive the agenda and the travelling allowance and then go back home. Resolutions are moved in respect of which the president says, ‘Agreed, agreed’. Nothing else takes place. As such, I feel that no useful purpose will be served by continuing the district boards.

“Sir, the Government should have looked after the financial position of the district boards. I am told that there is a Federation of District Boards. The President of that Federation is a Member here. But I do not know why at the time when the General Budget was discussed, the need for improving the financial position of the district boards was not pressed on the Ministry. Nearly twelve years ago the Government took over the motor vehicles taxation from the district boards. This tax was a big source of income for the district boards and it yielded a large amount. When the Government took over the motor vehicles taxation, they fixed a particular amount to be paid to the district boards. Now the

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [5th November 1952]

income from this tax has gone up ten or fifteen times. But still the Government have not thought fit to improve the financial position of the district boards. When the financial position is not sound, why should the district boards exist at all? Why should the little amount, that the district boards are at present collecting by way of taxes, be spent on the travelling allowance of the president, the vice-president and the members of the boards? That money could be profitably spent on some other things like the construction of a small hospital or a road. Under these circumstances, I feel there is no need for these district boards at all. All the same, the Government feel that they should exist.

"Sir, my humble suggestion is this. Most of the presidents of the district boards contested in the General Elections, and I would say that such of those presidents who succeeded in the elections, should continue as presidents till some other elections come off and such of those people who were defeated, should be removed and Special Officers should be appointed in those districts, because those people have lost the confidence of the electorate. That is why many hon. Members feel that the district boards must be abolished for the present and till the elections are again held, Special Officers should be appointed who can carry on the administration with better knowledge. As one of the hon. Members, Sri Pulla Reddi, has mentioned, the recent elections have had great repercussions on the employees of the district boards. It is a fact and it is the experience of almost every Member sitting here that the teachers, who helped the presidents standing as candidates for election to the Legislature, have got comfortable positions and all conveniences, whereas those teachers, who did not co-operate with the presidents who stood as candidates for election, are miserably suffering now. I know in my neighbouring districts some teachers have been dismissed from service on account of this. The Hon. the Ministers for Local Administration and Education may say, 'Let such cases be brought to our notice'. But how many cases can be brought to the notice of the Ministers? Is the Minister to pay attention to every such case? I say, 'No'. The papers are merely sent back to the districts and nobody knows where those papers go afterwards. These poor teachers are suffering. We are feeling the pinch of their suffering as Members of the Legislative Assembly. Every man feels, 'The M.L.A. from my district should look after me and solve my difficulty'. This fact has come to my notice. But I know most of the Members are unable to reach the Ministers and even if they reach the Ministers, they are unable to get the necessary information. Therefore, every case that is brought to the notice of the State Government is a failure in that respect. Everything depends upon the weight of the officer and the urgency of the case. The teachers are suffering very much and, therefore, I feel that the presidents who have been defeated in the General Elections deserve to be replaced by Special Officers.

"Then, Sir, it was mentioned by the Hon. Minister, while the Bill was moved, that it took a lot of time to redistribute the seats. May I submit that all the seats are there and that only certain

[5th November 1952] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

seats have been reduced? The latter seats are only general seats. There will be a change only with regard to them. If there are 52 seats in a district board, only some eight of them will be reduced and they will have to be converted into general seats. It will take only a few hours to refix these seats. If there is an appeal, it can be disposed of in a week or ten days. Therefore, the work of redistribution of seats will not take more than ten days. As such, this excuse will not be a proper one for postponing the elections.

"Then, there cannot be a big change in the voters' lists, if they are revised. After all, in every village the names of about 50 people may have to be deleted and those of some 50 people may have to be added. Anyhow the number will remain almost static, because within the one and a half years since the electoral rolls were prepared, I do not think that many people have died. Even famine has not killed many people. People somehow exist. So, there is not going to be a big change in the electoral rolls and the revision of the rolls is also not going to change the fate of the people who are going to seek election now. In view of these facts, let us have the elections as early as possible. Let us not give scope to anybody to indict the Government for postponing the elections for this reason or that reason and with this view or that view. Now, are the municipal elections standing in the way? No. We are adjourning the House itself for about fifteen days so that we may look after the municipal elections. Therefore, let us have the district board elections next month or, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition Sri Viswanatham says, let us have them within six months. I feel six months' time is not too long a period. Or even we can hold these elections within three months.

"I would like the Minister for Local Administration to give an assurance to this House that elections would be held as early as possible. He could very easily give an assurance in this House. The Hon. Minister said that elections have to be postponed as there was no time. I don't see any reason why the Government should postpone the elections for one year. One year is too long a period, because people are already suffering very badly in the districts. I would submit that the Education Minister and the Minister for Local Administration should investigate into cases in which teachers have been very unreasonably transferred from one taluk to another; and in many cases teachers were transferred to places even beyond 150 miles. Some of them have been dismissed for no reason. They have asked for the reasons for their dismissal, but nobody is forthcoming to give the reasons for their dismissal. Will the Government take effective steps to go into such cases and set right the malpractices obtaining in some of the district boards? The Government should take steps to appoint Special Officers in the case of all district boards, the presidents of which were defeated in the recent General Elections."

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMY:—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment moved by hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He says that the Bill can be postponed for six

[Sri C. Rajam Ramaswamy] [5th November 1952]

months. His idea seems to be to bury once for all this Bill. As we all know, the term of office of the present members of the district boards will cease on the 1st December 1952, and if we now postpone this Bill for six months, it will mean that we don't want the district boards to continue, and create a vacuum from 1st December 1952. Thus by moving for the postponement of the consideration of the Bill the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham has found a subtle way of doing away with the present district boards whose life this Bill seeks to extend. I feel, Sir, that he is not justified in moving for the postponement of the Bill just now.

"Sir, I have got a feeling that the future of these district boards should be considered *de novo*. We are all awaiting eagerly, the results of the ensuing panchayat elections under the Village Panchayats Act, we have given more powers to these panchayats and we must see how far they are able to do useful work in their villages."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the hon. Gentleman, opposite has misunderstood me. My idea in moving the amendment was not to do away with these district boards. The effect of my amendment is that elections should be held according to the schedule originally proposed, under the old rules by 1st December 1952. That is the effect of my amendment."

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMY:—"Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows fully well that elections cannot be held at such short notice. Panchayat elections are to take place on 15th of November. As such, the hon. Gentleman ought to know that elections to district boards cannot be held before 1st December 1952. That is why I say that his idea is only to bury this Bill and also create a vacuum in district board administration."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I will conduct the elections in 15 days."

* SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMY:—"Whatever it is, Sir, I would like to repeat that the future of these district boards should be examined *de novo*. We must examine and see how far these boards have been able to perform useful work in the matter of Local Self-Government. We should also see whether these boards are functioning properly and whether we should give them more and more powers or whether we should reduce the powers already given. At present, the district boards are running a few schools here and there and are maintaining a few dispensaries and hospitals. They are also maintaining some of the district board roads. Now, after the formation of the Provincial Highways Department, most of the roads previously maintained by district boards have been taken over by the Provincial Highways Department, and they are maintaining the roads very well. Take for instance the roads in Tanjore district: I can say for certain and without fear of contradiction that the roads taken over by the Highways Department have been very much improved. I should also say that there are some very good district board roads in

5th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajam Ramaswamy]

Tanjore district, especially after the Highways Department have taken over some of the main roads in that district, as the district boards have to keep pace with the Highways Department. Therefore, we should carefully examine how these district boards are functioning. We are all aware, Sir, of the many factions and politics in the case of some district boards. Already, the hon. Member, Sri Thimma Reddy has given us a picture as to how things are going on in the district boards of his area and as to how some of the presidents who stood as candidates in the recent General Elections were defeated and how some of the teachers who refused to work for the presidents were transferred or dismissed. In the past we have had considerable troubles, disputes and local animosity whenever district board elections took place. I feel, Sir, that we have had enough of elections already and it is therefore better that the future of the district boards are looked into carefully before a decision is taken in regard to the holding of fresh elections. The Hon. the Minister for Local Administration has rightly said that the electoral rolls have to be revised and delimitation made before fresh elections could be ordered. We noticed many malpractices that were prevalent in the recent municipal elections. Most of the voters were, it seems, provided conveyances to go to the polling stations. The rules that were applied for the General Elections were not applied to the Municipal Elections. If elections are to be held under the old rules and the old Act, it would be injurious and unfair. That is why I am saying, Sir, it is better to postpone the elections to a later date, and in the meantime the rules may be revised and arrangements made for proper elections to be conducted under the rules so revised.

"Sir, most of the district boards have been functioning for the last three years. We do not know what useful work they have done in this period. We only know that they have opened a few new schools here and there or a few dispensaries. The most important function of maintaining the district roads was very sadly neglected by many of them. They have not attended to this important matter. I feel that it is one of their main functions. In these circumstances, I request the Hon. Minister for Local Administration to examine the whole question *de novo* before making up his mind in regard to the holding of fresh elections for district boards.

"With these few words, I oppose the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and support the Bill. I wish to thank you, Sir, for having given me an opportunity to express my views on this Bill."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"On a point of information, Sir, may I know how much time has been allotted for the discussion of this Bill?"

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—"Till 5-30 p.m."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I requested the hon. the Leader of the House to allot as much time as was desired by the

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [5th November 1952]

hon. Members and in my calculation, I think it would take us over to the sitting day-after-tomorrow. I think the Leader of the House has given his consent by being silent."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“As the hon. Leader of the Opposition says that he would take my silence as consent, I wish to say that I only told him that as the debate developed we might see whether it was absolutely necessary to carry it over to the 7th November also. But from the trend of the discussion on this Bill, I feel that it is not necessary to waste further time on it. Anyway, let us see for half an hour more and then decide.”

[illegible]

* SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ கனம் உப-சபா
நாயகர் அவர் னே ! தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் சாந்திரை கட்சி ஜில்லா
போர்டு நிர்வாகத்தில் இருந்துகொண்டு வருகிறது. இப்பொழுது

5th November 1952] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை ஒத்திப்போடுவதின் காரணமாக அந்தே யுள்ள ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களின் நிலைமை மிகவும் கஷ்டமாக ஆகிறது என்பதோடு மட்டுமல்ல; எங்கள் ஜில்லாவில் ரொதுத் தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள் பெருவாரியாகத் தோற்றுப் போனதின் காரணமாக, அவ்வாறு தோற்றுப் போனவர்களை இன்று ஜில்லா போர்டு நிர்வாகத்தில் இருந்து கொண்டு வருவதன் காரணமாக சாங்ஷன் செய்யப்பட்ட பல கோடுகள் எல் லாம் இன்று கவனிக்கப்படாத நிலைமையிலிருக்கின்றன. ஒன்றாகோடு ஜில்லா போர்டுத் தலைவர் அவர்களும், உதவித் தலைவரும் ஜில்லா போர்டு காங்கிரஸ் கட்சித்தலைவர் கண்கசைப் பிள்ளையவர்களும் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லா காங்கிரஸ் தலைவர் வெங்கடகிருஷ்ண ரெட்டியார் அவர்களும் தேர்தலில் தோற்றுவிட்டகாரணத்தால் பொதுத் தேர்தலிலே அவர்களுக்கு ஒத்தஸ்தைக்க மறுத்த ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களை ஊர் ஊராக மாற்றிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறா கள். பொதுத்தேர்தலில் ஜில்லா போர்டு பிரசிடெண்டு அவ்வாறு ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களையும் அணுகி தேர்தலில் தனக்காக உழைக்காவிட் டால் ராஜ் தாமசு செய்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று வற்புறுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள் அம்மாதிரி வடக்குதியில் ஒரு ஆசிரியர் தனே. ல் ரெட்டியார் என்பவர் அவரை ஆதரிக்க முடியாது என்று சொல்லிவிட்டு ராஜ் தாமசு செய்து விட்டு வெளியே வந்திருக்கிறார். அப்படி ராஜ் தாமசு செய்யாத வர்களை தாலுகாவிற்குத் தாலுகாவாக ஒரு மாதத்திற்குள் பல இடங் களுக்கு மாற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். இன்னும் சொல்ல முடியாத கொடு மைகளையெல்லாம் அவர்களுக்கு இழைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அப்பேய்ப்பட்ட தோற்றுப்போன ஜில்லா போர்டு தலைவரும் அவருடைய சகாக்களும் இன்னமும் தொடர்ந்து இரக்கவேண்டுமென்று தேர்தலைத் தள்ளிப் போடுவது கொஞ்சம் கூட சரியாகாது. அவர்களால் ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர் களுக்கு ஏற்பட்ட கொல்லிகளோடு கூட பெரிய மக்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக் கொண்டிருக்கும் இன்னல்கள் கொஞ்ச நஞ்சுமல்ல. டைமர் திம்மா ரெட்டி அவர்கள் சொல்லியதைப் போலாவது பொது மக்களால் தங்க ளுக்கு வேண்டாமென்று இந்தப் பொதுத்தேர்தலில் புறக்கணிக்கப் பட்டவர்கள் யார் ஜில்லா போர்டுகளில் பதவி வசிக்கிறதாலும் அதை ரத்து செய்துவிட்டு தேர்தல் நடத்தாவிட்டாலும் அதிகாரத்தை ஜில்லா கலெக்டரிடமே, அல்லது வேறு அதிகாரிகளிடமோ ஒப்படைக்க வேண்டியதுதான் பொய்பவும் சரியானது, நியாயமானது என்று சர்க் காருக்குச் சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

“பழி வாங்கும் படலமாக ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களை அடிக்கடி மாற்றிக் கொண்டேயிருக்கும் விஷயத்தை 12 எம்.எல்.ஏ. ஆகிய நாங்கள் கையொப்பமிட்டு ஒரு மகஜூர் முதன் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரி யாரிடம் சென்ற கூட்டத்தின் மோது நேரில் சமர்ப்பித்தோம். கல்வி மந்திரி அவர்களிடமும் இதைப் பற்றிச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறோம். ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன மந்திரி அவர்களிடமும் முறையிட்டுக் கொண்டோம். ஆனால் இதுவரை யாரும் எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் எடுத்ததாகத் தெரியவில்லை. எதிர்க் கட்சியில் இருக்கிற எங்களுடைய தீவிரக்கைகள் புறக்கணிக்கப் படுகின்றன. திட்டமான கேஸ்களை எடுத்துக்காட்டியும், யார் யார் எந்தெந்தத் தேதியில் எங்கிருந்து மாற்றப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்று எடுத்துச் சொல்லியும் கூட இதுவரை எவ்விதமான நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கப்படவில்லை. எந்த ஆசிரியராவது அவர்களுடைய குறைகளை நீக்கிக்கொள்வதற்காக எங்களை அனுப்பினால் உடனே ஜில்லா போர்டிலிருக்கிறவர்கள் அவர்களுக்கு மேலும் மேலும் தொந்தரவுகளையே விளைவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே தான் இந்தத் தேர்தலைத் தள்ளிப் போடக்கூடா தென்று நான் வலியுறுத்த விரும்புகிறேன். திட்டக்குடியில் ஒரு ஹை ஸ்கூலை ஏற்படுத்துவதாகச் சொல்லி ஒரு காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியை அங்கே நிறுவினார்கள். ஆனால் அங்கே அந்த காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டி சரியாக வேலை செய்யவில்லை, பணம் வசூலாகவில்லை, பொதுமக்களும் அவர்களுக்கு ஆதரவு காட்டவில்லை. அதன் பிறகு பொதுமக்களைக் கொண்ட ஒரு கமிட்டியை நியமித்து பணம் வசூலித்து என். எஸ். சிருஷ்ணன் அவர்களை அழைத்து வந்து அஸ்திவாரக்கல் நாட்டினார்கள். உழைப்பாளி கட்சியைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் இந்த விழாவில் கலந்துக்கொண்டார்கள் என்

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar] [5th November 1952]

5-10
p.m.

5th November 1952] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

இதை மந்திரி அவர்கள் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். தேர்தலில் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியை ஆதரிக்கவில்லையென்பதற்காக ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களுக்குப் பிராவிடெண்ட் பண்டிஸிருந்து கடன் எடுக்க அனுமதிப் தீர்மானம். ஜில்லா கல்வி அதிகாரி அனுமதியில்லாமலேயே இம்மாதிரி 150 டிரான்ஸ் ரகம் நடந்திருக்கின்றன. இம்மாதிரியான அக்கிரமங்கள் நடக்காமலிருக்க வேண்டுமென்றால், ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு உடனடியாகவேண்டுமென்றால், தேர்தலைத் தள்ளிப்போட்டு காலதாமதம் செய்யாமல் உடனடியாக நடத்தவேண்டும். ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை ஒத்திவைக்கிறதினால் பொது மக்களுக்கு எந்த விதத்திலும் நன்மை இடையாது. பொதுத் தேர்தலிலே தோற்றுப்போன சந்தர்ப்பம் ஐங்காருக்கு கவர்னர் பதவி கொடுத்தது போல பொதுத் தேர்தலிலே தோற்றுப்போன திரு. சீனிவாச பட்டையாச்சிக்கு, ஜில்லா போர்டிலே தலைவர் பதவியை நீடித்துக் கொடுக்க ஆசையிருந்தால் தான் தேர்தலை ஒத்திப்போட வேண்டும்.”

* SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :— “ అధ్యక్ష, ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ స్థానిక పరిపాలనా వట్టము సహకారకారికు నొక తీర్మానమును ప్రతిపాదించుతూ రెండు మూడు కారణములు చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఈ తీర్మానము తెప్పించుకు మొదటి కారణము కొత్తగా electoral roles తయారుగాల్సిందునను, అవి తయారు అగుటకు ఇంకను కాలవ్యవధి అవసరమైయున్నదనియు, రెండవ కారణము కొత్త Constitution మీరకు మున్సిపలనును, క్రైస్తవాలనును రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ చేయబడిన రిజిస్ట్రేషన్లను జనరల్ సీట్లుగా మార్చించి క్రొత్త సర్కిళ్లను ఏర్పాటుచేసే విషయములూ కొంత వ్యవధి కావలసి యున్నదనియు మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఈ విషయములూ District Boards term ముగియుటకు ఇంకను ఆరు మాసములు ముందుగానే Local Administration Department నుండి కొన్ని District Boards ను revised circles ఏర్పాటు చేసే విషయములూ ఉత్తరువులు వచ్చించి ప్రభుత్వమువారు కాలయాపనకొరకు తప్పించుకొంటున్నారు. కొన్ని జిల్లా బోర్డులనుండి కావలసిన సమాచారమును ముందుగానే తెప్పించకుండా క్రొత్త circles ఏర్పాటుచేయవలెనని చెప్పతూ తప్పించుకొనుట ఏమిన్యాయమో వారే చెప్పవలసి ఉంటుంది. ఆరు మాసములకు ముందుగానే కావలసిన సమాచారము తెప్పించుకొని దానికి సరియైన కాలములూ మూడు ఏండ్ల లోపల కొత్తగా ఎన్నికలు జరుపుటకు తగిన ఏర్పాట్లు చేసియుండినట్లయితే చాలా సమంజసముగా ఉండేది. పాత electoral rolls వయోజన ఓటింగు పద్ధతిపైన తయారుచేయబడియున్నవి. ఆ ఎన్నిక పద్ధతిపైన క్రొత్త ఎన్నికల జరుపుటకు ఏమి యిబ్బంది ఉన్నదని అడుగుతున్నాను. కొత్తగా తయారుచేయబడు electoral rolls పైననే ఎందుకు ఆధారపడివుండవలయును? దీనికి పేరే కుంటి సాకులు లున్నవి. జిల్లా బోర్డులలో యింతవరకూ యీ కాంగ్రెస్ పక్షమువారు చేసిన దుష్ప్రవృత్తులన లోని చిక్కులను సర్దుబాటు చేసుకొనుటకున్నూ, తమ పరిపాలనతో తమ కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ జలంచేకూర్చుకొను దురుద్దేశంతోను ఇప్పుడు యీ జిల్లా బోర్డుల term ను పొడిగించుటకు యత్నించుతున్నారు. అంతేకాకుండా, వెనుకటి జిల్లా బోర్డులు ప్రాతినిధ్యము వహించడము లేదు వయోజన ఓటింగు పద్ధతిపైన జనరల్ ఎన్నికలు జరగవలసినవిగావున వి

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

“మరియు తెలుగు జిల్లాలో నాకు తెలిసినంతవఱకు నూటికి ఐదై ముందు జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లుగా పున్నవారు Legislative Assembly ఎన్నికలలో నిలబడి పోటీయినారు. కాబట్టి యింకను జిల్లా బోర్డు పరిపాలన జరపడానికి వారికి ఇకమీదట ఏలాటిహక్కు నున్న లేదు. ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డుల ఎన్నికలు కేవలంగా జరిగినట్లుయితే ప్రభుత్వం

[Sri R. Siddanna Gowd] [5th November 1952]

తప్పకుండా పాటించబడుతుంది. మరియు తాలూకా బోర్డులను స్థాపించి, వాటికి ప్రాధాన్యతను ఇవ్వవలసిందిగా స్థానిక పరిపాలనా మంత్రి శ్రీ శంకరరెడ్డిగారు అంటున్నారు. జిల్లా బోర్డుల అధికారములను తగ్గించునని నేను చెప్పడములేదు. జిల్లా బోర్డు అధికారములన్నీయు, గవర్నమెంటు డిపార్టుమెంటు తరఫున పేషన్స్ staff ను వేసినందువల్లను. రోడ్ విషయం Highways Department కునూ, విద్యా విభాగము Educational Officer కునూ యిచ్చియున్నారు. అందువలన యిది జిల్లాబోర్డుల అధికారంతో సంబంధం ఎందుకో తెలియడంలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు Elementary Education ను, ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డులు జయప్రదముగ నిర్వహించడం లేదు. Elementary Education కు ఎంత శ్రీమంతుడైనా ప్రాధాన్యతను ఇస్తే అంత మంచిది. జిల్లా బోర్డు అజమానిషిలో ఈ Elementary Education ఉన్నంత వరకు, విద్యా వ్యాప్తి జయప్రదముగా జరగదు. తాలూకా బోర్డులు ఉండినంతవరకు, ఈ విద్యావిభాగము సక్రమంగా విరుగుతూ వచ్చింది. విజనగూ, ప్రజలకనూ, ఉపాధ్యాయులకునూ, ఈ తాలూకా బోర్డు ప్రతినిధులగునూ, సన్నిహితసంబంధం ఉంటుండేది అటువంటప్పుడు, విద్యావిభాగమునూ శుభముపట్టి లోబుపాట్లను సరిదిద్దుటకు అవకాశంవుండేది. ఇప్పుడు, ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డుల jurisdiction ఎక్కువ అగుటచేత, విద్యావ్యాప్తి జరుపుటకు, జిల్లా బోర్డులకు అవకాశం లేకుండా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల విద్యావ్యాప్తి చాలా పీనస్ ఫిక్షాకి వచ్చింది. ముఖ్యంగా మన దేశం దారిద్ర్యంతోనూ, నిరక్షరాస్యతతోనూ నిండి యున్నది. అందువలననే, మన దేశము అభివృద్ధి చెందలేకుండా ఉన్నది. విద్యా వ్యాప్తికి మన చేతులూనే ఉన్నది. కాబట్టి మన దేశములో నిరక్షరాస్యతను నిర్మూలించజేసి నిద్రను improve చేసుకొనవలసివస్తున్నది, మన జిల్లా బోర్డులనుంచి ఈ విద్యా పరిపాలనను తొలగించి District Educational Officer కిరకీ అప్పగించి పెట్టవలెను. తాలూకా, జిల్లా బోర్డుల పరిపాలననుగురించి ఒక విషయము నేను చెప్పడము కున్నాను. తాలూకా బోర్డుకున్నూ, జిల్లా బోర్డుకున్నూ నేను 20 సంవత్సరములుగా ప్రసిద్ధులగున్నూ, మెంబరుగానున్నూ ఉండి చాలా అనుభవము సంపాదించి యున్నాను. వీటియొక్క పరిపాలన వివిధంగా జరిగినదో నాకు చక్కగా తెలుసును. ముఖ్యంగా, ఈ తాలూకా బోర్డులు, జిల్లా బోర్డులు ఉపాధ్యాయులమీద అధికారము చెలాయించుటకున్నూ, వీలుఅయినట్లుగా transfer లు చేస్తూ అక్రమంగా క్షీణించుటకు ప్రయోగపడేవి. ఉదయసుగాకుండా, ఈ బోర్డులకు President గా ఉన్నవారికి గాని, వారి పార్టీ మెంబర్లకుగాని ఎన్నికల సమయములో ఈ ఉపాధ్యాయుల సహాయము కలసిపడెదల వారిని transfer మొదలయినవి చేస్తూవుండేవామే. ఇదంతయు అన్యాయమని చెప్పుతున్నాను. గనుక ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డులను Elementary Education పై గల సంబంధంతోగొనిస్తే యిది ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డుల చేయవలసినది యేమి ఉండదు. అప్పుడు ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డులకు యిచ్చే గవర్నమెంటు గ్రాంట్లు రాబడి మరొక విధంగా ఖర్చుచేయబడవచ్చును. అందువలన ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డులను ఎత్తివేయమని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. కాబట్టి విద్యాశాఖమంత్రిగారు ఈ విషయములో తీవ్రంగా మోచించవలసియున్నది. ఈ విషయములన్నియు పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించగలందులకు, ఒక కమిటీని ఏర్పాటుచేసి వారి రిపోర్టును తయారుచేయించగలందులకు కోరుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము వారు యిప్పుడు ఎన్నికలను postpone చేయడానికి యత్నించడమనేది చాలా చెప్పిన సలహా చాలాదాగావున్నది. శ్రీ తిమ్మారెడ్డిగారు నూదా మంచి సలహా యిచ్చారు. శ్రీ విశ్వనాథంగారు ఆరు నెలల గడువు చెప్పారు కాబట్టి ఈ సలహా తీసుకొని ఎరకనులు జరుపుటకు మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. గనుక యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తెచ్చిన

5-20 p.m.

5th November 1952] [Sri R. Siddanna Gowd]

తీర్మానమును వ్యతిరేకిస్తూ ఉన్నాను. నేను చెప్పినది జిల్లాబోర్డుల ఉపయోగమునకే, కాబట్టి ప్రజాపరిపాలనకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు జిల్లాబోర్డులు ప్రజలకు యేవిధంగాను ఉపయోగపడనందున, ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డులు ఎత్తివేస్తేనే బాగాఉండునని ఘంటాపథంగా చెప్పుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వంవారికి ఈ జిల్లాబోర్డు పరిపాలన ఎట్లా జరుగుతున్నది తెలిసి నప్పటికీ, వారి పార్టీలను బలపరచుకునే నిమిత్తం, యిప్పుడు ఈ తీర్మానం తెచ్చినాను. కనుక ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారి తీర్మానమును నేను వ్యతిరేకించుతూ, మా Opposition Leader అయిన విశ్వనాథంగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. the Leader of the House."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Is he winding up the debate, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, he is not."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, this is a very simple measure and an innocent one. I had absolutely no idea of intervening in this debate. But unfortunately, some hon. Members have taken this occasion to attribute motives to the Government for bringing forward this measure. It has been said by several hon. Members on the other side that this Government are anxious to continue the various presidents of district boards, who belong to the Congress party, in office for another year, and that too, presidents who are committing various atrocities, as was suggested so very forcefully by the hon. Member, Mr. Govindaswami. I may assure this House through you, Sir, that we had and have absolutely no such idea. It is not with any idea of perpetuating any presidents in office that the Government have brought forward this measure. I may assure hon. Members that we had not the remotest idea that we should continue Congress Presidents in power. But what is the reason? I would like to explain it. After all, our general election was over only in February last. After that we assumed office and then we were faced with the situation that elections had to be held to municipalities and district boards in the normal course. We considered that in the interests of the State as a whole—leave alone parties—it would be unwise to have a State-wide election. It should be clearly understood by hon. Members that elections to district boards would be elections on a more extensive scale, and more intensive also, than the general election because there will be many more candidates and many more contests. We had to consider whether it would be good in the interests of the State to throw the whole State again into the frenzy of election so soon. What are the existing conditions in the State? We are passing through a period of acute famine not only in Rayalaseema but in other parts also where we are facing acute scarcity conditions. We had to take a decision, therefore, whether we should spend so much money at this juncture on another election. It is not only a question of spending money. We have to spend all our energy in it if we are to conduct another election. So, as a responsible Government—as persons responsible for the good of the State—we decided that it was better to postpone the elections than have them in the existing conditions. That was the main reason which prompted us to postpone this election."

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [5th November 1952]

5-30 p.m. "Some hon. Members argue that there are some district board presidents who are committing atrocities, that they belong to the Congress and therefore this Government want to continue them in power. After all, if we belong to the Congress party we are interested in the popularity of the Congress organization and also the Congress party. If as a matter of fact certain presidents belonging to the Congress party are committing atrocities, to that extent it is a slur on the Congress organization and the Congress party as such. Therefore if we want to continue these presidents who are committing atrocities, certainly we are not doing any good to the Congress organization. Therefore, please don't impute motives that we want to continue these presidents in office for our own purpose. Certain allegations were made and it was also pointed out that complaints were given to this Government in respect of a certain president of a district board, and that nothing has been heard about it. I enquired about it. The hon. Member made the allegation without even enquiring whether the matter was under enquiry or not. He made the further allegation that simply because the complaint came from the other side it had been ignored and no enquiry was made. Let me assure the hon. Members in this House to whichever party they may belong that whenever a complaint is made an enquiry is made, a thorough enquiry is made, into the allegations contained in the complaint and we always try to do justice. Therefore, let me assure the hon. Member Mr. Govindaswamy Nayagar that if he has made a complaint it has not been thrown into the waste paper basket but whatever action is necessary is being taken and the result of the enquiry will be communicated to him. So also the hon. Member Mr. Thimma Reddi made certain allegations that school teachers were being transferred from one taluk to another and they are being victimized. If my hon. Friend Mr. Thimma Reddi is prepared to give the actual grievances of any particular teacher or teachers certainly we will go into the matter, make enquiries and whatever is possible will be done. Let me here assure hon. Members that it is not in our own interest that we should allow them, especially if those presidents belong to our party, to commit wrongs because it reflects not only on us but on the entire organization as such.

"Therefore we are interested in the proper working of the Congress organization and in the proper conduct of Members belonging to the Party. Therefore let it not be said here that it is in the interests of those district board presidents that we have brought forward this Bill. It is only in the interest of the entire State—in the entire interest of the people who have to face a critical situation—that the measure has been brought forward. We were all hoping that the failure of the South West monsoon will be the end of our troubles, and we will have a good North East monsoon. But unfortunately it looked as if it began well but now we do not see any sign of the monsoon breaking. We do not know how we are going to fare. Under these circumstances, do hon. Members really suggest that we should have a State-wide election for all these district boards? And after all, what are

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [5th November 1952]

the powers of these district boards? If this is realized, hon. Members will certainly not prefer a State-wide election for the district boards at this juncture. Rather we must canalise all our energies and all our resources to meet the critical situation which is facing us. Let us not be disheartened. It might be a critical situation but let us not get disheartened. Let us all get ready for the challenge if it comes and meet it boldly, bravely and courageously. Instead of that let us not be thinking of elections and let us remember, once elections come, party feelings go high, and each party begins to work for its own end and success. Hon. Members know what an election means. When an election atmosphere is created we are unable to think of anything else. Under these circumstances, I would request the hon. Members on the other side in the name of the people who are suffering and in the name of the people who have got to undergo greater ordeals, not to oppose the motion, but on the other hand help Government so that they might postpone the elections.

"Sir, the hon. Member Sri C. V. K. Rao made an allegation. He said: 'Here is a Government which wants to have an undemocratic administration in the district boards to continue'. I know when a Communist says, 'undemocratic administration', what it is. I know it has a technical meaning. When the president belonged to his side or when a thing is in his favour, it is all democratic administration and the president is a peoples' representative. But if the president does not belong to his side, he is always undemocratic and an enemy of the people. All these slogans we know. Therefore don't be carried away by the slogans like 'undemocratic Governments', etc. Let us face facts as representatives of the people who are facing a great ordeal. In the name of the people and not in any party spirit I appeal to hon. Members, to pass this motion. I assure hon. Members of the House that whatever grievances are brought to our notice, if they are real, we will try to rectify them. Let that not stand in the way of postponing the elections. It would divert all our attention in a new direction altogether. With these words I support the motion."

* SRI A. RATHINAM :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர் கொண்டுவந்த வெட்டுப் பிரேரணைமீது கனம் திரு. சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் அளித்த பதிலை அனைவரும் அறிந்திருப்பார்கள். எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர் கொண்டுவந்த பிரேரணை மக்களுக்கு அவசியமானது. ஜனப்பிரதிநிதிகளுக்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல் ஜில்லாக்களிலேதான் மக்கள் அவசியம் பிரதிநிதி சேவையை எதிர்பார்க்கிறார்கள். ஜில்லாக்களின் பெரும் பான்மையான பிரதிநிதிகள் இந்தச் சபையிலே வீற்றிருக்கிறார்கள் என்றாலும், ஜில்லாக்களில்தான் ஆங்காங்கே மக்களுடைய குறைகள் அபங்கி யிருக்கின்றன.

"சென்ற சட்டசபைத் தேர்தலிலே ஜில்லா போர்டுகளிலே காங்கிரஸ் தோழர்கள் அதிகமாகப் போட்டியிட்டார்கள். ஆனால், அவர்கள் தோல்வி அடைந்தார்கள். குறிப்பாக, எனது ஜில்லாவாகிய தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லா போர்டு தலைவர் அவர்கள் போட்டியிட்டார் என்றால், அவர் அமோகமாக வேட்டுக்களைப் பெருமல் அவர் தோல்வியுற்றிருக்கிறார் என்றாலும்கூட அவர் இன்றும் கூட தென்னாற்காடு மாவட்டத்திற்குத் தலைவராக இருக்கக் கூடிய காரணத்தால் அவருக்கு யார் யார் வேட்டு போடவில்லையோ, அவர்

[Sri A. Rathinam]

[5th November 1952]

களுக்கெல்லாம் சதி செய்திருக்கின்றார். சென்ற ஒரு வருஷ காலமாக அவர் செய்து வரும் சதி மிக பிற்போக்கான தன்மையில் இருக்கிறது. அவர் காங்கிரஸ்காரராக இருக்கின்றார் என்ற காரணத்திற்காக நான் இதைச் சொல்லவில்லை. இந்த மாதிரியான நடவடிக்கை எல்லா ஜில்லாக்களிலும் நடப்பது கண்கூடு.

“தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கு எதிராக வோட்டுப் போட்டவர்கள் பறையர்கள், பிற்பட்ட வகுப்பினர். இன்னும் இதைப்போன்ற வர்கள் ஜில்லா போர்டுத் தலைவரின் ஆட்சியில் கஷ்டப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். தென்னாட்டு மாவட்டத்தில் காங்கிரஸ் தோல்வியடைந்ததற்கு முக்கிய காரணம் எதுவென்றால் பிற்பட்டவர்கள் மக்களும், தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களும் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுடைய ஆட்சியிலே அவர்கள் செய்துவந்த தீவ்லுமுல்லு களைக்கண்டு காங்கிரசுக்கு எதிராக வோட்டு செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதன் காரணமாகத்தான் என்னுடைய ஜில்லாவாசிய தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவிலே காங்கிரஸானது அமோகமான தோல்வியே அடைந்திருக்கிறது. அப்படி தேர்தலிலே தோற்றுவிட்ட அவர்களே இன்றும் அந்தத் தலைமையில் இருக்கின்றார்களென்றால், ஆரம்ப உபாத்தியாயர்களுக்கு அவர்கள் கொடுத்து வரும் தொல்லைகளைச் சொல்லிமுடியாது. ஆரம்ப உபாத்தியாயர்களென்றால் அவர்கள் அத்தனைபேரும், 95 சதவிகிதம் பிற்பட்ட வகுப்பினரும் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட வகுப்பினரும் ஆவர். எனவே, போர்டு தேர்தல் உடனடியாக ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் அமைக்கப்படவில்லையென்றால், அதற்கு இலக்கானவர்கள், சென்ற தேர்தலிலே காங்கிரசுக்கு எதிராக வோட்டு போட்டவர்களாகிய பிற்பட்ட வகுப்பினர்தான். அதாவது ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்கள் 100 மைல், 20 மைல், 50 மைல்களுக்குப்பால் மாற்றப்படுவதும் இன்னும் அதி அக்கிரமமான செயல்களுக்கும் அவர்கள் ஆளாக்கப்படுகிறார்கள். எனவேதான் நாங்கள் ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல்களை உடனடியாக அரசாங்கம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறோம். இவ்வையென்றால் கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்லும் பதிலுக்கு நான் ஒன்று கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அதாவது, ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல் உடனடியாக நடத்தப்படவில்லை யென்றால் சென்ற தேர்தலிலே போட்டியிட்டு தோற்ற ஜில்லா போர்டுத் தலைவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்களென்றால் அவர்களை அப்புறப்படுத்தி, அரசாங்க உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களை அந்த இடத்தில் அமர்த்தி வைத்தால்தான் ஜில்லா போர்டு நிர்வாகம் மிக நன்றாக நடக்கும். அது மக்களுக்கு உகந்ததாக இருக்கும். அத்தனை பேரும் இவ்வ வரலாற்றார்கள். அரசாங்கத்திற்கு உடனடியாகத் தேர்தலே நடத்தவேண்டுமென்று விரும்பும் இவ்வையென்றாலும்கூட, சென்ற ஜில்லா போர்டு மெம்பர்களாகவோ இருப்பார்களையாலும்கூட, அவர்களை அப்புறப்படுத்துவதே ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் நியாயமாகும். எனவே, ஜனநாயகத்தின் பேரால் நான் கேட்கிறேன்; அவர்களை ஜில்லா போர்டுகளிலிருந்து அல்லது மக்களால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட ஜனப்பிரதிநிதிகளையோ இடத்தில் உடனடியாக அமர்த்தவேண்டும். அது தற்காலிகமாக இருந்தாலும்கூட பரவாயில்லை. அரசாங்கம் எந்த தேதியில் தேர்தல் நடத்துகிறார் களோ அப்போது சரிப்படுத்திக்கொள்ளலாம். எனவே, எந்த ஒரு நோக்கத் தோடு மக்கள் விரும்ப வில்லையோ அந்த பிரதிநிதிகள் இன்னும்கூட ஜில்லாபோர்டில் இருந்துகொண்டு மக்களுக்கு தொல்லை கொடுக்கிறார்களென்றால், இந்த மாதிரி தொல்லைக்கு அரசாங்கத்தை அறைகூவுவதா அல்லது பிரதிநிதிகளாகத் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட அவர்களிடம் கூறுவதா என்று மக்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லை.

“நாங்கள் மகஜர் சமர்ப்படுத்தாலும்கூட அது சரியான ரீதியில் அல்லது குறிப்பாக சரியான முறையில் மக்களுக்குப் பதில் சொல்வது கிடையாது. ஏதோ நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்களே தவிர நடவடிக்கை எடுத்ததற்கு அத்தாட்சி ஒன்றுமில்லை. எத்தனையோ மகஜர்கள், பிராதுகள், புகார்கள் செய்திருந்தாலும்கூட, ஆட்சியாளர் அதை இங்கு

5th November 1952]

[Sri A. Rathinam]

மங்கும் அனுப்பிக்கொண்டு போஸ்டாபீஸ் வேலை மாதிரி செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே தவிர மக்களுடைய நன்மையைக் கருதி காரியங்களைச் செய்வது கிடையாது.

“மரண அறிக்கை, கொலை, சண்டைகள், சச்சரவுகள் பல இடங்களில் நடந்ததைப்பற்றி நான் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு தெரிவித்திருந்தும் கூட இன்று அதைப்பற்றி நடவடிக்கை எடுத்தாத தெரியவில்லை. 5-40 p.m.

“கொடுக்கப்பட்ட கேள்விகள்கூட இன்று சட்டமன்றத்திற்கு வரவில்லை. பல முக்கியமான பிரச்சனைகளைக் குறித்து கேள்விகள் கேட்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஆனால் அவைகளுக்கு சட்டமன்றத்தில் பதில் அளிக்கப்படாமல் அந்தக் கேள்விகள் இருட்டடைப்பு செய்யப்படுகின்றன, என்றால் என் போன்ற தோழர்கள் சும்மா இருக்க முடியவில்லை.

“ஜில்லா போர்டுகளில்தான் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களைப்போன்றவர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது நன்மைகள் செய்யமுடியுமே தவிர, பாட்டாளிகளுக்கும், பிற்பட்ட மக்களுக்கும் செல்கரியமான காரியங்கள் இந்த அரசாங்கத்தில் பெரிய உத்தியோகத்திலுள்ள நாங்கள் ஒன்றும் செய்யமுடியாது. நாங்கள் ஜனப்பிரதிநிதிகளாக சட்டசபைக்கு வந்திருக்கிறோம். ஆனால், மக்களின் நலனுக்கான காரியங்களுக்கு மகஜர்கள் அனுப்பும் போது, அவர்களுக்கு ஏதாவது தொந்தரவுகள் ஏற்படும்போது, அதற்குப் பரிசாரம் காண முடியாமல் இருக்கிறது. தாலுகா போர்டுகளிலும், ஜில்லா போர்டுகளிலும்தான் அந்த தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்களுக்கு ஏதாவது நன்மை செய்யமுடியும். எனவே, அப்படிப்பட்ட தாலுகா போர்டுகளும், ஜில்லா போர்டுகளும் மற்றவர்களுடைய கையில் இருக்கும்போது அந்த பதவிகள் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் கையில் இருக்கும்போது, தோற்கடிக்கப்பட்ட நபர்களிடத்தில் இருக்கும் போது மக்கள் எந்த நிரந்தரமான நியாயத்தைப் பெறமுடியும்? எந்த வசதியைப் பெறமுடியும்? அப்போட்ட நிர்வாகத்தை அழிக்கவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் அறைகூவுகின்றோம். மக்களுக்கு அவசியமில்லாத பெரிய உத்தியோகஸ்தர்கள், தலைவர்கள், நிர்வாகிகள், பிரதிநிதிகள் இருந்துகொண்டு நடத்தும் நிர்வாகத்தைக் கண்டிக்கிறோம் என்பதற்காக அதனை ஒத்திப் போட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை ஒத்திப் போடுவதில் நியாயமில்லை. அதனை உடனே நடத்தவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் இந்த சபையில் அறைகூவல் விடுகிறோம்.

“ஜில்லா நிர்வாகத்திலிருந்து ரோடு டீனையெல்லாம் இப்பொழுது கவர்ன்மெண்டு எடுத்து நடத்துகிறது. பாடசாலைகள், வைத்தியசாலைகள் போன்ற ஒரு காரியம்தான் ஜில்லா போர்டு நிர்வாகத்தில் இருக்கிறது. சிறு சிறு ரோடுகள் போடுகிறார்கள். ஜில்லா போர்டு நிர்வாகிகள் கணதுடைப்பு வேலை செய்கிறார்களே தவிர, குறிப்பாக மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்வதைக் காணோம்.

“ஐந்தாண்டுக்கு முன்னே ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல் நடந்தது என்றால் ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலிலே தலைவராக வந்தார் என்றால் அதற்குக் காரணம் பணம் படைத்தவர்கள் என்ற காரணம்தான். பெரிய நலசகவாந்தார்கள் என்ற காரணத்தால் நிறைய பணம் படைத்தவர்கள் என்ற காரணத்தால் மக்களை அடக்கி அவர்களுடைய வாக்குகளைப் பெற்று, அவர்களால் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு அவர்கள் தலைவர்களாக வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால், இன்று ஜனநாயக அடிப்படையில் சென்ற பொதுத் தேர்தலிலே நடந்த மாதிரி ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல் நடைபெறவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் ஜனநாயக ரீதியில் ஜில்லா போர்டுத் தலைவர்கள், ஜில்லா போர்டு பிரதிநிதிகள் ஜில்லா மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்ய முடியுமென்கிற ஒரு கருத்தைத்தான் மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கு நான் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். இந்த மாதிரி ஊழல் நிர்வாகத்தில் தலையிடாமல் உண்மையாக பிற்பட்ட வகுப்பினர், உண்மையாக தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள், குறிப்பாக உழைப்பாளி மக்கள், ஏழை மக்களுக்காக நீங்கள் வேலை செய்யமுடியுமென்று சொன்னால் அது ஜில்லா போர்டு, தாலுகா போர்டு, முனிசிபாலிடிகளில் தான் இருக்கிறது. சட்டசபையில் அங்கத்தினர்களாக இருந்தால் ஏதாவது பேசி விட்டுப் போகவேண்டுமே தவிர, வேறுவிதமாக மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்யக்

[Sri A. Rathinam] [5th November 1952]

கூடிய வேலை செய்யமுடிவதில்லை. இன்று ஒரு கடிதம் கொடுத்தால், பதில் கிடைப்பதற்கு 6 மாத காலம் ஆகிறது அந்த அளவுக்கு காரியங்கள் நடந்துகொண்டிருந்தால், மக்களின் கதி என்ன? அனேக கடிதங்கள் வந்துகொண்டிருக்கின்றன. ஆனால் இந்த ஆட்சியில் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட மக்கள் மிகவும் கேவலமாக நடத்தப்படுகிறார்கள், அவமதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள், கொடுமைப்படுத்தப்படுகிறார்கள். மக்களிடமிருந்து ஜனப் பிரதிநிதிகளாகிய எங்களுக்கு வரும் கடிதங்களை அவ்வப்போது அரசாங்கத்திற்கு அனுப்பிக்கொண்டுதான் இருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் எங்களுக்கு ஒரு விதமான பதிலும் வருவதைக் காணோம். எங்களுக்கு பதில் அனுப்பாவிட்டாலும்கூட அந்தந்த மாவட்ட அதிகாரிகளுக்குக்கூட தெரிவிப்பதில்லை. இந்த நிலையிலே நம்முடைய அரசாங்கம், நம்முடைய ஆட்சி நடந்துகொண்டிருந்தால், உண்மையாக பிற்பட்ட மக்கள், ஏழை மக்கள், பாமர மக்கள், அவதிப்படுகிறார்கள், அவர்களுடைய அழுதலைக் கேட்க யார் இருக்கின்றார்கள்? எனவே, ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை உடனடியாக நடத்தவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கின்றேன். தோற்றுப் போனவர்கள் ஜில்லா போர்டு தலைவர்களாக இருப்பதைக்காட்டிலும் அரசாங்கம் அந்த நிர்வாகத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு நடத்தட்டும், கலெக்டருடைய ஆட்சியிலாவது அல்லது ஒரு பெரிய உத்தியோகஸ்தருடைய மேற்பார்வையிலாவது அது நடைபெறலாம். அது மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்வதாக இருக்கும்.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ ஆட்சியாளர் பேரிலேயேதான் உங்களுக்கு நம்பிக்கையிலேயே அப்படி இருக்கும்போது அதிகாரிகளிடமிருந்து நம்பிக்கை இருக்கும்? ”

SRI A. RATHINAM :—“ அதாவது, மக்களால் கடந்த தேர்தலிலே தோற்கடிக்கப்பட்டவர்கள் இன்று ஜில்லா போர்டு தலைவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் சரியான முறையில் காரியங்களைச் செய்யவில்லை. அவர்கள் நிர்வாகத்தில் இருந்தால் மக்களுக்கு எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் ஏற்படமுடியாது. அவர்களை மக்கள் எதிராகிறார்கள் . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member's time is up.”

5-50 p.m. *** RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIAR OF CHETTINAD** :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of our local boards has always engaged the attention of the members of Legislature, engaged the attention of the public and might I say, has always resulted in raising controversies all over the State. In the good old days, I mean the days when the Raja of Panagal used to hold the portfolio of Local Administration, the portfolio of Local Administration used to be considered as the best of all portfolios. But I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that that portfolio has now become almost insignificant on account of the numerous amendments made to the Local Boards Act during the last 32 years.

“ Now, Sir, while I am not going to oppose the extension of the term of office of the members of district boards now proposed, I do want that the one year that is now going to be wasted should be properly utilized for bringing out a comprehensive Bill for the revival of the taluk boards. It is with that object Sir, I am supporting the proposed measure. Otherwise I am quite against this postponement. I, for one, feel that putting off election is not a good thing for any democratic party, let it be the Congress or any other party. Nevertheless I am supporting the present postponement in view of the difficulties involved in conducting a State-wide District Board election and that too so soon after the last general elections.

[Raja Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad]

5th November 1952] “ Mr. Speaker, I hope you would permit me to trace the history of the defunct taluk boards. Taluk boards played a very significant part in our democracy, Sir. The failure of the Justice Party was due to its abolition of the taluk boards. If the Justice Party had not interfered with the functions of the taluk boards and allowed them to continue, I am quite sure that they would not have met with defeat. We should take a lesson from them. After all what are we? We are here as representatives of the people after the general elections held for the first time on adult franchise. We should treat the panchayat boards, taluk boards, municipalities and the district boards as similar bodies like ourselves each functioning in a different manner. We do the legislative work. They do the executive work; of course each is being done in a different form. Sir, it is wrong to think that the taluk boards will not be manned by proper persons. The persons at the head of taluk boards are just like us. Let me sound a note of warning to my friends here not to belittle them. For after all there is also the possibility of some of us functioning in the taluk boards in case of our defeat at the next elections to the Legislature.

“ It is a notorious fact that the area of a district board is far too big for it to function effectively. It is also a well-known fact that elementary education is being neglected by the district boards. The only work, so far as my knowledge goes, that the district boards do is the frequent transfer of teachers in their high schools. It should be mentioned here that during the 15 or 17 years of its existence, the taluk boards have done their work with great efficiency. But the situation has changed after the abolition of taluk boards.

“ Sir, what do we find now in the so-called taluk committees? In the matter of the opening of a ration shop or fair-price shop or some such thing wherein some interest is involved, you find a tahsildar presiding over the taluk committee. The members of the legislature in the vicinity get an invitation to be present at the meeting to be held in Tiruppattur, Ramanathapuram or Srivilliputtur. At the sight of the M.L.As, naturally the poor tahsildar feels a discomfiture. These poor tahsildars are being called upon to do this and that by the M.L.As. Our leader, Rajaji, has called upon us not to interfere too much with such officials. But it should not be forgotten that the taluk boards during the fifteen years of their existence have done their work efficiently. To avoid the friction that is now exhibited during taluk committee meetings, the tahsildars should not be allowed to preside over those meetings. These controversies would not arise if new persons come in every year. That is why I want that there should be election every year. First year there should be election to the panchayats, then to the taluk boards, then to the municipalities and the district boards and then to the Assembly and Parliament. There should be systematic rotation. If such elections were to take place, it would enable us to be in touch with masses always. Then only it would be possible to have the electorate behind us. But what is it that is being done now. I do not understand the ‘touch’ business existing at the present moment! (Laughter.)

[Raja Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad] [5th November 1952]

“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take much of the time of the House. As I had already observed, we had just now passed through the gigantic task of the general elections throughout our country. I should like to congratulate the Government and the officials on the efficient way in which they conducted the elections. No single party had been allowed to exploit the masses by foul means.

“ While I am for the revival of the taluk boards, let me not be misunderstood as though I am against the retention of the district boards. At present the district boards are functioning in a different way. Their jurisdiction is too big for them to carry on the administration on efficient lines. Moreover there is too much of centralisation at Fort St. George. The district boards are not allowed any free hand. Even for small things as the purchase of broomstick or the appointment of a clerk, they have to await the sanction of higher authorities at the Secretariat in Fort St. George. This anomaly should be removed. The district boards should be given more powers. The same is the case with the municipal councils also.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Sir, on a point of order ముల్లయ్య చెట్టిగారు ఎప్పుటివో 30, 32 సంవత్సరముల క్రితము పానగల్ రాజా లోకల్ బోర్డు సంస్థలను తీసుకొనివచ్చినప్పటి విషయములు, మరియు క్రిందటి 5, 6 సంవత్సరముల పరిపాలన:పరించి గోపాల చెట్టిని అధినందించవలసిన విషయములు మొదలగువని యు చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఇవి ఈ బిల్లుకు ఏమీ సంబంధములేదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.”

* **RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIAR OF CHETTINAD :—**“ As I am blissfully ignorant of what the hon. Member had said just now, I shall continue my speech, Sir. I was saying that there is at present too much of centralisation of work in Fort St. George. Too much of energy and time is being wasted in saddling the poor officials of the Secretariat with too much work. There has been too much of accumulation of work in the Secretariat due to this centralisation. I plead for decentralisation of work now accumulated in Fort St. George and their proper distribution between the taluk boards, municipal councils and the district boards. I sincerely trust that the one year of postponement now requested for, would be properly utilised in bringing out a comprehensive Bill embodying all I have said, i.e., the revival of the taluk boards and the necessary modifications to the Madras District Boards Act, 1920, for the decentralisation of work at Fort St. George. A Bill embodying all such provisions will, I am sure, be of great benefit to the State as a whole.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. tomorrow.”

The House then adjourned.

5th November 1952]

APPENDIX

[Vide answer to starred question No 58 asked by Sri T. Viswanatham at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 5th November 1952, page 188 supra.]

Copy of Proceedings of the Additional District Magistrate of North Arcot, Vellore, dated 4th July 1952.

1 Name of the—

- (a) Station Katpadi.
- (b) Village Katpadi.
- (c) Taluk Vellore.

2 Complainant's name Report, dated 2nd June 1952, from the Inspector of Police, Vellore Town, in Crime No. 219/52 of Katpadi Police Station.

3 Name of accused

4 Offence, with law and section under which punishable. Death of one Rajagopal Naidu. “ Cause of death—not known.”

5 Explanation of any delay evidenced by dates in docket (outside).

6 Order to the Police, regarding making, or reframing from making further investigation and with regard to the bond, if any, executed by the accused.

7 Brief statement of facts of the case and reasons for the order.

Inquest on the dead body of Rajagopal Naidu was held by me on 3rd June 1952. The panchayatdars were of opinion that the deceased would appear to have died of natural causes—“ Fit.” Except Rajabai, the concubine of the deceased, none else of the available witnesses in the case, imputes aggressiveness to the Police. Even Rajabai's version is that the deceased was slapped on the face by the Police. In the absence of any injuries on the body of the deceased (except for a small superficial injury near the left eye) it is hard to accept Rajabai's accusation and much less to conceive that the deceased would have died as a result of the slapping. There is, in fact, no

[5th November 1952]

reason for the Police to assault the deceased, as the complaint before them (of the Rajabai against her married husband), was not one warranting their interference and particularly against the deceased. On the other hand, there is good reason to conclude that in order to divert any possible wrath of the deceased's relatives against herself at his death, she resolved to blame the Police. The Post-mortem certificate and certificate of the Chemical Examiner to Government reveal that death was due to natural causes. It would therefore be treated as a case of death due to natural causes.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 6th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Theosophical High School, Madanapalle.

*21 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation recently from the Madanapalle Theosophical High School requesting the Government to take up its management; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) & (b) The Government did not receive any representation from the management on this subject; but, it is learnt that the Director of Public Instruction received an offer from it for transfer of the school. The Director did not pursue the matter further, as he was not satisfied that there was a case for the Government taking over the school.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“మదనపల్లె తియసాఫికల్ హైస్కూలు చాలా కాలంగా రాయలసీమలో విద్యావ్యాప్తికి కృషిచేస్తున్న హైస్కూలు. ఈనాడు అధిక ఇబ్బందులవల్ల దాని management ఉపాధ్యాయులకు శీతములు ఇవ్వలేకపోయినట్లు, కాబట్టి దానిని స్వాధీనం చేసుకొనాలనేదని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అర్థించారు. ఈ స్కూలును ప్రభుత్వంవారు స్వాధీనం చేసుకొని రాయలసీమలో విద్యావ్యాప్తిని ప్రోత్సహిస్తారా?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“The grounds stated by the hon. Member were not stated by the management of the school when they made the offer to the Director; but, however, it has been reported that the management of the Madanapalle Theosophical High School addressed the Director of Public Instruction on the question of the transfer of management of the institution to the Government. The Government sanctioned last year the proposal of the Director of Public Instruction to take over under the management of Government some of the secondary schools under local bodies, so that candidates who are to be eventually appointed as lecturers in Government Training Colleges might be posted as headmasters of these schools. Eight schools were taken over by the Government which included the Municipal High School, Anantapur, and the Board High School at Harpanahalli. As these two schools from Rayalaseema had

[6th November 1952]

already been taken over by Government, the question of taking over a third school, particularly a private school, was given up."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"మదనపల్లి తియసాఫిట్ హైస్కూలు తెలియవారుండరని చెప్పడం ఎంతమాత్రం ఆతిశయోక్తికాదు. రాయలసీమ విద్యాభివృద్ధి విషయంలో ఈ స్కూలు నిర్వహిస్తున్న పాత అభ్యంత ప్రముఖమైనదని కూడా మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసు. కారణంతరాలపల్ల ఆ స్కూలు మేనేజమెంటువారు దానిని నిర్వహించు స్థానములో లాభాపేక్షలచేత వారు ఈ స్కూలును ప్రభుత్వంవారికి స్వాధీనము చేయదలచినట్లు తెలుస్తోంది. కాబట్టి దానిని ప్రభుత్వంవారు తమ యాజమాన్యం కిందకు తెచ్చుకుందుని ఆశించవచ్చునా?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"I have stated the circumstances under which the schools were taken by the Government. This year we could not take over any more schools on account of financial stringency and the proposals under the Part II Scheme were deferred. If this particular school approaches the Government, the matter will be considered on the merits."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"Does the Hon. Minister feel that financial stringency is the only condition which prevents the Government from taking over that institution?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Generally, in taking over these schools, the Government have up to now followed the procedure of taking over schools under the management of local bodies. We have not yet taken over any private school. So, this case has to be considered on its own merits as a separate thing. I cannot give any undertaking at present."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI :—"May I know whether it is the policy of the Government to undertake the responsibility of secondary education throughout this State in the future?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Secondary education is largely, as the hon. Member knows, in the hands of local bodies and private agencies. There is no proposal for the Government to take over the entire secondary education."

Scheme for establishing and spreading library service.

* 47 Q.—**SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether all local Library authorities have prepared and forwarded to the appropriate authorities schemes for establishing and spreading library service in their respective areas under section 8 of Act XXIV of 1948 and if only some have prepared and forwarded them, the names of those who have furnished the schemes and the names of those who have not; and

(b) whether all local Library authorities have taken over all properties, movable and immovable, of every public library in

[6th November 1952]

their respective areas and if some have taken over the properties and some did not, the names of those who did take over and the names of those who did not take over such properties?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"(a) A statement^{*} showing the names of the local Library authorities which have submitted schemes for the spreading of library service in their areas and the names of those from which such schemes have not yet been received is laid on the table of the House.

"(b) The Madras Public Libraries Act, 1948, does not contemplate the transfer of all the existing libraries to the local Library Authorities, though there will be no objection to their taking over libraries maintained by a local body or private agency."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that in the case of the Madras Local Library Authority which has been struggling to get a place to locate its own library, the Government have not come forward to help it in securing a suitable building?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"I am glad to inform the hon. Member that we have just succeeded in securing a suitable premises in the Pantheon Road."

Direct recruitment of Sub-Inspectors of Police.

* 75 Q.—**SRI G. RAMA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether there is any proposal with the Government to abolish the present system of direct recruitment for Sub-Inspectors of Police in the Police department?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"No, Sir, but in order to avert large-scale reversions of officiating Sub-Inspectors promoted from the ranks, the question of stopping direct recruitment of Sub-Inspectors in 1952 is under consideration."

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—"ఆ విధంగా స్థగించబడిన హెడ్ కాన్స్టేబుల్స్ ఎంతమంది ఉన్నారో చెప్పగలరా? ఇందులో హరిజనులెంతమందో చెప్పగలరా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I have answered before and given figures; I have said just now that the proposal to stop recruitment in 1952 is under consideration. The supplementary question does not arise out of that, I think."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—"How many of the reverted head constables have been promoted so far, since the order?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I think the hon. Member might clarify his question. What has happened is that in order to avert large-scale reversions, we are doing something. I do not understand the question."

[6th November 1952]

Production and sale of khadi by the co-operative societies.

* 77 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received a copy of the resolution passed by the Guntur District Handloom Board at its meeting held on 21st April 1952 that the weavers' co-operative societies dealing in handloom cloth produced out of mill yarn should be permitted to produce and sell khadi under the provisions of the Khadi (Development) Order, 1949; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO:—“(a) Yes, Sir.

“(b) As it is expressed as a general desire to liberalise the system of production and sale of handspun yarn, Government are examining the said Order and are actively considering the question of liberalization.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH:—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government would consider the desirability of abolishing the Khadi Control Order of 1949 in view of the several representations made to the Government that the provisions of the Order have already hit hard khadi production all over the State?”

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO:—“As I said, we are actively considering the question and are trying to see what could be done by liberalizing the Khadi Control Order.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM:—“1949-ம் வருஷம் ததர் உற்பத்தி உத்தரவு என்ன என்பதைச் சொல்லுவார்களா?”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Not now.”

Madras Public Service Commission Examinations.

* 78 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) the number of applicants who applied as candidates for the examinations for the Madras Ministerial Service held by the Madras Public Service Commission in 1950-51 and 1951-52 and the total fee collected as application fee from the candidates and the number of candidates declared fit for appointment; and

(b) the number of applicants who applied for direct recruitment to higher posts and the application fee collected from them in 1950-51 and 1951-52?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) & (b) A statement^a is laid on the table of the House.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ఈ పరీక్షలలో కష్టமாக 10-50 தேர்ச்சியైనார்கள் అని అడుగుతున్నాను?”

^a Printed as Appendix II on pages 377-378 infra.

[6th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I think the question is whether the results of the examination are communicated to the parties concerned. The results are notified and those who pass know that they have passed and those who do not hear about it, must take it that they have failed.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—“ఈ పరీక్షలలో కమిషన్ పరీక్షలకు జనరల్ స్టాండర్డ్ of general knowledge హెచ్చు అవుతున్నదా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“General knowledge is generally growing in the country but the examinations do not produce it.”

SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—“ఈ పరీక్షలలో ఫెయిల్ అవుతున్న వారికి రుసుము వాపసు చేస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Those who fail do not get back the fees; I do not think the Government can afford to do that because then competition would be unlimited.”

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI:—“ఈ పరీక్షలు ఎన్ని కేంద్రాలలో జరుగుతున్నాయి?”

Number of vans supplied to the Deputy Superintendent of Prohibition, Villupuram.

* 79 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) the number of vans supplied to the Deputy Superintendent of Prohibition, Villupuram, for his official purpose; and

(b) the total allotment of petrol allotted every month and for the year?

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER:—“(a) One van and one jeep have been supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram Circle. The jeep has been transferred to Tirukkoyilur Circle with effect from August 1952.

“(b) Thirty gallons of petrol are allotted for the van and 20 gallons for the jeep per month. If any more quantity is required, it is met from the 50 gallons kept as reserve for the whole district.”

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR:—“திண்டிவனம், விழுப்புரம், செஞ்சி, இந்த மூன்று தாலுகாக்களுக்கும் ஒரு லாரியும் ஒரு வானும் போதுமா, அல்லது மேலும் 30 காலன் பெட்ரோல் செலவழிந்தால் திறம்பட, நேர்மையாக சீக்கிரத்தில் வேலை நடக்கமுடியுமா என்பதை கனம் மதுவிலக்கு மந்திரி அவர்களைக் கேட்கிறேன்.”

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER:—“If 10-50 representation is received from proper quarters, the matter will be considered.”

[6th November 1952]

Orders regarding the assignment of lands to political sufferers.

* 80 Q.—SRI K. VENKAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to place on the table of the House, the different orders and Revenue Department memoranda issued from time to time since 1948 in relation to the assignment, both permanent and temporary of assessed and unassessed poramboke and lanka lands to political sufferers and the landless poor?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“The general orders^a now in force are placed on the table of the House.”

SRI K. VENKAIAH:—“నేను 1948 వ సంవత్సరమునుంచి రాజకీయపాథకులకు భూమినిచ్చే విషయములలో ప్రభుత్వము జారీచేసినటువంటి G.O. లు మొత్తములయొక్క కాపీలు ఇవ్వాలని కోరాను. కాని, 1948-49 వ సంవత్సరములలో ఇచ్చినటువంటి ఆర్డర్లు గల కాపీలు ఇవ్వలేదు. దీనికి కారణము ఏమిటో మంత్రిగారు చెప్పగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“I think, it is better, I ask notice for that.”

SRI D. LAKSHMAYYA:—“రాజకీయ పాథకులకు లాగడ వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు, కేదవారు సాగుచేసుకొనుచున్నటువంటి భూములను, ఎంతమందికి ఇచ్చారో చెప్పతారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“Notice, Sir.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“1952 వ సంవత్సరమునుంచి ఇచ్చినటువంటి ఆర్డర్లు కాపీలలో, 1952 వ సం॥ జూలై 7 వ తేదీన సౌత్ కనరా జిల్లాలోని ఒక గ్రామమునకు సంబంధించినటువంటి సమస్యను పరిష్కారముచేస్తూ ఇచ్చిన ఆర్డరును విలువగల భూములను, వంటి పంట భూగాణితో సహా వేలంవేసిగాని, మార్కెటు కిమ్మ తుకుగాని అమ్మాలనే ఆర్డరును ఇందులో ఎందుకు ప్రచురించలేదండీ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“A separate question may be put.”

Number of land disputes in the State.

* 81 Q.—SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) how many land disputes in the State were due to the assignment to the so-called political sufferers of banjar lands already claimed to have been occupied by the agrarian poor; and

(b) in how many cases orders under section 144 had to be issued to protect the assignees?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“(a) & (b) The information is not readily available with the Government. The Government consider that the utility of the same which can be collected only after a reference to all Collectors will not be commensurate with the time and labour involved in collecting it.”

^a Printed as Appendix III on pages 378-382 infra.

[6th November 1952]

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“ఇదివరకు ఈ టెంపరరీ అన్వై ట్రెంటు ఇచ్చినటువంటి వాటికి ఇప్పుడు పర్మనెంటు పట్టాలు ఇవ్వమని ఈ మధ్యన ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఏమైన ఆర్డర్లు పంపించారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“Each case is judged on its merits and, of course, in certain cases permanent pattas are also being given.”

SRI P. SYAMASUNDRA RAO:—“పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లాలో కొప్పర గ్రామంలోను తదితర గ్రామాలలోను 8 సంవత్సరములనుంచి, ఇంకా వైగా సాగు చేస్తున్నటువంటి రివిన్యూ భూములకు పర్మనెంటు పట్టాలు ఇవ్వమని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఆనేకసార్లు కోరుతున్నప్పటికీ ప్రభుత్వము పట్టాలు ఇవ్వలేదు కారణాలు చెప్పతారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“The original question relates to a general matter. How can I answer a particular question about a particular district?”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“144 వ షెక్షన్ జారీచేసే విషయములలో భూస్వాములు, వ్యవసాయకూలీలు సాగుచేస్తున్నటువంటి భూములను పునరాక్రమించుకొన్నచోట నిరాకరించి 50, 40 ఎకరాలుగల రాజకీయ పాథకులకు ఇచ్చే సందర్భమున 144 షెక్షన్ వ జారీచేసి వ్యవసాయకూలీలపైన దౌర్జన్యచర్యలు ప్రయోగిస్తున్నారు. ఈ విషయములలో వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు రక్షణలేకుండా ఉన్న పరిస్థితులు వచ్చాయి. ఈ ఆక్రమ పద్ధతిని తొలగించుటకు ఏమైన చర్య తీసుకొంటారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“No such inference could be drawn.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“ముత్తమమీద ప్రభుత్వము సృష్టించిన ఈ రాజకీయ పాథకులకు భూములిచ్చుటకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు సాగుచేసుకొనుచున్నటువంటి భూములను ఆక్రమించుకొను విషయములలో చాలా ఆక్రమాలు తగాదాలు వస్తున్నాయి. దీనివల్ల బీదవారు వ్యవసాయకూలీలు చాలా బెబ్బలింతున్నారు. కనుక ఈ రాజకీయ పాథకుల సమస్యను పునఃపరిశీలించి తీసివేస్తుందా?”

(THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, all these questions arise out of a misunderstanding of the present position. We have totally terminated this policy of assignments to political sufferers as such. The present policy is to make assignments to people only on the basis of their landlessness, requirements of public utility and objections to assignment. No question of political suffering enters into land assignments hereafter. There are a certain number of pending cases. Most of them have been disposed of but there are still some cases wherein some statements and claims are made on the ground that steps have been taken on the basis of a promised assignment and some money has been spent and things like that. Those cases are being dealt with on merits. We have terminated the policy of assignment to political sufferers as such.”)

[6th November 1952]

Anti-malarial operations in Divi taluk.

* 82 Q.—SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Regional Malariologist, Visakhapatnam, proposed that the villages in Divi Island in Divi taluk, Krishna district, be declared a malaria-infected area, a laboratory established there and put under a specialist and anti-malarial operations conducted to eradicate malaria there; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken on the matter?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) The facts are—

“(i) Malarious tracts are not declared as such by any notification.

“(ii) The Regional Malariologist, Visakhapatnam, has prepared a scheme which provides for the setting up of a small laboratory at Avanigadda. A qualified Entomological Assistant will be in charge of the scheme, if and when it is sanctioned.

“(b) The scheme is being examined.”

SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH :—“ప్రస్తుతము ఈ స్కీము propose చేసి ఎన్ని సంవత్సరములైంది. ఇంకా దీనిని పరిశీలించడానికి ఎన్ని సంవత్సరములు పడుతుంది. ఇప్పుడు మలేరియావల్ల ఆ తాలూకాలో చనిపోయే సంఖ్య ఎంతో పెక్కుగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“A separate question may be put.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA :—“ఇది అమంజరపదానికి ఇంకా ఎంతకాలము పడుతుంది?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“The scheme is being examined for introduction this year.”

Supply of energy from Jog Falls to Rayalaseema and South Kanara.

* 83 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) how much of energy the Government have contracted to take from the Jog Falls;

(b) how much of the energy is assigned to Rayalaseema and how much to South Kanara; and

(c) what is the amount of energy actually taken from Jog Falls now and how much is actually distributed to Rayalaseema and how much actually to South Kanara?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) & (b) This Government asked for Jog power up to 4,000 K.W. for distribution in the Ceded districts area and up to 6,000 K.W. for distribution in the South Kanara district. The agreement

[6th November 1952]

covering the supply to the Ceded districts area was completed; that for the supply to the South Kanara area has not yet been concluded.

“(c) Nearly 3,000 K.Ws. in the Ceded districts. Supply to the South Kanara area has not yet commenced.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ఈ అగ్రిమెంటు చేసుకొని ఎన్ని సంవత్సరములైనదంటి.”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ఈ Ceded districts agreement 1946 వ సంవత్సరములో జరిగింది.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ఆ agreement చేసుకొనిన తరువాత ఈ విద్యుచ్ఛక్తి సప్లయ చేసినటువంటి గ్రామాల సంఖ్య రాయలసీమలో ఎంతో పెక్కుగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“గ్రామాల సంఖ్య నేను చెప్పలేను. కాని 1949 వ సంవత్సరము జూన్ 7 వ తేదీ నుంచి ఈ విద్యుచ్ఛక్తి ప్రారంభించడం, వాళ్లకు సప్లయచేయడము జరిగింది. తరువాత మరికొన్ని గ్రామాలకు దీనిని extend చేశారు.”

SRI K. V. VEMA REDDI :—“In view of the proximity of the Jog Falls to the southern taluks of Anantapur district and in view of the availability of energy which is going to be sold by the Mysore Government, will the Government consider the proposal of purchasing the energy and extending the scheme to the southern taluks of Anantapur district?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I do not know what taluk the hon. Member is referring to. If he is referring to Kadiri taluk, the supply of power from the Jog Falls is not feasible.”

SRI L. C. PAIS :—“May I ask whether an agreement regarding the supply of electricity to South Kanara has been signed or is likely to be signed in the near future?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“The agreement has not yet been signed, Sir.”

SRI L. C. PAIS :—“My question has not been fully answered.”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“One point of dispute is with regard to the use of the word ‘tax’ or ‘surcharge’ and that has not yet been settled. Therefore, the agreement has not yet been signed.”

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI :—“Sir, will the Government give an assurance that as soon as the agreement is signed construction will be taken up without further delay?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Sir, I may tell the hon. Member that provision is being made for taking power

[6th November 1952]

and putting the construction work into execution. The whole difficulty is that the Mysore Government have not yet signed the agreement."

SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—" May I ask, Sir, whether power will be supplied to the eastern taluks of Cuddapah district? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Sir, the Tungabhadra Scheme is expected to supply power to all the Ceded districts."

SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI :—" Sir, is all the energy contracted for, for Rayalaseema being used up now? If not, why? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" 4,000 K.Ws. have been contracted for but only 3,000 K.Ws. are being used up. The rest is not used up because some schemes which have been sanctioned have not yet been implemented."

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :—" മലബാറിലെ വടക്കൻ താലൂക്കുകളിലേക്കു ഇതുവരെ ഉപയോഗമുണ്ടോ എന്നു ചന്തു പറയുമോ? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Notice, Sir."

Grant of interest-free loans to fishermen.

* 84 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Government have received representations from the organizations of fishermen in Andhra requesting the Government to help the fishermen by granting interest-free loans towards share capital for the purpose of forming into co-operatives and the action taken thereon by the Government?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Yes. One representation was received from the Andhra Provincial Fishermen Congress. The Government, however, consider that as the share capital of a member of a co-operative society is his stake in the society and ensures his loyalty towards the institution, it should be paid by him from out of his savings."

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA :—" May I know, Sir, whether in view of the distressed condition of the fishermen all over the State, the Government would consider the desirability of making interest-free loans towards share capital? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Sir, I have already answered it. If the question is with regard to any other aid or grant to be given apart from the share capital, the Government would certainly consider it."

SRI A. GOVINDASAMI NAYAGAR :—" தமிழ் நாட்டிலுள்ள மீன் பிடிப்பவர்களுக்கு இந்தச் சலுகை கொடுக்கப்படுமா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Notice, Sir."

[6th November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—" చేపలు సరస్సు చొరక్కపోవడంవల్ల కొన్ని స్థానాల్లో సకాలములో అప్పులు తీర్చలేకపోతున్నారు. అలాంటివాళ్ళకు మరి ఒక సంవత్సరము వ్యవధి ఇప్పించాలని విజ్ఞప్తులు వచ్చాయి. అలా వ్యవధి యివ్వడానికి ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరిస్తుందా? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" అలాంటి విజ్ఞప్తులు వచ్చినట్లు నాకు తెలియదు. వచ్చితే తప్పకుండా చూస్తాను."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, are the Government aware that there are several places where fishermen are unable to join the co-operative societies for want of funds to contribute towards share capital? Will the Government make some arrangements for the easy supply of yarn to fishermen for their nets?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Sir, there are about 100 co-operative societies in Andhradesa alone through which we are supplying yarn but, if my Friend refers to those who are not members of the co-operative societies, I cannot help."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, may I ask the Government whether it is not their responsibility to help the fishermen whether they are members of co-operative societies or not and whether they have under contemplation any scheme with regard to those who are not able to join these societies for lack of finance? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Sir, I invite my hon. Friend for a discussion on this subject and, if he is able to suggest some methods, we will willingly adopt them if they are feasible."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I ask, Sir, whether representations have not been received from the fishermen at Waltair that they are not able to join the co-operative societies for want of funds and whether the Government have considered any scheme of distribution to help them? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Sir, the only point for consideration in this connexion is that if the Government contribute or give money to these fishermen towards their share capital, they will become irresponsible and it would be to the detriment of the co-operative society itself."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I ask, Sir, the Hon. Minister to realize that it is a matter of life and death to the fishermen, that it is not the theory and practice of co-operation that matters and that it is the responsibility of Government to see that these fishermen who are pursuing their hereditary occupation are supplied with yarn or in the alternative to see that the controls are removed and the fishermen are given absolute freedom to purchase the yarn wherever they like? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Sir, while realizing the present difficulty that the fishermen are facing, we cannot at the same time shut our eyes to the principles of co-operation also."

[6th November 1952]

Construction of a bridge across the Godavari river at Alamuru (East Godavari).

* 85 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether tenders called for, for the construction of a bridge across the Godavari river at Alamuru (East Godavari) have been cancelled;

(b) if so, the reasons why; and

(c) the cost of the proposed construction and the contribution of the Government of India towards it?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The amounts quoted by the tenderers were far in excess of the estimate rates for the bridge. The alternative designs offered were also not acceptable. The Government of India have since revised the design and directed the call of fresh tenders for the revised design.

“(c) The estimated cost of the proposed bridge is Rs. 103.53 lakhs. When the cost of the two bridges across the Gowtami and the Vasishta (with the diversion road) was estimated at Rs. 140 lakhs, the Government of India had agreed to a contribution of Rs. 105 lakhs. Now that the Gowtami bridge alone is estimated to cost Rs. 103.53 lakhs the Government of India have been requested to increase their contribution correspondingly.”

SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO :—“Sir, is it a fact that the Government of Madras originally opposed the scheme with a view to have a bridge across the Godavari between Kovvur and Rajahmundry by the side of the existing railway bridge, at a lower cost?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMY MUDALIAR :—“May I know, Sir, if the scrutiny of the estimates was done by the Public Works Department when the Chief Engineer for the Highways is in charge of the whole works and, if so, why?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Sir, I submit that the Government could take the advice of any engineer they like and there is nothing like consulting a P.W.D. Engineer, a Highways Engineer or an Electrical Engineer only.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“Sir, may I know from the Government what is their policy in regard to priority in the construction of bridges as I see that many rivers where water does not flow even once in two or three years have been provided with bridges and while perennial rivers have not been provided with bridges?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I want notice, Sir.”

[6th November 1952]

Cancellation of assignments of lands made in Tanjore district.

* 86 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the fact of an enquiry made by the District Collector of Tanjore through the Town Tahsildar on the complaint made by Sri P. Kesavan of Tanjore against some of the political sufferers alleging that they had got assignments of land fraudulently; and

(b) what action has been or is proposed to be taken on the report of the Collector?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“(a) Yes.

“(b) The Government examined the matter and ordered the cancellation of the assignment of lands made in favour of thirteen political sufferers, as they were satisfied that they had not been correctly made.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“இம்மாதிரி சர்க்காரிடமிருந்து தியாகி என்பதாக நிலம் வாங்கிய கோலித்தியாகிகளின்மேல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க சர்க்கார் உத்தேசித்திருக்கிறதா?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Sir, the point is this, viz., that these assignments are first made and then it is brought to our notice that they are communal lands or tank-bed lands. Sometimes they are also given to people who are not eligible under the rules. For one or other of these reasons the assignments are cancelled.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“Sir, has any action been taken against those investigating officers who connived at these fraudulent assignments?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Sir, there are no investigating officers in this matter. The applications for assignments are made and they are scrutinized. Sometimes mistakes do arise here as they arise in other cases also.”

The Kanupur Scheme.

* 87 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when the Kanupur Scheme for providing irrigation facilities from Pennar river by a canal from Sangam to irrigate upland areas of Nellore taluk was taken up for investigation; and

(b) when the plans and estimates were prepared and at what stage the matter stands at present?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) In 1947.

“(b) The preliminary plans and estimates were prepared in 1948 but the detailed investigation and the preparation of the estimates have been held up pending a decision regarding the

[6th November 1952]

execution of the Krishna-Pennar Project, which includes a Kanupur Canal larger in size than the one investigated in 1947 and capable of supplying the lands better."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టు స్క్రీముయొక్క అసలు ఎస్టిమేట్లు తయారైనా, ప్యానులు తయారైనా కూడా వాటిని ఆవరణలో పెట్టకుండా నిలిపి ఉట్టిట్లు తెలుస్తున్నాయి. అటువంటిప్పుడు యీ కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టు స్క్రీము వెనుకకు త్రోసివేయడం మంచిదికదా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“ఏమో మీరు చెప్పేది నాకు సరిగా అర్థం కాలేదు.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“నేను చెప్పేది మీకు అర్థంకాకపోతే, మరొకసారి చెప్పేదిగా చెప్పాలనుకుంటున్నాను. తెలుగులోనే అర్థం అయ్యేట్లు చెప్పాలనుకుంటుంటే, ఈ కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ స్క్రీము ఆవరణ సాధ్యంకాదని కోస్తా కమిటీవారు చెప్పడంవల్ల, యీ స్క్రీము పేరుతో మిగతా చిన్న స్క్రీములు నిలిపివేస్తున్నందువల్ల కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ను త్రోసివేయడం మంచిదికదా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ స్క్రీము ఆవరణ సాధ్యంకాదని కోస్తా కమిటీవారు చెప్పిన సంగతి నాకు తెలియదు. పెద్ద స్క్రీములవల్ల పారించే భూములే చిన్న స్క్రీములు పారించితే వాటిని ప్రస్తుతము అటువంటి పెట్టకు.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ఈ ఎత్తివేసినవాటిలో కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టు అసలు ఎత్తివేయబడినట్లేనా? మారుకూడా వాడ కనిపిస్తున్న దీన్ని ఎత్తివేయడం మంచిదని మీరు భావిస్తున్నారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టు ఎత్తివేసినట్లు నాకు తెలియదు.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ఇటీవల కోస్తా కమిటీ నివేదిక తర్వాతకూడా కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టును మరల ఒప్పుకుంటారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“ఇదివరకు చెప్పిన జవాబులను బట్టి యీ ప్రశ్నకు జవాబు అనవసరము. నా స్వంత అభిప్రాయము అనవసరము.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“మినిస్టరుగారు సమాధానం ఇవ్వలేదు. కోస్తా కమిటీ రిపోర్టు ఏమిటో మీకు తెలుసునా అని అడిగితే, నాకు తెలియదు అని మౌనంగా వున్నారన్నారు. కృష్ణా-పెన్నార్ ప్రాజెక్టు వస్తుందని మంత్రిగారికి యింకను సమ్మతము ఉన్నదా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“మంత్రిగారు ఉన్నాను నా సమ్మతము అనవసరము. ప్రభుత్వము సమ్మతము అనవసరం కావచ్చు.”

Rent reduction in under-tenure estates.

* 88 Q.—**SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Revenue Board has instructed that rent reduction need not be applied to the under-tenure estates and darimila (subsequent) inams in Vizianagram Estate (Visakhapatnam district); and

(b) if so, for what reasons?

[6th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) No such instruction has been issued by the Board of Revenue or by any other authority.

“(b) Does not arise.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—“ఎస్టేట్లలో భాగములైన ఈ దరిమిలా యినాముల విషయంలో ఎస్టేట్లు రద్దువట్టంలో స్పష్టంగా స్వచ్ఛందపడిన కారణం చేత ఇస్తున్న తగ్గింపు సక్రమంగా అమలు జరగటం లేదనీ, కొన్నిచోట్ల ఇస్తున్న యినాం దార్ల చేతను, మరికొన్నిచోట్ల ప్రభుత్వంచేతను వసూలుచేయబడుతున్న విషయం మీకు తెలుసునా? ఇప్పటికైనా ఈ అనిశ్చితపరిస్థితిని తొలగించగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“If the hon. Member puts the matter in writing I will examine it.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—“రెవెన్యూ జూన్ 1950-51 లో ఈ దరిమిలా యినాముల విషయంలో వట్టా రైతులకు గాకుండా యినాందార్లకే యివ్వాలని ఆర్డరు జారీచేసి ఒక సంవత్సరం పాటు ఈ ఆర్డరును అమలులో వుంచి ఈ లోగా యినాందార్లు తమ భూములలో ఎక్కువ భాగం అమ్మకొనే ఆవకాశం యివ్వరన్న విషయం మీకు తెలుసా? అలా ఎందుకు యివ్వాలివచ్చింది?”

Report of the Special Officer on the improvement of Minor Ports.

* 89 Q.—**SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state the nature of action taken on the report of the Special Officer for the investigation of Minor Ports, appointed by the Ministry of Transport, Government of India, in so far as it affects

- (a) Masulipatnam,
- (b) Kakinada, and
- (c) Bheemunipatnam?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“The question of carrying out improvements to the ports is under the consideration of this Government and the Government of India.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ రిపోర్టు యివ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించుతున్నదా, లేదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“ఈ రిపోర్టును బహిరంగరచనాడడని ప్లానింగు కమిటీవారు మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలియజేసినారు.”

Fixation of minimum prices for tobacco.

* 90 Q.—**SRI K. VENKAIAH:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the steps taken by the Government for the fixation and enforcement of minimum prices for tobacco in the Guntur district?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—“The Government examined the question even as far back as 1941 but the matter was dropped. It was re-examined in 1947. They then considered that internal adjustment between growers and traders would offer a more satisfactory solution than imposition of

[6th November 1952]

statutory prices from without and constituted an advisory body called 'The Guntur District Tobacco Minimum Prices Fixation Advisory Committee' consisting of the representatives of the tobacco trade and growers for negotiating agreements between them and for fixing minimum as well as fair prices for tobacco. The Collector of Guntur, the Deputy Director of Agriculture, Guntur, and a representative of the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee are also members of this Committee. The Committee fixes minimum prices for every season and submits reports to Government."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“అధ్యక్షులు, ఇటీవల పంపదార వెలుగుకు కనీసధర నిర్ణయించినప్పుడు రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయం చేశారు. పుగాకుకు కనీస ధర నిర్ణయించేటప్పుడైనా అలాంటి అన్యాయం జరుగకుండా రైతులయొక్క వ్యవసాయ ఖర్చులు వగైరాలను ప్రభుత్వము జాగ్రత్తగా అంచనావేసి, రైతుకు గట్టుబాటయ్యేట్లు పుగాకు ధరలు నిర్ణయిస్తుందా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“No complaint against fixation of minimum price for tobacco has been received by the Government.”

SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“1947 వ సంవత్సరములో advisory committee ని వేసినపుడు అలాంటి మంత్రిగారు ఈ కమిటీని తాత్కాలికంగా వేస్తున్నామని, కమిటీ పనిని పరిశీలించి statutory provisions చేస్తామని హామీయివ్వటం, ఆ విషయాన్ని సూచనప్రాయంగా G.O. లో కొంతవరకు సూచించటం జరిగిన తరువాత ఆ హామీని భంగపరుస్తూ, statutory provisions అవసరము రాదనటము సరిగాదని మంత్రిగారు గుర్తిస్తారా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The Price Fixation Committee has not been doing adequate good work and the Government have not yet felt it necessary to put it on a statutory basis.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“May I know from the Hon. Minister the basis on which the minimum prices for tobacco are fixed by the Committee?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Usually the cost of cultivation of tobacco is taken into consideration.”

Guntur Tobacco Market Committee.

* 91 Q.—**SRI K. VENKAIAH** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Government proposed in 1947 the extension of the activities of the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee to the groundnut crop also and if so, the reasons for delaying and dropping out that proposal?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Yes. Again in December 1951 the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee submitted proposals for including groundnut within its jurisdiction. The growers and traders of groundnut and also the public were consulted on the proposal. It was understood that many of the traders and even the growers and a very large

[6th November 1952]

section of the public were not in favour of the proposal. The growers for whose benefit alone a regulated market is established, were against the proposal. Further, the Government considered that as there was a lot of work to be done by the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee in regard to tobacco marketing under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act, its hands were already full and that if groundnut also was brought within its scope the Committee would be unable to cope with the additional work and thereby the groundnut trade would suffer. The Government, it may be recalled, ordered the introduction of the system of auction sales of tobacco by the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee from 1951 onwards. Being an important scheme, the Committee has to pay special attention to it in order to ensure its success. In the above circumstances, the Government considered that it was inopportune to notify groundnut in respect of the Guntur notified area and therefore postponed the proposal indefinitely.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“Tobacco Marketing Committee కి, groundnut market ను యిచ్చినట్లయితే నష్టము కలిగిస్తుందని భావిస్తే groundnut crop కు సంబంధించినట్లువంటి ఒక committee ని నియమించటానికి ప్రభుత్వం ముసైనా చర్య తీసుకున్నదా? యితర జిల్లాలలో కూడా ఇటువంటి Marketing Committee లను ఏర్పరచటానికి ప్రభుత్వం ఏమైనా ఆలోచిస్తున్నదా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Groundnut has been notified in other districts and I know it has been working satisfactorily. But, here the important thing is there has not been enough demand from the growers themselves. Usually a produce is notified when there is a large demand from the producers. If such demand comes from the producers, I think it would be included.”

Setting up of a tobacco re-drying plant at Guntur.

* 92 Q.—**SRI K. VENKAIAH** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee requested the State Government for a loan or contribution towards the construction of a building to house a tobacco re-drying plant; and

(b) the action the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) Yes. The Guntur Tobacco Market Committee asked in June 1951 for a loan of Rs. 3,10,000 under the Madras State Aid to Industries Act for construction of buildings, etc., for erecting the tobacco re-drying plant in its yard.

“(b) The Committee proposed to purchase the re-drying plant from the Indian Central Tobacco Committee which had decided earlier to establish the plant at Guntur. Owing to

[6th November 1952]

financial stringency, the Government informed the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee that the loan asked for could not be granted. The Committee was also advised to leave the setting up of the re-drying plant at Guntur to the Indian Central Tobacco Committee."

SRI K. VENKAIAH:—"Indian Central Tobacco Committee, Guntur, ఈ crop plant పెట్టే సందర్భములో గుంటూరు పొగాకు మార్కెటు కమిటీ తన యార్డులో ఆ ప్లాంటును పెట్టుటకు భవనము నిర్మించుతామని హామీయివ్వడం తర్వాతనే plant తెప్పించటం జరిగినది. తరువాత ప్రభుత్వం ఆ ప్లాంట్ యివ్వటానికి నిరాకరించినందువల్ల Central Committee తెప్పించిన plant రెండు సంవత్సరముల నుంచి బయట పడివుండని, అందువల్ల వచ్చే నష్టమునకు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వంపైన బాధ్యత ఉందనే విషయము మంత్రిగారు గుర్తించారా?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"I think, Sir, I would like to have notice about that."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"ఈ plant ఇప్పటికప్పుడే దాదాపు రెండు సంవత్సరముల క్రితంనుంచీ గుంటూరు రైల్వే స్టేషను ప్రక్కన పడవేసియుండినందున అది శ్రువుపట్టి చెడిపోతున్న విషయము ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి వచ్చిందా?"

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"I think, it is the Indian Central Tobacco Committee that has incurred the expenditure, Sir."

Dispossession of lands of aboriginals in Wynaad.

* 93 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a representation from the aboriginals and other inhabitants belonging to Kidanganad, Nemmen, Noolpuzha and Nuppainad amsams in Wynaad taluk, complaining that they have been dispossessed of their lands leaving for them land only at the rate of 2 acres each; and

(b) what action has been taken on the same?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) No.

" (b) Does not arise."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Have not the Government received complaints from the inhabitants of the amsams in Wynaad taluk that they have been dispossessed of their lands?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. Minister has answered it already."

Eviction of certain villagers of Kottur, Adyar.

* 94 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to State—

(a) whether a representation, dated 9th August 1952, from the villagers of Kottur near Adyar was received by the Government

[6th November 1952]

complaining against the notices sent to them by the Government directing them to vacate from the lands in their possession in the survey field No. 7 in the village of Kottur; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

" (a) & (b) A copy of the petition, dated 9th August 1952, from Sri M. Chitrai and 12 others of Kottur village, Madras, addressed to the Collector of Madras, was received by the Government. The land in question has been alienated to the Women's Indian Association for use as a Cancer hospital, clinic, laboratory and museum. The encroachers have been shown alternative sites to which they could shift."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"What was the alternative site? Was any consultation held and was the site satisfactory to the people, Sir?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Two survey numbers were shown as alternative sites. Because there were no more petitions, I think, they were satisfied."

SRI A. M. RATNASWAMI:—"Sir, in view of the fact that a number of evictions under some pretext or other have been brought to the notice of the Government, would the Government make a clear declaration on the floor of the House that under no circumstances the poor dwellers of certain unoccupied lands would be disturbed unless some suitable alternative places are found for them?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"In this case, at any rate, there is no flimsy pretext. It has been given for a very laudable object. Probably some of the people who have been evicted will take advantage of the facilities that are given."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"మద్రాసులో అడయారువద్ద నివసిస్తున్న హరిజనప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు స్థానములనుండి వేరే యిల్లు కట్టుకొనుటకు చూపిన ప్రదేశము అడయారుకు కొన్ని మైళ్ల దూరములో వున్నదని ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా? అడయారుమట్టా యెంతైనా స్థలమున్నది. అట్టిచోటున యిల్లు కట్టుకొనుటకు ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరిస్తుందా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"No, Sir, they are given lands very near the place."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఎన్ని మైళ్ల దూరములో ఆ భూములు ఇచ్చారో మంత్రిగారు తెలిపారా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"My rough idea is that it would be about a few furlongs."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask the Hon. Minister whether he sees from the question and the reply he has given that the petition is dated only 9th August 1952 and that they have complained that they are not satisfied with the notices for eviction."

[6th November 1952]

That proves that they are not satisfied with any alternative arrangement which the Government claim to have made. So, will the Government go into the question and see that these people are not unnecessarily sent out to long distances?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I accept the very reasonable suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI:—"In view of the fact that the land in question is a Government land, will the Government consider the desirability of the land being used as a common grazing field and threshing ground for the villagers round about?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I think the hon. Member is returned from that constituency and therefore he seems to know more about it. I will look into it."

Management of the affairs of the Krishna Co-operative Central Bank, Masulipatnam.

* 95 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received a representation from Sri P. Nageswara Rao, Masulipatnam, alleging mismanagement and inviting an enquiry into the affairs of the Krishna Co-operative Central Bank, Limited, and the Bunder Co-operative Societies, Masulipatnam; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken by the Government on that?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—" (a) Yes.

" (b) The Registrar of Co-operative Societies was directed to enquire into the allegations and his report is awaited."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister is aware that the Joint Registrar who has investigated into the matter has already made a report and whether the Government is considering that report?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—"Government are really considering the report which has been submitted by the Joint Registrar, but still there are numerous allegations which have to be investigated into."

SRI G. ANJANEYALU:—"ఆర్యా, Masulipatnam Co-operative Central Bank President అనేక సందర్భాలలో తన వార్షిక ప్రకాశనాలకొరకు, అనేక Co-operative Societiesను రద్దుచేయడానికి ప్రయత్నించడం, Co-operative Registrar విచారించి యెన్నికలు జరిపించారు. ఆ సానైటీ మరల 38 వ సెక్షను వేస్తూ ప్రభుత్వం డబ్బు పృథాఖర్చు చేయించినందుకు సదరు సెక్రటరీ త్యాంకు నష్టం ప్రభుత్వానికి యిచ్చుటగూర్చి తీర్పువేప్పినాగూడా, ప్రభుత్వంవారికి నష్టం ఇవ్వక పోగా సదరు సానైటీకి అప్పుకూడా యివ్వలేదు, యిటువంటి సానైటీలు నేను రుజువు

[6th November 1952]

చేస్తాను. కాని తన అనుచరులు చాలా సానైటీలలో డబ్బు కాజేసి బినామీ లాన్సు చూపించినప్పటికీ ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలిసికూడా యందుకు చర్యతీసుకోరు. ప్రభుత్వంవారు యేమిచెప్పతారు?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA:—"విచారణ జరిగినమీదట వారిమీద ఏమి చర్య తీసుకోవాలో చెబుతాను. నేరాలు రుజువైనట్లయితే తీవ్రమైన చర్య తీసుకొంటాము."

Revision of the salaries of school teachers.

* 96 Q.—SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI (on behalf of Sri S. Narayanappa): Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation has been received recently from elementary school teachers and aided school teachers regarding revision of their salaries; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"This question has already been answered in reply to a similar question put by an hon. Member in July 10, 1952 (starred question No. 67), I shall, however, read out the reply to the question given on the last occasion—

"The answer is in the affirmative. The Government do not at present find it possible to revise the scales of pay of teachers in view of the heavy commitments involved and the present financial stringency."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, is the Hon. Minister aware of the following facts: that the Madras Corporation Council has accepted to give a better scale of pay for the elementary school teachers who are working in that organization and the Government of Madras have been niggardly in refusing the request from the Corporation Council, and later as a *via media* they have accepted 50 per cent of the increase in the scales suggested by the Corporation Council . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member putting a question about elementary school teachers or about the Corporation?"

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"This is about the elementary school teachers and not about the Corporation, Sir. Then, finally, Sir, the Government have not given permission to the Corporation Council to give effect to the increased scales of pay from the date on which the Council passed the resolution but from the date on which the Government Order was passed in their department."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may put a separate question."

[6th November 1952]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.*Tenders for the printing of bus passenger tickets.*

9 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether and if so when tenders were called for, for the printing of passenger tickets for the State Transport buses; and

(b) what are the firms whose tenders were accepted during the years 1947 to 1952; and what are the rates tendered for by each of the tendering firms and the rates accepted by the Government?

A.—(a) Quotations were invited for printing and supplying tickets for the State Transport from 1949 onwards.

(b) During the period 1947–48 as nationalization of the City Bus Service was not complete, the Department's small requirements of tickets were supplied by different printers at different rates depending on the quality of paper and type of tickets. The rates were approved by the Superintendent, Government Press. The following statement shows the names of the printers and the rate charged by them during the years 1947–48:—

Year.	Roxy.	Active.	Addison and Company.	Odeon.	Devi.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	RS. A. P.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1947	107 8 0	125	100	—	—
1948	110 0 0	100	115	110	115

When quotations were invited in 1949, Messrs. Golden Press quoted the lowest rate of Rs. 90 for printing and supplying 1,000 ticket blocks of 100 leaves each and the rate was approved by the Superintendent, Government Press.

The rates quoted by the other firms are shown below:—

Printer's name.	Rate per 1,000 block of 100 each.	Conditions stipulated.
(1)	(2)	(3)
	RS. A. P.	
Janatha Press, Triplicane ..	100 0 0	Nil.
Mani & Sons, Madras ..	135 0 0	Nil
Devi Press, Kilpauk ..	92 8 0	Major number of denomination requested, business guarantee for one or two years, if possible.
Fenn Thompson, Vepery ..	125 0 0	Nil
Roxy Press, Vepery ..	100 0 0	Nil.

6th November 1952]

Printer's name.	Rate per 1,000 blocks of 100 each.	Conditions stipulated.
(1)	(2)	(3)
	RS. A. P.	
Active Printers, Georgetown.	95 0 0	If order is up to 10,000.
	90 0 0	If order is up to 30,000.
	88 0 0	If order is up to 50,000.
	86 0 0	If order is up to 75,000.
	85 0 0	If order is up to 1,00,000.
Odeon Printers, Vepery ..	150 0 0	Nil.
Associated Printers, Mount Road.	95 0 0	Nil.
Royal Printing Works, Mount Road.	90 0 0	Paper not up to the quality specified.
Do.	145 8 0	Do.
Do.	153 8 0	Do.

Subsequently, however, the following firms also agreed to and supplied the tickets at the accepted tender rate, viz., Rs. 90 for 1,000 ticket blocks of 100 leaves each:—

- 1 Messrs. Associated Printers
- 2 " Active Printers,
- 3 " Golden Press,
- 4 " Roxy Press,
- 5 " Odeon Press,
- 6 " Fenn Thompson Company,
- 7 " Devi Press, and
- 8 " Janatha Press.

(Communities eligible for help by the Harijan Welfare Department.

10 Q.—SRI V. SRI KRISHNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) the communities eligible for help by the Harijan Welfare Department;

(b) the classes and sections eligible for admission to land colonization co-operative societies.

(c) for whose benefit the Ganapavaram Land Colonization Society in Guntur district was organized and to which community the members belong;

[6th November 1952]

- (d) how many of them are landless poor and local residents;
- (e) what is the extent of land assigned to the society and the average holding each member has got;
- (f) whether it is a fact that the land is fit for wet cultivation; and
- (g) what are the financial commitments of the Government regarding the society?

A.—(a) A list ^a of communities eligible for help by the Harijan Welfare Department is appended.

(b) Political sufferers; ex-servicemen of the II World War, including I.N.A. personnel who do not possess more than 5 acres of wet or 10 acres of dry land and landless poor persons including Harijans and Backward classes.

(c) The society was organized for the benefit of ten landless poor persons and twenty persons owning small extents of land ranging from 2 to 4 acres each. All the members belong to the Kamma community.

(d) Ten members.

(e) An extent of 360.35 acres of land has been assigned to the society for allotment at about 10 to 12 acres to each member. The lands have not yet been divided and allotted to each member.

(f) Yes.

(g) The financial commitment to Government on account of the scheme are (1) a free grant of Rs. 2,450, and (2) an interest-free loan of Rs. 2,000.

Employment for ex-tappers.

11 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) the districtwar figures of population of ex-tappers and their dependents in the Madras State;

(b) the steps so far taken by the Government to provide them with alternative means of livelihood; and

(c) how many ex-tappers in each district have been actually provided with means of livelihood so far, and the rate of their daily earnings?

A.—(a) and first part of clause (c) The population of ex-tappers in each district and the number of ex-tappers provided with alternate employment are given in the Annexure.^b The information regarding their dependents in each district is not available.

^a Printed as Appendix IV on pages 383-386 *infra*.

^b Printed as Appendix V on page 386 *infra*.

[6th November 1952]

- (b) To provide the ex-tappers with alternate employment, Government permitted the tapping of palm juice for the manufacture of jaggery on a co-operative basis and jaggery manufacturing societies were organized almost throughout the State. In view of the potentialities of palm gur industry to provide work to the ex-tappers, the staff of the Co-operative department have launched a scheme for giving State-wide training to the ex-tapper members of jaggery manufacturing co-operative societies in the improved method of production of jaggery and for introducing the industry in the areas where the tappers were not quite familiar with it. Government have sanctioned a subsidy of Rs. 10,000 to be distributed to ex-tappers towards half the cost of gur making implements purchased by them. With a view to enable the ex-tappers who are members of palm jaggery societies to take to dairying as a subsidiary occupation, interest-free loans from Government for the purchase of milch animals were permitted to be given to them. In addition to jaggery manufacturing co-operative societies, Milk Supply Co-operative Societies, Land Colonization Co-operative Societies, Cottage Industries Societies, Tenants' Co-operative Societies, Labour Contract Societies and other special types of societies, were formed to provide ex-tappers with employment through them. The cultivable waste poramboke and lanka lands are also assigned to the deserving tappers through co-operative societies wherever feasible. They were also trained in hand-spinning and admitted as members of Khadi Development Co-operative Society to enable them to pursue the industry. Steps were also taken to provide work to the ex-tappers in other modes of employment of unskilled workers in industrial concerns as peons, watchmen, etc., in Government and other institutions and as gang coolies, chowkidars, etc.

(c) Later part of clause (c) An ex-tapper family consisting of a man, a woman and a boy earns about Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 2-12-0 a day on an average by tapping 25 trees. It is not possible to assess the daily earnings of the ex-tappers in the other modes of employment provided in co-operative societies, such as dairying, contract labour, etc., as they are only of a subsidiary nature.

Ameliorative measures for ex-tappers.

12 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) the number of ex-tappers in Nellore district and their dependents; and

[6th November 1952]

(b) the ameliorative measures that have been taken by the Government for them?

A.—(a) & (b) The member's attention is invited to the answer to unstarred question No. 11 (previous question).

Medical officers deputed to Hyderabad State.

13 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Medical officers who were deputed by the Government of this State to Hyderabad State after the Police action;

(b) whether they were sent on promotion; and

(c) the number of Harijans, Scheduled Tribes, Christians, Muslims and Backward Classes among them?

A.—(a) to (c) No Medical officer was deputed by this Government to Hyderabad State after the Police action.

Remarks in confidential files of Government servants.

14 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether the remarks in personal confidential files of Government servants are communicated to the persons concerned or not?

A.—Adverse remarks which are remediable or explainable by the official concerned are communicated to the Government servants concerned.

Andhra Paper Mills, Rajahmundry.

15 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any foreign expert in Andhra Paper Mills, Rajahmundry, at present;

(b) if so, what is his pay per month including all allowances;

(c) the number of hand-made paper units sanctioned in 1949; and

(d) whether they are reported to be working satisfactorily?

A.—(a) No.

(b) The question does not arise.

(c) Nil.

(d) The question does not arise.

[6th November 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—TRANSLATION OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—ఇదివరలో శ్రీ రాజ 11-30
గోపాలాచారిగారికి విశ్రాంతి అయి వెళ్ళి, అన్నిటితోబాటు సమాధానాలు కూడా a.m.
యివ్వబడినవి. వీటిని చప్పలకపోయినప్పుడు, వారు దానికి ఆలోచించాలని సమా
ధానం చెప్పడమనేది వాద్యప్రతి తీసుకురావడం జరిగింది. ఆలోచించుకొను అని
చెప్పడమిగాని వాటిమీద యేమి ర్య తీసుకుంటారో తెలియదు. ఇంకను ఇతర భాష
లలోగూడ ప్రశ్నలు వేయటం జరిగింది. వాటిని అన్నిటికీని తెలుగు భాషలో అడిగి
నప్పుడు తెలుగులోనే సమాధానాలు ముస్తావు, భక్తులకు యింకను ఆ జవాబులమీద
supplementary questions వేయటం అవకాశము ఉండాలి. గనుక యీ
పద్ధతి అమలు అవుతున్నది. యీమీద తెలుగు భాషలో అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు తెలుగులో సమా
ధానాలు ఉప్పుమని కోరుతున్నాను. యీ పద్ధతి మకమీదట అంగీకరించగోరు
తున్నాను. ఈ విషయములలో ప్రధాన ముద్రాగాని తగి చర్య తీసుకొనవలసిన కోరు
తున్నాను.”

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I am not sure whether the Hon. the Chief Minister has followed all that has been said. I shall translate it.

“ During the Budget session we made a suggestion to the Government that printed answers might also be circulated in order to enable the Members to put intelligent supplementary questions and thereby save time. The Government said that they would consider the suggestion. Have they given any consideration to it?

“ The second point is this. The List of Questions is printed only in English. The suggestion made is that it may be printed in the regional languages also and circulated so that all the Members may understand the questions. If you look into the practice of the Bihar and Uttar Pradesh Legislatures, you will find that the questions are printed side by side in English and Hindi.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ In this State we have got four regional languages—Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada.”

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ There is only one regional language there. We here are good people and, therefore, we have more languages. The point is whether you, Sir, and the Government will take the necessary steps and whether the Government will make an interim statement about it for the present.”

*THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The problem of distributing the original answers to be given by the Government to all the Members beforehand just as the original questions are distributed to facilitate supplementary questions was raised some time ago, I remember. I felt great difficulty in appreciating the position because it would be logically followed up immediately with the request that the answers to the supplementary questions also should be known to every Member so that further supplementary questions could be asked. It will become a chain of impossibilities, if I may say so. The main question should be

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [6th November 1952]

kept in mind and all supplementary questions may be left to the spontaneous requirements of the situation at the time when the question is put. That being the main line that my mind followed, I did not think it reasonable to multiply the work of the House during interpellation time to the extent that was desired. If the oral answer that would be given by the Government were to be treated as a written answer, there would be considerable loss in the process. That is what I feel. But I shall give the matter further consideration with my Colleagues and with your assistance we may arrive at a settlement.

"Then the greater problem of translation arises. My Friend suggests that we should translate in the regional languages. They are four in number now—Malayalam, Kannada, Telugu and Tamil. It looks a logical proposition and if it had been raised on a different background, we could have put our heads together and found a solution. When we started this session, I found a very embarrassing situation developing in which practically every question put and every statement made on the other side of this table was in Telugu. It looked as if it was done with a set purpose. I say 'set purpose' because it followed immediately after a declaration in this matter by a well-known political agitator who has also given a statement expressing considerable satisfaction that his friends of the Communist Party have taken up his advice. I think that we should wait for a clearer background."

Messrs. T. Viswanatham and T. Nagi Reddi rose in their seats.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am not going to allow any discussion."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am only going to suggest that the Hon. the Chief Minister can leave off the political background and consider the point. He thinks that there is a political background and that it is a wrong background. If so, let him not also take it up. Two wrongs do not make a right."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Leader of the Opposition cannot have the last word in every matter. I must say that if he earnestly desires that Government and all the Members here should consider the matter in cold light without any political or other misleading background, this is not the time for it. We should wait at least for a few months for this atmosphere to clear up. I hope that in the meantime the monsoon will help us."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am not going to allow any discussion. I suggest to the hon. Member to put it in the form of a non-official resolution. The House can discuss it on a non-official day."

III.—NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

RESOLUTION re ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member, Sri G. C. Kondayya may move his motion and hon. Members who have given notice of amendments may move their amendments formally."

RESOLUTION re ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY

6th November 1952]

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

This Assembly recommends to the Government to form a Select Committee of the Members of the Assembly to study the principles, methods and procedure of the administrative machinery and to suggest ways and means for ensuring efficiency and economy in public administration in this State.'"

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"I second the Resolution."

SRI G. RAMA RAO:—"Sir, I move—

'After the word "principles" and before the word "methods" insert the words "categories and ranks".'"

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"I second the amendment."

SRI K. VENKAIAH:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words beginning with "to form a Select Committee" and ending with the words "administrative machinery" substitute the following:—

"to appoint a committee of the Members of the Madras Legislature to enquire into the principles, methods and procedure on the basis of which the present administration in the State is run."

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words "to suggest" substitute the words "to eliminate corruption, nepotism and lethargy by suggesting".'

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"I second the amendment."

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words beginning with "to form" and ending with "Assembly", substitute the following words:—

"to appoint a committee of experienced and efficient officials and non-officials."

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Resolution as well as the amendments are before the House. I call upon Sri G. C. Kondayya to speak."

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లును మొక్క అవసరాన్ని గురించి ఇక్కడ వివరంగా statistics లేనందువలన, administration వివరాలు ఇవ్వడానికి అవకాశము లేదు అనుకొంటాను. అయినప్పటికీ, కృతకత్వ యంత్రాంగము ఏలా పనిచేస్తున్నది, ఏయే దిపార్టుమెంట్లు ఏలా ఉన్నాయి, వివిధ దిపార్టుమెంట్లకు ప్రత్యేకించిన డబ్బు నిజముగా ఉపయోగించబడుతున్నదా, లేక దుర్వినియోగము అవుతున్నదా, అవి వివరించుటకు సమర్థులైన వారు ఉండవలసివస్తుంది. అందుకే ఈ బిల్లును ప్రవేశపెడుతున్నాను."

[Sri G. C. Kondayya] [6th November 1952]

మన దా అనే విషయాన్ని చూచినట్లుంటే, ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగము పుకమముగా నడుచుచుండలేదనే అభిప్రాయమును ప్రజానీకము మాయా సభలోని చాలామంది సభ్యులు అంగీకరిస్తారని అనకతప్పదు. ఉదాహరణకు కొన్ని ముఖ్యమైన డిపార్టుమెంటుల గురించి కొంత మనవిచేస్తాను. రెవిన్యూ డిపార్టుమెంటు తీసుకోండి. ఈ డిపార్టుమెంటు గ్రామదొంగల మొదలుకొని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రివరకు సంబంధము గలిగియుంటుంది. గ్రామదొంగలు అనగా గ్రామ ముసలబులు, కరణములు, వీరు వారియొక్క పనిని సరిగా నిర్వహిస్తున్నారా? అయితే ఈ వేళ్ళ ఈ గ్రామదొంగలకు ఇచ్చేటటువంటి జీతాలుచూస్తే మాత్రము చాలా తక్కువ. 12 రూపాయలు 13 రూపాయలు జీతము ఇస్తున్నారు. ఇంకా వీరికింద ఉన్నటువంటి వెట్టి, తలారి, వీకి ఇంకా తక్కువ జీతాలు ఇస్తున్నారు. వాళ్ళకు నిజంగా ఈ జీతాలు ఒక వారానికి కూడా సరిపోవు. కనుక ఈ ఉద్యోగములకు వాళ్ళ విసుగుచెందుతున్నారు. అదేవిధంగా లా కాఫీసులూ కూడా పరిస్థితులుంటాయి. అక్కడ బోలెడుమంది గుమాస్తాలు, తహశీల్దారు ఉంటారు. పజలు వారి కష్టసుఖాలను గురించి వివైన అట్టిలు పెట్టుకుంటే నెలలు, సంవత్సరాల వరకు అవి వైసలా కొవు. ఆ ప్రజలు మంటమాటికీ ఈ అఫీసు చుట్టూ తిరిగి విసుగుచెందిపోయి యుంటారు. తరువాత కలెక్టరు అఫీసు తీసుకోండి. వీరు సగ్రామీణులైన అధికారులుగా కృషిచూయాలారు. ఈ అఫీసులో ఉన్న ఉద్యోగులు, inefficiency బల్లవో లేక ప్రజలంతే ఒక విధమైన వివగింపువల్లనో అక్కడికి వచ్చిన ప్రజలను ఏ మాత్రము విచారించరు. ప్రజలు పెట్టుకొన్న అర్జీలనుగూడ పరిశీలించరు. వీవైనా అర్జీలువస్తే వాటిని మరల డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టరుకు పంపడం, అతను మరల తానీలాడుకుంటుండం, తురికిగా అది ఎన్నో అఫీసులు చుట్టుకొని కడకు బుట్ట దాఖలా అయినా అయిపోతుంది, నేక అనుకొన్న ఆశయము నెరవేరదు. ప్రజలు ఎంతో ఆశలు పెట్టుకొని గ్రామానుండి వీరి దగ్గరకు రావడము. వీరిచుట్టూ తిరిగి ప్రయోజనములేక పనుగుజెంది వెనకకుపోవడం జరుగుతూయుంటుంది. ఈ కలెక్టరు అఫీసువైన మరల ఇంకొక రెవిన్యూ బోర్డు ఉన్నది. గత 50 సంవత్సరములుగా కాంగ్రెసు వాడులంతా ఈ రెవిన్యూబోర్డు దండుగని, దీనికి వృధాగా లక్షలకొలది డబ్బు ఖర్చు అగుచున్నదని, కాంగ్రెసు అధికారములోకి వచ్చిన తరువాత తప్పకుండా ఈ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డును తీసివేస్తామని చెప్పారు. కాని ఈ మధ్యన ప్రధాన మంత్రి రెవిన్యూ బోర్డుయొక్క అవసరము చాలా ఉన్నదని చెప్పారు. కాని అటువంటి అవసర మేమున్నదో అర్థముకాకండా యున్నది. జిల్లా పరిస్థితులన్ని కలెక్టర్లు పరిశీలిస్తున్నారు, వీరివైన గవర్న మెంటు ఉండి నేడంది. అలాంటిప్పుడు యీ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డుయొక్క అవసరమేమో తెలియదు. ప్రజలను రేబెట్టిచి, వారు మంద్రాసుకువచ్చి డబ్బును నెలకుచేసుకొనుటకే ఈ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డును నియమించి దీనికి అవీలు అధికారము ఇవ్వడంతప్ప అంతకంటే మరేమిలేదు. రెవిన్యూ మినిస్టరు ఉండి, అతని క్రింద సెక్రటరీ అని, అండర్ సెక్రటరీ అని, అసిస్టెంటు సెక్రటరీ అని ఇంతమంది అఫీసర్లుగల ఒక సెక్రటేరియట్ డిపార్టుమెంటు కలెక్టర్ల పనిని సూపర్వైజ్ చేస్తూ యుండగా, వీరి మధ్య రెవిన్యూబోర్డు ఎందుకండవరకా అర్థంకావడంలేదు. రెవిన్యూ బోర్డు ఇప్పుడు చేస్తున్న పని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రి ఆతని క్రిందవున్న ఈ సెక్రటరీ యట్ డిపార్టుమెంటు సులభముగా చేయవచ్చును. ఆ విధంగా ప్రస్తుతము రెవిన్యూ బోర్డుకు ఖర్చుపెడుతున్న లక్షలాది డబ్బు మిగిలిపోగలదు. తరువాత డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టర్ అఫీసు అనునదికూడా అటువంటి అవసరమైనదే. తానీలారు చేసే పనిని కలెక్టరు direct గా supervise చేయవచ్చును. ఈ డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టరు చేసేదమిలేదు. తానీలారునుండి వచ్చే కాగితాలన్నీ, ముద్ర వేసి కలెక్టరుకు పంపడం తప్ప వీరు చేసే

11-40
a.m.

6th November 1952] [Sri G. C. Kondayya]

దేమిలేదు. దీనివల్ల అనవసరమైన అలస్యము అవుతూ యుంటుంది. అంతేగాక, ప్రజల అర్జీలు విషయమై మరల ఈ డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టరు అఫీసు చుట్టూగూడ తిరగవలసి యుంటుంది. కనుక ఈ అఫీసు ఒక ముద్రవేసేది తప్పితే దీనివల్ల మరేమి ప్రయోజనం లేదు. ఇంక పోలీసు డిపార్టుమెంటు తీసుకొన్నట్లుంటే, రోజు రోజుకు పోలీసు సిబ్బంది పెరిగిపోతున్నది, పోలీసు స్టేషన్లు కూడా పెరుగుతున్నాయి కాని crimes ఏమీ తక్కువకాలేదు. ఇంకా ఎక్కువ అగుచున్నాయి. ఎక్కడచూచిన అరాచకాలు, పోరాటాలు ప్రబలచున్నవి. ఈ డిపార్టుమెంటులో ఒక సబ్ ఇన్స్పెక్టరు ఉంటాడు. అతని సర్కిల్ ఇన్స్పెక్టరు ఉంటాడు. ఇది సర్, జిల్లా అధికారి అయిన D.S.P. కాకుండా, మరల Dy.S.P. అనే అఫీసరు ఉంటారు. ఈ పోస్టు అనవసరము. మరల ఈ Dy.S.P. చుట్టూ ప్రజలు తిరిగి, లంచాలు ఏమైన ఈ యువలనివస్తే ఈ యువకుగూడ కొంచెము లంచము ఇచ్చుటకే ఈ ఉద్యోగం ఉండని తోస్తున్నదిగాని మరేమి ప్రయోజనము కనబడదు. పోలీసు అఫీసర్లన్నా సక్రమముగా తమ విధులు నెరవేరుస్తారా అంటే అది లేదు. సామాన్య ప్రజలు రక్షణ కొరకే వెళ్ళినట్లుంటే ఇది civil కేసు మాకు సంబంధములేదు, అంటారు. వాళ్ళదగ్గరకు పోతే ఇంకొక డిపార్టుమెంటు దగ్గరకు పోవలసివస్తుంది. ఫలితము మాత్రము పోలీసు వారు తగిన సహాయము, రక్షణ ఇస్తూ యుంటారు. న్యాయము, అన్యాయము విచారించకుండా ఫలితము వారికి మాత్రము సహాయము రక్షణ ఇస్తూ యుంటారు. ఇంకా P.W.D. డిపార్టుమెంటు చూచినట్లుంటే ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన డిపార్టుమెంటు. ఇది ప్రజలకు ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి వ్యవసాయమునకు సంబంధించినటువంటిది. దీనిలో Special Food Production Officer అని Special Engineer అని అనేకమంది officers, అనేక branches ఉన్నవి. Budget లో దీనికొరకు కోట్లకొలది రూపాయలు కేటాయిస్తూ యుంటారు. నిజంగా ఈ డబ్బుంతా ప్రజల కొరకు, ప్రజలకు సహాయముచేయ పనులకు ఉపయోగించబడుతున్నదా అంటే, డబ్బుంతా ఎక్కువగా administration కే ఖర్చు చేయబడుచున్నదని స్పష్టమవుతుంది. వ్యవసాయానికి ఉపయోగపడే పనులనుగురించి శ్రద్ధవహించడంలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు మా constituency లో అసంతసారము చెరువు దానికి repairs లేక నీళ్ళన్నీ వృధాగా పోతున్నవి. అది సరిచేసినట్లుంటే ఆ నీరుతో ఒక 5 వందల ఎకరాల భూమి సాగువుతుంది. ఇంజనీరింగు డిపార్టుమెంటు విమిచేస్తున్నదో తెలియడంలేదు. కలెక్టర్లతో చెప్పకొంటే మాకు సంబంధములేదు, అంటారు. ఇంజనీరు కూడా మాకు తెలియదు అంటారు. అంటే, ఆ చెరువులకు supervise చేసే దిక్కుకూడా లేదన్నమాట. ఈ చెరువులు రిపేర్ చేసే బాధ్యత ఎవరికి లేదన్నమాట. కనుక ఈ Engineering department కూడ ఉపయోగంలేదు. వృధాగా డబ్బు మాత్రము administration కొరకు ఖర్చుచేస్తున్నది. ఇంక Forest department చూసి నట్లయితే, గ్రామాలలో పశువులు మేతకొరకై అటు ఇటు మెదలకుండా నిర్బంధిస్తున్నారు. అన్ని విషయాలలోనూ ఈ Forest ఉద్యోగులు లంచాలు తీసుకొంటూ పేదప్రజలను చాలా కష్టపెడుతూ యుంటారు. వందలకొలది ఎకరాల భూమిని, పశువులను మేపుకొనేందుకు ఏలలేకుండా forest గా declare చేసినారు. దీనివల్ల గ్రామస్తులకు చాలా కష్టముగా యుంటుంది. Forest officers ఎక్కడో 60, 70 మైళ్ళ దూరములో ఉంటారు. వాళ్ళకు forests లో ఉండే పరిస్థితులు, సరిగా తెలియవు. ఈ విధంగా Forest department యున్నది. అదే విధంగానే Labour department ఉన్నది. కార్మికుల కాగోగులను విచారించి ఎట్టి నకాదాలు లేకుండా వారికి తగిన సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేసేందుకు ఈ డిపార్టుమెంటు పెట్టాడు. కాని వీరు

[Sri G. C. Kondayya] [6th November 1952]

తగాదాలను తీసుకువచ్చేందుకే తోడ్పడుతున్నారు అని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఉదాహరణకు 1948 సం॥లో నెల్లూరు బస్ కార్మికులకు యజమానులకు తగాదావచ్చినప్పుడు ఆ adjudication తీర్పును ఆమలుజరపడానికి ఈ department లో ఎవరూకూడ బాధ్యత వహించలేదు. ఈ ఉత్తరువులను బస్సు యజమానులు తిరస్కరిస్తున్నాగాని, వీరు ఇది చూచి చూడనట్లు పలకకుండా ఉరకున్నారు. ఈ విధంగా కార్మికులకు ఉపయోగపడనటువంటి ఈ డిపార్టుమెంటు ఎందుకో తెలియడం లేదు. అదే విధంగా local boards గురించి ఆలోచించినట్లైతే, గ్రామాలలో ఉన్న పంచాయితీ బోర్డులు చాలా దండుగ. ప్రజల డబ్బు అంతయు ఈ పంచాయితీ బోర్డుల administration కే వినియోగపడుతున్నది. ప్రజలచేత పన్నులు వసూలు చేయించుకొని దానిని ఆ పంచాయితీ బోర్డు యొక్క సిబ్బందికే ఎక్కువగా వినియోగిస్తూ ఉంటారు. ఉదాహరణకు, అత్తూరు టౌను తీసుకుంటే, అది Major Panchayat. దాంట్లో 9 వేల రూపాయలు ఆదాయమువస్తే 6 వేల రూపాయలు ఆక్కడ ఉండే, ఒక executive officer కు, ఒక Deputy Panchayat Officer కు, వాళ్ల staff కు జీతాలు, maintenance కొరకు ఖర్చు చేస్తారు. వచ్చే 9 వేల రూపాయలలోను, 6, 7 వేల రూపాయలు ఈ విధంగా staff కే వినియోగిస్తే, ఇంక మిగతా 2, 3 వేల రూపాయలలో గ్రామములో ప్రజలకు ఏమి సౌకర్యాలు కలుగ జేయగలరో ఆలోచించుకోవచ్చు. ఏదో పేరుకుగాను, 1, 2 రోడ్లు సరచేయడము లేక వీధులలో కొన్ని లాంఛర్లు వెలిగించడం తప్పితే వీరు ప్రజలకు చేసే సహాయము వేరే ఏమి కనపడదు. గ్రామాభివృద్ధికిగాను నియమించబడిన ఈ పంచాయితీ బోర్డులు, ప్రజల దుడ్డు దండుగ చేయడానికే ఉన్నవి. అంతేగాని గ్రామాలకు చెప్పుకో తగినంత సౌకర్యాలు ఏవి కలుగజేయబడడంలేదు. అదే విధంగా Welfare department ఉన్నది. ఈ Welfare department వారు ఏమి చేస్తున్నారో వీరి బాధ్యతలేమో, అధికారాలేమో, ఎవరికీ తెలియదు. వీరు చేయవలసిన functions ఏమో ప్రజలకు తెలియదు. వీరుచేసేదంతా ఏమిటంటే ఒక అర డజను మంది ఆఫీసులో కూర్చొని typewriters ముందు పెట్టుకొని ఏమో టైప్ చేస్తూయుంటారు. కాని వీరు ప్రత్యక్షంగాచేసే పనులేమో తెలియదు. వీరికి అధికారాలుగూడ ఏమన్నట్లు తోచదు. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక గ్రామంలో హరిజనులకు భావి కట్టించాలంటే, ఈ Welfare department కు దానిని sanction చేసేందుకు శక్తిలేదు. అది రివిన్యూ డిపార్టుమెంటువారు చేయాలి. అది అంత మాత్రముతో సరిపోదు. మళ్ళీ Supervisor చూడవలసియుంటుంది. ఇదంతా అయిన తరువాత జిల్లా కలెక్టరుకు పోవలసియుంటుంది. ఇదంతా అయ్యేపాటికి 7 మాసాలు అవుతుంది. ఈ విధంగా ఏ పని చేయవలసినప్పటికీ ఇంత మందిద్వారా చేయవలసియుంటుంది. ఇటువంటిప్పుడు ఈ Welfare department ప్రజలకు ఏ రీతిగా ఉపయోగపడుతున్నదో అర్థముకాదు. అదే విధంగానే settlement officers అనే కొత్త ఆఫీసర్లు తయారగుతున్నారు. నా అనుభవములో M.L.A. గా నాకు తెలిసినంతవరకు, వీరినుండి ఏమి ప్రయోజనములేదు. ఇవన్నీ అనవసరమైనటువంటి ఉద్యోగాలు అని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. వృధాగా వీటిన్నింటికీ దుడ్డు దండుగ చేస్తున్నారు. కలెక్టర్ కే అన్ని హక్కులు, అధికారాలు ఉండినప్పుడు, మరల ఈ settlement officers ను ఎందుకు నియమించవలసో అర్థముకాలేదు. ఇదంతా ప్రభుత్వపు దుడ్డును వృధా చేయటం తప్ప ప్రజలకు ఏమి ఉపయోగపడని చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఇంక Education department గురించి కొంత ఆలోచించినట్లైతే, హైస్కూల్లో Headmasters ను appoint చేసేందుకుగూడ ఏవేవో విధానాలుపెట్టి, G.O. లుచేసి చిక్కులు కలుగచేస్తున్నారు. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక విషయము చెప్పుతున్నాను.

6th November 1952] [Sri G. C. Kondayya]

“విద్యా విభాగంలో చాలా లోటుపాట్లు కనుపిస్తున్నాయి. విద్యార్థులకు 11-50 శ్రేణుంగా పాఠాలు చెప్పబడుతున్నాయా? వారికిచ్చే తరగతి ఎలావుంది అనే విషయాల గురించి ఆలోచించే నాధుడే కనుపించుటలేదు. మా అత్తూరు హైస్కూలు విషయం ఈ సందర్భంలో ఉదాహరణగా మనవి చేస్తాను. గత చూడు మాసాలనుంచి ఆ స్కూలుకు హెడ్మాస్టర్ లేడు. కొత్త హెడ్మాస్టర్ ను వెంటనే నియమించుటకు బోర్డువారు పూనుకోలేదు. హెడ్మాస్టర్ నియామక విషయంలోకూడా ఎంతో తరంగంవుంది. ఒక పేసర్ తయారు చేయబడాలి. ఆ పేసర్లోనుంచి ఒకరిని హెడ్మాస్టరుగా డిప్యూటీకుబోర్డు తెసిపెంతున్నారు, విద్యాశాఖోద్యోగి ఎన్నుకోవాలి. ఈ కర్తవ్యం తెలిసేసేగాని హెడ్మాస్టర్ నియామకంకాదు. గత చూడు మాసాలనుంచి హెడ్మాస్టర్ లేడు. ఇక S.S.L.C. పరీక్షలకు గడువు చూడు మాసాలు మాత్రమేవుంది. ఈ తక్కువ కాలంలో S.S.L.C. కోర్స్ పూర్తిచేయడం ఎలా సాధ్యపడుతుంది? విద్యార్థులకు శిక్షణ ఎలా లభిస్తుంది? వారు పరీక్షలో కృతార్థులు కావటానికి అస్కారం ఎక్కడుంది? ఈ విషయాల ప్రసక్తి ఉపాధ్యాయులకుగాని, అధికారులకుగాని పట్టదు. ఈ పరిస్థితులు మారాలి.

“ఇక వ్యవసాయశాఖ విషయం గమనించండి. న్యాయానికి యీ శాఖకు ప్రాధాన్యత యివ్వబడవలసి ఉంది. కాని రైతులకు దీనివల్ల ఆశించిన ఫలితాలు కలుగులేదు. సకాలంలో వారు విత్తనాలను, పనిముట్లను రైతులకివ్వడం, ఋతువు అభిరి సమయంలో విత్తనాలిస్తామంటారు. ఆసరికి సన్నకారు రైతుకు విత్తనం అవసరమే ఉండదు. కొవ్వే స్త్రీమతకూడ ఆతనికుండదు. డిపోలలో విత్తనాలు మూలుగుకూ ఉంటాయి. ఏ పెద్ద బూన్యామో విత్తనాల పేరు మీదుగా వాటిని కొని బ్లాక్ మార్కెట్లో విక్రయిస్తాడు. ఈ అర్థరహిత విధానాలకు అంత్యమెప్పుడో తెలియడంలేదు. అధికారోత్పత్తి సాధనకు ఇవేనా అనుసరించవలసిన మార్గాలని ప్రభుత్వంకాని ఆడుగుతున్నాను. పశువైద్య శాఖగూడా యిలాగే పనిచేస్తోంది. నామమాత్రంగా చికిత్సా కేంద్రాలు ఏర్పాటుచేస్తారు. వాటిలో మందు లుండవు. ఈ కేంద్రాలైనా తాలూకాకు ఒక్కటి చొప్పునే ఉంటాయి. ఉదాహరణకు మా అత్తూరు హాస్పిటలు విషయం చూడండి. ఆ తాలూకాలో 190 గ్రామాలున్నాయి. నైలకు 30 గ్రామాలు దూచినా తాలూకాలోని గ్రామాలన్నిటినీ చూడటానికి ఎంత కాలంపడుతుందో ఆలోచించండి. ఈ మధ్యన ఒక వల్లెలో పశువులకు దొడ్డు రోగం వచ్చింది. ఆ విషయం వెటర్నరీ డాక్టరుగారికి తెలియజేసాం. కాని ఆయన వర్గం మందులులేవు. మద్రాసునుంచి మందులు తెప్పించాలన్నారు. అవి వచ్చేసరికి 15 రోజులు పట్టింది. ఈ మధ్య కాలంలో 50 పశువులు వనిపోయినాయి.

“ఇక వైద్య విషయం గమనించండి. అత్తూర్ హాస్పిటల్ కు 1,500 రూపాయలు మందులకుగాను యిస్తారు. అంటే రోగుల నిమిత్తం రోజులకు రూ 4-5-0 లు ఖర్చు అవుతుందన్నమాట. హాస్పిటల్ కు దాదాపు రోజుకు 70 మంది రోగులు వస్తారు. అంటే ఒక్కొక్క రోగికి రోజుకు సరిగా యివ్వవలసిన దామాషాన ఒక అణా మందు ఇవ్వాలి. ఇది ఎంత ఘనవైద్యమో ఆలోచించండి. ఈ కొద్దిపాటి మందులను రోగులకిచ్చే నిమిత్తం డాక్టరు, మౌరవపాని, నర్సు, కాంకాం తరు మొదలైనవారు ఉండాలి. వీరి నిమిత్తమే రోజుకు రూ 16-8-0 లు వచ్చింపబడుతోంది. రూ 4-5-0 లు రోగులకు రోజుకు పంచియివ్వటానికి రూ 16-8-0 లు ఇచ్చి సిబ్బందిని ఏర్పాటు చేయడంకాని విశిష్టతను సాధ్యలే గుర్తించాలి. ప్రజాసామాన్యంలో నిస్వేచ్ఛ, నిరాశ, నానాటికి తెరిపాతున్నాయి.

[Sri G. C. Kondayya] [6th November 1952]

లంచగొండితనం ఎక్కడ చూచిన తాండవిస్తోంది. ముఖ్యంగా ట్రామానికి గురియైన వేద రైతుల విషయమే లీనుకొండి. లాన్స్ తహశీల్దార్ కు, ఇతర ఉద్యోగులకు మెక్సెడెన్సే కాని వసులుకావు. 500 రూపాయల అప్పుకు 100 రూపాయలవరకు లంచమివ్వాలి. లంచమివ్వనిదే తన అప్లికేషన్ కాంక్షనేకాదు. సర్వీస్ లోన్స్ విషయంలోకూడా ఇట్లాంటి అన్యాయాలే జరుగుతున్నాయి. దినం గడవక అకలితో అలమటిస్తున్న టూథార్లునుంచి డబ్బు గుంజడం సైనిక వృత్తి ఖాతా కాబో గమనించండి. ఇచ్చే వందో రెండు వందలలాన్ సగభాగంతో గవర్నమెంటు దగ్గర్నుంచి మెలో కొనుక్కోవాలి. మిగతా రొక్కలలో అప్పు లీనుకొన్నవానికి మిగిలేది బహు కొద్ది. ఈ అప్పుల విషయంలోకూడా ఎన్నో అభ్యంతరాలు ఎదుర్కోవలసి వస్తోంది. మునసబు ఆస్తిపుస్తకం రికమండ్ చేయాలి. రెవిన్యూ ఐన్ స్పెక్టర్ అంగీకరించాలి. తహశీల్దార్, ఆ టై ఉద్యోగులు దానిని ఆమోదించాలి. ఈ ఆస్తి ఘట్టాలలోను ముడుపులు చెల్లించుకోవాలి. డబ్బు చెల్లించినవారికే ఏ వదిలీన రోజుల్లానో, వారంలానో, వివరాలు తెలిపినా తెలుపక పోయినా అప్పిస్తారు. లంచమివ్వనివాని ఆర్జీకి ఆతిగలి వుండదు. 6 నెలలకాదు అఫీసులమట్టు తిరిగి తిరిగి ఆఖరుకు ఆశ నిరాశ చేసుకుంటాడు.

“జుక P.W.D. విషయం చూడండి. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు దానిని తనద్యోగియ క్రతువుగా అభివర్ణించారు. ముత్తంమీద ఈ శాఖ రైతాంగానికి క్రతువుగా తయారైందనడంతో ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహంలేదు. ఇంజనీర్ల పాటాలు నిర్ణయమైతే కాని ఏ పనికి ఎట్టిమేల్లే వుట్టవు. చెరువులు కట్టలేని నీరు వృధా అయిపోతూవుంటే ఇంజనీర్లకు చీమకుట్టకట్టయినా ఉండదు. రైతులు లంచా లిచ్చుకోలేని కారణంచేత అనేక చెరువులు, జలాధారాలు మరమ్మతులు లేక అభ్యాస పరిస్థితులలో ఉన్నాయి. ముఖ్య పంత్రిగారు లంచగొండితనం రూపుమాపుతామని ఎంతగట్టిగా చెప్పినా అది అవరణలో పెట్టబడలేదు. ఇంజనీర్లు బలీయాలగు కంప్లెక్ట్ ల చేతులలోకిలుబొమ్మై పోతున్నారు. జరిపే మరమ్మత్తులైనా దృఢమైనవిగా ఉండవు. చెరువులలో నీరు నిలువజేయుటకు పెట్టిన తలుపులు తెరిపిపోయినా అధికారులు శ్రద్ధలీనుకోవడంలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు మోపాడు ప్రాజెక్టు విషయం లీనుకొండి. ఇది నెల్లూరుకు 60 మైళ్లదూరంలో వుంది, పెన్నలో నుంచి దీనికి నీరురావాలి. పెన్న పొంగి నీరు పోర్లిపోతున్నా ఈ చెరువు నింపటానికి అధికారులు తగినంత శ్రద్ధ లీనుకోరు. పెన్న కాలవల విషయంలోకూడా ఇదే విధంగా వుంది. నీరు పుక్కులంగా ఉన్నప్పుడు దానిని నిలువచేయటానికి వారు ప్రయత్నించరు. వారి పీలునుచూచుకొని కాలవలకు, ఇతర చెరువులకు నీరు పంపటానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తారు. ఈలోగా నీరు తగ్గిపోవచ్చు కూడా. ‘అయ్యవా రొచ్చేదాకా అమావాస్య అగదు’. కరువు కాలంలో అలమటిస్తున్న ప్రజలకు అండదండగా వుండని అధికారులు ఉండినా లేకపోయినా ఒకటే.

“భూమిలేని వ్యవసాయకూలీలకు బంజరుభూము లివ్వడంలో ఎంతో అన్యాయం జరుగుతోంది. అనేక సందర్భాలలో వేదవారి వేరిట ఉన్న భూములు పెద్ద భూస్వాములు తమవరం చేసుకుంటున్నారు. ఒక అసామీకి మా జిల్లాలో ఒకటిన్నర ఎకరాలు మొట్టమొదట మంజూరుచేయబడింది. క్రింది ఉద్యోగస్తులందరూ అతనికి భూమిని గ్రాంటుచేశారు. అతనికి పోటీ వచ్చిన ఒక పెద్ద భూస్వామి మద్రాస్ వచ్చి జోర్డు ఆఫ్ రెవిన్యూవారిని మంచిచేసుకొని ఆ భూమిని తనకు యిచ్చుకట్టు చేసుకోగలిగాడు. వేదరైతు మద్రాస్ రాలేడు. వచ్చినా అధికారులను మెప్పించి వారి ఆదరాభిమానాలను సంపాదించలేదు. ఇది నేటి పరిస్థితి.

[6th November 1952] [Sri G. C. Kondayya]

ఈ విషయమై ఎన్నో జి. ఓ. అండవచ్చు. కాని ఈ అభ్యంతరాలను అధిగమించేకొత్త అధికారులకు వుంది. లంచగొండితనం ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులలో తగ్గనిదే ప్రజలు నుఖపడరు. ఇలా విమర్శించానంటే నేను ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులందరిని మొత్తంగా విమర్శిస్తున్నానని భావించరాదు. వారిలో మంచివారు, సత్ప్రవర్తన గలవారు లేరని నేననను. కాని హెచ్చుమంది లంచగొండులున్న వారావరణంలో వారుంటారు. ఆయన వల్లనే అందరిపై గూడా ఈ నేరం మోపవలసివస్తోంది. కూడుకు గుడ్డకు సరిపోని వేత నాన్ని లీనుకొనే చిన్న ఉద్యోగులు లంచాలు పుచ్చుకొంటారంటే అశ్వర్యవదననైన పనేమిలేదు. లంచగొండితనం తగ్గాలంటే వారి జీతాల పెంచుచేయాలి. వేలకువేలు జీతాలు పుచ్చుకొంటున్న వారి జీతాలు తగ్గించాలి.

“ప్రస్తుతము మన ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా విధానములో యీ ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు 12 noon. ఆవలంబిస్తున్న లంచగొండితనము చెప్ప నలవిలేకుండా యున్నది. పీటిషనరీ పరిపాలన ఉన్నప్పుడు గూడా యింత విపరీతముగా ఉన్నట్టులేదు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వపరిపాలన వచ్చిన తరువాత ప్రతి ఉద్యోగస్తుడున్న, చిన్నవారి దగ్గరనుంచి పెద్దవారివరకు లంచములు లీనుకొననిది ప్రజలకు వసులు జరుపడములేదు. గ్రామాలలో వేదరైతాంగము వారి వారి వసులొరకు ఏ పనితైనను పీటిషను పెట్టుకుంటే, ఆ పీటిషను విమోచిస్తే, ఆతిగలి ఉండదు. ఒక వేళ దానికి సంబంధించిన అఫీసుకు వెళ్లగా వారిని విచారించే దిక్కు ఉండడములేదు. ఉద్యోగ వ్యవహారములలో ప్రజలకు వివిధమైన సహాయము కలగడము లేదు. ఒకరైత తనకుగాని, గవర్నమెంటుకుగాని, రెవిన్యూ జోర్డుకుగాని ఒక పీటిషను పెట్టుకున్నట్లయితే, ఆ పీటిషను కలెక్టరుకు పంపుతారు. కలెక్టరు తహశీలు దారుకు పంపుతాడు. అక్కడినుంచి, రెవిన్యూ ఐన్ స్పెక్టరు వద్దకు వస్తుంది. రెవిన్యూ ఐన్ స్పెక్టరు గ్రామమునకు వచ్చి నీ పని చేస్తాను, విమి యిస్తావు అని అడుగగా ఆ రైతు యివ్వలేని స్థితిలో ఉంటే, ఆ రైత ఆ పీటిషను సంగతే బయటికి రాదు. అలాగే యితర డిపార్టుమెంటులలో గూడ ఈలాంటివి ఎన్నో జరుగుచున్నవి. పూర్వపు పరిపాలనలో కన్న యీనాడు ఈ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగస్తుల సంఖ్యను ఆపరిమితముగా పెంచినది. ఇదివరకు ఒక గుమస్తా చేనేటిటువంటి పని ఇచ్చుకు నలుగురు, అయిదుగురు చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వ సిబ్బందిని హెచ్చుచేయడమువల్ల వసులు జరగకపోయినను, ప్రభుత్వ ఆదాయము అనవసరంగా ఖర్చు అగుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వములో ఉన్న యీ civil servants లంచగొండితనమును ఎక్కువగా అవలంబిస్తున్నారనేది ప్రజలకు అందరికీ తెలిసినవిషయమే. ఈ విషయము లన్నియు పరిశీలన చేయవలసినవాద్యత ప్రభుత్వమువారిపై యున్నది.

“ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పదలచినాను. Forest department విషయములో ఒక ఉదాహరణ యిస్తున్నాను. యీనాడు ఒక గ్రామములో ఒక రైతుకు నూరు శకువులు ఉండినప్పుడు అతనికి permit యీదై పశువులకే ఉన్నప్పుడు మిగతా యీదై పశువులు forest guard కున్నా, రేంజరుకున్నా లంచములు యివ్వనియెడల, ఆ పశువులను అడవులలో మేపుకొనినవివకుండా ఆటంకము చేస్తున్నారు. రైతులలో అనేక మంది యీ రోజులలో బీదవారు ఉంటున్నారు. ధనికవర్గమునకువెదిన రైతాంగము యీ లంచములుపెట్టి, వారి పశువులను కొన్ని సమయములలో permit లేకుండాగూడా మేపుకుంటున్నారు. బీద రైతాంగమునకు యీ విషయములో చోటే లేకుండా యున్నది. ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ G.O. ను త్యాగచేసే ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతులకు తయారముగా ఉన్నన, దానిని అవరణలో పెట్టేటప్పుడు యీ forest ఉద్యోగస్తులు యింకొక విధముగా సంకరించుచున్నారు. యీ విషయము కనుక్కోనేవారు లేనే లేరు.

[Sri G. C. Kondayya] [6th November 1952]

“ఇంకను రివిన్యూ డిపార్టుమెంటు అటుండనివ్వండి. Agricultural department విషయముచూడండి. గవర్నమెంటువారు బండి పట్టాలు వస్తే, యివ్వక పరికరములు ఎరువు మొదలగునవి వ్యవసాయమునకుగాను సప్లయచేయమని Agricultural Demonstrator కు యివ్వగా, అవిసరిగా సప్లయచాక, ఫనికవర్గపు రైతులకే ముందుగా అందుబాటుగుచున్నది.

“ఈ విధముగా ప్రతి డిపార్టుమెంటులో, గుమాస్తా మొదలుకొని పై ఆఫీసరువరకు లంకము, అబినీతి, అవలంబించడమువల్ల, ప్రజలకు యీ ప్రభుత్వముచేసిన నష్టము పోయింది. అందువలన ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన సక్రమ మార్గములో వెట్టినిడే, యీ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలయొక్క నష్టమును పొందలేదు. పోయిన జనరల్ ఎన్నికలలో ప్రభుత్వము సంపాదించిన ఓట్లలోనే తెలియవచ్చినది. ఇందుకు గాను ప్రస్తుతము అమలులో ఉన్న యీ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగము సరిదిద్దుటకు ఒక సెలెక్షన్ కమిటీని వేయించి, అన్ని విషయములు ఊర్ణముగా పరిశీలన చేసి అనవసరమైనవి తగ్గించి, ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా విధానము బాగుచేస్తారని నమ్మకముతో యీ resolution ను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, I am sure the hon. Member has said very important things. As he really intends that I should follow his speech and as I understand that he knows English, will he give me a gist of his speech in English?”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I think the House wants to discuss this Resolution the whole of to-day. Is that the idea?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The hon. Member has made such a long speech, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The House wants to discuss this Resolution the whole of to-day. Is that so?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“There is no time-limit.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“There is no hard and fast rule, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“If it is the desire of the House to discuss this Resolution the whole of to-day, I have no objection.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, this is an important Resolution and the whole Government will be brought under review.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Because it is practically a Resolution to replace the permanent service as well as the political Government.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“It will give us an opportunity to tell the Government what they will have to do.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“It may be so, or it may not be so. But it depends on hon. Members. But the

6th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

hon. Member who moved the Resolution has spoken for long and, as I am told that he knows English, I make this request to him to give a gist of his speech in English.”

SRI G. C. KONDAYYA:—“I will give the gist of my speech in English, but not now.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I am not fixing any time-limit.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“After half an hour, you may draw the attention of hon. Members to the time-limit.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“That rule is known to every Member.”

* SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will give you the assurance that I will not transgress the half an hour rule, because I do not feel inclined to make a protracted speech being unwell. Anyway, I have a few suggestions to make about this resolution. I am sure that the Government will give due consideration to the sentiments and thoughts expressed in this resolution so that the administrative machinery of the Government may be made more efficient and more economical. There is no doubt whatever that the present administrative machinery is lopsided and top-heavy and is far from efficient. Of course, we had been given promises that the administrative machinery would be made far more efficient, it being granted that it was not very efficient. The particular machinery that we have inherited is the British bureaucratic machinery which revels in files and redtape, the length of it being interminable. But after the present Ministry took over, we were told that there would be considerable change and there would be some sort of catalytic process and more efficiency. But nothing spectacular has happened yet except that files continue and more files continue. My submission to this House is that this kind of bureaucratic administration where only files are rife but things do not get done must be eliminated and some kind of quicker machinery which would be more useful and active should be substituted. For that purpose, we must make an investigation as to how things should be done. One of the objects of the resolution is to find out the ways and means by the appointment of an expert committee or otherwise to promote efficiency in administration. As it is, one need hardly say that at present one is simply lost in the departmental redtape. Suppose a particular request is made at the lowest level of the administrative unit, it has to ascend by slow spirals and reach the Minister concerned before any final decision is taken. It goes from the Revenue Inspector to the Tahsildar. From the Tahsildar, it takes its course to the Sub-Collector and Collector. Its sojourn may be long in the Collectorate, because there are more files and more clerks there (clerks A, B, C, D, E, etc.). It gets locked up there for some time. Then it goes to the Secretariat through the Board of Revenue, and ultimately probably reaches the Minister concerned, who considers the file as a human problem, because every file is a human problem. Then he comes to a decision. The p.m.

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [6th November 1952]

human being concerned may vanish by that time. It is a tedious process if the file is to go from the village karnam or the Revenue Inspector up to the Minister. So, we must have some far more efficient way of doing things for quicker disposal. We must remember that justice delayed is justice denied. Similarly administrative remedies and reliefs, if they are delayed, are virtually denied for all practical purposes. So, we must devise some method by which we can dispose of things more quickly than at present. For that purpose, we must certainly conduct an investigation into the methods of the administrative organ now functioning so that we may know how to realign or reshape it to achieve our objective of quicker administrative action.

"I shall now give an illustration of the working of the present administrative machinery. I have come across an instance of how the various departments are working in such splendid isolation that one department goes on deciding one thing, then the whole course has to be gone through in another department, and after the two departments have considered the matter, ultimately a decision is taken after a long time on, perhaps, a most trifling thing. I was given to understand by a particular friend of mine—it is not proper for me to disclose his name—that under the firka development scheme, a particular road was sought to be constructed and for the purpose of that construction, a tree had to be cut. The Firka Development Officer made a recommendation through his superior officers that a particular tree had to be cut because, fortunately or unfortunately, that tree happened to be on a Government land. After the file went through all the Firka Development Officers, it was made over to the Public Works Department, because the tree being on Government land, what exactly was its value and what the cost of cutting it was, had to be estimated by that Department. So, the matter then went to the Engineering Department and all the people of that Department had their say as to the cost of the tree and all that. Meanwhile two years elapsed. The people had by then constructed the rest of the pathway through private lands. Thus, this tree which stood on a Government land held up the construction of the road, till at last some energetic Sub-Collector or so said, 'Cut the tree right or wrong and then let us wait for some other Government servant to kick up a row with us and let us answer him that the tree has been cut for a right purpose.' This is the way in which things take place because of the redtape. Nothing gets done because of the administrative independence of each unit or each department of Government. What we require is a change in the methods and procedure of the administrative machinery so that we may get things done fairly quickly. But the present machinery does not work at all. It works very tardily and very slowly till at last the people get disgusted, exasperated and do not expect anything to come about. Suppose we make an application for the supply of five bags of cement or five hundredweights of steel. It has got to be recommended by the village karnam. It has got to have its course through the Tahsildar who has to find out if the need is real and

6th November 1952] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

genuine. Then it goes to the Collector. From there it travels up to the Controller. Then, after an inordinate length of time, some kind of an order is passed. (At this stage, the Chairman, Srimathi T. Kotamma Reddi, occupied the Chair and there was a loud applause.) May I take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Lady Member on occupying the Chair, because it is really very significant and I suppose it puts into practice the principle enunciated in the Constitution with regard to the equality as between man and woman?

"Now, Madam, continuing from where I left, I wish to impress on the Government that the present way of doing things is so disgusting and dilatory that people are dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs. Something has got to be done and some kind of a change is long felt and must be given to the people quickly.

"Another point that I wish to stress is that the present administrative machinery is rather bureaucratic. By saying that it is bureaucratic, I do not wish to merely indulge in some claptrap or cliché. But what I wish to emphasize is that people do not know what is taking place within the Government. The working of the administrative machinery appears to be something mysterious. People just do not realize what is taking place in the Government. If an application is made seeking some relief, it has its own course, it dives into some files and ultimately something emerges. People are not taken into confidence and officers do not care to tell the people what they do or what they propose to do. All this has got to change and one method of changing this will be to have advisory committees. I do not mean the *nam-ke-vaste* advisory committees which, we may have. There are some advisory committees even now. The Members of those committees meet once a month or once in two months, do nothing, and then disperse."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Perhaps they meet so that they may be entitled to draw travelling allowance."

* SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR:—"According to the Hon. the Chief Minister's insinuation, they probably gather for drawing their travelling allowance. It may be that it is his experience. Anyway my experience has not been quite that. I sometimes find that it is better to spend one's time otherwise than by attending these committee meetings because they are mere formal affairs. People gather, pass some resolutions, but nothing gets done. At the last meeting of the District Food Production Committee in Malabar, I was present and some Member asked what was to happen to the resolutions that were passed there. The Collector very cheerfully said, 'I shall start the file and correspond with the Government. It will become a huge file and at last something may come out of it, or the proposal may be rejected. Nothing more than that will happen'. I do not know whether these advisory committees are given real power to associate themselves in the administration so that the popular elements may get an inkling into the methods of administration, what the administrators

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

[6th November 1952]

do and why they do certain things and to influence the working of the administration. If this power is given, the people may feel satisfied that they are also being consulted, that their voice is heard and that the administration is shaped by the people themselves. So, what we require is not this bureaucratic and blind working of the administrative machinery but more and more association of popular elements in the administration. This can be done by effective control by, and effective consultations with, advisory committees. Advisory committees must exist not merely for food production but they must be created for practically every department, either at the district level or at higher levels and at lower levels. We do require association of the people with the administration by means of committees and, as I said, there should not be mere formal gatherings. Some kind of power should be given to such committees to advise the authorities and the normal expectation should be that the advice that is given or the resolutions that are passed will be carried out, because the president or chairman of these committees will be an official, for example, the District Collector or the District Superintending Engineer, if it is the Engineering Department that is concerned or the District Agricultural Officer, if it is the Agricultural Department that is concerned. Thus, under the presidency of the head of the department, there may be an advisory committee and the decisions arrived at by the committee may normally be carried out unless there is something very perverse or manifestly wrong with the resolutions passed or the decisions arrived at there. That is one of the methods by which people can be taken into confidence and made to feel that they are being consulted and that their voice or their say also has some effect upon the administration.

"Yet another point I wish to make about this particular Resolution is that there must be more decentralization and autonomy at lower levels. At present, there is quite a lot of concentration at the top. In every case, whether it is a question concerning religious endowments or motor transport, ultimately the matter comes up to the Government who have the last say. Even things that are done by an autonomous or statutory body are reviewed by the Government. If we take up the road traffic boards or the road transport authorities, we find ultimately orders are passed by the Government. In every other department also, we find all the power is concentrated ultimately in the hands of a few Ministers. Lord Acton has said, 'Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely'. In accordance with this, however much we may talk in this Assembly, if power is concentrated in the hands of a few or a single person, there will certainly have to be some kind of aberration or abuse. This should certainly be avoided by having more decentralization. The Government may be given power to interfere in exceptional circumstances but normally we must have some kind of decentralization and autonomy at lower levels. When there is the High Court to issue writs if there is any perversity on the part of statutory bodies like the Hindu Religious Endowments or the Road Traffic Board, I wonder why matters concerning those

6th November 1952]

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

bodies should go before the Government for passing final orders. I do not know why there should be this intermediate authority between the High Court and the statutory bodies? There is absolutely no need for the Government to interfere with these things. Quicker and more satisfactory disposals can be had without protracting things if the Government were not to dispose of them.

"My submission therefore is that we should promote decentralization; less and less power should be vested in the Government and more and more power should be vested in district authorities. The public functionaries in the districts should be given more autonomy. There is the Collector in the district. He is responsible for administering certain matters. But he is not allowed to do things all by himself. His papers go to the Secretariat at Fort St. George and the Minister concerned takes a decision. That is the position. Similarly, take the case of the District Agricultural Officer. He must have more autonomy so far as agricultural matters are concerned. He must have powers to pass final orders in certain matters. Even in the case of small matters, his papers will have to go to the Director of Agriculture and from him to the Minister for Agriculture. One wonders why even in small matters, papers should go to the Director of Agriculture and the Minister. The officials at the district level can very well look after such small matters and there is no need at all for the Minister to interfere in such matters. Again, if we look at the Fisheries Department, the same is the case. If some boat has got to be repaired somewhere in the district or if some extra expenditure is to be incurred, the papers should travel to the Secretariat at Madras and the Minister has to pass orders. I don't know why such a procedure should be allowed to continue. I strongly feel that there must be some decentralization and more autonomy should be given to the officials at the district level. They are the people on the spot who can effectively deal with such small matters. Again, some of these things have got to be done very quickly if efficiency is expected in the administration. The district officials should be made to feel that they also count for something and that they are not merely a cog in the wheel. Some of them at the present time feel that they are not responsible for anything as the papers always reach higher authorities, who take a decision and pass final orders. Therefore I say that this kind of long-drawn-out process should be avoided and we must have some simplification of the same.

"Moreover, the present system of administration is very, very wrong in that it has got various compartments and papers have to pass from one compartment to another. This means that the papers have to travel the whole pyramid up and down. When we come to the municipalities and other local boards, they cannot spend money for welfare schemes as they would like to. The matter has got to go to the Local Fund Inspector or Inspector of Local Boards or perhaps it may go higher up. Even if it is the grant of a licence for a cinema theatre, the Collector has power to

12-20
p.m.

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [6th November 1952]

revise the licence granted by the municipal authority. The Government have the power to cancel the whole thing. The same is the case with regard to the sanctions accorded by the municipal authorities for constructing buildings. I know of a case in Kozhikode where the municipal council granted permission for constructing a building. The Collector cancelled the permission so accorded. The matter was taken up to the Minister who revised the order of the Collector. After some time, the same Minister reviewed the whole matter again and passed a different order altogether. The point that I want to stress is that there must be some finalization at some point. Somewhere a quietus must be given to the proceeding. It is not as if such small matters should go to the Ministers at Fort St. George for decision. These can very well be decided by the local officials. These are not extraordinary things calling for the expert decision of the Ministers. In all such cases, the decision of the local authorities is the best. Often times, these decisions have to be taken very quickly and they cannot wait for months. It is absolutely essential that the whole administrative system should be investigated by a Committee. Of course the recommendations of this Committee will be placed before this House and it is for this House to decide which of the recommendations are to be accepted and which of them are to be rejected. I appeal to this House to consider the three aspects that I have indicated, viz., decentralization, annihilation of bureaucracy and giving of more and more autonomy to officials at lower levels.

“One word about economy. Even yesterday, a question was asked as to how many officers were there who were drawing a salary of Rs. 1,000 and more. The contrast could have been more clearly brought out if only Dr. K. B. Menon's question had been answered yesterday. There are many Government servants—non-gazetted officers, peons and menials—who are drawing very low salaries. In a free country like ours, so many people are getting on with very low incomes. In our country, where the standard of living is very low, it is a pity that we should have allowed such inequalities. Some kind of readjustment is necessary so that there may be contentment among the low-paid staff and efficiency in administration. There must be some cut in salary in the case of high-paid officials. (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam: ‘What about lawyers?’) The Hon. Minister, who is himself a lawyer and who has secured a Minister's job probably by an act of self-abrogation brings in the lawyers also in this connection. I shall take the hint from him and tell him at once that in their case also there must be some readjustment. Yesterday, he said that the question of effecting a cut in the salary of those who are getting a salary of over Rs. 1,000 is under the active consideration of the Government. I hope he will also consider the question of increasing the salary of the low-paid staff at the same time. There is no point in expecting efficiency in administration, when the bulk of the staff employed by the Government are not getting adequate salary and are not contented. There must be a thorough overhaul

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] 6th November 1952]

and effective steps must be taken to see that the low-paid officials are kept contented. Then only we can expect efficiency in the administration.

“With these words, I commend the Resolution for the acceptance by the House. I believe this Resolution will not be opposed by the Government, as this is a matter which affects all of us. We are all interested in effecting more economy in the administration and increasing the efficiency in the administrative organism. After all, both sides of the House are interested in promoting the welfare of the people through a very capable and efficient administrative machinery.”

* **SRI K. T. RAJU** :—“கனம் சபைத் தலைவி அவர்களே, நண்பர் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற தீர்மானத்தை ஆதரிக்கும் முறையில் சில விஷயங்களை சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவருகிறேன். நிர்வாகம் திறமையாகவும் சிக்கனமாகவும் நடக்கவேண்டுமென்பதுதான் கனம் நண்பர் அவர்களின் தீர்மானம். இன்றையதினம் நாட்டின் அமைப்பில் பெரும்பான்மையான கிராமங்களில்தான் ஜனங்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதில் ஆட்சேபம் இல்லை. நமது நிர்வாகம் பொதுவாக கிராம மக்களுக்கு சௌகரியம் செய்கிற அளவில் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கும் சட்டதிட்டங்களை எல்லாம் அவர்கள் புரிந்துகொண்டு அவர்களுக்கு சாதகமான முறையில் வழி காட்டக்கூடிய நிலையில் இருந்தால் அவர்கள் உண்மையாகவே பலன் அடையமுடியும். இன்று இருக்கும் நிலையில் கிராமங்களில் இருக்கும் மக்களில் பெரும்பான்மையோர் படிக்கத் தெரியாதவர்கள் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். தற்பொழுது சர்க்காரால் சட்டங்கள் இயற்றப்படுகின்றன. என்ன சட்டங்கள் இயற்றப்படுகின்றன என்பது அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. அப்படித் தெரிந்தாலும் அதனால் பயன் அடைவதற்கு அவர்களுக்கு வசதி இல்லை.

“இப்பொழுது சர்க்கார் ஜனங்களுக்கு பணம் கடனாகக் கொடுத்து வருகிறார்கள். சர்க்கார் கொடுக்கும் கடன் அவர்கள் பெறவேண்டுமென்றால் பலவிதமான விண்ணப்பங்கள் எழுதிப் போடவேண்டியதாக இருக்கின்றன. வில்லங்க சட்டபிகேட் வாங்கிக்கொடுத்து கடன் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்ட வில்லங்க சட்டபிகேட் வாங்குவதற்கு குறைந்தபட்சம் 50 ரூபாயாவது செலவு செய்துதான் அந்த வில்லங்க சட்டபிகேட்டை வாங்க வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. அவ்விதம் வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தால்தான் குறைந்தபட்ச கடன் கிடைக்கும்படியாக ஒரு சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. அப்படி வாங்கிக்கொடுத்தாலும் சிலசமயங்களில் கேட்ட கடன் தொகை கிடைப்பது இல்லை. கொடுக்கமுடியாது என்று மறுத்து விடுகிறார்கள். உடுமலைப்பேட்டை தாலுகாவில் இரண்டு கிராமங்களில் அவ்விதம் ரூபாய் 50 வரையில் சிலவுசெய்து வில்லங்க சட்டபிகேட்டுகள் வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தும் கடன் இல்லை என்று சொல்லிவிட்டார்கள். 50 ரூபாய் செலவானதுதான் மிச்சம். இவ்விதம் முன்னாடியே சொல்லி இருந்தால் அவர்களுக்கு அந்த 50 ரூபாயாவது மிச்சமாக இருந்திருக்கும். அவ்விதம் சுமார் 100 பேர்களுக்கு இல்லை என்று சொல்லிவிட்டார்கள். முன்கூட்டியே அதிகாரிகள் இல்லை என்று சொல்லி இருந்திருந்தால் கூட அவர்களுக்கு எவ்வளவோ சௌகரியமாக இருந்து இந்த 50 ரூபாயாவது மிச்சமாக இருக்கும். கிட்டத்தட்ட பல கிராமங்களில் இப்படி நடந்துவருகிறது. வில்லங்க சட்டபிகேட் வாங்கிவிட்டு கடன் இல்லை என்று சொன்னால் அதனால் கிராமங்களில் பெரிய நெருக்கடி உண்டாகிறது. அதன் காரணமாக இந்த நிர்வாகத்தின்பேரில் ஒரு அதிருப்தி இயற்கையாகவே உண்டாகிறது. இதற்காக தூண்டிவிட வேண்டுமென்ற நிலையே கிடையாது.

“எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும், சமீபத்தில் நமது சர்க்கார் இந்த மைலோவை குறைந்த விலைக்கு மக்களுக்கு விற்கவேண்டுமென்றும்,

[Sri K. T. Raju] [6th November 1952]

அதனால் ஜனங்கள் நன்மை அடையவேண்டும் என்றும் அதற்காக கிட்டத்தட்ட ஒரு கோடி ரூபாய் சர்க்கார் நஷ்டமடைந்தார்கள். ஜனங்களுக்கு செளகரியம் செய்யும்பொழுது சர்க்காருக்கு நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டால் அதனால் பரவாய் இல்லை. அந்த நஷ்டத்தினால் கிராமங்களிலுள்ள ஜனங்களுக்கு வசதி ஏற்பட வேண்டும். ஆனால் சர்க்காரால் நஷ்டப்பட்ட இந்த ஒரு கோடி ரூபாய் ஜனங்களுக்குக் கிடைத்திருக்கிறதா என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். இந்த ஒரு கோடி ரூபாயும் ஜனங்களுக்குக் கிடைக்காமல் ஒரு சில நபர்களிடம் போய் சேர்ந்திருக்கிறது. நியாயமாக ஜனங்களுக்குக் கிடைத்திருக்கிறதா, ஏன் கிடைக்கவில்லை, அதன் காரணம் என்ன என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். நிர்வாகத் திறமை எப்படி இருக்கிறது என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். குறைந்த விலைக்கு விற்கவேண்டும் என்று போட்ட உத்தரவின்படி விற்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறதா என்றும் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அவ்விதம் விற்கப்படவில்லை என்பது பத்திரிகைகளைப் பார்த்தால் தெரியும். அதைப்பற்றி கலெக்டருக்குக் கூட கடிதம் எழுதப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. தந்திகள்கூட அனுப்பப்பட்டு இருக்கின்றன. ரூ. 25-க்கு விற்கப்படவேண்டியது ரூ. 40-க்கு விற்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதற்கு என்ன காரணம் என்று தெரிந்துகொள்ளவேண்டும். அதற்கு என்ன நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள்? கேட்டால் தாசில்தாருக்கு எழுதியிருக்கிறோம் என்றும், சப்ளை ஆபீசருக்கு எழுதி இருக்கிறோம் என்றும் பதில் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது. கடைசியில் பார்த்தால் ஜனங்களுக்கு அந்தப் பணம் போகவில்லை. அதனால் பெரிய நபர்கள் ஷாபத்தை அடைந்திருக்கிறார்கள், இதற்குக் காரணம் நிர்வாகம் திறமையாக இல்லை என்பது தான்.

“ இன்றைக்கு பல அதிகாரிகள் ஜனங்களுடைய மனோபாவத்தை உணர்ந்து எழை விவசாயிகளுக்கு உதவி செய்யவேண்டும் என்ற நிலையில் அவர்கள் இல்லை. இதைப்பற்றி எத்தனையோ விஷயங்களை என்னால் எடுத்துக் காட்ட முடியும். சமீபத்தில் உடுமலைப்பேட்டை தாலுகா, வேலூர் கிராமத்தை சேர்ந்த வீதம்கட்டி கிராமவாசிகள் தாங்களாகவே ரூ. 2,500 செலவுசெய்து மூன்று பர்லாங்கு நீளமுள்ள ஒரு வாய்க்கால இரண்டு வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்பு வெட்டினார்கள். புரம் போக்கு நிலத்தில் வெட்டிக்கொள்ள அனுமதிக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டு வெட்டிக் கொண்டார்கள். கலெக்டர் உத்தரவு கொடுப்பார் என்று நம்பி வெட்டினார்கள். ஆனால் வாய்க்கால் வெட்டி முடிந்த பிறகு அதாவது ரூ. 2,500 செலவுசெய்து வெட்டி முடிந்த கிணறுகளுக்கு ஊற்று நீர் வர ஆரம்பித்த பிறகு வெட்டிக்கூடாது என்றும் வெட்டியதை தூர்க்க வேண்டுமென்றும் உத்தரவு கொடுத்துவிட்டார்கள். உண்மையிலேயே வாய்க்கால் வெட்டியதற்கு விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்றி செலுத்தி யிருக்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்யவேண்டும், வெள்ளாமை செய்யவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லும் நேரத்தில் வெட்டிய வாய்க்காலுக்கு உத்தரவு கொடுக்கவில்லை யென்றால் அது நிர்வாகத்தின் குறைதான். இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் சட்டங்களை மக்களுக்கு சாதகமாக உபயோகப்படுத்தவேண்டுமே தவிர அவர்களுக்கு பாதகமாக உபயோகப்படுத்தக்கூடாது. ஜனங்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்யவேண்டுமென்றுதான் சட்டங்களை இயற்றி இருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் இப்பொழுது நடக்கும் நிர்வாகம் ஜனங்களுக்கு விரோதமாகப் போய்க்கொண்டிருக்கிறது.

“ வேறொரு விஷயத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் சர்க்கார் வருஷத் திற்குக் கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை செலவழிக்கின்றார்கள். சென்ற வருஷ வரவு செலவு திட்டத்தின்படி 60 கோடி ரூபாய் வருமானம் வந்து 63 கோடி ரூபாய் செலவழிக்கப்படுகிறது. அந்தச் செலவுகள் சிக்கனமாக செலவழிக்கப்படுகின்றனவா என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது லோயர் பவானி திட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் அதில் எத்தனையோ ஊழல்கள் இருக்கின்றன. லட்சக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்கள் பல அதிகாரிகளால் அனாவசியமாக செலவழிக்கப்படுகின்றன. அவ்விதம் பல காரியங்கள் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். உதாரணமாக ஒரு இடத்தில் ஒரு குழி வெட்டினால் அதை வெட்டுவதற்கு பணம், பிறகு அதை அளப்பதற்கு பணம்

[6th November 1952] [Sri K. T. Raju]

செலவழிக்கப்படுகிறது. பிறகு மற்றொருவர் வந்து அவர் அந்தக் குழியை அளக்க மறுபடியும் பணம் செலவழிக்கப்படுகிறது. இவ்விதம் பணம் அனாவசியமாக செலவிடப்படுகிறது. இதைப்பற்றி பல விண்ணப்பங்களும் புகார்களும் சர்க்காருக்கு அனுப்பி இருக்கிறார்கள். நானும் இதைப்பற்றி கேள்விகள் மூலமாக அனுப்பி இருக்கிறேன். இதுவரையிலும் அந்தக் கேள்விகள் வரவில்லை. ஜனங்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம். இதேமாதிரி எத்தனையோ லஞ்சம் ஊழல் நடந்து வருகின்றன. அனாவசியமான செலவுகள் நடக்கின்றன. அவைகளில் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டும். இன்னும் எவ்வளவோ புகார்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அவைகளை சர்க்கார் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர ஜனங்கள் தயாராக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு கொடுத்தால் இவைகளை சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர தயாராக இருக்கிறார்கள். பல கிராமங்களில் நடந்தவரும் காரியங்களைப் பார்த்தால் நன்றாக தெரிய வரும். புகார் சொல்லுகிறவர்கள் தங்களுக்கு ஆபத்து வரும் என்று பயப்படுவதால் அவர்கள் சொல்ல முன்வரமாட்டேன் என்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் கேட்டுவந்தால் பல ஊழல்களை தடுக்க முடியும். அதற்கு ஜனங்களுக்கு வாய்ப்புக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். உண்மையான சம்பவங்களை சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர ஜனங்கள் தயாராக இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படிச் சொல்வதில் 40 பேரில் 30 பேர்கள் வேண்டுமென்று சொன்னாலும் அதில் மூன்றாவது உண்மையாக இருக்கும். அதனால் மக்களுடன் தொடர்பு இருக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம். அவ்விதம் தொடர்பு இருந்தால் லஞ்ச ஊழல்களை தடுத்து விடலாம். பொதுமக்களுக்கும் சர்க்காருக்கும் அங்கு இருக்கும் முக்கிய தலைமை அதிகாரிகளுக்கும் ஓரளவு தொடர்பு இருந்தால் இந்த மாதிரியான காரியங்களைத் தடுத்து நிறுத்தமுடியும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். உதாரணமாக எனது தொகுதியில் பல வருஷங்களாக விண்ணப்பம் அனுப்பியும் இன்னும் பதில் வரவில்லை. தண்ணீர் இல்லை என்று மனுப் போட்டால் ரெவினியூ இன்ஸ்பெக்டருக்கு அனுப்புகிறார்கள். அதனால் தாமதம் ஏற்படுகிறது.

“ இம்மாதிரியாக கிராமங்களிலிருந்து வரக்கூடிய பல குறைபாடுகளை யெல்லாம் உடனுக்குடனாக கவனத்து குறைபாடுகளை நீக்குவதில்லை. பணம் செலவழிக்கக்கூடிய காரியங்களில் சர்க்காரின் பொருளாதார நிலைமை சரியாக இல்லாததால் ஈடுபட்டமுடியாது என்பதை நான் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். பணச் செலவு இல்லாத காரியங்களில் அன்றாடம் மக்களுக்கு ஏற்படும் இன்னல்களை நீக்க, தினசரி மக்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிற இடஞ்சல்களை நீக்க சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் ஏன் நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுக்கக்கூடாது என்றுதான் நான் கேட்கிறேன். அவர்கள் அப்படிச் செய்யாததினால் இன்றையதினம் மக்களிடையே அதிருப்தி நிலவி வருகிறது. பல விஷயங்களில் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் உடனுக்குடன் கவனம் செலுத்தி வருவார்களேயானால் பல இன்னல்கள் தவிர்க்கப்படும். உண்மையில் அதிகாரிகள் இப்படி நடந்துகொண்டால் பல புகார்களை வராமல் தடுத்துவிடலாம். அனுபவ ரீதியில் செய்யக்கூடிய காரியங்களையெல்லாம் அவர்கள் செய்வதேகிடையாது. குறிப்பாக ஒன்றைச் சொல்லுகிறேன். சர்க்கார் அணைக்கட்டுகளைக் கட்டுவதற்காக பல கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை ஒதுக்குகிறார்கள். ஆனால் ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட பணம் பூராவும் செலவழிக்கப்படுவதே கிடையாது. ஓரிடத்தில் ஒரு அதிகாரி கட்டிடத்திற்காகக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட சிமிட்டி மூட்டைகளையெல்லாம் கொண்டுபோய் தன் சொந்த உபயோகத்திற்காகப் பதுக்கிவிட்டதாகச் செய்தி வந்தது. சென்று போய் பார்க்கும்பொழுது அந்த மூட்டைகள், அதாவது சுமார் நாநூறு, ஐநூறு மூட்டைகள் பூமியில் புதைக்கப் பட்டுக் கிடந்தன. அவைகளை எடுத்தால் அவைகள் யாவும் கட்டி தட்டிப் போய் பாறையாய் போய்விட்டன. இம்மாதிரியாக பல விஷயங்களைக் கண்டு பிடிக்கமுடியும். சர்க்காரும் உடனுக்குடன் போதுமான நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுப்பதாக இருந்தால் பல விஷயங்களை இவர்களுக்குச் சொல்ல முடியும். அதனால் ஏராளமான செலவினங்களைக் குறைக்கலாம்.

[Sri K. T. Raju] [6th November 1952]

அதிகாரிகள் பொறுப்புணர்ச்சியுடன் நடந்து கொள்ளவேண்டும். அந்த உணர்வு இப்பொழுது இருப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. சர்க்கார் போடும் சட்டதிட்டங்கள் மக்களுக்கு உதவிகரமாக இருக்க நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டும். தேவையான அதிகாரிகளை மட்டுமே வைத்துக்கொண்டு, அதிக சம்பளம் வாங்கும் அதிகாரிகளின் ஊதியத்தைக் கொஞ்சம் குறைத்து, குறைவான சம்பளம் உள்ளவர்களுக்குக் கொஞ்சம் கூடக் கொடுத்து எல்லோரும் உற்சாகமாக வேலை செய்யும்படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். லேபர் டிபார்ட்மெண்டு இருக்கிறது. அதனால் என்ன பிரயோசனம் என்றுதான் தெரியவில்லை. முதலாளிக்கும், தொழிலாளர்களுக்கும் சச்சரவு ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டால் அதைத் தீர்த்துவைக்க அவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அப்படி அவர்கள் செய்வது கிடையாது. அதற்காக ஒரு இன்ஸ்பெக்டர் வேறு இருக்கிறார்.

“இம்மாதிரி விரயம் ஆகும் பணத்தை எல்லாம் எப்படி மிச்சம் செய்வது என்பதைப்பற்றியும் யோசித்தாகவேண்டும். ஆகையினால் எல்லா வழிகளிலும் நிர்வாகத்தைச் செம்மைப்படுத்த ஒரு கமிட்டியை அவசியம் நியமித்து பரிசீலனைச் செய்ய சொல்லவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். ஆகையினால்தான் எனது நண்பர் பிரேரேபித்திருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரித்து சர்க்கார் அதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்றும் கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

12-40
p.m.

* SRI K. V. VEMA REDDY:—“Madam, Chairman, I rise to oppose the resolution because it is not within the scope of the Legislature to refer a matter like this to a Select Committee. So far as efficiency in administration is concerned, the Executive and the head of the State are responsible for it. When it is not, therefore, within the scope of the Legislature, it is not relevant to go into details of administration on this Resolution. Instead of the whole question being referred to a Select Committee, hon. Members can suggest ways and means of bringing about greater efficiency in the administrative machinery of the State.

“Madam, under the leadership of Rajaji there is a general feeling in the country to-day—not only among the people but also among the representatives of the people—that the tone of administration has improved to a great extent. But there is still red-tapism in existence which was the special feature of the bureaucratic rule of the British Imperialism. It still lingers to-day in the present administration. I am, however, sure that under Rajaji's leadership this will disappear. I think he is making sincere attempts to liquidate it which is a striking symbol of inefficiency in the administrative machinery. There is also another aspect to this question. It is not only the officials that are responsible for this. People should co-operate with the Government in ensuring a stable Government. It is not only the party in power but the parties in Opposition also that should co-operate in creating a better atmosphere and ensuring a stable Government. That is the fine and striking feature of democracy. Without people's co-operation democracy will never thrive.

“My Friends spoke at length about the corruption that is rampant in the administrative machinery. There may be a ring of truth in that statement with much of an exaggeration. But I feel that we are also responsible for the corruption in administration. We are partly responsible, if not wholly. With due deference

6th November 1952] [Sri K. V. Vema Reddy]

to the friends who hold the view that corruption is rampant, I may say that we, people's representatives are equally responsible. I need not dilate upon this question because it is a story of the past. But I am sure, under the leadership of Rajaji, such things will be liquidated and a better atmosphere will prevail.

“To-day our life has become very complex and human nature itself has changed as a matter of fact. Administration cannot be brought to a perfect level overnight. It takes a long time. Rajaji is trying his best to bring the administration to a better and perfect level. As I have already brought to the notice of this House, there are several defects in the present administration. There is much delay, for instance, not only in the Judicial Department but in other departments as well. No doubt, the separation of the Judiciary from the Executive is a good sign of democracy. But still there is much delay in courts meeting out justice in several districts. In many districts where the munsif-cum-subdivisional magistrate is functioning, criminal cases are pending for long. This delay should be put an end to. My suggestion is that special magistrates or subdivisional magistrates trying criminal cases should be appointed to such districts so that there may not be many cases pending in courts.

“Coming to other departments, there is much delay, generally speaking, in the transaction of official business. I hope this state of affairs will be remedied by Sri Rajagopalachari.

“The next point which I wish to invite the attention of the House to is that economy should be effected in the administrative machinery of the State. Our country is poor. We cannot afford to pay high salaries. Madam, yesterday, the Hon. the Minister for Finance, in reply to a question said that the salaries of high officials—ranging from one thousand rupees and above—would be reduced. It is true that the cost of establishment here as compared with that in other Asiatic countries is very high and that our officials are paid high salaries. But reduction of salaries is not a thing that can be done in a day or two. A committee can be constituted to go into details and suggest ways of effecting economy as far as possible.

“Madam, one of the hon. Members suggested the abolition of the Board of Revenue. No doubt it is superfluous body. But life has become complex now. If the Board is abolished it will give rise to complications in the administrative machinery. The Board of Revenue is transacting a variety of businesses now-a-days and I do not think that there is necessity for the abolition of the Board.

“Taking next the administration of the Police Department, some hon. Members suggested retrenchment in the Police force. I do not think under the present circumstances, the Police force can be reduced. On the other hand, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that in some districts, the Police administration is far from being efficient in the sense that the Police force

[Sri K. V. Vema Reddy] [6th November 1952]

there is not controlling crimes. Crimes are on the increase. As a matter of fact, in my district, crimes are on the increase, which may be due to political reasons or several other reasons. This surely is a reflection on the district Police head. Efficiency should be achieved not by retrenchment. At the present moment, retrenchment is not advisable because in the villages a tendency is developing now to break law and order. I do not know who is responsible for this. I know there are some subversive elements in the country, who are responsible for the undisciplined way of life of the villagers. It is not, therefore, advisable to retrench the Police staff. On the other hand, the Police force must be increased in order to change the undisciplined nature of the people in villages who are victims to certain slogans of political parties in the country.

"Coming finally, Madam, to the important part of the resolution, namely, to study the principles and methods of procedure of the administrative machinery, I submit that it is not the function of the Legislature to interfere with the administrative machinery by means of a Select Committee. So far as effecting economy in expenditure is concerned, I welcome a committee to go into the whole question and suggest ways of achieving the object."

12-50
P.M.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :— ఇప్పుడు మిమ్ములను అధ్యక్షులూ ఆనా, అధ్యక్షులూ ఆనా, ఏమని నిబంధించాలి మీరే తెలియవాలి. ఈ రోజున మాముందు ఉన్న టువంటి తీర్మానంలో ఉన్న ప్రధాన మైనటువంటి విషయాలను మనం అర్థంచేసుకున్నప్పుడు ఈ తీర్మానం యొక్క ప్రధానమైన ముఖ్యమైన గుర్తింపుగల గుర్తు. మేమూ రెడ్డిగారు యింతకుముందు మాట్లాడుతూ యిప్పుడున్న పరిపాలనా యంత్రం మారుతుందన్నది, యింతకుముందు పరిపాలించినది బ్రిటిషు సామ్రాజ్యవాదుల పరిపాలనా యంత్రం గాబట్టి ఆనాడు ఉన్నటువంటి కొన్ని పరిపాలనా శక్తులు యీనాడుగూడ అదేవిధంగా ఉన్నవి, అందుచేతనే యిది పరిపాలనా సౌష్ఠ్యము కల్గినటువంటి పరిపాలనకు ప్రజలందరికీ తగిన భవకారం చేయటం వీలుకాలేదని చెప్పినారు. బిస్మిట్టికి ఆనాడు ఉన్నట్టి యీ పాలనా యంత్రాన్ని యీనాడు పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి పరిపాలన వద్దలికా ప్రజలకు సన్నిహిత సంబంధం భావనానికి అనుగుణమైన యంత్రాంగం అవరణలూ పెట్టుటకు వీలగు యంత్రాంగాన్ని ఆమలులోనికి తెచ్చేందుకు యీనాడు నెలక్కు కమిటీని వేయగలండులకు కోరుతున్నాను. ఇదియే ఈ తీర్మానము యొక్క ప్రధానాంశము. అందుచేతనే యిప్పుడున్న పరిపాలనా వ్యవహారము మనకందరకు తెలియును. ఆ పరిపాలనా సౌష్ఠ్యము లేనందున పరిపాలనా యంత్రాన్ని మార్చుటకున్నా అదివరకు ఉన్న అసంభవములను తొలగించుటకున్నా మౌళికమే నెలక్కు కమిటీని వేయమని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. యంత్రాంగాన్ని మార్చేయడం ప్రజల సమస్యలు చిక్కులు తీర్చగల యంత్రాంగంగా తయారైన మార్పులు చేపడెను. ఇప్పుడున్న యంత్రాంగం సామాన్య రైతులు కూలీలు మధ్యతరగతివారికి యివిధమైన భవయోగం చేయటం సామాన్య రైతులు ప్రజలందరికీ పరిపాలన యివిధంగా జరుగుచున్నదో యిన్ని ఆక్రమాల అవినీతులు ప్రజలపై అనాదరణ చూపబడుచున్నదో అందరికీ గోచరమైన విషయమే. పరిపాలనా యంత్రంలో మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలకు గట్టుచున్న యిబ్బందులు యిప్పుడున్న యంత్రంవల్ల

[6th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

తీర్చుట కవకాశం లేనందున యీ పరిపాలనా యంత్రము సౌష్ఠ్యము చేయబడకతప్పని ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యుల భుద్దేశము. ధనికవర్గంవారికితప్ప మధ్య తరగతినుండి కూడా ప్రజానీకం వరకు జరుగుచున్న ఆక్రమ పరిపాలన వారికి జరుగున్న కష్టములు యీదేరుటకు వీలగు పరిపాలనా యంత్రం తయారుచేయవలసిన అవసరం వచ్చినది. ఈనాడు నూటికి 80 వంతులు వేద ప్రజానీకమునకు వెందినవారే. వీరి మొరలు పరిపాలకులలో అలకించువారే కన్పడుటలేదు. వీరు యెన్ని పర్యాయములు ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనభ్రువు పెట్టుకొన్నా కూడా వారియట్టు 10 కి 20 సార్లు తిరిగిననూ భవయోగం లేకుండాపోవుచున్నది. ఉత్తరగణకు, కరువుతో బాధపడేవారికి ప్రభుత్వంవారుయిచ్చే అప్పులు సక్రమంగా అందజేయవు. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగం మీద భ్రష్టమి. కాని అప్పులు ప్రజలకు సక్రమంగా అందజేయవు. అప్పులు శాంక్షికాకావాలంటే నూటికి వదియవంతు అధికారులకుయివ్వాలి. అట్టి నులకుట్టూ తిరగటానికి మరింతభయ్య. చివరకు 60% మాత్రమే గిట్టుతుంది. కదిరి తాలూకాలో యీ విధముగా జరిగినవిషయము కాంగ్రెసు సభ్యుడు 4 వేమూ రెడ్డి గారికిమాదా తెలుసును. — ఈనాడు నాఅనుభవమునుబట్టి ప్రజలలో యీ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగం అసంతృప్తి అనాదరణగల్గించుచున్నదని యాధికావేశము. ధనికవర్గం వారికితప్ప యీయంత్రాంగము సామాన్య ప్రజలందరికీ భవయోగకారిగా భ్రష్టమని వారి వసులు లేకగానెరవేర్చబడుచున్నదని చెప్పగలవారు ఒక్కరునూలేరని నా దృఢవిశ్వాసము. అందుకనే యీ పరిపాలనా యంత్రములలో మార్పురావలయునని నాయభిప్రాయము.

"మరొక చిన్న విషయము చెప్పాలను. ఈ Tenancy Ordinance ఆచరణలోనికి వచ్చిన తరువాత ఎంతోమంది కాలుదార్లు ఆశతో తమతమ మిమ్ములను రక్షించుకోవడానికి ప్రభుత్వముదగ్గరనుండి తమకు సర్వే నెంబర్లు కావాలని గ్రామీణ్యోగ్యులవద్దకు వెళ్లి తే వారు ఏవో కొన్ని విరోధ భావాలు మనస్సులో పెట్టుకొని వారిని వ్యతిరేకించిన కారణమున వారికి ఇవ్వవలసిన సర్వే నెంబర్లు కూడా ఇవ్వడం లేదు. వీటిని గురించిన పీటికన్లు ఈ మాదిరి ఆలస్యముగూ నిరాకరింపబడుచుండుటవల్ల ఈ విషయాన్ని అనెంబ్లీలో 1949లో చేయవలసినదని ప్రజలనుంచి కట్టలు కట్టలుగా ఉత్తరములు వస్తున్నాయి. ప్రధాన మంత్రికి నూడ ఈ సమాచారము తెలిపాము. వీలైన complaints ప్రభుత్వమునకు వస్తే విచారిస్తాము అని చెప్పారు. కాని ఇటువంటి విషయాలలో ఏవో 1, 2 కేసులు ప్రభుత్వము విచారించినంతమాత్రాన ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కారము కాదు. పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగములో లోపములున్నంతవరకు ఇవి పరిష్కారము కాజాలవు. కనుక పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగానే చక్కదిద్దవలసి యుండుంది. అందువలన complaints వస్తే వాటిపై తగు చర్య తీసుకొని కావలసిన సహాయము చేస్తాము అనే అభిప్రాయముతో కాకుండా, ఇటువంటి అన్యాయాలు ఇప్పుడు నూటికి తొంభై పాళ్లు జరుగుతున్నప్పుడు ఇటువంటివి నూటికి వదిలినా తక్కువగా జరిగేటట్లు ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రములో మాట్టు తీర్చడం రోజునే ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వముమీద, పరిపాలనమీద, వారి భావనీలైన సత్తుకం విర్రుతుంది. లేకపోయినట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క పాలనీలమీద, పరిపాలనమీద సత్తుకము విర్రుతుట అసంభవము. అట్లు ఆశించడానికి కూడ వీలు లేదు. కనుక ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రములో భగ్గు మార్పులు తెచ్చేందుకు ఈ విషయాన్ని నెలక్కు కమిటీకి మంపవలసిక అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉందని నేను అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను. మరొక విషయాన్ని మనవి చేస్తాను. పరిపాలనా విధానం విషయములో ప్రభుత్వము ఏ వర్గానికి సంబంధించినటువంటిదిగా ఉండుండో పరిపాలనా యంత్రం కూడా ఆ వర్గమువారికే అనుకూలంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తుంది. ఇది ఈనాడు అందరు చూస్తు

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [6th November 1952]

స్పృహకంటి విషయము. సాధారణముగా నేడవార్లు విమోచన అరీజులు పెట్టుకొన్నా
గాని, చెప్పకొన్నాగాని వారిని విచారించే దిక్కులేదు. కాని ఏ ధనవంతులైన లేక
భూస్వాములైన పలుకుబడి గలవారు ఎవరైన ఏ విషయాలలోనైన అన్యాయముగా
జోక్యము కలుగజేసుకున్నా complaint చేసినా కూడ ప్రభుత్వము, పోలీసులు తదితర
ఉద్యోగస్తులు త్వరగా దాన్ని విచారించి అజమాయిషి జరుపుతారు అనే విషయము
మేము కండ్లార కొన్ని సందర్భాలలో చూచాము. ఒక సామాన్య సంఘటన చెప్పు
తున్నాను. నార్సల్ గ్రామంలో సత్యనారాయణ అనే ఒక వ్యక్తి నాలుగు సంవత్స
రాలుగా ఒక పొరంబోకు స్థలములో ఒక పాక వేసుకొని ఆందులో పెరుగు పెట్టు
కొని తద్వారా జీవిస్తున్న వ్యక్తి ఎన్ని కలలో వ్యతిరేకంగా పనిచేసినాడనే కోపముతో
భూస్వామి ఆ పాకను పీకేవేయించిన సందర్భములో ఆ సత్యనారాయణ అనే ఆతను
ప్రభుత్వానికి ఒక చిన్న complaint పెట్టుకొని దానిని విచారించేవారు లేరు. ఆతనికి
ఈనాటికి ఇల్లు లేదు. పాక లేకుండా ఉన్నాడనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము, ప్రజలు
ఇక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి మిత్రులు గ్రహించినట్లయితే పరిస్థితులు అర్థమౌతుంది. ఈ
పరిపాలనా యంత్రము ఎవరికిగాను ఏ విధముగా పనిచేస్తున్నది ఎందుచేత ఒక మీద
వాడు నాలుగు సంవత్సరములుగా ప్రభుత్వమే అనుమతి ఇవ్వగా వేసుకొన్న ఆతని
పాకాను ఏ ప్రభుత్వపు ఉత్తరపు లేకనే పీకేవేయగా ఇచ్చినటువంటి complaint మీద
పోలీసులు ఈనాటికి విచారణ జరపకుండా ఉండేందుకు కారణమేమిటి అని చూచి
నట్లయితే పరిపాలనా యంత్రము ఈనాడు భూస్వాములచేతులలోను, పలుకుబడి
ఉన్నటువంటివారియొక్క పెద్దపెద్దవారియొక్క చేతులలోను నడుచుచున్నట్లు
కన్పిస్తున్నది. కనుక పరిపాలనలోని లోపములు తొలగవలసినట్లు ఈ యంత్రాన్ని
చక్కదిద్దవలసియుంటుంది. దీనిని ఎట్లాగా చక్కదిద్దడమనే ప్రశ్న వేసినట్లయితే
దీనికి మార్గాలు అనేకమున్నవి. బ్రిటిష్వార్లు వారి కాలములో బ్రిటిష్ వ్యతిరేక
దృష్టాన్ని నాశనం చేయడానికి ఏ రకమైన పరిపాలనా యంత్రాన్ని ఏర్పాటు చేసి
దాన్ని హద్దులలో పెట్టి నడిపించారో, అదేవిధంగా ఈనాడు ఈ పరిపాలనా
యంత్రాన్ని నడిపిస్తున్నారు. కనుక అదే పంథాన నడుస్తున్న యంత్రమే ఈ
లోపాలకు కారణమని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఇదే మనము దీనివల్ల నేర్చుకొనవలసి
యున్నది. కనుక ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రములో మార్పు తీసుకురావలసిని అవసర
మును గుర్తించవలసియున్నది అందుచేత ఇప్పుడు ఉన్నటువంటి ఈ పరిపాలనా
యంత్రాన్ని మొత్తంగా overhaul చేయాలి అన్నది గుర్తించి ఈ విషయాన్ని
సమగ్రంగా పరిశీలించేందుకు ఒక కమిటీని చేయడం అత్యవసరమైనదని మనము గమ
నించవలసియున్నది. అయితే ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఈ ఆధిపత్యమున్నదా అని
ప్రశ్నించినా, వారికి లేదు అనే నా ఆధిపత్యము. ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క ఆధిపత్యం
ప్రశ్నల సమయములో ఒక ప్రశ్నకు ఇచ్చినటువంటి సమాధానము, బట్టి వ్యక్తమగు
చున్నది. ఎందుకనగా వారి information కై నాగాని రిపోర్టులకై నాగాని వారి ఆధి
కారులు ఇచ్చినటువంటి information reports వైననే, వారి version వైననే
ఆధారపడుతున్నారు. కనుక ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాన్ని మార్పు చేయాలనే ఈ
ప్రభుత్వానికి లేదనే చెప్పవలసియున్నది. కాబట్టి ఇప్పుడున్న పరిస్థితులను బట్టి
చూచినట్లయితే దీనిని నెలెత్తు కమిటీకి నేసి నెలెత్తు కమిటీయొక్క ఆధిపత్యాన్ని
మనము అంగీకరించవలసినటువంటి అవసరమున్నది. ఇక పోతే ఒక విషయము
భూతము ప్రభుత్వమునకు జ్ఞాపకంచేయాలి. గత నాలుగు సంవత్సరముల పరి
పాలనా కాలములో ప్రజలయొక్క ఆధిపత్యానికి వ్యతిరేకంగా పోలీసులు ప్రజల
మీద జరిపినటువంటి చర్యలు, దాడులు తలచుకొన్నట్లయితే పరిపాలనా యంత్రము ఏ

1 p.m.

[6th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

విధానములో నడుస్తున్నదనే విషయము స్పష్టముగా బోధపడుతుంది. ఇటువంటి
పరిపాలన ఈనాడుకూడ జరుగుతున్నది అనే విషయాన్ని ప్రధాన మంత్రి దృష్టికి తీసు
కొనిరావలసియున్నది. అనాడు కొందరు భూస్వాములకొరకు గ్రామాలమీద, మీదవాడి
మీద దాడులు జరిపినందున ప్రభుత్వము ఏ విధముగా పతనమైందో అటువంటి పరిపాలన
కూడ పతనము కాక తప్పదు. గత పది రోజుల క్రితము అనంతపురములో జరుగు
చున్నటువంటి పరిస్థితులుగురించి ప్రభుత్వం చాలా జాగ్రత్తగా ఆలోచించి తగినటువంటి
రూపము పొందవలసిన కొరుతున్నాను. అక్కడ భూస్వాములు పోలీసులను బాప్పించి
నాదాపు 52 మంది సామాన్యమైనటువంటి రైతు కూలీలను అన్యాయముగా అరెస్టు
చేయించి ఈనాడు వీరిని వివిధ కేసులలో ఇరికించారు అనే విషయాన్ని
ప్రధాన మంత్రికి జ్ఞాపకంచేస్తున్నాను. అన్యాయంగా భూస్వాముల రక్ష
ణకుగాను వారి అన్యాయాన్ని రక్షించడానికిగాను ఇటువంటి చర్యలవల్ల,
ఇటువంటి కేసులవల్ల గత ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఏ గతి వచ్చినది అనేటటువంటి
విషయము మనము జ్ఞాపకంపెట్టుకొన్నట్లయితే ఈనాడు జరుగుతున్నటువంటి
ఈ అన్యాయాలను ప్రభుత్వము జాగ్రత్తగా పునఃపరిశీలనచేసి ప్రజలకు ఈనాడు
ప్రభుత్వం యంత్రముమీద కొంత నమ్మకము కలుగజేయవలసిన అవసరము ఎంతైనా
ఉన్నదని ప్రధాన మంత్రి దృష్టికి తెస్తున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భములో మరొక ఉదాహర
ణమును తెలుపుచున్నాను. కల్యాణదుర్గము తాలూకాలోని బెస్సరపల్లి గ్రామములో
సామాన్యమైనటువంటి రైతుకూలీలకు బంజరు భూమిని ప్రభుత్వము కొద్ది సంతకరముల
పోరాటము తరువాత ఇచ్చినది. భూస్వాములు ఆ కూలీలతో పేదలువేసుకొని ఆ
భూమిలోనుంచి వారిని ఆకుగాని, విడిగాని తీసుకొనిపోతూ, వారికి చెందకుండా
భూస్వాములు వారిమీద దాడిచేయడము, ఆ తరువాత వారితో పేదలు పెట్టుకొని
కొట్లాడి కేసులుపెట్టిన ఫలితంగా ఈనాడు వారు జైల్లో ఉండడం సంభవించింది.
దీనినిబట్టి భూస్వాముల రక్షణకే ప్రభుత్వము అన్ని విధాల తోడ్పడుతున్నదని, నేడ
వారి complaints అవి ఎంత వ్యాయమైనప్పటికీని, ధర్మమైనప్పటికీని, వాటిని విచా
రించే దృష్టి లేదని స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. అందుకనే ఈనాడు ప్రభుత్వముమీద ఈ పరి
పాలనమీద ప్రజలకు అసూయ, అపనమ్మకము ప్రబలిందనే విషయాన్ని వారి దృష్టికి
తెస్తున్నాను. అదేవిధముగా ఒక మంగలివాని విషయము తెలుపుచున్నాను. నడిమి
దొడ్డి గ్రామంలో ఒక మంగలివాడు అతనికి వంశపారంపర్యంగా ఉన్నటువంటి భూమిని
ఒక భూస్వామి పేదపెట్టుకొని దానిని కాజేసుకొన్నప్పుడు ఆ మంగలివానికి పోలీసులు
రక్షణ ఇవ్వడానికి బదులు, ఆ భూస్వామినే support చేసి అతనికి ఏమి చిక్కు
లేకుండా ఆ చాకలివానినేపోలీసు ఇన్స్పెక్టరు తదితరులు అరెస్టుచేసి జైల్లో పెట్ట
డము జరిగిందనే విషయము చాలా విచారముగా ఉన్నది. ఈ పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి
చూచినట్లయితే, ఈ లోపములన్ని తొలగవలసినట్లు ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వముమీద, పరి
పాలనమీద నమ్మకము కలుగజేయవలసినట్లు, ప్రస్తుత పరిపాలనా యంత్రాన్ని మార్చ
వలసిన అవసరమున్నది. గనుక ఈ విషయాన్ని సమగ్రంగా ఆలోచించి చర్చించే
దుకు ఒక పెరెట్టు కమిటీని నియమించడం మనము అంగీకరించవలసిన కొరు
తున్నాను.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“గత నాలుగైదు సంవత్సరములుగా కోసాగుతున్న పరిపాలనా విధానం ప్రతిపాదన
సామ్రాజ్యవాదుల పరిపాలనా విధానంకన్న అభ్యాసంగావుంది. అనాటి శాసనసభ
కాలము ఇది ప్రభుత్వము, ప్రజాధి పతామగుణంగా మనం పరిపాలించాలి అని”

1-10

p.m.

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [6th November 1952]

అనుకూలమైనది. అనేక విధాల ప్రజలను ఇబ్బందుల పాలుచేసి నిరంకుశంగా, దమన స్థితి సాధనంగా ఉపయోగించుకొని వారు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని నిర్వహించిన ఫలితాలే గత ఎన్నికల ఫలితాలు. పరిపాలనా యంత్రం కరడుగట్టిన సామ్రాజ్యవాద యంత్రంలా ఉంది. బీదవాడిగోడు అంకించేవారే కప్పించటంలేదు. ప్రజాసామాన్యం ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రం ఆడకత్తెరలాపడి నలిగిపోతున్నారు. పాత పద్ధతులు, పాత విధానాలు కట్టుకుని ప్రాకులాడతామని చెప్పినందువల్ల ఏమీ ప్రయోజనంలేదు. వేళకాల పాత్రాను గుణంగా ప్రజాసామాన్యానికి వెనుకబాటు కల్పించేదిగానే ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాన్ని వునర్పించాలి. ఈనాడు చెనా సీథిగతులు చూడండి. బహుశ మన ప్రధానామాత్యులకు చెనాచేరు వినిపించగానే కంపం ఎత్తవచ్చు. నాలుగైదు సంవత్సరాల క్రితం చెనాదేశీయుల స్థితిగతులు ఏమిటి? ఈనాటి పరిస్థితులేమిటి అని పార్లమెంట్ సీథిగతులను తెలుసుకొన ప్రయత్నం చేయండి. పరిపాలనా యంత్రం ఆదేశంలూ ఎలా వునర్పిస్తున్నాయి? తెలుసుకోండి. ప్రజాసీతంతో ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా యంత్రానికి సన్నిహిత సంబంధాలు ఉన్ననాడే దానిని ప్రజా ప్రభుత్వం అని పిలవాలి. ప్రజలను చీటికిమాటికి పీడించుకునే పరిపాలనా యంత్రం ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలకు విరుద్ధం. ప్రభుత్వ విధానాలు ప్రజాభిమతానుగుణంగా వుండాలి. సామాన్యుల జీవన ప్రమాణాన్ని పెంచేదిగా అవి రూపొందించబడాలి. ఈనాడు ఎవరైనా ప్రభుత్వానికి అర్జీలు తెచ్చుకొంటే దానికి సమాధానం రావడమే గతమే పోతోంది. ప్రజలు నిరేదింతుకొనే విషయాలను గురించి సమగ్రంగాను, సక్రమంగాను విచారించే పరిపాలన యంత్రం కావాలి. ఈనాడు చూడండి. జిల్లా పరిపాలన ఆ ప్రాంతీయభాష తెలియని అధికారుల హస్త గతమైఉంది. ఏ నేలంజిల్లా కాస్త్రప్రభుత్వం ఆనంతపురంజిల్లావంటి ప్రాంతంలో నియమించారనకోండి. ఆ అధికారికి ప్రజలు విన్నవించుకొనే విషయాలు తెలియవు. ఇతరులెవరో ఆయనకా విషయాలు బోధపరచాలి. ప్రజలతో సన్నిహితసంబంధ మేర్పరచుకొని వారి కష్టసుఖాలను తెలుసుకొనే అవకాశం అతనికుండదు. ప్రజలకు, అధికారులకు సన్నిహిత సంబంధాలు ఏర్పడవు. ఉద్యోగులు ప్రజల అంతుకాటులూ ఉండవు. ఇట్టి పరిపాలనా విధానం ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతానికి పూర్తిగా విరుద్ధం. ప్రజాస్వభావంలోనే పరిపాలన జరగాలి. అనాడే ప్రజాస్వామికానికి పూర్ణత సిద్ధిస్తుంది. సాధ్యమైనంతవరకు అన్య ప్రాంతీయులను నియమించే వ్యతిరేక ఆచరణనుంచి తప్పించాలి. పరిపాలన సాక్ష్యముగా ఉండాలి అంటే ఆయా ప్రాంతీయులనే ఆయా ప్రదేశాలలో నియమించాలి. ఈ విధానాన్ని అవలంబించక పోవుటవల్లనే ప్రభుత్వం నానాటికీ ప్రజలనుంచి దూరమైపోతోంది. ఇకముందైనా రాజకీయాలాచారిగారు ఈ విషయమే చూ సలవాలను పాటిస్తారని ఆశిస్తాను.

“ఇక ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క స్థైర్యత గురించి మంచిచేస్తాను. నాకంటే ముందు మాట్లాడిన శ్రీ వేమారెడ్డిగారు పలువురు కార్మికుల సభ్యులు ఈ ప్రభుత్వం Stable Government అని చెబుతున్నారు. స్థైర్యం గలదేమంటే వారి నిర్వహణమేమోనాకు తెలియదు గాని, నా అభిప్రాయాన్ని మాత్రం తెలియజేస్తాను. అసెంబ్లీలో ఏదో విధంగాసంఖ్యాబలాన్ని సాధించుకొని యీ ప్రభుత్వం Stable Government అని చెప్పుకోవడంవల్ల ప్రయోజనంలేదు. ఏ ప్రభుత్వమేలే తమ విధానాలవల్ల ప్రజల మన్ననలను పొందగలుగుతుంటే అదే స్థిరమైన ప్రభుత్వం. ప్రజా విశ్వాసాన్ని కోల్పోయిన ప్రభుత్వం కాసనసభలలో ఎంత సంఖ్యాబలాన్ని సమకూర్చుకోగలిగినప్పటికీ దానిని Stable Government అని పిలవడంలే ఆర్థంలేదు. ఈ విషయమై కొంత భావనలూ చూడండి. గత కార్మికుల ప్రభుత్వానికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వానికి కన్నా హామ్య

[6th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

సంఖ్యాబలమే ఉండినది. అయితే ఎన్నికలలో అనాటి మంత్రులు ఒక్కొక్కరే ప్రజల చేత ఓడింబున్నారు. దీనికి కారణం ఏమిటి? అందుకు వారే కారకులు. వారు అనుసరించిన విధానాలు అమలుపరచిన దమనస్థితి ఫలితమే ఆ ఓటములు. ముఖ్యంగా ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్ లో వారు అనుసరించిన విధానాలు ఎంతో లోపభూయిష్టమైనవి ప్రజలను వారు నానా పీంసలపాలు చేశారు. దేశస్థంతా రాజకీయ కక్షలతో నింపివేశారు. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాన్ని దళనస్థితి సాధనగా చేసుకున్నారు. అందువల్లనే ఎంత సంఖ్యాబలం కలిగిఉన్నదైనప్పటికీ తరఫుమైపోయింది. ఈ ప్రభుత్వంకూడా వెనుకటి ప్రభుత్వంవలె ప్రకర్తించరాదు. ప్రజావిశ్వాసాన్ని చూరగొనే విధానాలే దాని స్థిరతకు హేతువు లౌతాయి. ఇది Stable Government అంటే. జిల్లాలలోని ప్రభుత్వ శాఖల కార్యకలాపాలు చాలా లోపభూయిష్టంగా ఉన్నాయి. బీద ప్రజలకు గాక పెద్ద భూస్వాములకీ ఉపకరించేదిగా ప్రభుత్వ కార్యాలయాలు మారిపోతున్నాయి. పరిపాలనా సాక్ష్యమం దెబ్బతింటున్నది. ఈ విషయమై తీర్మాన ప్రతిపాదకులు, శ్రీ కొండయ్యగారు విభులంగా వివరించారు. కనుక ఆ వివరాల గురించే ఆట్టే తలచుకోవాలను. ముఖ్యంగా వివిధ ప్రభుత్వ శాఖలలోని లోపాలను సవరించు నిమిత్తం ఒక నెలకుకమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయవలసినదిగా ఆయన కోరిన కోరిక అతి సమంజసమైనది. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రంలో లోపాలు తొలగిపోవాలంటే అట్టి నెలకు కమిటీ అత్యవసరం, ముఖ్యంగా ఉద్యోగస్తుల స్థితి గతులు అభివృద్ధిపరచాలి. చిన్న ఉద్యోగస్తుల జీతాలు పెంచాలి. పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తుల జీతాలు తగ్గించాలి. 198 మంది పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తుల జీతాలకుగాను ఈ ప్రభుత్వం నెలకు చూడు లక్షలు ఖర్చుచేయడం విచారకరం. మన దేశం బీద దేశమని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు అంటున్నారు. కాని బహుశామైన తలకుమించిన ఖర్చుచేసే పాలక యంత్రాన్ని చేతులతో పెట్టుకొని కన్నులు వేయడానికి తయారవుతున్నారు. క్రింది ఉద్యోగులకు సరియైన జీతం లేకపోవుటవల్ల పరిపాలనా సాక్ష్యమం దెబ్బతింటుంది లంచగొండితనం పెరిగిపోతుంది. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రానికి ఈ క్రింది ఉద్యోగులే మూలాధారం. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాన్ని వునర్పించే విషయమై ప్రభుత్వ శ్రద్ధలీనుకోవాలి. ప్రజకు—ప్రభుత్వానికి సన్నిహిత సంబంధాలు ఏర్పడునట్లు చూడాలి. ప్రతిపక్షసభ్యులు కోరినట్టిదని భావించక ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించాలి. మంచి ప్రజాభావం కలిగి కాబట్టే ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని నేను హృదయపూర్వకంగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

*SRI K. RAMAIAH CHOUDARY :—“ఉపాధ్యక్ష, ఈ తీర్మానమును యీ రోజున ప్రతిపాదించడములో ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్య మేమనగా, ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనలో అవి స్థితి, లంచగొండితనము అవస్థాపరంగా జరుగుచున్నందున, యివన్నియు నిర్మూలించుటకు ఒక Select Committee నివేసి, ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన సక్రమముగా జరగ గలందులకే. కాని ఈ Select Committee ని నిర్ణయించడములో ప్రభుత్వము ఒప్పు కుంటుందా లేదా అనేసంగతి తేల్చడానికి ముఖ్యంగా ఈ రోజు ముందుగా ఎత్తుకుంటున్నాము. ఈ Select Committee ప్రజాసానుభూతిపైన general elections లో గెలుపొందినవారుగనున్నా, ప్రజాసూరాంగలవారుగనున్నా, సమర్థులని తేరు బడసినవారుగనున్నా, నిష్పక్షపాత బుద్ధిగలవారుగనున్నా, చేర్చివేయించినందులకే, ఈ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన చక్కదిద్దటానికి అర్హులని నేను వ్యవహిత్యముతో చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ కమిటీని వేళేటప్పుడు ఎక్కువ నిష్పక్షపాత బుద్ధితోను, ప్రభుత్వ విధానంలోని లోటుకాట్లు సరిదిద్దవలసిన దానిని వేస్తే మంచిది అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. వీలనగా వార్షిక బలం కోసం ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఏర్పాటు చేశారేగాని, నిష్పక్షపాతంగా ప్రభుత్వం పరిపాలన సరిగా జరిగేటందుకు ఏర్పడకందున నేను అట్లు చెప్పవలసివచ్చింది. ఈ నాడు

[Sri K. Ramaiah Choudary] [6th November 1952]

ఈ మంత్రులు ప్రభుత్వం పరిపాలన సరిగా పరిశీలించుతారు అనేది లేకపోగా, ప్రజా పరిపాలన అని చెప్పుకొనే మంత్రుల ప్రభుత్వము యంతవరకు ఎట్లున్నదో కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ విషయాన్ని గురించి నేను ఒక విషయము చెప్పుచున్నాను. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి హయాంలో ఉన్న ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన—Government administration ఎక్కువ వాగుచున్నందున ఆశించాము అదేమీ ఉన్నట్లు కనబడటంలేదు. వారు ప్రభుత్వపరిపాలనలో ఒక ఎన్నో అనుసరించి పరిపాలన జరుపుచున్నారు. ఇదియును గాక వారి ఉపన్యాసాలలో ఆంధ్రులకు మద్రాసు నగరంమీద హక్కులేదని అన్నారు. మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము ఒక అరవలకోసమే జరుపుతున్నట్లును, ఆంధ్రులకు ఏమీ చోటులేకట్లుగా ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన జరుపుటలో వారు ఆ విధంగా అనుసరించుచున్నారని చెప్పక తప్పదు. అట్లు వారు చెప్పడములో ఒక విషయము వారికి తెలియజెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ మద్రాసు నగరములో అరవలు, ఆంధ్రులు, కన్నడులు, మళయాళీలు, ముంకా యితర జాతులువారు నివసించుచున్నారు. వారు చెప్పినట్లు యిది ఒక అరవలవల్లనే విరృద్ధిపొందాడు. ఇంకను వారు అరవల కొరకే ముఖ్యమంత్రిగా ఉన్నట్లు అరవలకు తెలియజెప్పుచున్నారు. ఈ రోజు ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రము విషయములో శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మద్రాసును గురించి చెప్పుచు మద్రాసులో ఆంధ్రులు నూటికి పదహారుమంది మాత్రమే నివసించుచున్నారని చెప్పుచున్నారు. నిజంగా వారిలోకాటు యిక్కడ ఉండిన సభ్యులకు నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా చెప్పుచున్నదికాదు. వారి ఉపన్యాసము ప్రతికలలో చదివినదే. మద్రాసులో ఆంధ్రులు నూటికి 16 మంది మాత్రమే నివసించు చున్నారని . . .

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to encourage such an assertion. At any rate I violently protest against this allegation. I represent the Andhras, as much as any other Hon. Member does.”

SRI K. RAMAIAH CHOUDARY:—“ ఈ లీర్నానమును గురించి మాట్లాడుచున్నాను. ఈ లీర్నానము యొక్క ముఖ్య ఉద్దేశ్యాన్ని గురించిన్నీ యింకా లేబడినటువంటి లీర్నానములగురించి మాట్లాడదలచినాను. Select Committee నిర్ణయమే ఈ లీర్నానము యొక్క ముఖ్య ఉద్దేశ్యము. మద్రాసు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన విధానము సరిదిద్దటందుకు ఈ ఎనెట్టి సభ్యులతో నూడిన ఒక Select Committee ని వేయమని దాని భావం. అప్పటికి కాని ఈ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనలోని లోటుపాట్లు చక్కబడవు. ఉదాహరణకు, ఈ లంచగొండితనము విషయములో మన Land Revenue మినిష్టరుగారిని ఒక విషయము గమనించమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒక గ్రామములో గ్రామ కరణములు మొదలగువారికి Revenue department వారికి అవినా భావ సంబంధాలు ఉన్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన సరైనదాగా జరుగుతుంటే, ఆ department ఉపయోగపడుతుంది. ఈ విషయము పరిశీలించుటకు ఒక Select Committee ని వేసినయెడల దాని సంగతి తేలుతుంది. కృష్ణా-తెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టు విషయములో శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఎక్కువ జోక్యము కలిగించుకొని కృష్ణా-తెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టు అవసరమిస్తే, నందికొండ ప్రాజెక్టు యింకా పూర్తి పరిశీలన కాలేదని Planning Commission లో తన ఉద్దేశ్యము వివరించుటకు వెళ్తున్నాడు. అంటే ఆంధ్రులు రాయలసీమ ప్రాంతమువారు నందికొండ ప్రాజెక్టుపైనే వాగుచు పోతారు అందువల్ల ముందుగా మన దక్షిణ ప్రాంతము వాగుచేసుకొనవలెనని ఉద్దేశ్యముతో కృష్ణా తెన్నారు ప్రాజెక్టు ముందు అవసరమని చెప్పుచున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. ఆంధ్రుల దుఃఖ వారు ఎంత దయ చూపుతున్నారో ఈ విషయములో జోధపడుతున్నది. ఆంధ్ర

[6th November 1952] [Sri K. Ramaiah Choudary]

దేశములోనూడ అరవలారిని పెద్ద ప్రద్యోగస్థులను వేయటంలో అరవల విమిటో, వీరి యొక్క నిష్పక్షపాతబుద్ధి వాగా బయటపడుతున్నది. ఇందువలననే ఒక నెలకు కమిటీని వేయటం అవసరమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ కమిటీని వేస్తేనేగాని, ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారి వర్కలు వియబడవు. ఇంకొకవిషయము నూడండి. ఇప్పుడు కంట్రాక్టు విషయములో వున్న లోటుపాట్లను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. కంట్రాటు లేకుంటేనూడా బియ్యము ధరలు విపరీతముగా పెరిగి ప్రజలకు అందుబాటులో లేవని ప్రజలు ఆందోళన చేస్తూయంటే, బియ్యము ధరలు అంత విపరీతముగా పెరగలేదు. ప్రజలే మంచి రకము బియ్యముకొరకు మంచి రేటును తెట్టుకున్నారని తెలిపిచ్చారు, శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు. ప్రజలకు కొనుగోలు శక్తి ఉన్నదా, లేదా, ధరలు విపరీతముగా పెరుగుటకు కారణములు పరిశీలించుటకు ఒదులు ప్రజలపైన విసిరారు. కరువు కాటకాలకు గురిఅయి ప్రజలు కొనుగోలు శక్తి పడిపోయి పూట పస్తులతో బాధలు అనుభవిస్తున్నారు, నేడు ప్రజలు, అట్లాగే వేరూ రెడ్డిగారు చెప్పినట్లు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనావ్యవస్థ administration పాగిపోతున్నదంటే యంతవరకూ క్రింది ఉద్యోగస్థులలో బాధ్యత లేనివారినివేసి, పై ఉద్యోగస్థులలో తెలివి లేకుండావారిని వేసి తప్పించుకొనేందుకు ప్రయత్నముచేస్తున్నారు. నిజంగా రెండు మూడు రోజుల నుండి యిక్కడ శాసన సభలో వర్కలు జరుగుతుండంటే, అడిగిన ప్రశ్నలకు నోటీసు కావాలని చెప్పుతూ తప్పుకుంటున్నారే కాని, వీరు ప్రజలకు ఏమైనా సహాయం చేస్తారనే విషయం కనబడడంలేదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ రెవెన్యూ మినిష్టరుగారు ప్రతిదానికి నోటీసు కావాలని చెప్పి తప్పుకొంటున్నారు. ఈ రోజులలో మంత్రులు ప్రజల కష్టములను స్వయముగా కనుక్కొని వాటిని నీటికి నివారించేందుకు ప్రయత్నించడం లేదు.

“ ఇక ఇంజనీరింగు డిపార్టుమెంటు విషయమునూడగా విద్యా ప్రభుత్వము తల పెట్టితే, ఈ యింజనీర్లుగాని, సూపర్ వైజర్లుగాని ఎన్నిమేట్లు, ప్లానులు తయారు చేయటంలో నూరు రూపాయలు లంచము యిస్తే వెయ్యి రూపాయలకు ఎన్నిమేట్లు యిచ్చేది, రెండు వందలయిస్తే రెండువేల రూపాయలకు, మూడు వందల యిస్తే మూడువేల రూపాయలకు, యీవిధంగా ఎన్ని వందలయిస్తే అన్నివేలకు ఎన్నిమేట్లు తయారుచేసి ప్రపోజలుపంపి గవర్నమెంటుచేత ఈ ఇంజనీర్లు శాంక్స్ చేయించుచున్నారు. ఇదంతయు లంచగొండితనముక్రింద రాదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ రోజున P. W. Department వారుగూడా మామూళ్లు జాస్తేగా వుచ్చుకొని ప్రజలను అవస్థలు పెట్టుచున్నారు. లంచములు యివ్వకపోతే పనులు జరపడములేదు. లంచములు యివ్వగల ధనికులకు పనులు జరుగుచున్నవి. బీదవారికి అట్లా జరుగుటలేదు. ఈ విషయము ముఖ్యమంత్రి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి దృష్టికిగూడా వచ్చియుండినది. వారుగూడా ఈ విషయము యొక్క నిజానిజములు తెలుసుకొని ఉప్పుకున్నారు. ఈ విషయములలో ప్రభుత్వమువారు తగినవర్య ఆయా ఉద్యోగస్థులమీద అప్పటి కప్పుడు తీసుకొన్నట్లయితే, యీ రాష్ట్రములో లంచగొండితనము యింతగా ప్రబలము కానేరదు. మా జిల్లాలో ముగిలివెస్తే అనే గ్రామములో ఆ వెరువుక్రింద నూరు ఎకరములు భూమి ఉన్నది. ఆ వెరువు తూము తీయతనే నీళ్లు కారిపోతున్నాయని ప్రజలు అంటే, అదికాని పోవులేదు. అట్లు కొద్దిగా కారిపోయిన నీటిని అరేపాకెం తెరువుకు సప్లయి ఛానల్ తీసినామని జవాబు. కాని చివరకు ఆ వెరువుకు యీ సప్లయి ఛానల్ లేకుండాపోయింది. ఈ విధంగా ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగస్థులు లంచములు తీసుకొనుటకుగూడా ప్రజలకు ఎద్దిధమైనటువంటి పనులు జరుగకుండా అడ్డుపెట్టుతూ కనుక్కొనే దిక్కులేకుండా ప్రవర్తించడంవల్ల ప్రజలు అనేక కష్టాలకు గురియగుచున్నారు.

[Sri K. Ramaiah Choudary] [6th November 1952]

1-20
p.m.

“ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఈ రోజు loans Tahsildars సూటికి 30 రూపాయల
వంతున లంచాలు తీసుకొని loans కాంక్ష చేస్తారని ప్రజలు ఆందోళన చేస్తున్నారు.
ఈ విషయాలలో ఆర్టికల్ పెట్టుకొన్న మరల అదే ఆఫీస్లో ఈ ఆర్టికల్ విచారిస్తారు.
కాబట్టి ప్రజలకు మీల కలిగే మార్గము ఉండదు. ఈ తాసిల్దార్లుగూడ ఎటువంటి
రంటే ముందు ఇదేమంది లంచాలు తీసుకొని సుప్రీమ్ కోర్టువరకు పోయి తప్పించు
కొని వచ్చినట్లువంటివారు. వారినే ఈనాడు loans Tahsildars గా చేస్తున్నారంటే,
వారు ముందుమందినే ప్రవరిస్తారు. ఈ ఆక్రమాలనుగూరించి ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఎన్నో
పిటీషన్లు వచ్చినవి. మంత్రివర్గము కలెక్టర్లవద్దకు ఆర్టికల్ గూడా వచ్చినవి. అనేక
పిటీషన్లు కలెక్టరుకుగూడ పెట్టుకొన్నారు. అవి విచారణకు వచ్చేటప్పటికి ఆఫీసులు
వైచారివద్దకు పోయి డబ్బు ఖర్చుచేసుకొని విరోధముగా సంచేసుకొంటారు. మరల
ఆ పిటీషన్లపై విమి జరిగదు. ఈ విషయములన్ని గమనించినట్లయితే పరిపాలనా
యంత్రము ఎటువంటి అవకాశకలలో పనిచేస్తున్నదో స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. కనుక ఈ
పరిపాలనా విధానంలో, ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రములో మార్పురావలసిన అవసరము
ఎంతో ఉన్నది. తగినమార్పు వచ్చినప్పుడే ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వమునైన, పరిపాలననైన
సమ్మతము కలుగగలదు. అందువలన నేను ఈ తీర్మానమును బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

*SRI V. MUTHU :—“உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! எதிர்க்கட்சி
அங்கத்தினரால் சட்டசபை முன்பாகக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கும் பொறுத்
துக் கமிட்டி ஒன்றை நியமித்து சர்க்காரின் நடவடிக்கைகளைப் பரிசீலிக்க
வேண்டுமென்ற தீர்மானத்தை நான் எதிர்த்துச் சில வார்த்தைகள்
சொல்லப் பிரியப்படுகிறேன்.

“இந்த தீர்மானத்தின்படி பொறுத்துக் கமிட்டியை நியமிப்பதால்
எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் ஏற்படாது என்பதுதான் என்னுடைய
எண்ணம். குறிப்பாக ஒன்றைச் சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன். எதிர்க்கட்சி
அங்கத்தினர்கள் வெளியில் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியைக் குற்றம் சாட்டி பிர
சாரம் செய்து கொண்டேயிருந்தார்கள். சர்க்கார் நிர்வாகத்தை திறம்பட
நடத்துவதற்காகவும், குற்றங்களுகளை வெறுடன் களைவதற்காகவும்தான்
அதிர்ஷ்டவசமாக நமது ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த இராஜ்ஜியத்தின்
முதல் மந்திரிப் பதவியை ஒப்புக் கொள்ள இணங்கினார். அவர்கள் பதவியை
ஒப்புக் கொண்ட அன்றைய தினமே சர்க்கார் இலாக்காக்களில் இருந்த
பல குறைபாடுகள் நீங்கி விட்டதென்றே சொல்லலாம். காரணம் என்ன?
தான் பதவியை ஒப்புக்கொண்டு சர்க்காரை திறம்பட நடத்தவேண்டு
மென்றால் சட்டசபை மெம்பர்கள் யாரும் அதிகாரிகளை நெருங்கக்
கூடாது என்று முதன்முதலிலேயே சொல்லிவிட்டார். அவர் அம்மாதிரி
சொல்லியதைக் கேட்டவுடன் பெரிய பெரிய அதிகாரிகள் எல்லாம்
நடுங்கிப் போய் ராஜாஜி ஆட்சியில் அக்கிரமங்கள் எதுவும் செய்ய முடியாது
என்பதை உணர்ந்து கொண்டு விட்டார்கள். அப்படியிருக்க இன்றைய
தினம் ராஜாஜியின் ஆட்சியில் ஏதோ பெரிய குற்றங்கள் இருப்பது
போலவும், நிர்வாகம் திறம்பட நடக்கவில்லைபோலும் பேசி இதைப் பரிசீலனை
செய்ய ஒரு பொறுத்துக் கமிட்டியை நியமிக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்வதைக்
கேட்டு நான் மிகவும் ஆச்சரியமடைகிறேன். அவர்களுடைய ஆட்சி திறம்பட
நடக்குமா, அவர்களுடைய ஆட்சியில் மக்களுக்கு நன்மை உண்டாகுமா
என்பதைப் பற்றி யாரும் கவலைப்படவில்லை. நிச்சயமாக எல்லாம் உண்டாகும்
என்பதை சென்ற மந்திரி சபையில் அவர் அரசாங்கத்தை திறம்பட
நடத்தியதிலிருந்தே மக்கள் உணர்ந்து கொண்டு விட்டார்கள். அப்படி
யிருக்க இப்பொழுது ஒரு பொறுத்துக் கமிட்டியை அமைக்கவேண்டு
மென்று சொல்வது, அவர்களுடைய நிர்வாகத்தை திறம்பட, செம்மை
யாக நடக்கவிடாமல் தடை செய்வதற்காகவேதான் என்று நான்
நினைக்கிறேன். நம் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும்: எதிர்க்கட்சியிலுள்ள
அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொன்ன பிரகாரம் ஆங்கில ஆட்சியிலிருந்த அதிகார
வர்க்கத்தினரேதான் இன்றைக்கும் பதவியில் இருக்கிறார்கள். அ.

[Sri V. Muthu] 6th November 1952]

ஒரு வகையில் உண்மைதான். ஆனால் அதிகார வர்க்கத்தின் போக்கு
ராஜாஜி மந்திரி பதவியை வகிக்கப் போகிறார் என்று தெரிந்து மறு
நாளே பெரும்பாலும் மாறிவிட்டது என்பதையாரும் மறுக்க முடியாது.
அதிகாரிகளை அங்கத்தினர்கள் நெருங்கக் கூடாது என்று சொன்ன
உடனே நிர்வாகத் தர்கள் தங்கள் மனப்பான்மையை மாற்றிக் கொள்ளா
விட்டால் ராஜாஜி ஆட்சியில் இருக்கமுடியாது என்பதை உணர்ந்து
விட்டார்கள். அப்படியே இப்பொழுது வெகு சுறுசுறுப்பாகவும், ஜக்கிரதை
யாகவும் நடந்து கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும்
தெளிவாகத் தெரிகிறது.”

DEPUTY SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member may continue
his speech after lunch. I now adjourn the House for lunch
till 3 p.m.”

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

*SRI V. MUTHU :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, காலை யில் இந்தத்
தீர்மானத்தைப்பற்றி சில நேரம் பேசிவிட்டு மறுபடியும் இது விஷயமாக
சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல பிரியப்படுகின்றேன்.

“இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நான் எதிர்த்துப் பேசும்போது ‘நிர்வாகத்தில்
எந்த விதமான குறைபாடுகளும் இல்லை; அதனால் அதை எடுத்துச் சொல்
வதற்கு ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பம் கூடாது’ என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை.

“குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கலாம். அதை எடுத்துச் சொல்வதற்கு நாம்
சட்டசபையில் கூடுகின்றோம். எந்தத் தீர்மானம் வந்தபோதிலும் நன்றாக
விவாதிப்பதற்குச் சந்தர்ப்பங்கள் கிடைக்கின்றன. அந்த சமயத்தில்
நம்முடைய அபிப்பிராயங்களை எடுத்துச் சொல்லுகின்றோம். ஒவ்வொரு
வருக்கும் சுதந்திரம் உண்டு. அபிப்பிராயத்தை எடுத்துச் சொல்லும்போது
மந்திரி அவர்கள் நன்றாக யோசித்து அந்த யோசனையை எவ்வளவு
தூரம் கையாள முடியுமென்று பார்த்துத்தான் பதில் சொல்லுகின்றார்கள்.
ஆனால், இந்த நிர்வாகப் பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டதிலிருந்து
மந்திரிகளோ அல்லது மற்ற மேலான அதிகாரிகளோ ஏதாவது தவறுகள்
செய்திருப்பார்களானால், அவ்வப்போது ஒவ்வொரு அங்கத்தினரும் எடுத்துச்
சொல்லுகின்றோம். எழுத்து மூலமாகவும் சொல்லுகின்றோம். அத்தனைக்கும்
பரிகாரங்கள் தேடிக்கொடுக்கப்படுகின்றன. முடியாதது விடப்படுகின்றன.
சிலர் கேட்கின்றார்கள், ‘இதை ஏன் செய்யவில்லை, அதை ஏன் செய்ய
வில்லை?’ என்று. சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் எடுத்துச் செல்லும்போது, மந்திரி
அவர்கள் ‘முடியாத காரியம்’ என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள்.

“சட்ட வரம்பிற்குள் காரியங்களைப் புறக்கணித்து நடத்தும் அதிகாரி
களின் மீது தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுகின்றன. அனேகம் பேர்கள்
விலக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்களென்பதும் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்.

“சில சமயங்களில் சிக்கலான பிரச்சனைகளைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு அதிகாரிகள்
சட்டப்படி நடக்கவில்லையென்றால், அங்குள்ள நம் போன்ற பொதுமக்கள்
ஒத்துழைப்பதில்லை என்பதுதான் காரணம். இதை அறிந்துதான்
அதிகாரிகள் சில சமயங்களில் காரியத்தைக் கெடுத்துவிடுகிறார்கள்.
அவர்கள் சொல்லும் பதில் என்னவென்றால், ‘நான் இந்தக் காரியத்தை
சட்ட நுட்பப்படி செய்தேன். ஆனால், அதை இன்னார் வந்து தடுத்து
விட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் யோசனைப்படி செய்தேன். ஆகையால் இந்தக்
காரியம் தடைபட்டுப் போய்விட்டது; ஒருவருக்குப் பாதகமாய் நடந்துவிட்டது’
என்று பதில் சொல்லுகிறார்கள்.

“இதை உணர்ந்துதான் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சட்டபை அங்கத்தினர்
களுக்கும் நிர்வாகத்தினர்களுக்கும் சம்பந்தமில்லாமல் வைத்துக்கொள்ள
வேண்டுமென்று சொன்னார்கள். அதனால், சட்டசபை உரிமையைப்
பறித்துவிட்டதாக நினைக்கவேண்டாம்.

[Sri V. Muthu] [6th November 1952]

“உதாரணமாக, ஒரு உத்தரவு போட்டுவிட்டால், உடனே அங்கு செல்கின்றோம், சில சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்கள். பிரச்சனையால் பாதிக்கப்பட்ட ஒரு கட்சிபார் ஒரு அங்கத்தினரைக் கொண்டோ, வேறு யாரைக்கொண்டோ அந்த அதிகாரியினிடத்தில் போய் தனக்குத் சாதகமாய் சொல்லிக்கொள்ளலாம். அதனால் காரியம் கெட்டுவிடுகிறது. எப்படியும் அதிகாரிகள் சட்டத்தின் படி போகும்போது ஒருவருக்கு பாதகமாகவும், இன்னொருவருக்கு சாதகமாகவும்தான் நடக்கமுடியும். பாதிக்கப்பட்டவர்கள் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார்கள்? புகார் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதுதான் நிர்வாகத்தில் நாம் அதிருப்தியடையக்கூடிய முதல் காரணம்.

“ஆகையால், இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் அதிகாரிகளிடத்தில் நாம் நெருங்கி சில தனிப்பட்ட சலுகைகளுக்கும் விஷயங்களுக்கும் மிகவும் முக்கியத்துவம் கொடுத்துக்கொண்டு, பொது மக்களோ சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்களோ பிரவேசிக்காமல் இருந்தால் காரியங்கள் சரிவர நடக்கும். இருந்தபோதிலும் அதிகாரிகள் எல்லா உத்தரவுகளையும் சட்டங்களையும் தவறாமல் அனுசரிக்கிறார்கள் என்று முழுவதும் சொல்லவில்லை.

“சில அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொன்னார்கள் ஒரு சில அதிகாரிகள் சரிவர சட்டங்களை நிறைவேற்றுவதில்லையென்று. உதாரணமாக ரேஷன் சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் மிகவும் மோசமாக அட்டை நடத்தப்பட்டதாக அதிகாரிகளைப்பற்றி சொன்னார்கள். வாஸ்தவம். ரேஷன் சட்டம் மிகவும் நல்ல போக்கில் இருந்தது. அதை முழு மூச்சுடன் நடைமுறையில் கொண்டு வந்திருப்போமேயானால், சர்க்காருக்கும் நாட்டுக்கும் மிக நன்மையாக இருந்திருக்கும். இதையெல்லாம் இந்த சிவில் சப்ளை உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களும் மிகவும் அலட்சியமாக நடத்தியதால்தான் சர்க்காருக்கும் கெட்பெயர் ஏற்பட்டது. இந்த சட்டத்தை நடைமுறையில் நிர்வாகப் பொறுப்பில் ஏற்பட்ட குறைகளை அங்கத்தினர்கள் எடுத்துச்சொல்லவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டது. உதாரணமாக அரசாங்கத்தில் இந்த கீழ்த்தர உத்தியோகஸ்தர்கள் இருக்கிறார்களே, அதாவது கிராம முன்சிப், கணக்குப்பிள்ளை, இவர்கள்தான் நிர்வாகத்தில் அஸ்திவாரமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். இவர்களுடைய எழுத்துதான் கடைசி வரையில் நிற்கிறது. இவர்கள் ஒன்று எழுதிவிட்டால் அதை எமனால் கூட மாற்றமுடியாது. எந்த சட்டத்தையும் அவர்கள் தவிடுபொடி ஆக்கிவிட்டமுடியும். அப்படிப்பட்டவர்கள் உண்மையிலேயே யார் என்று பார்த்தால், அவர்கள் வேறு யாரும் இல்லை. தினம் தினம் நாம் பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள்தான். நம்முடைய பக்கத்திலேயே இருக்கின்ற வர்கள்தான். நம்முடைய சுற்றத்தார்களாகவும் இருக்கலாம். ஊரை விட்டு அவர்கள் எப்போதும் வெளியே போனதேயில்லை. அவர்கள் பெரும்பாலும் பரம்பரை வாரிசுகளாக இருக்கிறார்கள். இவர்களைப்பற்றி எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். அவர்களிடம் நேரில் போய் எதாவது சொல்லி நேர்மையான மனமாற்றம் ஏற்படும்படிச் செய்தால் காரியங்கள் சுலபமாக நடந்துவிடும். ஆகையால், நிர்வாகத்தில் குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கிற தென்றால், இந்தச் சிறு அதிகாரிகளிடந்தான் அந்த குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கிறதென்று அர்த்தம் பண்ணவேண்டும்.

“உதாரணமாக, மைலோ முதலியவைகளைச் சப்ளை செய்தால் அங்கிருக்கின்ற சிவில் சப்ளை ஆபீசர்கள் சில பேர்கள் தனிப்பட்டவர்களுக்கு சலுகை காட்டுகிறார்கள், இதை யாரும் தடுக்க முடியவேயில்லை. அவர்கள் எந்த இடத்தில் தப்பு செய்கின்றார்களென்று புரிந்து கொள்ளவே முடியவில்லை. மேல் அதிகாரிகளிடத்தில் புகார் தருகிறோம். ஆனால், யார் தவறுதல் செய்தார்கள்? எப்பொழுது செய்தார்கள்? எந்த இடத்தில் செய்தார்கள்? என்ற புள்ளி விவரங்களை நம்மில் யாரும் கொடுப்பதில்லை. ஏனென்றால், அங்கிருக்கின்ற அதிகாரிகள் சில பேர்களுக்கு சொந்தக்காரர்கள் என்ற சலுகையில் நாம் விட்டுவிடுகின்றோம். இதைப் பெரிய அதிகாரிகளிடத்தில் நாம் புகார் போட்டுவிட்டு நாம் எந்தவிதமான ஒத்துழைப்பும் அவர்களுக்குத் தராதயாராயில்லை.

[Sri V. Muthu] 6th November 1952]

“ஒரு ரெவின்யூ டிவிஷனல் ஆபீசரிடத்தில் புகார் சொன்ன காலத்தில், கார்டுகளை மொத்தமாக வாங்கிவைத்துக்கொண்டு (கனம் ஸ்பீக்கர் நேரம் முடிந்துவிட்டது என்பதற்கு மணியை அடித்தார்.) சரி இதோ முடித்துவிடுகிறேன்.

“ஆகவே, சில அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொன்னமாதிரி இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றி ஒரு கமிட்டி ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டிய அவசியமில்லை. நிர்வாகத்தில் இருக்கும் கஷ்டங்களை நேரில் எடுத்துச்சொல்லி தீர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம். அப்படி எடுத்துச் சொல்லப்பட்டால் மந்திரி அவர்கள் ஆவன செய்வதற்குத் தயாராய் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால், இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை வாபஸ் வாங்கிக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this resolution in view of the fact that the Government themselves have taken steps to appoint an official to go into the matter and suggest ways and means to reform the administrative machinery. At the same time I agree with some of the points raised by my hon. Friends on the floor of this House that the offices have been staffed heavily though very little work is turned out. For instance recently several Tahsildars have been appointed and they have also been given the assistance of special Revenue Inspectors. The duties assigned to these could easily be done by the regular Tahsildars and Revenue Inspectors. Further many of these are not qualified and they don't do their job well. I know of cases where files have been noted as having been dealt with, but the parties concerned have not at all received any communication from the officers concerned. I know of a case which happened in the office of the Sub-Collector, Rajampet division, Cuddapah district. The office of a village officer was given to a member of a different family. When the proper heir sent his petition, the records in the office showed that the petition was referred back to the petitioner for the reason that it had not been sufficiently stamped. But the party never received it. The appeal time expired and the family lost the right of getting the job. Such is the condition in some of these offices. We are prepared to wait and see what recommendations are going to be made by the Special Officer. We are for reorganizing and effecting retrenchment in the administrative machinery so that files will move urgently instead of getting stuck up in the present red-tape. We all expected much improvement would take place after the leader of the party in power took up office, but much has not been done to put down dishonesty among the services and to increase efficiency. All these need not now be dealt with in detail as we hope something would be done soon after the report of the Special Officer is received by Government.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ రిజ్యూనాన్సి ఒక సవరణకాల్సి 3-10 p.m.
రిజ్యూనాన్సి బలపరచవలసినా ఉండవలసింది. ఇటువంటి రిజ్యూనాన్సి ఈ సభకుండు
కాకం కుండానా ప్రధానము. దీని ఒక తలనొప్పిగావుంటుంది. కాస్తాను. ఎందుచేత
సంజా administrative machinery అంతటికీకానా అయిన ఒక నాయకుడు.
గనుక ఇప్పుడు ఉన్నటువంటి administrative machinery సరికొద్దని అంటే
ఉన్నట్టి కలుగునటువంటి విషయము సహజము. కాని administrative machi-

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [6th November 1952]

machinery సరిగాలేదని నేడు ఈ తీర్మానముయొక్క వాదన. ఈ administrative machinery ని సూక్ష్మంగా దీని ఉద్దేశ్యము. ఏ principles ఏ పద్ధతులైన ప్రస్తుత యంత్రాంగం ఉన్నది. ప్రస్తుతపు పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగము సిద్ధాంతరీత్యా వెప్పలి అన్నట్లుగా పాశ్చాత్య ప్రభుత్వకాలములో నిర్మించినట్లుంటే విధానము ననుసరించి నడుస్తున్న యంత్రాంగమే ఇది. ఆసలు మామూలు ప్రజల జీవిత అనుభవములుబట్టి చూచినట్లయిన ఇది ఒక లంచగొండ్ పరిపాలన యంత్రముగా ఉన్నది. మొట్టమొదట సరిగా ఈ శాసనసభలో ఇటువంటి తీర్మానం చేయించబడుతున్నదని నేను అనుకొంటున్నాను. బ్రిటన్ సమావేశములో శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు తమ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగాన్ని సమర్థిస్తూ మాట్లాడారు. నేను మాట్లాడే ముందు ఆయన యొక్క వాదన విరితిగా ఉంటుందో అని కుతూహలంగా గమనించుచుంటిని. చాలా తెలివితేటలుగల వాడవాదనను ఉపసంహరించి నాటికి కుర్రవానికి సాధ్యముకాదేమో కాని ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగ విధానాన్ని సమర్థించడం అంటే పాత ప్రభుత్వ విధానానికి ఎటువంటిగతి పట్టిందో అటువంటిగతే దీనికికూడ తడుతుందని చెప్పవలసియుంటుంది. కాని ఇప్పుడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు అనేకసార్లు మాట్లాడుతూ ఎక్కడైనా అక్రమం ఉండినట్లయితే, ఏ ఉద్యోగి అయినా లంచాలు వుచ్చుకొన్నట్లయితే, ఆ విషయాల నా దృష్టికి తీసుకురాండి ఏ ఉద్యోగి అయినా తన పదవిని సరిగా నిర్వహించడంలేదని అయినట్లయిన, నా దృష్టికి తెస్తే, న్యాయంగా విచారించి తగు చర్య తీసుకొంటాము, మేము న్యాయంగా పరిపాలన జరగాలనే పూనుకొంటున్నాము అని ఆయన చాలాసార్లు చెప్పుకొన్నాడు. ఇప్పుడు మన అందరికీ శాసనసభ్యులుగా ప్రజలతో సంబంధం కలిగి దాదాపు 4 నెలల అనుభవమున్నది. ఈ 4 నెలల అనుభవములో ప్రజలతో సంబంధం ఉన్నటువంటి ఈ శాసనసభ్యులను వారి గుండె మీద చేయివేసుకొని ప్రజలనుండి ఎన్నిసార్లు complaints వివరించడం చెప్పమని అడుగుతున్నాను. అంతేగాదు ప్రభావ మంతి మేము స్వయముగా complaints ఇచ్చాము. Complaints పంపించి 5 నెలలు, 6 నెలలు అయినప్పటికీ వాటిపైన ఇంకా ఏమీ జరగలేదు, అని చెప్పుతున్నాను. మేము ఇటువంటి విషయములు చెప్పినప్పుడు, కమ్యూనిస్టుల పని అలా అతిశయోక్తి చేయడమే అని అంటారు. నాకు తెలుసును ప్రజల సమస్యలు, వారి కష్టాలను చెప్పినప్పుడు, వీరు grievances ను multiply చేస్తున్నారని వచుతూరంగా అంటారు. మేము చెప్పినదానిని వారు వృథాయ ప్రార్థనగా నవ్వుతారు. ఇప్పుడు వీరి పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగ విధానము చూస్తే, బ్రిటిష్ పరిపాలనల యంత్రాంగాన్నే ఇప్పుడు ఈ ప్రభుత్వముకూడ అనుసరిస్తూ బలపరచుకున్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. అయితే, ఇది బుద్ధిప్రార్థనగా చేస్తున్నారా లేక అసహాయతవల్లనా అనే ప్రశ్న వస్తుంది. ఈ రెండు ఉన్నాయనే నా ఉద్దేశ్యం. ఇది అసహాయతేకాదు, హాస్యములు ఎట్లా ఉంటున్నా, గనుక ఇప్పుడు ఉన్నటువంటి ధనిక విధానాన్ని ఇట్లాగే సాగించి, ఎవరైతే ధనికులుగా ఉన్నారో, ఎవరైతే బలముగలిగి యుంటారో, వీరిని ఒకేసారి తారుమారుచేయుట కష్టమైనటువంటిదని, పరిస్థితులు ఎట్లాగు మారుతవో తెలియదు గనుక ఇట్లాగే సాగిస్తాము అని అనుకొనవచ్చును. ప్రస్తుతము డబ్బు ఉన్నటువంటివారియొక్కయు, అధికారము ఉన్నటువంటివారి యొక్కయు పనులు జరగుతున్నాయి. క్రింద తాలూకాఫీసునుంచి పైన Fort St. George వరకు ఇదే పని జరుగుతున్నది. ఇక్కడ Treasury benches మీద కూర్చున్న మంత్రులు మనకు ఎన్ని సమాధానములు చెప్పినప్పటికీ, ఆ ఉద్దేశ్యము ఉన్నప్పటికీ, ఈ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగం ఈ విధానము ఉన్నంతకాలము ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కరింపరాదు. పైనా మనది welfare State

6th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

అని చెప్పుకొంటారు. కాని దీనిలో అంతా corruption కేసులే కనబడతాయి. corruption కేసులు ఎక్కడైనా ఉంటే, ఎక్కడైనా అక్రమం జరిగినట్లయితే, దానికి తగు రీతిగా చర్య తీసుకొంటున్నామని పెద్ద కబుర్లు చెప్పడంకూడ వింటున్నాము. ఇది వరకు చాలా విషయాలు వదిలినాను. ఇతర దేశాలలో ఉన్నటువంటి పార్లమెంటరీ విధానాన్ని కొద్దో గొప్పో చూశాను. కాని ప్రజలమధ్య ఇంకా ఎక్కువ విషయాలు నేర్చుకోవలసినవి, ఈ యంత్రాంగముయొక్క నిజస్వభావాన్ని దాదాపు 4 నెలలనుంచి తెలుసుకొన్నాను. ఏ ప్రజలు ఇచ్చినటువంటి పిటిషన్లుగాని complaints గాని బుట్ట దాఖలా అవుతున్నాయో ఇవి చాలాసార్లు మా జిల్లాలో స్వయముగా చూచాను. ఇక మంత్రులు ఇక్కడ Treasury benches మీద కూర్చుని కబుర్లు చెప్పుచుండడమే గాకుండా, అప్పుడప్పుడు కొన్ని విషయాలలో చిక్కులు వచ్చినప్పుడు, ఎవరైన సభ్యులుగాని, పార్టీ నాయకులుగాని కొన్ని ప్రత్యేక విషయాలలో ఉత్తరములు వ్రాసి నపుడు, వాటికి అప్పుడప్పుడు తక్షణమే సమాధానాలు వస్తూఉంటాయి. ఈ సమాధానాలు సాధారణంగా “ఇది ఫలానప్పుడు పంపించబడింది, వీనినిగురించి ఆలోచిస్తాము” అని తెలుపబడుతాయి. కాని జరిగే పరిస్థితి అంతా ఏమిటంటే, మంత్రులు, వారి ఉద్యోగులపైన, వారిద్విన రిపోర్టులపైన ఆధారపడి ఆ ప్రకారము చేస్తారు. ఒకచోట ఒక ఘామి ఓడ ప్రజలకు వెందినటువంటి లంక ఘామి పట్టాలను అక్రమంగా జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ధనికులకు చేందేటట్లు చేసినాడు. దానిపైన ప్రభుత్వమునకు complaints వస్తే, దానికి సంబంధించినటువంటి ధనిక యజమానులుగాని, వారి బంధు వర్తముగాని దీనిని తక్కువదిద్దుకొనుటకు ఇక్కడి Fort St. George దగ్గరకువచ్చి ఇక్కడ Secretariat లో ఉన్న ఉద్యోగులను ఆశ్రయించి విచిక్కు రాకుండా సరిచేసుకొన్నారు. కనుక ఎవరికైతే చోరు, ఎవరికైతే అధికారము ఉండో వార్ల పనులు సాగుతూ ఉన్నాయి. ఇటువంటి విషయాలు గురించి ఇంతకుముందే Hon. Mr. కొండయ్య చాలా వివరాలు చెప్పారు. నాకు సర్వసాధారణంగా ఈ వివరాలు చెప్పడానికి జ్ఞాపకశక్తి ఉండదు. కనుక ఇప్పుడు కొన్ని జనరల్ ప్రిన్సిపుల్స్ మాత్రము చెప్పుతున్నాను. మొత్తముమీద చూచినట్లయితే ఇప్పుడు, ప్రభుత్వము వచ్చిస్తున్నటువంటి ధనము అన్ని డిపార్టుమెంటులలోకూడా ఉద్యోగవర్గాన్ని పెంచడానికే వచ్చిస్తున్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఏ రీతికైనను ప్రజలకు అనుకూలమైనటువంటి కనీస సంస్కరణలుకూడ చేయడంలేదు. ఇప్పుడు తలపెట్టబడినటువంటి కనీస సంస్కరణల కార్యక్రమము అమలులో ఉండాలి అన్నట్లయితే చాలా తీవ్ర చర్య తీసుకోవలసియుంటుంది. ఇందుకుగాను ఏ సూత్రాలమీద ఇక్కడ Fort St. George లోని Secretariat లో పనులు సాగుతున్నాయి. ఏ సూత్రాలమీద క్రింది తాలూకా ఆఫీసులు మొదలుకొని తదితర ఆఫీసులు పనిచేస్తున్నాయి అనే విషయాలన్నీ కూడ సమగ్రంగా విచారణ జరపవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ విషయముల గురించి ఇక్కడ శాసనసభ్యులు చెప్పుతున్నారంటే, ప్రత్యేకముగా ఉద్యోగులమీద ఏమి విరోధములేదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే, ఇప్పుడు శాసనసభ్యులు ప్రత్యక్షముగా స్వయముగా చూచినటువంటి తమ అనుభవాలనే చెప్పుచున్నారని వేరేకాదు. దీనిలో ఏమి సిద్ధాంతానుకరణము లేదని గుర్తించవలసిందని చెప్పుచున్నాను. నిజముగా ఇప్పుడు నడుస్తున్నటువంటి పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగము ధనికులయొక్కయు, పలుకుబడిగలవారియొక్కయు పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగమేనని చెప్పుటకు సందేహములేదు. కనుక ఈ విషయములో తగుపనులనుచేచర్యలు తీసుకొమ్మని ప్రభుత్వమునకు నచ్చ చెప్పుట శాసనసభ్యులయొక్క కర్తవ్యము, విధియైయున్నది. వారు ఇచ్చట ఈ విషయాన్ని చెప్పుతున్నారంటే, ప్రత్యేకముగా ప్రభుత్వముమీదగాని, మరే ఉద్యోగులమీదగాని తమయొక్క పిటిషన్లు

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [6th November 1952]

వైన, చర్య తీసుకొనబడలేదని, అవి గుర్తింపబడలేదనిగాని లేక రాజీయే ఎన్నికలలో వోటర్లను తమకు అనుకూలంగా చేసుకోవాలి అనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతోగాని ఇవన్నీ చెప్పుచున్నారని అనుకోవడంపై చెప్పుతున్నాను. ఇట్లు శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి నచ్చ చెప్పడం చాలా కష్టమైనటువంటి పనియని నాకు తెలుసును. ఎందుచేతనంటే, నారికి ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులవైన నే నమ్మకము, ప్రేమ ఉన్నదని ఇప్పుడు అనుభవాన్నిబట్టి తెలుస్తున్నది.

“నేడు ప్రభుత్వాధికారం యావత్తూ ఫోర్టు నెంటు జార్జి కోటలో కేంద్రీకృతమై ఉంది. స్థానికాధికారులకు విశేషాధికారాలు లేవు. ప్రతి చిన్న విషయాన్ని ముద్రానుకు వ్రాసుకుంటేనే కాని నిర్ణయించు అధికారం వారికిలేదు. ప్రజలు తమ విషయాలను స్థానిక ఉద్యోగులకు తెలుపుకున్నప్పటికీ అవి నెరవేరటానికి ఎంతోకాలం పడుతోంది. సాధారణంగా ఉద్యోగులు ప్రజల అందుబాటులో ఉండరు. ప్రజలకు, ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగానికి సన్నిహిత సంబంధాలు లేవు. ఈ నాడు ప్రజాప్రతినిధులైన శాసనసభ్యులూకూడా ప్రజల కష్టనిష్ఠులైన ఉద్యోగులకు తెలుపుకోనే పీలుకూడా తగ్గిపోతోంది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ప్రభుత్వంలో ప్రజాప్రతినిధులతో మాట్లాడుటకైనా ఉద్యోగులు వెనుదీస్తున్నారు. ప్రజలతోను ప్రజాప్రతినిధులతోను సంబంధం కోల్పోతుంటే ఉద్యోగులు సాధించగలిగిందేమీ ఉండదు. శాసన సభ్యులు చెప్పే విషయాలను అటు ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు ఇటు, ప్రభుత్వంకూడా శ్రద్ధగా విని చర్యతీసుకోవలసి ఉంది. స్థానిక ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు రాజకీయ విశేషాల నిమిత్తంలేకుండా ప్రజల సమస్యలను తీర్చుటకు ప్రయత్నించేయాలి. నిష్పక్షపాతబుద్ధితో ప్రవర్తించాలి. ప్రభుత్వ పక్షం వాడు, ప్రతిపక్షంవాడు అనే విచక్షణ వారు చూపరాదు. అపోజిషన్ సభ్యులు చెప్పే దానిని తిరస్కరించడమే వృత్తిగా పెట్టుకొనరాదు. జైల్లాలలో పరిపాలన సక్రమంగా కొనసాగించాలి. ఈ నాడు లంచగొండితనం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. దానిని రూపుమాపనిదే ప్రజలకు సుఖమనేదే ఉండదు. ప్రతి చిన్న పనికికూడా ప్రజలు లంచము లిచ్చుకొనవలసివస్తోంది. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు లంచగొండితనాన్ని రూపు మాపటానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తామని చెప్పేస్తున్నారు. వారు అధికారంలోకి వచ్చి ఆరుమాసాలైనట్లుంది. కాని అట్టి ఛాయలేవీ కనుపించుటలేదు. ప్రజల స్థితి నానాటికి దుర్భరమైపోతోంది. పోలీసు శాఖ పరిపాలన చాలా లోపభూయిష్టంగా ఉంది. ప్రజలను భయపెట్టి పరిపాలించుట ఈ ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్దేశ్యమేమీ నాకు తెలియటలేదు. ఎన్నో సందర్భాలలో పోలీసు దౌర్జన్యాలు ప్రభుత్వంవారి దృష్టికి లేబడుతున్నాయి. కాని విదో సాకుమీద అవి ప్రభుత్వం పరిశీలించటం లేదు. అనేక సందర్భాలలో పోలీసు శాఖ ప్రతిపక్షాలవారిని అణగారొక్కుటలో ఉపయోగింపబడుతోంది. ఈ విధానం మారాలి. ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులకు రాజకీయాలతో నిమిత్తం ఉండరాదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ ప్రభుత్వంవారు సభ్యులు చెప్పేదానిని తగినంత శ్రద్ధతోచూడాలి. ప్రతిపక్షంవారి ఆవశ్యకత ప్రభుత్వంవారి కెంతైనా ఉంది

“ఈ నాడు అధికారం అంతా ఫోర్టు నెంటు జార్జి కోటలో కట్టుబడివుంది. దానిని సాధ్యమైనంతవరకు వికేంద్రీకరణ చేస్తేనేకాని పరిపాలన సక్రమంగా నడవదు. ప్రతి చిన్న విషయానికి ముద్రానుకు వంక చూడడం అధికారులు తగ్గించుకునేటట్లు చేయాలి. ప్రజలు చేసుకొనే చిన్న విజ్ఞాపనలకుకూడా ఫోర్టునంచే ఉత్తరువులు రావలసి ఉన్నది. దీనివల్ల ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగంలో రెడ్ టేపిజమ్ పెరిగిపోతోంది. వి శ్రీనా జరుగవలెనంటే విండ్ర తరబడి కాలం గడిచిపోతోంది. జిల్లా అధికారులలో కొందరి నేషనలిజం ఉండుటలేదు. ఒక శాఖవారు చెప్పేదానికి ఇంకొకశాఖవారు

[6th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

చెప్పేదానికి ఎంతో వ్యత్యాసముంటుంది. ఉదాహరణకు P.W.D. వారు చెప్పే పనులను రెవిన్యూవారు అంగీకరించరు. ఒక కార్యాలయంనుంచి ఇంకొక కార్యాలయానికి కాగితాలు తిరుగుటలోనే కాలం గడిచిపోతోంది. ఎంత చిన్న దరఖాస్తుయినా విండ్రతరబడి ఎట్టి చర్య తీసుకొనబడకుండా ప్రభుత్వ కార్యాలయాలలో ఉండిపోతోంది. ప్రభుత్వంలో పని అంటేనే ప్రజలలో నిస్పృహ, నిరాశ కల్లుతోంది. పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగంలోని లోపాలవల్ల ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వం చేయదలచిన కొద్దిపాటి మేలుగూడా జరుగుటలేదు. లంచగొండితనం ఎంతమాత్రం తగ్గలేదు. తాలూకా కచేరీనుంచి ముద్రాను కార్యాలయాల వరకు లంచములిస్తేనేకాని పనులు జరగవని ప్రజలు చెప్పుకుంటున్నారు. ఈ లోటుపాట్లను సవరించుటకు కొంతవరకైనా అధికారాన్ని వికేంద్రీకరణచేయాలి.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“ప్రస్తుత ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగములోని లోపాలు లోటుపాట్లున్నాయి. 3-30 పీటినీ సరిదిద్దుకుంటూ సమర్థించుకొనిపోతున్న మానవులు యిక్కడ Treasury Benches P.m. లో కూర్చునియున్నారు. ఈ పరిపాలనా విధానము వెనుకటి పాశ్చాత్య పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగమును ఆధారముచేసుకొని నడుపబడుతున్నది. దీనిలోని లోటుపాట్లు యిక్కడ కూర్చునియున్న సభ్యులు అనేకమందికి పూర్తిగా గోచరమైయున్నవి. ఇవన్నియు వివరించుట అలవికానిపని. ఈనాడు రైతాంగమునకు కలిగేటటువంటి చిక్కులు ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులలో దయయున్నవారికి, లేనివారికి దృష్టాంతములుగానే ఉన్నవి. భూమివర్గమునకు వెండిన రైతాంగమునకు యీ చిక్కులు అడ్డురావడములేదు. పేద ప్రజలకు యీ అడ్డులనుండి తప్పించుకొనలేకున్నారు. ఈ ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులలో మంచివాళ్లు కలరు, చెడ్డవాళ్లు కలరు. ఈ సభ్యులలో నేడు పనముందు ఉన్న యీ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగ సవరణను ప్రతిఘటించ నుద్దేశించెడు ప్రముఖులు లేకపోలేదు. ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన సమర్థతతోనే జరుపబడుతున్నదని కొందరు ప్రముఖులే చెప్పగలరని నా విశ్వాసము. యీ ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగము తెలివితేటలతో కలదిసి అంతయు సక్రమపద్ధతిలో నడుపవచ్చునని నమ్ముటటువంటివారు యీ ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగస్థులలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ సభ్యులలో ఎవరికి యిట్లమువచ్చినట్లు వారివారి అభిప్రాయాలు వివరించిన దేశముయొక్క ప్రజల చాగుకొరకేనని చెప్పగలను. ఈ యంత్రాంగము సవరించిన తర్వాతనే complaints అనేది ఉండటానికి అనకాశముండదు. అన్ని విషయములు ప్రతి ఒకసభ్యుడు చెప్పవచ్చును. నిజానికి పార్టీ దృక్పథమునకే కాకుండా నిష్పక్షపాతబుద్ధిని ఉపయోగించిన యీ లోట్లు గోచరమగును. యీ లోటుపాట్లు తెలివితేటలతో నిర్వహింపబడుతున్నందున ప్రభుత్వంలో ఒక వర్గమువారికి యీ సవరణ యిష్టములేకపోవచ్చును. నిజానికి యిప్పుడు నడుపబడుతున్న పరిపాలనా యంత్రాంగము యే శాస్త్రములవైన, యే పద్ధతివైన నడుపబడుతున్నది అని ప్రశ్నించుకొనగోరుతున్నాను. ఇది శాస్త్రీయ పద్ధతిలో ఉండవలసి చెప్పేదాడల అది ప్రస్తుత వ్యవస్థకు అనుకూలంగా ఉన్నదని నేను అంగీకరించను. ప్రజల జీవితానుభవాబట్టి, యీ రోజులలో యీ ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగము సరిగా పనిచేయడంలేదు. దీనివల్ల ప్రజలకు ఉపయోగకరముగలేదని, యీ నాడు దీనికి సవరణచేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన శాఖామాత్యులు యీ లోటుపాట్లు బయటికి రానీయకుండా తెలివితేటలతో తప్పించుకొంటున్నారు అని నా అభిప్రాయము. యిది రాజకీయంగా తప్పించుకొనడము అన్నమాట. ఇప్పుడు ముఖ్యంగా యీ ప్రభుత్వ

[Sri M. Dharmalingam] [6th November 1952]

என்று கேட்டால் கொடுக்க மறுத்து விடுகிறார்கள். பிறகு டிஸ்ட்ரிக்ட் மாக்ஜிஸ்ட்ரேட்டினிடம் போய் கேட்டால் நீ யார் என்று எனக்குத் தெரியாது, அத்தாட்சி பத்திரம் கொடுக்க முடியாது என்று மறுத்து விடுகிறார்கள். இந்த நிலைமையில் நூற்றுக்கணக்கான மக்கள் தவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது நடந்து வருவதைப் பார்த்தால் இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் அரசாங்கம் இதில் சிரத்தை காட்ட வில்லை என்று தான் தோன்றுகிறது. இப்படிப்பட்ட விஷயங்களில் சென்னை ராஜ்ய முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நான் வேண்டிக் கொள்வது என்ன வென்றால் இந்த விஷயத்தில் சிறிதளவு சிரமம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு அந்தந்த அதிகாரிகளுக்கு instructions கொடுத்து கேட்கிறவர்களுக்கு சர்ட்டிபிகேட் பத்திரம் வழங்கும்படி ஏற்பாடு செய்ய வேண்டும். மத்திய அரசாங்கத்திற்கு அனுப்ப காலம் தவறி விட்டால் அந்தக் காலத்தை மறுபடியும் நீடித்துக் கொடுத்து 40 சத விசிதம் அவர்களுக்கு சலுகை கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

“இன்னுமொரு குறை ஒன்றைச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். எத்தனையோ குறைகள் இருக்கின்றன. குறைகளை எடுத்துச் சொல்வது என்னுடைய கடமை. அதில் ஒன்றிரண்டு மட்டில் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். அதிலும் முக்கியமானதைச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். சேரிகளில் ஜனங்கள் வசிக் கும் இடம் மிகவும் நெருக்கடியாகவும் சுகாதாரக் குறைவாகவும் இருக்கிறது. அப்படி இருந்தும் தாழ்த்தப்பட்ட வகுப்பை சேர்ந்தவர்களில் சிலர் கல்வி கற்றிருந்தும் அவர்கள் பக்கத்தில் சுகாதாரமாகவுள்ள இடங்களில் வீடு கட்டிக் கொள்ள இடம் கேட்டும் இன்னும் கொடுக்க வில்லை. ஒரு மாதத்திற்கு முன்பு அல்ல, இரண்டு மாதத்திற்கு முன்பு அல்ல, ஒரு வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பு அல்ல, இரண்டு வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பு அல்ல, ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்பாகவே வர்கள் மனுச் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்விதம் மனுச் செய்து கொண்டும் அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் தக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவில்லை. பணத்தை வாங்கிக் கொடுத்தார்கள் என்பது ஒரு பக்கத் தில் இருக்கிறது. இன்னும் நிலத்தைக் கொடுக்க வில்லை. இவ்விதம் திருவள்ளூரில் இன்னும் அரசாங்கம் நிலத்தை கொடுக்க முன் வரவில்லை. சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தின் பொறுப்பை எடுத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிற முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் தாழ்த்தப்பட்டவர்கள் முன்னேற்றமடைய இன்னும் அதிக கவனம் செலுத்தி வரவேண்டும். இது சம்பந்தமாக அதிகாரிகளுக்கு உடனடியாக உத்தரவுகள் அனுப்பிவைத்து இந்த விஷயங்களில் கவனம் காட்டி அவர்களை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டிய வழி காட்ட வேண்டு மென்றும் நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—“Sir, once again hon. Members of this hon. House are faced with the painful job of criticizing the Government and the Government machinery. It is a very painful job. I do not know whether it is the mistake of the voters or of the parties that selected us as candidates. I came into the House as a layman with the fond hope and the fond belief to find people and parties discussing things about the real progress of the country. But to my surprise and agony I find here people throwing mud at each other. It is a very painful thing. When we read reports of the proceedings of the House in the newspapers and also about the policies that are being followed by other countries—it may be the capitalist country of America or the Communist country of Russia—we find there is a difference between the two. They are thinking of greater production and distribution and of peace and happiness for the people of their country. But what do we discuss here? We discuss about the machinery that we have. This is a most painful thing even to think of. We know what kind of officers we have. We also know that certain representatives of certain parties who are sitting here as Members are threatening

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] 6th November 1952]

officers in certain districts and forcing them to oblige them, even if their cause be bad and I know, as a representative of the people, who are all indulging in certain of these bad things. But my hope is that our administrative machinery should be clean, very clean. I know Government have in certain districts certain officers who work against the Government, who work for the destruction of the Government and who want to make the Government unpopular. I have been long expecting that Government would take steps to clean the machinery of the Government. But what is it that has been done? My expectation has remained only a hope. I still hope that the present Government will take steps to clean the machinery. We have our administrative personnel. The party in power to-day may be here to-morrow, and the day after that they may or may not be here. It is one party that is running the administration to-day. It may be another that may take up the administration to-morrow. But the administrative machinery cannot be dispensed with. I do not know if it is the view of certain parties to demolish the existing machinery and recruit new people for the new Government to work their new deal, according to their new method for the progress of the country that would be extolled throughout the world. But I feel, and everyone should feel, that if the present machinery has been rusty, if any parts are broken and not suitable to the present conditions, the machinery should be cleaned or remodelled, or the parts should be replaced. This is what is wanted. Sometime back when I read in the newspapers that the Chief Minister had appointed Sri S. Venkateswaran, I.C.S., to go into the working of the Secretariat and suggest ways and means to bring about co-ordination and effect retrenchment, if possible, I was fondly hoping that the Government and the Hon. Chief Minister would institute some sort of an enquiry, like that of the Banking Enquiry Committee, or the Tariff Board Enquiry, to find out how certain institutions are working and give suggestions to reorganize the Secretariat. I was expecting the Government would constitute a small committee composed of officers or experts to go into this question. If that had been done, there would not have been any necessity for the Resolution that has been brought here to-day and for the unhappy discussion in this House. I hope the Government would do that very soon.

“But, Sir, as I was listening to the speeches of certain Members of this House I felt like being in a Sub-Magistrate's Court where layers fight like cats and dogs. It is an undesirable thing I see in this House each hon. Member accusing this party or that party in power. After all parties may come and go. But there is the big administrative machinery running the administration and not we. There are the people who have to work for 20 or 30 years and retire. It is they whom we should take care of. It is there in the administrative machinery that we have to root out the abuses. No doubt there are confidential records for each officer of the Government; but, I tell the Government to-day that each officer whether big or small carries a confidential record round his neck. Whenever an officer comes to a district, firka or taluk,

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [6th November 1952]

immediately people begin to form an opinion about him. What kind of fellow is this man? Is he a corrupt fellow or a romantic fellow? That is the first enquiry of the people about any officer who is transferred to their firka, taluk or district. We have had sufficient experience of people who had communal bias and tried to favour only the particular community they liked. I used the word 'romantic' previously. It is true. I know a specific case in which the people called the officer by the name of the South Indian actor 'Ranjan'. Any talk pertaining to finance now goes with the name of 'Mr. Subramaniam'. Previously it was the case with Mr. Gopala Reddi. (Laughter.) These things are taking place daily in the districts and I do not think it advisable to waste the time of this august House by talking about them now. There is no use of blaming the Hon. Ministers. The root cause lies in the administrative machinery. The tone of the administration has got to be improved.

"Of course, the Hon. the Chief Minister is doing his best to tone up the administration. Many people think that under his regime it is not possible for the representatives of the people to see the officers and approach them for redressal of grievances. That is not really so. If the complainant is sincere and is speaking the truth he need not be afraid to approach the officials. I do not think that we are banned from approaching the officers. It is due to the bad quality of some of the officers in the district that work is being delayed and we find no progress. Complaints go on coming and files are accumulating. They remain idle without any action being taken.

"The work of the officers in the districts should be watched and proper action taken immediately to rectify the defects. The officers should take the advice of the representatives of the people wherever they appear to be sane. For instance, I made some useful suggestions to the Famine Commissioner and the Cabinet regarding famine relief works in Rayalaseema. I do want the Government to bring out a report this year or early next year about the famine relief work in Rayalaseema and other districts similarly affected. I know that as much as one-fourth of the money spent on famine relief had been wasted. The value of money is so precious nowadays. What do we find? Money raised by our Hon. Chief Minister by way of loans is being wasted on surplus administrative machinery. I am sorry to note that the tax-payers' money is not being properly utilized. The tax-payers' money should be used for the development of our country by providing more irrigational facilities. I shall cite a specific instance to show how money is being wasted. As much as Rs. 30,000 has been spent on salaries of two or more tahsildars and subordinate staff in Chittoor district without any specific famine relief having been provided. Yesterday I received a petition from a poor ryot in Chittoor district. His story is a sorrowful one. He cultivated his little plot of land from a particular source. The karnam did not approve of it. He sent a report to the Tahsildar who in turn passed

6th November 1952] [Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

some orders. The ryot appealed to the Collector. The Collector passed some orders. The orders of the Collector were ignored by the Tahsildar and the karnam. Without even sending the 'B. Memo.', they sent the 'japti' warrant to the ryot. His property including an iron-safe containing jewels were seized. Meanwhile some other Collector came. The further appeal of the ryot was dismissed by this Collector. He upheld the orders of the karnam. What do we find now? The box is going to be auctioned. What for? Only for its iron contents. We do not know what has happened to the jewels inside the box. Of course I intend taking up this case with the concerned Minister. But what is the use? The Minister will send my paper back to the Collector for report. He in turn will send it to his subordinate and finally the paper will reach the same old karnam. His words will carry the final weight. What can the Minister do? He is not the man on the spot to detect the crime. That is why I say it is absolutely necessary to have a fool-proof administration. Honest people should be recruited for Government jobs and not corrupt ones. Take a typical example. We have good doctors to take care of the sick. They give good medicines. We have good disinfectants like D.D.T. and others. But we must know that certain diseases become incurable after sometime. Good medicines will have no effect on those diseases after the lapse of some years. Similarly we find even honest men becoming corrupt after some years of service. It is impossible to make them honest afterwards. Men of such type are to be found in large numbers in the districts. I would welcome any resolution by any Member of any party in this House to give full pension to such officers and immediately order them to retire from service. It is absolutely necessary to have an incorruptible administrative machinery. I know of a specific instance. Of course we have young men who are gems. But after some years of Government service they learn the 'trade' and become corrupt. I know the case of an overseer. He took a job in a district. When I met him after some years and asked him how he was getting on, he replied that he had learnt the 'trade'. What is the trade referred to? Hon. Members may very well judge for themselves what that 'trade' would have been. These abuses should be removed root and branch.

"It is true Hon. Ministers' time should not be wasted in looking into thousands of complaints pouring in every day. They have got better work to do for the upliftment of the State. But how can they do it? The answer is by having an incorruptible and effective administrative machinery. I do not want to take up the time of the House by going on citing countless examples of corruption amongst Government servants. I would be satisfied if our Hon. Chief Minister were to give us an assurance on the floor of this House that he would root out corruption amongst Government servants and try to build up an effective administrative machinery for our State. Thank you, Sir."

SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMI :—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I feel it my bounden duty to oppose the Resolution moved by

[Sri A. M. Rathnaswami] [6th November 1952]

Mr. G. C. Kondayya. It looks very superfluous as we all of us know that the Government are endeavouring their very best to tone up the administration and to root out all the evils of corruption found in the various sectors of administration in the State. The House knows that for the successful working of democracy, a very efficient administration on sound and strong lines is indispensable. After all we are on the threshold of democracy and therefore I earnestly urge on all those who preferred to speak in favour of this Resolution to think and talk along the lines on which the hon. Mover of the Resolution did, to extend their unstinted co-operation and support to the Government in rooting out all the evils and corrupt practices that are found in our administration to-day.

“ Sir, I only reiterate and re-echo what has already been said by certain Members on this side as well as on the other side of the House, that a stable Government is essential for the services in our State to remain contented. I know there is a good deal of discontent in the services, particularly among the N.G.Os. There is good deal of frustration among the Government servants that the Government are not doing their best to give them their due. But I would like to express my feelings on this occasion that the Government are endeavouring their very best to see that there is a contented service in our State so that the administration of our State can run in an efficient way. Sir, first of all I would like to refer to one baneful factor in our national life and that is there is communalism in the services, as much communalism as we find in politics and other walks of life. It is also very unfortunate that communalism has made a great stride in the ranks of the services. I hope hon. Members would agree with me that it has been largely responsible for corrupting the services. Knowing as I do that fair and adequate representation should be given for Backward Classes and Scheduled Castes in the services and at the same time taking a long range view of the question, I would make bold to say on the floor of the House that it is communalism in the services that is eating into the vitals of our society and the nation as a whole. When we take courage in both the hands to see that communalism is completely eschewed from the ranks of the services, then only we can hope to have the services above corruption and above suspicion of any kind. In this connexion, I should like to tell the House that, if we want to keep an efficient service—a service which could be above suspicion of any kind, we should take a leaf from the history of the services in England. When the Britishers left India, fears were expressed on all sides that the services would betray our country and that there would be a complete demoralization and even dislocation in the services. May I take this opportunity, on behalf of all the Members of this House, of expressing our deep gratitude and appreciation to the services who with their patriotism and sense of duty co-operated with our Government and kept the administration at a sufficiently high standard. It is true, Sir, that the standard of administration has gone down

[6th November 1952] [Sri A. M. Rathnaswami]

now. When we just look at the way in which the level of administration was kept up during the time of the Britishers and the standard of administrative efficiency that obtains now, there is indeed a good deal of difference. But we cannot help it. Our country has successfully passed through several ordeals and several difficult situations which would have impaired the solidarity and even the independence of any country. But for the loyal discharge of their duties by the services, we would not have been able to stand all the vicissitudes of national life.

“ The influence that is brought to bear upon the services by the public men is another factor. The public man has become a sort of nuisance and at the same time a grave menace to the efficient working of our administration in the State. I would be untrue to myself if I did not speak in plain terms about the ways in which public men bring influence to bear upon the services. Unless the Government take sufficient steps to see that public men do not bring their undue influence to bear upon the services and that they do not interfere in the day-to-day administration of our State, I am afraid, whatever the Government may do, we cannot expect to have an administration above corruption or above suspicion.

“ Another point to which I would like to refer on this occasion is the salaries drawn by high officials. I am really in sympathy with some of the hon. Members who said that the salaries of high officials must be cut down to a satisfactory level. I cannot but remind the House in this connexion what Mahatma Gandhi said in regard to the high officials—that the highest official in an Independent India should not draw more than Rs. 500 per mensem. It is really very pathetic to find the great disparity maintained by our Government between the salaries received by high officials and certain low-paid officials. This disparity must be reduced to the minimum. I know that there are many difficulties to be encountered by our Government for doing this; at the same time I hope the Government would see that the disparity is reduced as much as possible.

“ Then, Sir, our Government must see that the voice of the poorest man is heard by the officials. The poor villagers have no access to the officers of the district. May I submit on this occasion to the Government that *jamabandi* should as far as possible be conducted in areas where Harijans are living as they find it extremely difficult to represent their grievances to the revenue officers. I even hear in certain quarters that the revenue officers do not care to enter the slums; they stand at a distance and finish their work. Unless the revenue officers get into contact with these poor people, it would not be possible for them to get to know at first hand the correct information about the conditions of these people.”

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the motion moved by Mr. Kondayya to form a committee for suggesting ways and means for ensuring efficiency in the administrative machinery of this State. 4-10 p.m.

[Sri K. R. Viswanatham] [6th November 1952]

"Sir, much is being said about the change of heart and the efficiency of the administrative personnel of the Government, after assumption of power by Mr. Rajagopalachari. The fact is that all is not well, and much work has to be done to ensure the efficiency of the administration. I shall quote a few instances of inefficiency still prevailing in the administrative set up of the Government.

"The red-tapism which prevailed in the British regime still continues. If we send any communication or send any memorandum to the Government or the Ministers on behalf of the people, we receive no reply in time, and we have to suspect whether the communication or memoranda has fallen into the waste paper basket. The Heads of departments and the Heads of districts also follow the same precedent. Sir, I come from the Tiruchirappalli district and the President of the District Board, although he is a non-official, generally replies to my communications as soon as they are received by him; but the Collector of the district never cares to reply to the communications sent to him. For instance, I sent to him in June last a memorandum on behalf of the people requesting him to undertake some minor irrigation works in my constituency; and to that, I have not yet received a reply from him. Such is the state of affairs in the district and it should be changed.

"Coming to the question of the supply of milo in the villages, the position is deplorable. The taluk of Udayarpalayam from which I hail, is a deficit pocket in the Tiruchirappalli district. The whole area depends for its cultivation on the monsoon; the south-west monsoon has failed and the north-east monsoon also has not given much encouragement. The result is that the area is famine-stricken. At this time, the Government are supplying milo through some fair-price shops, but the quantity was found to be not enough. When the matter was taken to the notice of the concerned authorities, they did not take any steps to increase the quantity given. The present position should be clearly understood. During the period of control, in the non-statutory areas, i.e., in villages, no ration cards had been issued because there was no necessity; and as the movement of foodgrains was restricted as between one village and another, the people were able to get sufficient foodgrain from their own villages. But now that the control has been removed, the stocks in the villages have been removed to far away places and there is not much stock left over for the consumption of the local people in the villages. No doubt in this period of famine, the Government have undertaken to supply something through the fair-price shops, but, as I said, the supply is not enough. Apart from that, ration cards will have first of all to be issued to the villagers, as the supply of milo is made only to ration card-holders. What is the use of Government issuing orders that ration card-holders should be supplied with milo when ration cards themselves have not been issued to the villagers? So, when we asked that more quantity of milo,

[6th November 1952] [Sri K. R. Viswanatham]

should be supplied to the people, the Government order was to the effect that only ration card-holders must be supplied with milo and others not. The result is that the villagers have to go without any foodgrains whatsoever and have to starve. I, therefore, submit that if the Government want to stick to their order that milo should be supplied only to ration card-holders, they must see to it that first of all, ration cards are issued to the people and then only they must issue milo through the fair price shops.

"On the question of the condition of the handloom weavers, it is well-known that the distress is universal throughout the State. In my own constituency, the condition of the weavers is miserable. About 30,000 people live on this profession. In the last session we were told that the Government have allotted about Rs. 50 lakhs for the amelioration of the condition of the handloom weavers. I do not know how this amount is being spent for the benefit of these weavers. It was said that the Government scheme was to afford facilities to the weavers who become members of co-operative societies; but in practice, it is not useful to be members of co-operative societies. The Government give some advance to the members for purchasing yarn; they purchase the yarn with the advance. But when they go to sell the cloth, they have to compete in the open market where the price of cloth is lower than the cost of production of the weaver, with the result that they are not again able to take advantage of the advance given by the Government. So, if at all the Government are sincere in the matter of giving aid to the weavers, they should come forward to meet the loss or the difference between the open market price and the cost of production of the weaver and thus encourage the weaver to come under the Government scheme which is intended to help the weavers.

"The next question I wish to refer to, Sir, is that the Government are making unnecessary transfers of low-paid officials. For instance, forest guards and police constables are being transferred from district to district, or from Madras to Madurai or Tirunelveli. These poor-paid officials when they are transferred from their own surroundings to far-off places, find it very hard to pull on in these hard times, and naturally the efficiency of official work has to suffer as a result.

"In certain departments we see that people who enter a particular service have to continue in the same service for a long time, and they become vexed and tired of the tediousness of the work which they have to attend to for a very long time. For instance, if one enters as a Sub-Registrar in the Registration department, he has to continue for long as a Sub-Registrar and has to retire as Sub-Registrar. He can have no ambition to get promoted, because, while there are about 600 to 700 Sub-Registrars in the whole State, there are only about 25 District Registrars. And even out of this 25, one or two posts are being filled up by direct recruitment, with the result that there is not even the remotest chance of a Sub-Registrar becoming a District Registrar even after a long

[Sri K. R. Viswanatham] [6th November 1952]

period of service. There should be some opening provided for these officers in other departments, so that they may keep up their enthusiasm and their ambition to become more and more efficient in their duties. With these words I support the motion to appoint a committee to find ways and means to improve the efficiency of the Government machinery."

4-20
P.M.

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I moved an amendment to the resolution and I support the resolution in the amended form because there is need to increase the efficiency of the administration and also to establish proper co-ordination between the various departments. Instead of having a committee of the Members of this House, I suggest that a Committee consisting of high officials with wide experience may be appointed because, with the background of their vast experience gained during the period of their long service, they can study the problems thoroughly and make proposals for the effective and good working of the administrative machinery. Many hon. Members of this House will agree with me when I say that here is inordinate delay in disposing of matters referred to the administrative authorities both in the Secretariat and in the districts. To this, the Government might reply that they are having an able and efficient machinery and that the delays are not due to the fault in the administrative machinery but due to the nature of the matter referred to them. It may be true to some extent but I personally feel that the administrative machinery is mostly responsible for the inordinate delay being caused in the disposal of matters of even urgent nature.

" Another aspect of the matter to be considered is the question of reducing the cost of establishment in view of the slender financial position of the State. The House will remember that the Hon. the Chief Minister was telling the House sometime back that the number of staff is increasing from day to day but the work turned out by it is getting reduced. This is a matter for the committee to go into and it might see how far cost of establishment could be reduced without any effect on the administrative side.

" Then there is the question of want of proper co-ordination between the various departments and because of that the people are deprived of the benefit they are entitled to have from the departments. For instance, proper co-ordination between the Revenue and the Co-operative departments is necessary for the better working of most categories of co-operative societies. For instance, let us take the case of a tenants' co-operative society. The landless poor with the object of obtaining a piece of land from the Government on lease and forming into a co-operative society generally approach the Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies in the district and request him to register a society for their benefit. As soon as they approach him, he will say : You better approach the Revenue authorities and secure a piece of land and then a society

[6th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

can be formed and registered. The innocent and ignorant landless poor go to the Revenue authorities and ask them whether any land is available to be given on lease to them to enable a co-operative society to be formed for their benefit. But the District Collector or the Revenue Divisional Officer or the Tahsildar will immediately say : You better form into a co-operative society and then we will look into the question of giving land to you on lease. Then they go back to the Registrar and the Registrar gives his old answer and unfortunately neither the Deputy Registrar nor the Collector tries to get into touch with each other and solve the problem of the landless poor. Thus we find there is practically no co-ordination between various departments. We can show several instances of this nature. There is no co-ordination between the department of Agriculture and the Co-operative department as also between the Food and the Co-operative departments. It is therefore, essential that the Government should take measures to establish proper co-ordination between the various departments. For this purpose I suggest that the Government should direct that periodical conferences of the various heads of the district administration should be held so that the entire administration could be run more efficiently and co-operatively and in the interests of the people.

" I know the Government have appointed Sri S. Venkateswaran, an I.C.S. officer, to go into the question of re-organization of the Secretariat with a view to increase the efficiency and attain speedy disposal of matters referred to it. I suggest that the Government may also think of appointing two or three more high officials with considerable service and long experience to go into the question of the administration of the various departments in the districts and the most important thing to be considered is to see whether the cost of establishment could not be reduced and how to bring about an administration with speedy disposal of matters referred to them and with proper co-ordination between the various departments at the district level."

* SRI G. RAMA RAO :—" ఉపాధ్యక్ష, ప్రభుత్వ మెకానిజం అమలుపరచ వలసినది ప్రభుత్వ machinery, ప్రభుత్వ machinery వి విధంగా సాగునీ ఉంటున్నది. దాని ప్రకారమే ప్రజల జీవితం కూడా సాగుతున్నది. అయితే ప్రస్తుతము మన ప్రభుత్వ machinery వి విధంగా ఉన్నది? దానివల్ల ప్రజలకు వివిధమైన ఫలితాలు, సుఖాలు కలుగుతున్నవి అవి మనము చూడవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. ప్రజలలో వి వర్గానికికూడా ప్రస్తుతం సుఖం లేదు. ఉద్యోగస్తులకు, పేద రైతులకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు, కార్మికులకు మరి మే యితర వర్గములకాకి కూడా సుఖ యీ ప్రభుత్వవిభాగమువల్ల జరుగుటయు లేదనేది మన దైనందిన జీవితములో చూస్తున్నాం ఎందుచేతనంటే యీ ప్రభుత్వ విభాగం చాలా లోపము యిట్లుగా ఉన్నది. విమెనా సుఖం గలిగితే, భూస్వాములకు, కోటిశ్వరులకు, పెద్ద పెద్ద జీతగాంధ్రకు, పంతులకు మాత్రం సుఖంగా ఉంది. విభజించి పాలించే యింగ్లీషు ప్రభుత్వ విభాగాన్ని మనవారు విడిచిపెట్టకుండా అంటిపెట్టుకుని ఉన్నారు. దానిని విభాగాన్ని అమలుపరచడానికి, మనదేశాన్ని కొల్లగొట్టుకుపోవడానికి ప్రత్యేక పుష్టితులు కల్పించుకొని ఇంగ్లీషువారే యీ శాసనాలు చేసుకుంటే జాతీయ మన

[Sri G. Rama Rao] [6th November 1952]

వాళ్లు మార్చుకొని మార్చలేదు. కాననాన్ని ఆమలు జరిపే ప్రభుత్వ మేషినరీకి సుఖం లేదు. సంతృప్తి లేదు. ఫ్యాక్టరీలో మరలు తృప్తుపడితే, ప్యాక్టరీ విమి పనిచేస్తుంది. విమి ఫలితాలు వస్తే ఆలోచించవలసి వున్నది. ముఖ్యంగా ప్రభుత్వద్యోగస్తులు ఎంతుకని యూనిఫం గా యిబ్బందిపడుతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వద్యోగస్తులు జీతబట్టాలు చాలడములేదని పనిభారం ఎక్కువైందని ill-treatment సుక్కుమలా వున్నదని గోడెతున్నారు. వీనిలో ఏ ఒక్కటి కూడా ప్రభుత్వం సరిచేయలేనప్పుడు, machine వివిధంగా పనిచేస్తోంది క్రింద తరగతివారు పై ఉద్యోగస్తులవల్ల అనేక బాధలకు గురిఅవుతున్నారు. ఈ ఉద్యోగాల విషయములో discipline అనే పాకుతో పై ఉద్యోగస్తులు వారి క్రింద వారిచేత అనేక హింసలను పనులు చేయించుకొంటున్నారు. ఇది ప్రతి department లో జరుగుచున్నది ఇక పోలీసు department విషయము చెప్పనక్కరలేదు. ఉదాహరణకు Constables తరగతి వారు Sub-Inspector లాయతు Deputy Superintendent గాని, Circle Inspector గాని Constables ను సరిగాచూడక, హింసలుగాచూస్తున్నారు. ఈ Constables వల్ల యీ వైన పేర్కొనబడిన ఉద్యోగస్తులు వారియొక్క ఇంటిపనులే కాకుండా, boots మొదలైనటువంటివిగూడ తుడిపించుకొని, మూటలు, beds తో సహా హెయించుకొంటున్నారు. ఈ విధమైన పనిచెయ్యకపోతే in-discipline అని remarks వ్రాస్తారు. లేని తప్పులు వారిమీద వ్రాసి వారి జీవితమును నాశనము చేస్తున్నారు. ఇదిమీగాకుండా, యీ క్రింద తరగతి Constables విమనా పనిచేయక నిరాకరిస్తే, యీ పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులు rascal అనియా fool అనియా, scoundrel మొదలగు తిట్లును తిట్లుగా బెదిరించి పనిచేయించుకుంటున్నారు ఇదంతయు అక్రమమైన పద్ధతిగదా! గవర్నమెంటు ఇతర డిపార్టుమెంటు పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులకూడ గుమాస్తాలను యీవిధంగానే తిట్టుటగలదు. ఒకవేళ నిరాకరిస్తే వారిమీద confidential sheets లో వ్రాసి, వారి జీవితాని నాశనముచేయ ప్రారంభిస్తున్నారు. ఈ దినములలో యీ అన్యాయమంతమూ యీ అనాదరణీయమైన N.G.Os. కు లభించుచున్నది. ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనలో యిటువంటి హింసలైన treatment ఉండుట చాలా అన్యాయము, అధర్మము. పై ఉద్యోగస్తులలో అనగా ఒక కలెక్టరుగాని, డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టరుగాని, తహశీల్దారుగాని, పోలీసు సూపరింటెండెంటుగాని, డిప్యూటీ సూపరింటెండెంటుగాని తుదకు మంత్రులుగాని క్యాంపుచేస్తున్నప్పుడు యీ క్రింది ఉద్యోగస్తులు అనగా, గ్రామ కరణములుగాని, సబ్ యిన్స్పెక్టరుగాని, గుమాస్తాలుగాని వారి క్యాంపులలో సరియైన సత్తయి జరుగకపోతే, వారిని అసమర్థులని confidential sheets లో ఎక్కవలెసినదే, rascal, fool అనే మాటలకు వారు గురికావలసినదే. పాపము యీ క్రింది ఉద్యోగస్తులకు యీ సత్తయిచు మూలాన తమ జీతాలుగూడా వచ్చినట్లు ఖర్చుచేసుకోవలసినదే. తుదకు నెల జీతాలు గూడా ముట్టని పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుచుండును. ఈ చిన్న ఉద్యోగస్తులలో కొంతమందికి దినమునకు బత్తా పన్నెండు అణాలు మాత్రమే యింట్టున్నది. ఈ దినములలో యీ వస్త్రేండు అణాలతో, యీ హెచ్చుధరం రోజులలో ఎలా సరిపోవునో ఆలోచించవలెను. యీ విధముగా తక్కువ జీతాల వారు లంచాలు వుచ్చుకుంటున్నారంటే, పై ఉద్యోగస్తులను తృప్తిపరచుట కనుటకేగాని వేరే దేనికని సందేహించ నక్కరలేదు. ఈ N.G.Os. మొదలయిన చిన్నచిన్న ఉద్యోగస్తులు జీతాలు చాలకయండగా పై అధికారులచేత తిట్లుగూడా సంపాదించుకుంటున్నారు గనుక చిన్న ఉద్యోగి అయినను వీరికి సరియైన treatment, సుఖజీవనము లభించేయుట చాలా అవసరము. ఈ విషయ

6th November 1952] [Sri G. Rama Rao]

ములో మరొక ఉదాహరణ చెప్పుతున్నాను. క్యాంపుకు వెళ్లినప్పుడు బత్తా తీసుకొనే సందర్భములో చిన్న ఉద్యోగులు తన headquarters కు అయిదు మైళ్లు దూరము దాటి పోలేగాని వీరికి యివ్వబడే పన్నెండు అణాలుగాని, అంతగా యిస్తే ఒక రూపాయవరకూరాదు. అది కూడా యీ కర్ర రోజులలో వారికి ఖర్చులకుచాలదు. ఇకపోతే ఈ పెద్ద ఉద్యోగస్తులయినవారు అనగా డిప్యూటీ కలెక్టరు, డిప్యూటీ సూపరింటెండెంటు వగైరా ఉద్యోగస్తులు రాధారింగుకాలో కూర్చునికాని, headquarters లో ఉన్న బంగళాలో కూర్చునికాని ఆహూషిగా పికారుకు ప్రభుత్వ జీపు కాదుమీద వెళ్లవచ్చినట్లు, అయిదుమైళ్ల దూరము ఏ హెటారులావాపోయి తిరిగివచ్చి రోజుకు ర. 5-4-0 బత్తా సంపాదించుకొంటున్నారు. ఇదంత అక్రమ సంపాదనఅనిపిస్తే, ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క సొమ్మును సునాయాసంగా సంపాదించుటేనని చెప్పుతున్నాను. అదియు లేకపోతే ఆ గ్రామాద్యోగులను బంగళాకు పిలిపించుకొని ఆ ప్రయాణము చేసినట్లు బత్తా బిల్లులోను, డ్రైయరీలోను వ్రాసు కుంటున్నారు. ఇదంతయు కనిపెట్టేవారులేరు. అంతే యిదంతయు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని హెసగించుటతప్ప మరేమిటి అని ఎడుగుతున్నాను. ఇక లేఖరు ఇన్స్పెక్టరుచేయి అవకతవకలు చెప్పనవసరములేదు. పెద్దపెద్ద ఖాస్వాములు చూద్దామా వ్యవసాయ కూలీలచేత వారిపనులు జరుపుకొనుటయేగాని వారికి రావలసిన మాలిగాని, నెలజీతములు గాని సరిగాయివ్వరు. Shops లో పనిచేసే కార్మికుల విషయం విచారితే పనిలోసూత్రం ఖచ్చితముగా చేయించుకుంటున్నను, వారికి రావలసిన బోనసు వగైరాలు సరిగా యివ్వక ప్రభుత్వంవారు అడిగితే తప్పురెక్క. చూపి అక్రమ లాభాలు యీ shopowners సంపాదించుకుంటున్నారు. గ్రామాలలో గ్రామకరణం ముగ సబ్ అనే చిన్న ఉద్యోగస్తులు తెలివిలేటలులేని యీ రైతాంగాన్ని హెసముచేస్తూ డబ్బు లంచాలుగా తీసుకుంటున్నారు. యీ గ్రామాలలో యీ కేడరైతాంగము వ్యవసాయ పురిచేసుకొనేవారి కష్టములు చెప్పనలవికాదు ఇంతేకాకుండా వ్యవసాయ డిపార్టుమెంటువారు వ్యవసాయదార్లకు గవర్నమెంటు సత్తయిచేసే వ్యవసాయ పరికరములు లంచములు యిస్తేనేతప్ప, సరిగా సత్తయిచేయరు. సత్తయి రాలేదంటారు. అదికాకపోతే, అసలు కనపడనేకనపడరు. ఇంజనీరింగు డిపార్టుమెంటు విషయము ఆలోచిస్తే సూపర్ వైజరు మొదలు యింజనీర్ల వరకు ప్రతి పనికి లంచాలు తీసుకోవడంతప్ప మరేమి కనబడటంలేదు. ఈ నాడు యే డిపార్టుమెంటులో చూద్దామన్నా లంచాలు తీసుకొనితే పనులు జరగడములేదు. యీ ధరల హెచ్చు రోజులలో జీవనముగడుపుటయే సాధ్యపడకండాఉంటే, యీ లంచములను ఎక్కడికీవెళ్లి తీస్తారో ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఏ డిపార్టుమెంటులోచూచిన లంచ గొండితనము తప్ప వెరకనబడదు. ఈ కారణములచేతనే ప్రభుత్వమువారిని ఒక select committee ని వేసి యీ వివరములు నిష్పక్షపాత బుద్ధితో గమనించి పరినాయకములలో సరియైన మార్పు చేగలందులకు కోరుచున్నాను. ఏ డిపార్టుమెంటులో చూచినను inefficiency పెరిగిందేకాని, పూర్వపు రోజులలో ఉన్న efficiency కనబడటంలేదు. అందువలననే ప్రభుత్వపరిపాలనలో లోపాలు తొలగించి, అవసరమైన staff ను మాత్రమేఉంచి, quick disposal కు efficient administration ప్రవేశ పెట్టగలందులకు ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుచున్నాను. అప్పుడే ప్రజలు సుఖముగా జీవించగలందులకు అవకాశముయిచ్చిన వారగుదురు."

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise 4-30 to oppose the motion. Several hon. Members have suggested p.m.

[Sri G. Nagabhushanam] [6th November 1952]

several ways by which the administration could be improved but, broadly speaking, I consider they are all mere tinkering and cannot solve the problem. For example, in the Constitution of India it is provided that a person should not practise untouchability and in our State the Prohibition Act is in force. But how far and to what extent human nature is conforming itself to legislation? Therefore, everything depends on human nature, which is an essential factor in all democratic countries. The word 'efficiency' is a comprehensive term which includes integrity and character. If we want very efficient service and honest and capable administrators, we must go deep into the problem of human nature and bring about a change. We want patriotic and highly intelligent citizens and citizens actuated with a feeling of public service who alone can carry on an efficient administration. Even though the wages paid to officials may be a mere pittance, it is only their patriotism that surmounts all difficulties and this is what is happening in almost all democratic countries. There are some people who believe that they can bring about a revolution to change the human nature. But, I submit, we are wedded to non-violence and peace. We cannot bring about a bloody revolution. Also, my hon. Friends on the other side have suggested that we should follow the example of China in this matter. Sir, we have read several letters written by the recent visitors to China and in one of those letters, it is stated that the conditions in China are very bad and there is no freedom, not even religious freedom, and people are sent to jails for their religious convictions. Therefore, there is no country which is free from blemish. Also, the recent editorial in the 'Hindu' goes to show that even in Russia the State-managed industries are suffering from nepotism, corruption and inefficiency. Therefore, I submit, that the suggestion of my hon. Friends that we should follow the system of administration obtaining in China or Russia, is not practicable as both these countries believe in dictatorship.

"Some hon. Members pointed out that there is too much concentration of power in Fort St. George which leads to considerable delay and therefore suggested decentralisation of administration. For the first time in the history of Madras, an attempt has been made in the direction of decentralisation by passing the Panchayat Act which confers powers on the people. But now there is great opposition to it and some people want that this Act should not be brought into force as they fear that there will be party feuds, violence, bloodshed and things of that kind. Some people suggest that we should have secret ballot for elections and another set of people want mere show of hands. Therefore, there are two views on this question, one favouring concentration of power and another favouring decentralisation. As suggested by the Hon. Sri Deshmukh, we must have a mixed economy. Wherever centralisation is necessary we have to adopt it and whenever decentralisation is feasible it may be followed. In this way the administration of the State should be carried on and no fixed rule could be laid down nor

6th November 1952] [Sri G. Nagabhushanam]

is it possible to follow it. Of course, some mistakes may be committed here and there and they could be rectified, not by a Committee, but by the Ministers themselves who are representatives of the people and who are responsible to them. Therefore, I strongly oppose the appointment of a Committee because it will usurp the functions of the executive.

"Sir, I agree with my hon. Friend Mr. Thimma Reddi that the I.C.S. officers are good and courteous people and our revered leader Rajaji's influence has reached the Secretariat level but it has not reached the district level. I once more request Rajaji to use his influence with the district authorities for the good administration of the State. For instance, prohibition is a failure in Bellary district because the officials themselves drink and I hope Rajaji will look into the matter and see that something is done immediately. There is a general feeling among the people—which may be wrong—that Rajaji defends Government servants in season and out of season and therefore Rajaji should extend his vision to the districts and bring about efficient administration in the districts. We are hopeful that under the leadership of Rajaji our district administration will improve step by step and will achieve perfection ultimately. We, the people living in South India, must be grateful to Rajaji for having saved this State and putting an end to subversive activities. The people of the Madras State have full faith and hope in the administration of Rajaji and I hope that Rajaji will maintain that trust and confidence and carry on the administration efficiently.

"Sir, an attack has been made by some members on the other side that this administration is a capitalist administration. I submit, no other State has done so much service to the Harijans as the Madras State. In the interest of the people, we have introduced Prohibition. We have started several hostels and schools for Harijans and they are getting on well. For example, when Mr. Rami Reddi was the Collector of Bellary, as the Joint Secretary of the Bellary Harijan Sevak Sangh, I was able to get back a land belonging to a Harijan who had lost it, by filing a petition before him. In several cases I was able to arrange for loans and lands for Harijans. Therefore, the argument that this is a capitalist administration, falls to the ground. The recent labour legislation undertaken by the Government goes to show that our administration is carried on for the sake of the poor people. We live for the poor; we stand by the poor; and we work for the poor. The argument of the Opposition is only based on a conflict of ideology and born out of discontent and despair. They are dissatisfied with the administration because their wishes have not been carried out. It is only want of co-operation between officials and non-officials that is responsible for the present state of the administration. Therefore, I submit, there is no need for the appointment of a committee to go into the question. Also, it is a waste of public money as human nature cannot be changed within a short time even by laws. With these words, I oppose the Resolution."

[6th November 1952]

4-50
p.m.

* SRI ASI NEELADRIRAO REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Resolution does not require any opposition. The purpose of the Resolution is only to remedy the inefficiency of the administration and as such there is no reason why there should be any opposition. Now, Sri G. C. Kondayya, has only suggested the formation of a Select Committee to run the administration efficiently and the hon. Member, Sri Koti Reddi, has sought to amend it to some extent."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, Sri Koti Reddi, has not moved his amendment."

SRI ASI NEELADRIRAO REDDI :—" Probably, the Government fear that if there is a Committee of this kind, there will be dual control which may lead to difficulties. The occasion is such that to-day we have necessarily to have dual control because, if we once purchase a good machine, it does not mean that it requires no repairs. We have to carry out repairs where they are required. Many of the hon. Members have agreed on the floor of this House that the present Government is not running smoothly and that there are so many defects which require to be rectified and as such I feel the Government should be controlled by a Committee of Members of this Legislature. After all the rules of administration are framed for the people and, when we have come here as representatives of the people, there is no reason why there should not be a Committee of the elected representatives of the people and non-officials also.

" As regards corruption, I would say definitely that there is corruption, but there is no meaning in simply saying that there is corruption. Corruption is due mainly to one or two reasons. The disparity in the salaries paid to the different classes of Government servants is the chief cause. The non-gazetted officers who are mostly poorly paid and the teachers are so much discouraged that to make both ends meet they have to adopt corrupt practices. The existing Government composed mostly of non-officials who want to support one another cannot eradicate this corruption. A special advisory committee of non-officials as suggested in the Resolution would definitely rectify the defects in the administration. As an instance of the defects in the administration, I would only point out that every hon. Member of this House knows what the Prohibition Department is doing. There is absolutely no discipline in that Department. I mean to say that there is no discipline in the Government itself because, so far as I have seen in my parts, for every 20 or 30 houses in a village you find a liquor shop. If there is regular discipline maintained and if really efficient work is done these things should not have occurred. It only means that the administration is not efficient and as such the formation of an Advisory Select Committee is essential. Since the hon. Members, Sri Kondayya and Sri P. Thimma Reddi have dealt with this question elaborately, I need not reiterate what they have said and I support the Resolution."

[6th November 1952]

* SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this resolution is very wide in its scope and ambit. I find from the resolution that the hon. the mover of the resolution wants the principles, methods and procedure of the administrative machinery to be studied by a few Members of this Assembly. The Members of this Assembly are not all of them administrators nor have they great experience in administration. The Committee is to be selected for the purpose of studying the administrative machinery and to suggest ways and means for its improvement. In short, Sir, the hon. the mover of the resolution wants a modelling or a re-modelling of the Constitution. I may at once say that we are the inheritors of an excellent Constitution. There is absolutely nothing to say against the Constitution. It has stood the test of time and the Indian Constitution has been framed by the very best of Indians. The very best brains have participated in its making and to say now that a few members of this provincial Legislative Assembly should reconstitute the machinery of administration is something, Sir, which I think is too much for us to arrogate to ourselves. The machinery is all right but one would think from the speeches that one heard in this Assembly to-day that corruption in the administration is rampant and if one goes away with the idea that the administration is corrupt, he is going away with a wrong impression. Stray instances of corruption are brought to our notice. Now, corruption does not depend upon the machinery but it is the personnel who work the machinery that is corrupt. In fact, I felt so small and so ashamed when hon. Members of this House were saying that many of our officials were corrupt. After all it is a reflection on ourselves. Who are these officials? They are not God's special creation. They are our own men. Some of us may become officials and, if we say that the officials are corrupt, we are only saying that we are corrupt and that the standard of honesty and integrity in our own men is low. It is an admission of that sorry fact. I for one, Sir, would say that it is not so. There will be corruption here and there but to say that the entire administration is corrupt and the officials are corrupt is to give a wrong picture. I know of an old professor of mine in Zoology who told us that when he came to India from England he was very much surprised to find that wild animals were not roaming about the streets of Madras and other places. He had read so much about the wild animals of India, the elephants, the tigers and so on that he thought that when he came to India he would find every village and town filled with these wild animals. If hon. Members are able to pick out stray cases of corruption and think that corruption is rampant, it is something like the above.

" Sir, do we encourage corruption in our administration or in our laws? Can any hon. Member point out a single legislative enactment condoning corruption? On the other hand the provisions of the Penal Code and other administrative laws are there which say that corrupt people are to be punished. When the machinery is there, when the legal enactments are there, people

[Sri N. Gopala Menon]

[6th November 1952]

are still corrupt. A few of them are corrupt. Of course, I do not say that the Government should sit with folded hands and see even this small corruption going on in the administration.

"Sir, there are different ways of corruption. Corruption does not merely mean the taking of illegal gratification or money. In our country, we are so obsessed with our communal feelings or religious feelings and with our own caste prejudices that we are very often prone to help people who belong to our own community or to our religion or to our caste. Provincial patriotism also to a large extent plays a large part in the administration. These are the instances where the Government should step in and see that the right man is put in charge of those offices where these predilections and prejudices may not play a large part. That is an important thing which the head of the administration should do. Particularly in the Police Department the Government should see that proper men are appointed at the proper places because they are responsible for the peace of the particular locality. If you place a wrong man, a man with communal bias, a man who thinks merely of his own village or of his own community, he is absolutely unfit for the purpose of carrying on his work. These things must be borne in mind. But I do oppose very strongly this resolution which I submit is a condemnation of the character, integrity and honesty of our people."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ సందర్భములో ఇంతకుముందు మాట్లాడిన గోపాల మీనగారి లాజ్ నాకు పూర్తిగా అర్థంకాలేదు. ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగంలో తప్పులు ఉన్నాయని చెప్పినప్పటికీ సభ్యులు వారివారి స్వానుభవాలను తెలిపినప్పటికీ, ఇదికాదంటూ, ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగాన్ని మరోవిధంగా సమర్థిస్తూ వాదించడం గౌరవనీయ సభ్యులపై ఒక reflection గా ఉంది. వారు ఆ విధంగా మాట్లాడడం మంచిదికాదని చెప్పుతున్నాను. పరిస్థితులు సరిగా తెలుసుకోక ఎక్కడో ఒకరిద్దరు తప్పులు చేసియుండవచ్చునేమిగాని corruption ప్రధానంగా ఎక్కువ కనిపించడంలేదు అనేవిషయాన్ని వారు తెలియజేసారు. కాని ఈ అభిప్రాయము వాస్తవిక పరిస్థితులకు విరుద్ధమైనటువంటిదని ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులే కాకుండా ప్రభుత్వ సభ్యులూకూడా ఎక్కువమంది ఒప్పుకుంటున్న విషయమని వారు గ్రహించిఉంటే బాగుండేది. ఇప్పుడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ప్రధానమంత్రిగా వచ్చినారనుక ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనా యంత్రాన్ని తుల్యపరచి, పోలీసు ఎక్జిక్యూటివ్ machinery ని తదితర డిపార్టుమెంటులను అన్నిటిని చక్కదిద్ది ఒక రకమైన మార్పు లీసుకురావచ్చునని అందరు అనుకొన్నారు. అయితే ఆచరణలో పరిస్థితులు ఎట్లున్నాయి అని పరిశీలించిచూచినప్పుడు మనకు విషయములు సుస్పష్టంగా బోధపడగలవు. ఇప్పుడు మొట్టమొదట ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రమంతటికీకూడ చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటి అంగమును, అన్నిటికంటే ఎక్కువ బాధ్యతవహించుటకుంటుంటున్న cabinet విషయము ఆలోచిద్దాము. ఈ Treasury Benches మీద కూర్చున్నటువంటివారి మనస్తత్వమును మనము ఒకసారి జాగ్రత్తగా చూచినప్పుడు ఇది ఒక running thread మాదిరి క్రిందివరకు ఏ విధముగా వెళ్లిందో అర్థం చేసుకోవచ్చు. ఈ సందర్భంలో ఒక ఉదాహరణాన్ని తెలుపుచున్నాను. ఒక మంత్రిగారు పర్యటన చేస్తూ కమ్యూనిస్టులకు ఎక్కువ వోట్లు ఇచ్చిన ఒక గ్రామమునకు వచ్చినప్పుడు అక్కడి ప్రజలందరూ కొత్త వస్తువులు వీయకూడదనే వివాదాల్లో తోరగింపు చేసినారు. అందుకు మంత్రిగారు కోపము చేసుకొని వారి ఉపన్యాసములో మాట్లాడుతూ కాంగ్రెసుకు వోటుచేయనివారంతా పశువులు అధమాదములని ఆయన గట్టిగా చెప్పారు. నేనే కాదు, ఇతర M.L.A. లు ఎదుటకూడ ఇదంతా జరిగింది. ఇప్పుడు నేను ఎవరు పశువులనేది తప్పించ బోవటంకాదు. ఈ సమస్య ఎందుకు వచ్చినదంటే ఈ రకంగా ప్రజలంటే ఈ విధమైన నిర్లక్ష్య వైఖరిని ఆవలంబించుటలో పూర్వపు మంత్రి వర్గానికి, యీ మంత్రి వర్గానికి పెద్ద తేడాకాదనే నా యభిప్రాయం. ఇది ఒక్క విషయమే కాదు. ప్రతి చిన్న విషయములోను వీరి మనస్తత్వము ఈ విధంగానే ఉంటుంది. ఈ వేర ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు తెలుగులో మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ విధంగా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడేందుకు దీని వినక రాజకీయాలన్నాయని ఒక background ఉన్నదని విమర్శించారు. కాని మేము మొట్టమొదట అసెంబ్లీకి వచ్చినప్పుడే ఇప్పటి చాలామంది కా ర్మిగులు, వ్యవసాయదారులు ఇంగ్లీషు రానివారు అనేక మంది ఉంటున్నారు, వారికి ఇంగ్లీషు అర్థంకాదని అందుకొరకు ఇంగ్లీషుకు translation చేస్తే బిల్లుచేయవలెనని ఆనాడే చెప్పాము. అయితే మా కోరికలు ఇతవరకు గూడ గమనించలేదు. మేము ఏదో రకంగా ఇప్పటివరకు సర్దుకొంటూ రావలసివచ్చినది. కాని అంద్ర ప్రజలలో విభరీత గందరగోళము జరుగుచున్నందునను ఒకరి మాటలు ఇంకొకరికి అర్థము కాకుండాటచేతను కనీసము తెలుగువారైనా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడితే మిగతా సభ్యులకు ప్రజాసౌకానికి తెలుస్తుందని మేము ఈలాంటి నిర్ణయానికి వచ్చాము. దీనివెనుక ఒక రాజకీయ background ఉన్నదని లేక కుట్ర ఏదో ఒకటి ఉన్నదనే వాదనను లీసుకురావడమనేది వారి మనస్తత్వాన్ని నిరూపించే ఒక చక్కటి నిదర్శనము. ఇక ఇప్పుడు మన ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రములో Bureaucratism ఉన్నదనేది అందరు అంగీకరిస్తారు. ఇది అనేక రకాలుగా ఉంటుంది. ముఖ్యంగా మంత్రివర్గమునకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఒక చిన్న విషయానికిగాని, పెద్ద విషయానికిగాని ‘confidential’ అనే విధానము ఒకటున్నది. ప్రభుత్వ వ్యవహారాలలో ప్రజలకు చెప్పటకు వీలులేని విషయాలు రహస్యమైనటువంటివి ప్రభుత్వాన్నంతా నిర్వహించేటప్పుడు కొన్ని రహస్యమైన విషయాలు confidential గా ఉండవలసిందే. కాని అత్యధిక ప్రజలకు తెలుపవలసినటువంటి విషయాలలోను, ఇతర సామాన్య విషయాలలోను ప్రతిదానికి confidential అని చెప్పడం అంటే అర్థం లేదు. మొన్న క్రిష్ణా-వెన్నాడు ప్రాజెక్టు విషయములో అంద్ర ప్రజలు కోస్తా కమిటీ రిపోర్టు మీకు వచ్చినదా అని మంత్రులను అడిగితే అది confidential అని చెప్పారు. ఇక్కడ వీరి వైఖరి ఏమో అర్థంగాదు. ప్రజాసౌకానికి తెలియవలసినటువంటి అతిముఖ్యమైన సమస్యలలోగూడ confidential అని అంటే వారి వైఖరి ఏ విధంగా ఉందో తూచించుకోవచ్చు. రెండవది ఇప్పుడు వేరుకు ధర నిర్ణయించే విషయములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము మునుగు ఒకటికి రూ 1-5-0 లు చొప్పున ఈ సంచిత్రము నిర్ణయము చేసింది. మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వ వైఖరి గురించి అడిగితే ఎవరుకూడా మాట్లాడరు. పత్రికలలో మద్రాసు cabinet రూ 1-2-0 లు ఇస్తే చాలునని సిబార్డు చేసినట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. కాని అట్టి నిర్ణయమేది జరగలేదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. రఫీ అహమ్మద్ కిద్వాన్ గారు ఇటీవల జరిగిన గత కాన్ఫరెన్సులో మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వం మునుగు 18 రూ. 1-2-0 లు సిబార్డు చేసినట్లు ప్రకటించారట. ఇక్కడ వీరిని అడిగితే వ్యవసాయశాఖ మంత్రిగారు మేముటువంటిదేమీ చేయలేదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. ఇక ఎవరుకూటలు సభ్యుల మాకు అర్థమగుటెదు. ఈ విధంగా ఇటువంటి ప్రజాతపస్యమైనటువంటి విషయాలలోకూడా confidential అనే పదంతో

6th November 1952]

[Sri K. Govinda Rao]

అందరూ కొత్త వస్తువులు వీయకూడదనే వివాదాల్లో తోరగింపు చేసినారు. అందుకు మంత్రిగారు కోపము చేసుకొని వారి ఉపన్యాసములో మాట్లాడుతూ కాంగ్రెసుకు వోటుచేయనివారంతా పశువులు అధమాదములని ఆయన గట్టిగా చెప్పారు. నేనే కాదు, ఇతర M.L.A. లు ఎదుటకూడ ఇదంతా జరిగింది. ఇప్పుడు నేను ఎవరు పశువులనేది తప్పించ బోవటంకాదు. ఈ సమస్య ఎందుకు వచ్చినదంటే ఈ రకంగా ప్రజలంటే ఈ విధమైన నిర్లక్ష్య వైఖరిని ఆవలంబించుటలో పూర్వపు మంత్రి వర్గానికి, యీ మంత్రి వర్గానికి పెద్ద తేడాకాదనే నా యభిప్రాయం. ఇది ఒక్క విషయమే కాదు. ప్రతి చిన్న విషయములోను వీరి మనస్తత్వము ఈ విధంగానే ఉంటుంది. ఈ వేర ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు తెలుగులో మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ విధంగా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడేందుకు దీని వినక రాజకీయాలన్నాయని ఒక background ఉన్నదని విమర్శించారు. కాని మేము మొట్టమొదట అసెంబ్లీకి వచ్చినప్పుడే ఇప్పటి చాలామంది కా ర్మిగులు, వ్యవసాయదారులు ఇంగ్లీషు రానివారు అనేక మంది ఉంటున్నారు, వారికి ఇంగ్లీషు అర్థంకాదని అందుకొరకు ఇంగ్లీషుకు translation చేస్తే బిల్లుచేయవలెనని ఆనాడే చెప్పాము. అయితే మా కోరికలు ఇతవరకు గూడ గమనించలేదు. మేము ఏదో రకంగా ఇప్పటివరకు సర్దుకొంటూ రావలసివచ్చినది. కాని అంద్ర ప్రజలలో విభరీత గందరగోళము జరుగుచున్నందునను ఒకరి మాటలు ఇంకొకరికి అర్థము కాకుండాటచేతను కనీసము తెలుగువారైనా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడితే మిగతా సభ్యులకు ప్రజాసౌకానికి తెలుస్తుందని మేము ఈలాంటి నిర్ణయానికి వచ్చాము. దీనివెనుక ఒక రాజకీయ background ఉన్నదని లేక కుట్ర ఏదో ఒకటి ఉన్నదనే వాదనను లీసుకురావడమనేది వారి మనస్తత్వాన్ని నిరూపించే ఒక చక్కటి నిదర్శనము. ఇక ఇప్పుడు మన ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రములో Bureaucratism ఉన్నదనేది అందరు అంగీకరిస్తారు. ఇది అనేక రకాలుగా ఉంటుంది. ముఖ్యంగా మంత్రివర్గమునకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఒక చిన్న విషయానికిగాని, పెద్ద విషయానికిగాని ‘confidential’ అనే విధానము ఒకటున్నది. ప్రభుత్వ వ్యవహారాలలో ప్రజలకు చెప్పటకు వీలులేని విషయాలు రహస్యమైనటువంటివి ప్రభుత్వాన్నంతా నిర్వహించేటప్పుడు కొన్ని రహస్యమైన విషయాలు confidential గా ఉండవలసిందే. కాని అత్యధిక ప్రజలకు తెలుపవలసినటువంటి విషయాలలోను, ఇతర సామాన్య విషయాలలోను ప్రతిదానికి confidential అని చెప్పడం అంటే అర్థం లేదు. మొన్న క్రిష్ణా-వెన్నాడు ప్రాజెక్టు విషయములో అంద్ర ప్రజలు కోస్తా కమిటీ రిపోర్టు మీకు వచ్చినదా అని మంత్రులను అడిగితే అది confidential అని చెప్పారు. ఇక్కడ వీరి వైఖరి ఏమో అర్థంగాదు. ప్రజాసౌకానికి తెలియవలసినటువంటి అతిముఖ్యమైన సమస్యలలోగూడ confidential అని అంటే వారి వైఖరి ఏ విధంగా ఉందో తూచించుకోవచ్చు. రెండవది ఇప్పుడు వేరుకు ధర నిర్ణయించే విషయములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము మునుగు ఒకటికి రూ 1-5-0 లు చొప్పున ఈ సంచిత్రము నిర్ణయము చేసింది. మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వ వైఖరి గురించి అడిగితే ఎవరుకూడా మాట్లాడరు. పత్రికలలో మద్రాసు cabinet రూ 1-2-0 లు ఇస్తే చాలునని సిబార్డు చేసినట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. కాని అట్టి నిర్ణయమేది జరగలేదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. రఫీ అహమ్మద్ కిద్వాన్ గారు ఇటీవల జరిగిన గత కాన్ఫరెన్సులో మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వం మునుగు 18 రూ. 1-2-0 లు సిబార్డు చేసినట్లు ప్రకటించారట. ఇక్కడ వీరిని అడిగితే వ్యవసాయశాఖ మంత్రిగారు మేముటువంటిదేమీ చేయలేదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. ఇక ఎవరుకూటలు సభ్యుల మాకు అర్థమగుటెదు. ఈ విధంగా ఇటువంటి ప్రజాతపస్యమైనటువంటి విషయాలలోకూడా confidential అనే పదంతో

[Sri K. Govinda Rao] [6th November 1952]

యదార్థ విషయాలను దాచిపెట్టడం జరుగుచున్నది. ఇంతవరకు మంత్రివర్గంలోని
bureaucratic వ్యవస్థల విషయమై ప్రస్తావించాను. తరువాత దిగువ ప్రభుత్వ
శాఖలలో సమాచారము విచారిస్తాము. మా డివిజన్ Sub-Registrar Office ఉంటుంది.
అక్కడ వివరంగా లంచాలు తీసుకొంటున్నారని ప్రజలు ప్రతిరోజు మావిధకు వచ్చి
చెప్పుతూ ఉంటారు. మేము ఆ విషయము గురించి వారికి complaint ఇవ్వమంటే
వారు complaint ఇస్తే తమను కూడ జైలులులో పెడతారని భయపెడతారు. ఈమా
దిరి ఉన్నాయి పరిస్థితులు ప్రజలు complaint చేస్తే ఒక కట్టము, చేయకపోతే మరొక
కట్టము. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో పరిపాలనా యంత్రము పడ న్నున్నది. లంచ గొండి
తనాన్ని గూఢచూపుతామని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు చెబుతున్నారు కాని వాస్తవ
పరిస్థితులలో అటువంటిదేమీ జరగలేదు ”

5-10
p.m.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker Sir, I rise to support the resolution. I am not going into the details of the various acts of omission or commission on the part of the Government or Government officials. I just wish to convince the House of the need for the appointment of a Committee to go into the question of administrative efficiency and economy in public administration. My only purpose is that and I request every Member of this House not to mistake me that I make any remarks against the Government from any political point of view. Whether it is the Congress Government or whether it is the Government run by any other Party, it must be run with economy, with efficiency and with integrity and the Government must impress upon the people of the State whom they rule a sense of honesty and impartiality together with the other attributes which I have already enumerated. It is only when some of these things are failing that the people begin to complain that things are not going all right. It may be that the difficulty may lie in the procedure laid down by the Government or in the honesty or integrity of the Officers of the Government or it may lie also elsewhere. But it is the common man that is affected and in our country most of the common men are illiterate and they are not well-versed in the procedures and procedural technique of the public administration in this country. When they complain, they complain generally against the Government. It is therefore necessary, as in the case of any other Government, to take note of these things. When Members complain of partiality, let not Hon. Ministers think immediately that the attack is directed individually or collectively against any of the Ministers. It is not necessary to think so. I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister and other Ministers to detach themselves for a moment from the Government administrative machinery. Some of the hon. Members were very vehement in their opposition to consider our proposition. For a moment we must separate the political Heads of the Government from the administrative machinery. Then only we will be able to know why a resolution like this is coming. Mr. Speaker Sir, you are aware of the Gorwala Committee Report. You are also aware, Sir, that this very Government itself appointed, on a number of occasions, committees to go into the administrative reorganisation of

6th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

retrenchment, in 1923, 1931 and 1947. Yet the Government are not satisfied and the people also are not satisfied because on all these occasions the attitude that the Government took on the reports of the various Committees was not satisfactory. On many of the proposals the Government always took the same view. For example, if in 1923 the people wanted the abolition of the Board of Revenue and the Government of the day raised certain objections, the same objections were repeated in 1931 and 1937 and the very same objections were raised also by the Governments that came into power after the attainment of Independence. It is conceded that the system is complicated and the framework is somewhat stiff and old and that in the new political set-up, it has got to make its own adjustments. I submit there is a case for the setting up of a committee to go into the administrative efficiency and economy in public administration. I understand from the Hon. the Chief Minister that he has appointed one officer to go into the reorganization of some of the Secretariat Departments. The Central Government have likewise done it. Several other State Governments have done it. After 1947 people have been feeling in a different way from what they used to feel prior to 1947 with regard to these matters. But the permanent machinery of the Government is thinking in the same old way. That is the point which we want to impress upon the Ministry. To-day the machinery is as old as it was in 1786. Only extra compartments have been built into that old machine. You, Sir, remember the East India Company in those days was engaged in a great many wars. After a time, the Directors of the East India Company had to manage the affairs themselves. Therefore, they created the revenue organization. While the Governor and Members of his Council were engaged in the expansion of their Empire, the Revenue Department and the Board of Revenue were interested in consolidating the revenues of the country and framing laws to ensure better collection and greater collections from step to step. It is that machinery which we have inherited. Times have changed but the original framework is persisting. In the olden days, the Board of Revenue had to itself a great many powers. If you look into the old documents you would find that everything was concentrated in the Board of Revenue. The Board of Revenue was virtually the civil head carrying on the functions of the Government while the Governor and his Council were running the military side. Only the military side of it had changed subsequently. The revenue side remained where it was. The same procedure, namely, the Government delegating its powers by notification to the Board of Revenue to enable it to frame rules for the collection of revenues without legal authority is being continued. That was why, after 1937 when for the first time the Congress came into power, they really felt that something had got to be done in regard to the reorganization of the machinery of the Government. We felt everywhere that there was too much of routine. I would only ask whether there is a single Government officer or a single head of the department or a single Minister who does not say that we

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [6th November 1952]

must cut down red tape? That is the reason why we must appoint somebody, a committee of this House, to look into these matters and make the necessary recommendations. I would also ask whether there is a single officer of the Government or a single Minister who says that our expenditure to-day is not top-heavy. During the budget discussions last month, every one of us on one occasion or another was referring to the heavy expenditure but generally we satisfied ourselves by attributing it to the conception of the Welfare State which has replaced the conception of the Police State. It may be that if the Government do not involve itself in trying to regulate the life of its citizen from morning to evening in every aspect of life probably a great deal of expenditure on the Governmental organization can be immediately cut down.

5-20
p.m.

" But things are what they are. The conception of the Welfare State has taken hold of us. Individually speaking, I cannot entirely agree that the Welfare State ideal is being implemented in a proper manner. All that is different. All the same, there is a lot of overhead expenditure and a lot of red-tape and it is due to the red-tape that the efficiency of the administration is being affected. Sometimes, we do not get replies from any head of the department to our letters even for a long time. Why? I need not cite a great many examples for this. For instance, if a communication is addressed to a Collector, it goes to his Personal Assistant and from the Personal Assistant it goes to the Sarishtadar and the Sarishtadar sends it to the department and the department makes notes exactly similar to what is happening here in the Secretariat. What is being done in the Secretariat is being done also in the various districts and in every department. And, if the subject relates to both the Engineering and the Revenue Departments, just as in the Secretariat, the file goes through the various branches. Just I will take one case with which we are familiar. In England, Sir, you have observed that when a question is sent, the longest time that is taken by the Ministry to get a reply is 48 hours and the ordinary time is 24 hours, within which questions are answered. Why is it that we take months and months here? No further proof is required to show that our organization of the administration is defective and that it requires looking into. All that we say is, let us look into it. Let us have a committee. An hon. Member asked why should inexperienced Members of this House go into the question, because they are not experts in administration and so on. Experts have always been there. If this committee is appointed, they will consult those experts and in my experience the experts have always been against retrenchment and against reorganization. However, they will be consulted because they are there. It is only when non-official men who represent the common man and the sufferings of the common man and who represent the disappointed aspirations of the common man, come into contact with the officials who have got long experience,—then only something new can come out. All that this Resolution says is only that. Mr. Speaker, Sir, therefore, I do not want to take much longer time over this.

6th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

" Sir, I wish to give you one example of how things have become inefficient because of the concentration of power at Fort St. George in every case. I would like to submit to you a very small example. When I was Chairman of the Municipal Council at Visakhapatnam, we started a high school for girls. Then we could not get immediately benches, chairs and tables for the pupils. Just at that time the Government converted the Government Training School into a Basic School. When I happened to go there for selection of students, I saw a good number of benches, tables and chairs all huddled up in one of the rooms and locked up. I asked them what they were. I was told they were no longer necessary because the school was converted into a basic school. I asked the headmaster, 'Can you lend the furniture for a short time, before I get the necessary furniture?' He said, 'It is desirable to help each other, I shall help.' But, next day came a written letter saying, 'I am not the authority for it; please consult the District Educational Officer.' He was there and I contacted him in 24 hours and he said, 'Most certainly, I will help you; we are always friends; don't think that I am different from you.' In 24 hours, he wrote again another letter, after looking into the files and after getting the clerical help, 'I have no authority, kindly contact the Director of Public Instruction.' It so happened that there was a meeting of the Syndicate of the Andhra University and the Director of Public Instruction was there in about a week. I contacted him and he said, 'Most certainly, Mr. Viswanatham, could I not help you?' Then he came here and sent me a letter saying, 'I am sorry, I have not got the power, but it is the Government that should sanction it.' Meanwhile, I placed an order with a contractor and got some benches and tables. Why I point this out is, there is such great concentration of power even for small things.

" I would like to submit to you one more incident. We borrowed money from the Government—some Rs. 40,000—for the construction of what are called septic tank latrines for the municipality. You know, Sir, nowadays, whatever the condition may be, whether there is good water-supply, or whether the levels and the soil permit or not, the Health Department always insist on municipalities—wherever they get official knowledge—that there must be septic tank latrines. So, we borrowed money from the Government. We drew the money because the Engineer and the Health Officer said that the plans and estimates were prepared. In fact, we began to pay interest also on the borrowed amount. But, we could not get tenderers for the work. We called for tenders twice and even thrice and in spite of that, nobody came forward. Then we requested Messrs. Gannon Dunkerley and Company who were then working in the King George Hospital there, because they were the experts in sanitary installation. They gave us an estimate which was above the tender rates. It was of course a small thing, because our tender was only Rs. 3,000 for one latrine according to the rate fixed by the Government in consultation with the Engineers. Now, what happened was Gannon

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [6th November 1952]

Dunkerley and Company tendered for Rs. 4,500. I had to send their tender to the Government because their tender was more than the schedule estimate rate and so we had to get the sanction of the Government. Then we sent it to the officer concerned at Dowleshwaram, an intermediate Post Office. There it was kept for two months and when contacted, we were informed that because the percentage of increase in the tender was higher, they could not sanction. Then that officer sent it to Madras. For nearly six months the paper was thus moving here and there. And when I met the Engineer who was in charge—then I happened to be in Delhi and not in Madras—he said, ‘I rejected the tender’. I asked him, ‘why, and why I should pay interest on the loan taken for the purpose?’ He said, ‘I have no power to sanction it since the extra cost involved, though only Rs. 1,500, is 50 per cent above the schedule, and only the Chief Engineer could sanction it.’ The Engineer who was in charge at Dowleshwaram and the Superintending Engineer who are all qualified engineers and the Executive Engineer at Visakhapatnam, none of them had the capacity to sanction it. If, on the other hand, it was an estimate for one lakh of rupees and the tender asked for exceeded by Rs. 10,000 the Engineer there had the power to sanction it. But, here though it is only a question of only fifteen hundred rupees, none of the Engineers were able to sanction it because of a routine rule of percentage excess. Why was not the Superintending Engineer qualified to do it? Is the Chief Engineer excepting for the official position he occupies, who is also a qualified Engineer, not qualified to sanction it? It was all because the tender was 50 per cent more than the estimate. Even for this paltry sum of Rs. 1,500 he is not given the power to sanction. That is concentration of power to which I refer. It is the system that we attack now; it is the system that must be changed.

“Then, Sir, if in Visakhapatnam or any other municipal area a small tap has got to be removed from its place to a place ten feet away, an order has to come from Madras, such is concentration of power at the centre in all the departments. I have given only two or three instances and I do not like to take up much of the time of the House. All I want to say is, I am not making any criticism or any political point of view. It has been admitted by all and even the Ministers have admitted—even the heads of departments have admitted—that this red tape must be cut down and that overhead expenditure and the several intermediary officers who have been multiplied in number since the last 15 years, particularly after the war, most of these can be eliminated in the interests of efficiency, because the more bulky the organization the less efficient it becomes. All that I want to say is, that a committee should be set up to enquire into and report on remedying these things.

“I know, Sir, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar’s Committee made a report and a few of the recommendations like the retrenchment of a peon of the District Judge or the removal of a telephone from somebody’s house were given effect to. These things they have

[6th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

done, but no good substantial attempt was made to reorganize or retrench. After all what we want is a more efficient machinery; people want a more efficient machinery and no one should be gladder than the Hon. the Chief Minister himself, if he finds that his machinery became more efficient. I believe he does not claim to-day that the machinery is perfect. I do not also think that we can always get a perfect machinery. But, when the heads of departments and the people feel—and also the Ministers have now and then expressed an opinion—that the machinery has to be checked up and reorganized, I submit there is a case for constituting a committee to go into these matters. This is not a political claim. Unfortunately, the Ministry thinks that it is an attack on them. I repeat it relates to the permanent machinery and the reconstitution of the permanent machinery is what we want. I only submit, Sir, that the Hon. the Chief Minister should view the resolution from this point of view and accept it.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Sir, with 5.30
great deference to the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to begin p.m.
with this remark that if only the debate had been conducted in the spirit in which he has just now finished speaking, there would have been no misunderstanding. But surely the Leader of the Opposition will not forget what has happened since this morning. The debate has not been conducted in the manner in which he spoke at the end of his speech. Throughout the debate the position taken up looked almost as if it was an enquiry into the conduct or efficiency of the Ministry and whether it was good that they should go on or not. Of course, I know that that was not the intention of the resolution or the amendments. But unfortunately we are in a rut and we cannot get out of it. Whenever an important resolution or matter is debated in this House, the whole debate centres round the Government in power. I do not blame anybody; there is something in the atmosphere which turns the debate on every matter in that particular direction. When particular speeches were being made, I was expressing my opinion to the Leader of the Opposition across the table. He has no doubt explained and put me right with reference to those matters. As I said at the outset, if the debate had been conducted throughout in the spirit in which the Leader of the Opposition summarized the position, there would have been no misunderstanding. The reference to political motive was with regard to translation of speeches and to things like that, and to Members persisting in speaking in Telugu when they could speak in English and easily make themselves understood by me. I explained the background of this just after the interpellation hour this morning. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition remembers that in this connexion. It is irrelevant so far as this debate is concerned. I never imagined or expressed the opinion in any private conversation across the table that this resolution had any political motive behind it. I was explaining to him with a certain amount of regret only this, that somehow or other, we had got back into the rut of raising the question of confidence in the Ministry instead of sticking to the subject before the House.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [6th November 1952]

“ Now let us get back to the debate. I am second to none in my desire for efficiency, as the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to concede. My earnest desire is that we should be efficient. But efficiency should not in a hurry be interpreted to mean arbitrary disposal of matters. Let us take the very hard cases mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and the other Members to illustrate their point that much time was wasted in unnecessary references to and fro and that delay and inefficiency marked the conduct of official life. The Leader of the Opposition quoted some of his experiences as Chairman of the Visakhapatnam Municipal Council. It is true there are hard cases. We no doubt desire efficiency. But have our people learnt to trust one another? That is the block in the way of economy as well as efficiency. I shall explain myself. I want, and obviously the Leader of the Opposition also wants, to decentralize authority. It is not as if anybody wanted power and therefore had got the authority at the Centre. I am speaking of the present Government and their immediate predecessors; I am not speaking of the ancient Government. We do not want power at the Centre. But unfortunately, representing the people as we do, we represent the popular suspicion in all matters. Nobody trusts anybody else and that is the root cause for the employment of so many Inspectors, Assistant Inspectors, Supervisors and the like. When a little bit of work has to be done, the employer has to appoint a supervisor to watch the workman, because the employer does not trust the workman, and over that supervisor there is another supervisor and so on. Somehow or other this want of trust has been generated. Probably there may be good reason for it. But it is a fact that want of trust creates the need for an enormous number of unnecessary employees to look after one another. If I give a watch for repair, the repairer examines, repairs and gives it back to me. But suppose a man has to be placed there to see that he does not steal any part of the watch, another man has to be placed to see that the man who gave the verdict did not give a wrong verdict and so on and finally a man to see that the amount of the bill was neither more nor less and that there was no cheating in the accounting. When a number of people have to be employed even in a watch-maker's concern, the need for employing a large personnel in a big governmental machinery is all the greater. The extreme suspicion that has developed in the psychology of our people to-day is one of the main causes, if not the main cause, for want of economy. We have to employ a large number of people to do even a tiny little bit of work. As was observed by the hon. Member from Chittoor, if Rs. 30,000 is spent for famine relief, Rs. 30,000 has to be spent on official superintendence to draw and distribute the money. That is a gross example. But I admit that it is a prevailing difficulty. If I want ten rupees worth of relief to reach a poor man, I have to spend another ten rupees or probably more to see that the relief reaches him. As long as we have this suspicion, we cannot do away with this wastage. I am sorry to have to admit it. Let us go to the root of the matter. Let us reduce that suspicion; we cannot eliminate it all at once. Let us get used to trust one another.

6th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

When we give power to a man, let us not suspect him. Let us allow him to use that power. It may be that for some time the people may laugh at his errors or censure him. But finally they will learn to tolerate him. That is my hope. I have explained the present difficulty. Let those hon. Members who have complained about inefficiency place their hand on their heart and say whether they are ready to give up this suspicion. No, they will not give it up.

“ Mr. Krishna Ayyar spoke very ably. An experienced lawyer can speak very well. With his experience, he was able to make a caricature of many things. As soon as he gave a complaint to a court, would he just get a decision and be satisfied with it? No. He wants notice to issue to the opposite side, he wants the opposite side to file its statement and he wants evidence to be heard on both sides. But here evidence is taken not as in France but as in England. There must be cross-examination and re-examination, then arguments on the evidence, then a jury to give its verdict and a Judge to deliver judgment, then an appeal against that judgment not only on law but also on facts and finally a further appeal and the execution of the judgment. Mr. Krishna Ayyar can well tell me the time taken for getting a grievance redressed in a court of law. Would he agree to give up any of the processes in a court? I am sure he will not and I am sure no lawyer would agree to give up any of the processes, as giving up any of the processes is fraught with danger and very grave risk. Hearing of evidence, examination of witnesses, etc., are all necessary steps in coming to a judicial decision.

“ Let us take the instance given by the Leader of the Opposition. A set of benches were lying useless and huddled up together in a most tempting manner. He wanted them to be removed to the Girls' High School.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I wanted them on loan.”

5-40
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Whether it was loan or gift is a matter of detail and I am not examining it from that point. I am only explaining the position generally with reference to that instance. Suppose that headmaster had given them away, and suppose there was the headmaster of another school and he also had asked for it, what would the people immediately do with Mr. Viswanatham? They will say that Mr. Viswanatham who had power got it most illegally. We will have at least an interpellation on the subject here, if not papers in the Secretariat. Again I trace it back to what I said previously. There is this distrust. (Sri T. Viswanatham : ‘ There is the rule.’) No, no. It is not because of the rule. It is because of you and me. The rule permits us to distrust one another. It is not a good thing, but it is lawful and the distrust is there. If we did not have it, Mr. Viswanatham and I could sit together and make a beautiful constitution for our State whereby all authority could be handed over to honest men in charge of the district in the first place and honest

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [6th November 1952]

men in charge of the taluk in the next place, and then we could carry on our administration wonderfully well, cheaply, honestly and also efficiently. Unfortunately, we are not satisfied with it. If a man puts a voting paper in the ballot box, immediately the complaint is made that wrong people have put the ballot papers in the ballot box. It is not only that. Immediately after the ballot papers are counted, the complaint is made that ballot papers had been secretly removed. If the ballot boxes are steel boxes, it is said that even they could be opened. It is this sort of atmosphere that prevails in our country. How can we economise? How can we trust one another and how can we give up red tape?

“ Much play was made about red tape. People do not understand what red tape is. Much play was made about files. People do not know what a file is, I am sorry to say. What is a file, after all? Like some of my friends who spoke before, I am trying to explain very simple things. But it is better to explain and to understand, what is a file. A paper first comes to the office. A man has a grievance or has a request to make. That cannot be disposed of straightway, as I sometimes try to do. I get a paper by post, and I immediately dispose of it taking a certain amount of risk. Ordinarily what should be done? There are other persons concerned besides those that approached you. Those other persons must be told what this man wants you to do. Notices have to be given to the other people. They must also be heard. Then, what about the office? If a man wants a canal to be dug, not only the canal is concerned, but the ground is to be taken up for cutting the canal, the money to be collected for the canal, and many other matters are involved. There are officers to deal with them. Should they not give their opinions on this subject? That is what is called a file. When a paper is received, all the persons concerned with the matter intimately are asked to say what they think about it. Then it becomes a file. You may give it a bad name if you want to beat it. Even for a month if I tried to dispose of papers without the assistance of red tape and without files, you will see, Sir, that questions will thereafter be put in this very House. There would be utter suspicion of my conduct. There will be rightful claims that I was arbitrary, and that I did not do the thing properly. I have myself seen cases where officers have been taken up to the tribunal for enquiry because they did not follow the procedure, and it has been rightly held that these officers had gone wrong, and that they did not do justice in being arbitrary. Therefore, it is no use saying ‘burn files’. It was all right in the days of Hyder Ali and Tippu Sultan when nobody would ask about it. But that is not the case now. We must know what exactly happened. We must know the opinions of officers, and how those papers have been disposed of, and then, come to a decision. (Sri T. Viswanatham : ‘It is confidential’.) It is confidential up to a point. But when disposed of, it is no longer confidential. Look at the great curiosity that is there now to know at every stage of the process what is going on? What would happen if there are no processes at all? In spite of the safety measures, people want to know what is going on,

[6th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

and they want to know what happens at every stage. There will be much more complaint if we abolished the processes themselves. Therefore, it is impossible to make it all so simple. It is not possible, and it will not work in democracy. The other day someone wanted to know whether the *viva voce* examination by the Public Service Commission was recorded by a stenographer (both the questions and the answers) so that we could see whether the examination was fair, and whether the appraisal of the Commission was right or wrong. A suggestion was made that all the questions in the *viva voce* examination by the Public Service Commission should be recorded so that we might examine and see whether the Commission had been impartial or not. When we analyse the speeches of hon. Members and their complaints, we see the fundamental disease, namely, suspicion. Cannot we trust the Public Service Commission? When we have appointed them, when they are away from the departments and have no connection with the departments, and also when they cannot get any jobs once their term of office is over, even then we do not trust them. Much less do we trust the Tahsildar, the Sarishtadars and Collectors. If the Tahsildar were given all power to dispose of matters, every hon. Member here who has any particular case with the Tahsildar, would tell me, ‘No, it is not very good to make him arbitrary. There must be an appeal.’ That is what they would all say. We may appoint a committee. It is easy to appoint committees. But it is not easy to get results.

“ Sir, I shall place before you my impression of the debate before I sit down. There are one set of people who want—from their point of view rightly—a complete alteration of the whole system. They will pardon me if I name them. My Communist friends want a complete alteration of the entire system. It is their creed and conviction, if I may say so. It is not perhaps their creed, but it is their conviction. They feel that all this is wrong and that even the judicial system is wrong. They feel that people must assemble together, there must be a people’s court, a decision must be arrived at there, and if all the crowd shout, ‘Yes: they are guilty’, all the accused persons—may be a hundred—must be executed and finished. That is the people’s court which prevails in some countries, and we do not hear about the results. They want a complete alteration of the judicial system also. I remember to have read Mr. Pritt saying that the judicial system of the people’s courts in Russia was very good. Mr. Pritt is an eminent Member of the Bar in England, and, therefore, he knows what he says. He said that the Soviet people’s courts were very different from the British judicial system, and they were quite good if not better. May be, he can prove it. They want results and not waste of time. Here too, my Communist friends think that everything should be changed. I agree. They want a workers’ council in every office. If a clerk is to be promoted from lower division to upper division, the upper division clerks or perhaps the lower division clerks should sit and decide as to who should be promoted. That is one system of working. This is a kind of popular control

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [6th November 1952]

from top to bottom. This would work very well if an iron-minded and iron-charactered party governed everything with an iron hand. But if there is no iron handed party, it would be chaos and nothing else. If we decided that we should make a complete change of the whole public service including judicial procedure, it might be possible if we had a totalitarian, one-party government with an iron hand and iron power behind them, but not in our democracy. Here, the general rule is, doubt and suspicion, and suspicion and distrust of one another. Therefore, we want a different system here, and I think we are making the best of it here.

5-50
p.m.

"The other line of criticism taken by certain Members is that the personnel should be altered and that the whole system need not be completely changed. I agree that the personnel should be pure and efficient and consist of men of integrity and sound judgment. I quite agree with all that. If only we could, by a magic wand, change the personnel of all our offices and make them men of integrity from top to bottom and make them efficient and industrious, nothing would be so good as that. I have no doubt that if we could do it, any system would work. The system will simplify itself in no time and even the red tape will become softened and cut off very quickly. The whole thing would then be finished in no time honestly and quickly. But we have not got it. How can we change it? The only way to change it is by honest endeavour on the part of the public.

"What are we doing now? We complain of corruption. The Indian Penal Code defines 'bribery' in a particular way. But the psychology of the situation is this. There are two persons involved in any act of corruption. In the old days it was mostly corruption through intimidation and extortion by men in power. Officers had great power and people were asked to pay for services rendered and that was extortion. That was the form of corruption which prevailed before—to the extent that it prevailed, I do not make the mistake, which some hon. Members made and to which attention was drawn by the hon. Member Sri Gopal Menon, of saying that everybody is bad. I am only saying that those who were bad were bad in this way, namely, that they used their position and power in order to intimidate and make people pay. But to-day my own experience and my appraisal of the position is that things have changed and that the tables have been turned. There is no such misuse of power now. The temptation comes from the people who offer bribes now, because the administration has changed in character. Democracy has taken the place of bureaucracy and a Welfare State, as was described, has taken the place, in ideal and in goal, of the old Police State, so that numerous occupations are involved in Government and in the affairs of administration. A very large number of people are interested in them now. Look at the passenger traffic now to Delhi and back. In the old days how many people went to Delhi? To-day how many and what kind of people go to Delhi? There is a vast movement of people from place to place in order to get things done in Government offices. Now the greater danger lies

6th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

in the temptation that is offered either to one officer or to another. I am saying this not to blame the people or to justify the officers. I am saying this to find out where we should apply the treatment, and what the disease is. We must know whether it is the headache that has caused the fever or whether it is the fever that has caused the headache. In that way, I say, if we now analyse public psychology, and the desires and tendencies of people, we can see that we have to reform ourselves. A civic sense has to be developed. We must all be made to feel that this country is ours, that if the Government goes bad, we shall be ruined, that if the administration goes wrong, we are all bound to be unhappy, if not we, and our children will have to be unhappy. We must feel that if we gain anything in the immediate present, our children will have to suffer later under a corrupt Government. We must all feel that we must try to keep the roads clean and the traffic smooth. But I need not dilate upon what is known to everybody. I wish only to emphasize the point that it is no use saying that officials are corrupt. If the merchant goes and pays the official, both are corrupt and both are dishonest. If a man wants a piece of land to be assigned to him and wants another man not to get it and if he offers a small sum or a little temptation, for how many days can the poor clerk or the poor official withstand the temptation? Yes, he does withstand it in one case or two cases. But subsequently someone comes and tells him, as the hon. Member Sri Thimma Reddi said, 'Your peon will teach you how to manage this affair. You seem not to know how to carry on with your work.' That is what will happen. Therefore, we must go to the root of the matter and unless we improve the character of the people by some miracle or by some other means, such instances will occur. How this can be achieved, I believe in my own way. But it is no use repeating it here. There is only one way to improve the people's character and that is what I stand for. But that is not the issue now. Unless we do that and attain that there is no use thinking of improving the machinery of the State or changing the personnel. To improve the machinery is not wrong. But the machinery has stood the test of time. This machinery is not a British invention; it started much earlier. Each generation put on a little change over the old machinery just as we have done over the past machinery. In that way, the machinery has grown in our climate and in our country. It suits our country. Provided our men are honest and we deal with one another fairly and justly and trust one another, all can be well. My prescription is that we must, even at the risk of having errors committed and even at the risk of having troubles created, begin to trust one another. Then only will we be able to decentralize. Supposing we give power to a Collector or to a Municipal Chairman or to a Panchayat Board President, we must suffer the evils of it for some time and go on with it persistently and then it will be all right. That is the only way to attain the objective and not the mere appointment of a committee. I do stand for decentralization and I do stand for what my hon. friend Sri Pragada Kotaiah spoke for, namely, the co-ordination of the work of district officials. It is a very

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [6th November 1952]

necessary thing. In fact, when the hon. Gentleman Sri Kotaiah was speaking, I felt he was speaking my mind in all these matters. I do want decentralization and I do want that the officers of a district should come together every now and then, once a month or once a fortnight, exchange ideas, discuss matters, write down at a meeting what they would write on separate files, and pass orders also. I want all that to be done. I may be able to do it.

"People were complaining that I had promised a great deal about this efficiency and that I had not performed. I need not defend myself against that charge, because that is not the issue now. But I beg to say that I stated that I would try my best. I ask hon. Members here, 'Have you allowed me to try my best?' They have not allowed me to try my best. They have engaged me in various other warfares which did not permit me at all to find the leisure to look into this matter. How then can I be charged with not having achieved what I wanted to achieve and what I still want to achieve? I do not ask for any arbitrary power. If only I had the time to do it, I would have tried my best sincerely, to the extent I was capable of doing, to produce the result that I wanted to produce, namely, simplification of our administration and improvement of our character. But I do not give it up. We do try, and we propose to try, and continue to try to do it, in spite of all other preoccupations. We must do it and we have taken certain steps also. We are trying to do it and when I say 'we', it is not I only that am doing it.

"Sir, reference was made to Mr. Gorwala's Report. The Planning Commission wanted Mr. Gorwala to send them a considered report on the improvements to be made in public administration. The Government of India, as soon as they received that report, circulated it, without waiting for the Planning Commission's conclusions, among all the State Governments to consider immediately the various matters that related to administration and to take steps accordingly. Since that report was received, for the last one year, it is being examined and various points dealt with in it are being put into effect, without waiting for the results of the examination of other points. The report has been published, as all hon. Members know, and it is being given effect to in a way in the various States. We are doing that, but yet even Mr. Gorwala knows that a miracle cannot be accomplished within a short time. We have to go through a great deal of improvement in many matters if we expect any improvement at all. I do stand for and I do promise, if permitted and allowed and helped, to try to do my best to decentralize, but let it be remembered that it involves trust. I frankly confess that if there is no trust, there is no use trying to decentralize. Everything would have to be taken to the top for judgment. Therefore, if you want me to decentralize, I tell reformers, 'We must allow trust to prevail', and if hon. Members are prepared to allow errors and defects that may arise out of that trust, it is possible to decentralize and I will try to do it. Along with that, co-ordination of the various departments is a very necessary thing and I propose we should take steps

[6th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

in respect of that also. Nor do I lose sight of the need for economy. Economy is an easy word. Economy we can ask for. We all agree as to the goal, but it is mixed up with the occupation of a very large number of people in our country. We can economize by cutting down salaries; we can economize by retrenching the staff. Now, the retrenching of staff is a thing attended with great distress and opposition is bound to be there. So, it is a difficult thing. What I submit, therefore, is that it is a difficult task which I shall try to do."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the House will have no objection to sit till the Hon. the Chief Minister finishes his speech."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I will finish in a couple of minutes, Sir. The point now is whether a committee is useful and whether a committee is necessary. I submit, with all respect to the hon. Members of the House, that we will not be justified in forming a select committee, as over a Bill, to get this large reform in an old administration carried out. I, therefore, cannot accept this proposal that a committee should be appointed. Of course, there are amendments to say that the committee may be of officials and non-officials and retired officials and the like. These retired officials I have tried. As hon. Members know, we have tried officials also. It is not much good because the lawyers won't be able to improve the law and officials won't be able to improve officials. No doubt they may try to do something. That is the point which was stressed by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and that is perhaps in the Resolution also. Even adopting the amendments seeking to associate officials and non-officials with the committee, I feel that it would not be able to do anything useful. It would only mean wasteful effort. 6 p.m. I therefore submit with much regret that I cannot adopt this resolution or accept it on behalf of the Government. I would like to appeal to the House not to press for it. I also appeal to the House to trust the Government to do their best in the matter and not to press the matter to a vote." (Cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"I am now going to put the amendments to the vote of the House. Is the hon. Member, Sri Rama Rao withdrawing his amendment?"

SRI G. RAMA RAO:—"I am not withdrawing my amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'After the word "principles" and before the word "methods" insert the words "categories and ranks."'

The amendment was lost.

SRI K. VENKAIAH:—"I am withdrawing my amendment, Sir."

The amendment of the hon. Member was, by leave, withdrawn.

[6th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, I think the mover of the resolution is willing to accept my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House should also accept it. Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" No, Sir. I am not withdrawing my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For the words " to suggest " substitute the words " to eliminate corruption, nepotism and lethargy by suggesting.' "

The amendment was lost.

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—" I am withdrawing my amendment, Sir."

The amendment of the hon. Member was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

' This Assembly recommends to the Government to form a Select Committee of the Members of the Assembly to study the principles, methods and procedure of the administrative machinery and to suggest ways and means for ensuring efficiency and economy in public administration in this State.' "

The motion was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Friday, 7th November 1952."

The House then adjourned.

6th November 1952]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 47 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 6th November 1952, page 279 supra.]

Name of Local Library Authorities.

Which have submitted library schemes.	Which have not yet submitted library schemes.
(1)	(2)
1 Visakhapatnam.	1 Srikakulam.
2 East Godavari.	2 Krishna.
3 West Godavari.	3 Kurnool.
4 Guntur.	4 Chittoor.
5 Nellore.	5 Cuddapah.
6 Bellary.	6 Madras.
7 Anantapur.	7 Chingleput.
8 North Arcot.	8 Ramanathapuram.
9 South Arcot.	9 The Nilgiris.
10 Tanjore.	
11 Madurai.	
12 Tirunelveli.	
13 Tiruchirappalli.	
14 Salem.	
15 Coimbatore.	
16 Malabar.	
17 South Kanara.	

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 78 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 6th November 1952, page 282 supra.]

(a) —

Year of examination.	Particulars of the examination.	Number of candidates applied.	Fees collected.	Number selected.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			RS.	
1950	The Annual Competitive Examination held by the Madras Public Service Commission for recruitment to Madras Ministerial Service.	10,904	85,310	2,935
1951	Special Competitive Examination held for regularization of temporary appointments in April 1951.	3,168	26,120	1,368
1952	The annual examination held in February 1952 for recruitment of lower division clerks and typists and the Special Competitive Examination for regularization of temporary appointments in Civil Supplies and Textile Departments, etc., held in June 1952.	11,862	92,840	3,597

[6th November 1952]

(b)—

Year of recruitment.	Number of candidates who applied for higher posts.	Fees collected.
(1)	(2)	(3)
		rs.
1950-51	5,036	39,680
1951-52	2,765	29,750

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 80 asked by Sri K. Venkaiah at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 6th November 1952, page 284 supra.]

Memorandum No 21923-F-52-1, Revenue, dated 14th April 1952.

[Land—Grant to political sufferers—Further proceedings—Staying of.]

The Collectors are informed that all further proceedings in regard to the grant of lands to political sufferers should be stayed. They are also informed that no allotment or assignment need hereafter be made to political sufferers and that incomplete cases may also remain suspended.

Memorandum No. 21923-F/52-4, Revenue, dated 1st May 1952.

[Land—Grant to political sufferers—Further instructions—Government Memorandum No. 21923-F/52-1, Revenue, dated 14th April 1952.]

In partial modification of the orders issued in the memorandum quoted above, the following further instructions in the matter of assignment of lands to political sufferers are issued :—

(1) The Collectors should examine all pending cases and where the grant of land to the political sufferer does not involve the dispossession of any sivoijamadar, whether it be a Harijan or an ex-serviceman or a landless poor person and where the land to be assigned is not of great value owing to its proximity to a town the assignment to the political sufferer should be proceeded with.

(2) In proceeding with cases of assignment in such unobjectionable cases, care should be taken to see that the poor means of the political sufferers justify the grant of the land to him.

(3) All other pending cases, where the land to be assigned is held under sivoijama occupation of a third party referred to in paragraph 1 should be closed.

2. The Collectors are requested to disband with effect from 30th April 1952 afternoon the special staff employed in their districts for the work connected with the grant of land to the political sufferers.

6th November 1952]

Memorandum No. 21923-F/52-16, Revenue, dated 16th June 1952.

[Land—Grant to political sufferers—Further instructions—Clarification—Orders passed.]

The Collectors of East Godavari and West Godavari have requested clarification of certain matters which have arisen in giving effect to the orders in Government Memorandum No. 21923-F/52-4, Revenue, dated 1st May 1952. The Government have examined the points raised by these Collectors and issue the following instructions :—

(1) *What is meant by " pending case ".*—By ' pending case ' is meant every case in which neither a patta has been issued over possession of the land has been given to the political sufferer. The Government consider that the order of assignment issued by the Collector should not be treated as a patta and that the Collectors should cancel their orders of assignment in cases in which neither a patta has been issued nor possession of the land has been given.

(2) *Definition of the term " poor means of the political sufferer ".*—The term " landless poor person " has been defined in G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949, and later amended in Memorandum No. 42044-F/49-1, Revenue, dated 1st August 1949. The Collectors are informed that the political sufferers who come under the above definition will be the persons whose poor means justify the grant of land to them. They are also informed that the question whether a person should be treated as poor or not is left to their discretion and that they need not consult the Political Sufferers' Advisory Committees in this matter.

(3) *Definition of the term " of great value owing to its proximity to a town ".*—Where land is in the proximity of a town the same would be in demand for purposes other than for cultivation and consequently its value is much more than land of that quality in a village. The Collectors should themselves adjudge whether a land is more valuable owing to its proximity to a town or not as is done in acquisition cases.

(4) *Sivoijama occupation.*—All sivoijama occupation prior to application by a political sufferer should be protected. The Collectors are however informed that where co-operative societies of political sufferers have been formed to bring jungle or other such difficult land under cultivation for the first time, the ban need not be applied to such cases.

2. The Government consider that the work of assignment of land to political sufferers can hereafter be carried on with the existing staff. The Government are not therefore prepared to sanction the employment of any special staff for this purpose.

3. The Board of Revenue is requested to obtain from the Collectors a list of cases of assignments completed in favour of very well-known and well-off politicals and submit the same to Government at an early date.

[6th November 1952]

G.O. Ms. No. 1986, Revenue, dated 8th July 1952.

[Assignment of land to political sufferers—Order of priority—Re-fixed.]

The Government have examined the question of the necessity for altering the order of priority in regard to the assignment of land laid down in paragraph 2 of the Government Order first read above and in modification of the orders in paragraph 2 of that Government Order, they direct that hereafter the order of priority in regard to the assignment of lands shall be as follows:—

(a) Landless poor persons (this includes Harijans and Backward classes)

(b) Political sufferers who are eligible for land grant under the latest instructions and ex-servicemen of the II World War (this includes Indian National Army personnel) who do not possess more than five acres of wet or ten acres of dry land.

Memorandum No. 4785, F/52-1, Revenue, dated 28th August 1952.

[Land—Grant to political sufferers—Order of priority—Re-fixed—Further instructions—Issued.]

According to G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949, in assigning any land at the disposal of the Government, the claims of political sufferers who had applied for but had not been granted any land had to be considered although the political sufferer might not have applied for the particular land. As the policy in respect of assigning lands to political sufferers has been changed, G.O. No. 1986, Revenue, dated 8th July 1952, directs that landless poor persons should be given first preference in the matter of assignment. Any valid pending applications from all categories should be considered together and in assigning any particular land, for which there is more than one applicant, first preference should be given to the landless poor applicant.

2. As regards the suggestion of the District Food Production Committee that the only condition that should be imposed in assigning lands, should be that the land should be cultivated with food crops within a period of three years from the date of assignment on pain of cancellation, the Collector of South Kanara is informed that the Government have examined this suggestion but consider that there is no necessity to revise the conditions of assignment laid down in paragraph 9 of G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949.

G.O. No. 476, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1940.

(As modified in G.Os. No. 2555, Revenue, dated 27th September 1949, No. 72, Revenue, dated 9th January 1950, No. 805, Revenue, dated 17th March 1950, and No. 2707, Revenue, dated 9th October 1950.)

[Lankas—Lease without auction—Draft instructions—Approved.]

The draft instructions regarding the lease of lankas without auction to the communities eligible for the ameliorative measures

[6th November]

undertaken by the Labour department in the districts of East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna and Guntur, submitted by the Board of Revenue with its reference read above are approved as amended. The instructions as amended by Government are appended to this order.

Appendix.

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE LEASE OF LANKAS WITHOUT AUCTION TO THE COMMUNITIES ELIGIBLE FOR THE AMELIORATIVE MEASURES UNDERTAKEN BY THE LABOUR DEPARTMENT IN THE DISTRICTS OF EAST GODAVARI, WEST GODAVARI, KRISHNA AND GUNTUR.

I. Lankas may be leased without auction to members of communities which may be notified by the Government, from time to time, as communities eligible for the ameliorative measures undertaken by the Labour department or to landless poor people of the other communities if they form themselves into co-operative societies. Fishermen, extoddy tappers and members of criminal tribes will be regarded as such communities for the purpose of these instructions.

II. Such leases may be granted only in favour of registered co-operative societies which are composed solely of members of such communities.

NOTE.—In exceptional cases, however, such leases may be granted in favour of individuals or unregistered societies. In such cases, proposals should be submitted by the Collector to the Board for obtaining the sanction of the Government.

III. Ordinarily, preference should be given to societies of which the members are mostly, if not entirely, residents of the village in which the lanka is situated. But there is no objection to the grant of leases in favour of societies consisting of members resident in other villages, provided the needs of such communities resident in the village have been provided for as far as possible under these instructions.

IV. Lanka lands which have been leased without auction in this manner to such communities should not be taken away from them except for infringement or breach of any of the conditions of the lease or for refusal to pay the enhanced rent when such enhancement has been decided on.

V. Proposals for the lease of lankas without auction should be submitted to the Board of Revenue in the form approved in G.O. Ms. No. 825, Revenue, dated 4th June 1925.

VI. The lease should ordinarily be limited to three years.

VII. The area to be leased should be fixed with regard to the relative numbers of such communities and of other communities and other cognate factors, such as, the general economic conditions of the members of the proposed lessee society.

VIII. The form of the lease deed should be the same as that prescribed for lease by auction subject to the alterations specified in G.O. No. 1158, Revenue, dated 20th May 1935.

Fixing of rental.

IX. The rental proposed should, as a rule, be not less than the average rental of the same lanka for the immediately preceding three fasli years provided that the rentals for these faslis represented a fair and not a fictitious value.

[6th November 1952]

X. (1) Subject to the provisions of sub-paragraph (2), the rental may be revised only at the time of renewal of the lease. When revising the rental, changes in the fertility of the lanka, the trend of prices and any changes in the crops usually raised and agricultural practices which affect the net profits of cultivation of the lanka should be duly taken into account.

(2) If any commercial crops are grown during the currency of the lease, an additional rental to be decided by the Collector but not exceeding $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the original rental will be payable for each fasli for the extent over which commercial crops are grown during that fasli.

NOTE.—Renewal of the lease of a lanka on the existing rental should be regarded as a case of enhancement in cases where more than 10 per cent of the area of the lanka has been eroded.

Powers of sanction.

XI. The Board of Revenue is competent to sanction fresh leases and renewal of leases on the existing or reduced rentals.

XII. All cases of renewals of leases where enhancement of rental for reasons other than the raising of commercial crops is involved, require the sanction of the Government.

XIII. The power to take away lankas for breach of any of the conditions of the lease or for refusal to pay the enhanced rental, vests in the Board of Revenue.

G.O. Ms. No. 805, Revenue, dated 17th March 1950.

[Lankas—Lease without auction—Extension of concessions to non-eligible communities—Orders passed.]

The Government accept the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and direct that the concessions granted to the eligible communities in G.O. No. 476, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1940, may be extended to landless poor people of the other communities also if they form themselves into co-operative societies. The following amendment will be issued to the rules appended to G.O. No. 476, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1940.

2. In rule I of the rules in the appendix to the Government Order the following shall be added at the end of the first sentence :—

“or to landless poor people of the other communities if they form themselves into co-operative societies.”

[6th November 1952]

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 10 asked by Sri V. Sri Krishna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 6th November 1952, page 302 supra.]

List of communities eligible for help by the Harijan Welfare Department.

(a) Eligible communities—

(i) Scheduled Castes.

Throughout the State—	
1 Adi-Andhra.	40 Kuravan.
2 Adi-Dravida.	41 Kurichan.
3 Adi-Karnataka.	42 Madari.
4 Ajila.	43 Madiga.
5 Arunthaiyar.	44 Maila.
6 Baira.	45 Mala (including Gency Malas).
7 Bakuda.	46 Mala Dasu.
8 Bandi.	47 Malasar.
9 Bariki.	48 Matangi.
10 Bavuri.	49 Mavilan.
11 Bellara.	50 M'gor.
12 Bzagari.	51 Muchi.
13 Chachati.	52 Mudala.
14 Chakkiliyan.	53 Nalakeyava.
15 Chalavadi.	54 Nayadi.
16 Chamar.	55 Pagadai.
17 Chandala.	56 Painda.
18 Cheruman.	57 Paky.
19 Dandasi.	58 Pallan.
20 Devendrakulathan.	59 Pambada.
21 Dom or Dombara, Paidi, Pane.	60 Pamidi.
22 Ghasi or Haddi, Relli Sachandi.	61 Panan.
23 Godgali.	62 Panchama.
24 Godari.	63 Panniandi.
25 Godda.	64 Paraiyan.
26 Gosangi.	65 Paravan.
27 Haala.	66 Pulayan.
28 Holey.	67 Puthirai Vannan.
29 Jaggali.	68 Raneyar.
30 Jambuvulu.	69 Samagra.
31 Kadan.	70 Samban.
32 Kalladi.	71 Sapari.
33 Kanakkan.*	72 Semman.
34 Karimpalan.	73 Thoti.
35 Kodalo.	74 Tiruvalluvar.
36 Koosa.	75 Valluvan.
37 Koraga.	76 Valmiki.
38 Kudubi.	77 Vettvan.
39 Kudumban.	

(ii) Scheduled Tribes.

Throughout the State—	
1 Aranadan.	
2 Bagada.	
3 Bhottadas-Bodo, Bhottada, Muria Bhottada and Sano Bhottada.	
4 Bhumas-Buri Bhumia and Boda Bhumia.	
5 Chenohu.	
6 Gadabas-Boda-Gadaba, Cerilam Gadaba-Franji Gadaba, Jodia Gadaba, Dlara Gadaba, Pangl Gadaba and Pranga Gadaba.	

* Kanakkan of Malabar alone are eligible for the concessions—vide G.O. No. 188, Education, dated 27th January 1948.

[6th November 1952]

- 7 Gondi-Modya Gond and Rajo Gond.
- 8 Goudus-Bato, Bhirithya Dudokouria, Hate, Jatako and Joria.
- 9 Kosalya Goudus-Basothoriya Goudus Chitti Goudus, Dagayath Goudus, Doddu Kamariya, Dudu Kamarao, Ladiya Goudus and Pullosoroiya Goudus.
- 10 Mangatha Goudus-Bernia Goudu, Boodo, Magatha, Dongayath Goudu; Ladya Goudu, Poona Magatha and Sana Magatha.
- 11 Holva.
- 12 Jadapus.
- 13 Jotapus.
- 14 Kammar.
- 15 Kattunayakan.
- 16 Khattis-Khatti, Kommarao end Lohara.
- 17 Kodu.
- 18 Kammar.
- 19 Konda Dhoras.
- 20 Konda Kapus.
- 21 Kondareddis.
- 22 Kondhs Desaya Konda Dongria.
- 23 Kota Kondhs Kuttiya Kondhs, Tikiria Kondhs and Yenity Kondhs.
- 24 Cytia Bartika Bontho Oriya, or Dulia, Holva Paiko, Puitye, Sanrona and Sidho Paiko.
- 25 Koya or Goud, with its Sub sects—Baja or Rasha Koyas, Lingadhari Koyas (ordinary) and Kotty Koyas.
- 26 Kudiya.
- 27 Kurumans.
- 28 Manna Dhora.
- 29 Maune.
- 30 Mukha Dhora Nooka Dhora.
- 31 Muria.
- 32 Paigarapu.
- 33 Palaso.
- 34 Paniyan.
- 35 Porjas-Bodo Bonda, Daruva Didua, Jodia, Mudili Pengu Pydi and Salya.
- 36 Reddi Dhoras.
- 37 Savaras Kapu Savaras Khutto Savaras.
- 38 Sholaga.
- 39 Toda.
- 40 Inhabitants of the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands who, and both of whose parents, were born in these islands.

(iii) Other eligible communities.

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 Badaga. | 6 Padanna. |
| 2 Irula. | 7 Yenaji. |
| 3 Kani or Kanniyar. | 8 Criminal Tribes (to be specified). |
| 4 Malayali or Malaiali. | 9 Harijan converts. |
| 5 Marati. | 10 Paliyars. |

(b) List of Backward classes—

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 1 Agamudayans (including Tulva Vellalas). | 8 Archukatalavandu. |
| 2 Agasa. | 9 Badaga. |
| 3 Ambalakaran. | 10 Balolika. |
| 4 Annadan. | 11 Beatha. |
| 5 Are Mahrati. | 12 Bhendari. |
| 6 Arya (South Kanara). | 13 Billava. |
| 7 Atagara. | 14 Bissey. |
| | 15 Bondil. |

6th November 1952]

- | | |
|--|---|
| 16 Boys. | 78 Mangala. |
| 17 Chaptogara. | 79 Mappilla. |
| 18 Chattada Srivaishnava. | 80 Marati of South Kanara district (Hill tribe). |
| 19 Dasari. | 81 Maravar. |
| 20 Devadiga. | 82 Maruthuvar. |
| 21 Devalkar. | 83 Melakud or Kudiyan. |
| 22 Devanga. | 84 Modi Banda. |
| 23 Dhakkada. | 84-A Mogaveera. |
| 24 Dommara. | 85 Moiti. |
| 25 Dudekula. | 85-A Moniagar. |
| 26 Endadi. | 86 Muduva. |
| 27 Galada Konkani. | 87 Mukhari. |
| 28 Gandia. | 88 Mukkuvan or Mukayan alias Mogayan (including Bovis). |
| 29 Gangavars. | 89 Mutracha. |
| 30 Ganika (including Nagavamsam). | 90 Muttiriyar. |
| 31 Gatti. | 91 Nagaram. |
| 32 Gavara. | 92 Nakkale. |
| 33 Godaba. | 93 Nalkedays. |
| 34 Gonde. | 94 Namdev Maharatta. |
| 35 Goda (including Gamalla or Kalali). | 95 Odden (Donga). |
| 36 Gudigara. | 96 Odde (Vodde or Vadde or Voddai). |
| 37 Hegde. | 97 Odiya. |
| 38 Idiga (including setty Balija). * | 98 Oulu. |
| 39 Isai Vullalar or Melakarar. | 99 Omansaito. |
| 40 Illuvan (Eshuvan). | 100 Oriya. |
| 41 Irulas. | 101 Padayachi (Villayan Kuppam). |
| 42 Jakkulas (Guntur district). | 102 Pali. |
| 43 Jandara. | 103 Pamula. |
| 44 Jangam. | 104 Pangadikara. |
| 45 Jhetty. | 105 Panniyar or Pannayar. |
| 46 Jogi. | 106 Parakavakum (Surithiman, Malayaman, Nathaman, Moopanar and Nainar). |
| 47 Kabbeara. | 107 Patnulkaran. |
| 48 Kadaiyan. | 108 Pattanavan. |
| 49 Kaduppattan (Malabar). | 109 Pentias. |
| 50 Kaikolan (Sengunthar). | 110 Perika. |
| 51 Kalavanthula. | 111 Peruvannan. |
| 52 Kalingi. | 112 Pohigunta. |
| 53 Kallan. | 113 Poraya. |
| 54 Kammalans (Kamalas Viswa Brahman) and Viswa Karnas. | 114 Pulluvan. |
| 55 Kani or Kanyan and Kanisu or Kaniyar. | 115 Pussala (Pussalavadu). |
| 56 Kannadiyan. | 116 Rajapur. |
| 57 Kavuthiyan. | 117 Reddi (Ganjan). |
| 58 Kolasi. | 118 Ronas. |
| 59 Kharvi. | 119 Sadhu Chetty (including Telugu Chetty or the Manai Telugu Chetti). |
| 60 Khatri. | 120 Saliyan. |
| 61 Khodala. | 121 Sedan. |
| 62 Kolaries or Muniyanies. | 122 Paravatharajakulam. |
| 63 Koppa-avelamas. | 123 Senaithalaivar (Senaikudyan). |
| 64 Koracha. | 124 Setti Balija (in the Visakhapatnam, East Godavari and Krishna districts). |
| 65 Koteyar (Sheragara Kshtriya of South Kanara). | 125 Siviar. |
| 66 Kulaia. | 126 Sourashtra. |
| 67 Kuruba. | 127 Srisayana. |
| 68 Kurumba. | 128 Sagalis. |
| 69 Labbai. | 129 Tatapu. |
| 70 Lambadis. | 130 Telikula. |
| 71 Madivala. | 131 Thegata Veerakshatriya. |
| 72 Madugar or Modavar. | 132 Tholuva Naicker and Vettalakara Naicker. |
| 73 Mahendra (Medara). | |
| 74 Mahratta (Non-Brahman). | |
| 75 Malaali. | |
| 76 Malnyan (Malabar). | |
| 77 Male. | |

* Setti Balija pupils should not be newly granted the concession under Rule 92 of the Madras Educational Rules unless they belong to the Idiga Community. Such of the Setti Balija pupils as have already been granted the concession in question may be permitted to retain them until they complete the school or the college course as the case may be.

[6th November 1952]

133 Thoriyan.	144 Vaniar.
134 Thurpu Kapus.	145 Vannan.
135 Tigala (Tigla).	146 Vanniayakula Kshatriya (in Tamil districts) Aginikula Kshatriya (in Telugu districts).
136 Tondaman.	147 Velakitalavan.
137 Rajaka.	148 Veluthadan.
138 Uppara.	149 Virakodi Vellalars.
139 Ural Goundan.	150 Vathis.
140 Vada Balija of Ganjam and Vi-akhapatnam.	151 Yadava.
141 Vaduvan (Vadugan).	152 Yerukula.
142 Vakkliga.	
143 Valaiyan.	

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 11 asked by Sri G. Latchanna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 6th November 1952, page 302 supra.]

Serial number and name of district.	The estimated number of tappers (district-war) who were thrown out of employment by reason of introduction of prohibition on the date of introduction of prohibition.		Total number of ex-tappers provided with alternative employment.
	(1)	(2)	
1 Anantapur	..	693	468
2 North Arcot	..	1,085	2,491
3 South Arcot	..	3,140	4,437
4 Chingleput	..	3,459	8,172
5 Chittoor	..	398	667
6 Coimbatore	..	13,500	15,720
7 Bellary	..	440	82
8 Cuddapah	..	355	76
9 East Godavari	..	11,776	11,085
10 West Godavari	..	12,000	22,960
11 Guntur	..	2,930	1,213
12 Madurai	..	1,576	2,169
13 South Kanara	..	9,789	15,267
14 Krishna	..	10,042	11,930
15 Kurnool	..	2,462	154
16 Madras	..	4,398	1,677
17 Malabar	..	28,489	22,275
18 Nellore	..	2,465	2,932
19 Nilgiris	..	..	..
20 Ramanathapuram	..	9,657	6,477
21 Salem	..	2,169	9,555
22 Tanjore	..	11,060	12,499
23 Tirunelveli	..	25,000	27,229
24 Tiruchirappalli	..	1,791	2,348
25 Visakhapatnam	..	4,806	1,771
26 Srikakulam	..	..	1,306
Total	..	163,380	* 184,763

* Number is more on account of the same persons having two or more avocations and due to the migration of ex-tappers from one district to another.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 7th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Disturbance in an anti-cow slaughter meeting.

* 96-A Q.—SRI N. GOPALA MENON: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether a clash took place at Payyoli in Malabar district between the members of the R.S.S. group and others on account of the wilful slaughter of a bull at the place where an anti-cow slaughter meeting was being held, resulting in death and injuries to many; and

(b) if so, what steps have been taken to restore peace and security in the locality?

Communal disturbances at Payyoli.

* 96-B Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether he is aware of any communal riot having taken place at Payyoli, North Malabar on 31st October 1952 and, if so, whether he can give the details of occurrence?

MR. SPEAKER:—“There are two short notice questions Nos. 96-A and 96-B, one is given notice of by Sri N. Gopala Menon and the other by Sri M. Narayana Kurup. The Hon. Chief Minister wishes to make a statement on them.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, in answer to Sri N. Gopala Menon's question No. 96-A which will also cover Sri Narayana Kurup's question No. 96-B, I wish to make a brief statement to-day before we disperse.

“On the 26th of October at Payyoli in North Malabar, a local branch of the R.S.S. organized a meeting in connexion with cow slaughter. The meeting was a small one of about 50 persons. While this anti-cow slaughter meeting was going on, a local Muslim butcher is stated to have brought out an ox and slaughtered it in public within a few yards of the meeting. It is also alleged that there was some further provocation in addition to the public slaughter of the ox. The meeting was terminated without any serious incidents. But, on the next day, the organizer of the meeting was waylaid by about seven Muslims and he received serious

[7th November 1952]

injuries for which he was admitted in the hospital at Badagara and then transferred to Calicut Hospital. Two days later there were public protest meetings at which references were made to the action of the Muslim offenders.

" On the 30th of October, six of the accused persons who were concerned in the assault surrendered before the local Police, but were immediately released on bail. This release was unfortunate and has been taken notice of by the superior Police officials.

" On the 31st of October, one of the persons who was released along with some others trespassed into the house of a cousin of the R.S.S. organizer, but they were chased away by neighbours, who were Hindu fishermen. This led to an assault on a Hindu fisherman by a Muslim and as a result a large crowd gathered near the railway station and the bazaar. Some of the people who arrived by tram just about that time from Quilandy started attacking the Hindus on the railway station and near by. These assailants it seems had heard exaggerated versions about the happenings at Payyoli. There was retaliation on the part of the Hindu crowd resulting altogether in 3 Hindus and 8 Muslims being injured as far as we could ascertain. Further disturbances were fortunately prevented by the Armed Reserve, who brought the situation under control. About an hour later at a different spot, 5 or 6 persons chased one Kannan, a clerk of a local Vakil near the Vakil's residence inside a coconut tope and stabbed him to death as he ran into the house. There was another case of arson in which the house of the principal participants in the case of assault on the R.S.S. organizer was set on fire. This happened on the 1st of November. We have not heard any other unfortunate incidents so far. The situation has been kept under control and there are adequate Police forces to prevent any disorder. Effective patrolling has been organized in the area and elsewhere. The authorities in charge of order are alert throughout the district. A police station has been opened at the scene of trouble and non-official efforts on the part of both Hindus and Muslims are being exerted with good results. The latest report from the Inspector-General of Police indicates that the situation throughout the district is quiet, that the investigation into murder and rioting cases is proceeding vigorously and 4 out of 7 people alleged to have taken part in the murder have been arrested. The two principal offenders are, however, still absconding. The situation is entirely under control and is expected to become normal very soon. The cases resulting from these will soon be in courts for judicial trial and I would deprecate discussion which may prejudice or be thought to prejudice fair trial."

Mr. SPEAKER :—" Question No. 109 will be taken up on the 24th November as the Hon. Minister for Public Works has requested me to do so."

7th November 1952]

Opening a cement factory at Pudukkottai.

* 97 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the former Pudukkottai State Government had taken steps for the founding of a cement factory in the present Pudukkottai division, Tiruchirappalli district; and

(b) whether the Madras State Government propose to pursue the matter?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) It is reported that proposals for the establishment of a cement factory in Pudukkottai were considered by the then *darbar* but were dropped because the applicant did not pursue the scheme.

" (b) No, Sir."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" May I know the reasons as to why the Government do not propose to pursue the matter? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" The present policy of the Government is not to start any cement factory themselves. If any individual comes forward, the Government will consider the matter, support him and give him some help. As at present, no individual has come forward to start a cement factory there. That is why I said that the Government can take no action in the matter."

Permission for goat-browsing in zamindari forests.

* 98 Q.—SRI P. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any special order in zamindari forests taken over by Government permitting goats to enter the forests for this year or for some months in the year;

(b) if so, whether it is intended for all the forests taken over from zamindars or for some particular areas only; and

(c) whether the orders have been sent by the department to all the subordinate officials?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" (a) & (b) Goat-browsing has been totally prohibited in the major estate forests which had been notified as reserved forests prior to December 1951. In the estate forests which had not been declared as reserved forests prior to December 1951, goat-browsing was permitted up to 1st April 1952. In certain other minor forests which are not proposed to be constituted into reserved forests, no restriction on goat-browsing is imposed.

" (c) Yes, Sir."

[7th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMA RAO :—“మేకలు అడవులలో మేయటం వల్ల అడవులు చాడవచ్చు, కాని ముడిగిన అడవులకు వెరుగు ఉండదు. కనుక మేకలు ఈ ముడిగిన అడవులలో మేయటం నిషేధించుట అవసరమా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“It has been recognized all over that goats are a great menace to forests. It has been the policy of this Government from 1913 onwards, i.e., for a period of almost 40 years, not to allow goat-browsing. It has been recognized by everybody that forests suffer a good lot because of these goats.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“For the benefit of the peasants who are having goats, is it not necessary to reserve some areas for the maintenance of their goats?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“All the avenue trees are available for the purpose.” (Laughter.)

10-40 a.m. **JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—**“May I know whether the Government will consider the advisability of discontinuing the levy of grazing fees in Government forests?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“A separate question may be put.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“మేకలను, కుక్కలను అడవులలో మేయరాదంటే వాటికి గ్రాసుకు ఎన్నో ధర్మమవుతుంది? కాబట్టి అట్టి అవకాశాన్ని సాక్షాద్యం పంపించరా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“So far as cattle are concerned, there has been no restriction at all. Licences are issued very freely to owners of cattle for grazing in the nearest forest area available. But, so far as goats are concerned, in all the forests that have been under the control of the Madras Government, no goat-browsing has been allowed and no complaints have ever been received from these areas. It is only with regard to estate forests that this difficulty has arisen and, till about the 1st of April, goat-browsing, on a very small scale, was allowed in the forests that have not been reserved; these were only minor forests. As regards fodder, the hon. Member has asked where the goats should go. Sir, there are porambokes and lankas where browsing goes on even now.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOUD :—“ఈ గిరి అడవులన్నీ మేయబడుచున్నాయి?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“I admit that allowing goat-browsing in forests is in a way bad. But as these are not reserved forests, a concession was made.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Are the Government aware that, in the forests of the Mandasa Estate, the tenants are harassed—the local peasants are harassed—in the matter of issue of grazing licences and that their goats, cows and sheep are prevented from grazing even in the unreserved areas?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“A separate question may be put.”

[7th November 1952]

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“మనుష్యులకు గిరి అడవులను పట్టయిన వారు విరోధంగా సంపాదించుకొంటారు. కాని వారులేని పశువులమాట విమిటి? అందువల్ల కొన్ని అడవులను పశువులమేతకు మినహాయించుట అని మంత్రిగారి అభిప్రాయం. వారు వాకు తెలుగులోనే సమాధానం ఇచ్చి చెప్పగోరుతున్నాడు.”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“I take it that the hon. Member asks whether permission could be given in areas which are not demarcated as forests. In areas which have not been reserved or demarcated as forests, permission is now given. There is no difficulty at all there.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“May I know for what purposes, the Government take over forests, at what rate compensation is given to those from whom they are taken over, and what is the income to the Government from these forests?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Notice.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ఫారెస్టు ఉద్యోగులు అంతా ఇచ్చిన వారి మేకలను అడవులలో మేయిస్తున్నారు. అంతాకూ ఒకటేగా ఫిల్లంకట్టుకు వ్యాసా మేకలను ఫారెస్టులలో నేయనివ్యక్తులకు ప్రభుత్వం సమ్మతించుట?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The Government require the co-operation and help of the members including the hon. Member in preventing goat-browsing in forest areas and also in preventing officials adopting illegal methods to circumvent the rules.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“Is the cutting of avenue trees legally permitted?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“I think hon. Members of this House must help to stop this cutting of avenue trees also.”

SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY :—“Will the Government consider the advisability of forming District Advisory Committees to advise the Government on these matters?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The matter will be considered.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“In view of the importance of preserving vegetation in the country, will the Government consider the question of licensing of goats and shepherds who lead the goats into forests so that the depredation that is wrought by them to the vegetation in the country may be stopped?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Goats, I believe, are licensed in municipal areas.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అయినా గేకు అడవులను రికవర్స్ ఫారెస్టులనుంచి తొలగించి మేకలను మేపుటనేవారికి సహాయం చేయకరా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The matter will be considered if the hon. Member gives details of the case.”

[7th November 1952]

Mohan Industries, Limited, Tenali.

* 99 Q.—SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether any subsidy has been given by the Government to the Mohan Industries, Tenali;

(b) if so, how much; and

(c) whether the Government have called for a report of the progress made by the industry since the grant of the subsidy?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“(a) & (b) No subsidy has been given to Messrs. Mohan Industries, Limited, Tenali. But a loan of Rs. 1 lakh was granted to the company in 1948 under the provisions of the State Aid to Industries Act.

“(c) Progress reports were received and are being received by the Director of Industries and Commerce from the company as required under the provisions of the State Aid to Industries Act.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“అయితే, ఈ లాన్ ఇచ్చినప్పుడు 1948 వ సంవత్సరములో అప్పు ఇచ్చారు. అప్పుడు ఈ సారి గేండ్లకొంటూ ఎంతవని పొందింది? ప్రభుత్వం ద్వారా ఇచ్చిన డబ్బు పక్కనకు పెట్టి పరమకు ఖర్చు చేయలేదా, లేక మ్యూసియం రేయిడినదా అనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం విచారణచేసేదా? ఇది రకు విచారణచేసిన పాపక్షయితే ఇక ముందే enquiry చేసేదా అని అనుకున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Is the hon. Member putting a question? I think it is a long speech.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“In Telugu, we put so many clauses to complete a sentence.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“There is no punctuation in Indian languages.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“I am not prepared to accept the hon. Member's statement. But the Government are aware of the fact that the company did not utilize the loan properly. The one lakh loan was not used for the purpose for which it was intended. In August 1952, we took advice and asked the Collector and the Director of Industries to institute legal proceedings for the recovery of the loan that the Government have given the company. The matter is being proceeded with.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—“ఏది వస్తుంటే నయ్యా. రేయిటకు ఈ అప్పు ఇచ్చారు? ఏ terms మీ loan grant చేయబడింది.”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Loans are issued to a number of industrialists. If the hon. Member will only name them and give me notice, I shall answer his question.”

[7th November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—“నా ప్రశ్నలోని రెండవ భాగం answer చేయబడలేదు; terms of the loan ఏమిటి?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“This loan was meant for the purchase of machinery for the manufacture of bricks, tiles, china and ceramics. The company was asked to repay the loan in instalments of Rs. 12,000 each. So far only one instalment has been paid and the balance has not been paid. The Government are, therefore, taking action for the recovery of the loan.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know whether the Government will take steps to place on the table of the House the profit and loss accounts and the balance sheets of the companies to which State aid is given?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“I shall certainly place all facts on the table.”

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—“ఎట్టి పరిస్థితులకు ప్రభుత్వం అప్పు పంపింది? ఈ Mohan Industries లోని ప్రాముఖ్యతేమిటి?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Industries which are useful to the public and which require help are given loans. If anyone wants loans, he applies to the Government. The Government place the application before the Board of Industries and the Board advises the Government whether it can be given or not and if it can be given, under what conditions and on what terms.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“ఈ అప్పులన్నీ ఎందుకు ప్రభుత్వం నుంచి రూపొందేవి? ఎందుకైతే పంపిణీ చేసేటా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“As I have told the hon. Member already, all applications for loan are placed before the Board, which is a Board of experts; it considers them and makes recommendations which are normally accepted.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“అడిగిన ప్రశ్నకు ఇచ్చిన సమాధానం సంపూర్ణం కరంగాలేదు. ప్రభుత్వం వారు అప్పులిచ్చిన సంస్థల ఆక్సెంట్లు సరిగా ఉన్నవా లేవా? డబ్బు పక్కనకు పెట్టి ఖర్చుచేయలేదు అంటే అనే విషయాలను ప్రభుత్వం సమీక్షించి తెలియజేసే విచారణమైనా ఈ ప్రభుత్వం వారు చేయడంలేదా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“If it is the desire of hon. Members, they can ask questions and the Government will always accede to the request. But in this question, how does the hon. Member expect me to know all details now?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I understand, though the question is put in Telugu, that the suggestion is that in all cases where State aid is given continually all the accounts of the concerned parties should be periodically placed on the table of the House. The suggestion is good and the Government will consider it. Probably it will lead to stoppage of all loans.” (Laughter.)

[7th November 1952]

10-50
AJP.

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"In view of the answer given by the Hon. Minister that subsidy or loan will be given on application in deserving cases, will he be good enough to give subsidy or loan to the Krishna Engineering Works, Palghat; Metal Industries, Shoranur, and all the textile industries as a whole in the Malabar district which are on the verge of collapse or are collapsing?"

MR. SPEAKER :—“ A separate question may be put.”

Number of coupes leased out in Cuddapah South Forest Division.

* 100 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the number of coupes leased out in Cuddapah South Forest Division during 1951-52 and the estimated yield of the fuel in tons after felling the coupes as reckoned by the number of waggons despatched from the railway stations of Mamandur, Settigunta, Kodur, Urapadu, Reddipalli Rajampet and Cuddapah?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA : — The number of coupes leased is 27.

“ The estimated yield of fuel is 18,110 tons and the actual output of fuel is 15,211 tons or 1,170 waggon loads, and timber 19,105 pieces or 64 waggon loads. Nine hundred and fifty-one waggons or 12,510 tons of fuel, 25 waggons or 7,224 tons of timber and 1 waggon or 13 tons of charcoal were despatched from the various railway stations in the division.”

SRI M. VENKATASUBBA REDDI : " Sir, are the Government aware that illegal felling in the Cuddapah South Forest Division is going on on a large scale, and if so what action have the Government taken to prevent it ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMY :—“ Forest coupes auction ”
 “ The principle of auctioning forest coupes is to get the best price for the timber.”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Yes, Sir. There are principles on which forest coupes are worked out.”

SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI : "మన రాష్ట్ర ఎన్నడూ అరిగిపోదు. మన రాష్ట్రాన్ని కొట్టించి పోయేది అప్పుడు. అప్పుడు మన రాష్ట్రమును మన అరిగిపోయిన అవినాశావస్థనుండి ఉద్ధరించు శాస్త్రజ్ఞులు, ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి తెలుసునా ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ These coupes that have been set apart for fuel have been so arranged, that they come in rotation of 20 to 30 years. It is not cutting in these coupes that causes denudation of forests.”

7th November 1952]

Fee concessions for poor Brahman students.

* 101 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations have been received regarding the grant of school-fee concessions for poor Brahmin students; and

(b) if so, what action the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) No.

" (b) Does not arise."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—పద బ్రాహ్మణ, వైశ్యవిద్యార్థులను స్కూలు నీ విద్యులలో వ్యాపకము చేయవలసింది వస్తున్నది ప్రభుత్వం చేర్చుకోదా ? రెండవది రాయలసీమలో ఉప్పుమువంటి పేద రైతాంగము విడుదలైనవారు అందరు, అనగా వారిలో కాపువారు, కమ్మవారు, బలిజవారు ఎక్కువగా ఉన్నారు. గనుక ఇటువంటి కులాలవారిని కూడా backward community లో చేర్చుటకు ప్రభుత్వం అంగీచిస్తుందా ? అట్లా అయితే నెంబునే భత్తయ్యవారు చేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వం తెలుపుతుందా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Because of the distress there, Rayalaseema is acknowledged to be a backward area in certain respects but the class that the hon. Member has referred to cannot as such be considered a backward class and the question therefore does not arise."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ School fee concession తెలంగాణా కులానికి చెందిన విద్యార్థులకు కూడా క్రమంగా తగ్గింపుచేసే విధానాన్ని నుండి ప్రభుత్వం ఆలోచిస్తుందా ? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"This question has nothing to do with the present question."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“మంత్రిగారు ఇంట్లో భూమి సమాధానం తెచ్చు
తున్నారు. తెలుగువాడ కాదాండి?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, it is a duty I owe to the House to answer in a language which would be understood by all the Members (Applause). If the hon. Member does not know or understand English, and knows only Telugu, certainly I will answer in English, and repeat it in Telugu also.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ నేను ముదిరాళి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నది యేమిటంటే, తెలుగు రాజ తెలివైన సభ్యులు తెలుగులో ప్రశ్న అడిగివచ్చుకు ముదిరాళి తెలుగులో సమాధానం చెప్పితే హాగీ ఆర్డరువుతుంది. కాని తెలుగులో అడిగివచ్చుకు ఇంగ్లీషులో వచ్చే వద్దలి యిక్కడుంటు అయితను మార్చునాడదా అని విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. బిలసనగా ఇంగ్లీషు రాజ యిక్కడ ఉన్న సభ్యులకు కాలానుంది తెలియదు. ఈ విషయము ముదిరాళి తెలుసుకుంటే మంచిది.”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It is for the Hon. Speaker to make arrangements for the translation of the proceedings of the House in the languages if required.”

[7th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“(a) & (b) Instructions purely of administrative character have been received but it is not in the public interest nor is this Government at liberty to publish them.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ముఖ్య మంత్రి 4 రాజ్-హౌస్ లా-కారిగారు ప్రజల ప్రభుత్వాన్ని suspect చేయడానికి వారి trust ఉంచానికి వచ్చి విజ్ఞప్తులు చేస్తూ ఉంటారు. కాని వారు మాత్రం ప్రజలకు trust చేయరు. ఇది ప్రజల ఆందోళన తెలియజేస్తున్నది. యీ నిర్బంధ విధానమునకు సరికాకుండా జాగ్రత్తపడుదురా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Sir, continuing yesterday's debate, the hon. Member asks me to drop suspicion. I am quite prepared to do so; but the Government of India have marked this as 'secret'.”

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI :—“May I know whether the Hon. Chief Minister would retain the power of issuing warrants under the Preventive Detention Act to himself and not leave it to the concerned department?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“I wish to know how the present question by the hon. Member arises. The question under discussion refers to the instructions issued by the Central Government to the State Governments.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“Does this Act have the support of the Government of Madras?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“When a Bill is introduced in Parliament, they do not wait for the support of the Government of Madras.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ప్రధాన మంత్రి 4 రాజ్-హౌస్ లా-కారిగారు ఆర్డర్ Central Government నుండి 'secret' అని వచ్చింది కాబట్టి దాన్ని ప్రచురించుటకు నిలువేదని అంటున్నారు. గదా, అటువంటి విషయము Central Government ను secret అనేదిగా లేకుండా చేయమని కోరుతున్నా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I wish to consider the suggestion and may I also give the information that I have already communicated my views on the subject.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“Were the Government of Madras consulted by the Central Government before passing the Preventive Detention Act?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Sir, it is usual when law and order matters are taken up in Parliament to consult the States and I presume they must have consulted the Government of Madras also. I was not in office at that time.”

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAY :—“Have the Government of Madras approved those directives? Or have they submitted any representation to the Government of India asking them to change the directives?”

[7th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The directives, as I have already said, are purely of an administrative nature. Our approval does not at all arise.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“The Hon. Chief Minister says the instructions are purely of an administrative nature. Do they relate only to transfers of prisoners and issuing of warrants?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“They relate to every section under the Act, as passed by the Parliament. To be more or less uniform in its operation in various States, each section has been carefully explained and the Government of India have issued certain instructions to the States in regard to them. There is no going outside the law in this matter.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Are these instructions supposed to be binding on Courts?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The instructions have nothing to do with Courts. The instructions deal with only what the State Governments have to do.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“As this Preventive Detention Act is likely to put in jeopardy the individual freedom of citizens, have this Government of Madras taken the view of the Madras Civil Liberties Union in this matter?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Sir, I assure the hon. Member that the liberties of the people of Madras will not be in jeopardy as long as they do not commit any offence.” (Laughter.)

Sale of culinary essences.

* 104 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report to the effect that a large part of the stocks of culinary essences has gone underground and is being still illicitly disposed of to consumers at blackmarket rates; and

(b) if so, what steps the Government propose to take in this matter?

THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER :—“(a) No. Sir. It is however possible that some stock might have gone underground in view of the recent restrictions imposed on the sale of these essences. No reports have been received relating to their sales at blackmarket prices.

“(b) Does not arise.”

[7th November 1962]

Labour unions of municipal workers.

* 105 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state the grounds on which the Government issued G.O. No. 1671 not recognizing the labour unions of municipal workers in this State if the office-bearers of such unions include outsiders?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The orders in G.O. No. 1671, L.A., dated the 8th September 1948, follow the orders applicable to State Government servants. The reason for prohibiting outsiders from being office-bearers of Service Associations is that these Associations are intended to serve the interests of persons in active service only and that persons who do not belong to this class have no place in the management of the Associations.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Sir, in view of the fact that these trade unions are registered under the Trade Unions Act and that Act permits outsiders to become office-bearers in the unions and in view of the fact that this Government Order prevents outsiders from holding any office in the labour unions of municipal workers, and prevents the settlement of so many disputes between workers and municipalities will the Government consider the desirability of cancelling this particular Government Order? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The Government will consider the suggestion of the hon. Member.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ Are the Government aware that during the strike by the Mettur Township Scavengers' Union this was the central point at issue and that that was responsible for the failure of the strike and that the Government are thus abetting failures of strikes? Will the Government consider the desirability of amending the Government Order? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think this question should be addressed to the Hon. Minister for Labour.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Railway Administration ను కూడా యిక్కడ ప్రభుత్వం పరిపాలిస్తుంది. అందులో Railway Workers' Union తరఫున President ను కూర్చోవడానికై recognize చేసి వారికి అవకాశం యివ్వగా మునిసిపల్ workers' union కూర్చోవడానికై ఎవరినో recognize చేయడం యీ మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వం ఎందుకు నిరాకరిస్తున్నదని ప్రభుత్వం తెలియజేయాలా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The orders passed by the Government were intended to enforce better discipline in the associations of municipal workers and for their own benefit.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Railway service లోని కూడా కూడా essential service ఎక్కడ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనలో ఉన్నా, మునిసిపల్ కూడా essential service ఎక్కడ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలనలో ఉన్నా, యీ మునిసిపల్ ”

7th November 1962]

service workers ఈ ఎంపిక in-discipline చేస్తుంది, యీ municipal workers కు కూడా recognition యివ్వకుండా ఉండటానికై అవకాశం ఎందుకు ఇచ్చిందో ప్రభుత్వం వివరించాలా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The Government will certainly consider any representation connected with this matter.”

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—“ In view of the fact that most of the municipal workers of the category of scavengers, cart-men and sweepers are illiterate and ignorant and they are not in a position to represent their grievances properly, will the Government exempt these workers from the Government Order mentioned by the Hon. the Minister? ” 11-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ I think I have answered enough, Sir. The associations comprise all categories of municipal employees.”

SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI :—“ Is it not necessary to include outsiders in such associations and enable them to represent their grievances boldly without any diffidence? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, it is a question of public servants' unions. An association of public servants is for the remedy of their grievances. It is absolutely inexpedient to allow outsiders to take part in them for very many reasons which I need not go into now and therefore I am very unwilling to consider any such suggestion. But if it is a suggestion to be considered it will be considered. I have said enough to show, so far as I am concerned, that I am against it.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Will the Hon. the Chief Minister give an assurance on the floor of the House (interruption by the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari) or make a statement that the employees who are office-bearers of unions will not be punished during their tenure of office and afterwards for two or three months, so that the office-bearers may feel a sense of security in discharging their duties as labour union officers? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I give the assurance here and now that on account of any action taken by employees who are office-bearers of associations, in regard to the remedying of their grievances, no victimization will take place, as stated by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, during the period mentioned. But if any act of indiscipline is done outside the seeking of remedy of grievances, it should not be thought that it is covered by this assurance.”

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ In view of the fact that the Central Government representative at the I.L.O. made an objection only in the case of military personnel and Government servants and not in the case of employees of local bodies, will the Government reconsider and revise the Government Order? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I think that that representative was guilty of neglecting this matter.”

[7th November 1952

Opening of a fire station at Ongole.

* 106 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation was made to the Government of Madras by the Ongole Municipality authorities to open a fire station at Ongole; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

" (b) Government received representations from the Commissioner, Ongole Municipality, in May 1950 and in November 1951. The Commissioner was informed that due to the difficult financial position of the Government, the Government considered that it was not possible to consider the question of opening a fire station at Ongole in the immediate future."

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY :—“ దానికీ తిజ్జాయింపగా ఎంత భర్త్యులవుతుందో మంత్రిగారు చెప్పగలరా ?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Notice, Sir."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ కాంప్రొమైజ్మెంట్ ఇన్ ఫ్యూజిల్ కేసుల నష్టపడుతున్నారు. అందువల్ల ఆలాంటి ఫైర్ స్టేషన్లు ప్రభుత్వము ఏదో విధముగా దబ్బు చూపకొని ప్రారంభించడం, కాలా అవసరమని ప్రభుత్వము గురించేమిదా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Is the Hon. Minister aware that in most cases the fire engines operate after the fires are extinguished? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It has nothing to do with the main question."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" தீ அனைக்கும் நிலையங்களை நகரங்களில் அமைப்பதற்கு என்னென்ன தேவை யென்பதை கணம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் தெரிவிப்பாரா ? "

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member can put a separate question."

Fire station for Rajampet.

* 107 Q.—SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government received representations to establish a Fire Service Squad at Rajampet, Cuddapah district, and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ A representation has been received from Sri P. Narasimha Reddi, M.L.A., for the opening of a fire station at Rajampet. He has been informed that the question of opening a fire station at

7th November 1952]

Rajampet can be considered only after fire stations have been opened in the remaining 17 municipal towns in the State in which fire stations should be opened according to the peace-time programme."

SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI — “శ్రీ సచివశ్రీలు ఈ సాలా కాలాగ్రహాలు తగలబడి కారినోసా ఉంటాయి. కాత్రన రాజ్యం ఏ దశకాలము వరకు ముందుగానే ఒకర్ పైర నేడదు పాపినామని ముగిసినా ఉంది ఇప్పుడు కాదు !”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Notice, Sir."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" In view of the fact that nearly 33 villages in Sompeta taluk, Visakhapatnam district, were burnt during the last summer within a period of two months, do the Government feel it necessary to provide similar help in the rural areas also? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"What sort of help does the hon. Member want? I don't think fire engines will help after the fires are extinguished."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Just like the fire stations in the urban areas, will the Government provide similar help to prevent fires in rural parts? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" These fire stations in urban areas are intended to help rural areas also."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I ask the Hon. Minister whether, in view of the fact that in most of the villages the huts are all thatched and are subject to frequent fire accidents, the Government will consider increasing the number of fire stations as also the number of fire engines in the existing stations so that they may be of help to the villages nearby? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Yes, Sir, when our finances improve and when we can spare some money to buy fire engines, we will do so."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Take us into confidence. We will tell you where to find the money."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Yes, by donations from hon. Members."

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ In view of the fact that recently Punganur, Palmaner and Rajampet taluks were subject to frequent fire accidents, will the Government consider opening a fire station at Rajampet? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, the subject of fire stations comes under my portfolio. I may say that fire engines cost very much and if we make a plan for preventing fires in the rural areas, it would be cheaper to build less inflammable huts than to buy fire engines and employ men to run them.”

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [7th November 1952]

which were conducted on the basis of the old electoral rolls. The second reason adduced for bringing forward this measure is that the monsoons have failed and that famine exists in certain areas and that therefore the energies of the Government and of the people should be mobilized for combating the famine. Sir, there is no assurance given by the Minister that next year also the monsoon will not fail. As a matter of fact, it may or may not fail. So, we are not prepared to accept this reason also at its face value. On the other hand, certain political incidents would seem to indicate that it is on the basis of certain calculations to ensure the success of the party in power, that this Bill has been brought forward. I believe it was a calculated indiscretion on the part of the Hon. the Minister for Finance when he said that re-elections might be held at an early date though the Chief Minister hastened to give an official denial of the intention. The results of the municipal elections would seem to indicate that the Government has not been able to regain popularity after the present Ministry was formed. The results of the elections do not seem to have heartened the Congress Party and the Chief Minister himself has admitted that he had been humbled and that his anticipation that his personality would be able to sway the electorate did not have the intended effect. Hence, they seem to be nursing the hope that if there is one more year of the Ministry's rule in the districts, Congress popularity would increase and it would be possible for the Congress to secure a larger number of seats at the district board elections. An effort has been made to increase Congress popularity by creating false hopes on certain issues. The architect of the present Constitution stood for centralism some time ago, but to-day we find him as an ardent advocate of Provincial Autonomy. In a burst of enthusiasm—perhaps in a fit of delirium when he was running a temperature—the Hon. the Finance Minister extolled the exploits of the Chief Minister at the recent Delhi Conference of Finance Ministers in regard to a greater share to the Madras State of the revenue derived from income-tax and provincial autonomy regarding certain taxation measures. During this session, an attempt is being made to show that the present Ministry is ready to fight the Central Government on the question of handlooms. I believe all this is shadow-boxing for the purpose of making the electorate believe that the present Ministry stands for a greater degree of provincial autonomy. The postponement of the district board elections is for the purpose of making the electorate believe that the Congress is on the side of the people, on this issue. On the other hand, the violent opposition to this Bill by certain Members of this House is motivated by the fact that in the recent municipal elections, the results showed that the popularity of the Communist party is waning; therefore the Communist party members would like to have immediate elections, so that their present popularity may not wane still further. Though these are the political calculations of those who support this Bill and those who oppose it, we on this side of the House, have our own calculations with regard to this measure. We do not believe that the popularity of the Congress is likely to be

7th November 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

enhanced as a result of the postponement of the elections. The Congress Government nourishes pious hopes and these hopes will be belied in the same way as they were belied during the municipal elections. It will be some time before the electorate begins to understand that the attitude of the Ministry on the question of greater autonomy for the States is merely shadow-boxing with the Central Government. It will be some time before the people realise that the new broom is not sweeping as well as was sought to be made out by persistent propaganda. A number of concessions are being given nowadays with the idea of mobilising support for the party in power; but if you analyse the concessions, they are only crumbs thrown for the purpose of creating the impression that some further good is going to be done to the people subsequently. For instance, let us take the concession that was made to the bus transport workers. The concession was that gratuity would be paid to the workers some ten years hence; and that concession has been made with a view to create the impression that this Government are making every possible effort to improve the conditions of the workers. But so long as the Congress Government sticks to its preset economic programme, so long as it is going to be a Government for the protection of the interests of the landlords and the rich, we are confident that this Government will not be able to gain that popularity which it expects. On the other hand, we believe that this attempt on their part will lead to the same result as in the case of their previous attempts. In the matter of playing with separatist tendencies they are likely to sow the wind and reap the whirlwind. Even during the period of this one year of postponement of the elections, this attempt at playing with the separatist tendencies operating in this State is not going to bring any results in their favour. Like the sorcerer's apprentice, Sri Rajagopalachari will be unable to control the forces he is unleashing. On the other hand, they will be exposed as people who are not genuine supporters of a greater degree of provincial autonomy. Further, I would like to say that the Government which brought forward this measure, have failed to take note of one other calculation, viz., the possibility of a recession; and if the recession should deepen, as it is likely to do, then all these attempts and calculations which are supposed to bolster up the present Ministry's popularity are likely to be doomed. Therefore, our own calculation is, that the Congress popularity will wane further and that the Opposition forces are likely to gain by a postponement of the elections.

"The main argument that has been advanced by the Government in introducing this Bill is the inevitable delay in the preparation of electoral rolls. If this reason was genuine, I submit there is no necessity for postponing the elections for as long a period as one year. If it is genuine, it would be desirable for the Government to give the assurance that as soon as electoral rolls are prepared, the elections will be held. I believe that there is a great deal of truth in what has been said by many Members of the Opposition that there has been a great deal of harassment by Presidents of District Boards. Assurances of course have been

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [7th November 1952]

given by the Minister concerned that these matters will be looked into but we on this side of the House are afraid that these assurances just like other similar assurances will not be fully implemented. On the other hand if they are not implemented the Congress popularity in the State far from going up will wane faster as a result of the victimizations that are being perpetrated by the Presidents of District Boards who have lost popular support. Taking the picture as a whole we on this side of the House are of the opinion that if the Congress is desirous of committing political suicide through a miscalculated postponement it is welcome to do so."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had not intended to intervene in this debate at all nor am I competent to do it. But I do so, because I have just heard Sri Anthony Pillai and I wish to assure him that I am very grateful for his observations and in some respects he very clearly proved that our motives, if we are intelligent men, are all honest and at any rate free from self-interest. He has proved that it is very dangerous for the Congress to postpone the elections and he has asserted that the Congress popularity is waning and that it will further wane and that it would, therefore, not be advisable from our own point of view that we should postpone the elections. Admitting all this hypothetically as well as in parts substantially, I submit that he has proved that our motives are good and therefore, let us begin from that point. I am sure that the Hon. the Finance Minister and the Minister for Local Administration who have spoken and who will probably wind up the debate, one of them, will deal with the matter. But I wish to deal with one observation made by Sri Anthony Pillai. He said that I had admitted that in some cases my personal appeal failed; I admit it again and I am not ashamed of it because it only meant that communal feelings were stronger than the appeal that I made. That point apart, the question is whether the general results of the elections have proved what Mr. Pillai said. With regard to local board elections, whether in municipal or district board elections, I hold the view, with all respect to those who may differ from that view, that as far as possible we should have no politics in them but the present atmosphere did not permit it and there were certain challenges that had been made, so far as the main Opposition to the Congress which came from the Communists, went. Mr. Pillai has asserted—I hope he is right and I hope the Communists will admit it—that the Communists had failed in the elections." (Interruption.)

(Sri K. Govinda Rao rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order. I would request the hon. Member to resume his seat."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Let us examine the position calmly. I was proceeding to the point which perhaps is worrying the other side. Let me tell them that the Congress has not secured an over-all majority of the seats. I say,

7th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

Sir, that it is consistent with my desire because I want that local bodies should be free from extremely undiluted political bias. The Congress has succeeded and certainly the Communists who challenged its position did not succeed. A large number of independent members have succeeded in the elections. I welcome such a thing and I want independents to succeed in elections to the local bodies wherever possible because local bodies are concerned with matters which do not really require political party feelings. We should as far as possible put aside politics in local bodies but since adult franchise has been introduced all at once and at one time in all spheres, in the municipalities, district boards and in the general elections, this situation has arisen and this disturbance of understanding has taken place. Party feelings have played a larger part in the elections than they should. So far as the present elections are concerned, I wish to assure Mr. Pillai that I have no grievance whatsoever with the results, the Congress party has no grievance about it; the Congress is quite pleased with the success that it has secured and is also quite pleased with the fact that many independents have come in and they do hope that the independents will also stand for good administration."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Since many hon. Members have taken part in the discussion, I will allow a few more Members including of course the Leader of the Opposition to take part in the discussion and then I will put the motion to the vote of the House."

SRI RAJA SAGI SURYANARAYANA RAJU:—"అధ్యక్షా, జిల్లా బోర్డులకు సంబంధించిన ఈ చిర్రానాన్ని నేను ఇంకా చూస్తున్నాను. జిల్లా బోర్డుల గడువులను ఎంత పొడిగించినా నా కెట్టి అభ్యంతరం లేదు. ఐనప్పటికీ ఈ విషయమే కొన్ని సలహాలు చేయదలచుకొన్నాను. జిల్లా బోర్డు పరిపాలన చాలా లోపములతో కూడుకొనివుంది. వాటివల్ల ప్రజలకు కలిగే ఉపకారాలు నానాటికీ తగ్గిపోతున్నాయి. జిల్లా బోర్డులలో దుర్వ్యయం చాలా జరుగుతోంది. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు తమ ఆధికారాన్ని దర్శిస్తూనే ఉంటారు. ఇందుకోక ఉదాహరణ తెలియజేస్తాను. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లకు జిల్లా బోర్డు ఫండ్స్నుంచి ప్రభుత్వంవారు కార్లను కొని యిచ్చారు. వీటి ధరలు 20,000 రూపాయలకు పైబడి వుంటున్నాయి. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లకు మృతులకువరకు ఈ సౌకర్యం ఎందువల్ల కలుగజేయాలో తెలియదు లేదు. ఈ కార్లనువారు జిల్లా బోర్డు పనులకుకాక పార్టీపనులకు ఉపయోగించు కుంటున్నారు. నెలకు పెట్రోల్ కయ్యే ఖర్చు 500 రూపాయలకు మించి వుంటోంది. పాథారణంగా ఏ స్వంత కారు తిరగనంతదూరం ఈ కారులు ప్రయాణించేస్తాయి. విదాది తిరుగకుండానే వాటిమరలు వెడిపోయి మూలకడుతున్నాయి. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లకు కార్లు ఎందుకయ్యా అంటే వారు ప్రజాప్రతినిధులు కనుక కార్లు యిస్తున్నామనే సమాధానం చెప్తున్నారు. అలా అయినట్లయితే కాసనసభ్యులందరూ కూడా కార్లు సప్లయచేస్తే ఎంతో సంతోషిస్తాం. అదమం కాంగ్రెస్ సభ్యులొక్కరికైనా కార్లు సప్లయచేయండి లేకపోతే కాంగ్రెస్ సభ్యులందరూ కలిపినా ఒక కారు సప్లయచేయండి. దీనికి మేమంతగానో సంతోషిస్తాం. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు తమ స్నేహితులను, బంధువులను జిల్లా బోర్డు కారులలో ఎక్కించుకొని తిరగడం చాలా చేయాలి. కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ ప్రజాసేవకేగాను దానిని ఉపయోగించుకోరాదని ఉత్తరువులు జారీచేయాలి. జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు ఇటువంటి అతకతకాలు చేస్తున్నందు

[Sri Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju] [7th November 1952]
వల్లనే ప్రజలకు కాంగ్రెస్ పట్ల అగ్రహం కల్గిపోయింది. కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థ ఊహించుకున్నట్లు ఆయనా జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు వారి అధికారకాలంలో సక్రమంగా ప్రవర్తించలేదు మాదాల్సింది."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member speaking on this Bill."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"He is speaking on administration."

SRI RAJA SAGI SURYANARAYANA RAJU:—"ఎరిమంటరి ఎడ్యుకేషన్ విషయంలో కూడా ఎంతో శ్రద్ధ చూపవలసివుంది. డిప్టీ కమిషనరీ బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు ఈ ఉపాధ్యాయులపట్ల చాలా కఠినంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నారు. ఉపాధ్యాయులను తరచు ట్రాన్స్ ఫర్ చేయకూడదని జి.ఓ. లు వున్నాయి కాని జిల్లా బోర్డు ప్రెసిడెంట్లు ఈ వ్యవస్థలను చేతిలో పట్టి పట్టుకుంటుంటారు. వారి యిష్టప్రకారం ఉపాధ్యాయులను బదిలీ చేస్తున్నారు."

"ఎరిమంటరి ఎడ్యుకేషన్ విషయంలో వలసే హైస్కూల్స్ విషయంలో కూడా జిల్లా బోర్డులు సరిగా వర్తించలేదు. మా జిల్లాలో టాప్ వర్క్ క్లాస్స్ లో నిమిత్తం ఒక హాస్టల్ డిప్టీ కమిషనరీ బోర్డు నిర్వహిస్తోంది. కాని అది చాలా లోప భూయిష్టంగా ఉంది. దానిని ప్రభుత్వం వారే స్వాధీనంచేసుకొని నిర్వహించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. జిల్లా బోర్డుల గడువును రెండు మూడు సంవత్సరాలకు పెంచినా నేను అడ్డుచెప్పేవానిని కాను. బిల్ జిల్లాలో సరియైన పరిపాలన కొనసాగునట్లు చూడవలసినదని రాజగోపాలాచారి గారిని కోరుతున్నాను. మాజీటివారు స్వతంత్రంగా ఎన్నికలలో గెలిచి, కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రతినిధులను ఓడించినప్పటికీ ఈనాడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని బలపరుస్తున్నామంటే అందుకు కారణం వారి శక్తి సామర్థ్యాలపై మాకున్న విశ్వాసమే రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు అధికారానికి వచ్చిన తరువాత అధికారులు కొంతవరకు సక్రమంగానే వర్తించుకుంటున్నారని భావించవలసివుంది. ఆయన జిల్లా బోర్డు పరిపాలన విషయంలో కూడా సక్రమమైన విర్యాలు చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను."

"ఈ మధ్యన ఎరిమంటరి రిమానియింగ్ బోర్డు గురించి లా పాల్ లెక్క వసి ప్రభుత్వం ఈ లోపాలు సవరించుటకు సాయపడుతుందని నమ్ముతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

11-40 a.m. SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, నేను యీ బిల్లును గురించి మాట్లాడ వలసిన యింతకుముందు తలంచలేదు. కాని మన ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారి ప్రసంగంలో వెల్లడింపబడిన అభిప్రాయాలు తెలుసుకొనిన తర్వాత వాటిని ఖండించుట నా విధి యని భావించి మాట్లాడవలసినాను. వాస్తవ పరిస్థితులకు భిన్నంగా ఊహించుకొని ఆకాశసాధాలను నిర్మించుకొని వాటిలో తమకు తోచిన కలలుకంటూవుంటే శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని నేను విమర్శించిఉండే వాడినికాదు. కాని ఆయన యీ కాసేపు సభను ఒక వేదికగా చేసుకొని కమ్యూనిష్టులపై రాళ్ళు రువ్వటానికి ప్రయత్నించినందు వల్లనే నేను వారి విమర్శలకు సమాధానము చెప్పవలసినవచ్చింది. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడుతున్న కమ్యూనిష్టులకు మునిసిపల్ ఎన్నికలలో ఓటమి సంభవించిందని తెలివివ్వారు. ఇది వాస్తవం కాదు. జనరల్ ఎన్నికలలో అయిదోట్లలో కమ్యూనిష్టు పార్టీ ఎన్ని ఓట్లు తెచ్చుకోగలిగినదో, యీనాటి మునిసిపల్ ఎన్నికలలో కూడా అన్ని ఓట్లు తెచ్చుకోగలిగింది. అంత జిల్లాలో కాంగ్రెసువారు అభ్యర్థులను నిలబెట్టలేక పోయినారనే విషయం శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు గమనించినట్లు కనబడడం

7th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

లేదు. కాంగ్రెసువారమని చెప్పుకుంటేనే యేమి ముప్పువస్తుందో అని స్వతంత్రులము అనే మునుకువేసుకొని బొడ్డిదారిన Municipalities లో ప్రవేశించుటకు కొంతమంది ప్రయత్నించేవారు. ఈ యదార్థ విషయాన్ని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు గమనించాలి. అంతేకాని కాంగ్రెస్ వారికి యేదో విజయం సంభవించింది. కమ్యూనిష్టులు ఓడిపోయినారు అని భావించుకోవడంవల్ల ఎట్టి లాభమున్నూ కలుగదు. ఇరవై వార్డుల హాస్టిల్లు. ఇక Municipal wards విభజించిన విధానంచూడండి. అధికారంలోవున్న పార్టీవారికి వివిధంగా wards ను ఏర్పాటుచేస్తే లాభదాయకంగా ఉంటుందో ఆ విధానమే అనుసరించబడింది. ఒక ward లో మూడువేలమంది ఓటర్లు ఉన్నాక ward లో 1,500 మంది వుంటున్నట్లు విభజన జరిగింది. తక్కువ ఓటర్లు వున్న వార్డులకు యిద్దరు అభ్యర్థులను నిలవడంజరిగింది. ఎవరెవరికి ఏ wards లాభదాయకంగా ఉంటాయో అనే విషయంపైన ఆయా వ్యక్తుల పలుకుబడిని ఆధారంచేసుకొని wards ఏర్పాటుచేయబడ్డాయి. మునిసిపాలిటీలలోని వార్డులలో కొంతమందిమంది ఓటర్ల సంఖ్య సమానంగా ఉండాలి అనే సూత్రం పాటించబడలేదు. వ్యక్తుల పలుకుబడిని వారికి రాగల ఓట్లను ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని వార్డులలో ఉండవలసిన ఓటర్ల సంఖ్య నిర్ణయించబడింది. ఈ విధంగా అక్కడక్కడ కొంతమంది కాంగ్రెస్ వారు స్వతంత్రులని పేరుపెట్టుకొని స్టేజీ పైకి వెళ్ళియుండవచ్చు. నిజంగా స్థానిక సంస్థలలో కాంగ్రెస్ ఎక్కడ గెలిచిందో చెప్పండి. కాంగ్రెస్ పలుకుబడికి అది ఒక నిదర్శన మని వాదించడము, కమ్యూనిష్టుల అవజయ్యానికి దానిని ఒక కొలతబద్ధంగా చూడక భావ్యమూ అని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను. వాస్తవ విషయాలను ముగిసిన తర్వాత, పలుకుబడి కోల్పోయిన కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థ కొలుకుంటూ ఉందని చూపడానికి మాత్రమే ప్రచారంగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ప్రసంగం ఉపయోగిస్తుంటే మాతాని, ప్రజలను ఎంతమాత్రం మభ్యపెట్టలేరని ఆయన గమనించాలి."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBBA REDDI:—"On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is speaking on a subject that is not before the House."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ సందర్భములో ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు వారికి ధ్యేయము చాలక ఈ point of order ను అప్పుడు తీసుకొని రానందులకు నేను చింతించుచున్నాను."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBBA REDDI:—"On a matter of personal explanation, Sir. The hon. Member said that the Hon. Chief Minister was speaking on the same subject. I must tell him that the Hon. Chief Minister raised that point in connection with the point raised by Mr. Anthony Pillai."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అందుచేతనే, నేనుగూడా ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు అప్పుడు చెప్పిన దానినిబట్టి యిప్పుడు నేను చెప్పుతున్నాను అని గ్రహించి పూర్తి ఉంటే పోయేది. మునిసిపల్ ఎన్నికలలో కమ్యూనిష్టుల గెలుపు ఓటమి జిల్లా బోర్డు ఎన్నికలకు సంబంధములేదు. జనరల్ ఎన్నికల తరువాతకూడా వెనుకటి జిల్లా బోర్డు అధ్యక్షులు ఉండటమువల్ల ప్రజలకు అనేక చిక్కులు కలుగుతున్నాయి. వీరియొక్క అధికార దుర్వినియోగం తగ్గించాలనే భుద్దేశ్యంతో ఇంతకుముందు ఈ జిల్లా బోర్డు ఎన్నికలు జరిగి ఎన్నో సంవత్సరములైనవి. నేను యీ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. జనరల్ ఎన్నికలు జరిగిన వెంటనే యీ జిల్లా బోర్డు ఎన్నికలు జరిపితే ప్రజల యిబ్బందులు తీర్చుకొనిస్తే, మరల అధికారం వహించటానికిన్ని అవకాశం ఉంటుంది

7th November 1952] [Sri V. K. Palaniswami Gounder]

கார், பஞ்சாயத்து போர்டு தேர்தல் வைக்கிற சர்க்கார், இந்த ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலுக்காக பயப்படுவேண்டியதில்லை. சர்க்கார் பயப்பட்டு போவதுமில்லை. ஆனால், இந்த வருஷத்திலே இத்தனை தேர்தலும் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்கார் நினைக்கவில்லை.

“தவிர ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன மந்திரி சொன்னார்: அதற்கு வேண்டிய வோட்டர்கள் லிஸ்டு தயாராகவில்லை’ என்று. இன்மேல் ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல்களுக்கெல்லாம் உதிகப் பணச்செலவோடு நடக்கப்போகிறது. இந்த அஸெம்பிளி தேர்தலுக்கு எவ்வளவு செலவாயிற்றோ அதைவிட அதிகச் செலவும் சிரமமும் ஏற்படும். ஒரு ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலுக்குக் குறைந்தது ஒரு லட்சம் ரூபாயாவது செலவாகுமென்று நான் நினைக்கின்றேன். இந்தச் செலவையெல்லாம் ஜில்லா போர்டு தான் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதனால் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை மாற்றி ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை வருஷத்திற்கொருதரம் என்று வைப்பதுதான் முறை. அது தான் நியாயம்.

“இந்த சட்டசபைக்குக்கூட மூன்று வருஷத்திற்கெருதரம் தேர்தல் நடந்தது. ஆனால் ஐந்து வருஷம் என்று ‘கான்ஸ்டிடியூஷன்’ மாற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். அதைப்போலவே ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனங்களாகிய ஜில்லா போர்டு, முனிசிபாலிடி, பஞ்சாயத்து போர்டு இவைகளுக்கெல்லாம் தேர்தல்கள் ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு தடவை இருப்பதுதான் முறை. அப்பொழுதுதான் அந்த போர்டிலே சென்றவர்கள் தகுதியான, உருப்படியான வேலையைச் செய்து காண்பிக்கலாம். இந்த ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை ஒத்திவைப்பது வேண்டுமென்றே காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள் செய்த காரியமல்ல. எதிர்க்கட்சிகாரர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்களே தவிர, அவர்கள் கூட இந்தத் தேர்தலுக்கு தயாராய் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்று நான் சொல்லமுடியாது.

“ஜில்லா போர்டுகளிலே அநேக கெடுதலான காரியங்கள், ஜில்லா போர்டு தலைவர்களாலும் அதன் கீழுள்ள அதிகாரிகளாலும் செய்யப்படுகின்றன என்று பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். ஜில்லா போர்டினுடைய முறை தெரியாமல் அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள் என்றுதான் நான் நினைக்கிறேன். தற்போது இருக்கிற ஜில்லா போர்டு முறையிலே நல்லதும் செய்ய முடியாது கெட்டதும் செய்ய முடியாது. அவர்களாகவே செய்கக் கூடிய காரியம் பல இல்லை. ஜில்லா போர்டு சட்டம் 1920-ம் வருஷத்திலே ஆரம்பித்த போது பல அதிகாரர்கள் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருந்தன. ஆனால், இன்றைக்கு அந்த அதிகாரங்களெல்லாம் எடுக்கப்படவில்லை. ஆகையால் அதிக கெடுதலும் செய்ய முடியாது; நல்லதும் செய்ய முடியாது. இதனாலே ஜில்லா போர்டுகளில் அநேக கெடுதல்கள் செய்துவிட்டார்கள் என்று சொல்லுவது தப்பு.

“தவிர ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனங்களில் ராஜ்ய கட்சிகள் அவசியம் இல்லை. கணம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னது போல், அது அவசியமே இல்லை. ஒரு கட்சியார் தேர்தலுக்கு கட்சி ரீதியில் நிற்கிறார்களே யென்று மற்ற கட்சியார்களும் நிற்கிறார்கள். ஆகையினால் இந்த ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை ஒரு வருஷத்திற்கு ஒத்தி வைத்ததில் எதோ ஒரு ‘மோடிவ்’ இருக்கிறதென்று சொல்வது தப்பு. அது ஒத்தி வைக்கப் படுவது நல்லது. ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனத் தேர்தல்களெல்லாம் ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்கு ஒரு தடவை நடப்பது தான் நல்லது என்று தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு என்னுடைய வார்த்தையை முடித்துக்கொள்கின்றேன்.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—**“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I entirely agree with those who have spoken, that the elections must be held by the due date. I am not one of those who believe that there are valid administrative reasons for postponing the elections. We have got a very costly department of the Inspector of Local Boards and a big staff throughout the State who ought to have known better that even if there were changes with regard to the

SRI V. K. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER :—“கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது சபையின் முன்னால் இருக்கும் தீர்மானமானது மிகவும் சாமான்யமான தீர்மானம். இந்த மசோதா இவ்வளவு தூரம் ஆட்சேபணைக்குரியது என்று நான் நினைக்கவில்லை. சிப்ரவரி மாதத்தில் தான் சட்டசபைத் தேர்தல் நடந்தது. அதற்கு பின் முனிசிபல் தேர்தல் இப்பொழுது தான் நடந்து முடிந்திருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது பஞ்சாயத்து தேர்தல் நடக்கிறது. அதற்குள்ளேயே ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல் வேண்டுமென்று எதிர்க் கட்சிக்காரர்கள் நினைக்கிறார்களென்று நான் நினைக்கவில்லை. ஏதோ இந்த ‘பில்’-லுக்கு ஆட்சேபணை சொல்லவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள தவிர, மனதார ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலை இதற்குள்ளாக வைக்க அவர்கள் தயாராய் இருக்கிறார்களென்று நான் நம்பவில்லை.

11-50
a.m.

“இந்த ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனத் தேர்தல்கள் இந்த மூன்று வருஷங்களிலே ஒரு ஸ்தாபனத்திற்காவது இந்தத் தேர்தல் நடக்கவில்லை. இப்பொழுது நடந்ததே முனிசிபல் தேர்தல், அந்த முனிசிபல் சபைகள் ஐந்து வருஷங்கள் இருந்த பிறகுதான் தேர்தல் நடந்திருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது வரப்போகிற பஞ்சாயத்து போர்டுகளுக்கு 14 வருஷங்களுக்கு முன்பே தேர்தல் நடந்தது. 14 வருஷங்களுக்குப் பிறகு இப்பொழுதுதான் தேர்தல் நடக்கப்போகிறது. அது மாதிரியல்ல. இந்த 14 வருஷங்களிலேயே ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தலோ, முனிசிபல் தேர்தலோ மூன்று வருஷங்களுக்கொரு தடவை நடக்கவில்லை. இதற்கு முன் முனிசிபல் தேர்தல் 7 வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு தடவை நடந்தது. ஜில்லா போர்டு தேர்தல் 7 வருஷத்திற்கு ஒரு தடவை நடந்தது. இந்த முனிசிபாலிடிகள் பஞ்சாயத்து போர்டுகள், ஜில்லா போர்டுகள் ஆகிய ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனங்களெல்லாம் குறைந்தது ஐந்து வருஷங்களுக்காவது அதனுடைய period இருக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம். அப்பொழுதுதான் அந்த ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனங்களும், அதில் இருக்கின்றவர்களும் ஏதாவது வேலை செய்ய முடியாமென்று நான் பூரணமாய் நம்புகின்றேன். ஆகையால் இது ஒன்றும் புதிது அல்ல. இந்தத் தேர்தலை ஒத்தி வைத்தால் இதற்கென்று பல motives, கற்பிக்கிறார்கள். ‘இதை வேண்டுமென்றே சர்க்கார் ஒத்திப் போடுகிறார்கள் ; ‘தேர்தல் வரக்கூடாது என்று சர்க்கார் நினைக்கிறது’ என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இந்த முனிசிபல் தேர்தலை வைத்த சர்க்கார்

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [7th November 1952]

constitution of the Ministry and all these political matters, elections to local bodies would not be affected. His whole department should have been ready for it. They knew since April, after the formation of the Ministry, that the elections are bound to come at a particular time. Therefore, in my humble opinion the reasons advanced mildly by the Hon. Sri Sankara Reddi are really not valid. One of the reasons, he said, is that the revision of electoral rolls is going on. I submit revision of electoral rolls always takes place and it can never be a valid reason to postpone elections particularly in this case because the main electoral rolls are all ready and a little difference, if any, regarding a few names should really not stop the entire election machinery and interrupt the democratic programme of the life of the people. Day before yesterday the Hon. Finance Minister was good enough to intervene in the debate and he appealed to the House to understand the present position, namely, that immediately after the general elections, we should not thrust upon the people another series of elections. He pleaded this point with all the earnestness which world politicians to-day are pleading for preventing a Third World War. Sir, elections to district boards, not being of such a superior political nature—as the Hon. Chief Minister said—need not really worry us and their programme need not be disturbed at all.

“ Sir, it was also stated that there would be elections to panchayats and therefore it would not be possible to arrange elections to district boards also. I submit that every district has got so many officers and so many establishments and if only the Government want that the programme should be observed, there are enough officers and enough people to carry out the programme without any let or hindrance. Therefore, we should not view these things from any political point of view. We must see that elections are held in the regular course, just as the annual share-holders' meetings of companies and incorporated organizations and co-operative societies are held in a regular way. The election programme should not be disturbed and must always continue whatever party may be in power here. That is one reason why I urge upon the Government to drop the present Bill. I moved an amendment that the Bill might be taken into consideration six months from to-day. The meaning of that is that the elections should go on immediately and that the present Bill should be dropped. I am not going into other aspects, whether the Communists have succeeded or the Congress have failed to succeed and whether we should be glad over the success of the Independents or not. It may be, in a different political atmosphere some people will be coming into the district boards and in another seasonal atmospheric change, others might come in. But the work of Local Boards must be carried on uninterruptedly in a democratic way. If we postpone elections, things will stagnate on all sides. No president of a district board should ever be under an impression—however good he may be—that the term of the district board would be extended under pressure.

12 noon. “ Elections must be held immediately on the due date unless an act of God intervenes and everybody including the electors must

[7th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

be prepared and must have that certainty. Then only there will be a healthy development of ideas in public life. I know most of the presidents of the district boards who have been defeated in the last general elections. It is merely a question of some defects in the electoral rolls. I have consulted some of the presidents of district boards and they said that there could be no difficulty in regard to the electoral rolls and they were also of the opinion that elections to the panchayat boards need not really stand in the way of elections to the districts boards. I therefore appeal to the Government to drop the Bill or accept my amendment. But, the Hon. Minister may say that it is already November and ask, 'How is it possible for us to hold elections by 1st December?' My first charge against him is that having been in office for six months and more, he should have foreseen the elections instead of waiting for six months and then coming forward and saying that there is no time. I will make a sporting offer to the Hon. Minister. Will he change the date from 1st December 1953 to 31st December 1952? If he agrees to complete the elections before the 31st December 1952, we would all agree not to press our amendments. Sir, I will wait for the answer of the Hon. Minister. We have no objection to postpone the elections by one month more. To-day is only the 7th of November. We have still got 23 days and another 30 days in December making a total of 53 days which is more than enough. Presidents of the United States have been changed within less than one month and the entire election campaign of the United States of America was held in a short while because in America there is a fixed date for the elections and they stick to it. The Americans also knew that if it was left to the passing whims and fancies, or passing opinions of changing Governments, similar adjournments or postponements might take place creating uncertainties and they therefore made it a part of the Constitution so that nobody might come forward and change the date. Therefore the people as well as the State machinery were ready for the elections. We want the Hon. Minister to understand that although he has the power to change the law and to change the date, he should not ordinarily resort to these devices. I submit, Sir, that my suggestion might be acted upon which would be good for both sides. We want these elections to be finished before 31st December 1952. If the Hon. Minister is not agreeable to this, we will be very painfully compelled to oppose this measure tooth and nail.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for choosing to place the presidents of our district boards on a par with the President of the United States of America.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I am very glad that I have raised the position of our presidents of district boards to that level.”

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that a good number of hon. Members have evinced keen interest in the administration of local bodies and have expressed their opinions freely. From the trend of the discussion, I feel that there is a section of opinion which feels that elections to the district

[Sri N. Sankara Reddi] [7th November 1952]

boards must be conducted as early as possible. It is not at all the intention of Government that these elections should be postponed. I would like the House to remember what the Local Administration Department has been doing all along. After we assumed office we had to conduct elections to the Corporation and to so many municipalities whose terms were extended more than once already. Now we are busy with the conduct of elections to the panchayat boards which have stagnated for more than 14 years. These panchayats are scattered all over the whole State and it is essential that elections to these Boards must also be conducted. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has stated that Government has got a good army of officers to conduct the elections, but it has been seen from practical experience that the strength of the present staff is not enough even to conduct the elections to these panchayats. Some more Deputy Panchayat Officers and others have to be appointed to finish these elections to the panchayats as early as possible. It is therefore very difficult for the Government to commence the elections to the district boards unless and until we complete the elections to the panchayats, both major and minor, i.e., first and second-class panchayats, which number about 9,000 in our State.

"It is also said that some of the district board presidents who contested in the general elections were defeated and they have therefore lost the confidence of the people. In many areas, a constituency is only half a taluk whereas the president and members of a district board have been elected by the whole district. If the president of a district board has lost in a constituency or taluk in the general elections, it does not mean that the people of the district have lost their confidence in him. It is also said that because it is now more than three years since the last elections to the district boards the people have lost their confidence in these boards, and that these boards have become undemocratic institutions. I do not see any reason why these members who were elected by the people according to the then Constitution and electoral rolls should be deemed to have lost the confidence of the people simply because the term of the board has been fixed as three years. The term of a Member of the Legislative Assembly is five years. Because the terms are fixed, it does not mean that soon after that term the people have lost their confidence in them. This Bill only seeks for some more time for the Government to conveniently conduct the elections to these local bodies and asks for an extension of the life of these bodies. The lives of municipalities were extended twice and those of panchayats were perhaps extended more than twenty times. Considering all these factors, I think this extension is necessary and the Government will not take one day longer than is necessary to start the district board elections.

"In the discussion some mention or criticism was made about the general administration of the district boards. I cannot claim that everything is perfect in our district boards. In this imperfect world we must struggle to perfect things."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, judging from the tenor of the Hon. Minister's speech, I think he is trying to answer the points

7th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

which we have raised. After consultation with some of my colleagues and also with the Hon. the Chief Minister, I am suggesting that the election programme may be completed by the 30th June 1953. If the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Hon. Minister for Local Administration agree they can move an amendment that the election programme be finished by 30th June 1953."

MR. SPEAKER :—"If there is already any amendment proposed to that effect, it can be accepted."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sri M. Kalyanasundaram has given an amendment to the effect that the date '1st May 1953' be substituted for the date '1st December 1953'."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Sir, I will move an amendment that the date '1st July 1953' be substituted for the date '1st December 1953'."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"Sir, on a point of order, can an amendment be moved at this stage?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"If it is mutually agreed upon, the amendment can be moved. The Hon. Minister for Local Administration will now continue his speech."

* THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—"Mention was also made about maintenance of cars by presidents of district boards. The question of allowing presidents of district boards to draw travelling allowance ordinarily admissible or provide them with cars is engaging the attention of the Government and after consideration of the matter by the Government is over, what is needful will be done. I request that the Bill be taken into consideration at once."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I want to know whether the hon. Members Sri T. Viswanatham and Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah are pressing their amendments."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"No, Sir."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—"No, Sir."

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—"I am going to put the main motion of the Government to vote. The question is—

'That the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'"

The motion was carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER :—"I want to know whether the hon. Members Sri M. Kalyanasundaram and Sri D. Seetharamiah are moving their amendments to this clause."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—"No, Sir."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—"No, Sir."

[7th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Leader of the House will move his amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I move—

' That for the words and figures " the 1st day of December 1953 " in Clause 2 of the Bill the words and figures " the 1st day of July 1953 " be substituted. ' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For the words and figures " the 1st day of December 1953 " in Clause 2 of the Bill the words and figures " the 1st day of July 1953 " be substituted. ' "

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 2 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 1 was put and carried.

PREAMBLE.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I wish to know whether the hon. Member Mr. D. Seetharamiah is withdrawing his amendment."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" Yes, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Leader of the House may move his amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I move the amendment that for the words ' twelve months ' occurring in paragraph 3 of the Preamble, the words ' seven months ' be substituted."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For the words " twelve months " occurring in paragraph 3 of the Preamble, the words " seven months " be substituted. ' "

The amendment was carried.

The Preamble as amended was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. Minister may now move that the Bill as amended be passed into law."

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" I move—

' That the Bill as amended be passed into law. ' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952, as amended, be passed into law. ' "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am glad, Sir, that the Government have at this stage considered it fit to respond to public opinion and meet it half way."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We know about public opinion; we have responded to the request of the Leader of the Opposition."

7th November 1952]

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" అధ్యక్షా, ఇదివరకు ఇందులో చేసిన మార్పు విమిటా నాకు బోధపడలేదు. విమి తెలియకుండా వోటు మాత్రము చేశాము. అందువల్ల ఇప్పుడు ఇందులో మార్పు విమి చేశారో తెలియజేస్తే preamble లో వోటు చేయడానికి సహాయకరంగా ఉంటుంది. కనుక దయచేసి ఈ మార్పు విమిటా వివరించమని కోరుతున్నాను. "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" నా మాటను అందరు వినినదానికి నా gratitude ఇస్తాను. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" I now put the question to the vote of the House."

The question that the Bill as amended be passed into law was put and carried.

(2) THE MADRAS CHRISTIAN MARRIAGES VALIDATION BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir. I beg to introduce the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill*, 1952, and move—

' That the Bill be taken into consideration at once. ' "

" In moving this Bill, I have to submit that it is necessitated by a few mistakes and the object of the Bill is to rectify the after effects of those mistakes. Clause 2 sub-clause (1) refers to certificates granted by Sri Eragudla Devadoss of the American Baptist Telugu Mission, Nellore in having solemnized about 12 marriages as per Christian rights. It was brought to the notice of the Government that the gentleman concerned had died and hence the licence granted was cancelled by the Government. Subsequently it was brought to the notice of the Government that the information regarding the death was a mistake and hence the Government is bringing forward this Bill to validate 12 marriages solemnized by this gentleman. Clause 2, sub-clause (2) deals with the marriage performed by Rev. James Ponnurangam. The licence granted to Rev. James Ponnurangam was revoked on the 12th November 1946, and without knowing that his licence was revoked he solemnized one marriage. Certificates of cancellation of licences were granted in the case of both these persons and ignorant of the cancellation they have issued marriage certificates. Clause 2, sub-clause (3) tries to effect the validity of the certificates given by the two persons mentioned above and to serve as evidence in Civil Courts."

" Gentlemen, no rights are sought to be divested in respect of anybody else. It is only conferring rights on individuals who by mistake have lost them. I hope it will be passed without much difficulty."

MR. SPEAKER :—" This is a non-controversial Bill and I shall put the whole Bill to the vote of the House."

* Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 8th October 1952.

[7th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The marriages are already made.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are no amendments. The question is—

‘ That clauses 1 and 2 and the preamble do stand part of the Bill.’ ”

The motion was carried.

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—“ I move, Sir,—

‘ That the Bill be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘ That the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I want, on behalf of this House to congratulate those couples who are benefited by this legislation.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952 be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill passed into law.

(3) THE MADRAS COTTON CONTROL BILL*, 1952.

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952 and move—

That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

“ This is a Bill to provide for regulating or prohibiting the cultivation of any specified variety of cotton, the mixing of any specified variety of cotton with any other variety of cotton and the possession or use of, or trade in, any specified variety of cotton in certain areas in the State of Madras.”

“ Sir, I wish to state in brief the reasons for bringing forward this Bill. The question of improving the quality of the cotton crop in this State by maintaining the purity of improved strains, increasing the production of commercially uniform qualities and preventing abuses through wilful adulteration has been engaging the attention of the Government for some time past. The Madras Cotton Control Act, 1932 provides for the prohibition of the cultivation of pulichai

[7th November 1952] [Dr. R. Nagan Gouda]

cotton only, the mixing of such cotton with other varieties of cotton and the possession or use of, or the trade in, pulichai cotton or cotton mixed with pulichai cotton. This Act VII of 1932 is not therefore adequate for the purpose of preventing the evil of mixing other inferior varieties of cotton with superior varieties. The Government consider that a comprehensive enactment on the model of the Bombay Cotton Control Act, 1942 is necessary to prevent this evil and to ensure the quality and purity of the strains cultivated in the different areas of this State. This Bill is intended to achieve this object. The Bill gives power to Government to fix the variety of cotton known as ‘ standard cotton ’ to be cultivated in any area, prohibit the mixing of any variety of standard cotton with any other variety of cotton and it also gives power to prohibit or restrict the possession or use of, or trade in, any variety of standard cotton mixed with any other variety of cotton. A factory in which cotton is manufactured into yarn or cloth will, however, be permitted to mix varieties of cotton and use the cotton so mixed exclusively in the factory for the manufacture of yarn or cloth. Suitable penalties have been provided for the infringement of the provisions of the Bill. Provision has been made in clause 8 of the Bill for seizing cotton in respect of which an offence has been committed and for taking a sample of the cotton seized for examination by the Cotton Specialist before prosecuting the offender.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘ That the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ There are some experts, Mr. Speaker.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Nobody has come forward to speak.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I thought that in this matter of cotton some of the experts from Coimbatore district should have really made some contribution. I was looking to some of my friends, but I find them absent. I will confine myself to only one point and I will not go into other things. In clause 15, there is sub-clause (3), which says that ‘ All rules made under this section shall have effect as if enacted in this Act.’ According to sub-clause (1) of the clause the Government want to take power to make rules providing also for punishment with fine extending to fifty rupees. At present there is no penalty or fine, but only in the rule-making powers the Government want to take such powers. Sir, the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam was present at some of the Select Committees where a similar question cropped up in respect of certain other Bills and we thought it was very objectionable to give the Government power to make rules providing for punishment later on. As I have not given notice of an amendment to this effect, I would ask the Hon. Minister to give an amendment to delete the particular clause. The principle to which I am attached is that in the rule-making power Government ought not to take such powers. If really you want to punish people, provide a clause in the legislation itself. Whereas, here it is said that

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [7th November 1952]

all rules made under the Act shall have effect as if enacted under the Act. The rule is made in the secrecy of the executive; nobody knows what it is or why it is made and it does not come before the Legislature. Therefore, Sir, I tell the Government 'Do not take penal powers under the rule-making powers'. It is a good principle of jurisprudence. The Hon. the Finance Minister was good enough to accept the principle in the case of other Bills and I hope the Hon. Minister for Agriculture will also follow suit. He will not be in bad company."

***SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—**"అధ్యక్షా, ఇందులో పత్తి పండించే విషయములో ఒకే రకమైన పత్తి గింజలు వేయవలెనని చెప్పబడినది. అయితే ఒకే రకమైన పత్తి గింజలు ఎంత నేలకు వేయవలసియుండునో తెలియదు. సరైన చేసినటువంటి ఒకే రకమైన గింజలు కొంత నేలకు సరిపోగా, ఇంకా మిగిలిన నేలలో వేరే రకపు పత్తి గింజలు వేయక వ్యవసాయదారుడు తోరిక ఎట్లు నేలను ఉపయోగించుకుండా విడిచి పెట్టగలడు. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము ఒకే రకమైన పత్తి గింజలు సరైన చేస్తామని హామీ ఇస్తారా? అట్లు హామీ ఇవ్వకపోతే ఈ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకించ వలసియుంటుంది. రెండవది, అధికారులైన వారి మాటలైన ప్రజలకు నష్టకముండా లని రాజకీయాలచారిత్రాగారు అంటున్నారు. మళ్ళులను విశ్వసించండి అని వారు చెప్పు తున్నారు. అయితే ప్రభుత్వమును, అధికారులను, ఎంత విశ్వసిస్తామో అంత అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నది. విశ్వసించకపోతే, విశ్వసించలేదంటారు. విశ్వసించితే వ్యవహారము తలక్రిందలు చేస్తారు."

"తరువాత ఇందులోని notification లో ఫ్యాక్టరీలు మాత్రము పత్తిని మార్చ వచ్చు, అనేక రకాల పత్తిని కలపవచ్చు అని ఉంది, కాని వ్యవసాయదారులు మాత్రము ఒకే రకమైన పత్తి గింజలు వేయాలని చెప్పినారు. ఈ విధానము ఏ రీతిగా సరి అయినదో తెలియదు. కాని ప్రభుత్వము ఒకే రకమైన పత్తి గింజలు సరైన చేస్తామని హామీని ప్రకటిస్తే ఈ బిల్లును అంగీకరించడానికి వీలు అవుతుంది. లేకున్న ప్రతిఘటించవలసివస్తుంది. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము దీనికి సమాధానము చెప్పవలసిందని ఆడుగుతూ అధ్యక్షులను దీనిని వోటుకు పెట్టమని కోరుతున్నాను."

12-30 P.M. * THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill has been framed on the lines of the Act which has already been in force. As I said, in the earlier stages, we had the Madras Act VII of 1932. Section 10 (2) of that Act provides: 'In making any rule, the State Government may provide that a breach thereof shall be punishable with fine which may extend to twenty rupees'. A similar provision has been introduced in this Bill, as it was found necessary. We have not introduced any new provision."

*** SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—**"Sir, my objection was not to providing penalties or imposing punishments. I say that the Government should not take power to make a rule subsequently without the knowledge of the Legislature and in the secrecy of the executive and punish the people under that rule which they do not know."

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**"In deference to the principle stated, I wish to move an amendment to clause 5."

7th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—"I will put the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration at once to vote. Then, when the Bill is taken up clause by clause, the Hon. the Chief Minister can move the amendment. The question is—

'That the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'"

The motion was carried.

Clauses 2, 3 and 4 were put and carried.

Clause 5.

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'In clause 5, sub-clause (1) (b) add the word "or" at the end and after item (b) insert the following new item :—

"(c) knowingly in any other manner contravenes any rule made under this Act.'"

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'In clause 5, sub-clause (1) (b) add the word "or" at the end and after item (b) insert the following new item :—

"(c) knowingly in any other manner contravenes and rule made under this Act.'"

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 5 as amended was put and carried.

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**"Sir, I have to move another amendment to the clause. Hence I move—

'That clause 5 be re-opened.'"

The motion was carried.

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**"Sir, I move—

'In clause 5, sub-clause (2) (b) add the word "or" at the end and after item (b) insert the following new item :—

"(c) knowingly in any other manner contravenes any rule made under this Act.'"

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 5 as finally amended was put and carried.

Clauses 6 to 14 were put and carried.

Clause 15.

*** THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**"Sir, I move—

'In clause 15, omit sub-clause (2) and renumber sub-clause (3) as sub-clause (2).'

[7th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ In clause 15, omit sub-clause (2) and renumber sub-clause (3) as sub-clause (2). ’ ”

The amendment was carried.

Clause 15 as amended was put and carried.

Clauses 16, 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That the Bill as amended be passed into law. ’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952, as amended be passed into law. ’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill passed into law.

(4) THE BHAVANI RESERVOIR IRRIGATION CESS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952 (L.A. BILL NO. 10 OF 1952).

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to present the report* of the Select Committee on the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), and move—

‘ That the Bill as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration. ’ ”

“ The original Act provides for the irrigation of dry crops under the reservoir. Provision has been made in this Bill for the raising of wet crops and also for crop rotation. The Bill also fixes a ceiling on the rates of water-cess. The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill met on the 25th August 1952. There was an informal discussion on the provisions of the Bill. Some Members wanted time to enable them to inspect the area and make enquiries regarding the economic condition of the peasants. The Committee met again on the 6th September 1952, and recommended that the maximum rates of water-cess of Rs. 25 for cotton, Rs. 18 for paddy and Rs. 10 for millet, should be reduced to Rs. 20, Rs. 15 and Rs. 7-8-0 respectively. It has proposed no other changes in the Bill. The rates proposed are only the maximum rates, and the Government will see that in any case the maximum rates are not levied within the next two years. I submit the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, for the acceptance of the House.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘ That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. No. 10 of 1952), as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration. ’ ”

* Printed as Appendix on pages 442-443 infra.

[7th November 1952]

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ఒక ప్రధానమైన కొత్త పద్ధతి ప్రారంభించబడింది. ఇదివరకు ఇటువంటి పద్ధతి అంతగా లేదు. ఎక్కడైతే ప్రభుత్వము నీటి సౌకర్యము కలుగజేస్తున్నారో ఆయా చోట్ల కొత్తగా పన్నులు వేయడం ప్రారంభించబడింది. కొత్తగా కట్టేటటువంటి ప్రతి ప్రాజెక్టుకును ప్రజలనుండి డబ్బు రావలెనని వారినుండి నిర్బంధంగా వసూలుచేయటం ఈనాడు పూనుకొన్నారు.

“ ఇదివరకూ K.C. Canal సమస్య వచ్చినప్పుడు ఆ సీర్ల సౌకర్యము ప్రజలకు కలుగజేసినందుకు నిర్బంధముగా దానికి పన్ను విధించారు. దాని క్రింద పాలమునకు ఆయకట్టు నియమ నిర్బంధం లేదు. సన్నకారు రైతు పని ఆపాయం అవుతున్నది. వర్షం లేని రోజులలో పెద్ద రైతులు ఉన్న నీటిని వాడుకుంటారు. అప్పుడు సన్నకారు రైతుకు నీరు లభించదు. వర్షం ఉన్న సమయంలో పెద్ద రైతులు నీరు వాడరు. అందువలన ఆ సీరంతా చిన్న రైతు పొలంలోగ మిగిలిపోతున్నది. వర్షము ఎక్కువ వచ్చినప్పుడు ఈ మురికి కాలువలనుండి పొలాలను ముంచివేయను. వర్షము రాకుండా ఉంటే ఈ canal సీరంతా ముందుకుపోతును. ఈ విధముగా అక్కడ చిన్న రైతులు పొలాలను వర్షమువచ్చినా కష్టమే, వర్షము రాకపోయినా కష్టముగా యున్నది. ఈ సందర్భం గుర్తించుకొని విచారణ వచ్చినపుడు కొత్తగా కట్టే ప్రాజెక్టులో నిర్బంధ ఆయకట్టు ఉండవలెనన్నారు. ఈనాడు ప్రాజెక్టు వచ్చినప్పుడు, నిర్బంధంగా పన్నులు వేయాలనే సమస్య వచ్చినది. ఇదే రీతిగానే కొత్తగా కట్టే ప్రాజెక్టులన్నిటికి ఈ విధమైన పన్నులు వేయాలని తలపెడుతున్నారు. అందుకేనే గోదావరి ప్రాజెక్టుగాను, రామకృష్ణ సాగరు ప్రాజెక్టుగాను ప్రజలనుండి డబ్బు వసూలు చేయడానికి ఒక agreement కూడా లీసుకొన్నారు. అసలు, ఈ అధిక పన్నులు వసూలు చేయడానికి ప్రజలు అంగీకరించిన మీదటనే వసూలు చేస్తున్నారా అనునది మొదటి ప్రశ్న. తరువాత అసలు ఇటువంటి అధిక పన్నులు వేయవచ్చునా అనేది రెండవ ప్రశ్న. కొత్త ప్రాజెక్టులు కట్టేందుకు మావద్ద డబ్బులేదు, మీరు ఇవ్వాలి అని ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంటున్నారు. సరే అది కొంతవరకు ఒప్పుకోవలసిందే. కాని అది ఎంతవరకు ఇవ్వవలసివుంటుంది అనేది ఒక సమస్య. ఈ అధిక పన్నులు 200, 300 రూపాయల చొప్పున ఇవ్వాలంటే చాలా కష్టముగా ఉంటుంది. రైతులు భరించలేరు. రైతులకు దానికి తగినటువంటి లాభముకూడా ఉండవలెను. అందువల్లనే రాయలసీమలో ఈ వేళ్ల అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నది. ఏ ప్రాజెక్టులు అక్కడ కట్టవలెనన్నా, దానివల్ల 1 per cent, 2 per cent కూడ లాభము రాదు అని అంటున్నారు. కనుక అక్కడ ప్రాజెక్టులు ఏవి లీసుకోకుండా ఉన్నారో అసలు ఈ పన్నుల విషయములో నేను చెప్పనది ఏమంటే, కొత్త ప్రాజెక్టులు కట్టేందుకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలనుండి ఏమి వసూలు చేయకుండా ఉండుటయే వారి ధర్మము. ఎందుకంటే రైతులకు రావలసిన నీటి సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయుట ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క కర్తవ్యమై యున్నది. అయితే ప్రభుత్వము తమవద్ద ధనం లేదంటున్నది. కాబట్టి కొత్త ప్రాజెక్టులు నిర్మించేటప్పుడు రైతులవద్ద ఎక్కువ మొత్తాలను వసూలు చేయకుండా కొంత తక్కువ మొత్తాలను కనీసముగా వసూలు చేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. హెచ్చు పన్నులు వేయకుండా, కొద్దిగా వేస్తే రైతులకుకూడ అంత కష్టముగా ఉండదు. ప్రభుత్వము కొత్త ప్రాజెక్టులు కట్టేటప్పుడు, వాటికింద ఆయకట్టు కట్టి, దాని ప్రకారము రెక్క వేసుకొంటారు. పన్నులు విధించడంలో ఇంత percentage అని వేస్తే కొంతమేలు, కాని అధికంగా ఇంత మొత్తముని విధిస్తే అయకం తెచ్చు

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [7th November 1952]

అన్యాయము ఉండదు. కనుక యీ పన్నులు విధించడంలో సాధ్యమైనంత తక్కువగా, క్రమముగా వేయవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు కొద్ది సంవత్సరాలుగా వర్షాలు చాలా శక్తివగా ఉంటున్నవి. ముందు 45 అంగుళాలు వర్షాలు కురిసే ప్రాంతాలలో ఈనాడు 22, 23 అంగుళాలు వర్షముకూడా లేకుండా పోతున్నది అది ఎందుకో! దీనికి కారణమేమిటో నేను తెప్పలేను. Agriculture Department వారు, ఇతర మేధావులు దాన్ని గురించి చెప్పవలసి యుంటుంది. ఈ నాడు వర్షాలు తక్కువగా ఉంటున్నందువలననే, ప్రాజెక్టుల అవసరము ఎక్కువైంది. రైతులు నీళ్లకు చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. రాయలసీమ, అట్లాగే వెనుకపడిన విశాఖపట్నం జిల్లాలోని ప్రజలు వ్యవసాయమునకు తగిన నీళ్ల సౌకర్యాలకు పొందాలను సాగుచేసుకోలేకుండా ఉన్నారు. ఈ కరువు పరిస్థితులలో వారు ఎక్కువ పన్నులు ఇచ్చుకొను స్థితిలో లేరు. కనుక ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో అసలు అధిక పన్నులు విధించవచ్చునా అనునది ఒక సవస్థ. ఒక వేళ తప్పనిసరిగా పన్నులు వేయవలసివస్తే అది తక్కువగా వేయవలెనని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member has given notice of an amendment to clause 3. When that clause is taken up, the hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak. I have no objection if he speaks now also."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"ఇది ముఖ్యమైన విషయం. Amendment ను move చేస్తూ కూడా మాట్లాడుతాను."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The hon. Member says, Sir, that the Bill involves an important principle, that he will speak on the Bill now, and also on the amendment later."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"ఈ బిల్లులోని పిన్ని పర్వం ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప చేయవద్దని కోరుతున్నాను. నేడు న్యాయంగా చూచినట్లయితే రైతాంగం యొక్క స్థితిగతులే చాటుపడలేదు. మొట్ట ప్రాంతాలలో హెచ్చుతక్కులు రైతులు చెల్లించలేరు. ఈ మధ్యన డిల్లీలో జరిగిన ఆర్థిక మంత్రి సమావేశంలో వారు గ్రామాలలోని రైతుల స్థితిగతులు మారినట్లు భావించారని తెలుస్తోంది. కాని అది యధార్థం కాదు. మద్రాస్ ప్రభుత్వం ఎకనామిక్ అడ్వయజరు సటరాజ్ గారు డిల్లీలోని V.K.R.V. Rao గారు గ్రామముల ఆదాయం ఏమంత పెరుగలేదు. యధార్థ మాలాచిస్తే వెనుకటి ధరలకు ఇప్పటి ధరలకు వ్యత్యాసాన్ని బట్టి రైతు ఆదాయం 8 రూపాయలు తగ్గినదని వారు వెల్లడించారు. ఈ కారణం చేత రైతులపై హెచ్చుతక్కు వేయవద్దని కోరుతూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I did not understand what the hon. Member said. The matter is simply this. There is already the Bhavani Irrigation Cess Act, 1933. The Government now propose to amend it for two reasons. One reason is that the original Act provides for cess only on dry crops. This Bill now provides for the levy of cess on wet crops. Also it provides for a rotation of crops in the interests of the fertility of the soil. These are the two main points. All sections of the House were represented on the Select Committee. We came to a more or less unanimous conclusion, and I thought

7th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

that there would not be much difference of opinion in this House. Probably the hon. Member Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah is not aware of this. If the Leader of the Opposition makes him understand what the matter is, he will be all right, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration.'

The motion was carried.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely—

'For "twenty rupees", "fifteen rupees" and "seven rupees eight annas", substitute "fifteen rupees", "twelve rupees" and "five rupees" respectively.'

"నెర్రకు కమిటీలో రేట్లు ఏకగ్రీవంగా అంగీకరింపబడినప్పటికీ యీ సవరణను నేను ఎందువల్ల ప్రతిపాదించవలసి వచ్చినదని మంత్రిగారు తెలుసుజేసారు. ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించుటలో నా అభిప్రాయాన్ని మనవి చేస్తాను. కోయంబత్తూర్ జిల్లాలో యీ రేట్లు ప్రతిపాదించినందువల్ల నా తెట్టి అభ్యంతరం లేదు. కాని అదే రేటు ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు కూడా వర్తింపజేసినట్లయితే ప్రజలకు అన్యాయంచేసిన వాళ్లు మాతామనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే యీ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించాను. 20 రూపాయలు లున్నచోట 15 రూపాయలుగాను, 10 రూపాయలు లున్నచోట 7-8-0 రూపాయలుగాను, 15 రూపాయలు లున్నచోట 12 రూపాయలుగాను మార్పు చేయవలెనని నేను స్పృహించాను, మంత్రిగారు బిల్లులో నిర్ణయించిన రేటు ఒక కోయంబత్తూర్ జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తిస్తాయని ఆయా సందర్భాలనుబట్టి ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో రేట్లు నిర్ణయించబడతాయని మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. అంతవరకు సయమే. కాని, మొట్ట ప్రాంతాలలో నీటి వనరులు విచ్చాటు చేసినపుడు ఇంత హెచ్చురేట్లు వేయవద్దని మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లులోని ప్రిన్సిపల్స్ యితర ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింపజేయవద్దని కోరుతూ ప్రతిపాదనను move చేస్తున్నాను."

SRI G. BAPANAYYA:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, there is some misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Member. This Bill relates to the Lower Bhavani Project. Members who represent that area were in the Select Committee. Those who are interested in that area were in the Select Committee. As a matter of fact, they wanted time so that they might go to the area and consult the people there, and then come to a decision. Time was given for that purpose. The hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi was one of the Members. He wanted that he should contact all the ryots

429 THE BHAVANI RESERVOIR IRRIGATION CESS (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1952 (L.A. BILL NO. 10 OF 1952)

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [7th November 1952]

there, and then take a decision. So the Select Committee meeting was adjourned for the purpose, and when we met again, we considered the whole thing, and we came to a unanimous decision. We have already made some reduction. In the original Bill we proposed a higher rate of taxation. In the Select Committee we made some reductions. It is not a question of principle now. As a matter of fact, the principle of the Bill has been accepted. Now the hon. Member wants that it should be Rs. 15 instead of Rs. 20. It is not a question of principle. It is a question of reduction. This matter has been fully considered, and then we fixed this levy. There is no use of reducing once at the Select Committee stage and again reducing at the instance of one hon. Member. After all, he does not know the conditions existing in the Lower Bhavani Project, and it is no use saying that the cess should be reduced."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?"

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"మంత్రిగారు ఇచ్చిన హామీ మీద నేను నా సవరణను withdraw చేసుకొంటున్నాను."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"He says that on the assurance given by the Hon. Minister, he is withdrawing the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Whether he is withdrawing the amendment on the assurance given by the Hon. Minister or otherwise is not the concern of the chair. I hope the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw the amendment."

The amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah was by leave withdrawn.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 4 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), be passed into law.'

Sir, I thank, hon. Members including Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah for co-operating with me in passing the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), be passed into law.'"

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

7th November 1952]

IV.—GOVERNMENT MOTIONS.

(1) RULE UNDER SECTION 17 (1) OF THE MADRAS MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION ACT, 1931.

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I 12-50
have a very non-controversial motion to move, and it is this. I p.m.
move—

'That the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Government of Madras under section 17 (1) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931 (Madras Act III of 1931), amending Schedule II to the said Act, be approved.'

DRAFT RULE.

In the said Schedule II, clauses 5 to 7 shall be renumbered as clauses 6 to 8 and after clause 4, the following shall be inserted as clause 5, namely:—

Classes of vehicles.	Maximum quarterly tax.	
	For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres.	For other vehicles.
(1)	(2)	(3)
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
5. Motor vehicles owned by or on behalf of the State Government plying for hire and used for the transport of passengers—		
(i) vehicles intended to carry more than five persons and plying exclusively in the City of Madras—		
(a) for every seated passenger (other than the driver and the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry ..	23 0 0	35 0 0
(b) for every passenger (other than a seated passenger, the driver or the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry ..	5 11 0	8 11 0

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [7th November 1952]

Classes of vehicles.	Maximum quarterly tax.	
	For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres.	For other vehicles.
(1)	(2)	(3)
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
(ii) Vehicles intended to carry more than five persons and not plying exclusively in the City of Madras—		
(a) for every seated passenger (other than the driver and the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry.	30 0 0	45 0 0
(b) for every passenger (other than a seated passenger, the driver or the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry	10 0 0	15 0 0†

Sir, Schedule II to the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, which provides for levy of tax on various classes of motor vehicles does not specifically provide for assessment of tax on buses for which no permits are necessary under the existing law. Clause 4 of that schedule prescribes the rates of tax payable in respect of motor vehicles plying for hire and used for the transport of passengers and in respect of which permits have been issued under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939. The point was raised by the Transport Commissioner that tax under the clause referred to above could not be collected from State buses plying in Madras City for the reason that those buses are exempt from the requirement to take out permits and that therefore the State Transport Department was not bound to pay tax for standing passengers in respect of State buses as demanded by the Commissioner of Police. As it was intended that no concession which was not shown to a private operator should be allowed to the State Transport Department, it was decided that the State Transport Department should pay tax both for sitting passengers as well as standing passengers in respect of State buses at the rates prescribed in clause 4 of Schedule II, i.e., at the rates applicable to private buses, and that Schedule II should be amended suitably to legalize the existing practice of collection of tax in respect of State buses. It is therefore proposed to insert a new clause in Schedule II to the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act prescribing the rates of tax payable in respect of State buses.

“ It is a mere coincidence that this notification came on the agenda along with the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods Bill). This may have created an impression in the minds of the hon. Members that we as Government

7th November 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

are claiming something which is not given to private operators. May I take this occasion to remove that impression? It is by mere coincidence that the items are on the Agenda at the same time but the intention of the two are quite different. By introducing this draft rule we will say that the Government buses in Madras should pay for sitting and standing passengers as much as private buses.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ To whom do the Government pay? They pay to themselves.”

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It is just one item in the calculation of profits and losses. Account will be taken of all taxes paid by the Government which normally an individual will have to pay to Government. I hope the House approves of this draft rule.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Just a word of explanation in addition to what my Hon. Colleague has already said. To make it clearer, I wish only to say this. The idea is that in calculating on a commercial basis, the accounts of the Government Transport Department in the City should take note of expenditure for the payment of taxes. Hitherto under the rules as they stood, no tax was leviable on Government buses, and, therefore, it appeared as though they were escaping this tax and showing a profitable administration. The Accountant-General requires that we should show all expenditure legitimately as in the case of private companies, and then show that we are managing properly. This is only a rule made in order to bring the accounts into order from that point of view. The rates are the same and the accounts are the same.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I really thought that some more light would be thrown upon this. The Government do not tax their own buildings. They do not pay tax on their properties. (Interruption.) It is not necessary. The Government need not pay taxes because they have their own vehicles. As the Hon. Minister has said, they want to take account of the tax only for purposes of bringing it into the profit and loss account. (The Hon. C. Rajagopalachari : ‘ Yes ’.) That is to say, nobody should criticise the Government that profit is not ‘ real ’ profit. That is to say, there should be no criticism that the Government always boast of making huge profits without taking into account the taxes which private operators would have to pay. If I understand them aright, it is just to meet this criticism that they are introducing this resolution. In my humble opinion, they need not have done so. If any commercial concern shows that they have paid taxes, they do pay the taxes, and show those taxes in their account. But why should the Government show payment of taxes in their account which they have not paid? What is the meaning of one department of the Government paying taxes to another department of the Government and bolstering up accounts and expenditure which is not real? It is unnecessary.

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [7th November 1952]

It will only add to the work. I should think this is only a make-believe. The municipalities cannot tax their properties. The Central Government buildings cannot be taxed by our Government and by our municipalities. The Government need not tax their own vehicles either. Why should these accounts be prepared? They are prepared just to show that the profits are not very heavy and ultimately the fares of passengers might be increased. The Hon. Minister will one day come forward and say, 'We have to increase the fares of passengers in the City because our profits have fallen.' Now the taxes will be shown on the expenditure side. I only submit that the Government should not start the procedure of taxing their own properties and showing unreal expenditure in their account books. I do not think the Government will be losing anything if this Resolution is not passed."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is usual for the House to rise at 1 o'clock on Fridays. But I think it is better to sit for five more minutes to pass this Resolution. If the House is prepared to sit, I have no objection."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, there is only one more non-controversial Bill on the agenda. We have got time for it from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. So, we may rise now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The House will now rise for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m."

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this draft rule is said to be a non-controversial one. I wish it is a non-controversial one. But as long as there happens to be an opposition, there is nothing that is non-controversial. ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రతిపాదించిన యీ డ్రాఫ్టు రూల్ విషయమై సభ్యులు ఎట్టి సంశయాలను కలిగించుకొన నక్కరలేదని, వివాదమునకు యిందులో శోతువు విధిలేదని మంత్రిగారు తెలివిచ్చారు. అయితే ఒక్క విషయం గమనించాలి. ఈ రూల్ యొక్క అంతర్భాగం తరచి చూచి నట్లయితేనేకాని, యిది వివాదాస్పదమైనదో, వివాదరహితమైనదో బోధపడదు. ప్రభుత్వ యాజమాన్యం నిర్వహించబడుతున్న మద్రాసు బస్ సర్వీసు లాభ కరంగా ఉన్నదా, నష్టాన్ని కలిగిస్తున్నదా అనే విషయాన్ని జాగ్రత్తగా పరిశీలించ వలసివుంది. జమా ఖర్చు రెక్కలు చెప్పే విషయంలో ఎన్ని భూపాలనాసభ్యులకు ప్రశ్నలు వచ్చినవి. ఈ జమా ఖర్చు రెక్క తనిఖీచేసేది ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులే. విమోచనవృత్తికి మద్రాసు బస్ సర్వీసువల్ల లాభమే వస్తున్నది అనుకొందాము. మొత్తం రవాణా వ్యాపారాన్ని జాతీయం చేయడంవల్ల ప్రయాణీకులకు కార్మికులకు కలిగిన లాభాలు సమపాయాలు విమిటా గుర్తించిన తరువాతనే యీ సర్వీసువల్ల భవనాగమితమైనదో లేదో తెలుస్తుంది. రాష్ట్రంలోని బస్ రవాణా వ్యాపారం చాలవరకూ వ్యక్తులచేతనే ఉంది. ఆ వ్యాపారములు యీ ప్రభుత్వానికి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి యివ్వవలసిన వస్తులన్నట్టివి విశేషంగా లాభాలు సంపాదిస్తున్నారంటున్నారు. అయితే యీ ప్రభుత్వంవారు యితర వ్యక్తులవల్లనే

7th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

వస్తులను చెల్లిస్తున్నారా? అయినట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వానికి వచ్చే లాభం వ్యక్తులు సంపాదించే లాభానికి పోలివుంటుందా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.

"వాస్తవానికి ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎవ్వరికీ వస్తు చెల్లించుకోనక్కరలేదు. వారి బస్సు లపై వారు వస్తులను వసూలు చేయవలసినదా లేదు. కాని ఎక్కడెక్కడో జనరల్ విధో ఆభ్యంతరం తెలిపారని, వ్యక్తులు తమ బస్సులకుగాను చెల్లించుచున్న వస్తులను ప్రభుత్వంవారుకూడా చెల్లించుచున్నట్లు జమా ఖర్చు రెక్కలలో చూపుటకే యీ రూలు ఉద్దేశించబడినదని, మంత్రిగారు వారి ఉపన్యాసంలో తెలియజేశారు. జమా ఖర్చు రెక్కలలో క్రెడిట్, డెబిట్, గ్రెడ్జల్ యీ మొత్తాలను చూపించి సరిచేసినట్లయితే మాకేమి ఆభ్యంతరంవుండదు. కాని యీ వస్తులను మేము చెల్లిస్తున్నాము అందువల్ల బస్సు రేట్లు పెంచుతాము, లేదా డ్రైవర్లకు కండక్టర్లకు యితర కార్మికులకు యిచ్చే వేతనాలు, బోనసులు తగ్గిస్తాము అని అంటేనే, మేము యీ రూలు వ్యతిరేకించ వలసివుంటుంది. వాస్తవానికి యీ రూల్ వల్ల చెప్పుకోదగ్గ ప్రయోజన మేమియూలేదు. ఎక్కడెక్కడో జనరల్ గారు విధో ఆభ్యంతరం తెలిపారు గనుక దానిని సరిచేయటానికి యీ రూల్ తెచ్చారు, లేక వేరేకారణాలు ఏమైనా ఉన్నాయో మంత్రిగారు స్పష్టపర కాల్సి. ఏ ప్రశ్నమైనప్పటికీ జాతీయం చేసినందువల్ల ప్రజలకు లాభం కలుగవలసి వుంది. ఆ ఆశయాన్ని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకునే యీ నిబంధనను చేయవలసినదని కోరు తున్నాను. ప్రయాణీకులకు, కార్మికులకు ఎట్టి నష్టం సంభవించదు అనే విషయాన్ని మంత్రిగారు స్పష్టంచేయాలి."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Members have read much between the lines."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point or order, Sir."

"అధ్యక్షా, నేనుకూడ ఒక సవరణ చంపించాను. ఆ సవరణ దీక్షా రాలేదు. నేను అసెంబ్లీ ఆఫీసుకు చంపించాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I do not understand what the Hon. Member says."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The hon. Member says he had given notice of an amendment."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"20 రోజుల క్రిందట చంపించాను. దానికి జవాబుకూడా నాకు సెక్రటరీ నుండి వచ్చినది. దానిలో ఒక point వ్రాశారు."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It appears the hon. Member wanted to move that the draft rule be referred to a Select Committee. That is out of order."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"Sir, as I said, I thought this Resolution was non-controversial. I was just trying to regularise things which we had been doing for some time past. As I explained to you, Sir, we said that the Government transport should put upon itself all the taxes that we put upon individual bus-owners or fleet-owners so that it should not be said that when we showed profits at the end of the year, the Government did not

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [7th November 1952]

debit those charges which were legitimately made on private bus-owners and fleet-owners. That is why we wanted to charge in the accounts of our bus transport these expenses. But the Transport Commissioner raised an objection that since, according to the Act, only those buses which were given permits could be taxed and since the Government buses did not run on permits, they could not be taxed. We, therefore, felt that a regularisation of this procedure was necessary.

"Hon. Members will also remember that during the discussions on the Budget, hon. Member after hon. Member in this House and in the Upper House were insisting that I should place before them the balance sheets of this concern. They said that we must consider the bus transport as a commercial concern and that we should be able to place before this House a profit and loss account and complete balance sheet. May I ask how this balance sheet can be complete unless I am able to give the Accountant-General my complete expenses? That is another reason why I think a regularisation and the inclusion of these taxes in the regular expenses is necessary."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"What is the total tax likely to be?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"For every seated passenger, the maximum quarterly tax is Rs. 23. This has been going on for some time past. I am trying to regularize it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"What will be the total tax debited under this new head?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"For every seated passenger, the tax will be Rs. 23, and for every other passenger, it will be Rs. 5-11-0. From this, we will have to calculate the total tax."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"The average number of seats is about 30, the quarterly tax is Rs. 23 per seated passenger and there are 320 buses."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"I would like to add the standing passengers also. We had been paying this for the last year. There is nothing new that I am showing in this account."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Nothing new!"

3-10 p.m. * THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"Yes. We have been doing it and I am bringing it here only to regularize what is being done."

"With regard to the point made by the hon. Gentleman Sri C. V. K. Rao, I can straightway assure him that private bus-owners had no hand in this venture. I am not here to defend the private bus-owners or the combines. Whether they are making enough profits or not, this has nothing to do with it. May be that

7th November 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

they are accusing me of trying to show to the public that the profits in a bus concern are huge. I am not defending their position. But if we want to get at a correct estimate of the profits that the private bus-owners or combines are making, it can be arrived at by a comparison with our figures when we give the proper accounts and when we give the proper balance sheet. It will enable not only the hon. Members of this House but also others outside who are interested in the matter, to arrive at a correct estimate.

"I should also like to tell the hon. Gentleman Sri C. V. K. Rao that the Government have no intention whatever by regularising this procedure, to reduce the amenities to the passengers or the emoluments of the workers. I should not be misunderstood if I tell the hon. Members of this House that perhaps the Government Transport, after the recent announcement of the Hon. the Chief Minister, could easily be said to be the best bus-owner in regard to the facilities and emoluments offered to its workers. Now, I can only say that my Friends need have no apprehension that this is the thin end of the wedge for the purpose either of increasing the passenger fares or of decreasing the emoluments of the workers or of reducing the amenities available to the passengers. It is far from the truth. I can assure the House that we never intend to do it. We will come before the House and say what we wish to do. It is not as if we are afraid of coming before the House."

"I repeat that we want to pass this Resolution to regularize the irregular procedure that has been adopted. Hon. Members need not read between the lines. It is a simple process and I think I have convinced the House that this is a non-controversial rule. I would appeal to the House to accept the draft rule."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

That the following draft of a rule proposed to be made by the Government of Madras under section 17 (1) of the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931 (Madras Act III of 1931), amending Schedule II to the said Act, be approved.

DRAFT RULE.

In the said Schedule II, clauses 5 to 7 shall be renumbered as clauses 6 to 8 and after clause 4, the following shall be inserted as clause 5, namely :—

Classes of vehicles.	Maximum quarterly tax.	
	For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres.	For other vehicles.
(1)	(2)	(3)
5. Motor vehicles owned by or on behalf of the State Government		

[Mr. Speaker] [7th November 1952]

Classes of vehicles.	Maximum quarterly tax.	
	For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres.	For other vehicles.
(1)	(2)	(8)
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
plying for hire and used for the transport of passengers—		
(i) vehicles intended to carry more than five persons and plying exclusively in the City of Madras—		
(a) for every seated passenger (other than the driver and the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry.	23 0 0	35 0 0
(b) for every passenger (other than a seated passenger, the driver or the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry	5 11 0	8 8 0
(ii) Vehicles intended to carry more than five persons and not plying exclusively in the City of Madras—		
(a) for every seated passenger (other than the driver and the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry	30 0 0	45 0 0
(b) for every passenger (other than a seated passenger, the driver or the conductor) which the vehicle is intended to carry	10 0 0	15 0 0

The motion was carried.

(2) AMENDMENT AND RULE UNDER SECTION 40 (1) OF THE MADRAS ESTATES (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) ACT, 1948.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘That the following draft amendment and rule which it is proposed to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 40 (1) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Madras Act XXVI of 1948), be approved :—

I. DRAFT AMENDMENT.

In rule 1 of the rules published with Revenue Department notification, dated the 21st December 1949, at pages 397-398 of the Rules Supplement to Part I of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated the 27th December 1949, the words “or partly in cash and partly in bonds issued by the Government” shall be added at the end.

7th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

II. DRAFT RULE.

At any time after the advance payment on account of compensation referred to in section 54-A of the Act has been deposited in the office of the Tribunal in respect of any zamindari or under-tenure estate referred to in section 54-B, sub-section (1), the Government may deposit in the office of the Tribunal, bonds issued by them for such amount as they may deem fit, towards the compensation payable under the Act in respect of that estate; and the bonds so deposited shall be treated in all respects as if they were part of the advance payment aforesaid.

“Sir, under the Act, it is compulsory that a particular amount should be deposited in the office of the Tribunal as advance of compensation. That amount was Rs. 3.25 crores which has been deposited already. For the purpose of paying a part of the total compensation which amounts to about Rs. 12½ crores, this draft rule takes power to pay that amount in the shape of bonds.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The question is—

‘That the following draft amendment and rule which it is proposed to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 40 (1) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Madras Act XXVI of 1948), be approved :—

I. DRAFT AMENDMENT.

In rule 1 of the rules published with Revenue Department notification, dated the 21st December 1949, at pages 397-398 of the Rules Supplement to Part I of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated the 27th December 1949, the words “or partly in cash and partly in bonds issued by the Government” shall be added at the end.

II. DRAFT RULE.

At any time after the advance payment on account of compensation referred to in section 54-A of the Act has been deposited in the office of the Tribunal in respect of any zamindari or under-tenure estate referred to in section 54-B, sub-section (1), the Government may deposit in the office of the Tribunal, bonds issued by them for such amount as they may deem fit, towards the compensation payable under the Act in respect of that estate; and the bonds so deposited shall be treated in all respects as if they were part of the advance payment aforesaid.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఇందులో ఒక చిన్న విషయమున్నది. జమీందార్లకు ఇచ్చేటటువంటి compensation ను bonds ద్వారా ఇస్తే-రా లేక కొంతమొత్తము మూలమే bonds ద్వారా ఇస్తే-రా? వారి యజ్ఞానిగారి బండ్లు bonds ద్వారా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే inflation కు అవకాశములేకుండా ఉంటుందని అన్నది. కాని జమీందార్లకు ఇచ్చే compensation ను

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [7th November 1952]

bonds ద్వారాను ధన రూపములో ఇవ్వండిని అప్పుడు చెప్పారు. దాని తరువాత దేశములో వోల్టేజీ ముప్పురం పెరగడం అయినందున దానిని తగ్గించాలని ప్రయత్నం జరిగింది. Inflation ఎక్కువ అవుతుంది గనుక జమీందార్లకు compensation ను డబ్బు లేకుండా ఉన్నట్లయితే bonds ద్వారా ఇవ్వవలసిందన్నారు. ఈ విషయము compensation bonds ద్వారా ఇవ్వమని నేను కాదు చెప్పుతున్నది. బి. నారాయణస్వామి వారి Economic report లో ఈ మాదిరి వ్రాశారు. ఆ విధంగా ఈ compensation bonds ద్వారా ఇస్తామని కాగితము మీద వ్రాసి, ఇప్పుడు మంత్రిగారు ఉత్తర్వులకు లోంతు ధనరూపములోను, లోంతు bonds ద్వారాను ఇస్తామని అన్నారు. ఈ మాదిరి లోంతు భాగము ధన రూపములోను, మరికొంతు bonds ద్వారాను అనేమాట వోటితో చెప్పేదానికన్న ఈ ముక్క అసలు ఆ కాగితములోనే వ్రాసియుండవలసివది.

“కాత compensation లను ఈ మాదిరి ఇవ్వని నేను చెప్పలేదు. కొత్తగా ఇవ్వబోయే bonds ద్వారా ఇస్తేవారు.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“Sir, I did not fully understand what the hon. Gentleman said. But I think that he wants that all the amount to be deposited should be deposited in the shape of bonds. I do not know on whose behalf he is pleading. I do not know whether he is speaking on behalf of the zamindars or on behalf of himself. I think the zamindars welcome this. I do not know what the difficulty of the hon. Gentleman is.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“He is pleading on behalf of the legislators and not on behalf of anybody else.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The question is—

‘That the following draft amendment and rule which it is proposed to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 40 (1) of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Madras Act XXVI of 1948), be approved :—

I. DRAFT AMENDMENT.

In rule 1 of the rules published with Revenue Department notification, dated the 21st December 1949, at pages 397-398 of the Rules Supplement to Part I of the *Port St. George Gazette*, dated the 27th December 1949, the words “or partly in cash and partly in bonds issued by the Government” shall be added at the end.

II. DRAFT RULE.

At any time after the advance payment on account of compensation referred to in section 54-A of the Act has been deposited in the office of the Tribunal in respect of any zamindari or under-tenure estate referred to in section 54-B, sub-section (1), the Government may deposit in the office of the Tribunal, bonds issued by them for such amount as they may deem fit, towards the

[7th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

compensation payable under the Act in respect of that estate; and the bonds so deposited shall be treated in all respects as if they were part of the advance payment aforesaid.”

The motion was carried.

(3) BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MOTION FOR CHANGE IN THE ORDER.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, item No. IV (3) on the agenda, namely, the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken up before item IV (1), viz., the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952.’”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The question is—

‘That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Legislative Assembly Rules, item No. IV (3) on the agenda, namely, the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken up before item IV (1), viz., the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952.’”

The motion was carried.)

III.—GOVERNMENT BILLS—cont.

(5) THE MADRAS PROHIBITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER :—
“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’

“In moving this motion, I have to make a few remarks. The object of this Bill is to provide for an increase in the revenues of the State, which has been found very necessary, by the levy of a tax on sales of foreign liquor, which is justified by itself and from comparison with the prices of foreign liquor in other States. It is proposed to amend the Act and take power under Section 21-A, under which every person or institution which sells foreign liquor (a) to any person holding a permit for the consumption of liquor under section 20, clause (a), or (b) to any institution holding a permit for the supply of liquor to its members under section 20, clause (b) will be required to collect from the purchaser and pay over to the Government at such intervals and in such manner as may be prescribed, a sales tax calculated at the rate of eight annas in the rupee or at such other rate as may be notified by the Government from time to time, on the price of the liquor so sold. This amendment is found necessary on account of the need for

3-20
p m

[Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder] [7th November 1952]

increasing the revenues of the State and as this levy is justified when compared with the prices of liquor prevailing in other States."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), be taken into consideration at once.'

MR. W. J. FERNANDEZ:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not sure whether this Bill envisages the levy of the proposed additional duty on mass wine and wine used for sacramental purposes."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"No."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. the Chief Minister says 'No.'"

MR. W. J. FERNANDEZ:—"In that case, I have nothing to say, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), be taken into consideration at once.'

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think there is no amendment to this Bill. So, I am going to put the whole Bill containing Clauses 1, 2 and Explanation to the vote of the House."

Clauses 1, 2 and the Preamble were then put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI V. C. PALANISWAMI GOUNDER:—"Sir, I now move—

'That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), be passed into law.'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), be passed into law.'

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I submit that we have finished the non-controversial part of the Agenda for to-day and only two taxation Bills remain now. In fact, it was the idea of the Government

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, with the permission of the Leader of the House, I may state that we ought to be accommodative in this matter and accept the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. There is another Bill, viz., the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill and I suggest that after going through that Bill also, we may give a holiday to the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"In that case, a motion should be moved under rule 22 (3)."

7th November 1952]

IV.—GOVERNMENT MOTIONS—cont.

(3) BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MOTION FOR CHANGE IN THE ORDER—cont.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, I move—

'That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Assembly Rules, item IV (2) on the Agenda, viz., the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, be taken up before item IV (1), viz., the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952.'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That under rule 22 (3) of the Madras Assembly Rules, item IV (2) on the Agenda, viz., the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, be taken up before item IV (1), viz., the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952.'

The motion was carried.

III.—GOVERNMENT BILLS—cont.

(6) THE MADRAS REPEALING AND AMENDING BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill * 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think there are no amendments to this Bill. So, I am going to put all the clauses, the Preamble and Schedules 1 and 2 to the vote of the House."

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, the Preamble and Schedules 1 and 2 were then put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Sir, I move—

'That the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, be passed into law.'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952, be passed into law.'

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I now adjourn the House till 10-30 a.m. on Monday, 24th November."

The House then adjourned.

[7th November 1952]

CONFIDENTIAL.**APPENDIX.**

[Vide item III (4) at page 424 supra.]

(For the information exclusively of the members.)

To

THE HONOURABLE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
MADRAS.

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952, has the honour to make the following report.

2. The Bill was published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* Extraordinary on the 28th June 1952.

3. The Committee was appointed on the 31st July 1952.

4. The Committee met in the Council Chamber at Fort St. George on the 25th August 1952 and the 6th September 1952 and concluded the consideration of the provisions of the Bill.

5. The Committee has reduced the maximum rates of water-cess leviable under clause 3 of the Bill from "twenty-five rupees", "eighteen rupees" and "ten rupees" respectively into "twenty rupees", "fifteen rupees" and "rupees seven and a half"; it has made no other changes in the Bill.

6. The Select Committee directs that the report and the Bill as amended need not be republished.

7. A copy of the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, is annexed.

FORT ST. GEORGE, M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER,
6th September 1952. *Chairman.*

7th November 1952]

*Annexure.**(Note.—The changes made in the Bill are shown in clarendon type.)*

L.A. BILL NO. 10 OF 1952.

(As amended by the Select Committee.)

A Bill to amend the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess Act, 1933.

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess Act, 1933 (Madras Act XVI of 1933), for the purposes hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

1. *Short title.*—This Act may be called the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Act, 1952.

2. *Amendment of the preamble to Madras Act XVI of 1933.*—In the preamble to the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess Act, 1933 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), the word "dry" occurring before the word "crops" shall be omitted.

3. *Amendment of section 2, Madras Act XVI of 1933.*—In section 2 of the principal Act, in the second proviso, for the words "shall in no case exceed nine rupees per acre", the words **and figure** "shall not exceed **twenty** rupees per acre in the case of cotton, fifteen rupees per acre in the case of paddy, **seven rupees and eight annas** per acre in the case of millets, and such rate as may, from time to time, be notified by the State Government in the case of any other crop permitted under section 3" shall be substituted.

4. *Amendment of section 3, Madras Act XVI of 1933.*—In section 3 of the principal Act, in sub-section (2), for the words "and in particular the period in every fasli during which such land may be irrigated and the source through which water may be taken for such irrigation", the words "and such conditions may relate to the period in every fasli during which the land may be irrigated, the crop or crops which may be grown on the land, and the source through which water may be taken for irrigation" shall be substituted.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 24th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

I.—CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF SRI KUMARASAMY RAJA BAHADUR, RAJA OF KARVETNAGAR.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is my painful duty to inform the House of the death of Sri Kumarasamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar, Member representing the Puttur constituency, on 8th November 1952 at 5-30 a.m.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, before we proceed to transact any further business, I have a sad duty to perform. Within a short time we have lost another Member of this House. As hon. Members are aware, the late Sri Kumarasamy Raja Bahadur, Raja of Karvetnagar, who represented the Puttur constituency, passed away recently. The House might remember that it was on the 3rd November the Government Chief Whip moved a motion that the late Member may be given leave for one month because of his ill-health and the House was pleased to grant him the leave asked for. But unfortunately he died soon after.

“ The late Member belonged to a very ancient family of zamindars and I understand that Karvetnagar was one of the biggest zamindaris in our State. He was aged only 47 at the time of his death. It is my duty to move a formal Resolution of Condolence. I move—

‘ That this House place on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur, Rajah of Karvetnagar, late Member for Puttur, and conveys its deep sense of sympathy to the members of his bereaved family ’.

“ I am sure the whole House will associate itself with the resolution.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is my painful duty to associate myself and Members on this side of the House with the sentiments expressed in the Resolution of Condolence that has been moved by the Hon. the Leader of the House. I was away from here for some time and I did not expect that the first time I come here after my absence, we shall have to meet under the shadow of death. I came to know the Raja of Karvetnagar just after the elections and during the short period that I happened to know him I found that he was an extremely amiable person who, despite the fact of his being a zamindar, had the interest of his

446 CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF SRI KUMARASAMY
RAJA BAHADUR, RAJA OF KARVETNAGAR

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

ryots, the interests of the common people at heart. We did not have much opportunity to work with him. We worked with him for about two or three months. None the less I am sure every one of us feels that the House has lost a valuable Member. I associate myself again with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the House and support the Resolution."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the absence of the Raja of Karvetnagar from this House is really felt by every Member here. To the people of the Puttur constituency which he represented, it is nothing but sorrow. They can never forget him. He is perhaps the only Member who did not spend any money on his election. People there contributed in thousands for his election expenses. It is not merely the votes that he won, but he won the hearts of the people there. Chittoor district has really lost a champion of the people. Though he was not a Member of any local body formerly and this is the first time he represented his people in this House, he was boiling with real zeal to serve his people. But we have lost him. We are sorry. The Chittoor district is really sorry for the loss of the Raja of Karvetnagar. Myself and Members of my Party wholeheartedly join the Hon. the Leader of the House in extending our condolence to the Members of the bereaved family, and really to the people of his constituency."

* SRI P. V. R. GAJAPATHI RAJU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Praja-Socialist Party I would like to express our deep sense of sorrow at the untimely death of the Raja of Karvetnagar. Coming myself from a zamindari family, I am well aware of this ancient house. I did not know the Rajahsaheb till we met here and got together and discussed politics. His knowledge of men and things and his sterling qualities and character were apparent. It is indeed sad that colleagues of ours leave us, but that is, I suppose, part of life. As such I hope that whatever there may be for him in another world, if there is such a world, he will be able to achieve all peace that is possible there. I join again the Hon. Leader of the House in sending our condolences to the members of the bereaved family."

10-40 a.m. * SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Leader of the House correctly observed that Death has called on us again and that too within a short period, and this time the victim has been the Raja of Karvetnagar, a member belonging to the independent group of members of this Assembly. The Raja of Karvetnagar, though born a Raja, lived the life of a peasant. He had strong likes and dislikes and he was never afraid to speak out his convictions. Equally so, he was never slow to admit his faults. To his kith and kin, through this Resolution, we send our sincerest sorrow and deep sympathy, while at the same time we shall appeal to Death never to look upon this House again."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the House, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other leaders. The Raja of Karvetnagar belonged to the Suryavamsa Kshatriya dynasty. I was told the

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF SRI KUMARASAMY
RAJA BAHADUR, RAJA OF KARVETNAGAR

24th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

late Raja was the 105th in the line of Rajas. His ancestors ruled over Narayanavaram, Pallipattu and Tiruttani. He was a trustee of numerous temples and he had endowed large sums of money to various charitable institutions. The Resolution reads as follows :—

"This House places on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur (Raja of Karvetnagar), late member for Puttur and conveys its deep sense of sympathy to the members of his bereaved family."

"By way of passing this Resolution, I request the House to stand for two minutes."

The Resolution was passed *nem. con.*, all the Members standing in silence for two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER :—" As a mark of respect to the late Member, I now adjourn the House for 10 minutes. The House will meet again at 10-55 a.m."

[The House adjourned for 10 minutes and then reassembled with Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Calingapatnam Port.

109 Q.—SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to improve and re-open Calingapatnam Port in Srikakulam district?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The port has not been closed. The question of reopening it does not, therefore, arise. There are no proposals at present for improving the port."

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—" Is there any proposal before the Government to connect the port with the railway station at Amadalavalasa?"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may put a separate question."

Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill.

* 110 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any memorandum was received by the Government from a deputation on behalf of the Madras State Inam Ryots' Associations Conference held in Madras on 23rd August 1952 requesting the Government to drop the present Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill and to bring in, in its stead an amendment of the Estates Land Act so as to cover all

* Postponed from the list of questions for 7th November 1952.

[24th November 1952]

categories of inams despite the existence of more than one grant and to afford protection to the tenancy rights of the ryots in the State; and

(b) if so, the action taken so far?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“(a) Yes, Sir, a memorandum was received.

“(b) It is under consideration.”)

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ May I know how much time the Government would take for considering the resolution of the inam ryots? Will the Government finish their consideration at least before the end of the present session? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The Government would take only a reasonable time, Sir. I cannot exactly say whether the Government would finish their consideration of the resolution before the end of the present session or the beginning of the next session.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ మద్రాస్ ఎస్టేట్స్ ల్యాండ్ అమెండ్ మెంట్ బిల్లును గవర్నమెంటువారు పరిశీలించినా? గవర్నమెంట్ దాన్ని drop చేసిందా లేక pursue చేస్తుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ It is not intended to proceed with the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill in the present form.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“ Sir, the previous Ministry assured the previous Legislature that it would bring forward a legislation abolishing all inams in the State. May I know what is the attitude of the present Ministry to this question? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The present question deals with some representation by the Inam Ryots' Association.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The matter is under consideration, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ May I know what the Hon. Minister means by the term ‘reasonable time’? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ As the word ‘reasonable’ is generally understood, Sir.”

Establishment of a regulated market for groundnuts.

11 a.m. * 111 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the action taken by the State Government to establish the market for groundnuts in North Arcot district and Salem district under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The Director of Agriculture submitted proposals in June 1951, for the establishment of regulated markets under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act, 1933, for cotton and groundnut

[24th November 1952]

in Salem district and for groundnut in North Arcot district. After examining the proposals, it was decided that a regulated market should be established only in North Arcot district in respect of groundnut. The Government have accordingly issued a notification declaring the whole of the area situated within the limits of North Arcot district a notified area under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act, 1933, in respect of groundnut.

“ Proposals called for from the Director of Agriculture for the constitution of a Market Committee for the notified area and for the establishment of regulated markets in it are awaited.”

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ Will the Government appoint a Committee for regulating trade in groundnut in the area comprising the three districts of Salem, North Arcot and South Arcot, on the lines of the South Arcot Groundnut Market Committee? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Are there any commercial crops worth the name in Chingleput district, and if so, will the Government constitute a Committee to go into the question of bringing them under the Madras Commercial Crops Markets Act? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ What are the reasons for not constituting such a Committee for Salem district? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The Co-operative Marketing Societies in Salem district objected to the formation of a Commercial Crops Market Committee. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies also stated that the Marketing Societies in Salem district are working satisfactorily. A Commercial Crops Market Committee was not therefore organized there.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఈ సమస్యను వేరుకాగడర పరిహారసంఘం వల్ల రైతులకు చాలా నష్టము సంభవించినది. రైతుల స్థితిగతులు తారుమారుగాకుండుటకుగాను వేరుకాగడరను ఒక స్థాయిని నిలబెట్టుటకు (అదుపులా పెట్టుటకు) ప్రభుత్వం పూనుకుంటుందా? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ A separate question might be asked, Sir.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Will the Government consider the formation of such a Committee in other districts where the people ask for it? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Wherever the growers ask for it, the question will be taken up, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ In view of the fact that Salem is one of the major groundnut producing districts in the State,

[24th November 1952]

will the Government be pleased to place on the table of the House the reports of the Agricultural Officer and the Co-operative department, for and against the establishment of Market Committee? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" It will be considered, Sir."

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—" రాష్ట్రంలో ఎక్కడెక్కడచే వేరుకూక ముఖ్యమైన వంటి, అక్కడెల్లా marketing facilities కలుగజేయటానికి ప్రభుత్వం పూనుకుంటుందా ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" Wherever cultivators of groundnut ask for it, the matter will be taken up, Sir."

Reservation of posts under the separation scheme.

* 112 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Scheme for Separation of Judiciary from the Executive provides for the reservation of 40 per cent of the posts of Sub-Magistrates for the staff of the Revenue Department; and

(b) if so, whether it has been properly adhered to?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" (a) No proportion of vacancies of Sub-Magistrates has been specifically reserved to be filled up by the staff of the Revenue Department. But there is a provision in the scheme of separation for the initial recruitment of Sub-Magistrates that where suitable members of the Madras Revenue Subordinate Service possessing legal qualifications are available, they will be eligible for such recruitment. The appointing authority is the High Court.

" (b) Does not arise.

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" On a point of information, Sir. The notice paper says that the Hon. the Chief Minister has got to answer this question, but the Hon. the Minister for Law has answered it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is a printer's mistake in the notice paper."

Subsistence loans to the beedi workers.

* 113 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the awards delivered two years ago by the Industrial Tribunals regarding the beedi workers at Kalahasti, Chittoor and Puttur have not yet been implemented by the respective managements;

[24th November 1952]

(b) what action the Government propose to take in the matter; and

(c) whether the Government propose to grant unemployment doles, or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who are thrown out of employment in the famine affected areas like Rayalaseema?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) & (b) The information received by the Government is that the awards have been implemented by the managements.

" (c) There is no proposal under the consideration of the Government."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Are the Government aware that what has happened in the case of beedi workers is not an exception but a rule, and are the Government taking any measures to correct it? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, the question now asked is about five specific instances. If the hon. Member will give me some other cases, information will be given, Sir."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" రాయలసీమలోను, ముఖ్యంగా చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోనుగల బీడి ఫ్యాక్టరీలలో పనిచేసే కార్మికులు అనేకమంది ఇప్పుడు నిరుద్యోగం లోనారు. గ్రామీణ ప్రాంతములలోను పెట్టి కార్మికులను తీసివేస్తున్నారు. వారి పరిస్థితులను, సమస్యలను తెలుసుకొనునవిధమున ప్రభుత్వం ఒక కమిటీని వేస్తుందా ? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" The Government are at the present moment trying to see how best this difference can be settled. We have called for a meeting of the beedi factory proprietors; we have called for a meeting of the leaders of labour unions; we have called for a meeting of the branch managers and we shall do our best to see that all these differences are amicably settled."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, the Hon. Minister has not answered clause (c) of the question, ' whether the Government propose to grant unemployment doles, or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who are thrown out of employment in the famine affected areas like Rayalaseema? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, I have answered that question. There is no proposal at the present moment under the consideration of the Government to grant unemployment doles or subsistence loans to the beedi workers who have been thrown out of employment."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" బీడి ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానుల, కార్మికుల ప్రతినిధులను ఒకచోట సమావేశపరచి సంప్రదింపులద్వారా వివాదవిషయాలను పరిష్కరించుటకు ప్రభుత్వం ప్రయత్నం చేస్తున్నదని మంత్రిగారు తెలిపిచ్చారు. త్వరగా యీ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించగలమని కోమియిస్తారా? కార్మికులకు న్యాయం. ఇధుగునట్లు చూస్తారా ? "

[24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The hon. Member will realize how difficult it is to bring negotiations to a successful termination. I hope it will be as early as possible.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ ప్రజాస్వామ్య ఇచ్చిన తర్వాత మే నేటి ముందు అమలు జరుపుకుంటే మేము ఖచ్చితంగా చెప్పగలము. కాని తమకు అందిన సమాచారం అది కాదని మంత్రిగారు చెబుతున్నారు. ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు తమ వ్యాపార సంస్థలను వేరేరు ప్రాంతాలు విభజించి Tribunal యొక్క అవార్డులు నిరుపయోగమవుతున్నాయి. కుత్సితాలు వస్తున్నాయి. ఈ విషయమే యదార్థ పరిస్థితులను తెలుసుకుంటే, అవార్డులను సక్రమంగా అమలు జరుపుకుంటే, ఆయా ప్రాంతములవారగు శాసనసభ్యులతో ఒక కమిటీని ఏర్పాటుచేసి విచారణచేయిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I am sorry to say that my information is different. I have been told that in March 1950, the management of Shaik Ahamed Beedi Factory implemented the awards of the Industrial Tribunals and that in July 1950, the managements of four other factories also implemented the awards of the Industrial Tribunals. If the hon. Member will give me information and facts to prove that this information is wrong, I will certainly take action in the matter.”

Representations regarding commutation rates of rent.

* 114 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation addressed to the Chief Minister, dated 20th August 1952, from Sri V. Narayanamurthi of Palakonda, Srikakulam district, was received by the Government complaining about the unfairness of commutation rates of rent; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a)

Yes. The representation was that the rent fixed as the melwaram share due to him in accordance with the provisions of the Madras Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act, 1951, was too meagre.

“ (b) It was transferred to the Collector of Srikakulam for disposal.”

Experiments on Lignite Industry.

11-10 a.m. * 115 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) for the last how many years experiments on Lignite Industry are being carried out in Vadalur taluk, South Arcot district and with what results; and

(b) the total cost incurred in this behalf till the end of August 1952?

24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) Lignite investigation is being carried on in and around Neyveli in Vriddhachalam taluk, South Arcot district, for the last ten years. The investigation has revealed the existence of about 2,000 million tons of lignite in an area of about 100 square miles at a depth of 175 feet from ground level. The lignite deposits are sandwiched between two layers of water bearing beds. The extraction of bulk samples of lignite from a shaft in September 1951 has shown that the difficult underground conditions can be successfully overcome. The underground conditions have however to be studied in greater detail before launching on large scale mining operations. A pilot quarrying scheme estimated to cost Rs. 79 lakhs has therefore been prepared to ascertain the actual underground conditions that may be experienced in large scale mining. The Government of India have agreed to lend some items of essential machinery required for the execution of the project. The Government propose to proceed with the scheme on receipt of the machinery from the Government of India. Tests carried out on the samples of lignite have revealed that the mineral is of good quality, capable of great industrial potentialities.

“ (b) The total cost incurred by Government on the Lignite Project up to the end of August 1952 is 19.15 lakhs.”

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ Some time back we understood from the newspapers that there was a lot of percolation of water causing difficulties for the working of the scheme. What is the situation to-day? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ We are hoping that we have discovered a method by which this difficulty can be removed; but to give a definite and concrete answer, the pilot scheme must be put into execution.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Are the Government aware of the fact that the lignite expert who is in the area and who comes from the north, due to some misunderstanding with the villagers, is digging holes before the houses of villagers and is thus causing great difficulty to the villagers there? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI M. MUNI REDDI :—“ How many years will it take for the completion of the experiments, and may I know whether it will be a profitable concern? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The pilot scheme may take a couple of years to work, and if it does work, it will not only be a profitable scheme, but a very very profitable scheme.”

[24th November 1952]

Non-caste Hindus as Executive Officers of Hindu temples.

* 116 Q.—SRI A. APPU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) how many non-caste Hindus have been appointed as Executive Officers of Hindu temples in Malabar taken over by the Board; and

(b) whether there is any rule that only caste Hindus can be appointed as employees in temples in Malabar?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“(a) & (b) None.”

SRI A. APPU :—“Will the Government be pleased to issue instructions to the Endowments Board to appoint non-caste Hindus also as executive officers if suitable candidates apply for the post? In fact, there is not even a non-caste Hindu peon now; if a non-caste Hindu applies, the application is rejected summarily.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member should not make a speech.”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“The draft rules relating to appointment of executive officers have been published for general information, and they are awaiting confirmation. Under these rules, the appointing authorities will be the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners and Area Committees. No provision has been made in the draft rules for the reservation of any post for members of any particular community.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Is it a fact that the Government are contemplating to abolish all the advisory committees regarding temple management in the districts?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“No, Sir.”

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government still follow this distinction of caste-Hindus and non-caste Hindus?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“No, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“దేవస్థానాలకు సంబంధించిన వివిధ సంస్థలలో హరిజనులను నియమించుటలేదని మాకు తెలుసు కాని మంత్రిగారు అది సరికాదంటున్నారు. దేవుడే హరిజనులకు స్థానమివ్వవద్దనుచున్నాడా అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నాను?”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“There are trustees of temples who are Harijans. Members of the Harijan community are also members of Area Committees in the various districts.”

24th November 1952]

Grant of loan to “Kumar Industries,” Palghat.

* 117 Q.—SRI R. KRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) the amount of financial assistance granted to “Kumar Industries,” Parli, Palghat, Malabar, by the Government;

(b) what the running capital of the company is;

(c) on what basis the grant was given;

(d) whether the Government have received any interest on the grant; and

(e) whether the Government have got any voice in the management of the company?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) Messrs. Kumar Industries, Edathara, were granted a loan of rupees one lakh under the provisions of the State Aid to Industries Act.

“(b) The running capital of the company as on 31st March 1952 was Rs. 1,71,000.

“(c) The loan was granted to the company on the basis of the security valued at Rs. 2,97,647.

“(d) The Government have so far received a sum of Rs. 9,713 as interest on the loan.

“(e) No, Sir.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“May I know, Sir, whether any complaint has come to the notice of the Government regarding the labour dispute now continuing in the Kumar Industries? If so, what are the reasons for the dispute, how many labourers have been retrenched; and have the Government taken any steps to get them reinstated?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ఈ పరిశ్రమ వినియోగం పనిచేస్తున్నదో మంత్రిగారు చెప్పగలరా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“The Government do not participate in or control the management or the affairs of the company. The assets of the company are hypothecated to the Government; they are periodically inspected in order to ensure that they are intact and are maintained in sound condition.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“Is the insistence on the payment of interest the only demand which Government make when they make the grants, or do the Government have any general control during the period of these grants?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“I stated in my reply that the Government have received Rs. 9,000 and odd as interest, because that was the question asked. But the company has so far paid Rs. 12,950 in two instalments which fell

[24th November 1952]

due on the 1st February 1951 and 1st February 1952. As I said, our inspectors are only concerned with seeing that the Government money is secured. This is a private concern which works on its own responsibility."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I know whether the Government have got any information as to whether this concern is working satisfactorily? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I would like to have notice of the question, Sir."

*Construction of a bridge at Kanayangode Ferry,
North Malabar.*

* 118 Q.—SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the District Board of Malabar requested the Government for any subsidy for the construction of a bridge at Kanayangode Ferry, North Malabar, and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" The Malabar District Board has not made any request to Government for a grant for the work."

SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP :—" May I know if the Highways Department has any scheme under contemplation for the construction of the bridge? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may put a separate question."

Recognition of associations of Government servants.

* 119 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a Government Order laying down that no association of Government servants should be formed unless prior permission for the formation of the association is applied for and obtained;

(b) what are the conditions that an intended organization of Government servants should fulfil before permission for an association can be given; and

(c) whether any changes in the orders were effected after the Indian Constitution came into force, and if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" (a) & (b) There is no Government Order prohibiting the formation of any association, but the Government have prescribed certain conditions for the recognition of associations of Government employees. A copy of the Government Order^a containing the instructions is placed on the table of the House.

^a Printed as Appendix I on pages 501-502 infra.

[24th November 1952]

" (c) No changes were effected after the coming into force of the Constitution."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" 8క్ష్మి యే లేకుండా ఎస్సీయేషన్ లను form చేసేవారిపై చర్యతీసుకొనుదరని బెదిరిస్తున్నారా? లేదా? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The last portion of the question, I did not follow. What is sought to be done to these people? (An hon. Member: 'Intimidation.') Oh! It is hardly necessary to answer the question, because Government do not indulge in any intimidation."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Are the Government aware whether the officers are using any pressure to prevent these persons from joining these associations? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" No, Sir."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In view of the fact that it is a fundamental question of trade union rights, and also the question of collective bargaining is involved in it, will the Government consider the desirability of removing any condition attached to the formation of trade unions and the recognition of trade unions of Government servants? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Government employees come into possession of their offices on contract, express or implied, and Government are entitled to lay down these conditions according to the contract."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" If this premise is accepted, is the Hon. Minister aware that any employee in any industry or undertaking is also entering service under a contract, implied or otherwise, and other employers also will follow the Government and dictate their own conditions? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" No, Sir; I do not think that those who work in industries where trade unions are allowed and are working will be affected. This condition will not apply to those cases."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" ఇటువంటి సంస్థలలో సభ్యులగా ఉన్న ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు, మంత్రులను కలచుకొని వారి ఇబ్బందుల గురించి విన్నవించుకొంటే, అది అనుకూలం అట్టివారిపై disciplinary action తీసుకుంటున్నారనే విషయం ప్రభుత్వవారికి తెలుసా? అట్టి సందర్భాలలో ప్రభుత్వవారు ఎట్టి చర్య తీసుకుంటారు? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There are definite rules as to the procedure to be followed by all Government servants who have any grievance; and if those rules are followed, there will be no question of any disciplinary action."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I know whether Govern-¹¹⁻²⁰ment servants are prevented from meeting Ministers when they^{a.m.} have to make any representations to them about their grievances? "

[24th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Government servants of any particular category, grade or status who have a right of approaching Ministers directly can do so but others are not allowed to short-circuit and reach the Ministers without reference to those under whose discipline they must work.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ప్రభుత్వం recognise చేయని సంఘాలూ సభ్యులూ ఉన్న ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు తమ సమస్యలను మంత్రిలకు విన్నవించుకొనరాదా? ఆవిధంగా విన్నవించుకొనినవారిమీద ప్రభుత్వం చర్యతీసుకున్నదా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ There should be no confusion between approaching Ministers by the Government servant individually and approach by the associations as such collectively, and approach by associations as such collectively has not been prevented by the Government.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ May I know whether associations recognized by the Government are at liberty to discuss politics and pass resolutions? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ A study of the rules will show that this is not allowed.”

Fair price shops in Krishna district.

* 120 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how many fair price shops are newly opened in Krishna district after decontrol;

(b) what is the total offtake of rice from the ration shops --

(1) before decontrol and

(2) after decontrol; and

(c) how long the Government expect to supply rice through fair price shops at the present level of ration with the stocks that are held by the Government in the district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ (a) 430.

“ (b) (1) 1,140 tons for two weeks ending 14th June 1952.

(2) 1,052 tons for two weeks ending 13th September 1952.

“ (c) As matters stand at present the Government expect to supply rice through fair price shops till about the end of December 1952. The present scale of rice ration will continue until further orders.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ మట్టప్రాంతాలలో ఈ సంవత్సరం జొన్న వగైరా పంటలు పోయినందువల్ల ప్రజలకు ఆహారదాన్యాలు సరిగా లభ్యమగుటలేదు. కాబట్టి ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో fair price shops ను ప్రభుత్వం ఏర్పాటుచేయకుండా ఉన్నాయా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice, Sir.”

[24th November 1952]

Representation by Srimathi K. Savithriamma of Augiripalli regarding alleged death of her husband.

* 121 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 22nd August 1952, from Srimathi K. Savithriamma of Augiripalli, Krishna district, was received by the Government, complaining about the death of her husband during the Police enquiry on or about 12th August 1952 in respect of a theft case; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ (a) Yes.

“ (b) Even prior to the receipt of the representation, dated 22nd August 1952, the Subdivisional Magistrate, Nuzvid, on receipt of a telegram on the 13th August, promptly conducted an enquiry into the matter and himself inspected the dead body before post-mortem examination. He examined 26 witnesses in connexion with this matter and gave his considered finding that Konduri Satyanarayana committed suicide by consuming acid and that his death was not due to any police lathi charge. The post-mortem examination supported the finding and indicated that death was due to the rupture of the stomach on account of sulphuric acid poisoning.

“ As a magisterial enquiry was held, no further action in the matter is called for.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, where the post-mortem examination was conducted? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The post-mortem examination was conducted by the Civil Assistant Surgeon at Gannavaram.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the man was dead before he was taken to Gannavaram. According to the information in my possession the man was first taken to Nuzvid where the doctor was not found, but the man subsequently died and there was no post-mortem examination as such? If there was a post-mortem examination, might I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister if he will place the post-mortem examination report on the table of the House? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member is referring to an incident on which I can throw little light at once. The Civil Assistant Surgeon, Nuzvid, who could have possibly given him medical assistance was not in Nuzvid as he was away at Bandar on court duty, and later the body was examined at Gannavaram after death. The question of his having been alive at some point does not relate to the post-mortem examination, I do not exactly understand what the hon. Member means.”

[24th November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఈ వాస్తవంపై వ్యక్తిని ఆ నాటి ఉదయం ఆరు గంటలకు పోలీసులు arrest చేశారు. మూడు గంటలవరకు బాంబులు పింపించారు; అప్పుడు వదలిపెట్టారు. తిరిగి ఐదు గంటలకు arrest చేశారు. ఆ తరువాతనే ఆ వ్యక్తి పోలీసువారి చేతులలో చనిపోయాడు; ఇవేకదా యదార్థమైన విషయాలు?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The allegation now made is that the incidents have not been correctly represented and that some other version is true. If the hon. Member will kindly give me that version, I shall have the details examined, but so far as I know, what I have said is correct.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, whether a panchayat was held at Nuzvid and the panchayatdars in the presence of the village magistrate recorded their finding that the man died due to heavy and dangerous blows? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The inquest that the hon. Member refers to was held, but that was before the magisterial enquiry. The widow of the deceased had told them during the enquiry that her husband had told her that he had been beaten by the Police, but it was after that that the magistrate held the enquiry, and the *post-mortem* and the chemical examination were held.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Question No. 122.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I should like to request you, Sir, to allow a half-hour debate upon the question.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ There are so many instances like this, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I would like to submit to the House, Sir, that the verdict of the village panchayatdars should not disturb our minds when a magisterial enquiry with an examination of 26 witnesses was held subsequently and the *post-mortem* examination was held and a finding was arrived at, and subsequently the viscera and other things were sent for chemical examination and all these things confirmed the finding. I submit we must be content with that. In an old case like this, a debate in the House will not throw any further light on the question. It may be true that the villagers thought that he had been beaten to death, but as a matter of fact the action of sulphuric acid on the stomach is not a thing that can be hidden or covered or concocted. So, we must be content with the finding of the magistrate and the *post-mortem* examination. The Government are not prepared to submit to a half-hour debate in the House on this subject.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—**“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should submit to you that the facts given by the Hon. the Chief Minister are not at all convincing. We would certainly like to elicit some more information, but since you have passed on to the next question, I am not able to put any further supplementary questions.

[24th November 1952]

It would certainly serve the purpose of justice if you are pleased to allow a half-hour debate on this question, because there are more things which are still unanswered and there are so many matters of doubt that have to be cleared. There is no use the Hon. the Chief Minister saying that no purpose will be served by having a debate in this House after the magistrate has given a finding. I submit to you, Sir, every purpose will be served if at least one case is thoroughly examined on the floor of the House. Otherwise, it would serve as a bad encouragement to the Police.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ As for the request of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I must remind him that I have given enough time for this question. In case the hon. Member wants to have further information, I suggest to him to give notice of a separate question. It is not possible to have a half-hour debate, as we are going to rise at six o'clock.”

Distribution of yarn to fishermen.

* 122 Q.—**SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the procedure being adopted by the Government in the matter of supplying yarn for making nets by the fishermen?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The Fisheries Department procures yarn to meet the requirements of fishermen in accordance with the monthly allotments made by the Director of Controlled Commodities from specified mills. These allotments are based on the monthly indents sent by the Fisheries Department. From the procured stocks, supplies are made to fishermen co-operative societies who are permitted to distribute the yarn to members as well as non-members. The Fisheries Department has also opened 30 depots at suitable centres for direct distribution of yarn to individual fishermen who are not members of co-operative societies.

“ The distribution of yarn to fishermen is made both for mending old nets and for making new nets. Yarn supplied for the former purpose is sold at a subsidized rate in order to induce fishermen to bring back to use the nets in disrepair.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“ May I know, Sir, the rate of subsidy given for the yarn last year and the rate given this year? ” 11-30 a.m.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Last year it was 25 per cent. This year it has been reduced to 6½ per cent, but the Director of Fisheries has made proposals to restore the old subsidy in view of the fact that the price of yarn has fallen down.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Question Hour is over. The answers to the remaining starred questions will be printed in the proceedings.”

[24th November 1952]

Armed Police camps.

* 123 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Armed Police camps working in Madras State and the number of such camps in the Circars and the places where they are located;

(b) the number of villages raided by the Companies of Armed Police after 1st April 1952, to date; and

(c) the number of persons taken into Police camps for confinement, the number released and the number remaining in such camps from 1st April 1952 to 1st September 1952?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) In 1950–51 in order to combat the terrorist activities of subversive elements, Special Armed Police and Malabar Special Police detachments were posted at a few centres in Krishna, Guntur and Kurnool districts and officers on special duty used these centres for discussion with and interrogation of, persons who volunteered to give information about the terrorist dalams operating in those districts. As the Law and Order situation improved, the need for such interrogation diminished and it has now altogether ceased. Besides, a few armed police detachments were also stationed in certain places in Tiruvur, Gudivada and Gannavaram taluks in the Krishna district with the object of creating a sense of security and for maintaining law and order. Apart from the above, there are no Armed Police Camps at present in the State.

“(b) No villages were raided by the Armed Police but in connexion with the riot which occurred at Elugupadu in Krishna district on 26th June 1952, a section of the Armed Police was made use of to assist the local Police in arresting the accused, who were hiding in neighbouring villages.

“(c) No persons were confined in Police camps, even if the places referred to in the answer to clause (a) are termed as such, but persons who volunteered to give information about the terrorist dalams were directed to the Special duty officers who used to camp at the places where the Malabar Special Police and the Special Armed Police detachments were stationed. The number of persons who interviewed the officers cannot be estimated as no records of these were maintained in the interests of secrecy and protection of those who volunteered to assist the Government. After enquiry the persons concerned returned to their villages to pursue their normal avocations.”

Reduction in the price of yarn.

* 125 Q.—SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the action taken by the Government to get a reduction in the prices of yarn in proportion to the fall in prices of cotton?

24th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“This Government have already addressed the Government of India on the subject and the matter is under consideration of that Government.”

[“Starred questions Nos. 124 and 126 postponed for answer on 25th November 1952.”]

Fair price rice shop for Government servants in Krishna district.

* 127 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the non-gazetted officers of Krishna district requested the Collector of Krishna to open a fair price rice shop for them and if so, whether it was sanctioned and if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Yes. On a representation of the President of the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Masulipatnam, a fair price shop was granted to the Association exclusively to cater to the needs of the Non-Gazetted Officers in Masulipatnam town. As the President of the Association subsequently reported that the Association was not in a position to run the shop for want of funds, orders were issued, transferring the shop to the Masulipatnam Consumers Co-operative Society, on the suggestion of the President of the Association.”

Government Hospital, Nuzvid.

* 128 Q.—SRI M. R. APPA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a proposal to construct Taluk Headquarters' Hospital in Nuzvid; and

(b) if so, at what stage is it?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“(a) & (b) No; but the following improvements to the existing Government hospital have been sanctioned in April 1950 at an estimated cost of Rs. 1,93,338:—

(i) Acquisition of site.

(ii) Construction of an Operation Theatre.

(iii) Maternity ward.

(iv) Two general wards of 6 beds each.

“The Government have no information about the progress of these works.”

[24th November 1952]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.*Number of boys and girls studying in educational institutions.*

16 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the number of (1) boys and (2) girls studying in educational institutions including colleges in this State;

(b) the number of boys and girls receiving education from rural and urban parts; and

(c) the number of hostels attached to

(1) high schools;

(2) colleges; and

(3) the number of students admitted to such hostels?

A.—(a) Boys—3,253,995.

Girls—1,617,458.

(b) *Rural parts*—

Strength in males' institutions—3,094,504.

Strength in females' institutions—4,886.

Urban parts—

Strength in males' institutions—1,677,226.

Strength in females' institutions—94,837.

Separate particulars in respect of boys and girls receiving education from rural and urban parts are not readily available.

(c) The number of hostels—

(1) High schools—308.

(2) Colleges—99.

(3) The number of students admitted to hostels attached to high schools and colleges are 25,669 and 16,763, respectively.

Assessment on wet and dry lands in Malabar district.

17 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the average market price of commodities published by the Collector of Malabar under section 51 (1) of Malabar Tenancy Act from 1930 to 1950 in each year; and

(b) the assessment on wet and dry lands in Malabar districts?

A.—(a) The particulars required by the hon. Member are not available. Nor is it possible to collect them as it will involve much time and labour.

[24th November 1952]

(b) The assessment for fasli 1361 on wet and dry lands in the Malabar district is as follows:—

	RS.
Wet	23,59,397
Dry	3,43,899

Investigation of hydro-electric sites in the State.

18 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether hydro-electric charts prepared for (1) Gundlakamma river, (2) Manneru river, (3) Kalangi river, (4) Swarnamukhi river alluded to on pages 18–19 of the Administration Report of the Electricity department for 1949–50 have been followed by sanction for construction of reservoirs and hydro-electric stations and if so at what stage each scheme now stands; and

(b) of the 64 hydro-electric schemes alluded to on pages 18–19 of the Report the names of schemes (1) taken up for construction, (2) in course of construction and (3) completed and energy generated?

A.—(a) & (b) A statement^a is laid on the table of the House.

Water-rates under different projects.

19 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the water rate per acre for first crop;

(b) the water rate per acre for second crop; and

(c) the water rate per acre for land irregularly irrigated, under each of the following:—

(1) Godavari Irrigation system;

(2) Krishna Irrigation system;

(3) Pennar Irrigation system;

(4) Cauvery Irrigation system; and

(5) the Minor Irrigation tank system?

A.—(a) & (b) The water rate on dry lands depends upon the nature of the crop grown, that is, wet or dry, the nature of irrigation, i.e., systematic or occasional, by flow or by lift, the order of the crop grown, i.e., first crop, second crop or third crop and the class of irrigation source from which water is taken. The standard rates of water-cess vary generally from Rs. 1–8–0 to Rs. 4 per acre for a first crop and annas 12 to Rs. 3 per acre for a second crop. The rates under

[24th November 1952]

the different projects are however higher and vary and the second crop rate is generally half of the first crop rate.

For a second wet crop raised on a single crop wet land, the extra charge payable is ordinarily half the assessment.

(c) For irregular irrigation enhanced water-cess is levied and the levy varies from two rates to twenty rates of the normal water-cess chargeable under the system, depending upon the fact whether the irregular irrigation resorted to was the first, second, third or the fourth and subsequent occasion.

Distribution of milk in maternity and child-welfare centres.

20 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether free milk is distributed through maternity and child-welfare centres to (1) expectant mothers, (2) nursing mothers and (3) infants, and if so, how many such centres there are in the State and at what places; and what is the average number of each category daily receiving free milk; and

(b) what were the number of maternity and child-welfare centres on 1st April 1952 in famished areas of the State and what is the number as on 1st September 1952?

A.—(a) Yes. Cow's milk and milk constituted from skimmed milk powder are distributed free through maternity and child-welfare centres of the State to (1) expectant mothers, (2) nursing mothers and (3) infants. A statement ^a showing the number of centres which distributed cow's milk during 1951-52, the places where those centres are run and the average number of expectant mothers, nursing mothers and infants or children who received the free supply of milk is furnished below.

The UNICEF donated to this State a quantity of 1,412,500 lb. of skimmed milk powder and this was distributed during the period from July 1951 to March 1952 through various agencies including the maternity and child-welfare centres.

(b) A statement ^a is furnished.

Thermal station at Nellore.

21 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when the thermal station for Nellore began generating power;

(b) the number of maximum units of electricity the power plant at Nellore is designed to supply per day;

^a Printed as Appendix III on pages 503-505 infra.

24th November 1952]

(c) the average number of units that the thermal station is supplying per day to (1) consumers and (2) agriculturists for irrigation purposes; and

(d) the rate per unit charged for consumers for lights in (1) Nellore town, (2) Gudur town and (3) Kovur Panchayat area?

A.—(a) to (d) A statement ^a is laid on the table of the House.

Pay and allowances drawn by Ministers.

22 Q.—SRI D. KRISHNAMURTY GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state what are the actual amount of monthly salaries and allowances disbursed to each of the Hon. Ministers including the Hon. the Chief Minister?

A.—A statement ^b showing the monthly salaries and allowances drawn by each of the Ministers including the Chief Minister is laid on the table of the House.

Number of estates taken over by the Government.

23 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) when and how many Estates have been so far taken over by the Government in the State, districtwar;

(b) the names of Estates and Inam Estates which have not been yet taken over;

(c) the reasons for not taking them over yet; and

(d) when they are proposed to be taken over by the Government?

A.—(a) A statement ^c giving the information is appended.

(b) The Government have not got the information.

(c) The reason for which some estates have not yet been taken over is that appeals have been filed before the Tribunals and the appeals have not yet been disposed of or that the estates are covered by stay orders of the High Court.

(d) They will be taken over after the appeals have been disposed of or after the stay orders have been vacated, as the case may be.

(Number of Inam villages in the State.

24 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to place on the table a detailed statement regarding—

(a) the names of inam villages which are not estates even after the passing of the Madras Estates Land (Amendment) Act of 1936; and

^a Printed as Appendix IV on pages 505-506 infra.

^b Printed as Appendix V on page 506 infra.

^c Printed as Appendix VI on pages 507-510 infra.

[24th November 1952]

(b) the names of villages which are affected by virtue of recent judicial decisions—

- (1) by not being grant of whole inam village;
- (2) by being a grant of only a hamlet or kandriga;
- (3) by reason of more grants than one; and
- (4) by reason of being carved out of an original village?

A.—(a) There are about 7,400 inam villages in the whole of the State. In the course of their enquiry under section 9 of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, the Settlement Officers have found that, out of these 7,400 inam villages, 680 are not estates under section 3 (2) (d) of the Madras Estates Land Act. The Government do not have the names of these villages.

(b) A statement ^a is appended.)

Extent of cultivated land in the Kasargode taluk.

25 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) the total extent of cultivated land in the Kasargode taluk of South Kanara district;
- (b) the total extent of cultivable waste land;
- (c) the total extent of non-cultivable waste land;
- (d) the total extent of Government forest;
- (e) the total extent of non-Government forests;
- (f) the total extent of lands cultivated with coconuts;
- (g) the total extent cultivated with arecanuts; and
- (h) the total extent cultivated with pepper?

A.—(a) 586,373 acres.
 (b) 213,284 acres.
 (c) 328,105 acres.
 (d) 514,789 acres.
 (e) 17,448 acres.
 (f) 53,929 acres.
 (g) 23,241 acres.
 (h) 12,359 acres.

Substitution of sangathi in the place of gruel.

26 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether there is a proposal to substitute sangathi (solid form of food) in the place of gruel at gruel centres in Rayalaseema after receiving Soviet grain?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

^a Printed as Appendix VII on page 511 infra.

[24th November 1952]

Improvements to Bukkapatnam tank, Anantapur district.

27 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

- (a) whether there is any proposal to improve the water-supply resources of Bukkapatnam tank in Anantapur district; and
- (b) whether there is any agreement between Mysore Government and Madras Government with regard to the supply of water to this tank?

A.—(a) Proposals for raising the full-tank level of the Bukkapatnam tank in Anantapur district have been considered and dropped, since the surplusing history of the tank is not encouraging.

- (b) No, except the general agreement of 1892. According to this agreement, Mysore cannot take up any new irrigation scheme on the main Chitravathi river or in the whole basin to the north of the Chelur-Bangana-halli road without the prior consent of this Government.

The Pincha Project in Cuddapah district.

28 Q.—SRI Y. AUDINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

- (a) at what stage the investigation of the Pincha Project on the river Pincha near the village Mudumpadu in Rayachoti taluk is;

(b) what time it will take to finish the investigation;

(c) if the investigation has been finished what opinion the Engineers have given about the feasibility of constructing the project;

(d) what acreage will be served by this Pincha Project; and

(e) what cultivable acreage will be submerged by this project?

A.—(a) The field investigation is in progress.

(b) By the end of this year.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Possibly 2,400 acres.

(e) Possibly about 833 acres.

Scales of pay of the medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State.

29 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

- (a) on what date the medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State Medical Service were absorbed into the corresponding Medical Service of Madras State;

[24th November 1952]

- (b) from what date these absorbed officers were entitled to draw the Madras State scales of pay;
- (c) to how many medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State Service, house rent is allowed; and
- (d) to how many such rent is not allowed?

A.—(a) The medical officers of the former Pudukkottai State were absorbed in the Madras Medical Service from 1st January 1949.

- (b) Their pay was fixed in the corresponding scale of pay admissible to medical officers in the Madras Medical Service from 1st January 1949 but were allowed to draw arrears of pay only from 1st September 1949.
- (c) & (d) No house rent is allowed to any of them.

Sree Shaila Charities Trust, Kurumbranad.

30 Q.—JANAB K. MOIDU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Labour Officer, Malabar, has recommended to the Government to refer the industrial dispute in the Sree Shaila Charities Trust, Kurumbranad, for adjudication by an industrial tribunal; and what action has been taken in the matter?

A.—In July 1952, the Labour Officer, Kozhikode, sent reports to Government in respect of the dispute between the workers and the management of Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities, Katalur P.O., Malabar, stating that there was no case for adjudication and the Commissioner of Labour also agreed with him. The Government considered his report and decided that there was no case for adjudication. Both the parties have been informed accordingly.

Village vaidyas.

31 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

- (a) the number of village vaidyas trained up to date in the State;
- (b) whether all the trainees were appointed by the Government or not; and
- (c) what the individual payment to a village vaidya per month?

A.—(a) The number of village vaidyas trained up to April 1952—

- (i) Number of candidates admitted to training (up to April 1952)—755.
- (ii) Number of candidates declared as village vaidyas—704.

The result of 93 candidates admitted during April to October 1952 is awaited.

[24th November 1952]

- (b) The Government are not appointing the village vaidyas. They(?) are officially recognized as village vaidyas and they are given an honorarium by the panchayat board concerned if its finance permits.
- (c) The amount paid to a village vaidya depends on the financial position of the panchayat board and this amount varies from Rs. 15 to Rs. 50 per mensem.

New bus permits granted in Tiruchirappalli district.

32 Q.—SRI P. RANGASAMI REDDIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

- (a) the names of persons to whom and the routes for which bus permits were issued during the years 1947 to 1952 in Tiruchirappalli district; and
- (b) whether the Government have formulated any rules for issuing the bus permits or whether they are granted at the discretion of the respective Regional Transport Authorities?

A.—(a) A statement^a is annexed.

- (b) The Government have not formulated any special rules for issuing the bus permits. The Regional Transport Authorities follow the procedure prescribed in the Motor Vehicles Act and the rules made thereunder.

Number of criminal appeals pending before the High Court.

33 Q.—SRI P. RANGASAMI REDDIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

- (a) the number of criminal appeals pending before the High Court on 1st April 1952, more than three months old, more than six months, more than one year and more than two years; and
- (b) the number of appellants in jail during the pendency of their criminal appeals?

A.—(a) 82 (more than 3 months); 16 (more than 6 months); 7 (more than 1 year); and nil (more than 2 years).

- (b) 34 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 3 months); 10 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 6 months); 3 (in criminal appeals pending for more than 1 year); and nil (in criminal appeals pending for more than 2 years).

Supply of electricity from Jog to South Kanara.

34 Q.—SRI T. ANANTHA PAI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

- (a) what progress has been made in the negotiations between the Government of Mysore and the Government of Madras for the supply of electricity from Jog to South Kanara; and
- (b) when the agreement is likely to be signed?

[24th November 1952]

- A.—(a) & (b) Only the agreement for supply of Jog power to South Kanara remains to be concluded. The main point of difference between the Governments of Madras and Mysore regarding the draft of the clause relating to levy of surcharge on rates of supply is likely to be settled soon.

III.—MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have to announce to the House the following Messages, dated 17th November 1952, received from the Hon. Chairman, Madras Legislative Council :—

1. I transmit a copy of the Madras District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 13 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

2. I transmit a copy of the Madras Cotton Control Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 15 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

3. I transmit a copy of the Madras Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 14 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

4. I transmit a copy of the Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 10 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

5. I transmit a copy of the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 8 of 1952), as agreed to by the Council without any amendment and signed by me.

6. I transmit a copy of the following motion passed to-day by the Madras Legislative Council concurring with the Madras Legislative Assembly in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Chambers to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952) :—

‘ That this House concurs in setting up a Joint Select Committee of both the Houses consisting of 29 Members to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (19 Members from the Assembly and 10 Members from the Council) and that the following Members of this House be selected to serve on such a Joint Select Committee :—

- 1 Sri C. Rajagopalachari (Chief Minister),
- 2 „ N. Ranga Reddi (Minister for Public Works),
- 3 „ S. Narasapaya,
- 4 Janab A. M. Allapichai,
- 5 Sri V. Bhashyam Ayyangar,
- 6 „ C. Marudavanam Pillai,
7. „ T. J. M. Wilson,
- 8 „ K. Bhashyam,
- 9 „ V. Gurunandan Rao,
- 10 „ K. Suryanarayana. ’ ”

24th November 1952]

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

- (1) THE MADRAS ESSENTIAL ARTICLES CONTROL AND REQUISITIONING (TEMPORARY POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill^a, 1952, and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

“ This is a very simple measure. The original Act has been in existence from 1946. That Act was re-enacted in 1949 as Madras Act XXIX of 1949 and it expires on the 31st December 1952. In order to ensure proper supply and distribution of essential articles, it is considered necessary that the provisions of this Act should be kept alive up to the 25th January 1955. The date is fixed with reference to the Central Act, the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1946. The Central Act expires on the 25th January 1955 and so we want that our Act also should be in existence till 1955. That is why that date is fixed.

“ Sir, as far as this Bill is concerned, it is only supplementary to the Central Act. Very many essential articles come under the Central Act. In order to have powers with respect to certain other articles which are not contemplated under the Central Act, this Bill has been brought into existence and it is proposed to extend its life up to 1955. In asking for the extension of the life of this Act, we have taken this occasion to bring forward certain amendments so that there may not be any conflict between the Central Act in existence and our Act. The Central Act, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951, in some respects, comes into conflict with the existing provisions of our Act. The object of our amendments is to remove all reference to production of essential articles because the entire production is governed by the Central Act, the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951. We are removing certain articles mentioned in the Schedule with reference to which we can pass orders as to its supply and distribution because those articles are already covered by the Central Act. Sir, with these words I move that this Bill may be taken into consideration immediately and passed.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘ That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ On a point of information, Sir. The original Act has not been supplied to the Members of this House. Whenever an amending Bill is brought forward, the original Act should be placed on the table of the House so that Members can understand in what connexion the amending Bill has been brought forward.”

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 17th November 1952.

[24th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"If the hon. Member would only refer to the annexure attached to the proposed Bill, he would find the existing provisions and the proposed amendments side by side."

11-40
a.m.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning Amending Bill అనే దాన్ని యారోజున ప్రభుత్వం వారు తెచ్చారు. ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు ముఖ్యంగా కంట్రోల్స్ కు సంబంధించి ఉన్నది. ఇలాంటి సవరణను తెచ్చేటప్పుడు సభ్యులకు దీని విషయమే ఆలోచించి సభలో వర్ణించుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తగిన అవకాశము ఇవ్వాలి. అలాంటిది యేమిట జరుగలేదు. ఈ విషయములో నేను ఒక విషయము చెప్పు దలచుచున్నాను. ఇదివరకు క్రిందటి బడ్జెటు సమావేశములో యీ మంత్రివర్గమువారు కంట్రోల్స్ అన్నియును తీసివేస్తామని ప్రకటించియున్నారు. కాని యిప్పుడు essential articles మీద కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టుతామని అంటున్నారు. అటువంటప్పుడు అవసరమైన వస్తువులమీద కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టుతామని చెప్పుతూ ఇదివరకు అమలులో ఉన్నటువంటి బిల్లును మార్చాలని ప్రయత్నించుతూ ఉండడము అనేదిగా కన్పించు చున్నది. ఇదంతా తారీఖు మార్చవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యముగా కనబడుచున్నది. అయితే యీ సందర్భములో ఒక విషయము చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఆరోజున కంట్రోల్స్ తీసి వేసేటప్పుడు ప్రజలయొక్క అభిప్రాయమును తెలుసుకోకుండానే తాత్కాలికంగా తీసివేశామని అన్నారు. యారోజున మరల కంట్రోల్స్ పెట్టేటప్పుడైనా కనీసం ప్రజలయొక్క అభిప్రాయము కనుగొనవలసియుంది. అలాంటి అవకాశాన్ని ప్రజలకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఇవ్వడములేదు. అంతేకాకుండా Sri C. V. K. Row గారు చెప్పినట్లు యీ సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో సభ్యులకు ఆలోచనకే అవకాశంలేకుండా సభ్యులకు అందజేశారు. నిజానికి 22, 23 తేదీలలో మేము ఇక్కడికివచ్చాక యీ బిల్లు circulate చేశారు. మరురోజే యీ 24 వ తేదీన యీ బిల్లు వర్చుకు వచ్చింది. అందువల్లనే యీ విషయములో ఆలోచనకే అవకాశములేకుండా పోయింది. అలాంటప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారికి యీ ప్రజలమీద సహకారభావమున్నట్లయితే, యీ బిల్లులో దీని పరిమితకాలము యింకను మూడుసంవత్సరాలకాలము పొడిగించడమనేది ప్రజలకు లాభదాయకమగునా లేదా అనే విషయము తెలుసుకొనేందుకు యీ సవరణ బిల్లును ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి వదిలివేస్తే బాగుండునని కోరుతున్నాను. అట్లుచేయకుండా రాష్ట్రములో ఏ ఏ ప్రాంతాలలో ఏ ఏ యిబ్బందులు ఉన్నాయో తెలుసుకోకుండా యీ బిల్లును తేవడం చాలా అన్యాయము. ప్రజల కష్టముఖాలు, అభిప్రాయాలు ముందుగా ప్రభుత్వమువారు తేల్చుకోవాలి. ఈ కాల పరిమితి ప్రజలకు లాభమా నష్టమా అనేది పరిశీలించాలి. ఇటువంటిది యేమియు చేసినట్లు లోకము. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క control policy యేమిటో అర్థము కావడంలేదు. ఈనాడు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము అమలులోనికి తీసుకొని రాబోయే Planning Commission వారి రిపోర్టును అమలులో పెట్టినప్పుడు controls అమలులో ఉండాలని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము అంటున్నారని యీనాడు యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చినారా, లేక యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారికి యిష్టమువచ్చినప్పుడు controls ఉంచేది, యిష్టములేనప్పుడు తీసివేసే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చారా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. అట్లాంటప్పుడు యీ controls విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి control policy ఏమిటో విశదముగా చెప్పవలసియున్నది. లేదా

[24th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

ఒకవేళ యీ ప్రభుత్వము మరల controls ను అమలులోనికి తీసుకొనిరాదలస్తే control economy అన్ని వస్తువుల విషయములో జరుపుతారా, లేక యింతవరకు విడుదల అయినటువంటి వస్తువులమీద మరల controls పెట్టుతారా? యీ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి ఉద్దేశ్యము ఏమని అడుగుచున్నాను. లేదా Planning Commission విధానము అమలులో ఉన్నంతకాలము యీ controls అమలులో ఉంచుటకు యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు యిప్పుడు యీ కాలపరిమితిని పొడుగొంపు అనే సాకుతో మరల controls ను పెట్టి తప్పు దిద్దుకోదలచి యీ బిల్లును తెచ్చారా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. కంట్రోల్స్ అమలు జరుపదలంచిలే చేయండి. అదికానప్పుడు యీ కాలపరిమితి పొడుగొండడం సరియైనదికాదని చెప్పుతూ యీ సవరణ బిల్లును వ్యతిరేకించు ప్రజల అభిప్రాయమును కనుగొనవలెననే సా సవరణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

"That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the amendment. In doing so, I beg to state that the Hon. Finance Minister was not correct when he said that the information I asked for was contained in the annexure circulated along with the Bill. For, I find that there is no annexure along with the Bill given to us."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid the Hon. Leader of the House has not taken this House into his confidence to tell us what exactly are the reasons that have compelled him to bring this particular Bill at this particular moment. The information which he gave us in moving his motion is already contained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons contained in the Bill circulated to us. So, beyond repeating what is already contained there he has not cared to tell us anything else. He told us that this is a supplementary measure to the Central Act which has been in existence from 1949. He told us that this supplementary measure is necessary to enable the State Government to take power to control the supply and distribution of certain essential articles and to exclude from its scope the supply and distribution of certain other articles whose supply, distribution, transport, prices, etc., are or may be regulated by the Central Government. I find that the life of the present Act expires on 31st December 1952; and now, it is being sought to be extended for a further period, that is, up to 25th January 1955. I do not know how that date was arrived at; I fail to see the significance of that date. Perhaps the Central Act also has been extended up to that date. But that is a minor matter."

"The main question which concerns us here, is, how did this State Government come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to control the production of certain commodities which are considered to be essential commodities. Under the existing Act there are given in the Schedule certain articles which are considered to be essential commodities. They are firewood, charcoal,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

livestock, non-edible oilseeds, manures, electrical energy, all vat dyes, alizarine, other dyes used for textile printing, artificial silk yarn and motor vehicles (new or used). Sir, these are specific articles of public consumption, which Government considered to be essential articles and so they thought it necessary to exercise control over their production and distribution. Now what is it that makes Government think to-day that it is no longer necessary to control the production of certain of those articles but only their distribution? I am really unable to understand the logic of their reasoning. For, when there is no production in the country, I wonder, how Government are going to exercise their power over their distribution. What will happen is, the producer will take into his head to produce only a limited quantity, fix a higher price for it than at present obtains and thus create a monopoly and earn huge profits. So, I would ask the Hon. Finance Minister to explain to us what circumstances prevail in the country to-day to give up their control over production of the specific articles mentioned in the Schedule.

“Then, Sir, there is another point I wish to mention here. There are certain essential articles which are now sought to be removed from the purview of this measure. They are ‘manures not being (i) fertilizers referred to in item (15) of the First Schedule to the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (Central Act LXV of 1951), or (ii) oil cakes, all vat dyes, alizarine, other dyes used for textile printing, artificial silk yarn, motor vehicles (new or used).’ After the passing of this amending Bill, this State Government will have no power over the production and distribution of these articles. Of course, the Hon. Finance Minister will say that if they are retained, in the exercise of our rights we will come into conflict with the powers vested in the Central Government. Sir, it is one thing for us to have powers and it is another thing to exercise those powers in a way that will conflict with the powers vested in the Central Government. So, why should we to-day surrender our powers under a hypothetical case that at a certain stage the Central Government may choose to exercise control? If and when that stage comes, why should not the Central Government delegate its powers to the State Government? Why should we not ask the Central Government to do that, so that we may ourselves exercise that power in the best interests of our people? So long as this House has inherent powers with respect to these matters, it is not right that we should relinquish them. Even with regard to the distribution of fertilisers, I would submit we should not relinquish our powers. I know we have no power over the production of fertilisers in Sindhri factory, where the major portion of fertilisers of this country is produced. Nor have this Government any power over the production of fertilisers at Alwaye. I realize that. But, Sir, as a matter of fact, the bulk of fertilisers coming into our State is imported fertilisers, and that is monopolised by the Imperial Chemical Industry. Now, why should this State Government relinquish its control over the distribution of the fertilisers?

24th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Is it or is not a fact that fertilisers are not made available ¹¹⁻⁵⁰ to hundreds of thousands of peasants who are in need of them? ^{a.m.} There is maldistribution of fertilisers going on. There are, I know, hundreds of malpractices taking place in the distribution of fertilisers which are very much needed for agricultural operations. As a result of this Bill being passed into law, the Imperial Chemical Industries would have a monopoly of this much needed commodity which is badly needed by poor agriculturists and they would not be able to get it except at prohibitive cost. The Hon. Minister must give us cogent and convincing reasons as to why the Government consider it unnecessary to exercise control over all these things. Take again, for example, control over the production of charcoal and firewood. In a number of places forests are being burnt down for the production of charcoal. If forests are cut down for the manufacture of charcoal, then certainly we cannot get rains. Therefore, why should not the Government exercise control over the production of charcoal? I feel that Government have got to explain why these powers are no longer necessary to-day. It is immaterial for us whether the Government are going to exercise those powers or not. With regard to the extension of the life of the original Act proposed in the Bill, we agree, but with regard to other things stated in the Bill we oppose them.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that the hon. Member, Sri Ramamurthi, has raised the point as to why the Government are giving up the powers which they are already having under the existing Act. Unfortunately, Sir, we are bound by the provisions of the Constitution. With reference to the provisions of this Bill we are governed by Article 304 of the Constitution, namely,

“Notwithstanding anything in Article 301 or Article 303, the Legislature of a State may by law.

(a)

(b) impose such reasonable restrictions on the freedom of trade, commerce or intercourse with or within that State as may be required in the public interest :

Provided that no Bill or amendment for the purpose of clause (b) shall be introduced or moved in the Legislature of a State without the previous sanction of the President.”

“The State Legislature comes into the picture only under the above provision. Under the above Article of the Constitution no Bill or amendment for the purpose of clause (b) of Article 304 shall be introduced or moved in the Legislature without the previous sanction of the President. Therefore, we have to get the previous sanction of the President to introduce this Bill in the Legislature. (As a matter of fact, our original proposal was to extend the life of the existing Act [the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Act, 1949], as it is, for three more years. But fortunately or unfortunately the Central Government thought it fit—and it is the Central Government who have got to give the consent because the President acts only on the advice of the Central Government—that certain provisions in the original Act should be deleted because they thought

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1952]

that those provisions would come into conflict with the provisions of the Central Act. In pursuance of the above suggestion from the Central Government, we have deleted certain provisions from the existing Act. It is not as if we are not willing to have these powers even though we are not exercising them at present under the existing Act. Even if we require those powers we have to ask the Central Government to pass necessary legislation or give us specific authority under the existing central legislation. That is why, we have to bow down to the dictation of the Central Government in view of the provisions contained in the Constitution. I am glad that the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi agrees as to the necessity for extending the life of the present Act.

"Then the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi referred to the point as to why the life of this Bill should be extended only up to 25th January 1955. The Central Act has been extended up to 25th January 1955 and the present Bill after all is only complimentary to the Central Act.

"I have not understood the full implications of the speech of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah. I think he referred to controls or controlled economy with regard to production. As far as we are concerned, the policy of our Government with regard to the above is well known. Even under the existing Act, there are only seven orders in force with regard to the supply of electricity and there is also one order with regard to the distribution of cement. We have not passed any other orders under the existing Act. Our policy is that only when there is necessity we exercise the powers given to us under the Act, so that we may exercise sufficient control on the supply and distribution of essential articles. There is no use of circulating this Bill for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon. It should be left to the Government and to the Legislature to find out the circumstances and decide at what point control is necessary and at what point there should be decontrol. There is no use of referring a general matter like this for public opinion. I am quite sure that any responsible public person will certainly say that it is necessary for the Government to have these powers so that in times of emergency or in case of necessity they may impose controls in the larger interests of the community. I request Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw his amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion.

"As regards the complaint of not giving sufficient time, we took it for granted that hon. Members would be conversant with all the existing Acts and that it would not be necessary to give much time when the Bill is only for the extension of an existing Act. In the case of a new legislation, where new principles would have to be studied more time may be necessary. The present Bill has got to be passed by 31st December 1952. Not only that. We have also to get the assent of the President to the Bill within that time. I am sorry I could not give notice of the

24th November 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Bill earlier. As a matter of fact I was considering whether the present Act should be extended for three years or for one year. The Government came to the conclusion finally that it is very necessary to have the powers sought for in the Bill, particularly with reference to the supply of electricity.

"I once more request Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw his amendment, and vote for the main motion before the House."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Before the motion is put to vote, I should like to elicit a piece of information from the Hon. Minister. I am glad that my speech has elicited an answer from the Hon. Minister as to the attitude of the Central Government with regard to this Bill and the circumstances under which this Bill has been brought forward before the Legislature in the form in which it has been presented to the House. In view of these facts, will the Hon. Minister consider it desirable to convey to the Government of India the feelings of the entire House that powers must be conferred on the State Government to legislate on these matters . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I do not know whether the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi wants that the Constitution should be amended so that we should have unrestricted powers. The Central Government have also their own policy and we cannot dictate their policy from here. The Central Government have assured that all the necessary powers with regard to the carrying out of the provisions of this Bill would be given to us also in case of necessity. There is no question of our being left in the lurch in case there is any necessity to control production. Under the circumstances it is not necessary to convey, as suggested by Sri Ramamurthi, this view of alleged conflict between the Centre and the State."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్ష, నాయుక్కు సవరణ ఉపసంహరించుకోవడం అన్నప్పుడు శ్రీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు చెప్పినదానిలో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy కిని, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy కిని బేధమున్నట్లు కనబడుచున్నది. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వమువారు controls అక్కరలేదని తీసివేశారు. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఉండాలని అంటున్నారు. కాని సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు చెప్పినదానిలో చూస్తే ప్రభుత్వమునకు control కు అధికారము ఉంటే, వీలుఅయినప్పుడు ఉపసంహరించుకునే వీలుగావుంటుందని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అందువల్లనే యీ సవరణ బిల్లును తెచ్చామని అన్నారు. ఈ విషయములో ఒకమాట అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ కంట్రోలు విధానములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికా, రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వానికా, ఎవరికి పూర్తి అధికారమున్నదో ఖచ్చితము (definite) గా చెప్పండి అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ కంట్రోలు విధానములో రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము పాలనీ విమిటి, కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము policy విమిటి అనేది వివరింపవలసియున్నది. రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము కంట్రోలు అక్కరలేదని తీసివేశారు. కండిట్ డ్రాగా పర్యటనలో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము కంట్రోలు అన్నియు ఆమలులోనే ఉండాలని చెప్పారు. ఈ రెండింటిలో controls ఉంచడమో, తీసి

12
noon.

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [24th November 1952]

వేయడమూ, విధి ఉపయోగము, ఎవరి అధికారము ఎంతవరకు అవసరము అనేది తేల్చి చెప్పవలెను. ఒకవేళ ఈ కంట్రోలు విషయములో కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానమునకు రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానము వ్యతిరేకముగా ఉన్నప్పుడు, ఏ విధానము అవలంబించుట అవసరమో ప్రజాసీకమునకు తెలియజేయుట అవసరమైయున్నది. అట్లు చేయకపోతే ఎవరి యిష్టము వచ్చినట్లు వారు నడిస్తే, యిది ప్రజాసీకానికి అన్యాయము చేసినట్లు తుంది. ఈ విధానములో ఏ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రజలమీద వాధ్యత వహిస్తుందని అడుగు చున్నాను. Essential articles తయారుచేయడం, కంట్రోలు చేయడం అనేది కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ విధానం ప్రకారం అమలు జరిపేయడం ఒక సలహా వట్టం కావాలంటే నాకేమి అభ్యంతరములేదు. ఈ విషయములో ప్రజాభిప్రాయమును గురించి అమలులో పెట్టవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. అయితే Central Government చేయ బూనిన control విధానం అమలు జరపటానికి యింకను ఎంతకాలం కట్టుకో తెలియ జేయవలసిన మౌలికాధిని కోరుతున్నాను. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I am at a very great disadvantage in not having been able to follow the very eloquent speech made by the hon. Member. I am sure he has raised very pertinent points. But, unfortunately, I am unable to follow them. If any hon. Member could give me a gist of the points I shall try to reply, if necessary.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I am afraid I will not be able to do justice to what Mr. Vavilala has spoken, for I did not hear him properly as I did not think it would come to my lot to give a gist of what he has spoken. What he wants to make out is this, whether the policy of this Government and the policy of the Central Government are in accord on this matter. If the Central Government want control—and that is the information, and at any rate Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has said that willy-nilly there must be control—what is the policy of this Government with regard to the attitude of the Central Government? Are they going to follow the Central Government fully or are they going to say, ‘We shall have our own way and shall not have controls’. People are anxious to know something about this conflict, growing conflict and the partial conflict either in theory or in application between these two Governments.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ There is absolutely no conflict between the Central Government and this Government with regard to the policy of control. If the hon. Member will be pleased to go through the statement of the Prime Minister, it will be seen that he also says that controls will be lifted wherever possible and that controls will be continued where they are absolutely necessary. As a matter of fact, this Bill is only for the purpose of imposing controls, and if therefore Mr. Vavilala thinks that the policy of the Central Government is to continue controls, this Bill also seeks to take powers for the purpose of continuing the controls. So, Sir, all this talk of conflict between the Central Government and this Government with regard to the policy of control or decontrol is merely wishful

24th November 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

thinking. As I said, there is no such conflict. In fact, we are bringing forward this Bill with the full accord of the Central Government and in accordance with the wishes of the Central Government. Therefore, the question of conflict need not disturb our minds now and we may proceed with the Bill.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ కంట్రోలు విధానమును అమలు జరుపుకున్నామని అధిక మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన statement లోని హామీని గమనించి నా సవరణను నేను withdraw చేస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I hope the House gives permission to Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to withdraw the amendment.”

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952 be taken into consideration at once.’ ”

The Motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will now put the clauses to the vote of the House. I find there are no amendments to the clauses.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో ఏదైన సవరణ ఉన్నదంటే అది clausewise గా వర్తించుట అవసరమని అంటున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు నాయొక్క సవరణ తారీఖులకు సంబంధించినదే.”

(My amendment is only with reference to the date.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has not given notice of any amendment.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ With reference to dates, he says, he has given notice of an amendment.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నేను యిచ్చిన సవరణ మీ కాగితములలో చూస్తే దొరుకుతుందండి. ఒకటే కాగితముమీద రెండు amendments ను యిచ్చియున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ To whom has the hon. Member given notice of the amendment.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నేను యిచ్చిన రెండు amendments కున్నా ఒకటే పైపు అయింది. రెండవది పైపు కాలేదు.

“ ఈ సవరణ అంక 1955 వ సం॥ జనవరి 26 వ తేదీ తర్వాతగూడా యీ controls అమలులో ఉండాలని అంటున్నాను. అనగా యీ controls శాశ్వతముగా అమలుపరచడమే నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. గనుక యీ సవరణ బిల్లులో తారీఖులు లేకుండా అమలుకుతేనే, అది legal గా రద్దకాకుండా అమలులో ఉంటుంది అని చెప్పుచున్నాను.”

[24th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will look into the matter and in the meanwhile let the hon. Member say what his amendment is?"

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ Essential Articles Controls సవరణ బిల్లుకు నా సవరణ 1952 వ సం॥ డిసెంబరు 31 వ తేదీ నుంచి, 1955 వ సం॥ జనవరి 25 వ తారీఖులు అనే యీ బిల్లులో ఉదాహరించడం అనవసరమని తెచ్చాను. దీనినికూడా ఒక శాసనము చేసేటప్పుడు, తారీఖులు లేకుండా చేస్తే మంచిదని నా సవరణ. అట్లు చేసినయెడల యీ యాక్టు రద్దు అయ్యే వరకు యిది అమలులో ఉండగలదు. మన యొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశము యీ control శాస్త్రముగా యీ Essential Articles మీద ఉండగలదు. కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్దేశ్యమునూ యీ control ఎల్లప్పుడు ఉండవలసిన అంతున్నాయి. అందుచేత యీ బిల్లు తారీఖులు లేకుండా శాస్త్ర control కు శాసనము చేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇక యీ బిల్లును repeal చేసేవరకు యిది అమలులో ఉండగలదు."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The hon. Member wants the omission of the dates in Clause 3."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may move the amendment when we come to that Clause."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of order, Sir. ఈ సభలో శాసనసభ్యులు కొందరు తెలుగు భాషలో . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member knows English and he can say anything he wants in English."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ఈ సభలో శాసన సభ్యులు కొందరు తెలుగుభాషలో మాట్లాడుతున్నప్పుడు, అమాటలను translate చేయటానికి ఒక translator ను వేసి, translation కు సదుపాయాలను కలుగజేయమని Speaker గారిని యిదివరకే కోరియున్నాను. అలాంటిది ఎంత వరకూ జరుపలేదు. అలాంటప్పుడు మేము తెలుగు భాషలో ఏమైనా చెప్పితే, Speaker గారికి అర్థముకాకుండా ఉన్నాను నూరింగు యివ్వడమనేది జరుగుతున్నది. ఈ విషయములో Speaker గారు ఏమైనా ఆలోచించారా! మేము చెప్పేది అర్థము కాకుండా ఉన్నప్పుడు Speaker గారు సభాకార్యక్రమము నడపడము ఏ మాత్రము సబబుకాదు. ఈ రోజునకూడా మేము చెప్పేది అర్థము కాకుండా కార్యక్రమము నడపడమనేది ఎంత సబబో ఆలోచించమని కోరుతున్నాను. అర్థము కావడము, కాక పోవడము, అదంతా వేరే విషయము. Translator ను వేసి, translation కు సదుపాయాలు చేయడము విషయములో ఏమి చెప్పతారు? గనుక యిప్పుడు జరిపే చట్ట తప్పింది, తప్పుకుండా translator ను వేయడమనేది ప్రభుత్వముమీద బాధ్యత ఉందని చెప్పుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The point of order raised by the hon. Member is that we should appoint a translator."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అందుకని మేము మరియు రోజున reminder ను యిస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు జరిగే కార్యక్రమము

24th November 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

సరియైన translation సదుపాయాలు త్వరలో చేయించమని Speaker గారిని, ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. యీ అర్థముకాని కార్యక్రమము నడిపించటం సబబుకాదని మనచేస్తూ యీ విషయములో త్వరలో translator ను ఆహ్వానించు చేయగలండులకు కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయములో యిదివరకు ఎక్కో పార్టు point of order raise చేసియున్నానని remind చేస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will consider the hon. Member's point of order if he puts it in writing and sends it to me."

"It appears that the hon. Member, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah has given notice of an amendment to Clause 3. When we come to Clause 3, the hon. Member may move his amendment."

"I will now put Clause 2 to the vote of the House."

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

*SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లును 12-10 p.m. చేయడమంటే దీని యొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యము ఏమిటో గమనించాలి. ప్రజలకు ఎక్కువ పోకర్తలు యీ essential articles విషయములో చేయవలసిన గదా! అందుకనే నేను ఈ రోజున యీ బిల్లుకు సవరణ తెచ్చియున్నాను. ఈ నా సవరణ బిల్లు విషయములో ప్రభుత్వమువారి ఉద్దేశ్యమేమిటి? ఎంతవరకు చర్చ జరిగింది? దీని యొక్క ప్రధాన సూత్రమేమిటి? ఈ సూత్రాలు ఎలావుండాలి, యీ essential articles మీద ఏ విధమైన కంట్రోలు ఉండాలి అనేది మనము ఆలోచించాలి. కంట్రోలు అన్నతర్వాత యిది శాస్త్రముగా ఉండాలనే నా కోరిక. గనుక నేను చెప్పేది ఏమిటంటే యిప్పుడు control economy Central Government జరపటానికి శాస్త్రముగా జరిపించాలని నేను చెప్పుతున్నాను. శాస్త్రముగా జరపడానికి నేను వ్యతిరేకించడములేదు. అందుకని యీ బిల్లులో తారీఖులు లేకుండా చేస్తే యిది శాస్త్రముగా యీ controls పెట్టనట్లయి అట్లా శాస్త్రతాధికారము ప్రభుత్వానికి కలిగియుంటే అమలు ఎప్పుడువచ్చే అప్పుడు జరుపవచ్చును. అక్కర లేనప్పుడు అక్కరలేకుండా చేసుకోవచ్చును. అట్లా ఏబుగా ఉండే అధికారమును యీ బిల్లువల్ల ప్రభుత్వానికి సంపాదించమని ఆర్థిక మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అందు చేత నేను యీ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించుచూ అంగీకరించమని ఆర్థిక మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను—

"In clause 3, delete the words "up to and inclusive of the 31st December 1952" and the words "up to and inclusive of the 25th January 1955."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The amendment is—

"In clause 3 of the Bill the words "up to and inclusive of the 31st December 1952" and the words "up to and inclusive of the 25th January 1955."

That is, he wants to delete all references to dates. It is a negative amendment. Whether he moves the amendment or opposes the Clause itself it comes to the same thing. Let him therefore oppose the Clause instead of moving the amendment."

[24th November 1952]

*SRI ALLURI VENKATRAMA RAJU :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ అమెండు మెంటు విమిటా మాకు తెలియజేయకుండా, దాని కాపీలను మాకు కంపకుండా, చర్చను సాగించి వోటు చేయమనడం ప్రజాస్వామిక సిద్ధాంతాలకు అనుగుణంగా ఉన్నదా అని point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను. సవరణ విమో మాకు వ్రాత మూలంగా తెలియజేయవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“Let the hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah continue his speech. Then I will allow the hon. Member to raise the point of order.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I suppose the object of the amendment is to make the measure a permanent one. If the amendment is accepted as it stands, the present Act will expire on the 31st December 1952 which, I suppose, is not the object of the mover of the amendment. Whether we should have a permanent measure or a temporary measure is an altogether different question. The very Preamble of this Bill is : Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Act. . . . When the original Act itself is a Temporary Powers Act, the amending Act also can only be temporary. When we want to have control or decontrol, this House should have a dominant voice in formulating the policy. If the Act is for a temporary period, the Government will have to come before this House at the expiry of the period, if necessary, and then the House can express its opinion. If the measure is made a permanent one, then there is no opportunity for this House to express its opinion as to whether controls should continue or not. We are taking powers up to the 25th January 1955. I hope Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah will be in this House at the expiry of the period. Then this House can take stock of the situation, instead of making this Act a permanent one. Nothing is lost by limiting the period of this Act to the 25th January 1955. Therefore I request the hon. Member not to press his amendment.”

Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu began to speak in Telugu.

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may please speak in English, as he knows English.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“తమరు అమెండుమెంటును చదివి వినిపించారు. అది విమో ఇంగ్లీషు తెలిసినవారికి అర్థమవుతుంది. కాని ఈ సభలో ఇంగ్లీషు తెలియనివారు చాలామంది ఉన్నారు. వారికి ఈ విషయమై ఏమీ బోధపడుటలేదని point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Not now. The amendment has already been moved and discussed.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఈ సవరణ విమో ముఖ్యము బోధపడలేదు. చర్చనీయాంశమేమో తెలియకుండా వోటు చేయటం ఎటుల అని గౌరవ సభ్యులు కొందరు తమ అభ్యంతరాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నారు.”

24th November 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

ముఖ్యంగా తెలుగులో మాట్లాడు సభ్యులు తెలియజేస్తున్న విషయాలు తమకు బోధ పడుట లేనట్లు కనుపిస్తున్నది. ఇట్టి ఇబ్బందులు కలుగకుండుటకుగాను సభ్యులు చెప్పు దానిని ఇంగ్లీషులోనికి అనువదించి తమకు తెలియజేయు నిమిత్తం కొందరు ఉద్యోగు లను నియమించవలసిన ఇదివరలో కోరి ఉన్నాము. ఆ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టి శ్రద్ధ దూపినట్లు కనుపించుటలేదు.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I am only a novice, but still I presume to tell what exactly the hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu has submitted now to the Chair. He seems to submit that copies of the amendment should be distributed in English to the House before it is put to vote whatever may have been done by way of discussion, but, unfortunately, he does not seem to remember the fact that notice of the amendment has been given by the Telugu gentleman, if I may be allowed to say, by the fanatical Telugu gentleman, in English. (Hon. Members : ‘No, no.’) The amendment is written in English.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The amendment is written in English.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The amendment has been given in English, both in ink and in pencil. The amendment has been read by the Chair just now. The amendment will convert the measure into futility. This has been discussed, and it has been more or less given up.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, I think the Hon. the Chief Minister only as a matter of humour called him ‘fanatical’, and I do not think it is anything more than that.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“It is nothing more than that. I have proved that he is not fanatical. What was meant by the joke was that the hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah had written his amendment in English, and in ink and in pencil.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అంతే కాకుండా ఈ అమెండుమెంటు కంటే చాలావేరైనదని ప్రోచాలక్యమవుతూ ఉన్నాను. ఇట్టి సందర్భములో అమెండుమెంటు కాపీలను సభ్యులకు ఇవ్వనిదే ఈ చర్చ కొనసాగించడం సరియైన విధానమా అనే విషయమై తమ రూలింగు ఇవ్వవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“Sir, the point of order raised by the hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu is this. It is not a question of whether the hon. Member had given notice of the amendment in English or in any other language. The question that is raised is that once the amendment has been submitted to the office, copies of that amendment should be made available to every Member, before it is actually put to vote.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“Notice of this amendment was given just a few minutes before. We had no time to circulate copies of it to hon. Members.”

[24th November 1952]

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ నా సవరణకు technical నా ఏదో అభ్యంతరమున్నదని చెప్పిన కారణంపై, అంతేగాక మంత్రిగారు ఇచ్చిన హామీబట్టి ఈ సవరణను ఉపసహరించుకొనుట ఈ శాసనసభవారు, నా సవరణను బలపరిచినవారు ఆమోదించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, the hon. Member seeks the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is for the Chair, and not for the hon. Member, to ask whether the House gives permission to the Member to withdraw the amendment. I hope the House gives him permission to withdraw the amendment.”

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 were put and carried.

Preamble and Clause 1.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I move—

‘That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘That the Madras Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE MADRAS SURVEY AND BOUNDARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

‘That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.’

Sir, under this Act survey is being done, and especially now, it is being done on a very extensive scale. There are three sections which provide for appeals against decisions under these sections. Under section 8, which refers only to the cost of the survey and the survey mark, there is an appeal. Under the present law, only when all these appeals are disposed of, a notification under section 13 could be issued. But I submit, Sir, that the decision under section 8 is only in regard to the cost of the survey and the survey

* Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 29th October 1952.

24th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

mark. By retarding the issue of a notification under section 13, in order to await the decision on the appeal under section 8, the issue of the notification is unduly put off. Under this Bill, a decision under section 8 could be appealed against apart from the decisions under the other sections, namely, sections 9 and 10. An appeal under section 8 would stand apart. As it involves only cost, it need not retard the other notification. Therefore, I move that this amendment may be accepted in order to facilitate the issue of the notification under section 13. It does not affect the other provisions under sections 9 and 10. It affects only the decision under section 8, for which a separate appeal is now provided. It deals with only the question of cost. Sir, I move the Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The motion is—

‘That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I want to know what would happen if on a question decided under section 8 which necessarily will have to be considered on an appeal under section 11 the Appellate authority comes to a contrary decision. The best thing the Government can do is to have provisional powers to proceed with the maintenance work and not have final powers under section 8. The appeal under section 11 will necessarily affect the correctness or otherwise of the order passed under section 8. Therefore, instead of having two appellate authorities in respect of matters arising from one transaction, the Government, for the purpose of maintenance work, can have provisional powers and not final powers.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I am sorry I have not made myself clear. The only question arising under section 8 is the cost, and for that provision is made. The cost may be more or less. Whatever may be the result it does not affect the notification. It is only regarding the cost, which may be more or less, the appellate authority may decide.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.’”

The motion was carried.

Clauses 2, 3, 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I move—

‘That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘That the Madras Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

[24th November 1952]

(3) THE MADRAS SUGAR FACTORIES CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

12-30 p.m. * THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 and move—

‘ That the Bill be taken into consideration at once. ’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once. ’

“ The hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi has given notice of an amendment to this Bill. But he is not present here now.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I shall move it on his behalf, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ No, only the hon. Member who has given notice of it can move it. I am going to put the motion to the vote of the House.”

(The Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda was seen rising in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Does the Hon. Minister want to say anything? ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I think, Sir, some explanation is required from the Hon. Minister on this Bill.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If the Hon. Minister wants to say anything, I have no objection.”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the principal Act of 1949 provides that any sugarcane-grower in a reserved area may offer to sell a specified quantity of the sugarcane, which may be grown by him, to the sugar factories before the planting season. The State Advisory Committee on Sugarcane suggested that it would be more convenient for the growers if the time for offering cane to the sugar factories was fixed at any time before the close of the planting season. Further, it was found that the definition of the ‘ grower ’ of sugarcane required amendment so as to include co-operative societies consisting of sugarcane growers. That has been provided for in this Bill.

“ Then, according to the principal Act, sugarcane-growers are required to sell cane in the reserved area only to the specified factory-owners. But in this Bill provision is made enabling growers, who own not more than five acres of land each within the reserved area, either to crush or to sell, for the purpose of making gur within the same reserved area, the sugarcane grown by them. These are things that have been found essential for the proper working of the Sugar Factories Control Act. That is why this Amending Bill has been brought forward.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఈ సవరణ బిల్లు గురించి తెలుసుకొనుటకు సభ్యులకు సరిపోయినంత వ్యవధి ఇవ్వకపోవడం చాలా ఇబ్బంది కావజేసిన

24th November 1952] [Sri K. Govinda Rao]

దని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా జిల్లాలనుంచి వచ్చేటటువంటి నాటోటివారికి ఈ బిల్లు కాపీలు చాలా ఆలస్యంగా చేరినవి. ఈ కారణంవల్లనే సవరణలను ఇవ్వడం కష్టమే. ఇకముందైనా ఇట్టి అసౌకర్యం కలుగకుండా, బిల్లుల కాపీలను ముందుగానే సభ్యులకు అందునట్లు చేయవలెనని అధ్యక్షులవారిని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ గత నాల్గు, అయిదు సంవత్సరములుగా చెరుకు పండించే రైతులు ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులకు గురికావలసివస్తోందనేది అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. అనేక సంధ్యలు లోలో కంట్రాక్టు వరకు ప్రకారం మిల్లు యజమానులు చెరుకు తీసికోవడంవల్ల రైతులు ఎన్నో కష్టనష్టాలకు లోనుకావలసి వచ్చినది. ఈ ఇబ్బందులనుంచి రైతులను సత్పించుటకుగాను ఉద్దేశించబడిన ఈ బిల్లు కొంతవరకు సరిగానే ఉన్నదని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. అయినప్పటికీ దీనిని ఇంకా సమగ్రంగా చేయవలసివలెనని అవసరంకాదా ఉన్నది. పంచదార ఫ్యాక్టరీల యజమానులు రైతులు తెచ్చే చెరుకును సకాలంలో కొనక, కొనిన చెరుకుకు సక్రమమైన ధర ఇవ్వక, వెంటనే డబ్బు చెల్లించక చాలా ఇబ్బందులు పెడుతున్నారనే విషయం వ్యవసాయశాఖా మాత్యులకుగానూ తెలిసినట్టిదే. ఈ సంవత్సరం నూర్చిలోలీనుకొన్న చెరుకుకు ఇంతవరకు వెల చెల్లించలేదనే విషయంకాదా మంత్రిగారు ఎరుగుదురు. మిల్లు యజమానులు ఈ విధంగా అక్రమంగా ప్రవర్తిస్తున్నా వారిని అదుపులో పెట్టే అవకాశాలు ఈ బిల్లులో కలుగజేయలేదు. రైతులకు సకాలంలో, సరస్థమైన ధర చెల్లించకపోయినట్లయితే శిక్షకు పాత్రులవ్వటానినే నిబంధన బిల్లులో లేకపోయినట్లయితే మిల్లు యజమానులు వారి యిష్టం ప్రకారం ప్రవర్తించి రైతులను ఎన్నో ఇబ్బందులపాలుచేస్తారని మనవిచేస్తాను.

“ అయిదు ఎకరములుగాని, అంతకన్న తక్కువగాని ఉన్న రైతులు తాము పండించే చెరుకుతో బెల్లం తయారుచేసుకోవచ్చుననే అవకాశం కలుగజేయడం మంచిదే. అదేవిధంగా ఇతర రైతులకుగానూ సావకాశం కలుగజేయవలెనని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఆ విధమైన అవకాశంలేకపోయినట్లయితే చెరుకు పండించే రైతులందరూ మిల్లు యజమానుల దయాదాక్షిణ్యాలైన ఆధారపడవలసి వస్తుంది.

“ ముఖ్యంగా ప్రయ్యారులోని పంచదార మిల్లు యజమానులు చేస్తున్న అక్రమాలు గురించంగీరాను. ఆ మిల్లు యజమానుల రైతులవద్దనుంచి చెరుకును ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతరుల ప్రకారం కొనుటలేదు. రైతులకు సరియైన ధర ఇవ్వజింలేదు. కొన్న సరుకును వెల చెల్లించడంలో ఎంతో ఆలస్యం చేస్తున్నారు. ఇటువంటి అక్రమాలు చేయకుండా ప్రభుత్వం విమిశర్యలు తీసుకున్నదని మంత్రిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను. మిల్లు యజమానులు ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతరులను ఉల్లంఘించినట్లయితే ఆరు నెలలు శిక్ష లేక రెండువేల రూపాయలు జరిమానా విధించవలెనని ఈ బిల్లులో ఒక section ఉన్నది. ఈ శిక్ష వల్ల మిల్లు యజమానులను సరికేయడం సాధ్యపడదు. లక్షలాది రూపాయలు లాభాలు సంపాదించే మిల్లు యజమానులకు రెండువేల రూపాయలు జరిమానా చెల్లించడం విమంతులైనదిగా ఉంటుంది. మిల్లు యజమానులు రైతులను ఇబ్బందులు పెట్టకుండా ఉండాలంటే జరిమానా విధించటం మారు రెండుసంవత్సరాలు జుులు శిక్ష విధించుటకు ఏమిగా బిల్లులోని clause ను సవరించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Amending Bill that has been moved looks, on the face of it, a very innocuous one. On the face of it, the amendments seem to be consequential upon the amendment to the definition clause wherein the ‘ crushing season ’ is now sought to be defined in a way different

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

from that in which it had been defined in the original Act. But, apart from this, there are certain other questions, in connection with the working of the existing Sugar Factories Control Act, which have got to be considered. I want to take this opportunity to ask the Government to take the House into confidence and enable it to examine the entire scope of the original Act itself and its working and find out in what ways it needs modification. Of course, it is now sought to be made out that previously all cane-growers in a registered area were compelled to sell their cane to the factory-owners, and that now a very big concession is sought to be given to all those people who grow cane over an area of five acres and less. It appears, on the face of it, to be a big concession for the small cane-growers. But, I would like to point out that it is not a concession at all. On the other hand, it is a retrograde step in the conditions existing now. At a time when the price of cane was very high and when the cane-growers could sell their cane at a high price in the open market, the Government prohibited the sale of cane to people other than the scheduled factory-owners. But to-day, we know that the prices of cane tumbled down last year. Particularly it was so in March 1952. As a result of this, small cane-growers were absolutely ruined. In a number of districts small cane-growers were not able to market their cane and they found it unprofitable to convert cane into gur. That was the position then. The Government did not take any steps to improve matters and help the small cane-growers. At that time when the small growers were not able to sell their cane to factory-owners at a reasonable price, they were not given any assistance. Now, in this Bill the Government say that the small growers should be enabled either to crush or to sell the cane for the purpose of making gur, and that they should be given freedom to do this. Of course, freedom is necessary. But, where is freedom? What have the Government done in the past? They have not taken the needs of the situation that existed in the past into consideration. Though this Bill appears to confer a boon on the small cane-growers, I may state that in actual practice the small cane-growers will be put to very great hardship. On the other hand, other provisions have to be incorporated in the Bill so that the small growers may be really helped.

"There is another question to be considered. In the past, difficulties were experienced with regard to the marketing and sale of cane even by registered cane-growers. As a matter of fact, last year the Pugalur Factory owner refused to take the cane even from registered growers. He broke the contract. The Government were powerless to do anything in the matter, although their attention was drawn to the refusal of the factory-owner to take the cane from the growers. Thus the contract was broken by the factory-owner and the poor peasants who had grown the cane at the instance of the owner had to lose very heavily as a result of the refusal of the owner to take the same. Therefore, I suggest that we must go into the working of the Act and see how the Bill can be amended so that the small growers, the poor peasants and the real

24th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

peasants are protected and are able to find an adequate market for their cane. That is what is needed at the present juncture. Therefore I suggest that the Government may agree to the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. There is also a precedent for doing this."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member was not in his seat when I called his name."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I was saying that there is a precedent for referring such a Bill to a Select Committee. Recently the Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill was under discussion in the Central Parliament."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The whole Act was under discussion."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"When that Bill was under discussion, a request was made to the Central Government that the Select Committee should not be restricted to examine only the amendments that were already proposed, but it should also go into the original Act and suggest amendments to that Act. This suggestion was accepted by the Central Government and the Select Committee went into the working of the entire Act. I would like to appeal to the Government to follow that precedent. After all, we are interested in seeing that the poor peasant is protected. We are also interested in seeing that the small cane-growers are protected as much as other sections of people. Hundreds of cases have been brought before the Government, on the floor of the House and by various other means, where the small cane-growers have suffered a good lot because of the malpractices committed in the working of the Act. There has been favouritism and all sorts of things. We must see what are the steps that can be taken to give a fair deal to the small growers who are now sought to be freed. Now that the present amending Bill is before the House, I think the Government should find no difficulty in agreeing to refer it to a Select Committee. Unfortunately, I was not present in the House this morning when my name was called and so I was not able to move my amendment. Of course, it is a mistake and I must say it is a small technical mistake. But, I would request the Government not to take shelter under this technical mistake, but to agree to refer the Bill to a Select Committee so that the working of the entire Act can be effectively gone into. This amending Bill provides us an opportunity to review the situation. It will take a long time for non-official Bills to come before the House and get passed. Hence I appeal to the Government to agree to my request. When such an opportunity is provided, I think the House is entitled to review the working of the Act as a whole and suggest such amendments as are necessary for protecting the interests of the poor peasants and small cane-growers."

* SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు అయిన ఎకరాలలోపున ఉన్న టువంటి రైతులను మినహాయిస్తూ ఒక ప్రతిపాదన ఉన్నది."

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1952]

from that in which it had been defined in the original Act. But, apart from this, there are certain other questions, in connection with the working of the existing Sugar Factories Control Act, which have got to be considered. I want to take this opportunity to ask the Government to take the House into confidence and enable it to examine the entire scope of the original Act itself and its working and find out in what ways it needs modification. Of course, it is now sought to be made out that previously all cane-growers in a registered area were compelled to sell their cane to the factory-owners, and that now a very big concession is sought to be given to all those people who grow cane over an area of five acres and less. It appears, on the face of it, to be a big concession for the small cane-growers. But, I would like to point out that it is not a concession at all. On the other hand, it is a retrograde step in the conditions existing now. At a time when the price of cane was very high and when the cane-growers could sell their cane at a high price in the open market, the Government prohibited the sale of cane to people other than the scheduled factory-owners. But to-day, we know that the prices of cane tumbled down last year. Particularly it was so in March 1952. As a result of this, small cane-growers were absolutely ruined. In a number of districts small cane-growers were not able to market their cane and they found it unprofitable to convert cane into gur. That was the position then. The Government did not take any steps to improve matters and help the small cane-growers. At that time when the small growers were not able to sell their cane to factory-owners at a reasonable price, they were not given any assistance. Now, in this Bill the Government say that the small growers should be enabled either to crush or to sell the cane for the purpose of making gur, and that they should be given freedom to do this. Of course, freedom is necessary. But, where is freedom? What have the Government done in the past? They have not taken the needs of the situation that existed in the past into consideration. Though this Bill appears to confer a boon on the small cane-growers, I may state that in actual practice the small cane-growers will be put to very great hardship. On the other hand, other provisions have to be incorporated in the Bill so that the small growers may be really helped.

“There is another question to be considered. In the past, difficulties were experienced with regard to the marketing and sale of cane even by registered cane-growers. As a matter of fact, last year the Pugalur Factory owner refused to take the cane even from registered growers. He broke the contract. The Government were powerless to do anything in the matter, although their attention was drawn to the refusal of the factory-owner to take the cane from the growers. Thus the contract was broken by the factory-owner and the poor peasants who had grown the cane at the instance of the owner had to lose very heavily as a result of the refusal of the owner to take the same. Therefore, I suggest that we must go into the working of the Act and see how the Bill can be amended so that the small growers, the poor peasants and the real

24th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

peasants are protected and are able to find an adequate market for their cane. That is what is needed at the present juncture. Therefore I suggest that the Government may agree to the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. There is also a precedent for doing this.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member was not in his seat when I called his name.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“Sir, I was saying that there is a precedent for referring such a Bill to a Select Committee. Recently the Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill was under discussion in the Central Parliament.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The whole Act was under discussion.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“When that Bill was under discussion, a request was made to the Central Government that the Select Committee should not be restricted to examine only the amendments that were already proposed, but it should also go into the original Act and suggest amendments to that Act. This suggestion was accepted by the Central Government and the Select Committee went into the working of the entire Act. I would like to appeal to the Government to follow that precedent. After all, we are interested in seeing that the poor peasant is protected. We are also interested in seeing that the small cane-growers are protected as much as other sections of people. Hundreds of cases have been brought before the Government, on the floor of the House and by various other means, where the small cane-growers have suffered a good lot because of the malpractices committed in the working of the Act. There has been favouritism and all sorts of things. We must see what are the steps that can be taken to give a fair deal to the small growers who are now sought to be freed. Now that the present amending Bill is before the House, I think the Government should find no difficulty in agreeing to refer it to a Select Committee. Unfortunately, I was not present in the House this morning when my name was called and so I was not able to move my amendment. Of course, it is a mistake and I must say it is a small technical mistake. But, I would request the Government not to take shelter under this technical mistake, but to agree to refer the Bill to a Select Committee so that the working of the entire Act can be effectively gone into. This amending Bill provides us an opportunity to review the situation. It will take a long time for non-official Bills to come before the House and get passed. Hence I appeal to the Government to agree to my request. When such an opportunity is provided, I think the House is entitled to review the working of the Act as a whole and suggest such amendments as are necessary for protecting the interests of the poor peasants and small cane-growers.”

* SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు అయిన ఎకరాలలోపు ఉన్నటువంటి రైతులను మినహాయించు. ఒక ప్రతిపాదన తీస్తాను.”

[Sri M. Lakshmanaswami] [24th November 1952]

ఈ విధంగా ఒక 5 ఎకరాలను మాత్రము మినహాయించటంవల్ల ఈ సమస్యంతా పరిష్కారం అవుతుందా అనే ప్రశ్న ఉస్తున్నది. ఏ రైతేనా సరే చెరుకు పండించేటప్పుడు, తనకు అది గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా అనే ప్రశ్న ఒకటి తనలో ఉత్పత్తి అవుతుంది. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము ఈ రోజున ఈ విషయమై ఆలోచించేటప్పుడు ఏ రైతుకైనా సరే, ఈ బిల్లువల్ల చెరుకు పండించుటలో తనకు గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా, లేదా, రైతుకు ఇది వివిధంగా అన్వయిస్తుందనే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించడం అవసరమైయున్నది. ఇది వరలో ఈ రాష్ట్ర ప్రభుత్వము చెరుకు ధరలను నిర్ణయించేందుకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి recommend చేసినపుడు, ఆ ధరలను కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకంటే తక్కువగా అనగా రూ 1-2-0 లు, ఫకారం నిర్ణయించారు. ఈ విధంగా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి recommend చేయడమనేవిషయం చెరుకు పండించేటటువంటి రైతాంగానికి ఒక ముఖ్యమైన సమస్యగా ఉన్నది. ఏ రైతేనా సరే, ఈ రోజు ధరలు guarantee లేనప్పుడు, తనకు దానివల్ల గిట్టుబాటు లేనప్పుడు, అటువంటి పంటకు పూనుకొనే ఇష్టముండదు. కనుక రైతుకు ఈ నిర్బంధాలలో చెరుకు పండిస్తే గిట్టుబాటు అవుతుందా లేదా అనే ప్రశ్న గురించి ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్న క్లాజు ప్రకారం 5 ఎకరాలను మినహాయించడమేగాని ఏ రైతేనా సరే, తనకు ఇష్టముఉంటే ఫ్యాక్టరీకి చెరుకును ఇచ్చుకోవచ్చు, లేకపోతే వేరేవిధంగా అమ్మకోవచ్చునని దానికి ఇందులో అవకాశమివ్వడంలేదు. కనుక ఈ రీతిగా దీనిలో మార్పు చేయవలసియున్నది. అలాగే మిల్లు యజమానులకు పరిష్కలు సరిగా ఇవ్వకపోవడంవల్ల ఇబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. అవిధంగా రైతులు సరకును సరిగా మిల్లు యజమానులకు అమ్మలేకపోతున్నారు. ఈ ఇబ్బందులన్నీ తొలగించేటటువంటి తగిన బండోబస్తులు ఇందులో లేవు. అందువల్ల శ్రీ రామమూర్తిగారు చెప్పినట్లుగా ఈ బిల్లును ఒక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి వేసి మొత్తము బిల్లునంతా సరిగా సవరించేందుకు వీలుకలుగజేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు ముఖ్యంగా మిల్లు యజమానుల క్రింద sugarcane growers ను కట్టిబెట్టడానికి విర్వరచిస్తుంటుంది బిల్లుగా నాకు కన్పిస్తున్నది. ఇందులో ప్రత్యేకంగా చిన్న రైతుకు ఏదో మేలు కలుగజేస్తున్నట్లు పైకి కనిపించడమేకాని, మొత్తానికి మిల్లు యజమానులకు ఈ sugarcane అంతా వస్తున్నదానికి ఒక restriction విర్వరచివట్టుగా కనిపిస్తున్నది. నిజమే, పంచదార ఎక్కువ కావాలి. ఫ్యాక్టరీలు పనిచేసే పంచదార తయారుచేయాలి. కాని దీంతో మిల్లు యజమానులు ఉన్నారు, రైతులు ఉన్నారు. ఇది వీరిద్దరికీ సంబంధించిన విషయము. రైతులు పండించేటటువంటి చెరుకుకు సరియైనటువంటి ధర నిర్ణయించి ఆ ధరకు మిల్లు యజమానులు కొనేటట్లుగా చూడవలసిన బాధ్యత ప్రభుత్వమునకు ఉన్నది. అటువంటి నిర్ణయం ఇందులోలేదు ఎప్పుడైతే రైతులు నిర్మింబంగా ఆయా రిజర్వుడు areas లకు నిర్ణయించిన మిల్లు యజమానులకు తప్పకుండా ఇవ్వాలని నిర్బంధించడం జరుగుతుందో, అంశముమీద Tariff Board నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకు మిల్లు యజమానులు జేకును కొనడానికి సాకరించి ఆ ధరలను నిర్ణయముచేస్తూ, అవిధంగా రైతులకు నష్టము కలిగేటటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడతాయి. ఇక తో-అప లేటిల్ల రాన్వేటిల్ క్రింద grow చేసేటటువంటి వాటినికూడా ఈ మాదిరి ఫ్యాక్టరీలకే కట్టిపెట్టడం జరుగుతుంది. కనుక ఇది మొత్తమీద పైకి ఏదో కొంతమంది చిన్న రైతులకు లాభముగా కనిపించినప్పటికీ, ఎక్కువ పెట్టుబడిపెట్టి తమ లాభాలనే ప్రధాన ఆశయముగా పెట్టుకొన్నటువంటి మిల్లు యజమానులకే ఎక్కువ మేలు కలుగజేయ

24th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

డానికి పూనుకొనినటువంటిదిగా ఉన్నది. స్వేచ్ఛ అనేటటువంటిది ఇందులో ఎవరికి లేకుండా ఉన్నది. కనుక, శ్రీ రామమూర్తిగారు చెప్పినట్లుగా దీనిని పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. మొత్తము దీని original Act నే పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించి, దీని వల్ల నిజంగా sugarcane growers కు లాభము ఉన్నదా లేదా, ఏ వర్గానికి ఎక్కువ లాభము కలుగజేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నం చేస్తున్నది అనే విషయాన్నంతా కూడా స్పష్టంగా విమర్శించాలి. ఈ విధంగా విమర్శించి, రైతులకు మిల్లు యజమానులకు, consumers కు దీనివల్ల తగునటువంటి లాభము ఉండేటట్లుగా, ఒకరిని ఇంకొకరికి చానిసలుగా అత్యుత్పత్తికావడా చేయవలసిని అవసరమున్నది. అందుచేత దీనిని పరిశీలించేందుకు ఒక సెలెక్టు కమిటీకి దీనిని వస్తుజెట్టుట ఫావ్యుని నా ఆధిపత్యము.

"ఈ సందర్భంలో ఒక remark నేను చేయదలచుకొన్నాను. ఇక్కడ Treasury Benches లో ఉన్నటువంటి చాలా అనుభవం గలిగినటువంటివారు, బహుశా, ఉపన్యాసములలో వారికంటే మేము చిన్నవాళ్ళు కాము గాని administrative విషయాలలో మేము చిన్నవాళ్ళే మోసాని అనుకొంటాను, ఇటువంటి చిన్న చిన్న విషయాలలో ప్రత్యేకంగా హానికరం గానటువంటి బిల్లులు House ముందు వచ్చినప్పుడు వాటికి సంబంధించినటువంటి Act, amending బిల్లులు చాలా advance గానే సబ్యులకు పంపడం సబబైన పద్ధతి అనుకొంటాను. ఈ లోపము ఇప్పుడే కాదు. గత సెషనులోకూడా ఇటువంటి లోపాన్ని చూచాను. ఈ లోపాన్ని చాలామంది గౌరవ సభ్యులుకూడా ఇక్కడ చూపించారు కనుక ఈ లోపాన్ని గవర్నమెంటు సభ్యులు గమనించి ఈ విషయాన్ని త్వరగా ఈ సభలో rush చేసి ఏదో నిమర తోతున్న సభ్యులెందుట తర్వాత త్వరగా తీర్చించి పాస్ చేయడానికి పూనుకోకుండా విషయాలను పరిశీలించేందుకు తగినటువంటి వ్యవధిని కలుగజేయవలసిన కొరుతూ సెలవు తీసుకొంటున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the suggestion put forward by the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi and supported by other speakers is that although no Motion was made for referring the Bill to a Select Committee, it should be done, and that not only the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee but, following a certain precedent in the Central Legislature, the original Act also should be gone into by that Select Committee. Now, Sir, apart from the technical question that there is no Motion before the House for the appointment of a Select Committee over this Bill, let us understand the substance of the Bill. It has been brought forward in accordance with the advice given by certain Advisory Committees and by officials having to meet difficulties that have arisen in the execution of the Act. This Bill has been brought to make certain minor amendments in favour of the cane-grower. That the amendments are minor and are in favour of the cane-grower, whether they may be useful or not, has been admitted by all and there is no dispute on that point. The question whether the original Act may now be taken up by the suggested Select Committee is the pith of the suggestion that was made.

"Sir, during the discussion of the Preventive Detention Bill in Parliament, the question was whether the Act should be

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [24th November 1952]

extended, whether it should be given a fresh lease of life. At that time, it was possible for the Prime Minister to accept the suggestion from certain Members that the provisions of the original Act might also be gone into by the Select Committee before extension could be given. The present amendment is, however, different. It is not for extension of the lifetime of the law but for amendment in favour of the cane-grower in respect of certain matters. The amendments introduced are very important, though they are only minor taking the Act as a whole. The Minister who moves the Bill does not ask for extension of the life of the Act. In such a case, it is not possible to entertain the suggestion that we might consider the principle of the old Act itself. Sir, I submit that this is not the time or the place for making such a suggestion nor is it open to us at this stage to consider amendments to the original Act. We can only deal with the present amendments which are very necessary and I would advise Mr. Ramamurthi and his friends to examine the original Act and make any suggestions of an important nature which could be considered by the Government. If he suggests any such improvements to the Act, the Government will give their very earliest consideration."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.'

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"There are no amendments before the House. I shall, therefore, put all the clauses of the Bill together to vote."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లులోని క్లాజులన్నీ ఒకేతరమైన వోటుకు పెట్టబడినాయి. clause by clause వోటుకు పెట్టితే, వాటిపైన మాట్లాడ వలచుకొన్న సభ్యులు మాట్లాడేందుకు అవకాశం కలుగుతుంది. ఎందుకనగా కొంతమంది ఈ బిల్లును సెలెక్ట్ చేయటానికి refer చేయవలసిందిగా కూడా కోరుతున్నారు. కనుక అటువంటివారు వివిధ క్లాజులపై మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలుగా clause by clause వోటుకు పెట్టవలసిందని కోరుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If the hon. Member wants me to put the clauses one by one, I shall do so."

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇది వరకు నేను clause by clause వోటుకు పెట్టుచుని కోరడంలా ఆయా క్లాజులపై సభ్యులు మాట్లాడేందుకు అవకాశం కలుగుతుందనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో చెప్పితిని. కాని ఈ క్లాజులు ఒకటి తరువాత ఒకటి వెంట వెంటనే త్వరగా వోటుకు పెట్టుచున్నందువల్ల మాట్లాడవలసినవారు లేచి మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలులేకుండా పోతున్నది. ఒక్కొక్క క్లాజు వోటుకు పెట్టునప్పుడు కొంచెము time ఇస్తే మాట్లాడవలసినవారు మాట్లాడేందుకు వీలుంటుంది. కనుక ఒక్కొక్క క్లాజుకు కొంచెము వ్యవధి ఇస్తే బాగుంటుందని కోరుచున్నాను."

24th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"He is going from a point of order to a request for time."

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"What my Friend has in mind is, if you put the Bill to vote clause by clause, it will give an opportunity to Members to speak on each clause. Apparently, some hon. Members have not yet understood the implications of the procedure now followed. Mr. Venkateswarlu feels that he should say something (laughter) and therefore makes this request. It is now clear that those who want to speak on Clause 4 are at liberty to speak on it, and similarly with regard to Clauses that will follow. (The hon. Member explained the procedure in Telugu.)

"ఎవరికైతే 4 వ క్లాజుపై మాట్లాడే అభిలాష ఉందో వారికిప్పుడు దానిపై మాట్లాడే అవకాశమున్నది అటువంటివారు ఇప్పుడు మాట్లాడవచ్చును. అదే మోస్తరుగానే 5 వ క్లాజుపై వోటుకు పెట్టినప్పుడు, దానిపైన మాట్లాడవలసినవారు అప్పుడు మాట్లాడవచ్చును."

"Sir, I shall now take the opportunity of making a few comments on Clause 4 of the Bill. I would draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to the wording of the clause which says:

'... to crush the sugarcane grown by him for purpose of making gur within the same reserved area or to sell the sugarcane grown by him for that purpose.'

I see that some liberty is given to the small grower. It is true and to that extent it will give the cane-grower some relief. Now take the case of a grower who has got his cane ready but the factory in question does not take it. I would have been glad, Sir, if the Government had introduced, together with this new clause, another clause penalising the factory-owner who has not taken the sugarcane offered and driven him to sell otherwise."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The original Act has got it."

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I know in the original Act, there is a provision. But the complaint from this side and from those who know something about the subject is that the sections against the grower are enforced and those against the mill-owner are not enforced. In my own district, there have been several instances like this. I do not say that the Government were not able to enforce them because that will be a great reflection upon a mighty Government, but they have not enforced the sections against the factory-owners, although this is a worse comment than the former. Now, as I have said, some opportunity or liberty is given to the grower to dispose of the cane as he likes. But it happened in Bobbili, where there are two mills, that the mills would not purchase the cane offered by the grower and at the same time the grower was not allowed to sell the cane to a factory in Rayagada which offered to take it at a better price. The Act prevented the grower from selling the cane and a good deal of money was lost. Incidentally, the State and the consumer also lost since there was less production of sugar. Therefore, it is a

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [24th November 1952]

matter of policy also and not merely a question of penalising the factory-owner. The grower should be in a position to sell the cane to one owner or the other. The wording of the clause, as it is, enables him to dispose of his cane only for the purpose of manufacturing jaggery. If, on the other hand, the sugarcane is wanted for a better price to be utilized by another mill nearby, why should the grower be prevented from selling it to that mill?

1 p.m. "If the Government want to give real freedom to the grower to dispose of his cane, let them give him the freedom to sell it not for the particular purpose of making jaggery, but to sell it to another mill which might be prepared to pay him more. For instance, the Thumpala Mills in Visakhapatnam district might give the grower only Rs. 1-5-0 whereas the Darlapudi Co-operative Mills nearby might offer him Rs. 1-8-0. Therefore, it will be nice if the Government could give him freedom to dispose of it at the better price to the Mills near at hand."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—"The protection that is sought to be afforded to the tenants . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let the hon. Member first address the Chair and then proceed."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill seeks to afford protection to the growers of cane in areas of less than five acres. So far as my knowledge goes, there seems to be an anomaly here. In the districts of Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam, about 90 per cent of the tenants grow cane in areas less than five acres. If no compulsion is placed on the mill-owners to purchase the cane produced by these small growers, it will be a great hardship to them. The grower has been given freedom only to sell the cane for the purpose of making gur. But if the grower offers the cane to the mill and the mill refuses to take it, what is the remedy? The difficulty cropped up last year when there was a tremendous fall in the price of gur. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, to protect the interest of the grower. There should be an element of compulsion in this Bill. Whether the grower grows the cane in an area of less than five acres or in an area of five or more acres, whenever the cane is offered to the Mills, the Mills should be made to purchase the cane. Only in the case where the grower does not want to offer the cane to the Mills he should have the option to sell away in the open market. It is in that way that protection should be afforded to the grower. But, as the Bill stands, there is no compulsion on the mill-owner to purchase the cane. Therefore, I suggest that the cane-grower, whatever might be the extent of land on which the cane is grown, should first have the option to sell away to the Mill which is in the reserved area. If he is not willing to offer it to the mill for manufacture of sugar, then he should have the option to sell away as he pleases. This is a very necessary thing which the House must take into consideration before passing the Bill into law."

"Then, there is another difficulty as was pointed out by the Leader of Opposition Sri Viswanatham. There are three mills

24th November 1952] [Sri K. V. Ramesam]

in Srikakulam district, at Bobbili, Seethanagaram and Royagada. The area there has been reserved for the cultivation of sugarcane and the growers are restricted to sell cane only to particular mills. When the area is contiguous, it should be open to the grower to sell away the cane to whatever mill he likes. Therefore, that idea also should be borne in mind when we restrict the power of the grower to dispose of his cane."

* SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGIAH :—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము వారు తెచ్చిన యీ Sugar factories కు సంబంధించిన control సవరణ బిల్లులోని నాల్గవ క్లాజు చెరుకు పండించే రైతులకు అనుకూలంగా ఉండుటకును, వారి కష్టాలను తీర్చేటందుకు తెచ్చారు అసటానికి వీలులేదు. ముఖ్యంగా మా కృష్ణా జిల్లాకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఒక sugar factory ఉన్నది. ఈ factory యజమానులు యీ రైతులను అనేక యిబ్బందులు పెట్టుతున్నారు. ఈ factory యజమానులు తమకు యిష్టమవుచిన రైతులనుంచి చెరుకుకొని, యిష్టమలేని వాళ్లవద్దనుంచి కొనుక్కొంటున్నారు. అట్లు చేసినందువల్ల ఆ చెరుకు చెడిపోతుంటే కాకుండా రైతులు అనేక నష్టాలకు లోనవుతున్నారు. మా కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో క్రిందట ఎన్నికలు జరిగినప్పుడు యీ sugar factory యజమాని శ్రీ అడుసుమిల్లి గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు, తమకు ఓట్లు యివ్వలేదనే కార్యజ్ఞముతో చాలా కాలంనుండి చెరుకువేస్తున్న రైతులు యీ సంవత్సరంకూడా భూములు కాళ్లకు తీసుకొని, దున్ని పరమృతుచేసి చెరుకు నాటుటకు సిద్ధం చేసుకుంటే వాళ్లకు చెరుకు వేయటానికి permit యివ్వకుండా నష్టపెట్టి తన అనుచరులకు చెరుకు వేసుకోటానికి permits యిచ్చాడు. యీ విషయం వ్యవసాయశాఖా మంత్రిగారి దృష్టికి మమూరాండంద్వారా తెచ్చాము. కాని యీ సవరణ బిల్లు తెచ్చేటప్పుడు ఆ మమూరాండంలోని విషయాలు దృష్టిలో భ్రమకొని ఆ చెరుకు రైతుల కష్టాలు తీరడానికి సవరణలు చేలేదు. ఇట్లా ఇవ్వనందున రైతులు నష్టపడడం జరిగింది. ఈ విషయాలు ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెచ్చినను ప్రభుత్వమువారు యింతవరకు ఎలాటి చర్య తీసుకొనకపోవడము చాలా హాస్యాస్పదముగా యాస్తోంది. ఈ క్లాజును సవరించడంలో, చెరుకు పండించిన రైతులకు యజమానుల వర్తకవల్ల వచ్చిన కష్టనష్టములు తీర్చే విధంగా సవరించితే చాగుంటుందని సలహా యిస్తున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, the discussion has been more or less on the Act to which this is an amendment. The discussion has been on the principles and provisions of the permanent Act. I am afraid also, if I may be permitted to say so, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has not kept in mind the main provisions of the Act itself to which this is an amendment. According to the original Act, there is reservation and there is registration. Once the cane-grower is registered, he has the right to have his cane bought by the factory to which his cane is attached, so that the mill proprietor has no right to reject the registered cane-grower's cane. Now, the theme of the discussions has been that he should have the right to sell the cane to another mill if he likes. If he wants to do so, he has not to register himself and he takes the chance of his cane being bought or not. The existing provision is compulsory purchase by the factory-owner who has already got the growers registered in his books. That being the basic provision, now we get to an amendment,

24th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishniah]

ఇటువంటి పప్పుడు ఆ యేరియాలో పండిన సరుకును ఒక వేళ్ళ factory వారు కొనక పోలే ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆ సరుకు కొనేటందుకు హామీ యివ్వాలని అంటున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము బాధ్యత తీసుకొంటేనే, ఆ రైతు ధైర్యముగా పండించగలడు. అటువంటి బాధ్యత ప్రభుత్వము వారు తీసుకుంటారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. రైతు తెచ్చిన సరుకు factory owners కొనకుండా పడవేసిపెట్టిన కారణంచేత మురిసిపోయినను factory వారు కొనితీరకతననే నిర్బంధ సూత్రము చాలా అవసరము. ఈ విషయములూ యీ అయిదవ క్లాజును సవరించాలని ముఖ్యమంత్రిని కోరుతున్నాను. అందువల్ల యీ యిబ్బందులన్నియు యీ రైతుకు కలుగకుండా యీ అయిదవ క్లాజు సవరించ మంటే, ధరల నిర్ణయం విషయంలో ఒక పేచీ, విరియా విషయంలో పేచీ, సరకుకొనే విషయంలో పేచీ, అన్ని విధాలా యీ రైతులను పేచీలతో నష్టపరుస్తున్నారు. ఇన్ని పేచీలు రైతుల విషయంలో పెట్టుతున్నారే కాని, factory owner కు ఎలాంటి పేచీ లేకుండా ఉన్నది.

“చిన్న చిన్న రైతుల విషయంలో, అనగా అయిదు ఎకరాలు, అందుకు లోపు ఉన్న రైతులు కండించిన సదుక్తును ఆ విరియాలో వారికి యిష్టము వచ్చినవాళ్లకు అప్పుకోటానికి అవకాశం ఉండని అంటున్నారు. అట్లా ఎవరు కొనకపోతే, యీ రైతులయొక్క చెరకు అప్పుకము విషయములో ఏమి జరిగవలసో ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారిని agriculture శాఖా మంత్రిగారిని దీనికి ఏమి జరగాలు చెప్పారని అడుగుచున్నాను.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్ష, అనేక సంవత్సరాలనుండి రైతులకు రక్షణ యివ్వటానికి బడులుగా బడ్జెటాయముగా మూతమే చట్టములో ఉన్నదని నేనుగట్టిగా చెప్పుచున్నాను. లోగడ Sugar Factory ప్రకారం ఫాక్టరీ యజమానులు నడచుకోక రైతులకు చెరుకుడబ్బు వెల్లింపక నాన్ని ఉల్లంఘిస్తూ... తుంటే ఫాక్టరీ యజమానులను శిక్షించటానికి ప్రభుత్వము కట్టిస్తున్నది. కాని ఓ వైపు ఆర్థిక మాంద్యంతో కృంగిపోతూ ధరలుపడిపోయి తుకుతగినధర ప్రభుత్వము ఇవ్వక చెరుకును యితరత్రా ప్రచయించుకుంటే, రైతు శిక్షించుచున్నారు. లోగడ Defence of India Act ప్రకారం బెల్లించేసుకున్న రైతులకు తీవ్రశిక్ష విధించారు. అంతేకాని sugar factory owners ఏ విధమైన బెల్లించేసినప్పటికిని, శాసనబిల్లింగునముచేసినప్పటికి వారిమీద చర్యతీసుకోవడంలేదు. బట్టి రైతులు తాముపండించుకున్న చెరుకును తమకులోచిన పద్ధతిలో ఉపయోగించుకున్నామని హుక్కునివాస్తవీగాని, యీ విధంగా శిక్షించడము అన్యాయం. ఇది ఒక noxious clause కాబట్టి రైతుకు heavy punishment నుయిచ్చే యీ కాణ్జను ఉంచోరుతున్నాను.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అభ్యుదయ, ఇప్పుడు ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు మాట్లాడిన reserve areas ను అన్నియును ప్రత్యేకంగా తీసుకోవా లని ఆన్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు చెరుకు ఉన్నంత కాలం బాగానే ఉంటుంది. ఒక్కొక్క sugar factory, దానికి సంబంధించిన area ను ప్రత్యేకంగా తీసుకొనవలసి ఉంటుంది. ఆ విరియాకు సంబంధించిన రైతు చెరుకును తీసుకొనిపోతే, ఆ factory owner ఇష్టపడితే తీసుకొంటాడు, లేకపోతే లేదు. అటువంటప్పుడు ఆ రైతుయొక్క చెరుకుకు ఏ గతి పట్టవరక. రైతు యితరత్రా అమ్ముకొంటే శివ వేస్తామంటారు. Factory owner చూద్దామా చెరుకు కొనడు. అట్లాంటి సమయమున ఆ చెరుకు అటుఇటుకాకుండా మురిపోయి చెడిపోవుటకు అరంభమవుతుంది రైతుకు ఇదంతయు నష్టమేగదా ! అట్లుకాకుండా ఏ విరియాలో వుండించిన సరుకు ఆ విరియాలలో ఉన్న రైతులవద్ద కొని తీరవలసిందేనని నిర్బంధ సూత్రము పెట్టినట్లయితే, రైతులకు నష్టమండదు. Factory యజమానులూ నిరాకరించుటకు వీలులేదు. ఈ అయిదవ భాజకు అలాంటి సవరణ తెస్తేనే బాగుంటుందని నా యభిప్రాయము. ఒక్కొక్క factory కి ఒక్కొక్క విరియాను నిర్ణయించితేనే బాగుంటుంది. ఇప్పుడు అట్లా తరగనందున Factory owners కు లాభముగా ఉంటేనే ఆ సరుకును కొంటున్నారు. లేకపోతే, రైతు నష్టపడడము సంభవిస్తున్నది. ఉదాహరణకు, సాలూరు విరియ సంగతి చూద్దాము. ఈ విరియా వార్షికోపురిం విరియాకు దగ్గరగా ఉన్నది. సాలూరు ఫాక్టరీ యజమానులు ఆ యెరియాలలో వుండించిన చెరుకు కొనకపోతే, దగ్గరలో ఉన్న వార్షికోపురిం factory కి తీసుకొనిపోయి అమ్ముటకు వీలులేదు. ఇదికాకుండా, మరి యొక విషయము చెప్పుతున్నాను. చెరుకుకు ధర నిర్ణయించేటప్పుడు, స్పష్టముగా ఆ ధరకు ఆ రైతువద్ద కొంటే బాగానే ఉంటుంది. అట్లు చేయక ఆ నిశ్చిత ధరకు తగ్గించి అడిగితే ఆ రైతుకు గిట్టుబాటుకాక అమ్ముడు. అటువంటప్పుడు ఆ రైతు అటు ఇటుకాకుండా సరకు చెడిపోతూ నష్టమునకు అమ్ముకోవలసియింటుంది. ఇదంతయు చూస్తే రైతుకు నష్టము కలుగుతుండేకాని, factory యజమానునికే నష్టములేదు

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“ అధ్యక్షా, చెరుకు పండించేటటువంటి రైతులు ప్రభుత్వము నిర్ణయించినటువంటి మిల్లియన్ యజమానులకు తమ చెరుకును ఖచ్చితంగా అమ్మాలని నిర్ణయించినప్పుడు, ఈ నిర్ణయాన్ని రైతులగునక డిల్లీంఫించినట్లయితే 2 వేల రూపాయల జరిమానాగాని లేక 6 నెలల శిక్షగాని విధిస్తారని ఈ క్లాజు చెప్పుతుంది. కాగానే ఉంది! ఇదేమిదీరి ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు తప్పునిసరిగా, వారికి వట్టు జేప్పినటువంటి రైతుల చెరుకును కొనవలసినటువంటి నిర్బంధన ఉన్నదా, వారు అవిధంగా కొనకుండా నిర్లక్ష్యంచేసినప్పుడు, రైతులకువ రనే ఈ మిల్లియన్ యజమానులకుమాడ తగినటువంటి శిక్ష విధించబడుచున్నదా అని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా రైతులు కక్షపడి పండించి చెరుకును తీరా ఫ్యాక్టరీలవద్దకు తీసుకొనివెళ్లినప్పుడు, ఆ ఫ్యాక్టరీ

[Sri K. Subba Reddi] [24th November 1952]

యజమానుల దానిని కొనకుండా వదలివేయడమే, లేక నిర్ణీత ధరలకంటే తక్కువ ధరలకు కొనుటకు ప్రయత్నించడమే జరుగుతుంది. కనుక మిల్లు యజమానులు రైతులపద్దతుండి చెరుకును నిర్ణయించిన ధరలకు తప్పనిసరిగా కొనవలసి నేటటువంటి నిర్బంధన ఈ బిల్లులో చెప్పబడిందా? వారు ఈ నిర్బంధనను ఉల్లంఘించినట్లయితే వారికి ఇంత శిక్ష అనిగాని జరిమానా అనిగాని ఉన్నదా! అటువంటి దేదీపేదని నేను అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నాను. కేవలము మిల్లు యజమాన్లుకు లాభముకలుగజేసేదిగా వారికి ఒక వకాల్తారుపములూ విర్వాటుచేయబడినటువంటి పద్ధతిగాయన్నది. నిజంగా రైతుకు రక్షణఇవ్వాలనుకొంటే, అతడు పండించేటటువంటిదానిని తన ఇష్టము వచ్చినట్లు అమ్ముకొనేటటువంటి స్వేచ్ఛలొందాలి. అట్లుగాకపోయినా, కనీసము ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు తప్పనిసరిగా వారికి నిర్ణయించిన రైతులపద్దతుండి చెరుకును నిర్ణీత ధరలకు నిర్బంధంగా కొనేటటువంటి అవకాశాన్ని అయినా కల్పించాలి. ఫ్యాక్టరీ యజమానులు ఈ విధంగాచేయక దీనిని ఉల్లంఘించినప్పుడు, ప్రభుత్వము తగినచర్య తీసుకొని రైతులకు రక్షణఇవ్వవలసియుంతుంది. అవిధంగా చేస్తేనేతప్ప రైతాంగము చాగుపడదు. కనుక అలాంటి సవరణచేయవలసిన నేనుకోరుతున్నాను. ”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clause is only a consequential Clause. After the House had accepted the previous Clauses, it becomes necessary to amend section 13. Besides the House has also accepted section 11 (a). I therefore suggest that the present Clause may be accepted.”

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the preamble were then separately put and carried.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ I now move—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think that it is the consensus of opinion that we need not have the evening sitting to-day. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. to-morrow.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Tuesday, 25th November 1952.

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. G.O. No. 3602, P.W. (Electricity), dated 27th August 1952—Acquisition of Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking—Absorption of staff into Government service.

2. “ New Deal for Tanjore Ryots ”—Pamphlet issued by Information and Publicity Department.

3. Balance-sheet of the Madras Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited, as at 30th June 1952.

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 119 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 456 supra.]

G.O. No. 1160, Public (General-B), dated 11th May 1948.

[Service Associations—Recognition by Government—Revised instructions—Issued.]

In supersession of the orders issued in the Government Order read above, the Government of Madras hereby issue revised instructions regarding the recognition of associations of Government employees other than industrial employees. The instructions are annexed to this order and will come into force immediately.

ANNEXURE.

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE RECOGNITION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS OF ASSOCIATIONS OF THEIR EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN ASSOCIATIONS OF INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES.

Definition.—In these instructions, “ Government ” means the Government of Madras.

Part (A)—Associations of Government employees serving in the departments of Government other than those in the Police and Jail departments.—(1) Government are prepared to accord official recognition to associations of their employees which comply with the conditions set out below.

(2) The association must ordinarily consist of a distinct class of Government employees.

(3) Every Government employee of the same class must be eligible for membership of the associations.

(4) Persons who are not in the active service of Government shall not be office-bearers of the association.

(5) Representations from such associations whether made orally, by deputation or presented in writing, may be received by Government officers notwithstanding anything contained in the rules relating to the submission of petitions and memorials by Government servants:

Provided that—

(a) no representations or deputations will be received except in connexion with a matter which is, or raises questions which are, of common interest to the class represented by the association; and

(b) nothing in these instructions affects the discretion of the Governor, the head of a department or any other officer of Government to receive or not to receive a deputation from any association.

(6) Recognition is accorded for the purpose of enabling the employees of Government to communicate their needs and grievances to Government or to Government officers and it may be withdrawn by Government if the members adopt other methods of ventilating those needs and grievances.

NOTE.—For the purpose of this instruction, other methods shall include seditious propaganda, expression of disloyal sentiments, publication in the press, engaging or inviting the assistance of political and other parties for the representation of grievances, and threat of strike.

[24th November 1952]

(7) Government may require the regular submission for their information of copies for the rules of the association and the annual statement of its accounts and of lists of its members.

(8) Government may specify the channel through which representations from the association shall be submitted and authority by whom deputations may be received.

(9) The association shall not seek the assistance of any political party or organization to represent the grievances of its members.

(10) The association shall not, without the previous sanction of the Government, permit its proceedings to be open to the press.

(11) The association shall have the following rule incorporated among its rules:—

“ A strike or the threat of a strike against the Government shall never be used as a means of achieving any of the purposes of the association.”

Part (B)—Associations of employees in the Police and Jail departments.—The instructions in Part (A) shall be applicable to associations of employees in the Police and Jail departments with the following modifications:—

Instruction 2.—To this instruction the following sentence shall be added at the end, namely:—

“ The association shall also consist of such distinct rank or ranks of employees as Government may prescribe, provided that Government may accord recognition to particular associations of specified ranks of employees in the Police department of which specified ranks of employees in the Excise department are also members.”

Instruction 5.—For proviso (a) to this instruction, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“ (a) No representation or deputation will be received on questions of discipline or of promotion affecting individuals; but representations or deputations may be received in connexion with any other matter which is, or raises questions which are, of common interest to the class represented by the association.”

Instruction 7.—To this instruction, the following sentence shall be added at the end, namely:—

“ No rule of the association shall be valid until it has received the approval of Government and Government may from time to time require the modification of a rule or proposed rule in a particular manner.”

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 18 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 465 supra.]

Investigation of hydro-electric sites in the State of Madras.

A systematic and scientific study of all water basins in the State is being made by the Government Electricity Department from maps and available records and possible hydro-electric

[24th November 1952]

schemes are noted down for their hydro-electric values. The hydro-dynamic value of a basin so worked out from maps and available records will have to be checked with actual rainfall and run off observations over a number of years, say about 20 years. This is expected to cost about Rs. 25 lakhs. A programme spread over a period of 10 years is contemplated. The first Five-year Programme will cover the most important river basins, the development of which will be more promising. An estimate for Rs. 12.5 lakhs for the first part of the above programme of hydro-metric surveys covering a period of 5 years has since been sanctioned by the Government. From a study of hydro-metric observations so obtained, basins likely to yield the best and most economical hydro-electric schemes are chosen for detailed investigation. Only after the detailed investigations are completed, project reports are prepared and sent up to Government for sanction.

2. Out of the four rivers mentioned in clause (a) of the question, Gundlakamma is included in the second Five-year Programme of hydro-metric surveys while in respect of the other three, viz., Manneru, Kalangi and Swarnamukhi, preliminary study has indicated that the hydro-electric possibilities are poor. The quantities of water available in these rivers are not appreciable. Except Kundah river which is a tributary of Bhavani (item No. 2 on page 18 of the Administration Report for 1949-50), none of the other schemes have been investigated.

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 20 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 466 supra.]

*Statement I.**Distribution of free milk during 1951-52.*

Serial number.	Name of place.	Number of Maternity and Child Welfare Centres.	Milk supplied to		
			Expectant mothers.	Nursing mothers.	Children.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
DISTRICTS.					
1	Tiruchirappalli	11	9 (both i.e., expectant and nursing mothers).	..	71
2	Anantapur	3	4	4	70
3	Ramanathapuram	1	..	..	15
	Total	15	13	4	156

[24th November 1952]

Serial number. (1)	Name of place. (2)	Number of Maternity and Child- Welfare Centres. (3)	Milk supplied to		
			Expectant mothers. (4)	Nursing mothers. (5)	Children. (6)
MUNICIPALITIES.					
1	Kumbakonam	2	..	..	60
2	Kancheepuram	3	..	..	120
3	Chittoor	..	8 (both)	..	252
4	Ootacamund	2	4	..	58
5	Gudivada	1	..	..	20
6	Udamalpet	1	16	28	28
7	Tuticorin	4	..	..	120
8	Villupuram	1 (plus) 1 (home)	12	5	30
9	Hindupur	1	9	5	50
10	Palni	1	63 (both)	..	100
11	Rajahmundry	1	..	..	30
12	Coonoor	1 (oreche)	..	..	20
13	Tanjore	3	12 (both)	..	10
14	Vellore	2	..	..	136
15	Kozhikode	4	100	100	60
16	Tiruvavur	2	..	..	30
17	Rajapalayam	5	..	..	300
18	Palacole	1	14 (both)	..	244
19	Tiruppur	..	..	..	..
20	Tirunelveli	6	..	..	25
21	Cannanore	2	..	..	1
22	Nellore	1	4	..	42
23	Palayamkottai	2	81 (both)	..	92
24	Cuddapah	1	9	6	56
25	Dindigul	3	8	20	192
26	Chidambaram	..	..	13	..
27	Tellicherry	2	80 (both)	..	130
28	Palghat	1	..	..	19
29	Chingleput	1	..	..	20
30	Periyakulam	1	9	60	80
31	Vizianagaram	..	..	..	550 (in all)
32	Masulipatnam	3	..	..	87
33	Kakinada	2	..	..	59
34	Tiruchirappalli	2	..	..	70
35	Karur	1	..	..	80
36	Aruppukkottai	1	8	8	34
37	Gobichettipalayam	1	..	..	32
38	Tindivanam	2	..	..	100
39	Anantapur	2	3	9	40
Total ..		70	440	254	3,377
Grand total ..		85	453	258	3,533

[24th November 1952]

Statement II.

[Vide answer to clause (b) of the question.]

Number of maternity and child-welfare centres in famished areas of the State.

Serial number.	Name of the district.	As on 1st April 1952.	As on 1st September 1952.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Salem	22	22
2	Anantapur	8	8
3	Kurnool	4	4
4	Bellary	5	5
5	Coimbatore	13	14
6	Chittoor	21	22
7	North Arcot	13	13
8	Cuddapah	7	7
		93	95

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 21 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Thermal Station at Nellore.

(a) 2nd October 1950.

(b) About 30,000 units per day.

(c) Average number of units per day supplied to all consumers—5,300.

Average number of units per day supplied to agricultural consumers—20.

(d) I. Rates charged for consumers for lights in Nellore town and Kovur Panchayats areas—

For all lighting and fan purposes the rates are as under subject to a monthly minimum of Rs. 1-8-0 per single phase and Rs. 5 for three-phase services :—

	Per unit.
	AS.
For the first 100 units consumed per mensem.	6
For the rest up to 2,000 units per mensem ..	4
For all above 2,000 units per mensem ..	3

A war costs surcharge of 40 per cent is levied on the above rates.

[24th November 1952]

II. Rate charged for consumers for lights in Gudur town—

	Per unit.
	AS.
(1) Lighting	5
(2) Combined installations of lights and not less than 80 watts in permanently connected ceiling fans utilized per service.	4

Minimum Rs. 2 per month per service.

The above rate is subject to a war costs surcharge of 20 per cent.

APPENDIX V.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 22 asked by Sri D Krishnamurty Gounder at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Statement showing the monthly pay, etc., drawn by each of the Ministers.

Name and designation.	Pay.	Conve- yance allow- ance.	House-rent allowance (where free quarters have not been provided).
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	RS.	RS.	RS.
1 Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Chief Minister.	1,000	250	250
2 Sri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao, Minister for Rural Welfare.	1,000	250	250
3 Raja Sri Shanmugha Rajeswara Sethu- pathi, Minister for Accommodation and Sports.	1,000	250	250
4 Sri N. Sankara Reddi, Minister for Local Administration.	1,000	250	250
5 Sri K. Venkataswami Naidu, Minister for Religious Endowments and Registration.	1,000	250	250
6 Sri D. Sanjivayya, Minister for Co-operation.	1,000	250	250
7 Sri C. Subramaniam, Minister for Finance and Food.	1,000	250	250
8 Dr. U. Krishna Rao, Minister for Industries and Labour.	1,000	250	250
9 Sri A. B. Shetty, Minister for Health.	1,000	250	Provided with free quarters.
10 Sri N. Ranga Reddi, Minister for Public Works.	1,000	250	Do.
11 Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker, Minister for Land Revenue.	1,000	250	Do.
12 Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder, Minister for Prohibition.	1,000	250	Do.
13 Sri R. Nagan Gouda, Minister for Agriculture.	1,000	250	Do.
14 Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao, Minister for Education.	1,000	250	Do.
15 Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, Minister for Law.	1,000	250	Do.

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX VI.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 23 asked by Sri G. Latchanna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 467 supra.]

Particulars of estates taken over under Act XXVI of 1948.

District.	Date on which taken over.	Zamin estates.	Under-tenure estates.	Inam estates.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Srikakulam	7th September 1949	28	..	..
	7th September 1950	1	..	..
	12th January 1951	137	6	..
	20th January 1951	..	38	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	90
	22nd January 1951	..	..	30
	6th May 1952	1	1	..
	21st May 1952	..	1	..
	2nd July 1952	..	..	34
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	6	..	2
		173	46	156
Visakhapatnam	7th September 1949	3	..	..
	7th September 1950	2	..	..
	12th January 1951	30	..	..
	20th January 1951	..	36	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	26
	22nd November 1951	..	..	2
	2nd July 1952	..	..	21
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	1	..	..
		36	36	49
East Godavari	7th September 1949	8	..	..
	7th September 1950	72	..	..
	3rd January 1951	1	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	7
	2nd July 1952	..	..	11
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	6	..	..
		87	..	18

[24th November 1952]

District.	Date on which taken over.	Zamin estates.	Under-tenure estates.	Inam estates.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
West Godavari	7th September 1949	7	3	..
	7th September 1950	119	48	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	57
	2nd July 1952	..	..	10
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	5	2	..
		<u>131</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>67</u>
Krishna	7th September 1949	18	5	..
	7th September 1950	105	45	..
	3rd January 1951	2	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	51
	2nd July 1952	..	..	8
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	11	11	..
		<u>136</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>
Guntur	3rd January 1951	..	14	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	27
	2nd July 1952	..	..	3
		..	<u>14</u>	<u>30</u>
Nellore	7th September 1949	1	179	..
	7th September 1950	70	54	..
	3rd January 1951	..	11	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	143
	2nd July 1952	..	..	8
	Since taken over	..	13	..
		<u>71</u>	<u>257</u>	<u>151</u>
Chittoor	7th September 1949	6	..	..
	7th September 1950	204	42	..
	3rd January 1951	34	2	..
	1st July 1951	..	1	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	181
	3rd October 1951	2	..	..
	2nd July 1952	..	..	12
	16th July 1952	..	26	..
	Since taken over	11	..	..
		<u>257</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>193</u>
Hallary	1st October 1951	..	..	60

24th November 1952]

District.	Date on which taken over.	Zamin estates.	Under-tenure estates.	Inam estates.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kurnool	1st October 1951	..	..	52
Cuddapah	1st October 1951	..	..	120
	2nd July 1952	..	..	2
		..	..	<u>122</u>
Anantapur	1st October 1951	..	..	77
	2nd July 1952	..	..	2
		..	..	<u>79</u>
Madras	3rd January 1951	5	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	2
		<u>5</u>	..	<u>2</u>
Chingleput	3rd January 1951	268	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	202
	22nd November 1951	..	..	1
	11th March 1952	..	22	..
	2nd July 1952	..	..	1
	Since taken over	64	..	10
		<u>332</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>214</u>
North Arcot	3rd January 1951	56	45	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	35
	20th February 1952	..	4	..
	Since taken over	7	..	..
		<u>63</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>35</u>
South Arcot	3rd January 1951	4	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	39
		<u>4</u>	..	<u>39</u>
Salem	12th January 1951	275	96	..
	31st January 1951	..	28	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	18
	22nd November 1951	..	..	30
	30th January 1952	..	5	..
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders	4	..	..
		<u>279</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>48</u>

[24th November 1952]

District.	Date on which taken over.	Zamin estates.	Under-tenure estates.	Inam estates.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madurai	3rd January 1951	20	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	185
	2nd July 1952	..	..	2
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	3	..	..
		23	..	187
Ramanathapuram ..	7th September 1949	10	736	..
	7th September 1950	22	..	..
	3rd January 1951	5	59	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	1,098
	22nd November 1951	..	..	8
	2nd July 1952	..	..	92
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	..	2	25
		37	797	1,223
Tirunelveli	3rd January 1951	62	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	62
	22nd November 1951	..	..	19
	2nd July 1952	..	..	9
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	3	..	..
Coimbatore	3rd January 1951	7	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	9
		7	..	9
Tiruchirappalli ..	3rd January 1951	52	..	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	84
		52	..	84
Tanjore	3rd January 1951	93	9	..
	1st October 1951	..	..	390
	22nd November 1951	..	..	1
	2nd July 1952	..	..	22
	Originally covered by stay orders and subsequently taken over after vacation of the stay orders ..	1	..	9
		94	9	423
	Grand total	1,852	1,539	2,359

24th November 1952]

APPENDIX VII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 24 asked by Sri G. Latchanna at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 468 supra.]

Statement showing the names of villages which are affected by virtue of recent judicial decisions.

- By not being grant of whole inam village—
 - (1) Rajannapeta (Visakhapatnam).
 - (2) Kukalametta Lakshapattanam (Visakhapatnam).
 - (3) Arakkottai (Ramanathapuram).
 - (4) Athankottangudi (Ramanathapuram).
 - (5) Janardhana Rangarapuram (Srikulam).
 - (6) Melaseendanandal (Ramanathapuram).
 - (7) Malliboyanapalli (Krishna).
 - (8) Gopalapatnam (Visakhapatnam).
 - (9) Kallivayal (Ramanathapuram).
 - (10) Malkapuram (Guntur).
 - (11) Parisaiveduthan (Ramanathapuram).
 - (12) Chinnaierukapadu (Krishna).
- By being a grant of only a hamlet or kandriga—
 - (13) Siruvilathiendal (Ramanathapuram).
 - (14) Kothandaramapuram (Nellore).
 - (15) Idulaguntapalem (West Godavari).
- By reason of more grants than one—
 - (16) Soodiyur (Ramanathapuram).
 - (17) Perunthurai (Ramanathapuram).
- By reason of being carved out of an original village—
 - (18) Ulavapala (Nellore).

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 32 asked by Sri P. Rangasami Reddiar at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1952, page 471 supra.]

Statement showing the list of new permits granted for stage carriages in Tiruchirappalli district for the period 1947—52.

Route.	To whom granted.	Number of permits.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1947.		
No new permits were issued during the year.		
1948.		
Tiruchirappalli to Tanjore	Sri R. Krishnaswami Reddiar.	4
.. ..	Sri Chidambara Reddiar ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Thuraiyur	Sri R. Krishnaswami Reddiar.	2
1949.		
Ariyakur to Thirumanur	P. R. Srinivasa Reddiar ..	1
Ariyakur to Lubbaikudikadu via Perambalur.	A. Somasundara Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur	National Motor Service ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Erakudi via Thuraiyur ..	Charity Aids Bus Service ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mettupalayam via Musiri ..	Sadaya Pillai	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur.	Messrs. Charity Aids ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mohanur via Namakkal ..	B. S. Guruswami Pillai ..	1

[24th November 1952]

Route.	To whom granted.	Number of permits.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1949—cont.		
Thuraiyur to Thammampatty ..	R. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Perambalur to Namakkal via Thuraiyur ..	S. Natesa Udayar ..	1
Pallepatti to Thavuttupalayam via Karur ..	Karur Trichy Transports, Karur.	1
Karur to Dharapuram ..	P. Manickavasagam ..	1
Karur to Pallepatti via Dindigul ..	Star Transports ..	1
Karur to Palani ..	Do. ..	1
Erode to Pallepatti via Vellakoil ..	S. Natesan, Koodalur ..	1
Ariyalur to Musiri via Perambalur and Thuraiyur.	J. G. Dorairaj, Musiri ..	1
Perambalur to Attur ..	S. Natesa Udayar ..	1
Perambalur to Kattuputhur via Thuraiyur and Musiri.	P. R. Srinivasa Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam ..	A. Somasundara Reddiar ..	1
Thuraiyur to Mohanur via Musiri ..	R. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Mettupalayam to Ariyalur ..	S. M. Sadaya Pillai ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Musiri ..	J. G. Dorairaj, Musiri ..	1
Karur to Vallakoil ..	S. Natesan ..	1
Karur to Paramathi ..	P. Manickavasagam ..	1
Tiruvanaikoil to Tiruchirappalli Junction via guard Gate and Palakkarai.	Nadar Transports ..	2
Mainguard Gate to Court via Tennur ..	M. S. N. Shanmugam Pillai.	1
Mainguard Gate to Court via Woraiyur ..	A. S. M. Kandaswamy ..	1
Mainguard Gate to Crawford Colony via Route.	Southern Roadways ..	2
Mainguard to Jail corner via Roundtana.	M. S. N. Sivashanmugam ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Tanjore ..	Southern Roadways ..	2
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram ..	B. S. Guruswami Pillai ..	1
Perambalur to Arumbavoor ..	Charity Aids ..	1
Mainguard Gate to Somarasampettai ..	A. Somasundaram Reddiar ..	1
	Nadar Transport ..	1
1950.		
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur ..	Charity Aids ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Mohanur via Namakkal ..	B. S. Guruswami Pillai ..	1
Perambalur to Namakkal via Thuraiyur ..	Natesa Udayar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur.	Charity Aids ..	1
Ariyalur to Lubbaikudikadu via Perambalur to Tirumandurai.	P. S. Srinivasa Reddiar ..	1
Pudukkottai to Pattukkottai via Alangudi, Melaiyur and Thiruvonam.	A. S. S. Y. S. Nachiappa Chettiar.	1
	R. Natesan Pillai.	
Karur to Paramathi ..	P. Manickavasagam ..	1
Ariyalur to Musiri via Perambalur and Thuraiyur.	J. G. Dorairaj ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Thirumalavadi via Lalgudi and Pallambadi.	V. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Perambalur ..	Charity Aids ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Pandamangalam via Kattuputhur and Melur.	S. M. Sadaya Pillai ..	1
Ariyalur to Lubbaikudikadu via Perambalur ..	R. Rama Reddiar ..	1

24th November 1952]

Route.	To whom granted.	Number of permits.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1950—cont.		
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram ..	National Motor Service ..	1
	R. Venugopala Reddiar ..	1
Ariyalur to Lower Anaicut via Jayakondam ..	P. Natesa Chettiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam ..	M. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Musiri ..	S. M. Sadaya Pillai ..	1
Perambalur to Arumbavoor ..	T. N. Mooka Pillai ..	1
Musiri to Kattuputhur ..	R. Venugopal Reddiar ..	1
Ariyalur to Lower Anaicut via Jayakondam ..	S. Natesa Udayar ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Lubbaikudikadu via Perambalur and Tirumandurai.	V. Muthunallappa Reddiar, Tiruchirappalli.	1
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Tiruvanaikoil via Palakkarai and Mainguard Gate.	Messrs. Nadar Transports ..	3
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Court via Woraiyur.	Messrs. T.S.T. Co. ..	3
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Court via Tennur.	Messrs. T.S.T. Co. ..	1
	M. S. N. Shanmugam Pillai.	1
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Tiruverambur, via Butterworth road and Eastern Boulevard road.	Southern Roadways ..	2
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Somarasampettai via Tennur.	Nadar Transport ..	2
Tiruchirappalli Mainguard Gate to Mannachanallur ..	Southern Roadways ..	1
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Mannachanallur ..	Southern Roadways ..	1
1951.		
Karur to Chinnadarapuram ..	Star Transports ..	1
Pudukkottai to Oliyamangalam ..	M. Palaniyandi Velar ..	1
Vendampatti to Karambakudi ..	S. Muthuswami Naidu ..	1
Karur to Oddanchatram ..	Manickavasagam ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Chettikulam via Samayapuram.	V. Krishnaswami Reddiar ..	1
Pudukkottai to Karambakudi via Melayur ..	Srimathi V. Alamelu Ammal.	1
Pudukkottai to Karambakudi via Vattam Viduthu.	L. Narayanan ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Attur via Perambalur and Krishnapuram.	R. Rama Reddiar ..	1
	A. Doraiswami Reddiar ..	1
Jayakondam to Lower Anaicut ..	M. S. Ganesan and R. Krishnaswami.	1
Pudukkottai to Mangadu via Alangudi and Vadakkadi.	T. A. S. Thangavelu ..	1
1952.		
Tiruchirappalli Junction to Sembattur ..	Southern Roadways ..	2
Karur to Thavuttupalayam ..	Messrs. Star Transports ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Samayapuram ..	R. Chinnaiiah Naidu ..	1
Perambalur to Thuraiyur ..	Messrs. National Motor Service.	1
Musiri to Mettupalayam ..	J. G. Dorairaj ..	1
Mettupalayam to Thuraiyur ..	S. M. Sadaya Pillai ..	1
Sendurai to Madanathur via Jayakondam ..	Srimathi Periammal ..	1
Tiruchirappalli to Thiruvellarai ..	Tiruchi Co-operative Motor Transport Society for Ex-Service men.	1

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 25th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Running of Transport and Electricity services by local bodies.

* 124^a Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the Government have received any request from any local body for permission to undertake such services as bus transport or distribution of electricity and the action taken by the Government on such requests?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“ Some local bodies applied for permission to undertake bus services, but the permission was refused, as it was considered doubtful whether local bodies could successfully compete with private bus operators, unless they were enabled to run bus services on monopolistic basis. Application for permission to undertake distribution of electricity has been received by the Government from Erode and Palghat Municipal Councils. But in view of the policy of Government to nationalize the entire generation and distribution of electrical energy in the State, the request of the councils could not be complied with.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—“ Will the Government as a first step towards nationalization encourage local bodies to undertake public utility services such as electricity and bus transport? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“ Electricity is being nationalized; but regarding monopoly of running buses in municipal towns, I beg to state that the matter is under consideration and the question is being examined by the Government.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ మునిసిపాలిటీలు తమ వాణ్యత మీద బస్సు సర్వీసు నడిపిస్తామని మంత్రిగారికి ఆర్డీలు పెట్టగానప్పటికీ, వాణ్యత అంతా మునిసిపాలిటీలకే ఛరించేందుకు సిద్ధంగా ఉన్నామా? ప్రభుత్వము అందుకు ఎందుకు అడ్డంబడిందో, తెలియజేస్తారా? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“ For giving any monopoly in a particular area, an amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act of 1939 is necessary. We are examining the matter, Sir.”

^a Postponed from the list of questions for 24th November 1952.

[25th November 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Motor Vehicles Act ను amend చేయడానికి ఎక్కువ time పట్టదు. ఇంత చిన్న amendment ను త్వరగా తీసుకు రావచ్చునని మంత్రులకి తెలుసును. అలాంటప్పుడు ఇంత time వరకు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విషయాన్ని ఎందుకు suspense లో పెడుతుందో తెలియజేసారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ We thought of considering the proposal after the election to the municipal councils were over. Now that the elections are over, the Government are considering the matter.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Will the Government consider favourably the proposal of the Corporation of Madras to run the tramway services in Madras City after the expiry of the present contract? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—“ Will the Government grant monopoly to local bodies to undertake electricity supply and bus transport in their localities, now that the Constitution has itself been amended to facilitate such a procedure? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ Regarding granting of monopoly to run bus services in municipalities, I have already answered. At present Government are nationalizing electricity gradually all over the State. As such we cannot comply with the request of the local bodies for monopoly to undertake distribution of electric power.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I pass on to question No. 126.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—“ I want to know what has happened to my question No. 125? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member did not give me notice of his intention to have his question answered to-day.”

Local Fund Dispensary, Hosdrug.

* 126* Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to take over the Hosdrug Local Fund Dispensary in South Kanara district under Government control and convert it into a hospital; and

(b) if so, when the same will be done?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ (a) & (b) The answer is in the negative.”

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ In view of the fact that Hosdrug taluk is a sufficiently big one with a large population, will the Government consider the desirability of converting the Local Fund Dispensary into a hospital? ”

* Postponed from the list of questions for 24th November 1952.

[25th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ Government will consider the inclusion of this Local Fund Dispensary into the list of approved institutions.”

Hostel for Law College students.

* 128* Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the number of students now studying in the Law College, Madras;

(b) whether there is any hostel for those students; and

(c) if not, whether there is any proposal to construct one for those students?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) 1,260. F.L. course, 751 men and 13 women; B.L. course, 464 men and 7 women, and M.L. course, 24 men and 1 woman.

“ (b) There is no Government Hostel for the Law College students.

“ (c) Yes. There is a proposal under consideration.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Law College నుంచి ప్రభుత్వమునకు ప్రతి సంవత్సరము ఖచ్చితంగా లక్ష పెచ్చెల రూపాయల వరకు ఆదాయము వస్తున్నది. అలాంటప్పుడు విద్యార్థులంతా హాస్టలు కావాలని ఆందోళన చేస్తున్నప్పటికీ ప్రభుత్వము ఎందువల్ల ఇంతవరకు వారికి హాస్టలు నిర్మించలేదు. అదీకా ఒక permanent హాస్టలు నిర్మించేలోపల ప్రభుత్వము వీరైన buildings తీసుకొని వాటిని విద్యార్థులకివ్వడానికి ఆలోచిస్తుందా ? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ About 300 students are residing with their parents and relatives in the City. The others are residing in the University Students Club, Victoria Hostel, Triplicane, Venkateswara Hostel, Triplicane and several boarding and lodging houses in the City. There is at present no separate permanent hostel for the students of the Law College, Madras. The Government are on the look out for a suitable premises to serve as a hostel for the students as a temporary measure. The Government are also considering a proposal to construct a permanent hostel for the students.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I ask the Hon. Minister for Education whether he is aware of the fact that the income from the Law College in Madras during 1950-51 was Rs. 63,000, during 1951-52 Rs. 96,000 and during 1952-53 it had been estimated to come to nearly a lakh of rupees? In view of the increase in income will the Government expedite the construction of the hostel immediately? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Government are aware of the fact that they are getting some extra income from the Law College and therefore, Sir, we are anxiously considering the proposal to construct a hostel for the students.”

[25th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ మంత్రిగారు Law College లో మొత్తము 1,260 మంది విద్యార్థులు వదువుకొంటున్నారని, B.L. కరగతిలోనే 464 మంది ఉన్నారని చెప్పారు. వీరిలో ఎంతమందికి ఇప్పుడు హాస్టల్ accommodation ఉన్నది? ఎంత మంది accommodation కోరారు? గవర్నమెంటు హాస్టల్లు ఒకటి construct చేస్తామని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అది ఎప్పటికి పూర్తి అవుతుందో తెలివిస్తారా? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I require notice to give the exact figures, Sir.”

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—“ May I know whether it is a fact that a building in Pantheon Road was recently selected to serve as a temporary hostel for Law College Students and if the answer is in the affirmative, what has happened subsequently? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The attention of the Government was drawn to a building in Pantheon Road. It was also considered to locate the Central Library or the Law College Hostel in the building but unfortunately the Public Works Department found the building unfit for occupation.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ What is the criterion for the Government to come to a decision? Is it the needs of the students, furtherance of education or is it the income from the institution? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The needs of the students and of course the availability of sufficient finance in the hands of Government.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ప్రభుత్వము ప్రతి రోజు ఇచ్చేటటువంటి సమాధానాలలో ‘దీన్ని consider చేస్తాము’ అనే టుటువంటి జవాబులే చాలా ఇస్తున్నారు. కనుక యీ విషయములో విద్యార్థులూ మంత్రిగారు, ఈ సంవత్సరము రోయి, వచ్చే సంవత్సరం ఆరంభంలోపలైనా ఆ విద్యార్థులకు హాస్టల్ కు ఉపయోగపడేటటువంటి buildings ఏదైనా నిర్మిస్తారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I cannot give a promise about a permanent building which may be finished or not finished this year. But the Government would certainly provide the students with a hostel before the next academic year or as early as possible.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ How long was this proposal under the consideration of Government, Sir? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ As far as I know personally, this proposal had been pending for the last three months ever since it was brought to my notice.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I represent to the Hon. Minister that this proposal to construct a hostel for Law College students had been pending for the last 22 years? ”

[25th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ If the hon. Member means that the Law College had no hostel of its own all these years he can draw his own conclusion. That is all the more reason why we are anxious to provide a hostel now, Sir.”

Repairs to Nippatipadu tank, Ongole taluk.

* 129 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether it is a fact that although estimates have been finalized for repairs of Nippatipadu tank in Ongole taluk of Guntur district, yet the Government are going to stop the work?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The estimate for the work is ready for sanction, but the work has not been sanctioned and taken up consequent on the decision of the Government not to take up new irrigation works under the Intensive Cultivation Campaign during the current year. The work will be considered for sanction and execution if the loan of Rs. 1 crore for minor irrigation works is sanctioned by the Government of India, or as an ordinary scheme in due course.”

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI :—“ ఈ పనికి ఎంత ఖర్చు అవుతుందని ఎస్టిమేటు చేశారు? అసలు ఇది చాలా కష్టప్రాంతంగా ఉన్నది. దీన్ని గురించి ఎస్ట్ డిప్యూటీషన్లు కూడా గవర్నమెంటుకు వచ్చాయి. కనుక వెంటనే ఆ పని చేయడానికి పూనుకొంటారా? అసలు దీనికి ఎంత ఎస్టిమేటు చేశారు? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, there are schemes ready for execution but they have not been implemented because we have no money and we are expecting it from the Government of India.”

SRI G. C. KONDIAH :—“ లోకం ఈ చెరువును ఎన్ని సంవత్సరాల క్రిందట వాగుచేశారు? దీనిని వాగుచేసియుంటే, దానికి ఎంత డబ్బు ఖర్చు అయినది? ఇప్పుడు ఆ చెరువు ఏస్థితిలో ఉన్నది? వాడ్యతగల ఉద్యోగులు దానికి చూస్తున్నారా లేదా అనే విషయాలగురించి మంత్రిగారు సమాధానము చెబుతారా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I do not know to which ‘cheruvu’ the hon. Member is referring.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, the Hon. Minister stated that the Government are expecting money. Is it a windfall they are expecting or do they expect help from any other source? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ We expect a loan from the Government of India, Sir.”

[25th November 1952]

Separation of the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association of the Telugu districts from the State Association.

* 130 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Non-Gazetted Officers of the Telugu districts represented to the Government to separate their Non-Gazetted Officers' Association from the present State Association; and

(b) if so, what action the Government took on it?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) & (b) In 1950, the Andhra Non-Gazetted Officers' Association (Central), Eluru, applied to the Government for the recognition of the Association. The Government considered it undesirable to have different Associations for the same class of Government servants under the same Government and with the same objects in view.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO:—“ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్ లోని ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగి అసోసియేషన్ నుండి విడిపోయే అంశంపై ప్రభుత్వం ఏమి చర్యలు తీసుకుంది?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I require notice, Sir.”

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI:—“నా ప్రశ్నకుడా అదేసంది, అందుకే దాన్ని మరల వేయడమవసరంలేదు.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I have stated my objection in my primary answer.”

Extent of wet areas in the ryotwari tracts.

* 131 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the area of wet land actually cultivated with wet crops in ryotwari areas in the State has been going down as from 1946-47 and if so, by how much and if increasing, by how much;

(b) whether proportionately the amount of Land Revenue collected on account of supply of irrigation water for regular first-crop, has been decreasing and if so, by how much and if increasing, by how much; and

(c) whether the Government have ascertained the reasons that have led to a decline of receipts on account of supply of water by irrigation and if so, what they are?

[25th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) The wet areas in the ryotwari tracts in the State in the years 1946-47 to 1950-51 are as follows:—

					AOS.
1946-47	..	..	..	..	5,307,262
1947-48	..	..	..	..	5,301,516
1948-49	..	..	..	..	5,421,092
1949-50	..	..	..	..	5,417,703
1950-51	..	..	..	..	5,425,954

The wet area in 1950-51 exceeds by 2 per cent over that in 1946-47.

“(b) No separate charge for water is levied for irrigating first crop in wet lands but the assessment levied includes the charge for supply of water and hence it cannot be determined whether revenue on account of supply of water on this account is increasing or decreasing.

“(c) Does not arise in view of the answer to clause (b).”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ప్రభుత్వానికి ఏ మాత్రం సంబంధములే 10-50 నటువంటి కొన్ని జలాధారాలు, అనగా, చెరువులు లేక ప్రాథమిక యొక్క మరమ్మతుల విషయములో కూడా ఈ water-rates ను వేస్తున్నారనేటటువంటి విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా? ప్రజలే ప్రతిరోజు మాడుగుంటల నేపు కష్టపడి కాలువలు త్రవ్వినా పాడుదల పొకర్యము చేసుకొనేటప్పుడు కూడా ప్రభుత్వము వారి వద్దనుండి water-rates వసూలు చేస్తున్నారనే విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా? తెలిసియుంటే, అటువంటి పద్ధతి లేకుండా చేస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—“ప్రభుత్వము నీటిసప్లయ guarantee చేయక ముందే కొన్ని క్రొత్తగా take over చేసిన ఎస్టేట్లలో గత 5 సంవత్సరాలకు ఒకేసారి water rates వసూలు చేస్తున్నారనే విషయము గురించి లోగడ మంత్రిగారికి తెలిసిన దానిమీద ఏమి ఆలోచించారు?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“I could not understand the question; so I ask for notice, Sir.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO:—“Land Revenue Settlement reports ప్రకారం 1356 ఫస్ట్ లో 5,463,000 ఎకరాలనుంచి 1358 వ ఫస్ట్ లో 4,814,000 ఎకరాలకు తగ్గినట్లున్నా, తరువాత పశ్చిమ గోదావరిలో దాదాపు 2 లక్షల ఎకరాలు ఈ cultivation నుంచి పోయినట్లున్నా, ఈ విధమైన పరిస్థితులు వివిధ బోర్డు ఇస్తూ ఉంటే ఆ ఫిగర్స్ కున్నా, ముగ్గురిగారిచ్చే ఫిగర్స్ కున్నా భేదము ఉన్నదే, దానికి ఏ విధంగా సమాధానము ఇస్తారు?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, I hear the words, ‘East Godavari’ in the question and I do not know how it comes in here.”

[25th November 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఈ water-supply కి ప్రభుత్వము ఒక్క దమ్మిడి కూడా ఖర్చు చేయకుండునప్పటికీ, రైతులే కష్టపడి నీటిపారుదల చేసుకొంటూ యుండినప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము దీనిని రాయలసీమ వంటి ప్రదేశాలలో 12 రూపాయల వరకు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వము ఏమీ డబ్బు ఖర్చు చేయకనే, ఈ water-rates వసూలుచేయడ మనేదాన్ని ఏ విధముగా justify చేస్తుంది? దీన్ని ఏ రీతిగా ప్రభుత్వము సమర్థించుకొంటుంది? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The hon. Member may put the question in English if he really wants an answer from me, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఇంత ప్రధానమైనటువంటి ప్రశ్న చేస్తున్న సందర్భంలో మంత్రిగారు, ఇది అర్థంకాలేదని చెప్పడం న్యాయంకాదు. నిజంగా ఆర్థం చేసుకొనుటకు కృషిచేస్తే అర్థము చేసుకోవచ్చు. లేదా, ప్రక్కకు ఉన్నటువంటి వాళ్లను అడిగి కనుక్కొనవచ్చును; లేదా ప్రధానమైన విషయాలేమైనా చర్చించేటప్పుడు, వాటిని తర్జుమాచేసేందుకు ఎవరినైనా నియమించుకోవచ్చును. అయినా ఇప్పుడు నేను ఈ ప్రశ్నను విశదంగా అర్థమయ్యేటట్లు నిదానంగా చెప్పుచున్నాను. దీనిని విసి సమాధానము ఇవ్వగోరుతున్నాను ప్రభుత్వము ఇప్పుడు కొన్ని కొన్ని ప్రదేశాలలో ఏ రీతిగా water-rates వసూలు చేస్తున్నారంటే : ప్రాజెక్టుల క్రింద కొన్ని water-rates నిర్ణయించారు; చెరువులక్రింద కొన్ని water-rates నిర్ణయించారు; కావుల క్రింద కొన్ని water-rates నియమించారు. ఇవన్నీ కాక, ప్రభుత్వము ఒక దమ్మిడి కూడా ఖర్చు పెట్టుకుండునప్పటికీ కాలువలకింద (వెన్న మొదలగు కాలువ లున్నవి), 12 రూపాయల వరకు water-rates వసూలు చేస్తున్నదనే విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా, తెలిసియుంటే, ఇది న్యాయమని అనుకుంటున్నదా? మరియు ప్రాజెక్టుల క్రిందకంటే ఈ ప్రదేశాలలో ఎక్కువ రేటు వసూలుచేస్తున్నదే, అది వివిధంగా న్యాయమని ప్రభుత్వము అనుకొంటున్నది? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ A separate question may kindly be put, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Do the Government think it justifiable to collect Rs. 12 as water-cess in deficit districts like Anantapur and Chingleput where the Government do not spend even one pie for the supply of water to the ryots? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, it is a question of policy as to what tax should be collected from landowners. The tax is collected not merely on account of the expenditure by Government, but it is collected on the advantages which relatively a particular tenant gets, so that it cannot be straightaway disposed of in this manner on the basis of expenditure.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know from the Hon. Chief Minister whether he considers that water-cess and water-rate do not relate to the expenditure incurred by the Government in relation to a particular work? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Water-cess is water-rate.”

25th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ All the waters belong to the entire State and it has to be paid for by those who ask for it; so, it does not depend upon the expenditure by the Government.”

Development Board for Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts.

* 132 Q.—**SRI G. LATCHANNA :** Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether any representations have been received by the Government for the appointment of a Development Board for Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Yes, Sir.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ May I know whether the Government have considered the representation, and if so with what result? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am sorry the hon. Member did not include this question in the original question itself. There is no reason why it should have been omitted and why it should come as a supplementary question. However, I shall give the answer. Development Boards have now been constituted for all the districts including Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam. But in districts where there are now community projects started, separate Boards have been constituted for the whole district. In view of the desirability of not having too many Boards in the same district, the Government thought it unnecessary to accept the request in the representation as there were other Boards.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“ రాష్ట్రములో ఎక్కడైతే తరుగు ప్రాంతాలున్నాయో, వాటిని కలిపి వాటన్నిటికీ ఒకేబోర్డు నియమించి వెంటనే కరువు పనులు, అభివృద్ధిపనులు ప్రారంభించడానికి ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకొంటుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member will please repeat his question.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—“ రాష్ట్రములో యెక్కడెక్కడైతే తరుగు ప్రాంతాలున్నాయో, ఎక్కడెక్కడైతే ఊమ మున్నదో, ఆ ప్రదేశాలన్నిటికీ ఒకే బోర్డును ఏర్పాటుచేసి వాటన్నింటిలో కరువు పనులు ప్రారంభించడానికి ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకొంటుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The question is about District Development Boards and not about famines.”

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA :—“ Are the Government aware that all the Development Committees in various districts are abolished? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Government have passed orders constituting District Planning

[25th November 1952]

Boards for all the districts except Cuddapah, Kurnool, East Godavari, Coimbatore, Madurai, Malabar and South Kanara where Project Advisory Committees are functioning."

SRI S. C. VIRUPAKSHAYYA :—" Will the Project Advisory Committees consider problems relating to areas that do not come under the community project areas, Sir? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is altogether a different question. I pass on to the next question."

Salaries of Non-Gazetted Officers.

* 133 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the number of officers among the Non-Gazetted Officers drawing a monthly salary of—

(i) between Rs. 200 and Rs. 250,

(ii) between Rs. 250 and Rs. 300;

(b) the financial implication involved in bestowing the educational concessions to the children of the non-gazetted officers; and

(c) whether the Government will extend the kind of educational concessions granted to the non-gazetted officers to all persons whose monthly income and earnings are below Rs. 300?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) & (b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to paragraph 7 of the Budget Speech for 1952-53. The statistics will be available only after some time.

"(c) There is no such proposal at present."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" ఎందుకే ఆ అవకాశం ప్రతిపాదించలేదు? అవకాశం లేదా? లేక గవర్నమెంటుకు ఇష్టం లేకా? "

11
a.m.

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" It is not possible in the present financial conditions."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" There is a group of officers who do not come under any of these categories—a group termed by the Hon. the Chief Minister as 'hereditary'. Will the Government consider the question of extending these concessions to the children of the village officers? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" At present on account of financial stringency, the Government are not able to consider this."

SRI M. MUNI REDDI :—" May I know whether the Government have enquired into the properties of the officers drawing above Rs. 250 a month before granting educational concessions to them? Do the Government think that gazetted officers on a salary of Rs. 250 are better off than non-gazetted officers drawing a salary of Rs. 250; and what is the motive of the Government in extending the concessions to non-gazetted officers drawing above Rs. 250? "

[25th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The question of property or the amount of the property was not investigated."

SRI P. B. K. RAJA CHIDAMBARAM :—" Sir, in view of the recent cut imposed on the salary of the gazetted officers, will the Government consider the question of extending these concessions to their children also? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" The Government cannot consider the question in respect of those who are drawing above Rs. 300."

Irrigation schemes for Pudukkottai Division.

* 134 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any proposal of introducing a canal of the Cauvery into Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district, other than the Olavayal Canal recently opened;

(b) whether the Government have any proposals of Major Irrigation Schemes for Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district;

(c) if so, what the proposals are;

(d) whether the Manyavayal Anicut Scheme in Karambakudi vattam, Alangudi taluk, Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district, is under the active consideration of the Government; and

(e) if so, when the scheme is likely to be taken up for execution?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) No.

"(b) & (c) The possibility of the following four schemes are being examined :

(1) Construction of an anicut across the Vellar in Sundarapatti village.

(2) Construction of an anicut across the Vellar in Miratunilai vattam.

(3) Construction of an anicut across the Agniar near Sivayakudi.

(4) Construction of an anicut across the Agniar near Karambakudi.

"(d) & (e) The scheme is under examination by local Public Works Department Officers. The decision as to feasibility must await this examination."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" May I know, Sir, how long the scheme under clause (d) of the question has been under the examination of the Government? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The Chief Engineer, Irrigation, has reported in July in connection with a Legislative Assembly question that the ryots were not definite about the exact place in which they want the anicut

[25th November 1952]

and they appear, to have made frequent representations to shift the site from place to place. He had therefore instructed the local officers to examine the proposal and select a suitable site for the anicut, to yield maximum benefits with minimum cost, without affecting lower riparian rights. The Chief Engineer now states that a further report from the Superintending Engineer is awaited. On receipt of the Chief Engineer's report, necessary action will be taken separately."

SRI K. V. RAMASWAMI :—"காவேரி ஆற்றின் வாய்க்கால்களில் அநேகம் இடங்களில் மண் மேட்டிட்டு கரைகள் தூர்ந்து இருப்பது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியுமா? அவைகளை மராமத்து செய்தால் இந்த பஞ்சகாலத்தில் பலருக்கு வேலை கொடுப்பதுடன் உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கும் முடியும் என்பது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியுமா."

MR. SPEAKER :—"நீங்கள் வேறு கேள்வியாக எழுதிக்கொடுங்கள்."

Direct recruitment of District and Sessions Judges.

* 135 Q.—SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government recently appointed a member of the Bar as District and Sessions Judge by direct recruitment;

(b) whether the High Court was asked to submit a panel of persons before selection for the purpose and, if so, how many were in the panel;

(c) whether the panel contained members belonging to Harijan and Backward communities;

(d) if so, why a person belonging to Harijan or Backward community was not selected; and

(e) what were the special qualifications of the selected person?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" (a) Yes, Sir.

" (b) Yes. The High Court sent a panel of five names.

" (c) No, Sir. A special reference was also made to the High Court to give consideration to applications from qualified members of the Backward communities.

" (d) The High Court did not consider any applicant of these communities as good enough for the panel and so the question does not arise.

" (e) Sri S. Rangarajan, who was selected for the post, is an M.L. in Constitutional Law and International Law and was the recipient of the Wallace Gold Medal awarded by the Madras Bar Council in 1938. The High Court left all the five to be considered as equally good. Government are of the opinion that the person selected and appointed was undoubtedly the best of the five. The appointment probably means reduced emoluments to the gentleman. The High Court has said that he was enrolled as an advocate in August 1938 and commands an extensive and lucrative practice and

[25th November 1952]

is thoroughly conversant with Civil and Criminal work. He is therefore eminently suited to function as District and Sessions Judge."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"Sir, is it a fact that Mr. S. Rangarajan who has been appointed recently as District Judge was once appointed as District Munsif and after training for two months, he resigned from the post; is it right on the part of the Government to choose such a kind of person once again for this job?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, even a High Court Judge is in the same position as that; but that does not matter. The fact that he was trained only adds to his qualifications."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister read out what the High Court said about the selected candidate. Will he be pleased to read out what the High Court said about the other candidates in the panel?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"The suggestion is interesting, but I am sorry I cannot do it."

SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—"Is the selected person the first in the panel sent by the High Court?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I have already said that all the five in the panel were considered as equally good by the High Court."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"Did the panel submitted by the High Court contain the name of any candidate from the South Arcot district?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, the five names, as I have already stated, were put to us without any preferential allocation, and particulars of each one of them have been given. After the appointment, it is not desirable that Government should disclose the names or the particulars of the other candidates in the Assembly. These questions will lead to that result."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"Sir, is it not the policy of the Government to reserve some seats in the Judicial line also for Backward Classes? If so, do the Government think that nobody in the State from the Backward Classes is qualified for this post?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is altogether a different question."

Publication of S.S.L.C. Examination results.

* 136 Q.—SRI V. SRI KRISHNA (on behalf of Sri K. Venkiah) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the results of the S.S.L.C. examination for the year 1951-52 were published so late as to inconvenience the students joining different courses in the colleges; and

[25th November 1952]

(b) if so, the steps the Government propose to take for the publication of S.S.L.C. results in due time?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) The results of the S.S.L.C. Public examination, March 1952 were not published in the dailies. There was however a delay in the despatch of the S.S.L.Cs. of the candidates.

“(b) Necessary instructions have been issued to the Director of Public Instruction for the announcement of the results by the first week of June every year.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ఫలితాలు చాలా మందికి తెలియవలసి ఉన్నది కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వం వారి వాటిని పత్రికలలో advertisement గా ఆయిస్ పుట్టి పకటిస్తారా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“Advertisement charges are exorbitant. However, the marks as recorded in the books should reach the candidates in time; but on account of certain difficulties, some delay occurred. The delay in the despatch of the S.S.L.C. books was due to the blank mark books not being received from the Government Press in time. A large number of mark books were received from the Press in the Commissioner's Office only in the first week of May, and in spite of the quickest work, it was not possible to despatch all the books till 25th June 1952. Necessary instructions, as I have already stated, have been issued to see that no such delay occurs in the future, and that the results are published through the books by June first week.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“ఇటువంటి ఇబ్బందులు ఇకముందు కూడా రావచ్చు కనుక ఈ ఫలితాలను తప్పక పత్రికలలో ప్రకటించవలసివచ్చింది మంత్రిగారికి తెలియజేయబడింది. ఈ విషయమై మంత్రిగారు పురరాజుల వన చేస్తున్నారా ?”

11-10
a.m.

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“I think I have already said that instructions have been issued that care should be taken to see that the results will be available in the first week of June.”

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI :—“విద్యార్థులు హెచ్చు మంది pass అయినట్లు మితే పత్రికలలో ప్రకటించవలసివస్తుంది కనుక, వాసులు తగ్గించుకుంటున్నారా ప్రభుత్వం వారు డిటెయిల్ విధానాన్ని ప్రవేశపెట్టారా ?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“It is purely the conjecture of the hon. Member.”

Machkund Hydro-Electric Project.

* 137 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the present stage of the Machkund Project and when it is expected to be completed;

(b) the total number of K.Ws. of power that would be generated;

[25th November 1952]

(c) the quantity of power that would be supplied to Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts; and

(d) the proposed allotments of power to each of the remaining districts which are to be served by it?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) Many of the civil engineering works and a good part of work relating to the Power House and Transmission lines have been completed and the other items are in an advanced stage of construction. Most of the machinery required ordered from overseas has arrived and has been transported to the site. The entire project is expected to be completed by 1957. The first generating unit is, however, expected to be put into commission by the middle of 1954, using the storage in the forebay pending completion of the main reservoir at Jalaput.

“(b) When the first generator at Machkund Power House commences operation, about 14,700 K.Ws. of power would be generated. Out of this, 10,290 K.Ws. of power will be available to Madras. When storage at Jalaput Dam is available, the power that will be generated will be about 32,600 K.Ws. and out of this Madras will get about 22,820 K.Ws. Ultimate effective station capacity would be 68,000 K.Ws. out of which Madras would get about 47,600 K.Ws.

“(c) & (d) Allotment of power from any power project is not made districtwar, but to supply the loads available. From the loads existing and anticipated, it is expected that the power will be utilized as follows in the initial stages :—

(i) Visakhapatnam zone 7,400 K.W. (Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts.)

(ii) Kakinada zone. 1,600 K.W. (part of East Godavari district.)

(iii) Rajahmundry zone. 1,200 K.W. (part of East Godavari district.)

(iv) Vijayavada zone. 10,600 K.W. (parts of East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna and Guntur districts.)

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Is it a fact that the work of putting up the transmission lines which was under progress was stopped on the Srikakulam side?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“In his letter, dated the 21st August 1952 the Chief Engineer for Electricity has said that the works have neither been suspended nor slackened and that no workmen have been discharged. There is no question of slackening at all. He has however written that consequent upon the completion of certain items of work like camps and roads, two subdivisions were suspended from the 26th July 1952 and the 7th August 1952.”

[25th November 1952]

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ May I know when the Machkund Scheme was projected and when the Tungabhadra Hydro-electric Project was sanctioned and may I know how it is that the Machkund Hydro-Electric Scheme is nearing completion while the Tungabhadra Project will not be completed before 1960, though the sanction for the Tungabhadra Project was given earlier than the sanction for the Machkund Hydro-electric Scheme? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I heard the hon. Minister say that the ultimate effective capacity of the Machkund Project was 68,000 K.Ws. I would like to know from the Hon. the Minister whether it was not the original design that the ultimate capacity was to be 153,000 K.Ws. and how is it that the capacity has been reduced? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ I said, Sir, that the ultimate effective station capacity would be 68,000 K.Ws. out of which Madras would get about 47,600 K.Ws. I never said that the scheme is capable of an ultimate development of 100,000 K.Ws. The two things are different.”

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI :—“ May I know what is the estimated cost of the project? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ Two estimates have been prepared in connection with this scheme. One was prepared in 1946 and another the revised estimate, in 1950. So far as the estimate that was prepared in 1946 is concerned, the share of Madras was Rs. 420.1 lakhs initially, rising to Rs. 587.6 lakhs in the tenth year. According to the revised estimate sanctioned in 1950, the share of Madras was Rs. 1,280.87 lakhs initially, rising to Rs. 1,455.15 lakhs in the tenth year.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The Hon. Minister seemed to suggest that between the 100,000 K.Ws. and the 68,000 K.Ws. now sought to be obtained for supply, there is no difference. Will he kindly explain the ‘ difference ’? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ It means two distinct stages.”

SRI P. V. R. GAJAPATHI RAJU :—“ Is the Hon. Minister aware that at the site of the dam, labour recruited is essentially Andhra and not Oriya, and as such there is much labour unrest, because the workers are unable to secure continuous employment because the Government of Madras have not been able to maintain a continuous work schedule on this project? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ I suggest to the hon. Member to put a separate question.”

25th November 1952]

Representations from the Homœopathic Practitioners' Association, Melur taluk.

* 138 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 8th August 1952, from Melur Taluk Homœopathic Practitioners' Association was received by the Government requesting registration facilities under the Medical Registration Act; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ (a) A representation, dated 8th August 1952, from the Melur Taluk Homœopathic Practitioners' and Sympathisers Association, Melur, was received by the Government requesting them to enrol the deserving homœopaths as medical practitioners.

“ (b) The request was not considered, as the question of recognition of the system had already been dropped by the Government, pending formulation by the Government of India of an all-India policy for Homœopathy.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know what the view of this Government is? ”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“ The Government do not think it necessary to recognize homœopathy and register homœopathic practitioners; they are awaiting an indication in the matter from the Government of India.”

Higher Elementary School, Dokiparru, Krishna district.

* 139 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal with the Government to convert the Higher Elementary School of Dokiparru of Krishna district (run by the District Welfare Department) to a Middle School; and

(b) if so, why a final decision has been delayed?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) & (b) Yes. It was treated as a Part II Scheme for 1952-53 and orders were issued in August 1952 sanctioning the conversion of the school into a Middle School.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“ ఇప్పుడు మరికొన్ని విద్యార్థుల సంఖ్య పెరుగుతున్న వారికి స్కూలు కొరకక ఇబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. కాబట్టి హైస్కూల్ లాను, కాలేజీ లాను స్కూలు పెంచడం విషయమై ప్రభుత్వం వారు ఆలోచిస్తున్నారా? ఇప్పుడు మరి కొంతమంది నడవబడుతున్న హైస్కూల్ లాను కాలేజీ status కు raise చేస్తారా? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ It is a separate subject altogether, and I suggest, therefore, that a separate question may be put.”

[25th November 1952]

New schools in Kasargod taluk.

11-20 a.m. * 140 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation to open schools in the villages of Perumbale, Kolathur, Kodoth, Maloth and Belur II in Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district; and

(b) whether the Government have taken any, and if so, what action in the matter?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“(a) A representation was received by the Director of Public Instruction in July 1952 for the opening of a Board Elementary School under the Grant-in-aid scheme in Bare village and the matter is reported to have been under correspondence with the concerned Deputy Inspector of Schools. No representations have however been received so far for the opening of schools in the other villages.

“(b) It is reported that proposals for opening of Board Elementary schools under the grant-in-aid scheme in the villages of Perumbale, Kolathur, Kodoth and Maloth have already been forwarded to the President, District Board, duly recommended by the District Educational Officer, South Kanara.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—“In view of the fact that there are thousands of villages in the State having a population of more than 1,000, will the Hon. Minister for Education be kind enough to assure this House that immediate steps would be taken to start at least one school in every village of that kind?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“That is the wish of the Government, Sir. But for financial stringency, we should be able to do that.”

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—“Are the Government aware that there is not a single educational institution in these villages?”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“It is the policy of the Government to try to start an elementary school in every village with 500 or more of population. As I have already stated but for the present financial stringency, it should be possible to make headway.”

Tuberculosis patients in Government Headquarters Hospital, Mangalore.

* 141 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) what is the number of Tuberculosis patients admitted into the Government Headquarters Hospital, Mangalore, during the last financial year;

25th November 1952]

(b) how many were refused admission for want of accommodation; and

(c) whether the Government propose to introduce free Streptomycin injections to very poor and deserving Tuberculosis patients in all district headquarters hospitals?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“(a) 486.

“(b) 247.

“(c) The Government are incurring an expenditure of Rs. 40,000 every year on the purchase of this drug for administration to poor T. B. patients in select hospitals in the City and mufassal.”

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL:—“In view of the mounting incidents of T.B. in the district, will the Government provide more beds in the District Headquarters Hospital?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“As the District Headquarters Hospital is being enlarged it will become possible to provide more beds. There is also a tuberculosis sanatorium being put up at Mudushedde near Mangalore.”

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI:—“May I know when the new building for the District Headquarters Hospital is expected to be completed?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“As early as possible.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—“Are the Government aware that tuberculosis patients who applied for admission received admission cards sometimes long after they had passed away from this world. Will the Government take care that urgent cases are immediately attended to?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“Yes, Sir, It is a big problem. There is a long waiting list of tuberculosis patients in every tuberculosis hospital and sanatorium and the number of cases is so large that it is difficult to provide adequate accommodation for tuberculosis patients not only in this country but even in more progressive and advanced countries.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Next question 142.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Questions 142 and 143 relate to a very important matter. Now that we are at the fag end of the Question-hour, I request the Chair that these Questions may be taken up to-morrow.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I have no objection.”

Letting of Molasses in the Sarada river.

* 144 Q.—SRI K. GOVINDA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether representations were received by the Director of Public Health to the effect that the letting of molasses into

[25th November 1952]

the river Sarada in Anakapalli taluk, Visakhapatnam district, is causing unbearable inconvenience to the public of Anakapalli and should therefore be stopped; and

(b) if so, what measures were taken by the Government in this respect?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) Yes.

“(b) The Government have issued necessary instructions to the Director of Public Health to take action to abate the nuisance complained against and also to direct the sugar factory management to divert the waste matter into a different direction instead of letting it into the river or channel.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“శారదా నది నీటిలోనికి తుమ్మపాల షుగర్ ఫ్యాక్టరీవారు waste water ను వదిలివేయుటవల్ల నదిలోని నీరు పాక్షికము దుర్గంధం పుట్టుచున్నది. విషయం మంత్రులకు కూడా తెలిసినటువంటిది. ఈ నాడు ఇదొక బాధాకరమైన విషయంగా బలమిచ్చింది. మిల్లు యజమానులు ఈ విషయము ఎట్టి శ్రద్ధ చూపుటలేదు. కనుక ప్రభుత్వంవారు బాక్యం కలుగజేసుకుని సత్వరమే తగిన చర్యలు తీసుకొని అట్టిది జరగకుండా చూడగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“A separate question may be put.”

Community Projects.

* 145 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) the details of the Community Projects undertaken in the State and the special features of each of the areas selected for these projects;

(b) whether the Government have finalized plans for these project areas; and

(c) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to place the same on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“(a) Six Community Projects are set up in the following places :—

(1) Kurnool-Cuddapah Canal Area—(Kurnool, Sirvel, Nandyal, Nandikotkur and Koilkuntla in Kurnool District and Cuddapah, Proddatur and Jammalamadugu in Cuddapah district).

(2) Coimbatore—(Gobichettipalayam, Erode, Bhavani and Dharapuram taluks in Coimbatore district and three villages in Karur taluk of Tiruchirappalli district).

(3) Malabar—(Palghat).

(4) East Godavari—(Kakinada, Ramachandrapuram, Peddapuram and Pittapuram).

(5) South Kanara—(Karkal, Mangalore and part of Coondapoor).

[25th November 1952]

(6) Madurai—(Nilakottai, Melur and Madurai).

The centres were selected according to the directions given and approved as being areas where there are existing irrigation facilities or assured rainfall and where any additional effort is expected to produce the maximum results in the matter of agricultural production in the shortest time possible.

“(b) No. Not yet, Sir.

“(c) Does not now arise.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“With reference to clause (b) of the question,—‘whether the Government have finalised plans for these project areas’—the Hon. Chief Minister replied: No, not yet. May I know whether it is the policy of the Government to start with officers and establishments first before plans for projects are finalised or to finalise plans first and then start having establishments?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“On the surface of it, the hon. Member's question is very reasonable. But even for the formulation of detailed plans, staff is necessary and appointments are necessary. All that could be done has been done, and the staff appointed is quite busy, and it will be possible to give finalised plans after some time is spent by the staff on the plans.”

Government fuel depot, Pudukkottai.

* 146 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether a Government fuel depot existed in the former Pudukkottai State before merger;

(b) the varieties of fuel sold and the prices at which the fuel was sold;

(c) when the depot was closed and the reasons for such closure;

(d) whether the Pudukkottai Municipal Council offered to take over the functioning of the depot; and

(e) if so, why the offer was rejected?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“(a) Yes. Two fuel depots were run by the Government in the former Pudukkottai State before merger.

“(b) Casuarina and jungle wood were sold at these depots, the former at Rs. 13-8-0 and the latter at Rs. 9 per ton. In August 1948 these prices were increased to Rs. 20 per ton for casuarina and Rs. 15 per ton for jungle wood.

[25th November 1952]

" (c) These depots were closed down on 14th April 1949 for the following reasons :—

- (1) Consequent on its merger with the Indian Union, Pudukkottai became a Revenue Division of Tiruchirappalli district from 1st April 1949. It was considered that it was not desirable to continue in a small part of the district alone a special concession which was not enjoyed by the people of the adjoining territories, especially when the firewood depots catered only to the needs of the Government officials in Pudukkottai town and the upper and middle classes of the urban population, who derived full advantage out of these depots.
- (2) Moreover, the maintenance of the fuel depots was an extra responsibility on the part of the Government.
- (3) Further, it was reported that the price of fuel in the open market was actually less than that fixed in the fuel depots run by the Government and that the mass of the people would not be affected by the closure of the depots.

" (d) & (e) No. The Pudukkottai Municipal Council did not make any offer to take over the two firewood depots. But, the Chairman of the Municipal Council, Pudukkottai, made a request to the Collector of Tiruchirappalli to continue the Government fuel depots and a similar request was also made by one Sri T. R. Vaidyanatha Iyer, an ex-M.L.C. The Collector however, did not consider it necessary to concede the request in view of the reasons stated in the answer to clause (c) above."

Power supply for Hindupur.

11-30 a.m. * 147 Q.—SRI G. SIVASANKARA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether proposals for the extension of power supply to villages around Hindupur, from Hindupur supply station have been received from the Superintending Engineer, Rayalaseema Power System, Bellary; and

(b) if so, whether the Government have taken up the schemes as proposed for construction this year?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) Yes.

“(b) They will be executed as and when funds become available.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“As we began our sitting only at 10-35 of the clock in the Assembly Chamber I shall extend the question-hour by five minutes, that is, till 11-35.”

Minimum wages for agricultural labourers.

* 148 Q.—SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO :—“ఈ ప్రశ్న చాలా ముఖ్యమైనది కాదు. దీనికి మార్చవలసినదని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* Starred question No. 148 postponed for answer on 26th November 1952.

25th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“The hon. Member requests that the question may be taken up to-morrow, as it relates to a very important subject, namely, minimum wages for agricultural labourers.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“I have no objection.”

Supply of electricity to Ottappalam, Malabar.

* 149 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether there is any proposal for the extension of electricity to Ottappalam, Malabar, and the stage where it stands now?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“The proposal is under the consideration of the Government.”

Fair rent for pepper gardens.

* 150 Q.—SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have received any memorandum regarding some grievances of the pepper growers of the West Coast in July 1952, and if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“On 2nd August 1952, the Government received a memorandum on behalf of the pepper growers of Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara district, requesting that the fair rent for pepper gardens should be payable only once every ten years or, in the alternative, once every six years. The question of amending the Malabar Tenancy Act is engaging the attention of the Government and the question of reduction of the fair rent payable will receive consideration.”

Supply of electricity to Bapatla Municipality.

* 151 Q.—SRI V. SRI KRISHNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state when the Government propose to supply electricity to Bapatla Municipality?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“A proposal for extension of supply of electricity to Bapatla is under the consideration of the Government. The scheme if sanctioned, will be taken up in order, with reference to the funds available.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“చాపట్లకు విద్యుచ్ఛక్తి సరఫరా విషయంలో, రైసులు వేసినప్పటికీ, విద్యుచ్ఛక్తిని Agricultural College గోడల చుట్టూనే పెట్టుకుంటున్నారు. పట్టణానికి విద్యుచ్ఛక్తిని ఎప్పుడు ఇస్తారో తెలియజేస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I have said already that the proposal is under consideration.”

[25th November 1952]

Payment of travelling allowance to teachers in Walluvanad for doing election duties.

* 152 Q.—JANAB KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that many of the teachers in Walluvanad taluk, Malabar district, particularly the aided elementary school teachers of Melatur centre have not yet been paid their travelling allowances in connexion with the election duties they discharged in the last General Elections; and

(b) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) No, Sir. The amounts of travelling allowance have been disbursed in most of the cases and in the remaining cases, the amounts have been sent by money order to the persons concerned by the disbursing officer.”

“(b) Does not arise.”

JANAB KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE:—“Was the disbursement made after the receipt of my interpellation by the Government or earlier?” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“I suppose the interpellation was intended for that purpose.” (Laughter.)

Government Hospital, Nandigama.

* 153 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) what is the amount spent for the extension works of Government Hospital, Nandigama, for the year 1951-52; and

(b) what is the amount proposed to be spent for the year 1952-53.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“(a) Rs. 49,978.

“(b) Rs. 50,000.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO:—“ఈ సమస్యను బడ్జెట్టులో లక్ష్యరూపాయలు కేటాయించినప్పటికీ 50 వేలు మాత్రమే ఖర్చుచేశారు. ఎందువల్ల Budget provision ను తగ్గించారో తెలియజేస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“I am not able to understand the question.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know why Government have not spent all the budget allotment made in the year?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“A reduction was made in the budget provision, and all the works have been slowed down.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Why has the budget provision been cut down, Sir?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—“On account of financial stringency.”

25th November 1952]

Extension of term of panchayat boards.

* 154 Q.—SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) the number of extensions that have been given to the existing panchayat boards in the whole of this State, and in particular in Tanjore district after they were reconstituted in 1933, under the Old Local Boards Act; and

(b) the reasons for the delay in holding elections under the Village Panchayats Act, 1950?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“(a) Twenty-four extensions were ordered since elections to panchayats in all the districts were last held in 1939 and these orders related to the panchayats in Tanjore district also.

“(b) Owing to the abnormal conditions created by the War, elections to panchayats during the years 1942-46 were postponed from time to time. After resumption of office by the Ministry, the question of the reform of panchayats and the introduction of adult franchise were taken up. The Madras Village Panchayats Bill, 1949, was enacted into law on the 1st August 1950 and the new Act was brought into force from the 1st April 1951. The new Legislative Assembly rolls based on adult franchise which are also the rolls for panchayat elections, were not ready till the 30th October 1951. The elections to the State Legislature and subsequently to Municipal Councils intervened and they rendered it inevitable to postpone the elections to panchayats still further to avoid a clash. Preparations are now over and the elections to panchayats in Cuddapah are started and the elections in other districts also will go on.”)

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Economic development of Rayalaseema.

35 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: With reference to the answer to question No. 1061, dated 4th April 1951, of the Legislative Assembly, will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state the further action taken on the following:—

(a) The lump-sum grant of Rs. 3 crores in all for the economic development of Rayalaseema as suggested on page 955 of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, dated 4th April 1951;

(b) Afforestation of the Pennar and Hagari banks to protect lands from the shifting sands;

(c) Promotion of Industrial Development by State enterprise in Rayalaseema;

(d) Gandikota Project;

(e) Sagileru Project;

(f) Tungabhadra Hydro-Electric Project;

[25th November 1952]

(g) Constructing a Railway line connecting Cuddapah and Nellore; and

(h) Industrialization of Rayalaseema?

A.—(a) The proposal for the grant of a lump sum of Rs. 1 crore to be contributed by the State and Central Governments in equal proportion for the investigation and execution of smaller works to be spread over a period of five years was recommended to the Government of India, which failed to respond. The State Government is not in a position to impound this large sum but has directed that the highest priority should be given for the execution of all schemes relating to Rayalaseema, including those in the Five-Year Plan. A proposal of the Rayalaseema Development Board for reconsideration of the decision regarding the block grant is under consideration of the Government.

(b) Out of a total area of 385 acres to be afforested on the banks of the Pennar, 217 acres were planted up by 1948-49. The planting of the balance of 168 acres is held up pending the acquisition of 122 acres of patta lands which form the bulk of the area to be planted. The land acquisition proceedings are in progress. It is expected to resume planting during 1952-53.

On the banks of the Hagari all areas liable to sand drifts have been planted up.

(c) & (h) The policy of the Government is not to start and run any new industries themselves but to encourage private enterprise to do so, by recommending applications for Capital Issue, import licences, power supply and supply of iron and steel and other controlled commodities. The position in regard to starting of large-scale industries in Rayalaseema is set out below :—

Paint and lithopone industries.—The Government appointed Sri P. Gopala Rao as Special Officer and entrusted him with the preparation of a project report for starting paint and lithopone industries in the area. The report prepared by Sri Gopala Rao was advertised, inviting private enterprise to take up the starting of the units, Government offering all possible help. In response to this, two parties submitted proposals. They are under the consideration of the Government.

Paper.—A proposal for the establishment of a paper mill in Rayalaseema is under the consideration of the Government.

Textiles.—Under the Post-war Plan for expansion of the textile industry, five textile mills have been permitted to be set up in Rayalaseema as follows :—

(1) Rayalaseema Mills, Limited,
Adoni 12,000 spindles.

25th November 1952]

(2) Adoni Cotton Mills, Limited,
Adoni 6,000 spindles.

(3) The Madras Co-operative
Spinning Mills, Limited,
Guntakal 11,000 „

(4) The Jayanti Ramachan-
drappa Setty Mills, Limited,
Rayadrug 6,000 „

(5) Hope Prudhomme & Co.,
Limited, Tadpatri 12,000 „

Of these, Nos. (1) and (2) have started production. No. (3) is in the process of construction and is expected to go into production next year.

Cement.—Permission to set up a cement factory with an annual capacity of 100,000 tons at Kurnool was granted to a party in 1948. But after three years he expressed his inability to proceed with the scheme. The permission granted to him was therefore revoked. Another industrialist has since come forward to set up the factory at a cost of Rs. 35.0 lakhs. The proposal is under the consideration of the Government.

Vanaspathi.—Under the post-war plan, a vanaspathi factory has been set up at Kurnool (by the Tunga-bhadra Industries, Limited) and another at Hagari-bommanahalli (by the Karnataka Vegetable Oils and Refineries, Limited, Hospet), and a third at Chittoor Vegetols, Limited). All the three units have started production.

Oil Technological Institute, Anantapur.—The Government have set up an Oil Technological Institute at Anantapur to train apprentices in oil technology and also to undertake research on oil seeds, oils and fats, which are expected to be of great use to industry.

Confectionery.—Permission has also been given for the establishment of a confectionery factory at Chittoor. The installation is in progress and the factory is expected to go into production by the end of the year.

Technical education.—The Rayalaseema Polytechnic at Bellary offers two diploma and five certificate courses as detailed below :—

Diploma courses—

(1) Licentiate in Civil Engineering.

(2) Textile manufacture.

[25th November 1952]

Certificate courses—

- (1) General mechanics.
- (2) Cabinet making.
- (3) Blacksmithy.
- (4) Electric wiring.
- (5) Automobile repairs and servicing.

Arrangements are being made to start another course of certificate standard in Cumbly weaving during 1953-54 session.

Power Alcohol.—The India Sugars and Refineries, Limited, Hospet, was allowed to put up a power alcohol distillery with a capacity of 2.5 lakhs gallons per annum. But the allottees have not taken any steps for the implementation of the project.

Cottage Industries.—In regard to the promotion of cottage industries, a statement showing the progress made in the selection of artisans and distribution of tools in the selected firkas of the Rayalaseema and a statement showing the quantities of iron and steel allotted to Cottage Industries in the Rayalaseema are appended. *

- (d) The project has been recommended for inclusion in the Supplementary Five-Year Plan of the Planning Commission and their approval is awaited before taking up the question of sanctioning the project.

The plans and estimates for the project are under scrutiny.

- (e) The scheme has not been included in the basic or the Supplementary Five-Year Plan of the Planning Commission. On 4th April 1952 the execution of the canal portion of the project was ordered with a view to provide employment to those affected by adverse seasonal conditions in Badvel taluk, Cuddapah district. The Government subsequently directed that the work on the canal portion of the project should be stopped after bringing it to a safe stage. However in view of the further appearance of distress conditions and with a view to provide employment, the Government have since ordered on 5th August 1952 that the canal work on the Lower Sagileru Project be continued till the attendance falls appreciably. Further work on the project is under consideration.

- (f) The Government have sanctioned the scheme for development of hydro-electric power from the Thungabhadra river on completion of the Irrigation Dam which is under construction near Hospet. The work on the scheme is in progress.

* Printed as Appendix I on page 622 intra.

25th November 1952]

- (g) The proposal has been deferred owing to financial stringency.

Habitual offenders' settlements in State.

36 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) the number of habitual offenders' settlements and their names, the department or agency controlling each in the State of Madras;

(b) what is the number of men, women and children confined in each settlement now; and

(c) for how many days in the year 1951-52 the services of persons confined in each settlement were lent to outside contractors and establishments employing labour, and how much income was got and who received the amounts for which the inmates were hired out?

A.—(a) There are four habitual offenders' settlements in this State, one at Aziznagar in the South Arcot district, another at Siddhapuram in the Kurnool district and two at Sitanagaram and Stuartpuram in the Guntur district. The settlements at Aziznagar, Siddhapuram and Sitanagaram are managed by the Government through the Police department and the settlement at Stuartpuram is managed by the Salvation Army, Madras, on behalf of the Government who pay the Salvation Army the cost of maintenance and administration of the settlement.

(b) The number of men, women and children confined in each of the settlements is given below :—

	Men.	Women.	Children.	Total.
(1) Aziznagar ..	432	500	326	1,258
(2) Siddhapuram ..	107	112	197	416
(3) Sitanagaram ..	85	63	94	242
(4) Stuartpuram ..	621	627	1,224	2,472

(c) Particulars of the number of days for which the services of persons confined in each of the settlements were lent to outside contractors and establishments employing labour during 1951-52 are given below :—

(1) *Aziznagar.*—None was employed under contractors. About 10 per cent of the settlers were however engaged in cultivation work outside the settlement for a period of about 90 days.

(2) *Siddhapuram.*—Nil.

(3) *Sitanagaram.*—300 days.

(4) *Stuartpuram.*—216 days.

[25th November 1952]

The amount of income earned during 1951-52 is specified below :—

- (1) *Aziznagar*.—The average daily income of a coolie employed in cultivation work outside the settlement was about As. 8 to Re. 1-4-0 per head per day.
- (2) *Siddhapuram*.—Nil.
- (3) *Sitanagaram*.—Re. 1 per head per day on an average.
- (4) *Stuartpuram*.—Rs. 2-8-0 per head per day on an average.

The settlers themselves received the wages due to them.

Resolutions passed by the State Library Committee.

37 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

- (a) when the State Library Committee was constituted; and
- (b) the action taken on the resolutions passed at different sittings?

A.—(a) The State Library Committee was constituted on 5th October 1950.

(b) The information required is furnished in the statement annexed. *

Takkavi and subsistence loans disbursed in Nellore district.

38 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) the total amount that was disbursed as takkavi loan and subsistence loan in 1952 in Nellore district; and
- (b) the amount out of it that was given to Harijans and backward people respectively as takkavi loan and subsistence loan?

A.—(a) From 1st April 1951 an amount of Rs. 5,85,980 under Land Improvement Loans and Agriculturists Loans Acts and an amount of Rs. 2,56,068 under subsistence loans were disbursed up to 15th October 1952 in Nellore district. Separate figures for 1952 are not available readily.

(b) The particulars are not readily available. They have to be gathered and compiled for the district. The work will involve considerable time and labour, and will not be commensurate with the purpose served. The loans are granted to all applicants who satisfy the conditions of the grant and no distinction is made with reference to the community to which the applicant may belong.

* Printed as Appendix II on pages 623-624 infra.

[25th November 1952]

Construction of a bridge across Venkajeru river, Anantapur district.

39 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposal to construct a bridge across Venkajeru river in Penukonda-Bukkepatnam road, Anantapur district?

A.—There is no proposal at present to construct a bridge across the Venkajeru river on the Penukonda-Bukkepatnam road.

Starting of a Sulphuric Acid Industry in Chittoor district.

40 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

- (a) whether there is any proposal with Government to start a Sulphuric Acid Industry in the Chittoor district; and
- (b) if so, at what stage the matter stands now?

A.—(a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Nellore District Rural Welfare Committee.

41 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state who the members in the Nellore District Firka Development Committee are now?

A.—The following are the members of the District Rural Welfare Committee, Nellore (formerly called Firka Development Committee):—

- (1) Collector of the District (Chairman).
- (2) Revenue Divisional Officer (Vice-Chairman).
- (3) Rural Welfare Officer (Rural Welfare Department) (Secretary).
- (4) Centre Khadi Officer in respect of Intensive Khadi areas.
- (5) Sri V. Raghaviah, Nellore P.O.
- (6) Sri Bathina Ramakrishna Reddi, District Board Member, Allur P.O.
- (7) Sri Mopuri Muddukrishnareddi, Pottampadu, Anakapalli P.O.
- (8) Sri Potti Sriramulu, Sanchalak, Ghandi Memorial Trust, Andhra Pradesh, Nellore.
- (9) Sri Dega Ramireddi, Chettipalli P.O.

[25th November 1952]

Supply of jeeps to District Welfare Officers.

42 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal with the Government to provide jeeps to the District Welfare Officers in the State to speed up Harijan Uplift work; and

(b) if so, when the orders will be given effect to?

A.—Yes. It is being considered as a Part II Scheme for 1953-54.

Poultry Farming Centres.

43 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Government Poultry Farming Centres in the State;

(b) the number of private poultry farms to which Government granted subsidies; and

(c) the subsidy that has been granted to each poultry farm in 1951?

A.—(a) Eight.

(b) The Government have been granting a subsidy to American Arcot Mission at Katpadi for extension work on poultry farming in the villages.

(c) During the year 1951-52 a sum of Rs. 10,172 was paid.

Construction of Post-war buildings sanctioned in G.O. No. 214, P.W. of 1949.

44 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the construction of postwar buildings sanctioned in G.O. No. 214, P.W. of 1949, has been completed or not;

(b) if not, the reasons for the delay; and

(c) the amount spent on the buildings?

A.—(a) The information is furnished below:—

Item No. 1—Oil Technological Institute, Anantapur—
The work has been completed.

*Item No. 2—Central Polytechnic, Madras.—*The work has been completed.

*Item No. 3—Karnataka Polytechnic, Mangalore.—*The main building is nearing completion and the subsidiary buildings including the hostel are half way through.

*Item No. 4—Kerala Polytechnic, Kozhikode.—*The work has been completed.

25th November 1952]

Item No. 5—Arthur Hope Polytechnic, Coimbatore.—

The technical sanction of the Chief Engineer (Buildings), Public Works Department, Madras, was received on 19th February 1952 and 4th October 1952, and the work has commenced.

*Item No. 6—Andhra Polytechnic, Kakinada.—*The main building is nearing completion and the subsidiary buildings including the hostel are half way through.

*Item No. 7—Rayalaseema Polytechnic, Bellary.—*The work has been completed.

*Item No. 8—Polytechnic at Vuyyuru.—*The proposal to shift the Polytechnic from Vuyyuru is under the consideration of Government. The work has not therefore been commenced.

*Item No. 9—Tamil Nad Polytechnic, Madurai.—*The work has been completed.

*Item No. 10—Building for the expansion of the Institute of Leather Technology.—*The execution of this scheme has been deferred for the present in view of the establishment by the Government of India of a Central Leather Research Laboratory at Madras.

(b) The reasons for the delay in regard to items 5, 8 and 10 have been given against each item in the answer to clause (a) above. In regard to items 3 and 6 there has been no delay and the progress of the work has been fairly rapid having regard to the magnitude of the work and the difficulty of obtaining steel and cement. The remaining items have been completed.

(c) A sum of Rs. 36,77,000 has been spent so far on the schemes taken up for execution.

Supply of tools to Artisans in Nellore district.

45 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state—

(a) the number of artisans selected in Nellore district with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 37, Firka Development, dated 10th January 1950;

(b) the number of villages selected;

(c) the number of the artisans selected for distribution of tools;

(d) the number of artisans approved for distribution of tools;

(e) the number of artisans to whom tools have been supplied; and

(f) the number of Harijans who got tools?

[25th November 1952]

- A.—(a) 148.
 (b) 50.
 (c) 119.
 (d) 119.
 (e) 79.
 (f) 6.

Representation from the Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association.

46 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government recently received any representation from the Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association regarding their dearness allowance, etc.; and

(b) if so, whether the Government has issued orders in the matter?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Alleged corrupt practices in the recent municipal elections.

47 Q.—SRI T. ANANTHA PAI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that a number of corrupt practices were resorted to in the recent municipal elections and what steps the Government took to ensure fair elections being held all over the State?

A.—Three instances alleging what appeared to be corrupt practices were brought to notice of the Government after the elections were over.

Steps have been taken to amend the rules for the election of municipal councillors making provision in those rules to prevent the possibility of such corrupt practices. Action has also been taken to see that the polling officers and other election staff exercise more vigilance.

Direct recruitment of Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police.

48 Q.—SRI R. S. ARUMUGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how many persons were directly recruited in the cadre of Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police in our State, between the period 1st April 1937 and 31st March 1952;

(b) how many of them were Harijans in each cadre; and

(c) how many Harijans and non-Harijans so recruited have been promoted?

[25th November 1952]

- A.—(a) Sub-Inspectors—1,242.
 Deputy Superintendents of Police—36.
 (b) Sub-Inspectors—122.
 Deputy Superintendents of Police—8.
 (c) Harijan Sub-Inspectors promoted as Inspectors—4.
 Non-Harijan Sub-Inspectors promoted as Inspectors—320.
 Harijan Deputy Superintendents of Police promoted as District Superintendents of Police—2.
 Non-Harijan Deputy Superintendents of Police promoted as District Superintendents of Police—8.

Manufacture of paddy thrashing machines.

49 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal with the Government to manufacture cheap paddy thrashing machines through local fabricators for sale to the ryots in the State; and

(b) if so, at what stage the proposal stands now?

A.—(a) & (b) The cheap paddy thrashing machine mentioned by the hon. Member perhaps refers to the pedal operated type that is said to be very popular in Japan. Experiments are now in progress at the Agricultural College and Research Institute, Coimbatore, with this new pattern. The question of getting them manufactured on a large scale will depend on the results of the experiments in progress.

Return of election expenses.

50 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the expenditure incurred by the State in respect of the action taken by the Government regarding the failure in the lodging of the return of election expenses by the contesting candidates in the recent general elections?

A.—Under the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Representation of the People (Conduct of Elections and Election Petitions) Rules, 1951, all action relating to the failure to lodge the returns of election expenses will be taken by the Election Commission, which is the statutory authority for deciding questions of disqualifications. So far as the State Government are concerned they are only getting the notifications issued by the Election Commission published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* under instructions from the Election Commission. The Returning Officers are publishing on the notice boards of their offices, the names of persons who have been reported by them to the Election Commission as having

[25th November 1952]

not filed their returns of election expenses in time and in the manner required and also communicating copies of the Election Commission's notifications to the persons concerned. The expenditure incurred by the State Government in notifying the names of contesting candidates who were disqualified will not involve any appreciable amount, though the actual amount cannot be ascertained since neither separate lists of contesting candidates disqualified are published nor separate account of expenditure in respect of them is maintained.

Subsidies to Rural Medical Practitioners.

51 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned in the year 1952 any subsidies to the Rural Medical Practitioners of Indigenous Medicine in Rural Dispensaries in the State; and

(b) if so, in what centres?

A.—(a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b)

Name of places.	Number of Rural Medical Practitioners.
(1) Paramba in Malabar district.	One Rural Medical Practitioner.
(2) Chinnacherukur Panchayat in Nellore district.	One Rural Medical Practitioner.

Water-supply facilities in Tirupati town.

52 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representation from the Tirupati Municipality regarding the financial assistance to the Municipality to improve the water facilities of the town; and

(b) if so, when the Government are likely to issue orders in the matter?

A.—(a) & (b) The answer is in the affirmative. The matter is under consideration.

Revision of the electoral rolls.

53 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how the expenditure in connexion with the revision of the electoral rolls for 1952-53 will be divided between the Government and the local bodies;

[25th November 1952]

(b) whether it is a fact that employees in municipalities and district boards are entrusted with the work of verification and revision of election rolls during out of office hours in the areas where they work; and

(c) if the answer to (b) is in the affirmative, who pays the extra remuneration, if any, to the persons entrusted with the work?

A.—(a) The local bodies, viz., panchayat boards, district boards, municipal councils and the Corporation of Madras which adopt the same Assembly electoral rolls for their elections do not bear any portion of the extra expenditure incurred by this Government on the annual revision and printing of the electoral rolls for the Assembly and Parliamentary Constituencies, 1952. Only the cost of the copies of rolls supplied to local bodies are recovered at the following rates, from them:—

Rolls in the regional languages. Re. 0-0-6 per forme of four pages or fraction thereof.

Rolls in diglott .. Re. 0-0-9 per forme of four pages or fraction thereof.

These rates include only the extra cost of striking and binding the extra copies of the rolls required for the local bodies and the extra cost of paper involved.

(b) Yes. The employees of not only municipalities and district boards, but also all departments of the Government, State and Central, are required to do enumeration work in connexion with the revision of the rolls in certain selected areas every year.

(c) The remuneration to enumerators is paid by the State Government and 50 per cent of this expenditure is recovered from the Government of India.

Promotion of Harijan Police Inspectors.

54 Q.—SRI R. THANGAVELU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) how many Harijan Police Inspectors were promoted as Deputy Suerintendents of Police in 1951-52; and

(b) whether communal rotation is followed in the matter of promotion as Deputy Superintendents?

A.—(a) No Harijan Inspector of Police was promoted as Deputy Superintendent of Police in 1951-52; and

(b) No, Sir.

[25th November 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

(1) HUNGER-STRIKE OF WORKERS OF RAJA RAJESWARI WEAVING MILLS, AZHIKODE.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sri K. P. Gopalan. The motion reads as follows:—

'This Assembly hereby stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Government to take effective and urgent steps to reinstate the illegally retrenched 69 workers from the Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikhode, Baliapatam, North Malabar, resulting in mass hunger strike in front of the factory causing alarm to the public.'

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have brought this adjournment motion to bring to the notice of the Government how the factory owners of Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikhode, are violating the laws of the land."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The State is not responsible for that."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"I shall explain myself, Sir. Regarding the factory in question here, there is a dispute pending before the Appellate Tribunal, Bombay. As per the Trade Disputes Act, if there is an appeal pending before the Appellate Tribunal, the factory owners cannot dismiss a worker or reduce the wages of the workers."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is there no remedy for this except by way of an adjournment motion?"

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Sir, it is brought here to the notice of the Government so that they may enforce the existing laws and see that the factory owners do not go against the laws, and also reinstate the workers who have been retrenched. In this particular case, Sir, the Trade Union itself sent a telegram on this matter to the Hon. Minister for Labour and the Labour Department stating that the Management have openly violated the existing law and illegally dismissed certain workers. Sir, according to the Trade Union law if a worker has to be discharged from the factory he must be given 14 days' notice or he must be given 14 days' wages. In this case it is an open violation of the Trade Disputes Act as well as the Trade Unions Act. The workers were not only dismissed; they were caught by their neck and pushed out of the factory. It is in this way the management dismissed some of the workers, and this has resulted in mass hunger strike by the workers. Sir, here is a clear case of the violation of the ordinary law of the land by the management and the Government failing to carry out their duty. The factory owners have violated the laws of the land by dismissing the workers against the strict provisions of the law and the Government have not done anything to protect the workers against that action. In this particular case I want to bring to the notice of the Government that the action of the management in dismissing certain workers is illegal. It is the duty of this House and it is the duty of the Government to see that the workers are reinstated and to bring home to the factory management that they

25th November 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

cannot reduce the wages of the workers or dismiss them at their whim and fancy. I bring this matter to the notice of the Government so that they may take immediate steps to reinstate the dismissed workers and also safeguard the interests of the workers and see that the existing laws of the country are obeyed. So I request Government to intervene in this matter and take effective and urgent steps to see that the factory owners are made to understand that they cannot do as they please violating the laws of the country, and ask them to reinstate the dismissed workers."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the only question which we are now considering in this motion for adjournment is whether this is a definite matter of urgent public importance and whether the Government could in any way be held responsible for the particular circumstances that have arisen."

11-40
a.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I do not see how the Government are responsible."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"This is just what I want to explain. The whole question here is that there is an adjudication pending in respect of this very factory under the existing law which the Government are expected to uphold and administer. During the pendency of an adjudication, when a dispute is before an adjudicator the employer is not entitled to change the terms of service nor is he entitled to dismiss any person. This employer has now dismissed some people in contravention of the existing law. This is how the Government come in and, if they do not move in the matter and see to it that the trade union law as it exists to-day is properly enforced and administered . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Are there no other methods by which this can be done? Where is the necessity for this House to stop its business and consider this matter?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, there is unfortunately no other method. The point is that the worker cannot go to a court of law, nor is it a case where the courts can take cognizance of offences under the Industrial Disputes Act. Unless it is moved by the Government we cannot take it to a court of law. Therefore the responsibility of the Government comes in here. If I go before a court and say, 'look here, this employer has contravened the law, please take action against him', the court will not entertain my request. It is only the Government that can move the Court."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"You can go to the Tribunal."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, the trouble is that we cannot do so and that is why the adjournment motion that is now before the House is in order."

MR. SPEAKER:—"May I know when the strike took place and what the Hon. Minister for Labour has got to say on this subject?"

[25th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, this subject has been sprung upon me by surprise. So far as I am aware, if during the pendency of a dispute, the management or labour take any action, the proper course is to move the Industrial Tribunal. If the hon. Member had brought this fact to my notice I would have certainly made some enquiries, but the hon. Member has not done so."

MR. SPEAKER :—" May I know when the strike took place? "

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" On 15th November 1952, the manager dismissed three workers from the factory with 8 to 14 years of service. He again dismissed another worker on the 21st November. The next day, 22nd November, he dismissed 35 women workers and 30 boys. The satyagraha started on the 19th November and the hunger strike from the 24th November."

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" Sir, my submission is that, however much we may sympathize with the labourers, there are other methods which they must exhaust before they can come to this House, which they have not done."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have heard enough from both sides and I am going to give my considered ruling straightway. A hunger strike or a fast can never become the subject matter of an adjournment motion, nor are they fit subjects for adjournment motions. If the workers go on a hunger strike, they do so voluntarily. The Government do not ask them to go on a hunger strike."

" There is also another motion from my hon. Friend, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, about the fast undertaken by Sri Potti Sriramulu, on which also I am going to give my ruling now."

Apart from this, the motion before the House now is—

'This Assembly hereby stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Government to take effective and urgent steps to reinstate the illegally retrenched 69 workers from the Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Baliapatam, North Malabar, resulting in mass hunger strike in front of the factory causing alarm to the public.'

" If the facts are as stated in the motion, there are other ways by which these retrenched workers can be reinstated. The Government have no responsibility in the matter. I therefore rule the motion out of order."

(2) SRI POTTI SRIRAMULU'S FAST ON THE ANDHRA PROVINCE
ISSUE.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah has given notice that,

'This House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the serious situation arising out of the 38 days' fast of Sri Potti Sriramulu on the Andhra Province issue, who is in a serious condition and the Government's attitude upon it.'

" I had advised him privately that it was not a proper subject to be brought as an adjournment motion and, in spite of that, he

25th November 1952]. [Mr. Speaker]

has asked me to read his motion and give my ruling. In future whenever I advise an hon. Member in my chamber that a particular subject is not a proper one, I would like him to take it as my view in the matter."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, may I make a submission? There are two points which arise out of what you have said. The first thing is in regard to taking your advice in the chamber. Sir, all members are willing to take your advice and to meet you as often as possible in your chamber. But, the real difficulty is that when questions are brought to your notice in the chamber and when you give your advice or ruling in the chamber itself, the other members will be deprived of the opportunity of knowing what it was that was moved and what was ruled out and, therefore, it would not be a guidance to them. This is the reason for myself making a request to you so that we may be able to regulate our motions for adjournment."

" The second point is that even while giving your ruling on the previous motion, you have already indicated your mind that you are going to rule this motion also out of order. It puts us at a very disadvantage because we could not say anything more. Apart from this, I must submit in all seriousness that hunger-strikes are not matters . . . "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a hunger-strike but a fast."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, this fast undertaken by Sri Potti Sriramulu is not a light matter. It is in connection with . . . "

MR. SPEAKER :—" This House is not responsible for it nor are the Government responsible for it in any way."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I am going to submit that this Government are responsible for the situation leading to the fast and if you are pleased to give me only two or three minutes' time I shall try to satisfy you."

" This question has been raised for many years. What happened in 1949 was . . . (Interruption.) I would request the Hon. Ministers also to pay some attention. In 1949, when the Constitution was being finally shaped, the question came to a head."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN :—" Sir, on a point of order, I thought you had already given a ruling on this subject."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have given my ruling on the hunger-strike in the Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode. The question now is in regard to the fast undertaken by Sri Potti Sriramulu."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am going to focus attention on and concentrate on the point how this Government are responsible and how the failure of this Government is the reason for this fast. When this question came up in 1949, even before the promulgation of the Constitution, those who were in authority or had the

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [25th November 1952]

authority to make the Constitution said that if there was some amount of agreement in the State of Madras, the Andhra Province would be included in the Constitution. The Andhra Provincial Congress Committee consisting of several shades of opinion passed a resolution and, on the basis of this resolution, the Central Government directed and the Madras Government appointed a Partition Committee. The Central Government in passing orders on the Report of the Partition Committee said that, although the Committee was appointed in pursuance of the general agreement arrived at, as there were certain differences mentioned in the Report certain steps had to be taken before this question could be mooted again."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Central Government are responsible for this and not the Government of Madras."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" No, Sir. It devolved upon this Government to take those steps."

RAJA MUTHIA CHETTIAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Sir, on a point of order, I would like you to tell us whether you are allowing a discussion on this subject."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have given the hon. Member two minutes' time."

RAJA MUTHIA CHETTIAR OF CHETTINAD :—" From the way in which the hon. Member is dealing with it, we would like to have an opportunity to reply to the hon. Member."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I do not like to waste my time in replying to my hon. Friend. Sir, when the Central Government passed orders, it was the duty of this Government to have taken those steps in relation to the division of assets or of projects and other points raised in the Order passed by the Central Government. But, since the date of this Order, this Government have not taken any steps. It has therefore worsened the situation and has led several people to take several actions and, I am sure, this fast is also one of the consequences of the failure of this Government to follow up the directions given by the Central Government in their Order of 1950, and that is how, Sir, this Government are responsible."

11-50 a.m. * THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, will you allow me to say a word. The point raised is whether we should adjourn the business of the House now because a certain gentleman is observing a fast. Let us not involve ourselves, on this point, in the merits of the partition or whatever else it may be called. The question, now, is whether the fasting should be taken notice of by the House and we should adjourn. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to point out some of the facts in the history of this matter. He led up to a point that the Central Government asked for an agreement on the subject before anything further could be done. He interpreted it as if it

25th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

had been a duty laid on this Government to compel or persuade other people to agree. There, I think he is wrong in his interpretation."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I never said so."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If he did not say so, there is no argument in it. The Central Government said that there should be agreement up to a point before they could take up the question. That agreement essentially dealt with agreement of persons concerned, organizations concerned and the like and not the Government. In fact the Government can do very little in regard to this agreement. Government will be always misunderstood if they intervene in this matter. It would be better, therefore, if this agreement could be arrived at by organizations, public associations, leading citizens and the like and that is what is going on. As I interpret the fast, it is really a fast so that people should come to an agreement. It has nothing to do with the Government."

(At this stage, Sri T. Viswanatham stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am not going to allow any hon. Member to speak further on this matter."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, the hon. Member who gave notice of the adjournment motion may be allowed to speak."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have given time to the hon. Member who gave notice of the adjournment motion and he has not stood up. The motion before the House is that :

" This House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the serious situation arising out of the 38 days' fast of Sri Potti Sriramulu on Andhra Province issue, who is in a serious condition and Government's attitude upon it."

I do not know how the Government are responsible for this. I am not convinced by the arguments of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, shall I explain?

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not necessary at all. I am not speaking lightly. Let not the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition misunderstand me. On *Krithigai* and *Amavasya* days I also fast. My friend, just sitting opposite to me, Sri P. T. Rajan also fasts on *Krithigai* days. After all, it is a voluntary fast. We do it for religious purposes. Here Government are not responsible. If Andhra Province is necessary, there are other ways. The Central Government are responsible for it and not our State Government. I rule the adjournment motion out of order."

MIL—FOOD AND FAMINE CONDITIONS IN THE STATE—REQUEST FOR A DEBATE ON.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Last time, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I requested the Hon. the Leader of the House to allot two days for a discussion of the situation in the State with regard to food

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [25th November 1952]

and famine conditions. He then said that he would consider it. May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. the Leader of the House has considered the matter and whether he is going to allot two days for a discussion of the situation in the State with regard to food and famine conditions."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I am still having it in my mind."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I think, Sir, the answer of the Leader of the House is not quite satisfactory. Though I requested the Hon. the Leader of the House ten days ago to allot two days for the purpose, the Hon. the Leader of the House simply says, 'I am having it in my mind.' I would rather wish the Hon. the Leader of the House says that he is pleased to allot two days this week."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I would advise the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to consult the Hon. the Leader of the House and come to some agreement on this matter and inform me of it."

(At this stage the hon. Member Sri G. Latchanna stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member put in writing whatever he has to say or let him meet me in my chamber and I shall consider it."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"On a point of information, Sir. According to the Agenda supplied to us, the fourth item, namely, consideration of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, should be taken up."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is referring to yesterday's Agenda. Let him refer to do-day's Agenda."

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION
BILL, 1952 (L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)—cont.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I rise to present the report of the Joint Select Committee * on the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, and move—

"That the Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee be taken into consideration."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"On a point of order, Sir. To-day the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is being sought to be moved before this House. In rule 93 of the Rules

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

of Procedure of the Madras Legislative Assembly, the procedure for moving Bills after they have been referred to the Select Committee is laid down. That rule says:

* 93. (1) After the expiry of fifteen days from the making of the report, the Member-in-charge may move—

"(i) that the Bill, as reported by the Select Committee be taken in to consideration;

(ii) that the Bill be recommitted either—

(a) as a whole; or

(b) with respect to particular clauses or amendments only; or

(c) with instructions to the Select Committee to make provision in regard to any specified particular."

(2) "If the Member-in-charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration any Member may move as an amendment that the Bill be recommitted."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Chair has got power to dispense with the provisions regarding periods of notice."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Under rule 93 the Member-in-charge of the Bill may move after the expiry of fifteen days from the making of the report that the Bill as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration. This is a specific and inherent right of Members of this House. This provision has been specifically provided for a particular purpose. I know, under rule 115, the Hon. Speaker may, in his discretion, dispense with the provisions of rule 93 with regard to notice, periods of notice or interval between any two stages of legislation and allow any motion regarding a Bill or any amendment to be moved without notice, or after such interval, as he may think fit. My submission is that in view of the fact that this Bill is a very important Bill, that the report of the Joint Select Committee had been made available to Members of this House only just yesterday, that the questions dealt with in the Bill affect the relations between peasants and land-owners in an entire district, that a number of complicated legal questions are also involved—in view of all these considerations, the normal procedure that is laid down under rule 93"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Bill was introduced in the last session."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The purpose of referring the Bill to a Select Committee was to examine the various clauses in the Bill particularly in view of the complicated nature of the subject. The Select Committee has gone into the whole question and made a report. Is it not, therefore, necessary that in a Bill like this, involving complicated questions of law, involving relations between hundreds of thousands of peasants and landlords, the report of the Joint Select Committee must be studied by every Party in the House? That is the main question, Sir, before us. I would like to submit to the Hon. Speaker that he should not dispense with the entire period of notice. If necessary I would

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [25th November 1952]

request the Hon. Speaker to give us some time so that the whole House may have an opportunity to study the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Bill. In conclusion, I would request the Hon. Speaker not to waive the notice of the entire period of 15 days."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member's submission is not a point of order. It is only a request to the Chair."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I did not know that the Bill was being moved after the period of notice was waived under rule 115. This has not been made clear. I would therefore submit to the Hon. Speaker that this thing should not be allowed."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I do not know whether the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi is raising this point of order on his own initiative or with the concurrence and consent of hon. the Leader of the Opposition. When we agreed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee it was also agreed—and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was also a party to it—that the report must be submitted by 22nd November and consideration of the Bill must be taken up on the 24th. Mr. Speaker Sir, it is not a question of your exercising your discretion arbitrarily."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I can exercise my discretion."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" . . . That apart, Sir, it is a matter which was agreed to by the whole House. When the Bill was referred to the Joint Select Committee it was agreed by all that the report should be submitted by 22nd November. The report was submitted on the 22nd, and we are taking up the Bill for consideration to-day. Evidently the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi was not present in the House when the Bill was referred to the Select Committee."

12 noon MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a point of order. It is only a request to the Chair. It is time for the Hon. Minister to move that the Bill be taken into consideration."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, on a point of personal explanation with reference to what the Hon. Leader of the House has said. Whether the hon. Member, Mr. Ramamurthi has consulted me or not, generally, in regard to raising points of order, Members are at liberty to raise points of order as and when points of order or points of privilege arise on the spur of the moment. Therefore, the Hon. Minister need not make a point of it. But, Mr. Ramamurthi was only pointing out a salutary rule."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" One sentence more for me, Sir. The Speaker, it is admitted, has the discretion to order things as he likes, and I think, if there is a case in which discretion should be exercised in the manner that it has been done, it is this case. I am surprised, and I cannot understand why Mr. Ramamurthi is playing dilatory tactics in this case."

25th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, this has been a very much discussed subject. The report has been placed in the hands of hon. Members yesterday and therefore, I think, at this stage I need not paraphrase or amplify the material that is placed before the House. I will explain matters as and when any specific issue is raised."

MR. SPEAKER :—" No more amendments to the Bill will be received. In fact, I have given enough time for giving notice of amendments. As hon. Members are aware, yesterday just a few minutes before a Bill was moved, notice of an amendment was given by an hon. Member, and he raised a point of order that it was not circulated. Therefore the office must be given sufficient time to have the amendments typed and reneoed."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" May I submit, Sir, that the Bill as amended by the Select Committee contains several changes, as the marginal lines show. It was given to hon. Members only yesterday, and if you are pleased to extend the time for giving notice of amendments till this afternoon, it will be helpful."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Not possible."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I submit, Sir, that in a way we are going to have a general discussion on the Bill to-day, and the amendments may not come up after all till to-morrow. So, Sir, you may be pleased to extend the time for giving notice of amendments till 4 p.m. to-day."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will allow till 1-30 p.m. to-day."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In fact, we were supplied with copies of the report of the Select Committee and of the Bill only yesterday when we were sitting in this House. Afterwards we had to go back and study the entire Bill and the implications of the amendments. Therefore, to limit the time for giving notice of amendments till 1-30 p.m. to-day will not satisfy hon. Members. Moreover, how can we frame amendments when we are sitting here in the House."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The whole of yesterday afternoon was available to hon. Members."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" It was available to them without notice."

MR. SPEAKER :—" As a special case I shall allow time for receipt of notice of amendments till 3 o'clock to-day. The motion is—

" That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, as amended by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into consideration at once."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, I have given notice of a closure motion that the question be now put."

[25th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" To whom was it given? "

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I have given it to the Secretary."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will look into the matter. The Bill is now before the House for discussion."

* SRI P. G. KARUTHIRUMAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think it would be appropriate on this occasion to quote what Oliver Goldsmith said, namely :—

' Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay,
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath has made,
But the bold peasantry, the country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.'

These are the words of Oliver Goldsmith, in which he has stated that the bold peasantry, the country's pride, when once destroyed can never be supplied. So far as this Bill is concerned, our peasants are the backbone of our greatest industry, namely the agricultural industry. So far as the cost of cultivation in our State is concerned, it amounts to two thousand million rupees and this amount is incurred by the poor peasants who cultivate the lands. Therefore, protection is needed to these poor people and an assurance or guarantee of protection should be given to these people so that they may carry on their agricultural operations in a peaceful manner. Any Bill that is intended to provide for increased food production should be considered very important by the Government.

" So far as the district of Tanjore is concerned—and I have come in contact with the landlords and tenants during the past few years—there is misunderstanding between the landlords and tenants and the poor peasants are not in a position to cultivate the lands. They are not given a reasonable share to which they are entitled and some of them have been evicted from their places. This Bill enables the peasants who are engaged in agricultural work to get their due share from the cultivation of their lands so that they can eke out their livelihood. Sir, Tanjore is a district which has 13 lakhs of acres of paddy land and if the peasants do their work properly and increase the food production, I think, ten million people can be fed by this district alone. But, we find that the average yield in the Tanjore district is less than 2,000 lb. per acre. What happens is, the landlords who own large extent of land engage middlemen who enter into contracts with pannaiyals or other small peasants. As a matter of fact, the peasants do not get good income out of agricultural produce. Therefore, an agreement should be arrived at between the landlords and the peasants. Now, the share that is recommended in this Bill is quite a good one and it is decent and both the parties must therefore abide by it. So far as my district of Coimbatore is concerned, even the existing daily wages of peasants and pannaiyals there are equal to what is now recommended in this Bill for Tanjore. Therefore, in the districts other than Tanjore, the pannaiyals or

25th November 1952] [Sri P. G. Karuthiruman]

agricultural labourers are getting more wages than what the tenants in the Tanjore district were already getting. Therefore these people are complaining that the mirasidars have overlooked their rights. In some cases, there are mirasidars who do not know anything about lands and in fact even the nature of agricultural work, and yet because they are at the helm of affairs, they want to exploit the peasants. Since 90 per cent of the people are agriculturists, their rights should be protected. As far as the other districts are concerned, as I have already mentioned, the rate that is recommended in the Bill is less than or I may say, not even equal to, the rate that is already existing in a district like Coimbatore. Usually, we give a farm labourer during harvest season two marakkala. That is, ordinary and on a monthly basis, we give two kalams of paddy and to permanent labourers we give in addition two months' bonus. So, taking all these things into consideration, our tenants in the Coimbatore district are much better off and the relations between the landlords and the tenants there are much better than those between the landlords and pannaiyals in Tanjore. Of course there are a lot of difficulties in putting the Bill into execution and the Government should take all the things into consideration in giving effect to the provisions of the Bill. As far as I am concerned, I think the landlords should be allowed to take back their lands for cultivation purposes whenever they think it necessary to do so. I consider that such a provision should be made in the Bill, provided it does not affect the rights of the tenants or peasants. Then, Sir, there is another thing in regard to the harvesting charges. I think a certain percentage should be allowed to pannaiyals even though there may be certain practical difficulties in giving them harvesting charges. In lands which give a greater yield, they will get a larger share. In Coimbatore district, male agricultural workers are paid a wage of two marakkals per day during the harvest. During the harvest season, labourers move from place to place and undertake work on contract basis. Labourers are engaged for harvesting and thrashing, and a certain percentage of the produce is given to them. It will be better if there are terms agreed to between the landlord and the tenant instead of a fixed percentage basis. Only when misunderstanding between the mirasidar and the pannaiyal ceases and mutual goodwill prevails, agricultural industry will flourish. I am in entire agreement with the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee and I appeal to the House to pass the Bill unanimously. In the course of the discussion, Members will no doubt express their views on the Bill. The important point to be borne in mind is that the interests of the tenants should not be overlooked. The cost of cultivation is between Rs. 200 and Rs. 250 per acre. Tenants have to meet the cost of cultivation, pay the mirasidars according to the terms of the contract and eke out their livelihood. There are three systems of cultivation in the Coimbatore district. One is the fixed contract system under which the tenant agrees to pay to the landlord a specified number of bags of paddy—say

12-10
P.M.

[Sri P. G. Karuthiruman] [25th November 1952]

20 or 25—per acre. The second is varam cultivation under which the produce is shared between the landlord and the tenant in the proportion of 60 and 40 or 50 and 50 respectively as the case may be. If the lands are fertile and the yield bounteous, tenants generally agree to fixed contracts. If the soil is poor and the yield very low, they agree to varam cultivation. They choose whichever is advantageous to them. In any case, the lot of the tenant is very hard, because he has to meet the cost of cultivation, pay the mirasidar and maintain himself and his family. The third system of cultivation is cultivation by the landowner himself. If the owner himself attends to the cultivation of land and applies sufficient manure, it is more profitable. Personal cultivation is also a great service to the country. This Bill encourages personal cultivation by mirasidars, and it also encourages industrious labourers. It does not encourage lazy mirasidars, and absentee landlordism has no place in this Bill. If the mirasidars realize the duty that they owe to the country in the present grave food situation and take to personal cultivation, I think food production will increase. Some hon. Members apprehend that, if a percentage of the produce is assured to the tenants, they may not care for the land or apply sufficient manure, and suggest that the responsibility for manuring the land should be laid on the mirasidar. If the responsibility is laid on the mirasidar, the tenant may not take any interest in the land, and he may say that it is all the duty of the mirasidar and thereby cause hardship to the mirasidar. If the mirasidar has the welfare of the peasants at heart and wants to increase the fertility of the soil, it is his duty to advance money for purchasing manure or provide manure and recover the money or cost of manure from the tenant later on. (The proposals contained in this Bill have been in force for the last several years in the Coimbatore district. I have put them into effect in my farm. My lands were yielding 1,400 lb. of paddy per acre in 1940. Recently the crop on my lands was harvested in the presence of the Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gowda. I realized an average yield of 5,700 lb. per acre on an extent of 75 acres. This was possible because of personal interest in the cultivation and the goodwill and mutual understanding between myself and my tenants. So many difficulties may arise in working the Bill. They should be removed. Though this Bill is a good one, it will not succeed in achieving the object unless there is goodwill between the mirasidar and the tenant and each one realizes his responsibility and does his part of the work properly. It is the duty of the representatives of the people to approach the people in a proper way and instil confidence in them. We may make good laws. It is our duty to see that the food production is increased not by forcing the law on the people but by making them realize that they have got a part to play at this critical juncture in the country's food situation)

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

"For increasing food production, this Bill will be of great help. I have been applying the provisions of this Bill to my

25th November 1952] [Sri P. G. Karuthiruman]

farm in the Coimbatore district for the last ten years and I have got a considerable increase in the yield. That is why I entirely agree with this Bill and request the hon. Members to support it."

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! 12-20
இந்தப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம் செலக்ட் கமிட்டியால் பரிசீலனை p.m.
செய்யப்பட்டு இப்பொழுது விவாதத்திற்கு வந்திருக்கிறது. அதில் பொறுக்
குக் கமிட்டி சில மாறுதல்களைச் செய்திருக்கிறது. அதன் பிறகு இதில்
இன்னும் சில மாறுதல்கள் இருந்தால் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு
நல்லதொரு பாதுகாப்பு கிடைக்குமென்ற முறையில் நான் சில வார்த்தைகள்
சொல்லலாமென்று முற்படுகிறேன்.

"குறிப்பாக 'பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம்' என்று இருப்பதை 'விவ
சாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம்' என்று இருந்தால் நல்லமுறையில் இருக்கு
மென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். இப்பொழுது பண்ணையாள், மிராசதார்க
ளிடையே பாதுகாப்பு ஏற்படுகிறது. அந்தப் பாதுகாப்பு ஏற்கனவே இருப்
பதை இன்னும் மிகைப்படுத்திக் கொண்டே போவதினால், எந்த நோக்கத்
தோடு இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தோமோ அந்த நோக்கம் ஈடேறுது
என்பது தான் என்னுடைய எண்ணம். இதில் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும்,
மிராசதார்களுக்கும் எப்படி ஒரு சமூகமான உறவு நிலைமை இருக்கவேண்டு
மென்று சொல்லுகிறோமோ அதைப் போலவே விவசாயிகளுக்கும்,
மிராசதார்களுக்கும் ஒரு சமூகமான உறவு நிலை இருப்பது ரொம்பவும்
அவசியமாகும். அடிமைகளாக இன்று நடத்தப்பட்டு வருகின்ற விவசாயி
களுக்கு இந்த சட்டத்தால் அனுசூலம் ஏற்படவேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கான
நடவடிக்கைகளை நாம் இப்பொழுதே எடுக்கவேண்டும். பண்ணையாள்
என்பது தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் மாதிரி தான் இருக்கின்றது. பாரம்
பர்யமாக ஆட்களை அடிமைப் படுத்தி தங்களுக்கு எல்லாவிதமான
தொண்டுகளையும் செய்து வரவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா
மிராசதார்கள் இந்தப் பண்ணையாள் முறையை ஏற்படுத்தினார்கள். இந்தப்
பண்ணையாள் திட்டம் மற்ற இடங்களில் இதைப் போல கிடையாது.
ஆகையால் விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம் என்று இருந்தால் மிகவும்
நன்றாக இருக்குமென்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

"அடுத்தபடியாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் ஒரு வேலி நிலமுள்ளவர்களுக்கும்,
அதற்குக் குறைந்தவர்களுக்கும், இதில் கண்டிருக்கும் ஷரத்துக்கள் செல்லு
படியாகாதென்று விலக்கு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. சர்க்கார் இது மாதிரி
யாக ஒரு வேலி நிலமுள்ளவர்கள் தாங்களே இதை பயிரிட்டு
வருவார்கள் என்ற கருத்தினால் தான் இம்மாதிரி விலக்கு அளித்திருக்
கிறதோ என்று நான் ஊகிக்கிறேன். இம்மாதிரி ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைந்த
நிலச்சுவான்கள் தாங்களே விவசாயத்தை நேரிடையாகச் செய்து வருவார்க
ளையானால் இந்த மாதிரியான விலக்கு இருப்பது அவசியம் தான். அதை
எல்லோரும் வரவேற்பார்கள். ஆனால் இன்றைக்கு அந்த ஒரு வேலி மிராச
தார்கள் கூட தானே சாகுபடி செய்யாமல் பண்ணையாட்களைக்கொண்டு
பயிரிட்டு வந்தால் அவர்களுக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டம் கிடையாது என்னும்பொழுது
தான் நாம் இப்படி ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைந்த நிலச்சுவானிடம் வேலைக்
கிருக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு அநீதி இழைத்தவர்களாகிறோம். ஒரு வேலிக்கு
மேற்பட்ட நிலமுள்ளவர்களிடம் வேலைக்கு இருக்கின்றவர்களுக்கு அதிகமான
லாபம் சட்டத்தால் கிடைக்கும்பொழுது ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைந்த நிலச்
சுவானிடம் பண்ணை வேலை செய்கிறான் என்ற காரணத்திற்காக முன்பு
வாங்கிக் கொண்டிருந்த ½ மரக்கால் கூலியையே இவனும் வாங்கிக்
கொண்டிருக்கும்படி நாமும் விடக்கூடாது. இந்தச் சிறிய மிராசதார்கள்
இன்றைய தினம் தன்னை இந்த சட்டம் பாதிக்காது என்று பழைய வழக்கப்
படி ½ மரக்கால் கூலியையே இன்றைய தினம் கொடுத்து வருகிறார்கள்.
இதைப்பற்றி இப்பொழுது தீவிரமானதொரு சிளர்ச்சி நடைபெற்று வருகிறது.
சமரச அதிகாரிகளோ, ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டோ இதில் தலையிட முடியாமல்
தத்தளித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். Absentee நிலச்சுவாந்தாரைப் போல
இன்றைய தினம் ஒரு வேலிக்கு உள்பட்டு நிலமுடையவர்கள் சாகுபடிக்கு

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [25th November 1952]

ஆட்களை வைத்துக் கொண்டால் அவர்களும் மற்றவர்களைப் போலவே பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு வாரமோ கூலியோ கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சட்டத் தைத் திருத்துவது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். அப்படிச் செய்தால் தான் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு நாம் என்ன பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கவேண்டுமென்று விரும்புகிறோமோ அது ஓரளவு நடைமுறையில் சாத்தியமாகும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ‘tenant’ என்றால் யார் என்று விளக்கம் கொடுக்கப் பட்டிருப்பதில் சரியாகக் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லையென்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். யார் யார் விவசாயம் செய்வதற்கு சரீர உழைப்பை அளிக்கிறார்களோ அவர்கள் தான் ‘tenant’ என்றால் எப்படிப்பட்ட உழைப்பு என்று தெளி வாக்கப்படவில்லை. சாகுபடியில் இன்றைய தினம் நேரிடையாகப் பாடுபடுகிற வர்கள் பலர் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதே போல் மடத்து நிலங்களையோ, தேவஸ் தான நிலங்களையோ குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொண்டிருப்போர்கள், அதாவது விவசாயிகளுக்கு நிலங்களின் சொந்தக்காரர்களுக்கும் இடையில் இருப்போர்களும் தாங்கள் நேரிடையாக நிலத்திற்கு தினமும் சென்று ஆட்கள் சரியாக வேலை செய்கிறார்களா என்று பார்த்து வருவதால் தாங்களும் வேலை செய்கிறவர்கள் தான் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளலாம். ஆகையால் ‘tenant’ என்னும்பொழுது, நேரிடையாக நிலத்தில் பாடு படுகின்ற பாட்டாளி மக்களான விவசாயிகளுக்கும், நிலங்களை குத்தகைக்கு வைத்துக்கொண்டு இடையில் எஜெண்டாகவோ, குத்தகைக்காரனாகவோ பாடுபடுகின்றவர்களுக்கும் பொருத்தமாக அர்த்தம் கொடுக்கக் கூடிய வகையில் இல்லாமல் தனித்தனியாக இருவர்களுக்கும் வித்தியாசம் இருக்கும்படி விளக்கமாகச் சொல்லவேண்டுமே தவிர இப்பொழுது இருப்பது போல் அப்பட்டமாகச் சொல்லிவிடுவதில் பலன் இல்லை. நம்முடைய நோக்கம் இடையிலுள்ளோர்களை அடியோடு ஒழித்துவிடவேண்டுமென்பது தான். Middlemen-களே இருக்கக் கூடாது என்பதாக கலம் ராஜாஜி அவர் களும் கூட சீர்காழி, மாயவரம் சுற்றுப் பிரயணத்திற்கு வந்திருந்த பொழுது வெளியிட்டார்கள். கோவில் தேவஸ்தான நிலங்களையும், மடத்து நிலங்களையும் கூட உண்மையாக நிலத்தில் உழைப்பவர்களுக்குத் தான் குத்தகைக்கு விடவேண்டுமென்பதாக அபிப்பிராயம் தெரிவித்தார்கள். ஆனால் அப்படி அபிப்பிராயம் தெரிவித்தவர்கள் இந்தச் சட்டத்திலே அதை நிறைவேற்ற ஏதாவது திட்டம் வகுத்திருக்கிறார்களா என்று பார்த்தால் அது தான் இல்லை. இடையிலுள்ளோர்களின் தொந்தரவிலிருந்து தன்னை விடுவித்துக் கொள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்த விதமான பாதுகாப்பும் அளிக்கப்பட வில்லை. அது மாத்திரமல்ல. இப்பொழுது நெவில் இருக்கக் கூடிய ‘middlemen’ நூறு, இருநூறு ஏக்கர்கள் என்று நிலங்களைக் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதாவது ராஜ்யம், தெய்வீகமின்றி, விளைந்தாலும், விளையாவிட்டாலும் குத்தகைப்படி நெல் அளக்கத் தயாராக இருப்பதாகச் சொல்லி ஒப்புக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு 30 வாரம் கொடுத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தவர்களும் கூட இப்பொழுது உடனடியாக 40% வாரம் கொடுக்கவேண்டி நேர்ந்து விட்டதால் அவர்களுக்கு குத்தகை எழுதிக் கொடுத்தபடி அளக்க முடியாமல் நெல் அளவு குறைந்து விட்டது. நிலக்காரர்கள் இப்பொழுது கொஞ்சம் கூட தள்ளிக் கொடுக்காமல் குத்தகையில் கண்டபடி நெல்லை அளக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதனால் middlemen பாடு ரொம்பவும் கஷ்டமாக இருக்கிறது. Middlemen இருக்கக் கூடாது என்று சொல்லுவதில் நானும் சேர்ந்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இருந்தாலும் middlemen என்று இருக்கும் வரையில் நிலங்களை நேரிடையாக விவசாயிகளிடம் ஒப்படைக்கும் காலம் வரையில் அவர்கள் ரொம்பவும் கஷ்ட நஷ்டத்திற்கு உள்ளாகாமல் நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்வது ரொம்பவும் அவசியமாகும். ஆகையால் இதைக் கருத்தில் கொண்டு நிலச்சுவான்கள் இந்த குத்தகைதாரர்களுக்கும் தள்ளிக் கொடுக்கும்படியாகச் செய்யவேண்டும். இல்லாவிடில் middlemen என்பதையே நீக்கிவிட்டு எல்லா மடத்து, தேவஸ்தான நிலங்களையும் சர்க்கார் விவசாய டைரக்டர் மூலமாகக் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டு கோவாப்ப ரோடில் முறையில் விவசாயம் செய்வது மிகவும் நல்லதாகும். அப்படிச் செய்வதில் மக்களுக்கும் நல்லது, கூட்டுறவு முறையும் நன்கு முன்னேற்றம் அடையும்.

25th November 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

“இந்தச் சட்டத்திற்கு முன்பு சில இடங்களில் குத்தகை முறையும், சில இடங்களில் வார முறையும் வழக்கத்தில் இருந்து வந்தது. சில இடங் களில் ஒரு ஏக்கர் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் நன்றாக விளைந்தால் 30 கலம் வரையில் விளையும். குத்தகை 18 கலம் அளக்கவேண்டியிருக்கும். அது போக பாக்கி இருக்கக்கூடிய 12 கலமும் விவசாயியைச் சேரும். ஆனால் இப்பொழுது விவசாயிகள் எல்லாம் குத்தகைக்கு வேண்டாம், வாரப்படியே விவசாயம் செய்கிறோம் என்பதாகச் சொல்லிவருகிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரி பல தகராறுகள் ஏற்படாமலிருக்க ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். சட்டத்தில் எல்லோருக்கும் விளங்கும்படியாகச் சொல்லவேண்டும். ஆகையினால் இப் பொழுது நல்ல நிலம், கெட்ட நிலம், மத்திய தரமான நிலம் என்பதாக வெல்லாம் நிலங்களை அதன் தராதரத்திற்குத் தக்கபடி பிரித்து அந்தந்த நிலங்களுக்குத் தக்கபடி குறைந்த பக்க குத்தகை அளவையும் நிர்ணயித்து விடவேண்டும். ஆங்காங்கேயுள்ள ரெவினியூ அதிகாரிகளைக் கொண்டு இந்த மாதிரியாக நிலத்தை மூன்று பிரிவுகளாகப் பிரித்து தனித்தனியாக அவை களுக்கு குத்தகை அளவையும் நிர்ணயித்துவிட்டால், நிலங்களில் நேரிடையாக உழைக்காமல், சாகுபடி செய்யாமல் இருக்கக் கூடியவர்கள் நினைத்த படியெல்லாம் விவசாயிகளிடம் எழுதி வாங்கிக் கொண்டு விவசாயிகளைத் துன்பத்திற்கு ஆளாக்காமல் பார்த்துக்கொள்ள முடியும். ஆகையால் வாரம் என்றும், குத்தகையென்றும் ஏழை விவசாயிகளுக்கு சௌகரியமாக பல முறைகளை வகுத்து, அது தெளிவாக விளங்கும்படியாக ஏற்பாடுகள் செய்யவேண்டும்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய விசை மிருசுதார்கள் மீறிவிட்டால் விவசாயிகள் ரெவினியூ கோர்ட்டில் மனுச் செய்து கொள்ளலாம் என்று இருக்கிறது. ரெவினியூ கோர்ட்டின் தீர்ப்பை எதிர்த்து அப்பீல் செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்றால் ஹைகோர்ட்டுக்குத் தான் அப்பீல் செய்து கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று இருக்கிறது. பெரும்பாலான விவசாயிகளால் இந்த ரெவினியூ கோர்ட்டிலேயே வக்கீலை நியமித்து வாதாட முடியாத நிலைமையிலிருந்து கொண்டிருக்கும்பொழுது அவர்களால் எப்படி ஹை கோர்ட்டுக்குப் பணம் செலவழித்துக் கொண்டு போகமுடியுமென்றதை நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். ஆகையால் ரெவினியூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு அடுத்தபடியாக ஹை கோர்ட்டுக்குப் போகவேண்டுமென்றிருப்பதை மாற்றி ஆங்காங்கேயுள்ள தாலுக்கா சிவில் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அப்பீல் செய்துகொண்டால் போதுமென ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டும். சிவில் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அதிகாரம் கொடுத்தால் தான் விவசாயிகள் ஓரளவு அதிகச் செலவு இல்லாமல் தங்களுடைய கருத்துக்களை எடுத்துச் சொல்லி நியாயத்தைத் தேடிக்கொள்ள வசதி ஏற்படும்.

“இது வரையிலும் நான் அந்தப் பண்ணையாட்களின் குறைகளைப் பற்றியும், அவர்களுடைய நிலைமையைச் சீர்திருத்தவேண்டுமானால் அதற்கு என்னென்ன செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற விஷயங்களைப்பற்றியும் ஓரளவு சொல்லிவந்தேன். 12-30 p.m.

“நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களுக்கும், பண்ணையாட்கள் என்று சொல்லப்படுபவர்களுக்கும் உள்ள சுமுகமான உறவு நிலை ஏற்கெனவே மறைந்துபோய், இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் ஒருவருக்கொருவர் ஒற்றுமையில்லாமல் எதிர்க்கட்சி யாக இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிற இந்த நிலையில் மறுபடியும் இதே நிலைமை நீடித்துக்கொண்டிருப்பதாகத்தான் இந்தப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதா என்று வைத்து, அவர்கள் இன்னும் அதிகமாக ஒருவருக் கொருவர் சோராமல் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமையை ஏற்படுத்திக்கொண்டே போனால், அந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கோ அந்தப் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கோ ஒரு சுபிட்சம் ஏற்படுமென்று எதிர்பார்க்க முடியாது. ஆகையால், நெடு நாட்களாக வற்புறுத்திக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய நிலச் சீர்திருத்தத்தைச் செய்து, ஒரு நல்ல நிலைமை ஏற்படக்கூடிய ஒரு சட்டத்தை நாம் கூடிய சீக்கிரத்தில் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும். இந்தப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து விட்டதனால் மட்டும் அவர்கள் எல்லா விதநன்மைகளையும் அடைந்துவிட்டார்கள் என்று சொல்ல முடியாது.

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [25th November 1952]

இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் மசோதாவானது நிலச் சீர்திருத்தத்தின் முதல்படியானதே தவிர, அதுவே எல்லாவிதமான குறைகளுக்கும் பரிகாரம் என்று சொல்ல முடியாது.

“அதுமாத்திரமல்ல. அவசரச் சட்டத்தினால் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் அதிகமான நன்மை உண்டாகவில்லை. ஜமீன்தார்களிடமிருந்தும், ராஜாக்களிடமிருந்தும் நிலங்களைல்லாம் பறிக்கப்பட்டன. ரஷ்யாவில் ஒருவித Compensation-ம் கொடுக்காமல் அங்கே மிராசுதாரர்களோ நிலச்சுவான்தார்களோ இல்லாத நிலையை ஏற்படுத்தினார்கள். அதேபோல சைனாவிலும் நடந்தது. அதன் பிறகு காஷ்மீரிலும் அதே விதமான முடிவு ஏற்பட்டது. அதே மாதிரி நிலச்சுவான்தார்களுக்கு ஏதாவது ஒரு Compensation கொடுத்தாவது இந்த நிலங்களை விவசாயிகளிடத்தில் நேரடியாகக் கொடுத்தால், உற்பத்திப் பெருக்கும் அதிகமாக இருக்கும். இந்த நிலைமை ஏற்படுவதற்கு இந்த மசோதாவில் இடமிருக்கிறது என்று பார்த்தால் ஒன்றுமே தெரியாமல் ஒரு குழப்பத்தை உண்டு பண்ணியிருக்கிறது. இந்த ஏற்பாட்டினால் எந்தவிதமான நன்மையும் ஏற்படமுடியாது. அந்த நிலங்களுக்கு Compensation கொடுத்தோ, கொடுக்காமலோ, bond எழுதிக் கொடுத்தோ, ஜமீன்தார்களிடமிருந்து நிலம் எப்படிப் பறிக்கப்பட்டதோ அந்த அளவில் செய்தால் இனிமேல் உற்பத்தி பெருகும்; அதிலிருந்து விவசாயிகளுக்கும் ஊக்கம் ஏற்பட்டு சாகுபடி செய்வதற்கான நிலை ஏற்படும். இப்பொழுது எப்படி இருக்கிற தென்றால் நிலையலும் விடாமல், காயலும் விடாமல், நீனைந்து காய்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு குழப்பத்தில் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அவர்களுக்கும் ஒருவிதமான பாதுகாப்பும் இல்லை. மிராசுதார்களுக்கும் இனி என்ன நிலவரம் ஏற்படுமோ என்ற ஒரு குழப்பமான நிலையில் இருப்பதனால் அந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஏற்கனவே கொடுத்து வந்த விதை, எரு முதலியன, மாடு வாங்குவதற்கும் பணம் கொடுத்து உதவி வந்ததுபோல் இனி ஒருவரும் உதவி செய்யமாட்டார்கள். அப்படி ஏற்படும்போது உற்பத்தியை எப்படி நாம் அதிகமாக்கமுடியும்? நாம் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தை எதற்காகக் கொண்டுவந்தோம் என்றால் உற்பத்தி அதிகரிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவந்தோம். ஆனால், இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் வந்த பிறகு அங்கே ஏற்பட்டிருந்த குழப்பத்திற்கு மேல் இன்னும் அதிகமான குழப்பம் ஏற்படுமே தவிர, அதனால் சமூகமான நிலைமை ஏற்படுமா என்று ஐயுறுகிறேன்.

“நெல் உற்பத்தி மாதிரி தான் சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறதே தவிர, போரடிக்கிற அந்த இடத்திலே (Thrashing floor) விவசாயிகளுக்கு வாரத்தைப் பிரித்து கொடுக்கப்படும் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. Commercial crops என்று சொல்லப்படுகிற கரும்பு, வேர்க்கடலை, வாழை, கருவேலம் இந்த மாதிரியாக சாகுபடி செய்தால் அதற்கு என்ன விதி ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது? அதனுடைய விதிதாசாரம் என்னவென்பதை இது வரையில் அங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய பழக்கவழக்கப்படி இடக்கவேண்டுமென்று இருந்தாலுங்கூட, ஓரளவு நன்மையாக இருக்கும். அதுவும் இல்லாமல், Commercial crops என்று சொன்னால் விவசாயிகள் அதிகமாகப் பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள். இதற்குமுன் பகுதி ஓரளவு ரொக்கமாகக் கொடுப்பார்கள். குறைந்த அளவு மிராசுதார்களுக்குக் கொடுப்பார்கள். மற்றது பூராவும் அவர்களை எடுத்துக் கொண்டுவந்தார்கள். இப்பொழுது 40:60 என்று சொன்னால் அவர்கள் மிகவும் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள். அந்த Commercial crops-ஐப் பற்றின விஷயத்தையும் பரிசீலனை செய்து நல்ல விதமான முடிவு செய்யவேண்டும்.

“மாயவரம் agreement என்று ஒன்றும், அடுத்தபடியாக இரண்டு மரக்கால் கூலி கொடுப்பது என்றும் இரண்டு திட்டங்களைக் கொடுத்த படியினால் இந்தத் திட்டம் சாதகமா, அந்தத் திட்டம் சாதகமா என்று விவசாயிகளுக்குப் புரியாத நிலையில் அவர்கள் குழப்பம் ஏற்படுத்திக் கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த மாதிரி இரட்டையா, ஒற்றையா என்று போடாமல் ஒரேயடியாக மாயவரம் agreement என்றே, இரண்டு மரக்கால்

25th November 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

கூலி என்றே சொல்லி ஒன்றை வைத்து, இதைத்தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொன்னால் ஒரு குழப்பமும் இருக்காது. ‘Alternative’ கொடுத்திருப்பதினால் எதையும் புரிந்துகொள்ளமுடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். கிராமத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள் அத்தனை பேரும் கல்வி அறிவு இல்லாதவர்கள். நகரங்களிலுள்ள பழக்கவழக்கங்கள் அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியாது. இந்த மாதிரி இருக்கும்போது அவர்களுக்கு இந்த இரண்டு முறைகளையும் கொடுத்தால் இதில் எது பாதகம், எது சாதகம் என்று அவர்கள் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த மாதிரியான குழப்பம் கிராமத்தில் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. அதைப் போக்கவேண்டுமானால், சரியான முறையில் ஏதாவது ஒரு திட்டத்தைத்தான் சட்டத்தில் வகுக்க வேண்டும்.

“வாரிசு பாத்யம் சம்பந்தமாக பார்க்கும்போது, ஏற்கனவே சென்னையிலே ஒரு கூட்டம் நடந்தது. வண்ணார் தொழிலாளர் கூட்டத்திலே, ‘தொழிலாளர்கள் எல்லோரும் அவரவர் தொழிலை அவரவர்கள் அப்படியே பின்பற்றவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் நாடு செழிக்கும்’ என்று கணம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் சொன்னார். அதைக் கண்ணுற்றுப் பார்க்கும் போது ஏற்கனவே பிராம்மணர், கடித்திரியர், வைசியர், சூத்திரர் என்று இருந்த அந்தப் பாகுபாடு இன்னும் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று நினைப்பதாகத் தோன்றுகிறது. உழுகிறவன் உழுதுகொண்டு இருக்கவேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு ஓரளவு கல்வியறிவு இருந்ததாலுமே வேறு வேலைக்கு அவர்கள் போகக்கூடாது என்று அந்த கருத்தைக்கொண்டு இருக்குமேயானால் நாம் எந்த நோக்கத் தோடு எவ்வளவு அறிவு வளர்ச்சியோடு செய்தோமோ அத்தனையும் ஒரு விதமான பலனும் ஏற்படாமல் பாதிக்கப்படும் என்றுதான் சொல்லக்கூடிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் எப்படி இருக்கவேண்டும்? விவசாயிகளுடைய மகன் வேலை செய்ய விரும்பினால் அதற்கு ஆட்சேபணை இல்லை. அங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஒரு மகனுக்குப் பதில் ஒரு மகன் இருப்பதாக வைத்துக்கொண்டால், அவன் கல்யாணம் செய்துகொண்டு புருஷன் வீட்டில் இருக்கும்போது அந்த நிலம் கவனிக்கப்படமாட்டாது. அப்பொழுது absentee landlordism ஏற்படுகிறது. Absentee landlords கூடாது என்று சொல்லுகிறோம். இருந்தாலும் அதைத்தான் இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் விருத்தி செய்கிறோமே தவிர, எந்த விதத்திலும் absentee landlord-களை அறவே நிறுத்தி விட்டோம் என்று சொல்லமுடியாது. அந்தப் பெண் வேலை செய்யமாட்டாள். ஒரு பண்ணையானை அமர்த்திக்கொண்டு சாகுபடி நடக்கும். அங்கே நேரடியாக சாகுபடி நடக்கவில்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாகக் கூட ஓரளவு மிராசுதாருக்கு 60 சதவிகிதம் வந்து விடுகிறது. ஆகையால் அவர்கள் நிலத்தைக் கவனிக்கவேமாட்டார்கள். ஏற்கனவே பணத்தைக் கொடுப்பார்கள். சுற்றிச் சுற்றி நிலத்தை பார்ப்பார்கள். ஏன் இதைச் செய்யவில்லை, ஏன் அதைச் செய்யவில்லை? என்று கேட்பார்கள். அடிக்கடி நிலத்தை வந்து பார்ப்பார்கள். ஆனால் இப்பொழுது அம்மாதிரி இல்லாமல் போய்விடுகிறது. ஏதோ போட்ட அளவு 60 சதவிகிதம் வந்துவிடுகிறது. அவர்கள் ஒரு விதமான சிரத்தையும் விவசாயத்தில் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாமல் இருந்துவிடுவார்கள், 60 சதவிகிதம் வந்துவிடுகிறது என்ற ஒரு எண்ணத்தினால். ஆகையால் நாம் இந்த மசோதாவை எதற்காக கொண்டுவந்தோம்? உற்பத்தியை பெருக்குவதற்கு. எங்கு பார்த்தாலும் உற்பத்தி ஓரளவு பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் அந்து நிலைமை அங்கே ஏற்படாமல் உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கு சர்க்கார் அவர்கள் ஒரு amendment கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

“இதில், சாதாரணமாக, சீர்காழி, மாயவரத்திலே அதிகமாக நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றப்படுபவர்கள் கூட அதிகமாக இல்லை. ஆனால், மனைக் கட்டிலிருந்து வெளியேறினவர்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு நிலம் தன்னை விட்டு மாறுமலிருப்பதால் ஓரளவு சாப்பாடு கிடைக்கிறது. ஆனால் எங்கு இருந்து கொண்டு சாப்பிடுவது? ஏதாவது ஒரு இடம் வேண்டாமா? ஒரு வீடு, அல்லது தங்குவதற்கு குச்சாவது வேண்டாமா? அவனுடைய வாழ்க்கையை

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [25th November 1952]

நடத்துவதற்கு ஓரளவு வருவாய் வந்தாலும் அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டு, ஒருவித குழப்பமும் இல்லாமல் இருக்கவேண்டுமானால் அவர்களுக்கு தங்க வசதி இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் அப்பொழுது வேண்டுமென்று எல்லோருமே கேட்டோம். அதுவும் வந்தது. ஆனால் மனைக் கட்டு விஷயத்திலே ஒன்றும் செய்யப்படவில்லை. அதைப்பற்றி செலக்ட் கமிட்டியில் கூட ஓரளவு சொன்னார் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். அதில் சொன்னாலும், 'அது வேறு விஷயம்; பிறகு கவனிக்கப்படும்' என்று அதில் நிறுத்திவிட்டார்கள். அது உடனடியாகச் செய்யவேண்டிய வேலை. இந்தச் சட்டம் போட்டு அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகளுக்குத் தங்க இடம் இல்லையேல் ஒன்றும் நடக்காது. ஒன்று, அதிலே 10 அல்லது 20 வருஷம் பரம்பரையாக இருந்தார்களே அந்த மனைக்கட்டைக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

12-40 P.M. "இப்பொழுது சர்க்காரால் அவர்களுக்கு மூன்று செண்டு நிலம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அந்த மூன்று செண்டு நிலத்திலே அவர்கள் கக்கூஸ் கூடக் கட்டிக் கொள்ள முடியாத இடத்தில் எப்படி குடிசை போடுக்கொள்ள முடியுமென்பது தெரியவில்லை. அவர்களுக்கு ஆடுகள் இருக்கும், மாடுகள் இருக்கும், அவைகளைக் கட்டிக் கொள்வதற்கு இடம் வேண்டாமா? அந்த மாதிரி அவர்களுடைய நிலைமையைப் பார்க்கும் போது அவர்களுக்குக் குறைந்த பட்சம் வீடு கட்டிக் கொள்வதற்கு பத்து செண்டுகள் அவசியம். அவ்விதம் கொடுத்தால்தான் ஓரளவு அவர்கள் நல்ல முறையில் வாழ முடியும். அவ்விதம் இல்லாமல் அப்புறம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம் என்றிருந்தால் மறுபடியும் குழப்பம்தான் ஏற்படும். எந்த விதமான விவகாரமும் இல்லாமல் இருக்கும்படியாக நாம் சட்டம் செய்ய வேண்டும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு நாம் நன்மை செய்ய வேண்டும் என்பதற்காகத்தான் இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறோம். இந்த சட்டம் அவசரமாக போட்டிருந்தாலும்கூட அதன் விஷயங்களை பரிசீலனை செய்து அமலுக்கு கொண்டுவர வேண்டும். இப்பொழுது அதை சட்டமாகக் கப் போகிறோம். அது சட்டமானால் அதனால் என்ன பாதகம் ஏற்படுமோ அதை நன்கு கவனித்து இதை நல்ல முறையில் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத் தான் நாம் எல்லோரும் இங்கு கூடி யிருக்கிறோம். இதை நன்றாக விவாதித்து யாதொரு அவசரமும் இல்லாமல் இதில் வேண்டிய மாறுதல்களைச் செய்து இதைச் சட்டமாக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இத்துடன் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this Bill was once discussed on the floor of this House before it was referred to the Joint Select Committee. Now, once again it has come before us, after the Joint Select Committee has made its report, for discussing the general aspects of the Bill. Without taking much of the time of the House, I would like first of all to point out the history of this Bill. Once we trace the history of this Bill, we would see whether this Bill fulfils the purpose for which it was originally designed. During the last Budget session in this House, when questions were put to the Members of the Government, this question was repeatedly brought to the notice of the Government, namely, the existence of an extremely grave situation on the agrarian front not only in the district of Tanjore but in almost every district in this State. Particularly after the publication of the Subrahmanyam Committee report, landlords have been evicting tenants on the plea of bringing lands under the so-called personal cultivation with a view to obviate all necessity of undertaking any obligations that might be imposed on them if any land reforms were carried out. As a result of this, when we were putting questions to the Government, the Government were promising to us that they were going to bring in land legislation.

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

In fact the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam pointed out that the first act of this Government was de-control and the next act on which they were concentrating their entire attention was the question of land reform for the whole State. It was then we intervened and pointed out 'Well, you may take a little time to bring in your legislation; you still say that you are considering the Subrahmanyam Committee report; we do not know for how long you are going to consider it; while you are still considering, hundreds and thousands of peasants are being evicted from their lands; of what use is your Bill going to be later on? Therefore, the first and immediate task for the Government, if they really and seriously mean to bring in legislation of lasting benefit to the thousands of peasants, would be to stop these evictions and see that all these peasants who have been evicted from their lands are restored to their lands immediately.' It was in this connexion that I pointedly asked the Hon. the Chief Minister why he should burke the issue, and why he should not promulgate an Ordinance prohibiting evictions and restoring all those tenants who had been evicted. The Hon. the Chief Minister was good enough to promulgate an Ordinance of that type. I was expecting—at any rate Members on this side of the House were expecting—that immediately the House adjourned, an Ordinance would be promulgated prohibiting evictions of tenants not only in the district of Tanjore but throughout the State, and also restoring tenants to their lands from which they had been evicted during the last four or five years. That alone would give the Government breathing space to think of legislation that is absolutely essential in order to adjust the relations between the landlords and the tenants and also to see that food production is increased. Instead of doing that, the Government have to-day brought forward a legislation that would apply only to a particular district, namely, Tanjore.

"Sir, I would like to examine the provisions of the Bill now. Why is it that such a Bill is brought forward now? It was open to the Government to come forward and say, 'We are prohibiting evictions in all the districts.' Is it not a fact that evictions are taking place in other districts also? Is it not a fact that there has been agrarian unrest in other districts than Tanjore? Or is it not a fact that in Guntur, Krishna and Malabar districts, hundreds and thousands of tenants have been evicted? Or is it not a fact that in Watrap of Ramanathapuram district and also in certain parts of Tirunelveli district, there has been agrarian unrest? What is this agrarian unrest due to? Is it not a fact too that evictions constitute one of the most basic and fundamental causes for the continuance of this state of affairs in the various districts of this State? What prevented this Government from bringing forward a legislation of that type? The Bill itself makes that point clear. This Government will not take any steps unless they are compelled by the struggle and agitation of the people. That is crystal clear. It is because in the Tanjore district the agrarian discontent reached a very acute

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [25th November 1952]

stage due to the neglect of the Government for the last 5 or 6 years, the Government came forward with this legislation. In spite of the fact that the Government attempted to crush the peasant movement in the district, the peasants refused to be crushed. Therefore it is that the Government felt that this movement could not be crushed, and that they should do something in the matter. This is how, Sir, the Government proceed. I am sorry for it. This Government will not in any way move otherwise. This is the simple lesson that is to be drawn from this Bill. In order to prevent the extreme disturbances in the Tanjore district, the Government have come forward with this Bill. Therefore, if such a Bill in respect of other districts is to be brought forward in this House, there must be similar disturbances in those districts, bordering on revolt; and those disturbances alone will compel the Government to think of bringing forward legislation for those districts. This is the simple lesson that the ordinary peasant draws from the behaviour of the Government. I am glad about this. This is the truth, and I am glad that the Government should by their behaviour be proving the existence of this truth.

“ Now let us consider the provisions of this Bill. I am not considering this Bill from any humanitarian aspect. I do not also want this House to look at the matter from that angle. We are primarily interested in saving the people of our country from economic ruin that is overtaking them gradually and rapidly. I would like to ask hon. Members to look at the Bill from the proper perspective. For the last five years, this Government have been trying to introduce so many schemes of grow-more-food, but nonetheless the total quantity of food produced in the country has been going down year after year. We are interested not only in the question of growing more food for our people, but we are also interested in the other economic aspects of this country, the general economic betterment of the country. Now what is it that stands in the way of the general economic improvement of the country? We look at this legislation from that angle. Our contention is that it is not because that the landlord is to-day owning about 5,000, or 6,000 or 10,000 acres that we are against him, but it is the existence of the system of ‘ landlordism ’ that prevents the economic development of the country. This leads to a situation wherein the ordinary peasants and millions of our people, who constitute the bulk of the market for our industrial goods, are deprived of the much needed purchasing power, which alone will lead to the general industrialisation of the country.

12-50 P.M. Unless this problem is tackled and unless the peasant is enabled to buy the goods that are produced by our industries, there cannot be any further industrialisation of this country. The Government may bring about so many schemes, but all those schemes will flounder when they come up, against this wall of the market problem. Therefore it is that we say that, in order that the country as a whole may develop industrially and in order that there may be a balance between agriculture and industry, this

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

problem has got to be tackled. It is from that angle that we look at this problem of relations between the landlord and the tenant. It is also a historical fact that there is not a single country in the world which has industrially advanced unless this basic problem of feudal relations in land has been completely solved. In England, in France, in America, and in every other country in the world, industrial development has taken place only on that basis.

“ Now, what is it that this piece of legislation does? There are three or four aspects of it. Firstly, in respect of some tenants who have been evicted, the Bill provides that those people must be reinstated. So far well and good. Then, does it provide that these peasants will continue to enjoy the fruits of their toil? To-day we are talking of production. How can production increase unless the peasant has got that joy in his labour? Now, there is such a thing as the joy of creation. Everybody in this world knows what joy of creation is. If the peasant is not enabled to have that joy of creation, then how on earth are the Government going to give him the incentive to produce more? That is a simple proposition which anybody can understand.

“ For the last fifty or hundred years the landlords have been kept in charge of production. The argument is put forward how production can increase unless the landlord is there, who has got to find the money and the like. In this connexion, I shall put a simple question. For the last hundreds of years it is the landlord that has been in charge of production and despite that fact, how is it that production has been going down year after year? It indicates that he belongs to a class of people who are unfit to be kept in charge of production for a single day more, because the longer they are continued to be kept in charge of production the greater will be the danger to the entire country. This is a class of people who have nothing whatsoever to do with the land and who do not do any service on the land. Still they get the ownership of the land and that mere ownership entitles them to receive the major portion of the produce turned out by the sweat of the workers and the peasants there. That is the sort of thing that is taking place now. Of course, I would not demand that the entire class of landlords must be abolished forthwith.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Say ‘ liquidate ’. Use your own language.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I have got to tell the Hon. Sri Subramaniam that liquidation of a class has got a particular meaning and liquidation of a person has got a different meaning. Liquidation of a class means that there would be no longer a class of persons called the landlords, but all the people belonging to that landlord class will continue to exist not as landlords but as ordinary people in this country. I would like to refer the Hon. Minister to the ordinary meaning of the word ‘ liquidation ’ when we speak of liquidation of a class. (Interruption.) Certainly,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [25th November 1952]

the landlord class has got to be liquidated. There is no question about it. So long as there is a class of people who do not labour, that class has no right to exist. That is a simple matter. In fact, Mahatma Gandhi has spoken about it. The Hon. Sri Subramaniam need not ask me about it.

“ Now, the peasant must have a permanent interest in the land so that he may feel that, whatever is produced, at least a sufficient portion of it will go to him for a long, long time. Does this Bill create that interest in him? Obviously not. At the end of four years, the landlord may ask him to quit and then he has got to quit. Why has not the peasant to-day got the permanent occupancy right? I am told that if permanent occupancy rights are given, then it will be a perpetuation of the zamindari system. I am unable to understand this argument. Under the zamindari system, there are tenants-at-will and tenants with occupancy rights. To-day the existing land system in the Tanjore district and in various other districts, even though we may call it the ryotwari system, is analogous to the zamindari system. The only difference is that under the zamindari system, the zamindar was entitled to give the Government a certain fixed amount as *peshkash*, whereas here the amount of revenue that can be collected from the landlord is subject to revision from time to time by the Government. Beyond that, there is absolutely no difference between the big mirasdars or landowners in the various districts and the old zamindars. The zamindar does no work. Apart from this, he also receives rent. Now, the whole question is this. By abolishing the system of tenants-at-will whose services the landlord can dispense with at any time, and by giving occupancy rights to the tenants, how are we perpetuating the zamindari system? On the other hand, it is a step in the direction of ultimately making the land owned by the tiller of the soil. To-day the occupancy right may be given and to-morrow the land itself may be given to the tiller of the soil. This will be in accord with the slogan ‘ land to the tiller ’. Therefore, I do not at all agree with the contention that conferring occupancy rights on the tenant would be a retrograde step and would mean the creation of a zamindari system in this State. Unless permanent occupancy rights are given to the peasant, it is idle to talk of enthusing him for greater and greater production. It may be that the Government are not prepared immediately to give the right of occupancy to the tenant. (Interruption.) I know that the Hon. the Chief Minister cannot think of immediately abolishing landlordism. I will be very glad if he is not so much afraid of creating a class of *kulaks*. I will be very glad if he brings forward a legislation depriving the landlords of their lands and giving them to the tillers. If he is prepared to do that, then I would not at all object. I know he is not prepared to do it. Therefore, the present contention is intended only to prevent the giving of occupancy rights and it will cut no ice. The main question is whether we are enabling the peasant to have a permanent interest in the land which alone will enthuse him to give

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

his utmost for production. I say this Damocles' sword hanging over his head, that at the end of four years, there is every possibility of his being evicted from the land and the land once again going into the hands of the landlord, will not give him any real incentive which is absolutely essential, if food production in this State has got to be increased. That is why I ask, if the Government are not in a position to immediately confer occupancy rights, why we should not give the right to the tenant to opt out or to continue, to be the occupier of the land for a further period of ten years. We can examine the position after that period comes to an end. But the Government are not prepared to accept even that. Therefore, what guarantee is there for the tenant in this Bill?

“ Then, this Bill seems to confer a great many benefits on the tenant. I would like here to point out how exactly the Government treat the landowners and the tenants. In this Bill, it is stated in the case of the tenants that a Revenue Court may come to the conclusion that a tenant has not acted properly, and that on the basis of that, the landlord may evict him. But, would the Government apply the same rule to the landlord? Are the Government satisfied that the landlord to-day is properly cultivating the land or is putting the land to proper use? After all, land is a sacred property out of which is grown the food and other necessities of the people. If the landlord does not utilise it properly, are the Government prepared to intervene and take away the land and make it public property? Well, they are not prepared to do that. They are treating the tenants in a different manner altogether. If the lands are lying fallow, is it due to the negligence of the tenants and pannaiyals? I know of cases in which the landlords have allowed thousands of acres to remain fallow. In many cases, the landlords have refused to bring those lands under cultivation. Why then should the Government make this distinction against the tenants and pannaiyals? The ultimate effect of this Bill is going to be this. The landlords will bring hundreds of charges against the tenants and pannaiyals. No criterion has been specified in the Bill with regard to this matter. It is left to the sweet will and pleasure of the Revenue Courts or the particular authority that may be appointed under this Bill to decide whether a tenant has behaved well or not. If they were to decide that a particular tenant did not behave well, then he will be immediately evicted. That will be the result. I request hon. Members to carefully consider this point.

“ Sir, no doubt this Bill does confer some right on the tenants and pannaiyals, at least to remain on the land for five years. I agree that it gives that right. But, even with regard to this, I would like to make this simple submission. When a Court goes into the question whether a pannaiyal has been properly dismissed or not and whether the reasons adduced by the landlord for the dismissal are true or not and gives its finding, it generally happens that that verdict is against the peasant. Because, the peasant cannot afford to engage best lawyers to

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [25th November 1952]

represent his case in the Court and thus he is not given enough opportunities to represent his difficulties. He cannot spend much to engage best legal counsel. It is obvious that he cannot do all those things. Despite all these handicaps, if the Court comes to the conclusion that the reasons adduced by the landlord for the dismissal of the pannaiyal cannot hold water and that they are not true and that the pannaiyal should be reinstated, still the landlord will be entitled to say that he will not reinstate that pannaiyal. What will happen to the pannaiyal in such a case? I am told that the landlord will say, 'Well, I am giving you a sum of Rs. 300 as compensation. Are you not satisfied with it?' I understand that a sum of Rs. 300 or six months' wages whichever is less will be given to the pannaiyal in such cases. Can the poor pannaiyal be expected to be satisfied with this amount? This is the simple question which I would like this House to consider. Here is a landlord who refuses to accept the finding of the Court. Why then should the Government be soft towards him? Why should not he be punished for refusing to accept the Court's finding? Now, let us see what is the punishment that visits the pannaiyal if he were to refuse to accept the Court's finding. They deprive him of the means of his livelihood and he is evicted from the land. If the pannaiyal or the tenant commits the same mistake as the landlord, the punishment provided for is that the land should be taken away from him and thus his employment should be terminated. If the landlord commits that mistake, he is allowed to go scotfree, and not only that, he is given all facilities. I ask, why should the Government have such a soft corner in their heart for the landlords. I say, it is because of the class instinct which is very patent. I am just reminded of what Arjuna said in Mahabharatha. When Krishna asked Arjuna to go and fight the Kauravas, Arjuna said,

‘दृष्ट्वं स्वजनं कृष्ण युयुत्सुं समुपस्थितम् ।

सीदन्ति मम गात्राणि मुखं च परिच्यति ।।’

i.e., 'On seeing my friends and close relations here, my limbs give way, and my mouth is parched. They are all my own kith and kin. Though you may say that it is my duty to fight them, how can I fight my own friends and relations?' This is what Arjuna said. (Interruption.) Yes, I am speaking of the Hon. Chief Minister also. Now, here is a landlord, who can commit a mistake and who can act against the verdict of the Court and no action will be taken against him. When the question of giving some punishment to the landlord who commits such mistakes is raised, then the Government say, 'सीदन्ति मम गात्राणि'. No drastic punishment is given to the landlords. But if the pannaiyal commits the same mistake, they say, 'Deprive him of the means of his livelihood and send him out of the land.' I say this is all due to the class instinct and their anxiety to protect the class of landlords as against the interests of the peasants. As a matter of fact, I know that due to compelling circumstances this measure

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

has been brought forward. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari: 'Due to the Opposition also!') Not only that. Due to the agitation of hundreds and thousands of ryots, this Bill has come before us. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari: 'And due to the activities of the Communist Party also!') Yes, I am glad to say that due to the activities of the Communist Party and due to the struggle carried on by the peasants of this State and due to other compelling circumstances, certain things have been done. But that does not mean that the original class instinct which refuses to act against the landlord is completely abolished. That class instinct is still there refusing to take drastic action against the landlord who flouts the Court's findings. What is the effect of this? In all cases, where the dismissed pannaiyals happen to be members of the kisan movement, the landlords will say, 'Well, we will give you Rs. 300 or six months' wages. But, we will not reinstate you.' By making such a provision, victimisation is sought to be purchased. That is why I say that this is a measure which will protect only the landlord and not the tenant or pannaiyal. I say that this Bill is intended to protect the landlords against the rising kisan movement in this country. With this specific idea only this particular clause has been introduced in the Bill. That is the charge which I make on the floor of the House. Similarly, there are a number of other clauses in this Bill the net effect of which will be to protect the landlord. Though it may appear that the tenants and pannaiyals also are protected I wish to point out that it is only fictitious protection. While discussing the various clauses, these aspects must be fully borne in mind so that we can realise how exactly the Bill will defeat the very object for which it is brought forward, viz., the protection of the tenants and pannaiyals. This House should look at every clause carefully and I should say we must carefully study every word in the clauses and suggest suitable amendments to be incorporated in the Bill. When such amendments are brought forward during the detailed consideration of the Bill, I request hon. Members to understand the significance of those amendments and the amendments that may be brought forward by the Government themselves. The Government have already brought forward certain amendments, which I am of opinion, are of a retrograde nature. I repeat they are of an extremely retrograde nature.

“Sir, for the first time we are told that the landlord will have the right to dictate to the tenant what crops should be grown on the land. This is a thing which we have never heard of in this country till now. Why should there be a provision like this? After all, does not the tenant know the particular crop which will be of advantage to him? Why should the Government trust the landlords more than the tenants? The tenants are the people who till the soil and who produce the foodgrains for us. Why should we distrust them? The effect of this clause will be this. A big mirasdar owning 500 or 600 acres of land will ask the tenant to produce such a thing which cannot be produced there. (Interruption.) Yes, I am coming from Tanjore district and I

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [25th November 1952]

know the conditions obtaining there. If the tenant refused to act up to the instructions of the landlord in this regard, then he will be evicted from the land. For a person owning 500 to 600 acres of land, it does not matter if some of his lands were allowed to remain fallow for some time. It is only the poor tenant who will suffer because of such a provision. Thus a mirasdar in the Tanjore district may ask his tenant to grow cotton and if the tenant refuses to do that, he may well say, 'Look here, I asked this fellow to grow cotton but he says that he will not grow cotton but will grow only paddy in my land. Therefore he has got to be evicted.' This is a curious provision. This specific provision is directed against the tenant with a view to helping the big mirasdars to evict the tenants as and when they want. This is nothing but that and there can be no other explanation. That is why I say that the amendments brought forward by the Government are all of a retrograde nature excepting the one amendment which has been accepted by the Select Committee with regard to the sharing of the cost of manure. Beyond that, I should like to say that all the amendments that were brought forward by the Government were reactionary in nature and were more intended to protect the landlord and to see to it that the peasant movement did not grow and was completely crushed in the Tanjore district. I may tell the Government, Sir, that any attempt to crush the peasant movement by such legislation is not going to succeed. The peasant has got far more fundamental reasons to be dissatisfied with the Bill as it is placed before the House. Unless the Bill is completely amended, it cannot be accepted and I hope that the House will see to it that the Bill is so amended when we discuss the amendments."

1-10
p.m.

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, నేను ఇంట్లో మాట్లాడిన తర్వాత వచ్చే అంశమునందున, తెలుగువాడలో మాట్లాడుతున్నందుకు మన్నించాలి. ఈ బిల్లు విషయము, ఇదివరకు ఒకసారి select committee కి విన్నవించబడింది, చర్చించబడింది. తిరిగి యీ రోజున select committee report ఇచ్చట వర్చుకు లేబడింది. ఈ general discussion లో ముఖ్యంగా select committee report పరిశీలిస్తే రైతును భూమినుండి కనీసము అయిదేండ్ల వరకు తొలగించడాడనే సూత్రాన్ని రాష్ట్రమంతటినీ ఎందుకు ప్రభుత్వము వర్తింప చేయదలచలేదో నాకు అర్థముకాకుండా యున్నది. ప్రత్యేకమైన పరిస్థితులు తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఏర్పడి అశాంతి ప్రబలినందువల్ల ఆ అశాంతిని నివారించుటకు యీ బిల్లును ప్రత్యేకముగా ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే వర్తింపజేయుటకు తెచ్చియున్నారు. అయితే ఇటువంటి అశాంతి యితర జిల్లాలలో లేదని ప్రభుత్వోద్దేశముగా కన్పించుచున్నది. అశాంతి పరిస్థితులనా ప్రభుత్వ నిర్వహణము యేమిటో తెలియకుండా వుంది. ప్రజలు తలకాయలు పగలగొట్టుకొని, రక్తము వరదలుగా కారిపట్టయితేనే ప్రభుత్వ వృష్టిలో అశాంతి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడినట్లు గావించడము తోగోయింది. అదియునుగాక గత 15 సంవత్సరముల నుండి అనగా 1937 వ సంవత్సరము జూలై నుండి ప్రకాశం Enquiry Committee నియామకము అయినప్పటినుండి యీనాందార్లు అనేక విధాలుగా యీ పేద రైతాంగమును భూముల్ నుండి తొలగించడ మనే విషయము నియంపకపడి. తరతరాలుగా సాగుచేస్తున్నటువంటి యీ

25th November 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

రైతులను, ఈనాందార్లు భూభామందులు భూములనుండి తొలగించుటకు చేస్తున్నటువంటి ఘాతుకచర్యలు, క్రిమినల్ తగాదాలు, 144, 145 సెక్షన్లను అమలు జరిపించడం, మొదలైనటువంటి విషయములు, రైతులు రాయబారాంధ్వారా ప్రభుత్వ వృష్టికి తీసుకొనివచ్చినప్పటికిని ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టిచర్యలు తీసుకొనకండా నిర్లక్ష్య భావంతో ఉపేక్షించి పూరుకొనుటకు కారణమేమో అర్థంకావడంలేదు ముఖ్యంగా యీ విషయములో మన రాష్ట్రములోని తంజావూరు జిల్లాకొరకు యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన బిల్లును, అన్ని జిల్లాలకును వర్తింపజేయుట చాలా అవసరముగా ఉన్నదని అంటున్నాను. అటువంటిది యీ శాసనమును తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే కాకుండా మిగతా అన్ని జిల్లాలకు కూడా వర్తింపజేయకూడదనడంలో, ఆయా జిల్లాలలోని భూస్వాములు తమయొక్క భూసమస్యలు చక్కబెట్టుకొనేందుకు అవకాశమివ్వవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యము ప్రభుత్వమువారికి ఉన్నదా అని అనుమానపడవలసి యున్నది. అటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము నిజముగా ప్రభుత్వమునకు లేకపోయినట్లయితే, యీ సమయములో యిదే బిల్లును యితర జిల్లాలకు విల వర్తింపజేయ బూనలేదని ప్రభుత్వంవారిని ప్రశ్నించుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారు స్పష్టపరచెదరని ఆశించుచున్నాను. గత నాలుగేళ్లుగా జరుగుతున్న పరిపాలననుబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు పేద ప్రజల కష్టసుఖములు పరిశీలించి, వారి అభివృద్ధికొరకు చర్యలు తీసుకొనెదరనే అశకు ఆస్కారము లేకుండా యున్నదని చెప్పకతప్పదు. ఎందుచేతనంటే క్రిందటి మంత్రివర్గము అన. 1947 వ సంవత్సరములో శ్రీ కళా వెంకట్రావుగారు ప్రభుత్వములో రెవిన్యూమంత్రిగా ఉన్నప్పుడు Estates Abolition Act ప్రవేశపెట్టినప్పుడు 1936 ఈనాములు రద్దుచేయబడతాయని శాసనసభ్యుల ఎదుట అధికారరీత్యా ప్రభుత్వము తరఫున అనేక వాగ్దానములు చేసియున్నారు. అట్టి వాగ్దానములుచేసి యిప్పటికి దాదాపు ఆరు సంవత్సరములు అయినప్పటికినీ, ఆ వాగ్దానములు యింత వరకు అమలు జరుపడలేదు అట్లు అమలు జరపడకపోవడమువలన యికముందు ప్రభుత్వమువారు యివ్వవలసిన హామీలు విలైనను ప్రజలు విశ్వసించరు. ఈ Ordinance ను ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే అమలు పరచడంవల్ల ఇతర జిల్లాలలోని భూభామందులు ఈనాందార్లు, రైతులను భూములనుంచి బలవంతంగా తొలగించి వేయ ప్రయత్నిస్తారు. ఈ అన్యాయాన్ని రైతులు తప్పక ప్రతిఘటిస్తారు. అశాంతి ప్రబలిపోతుంది. రైతులు రచ్చిపోతారు. ఈ Ordinance ను అమలుచేయుటకు పూర్వం తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఏర్పడినటువంటి పరిస్థితులు అన్ని జిల్లాలలోను ఏర్పడుతాయి. సంభవించజోయే యీ దుష్ఫలితాలను ప్రభుత్వం దూరద్వైప్తితో గమనించాలి. రాష్ట్ర మంత్రీ అశాంతి, ఆందోళన ప్రబలకుండా చూడాలి. అందుకుగాను వెంటనే భూసంస్కరణలను ప్రోత్సహిస్తూ సమగ్ర సాసనాన్ని అమలుపరచాలి. ఈ విషయాలను ప్రభుత్వం పునరాలోచన చేయాలని కోరుతున్నాను.

"ఇక పోతే, 1947 వ సంవత్సరములో కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వ కాలదారివిధానంలో సంస్కరణలు తెచ్చే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో సుబ్బాస్వామి కమిటీని నియమించింది. ఆ కమిటీ వారు ఒక ప్రస్తావనని జారీచేసి, వివరాలు నేకరించి ఈనాందారుల, భూభామందుల, కాలదార్ల మధ్య సంబంధములు ఎటుల ఉండవలెనో, వందలలో ఉభయపక్షాలారకీ ఎంతంత భాగం రావాలో, అనే విషయములు గురించి సిఫార్సు చేసింది. ఈ సిఫార్సు తకు కూడా యీ తంజావూరు Ordinance కు సంబంధించిన యీ బిల్లులో తిలోదకములు యివ్వడం కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమునకు తీరిన కళంకమని చెప్పకతప్పదు. సుబ్బాస్వామి కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో చేసిన సిఫార్సులకు వ్యతిరేకంగా వంటలో భూస్వామికి వంటలో అయిదింటి మూడువంతులు భాగము యివ్వాలని భూభామందులకే భూమి

[Sri G. Latchanna] [25th November 1952]

హక్కు ఉండాలని స్పష్టమైన మొదలగు సహాయము చేయడం అనేది భూస్వాములను రక్షించే బంధుత్వం. ఈ ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విధమైన చర్య తీసుకొన్నదన్నట్లుగా కనిపిస్తున్నది. నిజంగా ప్రభుత్వము రైతుయొక్క దుస్థితిని పరిశీలించియున్నట్లుయితే, రైతు కూలీ రక్షణ బిల్లు అనే పేరుతో వేరు బిల్లును తీవ్రమైనదిగా ఉండదు. కాని యీ బిల్లు వల్ల భూస్వాముల రక్షణ ఎక్కువగా కనిపిస్తున్నది. భూస్వాములకే పండిన పంటలో ఎక్కువ భాగము లభిస్తున్నది. భూమిమీద హక్కు పోలేదు. రైతుకు మాత్రము వివిధమైన రక్షణ లేకుండా ఉన్నది. ప్రభుత్వము వారు తొరకనే కమిటీ పెట్టితే యీ రైతాంగముయొక్కయు, కౌలుదార్ల యొక్కయు, తుకూలీలయొక్కయు కష్టములు తీరవు. కాని యీ బిల్లు వల్ల రైతుకు అయిదేళ్ల వరకు భూమి తన స్వాధీనములో ఉంచుకొనగల హక్కు విస్తృతమవుతున్నది. కాని యీ బిల్లు అవరణలో మాత్రము యీ విధమైన ఉపయోగము ఉండదని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఈ బిల్లు వల్ల అయిదేళ్ల వరకు రైతును తొలగించడానికి ఏమిలేని స్మృతము తప్ప కౌలుదార్లకు సుస్థిరమైనటువంటి రక్షణ కలిగే అవకాశ మేమియు లేదని చెప్పక తప్పదు. కాని దీని కొక ముఖ్య కారణం వున్నది. భూ భామందే భూమిపై హక్కు కలిగి ఉండాలని ప్రభుత్వం చెప్పటములో అనుమానమునకు అవకాశము ఉన్నదని చెప్పవలసి యున్నది.

1-20
p.m.

“దేశాధిపతిని దృష్టిలో తుంతుకొని దేశ రక్షణకుగాను దేశములో అహంకార సమస్య పరిష్కారమునకుగాను ఏ ఏ ప్రాంతాలలో ఏ ఏ పంటలు వేయాలనే నిర్ణయం ప్రభుత్వం చేయడానికి పూనుకుంటే దీనిలో కొంతవరకు ఆర్థికం వున్నది. ఇది న్యాయ వినిగూడా చెప్పవచ్చును. అట్లుగానుండా పలానా పంట పండించాలి, పలానా పంట వేయకూడదు, అనేది ఎక్కటికప్పుడు నిర్ణయించే అధికారం భూభామందుకు మాత్రం ఇవ్వడమనేది చాలా శోచనీయమైన విషయమని చెప్పక తప్పదు. అది రైతుయొక్క భవిష్యత్తును, ఆధిపతిని అరికట్టేదిగా ఉంటుంది. ముఖ్యంగా యీ శాసనాన్ని అమలు నిరపడంలో రైతుకు అయిదేళ్ల పర్యంతం భూమిపైన హక్కు కలుగజేసేటటువంటి సూత్రాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము యీ నాటికైనా గుర్తించింది. కాని అధికారావరోధాన్ని, భూమి బలవంతపడడానికి, రైతుకు ఎక్కువ ఉత్సాహము, ఉల్లాసము కలుగజేయడానికిని యీ బిల్లు వల్ల రైతుకు యిచ్చినటువంటి హక్కును సుస్థిరమైన పద్ధతులలో నిర్మించవలసియుంటుంది. అందుకుగాను అవసరమైన సవరణలు ఆమోదించవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇదే సూత్రాన్ని రాష్ట్రమంతటానికీ గూడా వర్తింపజేయమని ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

* JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, as emerged from the Joint Select Committee, marks the beginning of a new era in the relationship between the landowners and the tenants in our State. The present Bill which is limited in its scope to the Tanjore district shows in clear and emphatic terms that the Government have set themselves to the task of solving the land problem in our State. A beginning has been made in Tanjore not because the Government are not aware of the situation elsewhere but because in Tanjore the situation reached a breaking point. The relationship between the landowners and the tenants was strained to such an extent that the Government had to step into the breach with an Ordinance. The Ordinance has been rightly

25th November 1952] [Janab M. S. Mogral]

hailed as an act of wise statesmanship, a laudable act of wise statesmanship, as it has already brought about peace in the district and contentment to the landlords and the tenants. The bickerings have been removed and the foundation has been laid for smooth relationship between the landowners and the tenants which is absolutely necessary for a planned economy in agriculture. The tillers of the soil must have a substantial share in the fruits of their labour as much as landholders in the fruits of their investments. The landholders should not oppose agrarian reforms of this type. Those who still cling on to the old notions of property rights and customary privileges and those who possess a false sense of pride and prestige should realize what is happening in Burma, in Kashmir and Egypt and now in Kenya and other parts of Asia and Africa. Then they will be convinced that the rights established under the feudal system to safeguard the interests of the landowners can no longer remain under modern conditions. The situation is such that one cannot look at it with equanimity. By the introduction of the present Bill, the Congress administration has not only solved the agrarian problem in Tanjore but also raised new hopes in the hearts of the tenant class throughout the State. I may add, Sir, in this connection that the Government are rather slow in making such a vital legislation applicable to other districts where the situation is as dangerous as in Tanjore. A wise man and wise statesmanship will foresee the problems before they actually arise and try to meet them. Our great leader and Chief Minister has already started on this noble work. Tanjore is the test case and I hope that his work, started so auspiciously, will yield real dividends and that this knotty problem will be solved for ever.

“ Sir, the condition of the tillers of the soil in South Kanara in particular and other districts in general is far from satisfactory. Tenants are suffering much from rackrenting. They have no champions to take up and work for their cause. They are like dumb cattle driven from pillar to post and are driven to intolerable conditions of life. No doubt, the world is changing and no power on earth can cry halt to the speed with which progress is taking place. It is high time that the Government brought forth a comprehensive legislation ensuring fair rent according to local conditions and permanency of tenure to the tenants in other parts of the State. I believe that there are many eviction suits and other allied proceedings pending in South Kanara and elsewhere. These are a pointer to the unsettled conditions and restlessness on the part of the tenants. I hope that the Government will bring forward a comprehensive legislation to save both the landowners and the tenants in other parts of the State from misery.”

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—“ The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p.m.”

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

* SRI S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill has received appreciation from all sides of the House, of course, with some reservations from the Members on the

[Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar] [25th November 1952]

Opposition. At a time when there were a lot of representations made on the floor of this House that some suitable legislation should be brought in to see that the relationship between the landowner and the tenants in Tanjore district is established on a cordial basis and that food production is not affected in the so-called granary of South India, the surplus district of Tanjore, it was decided by our revered Chief Minister, Rajaji, that some such measure should be brought in. In the first instance, an Ordinance was issued which brought a timely solution to the difficulties. As the Ordinance had to be replaced by a Bill, a Bill was introduced in this House by the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue. Every hon. Member of this House, on this side as well as on the other side, agreed that the principle underlying the Bill was a sound one for establishing good relationship between the landowner and the tenants, at least in respect of Tanjore where there was immediate necessity. But they suggested that the Bill ought to be referred to a Joint Select Committee to go into certain fundamental defects in the Bill and rectify them. The Government agreed to the proposal, the whole House agreed to the proposal and the Bill was referred to a Joint Select Committee. After days of deliberation, the Joint Select Committee has submitted its report and some hon. Members, in their dissenting minutes appended to the report, have complained that though the matter was referred to the Joint Select Committee there was not such a free and exhaustive deliberation as there ought to have been, considering the nature and importance of the subject. Then it was said that there was no freedom allowed to exercise one's independent will and Members of the Committee were bound by party discipline. I fail to see how there was no free and exhaustive discussion and how Members were not allowed to exercise their individual will, as complained of by Members of the other side. Of course, one cannot take exception to party discipline. Individual Members express their views at the party meeting and after detailed discussions, the party arrives at a particular unanimous decision. That being so, I fail to see how such a charge is levelled against some Members who agreed to certain provisions being incorporated in the Bill in the name of the party or in the name of anybody else.

3-10
p.m.

"Coming to the subject proper, it is said very often here that to call the Bill as the Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is a misnomer and that it is really a landowners protection Bill. With the provisions in the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee, I ask the House, is it really intended to protect the landowner? I do not want the House to take me as advocating the cause of the landowners. (I put it, on behalf of both the land-owning class and the labouring class, that this Bill is not intended to benefit the landowners as stated by the Members on the other side. You will see this from the various new provisions made in the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee. For instance, take the case of compensation to be paid to the pannaiyal by the landowner if he fails to comply with

25th November 1952] [Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

the award of the Conciliation Officer and wants to dismiss the pannaiyal. In the original Bill Rs. 150 was fixed as the compensation to be paid by the landowner. In the Joint Select Committee this has been increased to Rs. 300. We are here, all of us to see that cordial relationship is established between the landowners and the pannaiyals and that more food is produced there. Again in the matter of division of the produce of the catch crop, according to the original Bill, the Government thought it fit to allow the tenant to take away the entire produce. But in the first amendment introduced by the Government regarding catch crops, they were pleased to allow the landowner to take two-fifths and the tenant three-fifths. What is the fate of the landowner under the provision of the Bill as it has finally emerged from the Joint Select Committee? The landowner is allowed only one-fifth and the tenant is allowed the remaining fourth-fifths. Is this, I ask again, a hardship to the tenant and is this measure intended to benefit the landowner? The House must consider dispassionately whether the Bill is intended to benefit landowners only, and whether it deserves to be given the name of 'Landowners Protection Bill' as was suggested by some hon. Members on the Opposition Benches. Again, you will notice another fundamental change effected in the Bill. In the original Bill it was laid down that if a tenant had to be reinstated, he must pay all the arrears of rent. How has this clause been amended by the Joint Select Committee? If one year's arrear is paid, he must be reinstated. I ask, is this amendment in favour of the landowner? Let me go to another provision. You will see here also"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let not the hon. Member say, 'You' when he wants to refer to Government or hon. Members. 'You' refers to the Chair."

* SRI S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I am new to this work. I shall try to correct myself and use the proper form. It will be seen again that in respect of the manuring charges, the original provision making the tenant responsible for these charges has now been amended and, according to the amended clause, the cost of chemical fertilizers and other artificial manures including groundnut-cakes should be borne in proportion to the share of the main produce to which they are entitled. Originally the tenant was asked to bear the entire cost of manuring and other incidental charges. Now the tenant pays only for the usual manuring, but for other manures that have to be applied to the land, the cost is to be borne both by the landowner and the tenant in the proportion of 60 : 40. I ask hon. Members of this House whether this provision is intended to help the landowner and protect his interests."

"I submit this Bill gives fixity of tenure to the tenant for at least five years. If he continues to pay his rent regularly, the landowner has no option but to continue him."

[25th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has one more minute."

* SRI S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" Therefore, Sir, whatever charges may be made against this Bill, I say it is intended to give ample relief to the tenants rather than to the landowners, and everybody should be pleased to pass the measure brought forward by the Government. For the information of the House, I may submit I have given notice of some amendments for maintaining the compensation payable to the tenant at the original level, namely, Rs. 150 and for other purposes. I would request the Members of the House to accept the Bill as it was originally drafted and not as amended by the Joint Select Committee."

3-20 p.m. * SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said at the time when this Bill was originally introduced in the Assembly, I do welcome this Bill because it marks a very important step towards land reform. The necessity for such a measure has been realized by every section of this House. But when such a measure is about to be put on the Statute Book, it becomes the duty of every legislator to examine critically in what way the various clauses of the Bill would work, and if there are any loopholes in the Bill by which some particular section of the public would be adversely affected, to try to effect a change in that particular provision before the Bill becomes an Act. Hon. Members on this side of the House offer their criticisms only with a view to remedy certain defects that are apparent in the Bill. Their criticisms should not be misconstrued. With such an aim in view I have appended my dissenting minute to the report of the Joint Select Committee, of which I had the good fortune to be a Member.

" The one major defect I found in the Bill is the lack of specific provision in the Bill to exclude ' the middlemen ' or ' the intermediaries ' as some call them, who are to be found in large numbers in Tanjore district. These people take large tracts of land from matathipathis and devasthanams on lease and distribute them among their own men. Due to the definition of the ' cultivating tenant ' in the Bill, these intermediaries are also included under the scope of the Bill as ' cultivating tenants '. What is the definition given of a ' cultivating tenant '? It is as follows : ' A cultivating tenant or tenant means a person who contributes his own *physical* labour or that of his family in the cultivation, etc. ' In the original Bill the definition of a cultivating tenant meant one who contributed his own *personal* labour in cultivation. After much fighting by me in the Joint Select Committee the Government inserted the new definition of ' physical labour '. But even then the wording is not clear. I had pointed out this very clearly in my dissenting minute. Due to this vague definition of the term ' cultivating tenant ' ample scope is being given for intermediaries to exploit the situation. Take the case of a man who owns some acres of land in Tanjore.

25th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

He gives his instructions to the agents in Tanjore who cultivate the lands by having some tenants under them. These agents may contend that they must be recognized as cultivating tenants under these definitions since the word ' contribute ' has been used in the definition of cultivating tenant, which word can very well be satisfied by their act of periodical supervision. They are contributing their own physical labour by periodical supervision. Similarly the landowner in Madras by posting a card giving instructions to his agents might argue that he comes under the definition of ' cultivating tenant ' given by the Joint Select Committee. Such interpretation may find favour with the Courts also. There is a possibility. We cannot altogether exclude such a possibility. As a matter of fact in certain cases the Revenue Board have come to the same conclusion. I pointed out this specifically to the other Members of the Select Committee. But my view did not find favour with the Hon. the Chief Minister. Though the Hon. the Chief Minister says in so many words that the intention of the Bill is to exclude the intermediaries, he does not allow any change of words in the definition. It is a known fact that there are persons in Delhi, Kanpur and far off places who own lands in Tanjore. They can also now claim to be ' cultivating tenants ', due to the vague definition given. When there is such scope for intermediaries and absentee landlords to claim to be ' cultivating tenants ', the very purpose of the Bill to afford protection to the tenants and pannaiyals is nullified.

" Then coming to the bar of jurisdiction of Civil Courts, there again we see a difference. By clause 14 of the Bill, Civil Courts are prohibited from entertaining any petition to set aside or modify any order of the officer or Court created under the Bill. The final verdict is to be given by the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court. These officers are mostly departmental people and no one can deny that for them departmental circulars are more binding than any judicial interpretation. By barring the jurisdiction of Civil Courts, the Government have made the operation of the Bill as one connected with the executive administration. I pleaded earnestly for provision of revisional powers for the District Courts. But my request was turned down by the Hon. the Chief Minister. The Government Members say that instead of extending the jurisdiction to the District Courts, the validity of the Act can be questioned in the High Court. I ask this simple question : Is it really possible for the poor tenant to approach the highest judicial authority in the State, i.e., the High Court? When he is not in a position to appeal even in the District Court is near by, what is the meaning of asking him to question the validity in the High Court? The Government should first of all think whether the High Court is accessible to the poor tenants.

" A word about pannaiyal. The pannaiyal system in Tanjore district is a peculiar one. Their position is like that of slaves

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [25th November 1952]

of olden days. That system is gradually dying a natural death in Tanjore district. That serfdom has practically come to a stage of extinction. When such is the case what is the necessity to insert the wording of 'pannaiyal' in the Bill? The Bill has been named as 'Pannaiyal Protection Bill' but, in reality it protects landowners. I know there would be vigorous opponents to refute such an allegation. That is why we found Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar attacking me under instructions from the Government Whip. They held a conference just a few minutes before and Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar rose to make his speech attacking me."

SRI K. RAJARAM NAIDU :—"It is not fair on the part of the hon. Member to accuse me like that. I never asked Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar to attack the hon. Member."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—"If the Government Whip says like that, I will of course withdraw what I have said. But that is only a side issue which I have incidentally mentioned I knew the Government Whip, Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar and some others held a conference. Afterwards Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar began attacking me in his speech. At any rate, I do not press it now after the Government Whip has said that he did not speak to Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar on this point."

"In view of what I have pointed out it is fundamentally important to give a stricter definition of the term 'cultivating tenant'. This sort of loose definition will not do. Unless the intermediaries are excluded, the tenants who actually cultivate the lands will not find much relief under this Bill."

3-30 p.m. "The Hon. Chief Minister said in the Select Committee that the idea was to exclude middlemen. But, according to the definition of 'cultivating tenant' as given in the Bill, the middlemen cannot be excluded. There must therefore be some provision in the Bill to determine the relationship that should exist between the landowner or matadhipathi whoever he may be, and the middlemen. When we are bringing forward certain legislation that would affect the rights and liabilities of all parties concerned, is it not fair on our part as legislators to protect the interests of all concerned and make suitable provisions in the Bill? When the middlemen enter into contracts with the landowners or matadhipathis and when they are liable for damages in certain circumstances, is it not fair on our part to determine the relationship between the landowner or the matadhipathi and the middleman on the one hand and between the landowner or the middleman and the tenant on the other? My only object is that the rights of any person should not be adversely affected."

"Sir, I now come to the definition of 'cultivating tenant'. There are middlemen who take large contracts for 400 or 500 acres and become lessees. The definition of 'cultivating tenant' as given in the Bill gives scope to include middlemen also as

25th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

cultivating tenants and there is no limit to the extent of land which a cultivating tenant can hold. In the same way as some limit has been fixed in the case of pannaiyals in the schedule, there must be some provision to limit the extent of land that a cultivating tenant can cultivate, say, 5 or 10 or 40 acres. Now according to the Bill as it is, a middleman can take an order from the Revenue Court and the people who are on the lands will have to suffer for all time to come. Therefore I feel that a provision must be inserted in the Bill limiting the extent of land a cultivating tenant can hold.]

"Then, Sir, heirs have been included in the definition of 'cultivating tenant'. If a tenant dies today and leaves behind a minor son or a minor daughter, that minor son or minor daughter as heir becomes the cultivating tenant. But that minor son or minor daughter may not be willing to become the cultivating tenant. In such cases, what is the use of transferring the rights to the heirs? In fact, in some cases, there may be liabilities also where the tenant owes some paddy or money to the landowner. So, the heirs will be answerable to the landowner after the death of the tenant. Why should we saddle the heirs with all these liabilities when they are not willing to become cultivating tenants? Therefore, Sir, some provision must be introduced in the definition of 'cultivating tenant' on the following lines: 'heirs . . . provided he becomes the cultivating tenant or is capable of cultivating the land' or some such provision. Sir, these are the points I wanted to speak about today and I think at the time of second reading of the Bill I will have to say something more."

* SRI P. SELVARAJ :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill that is on the anvil is the first and the best piece of legislation for the amelioration and protection of the tenants of Tanjore district. The House is fully aware of the reasons that led to the promulgation of the Ordinance by His Excellency the Governor for the protection of the tenants and the pannaiyals of Tanjore district, and the present Bill is a consequential legislation of that Ordinance. This is only a forerunner of the legislation for agrarian reform that is to come in the future. We find all over the world a tendency on the part of the various Governments to bring measures of amelioration to the tenants and tillers of the soil and also to bring legislation making the land belong to the tiller alone. So this is only a prelude to what is to happen in the future."

"As regards the rights and duties of the tenants and the landlords, the tenant is given a security of tenancy for five years provided he does not do anything *mala fide* or there is no gross negligence on his part in the cultivation of the land. The landlord has been assured of his share of 60 per cent in the produce of the land. Prior to the passing of the Ordinance, the landlord had often to go to Court to get his share. But according to this Bill, the landlord is assured of his share and if the tenant does

[Sri P. Selvaraj] [25th November 1952]

not pay the rent within the prescribed time, he will be deprived of the land. So the first duty on the part of the tenant is to give the 60 per cent share of the produce to the landlord.

“As regards the catch crops, the provision in the Bill as amended is more favourable to the landholder. In the original Bill it was stated that the tenant should get the entire catch crop; but owing to agitation from the landlords that the fertility of the soil would be affected and that the tenant would be getting an unearned income by getting the entire catch crop, the Select Committee has introduced the provision that one-fifth of the catch crop should go to the landlord also.

“In the case of manure also, there is an improvement. Originally the cost of manure was asked to be borne by the tenant. But in the Select Committee it has been proposed to be proportionately shared by the landlord and the tenant.

“Sir, it was stated that the landlords and the tenants were not getting on in good terms and that there were riots and disturbances, and that thereby the productivity of the soil was affected. Sir, we are already in the days of scarcity of foodgrains and if there is to be difference of opinion or ill-feeling between the landlord and the tenant, it will be adversely affecting the food situation instead of our becoming self-sufficient within five years. Now, to facilitate the production of foodgrains and also to bring about order and concord between the landowner and the tenant, this legislation has been brought forward and it is marvellous, I should say. It has also been pointed out in the House that this same Bill should be extended to other districts of the State. But in extending it to other districts, the local conditions in the districts must be taken into consideration; and we all know that the conditions are not the same in those other districts as in the Tanjore district.

“One more suggestion I would like to make to the Government, and it is this: After the tenant is given the right to cultivate—and the right is given in the Bill—he will not sometimes be able to find the means to cultivate the land. For, under this Bill, the landlord and the tenant have been kept in water-tight compartments and there will not be that goodwill which was prevalent prior to the ill-feeling which recently arose between the landowner and the tenant. In the olden days, it was the goodwill and the give and take principle that made the tenant and the landowner work amicably and peacefully; but as time passed on, there were clashes, and ill-feeling arose between them, and each one began to assert his own right as a result. So, the landowner or the wealthy man will not come forward now to lend money to the tenant during the time of cultivation. So, the Government must start rural credit banks in every firkā of the district and make it convenient for the tenant to approach the bank for securing credit. It is not alone by passing legislation that such sort of differences as exist to-day between the landowner

25th November 1952] [Sri P. Selvaraj]

and the tenant can be eradicated. In addition to passing legislation, the Government must also come forward to offer monetary help to the poor peasants and the so-called spirit of give and take must be restored among the tenants and the landlords. However much the legislation may be perfect, unless there is a change of mentality in the agrarian community, agriculture as it is, cannot improve.

“Finally, Sir, I support the Bill *in toto*.”

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது விவாதத்துக்கு வந்துள்ள தஞ்சை ஜில்லா வாரம் குத்தகை பண்ணையாள் மசோதாவைப்பற்றி இந்த சபையின் முன் விவாதித்து பேசும்போது குறிப்பாக ஒரு விஷயத்தை இந்த சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகிறேன். 1943-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து தங்களுடைய நியாயமான கோரிக்கைகளுக்காக தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகள் பெரிய போராட்டத்தை நடத்தி வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்தப் போராட்டத்தின் காரணமாக சாதாரணமாக என்னைப் போன்ற ஒரு உழவனுக்கு இந்த சபையில் இந்த சட்டத்தைப் பற்றி விவாதிப்பதற்கு ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தின்படி அந்த விவசாயிகளுடைய நியாயமான கோரிக்கைகள் எல்லாம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறதா என்று பார்த்தால் பல குறைபாடுகள் இதில் உள்ளன என்றே தான் கூற வேண்டி இருக்கிறது. ஏனென்றும் இந்த மசோதாவில் சாதாரண விவசாயிகளுடைய குறைகள் தீர்க்கப்படவில்லை. சென்ற காலத்தைப் போன்றுமீண்டும் தட்டிக் கழித்துக் கொண்டிருக்க முடியாது என்ற நிலையில் தான் இன்றைய தினம் இந்த நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் என்கின்ற பெயரளவில் இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது. இன்று அழிந்து போய்க் கொண்டிருக்கிற நிலையைத் தான் இன்னும் நீடிக்கக் கூடிய நிலையில் இந்த நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் இருக்கிறது. விவசாயி வாழ்வதற்கு வேண்டிய வழி வகை செய்யக்கூடிய நிலையில் இல்லை என்றுதான் சொல்ல வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. மக்களுடைய எழுச்சியைத் தடுப்பதற்கும் அவர்களுக்கு சௌகரியம் செய்து விட்டோம் என்று கூறவும் இந்த சட்டம் சாதகமாக இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் ஒன்றை கூற முடியும். இந்த சட்டமானது நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் என்கின்ற முறையில் முதல் படியாக இருக்கிறது என்பதை மட்டும் இப்பொழுது என்னால் குறிப்பிட முடியும். இந்த சட்டப்படி 41 சதவிகிதம் கெடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் ஏற்கனவே 33, 25 என்று விவசாயிகள் பெற்றுக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படி அவர்கள் பெற்று வருடப்போது அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் கனவடி, வாரம், பொலியடி என்றும் பல வருமானம் கிடைத்து வந்தது. இப்பொழுது அவைகளெல்லாம் இல்லாது மொத்தமாக 40 சதவிகிதம் என்று குறிப்பிட்டிருப்பது அவர்களுக்கு ஏற்கனவே கிடைத்து வந்ததைவிட அதிகமாக கிடைக்க வழியில்லை. இன்னும் ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவாக உள்ள மிராசதாரர்களுக்கு இந்த மசோதா கட்டுப்படுத்தாது என்றிருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் மத்திய சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகளுக்கும் மாகாண சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகளுக்கும் வித்யாசமான சம்பளம் ஏற்பட்டிருப்பது போல இதிலும் வித்யாசம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதே போன்று ஒரு இடத்தில் வேலை செய்கிறவர்களுக்கு இரண்டு விதமான கூலி கொடுப்பது என்பதாக இருக்கிறது. இம்மாதிரி இருந்தால் விவசாயிகளிடம் குழப்பம் ஏற்பட சந்தர்ப்பம் ஏற்படும். அதனால் ஒரு வேலி மிராசதாரர்கள் வேண்டும்போது நேரடியாக சாகுபடி செய்யலாம். அவ்விதம் இல்லாது ஒரு வேலிக்கு பட்ட மிராசதாரர்களுக்கு இந்த சட்டம் கட்டுப்படுத்தும் என்பதாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இன்னும் ஒரு வேலி உள்ள நிலச் சொந்தக்காரர்கள் செக்ரேரியட்டிலும், தாசில்தாரர்களும், குமாஸ்தாக்களாகவும் பெரிய வியாபாரிகளாகவும் வேலை பார்த்து வருகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் பாதிக்கப்படாமல் அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய விவசாயிகளிடமிருந்து அதிக வரி வாங்கி வரலாம். அம்மாதிரி அவர்கள் அதிக வரி வாங்கி வந்தால் விவசாயிகள் கஷ்டப்படும் நிலைமை ஏற்படும்.

[Sri P. Venkatesa Sholagar] [25th November 1952]

ஏற்கனவே அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது கஷ்டப்பட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது, 5, 10, 100 ரூபாய் நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டு அவர்களை சாகுபடி செய்து பணம் சம்பாதித்து வருகிறார்கள். இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூலம் சவுகரியம் அடைவார்கள். சிறிய விவசாயிகளுக்கு மூலம் நலனம் இல்லை. நியாயமான குத்தகை கொடுக்க முடியாத வேளையும் என்று நியாயமாகக் கெடக்கூடிய வாங்குபவர்களின் 1946-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்து பரிசீலிக்கப்பட்டு வந்திருக்கின்றன. அவர்களுக்கு இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூலம் ஏதாவதும் கிடைக்கிறதா என்று ஒன்றை நினை. இந்த பாய்ட்டம் சுமார் 6, 7 வருஷங்களாக நடத்த பட்டு வருகிறது என்பது ஒப்புக் கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூலம் அவர்களுக்கு ஒன்றை இல்லை யென்றால் அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டம் மூலமும் அதிகரிக்கும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா சிறுகளத்தூர், கனகாசன முதலிய இடங்களில் விவசாயிகள் இப்பொழுது நசுக்கப்பட்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய போராட்டத்தை 1948-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டு நடத்தி வருகிறார்கள். ஏற்கனவே இருக்கும் விவசாயிகள் பண்ணையார்களாகவும் வைத்துக்கொள்ளாமல் நிலத்திலிருந்து தூத்தி விட்டார்கள். அவ்விதம் தூத்தி விட்டு இராம நாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து வந்தவர்களுக்கு வெளிகொடுத்து அவர்களை கஷ்டப்படுத்தி கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு குறைவான கூலி கொடுத்து அவர்களிடம் சேல வாங்கி வருகிறார்கள். இன்னும் அவர்களுக்கு ஏற்கனவேயுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கும் சண்டைமூட்டி விட்டுக் கொண்டு இன்றைய தினம் அங்கே நிலப் பிரச்சனை திருவனையாடல் நடத்திக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள்.

3-50
P.M.

"1946-ல் ந்து ஏழைகளுக்கு நிலம் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. அதனால் ஏழைகள் மொழிபெயர்ந்து கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அங்கேயுள்ள முறை மிருசுதாரர்களுக்கே சாதகமாக இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே அந்த முறையை மாற்றி யமைப்பதற்கு இச் சட்டத்திலே இடமளிக்கவேண்டும். குறிப்பாக இச் சட்டத்தை ஆதரித்துப் பேசுகின்ற குன்றியூர் சாம்பசிவ ஐயர் போன்றவர்களுக்கும் இன்றைய தினம் சாகுபடியாளர் பண்ணையாட்கள் பலர் கடன் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லி பழைய பாக்கிகளுக்காக அவர்களை வெளியேற்றிவருகிறார்கள். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிருசுதாரர்கள் இச்சட்டத்திலுள்ள விதிகளை எல்லாம் அப்படி எப்படி மீறிக்கொண்டுமோ அப்படி அப்படி மீறுவதற்காக வேண்டிய பல குழ்ச்சிகளை செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். செய்யப்போகிறார்கள் என்று காவலால் கட்டி அவர்களைப் பூரி நாயன ஸ்வாமி நாயுடு அவர்கள் வெளியே அழகாக சென்ற கூப்பத்தில் எடுத்துச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். இந்தச் சட்டத்தை மீறுவதற்கு வழிவகை செய்ய வேண்டும். அதற்காகத்தான் கடன் நிவாரணம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு அளிக்க வேண்டும். அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற மனைகளையே அவர்களுக்குச் சொந்தமாக்கவேண்டும். சுதந்திர நாட்டிலே ஒரு தொழிலாளிக்கு குடியிருக்க மனை சொந்தமில்லை என்ற இடிலு இருக்கக்கூடாது. இன்றையதினம் என்றைக்கு மிருசுதாரர்கள் வெளியேறா என்றாலும் விவசாயிகள் வெளியேற வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அதோடு விவசாயிகள் தோட்டத்தில் வைக்கும் மரங்களையும் மிருசுதாரர்கள் வெட்டிக்கொண்டு போய்விடுகிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரியெல்லாம் ஏற்படாமல் குடியிருப்பு மனைகளை விவசாயிகளுக்குச் சொந்தமாக்கவேண்டும்.

"சரியாக நடந்துக்கொள்ளாத விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடிய அதிகாரம் ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு காடுக்கப்பட்டுக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் அதிகாரிகள் பலர், தாமிரதாரர்கள் பலர் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிருசுதாரர்களின் பிள்ளைகள்தான். அவர்கள் தங்கள் இனத்தவர்களுக்கு, மிருசுதாரர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வார்களே தவிர சாகுபடியாளர் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வாட்டார்கள். ஆகையால் சரியான காரணம் இருந்தாலன்றி அவர்களை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாது என்று உத்தரவு போடவேண்டும். இது பெரும்பாலான மக்களையே ஐயாதா பிச்சின். ஆதலால் இதில் பல திட்டங்களைச் செய்ய விவசாயிகளுக்கு உண்மையிலேயே பயன் படத்தக்கதொரு சட்டமாக செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

25th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I allot ten minutes for each member."

*SRI A. S. SAHAJANANDA :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சை ஜில்லா பண்ணையாட்கள் சாகுபடி சட்டத்தின் Select Committee நல்ல திருத்தங்களை செய்திருக்கின்றது. ஆனால் இன்னும் சில செய்யவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. எனக்கு முன்பில் பெரியவா சொன்னாடி ஒரு வேலிக்கு விதி விலக்கு அளித்துப்போது சரியல்ல. ஏனென்றால் ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவான மிருசுதாரர்கள்தான் மிக அதிகமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவான மிருசுதாரர்கள் யார் யார் தங்கள் தங்கள் நிலங்களில் தாங்களோ பாடுபடுகிறார்களோ அவர்களுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிப்பது நியாயமாகும். அனால் அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் உத்தரவிடக்கூடியும், மற்ற ஆபீஸ்களிலும் பலவிதமான தொழில்களை செய்துகொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய நிலங்களை கிராமங்களில் இருந்துகொண்டு பரிசீலித்துக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளுக்கு இருக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்ற நிலங்களை விட அதிகமான சொல்வது சரியல்ல. ஆகையால் ஒரு வேலியை ஒரு வேலிக்கு குறைவான நிலம் உடையவர்களைத் தங்களை நிலங்களைத் தாங்களே பரிசீலித்துத் தரவில்லைக்கு உண்டு என்றும் நினைத்துப் படித்தால் மற்ற நிலங்களைப் போலவே இவர்களும் வாரோடா, கூலியோ கொடுக்கவேண்டுமெனச் செய்யவேண்டும். அந்த விதத்திற்குத் இதில் செய்யவேண்டுமென நான் விரும்புகிறேன்.

"நிலத்தில் எதைப் பயிரிடுவது என்பதைப்பற்றி மிருசுதாரர்களுக்கே சொல்ல உரிமை உண்டு என்று இந்தச் சட்டம் திருத்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது மிருசுதாரர்களுக்குத் திருப்தியளிப்பதாக இருக்காதும்கூட சில மிருசுதாரர்கள் பயிரிடுபவரை விலக்கவேண்டுமென்ற நிலை நெல் விவசாயக்கூடிய பூமியில் பருத்தியைத்தான் விவசாயிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கூறினால், அவர்களை யாரும் தடுக்கமுடியாது. ஆகையினால் எந்த பட்ச விளைவிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதை நினைப்பிக்க மிருசுதாரர்களுக்கு உரிமை உண்டு என்று சொல்வதைக் காட்டிலும் எந்த விதமான பட்ச அந்தப் பிரச்சினைகளிலே, அதாவது பருத்து நிலங்களிலே விவசாயிக்கப்படுகிறதா அல்லவோதான் விளைவிக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்வது சரியாக இருக்கும்.

"ஒரு விவசாயி சரியாக நடந்துகொள்ளவில்லை என்றால் அவனை வெளியேற்ற ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு முடி அதிகாரமும் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டில் உள்ளவர்கள் மிருசுதாரர்களுக்கு சாதகமாகவேதான் நடந்துகொள்வார்கள் என்று பல புகார்கள் சொல்லலாம். ஆகையினாலே ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டுக்குத்தான் அதிகாரம் உண்டு என்பதை மாற்றிப் பஞ்சாயத்துக் கோர்ட்டுக்கு அதிகாரமிடக்கூடும்படி செய்யவேண்டும். அந்தப்பஞ்சாயத்துக் கோர்ட்டில் ரெவின்யூ அதிகாரிகளும், நிபந்தனாந்தரர்களும், விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களும் இருக்கமுடியுமா செய்யவேண்டும். அப்பொழுது இருதரப்பாட்கும் சரியான நியாயம் கிடைக்குமென நம்புகிறேன்.

"மேலும் சமீபத்தில் நான் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஊர்க்கு அருகிலுள்ள சியாழியிலும் பக்கத்து கிராமங்களிலும் ஹரிஜனங்கள் உட்பட பல ஏழை விவசாயிகள் தாமதமான மட்டத்து ஆக்கத்திலுள்ள நிலங்களை குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். குத்தகை எடுப்பதற்கு மனைவிலக்களுடைய நகைகளையும் பத்துக்கள் நகைகளையும் விற்று Deposit-கட்டியிருக்கிறார்கள். போன வருஷம் சுமாராக விளைந்ததின் காரணமாக சரியான குத்தகையை அளந்தார்கள். ஆனால் இந்த வருஷம் மழை பெய்யாமல் பூயி சரியாக விளையவில்லையாதலால் குத்தகையை அளக்கமுடியவில்லை. ஆனால் மட்டத்துச் சொந்தவர்களோ சொந்த குத்தகைப்போலவே இந்த வருஷமும் குத்தகையை அளக்கத்தான் வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லி விட்டார்கள். குத்தகை அளக்கத்தவறினால் பெயர்வரித் தொகையைப் பிடித்துக்கொண்டு இவர்கள் அளக்கத்தவறினால் பெயர்வரித் தொகையைப் பிடித்துக்கொண்டு விடுவார்கள். அப்படிச் செய்தால், விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களின் நிலைமை அபேதமாகிவிடும். இதற்கும் இந்தச் சட்டத்திலே ஏதாவது பரிசீலனை தேட வேண்டும்.

[Sri G. Samia Koorayar] [25th November 1952]

“எவ்வளவு நிலம் இருந்தபோதிலும் ஒவ்வொரு கிராமத்திலும் அவர்களுக்கு ஒவ்வொரு வேலி நிலம் இருந்தால் அதற்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இது முறையல்ல. ஒருவனுக்கு ஒரு வேலிக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதுதான் உசிதம். அதற்குமேலே பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதென்றால் அது மற்றவர்களைப் பாதிக்கும். எவ்வளவு நிலம் இருந்தபோதிலும் அவர்களுக்கு கிராமத்திற்கு ஒவ்வொரு வேலி பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதாயிருந்தால் வெகுவாக விவசாயிகள் பாதித்துவிடும். அம்மாதிரி பாதிக்காமல் இருக்கும்படியாக இந்த மசோதாவில் திருத்தம் செய்யவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

“பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு விஷயத்தில் இப்பொழுது செய்கிற ஏற்பாட்டிலே அவர்கள் வசிக்கும் இடத்திலே அவர்கள் அப்புறப்படுத்துவதுதான் அடிக்கடி நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. இதற்கு அவர்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு இல்லை. இந்தப் பாதுகாப்பைக் கொடுத்த அவர்களை வெளியேற்றிவிட்டால் அவர்கள் தங்குவதற்குக் கூட இடமே கிடையாது. ஆகையால் அவர்கள் தங்குவதற்கு மீண்டும் அவசியமாக வேண்டுமென்று குறிப்பிடவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற இடம் எது சகுதியோ அதையேதான் அவர்களுக்கு ஸ்வாதீனம் செய்து கொடுக்கப்படுவேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு நல்ல இடத்தில் கொடுத்திருந்தாலும் அதை வைத்துக்கொள்ள பிரியப்படவில்லை. அவர்கள் பரம்பரையாக இருந்துவந்த இடத்தையே அவர்கள் விரும்புகிறார்கள். ஆகையினால் அதைத்தான் அவர்களுக்கு அளிக்க வேண்டும். இந்த மசோதாவில் அவர்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்காவிட்டாலும் கூட அவர்கள் வெளியேற்றப் படாமல் இருப்பதற்குப் பூரண பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கப்படுவேண்டும். அவர்கள் அடிக்கடி வெளியேற்றப்பட்டால், அவர்கள் மீது போலீஸில் complaint கொடுக்கப்பட்டு தொந்தரவு பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.”

“அப்படி இல்லாமல் அவர்களை தனியாக பாதுகாப்பதற்கு இப்போதுள்ள ஏற்பாடு போதாது. தனியாகவே ஜில்லா கலெக்டருக்கு அதிகாரம் கொடுத்து அவர்களுக்கு சுயமாக மனைக்கட்டுகள் கிடைக்கும் வரையில் அவர்கள் இருக்கும் இடங்களிலேயே இருக்கும்படியாக ஒரு ஏற்பாட்டை அவசியம் செய்பவேண்டும். இந்த ஜில்லாவில் அநேகம் குத்தகைக்காரர்கள் பெருவாரியான நிலத்தை குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொண்டு அவைகளை சில்லரை குத்தகைக்கு விட்டு அதனால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு கஷ்டங்களை விளைவித்து வருகிறார்கள். அவ்விதமான குத்தகை இல்லாமல் அவர்களைப் பாதுகாப்பதற்கு வேண்டியது இந்த சட்டத்தில் இல்லை. அதற்கு வேண்டிய காப்பத்து செய்யவேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்யாமல் விட்டு விட்டால் அநேக விவசாயிகளுக்கும், பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் பாதகம் ஏற்படும். ஒருவர் குறைந்த பட்சம் இவ்வளவுதான் சாகுபடி செய்யலாம் என்பதை வரையறுப்பது தான் உசிதம் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். ஒருவருக்கு அநேகம் ஏக்கர் நிலம் இருக்கலாம். பெரிய நிலச்சுவான்தார்கள் இருக்கலாம். அவர்கள் இவ்வளவு தான் சாகுபடி செய்யலாம் என்று நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டும். அநேகம் மிராசுதார்கள் கிராமம் கிராமமாக நிலங்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு அநேகம் பண்ணையாட்களையும், விவசாயிகளையும் வெளியேற்றி வருகிறார்கள். அதனால் அநேகம் விவசாயிகள் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அவர்களை காப்பாற்றும் பொருட்டு இவ்வளவு தான் சாகுபடி செய்யலாம் என்பதை நிர்ணயம் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்பதாகக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இந்த மசோதாவை நான் ஆதரிக்கிறேன்.”

4-10 *SRI A. K. SUBBIAH :—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே,
p.m. இந்த சபை முன்னால் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் செலக்ட் கமிட்டியின் திருத்தங்களை எதிர்த்து என்னுடைய சில அபிப்பிராயங்களைச் சொல்லுவதற்கு விரும்புகிறேன். குறிப்பாக இப்பொழுது தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளைப் பாதுகாப்பதற்கு இந்த அரசாங்கம் ஒரு சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டத்தால் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு சில நன்மைகள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அந்த சமயத்தில் ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு நிலத்தை உழுது வரும் வார குத்தகைக்காரர்களுக்கு வசதியளித்து அவர்களை நிலத்தி

25th November 1952] [Sri A. K. Subbiah]

லிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாது என்ற ஒரு உத்தரவாதமும் அவர்களுக்கு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. மற்றப்படி எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் வாரம்தார்களுக்கு வேறு எந்தவிதமான வருமானமும் கிடையாது. பல இடங்களில் 100-க்கு இப்பொழுது 40 கலம் வாரம் வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அதிகப்படியாக வாரம் கிடைப்பதற்கு வசதி இல்லை. அந்த மாதிரி பல பல இடங்களில் அதிகப்படியாக வாரம் வாங்கி வரும் வாரம் குத்தகைக்காரர்களுக்கு அதிகப்படியான நன்மை அடைவதற்கு இந்த சட்டத்தில் வழி இல்லை. ஆகவே இந்தச் சட்டப்படி அவர்கள் 40 கலம் வாங்கி வந்தால் 60 கலம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்றும், 60 வாங்கி வந்தால் 80 கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்றும், 30 வாங்கி வந்தால் 50 கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்றும் வாரத்தை 20 சத விசதம் உயர்த்தவேண்டும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக 1946-47-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டு நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றி இருக்கக்கூடிய விவசாயிகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு திரும்பவும் உழுவதற்கு நிலம் கிடைப்பதற்கு வழி கிடையாது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் குறிப்பாக மணலூருடி, திருத்தறைப் பூண்டியிலிருக்கக்கூடிய பெரிய நிலச்சுவான்தார்கள் 1946-47-ம் வருஷத்திலிருந்தே விவசாயிகளை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றி வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் பண்ணையாட்களையும் வைத்துக்கொள்ளாமல் நிலத்தை வாரத்திற்கோ அல்லது குத்தகைக்கோ விடாமல் temporary ஆட்களை வைத்துக் கொண்டு வெள்ளாமை செய்து கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அப்படி வெளியேற்றியவர்களுக்கு இந்த சட்டம் எந்த விதமான நன்மையும் அளிக்கவில்லை. அப்படிப்பட்ட விவசாயிகள் 1946-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டே வேறு ஊருக்கு வேலை தேடிக்கொண்டு போகவேண்டிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி 1946-47-ல் வெளியேற்றியவர்களுக்கு திரும்பவும் நிலங்களைக் கொடுக்கும்படியாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்த வேண்டும்.

“மற்றும் விவசாயிகளை மிருசுதார்கள் மனைக்கட்டிலிருந்து வெளியேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதைத் தடுப்பதற்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் எந்த விதமான உத்தரவாதமும் கிடையாது. எந்த விதமாகவும் விவசாயிகளை மனைக்கட்டுகளிலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக் கூடாது என்று சட்ட பூர்வமாக இருக்க வேண்டும். மனையிலிருந்து வெளியேற்றுவதைத் தடுக்க இந்தச் சட்டத்தை திருத்தவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்த பிறகும் கூட மிருசுதார்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை மீறிக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் மீது எந்த விதமான நடவடிக்கையும் எடுப்பதற்கு இந்த சட்டத்தில் உத்தரவாதம் இல்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தை மீறுகிறவர்களுக்கு தண்டனை அளிக்கப்படும் என்று இந்த சட்டத்தில் இடம் அளிக்கவேண்டும்.

“பண்ணையாட்களை மிருசுதார்கள் வெளியேற்றினால் பண்ணையாட்கள் சமரச ஆபீசரிடம் மனு செய்துகொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று இருக்கிறது. அப்படி மனு செய்து கொண்டால் உடனே மிருசுதார்கள் வக்கீல்களை வைத்து விவசாயிகளை மாறும்படி செய்து வருகிறார்கள். வக்கீல்கள் oros செய்யவில்லை விவசாயிகள் பதில் சொல்ல முடியாமல் திணருகிறார்கள். ஆகவே மிருசுதார்கள் வக்கீல்களை வைத்து oros செய்யக்கூடாது என்றும் வக்கீல்கள் ஆஜர் ஆகக்கூடாது என்றும் சட்டத்தைத் திருத்த வேண்டும்.

“இந்தச் சட்டம் அமுலுக்கு வந்த பிறகு கிராமம் கிராமமாக அதிகாரிகள் டாம் டாம் மூலமாக விவசாயிகளுக்கு தெரியப்படுத்தவேண்டும். அந்த முறையில் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை திருத்தி அமைக்கவேண்டும். எனக்கு முன்னால் சட்டத்தை திருத்த வேண்டும் என்று பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசி இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே அந்த அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொன்னதையும் நான் சொன்னதையும் வைத்துக்கொண்டு இந்தச் சட்டத்தை திருத்தும்படியாகக் கேட்டுக் கொண்டு என்னுடைய வார்த்தையை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

*SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, all arguments for and against the principle underlying this Bill were discussed at the stage when the Bill was first introduced, before

[Sri K. Varadachari] [25th November 1952]

it was referred to the Joint Select Committee. We seem to be traversing the same ground once more now in many of the speeches that have preceded mine. I wish to confine myself to one or two features which formed the subject-matter of discussion, of keen discussion, during the Select Committee stage and leave other matters for the consideration of the House at a later stage when detailed amendments would be moved and discussions would proceed on the same. For one thing, Sir, if we are at a stage when we can dispense with all proprietary interests in all forms of property, then we can adopt some of those policies and programmes which friends like Mr. Ramamurthi and others would advocate. We have not arrived at that stage in this country yet. We have to recognise property rights for a long time more; they cannot be brushed aside with a stroke of the pen just as my friends on the other side would advocate. If tillers of the soil—whatever that word may connote—have to be recognised as practical owners of the soil—which our Communist friends would like us to do—it will be nothing short of introducing chaos in our system, in our agricultural system at any rate, suddenly by a stroke of the pen. Sir, let me disabuse the minds of Members who are aghast at my remark, by saying that I am also an agriculturist, though I am a Brahmin. (Laughter.) People think and assume that Brahmins are not agriculturists at all. For fourteen generations, my family has been an agriculturist family. (An hon. Member: 'But they are not tillers.') My friend says that I was never a tiller. Well, has he been a tiller, I ask him. With our habits and with our heavy accoutrements, we are the least fitted for any agricultural operations. The mere fact that you take an umbrella, and wearing an *angavasthram* you go and stand on the ridge of the field cannot make you a tiller of the soil or a tenant on the land. On the other hand, let us look at the man whom our Communist friends call the 'tiller of the soil'. Every tiller of the soil cannot do all the cultivation himself without engaging hired labour for getting on with cultivation at every stage of agriculture. Even the smallest proprietor of land has necessarily to engage—though he may himself be working on the field—outside hired labour for finishing the agricultural operation in regard to every crop. It is not an easy thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to define the words 'cultivating tenant' or for that matter 'tiller of the soil'. It requires a great amount of thought and experience for any one to arrive at a proper definition of those terms. My hon. Friend Sri Swayamprakasam is very much perturbed at the definition of the words 'cultivating tenant' and is not happy about the definition as it finds a place in the Bill before the House. I feel, Sir, it is as it should be because we are unable to arrive at a better definition. Has my Friend suggested any improvement in that behalf? No. The language used in the Bill is, I feel, sufficient and perhaps more useful than what we can imagine. By the term 'contribution of physical labour either of himself or of his family in the cultivation of the land', a wide field is covered. Some people may take advantage of this definition just

25th November 1952] [Sri K. Varadachari]

as any one could do with any piece of legislation, and our people are capable of taking advantage of loopholes in any enactment, and that is what we, lawyers do. Therefore, it is not a difficult thing to find loopholes in any definition. I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant' is sufficient for all practical purposes. Let it be remembered that it has not been possible for me or for anybody on the other side to improve upon it. There may be a few who may perhaps be able to take advantage of the looseness of the language. What is the improvement that has been suggested? (Sri S. Swayamprakasam: 'The hon. Member can await the amendments that we are proposing.') I wish only to see how many loopholes the hon. Member's amendment will create. I assure you, Sir, it is not an easy job, because we are yet in the process of evolution even with regard to our agricultural system and unable to say such and such person is a cultivating tenant and such and such is the tiller of the soil and nobody else. I therefore, appeal to Friends like Sri Swayamprakasam to be charitable enough to accept the definition for the time being, because after all this legislation is intended for a particular area and for a particular period, to get over some difficulties which have been created by leaders of parties who are also present in this House. This agitation would not have been there had it not been for them, and of course Friends like Sri Viswanatham have joined hands with them for the time being because they are in the Opposition.

"Sir, objection has been taken to the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee on the ground that there is no provision in the Bill for punja lands. There is no definition of 'land' in this Bill and it is not said in the Bill that the Bill applies to wet lands and not to punja lands. The provision is made for all lands and the Bill will apply equally to all lands, dry or wet. I feel there can be no difficulty about that and my friends need not therefore think that there is a big loophole or lacuna in the Bill on this ground. Then Friends who have signed the Minutes of Dissent, some six or seven of them, including our redoubtable leader Sri Viswanatham, wish to take this opportunity of inducing the Government to make this legislation applicable to the whole State now alone and once for all, making it a State-wide legislation, and not only a legislation applying to the district of Tanjore. I do not know how far they are wise in hustling the House into framing a legislation for the whole State by means of this short Bill. There are several problems which arise for consideration if we undertake legislation for the whole State. For instance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you find that this system of pannaiyal is peculiar to Tanjore alone and obtains in no other district. Perhaps in some of the remote corners of the delta areas of the Circars, you may have a slightly similar institution, but there is no such system like the pannaiyal system anywhere else in Madras State. Therefore, we cannot introduce provisions of this sort in a State-wide legislation. Another thing is that it is assumed that eviction of tenants is happening on a large scale in all the districts, and that the landlords anticipating

[Sri K. Varadachari] [25th November 1952]

legislation of this nature are evicting all their tenants. In Rayalaseema, at any rate in my district of Chittoor, there is no such problem of wholesale evictions. Our friends have not been keeping quiet in my district but happily they have failed. I say, Sir, that conditions in other districts are so variegated, the tenures are so very different and the habits and customs and usages of the people are so very different from district to district, that we cannot apply the provisions of this Bill to the whole State. I therefore submit that these objections to the present Bill need not be pressed at this stage, but I appeal to Members to see that this Bill which is intended and admittedly intended as a measure of appeasement against the agitation that is prevailing there—whether it came about at the instance of Friends here or whether it was spontaneous, it does not matter—is allowed to pass through the House without much difficulty."

4-30
P.M.

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు చాలా ముఖ్యమైనది. ఈ ఎంపెంబ్లీ వసలేయడం ప్రారంభించింది మొదలుకొని యిప్పటివరకు చేసినటువంటి అనేక Acts, Ordinance లు అన్నింటికంటేను ఎక్కువ ప్రాధాన్యమైనటువంటి యీ తంజావూరు ఆర్డినెన్సు బిల్లును యీ నాడు మనము అందరము వర్చించుచున్నాము. ఎందుచేతనంటే, మనదేశము వ్యవసాయ దేశము. ఎక్కువగా వ్యవసాయ వృత్తిమీద నూటికి ఎనిమిది వంతు జీవింపుచున్నాము. భూసమస్య చాలా ప్రాధాన్యమైనటువంటిది. దీనికి సంబంధించిన భూమినిగురించి, రైతును గురించి నేడు మనము వర్చించుచున్నాము. అయితే యీ సందర్భములో గౌరవనీయులైన శ్రీ వరదాచారిగారు ఒకటి, రెండు విషయములు చెప్పారు. మరియు ఇంతకు ముందు చాలామంది మిత్రులు యీ బిల్లులో యింకా అనేకమైన radical changes చేయాలని చెప్పారు. తంజావూరులో భూభాగములకు, కాల దాడుకు, వస్త్రయిదార్డుకు భూమినుండి తొలగించే సమస్యలు, తగాదాలు ఏర్పడినందున యీ ఆర్డినెన్సు ప్రభుత్వము పెట్టారు. అందువల్ల యితర జిల్లాలోకి యీ భయము ప్రాచుటకువల్ల, అదే తగాదాలు ముఖ్యముగా ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలో ఏర్పడినవని మన మిత్రులు అందరు చెప్పగా, వరదాచారిగారు చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలో అటువంటి విషయములే లేవని అన్నారు. ఈ విషయముల సత్యాన్ని వారు కచ్చితముచున్నారని చెప్పగలము. ఇందుకు నేను కొన్ని ఉదాహరణలు యిచ్చుచున్నాను. చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలో అటువంటివి ఏమియు జరిగలేదని యీ విషయము వారు ఎక్కడ వివరించు అని అన్నారు. చిత్తూరు జిల్లా రాయలసీమలో చేరినదే. దుష్టపరిస్థితులు అక్కడ లేవని చెప్పినందున నేను వాటికి ఈ విషయము గురించి తెలియచెప్పుచున్నాను. చిత్తూరు జిల్లా ముజిలీఫ్ రాయలసీమ జిల్లాలో నీకర టేముమువలన జనలు భూములు వదలిపెట్టి ఎన్నో చోట్ల జనలు వలసపోయియున్నారు నే విషయాలు వారు వినియున్నారని అనుకుంటాను. ఇంతేకాకుండా మా కృష్ణా, గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో భూస్వామ్య కాలదారి విధానము ప్రాంతిక యిచ్చడని వీరికి తెలిసియుండవచ్చును. యీ తంజావూరు Ordinance యితర జిల్లాలకన్నాడ వర్చించిన విషయముతో అనేకచోట్ల కొట్లాటలు జరిగి, కాలదార్డు తొలగించిన కేసులు అనేకములున్నవి. ఈ నాడు యీ కాలదారి సమస్య చాలా దీనిమైన సమస్యగా తీర్పడినది. ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కరించడానికి వేలాది సంఖ్యలు ప్రజలలో ఏర్పడినవి. వీటిలో రైతు సంఘాలిన్ని, రైతు కూలి సంఘాలిన్ని, యింకా అనేక సంఘాలు యీ సమస్యలు voluntary గా పరిష్కరించుకోవాలని

25th November 1952] [Sri M. Narayanaswami]

[illegible]

“ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పుచున్నాను. పెద్దవారైన శ్రీ వరదాచారిగారు యింకొక విషయము చెప్పారు. ఈ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రము అంతటినీ వర్తింపజేసి నట్లయితే, దేశములో ఎక్కడ చూచినను ఆరావకము, అల్లర్లు, తోపిడీలు యింకా ఆనెకమైన దుష్కృత్యాలకు అది దారితీస్తుందనిన్నీ చెప్పారు. ఇందుకుగాను నేను ఒక విషయము చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఎక్కడ అయితే వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణలు లేవో, ఎక్కడ అయితే యీ కాలదారి విధానము అమలులో ఉన్నదో, అక్కడ అంతయు ఆకాలిబయలుదేరింది. దానికి తోడ్పడినది యీ శంకాపూరు Ordinance పెట్టారు. ఇందువల్ల ప్రజలలో యివర తిలలాలో అలజడి, ఆందోళన ఎక్కువ అయ్యింది. ఈ కాలదారి విధానమువల్లనే దేశంలో ఆనెక మందికి పుష్కలంగా తిండి లేకపోవడము జరుగుచున్నది. ఈనాడు ప్రతి ప్రజా

[Sri M. Narayanaswami] [25th November 1952]

ములా భూమిలేని రైతులు జాస్తి అయినారు. వందలకొలది ఎకరాలు భూమిని చేతిలో పెట్టుకొని, వేద రైతులను తొలగించే దురుద్దేశ్యము యీ భూస్వాములలో ప్రబలింది. ఇట్టి సమయములో సరియైన భూసంస్కరణ విధానము అమలు జరిపిన నే దేశములో శాంతి అనేది యేర్పడుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు చెనా విషయం చూడండి. చెనాలో యిలాంటి భూసమస్య విధానము వచ్చింది. చెనాలో జరిగిన Peiking Peace Conference కు వెళ్లివచ్చిన కొంత మంది మిత్రులు అక్కడ పరిస్థితులను చూచివచ్చి వ్యవసాయ కూలీల స్వాధీనములోనే భూములున్నట్లు చెప్పారు. అక్కడ చెనాలో యీ conference కు ముందు ఆశాంతి ఏర్పడిన కారణముచేత, యీ Peace Conference ఆనంతరం యీ భూమిని పంపిణీచేసి, వ్యవసాయదార్ల స్వాధీనములో ఉంచినందువల్ల శాంతి ఏర్పడినదని చెప్పారు. ఇదియునుగాకుండా అక్కడ వ్యవసాయ కూలీల యిండ్లలో పరిశీలనగావారు రెండేసి బండ్లధాన్యముకూడా చేర్చి పెట్టుకొని సుఖముగా జీవించుచున్నట్లు చెప్పారు. అట్లాంటిది మన దేశములో రైతుల ఇండ్లు వెదకిచూచిన ఒక గింజకూడ కనపడని పరిస్థితులున్నవి. గనుకనే యీ భూమి పంపిణీవల్లనే ప్రజలు అక్కడ సుఖముగా జీవించుచున్నారని చెప్పారు. అట్లాగే మన దేశములోగూడా యీ ఆహార సమస్య తీరటానికి, వేద ప్రజాసేకాని కనుగుణముగా భూమి పంపిణీ జరిపి, వ్యవసాయ కూలీల స్వాధీనములో భూమిని ఉంచి, సాగు చేయనిచ్చిన ఎడల అతనికి దోహదమివ్వదు. అందుచేత యీ బట్టాన్ని ఒక్క Tanjore జిల్లాకే కాకుండా యితర జిల్లాలకుగూడ వర్తింపజేసి, బిల్లులోమార్పులుచేస్తూ వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు భారత్వ పద్ధతులలో కలుగజేస్తే ఆశాంతి తగ్గినని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అదియునుగాక దేశములో అనేక ఆకలికాపులు గురించి వినియున్నాము. ఈ భూసమస్య పరిష్కారము చేసినయెడల ఆకలికాపులు, కరువు అనేది ఉండదు.

“పోతే మనకు యీ బిల్లులో కొలుదార్ల స్వాధీనములో భూమి అయిదేండ్లవరకు ఉండే హక్కును కలిగించింది. కాని ఇందులో ఒక ఇబ్బందిని గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఇట్లు అయిదేండ్ల కాలపరిమితి వున్నదంటే ఈ కొలుదారు మొదటి నాలుగు సంవత్సరములు బాగుగ ఎరువువేసి వంట పండిస్తాడు. అయితే సంవత్సరము యీ భూమిని భూభామండుకు ఒప్పగింత పెట్టవలెననే ఉద్దేశముతో ఎరువువేయ్యడు. వంట సరిగా పండించడు. మొదటి మూడు నాలుగు సంవత్సరములలో దూషింపంత ఉత్సాహము, అయిదేండ్లు పూర్తి అయ్యేసరికి, నిరుత్సాహము జెంది భూమిని దురవస్థలో వుంచి ౭౦ జరుగా విడుస్తాడు. ఈ విషయములో భూభామండుకు లాభములేదు. కొలుదారునకే అంతకన్నా ఉత్సాహము ఉండదు. దీనివల్ల భూమి బంజరులాకవచ్చును. అందుకనే అయిదేండ్ల కాలపరిమితి తీసివేసి కనీసము పదిసంవత్సరములైనను యీ కొలుదారుని చేతిలో భూమిని ఉంచినఎడల అది మంచిస్థితిలో ఉండగల పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడుతుంది. అందువల్ల యీ అయిదు సంవత్సరాల కాలపరిమితి వాలదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఇప్పటి కాల పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి భూములు రాష్ట్రములో ఏ విధంగాఉన్నవో ఆలోచించ గోరారు. ముఖ్యముగా గుంటూరు జిల్లాలో పరిస్థితులు కొన్ని గ్రామాలలో మరి అభ్యాస్త పు స్థితిలోవున్నవి. ప్రభుత్వమువారు Debt Relief Act ను ఒకటి వ్యాసు చేయించారు కాని యీ కొలుదార్లు యీ బట్టముయొక్క ఉపయోగమును అనుభవించలేకపోతున్నారు. ఎందుచేతనంటే, ఈ రైతు బీదతనములోవుండి యిది వరకు భూస్వాములవద్దను, ఇతర ధనికవర్గమునుండి యీ అప్పులు తనకు ఉన్న కొద్ది అస్తిని కాకట్టుపెట్టి అప్పులు వుట్టించుకొని జీవించుచుండగా యీ Debt Relief Act వల్ల వీరు యివ్వవలసిన అప్పులు సక్రమముగా వారికి చెల్లించనిపక్షములో యీ ధనిక

25th November 1952] [Sri M. Narayanaswami]

వర్గమువారు మరి అప్పుయివ్వరు. అతనికి సులభమార్గములో అప్పుచేసేవిధము వుండ గాదీనివలన ప్రజలకు అప్పులు సక్రమముగా తీర్చనియెడల, మరి అప్పువుట్టదు. అందుచేత ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన Debt Relief Act వారికి లాభకరముకాదంటున్నారు. ఉటువంటివి ప్రజలకు ఉపయోగము లేని యాక్టులు అనేకము ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్యాసు చేశారు. ఇప్పుడు Prohibition Act విషయము చూడండి. ప్రభుత్వమువారు prohibition అనేది పెట్టినప్పటికిని ఆజు త్రాగుడు అలవాటు పడిన కారణముచేత వాటుప మాటుప త్రాగుతునే యున్నారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు యీ Prohibition యాక్టువల్ల ఉపయోగమేమి? కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎన్నో యాక్టులు ప్యాసు చేశారే కాని, వాటిని అమలుపరచ లేకుండా యున్నారు. దేశములో అన్నము లేక పోతే యీ త్రాగుడువల్ల జీవించువారు కొంతమంది యున్నారు. అందువల్ల యెన్ని యాక్టులు తెచ్చినా అవరణ సాధ్యము కానప్పుడు నిరుపయోగమైన ఆ యాక్టులవల్ల ప్రయోజనమేమిని ఆడుగుచున్నాను. కాబట్టి యీ భూమిని కొలుదారు స్వాధీనములో 20, 30 సంవత్సరాలు ఉంచి సాగుకు విడిచినయెడల అతడు అనేక విధాల పాటుపడి, భూమికి ఎరువు వగైరా వేసి, సత్తు పెట్టి అహారోత్పత్తి చేయ గలడు. మరియు కడుపు నిండా భోజనము చేయగలడు. కడుపు నిండా భోజనము ఉంటేనే గదా, బాగుగా కృషిచేసి అహార ధాన్యాలు పండించగలడు. అట్లు చేయనియెడల యీ భూసమస్య కొలుదారి విధానముయొక్క పరిష్కారము కష్టసాధ్య మని చెప్పుచున్నాను. గనుక యీ బిల్లులో సరియైన సవరణలు చేసి కొలుదారుకు సహాయము చేస్తూ దీనిని రాష్ట్రమంతటను వర్తింపజేయమని కోరుతూ నిర మిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI V. S. SIVAPRAKASAM :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, so far in the debate there was no opposition to the main principle involved in this Bill. Even those friends who have given minutes of dissent have agreed on the dominant idea underlying this measure. So I can say there is no opposition to the fundamental principle involved in this Bill.

“ Sir, I had the honour of being a Member of the Joint Select Committee. As we all know, this is a small Bill. We were given nearly fourteen days to study this Bill; and after that fourteen days' study, ordinarily one would expect the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee to be over in two or three hours. But, Sir, somehow we took three full days to finish our work. There were free and lengthy discussions. Somehow, the Hon. Chairman of the Joint Select Committee and the Hon. the Chief Minister were exceptionally generous to meet all the points raised by the Opposition Members. In fact every point raised by them was considered fully and it was only after a common agreement was arrived at that the various clauses of the Bill were suitably amended. So, Sir, after all the free and lengthy discussions in the Joint Select Committee, to come and say here in the House that there was no free discussion in the Joint Select Committee, but that everything was rushed through there, is, really unfair.

“ Then, Sir, much has been said regarding the right given to the landlord in deciding what crop should be raised on his land. After all, in Tanjore district what actually happens, many of

[Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam] [25th November 1952]

my friends know; for, it is the cultivator, who is called Pannaiyal, who knows what crop will grow profitably in what particular land. So, it is the cultivator or the Pannaiyal, by whatever name you call him, who, after approval by the landlord, cultivates the particular crop. After all, it is the landlord who gets a larger share of the produce, and so the Joint Select Committee felt that it is but proper to give this right of choice of crop to the landlord. So, I feel the Joint Select Committee have rightly given this final voice in the selection of crop to the landlord, when the produce is to be shared between him and the tenant and not otherwise.

"Regarding the appellation 'Pannaiyal' my hon. Friend, Mr. Swayamprakasam took objection to the use of that word in the Bill. For he said that in actual practice there was no such slavery obtaining in the Tanjore district to-day, though, he said, that was prevalent some years back. Though he objected to the use of that term, he did not give us any alternative word for that. I do not know whether he will accept the word 'cultivator' for the word 'Pannaiyal'. Sir, I would like to say here that, though I do not belong to the Tanjore district, I have been there for the last ten years, and from what I know of that district, I can say with confidence that to-day the status of the Pannaiyals is a dignified one; they are a dignified class, much better than coolies and wage-earners. So there is nothing wrong in calling them Pannaiyals. After all, what is there in calling one by a particular name? What does it matter if I am called a Harijan or a Scheduled Caste man, so long as there is no difference in my status? So I wish my hon. Friend does not take serious objection to the use of the word 'Pannaiyal'. I do not know whether, if really he has any serious objection to that word, he will be satisfied with the word 'cultivator'."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Any other word will do."

* SRI V. S. SIVAPRAKASAM:—"Sir, in this connexion I wish to say another thing. The suggestion for the abolition of the word 'Pannaiyal' comes not from the Pannaiyals but from the landlord community who were oppressing them previously. I think their objection to the use of that word comes from the fear in the minds of the landlords that ultimately, one day the Pannaiyal, as he is the bona fide tiller of the soil, will be made the owner of the soil. So, Sir, this is, I think, the reason for the objection to the use of the word 'Pannaiyal'. I have nothing more to say. With these words I support the Bill."

* SRI A. VELOO:—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம் பொறுக்கு கமிட்டிக்கு விடப்பட்டு, திருத்த மசோதாவாக இப்போது கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருப்பதில் சில வார்த்தைகள் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன்.

"இந்த சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிருகதார்களுக்கும், பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் இடையில் நல்லுறவை ஏற்படுத்தவும் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்தவும் உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவும் வசதியாக இருப்பதற்காகக் கொண்டு

25th November 1952] [Sri A. Veloo]

வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறதென்று அதன் முகவுரையிலேயே குறிப்பிடப் பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றாலும், உழப்பவனுக்கே நிலம் சொந்தமாக்கப்படவேண்டும் என்று கூறப்படும் காலத்திலே, அதற்கு அடிப்படையாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலம் உழப்பவர்களுக்கு ஐந்தாண்டுகளுக்கு நிலவுரிமை அளிக்கப்பட்டிருப்பது பெரிய சந்தோஷத்தோடு வரவேற்கக்கூடிய விஷயம்தான். இதை எல்லோரும் வரவேற்கிறார்கள் என்பதில் ஆட்சேபணை ஒன்றும் கூறமுடியாது. இருந்தாலும் இதில் நிலவுரிமையை பாதிக்கக்கூடிய அளவிற்கு பல காரணங்கள் ஏற்பட்டதால் தான் இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரக்கூடிய நிலை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிருகதார்கள் விவசாயிகளை மனைகளிலிருந்து வெளியேற்றி விட்டார்கள். வீட்டைச் சுற்றியுள்ள மரங்களை எல்லாம் வெட்டிவருகிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரி யான தொந்தரவுகளை 1943-ம் ஆண்டிலிருந்தே மிருகதார்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கொடுக்க ஆரம்பித்து விட்டார்கள். அப்பொழுதிலிருந்தே பல பண்ணையாட்கள் வெளியேற்றப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். வீட்டு மனைகளிலிருந்தும் வெளியேற்றப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள், அவர்களுக்கெல்லாம் ஒரு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறேன். விலக்கப்பட்ட பண்ணையாட்களையும், விவசாயிகளையும், மனையிலிருந்து விலக்கியவர்களையும் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளப்படவேண்டும்.

"இந்த மசோதாவில் இன்னும் சில குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கின்றன. நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட பண்ணையாட்கள் அவசர சட்டத்தில் குறிப்பிட 30 நாட்களுக்குள் மனுசெய்து கொள்ளாமல் காலதாமதமானாலும், அங்குள்ள சமரச அதிகாரிகளுக்கு, காலதாமதத்திற்கு காரணம் சரிவென்று பட்டால், மனுச்செய்துகொள்ள காலத்தைக் கொஞ்சம் நீடிக்கலாம். அந்த மனுவை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளலாம் என்று இருக்கிறது. குறிப்பாக மாயவரம் சீர்காழி தாலுக்காவில் இருக்கின்ற சமரச அதிகாரிகள் ஒருவர் மாயுரத்திலேயே தாசில்தாராக சில ஆண்டுகளிருந்தவர். மற்றவர் சீர்காழியில் சொந்த நிலமும், சொந்தவூரகாபுரமாவார். மிருகதார்களின் சொந்தக்காரர்கள்கூட. ஆகையால் அவர்கள் மிருகதார்களுக்குச் சாதகம் செய்வார்களே தவிர பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு எந்தவிதமான சாதகமும் செய்வார்களா. இதற்குச் சான்றாக அனைத்து மனுக்களில் மிருகதார்களின் சாப்பாக்கவே இப்போது தீர்ப்பளித்து வருகிறார்கள் என்பதை வருத்தத்துடன் சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஆகையால் நிலத்தை வீட்டு நீக்கப் பட்டவர்கள் இன்னும் ஒரு மாத காலத்திற்குள் மனுச்செய்து கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று செய்து விட்டால் நல்லதாயிருக்கும்.

"இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைந்த மிருகதார்களுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அந்த மிருகதார்கள் தாங்களே நிலங்களில் பயிரிடவந்தால் விலக்கு அளிக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். ஆனால் இவர்களும் அதிகமான நிலத்தை வைத்துக் கொண்டிருப்பவர்கள் போல் தாங்களே பாடுபாடு வெளியூரில் சம்பாதித்துக் கொண்டு இதை பண்ணையாட்களிடம் ஒப்படைத்திருந்தால் இதற்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிப்பது சரியல்ல, ஏனென்றால் 10 வேலி, 5 வேலி நிலக்காரர்களுக்கு பண்ணையாள் எவ்வளவு பாடுபட்டு உழைத்து வருகிறானோ அவ்வளவு பாடும் இந்த ஒரு வேலி நிலத்தில் வேலை செய்கொண்டிருக்கிற விவசாயிகளும் பாடுபடுகிறார்கள். ஆகையால் இவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் வழங்க வேண்டுமென்றால் ஈழத் தங்களுக்கு சொந்தமான ஒரு வேலி அல்லது ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவான நிலத்தில் நேரிடையாக இருங்க வேலை செய்கிறார்களோ அவர்களுக்கு மாததிரம் விதிவிலக்கு அளித்து வீட்டு மற்றவர்களுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் செல்லுபடியாகும் என்று திருத்தவேண்டும். அப்பொழுது தான் எல்லா விவசாயிகளுக்கும் நியாயம் வழங்கியதாக ஆகும்.

"அடுத்தபடியாக குத்தகைப் பத்திரம் எழுதுவதிலே தற்போது ஏராளமான குறைபாடுகள் இருக்கின்றன. இப்பொழுது நவம்பர் 22-ந் தேதிக்குள் குத்தகைப் பத்திரம் எழுதிக்கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று இருப்பதால் மிருகதார்களின் தங்கள் இஷ்டப்படி குத்தகைப் பத்திரம் எழுதி வாங்கிக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். மரங்கள் இருந்தால் அதையும் வெட்டிக்கொள்ள அனுமதிப்

[Sri A. Veloo] [25th November 1952]

பேருகவும், என்றும் மற்ற எல்லா கட்டுப்பாடுகளுக்கும் உட்பட்டு எழுதிக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று நிர்ப்பந்திக்கிறார்கள். பத்திரம் எழுதிக் கொடுத்து விடுவதால் அவர்கள் கோர்ட்டுக்குப் போய்விடுகிறார்கள். விவசாயிகளின் பக்கம் வெற்றி கிடைக்காமல் போய்விடுகிறது. ஆகையினால் 'இந்த மாதிரியாகத் தான்' குத்தகைப் பத்திரம் எழுதவேண்டுமென்று நிர்ணயித்து விடவேண்டும்.

"பண்ணையான் என்ற பெயரையே மாற்றிவிடவேண்டுமென்று பல மெம்பர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். பெயரை மாற்றுவதால் நன்மை ஏற்படுமென்று தோன்றவில்லை. எப்படி, பறையன், பள்ளன் என்ற பெயரை ஹரிஜனன் என்று மாற்றி வைத்திருப்பதால் அவர்களுடைய நிலைமை உயரவில்லையோ அதேபோலத்தான் ஆகும். ஆனால் பெயரை மாற்றும் பொழுதே சமூகத்தில் அவர்களுக்குள்ள அந்தஸ்தும் மாறவேண்டும். அவர்களுக்கு மதிப்பும் ஏற்படவேண்டும். அப்படி இருந்தால் பெயரை அவசியம் மாற்றவேண்டுமென்று நானும் சொல்லத்தயார். இல்லாத பக்கத்தில் என்ன பயன்? விவசாயிகளுக்கு மனைக்கட்டு சொந்தமாக்கப்படவேண்டும். இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு 'வாரம் 40% கேட்கிறீர்கள், கூலி தினம் இரண்டு மரக்கால் கேட்கிறீர்கள். மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தப்படி வேண்டுமென்கிறீர்கள். நாங்கள் பிணத்தைக் கூட பொது ரஸ்தாவில் தூக்கிச் செல்ல இனிமேல் அனுமதிக்கமாட்டோம்.' என்பதாக பல இடங்களில் இப்பொழுது பயமுறுத்தி தடை செய்து வருகிறார்கள், இதுமாதிரியெல்லாம் செய்வதை தடை செய்து நன்மை ஏற்படும்படிச் செய்யவேண்டும்."

4-50 * SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIYAR:—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to get a clarification from the Government in respect of clause 8, sub-clause (4), about the 'usual catch crop'. Now there is an organization in the Tanjore district working vigorously to produce Co. 4 long staple cotton. The term 'usual catch crop' generally means the growing of pulses. The Co. 4 long staple cotton is specially grown in Tanjore district and is thriving very well. Ginning factories have been specially constructed and the concerned department of Government is taking every interest. While Co. 4 which is called 'Uganda' in Rajapalayam is not thriving so well there for want of sub-soil water, it is coming off very well in those parts of Tanjore district where it is grown. My point is whether this one-fifth of the catch-crop that is allotted for the landowner will be commensurate with the cost involved in raising long staple cotton. This is a matter which has got to be considered by the Government because the landowners are asked to put up bore wells. The usual catch crops are grown by rain-fed water whereas for raising the specialised Co. 4 cotton bore wells have to be put up. For this purpose the landowners have to invest extra money. Under these circumstances the proportion that is to be allotted to the landowner has to be taken into consideration. I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will consider this point."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Long staple cotton is not a catch crop."

* SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIYAR:—"It is only because of that I require a clarification and also because the long staple cotton is grown only as a second crop. Apart from this, I have nothing more to add."

25th November 1952]

SRI A. RATHINAM:—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தப் பண்ணையான் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதாவானது பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதாக மசோதாவில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆனால், உண்மையாகவே அது பண்ணையாட்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பாக இருக்கிறதா அல்லது மிருகத்தார்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பாக இருக்கிறதா என்ற பெரிய பிரச்சனை எழுகிறது. குறிப்பாக, பண்ணையாட்கள் பண்ணையிலே வேலை செய்யும் ஆட்கள் என்று பெயர் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. உண்மையாக, உழவன் தன் உரிமைக்காக நிலத்தை உழுது, பயிரிட்டு, அந்த நிலத்திலே சாகுபடி செய்யும் அத்தனை பொருள்களையும் அந்த நிலத்திற்குச் சொந்தமானவருக்கு உரிமையாக்கப் படுகிறது. ஆனால், உண்மையில் உழுது பயிரிடுபவனுக்கு எவ்வளவு கிடைக்கிறதென்றால், அது வாரதாரருக்கு 40 சதவிகிதம் கிடைக்கிறது. அந்த 40 சதவிகிதத்திலிருந்து பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு 2 மரக்கால் என்று அதாவது (மதராஸ் படி, ஒரு படி, அரிசிதான்) தினக்கூலியாகக் கிடைக்கிறது. அதாவது வருஷத்திலே அதிகமாக வேலை செய்தால் 30 லிருந்து 60 தினங்களுக்கு மேல் அவன் வேலை செய்ய முடியாது. அந்தப் பண்ணையானுக்கு அந்தக் கூலிதான் வழங்கப்படுகிறது. இந்தப் படிக்குத்தான் பண்ணையாட்களுக்குப் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமாக இன்று நடைமுறையிலே கொண்டுவரப் பட்டிருக்கிறதே தவிர, உண்மையிலேயே பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு இந்த மசோதா வானது பாதுகாப்பா, இல்லையா என்பது மக்களுக்குத் தெரிந்தபாடில்ல."

"60 சதவிகிதம் நிலச் சொந்தக்காரர்களுக்கு கொடுக்கப்படுகிறதென்றால் பெருநிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் ஆயிரமாயிரம் வேலி நிலங்களைத் தங்கள் சொந்த நிலங்களாக ஆக்கிக்கொண்டிருப்பவர்கள் அவர்கள் தன்றாகப் பெருக்கிக்கொண்டும் அவர்கள் ஊதியத்தைப் பெருக்கிக் கொண்டே போகவும் வழியிருக்கிறது. அந்த நிலத்திலே உழுது பயிரிட்டு உழுவதற்கு வேண்டிய ஒரு முதலியவற்றிற்குப் பணத்தைச் செலவு செய்து அந்த வாரம்தாரர் வாங்குவது 40 சதவிகிதம். ஆனால் ஏதோ ஒரு காலத்தில் பெரியவர்கள் சம்பாதித்து வைத்த நிலமோ அல்லது அவர்களுடைய பூர்வீக சொத்தோ என்ற காரணத்திற்காக நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள், நிலச் சொந்தக்காரர்கள், நிலப் பிரபுகள் என்ற காரணத்திற்காக அவர்கள் 60 சதவிகிதத்தை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். உண்மையாக, உழைப்பாளி, உழவன் பாடுபடுகிறான். ஆனால், பாடுபடுவதற்கேற்ற உணவே அல்லது கூலியோ நிர்ணயம் செய்யப் படுகிறதென்றாலுங்கூட, சென்ற அரசாங்கத்திலே சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியார் அவர்கள் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறபடி இரண்டாம் தரமான நீர்ப்பாசன வசதியுள்ள இடத்தில் 60 சதவிகிதம் உழவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படவில்லை. வாரம் தாரர்களுக்கு பாதி, அதாவது 50 சதவிகிதம், கொடுப்பது பல இடங்களில் வழக்கத்தில் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் இன்றைய மசோதாவில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு அளிப்பது 40 சதவிகிதம் தான். ஆனால், நிலச் சொந்தக் காரர்களுக்கு 60 சதவிகிதம் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. எனவேதான் செலக்ட் கமிட்டியிலே நாங்கள் எதிர்த்தோம், சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டி ரிபோர்ட்டில் கண்டிருக்கிறபடி இரண்டாம் தரமான நீர்ப்பாசன வசதியுள்ள இடங்களில் அறுவடையில் 60 சதவிகிதம் என்றும், முதல்தரமான இடங்களில் அறுவடையில் 55 சதவிகிதம் என்றும் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் வற்புறுத்தினோம். ஆனால், அந்த வற்புறுத்தலைப் பரிசீலனைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாமல் எதேச்சாதிகாரமாக வோட்டுக்கு விடப்பட்டு எங்களுடைய முயற்சி தள்ளப்பட்டு விட்டது. அந்த விவாதத்தின்போது."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to a point of order. I am sorry it is not in order to refer to what happened in the Joint Select Committee. I therefore object to the hon. Gentleman saying that certain suggestions were arbitrarily thrown out, etc. It is not proper to refer to these things in this debate."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I submit, Sir, that if it is part of the proceedings which are laid on the table of the House, the Member has got every right to refer to it."

[25th November 1952

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ It is not proper to do so.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"We have got every right, I submit, to refer to what is printed and circulated to us. The proceedings of the Select Committee have been circulated to us."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" A Member of the Select Committee has no such right."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Just a word, Sir, if you will not mind it. It was bad enough for the Members of the Select Committee to put it down that way in the printed proceedings and, as it was printed and put down, we did not think about raising any point against it. But, it is not really right for other Members to take it up, for we will then have to say whether the facts are correct or not. It is better that other Members are restrained from assuming things. (Interruption from some hon. Members.) The hon. Gentleman was saying that I was acting arbitrarily in the Select Committee.”

SRI A. RATHINAM :—“கழிப்படிமலை நடந்ததைப்பற்றி ஏதோ பேசக் கூடாது என்றாலும்கூட, பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு சரியான பாதுகாப்பு இல்லை என்பதைப்பற்றி தான் தான் பேச விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதாவிலே, அதாவது பெரு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் எந்த அக்கிரமம் செய்தாலும் எந்த அநீதி செய்தாலும் உரிமைதாரர்களுக்கோ, வாரம்தாரர்களுக்கோ குத்தகைதாரர்களுக்கோ அல்லது பண்ணையாட்களுக்கோ நீதி, நியாயம் வழங்கப்பட்டு அந்த நீதிக்கோ நியாயத்திற்கோ கோர்ப்பு தீர்ப்புக்குக் கூட மாறா நடவடிக்கை கொள்ளக்கூடிய வசதி நிலச்சுவாந்தார்களுக்கு இருக்கிறது. அதன் விலையாக ரூ. 150 அல்லது அதிசப்படியாக ரூ. 300, குறைந்தது ரீ மாதச் சம்பளம் தான். அவர்களை கூலியாகப் பெற்றுக்கொண்டு நியாயத்தை விலை கூறவேண்டுமே தவிர பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு ஏதாவது நியாயம், நியதி இருக்கிறதா என்றால், அதுதான் கிடையாது.

“ஆனால், அதே நேரத்தில் பெரு நிலச்சுவாந்தார்கள் என்ன வேண்டுமானாலும் செய்யலாம். அவர்களுக்கு வேண்டிய அளவு பாதுகாப்பு மசோதாவில் இருக்கிறது. ஏழைகளாகிய பண்ணையாட்களுக்குப் போதிய பாதுகாப்பு இல்லையென தவிர மற்றவர்களுக்கு அப்படியே இருக்கிறது.

“அதுமட்டுமல்ல. ஒரு வேலிக்கு உட்பட்ட சிறு நிலச்சுவாந்தாடிகள் அனேகமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களிடத்திலே பண்ணையாட்கள் அடிமை வேலை செய்கின்றார்கள். அந்த அடிமை வேலை செய்தும் நியாயமாக ஊழல்பவன் உரிமையற்று இருக்கிறான். உரிமையில்லாத அவர்களுக்கு ஆதரவு இல்லாமலிருக்கிறது. அதற்கு இந்த மசோதவிலே இடமில்லை. எனவேதான் அதையும் இந்த மசோதவில் சேர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கோருகிறேன்.”

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

8 p.m. “ மடாதிபதிகளுக்கும், ஆலயங்களுக்கும் சொந்தமான ஆயிரமாயிரம் வேலி நிலங்கள் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கின்றன. அந்த நிலங்களை மொத்தமாக வேறு தரகர்கள் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்துக் கொண்டு பண்ணையாட்களுடைய உழைப்பைக்கொண்டு தாங்கள் உண்டு கொழுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். ஆலயங்களுக்கும் மடாதிபதிகளுக்கும் சொந்தமான நிலத்தில் உழுது பயிரிடுகின்ற உழைப்பாளிகளுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படும் விதம் அவனுடைய உணவதிகட்டி

25th November 1952]. [Sri A. Rathinam]

வரது. அந்த அளவிலே மத்தியிலே இருக்கக்கூடியவர்கள் துரோகம் செய்துகொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். இந்த மாசோதாவில் 60:40 என்று விதிம் இக்கிறது. ஆனால், நியாயமாக உழைக்கும் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு நியாயமான கூலியோ கிடையாது. அந்த நிலங்களுக்கு அரசாங்கம் பாதுகாப்பாக இருக்கிறது. ஆலயங்களுக்குச் சொந்தமான நிலங்களுக்கும், மடாதிபதிகளுக்குச் சொந்தமான நிலங்களுக்கும் பாதுகாப்பாக நம்முடைய சர்க்காரே இருக்கிறது. அதற்கு ஒரு அமைச்சர் இருக்கிறார். ஆயிரம் ஆயிரம் வேலி நிலங்களைப் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு சாகுபடி செய்வதற்கு நேரடியாகக் கொடுத்தால் அவர்கள் நியாயமாக அதிலே பயிரிடுவது மட்டுமல்லாமல், அப்படியி் பயிராகும் பண்டங்களை மக்களுக்கு சரியான விதத்தில் விநியோகிப்பார்கள். அந்த விதத்தில் மக்கள், முக்கியமாக வேலை செய்யும் உழவர்கள், சரியான உரிமை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு சொந்த நிலத்தைப் பயிரிடுவது போன்று பவிரிடவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் விளைச்சலும் பெருகும்; பஞ்சம் திரும்ப, சென்னை போன்ற நகரங்களில் வசிக்கும் மக்களுக்கு அதிகமான விளைச்சலின் காரணமாக நல்ல முறையில் தானியங்கள் கிடைக்கும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா, தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் சிதம்பரம் தாலுகா போன்ற இடங்களிலும் நல்ல விளைச்சல் உண்டாகும். படி அரிசி 12 அனா என்று சென்னையில் விற்றுக்கொண்டிருந்த அரிசி இன்று ரூ. 1-4-0 என்று விற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. குறுவை அறுவடைக்குப் பிறகுட்ட அடுத்த ஜில்லாக்களிலிருந்து வியாபாரிகள் புருந்து கொள்ளை வர்ப்பு அடிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்திலே நெல்லை வாங்கக்கொண்டு பெரிய விட்டார்கள். அதற்கு உடந்தையாக இருப்பவர்கள் பெரு நிலச்சவாந்தார்கள், குத்தகைதாரர்கள், வாரதாரர்கள். எனவே, உழவர்கள் மிகவும் மோசமான நிலையில் போய்க்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதே நேரத்திலே நம்முடைய ராஜ்யத்திலே, பற்றுக்குறை பிரதேசங்களிலும் சென்னை போன்ற இடங்களிலும் நாம் அவதிப்பட்டிருக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். இந்த அளவிலே, நாம் எந்தவிதமான சட்டத்தைச் செய்தாலும்கூட சரியான முறையில் சட்டம் அமுல் செய்யப்படவில்லை. சட்டத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டவர்கள் ஏழை விவசாயிகளும், பண்ணையாட்களும் தான். இந்த மசோதா பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு நன்மை பயக்கும் விதத்தில் இல்லை. எனவே இந்தச் மசோதாவில் சரியான மாறுதல் ஏற்படவேண்டும்; பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம் பெயரளவில் இருக்கக்கூடாது; உண்மையாகவே இது பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கும் சட்டமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். அதற்கு வேண்டிய உபாய்மிகள் இந்த சட்டத்தில் இருக்கவேண்டும். பண்ணையாட்கள் என்ற பெயர் இருப்பதால் அவர்கள் கூலி-யாட்கள் என்றும் அடிமைகள் என்றும் பொருள்படுகிறது. அதை மாற்றியமைக்க வேண்டும். இந்த சட்டமானது கூடிய சீக்கிரத்தில் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் அமுல் நடத்தப்படலாம். அதனால் இந்த மாதிரியான பெயர் அதில் இருக்கக் கூடாது. அதற்குத் தகுந்தாற்போல் இந்த சட்டத்திலுள்ள பெயரை மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டும். ஏனென்றால் இந்த பண்ணையாள் சட்டம் வந்தால் அது ஆந்திர தேசத்திற்கும் வரும். அப்பொழுது அதை வேறு விதமாக மாற்றியமைக்கும்படியாக வரும். இந்தச் சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்கு மட்டும் இல்லாமல் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் வரவேண்டும் என்று விரும்புகிறார்கள். அதனால் இதைமாற்றி இது சரியான முறையில் அமுல் நடத்தும்படியாக இருக்கவேண்டும். ஆகையினால் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை சரியான முறையில் நிறுவி அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வர வேண்டும் என்று நான் விரும்புகிறேன். சரியான திருத்தங்களுடன் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு சரியான முறையில், பயன்படும்படியான முறையில், ஆய்வினாரர்கள் செய்வார்கள் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். அவ்விதமே செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் வாரித்தையை இத்துடன் முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

* SRI G. V. K. RAO :— అభ్యుదయ, సంకల్పం, కృషి, ప్రతిభ
అనేవి మానవ జీవితంలో ముఖ్యమైనవి. వీరిని పెంచుకోవడానికి ప్రభుత్వం చాలా

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [25th November 1952]

అధిపాయాలను తెలియజేయున్నాము. కాని మేము తెచ్చిన సవరింపుల నెత్తు కమిటీవారు ఆమోదించనందులకు నా విచారాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు ముఖ్యసూత్రాన్ని ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే కాకుండా యావత్ రాష్ట్రానికి వర్తింపజేయునని ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులమైన మేము తెలియజేశాము. ఈ విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఎట్టి శ్రద్ధ చూపలేదు. భూబంబంధమైన సమస్యలు ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే కాక అన్ని జిల్లాలలోను ఉన్నవనే విషయం ప్రభుత్వంవారు విస్మరించరాదు. ప్రతి జిల్లాలోను, ప్రతి గ్రామంలోను, కాలూదాద్దు, కూలీలు, భూస్వాముల కొర్రవ్యానికి గురికావలసి వస్తున్న విషయం అందరకు తెలిసినదే. ఈ బిల్లును ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే పరిమితం చేయడంవల్ల ఇతర జిల్లాలలోని భూస్వాములు రైతులను తొలగించి వేస్తున్నారు. ఈ eviction ను ఆపుడల చేయటానికి ప్రభుత్వం ఎట్టి చర్యలు తీసుకొనుటలేదు. ఈ కారణంచే ఈ బిల్లు ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని రైతులకు రక్షణ ఇచ్చుటకు మారుగా అవకారం చేసేదిగ తయారైనదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా ఈ బిల్లును కాలూదాద్దు, వస్తయార్ల రక్షణ బిల్లు అని పిలిచేస్తూ భూస్వాముల రక్షణ బిల్లు అని పిలుచుట సబబుగా కనపడుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లులోని అంశాలను కొంచెం తరచిచూచినట్లయితే ఈ విషయం బోధపడుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రకారం పంటలూ హెచ్చు భాగం భూస్వామికి దఖలు చేయబడవలసివున్నది. తమ కాలాన్నంతా భూమిలో పనిచేయుటకే వినియోగించే రైతులకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు ఈ బిల్లు ఇచ్చే సమకాలీన నాడుమాత్రమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. రాత్రుక, కులనక కష్టించి తనిచేసేవాటి కంటితో తక్కువ వాటాఇచ్చి, ఎక్కడో నేడు ఉద్యోగం చేసుకుంటూ, భూమి అంటే ఏమీ తెలియని భూస్వామికి పంటలూ కాచ్చుభాగం ఇవ్వాలని నిర్ణయించడం స్వాధీనమైనా అది ప్రభుత్వం మౌలికంగా తీసుకున్నాను. అతేడ ప్రజాసేవానికి తిన తిండి గింజులు పండించే వ్యవసాయదారులకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు ఈ ప్రభుత్వం చిన్న చూపుచూడడం భావ్యంకాదనిమాత్రా ప్రభుత్వమువారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయాలన్నీంటిని జాగ్రత్తగా ఆలోచించి చూచినట్లయితే ఈ బిల్లు కాలూదాద్దు, వస్తయార్ల రక్షణ బిల్లు, లేక భూస్వాముల రక్షణ బిల్లు బోధపడుతుంది. భూమిని ఆధారంచేసుకొని కష్టించినచేసి, కేవల పాధి సంపాదించుకొనేవారికి న్యాయం కలుగజేయకపోవడం కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వంవారు అనుసరించవలసిన విధానంకాదని వారు గుర్తించగోరారు. ఇంతకుముందు మాట్లాడిన పెద్దలు వర్తక కార్యకర్తలు ఈ బిల్లును Appeasement Bill అని వర్ణించారు. వారి అధిపాయాలనుబట్టి చూచినట్లయితే వ్యవసాయరంగంలో రేకెత్తిన సంచలనాన్ని తాత్కాలికంగా ఉపశమనంచేయు నిమిత్తమే ఈ బిల్లు తీర్చేదికంటేవలన భావించవలసి యున్నది. ఇదే ఈ బిల్లును తెచ్చుటకు ముఖ్యకారణమైనట్లయితే వ్యవసాయ రంగంలో కాంటిని నుస్థిరం చేయజాలమని కాంగ్రెసువారు ఎంతవేరగా గుర్తించే అంతమందిదని, మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఏదో తట్టు తగులవేయుటకు మాత్రంకాక సత్సంకల్పంతో భూసంబంధాలను కాగువరచకపోయినట్లయితే దేశంలో కాంటినితండదు. కష్టించి తనిచేసే రైతుకు భూమిపై హక్కుకలుగజేయనినాడు వ్యవసాయోత్పత్తివెరుగదు. దేశం నుండి దూరంగా ఉండదు, కరువుకాలుకాలు తొందరినూనేఉంటాయి. కాబట్టి Appeasement కు మాత్రమేకాకుండా నుస్థిర కాంటిసాధనకుకూడా భూసంస్కరణలు అత్యవశ్యకమని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. కాని కాంగ్రెసు సభ్యుల ప్రసంగాలు గమనించినట్లయితే వారు ఈ సమస్యపరిష్కారాన్ని మృదయపూర్వకంగా వాలించుటలేదని, తాత్కాలికంగా ఏదో రాజకీయ ప్రయోజనాల దృష్ట్యానే ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చివారని బోధపడుతుంది. ఈ dilatory tactics వల్ల కాంగ్రెసువారు విషయాన్ని

25th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

సాధించలేదని, రైతాంగాని మాయపువ్వులేదని గుర్తించవలసిఉన్నది. ఇటువంటి అవకతవక ఉద్దేశ్యాలతో ప్రవేశపెట్టబడిన సంస్కరణలవల్ల రైతాంగం, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు కాంగ్రెసువారి వలలోపడరు. కాలూదాద్దు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలు ఈనాడు తమ హక్కు లేదా బాధ్యత లేదా, తెలుసుకోగల పరిస్థితులలో ఉన్నారు. మనీషూసి మారేడికాయ చేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రయత్నించినందువల్ల కలిగే ఫలితం తప్ప కూనవనివారు తెలుసుకుంటే మంచిది. ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించుటకు రాష్ట్ర వ్యాప్తంగా వర్తించే సమగ్రమైన ఒక బిల్లును తీసుకొనిరావడం మంచిది. ఏదో ఒక జిల్లాకు పరిమితంచేసి, ఏదో రాజకీయ ప్రయోజనాలను దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని తెచ్చిన సంస్కరణలు ఎన్నడు జయప్రదంకావు. సరికదా ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో ఆకాంటిని, అల్లకల్లోలను రేకెత్తిస్తాయి. భూమిని ఆధారం చేసుకొని కేవల కాలూదాద్దు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు సరియైన రాబడి ఉండాలి. వారి శ్రమకు తగిన ప్రతిఫలం ఉండాలి. అనాడే వ్యవసాయ రంగంలో నుస్థిర కాంటి విర్రవకుంది. ఈ బిల్లులోని అంశాలు చూచినట్లయితే ఇది ఏ నాడో, విజై సంవత్సరం క్రిందట తీసుకొని రావలసినదిగా కనుపిస్తున్నది. ప్రపంచ దేశాలలో నేడు వ్యవసాయ రంగాలలో జరిగిన సంస్కరణలు గుర్తించాలి. ఇంకను పాత వ్యవస్థలను కట్టుకొనే ప్రేక్షాదుకాము, భూస్వామ్య విధానాన్ని నిరాకృతంగా కొనసాగిస్తాము అని అనడంలో అర్థమేమీ ఉండదు. దానివల్ల కాంగ్రెసువారు సాధించగల ప్రయోజనాలుకూడా విడిచిపెట్టిన మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విధానం ఏ కొద్దిమంది ధనికులకో వోటింగు హక్కు ఉండి ఉండిన రోజులలో అనుసరించబడినదేమోగాని, సర్వజనులకు వయోజన వోటింగు హక్కు దాఖలుపడిన ఈ రోజులలో ఇట్టి బిల్లు వల్ల కాంగ్రెసువారు సతాంగాన్ని లోబరచుకొనేరని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈపాటి నాడు మాత్రపు సంస్కరణలైనన అడ్డగించే శక్తులు లేకపోలేదు. భూస్వామ్య విధానాన్ని నుస్థిరం చేసిమితలం భూస్వాములకు హక్కు ఆదాయాన్ని రాబట్టేదిగా ఈ బిల్లు కచ్చిస్తోంది. భూమి అంటే ఏమీ తెలియని భూస్వాములకే భూమిపై హక్కు కలుగజేయబడింది. భూస్వాముల దయ దాక్షిణ్యాలమీద రైతులు ఆధారపడవలసివుంది. ఈ బిల్లుపై నాకు హక్కువుంది. కష్టించి తనిచేసే హక్కు పంటను పండించడం వానిది అని ఈ నాడు ఏ కాలూదాద్దు, ఏ వ్యవసాయకూలీ అనుకోవటానికి అస్సారంలేదు. ఈ అస్థిర పరిస్థితిలో అధికాశరోత్పత్తి సాధించడం ఎలాగో ప్రభుత్వం వారే చెప్పాలి. ఈ బిల్లు పాతకాలపు మితవాద బోరింగునే ఉన్నది కాని ప్రపంచ పోకడలకు అనుగుణంగాలేదు, ధనికవర్గాన్ని, పెట్టుబడిదారీవర్గాన్ని రక్షించడానికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం కంకణం కట్టుకుందా అనిపిస్తోంది. మనీషూసి మారేడికాయ చేసే ఈ విధానాలు తాత్కాలికంగా కొన్ని ప్రయోజనాలను సాధించవచ్చు నేమోకాని, దేశాన్ని కాంటి పథాన పురోగమితయలేవని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించాలి. ఈ నాడు శ్వాతంత్ర్య సంస్కరణములైనను అభివృద్ధి నిరోధక శక్తులు ఉత్పన్నమయ్యాయి. ఈ ప్రభుత్వం అత్యంత కట్టుబడితే లాంగిపోయినట్లు కనిపిస్తోంది. కాస్తా విషయాలను గణించి కాలూదాద్దు, వ్యవసాయకూలీలకు రక్షణ కల్పించే కాసేవలను మృదయ పూర్వకంగా ప్రవేశపెడదారని ఆశిస్తూ యంతటితో తెలపు తీసుకొంటున్నాను.

5-10
P.M.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, I shall not, I think, take much of the time as this is merely a general discussion, and I believe when the clauses are taken up we shall probably have to revert to many of the subjects referred to in the debate hitherto. Mr. Ramamurthi who spoke made some references which call for

[25th November 1952]

Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah rose.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order. I will allow the hon. Member to speak afterwards."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Is the hon. Member really wanting to say something very important?"

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, ప్రభావా మాత్రమే చర్చకు సమాధానమిస్తున్నారో లేక చర్చలో పాల్గొంటున్నారో తెలియ జేయగోరును."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am intervening in the debate. ఈంకే కంటే ముందుకుతాను Mr. Ramamurthi made some observations which induce me to rise now and say a few words. As is often done by him he has made in a very charming manner misuse of scripture. But, I must point out that it is very unfair to Arjuna himself. The overwhelming compassing which the poet describes in beautiful words has been brought down by Mr. Ramamurthi to the level of class bias. When Arjuna said, 'I shall not fight', it was not because it was against a particular class. They happened to belong to that class and he referred to that, but it is not an apt illustration of what Mr. Ramamurthi and his tribe refer to as class feeling. Now, the creed to which Mr. Ramamurthi belongs no doubt lays down that we cannot get over class bias and the emancipation of the world will come through that very class bias, and that we could never get rid of it. But, my faith is that class bias can be got over and should be got over. Though Mr. Ramamurthi belongs to that class, I will not point the finger at him and say he has also class feeling. Whereas he says that it cannot be got over, we say it can be got over. I am not sure that Mr. Ramamurthi has got over it yet but I do not wish to quote that as an explanation for the dilatory tactics he was seeking to employ. I think it helps the class which he does not wish to help apparently, but by some spontaneous unconscious feeling he is doing something which will help those he does not wish to help. But, this is only by the way. I only wish to defend myself against the charge he has made."

Sir, after misquoting from the Bhagavat Gita, he says that the motive of this Bill sponsored by the Government of which I am the Leader now is to suppress the peasant movement. (Motive number one is to help the landlords, and number two is to suppress the peasant movement.) If Mr. Ramamurthi contented himself with saying that this Bill will really help the landowners, he can argue about it. If he says that this Bill will in fact suppress the peasant movement, he can argue on that basis. But he goes further and says that it is with that object that the Bill is introduced by Government. Surely, it is a very strange and very wicked accusation. I am using a rather strong word, but as he made a strong accusation, I cannot but call it wicked. It is wrong because there is no reason why we should introduce this Bill if we wanted to help the landlords? We could just keep quiet.

25th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

Why should we take a circuitous course, introduce this Bill and create complications for them in order to help that class or in order to suppress the peasant movement? It was Mr. Ramamurthi himself from that very spot rose up at a previous sitting and said, 'Issue an Ordinance now'. And I said in reply, 'The House is sitting, how can I issue an Ordinance?' He said, 'After the House adjourns you had better issue an Ordinance'. He even asked me to take up the Mayuram agreement and enforce it and put back the evicted tenants into occupation. In fact, he told me all he wanted me to do and we have done very much more than what he wanted to be done. But, if he is dissatisfied, if his friends are dissatisfied, it is open to them to say, this is wrong, this is not enough or this is inadequate, but, to say this was our motive, I think, is really wrong and he ought not to have indulged in it.

"Mr. Swayamprakasam too who was a very active and useful Member of the Joint Select Committee, I think, has not been fair. He probably illustrates Mr. Ramamurthi's proposition to some extent. For some reason or other he thinks that the retention of the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts will help the tenants, cultivators and pannaiyals. Apart from any question of class bias, I am firmly of the opinion as a lawyer who has had some experience at the Bar that the jurisdiction of Civil Courts will not at all be helpful to the tenants or cultivators or pannaiyals. On the contrary, it will only give a further advantage to those who can spend money on litigation and spin it out as long as possible. If Mr. Swayamprakasam really wants to help the cultivator, he should not bring the Civil Courts in. If by any accident this House votes for the Civil Courts coming in, I give notice that I would rather withdraw the Bill than proceed with it, because it will ruin the tenants. I have no doubt in my mind that it will ruin them, and as I am honest in my motive that I want to help the tenant, I shall not bring in the Civil Courts even if asked by the other side to do it. That is my final reply to Mr. Swayamprakasam."

5-20
p.m.

"Mr. Swayamprakasam says that this Bill does not liquidate intermediaries. It is not very easy to liquidate a class of men unless we follow other methods. The laws as they stand, the fundamental rights prescribed in the Constitution as they stand disable us from liquidating any set of people and certainly intermediaries also. Mr. Swayamprakasam, who does not want intermediaries to exist, should be able to tell me what should be done in the present context to get rid of them. He said that the words 'personal labour' used in the definition of 'cultivating tenant' in the original Bill was not enough and I suggested the substitution of 'physical labour'. I thought that 'personal labour' meant physical labour and all forms of it. Any way, he was satisfied with the word 'physical' and it was embodied in the Bill. If he thinks that physical labour also can be contributed or claimed to be contributed by intermediaries and thus

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [25th November 1952]

make themselves come within the definition of 'cultivating tenant', what else does he want? If he suggests a limitation on the holding of a cultivating tenant, we can consider it, because possibly a man may deceive the courts and say that he also is contributing some physical labour whereas he is just an intermediary between a math and the tenant. I am surprised that Mr. Swayamprakasam, who wants to abolish intermediaries, says in his dissenting minute—

'If it be the intention of the Bill to exclude middlemen'—

It is not the intention of the Bill to exclude middlemen; the intention of the Bill is not to treat middlemen as cultivating tenants—

'is it not fair to make provision to determine the relationship between the landowner and the middlemen so as to give relief to all concerned when a new legislation is brought forth unsettling certain settled conditions?'

May I use a crude proverb and say that the cat is out of the bag? He really wants that middlemen should be protected. Therefore the sincerity of his pious statement that he wants middlemen to be excluded is doubtful. Whether it is a conscious or unconscious bias to which reference was made by Mr. Ramamurthi, I do not know."

* SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"I say that all people concerned must get some relief when a new legislation is brought forward. If it is the intention of the Bill that intermediaries should be there, it is one thing. If intermediaries are removed from the operation of the Bill, then they should not be hit at any stage."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"His plea is really to afford some protection and guarantee to intermediaries. Is it our business to settle the rights between the landowner and the intermediary? I submit, certainly not. He may take a share from the landowner out of what the Bill gives to him."

Then the question about 'heirs' was raised. It was to protect the interests of cultivating tenants that the word was inserted. If any difficulties are pointed out in connexion with the insertion of this word, we may consider them when the clause is taken up for discussion.

"It appears that some people do not like the word 'pannaiyal'. Those who know Tamil need not object to the word. Even a very good name in common parlance can be spoiled by the association of ideas which are not good. 'Pannai' means farm and 'al' means man. Thus, 'pannaiyal' means a farm man. I want Mr. Swayamprakasam not to bother much about names. Here are pannaiyals, we want to legislate about them and we do not want any ambiguities in the legislation. When there is a commonly used term to denote a class of people and when we want to legislate for that class, there is no harm in using that vernacular and local term. If we translate the word 'pannaiyal' into an English phrase and put down certain

25th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

conditions, doubts and disputes may arise and the Court may have to go into the question as to whether a particular person comes within the definition or not. Names can be changed later on. If the status of pannaiyals rises either as a result of this legislation or as a result of the agitation of the people who work for them or by the slow process of change of circumstances, then pannaiyals can change their name as many of us have changed our names. There is no great difficulty about names.

Our object in this Bill is to give for a few years a clear and guaranteed companionship between the landlord and the cultivating tenant. One cannot evict the other; they must get on together. It is something like what a Court does when a divorce case comes up before it. It allows some interval for the husband and wife so that time may operate upon them. It is true that we have not given permanency of tenure to the cultivating tenant. What this Bill does is to secure companionship for a specified period of time. It clearly specifies the share of the tenant. If there is any dispute, the provisions of this Act may be invoked to avoid any injustice. If there is no dispute, let the landlord and the tenant carry on like friends.

"Then I come to farm servants. We have raised their wages in a substantial measure in this Bill. If there is any dispute about their wages, they can settle it in the nearest revenue courts."

This Bill provides these three things. It brings about a certain and limited stable connection between the landlord and the tenant for a period of five years. Whatever else may happen, I believe that the status of the cultivating tenant and wage-earners will rise as a result of this measure. A time will come when they may become full owners of bits of land. It will come by this measure; it will not come by warfare or confusion. It will come if they take this Bill in the spirit in which it is offered and work it properly. If there is a smooth and clear atmosphere and good relationship between the landlord and the tenant, I promise as an intelligent gentleman, not as Chief Minister, that these little farmers will become owners of the land provided they all behave well during these five years. But if they are misguided and if they allow themselves to be misguided and are taken to courts to go on fighting as if something more was always to be got, then they will not get it for some time longer. As to who will get it for them finally, God only knows. Mr. Ramamurthi and his friends should understand clearly that it is the same thing whether they make 'A' the owner of the land or 'B' the owner of the land. If he is to-day a small man, to-morrow he will become a big man. It is the tendency of all evil things. Therefore, there is no great gain by merely changing the ownership of the land from one to the other. Small men may become big men later on provided the State has no right to control ownership. It is quite a different thing if Mr. Gopalakrishnayya says, 'Let the State manage all this'. If really hon. Members say and intend that the State should take over, we should

5-30
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [25th November 1952]

not splinter it away into a thousand fragments. If really the State is to take over, it is better that it is all together. It is easier for the State to swallow a zamindar than to swallow many little farmers. Therefore, giving away rights to small farmers all over the land will postpone the day when the State should manage all these lands. But this is not very relevant for the purpose. It is only relevant for the background of my friends opposite. I think they will allow me to call them 'friends' for a change! I think there is no question of ideology involved in this Bill. The only question in the present Bill is, 'Shall we smoothen things? Shall we at least confirm and assure for five years at a stretch companionship for the landlord and the tenant without a break?' If they want to break, they must make up their minds well in advance, that is to say, one year before. Let there not be parsimony in the distribution of the produce. Let it be distributed according to this pattern, and let us see what should be done later on. For five years, it is thought that this would be quite enough. And I think we have been liberal.

"Provision has been made in respect of details. Some suggestions at the instance of hon. Members on this side and some others at the instance of hon. Members on the other side have been accepted. It was wrong on the part of the hon. Member who suggested (I think it is Mr. C. V. K. Rao) that suggestions from the Opposition side were not accepted although they were good in substance, and that they should not be rejected merely because they came from the Opposition. Members of the Joint Select Committee and the Leader of the Opposition would testify to the fact that quite a number of suggestions which came from the other side were accepted by the Government without any difficulty or after some amount of discussion. Of course, they are entitled to say that they are all unsubstantial. It may be so. But if they are all so unsubstantial, and if hon. Members opposite do not want it, we shall withdraw the Bill. I am prepared to do that. Let us go back to agitation and turmoil. But I do hope that the House will give its support to this Bill. Let us see how this Bill will work. Let us also see whether landlords and tenants will work together and produce food which is what we want.

"Sir, much has been said that it is only the tiller of the soil that is interested in producing food and that the landlord is a mere usurper, usurer, or a Shylock and so on. It is easy to say all this. But for the last 1,000 years all our food was produced under those conditions. The conditions which we wish to change now were there before, and they have been getting on. Times change, and we have also to change. There is no good in saying wholesale that the landlord class was rotten and wicked, and that for the first time, we propose to produce a Heaven. It is not so. The fact that all of us lived on the rice that was produced there is proof that the then prevailing conditions served their purpose and well too. There is nobody too wicked to be condemned wholesale. Times have changed and let us also change. But let us change

25th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

wisely and not merely because we are on either side of the table here. Thank you, Sir, for allowing me to intervene."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister said that if nobody wanted this Bill, he was prepared to withdraw it. I am sorry he has misunderstood the total import of the speeches made from this side of the House. At the time of referring the Bill to the Joint Select Committee, we said that on principle we agreed to protection that has, for the first time, been afforded to the cultivating tenants. In the Joint Select Committee we said the same thing. We again say the same thing here. But he should not misunderstand us when we say—we repeat it again—this protection which is afforded to the tenants in one district should have been afforded to the tenants in other districts also. All that we say is: You have done a good thing; if it is a good thing according to you and according to us, do it in the case of tenants in other districts also without allowing the situation there to deteriorate in the same way as it deteriorated in Tanjore necessitating the issue of an Ordinance. Let not the Hon. the Chief Minister or the other Ministers misunderstand the spirit in which any criticism is offered from this side of the House. I am not a 'class-man'. I do not plead for any particular class, and I do not also believe in class warfare. But let me assure the Hon. the Chief Minister that I am not one of those who believe that lakhs and lakhs of cultivating tenants in this State should remain in the same state as they have been remaining in for centuries without any security of tenure. I do not belong to that class of thinkers who believe that the old state of things is all right. I want the Hon. the Chief Minister to realize, as he realized in the case of Tanjore, that in other parts of our State, the tenants do want protection and security of tenure. As I said in my minute of dissent, the least that we can expect of any civilized Government to give is security of tenure and protection to the cultivating tenant. I do not advance other arguments which are all well known. We never said that we did not want this Bill. We do want this Bill, and we want that cultivating tenants in other districts also should be given security of tenure.

"The Hon. the Chief Minister said that he did consider the opinions expressed by the Opposition. I agree that he has considered our opinions in some matters, though not on all important ones, and in full measure I acknowledge it here. Sir, on one or two matters on which I could not get the previous Government to agree for nearly five years, I could get this Government to agree. I was able to persuade the Hon. the Chief Minister to accept, or he of his own goodwill or volition did accept, certain amendments suggested by us. They relate to certain principles connected not merely with this piece of legislation, but with all Bills in general. Governments have been accustomed to claim the power to make rules and issue them themselves without coming to the Legislature and give the rules the force of law as though they were enacted as an Act. I have always been fighting against such a provision on principle. The

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [25th November 1952]

Hon. the Chief Minister was originally wedded to that principle, but all the same, after some time, I was able to divorce him from that old view. He did agree to our amendments. I certainly acknowledge that he has laid down a healthy precedent in that matter. Similarly, in regard to the provision of extending the legislation to other districts, the original provision said that the Government could do it by a notification with such modifications and adaptations which the Government might consider proper. That also we felt, on principles of ordinary legislative jurisprudence, to be quite wrong. After some time, we were able to get some concession from the Hon. the Chief Minister. I do not grudge paying a tribute to him in that respect also. I believe that every extension of legislation must be done only after coming to the Legislature in the regular and usual manner. All the same, he has conceded, and he has started a good precedent in saying that although such legislation could be extended by notification it will be extended only with the consent of the House. The notification will be laid on the table of the House for 14 days, and subject to modifications by the House, will come into effect thereafter. I say the Hon. the Chief Minister has done these two things. In respect of some other matters also, though not on the share question, it is true that he did accept certain amendments suggested by the members of the Opposition. When we speak of amendments not having been agreed to, we wish to convey that more amendments which were all good should have been accepted in the interests of agriculture and in furtherance of the objects of the Bill. The Opposition, I repeat, did not move amendments with any cross purposes. There was no intention to trip the Government upon any particular measure. The Government, for the first time, realized that protection to the cultivating tenant was essential. So, they came forward with a Bill and we commended them upon that step. Then, we suggested certain amendments. They were suggested only in furtherance of the objects of the Bill. Therefore, the Hon. the Chief Minister need not misunderstand us, and I want him to take all encouragement from us so that he can come forward with a good Bill in respect of the entire State. On that, Sir, some hon. Members said that Sri Viswanatham also wanted to join hands with the Communists. I have not joined hands with one or the other. I am joining hands only with a good principle. When I say I commend the principle of the Bill, I have not joined hands with the Government, and when I say protection to the cultivating tenant throughout the State is essential, I have not joined hands with any people advocating class warfare. If the party in power wants to convince us upon any points, surely that is not the right method of approach. There is no use of accusing each other. I do not attribute any motives to the Government. Even if we started with motives, I may say a man has always got a motive to start with, and here the motive was to get peace in the State. There is nothing wrong in it and one need not fight shy of it. In fact, the Preamble of the Bill says that we have to bring about peaceful conditions in the district of Tanjore. But, what we

5-40
p.m.

25th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

say is that the Tanjore cause must have been taken into account and the legislation must have been so drafted as to extend to the whole State. The Tanjore cause must have been taken as a reason for enacting an Act for the entire State."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will give me a draft of the proposed Bill, I shall extend it to the whole State."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In two days I shall give the draft if it comes to that. After all, it is only a question of giving protection and security of tenure to the cultivating tenant. The tenant may hold the land to whomsoever it may belong. It may be that he holds the land as a cultivating tenant. But, what is the difficulty in offering security of tenure to him?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition can give me a draft, I shall try my best."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Apart from any question of landlord and tenant, zamindars and non-zamindars, or Communist and Congress and any other party I submit that it is the duty of every civilized Government to offer and afford protection to all cultivating tenants, and the Hon. the Chief Minister can take this assurance from us that the moment he comes forward with a Bill to achieve this object, he will get our wholehearted support. As regards the request for a draft, certainly before the end of the session, I shall forward to him a draft which I can prepare in my own unassisted way and I hope he will certainly take up the matter so that all the cultivating tenants of this State, who number about a crore, may get the advantages of progressive legislation. I do not want to take up more of the time of the House."

MR. SPEAKER :—" As soon as the Hon. Minister's reply is over, I shall put the motion to the vote of the House."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, by way of winding up this general discussion, I may say a few words. The discussion ranged over a wide field beginning from the question of giving the land to the tiller of the soil to the sentimental objection to the use of the word 'pannaiyal'. The question of giving the land to the tiller of the soil bristles with many difficulties. There was the difficulty, even in the case of the zamindar who was, by some people, called only a collection agent, that it would amount to expropriation. Therefore, if we take up this question, we will come into clash with the provisions of one of the articles of the Constitution. Even in the case of zamindari abolition, the compensation payable to the zamindars amounted to about Rs. 12½ crores. In this case where the landowner has a right to the property acquired by the sweat of his brow, if he is to be expropriated, the Constitution requires that compensation should be paid to him. And I do not know how many crores of rupees that compensation would amount to. Therefore, that question is beyond our scope and we shall not be in a position to consider it."

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [25th November 1952]

"Then, hon. Members wanted that this legislation should be extended to the whole State. Even there, there is difficulty. Our country is full of lands with different kinds of tenures. Even in regard to our habits, we have got very many ways of living, dressing and eating, and we have different hours of eating also. In the West, there are particular hours for breakfast, lunch and dinner. In our country, for instance, dinner starts at about eleven or twelve in the case of some people and lunch goes on up to five or six in the evening. Thus there are various habits among the people of this country. So it will be very difficult to legislate for the whole State at one stroke. But we have not given it up altogether. We are at it. We are very deeply considering how best we could do it. As I have said on the floor of this House time and again, the whole question is being very carefully considered. It is very easy for a person without responsibility to say 'Do this and do that'. But, a person of some responsibility has to look to many things before he does anything. I say this from my daily experience. Daily one or two hon. Members come and tell me 'stop collection of taxes, or extend the period of time for collection of well subsidy, etc.' It is very easily said, but it creates a lot of problems. I have to contend with so many forces. But I may assure hon. Members of the House that the question of extending the legislation to the whole State is in the mind of the Government and it will be looked into in due course of time."

"Then, Sir, criticism was levelled that too many concessions were given to the tenants at the Joint Select Committee stage, and some other hon. Members said that too many concessions were given to the landholders at the Joint Select Committee stage. The truth is both are wrong. We gave certain concessions which were reasonable in the case of the tenant when there was a necessity for them. So also we gave one or two concessions to the landholders when the facts showed that they were reasonable. Therefore, people need not go away with the idea that we were out to tilt the scales to one side. If I mention how the tenants and the landholders were given concessions, then hon. Members will realize that the criticisms were not justified. In the case of the tenants, originally the time limit fixed for filing applications before the Conciliation Officers was thirty days. Advocates of the cause of tenants wanted at the Joint Select Committee that the time should be extended. Accordingly, the Committee decided to provide that an application could be received after the said period of thirty days, if the applicant satisfied the Conciliation Officer that he had sufficient reasons for not making the application within the said period."

5-50 P.m. "Again, in sub-clause (4) of clause 6, the time allowed for an appeal from a decision of a Conciliation Officer, to the Revenue Court was fifteen days but that was extended to thirty days. Again in the case of eviction proceedings, according to the original Bill, rent should be paid within one month. This has been extended to two months. According to the old Bill, when the matter goes to

25th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

a Revenue Court, the Court can ask the tenant to tender the rent in arrear to the landowner within 15 days. This has been extended to 30 days. In all these ways, we have tried to adjust things in an equitable manner. With regard to eviction for arrears of rent, we have now definitely stated that one year's arrears will entail eviction. With regard to the catch crops, originally the landowner had no share in it. Now he gets 1/5th of the gross produce. Half of the land must be devoted for green manure by growing leguminous crops or such other things which my Hon. Colleague the Minister for Agriculture knows. According to the original Bill, the landlords only were to sign lease deeds. Now the tenant also has to sign the deed. This is also a point in favour of the landlord. No, I won't say it is in favour of the landlord. We have introduced this change in order to make it well-understood by all. That is the idea behind this amendment."

"With regard to dismissal, it was provided originally that six months' wages or Rs. 150 should be paid to the dismissed man as compensation. Now, this amount has been raised to Rs. 300. I am glad that no criticism has been made against the provisions relating to pannaiyals. The provisions are also made very liberal and I am sure nobody can have any complaint about this matter. That shows our concern to give due and proper share to those poor people who are in the lowest rungs. Sir, some hon. Members said that fixity of tenure should be not only for five years, but for a larger number of years. They said that it should be for 10 years or 15 years. This period has been limited to five years for this reason. We are now venturing on a new measure and we do not know how it will work. But I may tell those hon. Members that even now there is a provision to the effect that at the end of the five years those tenants and pannaiyals can continue for another five years. There is no objection to that."

"With regard to the bar of jurisdiction of Civil Courts, that point has already been met. The remarks made by some hon. Members regarding the cultivating tenant and his share, have also been met. I may say one word with regard to the bar of jurisdiction of Civil Courts. In my short experience, I have known that Tanjore has figured very prominently in the High Court and other Courts. That district used to get a lion's share in the matter of judicial proceedings. Therefore, if there was a provision enabling the parties to go to Civil Courts, especially in the Tanjore district, it will be an interminable thing, and neither the landlord nor the tenant or the pannaiyal will benefit from such a provision. All of them will suffer. The tenants and pannaiyals will suffer far more than the landlord. The advocates and protagonists of tenants must be really thankful to us for not enabling the parties to go to Civil Courts. The bar of jurisdiction of Civil Courts is really in the interests of the tenants."

"As regards the intermediaries, as was said by the Hon. the Chief Minister, that point was discussed. We changed the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant'. He said that if any better

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [25th November 1952]

term was forthcoming, there was no objection to accept it. Nobody wants to retain the intermediary gentleman. If there is any way of getting rid of him, we can do so. But, the pity is, he is a man with flesh and blood and we cannot take a sword and finish him off. We must do that in a proper legal manner.

It was said that the extent of land of the cultivating tenant is not limited and that it should be limited. Sir, it was thought that a man can physically cultivate only a certain extent of land. In fact, I may say that it is something like an automatic shutter which adjusts itself according to the flow of water and either opens or shuts itself. In the same manner, the tenant will be able to cultivate only that extent of land which he is physically able to do and not more than that. Thus, things will get adjusted by themselves and there will not be much trouble. I don't know why much was made of this point.

As regards manuring, originally the tenant had to bear the cost of manuring. No doubt in theory, the tenant was to manure the lands according to the original Bill. But in actual practice, the landlord was advancing money in the past to cover the cost of manure and he was recovering the same from the tenant in very many ways. At the Select Committee stage, it was decided that the cost of the chemical manures and groundnut cakes will have to be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the main produce is divided between them, that is to say, of three-fifths to two-fifths. To this extent, the tenant also stands to gain. This means another burden on the landlord. We have been trying to adjust things in as equitable and reasonable manner as is possible. Unfortunately, whatever we do is not appreciated. I am in the same unenviable position as the proverbial elderly gentleman with grey hair who married two wives, both of whom complained against the poor old man. If we agree to some of the requests made by the landlord, immediately the tenants and the pannaiyals say, 'Oh! you are very lenient towards the landlord'. If on the other hand we concede some of the requests of the tenants and pannaiyals, then comes the complaint of the landlord forthwith, 'Oh! you are giving too much to the tenants and pannaiyals'. I do not know how the Government can satisfy both of them. Therefore, we took a very reasonable attitude and tried to adjust things as equitably as possible. I may mention that at the Select Committee stage, the whole matter was gone into very carefully with the help of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, whom I find now to be in a more responsive mood than he used to be. (Laughter.)

After all is said and done, whatever legislation we may make, it is not possible to adjust the relationship between the landlord on the one hand and the tenants and the pannaiyals on the other by means of legislation alone. We know laws are made all the World over, but still there will be some loopholes here and there. However much one may be ingenious in drafting a piece of legislation

25th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

I may say that even in the draft which the hon. Leader of the Opposition may prepare—there will be some loophole or other. So there must be adjustment. I conclude my speech with the appeal, 'Let us place this Bill on the Statute Book with the hope that our people will make it a success by all-round co-operation, friendliness, sympathy and commonsense.'

MR. SPEAKER :—" Before I put the motion to the vote of the House, I wish to make an announcement. At 10 a.m. to-morrow, for the benefit of the hon. Members, a Post Office is going to be inaugurated in this compound, adjacent to the Assembly Chamber, by the Hon. Minister for Industries. I understand there will be facilities for booking trunk calls also. Though, in the invitation it is mentioned as 10.15 a.m., the function will take place at 10 a.m. This is for the information of the hon. Members. Now, the question is—

That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), as amended by the Joint Select Committee be taken into consideration."

The motion was carried:

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. to-morrow."

The House then adjourned to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Wednesday, 26th November 1952.

[25th November 1952]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 35 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 25th November 1952, pages 540-543 supra.]

PROGRESS MADE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF COTTAGE INDUSTRIES IN
RAYALASEEMA UP TO THE END OF JUNE 1952.

The statement below indicates the progress made in the selection of artisans and distribution of tools in the selected firkas of the Rayalaseema.

Name of district.	Name of firkas selected for development.	Number of villages covered so far in the district.	Number of artisans selected so far in firkas of the district.	Number of artisans to whom tools have been ordered to be supplied.	Number of artisans to whom tools have been distributed.	Remarks.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Anantapur..	Hindupur, Madakasira and Parigi.	50	120	114	101	
Bellary ..	Alur, Holugundi and Chippigiri.	50	137	127	100	
Kurnool ..	Kurnool, Nandikotkur and Tirupurankam.	50	163	163	134	
Cuddapah ..	Proddatur, Chapad and Arkatavemula.	50	112	112	112	
Chittoor ..	Nagari, Tiruttani and Puttur.	50	136	136	101	

NOTE.—The tools distribution scheme is in progress in the area selected for rural development by the Grama Seva Mandiram, Timmapuram, Anantapur district.

Statement showing the quantities of iron and steel allotted to Cottage Industries in Rayalaseema districts.

	Anantapur.	Bellary.	Kurnool.	Cuddapah.	Chittoor.
Quarter ended I/52—					
Number of cottage industrialists allotted iron and steel.	11	5	13	5	10
Quantity allotted (tons)	5½	3½	7	3½	5½
Quarter ended II/52—					
Number of cottage industrialists allotted iron and steel.	6	3	11	5	2
Quantity allotted (tons)	3	1½	6	3½	½

[25th November 1952]

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 37 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 25th November 1952, page 544 supra.]

Statement showing the resolutions passed at the meetings of the State Library Committee and the action taken on them.

Date of the meeting.	Resolution passed.	Action taken.
(1)	(2)	(3)
24th November 1950.	(1) Resolved that this Committee in accordance with the provision in rule 6(4) of the Madras Public Libraries Rules, 1950, appoint sub-committees of nine members each, of whom, in every one of which there will be an official member (the President, the Director and the Secretary to the Committee) to examine special problems coming within its purview and to formulate proposals for its consideration and to deal with current administration in respect of matters referred to in clauses (c), (d), (e), (f) (g) and (h) of rule 7 of the rules.	Two sub-committees have been constituted as resolved by the Committee.
19th March 1952.	(2) Resolved unanimously to place on record the Committee's deep sense of sorrow on the sudden and untimely demise of one of its members—late Sri C. S. Prativasa-chari.	
Do.	(3) Resolved unanimously to admit as the committee Sri S. Ramaswami Naidu, representing the Annamalai University.	
Do.	(4) Resolved to communicate Government orders and proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction of a general nature to the Madras Library Association, the Kerala Library Association, the Andhra Library Association and the Kannada Library Association.	This is being observed.
Do.	(5) Resolved to constitute a sub-committee consisting of— (i) the Deputy Director of Public Instruction in charge of Libraries, (ii) Sri R. Janardhanam Naidu and (iii) Sri K. N. Sivaraman to go into the questions of maintenance by the Director of a register of appointed members of library committees for appointment in libraries, revision of grades, qualifications, scales of pay and other conditions of service.	The sub-committee has been constituted as resolved. The sub-committee's report will be placed before the State Library Committee at its next meeting.

[25th November 1952]

Date of the meeting.

Resolution passed.

Action taken.

10th March 1952.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(6) Resolved to appoint a sub-committee consisting of—

(1) Sri T. P. Meenakshisundaram Pillai, (2) Sri T. P. Mariappa Bhat, (3) Sri E. Raman Menon, (4) Sri P. Nagabushanam, (5) Sri K. M. Sivaraman and (6) Sri R. Janardhana Naidu, to go into the question of purchase of books and periodicals for the libraries under local library authorities and other affiliated libraries.

The sub-committee as resolved has been constituted and the matter is still under its consideration.

Do.

(7) Resolved to constitute a sub-committee consisting of Sri R. Janardhana Naidu and the Special Officer for Libraries to go into the question of prescribing suitable furniture and design for the building of libraries. Sri R. R. Sarma who is reported to have prepared some design may also be consulted.

The sub-committee is considering this question and its report will be placed before the State Library Committee at its next meeting for approval.

Do.

(8) Resolved to accept the proposal to authorize the Director of Public Libraries to recommend the purchase of works of Post Bharathi for use in public libraries under district boards and municipal councils.

Instructions commending the purchase of the works of Post Bharathi for use in public libraries have already been issued by the Director of Public Libraries.

Do.

(9) Resolved to refer the tentative schemes for spreading library service submitted by Local Library authorities to the sub-committee constituted as per item (1) above.

Copies of the schemes received from the local library Authorities were circulated to the members of the sub-committee. A general procedure has been formulated to be observed in the matter. In view of the very complicated procedure laid in the Madras Public Libraries Rules, 1950, for the approval of schemes for library service which necessitates considerable delay, the Government have approved the proposal to dispense with this procedure and to empower the Director of Public Libraries to approve the schemes as and when they are received. The Government has also permitted the Director to follow the changed procedure in regard to the approval of the schemes already received, pending the issue of necessary amendments to the rules. The Director is taking action in the matter accordingly.

Do.

(10) Resolved to refer the question of approving the purchase of books to shape by the Director for submission to the sub-committee constituted as per item (1) above.

See column (3) against item (8) above.

[25th November 1952]

APPENDIX III.

[Vide item IV at page 558 supra.]

REPORT OF THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952 (L.A. BILL No. 12 OF 1952).

To

THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
MADRAS.

The Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), has the honour to make the following report.

2. The Bill was published in English in an Extraordinary issue of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 24th October 1952, and in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada and Hindustani languages in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 5th November 1952.

3. The Joint Select Committee was appointed by resolutions of the Assembly, dated 5th November 1952, and of the Council, dated 17th November 1952, and had instructions from the Assembly to submit its report to the Assembly on or before the 22nd November 1952.

4. The Joint Select Committee met in the Council Chamber at Fort St. George on the 20th, 21st and 22nd November 1952, for the consideration of the provisions of the Bill.

5. The memoranda and representations on the provisions of the Bill received from individuals and associations were placed before the Joint Select Committee.

6. Some members were desirous and moved amendments that the Bill should be extended to the whole State. But the Bill has been drafted to meet the special situation which has existed for some years past in the Tanjore district, and has reference to the peculiar agrarian conditions in that district. The Joint Select Committee thought that it did not permit of general application to the other districts in the State.

7. The Joint Select Committee has made some changes in the clauses of the Bill, and the more important of them are mentioned below:

Clause 6.

The time-limit of "thirty days from the commencement of this Act" which was allowed under the original Bill to cultivating tenants for applying to the Conciliation Officer for restoration to possession of land, appeared to the Joint Select Committee to require modifications to meet exceptional cases. The Committee has provided that an application could be received after the said period of thirty days, if the applicant satisfies the Conciliation

[25th November 1952]

Officer that he had sufficient reasons for not making the application within the said period. The benefit of this amendment is also made applicable to applications rejected before the passing of this Act on the ground of their not having been presented in time.

A further concession has been shown to the cultivating tenant by restricting the power of the Conciliation Officer to impose as a condition to a tenant's being restored to possession, the payment only of one year's arrear of rent and not all the arrears due by him.

Sub-clause (4).—In sub-clause (4), the time allowed for an appeal from a decision of a Conciliation Officer to the Revenue Court has been extended from "fifteen days" to "thirty days".

Clause 7.

The Joint Select Committee considers that in all cases of tenure wherein the main crop or crops are to be shared between the landowner and the tenant and also where both the parties so agree, the landowner should have the right of determining the crop or crops which shall be grown on the land. A new provision has been inserted in this clause accordingly.

The clause as introduced had provided that the tenant should be responsible, among other things, for the manuring of the land. But, in view of the fact that this meant that he should bear the entire cost of chemical fertilisers, groundnut cake manure and the like, which have to be purchased, the Joint Select Committee has inserted a provision to the effect that the cost of these should be shared between the landowner and the tenant in accordance with the share of the main produce to which they are entitled.

In sub-clause (d) which provides for the renewal of a tenancy for a fresh term of five years, the Joint Select Committee has made it clear that the renewal will be subject to the terms of any agreement duly entered into between the parties, provided they are at least as favourable to the tenant as the provisions contained in the Bill.

Clause 8.

The Bill as introduced had provided that during the off-paddy season, the tenant could raise any catch-crop which he pleased and that such catch-crop should belong exclusively to the tenant. The Joint Select Committee has provided that he shall grow leguminous crops or green manure on the land to a certain extent, and it has also provided that out of the catch-crops so raised, the tenant shall be bound to give to the landowner one-fifth or such lower proportion as may be agreed upon between them, after meeting all cultivation and harvesting expenses.

In sub-clause (1), under the Bill as introduced, it was only harvesting and poradi charges that were deducted out of the gross produce. To meet cases where the main crop is other than paddy, the Joint Select Committee has added a suitable provision.

[25th November 1952]

Clause 9.

The Bill as introduced had provided for the execution of a lease-deed by a landowner to his tenant. Provision has now been made that the lease-deed should be in a prescribed form and signed both by the landowner and by the tenant.

Clause 10.

Among the grounds for the eviction of a tenant is the tenant's failure to pay rent. The Joint Select Committee has made it clear that for such eviction the rent should have accrued due after the commencement of the Act.

An amendment has been made to make it clear that the non-payment of rent would, in the case of waram tenants, include failure to share the produce as provided in clause 8.

The one month's time provided for payment of rent in the eviction proceedings has been raised to two months.

It has been made clear that failure to cultivate the land altogether on the part of a tenant will also be a ground for his eviction under this clause.

The time which may be given by the Revenue Court to the tenant to tender to the landowner arrears of rent together with the cost of proceedings has been extended from "fifteen days" to "thirty days".

A new provision has been added making the tenant's failure to observe any condition imposed by the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court in pursuance of section 6, a ground for eviction under this clause.

Clause 11.

In cases where produce other than paddy is raised on the land, provision has been made for the payment to the pannaiyal of an *aruvadaipangu* of one-twenty-fourth of the gross produce.

Clause 12.

In sub-clause (3) which provided for payment of wages to a pannaiyal whose dismissal by the landowner was set aside, provision has been made for his being reinstated with all the rights which would have accrued but for his dismissal.

A new provision has been added enabling the Revenue Court to recover the compensation from the landowner as if it were an arrear of land revenue.

Clause 13.

Clause 13 confers exclusive jurisdiction in regard to various matters arising under this Act on the Revenue Court. The Joint

[25th November 1952]

Select Committee has redrafted this clause so as to confer original jurisdiction on the Conciliation Officer and appellate jurisdiction on the Revenue Court.

Clause 15.

Clause 15 provided for adaptations, exceptions and modifications to be made in the provisions of the Act when the Act is extended to neighbouring areas outside the Tanjore district. Provision has been made that any notification making such adaptations, etc., should be placed on the table of the Legislative Assembly for fourteen days and be subject to such modifications as may be made by it.

Clause 16.

This clause refers to the power of the State Government to make rules. A sub-clause has been added to the effect that the rules made by the Government shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly for not less than fourteen days and shall be subject to either repeal or such modification as the Assembly may decide during the session in which they are so laid.

8. The Joint Select Committee considers that the Bill as amended need not be republished.

9. Some members have given dissenting minutes and they are appended.

10. A copy of the Bill, as amended by the Joint Select Committee, is annexed.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
22nd November 1952.

K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR,
Chairman.

ANNEXURE.

(Words sidelined or underlined indicate the amendments suggested by the Committee; dots indicate the omissions.)

L.A. BILL No. 12 OF 1952.

A Bill to provide for the improvement of agrarian conditions in the district of Tanjore.

WHEREAS in the district of Tanjore the relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other had become strained, resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances;

AND WHEREAS the situation threatened to cause deterioration in agricultural production;

25th November 1952]

AND WHEREAS the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance IV of 1952), and the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Amendment Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance V of 1952), were promulgated by the Governor of Madras to meet the situation aforesaid;

AND WHEREAS with a view to remove certain doubts which had arisen regarding the validity of the said Ordinances, the Governor of Madras after obtaining the instructions of the President in pursuance of the proviso to Article 213, clause (1) of the Constitution, promulgated the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection (No. 2) Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance VI of 1952), which repealed the said Ordinances and re-enacted the provisions contained therein;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to replace Madras Ordinance VI of 1952 by an Act of the State Legislature;

It is hereby enacted as follows:—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) This Act may be called the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Act, 1952.

(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force in the whole of the district of Tanjore on the 23rd August 1952; and it shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras, on such date as the Government may, by notification, appoint:

Provided that the Government may, by notification, direct that, with effect from such date as may be specified therein, this Act shall cease to apply to any specified area in the district of Tanjore or to any other specified area elsewhere in which this Act may have been brought into force.

2. *Definitions.*—In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,—

(a) “agricultural year” means the year commencing on the 1st day of May;

(b) “commencement of this Act” or “date of commencement of this Act” means the 23rd August 1952 in respect of the whole of the district of Tanjore, and the date appointed by the notification issued under section 1, subsection (2), in the case of any other area;

(c) “Conciliation Officer” means in relation to any area, the Conciliation Officer appointed under this Act for such area, and where no such Officer has been appointed, the Tahsildar having jurisdiction over the area;

(d) “cultivating tenant” or “tenant” means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person;

[25th November 1952]

- (e) "Government" means the State Government;
- (f) "gross produce" includes the yield obtained at the *poradi*;
- (g) "landowner" means the owner or other person deriving rights under him, who lets land for cultivation by a tenant, and includes the assignees, heirs or other legal representatives of such owner or person deriving rights under him;
- (h) "notification" means a notification published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*;
- (i) "pannaiyal" means any person engaged by the landowner or by the cultivating tenant to look after a farm and do all cultivation work on the land whenever necessary in the course of an entire agricultural year, but does not include one who is engaged either casually or only for a specific item of work;
- (j) "prescribed" means prescribed by rules made under this Act;
- (k) "rent" includes the share of the produce, if any, payable to the landowner;
- (l) "Revenue Court" means, in relation to any area, the Revenue Court constituted under this Act for such area, and where no Revenue Court has been so constituted, the Court of the Revenue Divisional Officer having jurisdiction over the area.

All references to the date or time of the "passing of this Act" shall be construed as references to the date on which the assent of the President to this Act was first published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

3. *Act to override contract and other laws, etc.*—The provisions of this Act—

(a) shall have effect, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any pre-existing law, custom, usage, agreement or decree or order of a Court, but

(b) shall not apply in respect of the land held by a landowner in any village if the land held by him in such village does not exceed one veli (6-2/3 acres) which is either wet land or dry land irrigated from any Government source, or three velis (twenty acres) of dry land not irrigated from any Government source.

4. *Appointment of Conciliation Officers.*—The Government or any authority empowered by them in this behalf may, by order, appoint any person for any area specified therein, to be a Conciliation Officer for the purpose of performing the functions entrusted to a Conciliation Officer by this Act.

5. *Constitution of Revenue Courts.*—The Government may, by notification, constitute for any area specified therein, a Revenue Court which shall be presided over by an officer not

25th November 1952]

below the rank of a Revenue Divisional Officer for the purpose of performing the functions entrusted to a Revenue Court by this Act.

6. *Right of cultivating tenants to a five-year term.*—(1) Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land on the 1st day of December 1951 shall be entitled to be in possession thereof as such tenant, subject to the provisions of this Act, until the expiry of a period of five years from the commencement of the agricultural year 1952-53; and if such tenant was not in possession of the land at the commencement of this Act, he shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession, any other person who was admitted to possession as tenant after the 1st day of December 1951 being evicted from the land.

(2) Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land during the agricultural year 1950-51 and who was not in possession thereof on the 1st day of December 1951, shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession, except in cases where some other tenant had been put in possession of the land on or before the 1st day of December 1951 and had raised a crop thereon before the commencement of this Act.

A cultivating tenant restored as above shall be entitled to be in possession as such tenant, subject to the provisions of this Act, until the expiry of the period of five years specified in sub-section (1).

(3) Every application to a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be made within thirty days from the commencement of this Act, and shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee:

Provided that the application may be received after the period of thirty days aforesaid, if the applicant satisfies the Conciliation Officer that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within that period.

Explanation.—The rejection of an application before the passing of this Act on the ground of its not having been presented in time shall not prevent the receipt of an application under the foregoing proviso after the passing of this Act.

(4) On receipt of . . . an application, under sub-section (3), the Conciliation Officer shall, after giving a reasonable opportunity to the landowner and the tenant, if any, in possession of the land, to make their representations, hold a summary inquiry into the matter and pass an order either allowing the application or dismissing it. In passing

[25th November 1952]

an order allowing the application, the Conciliation Officer may impose such conditions as he may consider just and equitable including conditions in regard to—

(i) the payment by the applicant of any arrear of rent already due from him to the landowner, but not exceeding in amount one year's rent, and

(ii) the reimbursement by the applicant of the landowner or the tenant in possession of the land on the date of the application, as the case may be, in respect of the labour done and the other expenses incurred by him during that part of the year in which the applicant was not in possession, if an agreement is not reached between the parties as regards the rates and manner of such reimbursement.

Explanation.—In lieu of imposing any condition relating to reimbursement as provided in clause (ii), the Conciliation Officer may, in his discretion, postpone the restoration of the applicant to possession of the land, until any crop which is being grown thereon at the time when the order is passed, has been harvested.

(5) Against any order passed by the Conciliation Officer under sub-section (4) or any condition imposed thereby, an appeal shall lie to the Revenue Court, within fifteen days of the passing of the order or in the case of an appeal presented after the passing of this Act, within thirty days of the passing of the order, unless the court in the special circumstances of any case condones the delay in preferring the appeal within that time.

The memorandum of appeal shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee; and the decision of the Revenue Court thereon shall be final.

(6) Any condition imposed before the passing of this Act requiring the applicant to pay any arrear of rent exceeding one year's rent shall, on application, be revised by the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court, as the case may be, so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent:

Provided that any payment made by the tenant before the passing of this Act shall not be required to be refunded.

7. *Terms applicable to all tenancies.*—Every cultivating tenant shall hold the land on the following terms:—

(a) Subject to the provisions of section 8, sub-section (4) (a), in all cases of tenure wherein the crop is to be shared between the landowner and the tenant, and in all other cases where the tenant and the landowner so agree, the landowner shall be entitled to determine the crop or crops which shall be grown on the land.

(b) The tenant shall be responsible for all labour and expenses of cultivation, including the provision of seed and the ploughing of the land.

[25th November 1952]

(c) The tenant shall bear the entire cost of all natural manures used on the land; but when chemical fertilizers and other artificial manures including groundnut cakes are used on the land, the cost thereof shall be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the gross produce is divided between them, that is to say, of three-fifths to two-fifths or of such lower proportion as may have been agreed upon between the parties as provided in section 8, sub-section (1) or sub-section (2).

(d) The landowner shall be liable to pay all dues payable to the Government and to local bodies in respect of the land, including the water-rate, if any, charged in respect thereof and all customary contributions and payments payable for local purposes.

(e) The liability for silt clearance and improvements shall rest on the landowner in the case of channels other than field channels, and on the tenant in the case of field channels.

(f) If the landowner wishes to terminate the tenancy at the expiry of the period of five years referred to in section 6, he shall give notice to the tenant in writing not less than twelve months before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy. Where the tenancy is not so terminated, the tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the land as tenant for a fresh term of five years subject to the terms and conditions set out in this and the following sections, or to such other terms and conditions, not being less favourable to the tenant as may have been duly agreed upon between the parties.

(g) The tenant may terminate the tenancy at the end of any agricultural year during the period of five years aforesaid by giving not less than six months' notice in writing expiring with the end of such year to the landowner.

8. *Rent payable by tenants.*—(1) Where the produce is to be shared between the tenant and the landowner, the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths (or such higher proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the gross produce, after deducting all harvesting and poradi charges in the case of paddy, and the like charges, if any, in the case of any other crop.

The tenant shall also be entitled to retain the bulk of the straw, where there is any, giving the customary headloads of straw to the landowner.

In case the produce is in grain, it shall be divided between the tenant and the landowner on the usual thrashing floor; and no portion of the produce shall be removed therefrom at such time or in such manner as to prevent the due division thereof at the proper time.

[25th November 1952]

(2) Where the tenancy provides for any rent, the tenant shall be bound to give to the landowner (in addition to the customary headloads of straw, where there is any) three-fifths (or such lower proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the normal gross produce of the land after deducting all harvesting and poradi charges in the case of paddy and the like charges, if any, in the case of any other crop.

In case the rent is to be paid in cash, the value of the three-fifths or of the lower proportion aforesaid shall be calculated at the price prevailing in the year immediately preceding the appropriate five-year term.

In case the rent is in grain, it shall be delivered immediately to the landowner on the usual thrashing floor at each harvest.

(3) Where the landowner has made any advance to the tenant towards seed or manure, for raising the produce, the landowner shall have a first charge on the tenant's share of the produce in respect of the cost of such seed and the cost of such manure or of such proportion of the cost of such manure as should be borne by the tenant under section 7, clause (c).

Where the produce is in grain, such quantity thereof as is equivalent in value to the amount due to the landowner as aforesaid shall be made over to him by the tenant at the usual thrashing floor.

(4) In the off-paddy season, when no wet crop operations are in progress or are possible, the following provisions shall apply:—

(a) The tenant shall be entitled to raise at his own risk any usual catch crop which he wishes, provided that he shall grow leguminous crops or green manure on one-half of the land or on such other extent as may be notified by the Government,

(b) Of the catch crops so raised, the tenant shall be bound to give to the landowner one-fifth (or such lower proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the gross produce, after meeting all cultivation and harvesting charges.

(5) The tenant shall not be bound by any agreement which gives him less favourable terms than are specified in sub-sections (1) to (4).

9. *Execution of lease.*—(1) In the case of every tenancy, a lease deed shall be executed in triplicate in the prescribed form, specifying the name and description of the tenant, the name (if any), survey number, description and extent of the land leased out, and the terms of the tenancy; and shall be signed both by the landowner or his agent and by the

[25th November 1952]

tenant. One of the three copies shall be kept by the landowner, one shall be kept by the tenant and the third shall be caused to be lodged in the taluk office by the landowner or his agent within a fortnight of the date on which the tenant signs it.

(2) No stamp need be affixed to the lease deed.

(3) In the case of any tenancy, if the landowner or his agent or the tenant contravenes the provisions of sub-section (1), the Revenue Court may impose on the landowner or the tenant, as the case may be, a penalty which may extend to fifty rupees; and any penalty so imposed may be recovered as if it were an arrear of land revenue.

10. *Eviction of tenants.*—(1) No cultivating tenant shall be evicted except as provided in section 6, or unless—

(a) he has failed to divide the produce as laid down in section 8, sub-section (1), or has failed to make over to the landowner the quantity of the produce to which he is entitled under section 8, sub-section (3), in conformity with the provisions of that sub-section; or

(b) he has failed to pay any rent accruing due after the commencement of this Act within two months of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed, within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village; or

(c) he has done any act or has been guilty of any neglect which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land; or

(d) he has used the land for any purpose contrary to that for which the land was let; or

(e) he has sub-let the land; or

(f) his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation; or

(g) he has failed to observe any condition imposed by the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court in pursuance of section 6.

(2) (a) No tenant shall be evicted under this section except on an application made in that behalf to the Revenue Court.

(b) The Revenue Court shall on such application inquire into the matter and give its decision.

(c) Upon any application made for the eviction of a tenant on the ground of non-payment of rent or of any

[25th November 1952]

amount made payable by a condition imposed in pursuance of section 6, the Revenue Court shall, before passing an order for eviction, call upon the tenant, by notice in the prescribed manner, to tender to the landowner the rent or amount in arrear together with the cost of the proceedings within thirty days from the date of the notice, and if the tenant does not comply with such notice, the Revenue Court shall pass an order for his eviction.

11. *Wages payable to pannaiyals.*—Wages shall be payable to pannaiyals and the members of their families, for each day of work done according to custom, as follows, but not for days on which there is no work to be done:—

(a) in accordance with the terms set forth in the Mayuram agreement, dated the 28th day of October 1948, as reproduced in the Schedule to this Act; or

(b) at the following rates in kind:—

2 marakkals of paddy for every adult male worker.

1 marakkal of paddy for every adult woman worker.

$\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal of paddy for every worker not being an adult.

Any pannaiyal may elect to be paid his wages for an agricultural year either under clause (a) or under clause (b) of this section; but if he prefers to be paid under clause (b), he shall not be entitled to claim in addition any kind of customary privilege or remuneration, provided that an adult male pannaiyal shall, in addition, be entitled at each harvest to an *aruvadaippangu* (crop-share) of half-a-marakkal for every kalam of gross produce (or in the case of produce other than paddy, of one-twenty-fourth of the gross produce) actually raised by him and the members of his family, and be given *manai kollais* according to custom.

12. *Dismissal of pannaiyal.*—(1) Whenever a landowner dismisses a pannaiyal, he shall, within a week from the date of such dismissal, make a report thereof to the Conciliation Officer having jurisdiction over the area.

(2) The Conciliation Officer may, on receipt of such report from the landowner, or of any complaint from the pannaiyal who has been dismissed, whether after the commencement of this Act or at any time before such commencement not being earlier than the 1st day of March 1952, call upon the landowner and the pannaiyal concerned to appear before him in person or by agent and to represent their respective cases.

(3) After considering the representations, if any, so made, and after making such further inquiry into the case as he may deem fit, the Conciliation Officer may, if he finds

25th November 1952]

that the dismissal of the pannaiyal was not just and proper, by an award in writing, require the landowner to take back the pannaiyal and reinstate him to all the rights which would have accrued to him but for his dismissal.

(4) If the landowner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer under sub-section (3), the Revenue Court may, on receipt of intimation of such failure, after such inquiry as it considers necessary, direct the landowner to pay the pannaiyal such compensation as may be fixed by it, not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 300, whichever is less.

(5) If the landowner fails to pay the compensation so fixed to the pannaiyal, the Revenue Court may, on application by the pannaiyal, direct that it be recovered from the landowner as if it were an arrear of land revenue and paid over to the pannaiyal.

(6) In this section, "landowner" includes a cultivating tenant who has engaged a pannaiyal.

13. *Adjudication of disputes.*—(1) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, any dispute between a landowner and a cultivating tenant or between either of them and a pannaiyal, including any matter which affects their mutual harmonious relationship in the cultivation of land, or any question which may arise as to the terms of a tenancy or the payment or non-payment of any rent or wages shall, on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.

(2) Against any final order passed by a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1), an appeal shall lie to the Revenue Court within thirty days of the passing of the order, unless the court in the special circumstances of any case, condones the delay in preferring the appeal within that time; and the decision of the Revenue Court on such appeal shall be final.

(3) Every application under sub-section (1) and every memorandum of appeal under sub-section (2) shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee.

(4) Nothing contained in this section shall affect any decision of the Revenue Court which has become final under section 13 of the Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 or of Madras Ordinance VI of 1952.

(5) Any application made to a Revenue Court under section 13 of Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 or of Madras Ordinance VI of 1952 and pending on the date of the passing of this Act shall be transferred to and disposed of by the Conciliation Officer who would have had jurisdiction to entertain such application under this Act, as if it had been made thereunder.

[25th November 1952]

14. *Bar of jurisdiction of civil courts.*—No civil court shall entertain any suit or other proceeding to set aside or modify any order, decision or award passed by any Revenue Court, Conciliation Officer, or other authority under this Act or in respect of any other matter falling within its scope.

15. *Special conditions applicable to areas outside Tanjore district.*—(1) Where this Act is to be brought into force in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district, its provisions shall apply subject to such adaptations, exceptions and modifications, if any, as the Government may, by notification, specify in this behalf.

(2) Any such notification shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly of the State for not less than fourteen days and shall have effect thereafter subject to any modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment as that Assembly may make during the session in which they are so laid.

16. *Power to make rules.*—(1) The Government may, by notification, make rules to carry out the purposes of this Act, and in particular for the execution or enforcement of any orders, decisions or awards passed thereunder or for the removal of any doubts or difficulties which may arise in giving effect to the provisions thereof.

(2) All rules made under this section after the 31st December 1952 shall be laid for not less than fourteen days before the Legislative Assembly of the State, as soon as possible after they are made, and shall be subject to such modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment, as that Assembly may make during the session in which they are so laid.

Explanation.—This sub-section, shall not apply to any rules made on or before the 31st December 1952.

17. *Repeal of Madras Ordinance VI of 1952.*—(1) The Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection (No. 2) Ordinance, 1952 (Madras Ordinance VI of 1952), is hereby repealed.

(2) Any rules made, notifications issued, orders, decisions or awards passed, action taken, or thing done in the exercise of any power conferred by or under Madras Ordinance IV of 1952, or by or under that Ordinance as amended by Madras Ordinance V of 1952, or by or under Madras Ordinance VI of 1952, shall be deemed to have been made, issued, passed, taken or done in the exercise of the powers conferred by or under this Act.

25th November 1952]

THE SCHEDULE.

[See section 11 (a).]

Wages.—(1) Pannaiyals will be paid *daily wages* at one marakkal and women labourers at 3/4th marakkal.

(2) For harvesting, kalavadi, chindumani, sattuva, nadaval, kalavadi and other items, pannaiyals will be paid 1/7th of the gross produce of the plots on which they have worked as pannaiyals.

(a) the 1/7th share will be split up and the kalavadi will be fixed at 1½ marakkals out of 14 and harvest cooly at half a-marakkal out of 14.

(b) Where the pannaiyal exclusively harvests the field, he will get 1/7th of the produce.

(c) Where the pannaiyal harvests part of the field, he will get 1/7th of the produce harvested by him.

(d) Where outside labour has harvested certain areas and the pannaiyal certain other areas, the pannaiyal will get 1½ marakkals out of 14 as kalavadi, irrespective of what cooly is paid to outside labour.

(e) To prevent pannaiyals from claiming their share and working elsewhere, a penalty of two marakkals for each day of wilful absence during the harvest season will be deducted out of the kalavadi or other dues to him.

(f) Each pannaiyal will get his share only on the yield from not more than one veli (6-2/3 acres) of land belonging to the mirasdar.

(3) For *poradi* pannaiyals will be paid only daily wages at one marakkal and they should finish the *poradi*.

(4) Pannaiyals will be given *maniams* (manai kollais) according to custom.

DISSENTING MINUTES.

APPENDIX I.

While agreeing with the general scope of the Bill, I feel bound to make a note of my dissent on some of the provisions contained in the Bill as they are likely to defeat the object for which the Bill is intended.

Under section 2, clause (c), cultivating tenant is defined as meaning a person who "contributes" his own physical labour, etc. The phrase "contributes his own physical labour" may mean any labour including supervision or management occasionally. This is exactly what is being done by a number of intermediaries who hold leases under *Madhiathipathies* and temple managements in Tanjore district. The spirit of the Act is to help the tiller

[25th November 1952]

of the soil putting down at the same time the middleman of the class described above. The cultivating tenant must be a tiller of the soil. This definition as it stands does not cure this defect.

Also in the same clause, "the heirs" without any qualifying adjective is included in the term cultivating tenant. Sri K. Bhashyam moved an amendment, which was lost, that for the words "and includes the heirs of such person" the words "all such heirs of the person who are willing and capable of contributing such labour as aforesaid" be substituted. This appeals to reason. Else the heirs, if they happen to be minors and females, may not be in a position to contribute any labour to bring them within the definition of the said clause, with the result that the lands may have to lie fallow.

It is deplorable that provision is so made in the Bill under section 13 as to give final decision of matters requiring judicial view to Revenue Courts presided over by Executive Officers of the State. Under section 14, Civil Courts are barred from entertaining any suit or other proceedings to set aside or modify any order, etc., passed by a Revenue Court under this Bill. This looks as if this Act is intended to be administered by the Executive Officers only. This is likely to lead to erroneous decisions on points of substantial importance, in the interest of parties concerned. The adamant attitude of the Chief Minister in refusing to introduce a clause to make provisions for an appellate or revision court presided over by a Judicial Officer to revise the orders passed by the Executive Officers of the State as mentioned above at least on questions of law is inexplicable.

Hence I feel obliged to submit my dissenting minute regarding the points raised above.

MADRAS.

22nd November 1952.

V. GOPALA GOUNDER.

II

The conception and preparation of the Bill are not in accordance with the declared object for which it has been brought into existence. At the outset it is said that this Bill is to provide for the improvement of agrarian conditions in the district of Tanjore. In the preamble it is said the relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other had become strained resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances which has created a situation threatening to affect badly the total production in the district. So the object is to give security of tenure to the tiller of the soil if he is a tenant and the maximum wages if he happens to be an agrarian labourer always having an eye on the establishment of good relationship between the landowner and the man on the land and on the maximum yield one can get from the land.

25th November 1952]

So between the landowner and the tiller of the soil there cannot be an intermediary. In Tanjore district every one knows that there is a class of persons who take large extent of lands on lease from the landowners and distribute them to a number of persons on oral arrangement. These persons do not cultivate the land themselves unless they reserve for them small extent for pannai cultivation. What they really do is periodical supervision of the lands at various stages of cultivation. These persons cannot be considered to be tiller of the soil or cultivators.

But the definition of "cultivating tenant" reads thus as amended: "Cultivating tenant or tenant means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family in the cultivation, etc." The definition of the word pannaiyal reads thus "Pannaiyal means any person engaged by the landowner or by the cultivating tenant, etc." The so-called middlemen above named may contend that they must be recognized as cultivating tenants under these definitions since the word "contribute" has been used in the definition of cultivating tenant which word can very well be satisfied by his act of periodical supervision. An attempt may be made by these middlemen to treat all those who are on the soil as their pannaiyals or casual labourers. After reading both these definitions if any court comes to the conclusion that such a man is a cultivating tenant, it cannot be said that the interpretation is totally incorrect since the provision is capable of such an interpretation.

Though the Chief Minister says in so many words that the intention of the Bill is to exclude the intermediaries, he does not allow any change of words in the definition.

Further nowhere in the Bill any provision has been made to limit the extent of land a cultivating tenant can hold. If a lessee of 400 acres is able to get a favourable order from the court as indicated above, so many tillers of the soil are to suffer and the object of the Bill in giving relief to the tiller of the soil is defeated.

It may be pointed out that provision has been made in subsection (d) of section 10 to evict the tenant if he sublets the land. The tiller of the soil is at liberty to establish his claim as a lessee by producing evidence. But under the circumstances one must realize the difficulties that a cultivator will have to face as against the powerful middleman. Further in almost all the cases of middlemen, the landowner if he happens to be Devasthanam or Madhathipathi is not prepared to take advantage of his provision of evicting the tenant on the ground of subletting even though he is aware of such a conduct on the part of his lessee since it is advantageous to him. He prefers the middleman for easy collection work to the number of poor tillers of the soil.

If it be the intention of the Bill to exclude the middlemen, is it not fair to make provision to determine the relationship between

[25th November 1952]

the landowner and the middlemen so as to give relief to all concerned when a new Legislation is brought forth unsettling certain settled conditions?

Further, the definition "cultivating tenant" includes the heirs of such person. A tenant is chosen for his knowledge and capacity for cultivation and for his honesty and straightforwardness. The rights and liabilities of such a tenant should not be transferred to the heirs. If a tenant dies leaving behind him a minor girl or a minor son or a major son who is neither willing to become a cultivating tenant nor capable of becoming a cultivating tenant what is the use of transferring the rights and liabilities of the tenants of such heirs? The idea seems to have been borrowed from the Estates Land Act and in effect it introduces occupancy rights in the ryotwari area. If it be the idea of the framers of the Bill to give some right in the soil to the heirs of the tenant it is well and good, but this is not the object of this Bill and a separate provision may be made in a fitting place. If this provision is permitted to remain in this Bill there may be occasions and instances where land will be fallow without proper persons to take care of it affecting badly the total production. This will create unnecessary litigation also. The Chief Minister does not choose to be convinced.

There is no provision in the Bill regarding punja lands. Custom and usage regarding the cultivation of punja lands are not uniform in all parts of the district. Punja lands are used for raising cash crops and also vegetables. The produce in cash crops is realizable at a particular period of the year and the produce in vegetable gardens and betel and plantain garden the realization of the produce is day-to-day affair. Whether these crops on punja lands are included within the scope of the Bill are not clear. The Chief Minister says that they are included.

In the definition section, sub-section (e) defines the "gross produce". "Gross produce" includes the yield obtained at the "Poradi". The word "Poradi" is peculiarly applicable only to paddy cultivation which follows the main thrashing. From this definition one may not be totally in the wrong if one infers that the whole Bill is applicable only to the paddy cultivation. But the Chief Minister says that the Bill is applicable to the punja lands also. If proper provisions are not clearly made in the Bill, the tenants are to lose heavily since the labour involved in raising punja crops is far more than that of paddy cultivation.

Bar of jurisdiction of Civil Courts.—Under the Bill by section 14, Civil Courts are prohibited to entertain any petition to set aside or modify any order of the officer or court created under the Bill. The Revenue Court and Conciliation Officers are drawn from the Revenue Department. No one can deny that for these officers departmental circulars are more binding than any judicial interpretation. By barring the jurisdiction of Civil Courts, the Government have made the operation of the Bill as one connected with the executive administration. Even members belonging to the

[25th November 1952]

Congress Party supported the move for making provision of revisional powers with the District Court. But the Chief Minister turned down with an iron hand.

On the whole, the deliberation of the Joint Select Committee was not as free and exhaustive as it ought to be considering the nature and importance of the subject it was dealing with. Since the provisions of this Bill relate only to Tanjore district members belonging to other districts were not expected to know the implications of the various sections of the Bill. Further at the commencement of the discussion, Mr. Rajagopalachariar said that this Bill is intended only for Tanjore district and it will not be extended to any other district. This assertion on the part of the Chief Minister in the Select Committee took away the inclination on the part of the members belonging to other districts to understand the real working of the provisions. Members belonging to the Tanjore district bound themselves more by party discipline than by their convictions. The Chief Minister who was against the Select Committee proposal originally tried to get through the Bill without any major alteration or addition. Unfortunately, Tanjore, which is only major surplus district in the Tamil area has been made a subject-matter of this experimental measure.

Then a word about pannaiyal. Pannaiyal system in Tanjore district is a peculiar one. In olden days, they had to work as permanent servants and their position was just like slaves. This system in all its phases is not at all prevalent in any part of the district now. But the association of idea is there and the word pannaiyal gives the colour of a person akin to slave. So it is not advisable or proper to recognize statutorily the word pannaiyal with all its implications. The Bill may provides more attractive terms for casual labourer than that of pannaiyal so that the tendency for anyone to claim certain rights as pannaiyal might be there.

MADRAS,

22nd November 1952.

S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM.

III

Security of tenure to the cultivator.—We thought that legislation has been undertaken with a view to begin land reform in the State taking Tanjore situation as the proximate cause and afford protection and security of tenure to the cultivator which is the least that a civilized Government is expected to do. But the purpose is lost when, as in the Ordinance, the period of protection is limited to the all too brief period of five years and when it is confined to one district. The five years period with one year's notice leads to uncertainty and in effect fails to serve fully the purpose of protection to the tenant or peace to the landowner. The eviction clauses are unduly weighted against the 'cultivating tenant.' We cannot, therefore, agree with the majority decision not to redraft the clauses to make them of general application extending protection

[25th November 1952]

to all cultivating tenants, from whomsoever they hold land. The argument that such a step would create new zamindars in the 'lessors' is a mere slogan; for, it wilfully overlooks the immediate necessity of giving security of tenure to him that labours and does not avoid the large "pattadar-zamindar" anyway. The further argument that a general protection is outside the scope of the Bill is also not strong; for, we could report progress and take instruction from the Assembly on the 24th instant, only two days from to-day, even if it is correct to hold that it would be outside its scope notwithstanding the language of clause (1) of the Bill.

2. *Share of the produce.*—The second point on which we differ from the majority is on the question of share. We are for sticking to the proportions given in the Subrahmanyam Committee Report as the minimum. They were arrived at after some consideration on evidence tendered before them and there is no justifiable reason to reduce the tenant's share to a lower percentage. Reduction will only lead to agitation which can even now be set at rest by accepting that Committee figures.

3. *Jurisdiction of civil courts.*—The third point on which we differ from the majority is on the question of the exclusion of jurisdiction of civil courts.

We believe that a law is not law which seeks to prevent a Civil Court from interpreting or applying it. Revenue Courts act upon instructions from the executive and in hearing cases, are often guided by office notes. They may often do the right thing; but why should we exclude a remedy where they go wrong? It may be the tenants that happen to be the aggrieved persons; why should their fate be sealed without right of appeal? It may be the landowner that happens to be the aggrieved person; why should he be penalized?

The theory that Revenue Courts know landlord and tenant problems better than Civil Courts and the theory that Civil Courts mean interminable appeals, are both of them exaggerated. Anyway, we should not raise any great objection if Revenue Courts are entrusted with the original jurisdiction and if they are made the final arbiters on questions of fact, provided the right of judicial review on questions of law is retained in Civil Courts, which exist for that purpose.

To say that any provision for judicial review would create a rush of review petitions and involve the poor tenants in avoidable litigation is only to create a smoke-screen for avoidable injustice. Nor is it reasonable to suggest that an aggrieved man could go to the High Court with a writ or certiorari petition. For one thing, the jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution is a limited and "extraordinary" jurisdiction and it is perverse to make laws deliberately excluding the ordinary judicial machinery from functioning and driving people to seek the "extraordinary" jurisdiction of the High Court as if it is an ordinary feature of judicial process. For another, the aggrieved man should have the remedy as near at hand as possible and as it is a matter

25th November 1952]

of "review", not always on complicated matters requiring the decision of the highest tribunal, the District Court would serve the purpose well indeed.

4. *Extension of legislation by notification.*—Fourthly we are of the opinion that the "press-button" provision made in clause 15 to extend territorially legislation intended for a district by executive notification without the assent of the Legislature is not a desirable device, even if the piece of legislation is an excellent one. To pass it in this manner is too much of a surrender of the legislative authority to the executive. Whenever a legislative enactment is sought to be extended to another area, the Legislature must be consulted, so that there may be an opportunity to look into the legislation in the light of the experience of its working. Sub-clause (2) of clause 15 adopted after strenuous argument providing for the notification procedure cures the defect to some extent, although one cannot be sure of its constitutional adequacy.

5. *Conclusion.*—There are other small points of difference also. Subject to the above remarks, we agree with the dominant idea of the Bill, which is to give protection and security of tenure to the cultivator, and with the report of the Committee.

T. VISWANATHAM.

K. SURYANARAYANA.

A. RATHINAM.

K. R. NALLASIVAM.

V. G. RAO.

PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU.

C. KANDASAMI.

MADRAS,
22nd November 1952.

IV

I write this to request you to please record my minute of dissent to the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill as passed by the Select Committee during its sittings held on from 20th to 22nd instants as follows.

I regret that I have to dissent strongly from the views expressed and conclusions made on most of the fundamental and important sections of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, by the Joint Select Committee. My difference with the Committee (when I use the word "Committee" in this minute I mean the majority who disagreed with me on those issues) is not merely a difference in reactions, but a difference in the angle of vision. Having been a worker in the cause of kisans for the last 22 years, I have got used to looking at agrarian questions from a particular point of view. To my mind, therefore, the purpose of the present Bill with the few changes made therein by

[25th November 1952]

the Joint Select Committee will not be served, as they are not much conducive to the amelioration and protection of the cultivating tenants and pannaiyals.

The main objection or difference with the decision of the Joint Select Committee is that it refused to extend the Bill to the other parts in the State. There is agrarian unrest throughout the State since 1947 when the then Government had issued questionnaires about Land Reforms in the State. It is becoming more and more acute since the appointment and reports of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee and the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, Madras. There are wholesale evictions of the tenants by the landowners as the tenants have not got sufficient material and evidence and as they are not protected by law. This was mainly due to the landowners apprehending some reforms and rights to the cultivating tenants. These tenants are thinking themselves morally justified to continue on the land as they have no other occupation or means to live, and the eviction is not at all justified for no fault of theirs. This resulted throughout the State in agrarian unrest and too much litigation in the Courts. Naturally, it goes without saying that the production has greatly suffered and as a result, the whole State is going through famine and the agricultural industry in crisis. It is not in Tanjore alone that there is agrarian unrest but it is also prevalent in other parts of the State which can be seen through the press and through the speeches made by various members of the Assembly, not only of the Opposition but from the Government side also. It may be argued that the provisions of this Bill do not apply to the other parts of the State where the conditions are somewhat different. In this connection, I wish to point out that the provisions do generally apply and where they do not apply generally there is the clause 15 which provides for suitable adaptations, exceptions and modifications. Therefore, the Bill can safely be extended to the whole of the State.

Secondly, with regard to the clause 6, sub-clause (2), Mr. Kandaswamy's amendment or some such amendment should have been accepted as the wholesale eviction of the tenants for fear of some agrarian reforms in the State is taking place since 1947 when the then Government issued a questionnaire and the Government proposed abolition of estates. This naturally caused the absentee landlords to apprehend some legislation to safeguard the interests of cultivating tenants and conferring some rights on them.

Regarding clause 7, I will be failing in my duty if I do not congratulate the Government for readily accepting my amendment to the various sub-clauses therein and the Joint Select Committee to pass these amendments unanimously, that the cost of artificial and chemical manures such as ammonium sulphate, ammonium phosphate, groundnut cake, etc., should be borne by the landowners as well as the tenants in each agricultural year in the ratio of tenancy in the ratio of their shares in the produce.

[25th November 1952]

Now with regard to the appearance of the parties and their agents or advocates before the Conciliation Officer and the Revenue Court, I strongly commend to the Government to make suitable provision in the Bill or make such rule under clause 16 that the parties can appear before the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court through any agent or lawyer engaged for the purpose as especially illiterate and poor tenants or pannaiyals cannot engage lawyers as it will cost them very much.

My other main difference with the Select Committee with regard to clause 8 about the sharing of the produce by the landowners and the tenants. We hear our Chief Minister and one of the members of the Joint Select Committee, Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachariar, time and again that people should not leave their normal and hereditary professions and I need not stress upon his primary duty as the Head of the Government to see and enact such laws as will not make the people to leave their hereditary and normal professions and such professions are attractive and encouraging. It should also be seen that one can pull on even normally with that profession. Agricultural industry or profession is one of the main items of professions of our country of more than 60 per cent of the population. So it is needless to say that our country will be happy if this 60 per cent of the population is contented and lead a peaceful and happy life. An ordinary cultivating tenant has not got even what we call an economic holding or even a minimum holding. In such a case, he and his family to make a living at least somewhere near the average standard of living, though not for better education, better housing and other provisions for his children and other members of his family, he should have a large share in the produce. My amendments to this clause are in tune with the above contention and this will pave the way a great deal to the abolition of absentee landlordism also, as the landlord will choose either to be a cultivating tenant himself or do away with the land as one cannot exploit the tenantry as absentee landlord getting much share for his right of ownership in the land. In the long run, it will help to a great extent to the healthy growth of the country. The Andhra Provincial Kisan Congress, in its answers to the Questionnaire in 1947, opined that the tenant should have two-thirds share and the landlord one-third. My amendment to the clause 8 that the tenants should have two-thirds share of the produce and the landowner one-third is also based on the opinion of the Andhra Provincial Kisan Congress now known as Andhra Provincial Kisan Sammelan. The Select Committee refused to accept my amendment. Not even the amendment proposed by Sri T. Viswanatham, M.L.A., that the produce should be shared among the tenant and the landowner as per the recommendations of the Land Reforms Committee, Madras (vide page 55, first report). I request the Government to consider the matter once again and bring in such suitable amendments that the tenant will have a large share, that is, at least two-thirds in the main crop.

Now with regard to clause 12, sub-clause (4), it is pressed to alter or amend the wording at the end "whichever is less" to

[25th November 1952]

"whichever is great". I do not see much reason why it should not be accepted. If this is accepted, the landlord will not come forward so easily to dismiss a pannaiyal and what our Chief Minister aspires will be achieved, the harmony and good relationship between the landlord and pannaiyal.

Therefore, my report to the Assembly should be that the Bill be amended or modified with my above suggestions.

MADRAS,

22nd November 1952. P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU.

V

While in agreement with the general principles of the Bill, namely, that evicted tenants should be restored to possession and also that security of tenure and fair rent should be provided for the tenant and pannaiyals, we, however, feel that the Bill as recommended by the Select Committee is thoroughly inadequate to meet the needs of the situation and we feel that in several matters, which we are setting out below, it is essential that certain amendments should be carried out in the Bill, amendments which though moved before the Select Committee, were not acceptable to Government.

At the very outset, we desire to state that almost every amendment moved for that purpose. Since the passing of the Ordinance was one in favour of the land-owner and intended rather to give protection to the landlord than to the tenant or pannaiyal. It would seem as though the Government is attempting to convert the Tenants and Pannaiyal protection Bill into a Land-owners Protection Bill and what little benefit the tenant and pannaiyal had under the Ordinance is attempted to be curtailed by the amendments, which have been put through by the Government.

At several stages of the proceedings of the Select Committee we raised the question of extending the operation of the Bill to the whole State, but at every stage the Government opposed the amendments moved for that purpose. Since the passing of the Ordinance, the land-owners all over the State fearing an extension of the Ordinance and even before the passing of the Ordinance started evicting a number of tenants on a large scale. The main arguments put forward against extension of the Bill were that conditions vary from place to place and a thorough investigation is necessary and that the Government are considering a comprehensive Bill for Agrarian Reform. We can only consider this as a lame excuse on the part of the Government, especially as the Subramaniam Committee have made a thorough investigation and have given an exhaustive report and have made certain recommendations. It is also significant that the Subramaniam Committee Report was subscribed to by two of the Ministers who are now on the Select Committee and even though the recommendations in the Subramaniam Committee Report were not quite adequate, the Government have chosen not to implement even the meagre recommendations in the Report, but on the other hand the Government

25th November 1952]

are now coming forward with the unacceptable excuse that an investigation has yet to be made and that the Subramaniam Committee Report has not yet been accepted. We feel that the position of the tenants in other parts of the Madras State will become insecure and miserable unless the operation of the Bill is extended to the whole of Madras State. This can only mean that a situation similar to that which developed in Tanjore, and which in fact necessitated the passing of the Ordinance, will develop in other places also. We therefore feel that the Bill should be suitably amended, so as to make it applicable to the whole of Madras State, probably with the exception of the Malabar district for which tenancy legislation has always been passed separately in view of the peculiar local conditions there.

Being of the opinion that the main cause for inadequate food production was the heavy rent that had to be paid by the tenants of the landlords and the insecure nature of tenancy, we had suggested several amendments both for increasing the share of the tenant as well as for ensuring the security of the tenancy to cover more than five years and in fact make it a permanent tenancy. For this purpose, amendments were moved to clauses 6, 7 and 8 of the Bill but all these amendments were summarily rejected by the Government.

With reference to the question of security of tenure, the Government would not even accept a period of 15 years and even the amendment to section 7 giving the option to the tenants to continue for another period of ten years was not acceptable to Government. We are not in favour of provisions of clause (7) (d) which enables the land-owners to terminate the tenancy after giving one year's notice. We apprehend that before the end of the fourth year almost all the mirasdars will give eviction notices and will be in a position to bargain with the tenant or to convert lease-hold lands into pannai cultivation or even to cultivate such lands with casual labour. This would undo what little benefit the Bill is intended to do to the tenants and pannaiyals. It was to meet this situation we suggested the amendment that instead of the land-owner being given the option of terminating the tenancy by a notice sent at the end of the fourth year, an option should be given to the tenant instead to continue the tenancy for a further period of five years. In this connexion we would like to state that the tenant who would have put in a good deal of labour and improved the land will be at the mercy of the land-owner and this insecurity will really in the long run impede the production of food and good cultivation.

With reference to increase in the share of the tenant, we moved an amendment that a flat rate of 20 per cent increase in the share percentage going to the cultivating tenant should be provided for in clause 8 of the Bill with a minimum of 40 per cent for him. This amendment was moved, so that all the tenants would be equally benefited and even the tenants who are now getting a little below the 2/5th share would be substantially benefited in

[25th November 1952]

the same manner, as those tenants who get less than 1/5th share. This was not accepted by the Government and even an amendment moved to provide for 55 per cent share in land produce under I class irrigation sources and 60 per cent share under irrigation sources grouped as II class and below, which were substantially the recommendations of the Subramaniam Committee, were not acceptable to the Government. We feel that the 2/5th share provided for in clause 8 of the Bill is thoroughly inadequate and of little benefit to the majority of the suffering tenants.

With reference to the restoration of tenants though an amendment was suggested for the deletion of the sub-clause dealing with the payment of any arrears already due from the tenants as a pre-condition for reinstatement in clause 6 of the Bill, the Government was willing to accept only the amendment, that the arrear of rent for the previous agricultural year was to be paid by the tenant for being restored to his land. It was suggested by us that even in this very Bill, there should be a provision for a moratorium of the rest of the arrears. In this connexion the Government stated that a separate Bill will be brought for that purpose and this Bill did not cover the question of moratorium on arrears to be paid by the agriculturists. We, however, feel that a provision could have been made in this Bill itself, because without such a provision, the already pauperised tenants will be harassed by the landlords and taken to Civil Courts for the recovery of such arrears which will by itself impede food production.

The Government have brought forward this Bill on the supposition that large-scale evictions have only occurred from 1950-51 onwards but the real fact is that large-scale evictions have taken place even from the years 1946-47. When this was pointed out and an amendment was moved that any tenant in possession on the 1st December 1947 should also be entitled to the benefit of restoration under the Bill, provided that there is no cultivating tenant in possession on 1st December 1951, the Government rejected the amendment, on the plea that these tenants have been evicted because of their aggressive political agitation and hence their case should not be re-considered. This can only mean that the Government want to wreak political vengeance on such of those tenants, who from 1947 onwards actively worked for bettering their conditions. Even the fact that the amendment provided for restoration only in cases, where there was no cultivating tenant in possession on the 1st December 1951 would not persuade the Government to accept the amendment, which also shows that the Government wants to protect the landlords, who have after the eviction of such tenants taken to pannaï cultivation or cultivation by casual labour.

It is a well known fact that many tenants were not in a position to avail themselves of the provisions of the Ordinance, in view of the short time given, within which they had to make applications for their restoration and because of this many tenants have been deprived of the meagre benefits given by the Ordinance. Several Congressmen themselves have agitated for the extension of the

[25th November 1952]

time-limit for restoration. Even so, the Government have thought it fit to reject the amendment suggested by us for extending the time for filing the application by an amendment to sub-clause (3) of clause 6, by substituting the word "passing" for the word "commencement" which would have enabled the tenants who have been deprived of the right, to file such application within 30 days from the passing of this Bill. The reply of the Government to this was by an amendment to sub-clause 3 of clause 6 of the Bill, by adding a proviso that the Conciliation Officer may entertain applications, even if the prescribed time is over, if sufficient cause is shown for the failure on the part of the tenant to apply within the time. We feel that this proviso is bound to create serious difficulties and complications and would therefore suggest that the amendment that was moved should be accepted.

With reference to the exemption to the landowner who possesses more than 6-2/3 acres, we suggested a very reasonable amendment that the 6-2/3rd acres limit should be of the total extent held by the landowner and not 6-2/3rd acres possessed by the landowner in any village as provided in the Bill, as mentioned in clause (b) of sub-clause 3 of the Bill. We showed that there is a loophole here whereby many big landowners may get exemptions with regard to certain small portions of lands, which they own in various villages. But even this amendment was rejected by the Government.

We feel that almost all the sub-clauses of clause 10 of the Bill, except sub-clauses (c) and (d) of the Bill are in the nature of a sword of Damocles hanging over the heads, of the tenants, which could be made use of by the landowner at any moment for the purposes of evicting the tenants. We are of the opinion that whatever security may have been given by the five years' term, is in substance taken away by such wide and exhaustive terms of sub-clauses (a), (b) and (e) of clause 10 of the Bill and particularly (b) and (e). The amendment to delete clauses (a), (b) and (e) of clause 10 of the Bill was rejected by the Government. We are, however, of the opinion that there is in effect no security for the tenant, if sub-clauses (a), (b) and (e) are allowed to stand.

While the Government were very anxious to widen the terms and conditions under which the tenant could be evicted, when it came to clause 12 of the Bill, namely, the reinstatement of a dismissed pannaiyal in spite of strenuous efforts, our suggestion that a provision should be made for compelling the landowner to reinstate the pannaiyal or in any event to impose drastic punishment, in the event of the landowners' failure to reinstate the pannaiyal, was not acceptable. This clearly shows that the Government are not so much concerned about the fate of even a pannaiyal, who is admittedly wrongfully dismissed, but on the other hand seem to be very much concerned for the right of the landowner to dismiss the pannaiyal at his own will and pleasure.

In the working of the Ordinance during the past three months it was found that several pannaiyals and tenants while appearing

[25th November 1952]

before the Conciliation Officers and the Revenue Courts, were severely handicapped on account of their own ignorance due to the fact that landowners were able to engage leading lawyers. It was pointed out that firstly the tenants or pannaiyals being very poor are rarely in a position to engage an advocate and secondly that in practice almost all the advocates have either been engaged by the landlords or are reluctant to appear for the tenants. It was at first suggested by us that a Tribunal should be constituted as a Revenue Court with the Subdivisional Officer as the presiding Officer and a representative each of the kisans and landowners should be members of the Tribunal. When this suggestion was rejected by the Government, we suggested that the tenants and the pannaiyals should at least be given an opportunity to be represented by any agent, not necessarily an advocate, so that his case may not be prejudiced on account of his ignorance or his inability to put forward his case before the Conciliation Officer or Revenue Court properly and effectively. Even this moderate suggestion, which we feel is essential to protect the tenants and pannaiyals, has not been accepted.

In conclusion, we feel that this Bill, if passed without the amendments suggested above, will not appreciably better the conditions either of the tenants or the pannaiyals or better the conditions for the production of food. We request the members of the legislature to consider carefully and pass all the amendments suggested above so as to make the Bill comprehensive and effective for the protection of the tenants and pannaiyals which alone will be a real step in the right direction for a solution of the food problem facing this State.

V. G. RAO.

C. KANDASAMI.

PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU.

K. SURYANARAYANA.

A. RATHINAM.

T. VISWANATHAM.

MADRAS,

22nd November 1952.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 26th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—SWEARING-IN OF A NEW MEMBER.

Sri Vyricherla Chandra Chudamani Deo was sworn-in.

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Report of the Khosla Committee.

* 142 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the report of the Technical Committee of the Planning Commission on the Krishna and Godavari River Valley Schemes has been received by the Government; and

(b) if so, whether a copy of the same will be placed on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“(a) & (b) The Planning Commission have forwarded to this Government the tentative interim report of the Technical Committee received by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission inform us that they are arranging for further investigations and have banned publication of the interim communication. When a communication is received by this Government and made available for publication, it will certainly be placed on the table of the House.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know when this report was communicated to this Government and whether the Technical Committee which made the report called it tentative?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The Technical Committee did not send us any report. The Planning Commission sent it to us with a demi-official letter stating that this so-called report was being sent for further examination. It was marked confidential.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I know, while perusing the report which was sent along with the demi-official letter, whether the Government noted anywhere that the Technical Committee called it an interim report or a tentative report?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I might mention to the hon. Member that I have not yet seen the report. It was a letter from the Planning Commission which was dealt with by the Government. The matter itself was and

[26th November 1952]

is still being dealt with by the technical officers of this Government. It is going on and it will be a subject for further discussion there. Any questions about the title given to the paper must be addressed to the Planning Commission."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—"ఇప్పుడు గవర్నమెంటు వారికి వచ్చినట్లుంటే యీ రిపోర్టు interim technical committee report అని చెప్పవచ్చును. అసలు ఇది మొదటనే interim report గా వచ్చిందా, లేక మద్రాసు గవర్నమెంటు ఆ విధంగా చేయాలని Planning Commission వారిని కోరిన తరువాత అలా వచ్చిందా ?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is no good spinning it out. I have made the matter perfectly clear. The Planning Commission are still considering this communication that they received from the Technical Committee of theirs. They may give it out for opinion to all and sundry but it is not yet in the possession of this Government."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"ఈ కమిటీ రిపోర్టు వచ్చిందని రంగారెడ్డిగారు, రాలేదని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. అది వచ్చినట్లుంటే ఇక్కడ cabinet సభ్యులు దానిని పరిశీలించి తమ అభిప్రాయాలను Central Governmentకు పంపించారా ? రాకపోయినట్లయితే దానిని తెప్పించేందుకు కృషి చేసి మా అందరికీ కూడా దానికాపీలు సమర్పించేస్తారా ?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is still under technical examination by technical people. I want the hon. Member to take my word for it. I have not yet seen the report. I have not looked at even the first page of this paper."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I know whether the Hon. the Minister for Public Works, who is in charge of the subject, has seen the report, touched the report or at least read the title page of the report? I want to know whether he has physically seen the report."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—"I may tell the hon. Member that I have seen the report."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"May I know then, whether the Technical Committee called it a tentative or an interim report and that, therefore, it should not be published? May I also know the date on which this Government received the report?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Any questions with reference to the contents of the paper are covered by our previous answer made on behalf of the Government that the report is still declared to be a confidential paper by the Planning Commission who have sent it to us, and it is not right for us to give out in bits any particular parts of it for publication. It will lead more to misunderstanding than to understanding."

26th November 1952]

Report of the Khosla Committee.

* 143 Q.—**SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras State Government have received a copy of the report either provisional or final of the Technical Committee of the Planning Commission headed by Khosla; and

(b) if so, whether it or a summary of its contents will be placed on the table?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—"The question is the same as the previous one. I have already answered it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, I am not asking for parts of the reports to be given out. I am asking whether the report was declared by the Technical Committee to be a tentative or an interim one, whether the Hon. the Public Works Minister will be able to say whether he has seen the title page at least, if he has not studied the report, and whether he can give us also the date of receipt of the report. I have asked this question three times. I want to know when this Government received the report."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"All that is part of the same matter. It is a confidential paper, the date, signature, name, title, matter, paragraphs, marginal notes, all included."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"May I know whether this Government have given any opinion on that interim or tentative report?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"No, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"I am asking whether the Hon. 10-40 a.m.
the Minister for Public Works has seen the report in newspapers of the proceedings in Parliament where the Central Minister in charge of the subject stated that the report was forwarded to this Government in September. May I know whether the Hon. the Minister for Public Works will be able to say on what date the report was received here? It is not part of what the Chief Minister has already stated."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"With the permission of the Hon. the Minister for Public Works, I wish to say that we cannot go by newspaper reports of what answer was given and what exactly the hon. Member who put the question meant, when he spoke of the 'report.' What the Hon. the Minister for Public Works gave as answer just now may be remembered. He said, 'I have seen the report.' He meant the paper called so by the questioner. There is nothing more which we can draw from it, and I do not think that we can answer questions relating to newspaper reports."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"In view of the fact that this report concerns projects affecting the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in this State, will the Government consider it

[26th November 1952]

desirable to write to the Planning Commission to see that the public of this State are taken into confidence with regard to the report and to publish the report immediately for discussion?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Apart from the number of lives involved and the guardians thereof, I wish to inform the hon. Member that I have already enquired of the Planning Commission whether they would allow us to publish it and place it on the table of the House, but they replied that it should be still kept confidential. If hon. Members do not agree with that decision, they are entitled to move their comrades and friends in Parliament to ask the Planning Commission to take necessary action." (Cheers.)

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఒక రిపోర్టు వచ్చిందని ముందు చెప్పి, తరువాత అది రిపోర్టు కాదని చెప్పుతున్నారు. అంటే ఆ వచ్చినట్లువంటి కాగితాలను చదువకుండానే వాటిని వెనుకకు పంపించడం ఈ ప్రభుత్వము యొక్క పాలిసీయూ, లేక వచ్చిన కాగితాలను చదివి అంటే దానిమీద తమ ఆభిప్రాయాలను చెప్పకుండానే పంపించడం వారిపద్ధతియూ లేకపోలే వచ్చినదాన్ని దాచిపుంచి, ఏమి జరిగిందో ప్రజలకు తెలుపక ప్రజలలో కలతలు కలగించడమే వారి ఉద్దేశ్యమూ అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Nagi Reddi is conversant with democratic practice in general. But he does not seem to know what is necessary to be done in this particular case which involves technical examination. When any paper is received, which is called a technical paper or a paper on technical subjects calling for opinion, it must first be seen by the technical people here. There is no question of the insinuation that was made being at all correct, namely, that the policy of this Government is to return papers without studying them."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall allow only one more question."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I submit to you, Sir, that this is a very important matter? It is because it is important, I requested you yesterday to have it taken up at the beginning to-day so that we might have some time."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The matter is confidential. What is going on now is mere cross-examination and not questions put for eliciting information."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I make a submission to the Chair? I have strictly followed the Hon. the Chief Minister when he said that the report was confidential and that, therefore, he was unable to give information. I am not pursuing that point. I am only asking for the date on which this Government received the report. How can that be confidential?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Please do not shout. This is fast approaching the third degree method."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister, who has intervened now, whether he is aware that the

[26th November 1952]

Hon. the Minister for Public Works said on October 21—although he originally had denied the fact—that he did receive the report? I am not asking any particular question of a confidential nature. Did the Planning Commission tell this Government that the date on which this Government received the report also should be treated as confidential? I want to know the date; the public are anxious to know something about all this. There is no use of side-tracking the issue when the Central Government said that they had sent the report."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no question of side-tracking on our part. When a paper is marked confidential, all matters relating to it must be treated as confidential. I have already said, if hon. Members are very particular as to the date when it was received or it was posted, even that question should be referred to the Minister in charge at Delhi and not here."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In view of the fact that the Minister has said that the report was forwarded in September, what is the objection of this Government to giving the date of its actual receipt here? Is the date of receipt also confidential?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am bound by the direction given to me along with the posting of the paper. I am bound to do in courtesy as well as in administrative propriety what I have been asked by them to do. If the hon. Member has got an answer from the Minister in Delhi, he should be satisfied with that."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"ఈ ప్రశ్న వేసిన నాకు అవకాశము ఇవ్వలేదంటే."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have allowed enough time for this question. I cannot allow every hon. Member to put supplementary questions in a House where we have 375 Members."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point of order, Sir, నేను ప్రశ్న వేస్తే, నాకే అవకాశమివ్వకుండా ఉండడం అన్యాయమంటే."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No point of order now. Next question."

Minimum wages for agricultural labourers.

* 148 Q.—SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

- whether the Government are considering the question of fixing minimum wages to agricultural labourers; and
- if so, the present stage of the matter?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) Yes, Sir. (b) A special enquiry was conducted in the low wage areas of the State. The results of the enquiry are under examination. Orders will be issued after the examination is over."

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“How long will it take to examine these proposals?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“We have referred the matter to the Economic Adviser who has given his tentative report. It is being examined by the Board of Revenue, the Commissioner of Labour and the Director of Agriculture. It will be published as a notification for public criticism. I do not think it will take long. If the hon. Member will have some patience, it will not take more than six months.”

10-50 a.m.

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“నాట్లు వేసింది మొదలు మరల కోతలు కోస్తే వరకు కూలీలకు పనులు దొరకక unemployment సమస్య ఎక్కువ అవుతుంది. దీనికి తక్కువ కూలీ ఆధిక ధరలు తోడ్పడిస్తాయి. కనుక ఇప్పుడైనా ప్రభుత్వము కూలీలకు కనీస వేతనాల గురించి ఒక బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టుతుందా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“The Hon. Member may put a separate question.”

SRI M. VEERABHADRAM:—“గవర్నమెంట్ అగ్రికల్చరల్ ఫారములో పనిచేసేటటువంటి కూలీల విషయాన్ని కూడా పరిశీలనకు తీసుకుంటారా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“I think, Sir, that category of employees are also under consideration.”

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—“May I know whether they will take into consideration the Mayuram agreement and such other things included in the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill in fixing the agricultural minimum wages.”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Notice, Sir.”

SRI G. ANJANEYULU:—“ఈ కూలీల రేటును నిర్ణయించడానికి ఇంకా ఎంతకాలము అవుతుంది. ఇదివరలో దీనిని గురించి ఒక కమిటీ కూడా వేశారు. ఈ కమిటీ ఏమి రిపోర్టుయిచ్చింది? ఈ wages నిర్ణయము చేయడానికి ఎంతకాలమవుతుందో మంత్రిగారు నెలవివ్వగలరా?”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“Sir, I have just answered this question. The matter is being examined by the Board of Revenue, the Commissioner of Labour and the Director of Agriculture. After this is done, it will be published for eliciting public opinion. I said, all this may not take more than six months. It may be done even earlier. I will try my best to bring it out earlier.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ విషయములో Labour Commissioner మొదలైనటువంటి ఉద్యోగస్తులు విచారణచేసిన తరువాత రిపోర్టు ప్రజలకు అందజేస్తామని చెప్పి, తరువాత ప్రజలకు అందజేసేందుకు ఎక్కువకాలము అవుతుందని చెప్పేదానికంటే ఈ Labour Commissioner మొదలైనటువంటి ఉద్యోగస్తులు పరిశీలనచేయకుండానే దానిని వెంటనే ప్రజలకు అందజేసేట్లు చే ప్రజాధిపత్యాలను తెలుసుకొనడానికి ఏలుతుందికదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“I might tell my hon. Friend that the Planning Commission has given me time till December 1953 to produce the report. I shall try to bring it out much earlier than the scheduled time.”

(Sri P. Syamasundara Rao stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“The House should realize my difficulties I have already received a large number of answers. More answers are pouring in from the Departments. I am placing about 24 questions each day before the House. Therefore it is not possible to allow all hon. Members to put supplementaries.”

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO:—“ప్రశ్న వేసినది నేను. శ్యామసుందర రావును నేనేకాని నాకింతవరకు ఉపప్రశ్న వేసేందుకు chance ఇవ్వలేదు.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“The hon. Member says that he put the main question and that he was not allowed to put supplementaries.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“If he is sitting quiet, how is it possible for me to call him? He must get up in his seat.”

Memorandum submitted to the Hon. the Prime Minister of India.

* 155 Q.—SRI A. RAMASAMY THEVAR (on behalf of Sri K. T. Kosalram): Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government presented any memorandum to the Hon. the Prime Minister of India;

(b) if so, whether the Government will place a copy of it on the table of the House;

(c) whether the memorandum was pressed by the representatives of this Government in the recent Finance Ministers' Conference at New Delhi; and

(d) if so, what is the outcome?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) Yes, Sir.

“(b) The subject is still under correspondence with the Government of India. The Government do not consider it proper to publish such correspondence.

“(c) & (d) The question as far as it was relevant and in the form in which it could with propriety be brought to notice at the Conference was so brought to notice.

“The Government of India accepted the principle of taking into consideration the question of providing in the National Plan for unforeseen expenditure on natural calamities and other similar contingencies arising in any part of India.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ఏదైనా మొమరాండం ప్రభుత్వము ఇచ్చారా అని ఇందులో ప్రశ్న వేశారు. ప్రభుత్వము ఎన్నో మొమరాండములు ఇచ్చివుం

[26th November 1952]

అందు, కనుక యీ ప్రశ్న ఏ మొరొందమునకు సంబంధించినదో మరియు మంత్రిగారికి విన్నవించి జవాబు ఏ మొరొందమునకు సంబంధించినదో వంటిదో నెలవిస్తారా?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Prime Minister was here only once and I gave him only one memorandum at the time and that is why I have said 'Yes' in answer to the question."

Location of a Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur.

* 156 Q.—SRI B. KRISHNAMURTHY RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state why the Government have not thought it fit to locate a Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"It was considered that the volume of work arising in and around Punganur did not justify the stationing of a full-time Sub-Magistrate at that place. Prior to the introduction of the scheme of separation in Chittoor district, the Deputy Tahsildar of Punganur was exercising magisterial functions which was terminated when separation was ordered. The jurisdiction over Punganur taluk has been conveniently divided between the Stationary Sub-Magistrates at Madanapalle and Piler each of them exercising jurisdiction over the adjoining area of Punganur taluk."

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"May I ask, Sir, whether the Government have noted the fact that Piler where the present Magistrate's Court is situated is nearly 70 miles from Punganur and that people find it difficult to cover such long distances?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Sir, the Government considered the question in 1950. The Committee was also asked to examine it. It was found that the present arrangement was the most suitable to the litigant public."

SRI V. CHIDANANDAM:—"Is it not necessary, Sir, irrespective of the distance and the number of cases tried, that a Sub-Magistrate's Court should be there for each taluk?"

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"It will be only waste of time if such a rule were to be adopted."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"May I bring it to the notice of the Government, as my hon. Friend just now said, that some people have to travel for three days to go to the Piler Sub-Magistrate's Court? The Hon. Minister just now said that the Committee recommended that the present arrangement was adequate. Whatever the recommendations of the Committee may be, I request the Government to open a court at Punganur and thus remove the difficulty experienced by the people?"

26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"Sir, so far as the Government are concerned, they have another difficulty. It is the High Court which has to locate the Sub-Magistrates' Courts, and they have held that the present court is more suitable to the litigant public."

Thefts in the Legislators' Hostel.

* 157 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) how many thefts committed in the Legislators' Hostel were reported at the D-2 Police Station (Wallajah Road) within the last one year;

(b) what is the amount of property involved; and

(c) what action has so far been taken?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a), (b) & (c) Six cases of thefts were reported at D-1 Triplicane Police station within the last one year.

"The total amount of property involved is Rs. 538.

"All these cases were duly investigated but had to be finally treated as undetected.

"The menial staff has been strengthened and a constable in mufti has been posted to patrol in the early hours of the morning, as precautionary measures."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, in cases of such thefts may I know whether it is the duty of the hostel authorities or the duty of the Members who live in the hostel to report the thefts to the police authorities?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It is not the duty of anybody, Sir. But it is in the interest of the person who lost the property to complain." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Chief Minister is aware that part of it is due to the fact that the hostel is not provided with proper compound walls and some of the openings are not provided with doors?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, these thefts in my opinion are internal thefts." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I ask the Hon. Chief Minister to tell us what he means by 'internal thefts'?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What I mean, Sir, is that people do not scale over the walls and steal, but people who have an opportunity and who are already inside manage to steal something which they very much need." (Laughter.)

[26th November 1952]

SRI A. RAMASAMY THEVAR:—"Being one of the victims of such thefts, and as such thefts are going on even today, may I request the Government to take extra precautions to prevent such thefts occurring in future?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, firstly, it is better not to have any valuable property in these temporary lodgings. Secondly, if we have any, we must keep an eye over them. Thirdly, when we leave the room we must carry them with us." (Laughter.)

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—"నానుముల్కూడా అవహరించడం జరిగింది. హాస్టల్ లో నియమించబడినటువంటి చిన్న నాకర్లు ఇటువంటి పనులు చేయకుండా ప్రధానమంత్రి విమిచర్య తీసుకొంటారు?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"మీరిది ముఖ్యమైన విషయమని అవకాశం దీనికి నోటిసు ఇవ్వాలి."

Memorial from the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore.

11 a.m. * 158 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received a memorial from 216 members of the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore, requesting restoration of the cut in the rates of the dearness allowance and for other reliefs; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) & (b) Yes. The requests were—

(i) To rescind the order of cut in the rates of dearness allowance to pensioners and to enhance the rates, so as to bring them to the level of those granted to the non-gazetted servants in active service.

(ii) To extend similar relief to retired non-gazetted servants drawing a pension of above Rs. 110.

(iii) To extend the educational concessions granted to the dependants of military men and to the children of pensioners also.

"The existing rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of this Government drawing pensions not exceeding Rs. 100 per mensem follow those adopted by the Government of India and all other State Governments. The rates were enhanced in 1947 without reference to the rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of the Central Government or other Provincial Governments and considerable additional expenditure was involved in the enhancement. These rates were reduced to the old level with effect from the 1st January 1948, $\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 years ago.

[26th November 1952]

"Neither the Government of India nor any of the State Governments have sanctioned temporary increase to pensions exceeding Rs. 100 per mensem. It was considered by the Government that there was no justification to sanction to pensioners dearness allowance at the same rates as those adopted in the case of Government servants.

"The educational concessions referred to in the petition were intended only for the benefit of children and dependants of Defence Services personnel and could not be extended to others. Those concessions which were previously granted to dependants of military men at the expense of the Provincial Government have since been withdrawn. The Post-war Services Reconstruction Fund Committee is now meeting the entire expenditure involved in the grant of these concessions."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In view of the rise in the cost of living since 1948 and also in view of the fact that these petitions have been pending since 1948, will the Government at least consider the restoration?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"The increase is not only for the pensioners but for the entire community. So we cannot consider the increase in dearness allowance to pensioners alone."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"But the pensioners have got to live, Sir. In view of the difficulty to which the pensioners are put due to the cut effected in the rate of their dearness allowance, will the Government specifically reconsider their case?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"The existing rates of dearness allowance granted to pensioners of this Government follow those adopted by the Government of India and all other State Governments. The rates of dearness allowance were enhanced in 1947 without reference to the rates of the Centre and other State Governments. The rates were reduced to the old level with effect from 1st January 1948, i.e., about five years ago, when I think, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member of the party in charge of the Government."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"In view of the fact that a cut in the pensioners' dearness allowance is considered a 'dattapaharam' (taking back a gift) and a sin according to moral principle, and in view of the fact that there are pensioners who are getting pensions in one digit, will the Government at least reconsider the restoration of the cut?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I am really pleased to hear the hon. Member talking on moral principles; but that is only a matter of opinion. Here we are concerned with rules and regulations. As such we cannot consider the hon. Member's request."

[26th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In view of the fact that the dearness allowance of Government servants has been increased since 1948, will the Government restore the cut effected in the dearness allowance of pensioners?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"In view of our acute financial position, we are not in a position to increase the dearness allowance of pensioners."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU —“పండ్ల రూపాయలకు పెన పెట్టిన పీనుగ నేనా? ఈ cut ను restore చేయడం జరిగినదా? ఈ cut ను restore చేసిన తరువాత Central Government పెన్షన్ల కిచ్చే dearness allowances rate కు Madras Government ఇచ్చే dearness allowance rate కు ఏమైనా వ్యత్యాసమున్నదా?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I want notice, Sir."

Memorial from the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore.

* 159 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government received a memorial, dated the 26th October 1952, signed by the President of the Pensioners' Association, Cannanore, requesting the restoration of the cut in the dearness allowance imposed in G.O. No. 45, Finance (Pension), dated the 22nd January 1947, and if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Yes. The Government considered it unnecessary to restore the cut made in 1948, as no other State Government or the Central Government were paying dearness allowance to pensioners at the higher rates sanctioned by this Government in 1947. The restoration of the higher rates would involve considerable extra expenditure of a recurring nature, and the Government see no justification for it, under the present financial conditions."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The Hon. Minister for Finance has just now stated that in view of the acute financial position of the Government they are not in a position to restore the cut in the dearness allowance of pensioners. May we have an assurance from the Hon. Minister that no further cut (if not restoration) will be imposed on their pension?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I cannot give any assurance. Everything will be decided according to the money available with the Government."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Is there any irreducible minimum which should be given to pensioners whatever salary they might have been drawing while on active service?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"A separate question may be put."

[26th November 1952]

Transaction of Government business in regional languages.

* 160 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASAMI: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government introduced as an experimental measure the transaction of Government business in Tamil in the Government offices in Tiruchirappalli district; and

(b) whether the Government consider that the results of the experiment warrant its extension to other Tamil districts also?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a) Yes.

" (b) The question of extending the scheme to other districts was considered and it was decided that it might be deferred for the present."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI:—"May I know from the Hon. Chief Minister the reason for deferring this question for the present?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"This is a process of gradual change and deferring it is in consonance with the policy of gradual change."

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAKAR:—"அரசாங்க நடவடிக்கைகள் தமிழில் இருப்பதால் கஜாநூ என்பதற்கு கருவுலகம் என்றும், மோட்டார் கார் என்பதற்கு உந்து என்றும் பொது மக்களுக்குப் புரியாதபடி தமிழ்ச் சொற்களை அமைப்பதை மாற்றி பொது மக்களுக்குப் புரியக்கூடிய வகையில் தமிழ் வார்த்தைகளை அமைப்பார்களாவென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"பாஷை நிதானமாகத் தான் மாறும். இடையில் பல்வேறு விதமாக மாறும். கடைசியில் முடிவாக சரியாக மாறும்."

SRI Y. MANJAYA SHETTY:—"May I know why this experiment has not been extended to the Kannada and Malayalam districts when it has been tried in Tamil and Telugu districts? Why is this sort of discrimination made?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"In every gradual process there is prudential discrimination. This discrimination has something to do with wisdom and should not be understood in the sense of partiality."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In view of the experiment being termed as gradual, will the Hon. the Chief Minister introduce it in one taluk each of Malabar and South Kanara?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"We will watch the result in the Telugu area, Sir."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is working very well in Telugu districts."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—"Have the Government received any representation regarding the difficulty in the implementation of this scheme at least from Tiruchirappalli?"

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I think the hon. Member is suggesting that I have received one and if so asking whether I would agree to such representation. Let me say to the hon. Member that I have not till now seen such a representation, but I feel that many difficulties must have been experienced."

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO:—"తమిళ జిల్లాలలోనే తెలుగు జిల్లాలలోకూడా ప్రాంతీయ భాష ద్వారా ప్రభుత్వ వ్యవహారాలు జరుపుకున్నారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The hon. Member is not aware that the experiment is being carried on in Telugu districts also."

SRI T. ANANTA PAI:—"Are the Government crediting the people of the Kannada districts with wisdom, because this experiment is not sought to be extended to South Kanara?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no question of wisdom being appraised districtwar, Sir. The question is experimenting wisely, which is examined by Government."

11-10 a.m. SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"Sir, how, in the opinion of the Government, is this experiment working? Is it working successfully or not?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"We have not yet come to any conclusion, Sir."

SRI V. V. RAMASAMI:—"Will the Hon. the Chief Minister give us an assurance that even though some difficulties are experienced in this experiment, the principle of conducting the administration in the regional language will not be given up?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Even at the cost of a little time, I might make my position clear. There are many reforms to be made in the world. Language has to be reformed. Administration has also to be reformed and has to be maintained also. When we try to reform one thing we should not become fanatical about that particular thing. We should keep other things also in our mind. For instance, if for the sake of language we try to do something in courts, we may do injustice to the parties concerned. Therefore we have to keep all things together in our mind and not imagine that language reform is our only goal."

Paper used in Government offices.

* 161 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether Indian or foreign paper is used for Government stationery purposes;

(b) whether the letter paper, envelopes, etc., supplied to the Members of the Legislature are of Indian or foreign make; and

[26th November 1952]

(c) in case foreign paper is supplied in part, what is its proportion to the total supply for the above two items?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) For writing and printing purposes, only Indian paper is used. But for special purposes such as drawing, tracing and making ledgers, foreign paper is used, as suitable Indian-made paper is not available.

" (b) The letter papers and envelopes supplied to the Members of the Legislature are of Indian make only.

" (c) Does not arise."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—"శాసన సభ్యులకు ఇచ్చుచున్న కాగితముల వెల చాలా అధికంగా ఉన్నది. ఈ stationery కి పెంచు ధర నిర్ణయించడం ద్వారా లాభం పొందవలసిన ప్రభుత్వంవారి ఉద్దేశమా?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Some stationery is supplied free to the Members of the Legislature and some is for sale. I cannot agree that the cost is extraordinary."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Hon. Minister is aware that that part of the stationery which is freely supplied to the Members is very poor in quality compared with the quality of paper which we are asked to purchase, and whether this kind of gift is quite in keeping with the dignity of the Government?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"It is a matter which affects the dignity of the whole House as well as the Government. There is no motive in supplying poor quality paper especially to the Legislators."

Fees in the Registration offices in Guntur district.

* 162 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received complaints that in several Registration offices in the Guntur district, persons presenting documents for registration are asked to pay double the amount of registration fee on pain of being refused registration of document; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will make an enquiry?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—" (a) No. Government have received complaints of corruption against certain Sub-Registrars in that district, but on enquiry the charges were found not proved.

" (b) Does not arise."

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—"గుంటూరు జిల్లాలోని, పల్నాడు, గురజాల, మాన్గల్ల మొదలైన పట్టణాలలో ఉన్న Sub-Registrar కచ్చేరీలలో, రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ ఫీజు ఎంతో అంత లంచంకూడా తీసుకుంటున్నారనే విషయం అందరకు తెలిసినట్టిదే. ఈ విషయమై అనేక complaints వచ్చినట్లు కొన్ని కొట్లాటలుకూడా జరిగినట్లు ప్రభుత్వం వారికి తెలుసా?"

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“ As I have already said, no complaint such as is referred to in the original question has been received either by the Government or by the Inspector-General of Registration. The Inspector-General has however reported that complaints alleging corruption on the part of Sub-Registrars of Ongole and other places were received by him and that the enquiry conducted did not bring home the guilt of corruption.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ ఈ విషయంలో గుంటూరు జిల్లానుంచి complaints వచ్చినట్లయితే మంత్రిగారు విచారిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—“ Certainly.”

Auctioning of forest blocks in Pudukkottai division.

* 163 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the agriculturists of Pudukkottai division of the Tiruchirappalli district have petitioned the Government for the revival of the auctioning of forest blocks in their division for green manure purposes; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ (a) No, Sir.

“ (b) Does not arise.”

Allowances paid to the temporary staff employed during the Assembly meetings, dated June-July 1952.

* 164 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state how much extra money and the rate at which such an amount was paid to the staff including the temporarily appointed peons for working more hours during the last Assembly sitting, i.e., Budget Session?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ The total amount paid to the staff, including temporary staff (clerks and peons) employed for the meeting days during the last Budget Session of the Assembly was Rs. 439. The rate of payment was Re. 1-8-0 per day per Superintendent or Reporter, Re. 1 per day per clerk and Re. 0-8-0 per day per peon.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ శాసనసభ కార్యాలయ ఉద్యోగులకు వారి వారి హోదాలను బట్టి, రూ 1-8-0, 1-0-0, 0-8-0 లు చొప్పున ఇచ్చిన మొత్తం చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది కనుక దానిని పెంచి ఈ సమావేశ సందర్భంలో కూడా వారు హెచ్చుకాలం పనిచేస్తున్నారు కనుక, అదనపు బత్తెం ఇవ్వడంపై చర్యలు తీసుకుంటారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I want notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Are the Government aware that the overtime allowance and wages of Rs. 1-8-0, Re. 1 and Re. 0-8-0

[26th November 1952]

paid to the Superintendent and other personnel during the last Budget Session is negligible when compared to the amount of labour that is involved in this work?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ As far as I know, they are more than satisfied; I don't think that Members should instigate them to be dis-satisfied and discontented.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Apart from the insinuation of the Hon. Finance Minister that Members are instigating, them, may I know whether the Government are paying them any extra allowance during this session as we are working for one hour more every day?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Last time it was not merely one hour; the sittings continued till 7-30 or 8-00 in the night. But this time for the extra one hour we are working, we are giving a day off on Saturdays.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ నేను నెమ్మదిగా తెలిసేటట్లు వివరంగా చెబుతాను; మంత్రిగారు అర్థంచేసుకొనవచ్చు.

“ గత ఆసెంబ్లీ సమావేశ కాలంలో సిబ్బంది గోజూ రెండు, మూడు గంటలు అదనంగా పనిచేసినందుకు వారికి ఏ కొద్దిపాటినా allowance ఇచ్చారున్నాడు. ఈ సమావేశ సందర్భంలో కూడా వారు హెచ్చుకాలం పనిచేయవలసి వస్తున్నది కనుక బత్తెం ఇవ్వడంపై చర్యలు తీసుకుంటారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice, Sir.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Before the conclusion of the last Budget Session, the Hon. Chief Minister made a specific promise that payment of cash bonus would be made to all the staff that was employed in the Legislative Assembly. Has anything been done by way of fulfilment of that promise?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I will look into that. I want notice, Sir.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Is it a fact that the extra allowance and wages that were paid during the last Budget Session are not now being paid and that the staff are even now working outside their legitimate working hours till 9-00 in the night?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ If it is brought to the notice of the Government and if it is necessary, certainly extra allowance will be paid.”

Lanka lands leased out to the Field Labour Co-operative Societies, Krishna district.

* 165 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any report that in certain blocks of the lanka lands leased out to the Field Labour Co-operative Societies of Ibrahimpatnam, Jupudi and Kotanakonda, Krishna district, crops were not possible to be raised for the fasli 1361; and

[26th November 1952]

(b) if so, whether the Government have taken any steps to grant them remission of the rentals?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“(a) Yes.

“(b) The matter is under examination by the Collector of Krishna and the Board of Revenue. The Board of Revenue is competent to sanction remission of rentals up to a maximum of Rs. 2,500 in each case.”

SRI V. RAMA RAO :—“గత సంవత్సరం రెవిన్యూ అధికారులు ఈ భూములను తనిఖీచేసి పెరుగు పాడై పోయినట్లు స్థానిక రైల్వే తెల్పారు. తాత్కాలికంగా పన్నులు వసూలుచేయడం నిషేధించేశారు. జమాబందీ సందర్భములూ కూడా పన్నులు వసూలుచేయవలసినట్లు రైతులకు తెలియజేయలేదు. కాని September నెలలో పన్నులు వసూలుచేశారు. ఇది అన్యాయం కాబట్టి వసూలుచేసిన మొత్తాలను రైతులకు తిరిగి వాపసుచేయస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“It looks as though some remissions might be granted, Sir.”

11-20 a.m. SRI A. VENKATARAMA RAJU :—“ఆర్థిక శాఖకు ఈ లంక భూముల విషయంలో తూర్పు గోదావరి జిల్లాలో గత 30 ఏళ్లుగా సాగుచేస్తున్న రైతులను కూడా తొలగించి పెద్దన్నారనే విషయం మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసునా? అయితే యేమి చర్య తీసుకున్నారు?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“We are dealing with Krishna district, not East Godavari.”

SRI P. SYAMASUNDARA RAO :—“అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో పంటలు పండినప్పటికీ ధనవంతులైన భూస్వాములకు రెమిటెన్సు ఇవ్వడం, పంటలుపోయినప్పటికీ పేద రైతులైన పూర్తి పన్ను విధించడం జరుగుచున్నారనే విషయం మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“All that will be looked into by the proper authorities.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA :—“కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో లంక భూములు ఎంతకల వల్ల, ఇసుక మీటి చేయబడవల్ల పాడగుచున్నవనే విషయం, అనేక భూములలో అదా శంటకూడా పండనప్పటికీ రెమిటెన్సు ఇవ్వడంలేదనే విషయం మంత్రిగారు ఎరుగుదురా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“I have already said that remissions might be granted.”

Roads laid under the Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema.

* 166 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the roads laid under the Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema are going to be maintained by the District Boards or by the Highways Department?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“The roads will be maintained by the District Boards or panchayats concerned in whose jurisdiction they are laid.”

26th November 1952]

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“May I know, Sir, what steps the Government are going to take to repair the roads which have gone to ruins in the Cuddapah district?”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The Hon. Minister has said that the roads have been handed over to the district boards and the panchayat boards.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“మంత్రిగారు మా ప్రాంతంనుంచి వచ్చినవారే కనుక ఈ ఫార్మ్ రోడ్లుగలగలది వారికే వాగుగా తెలిసేవుంటుంది. ఇవి ఎల్లప్పుడూ ఫ్యామిల్ రోడ్లుగానే ఉంటున్నాయి. వాటికి నివేదించేయించే విషయమై ప్రభుత్వం ఏమైనా శ్రద్ధ తీసుకుంటున్నారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“Wherever repairs are necessary, the district boards will attend to them.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“నా ప్రశ్నకు సరియైన సమాధానం లేదు. ఈ రోడ్లు పుట్టినప్పటినుంచి పాడైపోయేవరకు ఫ్యామిల్ రోడ్లుగానే ఉంటున్నాయి. ఈ రోడ్లమీద బండ్లు బోల్తాకొట్టిన రోజుండవని మంత్రిగారికి తెలుసు. కాబట్టి వాటిని పేరుచేసి సరియైన స్థితిలో ఉంచే విషయం మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచిస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“I have already answered that repairs will be attended to by the district boards or the panchayat boards concerned.”

Appointment of librarians under the District Libraries Committees.

* 167 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are a set of directions to the District Library Committees to have librarians who are trained and if so, how many Committees have such trained librarians under their employ; and

(b) the service conditions of the librarians under the District Libraries Committee?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“(a) Under rule 42 (1) (c) of the Madras Public Libraries Rules, 1950, the Chairmen of the Local Library Authorities should, on application, obtain suitable candidates from the Secretary of the State Library Committee for employment in the libraries under their jurisdiction. Seven Authorities have been provided with graduate librarians trained in Diploma Course in Library Science.

“(b) The question of prescribing suitable qualifications, grades and scales of pay for librarians employed under Local Library Authorities is under consideration.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“నా రెండవ ప్రశ్నకు జవాబు ఇవ్వలేదు.”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—“I have stated that it is under consideration. The State Library Committee which met in March last formed a sub-committee consisting of Sri R. Janardhanam Nayudu, Sri K. N. Sivararaman and

[26th November 1952]

the Deputy Director of Public Instruction in charge of libraries, to go into the question of the qualifications, the revision of the scales of pay and other conditions of service for librarians. The sub-committee's report will be placed before the State Library Committee which is to meet this month; and afterwards, it will come before the Government."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Is the Hon. Education Minister aware of the fact that in most districts, district library committees have not started district libraries, and in Madras also the Madras District Library Committee has not started a Central Library?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Out of the 26 Local Library Authorities, twenty authorities have already opened district main libraries. I need not read the list now. Of the remaining six local authorities, the districts of Kurnool, Ramanathapuram, the Nilgiris and Madras City have not been able to establish the main libraries for want of suitable accommodation. The Visakhapatnam local authority has secured a building, but it has not yet opened the main library there. The Salem district local authority's report in regard to the opening of its main library is still awaited. The Accommodation Officer, Madras, has been instructed to secure a suitable building for the Madras Local Library Authority by giving it a high priority. In the meanwhile, the authority is also negotiating for the purchase of a private building in Egmore for the purpose."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"జిల్లా లైబ్రరీ కమిటీలు నియమించే లైబ్రరీయనులకు ఎట్టి అర్హతలుండవలెనో నిర్ణయిస్తూ ఈ మధ్య విధాన శాఖాధికారులు ఉత్తరువులు జారీ చేశారు. ఇదివరకూ లైబ్రరీయనులుగా పనిచేస్తున్న వారూ కొందరు ఇట్టి అర్హతలు లేకపోయినప్పటికీ ఎంతోకాలంగా సమర్థతతో లైబ్రరీలను నిర్వహిస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి వారి సర్వీసును అనుభవాన్ని కూడా దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని లైబ్రరీయనులను నియమిస్తారా? అనుభవం తోచినట్లయితే వారికోసం పాఠశాలలను పెట్టి training ఇవ్వస్తారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"I have stated that the question of revision of the scales of pay and the conditions of service is under consideration by a sub-committee to which I have already made reference. We are awaiting its report. It will go before the State Library Committee. At present, the librarians engaged, receive Rs. 75-5-145."

* 168 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN:**—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will put the question to-morrow."

MR. SPEAKER:—"All right."

Bus fares in the Kozhikode and Kakkodi route.

* 169 Q.—**SRI A. APPU:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether any action has been taken on the memorandum submitted to him by the members

[26th November 1952]

of the public of Kakkodi amsom of Kozhikode taluk at Kozhikode on 24th August 1952 regarding the revision of the existing passenger fares between Kozhikode and Kakkodi collected by the operators running buses on that route?"

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—"The route Kozhikode to Kakkodi is a mufassal route and under the existing orders the operators are entitled to charge a minimum fare of five annas. The route could not be declared as a City route as more than half the length of the route is beyond municipal limits. The Regional Transport Authority, Malabar at its meeting held on 22nd September 1952 has approved the proposal for the introduction of a town service between Kozhikode and Karaparamba with two buses and is taking further action in the matter. When this new town service is introduced with two buses, it is likely that the operators on the route Kozhikode to Kakkodi will reduce their fares."

* 170 Q.—**SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:**—"Sir, may this question be taken up to-morrow?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"No objection."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"After all, Sir, there may be more important questions to-morrow. I think it is always safe to answer the questions then and there."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is only one more minute left for questions and probably the hon. Member wants to put supplementary questions. It may therefore be taken up to-morrow."

Tour programmes of Hon. Ministers.

* 171 Q.—**SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:** Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) what the object of Ministers' tours is;

(b) popular organizations to which Ministers' tour programmes are sent; and

(c) whether such tour programmes are fixed in consultation with the local officials and M.L.As?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" (a) Generally to keep in touch with affairs in addition to fulfilling any particular local requests of sufficient importance.

" (b) Such organizations as each Minister in his personal capacity considers it desirable in the interests of cordial relationship and good administration.

" (c) Yes. As far as possible."

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—"మంత్రుల పర్యటనలు కొన్ని ప్రముఖ విషయాలకు సంబంధించినవిగానే ఉంటాయని, ప్రజా సంస్థలకు వారి శర్యటనల విషయం తెలియజేయబడుతుందని, ప్రధానామత్తులు చెప్పారు. కాని అనేక సందర్భాలలో స్థానిక శాసనసభ్యులకు తెలియకుండానే పర్యటనలు జరుపబడుతున్నాయి. ఏ

[26th November 1952]

విషయము ప్రాముఖ్యమైనవి, వివిధ ప్రాముఖ్యమైనవి అనే విషయమే స్థానిక సభ్యుల కోరికలు. ఇంకా ప్రతినిధులను, స్థానిక అధికారులను, శాసన సభ్యులను సంబంధించు డా విచారణ ప్రమాణాల సమీక్ష కూడా.

MR. SPEAKER:—"It looks like a long speech."

11-30 a.m.

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—"నేను ప్రశ్న వేస్తున్నాను. కొంచెం ఓపికగా చింతించిపట్టయితే ఆ విషయం తమకు జాబుపడుతుంది."

"మంత్రులు అనేక గ్రామాలకు వివిధ రీతిగా వెళ్లి అవసరంగా ప్రభుత్వ ధనాన్ని పర్యటనల నిమిత్తం వెచ్చిస్తున్నారు. ఆ గ్రామాలకు వారు వెళ్లవలసిన అగత్యంకూడా కరువీ ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి వివిధ ప్రాంతాలకు మంత్రులు రావలసి ఉంది. అనేక విషయమే స్థానిక R.D.O. లను, శాసన సభ్యులను మంత్రులు ఇక ముందే పంపిస్తారా అని కోరుతున్నాను. మంత్రుల tour programme అవసరమైన సందర్భాలకు పురుషున్నారన్నారు. ఆ సందర్భం కేల్లకూడా చెప్పండి."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It seems to be a very long compound sentence."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"In the guise of speaking in their mother-tongue interpellators are making long speeches."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The difficulty is that I do not know that language."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I know something of that language and the genius of that language is like that, Sir. When they are putting a question, it looks like a speech."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The genius of the language closely follows the genius of the people."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Question time over. Answers for the rest of the questions will be printed in the proceedings."

Industrial dispute in the Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat.

* 172 Q.—SRI R. KRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any memorandum regarding the Industrial dispute at the Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat, Malabar; and

(b) if so, what the action taken by the Government is?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—" (a) Two petitions, dated 16th September 1952 and 2nd October 1952 regarding the dismissal of workers were received."

" (b) The petitions were forwarded to Commissioner of Labour for necessary action. The Commissioner has since reported that as the parties had come to an agreement on 1st October 1952, no action was taken by him in the matter."

[26th November 1952]

Rural Medical Training Centres.

* 173 Q.—SRI G. SATYANARAYANA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the number of Rural Medical Training Centres run by the Government in the State?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"There are no rural medical training centres run by Government."

Gruel centres in South Arcot district.

* 174 Q.—SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any proposals to declare the South Arcot district a famine area under the Famine Code; and

(b) how many gruel centres have been opened in the said district?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) There is no proposal at present to declare the South Arcot district as a Famine area under the Famine Code."

" (b) Nine gruel centres are functioning in the district."

Opening of a Munsif's Court at Payyanor.

* 175 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state whether the Government have sent any recommendation to the High Court to open a Munsif's Court at Payyanor?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR:—"The answer is in the negative."

Dearness allowance to the employees of the former Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department.

* 176 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments be pleased to state—

(a) whether all the employees of the former Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department have been given an increased rate of dearness allowance;

(b) if so, from what date and at what rate;

(c) whether it is a fact that the grant has not been universal or uniform; and

(d) if so, why and the basis on which the grant was made?

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—" (a) No. The Government are examining the question."

" (b) to (d) Does not arise."

[26th November 1952]

Applications for assignment of lands.

* 177 Q.—SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI: Will be Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why 1st July 1952 has been fixed as the last date for receipt of applications for assignment of lands (pattas) from the landless poor, in G.O. No. 2600, Revenue, dated 4th October 1951; and

(b) whether it is a fact that as nearly as 2,000 applications for assignment of land are time-barred in Cuddapah district alone?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) In order to complete the work of granting land to ex-service-men and landless poor persons as early as possible, the Government fixed the last day for the receipt of applications as 1st July 1952, which is the first day of the fasli year next to that in which the orders were issued. Under the revised priority scheme, there is, however, no time limit for the receipt of applications from landless poor persons.
“(b) The Government have no information.”

Subsistence allowance to Burma evacuees.

* 178 Q.—SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDER: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that State officials in Malabar are compelling dependants in India of Indian Nationals in Burma to repay what the Government of India had given them as subsistence allowance when war broke out in South-East Asia and during the war;

(b) if so, why the present demand is being made; and

(c) the conditions under which the original allowance was given?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—“(a), (b) & (c) During the last war, the Government of India started a scheme of financial assistance to help the evacuees from Burma, Malaya, etc., and the dependants in India of Indians stranded overseas, in order to enable them to get themselves absorbed in the economic life of this country. The assistance given under the scheme was in the shape of repayable loans against written undertakings to repay. Presumably the hon. Member refers to this repayable advance in his question. No subsistence allowance was granted to the evacuees. As the advances are repayable, recovery is now being effected in all districts from all those who took repayable advances in accordance with the instructions of the Government of India. To obviate hardship, the financial position of each grantee is fully considered before any are remote. the amounts are written off.”

* 179 Q.—Postponed for answer on 27th November 1952.

26th November 1952]

Purchase of stores in England.

* 180 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state in the matter of purchase of stores in England—

(a) the reasons as to why, when stores of the value only of Rs. 23.64 lakhs and Rs. 29.07 lakhs were purchased in 1950-51 and 1951-52, respectively, provision is made for a total purchase in England in 1952-53 for Rs. 162.14 lakhs;

(b) whether orders for stores budgeted for purchase were available only in England and not from any Indian manufacturer in India; and

(c) whether in the case of stores that have inevitably to be purchased from England or other foreign countries quotations from other countries for similar stores of equally good or superior quality are obtained?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) The large provision made for the purchase of stores from abroad in 1952 to 1953 as compared with the previous years is mainly due to the large demands made by the Electricity Department (Rs. 118 lakhs) for the purchase of plant and machinery such as synchronous condensers, power transformers, towers, Penstock pipes, hydraulic machinery, generating plant and switch gear for the new Electricity projects, namely Machkund Scheme, Madras Thermal Scheme, Pykara Extensions and Tungabhadra Hydro Electric Scheme and other Schemes which are nearing completion.

“(b) It has been laid down in the Madras Financial Code that preference for making purchases should be given in the following order:—

Firstly, to articles which are produced in India in the form of raw materials, or are manufactured in India from raw materials produced in India;

Secondly, to articles wholly or partially manufactured in India from imported materials;

Thirdly, to articles of foreign manufacture held in stock in India; and

Fourthly, to articles manufactured abroad which need to be specially imported.

The Purchasing Officers of the Government invariably follow this procedure. The items of purchases abroad including those made by the Electricity Department were not available in India or from Indian manufacturers.

“(c) The provision made in the budget under the head ‘Charges in England’ covers purchases to be made in other foreign countries also. The payments to be made in such

[26th November 1952]

countries as Switzerland, Belgium, Italy and Poland are made through the High Commissioner for India in London and hence that expenditure is shown as 'Charges in England'. In every case, the order is placed for the best offer on the open tender system taking into account technical superiority of the equipment concerned as well as its cost, irrespective of the country of manufacture."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Representation regarding Backward Classes.

55 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the population of each community included in the list of Backward communities in the Madras State;

(b) whether any representations were received by the Government requesting for the constitution of a separate Statutory Welfare Board for Backward communities and also stating that funds hitherto allocated by the Government for their welfare are inadequate; and

(c) if so, the action taken so far?

A.—(a) In the recent census, there was no enumeration in the order of communities and therefore information regarding the total population of each community included in the list of Backward Classes is not available.

(b) No representation was received for the constitution of a separate Statutory Welfare Board for Backward Classes. However, representations were received from the Backward Classes League, Madras, that the Backward Classes Advisory Board should be invested with powers to administer the funds made available for the uplift of Backward Classes and that the allotment should be increased.

(c) As there is an advisory committee already under existence to advise Government in the matter of advancing the interests of the Backward Classes, the Government consider it unnecessary to constitute any other body with powers to distribute grants, etc.

An additional grant of Rs. 75,000 has since been sanctioned by the Government.

Starvation deaths in the State.

56 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the number of deaths, if any, on account of starvation in 1951-52 in the State?

A.—Nil.

26th November 1952]

Photos of British Governors.

57 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government propose to remove the British Governors' photos from Rajaji Hall?

A.—Not only in the old Banqueting Hall but in other places throughout India there are many fine paintings belonging to the British period; and the question of how best to preserve these historic relics when terminating the present obvious incongruity in public exhibition has been exercising the minds of the departments concerned in the Governments of India and of the various States.

Dramatic performances for collecting funds for the Government Arts College hostel, Cuddapah.

58 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) if any dramatic performances were contemplated on 9th, 10th and 11th November 1951 to collect funds for the construction and expansion of the hostel buildings of the Government Arts College, Cuddapah, by the College Hostel Committee;

(b) if so, how much money was realized;

(c) whether the dramas were enacted;

(d) whether accounts were published; and

(e) who was the president of the Hostel Committee in November 1951?

A.—(a) The Cuddapah College Hostel Building Committee proposed to conduct a benefit performance in November 1951 to raise funds of about forty thousand rupees for the work relating to the construction of the College Hostel Buildings.

(b) An amount of Rs. 2,225 was realized through the sale of tickets.

(c) & (d) The proposed benefit performance was postponed to February 1952, in view of the poor response; and the idea was later on abandoned in view of the famine conditions. The unsold tickets were called back. The amount realized was received by the Secretary and Treasurer of the Cuddapah College Committee and spent for the Hostel work. The unsold tickets and the accounts of the College Committee are with him. The accounts were not published.

(e) Sri N. Ranga Reddi, M.L.C., now Minister for Public Works, was the President of the Committee at that time.

[26th November 1952]

Expenditure on the Government Basic Training School buildings, Pallipad, Nellore district.

59 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state what the total expenditure is for the construction of building of the Government Basic Training School, Pallipad of Nellore district?

A.—The total expenditure on the construction of buildings for the Government Basic Training School, Pallipad, Nellore district, is Rs. 1,70,053.

Artesian wells in South Arcot district.

60 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of artesian wells completed in the South Arcot district since the year 1948; and
(b) the amount spent so far on these wells?

A.—(a) The number of artesian wells so far completed in the South Arcot district since the year 1948 is 119, comprising 20 wells under the 20 wells scheme sanctioned in 1948 and 99 wells under the 101 wells scheme sanctioned in 1950. Of these 5 wells have proved to be unsuccessful.

(b) The amount spent so far on the construction of these wells is Rs. 6,48,400 (Rs. 1,32,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 5,16,400 under the 101 wells scheme).

Alleged discovery of a treasure-trove in Singapet, Nellore district.

61 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representation in September 1952 about the discovery of gold worth about Rs. 30,000 in Singapet village of Nellore district, in June 1952; and

(b) if so, what the action taken by the Government under the Treasure Trove Act is?

A.—(a) & (b) The Collector of Nellore has reported that he received a petition in September 1952, from the member alleging the discovery of gold worth Rs. 30,000 in Singapet village of Kovur taluk, in June 1952. The Collector is enquiring into the matter in consultation with the Deputy Superintendent of Police.

Alleged cultivation of lands reserved for depressed classes by caste ryots.

62 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government received any representations from the members of Scheduled Castes of Nellore district in the year 1952 regarding the cultivation of lands reserved for the depressed classes by caste ryots in Nellore district; and

26th November 1952]

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Artesian wells sunk under the Grow More Food Campaign.

63 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the number of artesian wells sanctioned in the year 1950 and 1951 respectively to be sunk under the Grow More Food scheme and in what districts;

(b) the number of wells completed in 1950 and 1951 respectively; and

(c) the amount spent for the purpose in 1950 and 1951 respectively?

A.—(a) One hundred and one artesian wells were sanctioned in 1950, all of them in the South Arcot district. No artesian wells were sanctioned in 1951.

(b) In 1950, 8 wells under the 20 artesian wells scheme in the South Arcot district sanctioned in 1948 and 3 wells under the 101 artesian wells scheme in the South Arcot district sanctioned in 1950 were completed. In 1951, 6 wells under the 20 wells scheme and 50 wells under the 101 wells scheme were completed.

(c) The amounts spent on the construction of artesian wells during the years 1950 and 1951 are as follows:—
1950.—Rupees 32,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 1,01,704 under the 101 wells scheme. The total expenditure in 1950 was Rs. 1,33,074.

1951.—Rupees 56,000 under the 20 wells scheme and Rs. 3,26,565 under the 101 wells scheme. The total expenditure in 1951 was Rs. 3,82,565.

Rural Industrialization Scheme of Sri M. Visveswarayya.

64 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state whether the Government have implemented Sri M. Visveswarayya's Industrialization Scheme for Rural Areas and, if so, in what districts and the names of the taluks that have been taken up for the purpose?

A.—The Rural Industrialization Scheme is now being implemented in Musiri taluk of Tiruchirappalli district and Nellore taluk of Nellore district as an experimental measure.)

[26th November 1952]

Applications for pattas received in West Godavari.

65 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of applications received for pattas and the number of pattas granted to (i) Harijans, (ii) Harijan Christians, and (iii) other landless poor up to 30th June 1952 as per G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, dated 11th June 1949, in West Godavari district?

A.—Applications have been received in thousands. The particulars asked for are not readily available as no record of the communities of the applicants has been kept.

Pay and daily fees of Public Prosecutors.

66 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation from Coimbatore in the second week of October 1952 regarding the enhancement of pay of Public Prosecutors; and

(b) if so, at what stage the matter stands?

A.—(a) & (b) A representation has been received from the Public Prosecutors' Association requesting the Government to consider the resolutions passed at a Special Conference held at Madras on 12th October 1952. The resolutions relate to enhancement of pay and daily fee payable to Public Prosecutors. The matter is under consideration.

Oral examinations by the Madras Public Service Commission.

67 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether stenographic records of the *viva voce* examinations by the Madras Public Service Commission of candidates applying for Government services, are kept and maintained; and

(b) whether the Government have issued any instructions to the members of the Madras Public Services Commission to speak before candidates, disparagingly about the Andhra University, or the Andhras in general and if they have, the reasons therefor?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) There is no truth in these allegations which, on the face of them, it is very improper to make without adequate basis.

Calculation of officiating service and pay for pension.

68 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that salaries of non-gazetted officers of all departments were revised with effect from the 1st January 1947;

26th November 1952]

(b) whether it is a fact that officiating service would count for pension, only in the case of non-gazetted officers who retire after the 1st January 1948; and

(c) whether representations have been received from the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association that the order giving concession in the matter of pensions only in the case of non-gazetted officers who retire after the 1st January 1948 would work hardship to those who retired in 1947, and requesting relief even to those who may have retired in 1947, and if so what action was taken thereon?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) In the case of Government servants retiring from service on or after the 1st March 1950, officiating service in excess of five years will count for pension. As financial concessions are usually sanctioned with effect from the date of the order, retrospective effect was not given to the above order. The crucial date in this case is the 1st March 1950 and not the 1st January 1948. The Member probably refers to the concession of counting officiating pay to a limited extent which was sanctioned in 1951. This concession was not new. It was in fact continuance beyond the 31st December 1947, subject to certain restrictions, of the concession which was admissible from the 3rd September 1939 to the 31st December 1947. Therefore, Government servants who retired before the 1st January 1948 after officiating in higher posts were also entitled to the concession. The concessions referred to above, namely counting officiating service and officiating pay for pension are admissible, not only to non-gazetted Government servants but to gazetted servants also.

(c) As stated in the answer to clause (b) above, there is no hardship of the kind stated, and no representations on the subject have been received from the Non-Gazetted Officers' Association.

Qualifications of Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks.

69 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state whether any qualifications are prescribed for the Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks?

A.—No specific qualifications have actually been prescribed but the considerations that were borne in mind in selecting candidates to the posts in question at the time when the Rural Welfare Scheme was launched originally in the year 1946, were the following, namely:—

(i) possession of necessary enthusiasm and aptitude for rural reconstruction work;

(ii) organising capacity; and

[26th November 1952]

- (iii) ability to feel at home in rural surroundings, study the needs of the villagers with understanding and sympathy, evoke their confidence and secure their willing co-operation in pushing through schemes of rural uplift.

Besides the above aspects, persons possessing minimum general educational qualification, i.e., S.S.L.C., in the case of Grama Sevaks and a Degree in Arts or Science of a recognised University in the case of Rural Welfare Officers are now given preference in the matter of appointment.

Nominations to District Rural Welfare Committees.

70 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state the principle followed in selecting non-officials for nomination to serve on the Firka Development Committees in the various districts?

A.—The District Firka Development Committees are now known as District Rural Welfare Committees. The non-official members of these Committees are selected for nomination, based mainly on their real enthusiasm for Rural Reconstruction work and co-operative tendency, so that full local support for the successful working of the Rural Welfare Scheme is obtained. One local M.L.A. or M.L.C. and a member, if any, represented in the State Rural Welfare Board are also nominated, as their association will also be useful in the deliberations of the Committees. Non-official members for each District Committee are accordingly nominated on the following basis:—

(a) Four prominent constructive workers—two of them being preferably from the firkas and centres selected and the other two being from the rest of the district; one of these four should be a District Board Member;

(b) one Member, if any, from the district on the State Rural Welfare Board; and

(c) one local M.L.A. or M.L.C.)

Appointment under the emergency provisions in State Service.

71 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state the number of Government employees employed under emergency provisions under rule 9 (a) (i) of the Madras Ministerial Subordinate Service who are still in service?

A.—The time and labour involved in collecting the information from all over the State will not be commensurate with any good purpose the collection of such statistics may serve.

26th November 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

III.—MOTIONS FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

(1) EVICTION OF LANDLESS POOR IN MUSAVELI VILLAGE IN TANJORE DISTRICT.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I have received notice of a number of adjournment motions to discuss matters of urgent public importance. Dr. K. B. Menon has given notice of one and it reads as follows:—

‘ This House do adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the mass arrests and satyagraha in the Musaveli village of Tanjore district consequent on the large-scale evictions of landless poor from their lands by the Government for allotting them to ex-service men.’

I remember that when he gave this to me, he himself said that this question had been hanging fire for the last one year, but I wish to know from the hon. Member before I give a ruling what he has to say with regard to this motion.”)

* DR. K. B. MENON:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, permit me to present this case.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ But let him not make a long speech. The hon. Member himself told me that it has been pending for the last one year.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—“ Not for one year, Sir. I was wrong in giving that figure if I did.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Then the hon. Member is correcting that now.”

DR. K. B. MENON:—“ I shall in the course of my statement . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ But let it not be a long statement; a short statement will do.”

(* DR. K. B. MENON:—“ I shall be very brief in presenting my case, Sir. Musaveli village is in Tanjore district. In 1944, about 1,300 acres of uncultivated waste lands were distributed among 300 families under the Sivoijama Scheme. These lands were taken up by poor peasants. Among them were many Harijans and each family received from one to five acres of land. These people thought that the lands would be theirs and they invested all their accumulated earnings and constructed irrigation channels at their own expense and effected other improvements in order to make the lands cultivable. In 1950-51 a survey of the village was conducted and the plots were marked out and numbers were allotted and the peasants were paying their kist. One bright morning in June 1952, the villagers heard the village announcer beating the tom-tom, announce that the Government

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [26th November 1952]

had decided to take their lands away and give the same to co-operatives to be distributed to ex-service men. It was only then that they realised that the Government had changed their mind."

MR. SPEAKER:—"On what date was it?"

* DR. K. B. MENON:—"In June 1952; I think it was on the 27th June because I am not quite sure of the date. It was only then that the villagers realized that the Government had changed their mind and the lands would no longer be with them but will be taken away from them in order to be given away to ex-service men. This came as a terrible shock to the villagers and they ran helter-skelter to the Collector and everyone in order to prevent their land being taken away from them but nothing was done and the only thing they could do was to resort to *satyagraha*. I ask, Sir, was it necessary for the Government to have resorted to eviction of these people in order to provide for ex-service men? Nobody contends that ex-service men should not be provided with lands, but we do contend that it was not necessary for the Government to take away the lands from the peasants to provide for ex-service men. There is plenty of land available in the same village and also in the neighbouring taluk. There are thousands of acres of cultivable land that can be conveniently given to ex-service men and the Government could have provided ex-service men with such lands and avoided taking the lands from the poor peasants. In the second place, there was no urgency in the matter because even these ex-service men to whom the lands had been given, have not taken advantage of it, because up to date, only 22 of them have shown themselves on the scene and have taken possession of the land. They seem to be very reluctant to beat their swords and guns into ploughshares, and they do not really seem to want to do it. Why then are the Government so anxious to deprive the poor peasants of their lands and hand them over to the ex-service men who will not take them? I feel, Sir, that this is against all canons of justice and fairness. I think that it is against the voluntary assurance that the then Chief Minister himself gave, that the lands given under the Sivajirama Scheme would not be taken from those who had taken possession of them and it is also against the priority fixed by the Government in the distribution of land. The first to be served according to Government are the poor landless people including Harijans, and next preference is to be given to political sufferers and the ex-service men come last. With regard to Tanjore the Government promulgated an Ordinance and then came forward with a Bill to prevent evictions. I do not know why the Government themselves are committing acts which would make them guilty of the same offence against which they are providing safeguards by means of the Bill. What I say to Government is, 'Physician, heal thyself'."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I did not hear the date properly. May I know what it is, Sir?"

DR. K. B. MENON:—"27th June 1952."

26th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Whatever may be your ruling, Sir, if the hon. Member has a grievance about the matter, I would request him to send it up to Government. They will look into the matter and there is no need to make a motion for adjournment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have heard the hon. Member. I really sympathize with those poor people who have been evicted from their lands. I am not going to enter into the merits of the matter. As far as the Chair is concerned, the question is whether it can be admitted as an adjournment motion or not. I really sympathize with those who have been evicted, but I know that our sympathetic Chief Minister will look into it and do justice to them. Let me point out to the hon. Member that he himself told me that the evictions took place in June last, and so the question has been there for the last six months. So, it is not an urgent matter and I rule it out of order."

(2) ELECTIONS TO MINOR PANCHAYATS BY SHOW OF HANDS.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Two hon. Members have given notice of adjournment motions, more or less on the same lines. Let me first take the adjournment motion of Sri Sankarayya. The motion reads as follows:—

'This House stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the impending elections to the minor panchayat boards in the State of Madras by show of hands instead of by secret ballot which is the recognized democratic method.'

Let me hear what the hon. Member has to say on this motion."

* SRI B. SANKARAYYA:—"ఇప్పటికే యీ మైనరు పంచాయతీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రారంభించినట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. ఈ విధంగా యీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రారంభించినట్లయితే అప్పుడు రాష్ట్రములో అనేక గ్రామాలలో చాలా ఆరాటక పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడేటటువంటి ప్రమాదాలు ఉన్నవి. అందువలన యిప్పుడు ఈ అసెంబ్లీలో ఈ రోజు కార్యక్రమము ఆపుదలచేయించి, యీ ఎన్నికల విషయం ముఖ్యంగా చర్చించుట అవసరమైయున్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు జరుపుతున్న పంచాయతీ ఎన్నికలు ప్రాథమికమైనటువంటి ప్రజాస్వామ్యానికి విరుద్ధముగా నడచుచున్నవి. ఈ విధంగా ఎన్నికలు పెట్టడమనేది మన రాష్ట్రములో పెద్ద ప్రమాదమైనటువంటి అశాంతిని ఆల్ల కల్గొలుపును. రెచ్చగొట్టటానికి దారి లిస్తున్నది. ఇప్పటికే ప్రతి గ్రామములోనూ, ప్రజలలో కక్షలు, పెద్ద పెద్ద కొట్లాటలు పోరులు బయలుదేరినవి. ఇప్పుడు యీ ఎన్నికలు జరిపే పద్ధతినిబట్టి గ్రామాలలో కొట్లాటలకు అవకాశము యిస్తున్నది. యీ ఎన్నికలకు బహిరంగంగా చేతులు ఎత్తే పద్ధతి సామ్యమైన పద్ధతి కాదు. రహస్య ఓటింగు ఉంటేనే ప్రజాశాంతికి రక్షణ యివ్వగలదు. బహిరంగముగా చేతులు ఎత్తే ఓటింగు పద్ధతి తక్షణము మానివేయించవలసియున్నది. అందువలన యీ ఎన్నికల పద్ధతి సక్రమమైన పద్ధతి అగునో కాదో సభ్యులందరూను, ప్రభుత్వమువారును గురించ వలసియున్నది. అందుకనే నేను యీ అవసరమైన adjournment motion ను వలసియున్నది. గనుక యీ దినము నా లీర్నానము అత్యావసరమైన లీర్నానము తెచ్చియున్నాను. గనుక యీ దినము నా లీర్నానము అత్యావసరమైన లీర్నానము గనుక సభా కార్యక్రమము ఆపుదలచేయించి యీ లీర్నానము చర్చించవలసియున్నది."

[Sri B. Sankarayya] [26th November 1952]

ఇప్పటికే గ్రామాలలో ఎన్నికలు ఆరంభము చేయించారు. ఇకమీదట అయినను గ్రామాలలో డెబ్బలాటలు కక్షలు ఆపుదలకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రయత్నించవలసి యున్నది. ఈ ఎన్నికలు తక్షణం ఆపుదలచేయించి, సక్రమ మార్గములలో ఎన్నికలు జరపనివడల యింకా గ్రామాలలో అనేక కొట్లాటలు జరుగును గనుక నేడు నేను తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమును బలపర్చుకొందులకు సభ్యులందరిని విన్నవించుచు, ప్రభుత్వము వారిని నా తీర్మానమును అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. the Leader of the Opposition may give a gist of his speech."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Apart from the gist of his speech which I have not entirely followed, I agree with the hon. Member who has moved this adjournment motion that this relates to a very urgent and definite matter of public importance."

MR. SPEAKER:—"This matter has already been discussed here."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"This matter has already been raised on the floor of this House only by way of interpellations."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member who gave notice of this motion has already raised this point when the District Boards (Amendment) Bill was under discussion in this House and the Hon. Minister replied to that point. Therefore it is not a new thing."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"That matter incidentally arose in connexion with that Bill. The subject-matter of the Bill was only an extension of the life of District Boards. The real question which is now of very urgent public importance is the coming election to panchayats which is going to be conducted under a system of voting by show of hands."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is it a new thing?"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is a new thing. Originally it was proposed to hold the election by secret ballot. Subsequently it was changed to voting by show of hands, and representations were made in that regard and the attention of the Hon. Minister had been drawn not only by hon. Members from this side of the House but also from the other side. Sir, this voting by show of hands in nearly 7,000 panchayats will lead to great friction and therefore this matter must receive the immediate attention of the Government. We are now only forewarning the Government that if they conduct the elections in this manner, they will be leading to a condition which they can avoid by appropriate action now. That is the urgency and that is the definite matter. It has not been previously discussed. As a substantive thing it has not been discussed, except perhaps some questions were put and some kind of answers were given. We did not bring a non-official motion. There is no Government motion on the Agenda for taking the opinion of the House on this particular matter. I say, in the interests of the people of this State, and in order to allay the

26th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

anxieties of hon. Members not only on this side but also on the Government side with regard to this particular matter, the Chair might be pleased to give a ruling that it is entirely in order.

"Also, I would tell the Government that this is a matter on which they can agree to a discussion. After all, the discussion is only for two hours and we might take up this motion at 4 o'clock. I believe, the Hon. the Chief Minister also is not absolutely unaware of the conditions created by the change in the system of voting and a discussion of this kind will certainly be useful. Voting by secret ballot is the very essence of democracy. If this system of voting is changed, it will only lead to friction and breaking of heads almost near polling booths. This is a matter which should immediately arrest our attention and I submit that it is absolutely in order. It is not a vote of censure against the Government."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It amounts to vote of censure."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am not one of those who subscribe to that view."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Whether the hon. Member subscribes to it or not it is so."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I submit that an adjournment motion is not always to be treated as a vote of censure. It is for drawing the attention of the Government to a matter of urgent public importance so that it may be possible to arrive at some reasonable understanding by which peace in the State can be maintained, and at the same time the election procedure can be satisfied. Therefore, I submit that it is in order. The Government must not have any rigid view on this matter. Let us have a two-hour discussion and something might emerge. I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will agree to it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If it is the desire of this House and if the Hon. the Chief Minister and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition can come to an understanding, the Government themselves can bring forward a motion of this kind. They can do it."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"That is one of the methods. Sometimes an adjournment motion is the method to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. Once more, at the risk of repetition, I request the Government to accept this motion."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I want to know the opinion of the Hon. the Chief Minister on this motion."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I am sorry that an anticipated discussion of this kind as to trouble arising at election time here and there is likely in itself to encourage and produce the result which is sought to be avoided. We have followed a certain policy and issued directions and the election is imminent. If and when trouble arises we had better discuss the question. If beforehand we discuss, the apprehended

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [26th November 1952]

trouble will arise. If we discuss the policy and the policy is not agreed to, then trouble is encouraged. For that reason, I am sorry, I cannot accept the adjournment motion. But, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, my mind is open and we shall look into it when trouble arises and let us not excite trouble now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I remember a question was put on this subject and I allowed 15 minutes for that question. Again when the District Boards (Amendment) Bill was under discussion the same question was put and the Hon. Minister for Local Administration answered it. In the circumstances, it is not an urgent matter. It has already been discussed in this House in some other form though not in this form. Therefore, I rule this motion out of order."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let me now take up the adjournment motion of Sri Ranga Rao. I am not going to allow the hon. Member to speak on his motion as it is on the same lines as the previous one on which a ruling has been given. The motion reads as follows:—

'This House be adjourned to discuss a specific matter of urgent public importance, namely, the policy of the Government in conducting the elections to the minor panchayats by open show of hands as it will result in the disturbance of the peaceful life of the villages creating increasing bitterness and inimical factions in the villages and as it is *ultra vires* of the fundamental democratic right of free voting given by the Constitution.'

So far as matters relating to elections to minor panchayats are concerned, my ruling with regard to the previous motion holds good for this motion also. As regards the latter portion of the motion, the question whether a particular matter is *ultra vires* of the Constitution has to be decided by the courts."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Some other hon. Members have also given notice of adjournment motions to discuss matters of urgent public importance. I will take them up to-morrow as I have no time to go through them."

IV.—MOTION FOR TRANSACTION OF OFFICIAL BUSINESS ON A NON-OFFICIAL DAY.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, to-morrow Thursday, which is allotted for Non-official Business may be taken up for Official Business and in its stead, the next day, that is 28th November, may be allotted for Non-official Business. I move—

'That rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 27th November 1952.'

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I do not think there will be any objection to this motion. Instead of transacting Non-official Business on Thursday, it will be done on Friday."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I believe the Cricket Test match between India and Pakistan begins on the 28th November."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Does the hon. Member want that this House should not sit on that day on account of the match?"

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"The Government have declared 28th and 29th November as holidays in Madras City and the Chingleput district."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Only 29th November is a holiday."

SRI M. NARAYANASWAMY:—"అధ్యక్షా, point of order ను raise చేస్తున్నాను

"మీరు నేను పెట్టిన adjournment motion ను తిరస్కరించారు. మీరు రాజ్యాంగ వట్టిమువ్వ కలిగినట్లుంటే సభ్యుల యొక్క ప్రాథమిక హక్కులను మీరు గమనించడములేదు. సభ్యుల హక్కులను సరించి, వారి తీర్మానముల ముఖ్యోద్దేశమును గమనించక, హిరంక ఎన్నికల: పనికిరానివి నే విషయములూ తీర్మానమును తెచ్చినను, దానియొక్క అవసరమును గుర్తించకదు. విచారకంగా తీర్మానము తిరస్కరించటమనేది సరియైన పద్ధతి కాదని నా అభిప్రాయమును వెల్లడించుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The discussion on the motion the hon. Member is referring to is already over. We are now discussing another motion. 'The motion before the House is—

'That rule 24 of the Madras Assembly Rules be suspended and the House do resolve to transact Government business on Thursday, the 27th November 1952.'

The motion was carried unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER:—"We shall now proceed to the next item in the agenda, namely, the consideration of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952. I shall take up the Preamble and Clause 1 at the end."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to say a few words on the previous motion, but before I could do so you put the motion to the vote of the House and passed on to the next item on the agenda."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have given sufficient time to the House to consider that motion, namely, that instead of Thursday, Friday, will be declared a Non-official day."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"Sir, on that motion I wanted to remind the House that already on a previous occasion a Non-official day was declared to be an Official day. Now it is proposed

[Sri G. Latchanna] [26th November 1952]

to convert a Non-official day into an Official day. We do not mind which day is allotted for Non-official business, Friday, Monday or Tuesday. We want that the Non-official day which was taken away previously may be given now, and so let us have two days for transaction of Non-official business now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Instead of discussing this on the floor of the House, let the hon. Member and other Members have a talk with the Hon. the Chief Minister or the Leader of the House and let them inform me of the result?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I think we shall have a talk with the Hon. Chief Minister on this matter."

V.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)—cont.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The House will now proceed to the next item on the Agenda, namely, the consideration of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952. I shall take up the Preamble and Clause 1 at the end."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would submit for your consideration that in this particular Bill, the Preamble itself may be taken up first, because the Preamble governs the entire Bill. The very purpose of this Bill is given in the Preamble. There are certain other things also stated in the Preamble and so I wish we discuss the Preamble and the amendments given notice of thereto first."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There are no amendments to the Preamble."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"There are some amendments given by me to Clause 1 and I want the Preamble and Clause 1 to be taken up first, as they both go together."

MR. SPEAKER:—"They deal with the scope of the Bill and the other provisions deal with the body of the Bill. So we shall discuss the body of the Bill first, and then, in view of the modifications we may make in the body of the Bill the Preamble will have to be modified. So if we are to discuss the Preamble first and then make any modifications in the body of the Bill, no useful purpose will be served by such modifications in the body of the Bill. It is not as if I am shutting out discussion of the Preamble."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I only submit that the Preamble and Clause 1 should be discussed first, because they go together. Further I have given notice of an amendment to Clause 1. My amendment seeks to make this Bill applicable not only to the district of Tanjore but the entire State. So I submit the consideration of that aspect will not in any way change the consideration of the other clauses of the Bill. Therefore I submit

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

we may discuss whether we want the Bill to apply to the entire State or not. That is the sum and substance of my amendment. So I submit the Preamble and Clause 1 may be taken together."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"With due deference to my inexperienced friends, I would like to say that by long and tried experience we have arrived at the convenient practice of considering Bills from Clause 2 onwards first."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Even in England that is the practice."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"But my friend seems to lay stress on one thing, namely, that the Preamble and Clause 1 should be considered together. Nobody objects to it. But we are now proceeding from Clause 2 onwards."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Sir, I rise on a point of order."

"ఇంతవరకు Speaker గారు ఏ రూలింగు ఇచ్చినప్పటికీ కూడా preamble మొదట తీసుకోవడానికి ఎక్కడలేదు. Practice లో మాత్రం మొదట్లో అందరు అంగీకరిస్తే, ఏ క్లాజు అయినా తీసుకోవచ్చు. కాని ఇప్పుడు బిల్లులోని క్లాజు లన్నియు అంగీకరించకుండా మొదట preamble ను తీసుకోవచ్చు. తర్వాతనే బిల్లులోని అంశములను చర్చించవచ్చును. ఇట్టి పరిస్థితులలో బిల్లులోని clauses ను చర్చించడము అపి, ముందు preamble తీసుకోవడమనేది ఒక ప్రత్యేక సమస్యగా తీసుకోవలసిన అవసరం మూత్రం ఒకటి ఉన్నది. అందుకని ఇక్కడ మాత్రం వచ్చే amendments ను ముందు అంగీకరించినట్లయితే, అసలు బిల్లునే మార్చునననే అవసరము ఉంటుంది. అందుచేత ముందు preamble లోని విషయాలు చర్చించిన దానిపట్టి Bill యొక్క clauses మార్పుటకు అవకాశం కలుగుతుందని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఈ బిల్లు ఒక Tanjore జిల్లాకే అన్వయించేటట్లు తెచ్చియిస్తారుగాని, రాష్ట్రమునంతటికీ అన్వయించజేయు బిల్లును తెచ్చియుండలేదు. సభ్యులు బిల్లును అంతయు పరిశీలించుటకు ముందు preamble లోని text, దాని ఉద్దేశ్యమును గ్రహించి బిల్లులో క్లాజులు చర్చించిన బాగుండునేగాని ముందు clauses తర్వాత preamble అనేది సక్రమమైన పద్ధతికాదు. ఈ బిల్లు State అంతటకు వర్తింప జేయాలని కోరినను, ప్రభుత్వము మాకు majority ఉన్నదనే ధైర్యముతో ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే వర్తించేటట్లు చేసింది. అందుకని preamble ముందు వదిలి చర్చించకపోతే, అది సరియైన పద్ధతికాదని చెప్పవచ్చును. మరల బిల్లును అంతయు పరిశీలించుటకు అవసరము లేనప్పుడు . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I fear the hon. Member is repeating what the other hon. Member was saying."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అందుకని preamble ముందు వదిలి, చర్చించి, ఆమతర్వాత Bill యొక్క clauses చర్చించిన బాగుండుండుని, యీ విషయము ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచించిమని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Preamble is more or less like a cap on the head. The hon. Member wants to shape the head according to the cap. (Laughter.) We can only shape the cap according to the head. Clause 2 and the other clauses may be called the head and body of the Bill."

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ There are some tailors who shape the head according to the cap.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“ So the House will now take up for consideration Clause 2 of the Bill.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ ఇప్పుడు మీరు యిచ్చినది చాలిందా? లేక పాత మాటా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The motion is—

‘ That Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.’ ”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

‘ For sub-clause (d), substitute the following:—

“ ‘ Cultivating tenant ’ or ‘ tenant ’ means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land.’ ”

12 In the alternative, I have also proposed the following amendments to sub-clause (d), viz.,—

(i) In sub-clause (d), after the word “ land ” occurring in line 3, insert the words “ not exceeding 5 acres in extent ”,

and

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):—

“ Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land’ ”

“ Sir, there is also another amendment to sub-clause (f) which, I think, I need not move now.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Before the hon. Member moves his amendments let him read the amendments.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ The amendment to sub-clause (f) is—

‘ In sub-clause (f), add the following at the end:—

“ and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands ’.” These are my amendments to Clause 2.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Sir, I am seconding the amendment and, while doing so, I want to give my views also.”

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I will allow the hon. Member to speak again. The hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam, has now moved his amendment to sub-clause (d).” Amendment moved—

‘ For the sub-clause (d), substitute the following:—

“ ‘ Cultivating tenant ’ or ‘ tenant ’ means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land.’ ”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the phrase ‘ cultivating tenant ’ which has been introduced in this Bill is capable of different interpretations.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ Sir, on a point of order, as I have moved the amendment, I should have an opportunity to speak on the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I will allow the hon. Member to speak. There are so many amendments and, I think, the amendment given notice of by Sri P. G. Karuthiruman comes first.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Sir, as this is a long clause with so many definitions, I suggest that the definitions may be taken one by one.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The amendment of the hon. Member, Sir P. G. Karuthiruman comes first and then comes the amendment of hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam. Sri P. G. Karuthiruman will therefore please move his amendment.”

* SRI P. G. KARUTHIRUMAN:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘ That the following be added as additional sub-clause (aa):—

“ (aa) A catch crop is any secondary crop grown when the cultivation of the main crop is not possible and includes pulses but does not include cotton.’ ”

The amendment was duly seconded.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“ Sir, it has not yet been circulated.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ It is being circulated.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Amendment moved—

‘ That the following be added as additional sub-clause (aa):—

“ (aa) A catch crop is any secondary crop grown when the cultivation of the main crop is not possible and includes pulses but does not include cotton.’ ”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Sir, I just want to know whether leguminous crops also come in as catch crops under this definition.”

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Pulses are leguminous crops."

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"A catch crop may be anything except cotton."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I wish to know the attitude of the Government towards this amendment. Are they accepting it?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It is not necessary but I was wondering whether any light would be thrown by hon. Members who are suspicious. But, if there is no suspicion, I would rather not have it because I do not see what is the object of the amendment. Anyhow, if the hon. Gentlemen opposite have any information, I would like to hear them."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I should think that this amendment is wholly unnecessary."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I want to know whether the hon. Member, Sri P. G. Karuthiruman, is withdrawing his amendment."

SRI P. G. KARUTHIRUMAN:—"Sir, I withdraw the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I hope the House gives him permission to withdraw the amendment."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member, Sri S. Swayamprakasam, will now speak on his amendment."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I have moved that the following definition of 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' be substituted for sub-clause (d) of Clause (2):—

" 'Cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land."

As I said before, this definition is a very important one as the operation and working of this Act will wholly depend upon this definition of the 'cultivating tenant'. The question whether the definition of 'cultivating tenant' includes middlemen or intermediaries is an important one which has got to be tackled. Yesterday, when the Hon. the Chief Minister by way of a personal explanation intervened in the debate, he asked whether my attitude was one of supporting the claims of middlemen or whether it was one of exclusion of middlemen once and for all. My attitude is that when a new legislation is brought into existence the rights and liabilities of various parties are affected. While the rights and liabilities of the various parties concerned should not be adversely affected, each party should, at the same time, be definite about its position when the new legislation is brought

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

into force. That is my object. In the district of Tanjore to which this Act is applicable, in the first instance, we have got mirasdar land-owners and also lessee middlemen or intermediaries. Then we come to the tenants, pannaiyals and casual labourers who are actually on the soil. These are the people that are affected by this piece of legislation. What their rights and liabilities are should be determined and there should not be any doubt in any part of the Act in regard to these rights. If we say that the middle men are not to be excluded, we must have a certain provision in the Act as regards the relationship between the middlemen and landowners with whom they have entered into a contract. If we say that their rights and liabilities are abolished, my attitude will be quite different. Again, the rights and liabilities of the actual tiller of the soil under the middlemen have got to be determined. Therefore my attitude as a legislator is, that there should not be any doubt in the various sections of the Act. Yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister said that while I was pleading for relief for the tiller of the soil, I was also pleading for the middlemen, as if I was inconsistent in my argument. Certainly not. My argument is that the rights and liabilities of all the parties should be determined without the least shadow of a doubt. The mirasdars should not be under the impression that a particular section gives them relief, while as a matter of fact, the legislation has no intention of giving them such relief. When we are passing a new legislation, we must think over the matter and see that there are no loopholes. My learned friend, Sri K. Varadachari, said that loopholes were common in any legislation. I am sorry that even the Hon. the Minister for Revenue said in his reply to the general debate on this Bill that it was common to find loopholes in all the Bills. This is not the stage when we should talk about loopholes. It is just like saying that it is our fate. If we try to achieve a certain objective and fail in our attempt, we should then only say that it is our fate and not before even making an attempt to achieve a particular objective. So also, when we are making a new legislation, we should not allow loopholes as far as possible. When certain loopholes are brought to the notice of the Legislature, is it not our duty to remove them? When we are talking about certain definitions and the different interpretations that can be put on them, we should not talk about loopholes because it will be taken advantage of by others. This is exactly the reason for my saying that as far as possible there should be no loopholes. Though the Hon. the Chief Minister remarked that the cat was out of the bag, it was really out to find a rat.

"These loopholes are there. My intention is definitely to see 12-10 that there is not more than one particular interpretation for a particular section. The original definition of 'cultivating tenant' was as follows:—

" 'cultivating 'tenant' or 'tenant' means a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs to of such person."

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [26th November 1952]

The word 'contributes' is a very big term. As I said before, even a person writing a letter from Madras or sending word or once in a way going to the place where his lands are situated and supervising the agricultural operations will satisfy the word 'contributes'. The word 'contributes' is a very wide term which may bring in middlemen. There are people in the district of Tanjore who belong to other districts, e.g., Tirunelveli, Ramanathapuram, Salem, etc. They have come to Tanjore and have taken large extents of land—four hundred and five hundred acres. Periodically they go to Tanjore district and supervise the agricultural operations in their lands, namely, whether all the lands have been cultivated by the villagers of the soil, whether the lands have been properly manured and irrigated, etc. The Chief Minister said that because of my request the word 'physical' had been substituted for the word 'personal'. Merely going about and supervising the lands and looking after the work of pannaiyal or casual cultivator will satisfy the term 'contribute.' A person may very well contend, 'I am a lessee, even though I reside in Madras. I have got so many men on the soil. I contribute my physical labour by going round and supervising the cultivation of my lands. I must be classed as a "cultivating tenant".' As it is, the definition is capable of such interpretation. That is the reason why I am putting it that a cultivating tenant means 'a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land . . .'. The extent of the land to be cultivated by a cultivating tenant must also be fixed. If, as I said before, a particular middleman is able to convince the Revenue Court that he should be recognized as a 'cultivating tenant,' the question which arises next is, for how many acres—400 or 500 acres of land—he is a cultivating tenant. The hon. Members may imagine how many people must be there on the soil, and what their liabilities and assets should be. A pannaiyal cannot cultivate more than 6-2/3 acres according to the schedule attached to the Bill. When the Government have fixed a limit for a pannaiyal for cultivation purposes, why should they not fix a limit for a 'cultivating tenant'? The whole object of the Bill is defeated if this is not done. The successful working of this Act depends upon the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant.' Yesterday the Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to say that I must come forward with an alternative suggestion. Though the Legal Department is there, yet I was asked to put forth my suggestion. Further, sufficient time was not given to me. That is why I have to fix the limit 'not exceeding 5 acres in extent' in a hurry.

"Again according to the definition of the words 'cultivating tenant' in the Bill, 'cultivating tenant' means 'a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging to another, under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person.

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

"The 'heirs' may be persons who may not be willing or competent to cultivate the land. Our object must be that the total production from land should not be affected badly as a result of this Bill being passed into law. Suppose a tenant dies in the middle of a cultivating season leaving behind him minor girls or sons who may not be competent to satisfy the definition of 'cultivating tenant'; or he may leave behind him a major son who may not be willing to cultivate or who may like to pursue other avocations in Simla or New Delhi. Why should the Government saddle him with the rights and responsibilities of a 'cultivating tenant'? This is the reason why I have provided in my amendment, relating to the definition of 'the cultivating tenant', . . . and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land.' I have to include these things in the definition of the cultivating tenant with a view to see that the objects of the Bill are properly carried out. Sir, I hope there will be no difficulty in accepting my amendment to sub-clause (d) of Clause 2."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am seconding the amendment which has been ably moved by my hon. Friend Sri Swayamprakasam. I have not much to add to what he has stated because all the points involved in the amendment have been exhausted by him. I feel that the object of the Bill is to eliminate the intermediaries like middlemen who do not own lands but still get the benefit from the lands through some tillers. If this was the object, the term 'cultivating tenant' must be specifically defined so as to eliminate tenants who profit from the labours put in by pannaiyals and others. There are many educated men coming from Tanjore district who do not actually contribute by their own physical labour to the production of food, but who work in offices like the Madras Secretariat or the New Delhi Secretariat. Even though they are far away from these lands in the district of Tanjore, still they would come under the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant', because they go periodically once in a year to these lands and see whether they are properly irrigated and manured. That is the reason why we insist that the definition of the 'cultivating tenant' should be properly amended to eliminate middlemen.

"Secondly, according to the definition of the 'cultivating tenant' in the Bill, it includes 'the heirs of such person'. Our fear is that this kind of cultivating tenancy should not be prolonged for too long. It would not be possible in all cases to insist upon the heirs of a cultivating tenant being made responsible for the liabilities and assets of the deceased cultivating tenant. A minor girl who happens to be the heir will not be in a position to execute the terms of tenancy. But the liability if any left by the deceased tenant will be forced upon her. For no fault of hers she will be forced to bear the responsibility of the

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [26th November 1952]

deceased tenant. Let us not create a situation whereby the heirs of a cultivating tenant who happen to be educated men and who are trying to take to different avocations like Government service would be made to bear the liability left by the deceased cultivating tenant. We are introducing this amendment only to see that middlemen are completely eliminated from the scope of this Act."

12-20 P.M. * SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I think there is a certain amount of confusion with regard to the actual position. Sub-clause (d) of clause 2 defines 'cultivating tenant' or 'tenant' as a person who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land belonging, etc. Here the tenant is defined as one who contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family. Now, if you try to limit the extent of land that he can take out on lease or varam or kuthagai, it will lead to an anomalous position. For example, there might be a large family consisting of half-a-dozen members, and all of them will be able to contribute their physical labour. If the amendment of Mr. Swayamprakasam is accepted, it will lead to a position where the entire family can take on varam, kuthagai or contract only a total extent of 5 acres of land and nothing more. I therefore think that Mr. Swayamprakasam has some other thing in view and unfortunately that thing cannot be fitted into the definition clause."

(Sri S. Swayamprakasam rose.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order, the hon. Member has got a right of reply later on."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I think, as I said, Mr. Swayamprakasam has got something else in view, and unfortunately if that is sought to be put in this clause it will lead to an anomalous position, and large families will not be able to take the extent of land which they can normally cultivate with the labour available in their own family. That sort of affairs should be prevented. In the definition of 'tenant' there is no limitation of the total extent of land a tenant can take, and the only limitation by which he is bound is the total amount of physical labour that is available to him either of his own or the members of his family. That limitation is already there. Therefore, I think, it is unnecessary to think of putting in any further limitation. The purpose which Mr. Swayamprakasam has in view will be served by moving some other amendment, that is, with regard to middlemen which will come later. I would therefore now request him not to press his amendment."

* SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to clause 6, but the subject-matter under discussion is very similar to that of my amendment, and therefore I would like, with your permission, to say a few words on this occasion. One of the objects of the Bill is to improve

26th November 1952] [Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao]

the relationship between the landlord and the tenant and the other and a more important objective aimed at is the improvement of food production, because though we are pre-eminent an agricultural country, we are suffering from acute food shortage. No legislation that does not aim at the improvement of food production in the State is worth its name. The improvement in, or the stepping up of, food production is the main objective of all modern legislation. Concentration of large extents of land does not conduce to proper food production. With this in view the sponsors of the Bill rightly feel that a ceiling limit or an upper limit is necessary in the case of a land-owner for personal cultivation. But, that is not done in the case of a tenant. Under the present arrangement, while the extent of land for a landlord is fixed, the tenant's extent is not fixed. This is unwise and also unjust, on wise because if it is an evil to keep an extent of more than 6-2/3 acres of land in the hands of a landlord it is equally, if not more, dangerous to put more acres of land in the hands of the tenant; and the result is, food production suffers. If what is aimed at in the Bill is only a sentimental satisfaction that the big land-holder is expropriated, I have nothing to say. On the other hand, if the object is to increase food production, I think, my submission is that the ceiling, for the extent of land that a tenant could lay his hand on, should be fixed at a level not higher than 6 2/3 acres. Otherwise, it neither serves the interests of social justice nor does it serve to promote food production."

* SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU:—"கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் சுவயம்ப்ரகாசம் அவர்களுடைய நோக்கம் நல்லதாக இருந்தாலும் கூட அவருடைய திருத்தமானது பல புதிய தொந்தரவுகளை உண்டாக்கும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஒரு குடும்பத்தார் எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் நிலம் சாகுபடி செய்ய முடியும் என்பதைப்பற்றி அந்தக் குடும்பத் தலைவருடைய பலம், அநுபவம், அந்தக் குடும்பத்தின் சாகுபடி திறமை எல்லாவற்றையும் பொறுத்திருக்கிறது. பெரிய குடும்பத்தின் தலைவரை இருக்கப்பட்டவன் வயதடைந்து போகலாம் அல்லது வேறு ஊருக்குச் சென்றுவிடலாம். அப்படிச் சென்றுவிட்டால் சாகுபடி செய்யும் நிலத்தின் அளவு குறைந்து போய் விடும். அவருடைய நோக்கம் இடையீட்டுக்காரனை ஒழிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் இந்தத் திருத்தம் பொருத்தமானது அல்ல, நியாயமானதும் அல்ல. ஒரு ஏக்கர் நிலத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு இருக்கும் ஒரு உழவன் அந்த ஒரு ஏக்கரை வைத்துக் கொண்டு அவனுடைய வாழ்க்கையை பூராவும் நடத்த முடியாது. அவன் நான்கு ஏக்கர்கள் குத்தகைக்கு வாங்கி பயிரிட்டு வந்தால்தான் அவனால் தன்னுடைய குடும்பத்தை நடத்த முடியும். அவனை இடையீட்டுக்காரன் என்று ஒத்துக்கொள்ள முடியாது. அவன் ஐந்து ஏக்கர்கள் வைத்திருந்தால்தான் அவனால் ஏர் வைத்து மாடுகள் வைத்து குடும்பத்தை நடத்த முடியும். வேறு ஜில்லாக்களிலிருந்து வந்து ஏராளமான கைப்பணத்தைப் போட்டு நிலங்களை குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்து இடையில் இருந்து கொண்டு ஏராளமான லாபம் சம்பாதிக்கின்றவர்கள்தான் இடையீட்டுக்காரர்கள். அதற்கு பதிலாக குறைந்த அளவில் நிலத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தால் இந்த தொந்தரவுகள் இருக்காது. அப்படி இல்லா விட்டால் ஏராளமான நிலத்தை குத்தகைக்கு எடுக்கும் நிலைமை வரும். எவ்வளவு நிலம் ஒருவன் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று மதிப்பிட்டால் இந்த திருத்தத்திற்கே வழி இல்லை. இந்த திருத்தத்தினால் குடும்பம் தான் உண்டாகும் என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். சமீபத்தில் சுவாமி சங்கராச்சாரியார் கூட ஒரு திட்டம் வகுத்திருக்கிறார். ஐந்து ஏக்கர் நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டு தானே சொந்தமாக விவசாயம் செய்ய வேண்டும்

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [26th November 1952]

என்றும், அப்படி வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவர்கள் தான் தனக்கு பிட்சையிட வேண்டும் என்றும், அப்படி பிட்சை இட்டால்தான் தான் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளமுடியும் என்றும் அவர் மாயூரத்திலிருந்து ஒரு ஸ்ரீமுகம் விடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்பதாக நான் அறிகிறேன். இவ்வளவு நிலம் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சட்டம் செய்து விட்டால் இப்படிப்பட்ட இடையீட்டுக்காரர்கள் தானாகவே ஒழிந்துபோய் விடுவார்கள் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு கனம் சுவயம்பரகாசம் நல்ல நோக்கத்துடன் இந்த தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்த போதிலும் அது காரியத்தில் சாத்யமில்லாமல் போய் விபரீதம் விளைவிக்கும் என்பதாக நான் கருதுவதால் அதை எதிர்த்தேன்.”

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—“Sir, I too oppose this amendment. The reasons have been stated by the two previous speakers. Apart from those reasons, I have also my doubt with regard to the last line of the amendment. According to the amendment, I wish to know what would happen to a family consisting of a lady and two minor children? Suppose the husband has been a tenant under a contract for five years. If the husband dies after the first year the poor wife with two minor children is left alone. According to this amendment that lady, with the minor children, is precluded from carrying on the cultivation of the land contracted for by the husband. If this amendment is adopted and given effect to, the lady with the two minor children will be thrown on the streets, and what is the safeguard which my Friend proposes for such cases?”

12-30 P.M. * SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I only want to say that some provision must be made to safeguard the interests of the minors and the widow who survive the tenant during the term of the tenancy. If the Government were to accept the amendment of Sri Swayamprakasam, I think the Hon. the Chief Minister will make a provision for safeguarding their interests.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, only if we accept the amendment, all these difficulties arise and we have to make provision to safeguard the interests of minors and widows. Mr. Swayamprakasam was a party to preparing this draft in the Select Committee and so I can understand his object. I think that the way in which he tries to achieve his object will lead to further difficulties, some of which we can foresee now and the others we cannot. So I suggest that he does not press his amendment. The substitution of the word ‘cultivates’ for the word ‘contributes’ will only lead to more ambiguity instead of removing ambiguity. I submit that the words ‘contributes his own physical labour or that of the members of his family in the cultivation of any land’ are the most suitable words that we can discover for the purpose we have in view. If Mr. Swayamprakasam agrees, I propose to add at the end of sub-clause (d), the

‘but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs’. This addition will give a clear indication to the courts as to what we mean.”

26th November 1952]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“Sir, Mr. Ramamurthi said in the course of his speech that I had something else in my mind. Let him rest assured that I have nothing else in my mind except what I say on the floor of this House, viz., that the wording of the clauses must be clear and unambiguous and must not be capable of more than one interpretation.

“In opposing my amendment, he objected to the limitation of the holding of a tenant to five acres. I do not object to a family having as many five acres as there are number of members in it. Even a middleman may say that he has ‘contributed’ towards the cultivation of the land by his periodical supervision, and the Revenue Courts may hold that he comes within the definition of a cultivating tenant. That is my difficulty. It is better to define the word ‘intermediary’. In the absence of such a definition, I press my amendment.”

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—“Sir, a landowner might have mortgaged the usufructuary rights on his land and taken back the land on lease as a tenant from the mortgagee. In that case, the owner of the land happens to be the tenant himself. If any clarification is needed in respect of such lands, it may be made.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, let us take the points one by one and clear our minds. The first point is about the choice between the words existing in the Bill ‘contributes his own physical labour . . . in the cultivation of any land’ and the words proposed in the amendment ‘cultivates any land . . . with his own physical labour’. I submit with all respect to Mr. Swayamprakasam that he should not be obsessed with the present idea. Let him look at the question objectively. The proposed wording does not improve the position. I propose to add at the end the words ‘but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs’.

“The second point is about the inclusion of ‘heirs’. All of us, especially the Members belonging to the Opposition, bestowed a great deal of thought on this issue in the Select Committee. They agreed with me that to exclude heirs would lead to injustice. We do want to give protection to minor or female heirs of a deceased tenant. Therefore we need not spend any more time on this point. I would ask Mr. Swayamprakasam to accept my assurance that the definition with the amendment that I have suggested will satisfy all that he wants.”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—“If the Government define the word ‘intermediary’ properly, I have no objection to withdraw my amendment.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“We cannot go on defining all the words in the Definitions clause. The courts will have to be guided by the general dictionary meaning.”

[26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—
For sub-clause (d), substitute the following:

"Cultivating tenant" or "tenant" means a person who lives in the locality and cultivates any land not exceeding 5 acres in extent and belonging to another with his own physical labour or that of the members of his family under a tenancy agreement, express or implied, and includes the heirs of such person who are not minors or females competent to cultivate the land."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Swayamprakasam has given an alternative amendment. After that is disposed of, I will take up the Government amendment."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I move—

(i) in sub-clause (d), after the word "land" occurring in line 3, insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in extent."

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):
"Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I second the amendment. If the Government do not agree to the limitation of five acres, we do not mind if any other limitation is put in."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

(i) In sub-clause (d) after the word "land" occurring in line 3, insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in extent."

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):
"Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the idea with which the hon. Member moved the amendment is very laudable. But I believe that if we limit the holding of a tenant to five acres, it will be very uneconomical for him. In my part of the country, tenants take wet lands from one landlord, a little garden land from another landlord and some dry land from yet another landlord and the total holding of a tenant may exceed five acres. A family cannot live on a small extent of five acres. If the hon. Member proposed 25 or 50 acres, it would have been a different thing and we could have discussed the matter. Since he has proposed five acres, I submit it is very uneconomical and I want him to reconsider the position."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If, for instance, twenty acres is put in, it will mislead the Courts, because physical labour for twenty acres would be meaningless. It will be the beginning to include intermediaries. Therefore it is better to have the clause clear."

26th November 1952]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"I do not mind increasing the extent. My idea was five acres for each member of a tenant's family."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Are the Government accepting the amendment?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"No, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (d), after the word "land" occurring in line 3, insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in extent."

(ii) Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (d):—
"Provided they are not females and minors and competent to cultivate the land."

The amendment was lost.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move the following amendment, namely:—

"Add at the end of Clause (d) the following, namely—
"but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, the intermediary may include in such cases, as my learned friend on the other side knows, different persons. There may be a mortgagee, there may be a matadhipathi, and there may be other persons. So many persons will come under the term 'intermediary', and the Court will find it difficult to decide who is the intermediary unless the term 'intermediary' is defined. If the term 'intermediary' is defined, I accept the amendment. Otherwise I oppose it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

"Add at the end of Clause 2 (d) the following, namely:—
"but shall not include a mere intermediary or his heirs."

The amendment was carried.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"I move the following amendment, namely,—

"In sub-clause (f) add the following at the end, namely:—
"and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands."

"Sir, sub-clause (f) reads as follows:—

"Gross produce" includes the yield obtained at the poradi. "Poradi" is a peculiar term applicable only to paddy cultivation. First there will be the first threshing, and then will follow the poradi. There will be produce both from the first threshing and second threshing that is, poradi. So, poradi is confined to only paddy cultivation. But the object of the Bill is not that. The object of the Bill is to see that the produce obtained from any other crop is also included in the gross produce. Therefore, in order to implement the provisions contained in other Clauses of the Bill, I am seeking to include other crops also in the gross produce. As it is, the definition of gross produce may mean

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [26th November 1952]

only the produce obtained from paddy cultivation, because *poradi* has application only to paddy cultivation. It will not include any other crop. Other crops have been included in the other Clauses of the Bill. Only to implement them, I am moving my amendment, which is only consequential."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is it a consequential amendment?"

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"I am putting it as a consequential amendment. I think it will not be difficult for the Government to accept the amendment."

The amendment was duly seconded.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I would deprecate merely going on adding to the sub-clause. We have not defined 'gross produce'. We have only stated that it should include something. It is unnecessary to go on defining it further by including in it further things. It will create more difficulty than, simplification."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Let me explain the position. There are two processes in getting yield from paddy cultivation. As soon as the harvest takes place, there is the first threshing. This is the first process. The second process is the second threshing, which is *poradi*. The term '*poradi*' applies only to paddy cultivation. It may be argued later that it does not include any other crop. To make the position clear, I have brought forward this amendment. Hon. Members need not think that I have any other object in view."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, the hon. Member does not make the position clear. '*Poradi*' is peculiar to paddy cultivation. There are two gatherings, namely, (1) as soon as the harvest is over, that is, the first threshing and (2) the *poradi* after the first threshing. It is only to clear the doubt in regard to paddy, it is stated that gross produce includes the yield obtained at the *poradi*. So, I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (f) add the following at the end, namely,—
"and that obtained from the cash crop on punja lands",'

The amendment was lost.

Clause 2, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 3.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely,—

'Omit sub-clause (b).'

"Sub-clause (b) states that the provisions of this Act shall not apply in respect of the land held by a landowner in any village if the land held by him in such village does not exceed one veli

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

(6 2/3 acres) which is either wet land or dry land irrigated from any Government source or three velis (twenty acres) of dry land not irrigated from any Government source. My amendment seeks to delete this provision and make the Act applicable to all landowners whether they give the land either on rent or on lease or they take to pannai cultivation. As it is, the Bill seeks to make an invidious distinction between tenants who work under landlords possessing more than one veli (6-2/3 acres) and those who work under others who own one veli and less. This invidious distinction will not work in actual practice. In one and the same village there will be tenants who do the same work and who contribute the same amount of labour, but the mere fact that they happen to be working under landlords who do not own more than one veli, will make them work on less favourable terms of service than those obtaining in the case of tenants who work under landlords owning more than one veli. Tenants working under landlords owning one veli and less will be subject, therefore, to eviction at any time by the landlords. The object of the Bill to give protection to people who are working as tenants or as pannaiyals will be defeated by giving exemption to that large class of people owning one veli and less. Of course it is sought to be made out that people owning one veli and less are poor people, and are people who do not make much out of their land, and that, therefore, in their case, a certain amount of exemption should be provided. But my submission is that we are not concerned with the question whether or not a particular person has got 6-2/3 acres of land or more. We are now concerned with the kind of exploitation that is going on. The landlord owns the land but does not work on the land. Nobody wants to prevent a person who to-day, for example, owns less than 6-2/3 acres of land, from resuming personal cultivation at any time if he chooses to do so. I would be prepared to allow that. If there are persons who own less than 6-2/3 acres of land and if at any time they want to resume personal cultivation, in such cases they may certainly get the preference and the tenant who may be on the land may even be sent out. But so long as there is a system of tenancy, that is, so long as a landlord carries on cultivation under the pannaiyal system, then that pannaiyal must be entitled to the protection which his brother pannaiyals are entitled to under the Bill. Otherwise, there will be innumerable disputes taking place in village after village. As a matter of fact, already in the Tanjore district in a number of villages, there have been disputes and very grave disputes at that, after the promulgation of the Ordinance, between small mirasdars and their pannaiyals, and small mirasdars and their waramdars. Really, in practice, it will be impossible to make them conform to any lower rates, because the peasants will fight. Why should we unnecessarily encourage this fight? Instead of that, let us see to it that everybody gets a square deal. On that basis, I would press this amendment not to give exemption to anybody."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is any hon. Member seconding the amendment?"

12-53
p.m.

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. KANDASAMI:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—
'Omit sub-clause (b)'."

"Now, I must tell the House that as soon as an amendment is moved, it should be seconded. If it is not seconded, the amendment will fall through."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to clause 3."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall call the hon. Members to move their amendments according to the order in which I am going to take them up. The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi has given notice of an alternative amendment. As soon as the present amendment is disposed of, I am going to take up the alternative amendment. Then, hon. Members Sri Samia Koorayar and Sri Bapanayya have given notice of amendments similar to that of Sri Ramamurthi. They will be taken up. Then comes the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Rajagopala Rao. After that comes the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam."

"Now, I want to know what the Government want to say on the present amendment."

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"Sir, I have also given notice of an amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It will be taken up later."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards procedure, I want to know one thing. To clause 3 there are quite a number of amendments covering different subjects. Now, is it the intention that the discussion should be on all the amendments together or separately?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendments will be taken up one after another."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Now, with regard to this amendment, the idea is, apart from the language, to extend the Bill at once to even small holdings. That is the proposal contained in this amendment. I submit that that would be very inadvisable as a matter of general policy. We have now a certain number of applications to be disposed of, petitions regarding evictions to be disposed of, and disputes to be settled, and we have limited them to a certain extent now by providing legislation. If we all at once begin with the whole of the lands in the Tanjore district, the difficulty will be far too great and we shall not be able to proceed properly and effectively. I would therefore, submit with all respect that this amendment should not be pressed."

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

"The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi appeared to me to give away the whole case when he said that, if the owner wished to take for personal cultivation the land which comprised less than 6-2/3 acres, he would have no objection. Now it means this. If we provide all this complicated machinery for the land in the first instance and then say that the owner may take it away, we take away really what we give in the first instance, and we would have to pass a new law, so to say, to cover such cases, where he will be bound by all these provisions in the first instance, but yet the over-riding claim of the owner will cancel the whole thing. I think it would not be proper to create this confusion just now. I would advise and request hon. Members on the other side not to press this amendment for this reason that ultimately the policy which is embodied in this Bill, will certainly have its influence on the general custom and privileges that will be claimed and enjoyed by landowners as well as tenants even in respect of the smaller holdings. It will operate by influence in course of time. Let us allow that natural operation to take place, and then let us enter, if there is necessity, by legislation. Otherwise, it would be really starting immediately a difficulty throughout the length and breadth of the district. If we allow the natural operation to take place, then the natural instinct of the people will be to claim what is enjoyed by the neighbour. Let them claim and let them get it. I assure hon. Members, who are doubtful about the effect of it, that they need not have doubts, because the tenant will have a great deal of moral strength behind him when he makes the claim and he will get it without difficulty and agreement will begin to prevail in spite of rules and regulations in force."

"Let us take also the procedure that is to be followed in giving effect to the provisions of this Bill. It involves a certain amount of litigation of one kind or another. Let us not put the whole of the Tanjore district into litigation. Let us proceed first with this small limit. If the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi is willing to allow the owner to take over the 6-2/3 acres of land, why should we not allow him to choose his own tenant, for the time being, if there is such a tenant? And all this difficulty of finding out whether he is a tenant or whether he is an owner or whether he is an intermediary, will be soluble in the case of the bigger holdings and insoluble in the case of the smaller holdings. These and many other reasons which I need not go into, induce me to say that we cannot accept the amendment, and I would go further and ask hon. Members on the other side not to press it."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, after hearing the reply of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I must say that I am not convinced, because the only reason that he has adduced against the acceptance of this amendment is an administrative one. He does not say that the tenants under the small landholders should not get whatever protection is afforded to the tenants under this Bill, but says that in view of the administrative difficulty this amendment may lead to, it should not be accepted. I would submit that

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

administrative difficulties should not come in the way of affording protection to the tenants irrespective of under whom they are actually working to-day as tenants.

"Secondly, the main thing with which we are concerned, is the question of share that the tenants will get under this Bill. If a certain class of people are excluded from the operation of this Bill, then what would happen? Just now when I was coming to the Assembly, some people from certain parts of Tanjore came to me and told me that the smaller landholders had actually started giving less than what they were even previously giving, under the plea that the law allows them exemption. Therefore, the share that the tenants will get will be further reduced. Now, irrespective of the question of litigation, not exempting any kind of landholders, which means that everybody will get a certain share of the crop, is the biggest thing that is absolutely essential. Therefore, I press my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Has the Hon. the Revenue Minister anything to say on this matter?"

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I have only to repeat the arguments advanced by the Hon. the Chief Minister that there is not only the administrative difficulty but other ones also. There must be a certain extent of land in which the owner can operate. There may be some circumstances in which he can himself take the plough and cultivate the land. After all, we have limited the area to a very small extent and there must be that much of freedom, so that any gentleman, whether he is the owner or a tenant, may cultivate his own land. I cannot see my way to accept the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—
'Omit sub-clause (b).'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi wants in his alternative amendment to omit certain words and substitute certain other words. So, I would call the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam to move his amendment now."

1 p.m. SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM:—"Sir, I move the following amendment standing in my name:—

'Omit the words "in any village" and "in such village" occurring in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause (b).'

"While moving the amendment, I wish to say a few words. Sub-clause (b) of clause 3 says that the provisions of this Act 'shall not apply in respect of the land held by a landowner in any village if the land held by him in such village does not exceed one veli (6-2/3 acres) which is either wet land or dry land irrigated from any Government source, or three velis (twenty acres) of dry land not irrigated from any Government source.' My amendment is

26th November 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

for the deletion of the words 'in any village' and 'in such village' occurring in this clause. If a tenant is cultivating a land of a landowner who has less than one veli, say by 5 cents or 8 cents in a particular village, according to this sub-clause, he will be put to difficulty. He will not be able to reap the benefits of this Act. There are many landowners who have lands in different villages. I mean, in different contiguous villages. They may by accident possess less than a veli in a particular village. In such cases, the Act will not give relief to a tenant who is working on the spot simply because the landowner does not have more than 6-2/3 acres of land in that particular village. A tenant who has accidentally to be in a village in which the landowner does not possess more than a veli, should not be deprived of the benefits of this Act. That is the point which I wish to stress. The tenant should be given adequate relief in such cases. It is for this purpose only I have moved my amendment and request the House to accept the same."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam. While doing so, I wish to point out that the amendment standing in my name and the one standing in the name of Sri Vadivelu are more or less the same as the one just now moved by Sri Swayamprakasam."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, the hon. Member's amendment contains something more."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"But, the effect of both the amendments is the same. So it is immaterial if my amendment is accepted or not."

MR. SPEAKER:—"In that case, let not the hon. Member move his amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, the main question is, who are the people who have got to be exempted and whether it is right to exempt landlords owning less than 6-2/3 acres of land from the operation of this Act. Why should we restrict the extent of the land to one veli? As a matter of fact, there are landlords who own hundreds of acres. Their lands may be situated in a number of villages. I can give concrete instances—and I do not want to mention names here—in which landlords, who own more than 200 velis in different villages, possess less than 5 acres of land in a particular village. Why should the tenants working under such a landlord in that particular village where he owns less than 5 acres of land, be placed at a great disadvantage? Therefore it is we urge that in such cases the landlord should not be exempted from the operation of this Act. In such cases, the extent of the land possessed by the landlord in a particular village should not be taken into account, but the total extent of the land that he possesses in various villages should also be taken as a single unit for purposes of this sub-clause. This amendment is meant only

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

to help the poor tenants. Therefore I don't think the Chief Minister or the Government will have any difficulty whatsoever in accepting this amendment. This is a simple proposition. If the amendment is accepted in principle, then we can certainly look into the wording carefully."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—
'Omit the words "in any village" and "in such village" occurring in lines 2 and 3 of sub-clause (b)."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ సమస్య మీద రామమూర్తిగారు మాట్లాడుతున్నారంటే అటువైపు ఉన్నటువంటి మంత్రులలో ఏదో ఒక విధమైన అభిప్రాయాలు యీ భూముల విషయములో స్థూలించుచున్నట్లునూ, opposition వారు కాలయాపనకు దారితీస్తున్నా గని అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నట్లు నేను అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను. యీ విషయములో నేను ఒక సంగతి చెప్పుచున్నాను. రాష్ట్రములో అనేకమందికి అనేక చోట్ల భూములు ఉండుట కద్దు. భద్రహరణకు అనంతపురం చెరువుకింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, సింగనపాల చెరువుకింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, ధర్మవరం చెరువుకింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలు, హిందూపురం చెరువుకింద కొన్ని ఎకరాలుగల వ్యక్తులు ఎంతోమంది, ఒక జిల్లాకు చెందినవారు ఉన్నారు. మొత్తము మీద చూచుకుంటే ఒక్కొక్కరికి వదిలెకరాలు, ఇరవై ఎకరాలకు ఎక్కువగా ఉన్న వ్యక్తులు ఉన్నారు. కాని ఒకే ప్రదేశములో చూచినచో ఒక వ్యక్తికి 6 2/3 ఎకరాలకు తక్కువగానే ఉండవచ్చు."

"ఇదికొక మరొక చిన్న విషయాన్ని చెప్పుతున్నాను. గవర్నమెంటు ఆఫీసర్లు procurement కొరకు వెళ్లగా ఒక గ్రామములో ఒక వ్యక్తికి అయిదు ఎకరాలకు తక్కువగా ఉండుట వల్ల వారు యీ procurement నుండి తప్పించుకొనుటకు సాధ్యమగుచున్నది. ఇట్లా ఆ వ్యక్తికి శున్న భూమిని అంతయు చూచుకున్నచో యీ procurement నుంచి తప్పించుకోలేరు. ఈ విషయములో గవర్నమెంటుకు నష్టమేనని చెప్పవలగుచున్నది. ఇట్లాంటి వ్యక్తులు ఎంతోమంది exemption సంపాదించుకొనుటకు ఉన్నారు. ఇటువంటివి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎవరెవరికి ఎంతెంత భూమియన్నచో తెలుసుకొనలేకపోతే అదంతయు గవర్నమెంటుకు నష్టమనే చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు పరతులనుబట్టి, ఆయా ప్రదేశములలోనున్న సభ్యులు యీ clause ను అంగీకరింతురని నమ్ముతున్నాను. Procurement విషయములో ప్రతివ్యక్తికి అన్ని గ్రామాలలోచేరి రెక్కచేయనందున procurement నుండి తప్పించుకొనుట వల్ల, గవర్నమెంటు procurement విధానంలో fail అయిఉన్నారు. అట్లాగే యీ బిల్లు విషయములో గూడా ప్రతివ్యక్తికిని అతనికి ఉన్న భూమి అన్ని చోట్లకలిపి ఒక unit గాచేస్తే యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపజేయగలరేగాని, ఏ గ్రామానికి ఆ గ్రామందూరుకుంటే పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములకుగూడా యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపకుండా తప్పించుకొనుటకు అవకాశముండగలదు. గనుక ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ క్లాజును సరిగా ప్రతికేసులూ అన్వయింపజేయుటకు తగు శ్రద్ధవహించే ప్రయత్నములు చేసే యీ క్లాజు చేర్చవచ్చును. కాకపోతే, పెద్ద వేస్తేనే బాగుండుదని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఈ విషయములో మంత్రిగారు ఆలోచించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా ఈ clause 3 (b) మొత్తము పొలానికి అనువర్తింపకుండా ఒక వేలి భూమి శున్నదంటే లాభ

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

కరమే. ఎందుచేతనంటే అనేక చోట్లలో అక్కడక్కడ పంటలు బాగా పండుతాయి. అనేక చోట్ల ఒక వేలికన్న ఎక్కువ శేకుండా చూపించవచ్చును. ఈ యాక్టు ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే సంబంధించినది కాబట్టి వివరాలు చూపించవచ్చును. ఒక చోటనే శుంటే నష్టము ఉండుంది. ఒక్కొక్క చోట రెండు, మూడు, అయిదు యకరాలు ఒక వేలికి తక్కువగా అక్కడక్కడ చూపించితే, యీ యాక్టును వర్తింపజేసుకోకుండా తప్పించుకోవచ్చును. అట్లాంటున్నప్పుడు భూస్వాముల పని పెరుగే, యీ యాక్టును నిరుపయోగము చేసినట్లే. ఈ క్లాజు భూస్వాములకే శుపయోగపడేదిగావుంది కాబట్టి నేను యీ సవరణను ఉపసాదిస్తూ ప్రభుత్వమువారిని అంగీకరింపమని కోరుచున్నాను."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ amendment చాలా ముఖ్యమైంది. Select Committee stageలో దీనిమీద చాలా సవరణలు తీసుకు వచ్చారు. కాని ప్రభుత్వము ఆ రోజున అంగీకరింప లేదు. ఈ amendment విషయములో ఒక విషయము ముఖ్యంగా గమనింపవలసియున్నది. ఒక వ్యక్తికి అనేక గ్రామాలలో మొత్తము 40 ఎకరాలుగాని, 50 ఎకరాలుగాని అంతకుపైన నూరు ఎకరాలుగాని భుండేవున్నా ఒక్కొక్క గ్రామములో ఒక వేలికన్న తక్కువగా శుంటే యీ యాక్టు వర్తింపదు అని శున్నది. ఇది ఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే తెచ్చినను, ప్రతి వ్యక్తిగూడ యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకోగల సావకాశాలు ఉండగలవు. ఇది ఎక్కడాలేవని ప్రభుత్వమువారు చెప్పడములో అర్థము లేదు. అయితే యీ విషయములో Select Committee ఎందుకు ఆహ్వానించలేదంటే, ప్రతి వ్యక్తికిని ఎంతెంత భూమి ఏ ఏ గ్రామములో ఉన్నచో Statistics తీయుటకు కష్టపాద్యమని Select Committee లో యిది అంగీకరింపనందున యీ రోజున amendment గా తీసుకొని వచ్చాము. ఈ విచారణ కష్టపాద్యమనిస్తే, ప్రభుత్వానికి యిబ్బంది అని అన్నప్పటికిని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు యీ విషయములో శ్రద్ధ వహించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఒక జిల్లాలో యీ విధమైన వ్యక్తులు ఎంతమంది శున్నారో దర్శాత్తు చేయించినచోడల యీ విషయము బోధపడగలదు. యంతమందియన్నూ యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకొనుటకు సాధ్యపడినప్పుడు యీ యాక్టు పెట్టిన ప్రయోజనమేమీ ఉండదు. ప్రభుత్వానికి యిది కష్టతరమైన పనికాదు. ఈ బిల్లు ముఖ్యంగా కొలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు తెచ్చామని ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుచున్నారు. అట్లాంటున్నప్పుడు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న ప్రతి వ్యక్తిని యీ యాక్టునుండి exemption పొందితే యిక యీ కొలు దార్ల యొక్క స్థితి ఏమవుతుంది. అందువలన యీ amendment ను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

"ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పుతున్నాను. రాష్ట్రంలో యీ కొలుదార్లు భూములను చూడేండ్లు, అయిదేండ్లు, ఆరేండ్లు, అరవై యేండ్లుగాను కొలు చేస్తూన్నటువంటి వారు గలరు. అటువంటివారుగూడా యీనాడు యీ యాక్టును కమిటీకి తెచ్చారంటే యీ భూములు వదిలిపోవలసిన స్థితి పడుతుంది."

"ఈ amendment ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరింపక పోయినట్లయితే ఎన్నో విండ్ల నుంచి అనుభవించుచున్న యీ పేద రైతులను తొలగించుటకే యీ యాక్టు తెచ్చుచున్నారని బోధపడగలదు. ముఖ్యంగా భూస్వాములకు ఎక్కువ అనుకూలమగును. వారు వివిధంగా నైనను భూమిని వారికి శున్న గ్రామములలో యీ యాక్టునుండి తప్పించుకొనుటకు భూములను ఇతరుల పరం చేసి, ఒక వేలికి తక్కువగా చూపించుటకు వీలు గలుగును. యీ విషయములో యీ పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములకే లాభము

[26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village if the land held by him in such village" substitute the words "if the total extent of land held by him".'

"Hon. Members Sri Krishna and Sri Bapanayya need not move their amendments."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ సవరణ ఇంతకు ముందు move చేసినటువంటి స్వయంప్రకాశంగా సవరణనే పోలియున్నది. కాబట్టి, దీని విషయములో మా అభిప్రాయాన్ని తెలుపుతున్నాము. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ సవరణను గనుక అంగీకరించక పోయినట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశమే పోతుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయాన్ని ముఖ్యంగా రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు, ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. కారణమేమిటంటే, ఈ బిల్లు ప్రవేశపెట్టడములో, భూస్వాములు, వారి పొలాన్ని కొలుక ఇచ్చిన సందర్భములో ఆ కొలుదార్లయొక్క హక్కును రక్షించడమనేదే దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశమై యున్నది. ఆలాంటిప్పుడు ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాలలోపుగా ఉన్న భూస్వాములను మినహాయించినట్లయితే, చాలామంది భూస్వాములు దీనివల్ల affected కాకుండా అనేకవేల మంది కొలుదార్లకు నష్టంకలిగే విధముగా ఇది పరిణమిస్తుంది. ఎందుకనగా ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాల హక్కున 5, 6 చోట్ల కలిసి మొత్తము 30, 40 ఎకరాలు ఒక్క భూస్వామికి ఉండవచ్చును. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో కొలుదార్లకు నిజంగా చేయదలచుకొన్న సహాయము జరుగదు. కొన్నివేల కొలుదార్లు దీనివల్ల నష్టపడవలసి వస్తుంది. కనుక ఇప్పటికైనా ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ప్రధాన ఉద్దేశాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించి ఈ సవరణను మాత్రము అంగీకరించి దానిని ఆమోదించాలని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారిని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అదే మా అభిప్రాయము."

SRI G. BAPANAYYA:—"అధ్యక్ష, నా ప్రతిపాదనయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము ఏమిటంటే, సాధారణంగా భూస్వాములు ఒకే ఒక ప్రాంతంలో తమ పొలాన్ని కలిగివుండటం లేదు. వీరు అనేక గ్రామాలలో పొలాలు కలిగిఉంటారు. అటువంటిప్పుడు, వీరికి ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాల హక్కున ఇప్పుడున్న clause ప్రకారం మినహాయించవలసి యుండుంది. ఆ పక్షములో మొత్తము వీరికి అన్ని చోట్ల కలిసి అనేక ఎకరాల పొలము ఉండినప్పటికీ, ప్రతిచోట ఈ పరిమితిలోపుగా ఉన్నందున మినహాయించబడి చాలామంది tenants కు అన్యాయము కలుగజేసినట్లువుతుంది. ఒకేచోట మాత్రమే 6 2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించకుండా ఉండినట్లయితే, దానిని భూస్వామి స్వయంగా సాగుచేసుకోదానికి అవకాశము ఇవ్వవలసిందే. కాని ఒకరికే అనేక గ్రామాలలో ఒక్కొక్కచోట 6 2/3 ఎకరాలలోపుగా ఉన్నటువంటి పొలాలన్నీ, మినహాయించడంవల్ల, అనేకమంది కొలుదార్లకు నష్టము కలుగుతుంది. కనుక, ఒకచోటనే ఉన్న భూమినే రెక్కవేసుకొని మినహాయించ కూడదనే ఈ ప్రతిపాదనను ప్రభుత్వము తప్పనిసరిగా ఆమోదించవలసినదిగా కోరుతున్నాను."

1.20 p.m. * THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, it is no use repeating the same arguments and contentions too much. So I shall not go into all that. I want to point out the possible lapses in the mind of Mr. Ramamurthi. It is true he is obsessed by one fact, namely, that some big landowners possess small bits of land elsewhere, and he asks, why should we

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

prevent the application of the Act to these small bits. On the other hand, I have got the small owners of land in my mind. The object of the Government is not to benefit one or the other. The small owner for instance who has three acres in one village and another three acres in another village—must he be made to worry going through all these formalities and technicalities of this law? (Hon. Members: No, No.) Therefore I wish to prevent it. That is what my hon. Colleague meant when he said 'administrative difficulties'. He did not mean difficulties for the Secretariat or the Ministers or the other Government staff. He meant difficulties arising in putting into operation the provisions of this law—the difficulties for the tenant, the landowner, the court and everybody else. If we include the small bits of land also, we must have a totalizing mechanism and all that, such as we have for calculating the income derived by a person not only here but throughout the world for purposes of income-tax assessment. We have to have such machinery if we have to include in the case of the landowner all the bits of land that he possesses in all the villages in the Tanjore district, or, as some other amendment puts it, in the State of Madras. This would lead to great difficulty in finding out to whom it belongs and to whom it does not belong and all that. Therefore it is that we wish that every village officer's jurisdiction should be a unit. Therefore I ask the opposite side to accept the clause as it is. It is only then that the lease deeds could be written and the procedure will be easy. It is with this object that we said 'in one village' and not with the object to provide either more or less for the landowner or the tenant. It is only with a view to making the application of the Act easy and acceptable from the village officer upwards. I therefore hope that the decision already reached on Mr. Swayamprakasam's amendment will be made legally applicable to the rest of the amendments."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the Hon. the Chief Minister . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to interrupt but I hope the Hon. Speaker agrees with me that it is not usual to allow a right of reply to movers of amendments."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not only usual, but it is our right and it cannot be cut down."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want just to bring to the notice of the Government certain things with regard to the difficulties that are now being sought to be made out in accepting the amendment. Recently Government have promulgated an order called the 'Levy Procurement Order' for the procurement of foodgrains. Under the order it is possible for the Government to take into account the total extent of land held by

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

a particular individual irrespective of the fact that that land may or may not be situated in the same village. On that basis the small landowner has to be taken into account here also, irrespective of whether he has lands situated in one village or lands distributed in a number of villages. When it is a question of paddy procurement from the landowner (interruption). I am not saying that it is a wrong thing. It is a good principle. I only ask why that principle should not operate when it comes to a question of giving protection to the tenant. Why should these difficulties, administrative or whatever they might be, come in the way of giving protection to the tenants of such landowners whose lands are situated in various villages? Therefore, I am not convinced with the reply of the Government and I am pressing my amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Regarding the point raised by the Hon. the Chief Minister the rule is clear. A Member who has moved a substantive motion (not being a cut motion on a budget, a supplementary, an additional or an excess grant or an amendment to a resolution) may speak again by way of reply. He has a right. I shall now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village if the land held by him in such village", substitute the words "if the total extent of land held by him".'

The amendment was declared lost.

Sri P. Ramamurthi demanded a poll. The division bell was rung.

MR. SPEAKER:—"In view of the fact that the House has already given a verdict on the amendment of Mr. Swayamprakasam, I wish to know whether Mr. Ramamurthi is pressing for a division on his amendment. I think he is not."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In view of the fact that already a decision has been taken on a similar amendment, I am not now pressing for a division on my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"So the amendment of Mr. Ramamurthi is lost."

The House will now adjourn for lunch and reassemble at 3 p.m.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall take up the amendment of Sri K. Rajagopla Rao. But before that I want to know whether his amendment falls within the scope of the Bill."

26th November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"అయినప్పటికీ, సభ్యుల అభిప్రాయాలను తెలుసుకొనుటకు ప్రతి mover కు కూడా చూట్టాడే chance ఉంటే మంచిదని నా అభిప్రాయము."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I think the hon. Member has not understood what exactly the Hon. Speaker has said."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member wants to substitute for the words "in any village" the words "in the State of Madras" in sub-clause (b) of clause 3 of the Bill. First of all I want to know what he means by it."

* Sri K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము, భూస్వామి రాష్ట్రములో ఎక్కడైనా 6-2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించి భూమి ఉన్నప్పుడు యీ వట్టం పర్చించాలి. "ఒక్కొక్క ఊళ్లో 6-2/3 ఎకరాలకు మించి ఉన్నప్పుడు అనేదాన్ని తీసేయాలి. ఈ సవరణ అంగీకరించకపోతే ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారి, ప్రభుత్వపక్షముగాని ఈ బిల్లు ఏ సదుద్దేశ్యముతో తేబడినదని చెప్పు కొంటున్నారో, ఆ ఉద్దేశ్యానికే భంగము కలుగుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక భూస్వామికి పాతిక ఎకరాల భూమి ఒక గ్రామములో ఉన్నట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లు వర్తిస్తుంది. మరొక భూస్వామికి ఇదే పాతిక ఎకరాల భూమి 4, 5 ఊళ్లలో పంపకమై ఉంటే అతనికి మాత్రం వర్తించదు. అంటే, ఒకే రకమైన అస్తికలిగినటువంటి భూస్వాముల మధ్య ఈ బిల్లువల్ల విభేదము కల్పించబడుతున్నది. అందుచేత ఈ బిల్లు అందరి భూస్వాములకూ సమానంగా వర్తించలేని, tenants కు ఎక్కువ లాభము కలిగించే టట్లు చేయాలి. లేకపోతే ఈ బిల్లు ఉద్దేశ్యానికే భంగము కలుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లును స్త్రీలు, కార్మికుల వేయడానికి, అప్పుడే భూస్వాములు అనేకరకమైన ప్రయత్నాలు చేస్తున్నారు. పాతిక ఎకరాలు ఉండే భూస్వామి, ఆ భూమిని తన భార్యపేరిటా, బిడ్డల పేరిటా విభజించి ఈ బిల్లునుండి తప్పించుకోడానికై ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నాడు. కనుక ఇటువంటి తప్పుడు మార్గాలకు అవకాశము లేకుండా ఉండేటందుకు ఈ సవరణ అంగీకరించడం చాలా అవసరం. అయితే రివిన్యూమంత్రి ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరిస్తే ఆచరణలో పెట్టడం చాలా కష్టమవుతున్నారు. ఇది నిజంకాదు. చాలా సులభంగా చేయవచ్చు. ఏదే గ్రామములో ఏదే ఆసామీకి ఎంతెంత పొలము ఉన్నదని మొదలైన లెక్కలన్నీ కరణాలద్వారా తయారుచేయించవచ్చును. అందుచేత ఇది difficult task అని చెప్పుట సరియైనదికాదు. కాబట్టి ఎక్కువ మంది కౌలుదార్లకు నష్టం వాటిల్లకుండా తగిన రక్షణ ఇవ్వాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యమే నిజంగా ప్రభుత్వానికుంటే ఈ సవరణను తప్పక అంగీకరించవలసియ్యవచ్చు. లేకపోతే, ఈ బిల్లువల్ల ఏ మాత్రమూ ప్రయోజనం ఉండదని నేను మనవిచేస్తూ, నా పేరున లెక్క సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

In sub-clause (b) for the words "in any village" substitute the words "in the State of Madras."

In sub-clause (b)- for the words "in such village" substitute the words "in the State of Madras."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"నేను దీనిని బలపరుస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Has the Hon. Minister for Revenue anything to say about this amendment?"

[26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I have nothing to add to what I had already said, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (b), for the words "in any village" substitute the words "in the State of Madras."

(ii) In sub-clause (b) for the words "in such village" substitute the words "in the State of Madras"."

The amendment was lost.

* SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name:—

Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals."

"The small landholders, viz., those who possess less than one veli are no longer bound by this Bill since it has fixed the exemption limit as 6-2/3 acres, i.e., one veli. Suppose these mirasidars engage pannaiyals, they are under no obligation to pay their pannaiyals according to the provisions of the Act. Their own comrades working under mirasidars possessing more than one veli will get fair wages which this Bill provides for them. This reminds me of the Tamil saying 'ஒரு ஊரில் இரண்டு யைத்தியக் காரர்களா.' If the pannaiyals working on the lands of these small mirasidars possessing less than one veli each clamour for the same wages got by their brethren working in the fields of the big mirasidars, their cry will be a cry in the wilderness. If these poor pannaiyals go to the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court, it will serve no purpose. I know thousands of such applications are pouring in in the Revenue Court at Mayuram. But what does the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court say? They say, 'What can we do? The law has fixed one veli, i.e., 6-2/3 acres as the exemption limit. Unless and until the law is amended lowering the exemption limit, we cannot do anything'. What is the result? We find only discontent among these poor pannaiyals. Their mirasidars refuse to pay them higher wages. They say, 'We will pay you according to the old custom of half a marakkal as daily wage. This is half of what we have been asked to give under the Mayuram agreement'. In order to provide an equitable share in the produce for these pannaiyals also along with their brethren working in the big pannais, I move this amendment, Sir."

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals."

"I want to know whether the Hon. Minister for Revenue wants to say anything on this amendment."

26th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The hon. Member was pleading for the abolition of the pannaiyal system at the time of the introduction of this Bill. Now he comes and says that pannaiyals working under mirasidars owning less than one veli should be given equal rights as those working under mirasidars owning more than one veli. I am sorry I cannot accept his amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member, Sri K. R. Sambandam pressing his amendment?"

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—"Yes, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

Add the following words at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"but the landowner shall pay the pannaiyals according to this Act if he engages pannaiyals."

The amendment was lost.

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate."

Sir, this amendment is intended to minimize the mischief which would otherwise result from the working of sub-clause 3 (b). It has been claimed by the framers of this Bill that they want to hold the scales even between the landowners and the tenants; but it is not difficult to find out in whose favour the scale is tilted. By a comparison of the definitions of 'tenant' and 'landowner' the matter is clear. While the definition of 'tenant' is narrow and restricted, the other is wide and comprehensive. I do not propose to read the definitions. But two important expressions as 'the assignee and persons deriving rights from him' are conspicuously absent from the definition of 'tenant'. The inclusion of these two phrases in the definition of 'landowner' is potentially dangerous to whatever benefits this Bill is supposed to confer on the tenant. To understand the full implications, it must be read in conjunction with sub-clause 3 (b). Of course, the word 'landowner' includes assignee. Suppose there is a landowner 'A' who to-day has 60 acres of land and after coming into force of this Act he assigns the whole land in the names of 10 persons, his near relatives and friends including himself, at 6 acres each. As a result of working of sub-clause 3 (b), all these pieces of land will be outside the purview of this Bill. The Bill imposes a restriction on the rights of the tenant because it says that the tenant forfeits all the rights under the Bill if he sub-leases the land.

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [26th November 1952]

I think the intention of the framers of this Bill must be to protect the persons who are landowners. There is no reason why an assignee who with open eyes takes the assignment of the land after interests are created in favour of the tenant, must be in a better position than the landowner himself, for it is well known that an assignee cannot have higher rights than the assignor. To-day an assignor who is in possession of more than 6-2/3 acres is bound by the provisions of this Bill. But an assignee taking 6 acres of land from a landowner gets higher rights than the assignor himself. This is opposed to all principles of law. Moreover, we know how this provision will be abused by landowners who will pick and choose and take full opportunity of assigning the lands of those tenants whom they do not favour and such tenants will be helpless victims to this kind of action on the part of the landowners. Under section 15 of the Evidence Act, a tenant is prohibited from questioning the title of the landowner, which means also the assignee; he is a third party to the contract and he cannot question the document. As has been pronounced by judicial authorities, *benami* transactions in India are a rule but not an exception. If, with a view to deliberately defeat the provisions of this Bill, the landowners assign their lands in portions of 6 acres, the tenants will be without any remedy. Therefore, Sir, my amendment is just and reasonable and the intention is to protect whatever rights this Act confers upon the tenant. I hope the House as well as the Government will find it acceptable."

SRI M. NARAYANA NAMBIAR:—"I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri M. Narayana Kurup."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved:—

"Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate." "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, the hon. Member who moved the amendment has spoken on the basis that some kind of advantage is given and that advantage should not accrue to a purchaser. That is the basis of his argument. But the motive and reason behind this provision is not a question of advantage or disadvantage, but that the complicate provisions of this Act should not apply to small owners; once an assignment takes place—and it is not a fraud but a real assignment, the assignee becomes a small owner. It would be administratively difficult to apply this Act to some small owners and not apply it to some other small owners and keep the history of their title in order to enforce the Act. It would be very, very complicated and I submit, it would be undesirable."

26th November 1952]

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP:—"Sir, there is absolutely no complication. I only mean that assignees in future should not have this personal right because this is a right which is given to the landowner in consideration of his being in possession of the land. Where is the complication if it is stated 'except those on whom properties devolve by partition or as a legatee'? The future assignees will not be entitled to claim exemption under this sub-clause. I fail to see where the complication is. Therefore, I submit, there is no complication because we do not discriminate as between one future assignee and another future assignee."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

"Insert the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"Provided that the benefits of the above sub-clause shall accrue only to those who were landowners on 23rd August 1952 and to those who become entitled to property on account of partition and to legatees who would be heirs, had the deceased died intestate." "

The amendment was lost.

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

"Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—

"Provided such landowner wishes to cultivate the farm by himself." "

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—"ఈ సవరణను నేను చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిదిగా భావిస్తున్నాను. కారణమేమిటంటే, exemption అనే టెంటువంటిది small holdersకు ఉండవలసిందే. ఇది అవసరమేగాని అది ఒక పరిమితిలో ఉండాలి అని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను. స్వంతంగా నేవ్యకు చేసుకోవడానికి ఈ exemption ఉండాలి. అలాగే occupation right ఇస్తున్నట్లయితే, భూమి అక్రమణ అధికారాన్ని గనుక కొలుదారుకు ఇస్తున్నటువంటి సందర్భంలో అయితే ఈ విధమైనటువంటి exemption వర్తింపజేయడంలో అర్థమవుతుంది. Small holdersకు ఉన్నటువంటి కొద్ది అస్తి అనగా 20 ఎకరాల మెట్టు, 6-2/3 ఎకరాల మాగాణి ఈ కాస్త పొకుండా, వాళ్ల చేతుల్లోనే ఉండాలి గనుక వారికి రక్షణ ఇవ్వడం అవసరము. కాని ఈ సందర్భములో tenantsకు protection ఇవ్వడం అనేటటువంటిది, ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యము. అయితే పది ఎకరాలు ఉన్నటువంటి మిరాసీదారుగాని, భూస్వామిగాని అయిన నేద్యానికి ఇస్తే ఆ నేద్యగాడు, అంటే కొలుదారు ఒక విధమైనటువంటి rate భూస్వామికి ఇస్తున్నప్పుడు, 6 ఎకరాలకు small holders విధానం ఇతర ఉద్యోగం చేసుకుంటూ వస జీవితావసరాలను తీర్చుకొనే నిమిత్తం ఇతరత్రా ఆదాయాన్ని సంపాదించుకొంటు ఉండేటటువంటి వ్యక్తి ఆ పొలానికి పొకుండా దాన్ని కొలుకు ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఆ కొలుదారుకు మాత్రము ప్రక్కన ఉన్నటువంటి కొలుదారుకు ఏ రక్షణ ఇస్తామా అదే రక్షణ ఈ బిల్లులో ఉన్న మినహాయింపుద్వారా లేకుండాపోతుంది. అందుకని కొలుదారుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వడం చాలా ముఖ్యము. ఈ రక్షణ ఇవ్వడంలో 5 ఎకరాలు భూభాగమునుండి నేద్యానికి తీసుకొంటే ఒక విధమైన పద్ధతి, 20 ఎకరాలు భూభాగమునుండి నేద్యానికి తీసుకుంటే

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [26th November 1952]

మరొక రకమైన పద్ధతి అనుసరించడం కొలుదార్ల మధ్యన వ్యత్యాసము ఏర్పాటుచేసి అనారోగ్యకరమైనటువంటి పోటీలను ప్రేరేపించటంగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి కొలుదార్లు ఎవరైనానో, ఏ భూమిఅయినానో, దానికి తప్పనిసరిగా ఏరక్షణను మామూలు కొలుదార్లకు ఇస్తామో ఆ రక్షణ అందరు కొలుదార్లకు ఇవ్వాలన్నదే ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. అయితే small holders స్వంతముగా నేవ్యము చేసుకొని శ్రమపడటము వంటివాళ్లకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసిందే. పాలము కలిగియుండే హక్కువారికి ఉండవలసిందే. కాని ఈ విధంగా కాదు కాబట్టి ఈ సవరణను తప్పనిసరిగా అంగీకరించాలని నేను ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను."

3-20 p.m. SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I second this amendment. It is a very reasonable amendment. It is equitable both to the landholder as well as to the tenant; and particularly it is designed to protect the small landholders. Therefore, I hope that the Government will accept this amendment without any reservation whatsoever."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, the amendment itself as framed, is defective. Logically speaking, it must read like this: "to cultivate the farm by himself or herself". (Hon. Members: We have no objection). The difficulty will be this: Suppose a poor old widow is in possession of a piece of land. According to this amendment, she cannot herself cultivate the land; and if this amendment is accepted, she will have to leave the land and go away. As I said, the amendment is defective, and by accepting the amendment, we will only be creating new difficulties. So, I oppose the amendment."

SRI M. HANUMANATHA RAO:—"వినుత్య మంత్రిగారు వృద్ధ వితంతులకు రక్షణ అవునరమని, మైనర్లకు రక్షణ అవునరమని సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నారు. కాని అది సరికాదు. వృద్ధ వితంతులకు, మైనర్లకు అస్తి రక్షణ ఉండవలసిందే. కాని యిట్లువచ్చిన వివరీత కొలు వసూలు చేయటానికికాదు. పాలమీద నేద్యంచేసేవానికి ముఖ్యమైన రక్షణ వుండటం అవునరం. కనుక నా సవరణను ఓటుకు పెట్టమని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (b):—
"Provided such landowner wishes to cultivate the farm by himself."'

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"Sir, I am moving the amendment which stands in my name."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member should address the Chair."

* SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"I thought I addressed the Chair, Sir. If I have really made a mistake, I convey my apologies to the Chair."

26th November 1952] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I move the amendment which stands in my name. It reads as follows:—

'Number the existing clause (3) as sub-clause (1) of that clause and add the following as sub-clause (2):—

"(2) Where a landowner holds land exceeding one veli whether in the same village or in different villages, he shall be entitled to retain in any one village, land not exceeding one veli for cultivation by himself and the members of his family and this Act shall not apply in respect of the land so retained by him."

"As regards the amendment itself, it is simple and self-explanatory. However, I wish to say that agriculture is supposed to be the oldest and noblest of occupations. With the advent of foreign rule, especially British rule, landholders for more reasons than one, became absentee landholders. Now, things have changed and there has been a feeling in some quarters that people should revert to the old occupation. When such is the idea, if, as a result of this Act, people are so minded and inclined to revert to agriculture and carry on agricultural operations themselves, it is but reasonable that the Government should allow them to do so. I hope, Sir, that the Government will accept this amendment."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించినట్లయితే భూస్వామ్య విధానం యథా తథంగానే ఉంటుంది. ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చిన కారణములు అలాగానే నిలచిఉంటవి. దున్నేవానికి భూమిపై హక్కుఉండాలి అనే ముఖ్య సూత్రానికిది విరుద్ధం. అందు చేత నేను దీనిని తప్పక వ్యతిరేకించవలసివచ్చినది."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Government are sorry, Sir, they cannot accept the amendment. It will complicate everything."

SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"I feel it is impossible to persuade the Government even to do a small thing like this. I will leave it at that."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, we are all interested in young gentlemen of landowning families going back to the land; but we must make laws for the generality of things. That is the reason why we cannot accept this amendment."

* SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"I do not say that we should make an exemption automatically. On the other hand, if the landholder who owns more than one veli will tell the local officials that he is

[Sri P. T. Rajan] [26th November 1952]

going to carry on agricultural operations, it ought to be possible under this Act, to give him that exemption. I do not think anything can stand in the way of this amendment being accepted."

The amendment was put and lost.

3-30 p.m. MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri Venkatarama Ayyar's amendment for the insertion of new sub-clause (2)."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, although here and there some words are different, the substance of the motion has already been decided upon, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is that clause 3 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was carried.

Clause 4.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

"For the words 'appoint any person . . . Conciliation Officer', substitute the words 'appoint one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner as Conciliation Board'."

"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణ స్వాయంశరణం. Conciliation board లో గవర్నరు మొదలు ఉద్యోగి వరకు, ఘోషామయిక్కు, రైతుయిక్కు ప్రతినిధులను కూడా చేర్చవలసిన నేను కోరుతున్నాను. విషయస్వభావము ప్రకారముగా కురిష్కరింపవలసినట్లే, ఆ తగాదాకు సంబంధించిన ఉభయపక్షాలవారి ప్రతినిధులు బోర్డులో ఉన్నట్లయితే ఇదివరకే అభిప్రాయాలు సాకిల్సగా తెలుసుకోవటానికి అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. స్వాయం శరణుకు విలువ ఉంది. ఒక్కో ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగిని నేనీ పరిష్కార భారముంచినట్లయితే అన్ని సందర్భాలలోను స్వాయం శరణుకోవవచ్చు. మా ఆరు భవాలబట్టి, సాధారణంగా ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు పూకుబడి, ధనశీలిని భూస్వాములతో అనుకూలంగా తీర్చుకొనినా రూపొందినట్లే. ప్రజాసామాన్యంగా కూడా ఇట్టి భావము ప్రబలంగా ఉంది. కనుక ఇది ప్రతినిధులను స్వాయం శరణు జేయవలసిన కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగుల ట్టయితే నా సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను."

* SRI PILLA LAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"నేను ఈ సవరణను విలక్షణము చేస్తున్నాను. కొలువార్లకు స్వాయంశరణం లేదు ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసిన అవకాశం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. Industrial Tribunals విషయంలో ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగులు అనుకరిస్తున్న విధానాలను తీర్మానే, ఈ conciliation బోర్డులో కొలువార్ల ప్రతినిధులు ఉండడం ఎంత అవసరమో బోధపడుతుంది. కన్సీలియేషన్ బోర్డులో భూస్వాముల, కొలువార్ల ప్రతినిధులు ఉండవలసినట్లే ఉండడం సబబైన సవరణ కనుక బానిసి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు అంగీకరిస్తారని అనుకున్నాను."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"This, Mr. Speaker, is a very salutary and good principle which has been accepted almost all over the word in all civilized countries. When disputes arise between two parties one of the most fundamental principles, when the method of conciliation is attempted, is that it is better to get the

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

parties together so that all of them can put their heads together and see if a method of resolving the conflict cannot be evolved. Now, Sir, the position is that a Government official who often-times may not know anything of the conditions prevailing in the particular district but is clothed with the powers of conciliation has to do this job, but that defeats the very purpose for which conciliation is intended. When a representative of the landholder is there and when a representative of the tenant or the pannaiyal is there the three are associated with the very task of conciliation. But in the other case, the Conciliation Officer tries to get the parties together and suggests some remedies. But on the other hand, if the representatives of the two contending parties come together for a common purpose, the very purpose of conciliation, the very approach to conciliation changes. I suggest, Sir, that the method of conciliation by bringing together the parties and clothing them with responsibility for coming to some terms is the best method of conciliation, and that is what has been accepted in all the International Labour Conventions with regard to the settlement of industrial disputes. This method has been followed with good results all the world over, and I do not think that in the case of the peasants of Tanjore alone a different method should be followed by asking the Conciliation Officer to take upon himself the onus and the responsibility of bringing about conciliation between the contending parties. Oftentimes under the system suggested in the Bill, the Government Official himself will be subject to the charge, he is open to the charge that he has favoured someone to the detriment of some other. It is bound to happen, and if that happens, the Conciliation Officer will lose authority, and he cannot command the full confidence of other parties. If such a situation develops, it is a very bad and unhealthy thing and no conciliation will be possible and unrest will continue. In the interest of seeing that conciliation takes place, I do not think that Government should have any difficulty whatever in accepting the amendment. I, therefore, commend this amendment to the acceptance of this House."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, there will be no difficulty if I accept the premises, but unfortunately I do not believe that the procedure proposed of three persons sitting together, namely, the Conciliation Officer, the representative, not of the tenants in general but of the tenant concerned and the representative of the landowner concerned, will work. If these three sit there . . ."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"That is not the proposal."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Let the hon. Member read the amendment even when I am speaking."

"The proposal is that the two parties concerned and the Conciliation Officer should form a board to perform the functions of the Conciliation Officer. I submit, Sir, that it would not work and it cannot work under any system or psychology. The Conciliation Officer has to pass orders, and it may go in appeal also."

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [26th November 1952]

Under the present proposal, below the Conciliation Officer's dais, there will be the landowner and the tenant. All the heads will be brought together; only they will not clash on the bench; they will be there to exchange views and he will then pass orders and it will be subject to appeal. I submit that this amendment is not reasonable."

3-40
p.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"On a matter of personal explanation, Sir. If there is some misunderstanding I want to clear it. If the Hon. the Chief Minister's difficulty with regard to the amendment is that it should provide for representation for the generality of landlords and the generality of tenants, we will certainly accept it."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I shall not deal with it because it was not the amendment. If that is done it will become a Legislative Assembly and not a Conciliation Body."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సవరణను వ్యతిరేకిస్తూ మాట్లాడారు. సవరణ చర్చకు బదులు చెప్పవలసినది శ్రీ మాణిక్యనేల నాయకరుగారు. కనుక రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడిన తరువాత ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు మాట్లాడుటకు అవకాశమివ్వగోరాను. లేనిచో శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి మాటే అఖరు మాటగా అవడం సంభవిస్తోంది. ఇరుపక్షాలవారి పసంగాలను విని రెవెన్యూ మంత్రిగారు సమాధానమివ్వడం న్యాయం కాబట్టి నాగిరెడ్డిగారిని మాట్లాడ నివ్వవలసిన మిక్కు కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I cannot follow what the hon. Member has spoken."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The hon. Member wants that Sri Nagi Reddi should be given an opportunity to speak."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is not a kind of concession to be shown to Sri Nagi Reddi. I will try to give a gist of Mr. Venkateswarlu's good and eloquent speech in a very moderate language . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to remove the incongruity and unreasonableness in his speech."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, when the Hon. Chief Minister intervenes, it is sometimes taken as the reply on behalf of the Government, with the result the Chair is calling the Mover in the debate and others will have an opportunity to speak after the Hon. the Chief Minister. It is only after the Hon. the Minister for Revenue replies to the debate, the Chair can call upon the Mover of the amendment to reply. Then only it will give an opportunity for the Members of the Opposition to cover the points raised by the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Minister for Revenue."

26th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"In this particular case, I have nothing to oppose or object to. I submit, it is a dangerous doctrine and, if accepted, it would cut down the privileges of the Chief Minister too much." (Laughter.)

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సవరణలోని మాటలు సరిగాలేవని సమాధానమిచ్చారు. సవరణయొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశ్యాన్ని వారు అంగీకరించినట్లయితే సదనుగుణంగా మాటలను చెప్పుటకు నాకభ్యంతరం ఎంతమాత్రం ఉండదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. Conciliation board లో ఒక్క ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగి ఉన్నట్లయితే పేదవారికి కొలుదారులకు న్యాయంజరిగే అవకాశం తగ్గిపోతుంది. న్యాయం కలుగజేయడానికి ఆ ఉద్యోగికి ఎన్నో అడ్డంకులు కలుగవచ్చు. ధనవంతులు, పలుకుబడిగలవారు అటువంటి భూస్వాముల ఒత్తిడిని తట్టుకోవడం అతనికి కష్టపాత్యమవుతుంది. ఇది మన ఆనుచున్న బట్టి చెప్పుతున్న విషయం. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు, ఇతర మైన పలుకుబడులకు గొప్పగానూ ముఖ్యంగానే conciliation board లో భూస్వాముల, కా. బా. రు. ప్రతినిధులు ఉండవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు మాట్లాడుతూ conciliation board లో భూస్వాముల రైతు ప్రతినిధులను చేసినట్లయితే అకౌక కురుక్షేత్రంగా మారుతుందని శలచిచ్చారు."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"కురుక్షేత్రం కాదు, రెడీనేటిపు ఆ సెంట్రాల్ "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"వారి పాయింట్ ప్రకారం conciliation board దాదాపు యంత్రంలాగా మారిపోతుందని, ఎటువీర్చి చెప్పడానికి అవకాశం సన్నగిల్లిపోతుందని, వా. పనాదాలలో కాలయాపన జరుగుతుందని భావపడుతుంది. అది సరికాదని నా భావన. భూస్వాములు, కొలుదారు భూములలో తగవులొకటి వాటిని మన నేత్రాలకు చేనేకమై ఒక బోర్డుగా ఏర్పడి వారివారి అభిప్రాయాలను తెలుపుకొని విదో ఒక అంగీకారానికి రాడమే భావం. ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించినట్లయితే భూస్వాములు, కొలుదారుల సలలు పగలు కొట్టుకోవడం, రక్తాలు అంగీకరించినట్లయితే భూస్వాములు, కొలుదారుల సలలు పగలు కొట్టుకోవడం, రక్తాలు పారించుకోవడం జరుగను. వారి భద్రతకు కలెక్టు సర్ప్రైజ్ ఫులడావ్వారానే పరిదిద్దుకొనే సావకాశం ఏర్పడుతుంది. ఈ సవరణను రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు వ్యతిరేకించడం విచారకరం. పస్తుతం పన్ను క్లాజులల్ల కొలుదారులకు ఎట్టి రక్షణ కలుగదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం నాలు భవనాలోంచి సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసినదిగా కోరుతున్నాను."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, రెవెన్యూ మంత్రిగారు ఈ సవరణలోని సవరణను గుర్తించవలసి కోరుతున్నాను. మనం ఈనాడు తనాదాలనున్నట్టిని సర్ప్రైజ్ ఫులడావ్వారా, అవకాశావ్యయం లిరుక్తకావలసిన పదే పదే చెబుతున్నాము. కేంద్ర మంత్రులు, రాష్ట్ర మంత్రులు తరచు ఇటు సలహాలనే ఇస్తున్నారు. ఆ సూత్రానికి అనుగుణంగానే నేనీ సవరణను తెచ్చాను. కేవలం ప్రభుత్వోద్యోగుల రిటక్షన్ మాత్రమే ఆధారపడి లిరుక్తకావడం మంచిదికాదు. చదు కక్షలవారి ప్రతి నిధులు చెప్పేది జాగ్రత్తగా పడడం, బల్లముదేవారి వివాదాలను పరిష్కరించడం మంచిది. ఏదో arbitrary గా లిరుక్తకావడం మంచిదికాదు. ఎన్నో సమాదాలను ఎదుర్కొనవలసినందుననే విషయం రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియజేయబడింది. నా ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించినందుల్ల conciliation board కురుక్షేత్ర మవుతుందని భయపడవలసిన అక్కర ఏమీలేదు. తనాదాలు అక్కడే పరిష్కరించబడతాయి."

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

కాని అది పొలం గట్టకు ప్రాకృత. పొలం గట్టమీద కొట్టాటలు, రక్షణాశం సంఘం వడం అవుతే మూలం లేదు. సవరణను అంగీకరించుట అవసరమైతే ఉన్నది. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించాలి. Opposition side నుంచి వచ్చిన సవరణ కనుక వ్యతిరేకంగానే ఉద్దేశంతోనే కాక, కొలుదార్లకు మేలు కలగజేయాలనే న్యాయమైన ఉద్దేశంతో ఈ విషయాన్ని పరిశీలించవలసినదని కోరుచున్నాను. Industrial Tribunals మీద లైసెన్స్ హోల్డింగ్ కార్మికులకు సంబంధించిన మూలమే ప్రతిష్టా నున్న వ్యవస్థ అన్నారు. యదార్థంగా న్యాయం జరుగుతోందా అనే విషయం గమనించండి. వెట్టుబడిదారుల, భూస్వాముల పాలుబడి, ఓత్తిడి ఎంత హద్దుగా ఉంటాయో ఊహించండి. రాజకీయ ప్రయోజనాలను మూలమే ఆశించక, కొలుదార్లకు న్యాయం కలుగజేయాలనే సత్సంకల్పంతో ఈ విషయాన్ని గమనించండి అని చెబుతూ మంత్రిగారిని కోరుకుంటూ నా సవరణను ప్రభుత్వంవారి ఆమోదానికి వదిలితున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The Hon. Chief Minister has explained it on behalf of the Hon. Minister for Revenue.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, I do not know what is the idea behind the move on the part of the hon. Member representing North Madurai in supporting the amendment. As far as the Mover of the amendment is concerned, I know he has moved it with a good motive. But I may tell him that he is comparatively young and he does not know the effects of this amendment. If this amendment is accepted, the Conciliation Board will turn out to be a mutual wrangling place and no conciliation work would be done.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I am going to put the amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘For the words “appoint any person . . . Conciliation Officer”, substitute the words “appoint one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner as Conciliation Board”.’

The amendment was put and declared lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“I am pressing my amendment to a division.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I think the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not particular about the amendment.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Not particular, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The amendment is lost. Now, Sri Kolkebail will move his amendment.”

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

‘For the words “appoint any person”, substitute the words “appoint any Senior Subordinate Judge.”’

“My amendment is very simple and innocuous . . .”

3-50 P.M. SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“Sir, I am pressing my amendment to a division.”

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—“Will the hon. Member go to the Leader of the Opposition and he will tell him what the position is.”

* SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“Sir, in explaining my motion I want to point out that in the Bill, under Clause 14, the framers of the Bill want to oust the jurisdiction of civil courts in matters covered by this measure. The other day, the Hon. the Chief Minister threatened that he would withdraw the Bill if the Members wanted to give civil courts jurisdiction in these matters. Sir, I do not want him to withdraw the Bill on this score. But I suggest to him a *via media* and that is, instead of having as Conciliation Officer a Tahsildar or Revenue Divisional Officer, who is not well-versed in law, it is better to have a senior Subordinate Judge. Sir, my amendment is a very innocuous one and so I expect it will be accepted by the Government.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the amendment, and in seconding it, I submit that the term ‘any person’ is a very vague one, and that for a person to be a conciliation officer he should be an officer of some standing.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, in the context of appointment of Conciliation Officers this is not a practical proposition and so I oppose the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

‘For the words “appoint any person”, substitute the words “appoint any senior Subordinate Judge.”’

The amendment was lost.

Clause 4 was put and carried.

Clause 5.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The motion is—

‘That Clause 5 do stand part of the Bill.’

Mr. S. S. Kolkebail cannot move his amendment under this clause, for it is a consequential amendment to his previous amendment, and as that was lost he cannot move his amendment here.”

* SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, Clause 5 deals with the court of appeal, while the previous one deals with the court of original jurisdiction. So the two are different; and therefore I submit my amendment under this clause is not a consequential amendment. Therefore, Sir, I beg to move—

‘For the words “Revenue Court which shall be presided over by an officer not below the rank of a Revenue Divisional Officer”, substitute the words “Revenue Court which shall be presided over by a Judge not below the rank of a senior Subordinate Judge.”’

I only request that at least in the matter of appeal a senior Subordinate Judge may be appointed instead of a Revenue Divisional Officer.”

SRI N. V. L. NARASIMHA RAO:—“I second it.”

[26th November 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"On a point of information, Sir, I want to know if Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah was conciliated about his pressing his motion to a division." (Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I oppose the amendment on the same grounds I advanced with regard to the previous amendment, namely, it will not be a workable one. A Revenue Divisional Officer will be all right for this work."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'For the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by an officer not below the rank of a Revenue Divisional officer" substitute the words "Revenue Court which shall be presided over by a Judge not below the rank of a senior Subordinate Judge."'

The amendment was lost.

4 p.m. SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'After the words "a Revenue Court", insert the words "consisting of one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner."'

"అనే విషయము చర్చించవలసిన సవరణను ఉపపాదిస్తున్నాను. చిట్టల రెవిన్యూ కోర్టు అని ఉపపాదించారు. దీనిని మార్పుచేయ విషయములో ఆర్థిక మంత్రి సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు నా సవరణ ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆశుకుంటున్నాను. ఎందు చేతనంటే సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో రెవిన్యూ వ్యవహారములన్నియు conciliation board వల్ల విచారణపడాలని వున్నది. యీ conciliation board అంటే అందులో గవర్న మెంటు అఫీసరును నియమించవలసివున్నది. ఇక రాష్ట్ర వేండ్ల రాశ్ర కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోనూ ఆలాగే conciliation board ను నియమించి రెవిన్యూ వ్యవహారములు కలిపి రివ్యూచు చేయవలసి ఉన్నది. కుమారప్ప కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోనూ ఆలాగే సిఫార్సు చేశారు. అట్లాంటప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమును యిప్పుడు కన్సిలియేషను అఫీసరు అనేదానికి బదులు ఒక conciliation బోర్డు ఎందుకు వెయ్య గూడదని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఈ రెవిన్యూ కోర్టును నిర్ణయించేటప్పుడు ఒకటి గవర్న మెంటు తరపునను, భూస్వామి తరపున ఒకరున్నా, కాదు తరపున ఒకరున్నా వేస్తే బాగుంటుందని నా ఆధిపత్యాన్ని చెప్పుతున్నాను. అట్లాంటప్పుడు భూస్వా ములు కోర్టు, litigation ఆధారం చేసుకొని, యీ కాలిదార్లను మాములనుండి తరిమివేయకుండా ఉండటానికి వీలుంటుంది. నా ఆధిపత్యాన్ని యీ Conci- liation board ను యేర్పరిచి దానియొక్క తీర్పు final గా చేయడం నుంచి. ఇది వరకూ గవర్న మెంటు యీ జమీందారీ అప్లు ప్యాసు చేసినప్పుడు ట్రిబ్యూనల్ విచారణ చేశారేగాని. కోర్టుకు finality యిచ్చారు. యిందులో జమీందారీలు, ఆగ్రహారాలు, యీ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ finality యివ్వకుండా చేసినందున యివ్వియ సర్వనాశనం చేశారు. ఈ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ finality యివ్వకపోవడంవల్ల, ట్రిబ్యూ నల్ వద్ద వ్యతిరేక తీర్పుయినే, కోర్టులో అనుకూల తీర్పు యివ్వడం, ట్రిబ్యూనల్ వద్ద అనుకూల తీర్పు యిస్తే కోర్టులో వ్యతిరేక తీర్పు యివ్వడంవల్ల, అనేక తికమకలు జరిగి

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

రైతాంగం నష్టపడింది. అందువల్ల నా సవరణ ప్రకారం ఒక Conciliation Board ఏర్పాటుచేసి, దానిలో ప్రభుత్వము తరపున ఒకరిని, Land holder తరపున ఒకరిని, కాలిదారు తరపున ఒకరినివేసి, ఆ బోర్డుయొక్క తీర్పు final గా చేస్తే, litigation కు సావకాశం లేకుండా త్వరలో పరిస్థితులు జక్కపరచవచ్చును. అట్లు చేయనియెడల యీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ సిఫార్సులు, కుమారప్ప కమిటీ సిఫార్సులుచేసి ప్రయోజన మేమిటి? యీ సిఫార్సులను అంగీకరించకపోతే, వాటిని త్రోసివేసినట్లే! అందువల్ల ప్రజాక్షేమం కోరిక ప్రభుత్వము అయితే నా సవరణను ఆమోదిస్తారని ఆసి స్తున్నాను."

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—"I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Sri V. Sri Krishna and Sri D. Seetharamiah may speak on this amendment. Their amendments^a are almost on similar lines to this amendment and so they may speak on Mr. Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah's amendment. They need not move their amendments."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"Sir, నా amendment ప్రతి భూస్వామికి, గారి amendment రెండు ఒకటికాదని నా విజ్ఞప్తి. ఎందుచేతనంటే నేను చెప్పేది . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The difference is only a minor one, and so let us not waste the time of the House by asking each Member to move his amendment. Let us consider them all to have been moved and the discussion may proceed on all the amendments."

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"అదృష్ట, ఈ amendments అన్నియు ఒకటికాదని నా విజ్ఞప్తి. ఎందుచేతనంటే, నా amendment ప్రతి భూస్వామికి, కాలిదారుకు, వస్త్రయాలకు ఒక్కొక్క ప్రతినిధిని వేయించాలని కాదు. మొత్తము మీద కాలిదారి రైతాంగానికి, భూస్వాములకు, వస్త్రయాలకు అందరికీ ఒక ad hoc tribunal వేసి అందులో representation ఉండాలని నేనీ amendment ను move చేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా యీ amendment move చేస్తున్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారి దృష్టికి రెండు ముఖ్య విషయాలు తీసుకురావాలని నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. ప్రభుత్వం ఒక వైపు కాలిదార్ల రక్షణకంటూ చిట్లు ప్రతిపాదిస్తూనే మరోవైపు ఇలాంటి క్లాజుల ద్వారా అసలు బ్రదేశ్యానికి తూట్లు పాడుస్తున్నదని నా విశ్వాసం. ముఖ్యంగా యీ కాలిదారి వట్టును నిజంగా కాలిదార్లకు భూస్వాములకు మధ్య జరిగే తగాదాల పరిష్కారములో న్యాయం జరగాలంటే, నేను కోరిక ad hoc tribunal ను వేసి అందులో ఒక్కొక్క పార్టీయొక్క representative ను వేస్తే వారి అందరికీ యీ తగాదాలు న్యాయంగా పరిష్కారమవునని భార్యము ఉండగలదని నా ఉద్దేశ్యము. రెండవ విషయం—Select Committee లో వచ్చినప్పుడు, ప్రధాన మంత్రి 'apartisan

^a SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"For the words "a Revenue Court . . . Revenue Divisional Officer" substitute the following words:—

"ad hoc tribunal with the Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman and representatives of landowners, tenants and pannaiyals as members."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"Add at the end the words 'The Revenue Court shall consist of equal number of representatives of landlords and tenants or pannaiyals and will be appointed by the disputing parties'."

[Sri V. Sri Krishna] [26th November 1952]

cannot be a good judge' అని కారణం చెప్పి దీన్ని త్రోసివేయటం జరిగింది. కుమారప్ప కమిటీలో Tribunal వేయాలని సిఫార్సు చేయబడింది. దాన్ని Special Officer Raghavendra Rao స్వబహుళ్యం కమిటీవారు బలపరచియున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు వేసిన Sub-Committees, Special Officer రాసుచేంద్రారావుగారి సిఫార్సులనుగాడా ఆమోదించి రాకరిస్తున్నారు. Revenue Divisional Officer ను వేసే సూచన ఆమోదించారు. ఇది సక్రమమైన పద్ధతికాదు. పైగా ఈ Conciliation Officer తీర్పుగాడా final అయియున్నది. అట్లుంటప్పుడు కొలుదార్లు, ఘాస్వాముల మధ్య తగాదాల పరిష్కారములు న్యాయముగా జరిగవు. గనుక, యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు చేసే clause ను ఆమోదించితే వాళ్లకు అన్యాయము చేసినట్లు అవుతుంది. ప్రభుత్వము వారు న్యాయమైన దృష్టితో యీ విషయము పరిశీలించి ad hoc tribunal వేసే నా సవరణను ఆమోదించమని కోరుతున్నాను."

*SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ కృష్ణగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను హృదయపూర్వకంగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను. కొలుదార్లు పన్నయాళ్ల రక్షణార్థం యీ బిల్లు తేబడినదనే విషయం వాస్తవమని ఎంతబడాలంటే ఈ సవరణను ప్రభుత్వము వారు అంగీకరించాలి. Revenue Divisional Officer ఒక్కరికానే కూడుకున్న రెవిన్యూ Court వల్ల పేదవారైన కొలుదార్లకు పన్నయాళ్లకు న్యాయం జరుగుతుందనే విషయం ఆనుమానాస్పదం. ఈ నాడు ధనమున్నవానికి అనుకూలంగా అధికారుల అభిప్రాయాలు ఉంటున్నాయనే విషయం అందరికూ తెలిసినట్టిదే. కొలు దార్ల పన్నయాళ్ల ఘాస్వాముల ప్రతినిధులుగాడా రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరుతోవాట రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో ఉన్నట్లయితే ఉభయపక్షాలవారి వాదనను విని న్యాయంకలగజేయ టూనికే అవకాశం హెచ్చుగాఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి ఒక్క ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగుల విచక్షణా దృష్టికే ఈ విషయాన్ని పడలివేయక ఇరుప్రక్కలవారి ప్రతినిధులుగల కోర్టును ఏర్పా టుచేయవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని తిరిగి కోరుతున్నాను. శ్రీ కృష్ణగారి సవరణలోని ఆశయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమువారు గుర్తొస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.”

*SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—“అధ్యక్ష, రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో Revenue Divisional Officer అవసరమే కాకుండా ఆ కోర్టులో యొకను రైతులయొక్క పన్నయాలులయొక్క ప్రతినిధులు, ఘాస్వాములయొక్క ప్రతినిధులుగాడా ఉండ డము అవసరమే. లేకపోతే రైతులకు, పన్నయాలులకు అన్యాయము జరుగు తుందని మా భయం, రైతులందరి భయంకూడా. ఎందుకంటే యీ రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు మేజిస్ట్రేటులుగా ఉండి అన్యాయముచేసిన కేసులు ఎక్కో ఉన్నవి వీరు యిచ్చిన తీర్పులు ఎన్నో హెక్టోలీలును, నెషన్లు కోర్టులలోనూ సరిమైనవి కావని త్రోసివేయబడినవి. ఇదంతా అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. ఉదాహరణకు చిత్తూరుజిల్లా పల్లెనేరు తాలూకా, కంగుండి మున్సిపాలిటీకు చెందిన జోయన బల్లి యినాం రైతుల కేసును చూడండి. ఈ కేసును విచారించిన రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీ సరు రైతులపై 107 కేక్స్ను జారీచేసి వారిపందరిని జామీను అరెస్టులూ తెల్పాడు. ఇటీవలనే వారందరికీ జామీను ఇవ్వబడినవి. ఇనాందార్లు, వారి రోడిలు యీ రైతుల స్త్రీలను మానభంగము చేశారు. రైతులను చావబాదారు. ఇదంతా యీ యినాం ఈ Revenue Court అసబడే ఈ రెవిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు ఘాస్వాములకు లోబడి పోయి వారు చెప్పినట్లు నడిపించమన్నా. అందువల్ల నే యిటువంటి ఆకమాలు జరిగ కుండా, నేను నా సవరణను ప్రవేశపెట్టాను. అందువల్ల నా సవరణ ప్రకారము

26th November 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

conciliation బోర్డు అనగా, ప్రభుత్వ ప్రతినిధి చేర్చునుగానున్నా, ఘాస్వాముల యొక్కయు రైతులయొక్క ప్రతినిధులు అందులో సభ్యులుగా ఉండాలి. ఈ విధముగా ఘాస్వాముల, రైతుల మధ్య వచ్చు తగాదాలను పరిష్కరించాలని కోరు చున్నాను. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ విషయము గుర్తించి నా సవరణను అంగీక రించాలి. ఇదే సందర్భములో మరొకవిషయము తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఇది నా ఆను భవములో జరిగియున్నవిషయము. అదేమిటంటే, 1938 వ సంవత్సరములో మా చిత్తూరు జిల్లా, మదనపల్లి తాలూకాకు చెందిన టి. చదుం పుదామరణ 1938 వ సంవత్సరములో యీ గ్రామములో యీ నాందార్లకు, రైతులకు మధ్య పెద్ద తగా దాలు వచ్చినవి. తమ హక్కును కాపాడుకొనుటకై రైతులు సమ్మేచేశారు. అట్టి సందర్భములో యీ రైతులను ఘాములనుండి తరిమి వేయటానికి ఇనాందార్లు ప్రయ త్నముచేశారు. రైతులపై మున్నో అక్రమాలు జరిపించారు. అప్పుడు యీనాం దార్లు రైతుల ప్రతినిధులతోను, జిల్లా కలెక్టరుతోను ఒక conciliation బోర్డు యేర్పడింది. దాని ప్రకారము ఉండిన పంటలో మూడింట రెండు భాగాలు రైతులకు యీచ్చేటట్లు నిర్ణయించబడి తగాదా ములభముగా పరిష్కరించబడింది. కాని జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ఒక్కడే conciliation చేసియున్నట్లయితే, ఆ తగాదా న్యాయరీతిగా పరిష్కారము అయిఉండేదికాదు. యీనాందార్లు ధనవంతులు అగుట చేత వారికి అయ్యబోబడి, యీ విషయములో ఎంతో అన్యాయపు తీర్పు యిచ్చి ఉండేవాడు. గనుక ఘాస్వాములకు రైతులకు మధ్య తగాదాలు అందలి ప్రతినిధులతో conciliation బోర్డుగా ఏర్పడి పరిష్కరించబడితే, ఉభయలకు న్యాయమే జరుగును గాని అన్యాయానికి చోటుఉండదు. కనుక ప్రభుత్వమువారిని, నా సవరణను అంగీక రించమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like 4 p.m. to point out . . .”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I suppose the hon. Member is seconding the amendment of Sri D. Seetharamiah.”

*SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Yes, Sir. In seconding this 4-10 amendment, I would like to point out that this amendment should p.m. not be treated on a par with the amendment that was moved in respect of the clause relating to Conciliation Officers. Under this Bill, the Revenue Divisional Officer is given absolute powers. His decision is not subject to any revision by any authority. It may be that the Government may have their fullest confidence in the Revenue Divisional Officers but, we on this side must make it very clear that we have not got that amount of confidence in the Revenue Divisional Officers. In spite of the fact that the Hon. the Chief Minister might say that he has got great faith in seeing to it that class bias does not play any part in human affairs, we have got to take into account the state of affairs as it exists today. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that temptations are there; other-wise, if temptations were not there and, if all the people in the Government service were free from falling victims to these temptations, we will not be hearing so much of corruption in the various departments. I am not going into this question at all but here is the fact that a lot of temptation will be placed before the Revenue Divisional Officers for, after all, we deal with two

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

parties here. One party is a very powerful party which owns hundreds of thousands of acres of land and the income that it can derive from that land. It is therefore very easy for that party to tempt the Revenue Divisional Officers. I am not saying that the generality of Revenue Divisional Officers in this State are corrupt of any such thing. It is far from my intention but what I do submit is that temptations will be placed before the Revenue Divisional Officers and one cannot say that all of them will be completely free from corruption. This is one aspect of the question.

"Then there is such a thing as what is called an 'outlook' also. In spite of the fact that one might say that there is such a thing as justice and holding the balance even between the two parties, there is also the peoples' mentality. The peoples' outlook is corroded by the particular circumstances in which they are brought up and also by their entire upbringing. A certain outlook and a certain mentality develop as a result of this, and, unfortunately today it so happens that in the society in which we find ourselves most of the officials have developed a particular outlook and are biased in favour of the landowners and against the peasants. This is a fact. After all, when we go to a Court, the first question that is put to every witness is, 'How much land revenue do you pay, and what property do you hold?' as if the fact that he holds a good deal of property will mean that the evidence that he gives will correspond to the truth. Unfortunately that system is still there and we cannot get over it. Therefore, so long as the basis of society is exactly what it is to-day, we cannot shut our eyes to this fact, and that is why we say that you should not make these officials all powerful in respect of the relations between landlords and tenants, and particularly so when these officials are clothed with extreme powers under Clause 10 in the succeeding portions of the Bill. These officials can decide whether a particular tenant has cared for the land or has not done this thing or that thing and for any and every reason they can say today that the tenant should be evicted. They could do so even for political reasons. After all, there is the political bias also. They cannot look at problems without political bias, for today they are biased against a certain political party. If a tenant happens to have particular political leanings, that itself might go against him. Whether the officer does it consciously or unconsciously, his political bias, at any rate, corrodes his outlook. Therefore, taking into consideration all things,—I am not saying that absolute justice is ever possible—in order to minimise the hardships and to see that the peasants and the poorer sections of the people are not victimised today by this kind of bias on the part of the Revenue Officials, a method must be found by which they will be able to get justice to the extent that is possible.

"This amendment lays down that where Government are making the Revenue Divisional Officer the absolute authority in matters regarding relations between the landlords and the tenants, at least in such cases, you have got to substitute for the Revenue

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Divisional Officer some other machinery that will see to it that proper canons are set up, proper rules are evolved and that proper understanding takes place between both the parties. I therefore say that it is a very reasonable amendment and, if the Government are really interested in seeing that injustice is not rendered to the people, they should have no hesitation whatsoever in coming forward and accepting this amendment; otherwise, I should think that a different conclusion will have to be drawn."

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అధ్యక్షా, నేను ఈ amendment ను బలపరచున్నాను. అయితే ఒక విషయము మాత్రము ముందు చెప్పవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. ఇంతకుముందు క్రింది క్లాజులలోనే, వివాదాల విషయంలో రైతుల యొక్క ప్రతినిధి ఉండాలని మేము కోరాము. కాని ప్రభుత్వము ఆ సూచనకు సమాధానము చెప్పకుండానే తమకు మెజారిటీ ఉన్నదనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో, మరే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో కాని మాకు సమాధానము చెప్పకనే వోటుకు పెట్టి పాస్ చేయడం జరిగింది. కనుక తిరిగి ఈ విషయమున అనేక సమస్యలు వారిముందు పెట్టుతున్నాము. అందువల్ల ఈ రెవిన్యూ కోర్టులో Pannaiyal యొక్క, tenants యొక్క, మరియు landholders యొక్క ప్రతినిధులు ఉండవలసిన అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అయితే శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ సందర్భంలో ఇంకొక విషయము చెప్పారు. ఈ మాదిరి ఏరందరి తరపున ఆసా పార్టీలందరి తరపున ప్రతినిధులు వుంటుంటే ఈ court ఏ మద్రాసు Legislative Assembly గానో లేక ఒక select committee గానో తయారు అవుతుందని చెప్పారు. ఈ సందర్భమున వారికి ఒక విషయాన్ని జ్ఞప్తికి తెచ్చుకున్నాను. మద్రాసులో murder case లు వచ్చినప్పుడు కూడా, ఒక jury ని పెట్టి, ఆ jury యొక్క నిర్ణయాన్ని తీసుకోవడం జరుగుతుందనే విషయము రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలుసును. (Interruption by Hon. Sri Subramania.) ను బ్రహ్మాండంగా తొందరపడడం అలవాటు. కొంచెము ఓపిక గా ఉంటే విషయము అర్థమవుతుంది. కాని వారు ఇంకా ఓపిక అలవాటు చేసుకోలేదు. అందువల్ల నేను చెప్పేది విమిటంటే ఈ Jury లో ఉన్న representatives వలెనే ఈ భూస్వాముల యొక్క tenants యొక్క pannaiyals యొక్క representatives ఈ వివాదాల పరిష్కారానికి ఉండనక్కరలేదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. Jury లో వివిధంగా public opinion ను తెలుసుకోవడానికి అదేవిధంగానే ఇక్కడ కూడా అందరి హక్కులను సమదృష్టిలో పరిశీలించేందుకును విచారించేందుకును అన్ని పార్టీలవారికి representatives ఉండి సవసరములేదా అసలు Judges కూడా కొన్ని సందర్భాలలో murder cases లో వాటిలో public opinion ఎట్లా ఉంటుందో అని తెలుసుకోవలసి యుంటుంది. ఇక్కడ mufassal అయితే murder cases లో Jury అభిప్రాయాన్ని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొనే కేసులను పరిశీలిస్తారనేదాన్ని చూస్తున్నాము. ఈ విధానము బ్రిటీష్ ప్రభుత్వము కూడా అనుసరిస్తూ వచ్చియుండినది. ఈ రోజుకు కూడా జరుగుచున్నది. కనుక ఈ వివాదాల విషయములూ గూడ అందరి హక్కులను న్యాయా న్యాయాలను సరిగా తెలుసుకొని పరిశీలించి పరిష్కారం చేసుకోవడానికి pannaiyals యొక్క యు tenants యొక్క యు, భూస్వాముల యొక్క యు ప్రతినిధులు ఉండేటప్పుడు వివిధంగా ఆ కోర్టు, రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు చెప్పినట్లు, ఒక కురుక్షేత్రంలాగా అవుతుందో నాకు బాధపడడం లేదు.”

MR. SPEAKER : —“The hon. Member must finish his speech.”

*SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“నాకింకా కొంచెము time కావాలని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాను. ఇది ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. అందువల్ల, ఈ ప్రజాధి

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [26th November 1952]

ప్రాయాన్ని తెలుసుకొనేటటువంటి అలవాటు ఇప్పుడు కొత్తగా వచ్చింది. ఇతర అన్ని వ్యవహారాలలోను అనేక రకాలైన రాజకీయ విషయాలలోనూ, public opinion రాబట్టుకొనుట చూస్తున్నాము. ఇటువంటి agrarian వివాదాలలో కూడ tribunals అనగా అందరియొక్క representatives ఉండవలసిన రాసుపేర్లదారితో కమిటీయూన్ను, మరియు కుమారప్ప కమిటీయూన్ను కూడచెప్పింది. కనుక దీనిలోకూడ అటువంటి న్యాయసమస్యలను అనుకూలాన్ని కలుగజేయవలసిన అవసరమైతేనాడవచ్చు. అందువల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ వారందరూకూడ ఈ సవరించడాన్ని ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి విషయాన్ని గమనించి దీనిని ఆమోదించడానికి తమకు స్వేచ్ఛగా వోటింగు హక్కు ఇవ్వవలసిందని వారి నాయకులను అడిగి దీనిని అందరూ ఆమోదించవలసినది కోరుచున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Before I call upon the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue to reply, I wish to say a few words about the procedure of the House. There is a wrong impression in the minds of some Members. Simply because they have given notice of amendments, it does not mean that the Speaker is bound to call each and every amendment. There is what is known as the 'Kangaroo' method. The Speaker has got the power to select some amendments, allow one or two speeches on them and declare the rest as out of order. I am saying this because I have seen a number of similar amendments given notice of by Members and there appears to be an impression that every member should speak on every amendment. It is not possible, and let me also tell the House that, if the Speaker considers he has given enough time to a particular amendment, he can put it to the vote of the House."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"With regard to what you have been pleased to say, I submit that we are always in general agreement with what you say and are willing to abide by your orders."

MR. SPEAKER:—"These are not orders. I was only giving out the procedure to be adopted."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I submit that when amendments are of a similar nature the Chair has got the right to select the amendments."

MR. SPEAKER:—"That is known as the 'kangaroo' method."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"No doubt, Sir, an 'Australian gentleman' has been introduced into our procedure with a view to simplify it. It is a fact, Sir, that this procedure can be put into effect if there are more than a hundred amendments. After all, all the amendments put together in the present case do not cover even 9 pages, and you are pleased to say that every member cannot get an opportunity. Only about 7 or 8 persons are taking part."

MR. SPEAKER:—"But, I have seen my old Friend, Sri P. Venkateswarlu, speaking on every amendment."

26th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"It is so because Sri P. Venkateswarlu is the person who is most interested in this subject."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ఇప్పుడు నేను మాట్లాడినది మీకు అర్థంకావడంవల్ల మీరీవిధంగా చెప్పచున్నారు, కాని మీరు అర్థంకావడానికంటే అలా మాట్లాడరు. ఎందుకంటే నేను తీసుకొనివచ్చిన amendments కొత్త points మీదనే ఉంటున్నాయి. నేను మాట్లాడినదానికొత్త points తోనే మాట్లాడాను. కాబట్టి నేను మాట్లాడినదానిని translate చేయించుకొని తెలుసుకోవచ్చును. కనుక అలాంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము పెట్టుకోకూడదని ప్రార్థిస్తున్నాను."

4-20
p.m.

SRI K. V. RAMESAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting the amendment, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that when Conciliation Boards are formed non-officials are recruited to help the Conciliation Officer. Some such arrangement can easily be made with regard to the constitution of Revenue Courts also. I submit, Sir, that the amendment simply suggests the appointment of one representative on behalf of the landowner and one representative on behalf of the tenant to help the Revenue Divisional Officer, in order to arrive at a just settlement."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I intervene without interfering with the right of reply of the various people who have moved their amendments? The position has not, I submit, been properly understood or it is deliberately ignored. The Revenue Court is a Court just to take the law which we lay down now into account and the facts which will be proved and give a decision. It has nothing whatsoever by way of a parallel with the Industrial Tribunals where there is no such thing as proved facts, but the administration, management and other things have to be taken into account. Here the case is, the clauses that we now pass with the consent of the House and which will become law have to be applied to the facts placed there on sworn evidence. Therefore, I submit that it is impossible for plaintiff and defendant to sit in judgment over their own cases. The whole scheme is wrongly conceived."

"As regards the other suggestion in the remaining two amendments, namely, that two partisans—not persons interested in the plaintiff and the defendant, but in the landlords as a class and the tenants as a class—should sit along with the Revenue Divisional Officer, it only means that we wish to convert Courts in India into class tribunals, which I submit is not the scheme either of the Constitution or of this law."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి ఈ tribunals ఉండవలసిన సలహా అసలు ఎవరినుండి వచ్చిందో చెప్పమన్నాను. ఇది పార్టీశాసక వివాదాలకు మాత్రమే వాడుతారని అన్నారు. ఇది పార్టీశాసక వివాదాలకు కాకుండా వ్యవసాయక వివాదాలకు కూడా ఉపయోగపడవలసిన అంతున్నది. ఇది మీకు ఈనాడు చెప్పేటటువంటి విషయము కాదు. శుభాహ్వానం"

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

కమిటీ ఆఫ్ ట్రిబ్యూనల్స్ 'Land tribunals consisting of a Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman with representatives of landholders and tenants'. అని ఆ కమిటీవారే చెప్పియున్నారు. మేము ఆ అభిప్రాయాన్ని ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టికి తెస్తున్నప్పుడు, వారెందుకు దీనిని అంగీకరించడం లేదో అర్థం కాదు. ఇందులో తప్పు తివరిదో తెలియదు. అసలు గవర్నమెంటు appoint చేసిన వంటి సుబ్బహ్మణ్యం కమిటీయే నశ్వరమేనాదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా కుమారప్ప కమిటీ రిపోర్టు ప్రాసెస్ పుడుకూడా land tribunals వల్ల ఉపయోగమున్నది అవి ఉండవలసినవాళ్ళారు. ఈ విషయాన్ని కూడా ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు గమనించవలసి యుంటుంది అయితే ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఇంకొకవాదన తీసుకువచ్చారు. ఈ విధంగా అందరి representatives ను నియమించినట్లయితే, ఇది వర్గపోరాటాలకు దారితీస్తుందని చెప్పారు. ఇది సరియైన అభిప్రాయముకాదు. అసలు ఈ amendment తీసుకువచ్చినది ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు లేకుండా చేయడం ఉద్దేశ్యము తోనేగాని మరో ఉద్దేశ్యంతోగాదు. భూస్వాముల యొక్క tenants యొక్క అందరియొక్క హక్కులను, నాయాన్యాయములను సరిగా తెలుసుకొని వారి తగాదాలను పరిష్కారం చేయడానికి ఈ సవరణ తీసుకురాబడినప్పుడు, దీనివల్ల వర్గ పోరాటాలు ఎట్లు రాగలవో అర్థం కావడంలేదు. మేము ఈవిధంగా ఇటువంటి సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నామంటే, మేము ఒక trusteeship మీద, వ్యవసాయపరివర్తనమీద, సిద్ధాంతరీత్యా ఆలోచిస్తున్నామని లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని గమనించ వలసియుంటుంది. ఇటువంటి విషయాలతోనేకాదు, ఇంకా గొప్ప గొప్ప అంతర్జాతీయ విషయాలతోకూడ, మనము కమిటీలకు కట్టుబడి, వాటిద్వారా తగాదాలను పరిష్కారం చేసుకొనుచుండుట లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని కూడా వారు గ్రహించవలసి యుంటుంది. దీనిని ప్రభుత్వముకూడ ఒప్పుకుంటుందనే ఆశుంటాను. కనుక trustee సిద్ధాంతాన్ని కోరికలువంటి ప్రభుత్వము, న్యాయ సత్తుతంగా, అందరి హక్కులను సమానంగా పరిశీలించి వివాదాలను పరిష్కరించేందుకు ఏర్పాటుచేయటాన్ని మేము ఈ సలహాను ఇస్తున్నామనిపప్పుడు, ఇది ఏ విధంగా class struggle కు దారి తీస్తుందని వారు ఉద్దేశపడుతున్నారో తెలియదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ఇప్పుడు మేము కొత్తగా చెప్పుచున్నదిగాదు. ఇదివరకే గవర్నమెంటువారు appoint చేసిన Subramaniam Committee వారు చెప్పినటువంటిదేగాని మేము ఇప్పుడు కొత్తగా చెప్పుచుండుటలేదు కనుక రివిన్యూ డిపార్టుమెంటులోని ఈ సుబ్బహ్మణ్యం కమిటీవారు ఇచ్చినటువంటి సలహానే, ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను. అదే మా సవరణయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము."

Mr. SPEAKER:—"May I know whether the hon. Member Sri V. Sri Krishna is going to say anything?"

* SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ విధముగా భూస్వాములకున్న, tenants కున్న ప్రతినిధులను విర్వాటుచేయడం వర్గకలహాలు వస్తాయని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు అంటున్నారు అసలు ప్రభుత్వం వర్గాలకేతమయినదిగాదని, కోడికి వర్గాల రిక్షకలనీ గుర్తించబట్టి రైతులకు రక్షణకలిగించాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మేమీ సవరణను తీసుకువచ్చామని ప్రభుత్వంవారు గుర్తించవలసియుంటుంది. అందరి హక్కులను సరిగా తెలుసుకొని పరిష్కారంచేయడానికి ఈ ప్రతినిధులు తోడ్పడు తారు. అంతేకాకుండా అందరి తరపున ప్రతినిధులు లేనప్పుడు, బలమైనటువంటి ఒకవర్గమునకే మేలుజరిగి తక్కినవారికి అన్యాయము జరుగుతుంది. అందరి తరపున

26th November 1952] [Sri V. Sri Krishna]

ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడు ఈలాంటి అక్రమం జరగడానికి వీలుండదు. ఈ ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మేము ఈ సవరణను తీసుకువచ్చాము. కాబట్టి కాలకు నాగుండిచేస్తున్న రైతులు వారి హక్కులను నిలబెట్టుకొని, వారికి న్యాయమువరగాంటే, ప్రభుత్వముదీనిని అంగీకరించవలసియున్నదని కోరుతున్నాను."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఈ రివిన్యూ కమిటీలోని విభాగము ప్రతినిధులందరినీ పర్లమెంటులోని దారితీస్తుందని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు నెలవిచ్చారు. అది సరియైన అభిప్రాయముగాదని చెప్పుచున్నాను ఎందుకనగా, ఈ విభాగములో ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడే వీరి దరుకలిసి సమయొక్క వాదనలను రివిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరు (Revenue Divisional Officer) కు తెలియజేయడంవల్ల, ఆయన సరియైనటువంటి నిర్ణయానికిరాగలడు. ఏ తగాదాలూగాని, సమస్యలూగాని అన్ని వర్గాలకు ప్రతినిధులున్నప్పుడే న్యాయముజరుగలదు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ శాసన సభలోకూడా మంత్రివర్గము, వ్యతిరేకము అని రెండుపక్షాలున్నాయి. అందరుకలిసి వారివారి అభిప్రాయాలను సరిగా తెలియజేసినప్పుడు, ఏది సరియైనదో ఏది సరియైనదాదని తెలుసుకొని నిర్ణయించేందుకు వీలుంటుంది. అలాగే రివిన్యూ కోర్టులలోకూడా సరియైనటువంటి పరిష్కారము, న్యాయము జరగాలంటే కిడుదారులైన రైతుల, వస్త్రయాల, భూస్వాములయొక్క ప్రతినిధులందరినీ తోడ్పడతారు. అలాంటప్పుడు ముఖ్య దరుకలిసి న్యాయంగా పరిష్కరించేందుకే తోడ్పడతారు. అలాంటప్పుడు ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు అన్నట్లు ఇదివర్గకలహాలకు ఏరీతిగా దారితీస్తుందో అర్థంకావడంలేదు అదీకాకుండా, జిల్లా జడ్జిలకోర్టులలోను, ఇంకా ఇతర కోర్టులలోనుకూడా, అన్ని విషయాలు సరిగా తెలుసుకొనేందుకు (Juries) జూరీసును నియమిస్తున్నారు. అది చట్టవిరుద్ధమని, లేక కాన్స్టిట్యూషన్ కు (Constitution) కు విరుద్ధమని, అని అడుగుతున్నాను. అది చట్టానికిమాత్రము విరుద్ధముకాదు. అలాంటప్పుడు రివిన్యూ కోర్టులలోకూడా ఈ ప్రతినిధులందరినీ Constitution కు విరుద్ధముకానేరదు. అంతే కాకుండా జూరీస్ (Juries) ఏ విధముగా అయితే న్యాయముచేయారోచేందుకు తోడ్పడుతారో, అదేవిధంగానే ఈ ప్రతినిధులందరినీ సరియైనటువంటి అభిప్రాయాలిచ్చి, న్యాయమైన పరిష్కారముచేసేందుకు తోడ్పడతారు కనుక ఈ సవరణను ముఖ్యమంత్రి గారు అంగీకరించవలసినది కోరుతున్నాను."

"అంతేకాదు అనుభవములూచూచినా యిది సరియైనదని రుజువుచున్నది. అన్ని కేసులూ రివిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు మేజిస్ట్రేట్లుగా ఉన్నప్పుడు తీర్పులను, సెషన్స్ కోర్టులు, హైకోర్టు త్రోసివేస్తున్నవో చూడండి. వారి తీర్పులు యెట్లు పోలీసుల చార్జీలకు అనుకూలంగావున్నవో చూడండి. ఇటీవల కలచనేరు తాలూకా (చిత్తూరుజిల్లా) కంగుందికుప్పం యెట్టులోని బోయనపల్లి ఇనాందారి కేసులో యెట్లు రైతులను నెహ్రూజీ ప్రాసీడింగ్స్ కిందకు తెచ్చి వారివద్ద బాండ్లు వ్రాయించుకొని, అదే సమయంలో ఇనాందారును, అతని యెజెంటును నెహ్రూజీ ప్రాసీడింగ్స్ కిందకు తెచ్చి అ కేసును నడిపిన మదనపల్లి రివిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసరు చర్యనుచూడండి. ఇనాందారు యెజెంటు రైతులను యెముకలు కలిగేట్లుకొట్టినా, రైతు స్త్రీలను మానభంగం చేసినా, వారిని ప్రాసీడింగ్స్ కిందకు తెచ్చుకు తీసుకురాలేదో చూస్తే యెట్టి రివిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్లు యెట్లు భూస్వాముల ఒత్తికి లొంగుతారో తెలుస్తుంది. ఇట్టి రివిన్యూ డివిజన్ ఆఫీసర్ల తీర్పులకు రైతులను వదలిపెట్టడంవల్ల కాంగ్రెస్ మంత్రి వర్గం తంజావూరు రైతాంగానికి వస్త్రయాలకు అన్యాయంచేస్తున్నది అందుకే నేనీ సవరణను ప్రవేశ పెట్టుతున్నాను."

[Sri D. Seetharamiah] [26th November 1952]

“అంతేకాదు మదనపల్లి తాలూకాలో వడుం గ్రామంలో రైతులకు భూస్వాములకు 1938 లో కోర్టు సమస్యపై సాక్షిపోరాటం సమైక్యంగా జరిగినట్లు రైతు ప్రతినిధులు, భూస్వాముల ప్రతినిధులకులని కన్ఫిలిక్షన్ బోర్డుగా పనిచేసి సమస్యను సులభముగా పరిష్కరించారు. పండితవంశం రైతులకు, రెండు భాగాలు భూస్వామి లకు ఒక భాగం ప్రకారం పంచుకోవాలని తీర్పుచెప్పారు.

“అందుకే నేనీ సవరించు ప్రవేశపెట్టాను. మంత్రివర్గం దీనిని అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, after so much discussion for and against this motion, my reply can only be, I oppose the amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I shall now put the amendments of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri V. Sri Krishna and Sri D. Seetharamiah to the vote of the House. The question is—

“After the words “a Revenue Court”, insert the words “consisting of one person on behalf of the Government, one person on behalf of the tenant and one person on behalf of the landowner”.”

The amendment was declared lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—“నేను పోనే తీసుకోనమని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“When an hon. Member wants a division, his request must be seconded. The hon. Member's amendment is lost.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

“For the words “a Revenue Court . . . Revenue Divisional Officer”, substitute the following words:—

“ad hoc tribunal with the Revenue Divisional Officer as the Chairman and representatives of landowners, tenants and pannaiyals as members”.”

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

“Add at the end the words “The Revenue Court shall consist of equal number of representatives of landlords and tenants or pannaiyals and will be appointed by the disputing parties”.”

The amendment was lost.

Clause 5 was put and carried.

Clause 6.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan has given notice of two amendments. He will please move the amendments.”

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—Mr. Speaker Sir, I have got two amendments to clause 6. The first amendment states that the security of tenure to the cultivator should not be for five years, but

26th November 1952] [Sri K. P. Gopalan]

that every cultivating tenant should be given possession of the land permanently. Regarding this I wish to speak a few words. In every radical land reform measure, security of tenure to the cultivator and reduction of rents must find a place.

“Sir, the point which I wish to stress here is this. From the speeches we heard yesterday in the House, it was found that all the Congress members were praising this Bill too much. I want to ask, you, Sir, in a respectful manner whether the Congress members and the Congress Government have forgotten the resolution passed at the Karachi session of the Congress, or at the Faizpur session of the Congress or even the slogan which they put forward before the electorate at the time of the last elections. I wish to point out that both in the resolutions passed at the Karachi and Faizpur Congress sessions and in their election propaganda, the Congress Party said that they would stand for the abolition of landlordism. They said they would give full rights to the tenants over the land. I now want to ask the Congress Government, where are those resolutions and where has their propaganda gone. I am not raising any new point. I am only saying if the Congressmen and the Congress Government have got any respect for the resolutions of the Congress, they must give full rights to the tenants over the land. That is what I have got to say on this point.

“The second thing as far as I understand is that in the Tanjore district, evictions have taken place in large numbers. Hundreds and thousands of tenants have been evicted from the land since 1946, 1947 and 1948. According to this Bill, only tenants who have been evicted recently will have the benefit whereas the tenants who were evicted since 1946 to 1948 cannot go to the Conciliation courts to get such benefits. I would therefore request the Government to so modify the Bill that the tenants who were evicted during the period from 1946 to 1948 may also be given the right to go before the Conciliation officers and get back their land. That is the object of my second amendment.

“Now, the next point I wish to place before the House is this. In the speeches made yesterday, one hon. Member referred to a portion in clause 6 according to which the tenant must pay back all the arrears for one year. Suppose I owe a certain amount of money to a person. Have I got a right to appear before a court and file a suit against that man? That is what happens in the case of this Bill. Suppose a tenant has to pay rent to the landlord or the mirasdar. He is forbidden to appear before the court. It is even now existing in our country. Here I want to point out to the Chief Minister and the Government that if this provision is not removed, I will have to take it that this Congress Government exists for collecting the arrears of rent for the mirasdars and the janmis, and surely I will consider this Government as the Government of the janmis, the mirasdars and the zamindars.

“With these remarks I move the three amendments standing in my name.”

The amendments were duly seconded.

4-20
p.m

[26th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, my hon. Friend has moved three amendments . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think, the hon. Member, Mr. Gopalan has given notice of only two amendments. Let him read his amendments."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"The amendments standing in my name are—

"1. In sub-clause (1) for the words 'Every cultivating tenant . . . 1952-53', substitute the following words:—

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land on the first day of December 1951 shall be entitled to be in possession of such land permanently."

2. In sub-clause (1) for the words 'Every cultivating tenant . . . December 1951', substitute the words—

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date."

3. In sub-clause (4), omit item (i) ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The last amendment may be moved when we come to that sub-clause."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Then, I am moving only the first two amendments now."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, there are two amendments which Mr. Gopalan has moved. The substance of these two amendments is different. One has the effect of conferring permanent occupancy rights on the tenant. The other amendment relating to the substitution of the words 'Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date' has got a different substance altogether. That means in effect substitute the figure '1947' for '1951'. There are two other amendments which stand in my name which come later on. One of the amendments is to omit the words 'until the expiry of a period of five years'. That also will have the same effect, namely conferring permanent occupancy rights on the tenant. I do not want it later on to be said that this question has already been discussed and disposed of. Therefore, I suggest that these two amendments may be taken up separately and speeches called for on these two separate amendments, so that there may not be confusion later on. As I said, one of the amendments proposes to confer permanent occupancy rights on the tenant and the other deals with the question whether the rights conferred under the present Bill should be conferred even on those tenants who were evicted prior to 1951 or only those who were evicted after 1951. These are entirely two different amendments. I therefore suggest that these amendments may be taken up separately."

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The discussion may take place on the two amendments and when I put them to vote I will put them separately."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The question whether permanent occupancy rights should be conferred on the tenant or not is a very important question and that must be dealt with separately."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If that is the desire of the House I have no objection."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"In that case, I shall confine myself only to this particular amendment relating to permanency of occupancy rights to the tenant."

"Sir, yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister developed a very strange theory with reference to this Bill. He developed the theory of husband and wife . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I submit that points should be replied to the same day they are raised."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am replying to that particular argument that he made out since that particular argument leads to the line of thought which is behind the whole structure of the Bill. That is why it becomes necessary for me to refer to that. I think, Sir, that that line of thought does not lead us anywhere, but it will lead us to a situation which will be very undesirable."

"In the first place, I want to point out that it is that mentality that is behind the whole scope of this Bill. Here is a case where the relationship between the landlord and the tenant is pretty bad for the last so many years. Now, the Bill seeks to make out that they give certain rights to the tenant, and at the end of five years, if either party does not like this kind of relationship he will have the right to break off. That was the line of argument that was developed by the Chief Minister yesterday. I submit that such a kind of mentality itself is class mentality. It shows feudal outlook and the ideology of the feudalism is very rampant there, because the effect of the clause is that at the end of four years the landlord has got a right to give notice to the tenant to go. No ryot can break off his existing relationship. It is the landlord, if he wants to terminate the tenancy at the end of four years and wants to take possession of the land that will have the right to ask the tenant to go and the tenant will not have the right to stay. Therefore, under the existing system of law, under any feudal society, it is only the husband that has got the right of divorce and has got the right of treating his wife in any way he pleases and it is that right that is sought to be imported into this Bill. Here where we are concerned with the relationship between the landlord and tenant, that is, between two human beings, I submit that it is a very dangerous outlook and such an outlook should not govern the conduct of this Bill at all. We have to look at the question from an entirely different angle. Whether the tillers of the soil, those who are engaged in the production of

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [26th November 1952]

food and but for whose toil day in and day out, society will perish, should be allowed to live without the fear of the morrow or whether the Damocles Sword of eviction at the end of five years should be kept hanging over their head is the simple proposition before the House. At the end of five years, the tillers will have no rights whatsoever and they will have to fend for themselves. If we are interested in doing justice to this class of people, people who toil for the society and produce food, we should change our line of thought and adopt a different outlook. Here are landlords who, for the mere fact that they are owners of land, can treat the tenants in any way they please. To say that a tenant cannot be evicted for five years and that he can be evicted at the end of the period is not conferring any right. So long as we do not give the tenant the incentive of permanent tenancy of the land, food production cannot increase. I have seen some countries recently. In spite of the fact that the Hon. Chief Minister may not like those countries, I have seen what has been achieved there. I have seen Warsaw very recently, a city which was devastated house by house by the Nazi Army."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"What is the price of a loaf of bread there?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I may inform the Hon. the Chief Minister that there is not a single man who is dying there of starvation, unlike in this country."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"People have been disposed of without starvation!"

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I have also seen countries where people are dying of starvation. In some of the countries which I visited recently, I have seen the joy of creation. The people feel that what they are constructing is for themselves. A whole city which was devastated house by house has been rebuilt within the last five years and beautiful buildings have sprung up. Unless we create the joy production in our peasants, unless we make them feel that what they produce is theirs and that the produce will not be taken away from them, we cannot really enthuse our peasants to produce more food. I want this joy of creation should be created in our people. If this joy is not created, all talk of increasing food production and the Five-Year Plan will not be of any avail and will be a sheer waste. Permanent occupancy right must be conferred on the tenant. He should not be made to feel that at the end of five years, he could not continue on the land which he had been cultivating and that he would be turned out on the streets as a derelict in society. The Directive Principles of State Policy in our Constitution refer to solving the unemployment problem and the provision of security. Why should not this minimum security at least be provided for the tenant? We are not saying to-day that the lands must be taken away from the landlords. If a tenant looks after the cultivation properly, he should not be deprived of his land which is his only means of livelihood and made to starve. If we provide this minimum

26th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

security for the tenant and his family and heirs, then we will be doing something which will make him enthusiastic about food production. Therefore this amendment must be accepted. If it is not accepted, the peasants will feel that the rights that are sought to be conferred on them are fictitious. I commend the amendment for the unanimous acceptance of the House."

* SRI N. VENKATARAMIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Act is called the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Act. But when we consider the provisions of the Act, we see that what is given is not real protection. The tenant is told that he will have to quit his land at the end of five years. Unless we guarantee him permanency of tenure, he will have no enthusiasm to produce from the land as much food as is possible. Further, there will not be happy relations between the landlord and the tenant. I therefore support Mr. Ramamurthi's plea for the acceptance of the amendment."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I have already answered this point during the general discussion. The acceptance of this amendment will entail expropriation of a certain class of people and there will be legal and other difficulties. Therefore I oppose the amendment."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister has given no reason to reject my amendment. After hearing the speech of the Hon. Minister, what I feel is that the Government have brought forward this Bill to stem the tide of the strong peasant movement in this State, to stop radical agrarian reforms and to put off abolition of landlordism. I regret that the Government run by the Congress Party, which trumpets so much for agrarian reforms and has passed so many resolutions regarding agrarian reforms, are not accepting this simple amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "Every cultivating tenant 1952-53", substitute the following words:—' 4-50 p.m.

"Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of any land on the first day of December 1951, shall be entitled to be in possession of such land permanently."

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

Ayes.

Sri K. V. Ramesam.
" C. V. Somayajulu.
" K. R. Nallasivam.
" C. Velukkan.
" P. Chinnamma Reddi.
" M. Kalyanasundaram.
" K. P. Gopalan.
" C. Kandaswami.
" S. Ramalingam.
" N. Sivarami.
" A. K. Subbiah.
" K. V. Ramasamy.

Sri T. S. Ardhanari.
" P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
" P. Narasimha Reddi.
" N. Sivarami Reddi.
" D. Seetharamiah.
" C. H. Kanaran.
" K. Madhavan Nambiar.
" R. Krishnan.
" E. T. Kunhan.
" M. Hanumantha Rao.
" C. V. K. Rao.
" K. Rajagopala Rao.

[26th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. Venkatasiviah.
" P. Rama Rao.
" V. Rama Rao.
" T. Potha Raju.
" P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
" M. Narayanaswamy.
" P. Syamasundara Rao.
" G. Satyanarayana.
" G. Anjaneyulu.
" V. Sri Krishna.
" G. Joseph.
" D. Lakshmayya.
" M. Kune Rao.
" G. Nageshwara Rao.
" Alluri Venkataramaraju.
" R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
" K. Ranga Rao.
" K. Subba Reddi.
" Chandra Ramalingayya.
" K. Govinda Rao.
" M. Veerabhadran.
" S. Swayamprakasam.
" V. V. Ramasami.
" Mookiah Thevar.
" E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
" M. Palaniandi.
" K. Krishna Rao.
" P. Rangaswamy Reddiar.
" T. Shanmugam.
" A. Veloo.
" M. P. Subramaniam.
" Mottaya Kudumban.
" Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
" T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
" G. O. Kondayya.
" M. Manickasundaram.
" K. R. Sambandam.

Sri S. Kasi Reddy.
" P. Chokkalingam.
" Saka Venkata Rao.
" T. Nagi Reddi.
" Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
" S. Deivasigamany.
" Bojja Appalasamy.
" D. Dasarathan.
" S. Vemiah.
" R. Siddanna Gowd.
" K. Ramiah Chowdry.
" S. S. Kolkeball.
" Y. V. Krishna Rao.
" N. Ramabhadra Raju.
" P. Kunhirama Kidav.
" N. Venkatramiah.
" B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
" K. Ramiah.
" M. Lakshmanaswamy.
" T. Viswanatham.
" P. Ramamurthy.
" P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
" T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
" N. Paramasivam.
" V. Gopala Gounder.
" A. Govindasamy Nayagar.
" A. Ayyaru.
" V. Santaranarayana Menon.
" K. T. Sridharan.
" M. Narayana Kurup.
" M. Narayana Nambiar.
" O. Koran.
" C. Kunhirama Kurup.
" K. R. Narasa Raju.
" P. K. Gopalakrishnan.
" K. C. Gopalan Unni.

Noes.

5 p.m. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
" M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
" Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
Sri K. Rajaram.
" B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
" C. Rajam Ramaswami.
" P. G. Karuthiruman.
" B. K. Nallasamy.
" S. C. Virupakshayya.
" P. S. Nalla Gounder.
" P. G. Manickam.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" P. K. Thirumurthi.
" V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
" N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
" A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
" P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugam.
" K. H. Bomman.
" Kempai Gounder.
" T. M. Kaliannan.
" M. P. Periaswami.
" Ardhanareswara Gounder.
" A. Sambasivam.
The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
" Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
" T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" K. Koti Reddi.
" A. M. Sambandam.

Sri M. R. Ramachandran.
" O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
" V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
" T. P. Elumalai.
" S. Panchaksharam.
" A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
" H. M. Jagannatham.
" A. A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" R. Thangavelu.
" R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
" M. Kendusamy Padayachi.
" L. Anandan.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" G. Vagheesam Pillay.
" A. S. Sahajanandam.
" O. S. Nanjappa.
" P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
" S. Arumugham.
" A. M. Ratnaswami.
Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.
The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Gounder.
" K. Venkataswami Naidu.
" N. Sankara Reddi.
" D. Sanjivayya.
" Shanmuga Rajeswara
Sethupathi (Raja of
Ramanad).
" S. B. P. Patabhi Rama
Rao.

26th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Srimathi Dr. Soundaram
chandran.
Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
" V. S. Chinnasami Naidu.
" S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
" V. S. Sivaprakasam.
" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" Thinakarasami Thevar.
" R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
" S. Jayarama Reddiar.
" A. Vaikuntam.
" G. Govindan.
" P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyanger.
" S. Ramasamy Naidu.
" Ar. A. R. M. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
" P. Chellathurai.
" N. Rajagopal.
" R. M. Palaniappan.
" A. Ramasamy Thevar.
" T. V. Sannasi.
" Antony Peter.
" T. R. Varadan.
" C. Muthiah Pillai.
" Thiagaraja Pillay.
" S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
" K. Subramania Pillai.
" P. Urkavalan.
" R. S. K. Pandian.
" M. G. Shanker.
" Venugopalakrishnaswamy.
" Chinnathambi Thevar.
" P. Selvaraj.
" V. Arumugam.
" K. Ramasamy Doss.
" R. S. Arumugam.
" A. Rami Reddi.
" N. Chenchurama Naidu.
" P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
" K. Shanmugham.
" P. Venkataswami Reddi.
" Muthukumarasamy.
" G. Narayanasamy Naidu.
" S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.
" D. Narayana Raju.
Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju Bahadur.
Sri Thotta Ramasamy.
" P. Satyanarayana Reddi.

Rama- Sri V. C. Chudamani Deo.
" A. Venkatasubramanian.
" P. Gunayya.
" L. Lakshmana Das.
" H. Satyanarayana Dora.
" M. Rajeswara Rao.
" P. Venkatasubbayya.
" K. V. Vema Reddy.
" G. Sivasankara Reddi.
" S. Narayanappa.
" K. Santhappa.
" P. Ranga Reddi.
" A. Appu.
" B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
" K. Varadachari.
" A. Balarama Reddi.
" D. Ramabrahmam.
" K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
" M. Doraiannu.
" G. Nagabhushnam.
" T. Mallayya.
" T. Anantha Pai.
" Y. Manjappa Shetty.
" K. Venkatramana Gowda.
" M. Jagannathan.
" E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
Janab M. S. Mogral.
Sri T. Chinnayya.
" P. Thimma Reddi.
" P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
" K. Narayana.
" N. Venkatayya.
" M. Gangappa.
" L. C. Pais.
Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
Sri N. Pentannaiatu.
" N. C. Ramasamy Kander.
" Somasundara Gounder.
Janab K. Uppi.
" C. Ahmed Kutty.
" K. M. Seethi.
Sri G. Samia Koorayar.
" V. Chandanandam.
" R. Lakshminarasimha Dora.
" K. S. Lakshminipathy Naicker.
" R. Rangaswami Gounder.
" Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.
" A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.

Ayes 97, Noes 151.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—" We shall now take up the second amendment of the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name:—

" In sub-clause (1), for the words " Every cultivating tenant December 1951," substitute the words " Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date."

" Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister has said that he has brought in this Bill for the benefit of the peasants. In this amendment I am not introducing anything new or anything which could not be

750 THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)

[Sri K. P. Gopalan] [26th November 1952]

conceded by the Government. My amendment only requests that the benefit of the Bill may be extended to those tenants who have been evicted from December 1947 onwards. In the Tanjore district, as far as I understand, hundreds of peasants were evicted by the mirasdars in 1947 and 1948. Therefore, if this amendment is accepted by the Government, it will be beneficial to very many tenants. I request the Government to accept this amendment without any discussion and without raising any controversy."

SRI M. PALANIANDI:—"I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'In sub-clause (1), for the words, "Every cultivating tenant . . . December 1951", substitute the words "Every cultivating tenant who was in possession of the land on the first day of December 1947 and was evicted subsequent to that date."'

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, this amendment is only slightly different from that which has just now been disposed of. Whatever was said against that amendment applies to this also. Therefore, I oppose this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member withdrawing the amendment?"

SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"No, Sir."

The amendment was then put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Hon. Members Sri Kune Rao and Sri Pundarikakshacharylu will now move their amendments."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The difference between these amendments and the previous one is only slight. But if they wish to move the amendments, let them do it."

Sri Kune Rao was not in his seat.

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU:—"అధ్యక్షా, నా పేరున ఉన్న సవరణను నేను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను."

"My amendment runs as follows:—

'In sub-clause (1) for the expression "first day of December 1951" wherever it occurs, substitute the expression "first day of December 1947."'

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I beg your pardon, Sir. The amendment that was put to vote already and decided upon was Sri Gopalan's amendment. Now, Sri Pundarikakshacharylu's amendment is exactly the same as that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then, let him not move the amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If there is any new reason, he may move it, or else he need not move it."

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952 751
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)

26th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"This amendment is exactly the same as that of the hon. Member Sri Gopalan. The House has given a verdict on that. Therefore, this amendment need not be moved. The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah will now move his amendment."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణను ఉపపాద్యస్తున్నాను—

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "five years" substitute the words "ten years".'

MR. SPEAKER:—"Before taking up the amendment of the hon. Member, the amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member Sri P. Venkateswarlu has to be taken. Is Sri Venkateswarlu moving his amendment? (after a pause) Sri Venkateswarlu is not in his place. So Sri Gopalakrishnaiah may proceed."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"కొలు కాల్చాన్ని ఐదు సంవత్సరాలనుంచి పది సంవత్సరాలవరకు పెంచవలసినదే నా సవరణను ఉపపాదిస్తున్నాను. అసలు ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చిన ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యము ఏమో దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని నట్లయితే ప్రభుత్వమువారు నా సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసియున్నది. తగినంతకాలం ఒక కొలుదారు క్రింద భూమి ఉంటుందనే హామీ ఉన్నట్లయితే అతడు భూమియొక్క సారాన్ని అభివృద్ధి పరచి ఉత్పత్తిని పెంచుచేయుటకు అవకాశం వుంటుంది. అందువలన ఐదు సంవత్సరముల కొలు గడువును 10 సంవత్సరములకు మార్చవలసినదిగా కోరుచున్నాను. ఈ సవరణలో విప్లవాత్మకమైనదేదీలేదు. మన పొరుగున ఉన్న బొంబాయి రాష్ట్రంలో కొలుదారులకు కలగజేసిన సదుపాయాన్నే ఇక్కడి రైతులకు కూడా కలగజేయమని కోరుతున్నాను. 1948 వ. సంవత్సరంలోను యిట్టి అవకాశముతో బొంబాయి ప్రభుత్వం శాసనంచేసింది. అస్థిర పరిస్థితులలో కొలుదారును ఉంచినందున అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి జరుగదు. సాధారణంగా రైతు పొలంలో మంచి ఎరువు వేసినట్లయితే మొదటి రెండు మూడు సంవత్సరములలో దాని ఫలితము హెచ్చుగా కనుపించదు. ఎరువువేసి దాని ఫలం ఆనాటివలెటానికి పది సంవత్సరాల వఱకు వుంటేనే కానిలాభంలేదు. అనగా ఏ నాలుగో ఏటో, అయిదో సంవత్సరములోనో కంటే వాగుగా కండడం ప్రారంభిస్తుంది. ఈసరికి రైతు భూమిని వడలుతో వలసిన స్థితిలో ఉంటాడు. తాను ఖర్చుచేసిన డబ్బుకు ప్రతిఫలం రాదని తెలిసిన ఏ రైతుకూడా భూమిని సారవంతం చేయుటకు ప్రయత్నించడు. కాబట్టి రైతును అస్థిర పరిస్థితులలో ఉంచడం మంచిదికాదు. అంతే కాక ఈనాడు తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న కొలు విధానంకూడా గమనించవలసిఉన్నది. ప్రభుత్వంవారి నివేదికలలో చూపినట్లు 2,112 మంది కొలుదారులలో—

ఒక సంవత్సరం కొలు	...	357 మందికి
రెండు సంవత్సరాల కొలు	...	490 "
మూడు	"	419 "
నాలుగు	"	247 "
అయిదు	"	278 "
ఆరు సంవత్సరాలు కొలు	...	216 "

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

విడు సంతకాలు కాలం ...	...	75 మందికి
ఎనిమిది ,, ...	...	114 ,,
తొమ్మిది ,, ...	...	13 ,,
పది ,, ...	...	293 ,,
పది సంతకాలకు పైన	...	405 ,,

“పది సంతకాలకు పైన 405 మంది ఉన్నారు. వీరిందరి కాలం కాలం పది సంతకాలకు పైన ఉన్నట్లుంటే ఒక్క 405 మందికి అనగా మొత్తంలో అయిదవవంతు వారికి మాత్రమే కొంత ఇబ్బందికలుగవచ్చు. కాని తక్కిన నాలుగు వంతులవారికి వారి వ్యతిరేకమైన కొంత స్థిరపరిచి కాలదార్లకు భూమిపై హక్కు శ్రద్ధ పుడుతుంది. తప్పనిసరిగా అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి జరుగుతుంది. ఈ రకంగానే రానుండరావు రిపోర్టుకూడా ఉన్నది. 1948 ల సం||రంలో బొంబాయి ప్రభుత్వం వారు అప్పటి కాలదార్లకు చేసిన మేలును ఈ ప్రభుత్వం కూడా చేయవలసినది ఉద్దేశంతోనే నేను ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించాను. దీని ఉద్దేశ్యాన్ని గుర్తించి, ప్రభుత్వం వారు అంగీకరించ వలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

SRI M. KUNE RAO:—“అధ్యక్ష, నా పేరు కూనే రావు. శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. నేనుకూడా అట్టి సవరణనే ఇచ్చి ఉన్నాను. కాలం కాలం తగినంతగా ఉండినప్పుడే రైతు భూమిపై కొంత పెట్టుబడి పెడతాడు. సరియైన గట్టి ఎరువు వేసినట్లుంటే హక్కు డబ్బు ఖర్చు పెట్ట వలసియ్యున్నది. పాటి మట్టివంటి ఎరువు వేస్తే ఏ నాలుగైదు సంతకాలములకోగాని ఫలి తానికిరాదు. అందుచేత భూములలోపాటి మట్టి పోయాలంటే కాలం కాలం అయిదు సంతకాలకు మించివుండాలి. లేకపోతే 3 రైతు పాటిమట్టిగాని, లేక గట్టి ఎరువు లనుగాని భూములకు వేయరు. తప్పనిసరిగా భూసారం నానాటికి తగ్గి పోవడమే సంభ విస్తుందికాని అధికం కావడానికి ఎటువంటి అవకాశం ఉండదు. పాటిమట్టి పోసిన ఫలితం 15, 20 సంతకాలవరకు నిలబడిఉంటుంది. అందువల్ల భూసారం తగ్గ కుండా చూడాలంటే కాలకాలపరిమితిని అధికం పది సంతకాలకైనా పెంచవల సిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. విదేశీ తాత్కాలి కంగా కాలదార్లకు; భూస్వాములకు మధ్య ఉన్న తగాదాలను వెనుకకు నెట్టుదామనే అభిప్రాయంతోకాక జాతిసంపదను అభివృద్ధిపరచు ఉద్దేశంతో ఈ సవరణను అంగీక రించవలసినదని మంత్రిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను. శ్రీ గోపాలకృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను వ్యూహపూర్వకంగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Amendment moved—

‘(i) In sub-clause (1) for the words “five years” substitute the words “ten years”’.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this very reasonable and modest amendment moved by hon. Member Sri Gopalakrishnaiah. In the Select Committee I proposed that a period of at least 15 years should be fixed so that the cultivating tenant may have some security of tenure. I was not able to make the Committee accept my amendment. Just now there was a division on the question of permanency. The House without fully understanding the implications of the amendment

26th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanathan]

regarding this question did not perhaps like to accept it. I do not think that the vote is against giving security of tenure to the cultivating tenant at all. Though it may be final for the purpose of the Legislature, yet I don't think the mind of the Government and that of the Members of the party in power are permanently made up on this point. I believe the Hon. the Chief Minister, who is as anxious as most of us to give security of tenure to the poor cultivating tenant has not permanently made up his mind on this subject. Of course, it is true that he could not agree to the demand that 15 years' security of tenure should be provided. But, I believe, he realises that 5 years' period is too little. A period of 10 years as suggested by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah is a very reasonable period. I think the hon. Member has suggested this amendment on the lines of the Bombay Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act, 1948. So, it is not as if we want to spring a surprise upon the Govern ment. A sister Government in a Sister State has adopted this. Therefore, there is no reason why we, who are anxious to help the cultivating tenant, should fight shy of introducing a period of 10 years as the period of security. Therefore I submit that the Government may be good enough to accept this amendment. If they accept this amendment, people will be satisfied and an atmosphere will be created in which the people of this State will feel, 'Well, whatever may be the party and to whatever political complexion they may belong they are really interested and sincere in giving some protection to the cultivating tenants.' For these reasons, I wholeheartedly endorse the amendment.”

* SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—“అధ్యక్ష, శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు తెచ్చిన సవరణ న్యాయమైనటువంటిది. వ్యవసాయంలో సంభంధ మున్న రైతుగా నేనీ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. రైతు తన భూమిపై హక్కు కాలం సాగుచేసుకొనే మక్కువలదని తలచినాడే భూమిపై హక్కు శ్రద్ధ చూపుతాడు. భూమియొక్క సారాన్ని అభివృద్ధిచేయటం సాయశక్తులూ పనిచేస్తాడు. కాలం కాలం తక్కువగా ఉన్నట్లుంటే, విదేశీ పండిన పంటలూ తన భూమిని లీసుకొని సంతృప్తి పడతాడు కాని భూసారాన్ని అభివృద్ధిచేయ యత్నించడు. అందువలన నానాటికి భూసారము తగ్గి పోవడమే సంబంధిస్తుందికాని భూమి బాగుపడదు, పంట వృద్ధి అవదు. ఈ కుబ్జవికయాన్ని దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని ప్రభుత్వం కొరగడుపును నిర్ణ యించవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. ఈ అవసరాన్ని గుర్తించే ఇతర దేశాలలో భూసంస్కరణలు చేయబడుతున్నాయి. మనంకూడా అవిధంగానే చేయ వలసియ్యున్నది. లేనిచో అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి కొరతగాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించే విషయంలో రాజీయభేదాల ప్రసక్తి లేవద్దని, దేశంయొక్క పురోభివృద్ధిని, భూమిని అభివృద్ధి చేసుకొని జీవించే రైతులొకయొక్క ప్రగతిని దృష్టి యందుంచుకొని కాసన నిర్మాణం చేయవలసినది కోరుతున్నాను. సాగుచేసుకొనే భూమిపై రైతుకు శ్రద్ధ కలగలన్నా, భూమిలో హక్కు పరిపూర్ణమైనట్లు శ్రీ గోపాల కృష్ణయ్యగారు ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసినదని ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరు తున్నాను. భూమిని నమ్మకొని జీవించేవారిని రక్షించుటే ఈ ప్రభుత్వోద్దేశమైనట్లు యితే, అధిక ఆహారోత్పత్తి సాధనే వారి ఆశయమైతే మా కోరికను ప్రభుత్వంవారు

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [26th November 1952]

మన్నించవలసియున్నదని తిరిగి మనవిచేస్తూ ఈ సమరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. రాజకీయ కారణాలను ఈ విషయంలో త్రోసివేయాలని మా ప్రభుత్వం వారిని కోరుచున్నాను."

5-30 p.m. * SRI C. V. K. RAO:—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have also given notice of a similar amendment. Arguments have already been put forth by some hon. Members and the Leader of the Opposition in favour of it. I, therefore, wish the Government accept this modest demand advanced with sweet reasonableness by the Leader of the Opposition."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is speaking in English."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"He can speak in more than one language. He can also speak in German."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I am not able to follow the Hon. Speaker."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is now speaking in English."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I don't know that. English first comes out."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I know that. I want him to speak in English always."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"I hope the Government will also be so sweet in their attitude and accept this modest demand."

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMY:—"ఈ సమరణను నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ఎంతోకాలంగా కాంగ్రెసువారు భూసామ్య విధానాన్ని రద్దుచేస్తామని, దున్నే రైతుకు భూమిపై హక్కుకలుగజేస్తామని చెబుతూ వచ్చారు. కాని తుదకు కొలుకాలాన్ని కూడా 5 ఏండ్లకు పరిమితం చేశారు. ఇది నిజంగా భూవిధాన సంస్కరణాలేక భూస్వామ్యవిధాన రక్షణ అనే సందేహం కలుగుతోంది. గత కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వం కొలు దార్లకు రక్షణకలుగజేసే ఉద్దేశంతో కొన్ని కమిటీలను ఏర్పాటుచేసింది. ఆ కమిటీ వారు స్థితిగతులను విచారణచేసి కొన్ని సూచనలను చేశారు. అదేవిధంగా కాంగ్రెసు సంస్థ నియమించిన కమిటీవారు కూడా కొన్ని సూచనలను చేశారు. ఒక శాసనాన్ని తెచ్చామనే ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఆ సూచనలు నేటి పాటించదలచినట్లులేదు. ఎడో నామక పేరుకు ఈ శాసనాన్ని చేయదలచినట్లే కనుపిస్తోంది. ప్రభుత్వంవారు చెప్పేదానికి చేసేదానికి చాలా వ్యత్యాసం కనిపిస్తోంది. ఉదాహరణకు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు తమ తంజావూరు జిల్లా పర్యటన సందర్భంలో పలికిన పలుకులు ఏమో మనవి చేస్తాను. తంజావూరు మిరాసీదార్ల సుద్దేశించి చెప్పినమాటలివి—

'Production cannot be improved unless you give the tiller of the soil sufficient interest in cultivation. I am not advising you to give away the land to the cultivators. It is to prevent such a calamity that I have brought in this Ordinance.'

26th November 1952] [Sri M. Lakshmanaswamy]

"కాని వారి మాటలకు చేతలకు ఎంతో వ్యత్యాసముంది. కాంగ్రెసు కాలాన్ని అయి దేండ్లకు మాత్రమే పరిమితం చేయడంవల్ల నిజంగా భూమిని దున్నే వానికి భూమిపై తమ పుంతుండేమో గమనించండి. భూమిని వాగుచేసి దాని సరిఫలం అనుభవించు సమయానికి భూమిని భూస్వామి తిసివేసుకుంటూడేమోనని రైతు ఎప్పుడూ భయపడు తూపుండవలసిన స్థితిలోఉంటాడు. ఇట్టి పరిస్థితిలో భూమి వాగుపడుటకు ఎంతమాత్రము ఆస్కారం ఉండదు. భూస్వాముల రక్షణను మాత్రమే దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొనక దేశ ఆహార సంచదను అభివృద్ధిపరచుటే ప్రభుత్వం ముఖ్యంగా గమనించవలసియున్నది. నిజంగా దేశం కరువుకాటకాలకు గురిగాకుండా ఉండాలంటే కనీసం కొలు కాలాన్ని పది సంవత్సరాలకు పెంచాలని కోరుతున్నాను. లేనిచో ఈ శాసనం చేసిన ఫలితమేమి ఉండదు; ఇదంత నియమయోగ్యమే పోతుందని మనవి చేస్తూ సమరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of the reply to the debate on the previous amendment the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue brought in an argument that though occupancy rights might be given, unfortunately, the Constitution of India came in the way and that would be a sort of expropriatory legislation. While I do not concede that if such a step were taken, it would be expropriatory, granting that it would be, the Hon. Minister took shelter under the Constitution. Now I would submit to him that if that was his difficulty in granting occupancy rights, he can have no difficulty in accepting the ten years tenure. The Constitution will not stand in the way of his accepting it. Instead of providing for five years, certainly the Government can provide for ten years unless they have some other reasons behind them for not conceding to the tenants permanency of tenure. Taking shelter under the Constitution is not going to help them as far as this amendment is concerned. Therefore, I would request the Government not to try to find some other shelter but to face the issue squarely and accept the amendment which is very very reasonable. I would specially request the Hon. the Chief Minister to accept the amendment because he had made it clear while promulgating the Ordinance that unless the tenants were given this much of right there cannot be continuity in food production and food production might suffer. Is it that food production is necessary only for five years and after that the tenant might be evicted from the lands and we need not bother about it and allow the people to suffer starvation, hunger and all that? In the interest of all, if the Constitution does not come in the way, I would request the Hon. the Chief Minister to accept this reasonable amendment and prove that the excuses given by the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue were real excuses."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"Sir, I wish just to request the mover of the amendment to withdraw it for this reason. I know the previous amendment asked for permanent occupancy rights being conferred on the tenants. That is a different subject altogether. But I am sure the hon. Member who moved the amendment is aware that the Congress party and the

[Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi] [26th November 1952]

Planning Commission are now engaged on the question of bringing land reforms for the whole country. Their proposals will be coming up before the country very soon. This measure has been taken up only to solve an urgent problem that has arisen in Tanjore district. That is why I feel the tenure has been restricted to a term of five years. I am a landlord myself. I have given my lands on lease to my tenants and I may tell the House my tenants are not changed for generations. The advantage in having a short tenure is, it will make the tenant obtain the optimum results from the land. Anyway since the land reforms under contemplation are to come within a period of five years, it is not necessary that we should increase the term of tenure to ten years at this stage."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker. Sir, the references to the advantages of giving an interest to the cultivator are perfectly relevant and sound. But the question is, what we should do immediately. I did say and I stick to my statement that we must give an interest, a greater interest than was previously enjoyed by the cultivating tenant. That is the reason why so many new rights are given them under this Bill. The question is whether we should give immediately a five year or a ten year term of tenure. That is nearer the question before the House, if I had been convinced in my mind that the tenant could take care of the land in the manner in which the tenant could take care of, I would have no difficulty in accepting this modest proposal and all the rest. But I am convinced that the landowners' participation and their full co-operation and even fuller co-operation than they have been giving till now is necessary. If it is necessary for the tenant to have an interest in order to work on the land, it is also necessary for the landowner to have a reasonable quantum of interest if he has to put his co-operation in it. Therefore it will not do to put aside altogether the landowner for ten years on the shelf. He must be there and give his co-operation. The tenant must also be there and they must come together to produce the food we want.

5-40 p.m. "If hon. Members want a general assurance from me, let them take this implied assurance I am giving, viz., that if during the five years the tenants are not misled but are allowed to work and there is co-operation on both sides, and tenants work in amity with the landowners, if things go on well, I have no doubt as I said on a previous day, that the tenants will get the permanent interest that they desire to have without any right of intervention by the landowner, if I may say so. Therefore I submit, Sir, it would be proper if at this moment the Opposition yields instead of requesting me to yield, and take my implied promise that if tenants are not misled and if things go on well, the tenants are bound to get permanency of tenure during the five years period, if not earlier. They will get the permanency from the people and not from me, for it is not sure that I am going to last for five years more. Somebody in office at that time may bring in

26th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

legislation granting permanency of tenure. The entire population will be impressed by the fact that during the five years the tenants have co-operated well and therefore it would be wise to hand over the land entirely to the tenants, and thereby a permanent interest in the land would accrue to the tenants. Therefore that implied promise of mine is there. Hence I submit that this five-year period is more advisable than the ten-year period for the present. There is no question of principle involved in this fixation of the five-year period. We have started with five years; that is a period during which the tenant and the landlord can work together.

"My friend Mr. Ramamurthi took great pleasure in dissociating himself from the analogy of the husband and wife. I say, Sir, that both are one and indivisible, and what applies to one of the numerous ramifications of human intercourse applies also to another and we need not be ashamed of this comparison. It is necessary for human progress that we should lead lives of mutual affection, whether it be between the husband and the wife or the landlord and the tenant.

"Therefore, Sir, it would be better if we take the period of five years as it is for the present. If after the expiry of five years the relationship between the landlord and tenant has improved, those in office at that time here either in Government or in the Opposition may find it easier to make further concessions to the tenants in the matter of affording them greater protection. This is my explanation for not accepting what is considered and what is put forward by the Opposition as a reasonable proposition. Such an amendment was not discussed in the Joint Select Committee. None on the other side put forward this proposition then. The talk was there regarding permanency or fifteen years tenure. I am sorry that my friend Mr. Viswanatham did not take that opportunity to put me inside his pocket in the joint Select Committee."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, నేను Select Committee లో ఈ యాభై సంవత్సరముల దృక్పథముకలవాళ్లు లేకపోవడమునకు చాలా బాధాకరంగా ఉన్నది. పది సంవత్సరముల అభిప్రాయముకూడా వచ్చినట్లు యితే ఇప్పుడు శాసన సభ్యులకు, నాకు ఉపయోగకరమే. అప్పుడు రాష్ట్రము అంతటా ఉపయోగపడనే అభిప్రాయము శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు యిచ్చారు. నువ్వు రెడ్డిగారు నువ్వుగారు ప్లానింగు కమిషన్ యిదే విషయము ఆలోచిస్తున్నది అన్నారు. నేను చెప్పేది చట్టముకాదు అవడాలేదు. Bombay Tenancy Act లోను కొండీ. దానికీపైన విమతేయడమని యిప్పుడు ప్లానింగు కమీషను ఆలోచిస్తున్నది ఈ 10 సంవత్సరముల విషయమే. కొంతమంది అయిదు సంవత్సరములు తక్కువకాదు ఎక్కువకాదంటున్నారు. అయిదు సంవత్సరములు మేం అంటాం! ఆ సంఖ్య మీకు తెలియదు వాకి తెలియదు. పది సంవత్సరములు లండడము మీరుసంతోషించి కాదు మేము సంతోషించికాదు. అందువలన పది సంవత్సరములవరకు విర్వరణ మంటే, అది అయిదు సంవత్సరములయిన తర్వాత కావల మేమరల వెంచుకొన వచ్చుంటారు. కాబట్టి కాదు నెప్పేది విమతే యిది అధికారికత్యా అయిదు

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [26th November 1952]

సంవత్సరాల కొలు ఎర్పరుస్తున్నాము అన్నారు. అయిదు సంవత్సరాల గడువునునే నాలుగు సంవత్సరాలవరకు ఎరువు చేస్తాడు. అంతవరకు పండించుకున్న దేమో భూస్వామికి ఒప్పజెప్పుతాడు, చివరికి అయిదో సంవత్సరములో భూమిని ఎరువు వ్వగైరా వేయకుండా అనుభయోగముగా అట్టి పెట్టుతాడు. ఆ గడువుతీరగానే భూభూమిందుకు చదులుతాడు. అందువల్ల కొలుదారుని నిరుత్సాహపరచి భూమిని పాడు జేయడమే సంభవిస్తుందిగాని, కొలుదారు శ్రద్ధ వుచ్చుకొని పంట వాగా పండిస్తాడనే గ్యారంటీ మొక్కడ ఉంది? అందువల్ల నాకు భూమి ఆకర్షణలేదంటారు. అందువల్ల యీ కొలుపరిమితి అనే విషయము Select Committee లో స్పష్టపడలేదు. ఇక్కడ శాసన సభ్యులను యీ amendment ను support చెయ్యమంటున్నాను. Select Committee లో యిది ఆమోదించివుంటే బాగుండేది. అందువలన యీ పది సంవత్సరముల పరిమితి కొలుదార్లకు పయోగపడుతుంది గనుక యిది ఆంగీకరించమని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Excuse me for interrupting in the middle, Sir. There is one point that has been missed by the people on the other side. The five-year period is so adjusted now on account of the one year notice which we have now provided before the fifth year lapses that the last link of one year is another opportunity, and if the landowner does not give notice well in advance, another entire period of five years security comes to the tenant. Therefore the period of ten years is there without any difficulty if only people do not talk much about it.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“కొలుదారీ విధానములో జుర్రే కొన్ని పద్ధతులు యిబ్బందులు తెలుపుతున్నాను. ఇది నా అనుభవము వల్ల చెప్పగలుగుచున్నాను. ఒక సంవత్సరము గవుడువుండగానే వోటీసు యివ్వాలంటే ఆ గడువు తప్పించుకొనేందుకు అనేక విధాలు జరుగుతున్నవి. రిజిష్టరువోటీసు పంపింపినట్లే, యీ భూస్వామి డబ్బుకలవాడైనందున వోటీసుకు వోటీసుమాత్రం సక్రమంగానే తెచ్చి పోస్టుమాస్టరుకు యిస్తాడు. ఆ పోస్టుమాస్టరును జేబులోవేసుకొని పోస్ట్ ముద్రమాత్రం వేయించుకొనిపోతాడు. కాని వోటీసు మాత్రము పోదు. అది యీ మధ్యనే పోస్టుమాస్టరు దగ్గరనేవుంటుంది. తీరా కోర్టులోపోయి వోటీసు భూస్వామి చూపించుతాడు. కొలుదారుని చూపించమంటే అతను నాకు తెలియనే తెలియదు అంటాడు. పోస్టుముద్ర మాత్రం ఉంటుంది. అట్లాగే యీ కొలు దార్లను అనేక విధాలుగా వాధించవచ్చు. ఇంకా ఎన్నో విధాలు వోటీసు అందించకుండా వోటీసు పంపింపు రుజువులు పెట్టుకుంటారు. ఈ విధానము మంచిదికాదని అంటున్నాను.

“సివిల్ కోర్టులో మారు అనుకూలమగుననే ఉద్దేశముతో ఎదోవిధంగా వీడవాడైన ఈ కొలుదారుమీద మోసపువిధ్యలు చేసి, వోటీసు రిటరన్ ఆయ్యేటట్లు చేసుకుంటాడనే యీ విధానము మంచిదికాదంటున్నాను. అందువల్ల నేను మరచిచేసేది ఏమిటంటే ఇటువంటి కాలపరిమితి పెట్టి, అయిదు సంవత్సరముల కొకవర్గాయము యీ కొలు దారుని కోర్టుకు యీడమకుండా మరొక అయిదు సంవత్సరముల గడువుకు పెంచి, ఒకే మాటు పది విండ్ల పరిమితి పెట్టినే కొలుదారు ధైర్యంగా కాలక్షేపంచేస్తాడు. ఇదిగాక Grow More Food Scheme కు కూడా గవర్నమెంటు దోహదమివ్వటానికి సావ

26th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

కాశం వుంటుంది. అందువల్ల యీ విషయాలన్నియు జాగ్రత్తగా పరిశీలించి యీ సమరణ ఆంగీకరించమని శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని కోరుతూ సభ్యులను బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Sir, this move on the part of the Opposition looks like a rear-guard action. No doubt there is no constitutional or legal difficulty involved in accepting the amendment; but the difficulty is that this amendment goes against the whole scheme of this Bill. The Bill has been envisaged on the plan of a five-year period. As pointed by the Hon. Chief Minister let us see what good results come out during a couple of years or three years working of this Bill. I think that this five-year period is a reasonable one. I therefore oppose this amendment.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

“In sub-clause (1) for the words “five years” substitute the words “ten years”.”

“Before putting this to vote I want to know whether the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is pressing the amendment to a division.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I think the proposed period of ten years is a very reasonable request, Sir. I do hope that the Hon. the Chief Minister would agree. If not to-day let him say ‘yes’ to-morrow; let the Hon. the Chief Minister give us a promise to that effect, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“If I were to yield to pressure, I would have accepted this long ago. I am sorry I cannot accept the Hon. Leader of the Opposition’s request.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The question is—

In sub-clause (1) for the words “five years” substitute the words “ten years”.”

The amendment was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

Ayes.

Sri P. Thimma Reddi.
K. V. Ramesan.
P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
K. Narayana.
N. Venkatayya.
M. Gangappa.
M. Pentannaaidu.
S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
P. Chinnama Reddi.
K. P. Gopalan.
C. Kandaswami.
S. Vadivelu.
V. Madanagopal.
S. Ramalingam.
N. Sivaraj.

Sri A. K. Subbiah.
K. V. Ramaswamy.
P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
N. Sivarami Reddi.
D. Seetharamiah.
E. T. Kunhan.
M. Hanumantha Rao.
C. V. K. Rao.
P. Rama Rao.
V. Rama Rao.
T. Potharaju.
P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
B. Lakshminaras Raju.
G. Satyanarayana.
S. Swayamprakasam.

[26th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri V. V. Ramasami,
„ G. Anjaneyulu.
„ A. Veloo.
„ M. P. Subramaniam.
„ B. Sankaraya.
„ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
„ T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
„ G. C. Kondayya.
„ K. R. Sambandam.
„ S. Kasireddy.
„ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
„ S. S. Kolkeball.
„ Y. V. Krishna Rao.
„ P. Kunhirama Kidav.
„ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
„ Pragada Kotaiah.
„ T. Viswanatham.
„ P. Ramamurthi.

Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar
„ K. R. Viswanathan.
„ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
„ G. Yellamanda Reddi.
„ V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
„ K. T. Sridharan.
„ M. Narayana Kurup.
„ M. Narayana Nambiar.
„ O. Koran.
„ T. Nagi Reddi.
„ S. Deivasigamony.
„ Bojja Appalasamy.
„ S. Vemiah.
„ R. Siddanna Gowd.
„ V. Sri Krishna.
„ Chandra Ramalingayya.
„ C. Prabhakara Choudary.
„ M. Veerabhadram.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
„ M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
„ Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
„ B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
„ C. Rajam Ramaswami.
„ P. G. Karothiruman.
„ B. K. Nallaswamy.
„ S. C. Virupakshayya.
„ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
„ P. G. Manickam.
„ R. Kuppuswami.
„ P. K. Thirumurthi.
„ V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
„ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
„ A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
„ P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
„ S. R. Arumugham.
„ K. H. Bomman.
„ Kempai Gounder.
„ T. M. Kaliannan.
„ M. P. Periasami.
„ Ardhanareswara Gounder.
„ A. Sambasivam.
Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.

The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishna Nayar
„ Dr. R. Nagana Gowda.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
„ T. N. Venkata Subba Reddi.
„ K. Koti Reddi.
„ A. M. Sambandam.
„ M. R. Ramachandran.
„ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
„ B. Parameswaran.
„ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
„ T. P. Elumalai.
„ S. Panchaksharam.
„ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
„ H. M. Jagannatham.
Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.
Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
„ R. Thagavelu.
„ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
„ M. Kandasami Padayachi.
„ V. Krishnaaswami Padayachi.
„ A. S. Sahajanandam.

Sri P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
„ A. M. Ratnasami.
Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.
The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswami Gounder.
„ K. Venkataswami Naidu.
„ N. Sankara Reddi.
„ D. Sanjivayya.
„ S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao.

Srima'hi (Dr.) T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
„ V. S. Chinnaaswami Naidu.
„ S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.
„ V. S. Sivaprakasam.
„ V. Muthu.
„ A. S. Subbaraj.
„ Thinakaranaswami Thevar.
„ R. Krishnasami Naidu.
„ Vaikuntam.
„ G. Govindan.
„ P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
„ S. Ramasamy Naidu.
„ Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
„ P. Chellathurai.
„ N. Rajagopal.
„ R. M. Palanisappan.
„ A. Ramasamy Thevar.
„ T. K. Rama.
„ T. V. Sannasi.
„ T. R. Varadan.
„ C. Muthiah Pillay.
„ Thiagaraja Pillay.
„ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
„ L. K. Subramania Pillai.
„ P. Urkavalan.
„ M. G. Shanker.
„ Venugopalakrishnaswamy.
„ Chinathambi Thevar.
„ P. Selvaraj.
„ V. Arumugham.
„ K. Ramasamy Doss.
„ R. S. Arumugham.
„ A. Venkatramaiah.
„ A. Rami Reddi.
„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.

26th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Sri P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
„ K. Shanmugham.
„ P. Venkataswami Reddi.
„ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.
„ Raja V. V. Krishnam Raju
„ Thota Ramasamy.
„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.
„ V. C. Chudamani Deo.
„ A. Venkatasubramaniam.
„ P. Gunnayya.
„ L. Lakshmana Das.
„ K. Suryanarayana.
„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
„ P. Venkatasubbayya.
„ K. V. Vema Reddi.
„ S. Narayanaappa.
„ K. Santhappa.
„ A. Appu.
„ B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
„ K. Varadachari.
„ A. Balarama Reddi.

Sri D. Ramabrahmam.
„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
„ G. Nagabhusnam.
„ T. Mallayya.
„ T. Anantha Pai.
„ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
„ K. Ishwara.
„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.

Janab M. S. Mogral.
Sri M. Jagannatham.
„ T. Chinnayya
Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
Sri L. C. Pais.
„ M. Chadayan.
Janab C. Ahmed Kutty.
„ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
„ K. M. Seethi.
Sri G. Samia Koorayur.
Janab K. Uppi.

Ayes 66, Noes 130.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ Before I adjourn the House, I wish to inform the House that at the request of some Members, we are not going to have a sitting on Friday. Saturday and Sunday will as usual be holidays. Monday being Meeladi Nabi for Muslims is a holiday. So, continuously for four days from Friday to Monday there will be no sitting.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ Sir, will there be two non-official adys next week.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I am not informed of that.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Sir, on the understanding that the next non-official day which is due on Friday the 28th instant will be substituted by another non-official day on Saturday or some time next week, the above arrangement has been agreed to.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Thursday, 27th November 1952.”

The House then adjourned.

VI. PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.
Krishna Aicut Enquiry Committee Report.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 27th November 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

1.—PRIVILEGE MOTION *RE* INCORRECT ANSWER TO A QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member Sri M. Veerabhadram has given notice of a privilege motion. The motion reads as follows :—

‘ Inasmuch as the answer that the Chief Minister gave to a supplementary question arising out of the answer to question No. 119 on 24th November 1952 wherein he stated that the Government did not intimidate any Government servant who joined an unrecognized Union does not correspond to truth as may be seen from the specific directive contained in the Government Memorandum No. 20697-H/51-4, Health, dated 20th June 1951, and thus constitutes a breach of privilege of the Members of this House who are entitled to receive truthful answers from the Members of the Government, this House hereby resolves that the whole matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges ’.

I want to give a ruling straightaway. Probably, the hon. Member wants to say something in that regard.”

*SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“ అన్యాయం, ఇది విరక్తంగా భంగకరంగా ఉన్నదో కొంత మంది చేయాలి అని అవసరమున్నదని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను.

“ మొన్న 24 వ తేదీ క్రిష్ణరాజగారి ప్రశ్నకు సమాధానము చెప్పడం కుఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ఈ గాజ్యంగము అమలులోనికి వచ్చిన తరువాత ఈ చూపు విమోచన మార్పుచేసినాం అని అడగగా చేయలేదని స్పష్టంగా చెప్పారు ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member be brief. I will allow him two minutes.”

SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“ కాని యథార్థము విమిటంబే ఇప్పుడు ఈ శీర్షికములో ఉన్నటుంటి ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క అర్డరు నెం. 20697 రు 1951 వ సంవత్సరం జూన్ మాసములో pass చేయబడింది. అలాగు ఉత్తర్వు ఇచ్చినప్పుడు, ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగిలను బెదిరిస్తున్నారని అది అడిగితే, బెదిరింపడంలేదని మంత్రిగారిచే స్పష్టం చేయబడింది. కాని ఆ గవర్నమెంటు మెమోరాండం తెలియ జేస్తున్నది విమిటంబే, ఏ ఉద్యోగి అయినా విదేశ హాస్పిటల్ శాఖలో సభ్యుని పాదాలలో ఉండడం Government Servants Conduct Rules లో Rule 22 (2) కు విరుద్ధంగా పరిగణింపబడుతుందని”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member is reading something What is the use of reading the matter now? ”

SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“ అటువంటి వారు క్రమ విఠనకు గురి కాబడుతారని, కనుక ఉద్యోగులు అటువంటి సంబంధము పెట్టుకోకూడదని చెప్ప వలసిందని Director of Medical Services కోరబడు తున్నారని అందులో స్పష్టంగా ఉన్నది. ఆ ప్రభుత్వ అర్డరును ఆధారంగా తీసుకొని అనేక చోట్ల అనేక శాఖలలో పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి వారిని intimidate అంటే బాధించడం జరుగు

[Sri M. Veerabhadram] [27th November 1952]

మనస్సు. ఇక్కడ చూడవలసినటువంటి విషయమేమిటంటే, మేము ఇక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి సభ్యులందరూ కూడా ప్రభుత్వమునుంచి న్యాయమైనటువంటి, లేక నిష్పక్షపాతంగా న్యాయ నేరాలను తీసివేయ ప్రశ్నలు విస్తాము. కాని ముఖ్యమంత్రి ప్రభుత్వ దురిమైన విషయాలను తెలుపడమే కాకుండా, ఈ విషయాలను ఇక్కడ తిమిళానాటి వచ్చుటకు అవకాశములేకుండా చేస్తున్నారు."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have already given the hon. Member sufficient time. He will kindly resume his seat. I have not followed the hon. Member."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Precisely in view of that, Sir, I want to give a gist of what I understood him to say. He stated that the particular answer was given by the Hon. Chief Minister, in which he said that Government employees who joined unrecognized associations are not in any way intimidated and no pressure is exercised on them if they join such unrecognized associations. The hon. Member now produces before the Chair the Government Order in which it is said that the employees will be punished for any violation, and says that that particular Government Order was specially forwarded to a particular Government employee. The hon. Member's question is not that the employee was specially intimidated, but that on the floor of this House when Members ask questions, they want answers to be in accord with Government Orders and facts. When there is variance between the Government Orders and the answers given by the Hon. Chief Minister, Mr. Veerabhadram says that it amounts to a breach of privilege."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I do not think any Hon. Minister wants to speak. Probably, if any Minister speaks, he will say that it is a breach of privilege on the part of the Member, Mr. Veerabhadram to say, when the Minister gives an answer, that it is not a correct answer. I think he may say so, but I am not certain of that. Whatever that may be, granting, for argument's sake, that it is not a correct answer that was given, it will not come under 'breach of privilege'. I say that granting, for argument's sake, that it is not a correct answer that was given the other day, it does not come under 'breach of privilege'. The hon. Member Mr. Veerabhadram has not made out a case for his motion. There is no *prima facie* case. I, therefore, rule it out of order."

II.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I may tell the House that to-day I have placed before the House as many as 29 questions. I hope the House will co-operate with me in finishing all the 29 questions."

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—" On a point of order, Sir. My question No. 172 was not taken up yesterday. I wanted to take it up to-day."

MR. SPEAKER :—" But the hon. Member has not asked for it in time."

27th November 1952]

Transfer of Communist political prisoners from Salem Jail.

* 168^a Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Law be pleased to state when the Communist political prisoners will be transferred from Salem Jail to their linguistic districts?

THE HON. SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR :—" The hon. Member is apparently referring to the ordinary convicted prisoners in the Central Jail, Salem, who are members of the Communist Party. The Government have since ordered the transfer of the Malayalam-speaking and Telugu-speaking prisoners among them to jails in their respective linguistic areas, namely, the Central Jails at Cannanore and Rajahmundry. The Tamil-speaking convicts will continue to be confined in the Central Jail, Salem, which is in the Tamil area."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Will the Government be pleased to release all the political prisoners? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" That is altogether a different question. This question relates to the transfer of Communist prisoners from the Salem Jail to some other jails. Out of that, how can the question of release of all prisoners arise? "

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Will the Government consider it desirable to release all the Communist prisoners, since their accredited leaders, most of them, are in the Assembly? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question. This question relates to the transfer of prisoners."

Ramalingam Chettiar Retrenchment Committee.

* 170 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) when the Ramalingam Chettiar Retrenchment Committee was appointed;

(b) the terms of appointment;

(c) the expenditure incurred on the Committee;

(d) whether the Committee's recommendations were accepted and implemented by the Government to any extent; and

(e) what the savings are to the Government by such implementation?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (a) The Committee was appointed by a Government Order on 11th October 1947.

" (b) The terms of reference to the Committee were—

(1) effecting of economies in expenditure on new departments and appointments brought into existence during the war and after;

^a Starred questions Nos. 168, 170 and 179 postponed from the list for 26th November 1952.

[27th November 1952]

- (2) re-organization of the departments in order to reduce cost and increase efficiency;
- (3) amendment of the relevant rules, so as to expedite the procedure to be followed in regard to land acquisition, investigation and the preparation of estimates for irrigation works, rural water-supply schemes and departmental enquiries in disciplinary matters;
- (4) examination of the system of grants-in-aid to various local bodies and private managements;
- (5) re-organization of the pension system; and
- (6) matters connected with (1) to (5) above and any other matter which may specifically be referred to the Committee.

“(c) Roughly a sum of Rs. 34,000 was incurred towards the pay, dearness allowance and other compensatory allowances for the staff connected with the Committee and towards travelling allowance to the members of the Committee.

As separate accounts were not maintained for all items relating to the expenditure on the Committee, the amount has been worked out approximately.

“(d) & (e) The attention of the Member is invited to the statement placed on the table of the House on the 19th December 1950, in answer to question No. 58 put by Sri A. Vedaratnam Pillai, indicating that the saving resulting from the action taken on the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee was about Rs. 1½ crores per annum, up to the 1st December 1950. These savings have been offset now by the increased expenditure consequent upon the expansion of the activities of the various departments, due to the sanction of new schemes in nation-building departments and to the undertaking of measures to increase food production. The question of effecting economies in the various departments under present conditions is engaging the attention of the Government.”

10-40 a.m. SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“ Since the present members of the Assembly were not Members of the Assembly in November 1950, will the Hon. the Minister be pleased to lay a fresh copy of the recommendations of the Committee on the table of the House? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ If it is necessary, it will be supplied to any Member who wants it.”

Encroachment on a pathway acquired for Harijans in Gudivada taluk.

* 179 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether a pathway acquired for Harijans of Dondapadu village of Gudivada taluk was encroached upon by the adjacent ryots of the path;

[27th November 1952]

(b) (1) what the total extent acquired was and (2) what the total extent under encroachment by the ryots was;

(c) (1) when these encroachments were made, (2) by whom and (3) in what year they were detected;

(d) what the remarks of the azmaishing officers were against these encroachments and what action was taken to evict the encroachers;

(e) whether notices under section 6 (1) of the Madras Land Encroachment Act were served on the encroachers, if not, why not;

(f) what the total amount of penalty levied on the encroachers was; and

(g) when the Harijans represented the matter to the Collector or the District Welfare Officer and what action has been taken by them?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“(a) No pathway was acquired but a pathway was sanctioned to be put up on a poramboke (which has been encroached upon);

“(b) (1) An area of 54 cents was set apart for the pathway; (2) the area of encroachment is 14 cents;

“(c) the encroachments were made during the current fasli by the adjacent ryots and were detected during this year;

“(d) As the encroachments were detected during the current year, there are no remarks of the previous azmaishing officers. Steps are being taken by the Collector to evict the encroachers.

“(e) Action is being taken now by the Collector to evict the encroachers.

“(f) This does not arise as these are new encroachments this year.

“(g) The Harijans represented the matter to the District Welfare Officer on 8th July 1952. The encroachments were inspected on the same day and necessary action is being taken to evict the encroachers.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“ ఇటువంటి encroachments చాలా చోట్ల ఉన్నాయి. అనేక చోట్ల గవర్నమెంటువారు acquire చేసి స్థలాలను ఖాస్సా ములు అక్రమించుకొని ఇబ్బందులు కలుగజేస్తున్నాయంటే హరిజనులు అధికార స్థలిలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ విషయమునా మాత్రం ఇప్పటికీ ఏ సమస్యను సూచించి encroach చేస్తున్నారు. అధీకర్త ఇదంతా చూచి ఉండడం, రిపోర్టు, ముససలులు కూడ ఈ విషయాలన్ని చూచి ఉండడం, ఖాస్సాములకు సహాయకరంగా ఉండడము, ఇదంతా గవర్నమెంటువారికి తెలిసియండియో అన్వయము జరుగుచున్నది. ఇటు వంటి విషయాలలో ఇక్కడ నా ఒక general order అధీకర్తకు issue చేసి ఇటువంటి encroachments అన్ని కూడ evict చేయిస్తారా అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

[27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I have already stated in the answer that this particular encroachment occurred during the current year. Wherever there is a report of such encroachments in a specific way, it is being enquired into promptly.”

Alleged death of Ravula Subba Rao in police lock-up.

* 181 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 23rd August 1952, from Sri R. Chelapathi Rao of Polavaram, West Godavari district, was received by the Government complaining about the illegal detention of Ravula Subba Rao on 19th August 1952 in a police lock-up without producing him before a Magistrate within 24 hours and his subsequent death while under lock-up; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ (a) Yes.

“ (b) The illegal detention referred to is being enquired into by the District Superintendent of Police, West Godavari district. As a result the station-writer, one head constable and five constables are facing charges for dismissal. The Government are awaiting the final report in the matter.

As regards the death of Ravula Subba Rao in the police lock-up the matter was immediately enquired into by a Second-class Magistrate who held the inquest, and after examining all the necessary witnesses including two daughters of the deceased the Magistrate returned a verdict of death due to suicide. The body was sent for post-mortem examination and the Medical Officer found that the death was due to asphyxia due to hanging. The District Superintendent of Police, reported the death to the Subdivisional Magistrate, Kovvur, on 22nd August 1952. He immediately took up the enquiry and as allegations of a police torture and homicidal death were made, the Subdivisional Magistrate had the body exhumed and examined by the Additional District Medical Officer on 24th August 1952. The Additional District Medical Officer gave it as his opinion that the death was due to asphyxia due to hanging as a result of suicide. There were no grounds to suspect that he was beaten to death as there were no injuries, external or internal. The Subdivisional Magistrate examined in all 24 witnesses who offered to give evidence, and came to the conclusion that the deceased was dispirited and committed suicide by hanging himself by the neck while in police custody. The Government have gone through the Subdivisional Magistrate's report and do not find reasons to differ from the First-class Magistrate's finding.”

[27th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ It is very unfortunate that I am bringing to the notice of the Hon. the Chief Minister so many cases of this type and in every case the Hon. the Chief Minister says that the death is due to suicide. May I know, Sir, if it was a case of suicide, what conditions there were for inducing the prisoner in the lock-up to commit suicide and whether the people in charge are not responsible to save the life of a prisoner in the lock-up? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The man had been previously convicted of the same kind of offence, namely, cycle theft and this was a charge of another cycle theft and the ownership of the cycle was also traced. The man was posing as a respectable citizen in the village and he had arranged for the marriage of his daughter. All these things might have contributed to a desire on his part to put an end to his own life as he was about to face a disgrace.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఆ మనషియొక్క ప్రవర్తన మీరకు తెలుసు, అందుచేతనే, తన ప్రవర్తన చాలా అపరాధమైనది అని మనషి చాటివేడానికి కారణమయినది మరలొకరు వెబుయ్యడానికి ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు. అయితే నేను అడుగుదున్నటువంటి ప్రశ్న ఏమిటంటే, ఒక మనషిని 24 గంటల నేపు సాక్షిగానూ, illegal నా lock-up లో ఉంచిన తరువాత ఆ మనషి ఆ 24 గంటలలోనే suicide చేసుకొన్నాడని మీరు చెప్పటం న్యాయబద్ధం అని మనషియొక్క కేసును పరిశీలించి లకుమాడా నివ్వకుండా బాచి ఉంచి విచారణను dispose of చేయవలసిన అవసరం మేము ఉన్నది. ఇటువంటి ప్రభుత్వము guilty conscience ను ఉన్న దువల్ల భయపడుతూ దీనిని బాచి ఉంచి ఎవరికినీ చూడకనే ఆ నిధానం dispose of చేసింది. అని ఆధారాలపడు తున్నటువంటి ప్రజలకు మీరు ఇచ్చే జవాబు ఏమిటి? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The long lecture made by the hon. Member in substance meant that the Government are trying to hide the truth. I deny the allegation, Sir.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ In view of the denial of the Hon. the Chief Minister, may I ask whether it is or is not a fact that the wife and children of the deceased requested that the body should not be disposed of until the District Medical Officer came and whether the representation was agreed to and if so, why was it disposed of without the District Medical Officer coming? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ When the family wanted the District Medical Officer to be brought to examine the body, the Sarishtadar-Magistrate went up to the other hospital where the body had been sent up for examination. Before he went up the post-mortem examination had been concluded. The body was exhumed thereafter and it was examined. On the whole, Sir, I want to ask the Leader of the Opposition who put this question not to be obsessed with a prejudice and without enquiring into the matter to imagine that the police always go wrong and that cycle thieves are always innocent.”

[27th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I do not want to imagine that the police are always in the wrong. I am drawing the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to a few cases where I am perfectly convinced that death is due to police beating. In regard to this case, Sir, may I know from the Hon. the Chief Minister why the relations were prevented from seeing the dead body if it is a case of mere suicide? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ That is not correct, Sir. There was a gentleman, I think he was the local M.L.A., who produced all the witnesses that he desired to be examined and they were all examined and there was no question of preventing anybody from seeing anything.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్షా, sub-jail లో custody లో ఉన్నటువంటి వనిపి చనిపోయాడని, అందులోను hanging వల్ల చనిపోయాడని చెప్పుతున్నారు. సాధారణంగా sub-jail లోగాని లోకలోగాని ఎప్పుడూ duty staff ఉంటుంది. తరువాత hanging పరికరాలు విని లేకుండా చేస్తారు. అటువంటి సందర్భంలో పోలీసు కస్టడియాలో చనిపోయాడని, అందులోను hanging ద్వారా చని పోయాడనిపది చాలా అసందర్భంగాను, అసంభవముగాను కనబడుతున్నాయి. దీనికి ముఖ్య మంత్రులారు విని సమాధానము చెప్పతారు.”

10-50
a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ There was no question of sub-jail in the matter. It was a death in the police lock-up. Because the death was reported, the Sub-divisional Magistrate was called to hold a special enquiry and the persons who were on sentry duty and the persons who were in charge of the station, the writer, police constables were all subjected to departmental enquiry. There is no evidence for putting them upon a charge of murder.”

SRI P. S. RAMACHANDRA RAO :—“ నేను అక్కడ ఉండినాను, ఈ విషయములో సాక్ష్యము ఇవ్వడానికి సాక్షులను తీసుకొని R.D.O. వద్దకు వెళ్లి నవ్వుడు, ఈ పోలీసులంతా సాక్షులను బెడరించడంవల్ల వారు సరిగా చెప్పలేకపోయే ఇబ్బంది ఏర్పడింది. అక్కడ ఉన్న sweeper మొదలైనవారు చూచినటువంటి వారు ఉండినప్పుటికిగూడ వారు భయము సాక్ష్యము ఇవ్వలేక పోయారు. అప్పుడు మేము ఈ ప్రశ్న పోలీసుల ఎదుట ఉండడంవల్ల సాక్షు భయపడు తున్నారని కనుక, దీనిని విచారించేవరకు పోలీసులను suspend చేయవలసిందని చెప్పుకొన్నామట, దానిని వినిపించుకోకుండా వారికి అనుకూలంగా ఇచ్చినటువంటి సాక్ష్యని మాత్రము అంగీకరించారు. ముఖ్యముగా గ్రామాధికారి చెబ్బు కొట్టివచ్చుచు చూసినట్లుగూడ విన్నాము. తరువాత A.D.M.O. వచ్చేటాడే దీనిని post mortem చేయబడవద్దన్నప్పటికి వివరాలు. దీని కంఠటికి విమల కారణమే చెప్పతారా? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member put it in the form of a question.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I think the gentleman who spoke last was the M.L.A. to whom I referred. He says, he produced witnesses and he wanted the officers concerned to be suspended before the enquiry could be conducted. The normal procedure is for the magistrate to conduct the enquiry according to his discretion and

[27th November 1952]

according to law. The local M.L.A. cannot lay down a new rule of procedure to the magistrate that certain officers should be discharged or dismissed or transferred before the enquiry could be got through. The enquiry had to be finished and it could not be postponed. I do not think that we can go behind the magisterial enquiry. The Government cannot afford to have an appeal in the Assembly over the facts and procedure and magisterial enquiries. If the hon. Member or anybody else had any grievance, it was open to them to file a complaint of murder and proceed with it and it has not been done.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Was the evidence of the sweeper who was in charge of the building and who was reported to have seen the beating by the police and who offered to give evidence, taken by the Subdivisional Magistrate when he conducted the enquiry? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ As I said, I have disclosed all that happened. As far as I can see from the papers, 24 witnesses who were put forward by the M.L.A. who spoke before the hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken were examined. From the records I could not say what the magistrate did or did not do. It is not possible for me to say it because there is no record for such a thing.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ప్రధాన మంత్రులారు చెప్పుతున్నటువంటి answers లో ఒక ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి విషయమున్నది. ఎప్పుడైతే పోలీసుల మీద నేరారోపణ జరిగిందో, అటువంటి సందర్భంలో దీనిని గురించి enquiry చేసే సమయంలో enquire చేస్తున్నవారు పోలీసులను తమ ప్రక్కన ఉంచుకొని enquiry చేయడంవల్ల ప్రజలు తమ అభిప్రాయాలను చెప్పుటకు ఏలులేని పరిస్థితులు కల్పిస్తున్నారు. కాబట్టి వారిని దగ్గర ఉంచుకోకుండా విచారణ జరుపమంటే, దీన్ని నిరాకరించడానికి విమల కారణమే తెలుపుతారా.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member is following the genius of the language. He does not put a question but has argued that when a magisterial enquiry is taking place in the nature of an inquest according to the law in such cases, that officer should be held up for transfer and suspension. If such a thing takes place, it has to go to another magistrate. Can a magistrate postpone the enquiry of this kind because someone desires that some police officer should be suspended or transferred? All the interpellations start from two fundamental fallacies, namely, (1) that we can hold a court of appeal now over magisterial enquiries, and (2) that the opinion of the public is more important than the verdict of a magistrate.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“ Did the lock-up contain instruments helpful to prisoners to commit suicide? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The man was found actually hanging from the beam of the roof. There is no question of any instruments.”

[27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ In view of the fact that when a prisoner goes inside the police lock-up, the police generally search him completely to see that there are no implements or cloth or rope which will enable him to commit suicide, how does the Hon. the Chief Minister explain the story that in this particular case inside the lock-up, the man was found hanging from the beam? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Ramamurthi should go to court and explain his position. If I am appointed Judge, I would give the answer.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Does the evidence disclose that the hanging was by a piece of cloth or by a rope? If it is by cloth, what was the colour of the cloth? ” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I do not propose to hold an enquiry here.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ Were there no sentries in the lock-up to watch the prisoners? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ As I said, all the police officers in the station—the writer, the sentry and the constables—are under departmental enquiry and if the hon. Member will wait for a few more days, I will be able to tell him, who were dismissed and who were not dismissed among them. The charge, the departmental charge, against them is that they allowed the man to be locked up for more than 24 hours and it should have been reported earlier. But that is not the charge in the interpellations. The charge is now the death itself. The enquiry is going on and it will be finished soon. But so far as the culpability for the death is concerned, the inquest and the medical opinion have led to this result which I have put forward. If hon. Members always presume the guilt of the police and the innocence of the other party, I cannot be arguing.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ We do not presume the guilt of the police. At the same time, I want the Hon. the Chief Minister not to presume the guilt of the under-trial prisoner. While I appreciate that action has been taken with regard to the illegal detention for more than 24 hours, I want to know whether the witnesses have disclosed the time of the suicide.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ He was found hanging at 3 a.m. on the 21st August. He was arrested on the 19th and he slept there that night. On the night of 20th he must have committed suicide.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Was there evidence that he actually died much earlier and that the discovery of hanging was only at 3 o'clock? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ That is a re-statement of the charge that the police killed him. That is all. It does not amount to anything more.”

27th November 1952]

Allegations against the Taluk Supply Officer, Guntur.

* 182 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased state— 11 a.m.

(a) whether a representation, dated 18th August 1952, from D. Venkanna of Guntur, was received by the Government complaining about the misconduct of the Taluk Supply Officer at Guntur in connection with the distribution of quotas to fair price shopkeepers and his collection of contributions from them for private purposes; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ (a) Yes. A petition was received on 7th September 1952. An anonymous petition containing similar allegations against the same Taluk Supply Officer was received by the Collector on 22nd August 1952.

“ (b) An enquiry was made by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Guntur, regarding the allegation made against the Taluk Supply Officer. It was found that the quotas were increased to only one fair price shop because the adjoining one was not functioning for several weeks and as such the requirements of both the shops had to be given to one. It was also found that there was no basis for the other allegation in the petition that the Taluk Supply Officer is taking bribes to build a house.”

SRI A. VENKATARAMA RAJU :—“ గత మూడు మాసములలో టి. ఎన్. బి. యి చేస్తున్న పనుల గురించి ఏదైనా నిశ్శబ్ద వచ్చినదా? వచ్చినట్లయితే దానిపై ప్రభుత్వం వారు తీసుకొన్న చర్య ఏమిటి? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Promotion of Harijans as Tahsildars.

* 183 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH (on behalf of Sri M. Rajeswara Rao) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are any Harijans qualified for promotion as Tahsildars in the West Godavari district who could not be promoted due to want of vacancies; and

(b) whether there is any rule to the effect that where there are no vacancies of Tahsildars in any district, persons qualified for those posts in that district may be posted to other districts where there are vacancies?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“ (a) There is no case of any Harijan who could not be promoted as Tahsildar due to want of vacancies in the West Godavari district.

“ (b) There is no such rule.”

[27th November 1952]

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ May I know whether there is any preference shown to employees belonging to the Scheduled and Backward Classes in respect of promotions, and if it is not shown, may I inquire whether it is not possible to show such concessions in view of their backwardness? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“ The usual preference is already there in the existing rule. ”

SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—“ తహశీల్దార్లుగా నియమించుటకు అర్హతలు కలిగినవారు పబ్లిక్, గోదావరి జిల్లాలో ఉన్నప్పటికీ ఇతర జిల్లాల నుంచి ఉద్యోగులను లీసుకొనివచ్చుటకు కారణం ఏమిటో మంత్రిగారు తెలిస్తారా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Notice. ”

Representation by the Krishna Motor Workers' Union.

* 184 Q.—**SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation was made by the Krishna Motor Workers' Union about the violation of section 65 of Motor Vehicles Act by the bus owners operating on Masulipatnam-Nagayalanka route; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ (a) The answer is in the affirmative. ”

“ (b) The Regional Transport Officer, Vijayavada, conducted enquiries in the matter and found that there was no violation of section 65 of the Motor Vehicles Act. ”

SRI CHANDRA RAMALINGAIAH :—“ ఈ నాడుకూడా బస్ కార్మికులు రోజుకు పన్నెండు, పదమూడు గంటలు పనిచేయవలసి వస్తున్నదనే విషయం ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలుసా? బస్ ప్రయాణాలకు సంబంధించిన Time tables ను చూచినట్లయితే ఈ విషయం బోధపడుతుంది కనుక మన మంత్రిగారు వాటిని పరిశీలిస్తారా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, the actual working hour is calculated only as the time spent in the driving of the vehicle, and not the time taken to go to the vehicle or to go home. ”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Sir, at the time of the inquiry, may I enquire whether the complainants were given a chance to prove their allegations? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ This is not a charge. This is a memorandum stating that section 65 of the Motor Vehicles Act is violated. An inquiry is made by the Regional Transport Officer looking into the trip sheet of the drivers of the vehicles and into the number of the vehicles given. So, trip sheets are naturally looked into. ”

[27th November 1952]

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ కార్మికులు పంపిన మొమెంటంలు గమనించినట్లయితే వారు ఈ నాడుకూడా, తొమ్మిది, పది గంటలు పని చేయవలసి వస్తున్నదనే విషయం స్పష్టమవుతుంది. కాబట్టి నిష్పత్తిక బుద్ధితో ఈ విషయమై విచారణ జరిపి కార్మికులకు న్యాయం కలుగజేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వం వారు పూనుకొంటారా? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, I have given my information; but if the hon. Member will give me in writing that it is not correct, I shall make inquiries. ”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ అయ్యో, మంత్రిగారు ప్రశ్నను సమాధానమిస్తూ, బస్ కార్మికులు పనిచేయ కాలము, బస్ నడుచున్న సమయాన్ని బట్టి నిర్ణయించవలసి యున్నదని, బస్ ట్రెప్పకు, టిప్పకు మధ్య ఉండే వ్యవధి రెక్కి శుభాధని అన్నారు. బస్ కార్మికుల విషయంలో వెస్ట్రా మయ్యగారు ఇచ్చిన అత్యధిక జీతం యందున్నదా? ఉన్నట్లయితే ఆ అత్యధిక ప్రకారం బస్ ఓకప్రక్క ప్రయాణించేసిన తరువాత, రెండవ వైపుకు తిరిగివచ్చుటకు ముందు, ఉండే వ్యవధికూడా పని కాలంగానే నిర్ణయించబడినది విషయం గమనించారా? అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I am not aware of what Mr. Gopalakrishnaiah said. But section 65 makes it clear that the calculations should be made only as per the actual driving hours. ”

Payment of bonus to those from whom paddy was procured in Bapatla taluk.

* 185 Q.—**SRI K. VENKAIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether it is a fact that applicants for bonus of Tadiparru, Munipalle, Jupudi, Gayamvaripalem, etc., villages of Bapatla taluk from whom paddy was procured have not been paid though they sent their applications in time; and if so, why?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Payments of bonus were made in all the four villages in all cases of applications which were correctly presented. Thus Rs. 5,946 was disbursed in Tadiparru village, Rs. 2,187 in Munipalle village, Rs. 3,464 in Mamillapalli and Gayamvaripalem and Rs. 4,179 in Jupudi village. Only a few applications which were defective either for want of 'E' forms or other particulars are pending in respect of these villages. The sums covered by these applications are Rs. 249 in Tadiparru, Rs. 186 in Munipalle, Rs. 60 in Mamillapalle and Rs. 120 in Jupudi. Supplemental bills for payment of these sums are being prepared. ”

SRI K. VENKAIAH :—“ ఈ ప్రశ్న పంపిన తరువాత అక్కడ డబ్బు ఇచ్చారా? లేక ముందుగానే ఇచ్చారా? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Long before the question was put. ”

[27th November 1952]

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“ ఇప్పటికీ కూడా రోసనలు ఇస్తూ సందర్భాలు ఎక్కువ ఉన్నాయి. మా కృష్ణ జిల్లాలో ఎంతో మందికి రోసనలు అందలేదు. ఈ జాప్యానికి మంత్రిగారు ఏమని జవాబు ఇస్తారు అని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I know in many districts there are still payments to be made. That is because orders were passed granting this bonus in March last and retrospective effect was given to it from 1st January 1952. Therefore it requires very careful verification before moneys are disbursed; so that people who are entitled to it may get it properly.”

Representations from the Romperu Ryots' Association and others.

* 186 Q.—SRI V. SRI KRISHNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received representations from the inhabitants of various villages adjoining the Romperu drain requesting the Government to appoint an official-cum-non-official committee to settle the dispute in that area between the political sufferers and the landless poor;

(b) whether the Government have received any representations from the Romperu Ryots' Association and the local M.L.As.; and

(c) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) & (b) Yes.

“ (c) A report has been called for from the Collector on the representations and the same is awaited.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో మంత్రిగారు పర్యటించి చాలా కాలమైంది. అనేక సందర్భాలలో వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు, ఖామిలేని రైతులకు ఇచ్చిన భూములను తీసుకొని రాజీయభాధితులకు ఇవ్వడం జరుగుతోంది. అనేక చోట్ల 144 వ సెక్షన్ కూడా అమలుచేయబడింది. ఈ సమస్యపరిష్కారానికి మంత్రిగారు ఏ చర్యలు తీసుకొన దలచారో సమాధానం చెబుతారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ That is exactly the reason why Government are taking steps to arrange and see that there is no confused state of affairs there.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Is it not a fact that in some of those places order under section 144 has been promulgated? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I am not aware that it exists now. I knew some time back there was a ban under section 144. I do not know whether it is in existence now.”

SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ సాగుచేసుకొనే కూలీలకు భూములను ఇవ్వడానికి రాజీయభాధితుల సమస్య అడ్డుపడ్డట్టుకు కారణమేమిటైంది ? ”

[27th November 1952]

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“ Sir, I would like to know whether the Government propose to appoint an officer not below the rank of a Deputy Collector for the early distribution of these lands and whether the lands will be given free or auctioned? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ It is likely that a committee may be appointed, and upon the receipt of their report, the question will be decided.”

Payment of the increased procurement price of paddy in Malabar.

* 187 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether Malabar agriculturists have been paid the increased procurement price of paddy ordered by the Government in 1952; and

(b) if not, what is the delay due to and what steps the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ (a) & (b) The subordinate officers in the district had received several thousands of applications and had to conduct careful and exhaustive verification of all the relevant accounts before preparing the consolidated statements due from them to the District Supply officers. Further in several cases, the bills, etc., received by the District Supply Officers had to be returned for want of the prescribed certificates and such other defects. Some delay was, therefore, unavoidable in the initial stages especially when the number of items to be verified in each area was very considerable running into thousands. However bills for an aggregate amount of Rs. 4,78,334-4-7 against a total sum of over Rs. 9,00,000 have already been sanctioned and steps have also been taken by the officers concerned to sanction bills in the remaining cases without delay. Disbursement to individual ryots has actually started in many places. Instructions have also been issued to complete the payments by 15th November 1952 at the latest.”

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—“ Sir, have the Government received information that it has been completed by the 15th November 1952 because we are now far ahead of this date? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, we will be receiving the report shortly.”

The Pudukkottai Division General Hospital, Tiruchirappalli district.

* 188 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the number of sanctioned beds in (i) the Pudukkottai Division General Hospital (Tiruchirappalli district); (ii) The Rane's Hospital of Pudukkottai division; and

[27th November 1952]

(b) the average daily number of admissions (in-patients) into the Pudukkottai General and Ranees Hospitals respectively?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“(a) (i) 96.

(ii) 72.

“(b) 129 and 86, respectively.”

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—“Sir, in view of the fact that the figures have proved the overcrowding of these hospitals and, as overcrowding itself is contagious, will the Government be pleased to consider the expansion of these hospitals?”

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—“Sir, the Government have recently sanctioned the construction of a tuberculosis ward with 24 beds and, when this is completed, it will meet the demands to a large extent.”

Collection of the annual kattubadi from landholders.

* 189 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that an order has been issued in Board's Proceedings Ms. No. 13 (Settlement of Estates), dated 29th January 1951, by the Commissioner for Settlement of Estates, Board of Revenue, Madras, to the effect that annual kattubadi previously payable in respect of darimila inams should be collected from inamdars or landholders; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“(a) Yes.

“(b) The reasons are contained in the Board's Proceedings itself.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Sir, is it not possible for the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue to disclose the reasons in this House and will he be pleased to state whether this circular was issued with the consent of the Government?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“What I said was that this has been disposed of in the Board's Proceedings referred to in the question. If the hon. Member puts any question in regard to a specific case, I will answer him.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“దీని విషయంలో తొందరపాటు అడిగిన ప్రశ్నల మంత్రిగారికి అర్థం కాకపోవడంచేతనే లేక వేరొక కారణం చేతనో వారు సోపానం అనీ, separate question అనీ జవాబు చెబుతున్నారని. కాబట్టి వారు ఓటికొట్టేస్తే, సామాన్యంగాను ప్రశ్నలకు సరియైన జవాబు ఇవ్వవలసినదని కోరుకున్నాను.”

27th November 1952] [Sri K. Govinda Rao]

“Estate Abolition Act ప్రకారం దరిమిలా ఇనాములకు ఇవ్వబడిన status ఏమి? ఈ దరిమిలా ఇనాములలో పట్టాబు రైతుల కిస్తారా? లేక ఇనాం దార్లకిస్తారా? ఈ దరిమిలా ఇనాములలో Rent Reduction Act అమలు పరుస్తున్నారా? లేదా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Sir, darmila inam is an inam given subsequent to the permanent settlement. There are both major and minor inams and in certain inams both the kudivaram and melvaram rights vest in one person and in other cases they vest in different persons. In the case of inams where the rent payable is in excess of the ryotwari assessment it is worked out under the Rent Reduction Act. In other cases kattubadi is collected.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“Sir, I am not in a position to understand what this kattubadi is. Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state what this kattubadi is?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“It is a small rent payable, something like jodi.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Sir, my question was whether it will not be possible for the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue to disclose the reasons mentioned in the Proceedings of the Board and also whether the circular or memorandum that was issued had the consent of the Government?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Sir, I will readily give it to the hon. Member from Sompeta but I do not know why he wants to confuse the other hon. Members, with this Proceedings of the Board.”

Export of foodgrains from Visakhapatnam district.

* 190 Q.—SRI K. GOVINDA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether it was brought to the notice of the Government that foodgrains are being exported from Visakhapatnam district, and if so, what steps the Government propose to take to prevent the same in future in view of the fact that Visakhapatnam district is a deficit district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“Under the Revised Food Policy, Visakhapatnam district is placed in zone No. 1, along with Srikakulam and East Godavari districts. There have been no exports of paddy and rice by private trade from this district to any place outside the zone or outside the State. But, it has been reported that there was some export of paddy by private merchants from the district to East Godavari, within the same zone, for a short while immediately after decontrol. This movement from a deficit to a surplus district was mainly due to the fact that there was a bumper paddy harvest in Visakhapatnam district during 1951 and consequently large stocks were available in the open market

[27th November 1952]

at a price lower than that in East Godavari district. This was the position for some time immediately after decontrol. Even these exports have now stopped.

Certain stocks of rice imported from Orissa were temporarily stored in Visakhapatnam district on Government account. These stocks were intended for supply to all the deficit districts, in the State, including Visakhapatnam. A portion of these imported stocks was exported to meet the urgent requirements of other needy deficit districts.

In view of the above, the question of taking steps to prevent exports of foodgrains from Visakhapatnam district does not arise."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—"ఈ సమస్యను వ్యాపారవంతుల వంటి వారు చూడకుండా విశాఖ జిల్లానుంచి, ఆహారధాన్యాలు ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు ఎగుమతి అయి నట్లయితే ధరలు విపరీతంగా పెరిగిపోయి ప్రజలు నానా ఇబ్బందుల పాలుగావలసి వస్తుంది. కరువు పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడుతాయి. శేష మిట్టి కొత్తపంట రాబోతున్నది. తిరిగి ఏ తూర్పు గోదావరినుండి వర్తకులు వచ్చి తీసుకుపోయే ప్రమాదమున్నది. కాబట్టి యిప్పటికైనా తరుగు జిల్లాలోని విశాఖ జిల్లానుండి ధాన్యం ఎగుమతి కాకుండా జిల్లా పరిషత్తులలో కాపలాను ఏర్పాటు చేయిస్తారా?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"I have not been able to follow the long speech."

Filariasis in Cannanore and Baliapatam towns.

* 191 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state what steps the Government have taken to check filariasis in Cannanore and Baliapatam towns in North Malabar?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"Since 1950 the Municipal Council, Cannanore, is working a control scheme estimated to cost Rs. 7,000 per annum with the aid of a one-third grant from State funds. The Government are considering in connexion with the Annual Estimate of Expenditure for 1953-54 a control scheme for Baliapatam Panchayat at a cost of Rs. 2,800 per annum, for a one-third grant from State funds."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—"Sir, are the Government aware that the panchayats and municipalities have difficulties in expanding their staff, as the permission of the Inspector of Local Boards and also that of the Director of Public Health are required, and it takes an inordinately long time to get such permissions, and the budget allotment lapses on account of non-expenditure? Would the Government, therefore, devise a quicker process to enable these local bodies to spend larger sums for increasing their staff and thereby effectively carry out the anti-filarial campaign?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"Sir, the finances of the local bodies have to be examined by the Inspector of Local Boards."

27th November 1952]

DR. K. B. MENON :—"Sir, since filaria is also prevalent in South Malabar which is nearby, will the Government take preventive measures there as well?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"The Government are considering a number of anti-filariasis schemes in connexion with the next Budget."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—"Sir, may I know what is the percentage of incidence of filaria in Cannanore and Baliapatnam?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—"Notice, please."

Promotions to Senior Telugu Pandits in secondary schools.

* 192 Q.—**SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a Government Order has been passed to the effect that Senior Telugu Pandits (in secondary schools) holding Oriental Titles should pass the S.S.L.C. Examination in order that they may be promoted from the Lower Grade into Grade I; and

(b) if so, for what reason?

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"(a) Yes. These qualifications were prescribed in 1948 and they apply to Pandits in all languages.

"(b) The Government consider that without the prescribed minimum educational qualification it will not be possible for the Pandits to handle high school classes."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—"తెలుగు సీనియర్ పండితులలో చాలామంది వయోవృద్ధులనే విషయం గమనిస్తే తెలియనిది కాదు. కాబట్టి ఆట్టివారు S.S.L.C. Examination pass కావాలనే నిబంధన లేకుండా ప్రత్యేకంగా విస్వాత్తు చేస్తారా?"

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Sir, as a matter of fact, Pandits with over fifteen years experience on the date of the promulgation of this Government Order were given the First Grade without passing the S.S.L.C. examination. It is only the subsequent entrants that are affected."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—"అధ్యక్షా ఈ తెలుగు పండితులు తెలుగు కాక ఇంగ్లీషు హిందూ మొదలైన ఇతర విషయాలు కూడా విద్యార్థులకు బోధించ వలసి ఉన్నదా? లేనిచో తెలుగు పాఠాలను బోధించుటకు ఓరియంటల్ టైటిల్స్ Oriental Titles చాలా? S.S.L.C. పరీక్ష అంత అవసరమ? అని అడుగు చున్నాను."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Sir, it is considered necessary to-day that even the language Pandits should have some general knowledge."

[27th November 1952]

11-20 SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ముక్తగారు ఇచ్చిన సమాధానాలను బట్టి S.S.L.C. చదివి, ఇంగ్లీషు భాషా పరీక్షానం సంపాదించుకొంటే ఆర్ హత ఉన్నట్లు, ఇతర భాషలు చదువుకొని పెద్ద పరీక్షలలో కృతార్థులైతే వీటికి తెలుగు బోధించుటకు ఆర్ హత కలుగదని వారి తాత్పర్యమా ? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ I may also state that Pandits have to do some translation work also and this requires some general knowledge.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, is general knowledge equated with S.S.L.C. for persons who hold First Class Degrees in their languages? Has the Hon. Minister received similar representations from all the 24 or 25 districts? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Some standard has to be laid down for general knowledge and the minimum standard that was laid down was the S.S.L.C. standard.”

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMY MUDALIAR :—“ Will the Government be pleased to relax the rules, at least temporarily, in view of shortage of language Pandits in secondary schools? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ In the interest of maintaining standards, I am afraid, we have to adhere to the present position.”

Proposal for organizing a Co-operative Motor Transport Society at Cuddapah.

* 193 Q.—SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the reasons for dropping the proposal for organizing a Co-operative Motor Transport Society at Cuddapah?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The proposal for the organization of a Co-operative Motor Transport Society for Ex-Servicemen at Cuddapah has not been dropped. It is under investigation.”

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ May I know from the Hon. Minister how long will it take for the Government to organize the society? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, we have got to find out (1) whether the ex-servicemen are willing to pay the share capital; (2) whether there are enough technical personnel among the applicants; (3) whether it is possible to obtain route permits for the vehicles; (4) whether the society can withstand competition; and (5) whether the Disposals Directorate can give them vehicles? It is difficult for me to say how long it will take to fulfil these conditions.”

[27th November 1952]

Rates of tax on motor buses and private cars.

* 194 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state the increase in taxation on motor buses and private cars from 1948 onwards in this State?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ A statement* is laid on the table of the House furnishing the information required.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ 1949 వ సం॥ జూన్ 30 వ తేదీన సీటు ఒకటికి 17 రూపాయలు చొప్పున ఉండే రేటును, ఆ సంవత్సరం జూన్ 1 వ తేదీ నుంచి 30 రూపాయలకు పెంచారు. యింకానున్న ఆరాయం హెచ్చుగా పెంచడం లేక ప్రభుత్వానికి డబ్బు అవసరమయ్యా ఈ పెంపు దల చేయబడింది ? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Hon. Members must realize that we took up office only in 1952.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Are the Government aware that the incidence of motor vehicles taxation in this State is the highest compared with that in all the other States in India? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ That was the position a few months ago and, now, all the States have come up to our level.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ఈ rate ను 30 రూపాయలకు పెంచనపుడు అప్పుడున్న ముక్తగారు ఇకముందు రేట్లను పెంచమని హామీ ఇచ్చినా ఇచ్చారా ? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ There is nothing on record, Sir.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know, Sir, of all the 22 or 23 States in India, how many States have come up to this great level of the Madras State? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The hon. Member may put a separate question.”

Alleged illegal alienations of lands by zamindars.

* 195 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representations have been received by the Government regarding wrongful and illegal alienations by zamindars of communal lands, private lands, porambores, tank-beds, etc.; and

(b) if so, the action so far taken?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a)
Yes.

“(b) The Government have examined the representations made and instructed the District Collectors and the Managers of Estates to take appropriate action under the Madras Estates Communal, Forest and Private Lands (Prohibition of Alienation) Act, 1947 and the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, respectively.”

SHRI G. LATCHANNA : "Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to mention any one instance in which action was taken in this respect?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I think some prosecutions also have been ordered."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI : "Is the Hon. Minister aware that the Zamindar of Adyar is claiming proprietary rights over the Adyar river and is trying to prevent the dhobies from making use of the water in the Adyar river?"

The Manners Project in Kandukur taluk, Nellore.

* 195 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when the Mannern Project in Kandukur taluk, Nellore district, was taken up for investigation; and

(b) when plans and estimates were prepared and at what stage the matter stands at present?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI. (a) & (b) The following three irrigation schemes on the Manneru in Kandukur taluk, Nellore district, have already been sanctioned by the Government :—

- (i) Reddihalva Ament Scheme;
- (ii) Rallapad Reservoir Project; and
- (iii) Scheme for improvement of supplies to Karedu, Gokula and Zammula tanks.

All the above three schemes are under execution. There is at present no scheme under investigation on the Mannaru and there is also no scheme on the Mannaru ready for sanction and execution, the scheme having been fully investigated already."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister at what stage these schemes stand after they have been sanctioned? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" As I said, all these three schemes have been investigated and they are already under execution."

27th November 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ మా ఎంతైనా పరిశోధించి తెలియజేయండి. ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ A separate question may be put.”

Hydrogenation factory, Kozhikode.

* 197 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to hand over the Hydrogenation factory at Kozhikode, Malabar, to Lever Brothers?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ No. Sur.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" May I know whether it is a fact that such a proposal emanated from a Minister of the Government of India connected with the Lever Brothers and will the Government give an assurance that they will not allow this factory to be acquired by foreign interests? "

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO:—“I am not aware of any Minister of the Government of India connected with the Lever Brothers.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ In view of the fact that there was a proposal to give up the Hydrogenation factory at Kozhikode, Malabar district, that this matter was discussed at a Cabinet meeting and that a Sub-Committee was formed to go and investigate it, and that the Members of the Sub-Committee visited Kozhikode and received memoranda and representations from the various organizations, will the Government be pleased to state at what stage the proposal stands? ”

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ The Government propose to run it themselves.”

Allegations against the Police authorities in Karur.

* 198 Q.—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have perused the observations made by the Hon. Judge of the High Court in the judgment, dated 29th May 1952, in a criminal revision petition, about the Police at Karur, in getting an order passed under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, prohibiting M. R. Radha and others from staging any drama or play in Karur Municipal area for two months from 26th March 1952; and

(b) if so, what action the Government propose to take thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Government have perused the observations made by the Hon. Judge of the High Court in his judgment, dated the 29th May 1952.

[27th November 1952]

The views of High Court Judges are entitled to great weight even in respect of preventive action on the part of the police and the magistracy and will be kept in mind. No other action is called for."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" May I know from the Hon. the Chief Minister whether it is not a fact that the police at Karur provided adequate police bundobust on former occasions to some political parties to stage dramas even in open air theatres? If so, why were the police consistently acting in a discriminating manner against M. R. Radha and his party in connexion with staging dramas in that area? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is going behind all that has been already examined by the High Court. The High Court judgment is there and I have answered already."

Supply of electricity to Hosur taluk.

* 199 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was any representation made with regard to the supply of electricity to Hosur taluk for distribution in the taluk from Karimangalam;

(b) if the Government have sanctioned the scheme, when it will be executed; and

(c) what will be the estimates of the scheme?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) Yes.

" (b) The scheme is under the consideration of Government.

" (c) Rs. 9,38,500."

SRI M. MUNI REDDI :—" May I know from the Hon. Minister as to when the Government will come to a decision in the matter."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The scheme is under examination by the Government. I may also add that the scheme has been sanctioned by the Standing Finance Committee."

Five crores loan raised by the Government.

* 200 Q.—SRI K. T. KOSALRAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government raised the 5 crores loan only to finance irrigation schemes; and

[27th November 1952]

(b) how the Government propose to distribute the loan among different irrigation schemes?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (a) As stated in the Loan Notification announcing the issue of the Madras Government 4 per cent Loan, 1964, the loan was raised for financing capital expenditure on both Electricity schemes and Irrigation works.

" (b) The total budgeted expenditure on both Electricity and Irrigation schemes during the current year is of the order of Rs. 17 crores. Of this, a sum of Rs. 525 lakhs will be deemed to have been found from the market loan. It is not usual to distribute the loan money as such among individual irrigation or electricity schemes."

SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—" சர்க்காரால் ஏறக்கனே பங்கினை செய்யப்பட்டு 'லாங்குன்' செய்யப்பட்ட திட்டங்களை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்காக என்று தான் இந்தச் சர்க்கார் கடன் வாங்கினது என்பது வாஸ்தவமா? அப்படி கடன் வாங்கியிருந்தால், அதிகாரிகள் தீயதிக்கப்பட்டு வேலை நடந்துகொண்டு இருந்த 'எலக்ட்ரிஸி' ஸ்கீம் கனெக்ஷனம் தடுத்தாபட்டிருக்கின்றனவே, அவைகளை அரசாங்கம் நிறைவேற்றுமா? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" சர்க்காரிடத்தில் எவ்வளவு பணம் இருக்கின்றதோ அந்த அளவுக்குத் திட்டங்களை எடுத்தல் நிறைவேற்றிவருகின்றது. அதற்குமேல் நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமென்றால், அதற்கு இன்னும்பலாம் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும்."

Execution of Dedda Hall Aicut, Hosur taluk.

* 201 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state what steps are being taken by the Government to execute Dedda Hall Aicut in Anchatty in Hosur taluk, Salem district; and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The flow in the stream is being gauged to assess the availability of supply of water."

Tobacco barns in Guntur district.

* 202 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total number of tobacco barns in Guntur district;

(b) how many tons of coal are allotted for each barn; and

(c) out of this how many tons of Singareni coal are allotted for each barn?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) In Guntur district 10,747 single-furnace and 1,146 double-furnace barns have so far been enumerated.

" (b) A quantity of 10 tons and 15 tons of coal has been tentatively allotted to each single and double-furnace barn, respectively.

" (c) A quantity of 5 and 7½ tons of Singareni coal is allotted to each single-furnace and double-furnace barn, respectively.

[27th November 1952]

towards first allotment and the balance quantity is allotted in the shape of North Indian coal towards the second allotment. If North Indian coal is not available, Singareni coal will be supplied."

11-30 a.m. Mr. SPEAKER :—" Since we are not going to sit for another four days, I will ask the Hon. Ministers to give their answers to the subsequent questions, without allowing hon. Members to put supplementary questions."

Number of handlooms working in South Arcot.

* 203 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether Government possess statistics showing—

(1) the number of handlooms working in South Arcot, Chittoor, Nellore and Chingleput districts;

(2) the number of such looms engaged in weaving cloth for export to overseas markets; and

(b) whether it is a fact that there is a decline in exports of the products of handlooms produced for overseas market and if so what steps the Government have taken to afford relief to those handloom weavers?

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" (a) (1) The number of handlooms working in South Arcot, Chittoor, Nellore and Chingleput districts is as follows :—

Name of district.	Number of handlooms
South Arcot	30,955
Chittoor	28,046
Nellore	20,098
Chingleput	18,059

" (2) The exact number of looms engaged in weaving cloth for export to overseas markets is not available. But it can be said that a major portion of the looms in these districts is engaged in the production of such exportable varieties of goods.

" (b) Yes, Sir. This Government and the Government of India are exploring the possibilities of expanding the overseas markets for these goods. This Government have also allowed larger supplies of yarn at cheaper rates to the producers of Madras Handkerchiefs in these districts which will enable them to sell their goods at cheaper and competitive rates. The Madras State Handloom Committee and some firms are also taking steps to open sales depots in West Africa to effect better sales of Madras Handkerchiefs in that country."

Irrigation works in Atmakur taluk.

* 204 Q.—SRI G. C. KONDAYYA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state the amount of money spent on the irrigation works in Atmakur taluk of Nellore district for the last 25 years?

[27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Rs. 4,30,746 exclusive of expenditure incurred by the Public Works Department during the years 1926-27 to 1933-34 for which years figures are not available, the concerned records having been destroyed."

* 205 Q.—SRI V. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I would like this question be taken up after four days since it is a very important question."

Mr. SPEAKER :—" That may be the case. No, I cannot allow it. The Hon. Minister may give his answer."

Press Note No. 195, dated 11th December 1951, regarding rights of people in zamindari forests.

SRI V. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the Press Note No. 195, dated 11th December 1951, issued by the Government regarding the privileges of the people in zamindari forests, is still in force to-day?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" Yes, Sir."

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

III. ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER :—" I have received notice of thirteen adjournment motions to discuss matters of public importance. Yesterday I received notice of a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a matter of public importance and the subject-matter of the motion was the death of the Raja of Karvetnagar. The hon. Member wants the death of the Raja of Karvetnagar to be discussed here on an adjournment motion!

" The House is perhaps aware that hitherto I used to give my ruling in my Chamber itself, but since the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me the other day to give my rulings in the House so that the new Members may know the reasons for ruling the motions out of order, I shall do so.

" As I have been receiving notices of a number of adjournment motions, I want to prescribe certain rules that should govern motions for adjournment of the business of the House

" Firstly, the subject of an adjournment motion must relate to a definite matter. Hon. Members may ask what I mean by the term 'definite matter'. I mean that it should be a specific matter.

" Then, the subject-matter of an adjournment motion should not be couched in general terms, covering a number of cases and it should not also involve hypothetical circumstances.

" Again, it must relate to an urgent matter. Suppose, something happened a month ago and at that time there was no sitting of the House. Simply because at the time of the occurrence there

[Mr. Speaker] [27th November 1952]

was no sitting of the Legislature, the hon. Member cannot come forward and say that at that time there was no meeting and so he wants to move an adjournment motion about it when the House meets again. That cannot constitute urgency of the matter."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :— "If the urgency continues?"

MR. SPEAKER :— "It is not sufficient. It must be of recent occurrence and the question should be raised without delay."

"Then, there are certain matters which can be raised during the Budget. They should not be brought now by way of adjournment motions. Again, there are also certain matters which can be brought up during the debate on the Address of His Excellency the Governor. Therefore, those matters which could be brought up during the debate on the Budget or the Governor's Address should not be brought forward as adjournment motions. As a matter of fact, adjournment motions should relate to matters of public importance. For instance, administrative responsibility must be involved in such matters. Then, there are certain matters that could be brought forward in local boards and they also should not be discussed here by way of adjournment motions."

"I have given the above rules so that in future hon. Members may be guided by them in regard to adjournment motions."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :— "May I submit with regard to one or two points suggested by you, Sir . . . ?"

MR. SPEAKER :— "I will put these things in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and English and have them circulated to hon. Members and if they feel any doubt, they may raise them later on."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :— "I wish to refer only to your remark relating to the subject-matters that could be discussed during the budget and in the debate on His Excellency's Address."

MR. SPEAKER :— "Not all matters, but only certain matters which could be discussed during the Budget alone."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :— "I submit, Sir, that the Budget covers almost every subject. I think the rule refers only to subjects which are not on the Agenda."

MR. SPEAKER :— "However, I shall send a note to all the members and then they will know what exactly I mean."

"Now, coming to the adjournment motions which have been given notice of by members to-day, there are thirteen adjournment motions. I may inform hon. Members in this connexion that in the Union Parliament, hon. Members themselves know fully well that their adjournment motions will not be admitted and yet they give notice of them probably because they think they will appear in the papers. There, what Mr. Mavalankar does is this. He merely reads the motion without giving the name of the Member who has given notice of it and rules it out of order. I do not want to do so in these cases now. I shall now deal with the adjournment motions of which notice has been received :

27th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

(1) *Adjournment motion re starvation deaths in Guntur.*

Mr. K. Subba Reddi has given notice of the following adjournment motion :—

"This House stands adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of definite public importance, viz., a serious situation has arisen in Palnad taluk, Guntur district, in view of the starvation deaths daily occurring there and deaths due to infectious diseases such as cholera, after a ravage of serious famine for the last two years, and the Government does not take steps to better the conditions there."

"In this motion a number of matters have been jumbled together. Apart from that, the famine condition has been there for a very long time and the devil of famine has been in our land for a long time. So, it is not an urgent matter and I rule the motion out of order."

(2) *Adjournment motion re acute famine conditions in Nellore.*

The next motion which stands in the name of Mr. G. C. Kondaiah reads as follows :—

"This House stands adjourned to discuss the acute famine conditions prevailing in the district of Nellore in general and in Atmakur constituency in particular consequent upon the failure of north-east monsoon and the failure of the Government to provide any relief to the needy and distressed people there."

"As I said the other day, there is likely to be a full-dress debate on the food situation during the next sitting of the House. Moreover, famine conditions have been in existence in our land for a long time and it is not a question of recent occurrence. Now the hon. Member, Mr. Kondaiah, has given notice of a motion relating to Nellore; Mr. Subba Reddi has given notice of a similar motion relating to Guntur and another hon. Member relating to Malabar. So, I consider that it is better to discuss these matters threadbare during the food debate. I therefore rule the motion out of order."

(3) I have received notice of the following adjournment motion from Sri G. Yallamanda Reddy :— 11-40 a.m.

"I hereby give notice to move a resolution to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the forcible collection of rents and arrears, and rents for grazing lands in Kanigiri taluk, Nellore district, despite severe famine conditions prevailing there."

This matter comes under day-to-day administration. It cannot form the subject-matter of an adjournment motion. I rule the motion out of order."

(4) I have received the following adjournment motion from Sri S. Vemaiah :—

"Under rules 41 and 42 of the Assembly Rules, I beg to request the leave of the House to move an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing the action of the Government in passing G.O. No. 1957, Revenue, dated 9th May 1952, which is definite urgent matter of public importance in contravention of G.O. No. 1523, dated 11th June 1949, without taking the opinion of the public or the Legislators of this House, affecting all the landless labourers in the State in getting lands or pattas."

[Mr. Speaker] [27th November 1952]

'The Government Order was issued in May and we are now in November. The hon. Member thinks that this is an urgent matter. I rule the motion out of order.

(5) Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni has given notice of an adjournment motion a. He is not pressing it.

(6) I have received notice of the following adjournment motion from Sri V. Sri Krishna :—

'That this House be adjourned to consider an urgent matter of public importance, viz., the disputes on land issue in the Romperu Drain area consisting of 18,000 acres and the issue of section 144 and consequent discontent and explosive situation that is prevailing among 3,000 landless poor.'

This matter comes under day-to-day administration. I rule the motion out of order.

(7) This adjournment motion is from Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddi :—

'This House stands adjourned to discuss the present serious situation, threatening starvation deaths, that has developed in Nellore district due to the failure of monsoon and the floods in Pennar river on one side, and the total negligence of the Government to bestow their attention in time on the other side.'

I rule it out of order.

(8) Sri V. Balakrishnan has given notice of the following adjournment motion :—

'That this House do adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the failure of the State Government to provide adequate funds this year to defray the expenditure on free educational concessions and facilities for Scheduled and Backward Class students resulting in the wholesale discontinuance of their studies in the schools and colleges throughout the State.'

This matter ought to have been discussed during the Budget discussions. I rule the motion out of order.

(9) Sri C. V. K. Rao has given notice of the following adjournment motion :—

'That the business of this House may stand adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance caused by mass unemployment, malnutrition, and starvation of the labouring sections of Kakinada taluk.'

I rule the motion out of order.

(10) Sri R. Krishnan has given notice of the following adjournment motion :—

'This House be adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance, namely, the compulsion by the landlords to pay exorbitant price to varam paddy due to the failure of the Government to fix the price of paddy.'

This matter has been there for a long time. This is not an urgent matter. I rule the motion out of order.

(11) Sri P. Ramamurthi has given notice of an adjournment motion disapproving the policy of the Ministry in respect of food and famine. Question of policy cannot be raised on an adjournment motion."

'This House be adjourned to discuss a definite matter of public importance, namely, the acute famine conditions prevailing in Malabar consequent on the failure of the monsoon and the gross neglect of the Government to take adequate steps to deal with the situation.'

[27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I am sorry if the Hon. Speaker has understood my motion as an adjournment motion. I have given notice of a motion disapproving the policy of the Ministry under rule 48 of the Assembly Rules.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Because he gave it to me when I was about to leave for the House, I thought it was an adjournment motion. This is a no-confidence motion.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ It is not a no-confidence motion. I have given notice of the motion under rule 48 of the Assembly Rules which says :

'(1) A motion expressing want of confidence in the Ministry or a motion disapproving the policy of the Ministry in a particular respect may be made with the consent of the Speaker and subject to the following restrictions, namely :—

(a) leave to make the motion must be asked for after questions and before the list of business for the day is entered upon ;

(b) the member asking for leave must, before the commencement of the sitting of the day, leave with the Secretary a written notice of the motion which he proposes to make.

(2) If the Speaker is of opinion that the motion is in order, he shall read the motion to the House and shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The heading of the Chapter under which rule 48 comes is :

'Motion expressing want of confidence in the Ministry.' ”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Though that is the heading of the Chapter, the rule includes both : motion expressing want of confidence or a motion disapproving the policy of the Ministry.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will explain the position to the hon. Member. Perhaps he is confused. The next adjournment motion is from”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ What has happened to my adjournment motion? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall explain the position later.

(12) The next adjournment motion is from Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu. It reads as follows :—

'That this House stands adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the situation caused by the recent strikes in Andhradesa by the students in Guntur, Palakole and other places against the “ detention ” system which was being introduced by the Government.’ ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU.—“ అప్పుడు, ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన విషయం. దీనిపై 10 వ తారీఖునంచి పరీక్షలు జరుగబోతున్నాయి. విద్యార్థులందరూ మృదాను ప్రభుత్వం అమలు జరుపుతున్న detention విధానంవల్ల చాలా అలజడి చెందారు. అప్పుడే అనేక పాఠశాలలో విద్యార్థులు స్త్రీలు జరుపుకున్నారు. ఈ పరిశ్రలే కనుక జరిగినట్లయితే పాఠశాలలో చోక్క కలుగ జేసుకుంటారు. కొట్లాటలు, అల్లర్లు సంభవించవచ్చు. పరిస్థితులు లేయ చాటుక ముందే తగినంత శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోవలసి ఉంది. పరీక్షల తేదీలు సమీక్షిస్తున్న కొలది విద్యార్థులలో అలజడి అధికమవుతోంది. విద్యార్థుల ప్రాణాలను కాపాడమని మనవి.

794

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [27th November 1952]

“విద్యార్థుల తల్లి తండ్రులకుడా చాలా ఆందోళన చెందుతున్నారు. అందు వల్లనే ఈ విషయంలోని urgency ని గుర్తించవలసిన Speaker గారిని కోరుకున్నాను. సభకు దగ్గుటనుంచి విద్యార్థులను తప్పించుటకు ఈ విధానాన్ని రద్దు చేయాలి. ఈ అవసరాన్ని ప్రభుత్వవారికి తెలియజేయుట కొరకే ఈ విరామ తీర్మానాన్ని అంగీకరించవలసినదిగా విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను.”

11-50 a.m. SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, this adjournment motion relates to a very important subject. There are thousands and thousands of students in the higher forms in the high schools of this State. Some years ago the Government cancelled the detention system, as it was called, by issuing an order. But this year it has been reintroduced. The result is, there will be what are called selection examinations in the month of December, and the students are likely to be detained as in the days of old. The students were free from this detention, and, in fact, the parents were free from the bother of the detentions of their boys in the schools. The Government Order cancelling the detention system was obtained by students by their great efforts in the years 1948 and 1949. It was not an ordinary matter. Some lives also were sacrificed in this respect and blood flowed in front of one college at Masulipatnam, if I remember aright. The present Government have now reintroduced the selection examinations. The urgency of the matter is that selection examinations are going to be held soon. The Parents' Associations met and they have already made several representations to the Government on this subject. But the Government have not yet moved in the matter. I have had occasions to discuss the matter with some of the responsible headmasters, and they think that it will be a very great problem for them if they adopted this selection examination, because the remaining four months in the schools will be a sort of hell for the teachers themselves. In this connexion, several petitions have already been presented. Sir, with your permission I am presenting now to this Assembly a petition signed by more than 2,000 students coming from Telugu districts, and the Democratic Students' Union requesting this Hon. House to recommend to the Government to cancel the order re-introducing the selection examination. This is a very urgent matter. We as parents are affected as we pay the school fees. We have to deal with our school-going boys. If the boys are detained, we are affected. Speaking generally, I am against this detention system. A majority of experts have told me that they are against this system, and that a chance must be given to the boys to make up in the months of December to February and to sit for the examination. This is an urgent matter and a definite matter also.”

(Sri K. Vinayakam rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am not going to allow a debate on this. The motion reads, ‘to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the situation caused by the recent strikes in Andhradesa by the students in Guntur . . .’ How are the Government responsible for the student strikes? The wording of the motion itself is wrong. (Interruption.) If the House wants to

27th November 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

have a debate, I have no objection. A better way will be to consult the Hon. the Minister for Education and come to a conclusion. This should not form the subject-matter of an adjournment motion. Therefore, I rule the motion out of order.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ On a point of information, Sir, ఈ విషయమై మంత్రుల వారి అభిప్రాయ మేదా తేలువ వలననదిగా ఆద్యక్ష సభ్యులనుంచి తాము అడిగినట్లైతే చాగుగా ఉంటుందని, ప్రభుత్వం తమ విధానాన్ని మానుకొని విద్యార్థులను సంతృప్తి పరచవలసిన మంచి చేస్తున్నాను.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Sir, may I ask the Government whether they will be pleased to give us some time to discuss this subject? ”

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Sir, the House knows that there are certain interpellations on this subject, and certain resolutions also had been given notice of. I do not think that this is such an urgent matter as to deserve a special discussion or assignment of time.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, in addition to what has been said, let me assure hon. Members that this subject appears to have been taken up on the representation of the educational authorities themselves. On the one side, we have the demand of the educational authorities to improve the position, which they consider to have deteriorated. On the other hand, there is the demand of the students not only to abolish the selection examination, but, perhaps, even the regular examinations too. (Laughter.) But the question will be duly considered in the ordinary course. We have to weigh what the educational authorities feel necessary and what the students also say in the opposite direction. Instead of discussing it as a political issue, and the Leader of the Opposition taking part in such matters, I would advise that it be left to Government for calm consideration and disposal.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, with reference to what the Hon. the Chief Minister said, I am very glad to see that he has still an open mind in the matter. I want to correct him when he says that the matter is not very urgent. I want to say the same thing to the Hon. the Minister for Education. The matter is urgent; and selection examination is fast approaching. (Interruption.) What we want is that the Government must come to a conclusion after discussion . . .”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There is a non-official resolution in the matter.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I want to assure the Hon. the Chief Minister that it is not any political issue. Let me not give him any wrong impression. This is an ordinary simple matter affecting the students and parents. The Government rely on the opinion of educationalists. It is wrong to think that all the educational authorities are in favour of detentions. I have myself

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[27th November 1952]

had the privilege of discussing this with some educational authorities. Anyway, I want the Chief Minister to give one hour's time for discussing this subject. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopachari : 'No, not here'.) It is not a political issue."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Sir, it would be most inadvisable and it will be very bad for the young people of our country if we make such things subject-matter of our debates here. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry to say, went and addressed a meeting on this subject. I wish he had not done it. We will give every consideration to the question with reference to the good of the students concerned and not to score a point in public."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"It is my conviction. It is not politics."

MR. SPEAKER :—"We have a non-official resolution on this subject."

SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI :—"On a point of order, Sir, నేను ఇచ్చిన విరామ తీర్మానం విషయం ఆలోచించ నీవరాదు."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Is it a point of order?"

SRI B. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI :—"Yes, Sir, నేలూరు ఎల్లూరు ఈ నాడు క్షామ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి. పన్నాభాయిలకు, వరదలవల్ల పంటలు నాశనమయ్యాయి. పేద ప్రజలకు ఆకలి వాళ్ళు కూడా సంభవిస్తున్నట్లు తెలుస్తోంది. ఇంత ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి విషయంగురించి చర్చించవలసిన అవసరం ఉంది."

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is not a point of order. Let the hon. Member resume his seat. We will now proceed to the next item on the agenda."

(Some hon. Members rose on a point of order.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"Order, order. I am not going to allow any points of order."

(Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddi rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member will please resume his seat. We will now take up the next item on the agenda."

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952).

Clause 6—cont.

12 noon. * SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name :—

'Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (1) :—

'Provided that the tenant shall not claim for continuance of possession for cultivation of more than 6-2/3 acres.'

"Sir, this amendment is a very just and reasonable one. It is quite in keeping with the spirit of the times and in the larger

27th November 1952]

[Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao]

interests of food production. Yesterday when I spoke on clause 2, I clearly stated my view point on the matter. Now also I shall say a few words. The main objective that is aimed at in all Governmental undertakings at the present time is stepping up of food production. The Government seem to think that this objective cannot be achieved if a large extent of land is concentrated in the hands of a single individual, namely, the landholder. Therefore, they have restricted the extent of land for cultivation by a landowner to one veli, that is, 6-2/3 acres. I urge that the sponsors of the Bill should put the same limit in the case of the tenant also in the interests of food production and consistency of policy."

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—"I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Amendment moved—

'Add the following proviso at the end of sub-clause (1) :—

'Provided that the tenant shall not claim for continuance of possession for cultivation of more than 6-2/3 acres.'"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I oppose this amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The Government are not accepting the amendment of the hon. Member. I am going to put it to the vote of the House."

(The hon. Member Sri B. Ramakrishna Reddi rose.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"An amendment similar to the one given notice of by the hon. Member Sri Ramakrishna Reddi was rejected by the House yesterday."

(Still the hon. Member Sri Ramakrishna Reddi was standing.)

MR. SPEAKER :—"Will some hon. Member tell him in Telugu that a similar amendment was rejected by the House yesterday and that, therefore, I am not going to allow the hon. Member to move his amendment now?"

Sri P. Ramamurthi explained it in Telugu to the hon. Member.

The amendment (of Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao) was then put and lost.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, I move the following amendment :—

'In sub-clause (1), for the words "he shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" occurring in lines 7 and 8, substitute the words "he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

MR. SPEAKER :—"Amendment moved—

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "he shall be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" occurring in lines 7 and 8, substitute the words "he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

[27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, the language of the clause is ‘ he shall be entitled to apply ’. There is nothing said about his right itself. So, it is corrected verbally as ‘ he shall, on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled . . . ’ ”

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then there is the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Pundarikakshacharyulu. But a similar amendment was rejected by the House yesterday. Therefore, he cannot move his amendment now.”

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ I press my amendment, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member cannot move his amendment. It is out of order. The amendment of the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi is also of the same kind.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ My amendment is different, Sir. It makes a specific distinction between those tenants who were in possession of the land from 1946 to 1951 and those tenants who were in possession in 1951. I do not think it is covered by the previous amendment that was disposed of yesterday.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then, let him move it.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name :—

“ To sub-clause (2), add the following proviso :—

“ Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession ”.

“ I would like, first of all, to explain what the effect of this amendment is and why it is absolutely essential. This is entirely in conformity with the spirit of the Bill now before the House. The present Bill lays down, under clause 6, that all those tenants who were in possession of any land on the 1st day of December 1951 shall be entitled to possession thereof, subject to the provisions of this Bill, until the expiry of a period of five years from the commencement of the agricultural year 1952-53. No condition is laid down here. All those people who were in possession of the land on the 1st day of December 1951 shall be entitled to be in continuous possession of that land for a period of five years thenceforward. Then, those tenants who were in possession of the lands in the year 1950-51 but who were evicted prior to December 1951, will be

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

restored to such possession on certain condition, that is, provided that the land is not in the occupation of any other tenant who has raised a crop thereon. In other words, if a new tenant is in occupation of the land but has not raised a crop thereon, then the old tenant of 1950-51 will be entitled to reinstatement. These are the existing provisions. I go further and say that those people who have been evicted from 1946 onwards should also be entitled to reinstatement. We know that there will be cases where, in the intervening period, some other tenant might have been in possession of the land. We do not want to-day to disturb that possession. We do not want to harm the interests of those peasants who have got possession of the land between 1946 and 1951, irrespective of the fact whether they have raised a crop at the time when this enactment comes into force or not. In other cases, the people who have been in possession of the land from 1946 must be entitled to be reinstated.

“ I would like to explain why we are attaching particular importance to this amendment. In the Preamble of the Bill itself it is stated that this Bill was necessitated as a result of the strained relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other, resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances. Now, it is admitted that the agrarian situation in the district of Tanjore was due to certain causes. It was due fundamentally to the extreme exploitation carried on by the landowners. It is because the landlords were not willing to yield, the agrarian situation became worse. When the peasants started the agitation for a higher share of the produce, then immediately the landowners started evicting them. This process started from 1946 onwards. The very fact that the Government have brought forward this Bill is a clear proof that the claim made by the tenants was just and proper. But the landowners were determined to resist that claim. Even to-day it is being resisted. From 1946 they have been continuously attempting to resist this claim and in their attempt they have been adopting the method known, in trade union parlance, as victimisation. This victimisation has been going on from 1946 and large numbers of tenants have been evicted. Therefore, to-day when the Government try or presume to put an end to the root cause of the trouble, at least those people, who raised the question and who have been fighting over it from 1946, should not be unnecessarily victimised. I should like to tell the Hon. the Chief Minister that he should not look at this question from a political angle. No political issue is involved in this. Here are people who started the movement and who fought for a very just right. So long as the Hon. the Chief Minister admits that their cause was just and their demand was proper, to say that simply because certain people were the agitators of a just cause, they should be victimised and should not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their agitation, is something that is reprehensible. Therefore, the Government should have no difficulty whatsoever in accepting this amendment, and if they refuse to accept it, the only

[27th November 1952

12-10
p.m.

conclusion that can be drawn is that political motives are behind it. I say that political motives should not weigh in this matter of giving some relief to the poor peasants. There should be equity. That is the point which I want to stress. The question of the relationship between the landlord and the tenant should be carefully tackled in such a manner that the poor peasants are able to get justice irrespective of the fact whether there had been a movement for getting justice or not. Otherwise, it may be interpreted that those who joined the struggle for getting justice should be victimised. Such a thing should not happen. Therefore, I commend this amendment for the acceptance of this House."

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி கொண்஠ுவந்திருக்கும் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரித்து நான் சில வார்த்தைகள் பேச விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த மசோதாவை இந்தச் சபையில் கொண்஠ுவரும்படி செய்வதற்கு காரணகர்த்தர்களாக இருந்து அன்றையதினம் பல அடக்குமுறைகளின் இடையில் விவசாய இயக்கத் திற்குத் தலைமை தாங்கி அதை நடத்தி வைத்த—தென்பரை விவசாயிகளுக்கும், மிராசதாரர்களுக்கும் இடையில் தகராறு நேர்ந்த காலத்தில்தல்திலிருந்து விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றக்கூடாதென்ற ஒப்பந்தத்தை ஏற்படுத்தியது அன்று உள்ள சர்க்கார். அதாவது 1945-ம்஠ுல் டிசம்பர்மீ 25உயிலேயே ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளும் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளும் மிராசதாரர்களும் கூடி ஜில்லா பூராவாக நிலவெளியேற்றம் கூடாதென்ற திட்டத்தை முடிவுசெய்து அமுலுக்கு கொண்஠ுவரப்பட்டது. அதற்குப்பிறகு 1946-ம் வருஷத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா செஷன்ஸ் ஜட்ஜ் அனந்தநாராயண அய்யரை அப்டீஜுடிக்கேடராக நியமித்து விசாரணை செய்யும்படி சொல்ல அவரும் தீர விசாரித்து எந்த விவசாயியையும் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாதென்று 1946-ம்஠ுல் மார்ச்சுமீ 13உயில் ஒரு ஒப்பந்தத்தைக் கொண்஠ுவர முயற்சித்தார். ஆனால் துரதிருஷ்டவசமாக அப்பொழுதிருந்த காங்கிரஸ் சர்க்கார் அதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ளாமல் முரண்பாடுசெய்து விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே அடக்கிவிட முயற்சித்தார்கள். அதற்குப்பிறகு 1946-ம்஠ுல் டிசம்பர்மீ 24உயில் மறுபடியும் ஒரு ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டது. இப்படித் தொடர்ந்தார்ப்போல விவசாயிகளின் இயக்கத்தை மதித்து அவர்களுடைய குறைகளை சர்க்கார் கவனிக்கத் தவறிவிட்டதினால், மிராசதாரர்கள் இந்த மாதிரியாக இயக்கத்தில் ஈடுபட்டவர்களையெல்லாம் பழிவாங்க நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். மிராசதாரர்கள் செய்துவரும் அநியாயத்தை எடுத்துக் காட்ட நியாயமாகப் போராடிய பல விவசாயிகளிடமிருந்து நிலங்கள் பிடுங்கப் பட்டிருக்கின்றன. பழிவாங்கும் கருத்தோடேயே தான் இந்த மாதிரியாக களப்பார், சிறுகளத்தார், ஆலத்தூர் புதுக்குடி, போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள மிராசதாரர்கள், பெரிய பெரிய நிலப்பிரபுக்கள் நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே தவிர தாங்களே சாகுபடிசெய்ய உத்தேசித்து அல்ல. இன்றைய தினம் ராமநாதபுரம் போன்ற பஞ்சப் பிரதேசங்களிலிருந்து வருகின்ற கூலியாட்களைக்கொண்டு மிகக் குறைந்தகூலியில் வேலை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். மேலும் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தில் அந்த நிலம் யாரிடமாவது இருந்தால் அதைப் பிடுங்கிக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் கேட்கவில்லை. ஆனால் நிலப் பிரபுக்களே அதை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தால் அதைத் திரும்பவும் விவசாயிகளிடம் போய்ச்சேரும்படியாக நாம் சட்டத்தை திருத்தவேண்டும். ஆதலினாலேதான் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு சாகுபடியாளர், 1946-ம்஠ுல் டிசம்பர்மீ 1உ சாகுபடி உரிமை பெற்றிருந்தால் அத்தேதிக்குப்பின் வெளியேற்றப்பட்டாலும் 1951-ம்஠ுல் டிசம்பர்மீ 1உ வெறெந்த: சாகுபடியாளரும் நிலத்திலில்லாவிட்டாலும் அவர் சமரச அதிகாரிக்கு நிலத்தில் சாகுபடி உரிமை கோரி மனு செய்துகொள்ள உரிமையுண்டு, என்ற திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Amendment moved—

To sub-clause (2), *add* the following proviso:—

" Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer to be restored to such possession " " "

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the amendment moved by Sri Ramamurthi. While doing so, I wish to point out that in the year 1946-47, the then State Government issued a questionnaire about the proposed land revenue reforms. So the landlords apprehending some agrarian reforms for conferring some rights on cultivating tenants began to evict the tenants gradually and thus there were wholesale evictions in many instances which can be very well seen from the magnitude of litigation pending in the different Civil and Criminal Courts. Subsequently, after the appointment and reports of the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee and the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, Madras, there has been considerable agrarian unrest throughout the State, and wholesale eviction of poor innocent peasants has taken place in a number of villages. Hence, we must give effect to this Bill and give relief to tenants from 1946. With these words, I support the amendment."

* SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD:—“ Sir, శ్రీ రామమూర్తి గారు తెచ్చినటు
పంటి amendment ను బలపరచుట. వేను మాట్లాడుతున్నాను. గవర్నమెంటు
వారు తెచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు ఆరవ క్యాబినెట్ 1951 వ సం॥ డిసెంబరు 1 వ తేదీన
వి tenant ఆయితే భూమిని సాగుచేస్తూ ఫుండస్ అర్జెటును యీ యాక్టు ఆన్
రెవల్యూస్ వచ్చినప్పటినుంచి మరల భూమిపైనే పెట్టి, సడరు భూమిని ఆశని స్వాధీ
నములో పెట్టవలసినదిగా తెలుపుచున్నది. శంజావూరు జిల్లాలో 1946 వ
సంవత్సరములోనే ఆశాంతి ప్రారంభం అయింది. 1946 వ సంవత్సరములో
ఆశాంతి ప్రారంభమైనప్పుడు, అనేకమంది రైతులను భూస్వాములు భూములనుండి
తొలగించారు. ఆ తొలగించబడిన రైతుల విషయములో యీ బిల్లులోని ‘ఏ’
క్లాజు చెప్పడమే కాదు. ఈ amendment యొక్క అర్థమేమిటగా 1946 వ సం
వత్సరములో భూమిని స్వాధీనములో పెట్టుకొని సాగుచేస్తున్న రైతులు ఆప్పటి
అశాంతివల్ల తొలగించబడినట్లైతే, వారిని మరల 1951 సంవత్సరములో సాగు
చేస్తూఉండే రైతులు మాదిరిగానే, భూముల పై నయిండవలసినదిగ అర్థము. ఈ
amendment చాలా తృప్తికరంగాను, modest గాను ఉన్నది. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము
వారు దీనిని అంగీకరించెదరని నమ్ముతున్నాను. ”—

SRI V. B. KRISHNA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I warmly endorse and support the amendment that has been just now moved by hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi. According to him and even as the previous speaker said, it is but a very moderate and very logical amendment, if only we carefully study the historical development that has led to the present Bill. What really happened was, there was a large-scale eviction in 1946 and thereafter the process of

[Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar] [27th November 1952]

eviction continued right up to 1952, when the matter became very worse and the Government had to interfere and bring in an Ordinance in the first instance and the present Bill to validate that Ordinance. It is but natural that those who have been victimised in the first instance should also be included under this Bill and given the benefit of the relief measures which are contemplated under this Bill. I don't think there will be any dispute over the fact that evictions did start as early as 1946 and that too on a large scale. It is but natural to expect that when any relief under legislation is given to a certain class of people, retrospective effect should be given from the date on which the mischief started in order to effectively counteract any further possible mischief. Sir, I may state that the amendment brought forward by Sri Ramamurthi is nothing new and we know of many instances in which such retrospective effect has been given with regard to certain beneficial measures. Even in the case of the Madras Agriculturists Debt Relief Act, of which the Hon. Chief Minister was himself the pilot, it was definitely laid down that the provisions of that Act would come into effect from a much earlier period than the actual date of its introduction in the Legislature. The Hon. Chief Minister rightly thought then that retrospective effect should be given to that Act in order to counteract any possible mischief to violate the provisions of that Act. Similarly, in the case of the Malabar Tenancy Bill, retrospective effect was given, I think, from the year 1945. They have put the clock back to 1945. What I wish to stress is there must be equity and the poor peasants who might have been evicted in the year 1946 and thereafter should also be given some relief. In the case of the Malabar Tenancy Bill, there was some agitation for giving relief to the poor peasants by giving retrospective effect to the provisions of that Act. It is agreed on all hands that the present Bill under discussion is intended to afford adequate relief to the poor suffering peasants and it is but fair that we must give retrospective effect to the Bill. Therefore I submit that since 1946

12-20
p.m.

there has been eviction and the equity must start in future from that period, namely, 1946. Therefore I submit to this House that the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, is a modest one. It is not only modest, it is just one because he has mentioned in his amendment that wherever new tenants have been brought into the land there may not be equity in evicting the new tenants and third party rights might be interfered with. He has only suggested that if new persons have not come in, where the original sinner, if I may use that term with considerable deference, if that person continues to be in possession the land should be disgorged in his favour. The only argument that could stand in the way of this amendment being accepted is, support for those persons who I dare say must be big landlords. There is no need to be so very soft about these persons and when new tenants have not come in, it is just and desirable and also in the interests of the furtherance of the objectives of this Bill, to accept this amendment.

I only wish to say a word more. Let us not have suspicion and mistrust. Let not everything coming from one side be condemned as based on political motives. Let us not also recriminate

27th November 1952] [Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar]

the other side if there is refusal to accept a particular amendment. There is no political motive on either side. This is purely a measure seeking to improve the relationship between the landlord and the tenants. This is purely an economic question. This is a matter concerning food production and agriculture. Let us view it from the economic plane and give full effect to the objective of the Bill. I humbly believe that if Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment is accepted, it will fully bring into effect the real objectives of the Bill, namely, to benefit the tenants who have been unreasonably evicted."

SRI S. VADIVELU :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஆதரித்து சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

"பெரும்பாலும் 1946-47-ம் ஆண்டுத்தில்தான் நியாயக் கூலிக்காக தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகள் போராடினார்கள். அதன் காரணமாக அடக்கு முறையைக் கையாண்டு மிராசுதார்கள் பெரும்பாலான விவசாயிகளையும் வாந்தாரர்களையும் நிலத்தை விட்டு வெளியேற்றினார்கள். ஆனால், இந்தச் சட்டத்தில், 1946-47-ம் ஆண்டுத்திலே நீக்கப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு மீண்டும் அந்த நிலத்தைத் திருப்பித்தரவேண்டுமென்று நண்பர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இன்னொரு வடிவத்தையும் சர்க்காருடைய ஞாபகத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

"பெரும்பாலும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு இரண்டு விதமான கூலிகள் வழங்கப் பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஒரு வேலிக்குட்பட்ட மிராசுதர்களை இந்தச் சட்டம் கட்டுப் படுத்தாது என்று நேற்று இந்தச் சபையில் தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றப் பட்டது. அதனால் ஒரு கிராமத்திலே பல விவசாயிகளுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரம் பாதிக்கப்படும் என்று இந்தச் சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

"ஒரு கிராமத்தில் 100 சிறு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களும், 10 பெரிய நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களும் இருந்தால், 10 மிராசுதார்கள் இந்தச் சட்டப்படி கூலி கொடுத்தால் பாக்கி இருக்கக்கூடிய 100 சிறிய மிராசுதார்கள் அதே கூலியைக் கொடுக்கமாட்டார்கள் என்பதை நான் ஞாபகமுட விரும்புகிறேன். பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக கூலி எவ்வளவு வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வந்தார்களோ அந்தக் கூலிகூட இன்றைக்கு கிடைக்க முடியாத நிலையில் இருக்கிறது.

"அடுத்தபடியாக விவசாயிகளுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டப்படி குடியிருப்புக்கு மனைக்கட்டு சொந்தமாக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். 1946-47-ம் ஆண்டுத்திலே நீக்கப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு மீண்டும் நிலம் அவர்களுக்கு கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்."

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi. If from 1946 no new tenant has been brought in on the land, it can only mean that the land ought to be in the actual occupation of the landlord. Such things happen only in the case of small landlords. Here our aim is chiefly to discourage absentee landlordism. When the small landlord is inclined to cultivate the land himself and profit by personal cultivation, he should not be prevented from doing so. If there are cases where new tenants have not been brought in on the land from the year 1946, it should be that the land is not left waste but that the lands are under the personal cultivation of the landlords themselves.

[Sri P. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar] [27th November 1952]

Their rights should not in any way be affected by a person who was evicted from the land long long ago. Such small landlords will be affected if this amendment were to be accepted. I therefore oppose the amendment."

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, எனக்கு முன்பு பேசிய சர்க்கார் கட்சி அங்கத்தினர், ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை எதிர்க்கும்போது, இந்தத் திருத்தம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளப்படால் தாங்களே சாகுபடி செய்யக்கூடிய சிறு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் இதனால் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள் என்று சொன்னார்கள். ஆனால் நிலைமை அப்படியல்ல தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில். 1946-வது வருஷத்திலிருந்து அங்கு நடந்த விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே ஒழிக்கவேண்டுமென்று திட்டமிட்டு பெரு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் அவர்களிடம் சாகுபடி செய்த விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். வெளியேற்றுவது மட்டுமல்ல. அவர்கள் முன் கூட்டியே திட்டமிட்டு வேறு விவசாயிகளுக்கு குத்தகைக்கோ வாரத்திற்கோ சாகுபடி செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் சிறு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் அல்ல. பெரு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஏனென்றால் இந்த விவசாய இயக்கத்தையே ஒழிக்கவேண்டும், மீண்டும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இம்மாதிரி விவசாயிகள் இயக்கங்கள் ஏற்படக்கூடாது என்ற நோக்கத்தோடு வெளியேற்றங்கள் நடைபெறுகின்றன.

“ நிலங்களிலிருந்து விவசாயிகள் வெளியேற்றப்படுவதோடு மட்டுமல்ல. ஏற்கனவே அவர்களிடம் பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக தொன்றுதொட்டு வேலை செய்துவந்த பண்ணையாட்களை வேலையிலிருந்து நீக்கிவிட்டு இன்றைக்கு சாகுபடி செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட போல், விவசாயிகளுக்கும், விவசாயக் கூலிகளுக்கும் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க வேண்டுமானால், அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலச் சுவாந்தார்களும், விவசாயிகளும், விவசாயக் கூலியாட்களும் அந்நியோன்யமாகப் பழகவேண்டுமென்று முன் திணைமிகத் தெளிவாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அதை ஒத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமானால், அம்மாதிரி நடைமுறையில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நடைபெறவேண்டுமானால் 1946-லிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளையும் அம்மாதிரி வெளியேற்றப்பட்ட விவசாயக் கூலிகளையும் பண்ணையாட்களையும் திரும்ப எடுத்துக்கொள்வதென்று சட்டத்தில் இருந்தால்தான் எந்த நோக்கத்திற்காக இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரப் பட்டதாகச் சொல்லப்படுகிறதோ அந்த நோக்கம் ஓரளவு நிறைவேற்றப்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய தாழ்மையான அபிப்பிராயம்.

“ 1946-லிருந்து யாருக்கும் வாரக்குத்தகை மாற்றிக் கொடுக்காமல் அவர்களே வைத்துக்கொண்டு இருக்கக்கூடிய பெரு நிலச் சுவாந்தார்கள் இந்த ஏழைகளுக்கு, இன்றைக்கு வேறு நிலம் கிடைக்காமல், கூலி வேலை கிடைக்காமல், கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டும், சாப்பாட்டுக்குக்கூட வழியில்லாமல் அவஸ்தைப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற விவசாயிகளுக்கு நிலம் திருப்பிக் கொடுத்து, அவர்கள் நல்வாழ்வு வாழ்வதற்கு வகை செய்வதற்கு எந்த வித ஆட்சேபனையும் காங்கிரஸ் அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கோ சர்க்காருக்கோ இருக்கமுடியாது என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு இந்தத் திருத்தப் பிரேரணையை சர்க்கார் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Ayyar took away the sting from Mr. Ramamurthi's presentation of the demand. Mr. Ramamurthi at every stage seemed to think that whatever amendment was proposed which he considered to be important, to that should be tacked a statement that if it was not accepted, the motives of the Government were proved to be wrong, that they

27th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

intended to suppress the peasant movement or support the land-owners. I submit that that way of presentation, to say the least, does not appeal to me. I may even go further and say that it rather prejudices my mind unnecessarily. I wish to fight against the prejudice and present only the justification for the Government not accepting the amendment. Now the provision as proposed in the original sub-clause (2) takes us back two and a half years from now, that is, roughly 2½ years before the Ordinance. Whoever was then in possession will be restored to possession more or less.

“ If there was any new tenant in possession of the land he has got every right to enjoy what he had laboured for to raise the crop. But Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment asks us to go back six years. He wants that we should go back six years and reinstate those cultivating tenants who had been deprived of their possession so long ago. Let us remember the time limit imposed in Mr. Ramamurthi's amendment. It is six years. He says somebody who had no right in the land according to law, but who was cultivating the land six years ago should now be called and given occupancy rights in preference to those tenants who had been working on the land subsequently all these two and a half years. To give legal rights to the cultivator working six years ago, of whom we do not have any records or any authoritative document, is almost an impracticable task. To determine whether those tenants had been cultivating tenants or casual labourers before six years would mean taking upon ourselves such stupendous administrative difficulties which are well nigh impossible to be performed properly.

“ Apart from this difficulty, let us see what the amendment says with regard to existing tenants who are now working in the lands. If we were to accept the amendment, it virtually amounts to calling back those cultivating tenants or pannaiyals (it does not matter to which category they belong) and give them legal rights over the land now and at the same time dispossess those cultivating tenants who had produced paddy all these two and a half years. This would amount to a great disturbance among the people who are now working. Let us remember that all these years from 1946 up to now the land had been under cultivation, food was produced, paddy was grown and the land was under continuous supervision. Merely for the sake of politics or for creating a new political agitation, it is unfair to eject all these people who had been working on the land all these six years and reinstate in their place men who were working before them. This would be highly unjust and improper. In every case where we make an amendment of this nature, disturbances are bound to occur. We should of course see that disturbances do not mount too much. At the time of the drafting the Ordinance, Government paid careful consideration to this question and came to the conclusion that the two and a half years period was an equitable one. More than that, hon. Members should know that the agricultural year for 1950-51 would begin in May 1950. Let us not go farther back than this period. The present fixation of the period of two and a half years

12-30
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

would create no undue hardship to the tenants. If cultivation has proceeded rightly or wrongly all these two and a half years, there won't be any difficulty involved either way to the tenants by the provision under this clause fixing the period of two and a half years. If on the other hand, as I had already stated, we were to ask the tenants who had been growing paddy all these years right from 1946 up till now to get out and were to insert an amendment bringing back the tenants prior to 1946, it would be very unfair. Apart from the difficulties involved, it would be unjust to evict the present tenants. These are the reasons, Sir, why the Government are unable to accept the pushing back of the date beyond two and a half years."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Chief Minister has put forward the excuse that if he were to accept my amendment it would mean a lot of administrative difficulties. He admits that in the case of those people who have been evicted two and a half years ago, it is quite a proper thing for their case being considered sympathetically. According to the Hon. Chief Minister, those tenants are perfectly justified in being reinstated. The case of thousands of tenants dispossessed long before, i.e., six years ago and who are now helpless, does not appeal to our Hon. Chief Minister.

"What is it that my amendment exactly seeks to bring about? I want that those poor tenants who number in thousands and who had been evicted six years ago should now be given legal rights over their lands. The plea has been put forward by the Hon. Chief Minister that the lands are now being cultivated by other persons and that they should not be disturbed. I know practically in several of the villages in Tanjore the mirasdars have not engaged other regular tenants. They have been engaging their own pannaiyals or casual labourers. These mirasdars are thus no longer employing any new tenants in the place of the old men and so are not in duty bound to give the tenants an equitable share in the produce."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I do not wish to be too long. I tried to be as brief as possible. But my friend Mr. Ramamurthi who is dealing with this amendment at great length should remember that the lands he is referring to have been under cultivation all these years and people have been working there. The question is, why should we disturb the present workers who are cultivating the fields? "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Chief Minister pleads that those people evicted before the agricultural year 1950-51 are entitled to being reinstated. Their number may be comparatively few. I want to ask what justice had been done to thousands of tenants evicted six years before and who are at present helpless? "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The rule of quantity should be applied, Sir. We can tolerate ten people but when it comes to thousands, it becomes intolerable."

27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Therefore, the Hon. Chief Minister had explained that this is a question of toleration and not one pertaining to justice."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Toleration of nuisance, Sir."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Let it be toleration of nuisance. It is bound to be nuisance whether we like it or not, for it is a problem involving poor tenants. These poor tenants evicted six years ago deserve our immediate attention. Justice should be done to them. They had been in possession of the lands not for some years but for generations. I know thousands of such cases. What has happened since then? In several villages, I do not want to give the names, the old tenants had been evicted and in their stead the mirasdars have employed casual labourers whom they pay according to their likes. These casual labourers get wages for the days they work. They are not to work there all through the year. What was the case with reference to the old tenants? They had been cultivating those lands for several generations, from time immemorial. Suddenly they had been evicted. From 1946, they have lost proprietary rights over the lands. The casual labourers had taken their place. Therefore, we see that this is not a question of disturbing the existing tenants, as pointed out by the Hon. Chief Minister. This question does not involve any expropriatory right. We only want that justice should be done to those tenants evicted from their holdings which they had been enjoying from time immemorial. This is what we ask. A very simple and modest request that those tenants evicted six years ago, i.e., before 1946, should now be reinstated in their original places. I think nobody can deny that this is a very modest request which could be easily complied with.

"I shall come to what is termed by the Hon. the Chief Minister as 'attributing motives to the Government'. It has been the practice of the Hon. Chief Minister to attribute motives to us in every one of his utterances. Whatever we say (I mean the Communists) carries with it some sting. This is how the Hon. Chief Minister looks at us. Whenever we represent the grievances of the people, according to the Hon. the Chief Minister, we are 'attributing motives to the Government'. When for every word we say the Hon. the Chief Minister himself is attributing a 'motive', we on this side of the House are also entitled to retaliate. The Hon. the Chief Minister has just now told us that he gets at times 'prejudiced' with our remarks and he is fighting to get rid of that prejudice and trying to take a dispassionate view of things. I am glad that the Hon. the Chief Minister is trying to take a dispassionate view. Let him root out the prejudice completely from his mind and examine this present question on the merits of the case. Let him realize that thousands of lives are involved here. Let him therefore look at this problem with a clear and dispassionate view. Let justice be meted out to those who deserve."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :— 12-40
"Sir, the hon. Member wants to put back the clock from 1st p.m.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [27th November 1952]

December 1951 to 1st December 1946. He also asked while we could adjust for a period of 2½ years why we could not adjust for a period of six years. If we accept the amendment, some other amendments may come putting back the date to 1st December 1940 or 1937. There must be some point from which we could start. 1st December 1951 was fixed because it was the date on which the Land Revenue Reforms Committee Report was published and it might be that some tenants were evicted in anticipation of the publication of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee Report. If any tenants were evicted after 1st December 1951, they must be reinstated according to this Bill. The argument of the hon. Member looks like finding out the heart and lungs of a man who died by exhuming it now. Five or six years ago, it is not practicable. I therefore oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (2), add the following proviso:—

"Provided that in the district of Tanjore every cultivating tenant who was in possession on the first day of December 1946 and was evicted subsequent to that date and if no other cultivating tenant was in possession on the first day of December 1951, shall also be entitled to apply to the conciliation officer to be restored to such possession."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishniah has given notice of the following amendment:—

'In sub-clause (2) for the words "five years", substitute the words "ten years".
As I already said yesterday, he cannot move the amendment."

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, ఆరే క్లాజులో ఉన్న రెండవ క్లౌజుకు చివర sub-clause (2-A) గా ఒక క్రింది భాగాన్ని చేర్చాలని నేను సవరణ ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

'Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A):—

"The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district."

ఒక precautionary measure గా ఉండటంతోనే నేను ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించి పోషిస్తున్నాను. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో Ordinance ప్రవేశ పెట్టగానే రాష్ట్రపతిగారు కొలుదార్లకు జమనుతున్న అన్యాయాన్ని విచారించడానికి యీ సవరణ ఆవసరమవుతున్నది. ఇప్పటికప్పుడే అనేక జిల్లాలలో ఖాస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను ఖాముల నుండి తొలగించి వేశారు. ఇలా పెద్దపెట్టున కొలుదార్లను తొలగిస్తున్న సంగతి ప్రభుత్వానికి సూచనగా రాగా తెలుసును. కొలుదార్లను తొలగించకుండా, తొలగించినా కొలుదార్లకు నష్టము వాటిల్లకుండా చేయడానికి యీ సవరణ precautionary measure గా ఉపయోగపడుతుంది. మన ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు యీ బిల్లుకు

27th November 1952] [Sri K. Rajagopala Rao]

యీ బిల్లుకు కాకపోతే రేపా, రేపు కాకపోతే ఎల్లప్పుడూ రాష్ట్రపతిగారికి వ రింపుండం టున్నారు ప్రభుత్వం రాష్ట్రపతిగారికి యీ బిల్లు పంపిస్తే నేనాటికి కొలుదార్ల క్రిందను ఖాములపన్నిటిని ఖాస్వాములు పూర్తిగా స్వాధీనము చేసుకుంటారని, కొలుదార్లనే వాడే రాష్ట్రములో లేకుండా పోతాడేమో నని అనుమానం. అందువల్ల రాష్ట్రంలో వ్యవసాయానికి జీవించే లక్షలాది కొలుదార్ల స్థితి వరింత క్లిష్టము, దుర్భరము అవుతుంది. ఇప్పటికే చాలా జిల్లాలలో తొలగి పంపిన కొలుదార్లు నిరాశ్చర్యులై ఉన్నారు. జీ.వో.పాధికే పేరే మార్గంలేక అల్లాడుతున్నారు. అందుకని యీ సవరణ ఆవసరమని, యిది ఒక precautionary measure గా చేర్చమని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వము రాష్ట్రములోని వాస్తవిక పరిస్థితుల్ని, కొలుదార్లలో ఏర్పడిన ఆలస్యతని, కొలుదార్లను అక్రమంగా తొలగిస్తుండడమువల్ల ఏర్పడుతున్న సంఘర్షణాన్ని, దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని ఖామిని పాగుచేసుకున్నప్పుడు రైతుకు తగిన రక్షణయివ్వాలి. దీనికికూడా ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించకపోతే, మరి కొంత భార్యకు చేయగలిగిన సహాయమేమిటో బోధపడటంలేదు. కాబట్టి సభవారు యీ విషయాన్ని జాగ్రత్తగా పరిశీలించి యీ సవరణయొక్క ముఖ్యోద్దేశ్యాన్ని గుర్తించి, పేదరైతులకు కొలుదార్లకు సహాయము చేయడానికే, ఖాముల నుంచి తొలగించబడుతున్న కొలుదార్లకు నేడ్యంతేసుకునే అధికారం సౌకర్యమివ్వడమేమోనా, యీ సవరణను ఆమోదించవలసిందిగా కోరుతున్నాను."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri K. Rajagopala Rao."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Motion moved—

'Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A):—

"The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, the hon. Member is thinking too far ahead of the provisions of this Bill when he refers to extension, etc. I therefore oppose the amendment."

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"నా సవరణకు రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారిచ్చిన జవాబు సంతృప్తికరంగా లేదు. కొలుదార్ల తొలగింపును ఆరకట్టడానికి ఒక precautionary measure గా యీ సవరణను ఆమోదించడంలో ప్రభుత్వానికిన్న అభ్యంతరాలేమిటో వారు వివరించలేదు. అందుకని సభవారు నా సవరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'Insert the following as new sub-clause (2-A):—

"The date of determining possession of the cultivating tenant shall be determined by taking into consideration the circumstances in the district when this Act is applied by notification to such district."

The amendment was lost.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

have applied under the Ordinance. If out of ignorance of the law or for any other reason they did not apply, they can easily satisfy the Conciliation Officer that they could not apply till now. So, Sir, the amendment cannot be accepted, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I have already explained, on merits, why it cannot be accepted."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, the only reason the Chief Minister adduced against the acceptance of this amendment is that it will throw the door open for a large number of applicants now. I would like first of all to disabuse the mind of the Chief Minister of any fear that litigation will increase; at any rate, litigation is not something which is liked by this class of people. It may be that the peasants who have already got lands and money may go in for the courts; but as far as these people are concerned, they cannot afford the luxury of going to the courts. It is only people who were genuinely thrown out of the land, people who might have a claim but who did not previously understand what this Ordinance is, that could put in such applications. I am sure it will not throw the door open to false claims; I may assure the Chief Minister of that, because, as I said, these people will not obviously think of resorting to litigation. My main objection is: you are leaving it to the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officer. What is the criterion, I want to know? Are you laying down, for instance, that the Conciliation Officer should entertain all these cases on certain grounds? It is all a question of his own personal satisfaction; and the satisfaction of various individual Conciliation Officers whose minds may differ on the question of re-entertainment, is not easy. I say that in all fairness, you cannot leave it to the Conciliation Officer's individual discretion. I submit this is a very reasonable amendment, and I therefore press it."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, the object the hon. Member has in view is covered both by the proviso and the Explanation under this sub-clause. I think there is a slight misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Member in assessing the implication of the amendment. He says that the Conciliation Officer works as an ordinary man. I submit it is not as an ordinary man that he works; he will work as a judicial man. He exercises his judicial mind and all reasonable cases under the Act would be covered. Cases that are likely not to be covered by these provisions can naturally be only frivolous cases. I therefore oppose the amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I would like to tell the Hon. Minister that Conciliation Officers are certainly not judicial people; they are only Tahsildars."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" But they will apply a judicial mind to these cases."

27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The amendment is—

' In sub-clause (3), for the word " commencement ", substitute the word " passing ".'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Sri D. Seetharamiah has given notice of two amendments. He may move both the amendments together."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ఆరవ క్లాజులో మూడవ సబ్-క్లాజు విషయమై రెండు amendments యిచ్చాను. యీ బిల్లులో భూస్వాములకు, రైతులకు, పన్నెయ్యాలకు, కౌలుదార్లకు జరిగే తగాదాల విషయములో Conciliation Officers కు complaints ముప్పది రోజులలోగా ఇవ్వాలని ఉంది. యీ గడువు 30 దినములు చాలదని నా అభిప్రాయము. యీ కొలది కాలములో రైతులు, కౌలుదార్లు వగైరాలకు, యాక్టులోని legal implications తెలియని కారణము చేతను, చదువురానివారు అయినందునను, వాళ్లకు యీ యాక్టు, దాని యొక్క విషయములు అందుచాటులో ఉండవని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో వారికి ముప్పది దినములు మాత్రమే టైము యిచ్చి తమ హక్కును రక్షించుచు ఉండవచ్చును. అందులో 23 వ ఆగస్టునండి మాత్రమే టైము యిస్తున్నారు ఈ నెలరోజులలో వారు తగాదాలు అన్ని కూడా కన్సైలియేషన్ ఆఫీసరుకు అందజేయాలని యీ బిల్లులో చూపబడింది. ఇది రైతులకు చాలా అన్యాయము కలుగజేస్తుందని నేను భావిస్తున్నాను. అందువల్ల ఈ ముప్పది రోజులకు బదులుగా తొందరై రోజులు పెట్టాలనినీ, యిది సరియైన పద్ధతి అనినీ నేను కోరుతున్నాను. యీ రైతులు, పన్నెయ్యాలలు చదువురానివారు అయినందున, వీరు ఈ complaints ను Conciliation Officers కు అందజేయుటకునూ, అవి నిర్వహించుకొనుటకునూ యీ సవరణ ద్వారా తగిన సౌకర్యము యిచ్చుటకు ఏలుతున్నాను. అందువలన తొందరై రోజులు గడువును పెట్టవని నేను నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించుచున్నాను."

" అంతేకాకుండా, మరొక సవరణ యిచ్చియున్నాను. యీ బిల్లులో ప్రతి రైతుగాని, పన్నెయ్యాలగాని, తమ కంప్లెయింటుకు ఒక రూపాయ కోర్టుఫీజు బిల్లు అంటించవలసి యున్నది. యీ బిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతులను రక్షించుటకు తెచ్చామని చెప్పవచ్చు, వారు Court-fee stamp కుగాను ఒక రూపాయ బిల్లు తమ పిటిషన్సుకు రైతులు అంటించవలసి చెప్పబడియున్నది. పేద ప్రజానీకమైన యీ రైతులకు యిటువంటి ఖర్చు పెట్టుట చాలా అన్యాయము. రైతుల పరిస్థితి యేమిటి? ఎన్నో సంవత్సరాలుగా రైతులు, పన్నెయ్యాలలు భూస్వాముల దోపిడికి గురియై కాటక దరిద్రావస్థతో కుమిలిపోతున్నారు. అట్టివారినుండి కూడా కోర్టుఫీజు వసూలు చేయడం సబబుకాదు. డబ్బుగల భూస్వాములు ఎంత ఖర్చు అయిన భరించగలరు. వారిని ఒక రూపాయకాదు పది రూపాయలు ఫీజు కట్టమనండి. కాగా వుంటుంది. కాని యీ పేద రైతులు యీ ఖర్చును ఎట్లు భరించగలరు? Court-fee stamp కు గాను డబ్బులేని పక్షములో, వారు ఎట్లా తమ కంప్లెయింటు నైంపు కోరితారు అడుగుచున్నాను. యీ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారు గుర్తించాలి. అందువలన, యీ పేద రైతాంగమును మాత్రము యీ stamp fees నుండి మినహాయించే అవకాశము యివ్వాలని యీనాడు నేను సవరణ తెచ్చాను. అట్లు చేయబడుట కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమువారికి అన్యాయమే చేయదలచారని చెప్పక తప్పదు. భగ

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name :—

In sub-clause (3), for the word “ commencement ”, substitute the word “ passing ”.

Sir, the present sub-clause (3) says, ‘ Every application to a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be made within thirty days from the commencement of this Act, and shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee ’. Instead of that, by my amendment, it reads, ‘ Every application to a Conciliation Officer under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be made within thirty days from the passing of this Act, and shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee ’. This Act comes into force from the 23rd August 1952, i.e., from three or four months before. At the time the Ordinance was passed, it was laid down that within one month from the date of passing of the Ordinance, the tenants who had been evicted should claim possession of the land before the Conciliation Officer. We feel that, for a law of this type, one month’s time is too short a period. It is only with a view to enable those people who could not possibly have put in their applications within one month from the date of the Ordinance, to put in their claims within one month from the passing of this Act, i.e., from the date the assent of the President is received, that this amendment is suggested. As a matter of fact, when we approached the Conciliation Officers, it was found that they did not get instructions as to what they had to do and that forms were not available, etc. I know that, as a result of representations made in the Select Committee, certain new provisions have been adopted, viz.—

‘ Provided that the application may be received after the period of thirty days aforesaid, if the applicant satisfies the Conciliation Officer that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within that period.

Explanation.—The rejection of an application before the passing of this Act on the ground of its not having been presented in time shall not prevent the receipt of an application under the foregoing proviso after the passing of this Act.’

Therefore, if there are cases of peasants whose applications were not entertained on the ground that they were not presented within thirty days from the commencement of this Act, it certainly gives power to the Conciliation Officer to entertain them. Even though applications might have been rejected on that ground, the Conciliation Officer can re-entertain them if there are sufficient grounds for not making the applications within that period. What does this mean? It means that each Conciliation Officer without any criterion whatsoever, according to his own discretion, can decide whether a particular application which had been rejected before on the particular ground I mentioned above, should be re-entertained or not. The whole question is left to the individual discretion of so many Conciliation Officers that may be appointed throughout the district and the peasants are made to depend upon the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officers. In order to obviate the necessity of the peasants depending upon the individual discretion of the Conciliation Officers, I moved the amendment

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

to change the words ‘ from the commencement of this Act ’ to ‘ from the passing of this Act ’, i.e., from the date of receipt of the assent of the President. This is my simple request and I request the Government to accept it.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“ Sir, I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Mr. P. Ramamurthi.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Motion moved—

In sub-clause (3), for the word “ commencement ”, substitute the word “ passing ”.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I should like to make one matter clear. Between the Hon. Chief Minister and the Opposition, on the subject-matter of this provision, there was no difference of opinion. In fact, the Hon. Chief Minister agreed to extend the time for putting in these applications. The Ordinance is already now in force, and therefore, if the original time given in the Ordinance is not sufficient, in view of the Act, the Hon. Chief Minister was pleased to say that he would issue another notification extending the time, so that the period not covered by this Act may still be covered by the notification under the Ordinance. The only fear is whether the present provision in the Bill carries that into effect, if we say from the ‘ commencement ’ of the Act. If we say ‘ from the passing of this Act ’, the period between the date of the Ordinance and the date of passing of this Act will be covered, and there will be no fear about it. And that is the reason for moving this amendment, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I am afraid the Leader of the Opposition has not understood Mr. Ramamurthi’s amendment. The Leader of the Opposition and I and all the Members of the Committee agreed that the present provision here as it stands covers all the cases which the Leader of the Opposition has in mind, as he explained just now. But Mr. Ramamurthi wants to go further. He says that not only should there be an opportunity for those who did not apply, to apply again and not only should there be discretion left to the Conciliation Officer to find out whether there was sufficient cause for not applying within the limited time or up till now—he might have good cause for not applying even till to-day—but he says ‘ leave no discretion to the Conciliation Officer, and allow anyone to apply within thirty days after the Act is passed—i.e., in December or January next ’. Therefore, it is not as if Mr. Ramamurthi’s amendment arises out of any doubt in the language of the provision in the Bill; he wants to extend the provision to those who deliberately remained without applying so far, so that they may apply hereafter. It is a substantially large amendment which he wants and it would be altogether impossible to consider or even dispose of properly. Here is a case where people had to apply within thirty days. Supposing by some magic the Ordinance had been complete law by itself. All those who had to apply must

27th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

insist upon a court-fee stamp being affixed because they feel that only if a court-fee stamp is affixed their case will be properly looked into. Apart from that, it follows the general principle of requiring court-fee for petitions.

(i) in sub-clause (3), omit the words "shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee" occurring after the words "commencement of this Act."

“ With regard to the second amendment, I wish to remind the hon. Member that it will have the effect of defeating the very object he has in view. According to the provision as reported upon by the Select Committee, there is more time than that allowed originally for putting in the applications and the hon. Member wants to restrict the period. Further the amendment would be infructuous because the period of ninety days would have already lapsed. Therefore, I oppose the amendments.”

* **SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH** :—“ అద్యక్ష రైతులంతా court-fee stamp దాఖలే కోరుతున్నారని మంత్రిగారు సెలవిచ్చారు. మంత్రిగారి భావములో రైతులు శ్రీ ఎవరో నాకు అర్థం కావడంలేదు. వారి భావములో ఉన్నటువంటి రైతులు స్వతహా నేదవ్వము చేస్తూ 24 గంటలు ఘామిపైనే కష్టపడుతూ ఉండేటటువంటి రైతు రెవరూ కూడ అవిధంగా కోరడం లేదు. వారివద్ద పైకెక్కుతా లేదు. మనదే లేనప్పుడు ప్లాంపుడ్యూటీ వేస్తామని (stamp) వారు అంటున్నారని మంత్రిగారు సెలవిస్తున్నారంటే అది వాస్తవిక శరిస్థితికి విరుద్ధమైనటువంటిది. అంతేకాకుండా ప్లిజర్ (application) పెట్టుకోవడానికి 30 రోజులే గడువు ఇస్తున్నారంటే బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యమే పోయిందని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ గడువును 90 రోజులకు పొడిగించితేనే రైతులకు సరియైనటువంటి న్యాయము కలుగుతుంది రైతులు దువురాని వారు. వారి గ్రామాలకు మనం చేస్తున్న చట్టాలు చేరే మార్గాలు లేవు. అంటున్నామని 90 రోజులు గడువు యిస్తేనే గానీ, వారు తమ హక్కులను కాపాడుకోలేరు. గనుక ప్రభుత్వము వారు యీ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let me make it clear to the House that I am going to put both the amendments to the vote of the House. I will read the amendments. The question is—

(i) In sub-clause (3), omit the words "shall bear a court-fee stamp of one rupee" occurring after the words "commencement of this Act".

(ii) In the proviso in sub-clause (3), for the word " thirty " substitute the word " ninety ".

The amendments were lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a printer's devil in the amendment that I gave notice of and it has been circulated to the House like that. I, therefore, move—

'In sub-clause (4), omit the condition (i) and re-number condition (ii) as condition (i).'

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know why hon. Members wish that no court-fee stamps should be required. It is based upon the principle on which court-fee stamps are generally required on applications and petitions. Further, I know many cases where villagers who, even in cases where no court-fee stamps are required,

My amendment, Sir, relates to the payment of arrears of rent. The arrears of rent have accrued because the tenants were not able to pay but under this provision, to be restored to the occupation of their lands, they have to pay arrears. I submit that this is a very reasonable amendment because the tenants had not

[Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan] [27th November 1952]

been in a position to pay and to ask them to pay now would be difficult. I submit that it is reasonable that the Government should cancel arrears of rent and I request the House to accept the amendment."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment. Unless the tenant pays the arrears of rent, he cannot regain possession of the land. That will amount as a matter of fact to imposing a condition upon the tenant for his being restored to the right of tilling the land. If the land-owner has got any claim for the arrears of rent, there is always, according to the Chief Minister's intention, resort to courts. There are the courts in which he can file a suit. I submit that when once the claim of the tenant is to be decided by the Conciliation Officer, this matter should not be taken into account because the Conciliation Officer is not a judicial officer and there is every danger of his arbitrarily deciding these things. Most land-owners will put up the plea that the tenants owe them money and many false allegations will be made. As such, this clause should be omitted."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a subterfugeous amendment. This will defeat the very object with which those clauses have been put in and so, I cannot find my way to accept the amendment."

1-10 p.m. SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" I do not understand what the Hon. Minister means by saying 'subterfuge'. I have given notice of another amendment in respect of sub-clause (6) of clause 6 which will fit in with this amendment and it is quite suitable. Therefore, I am not withdrawing my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (4), omit the condition (i) and re-number the condition (ii) as condition (i).'

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" Sir, I move—

'In sub-clause (6), for the words "so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent", substitute the words "so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded".'

This is a corollary to my previous amendment I moved in respect of sub-clause (4) of clause 6. There is no need for me to explain my amendment."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

'In sub-clause (6), for the words "so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent", substitute the words "so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded".'

27th November 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I have nothing more to add to what I have already said."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (6), for the words "so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent", substitute the words "so as to annul the payment of rent required and any payment made by the tenant before passing of this Act be refunded".'

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" I move—

'Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6).'

Sir, tenants are forced to pay arrears of rent and it is only just that they are refunded if already collected. That is the object of my amendment."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" I second the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

'Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6).'

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'Delete the proviso to sub-clause (6).'

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'Clause 6 as amended do stand part of the Bill.'

The motion was carried.

Clause 7.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the amendment that stands in my name—

'Omit sub-clause (a) and re-letter the other sub-clauses.'

MR. SPEAKER :—" If this amendment is lost, then Mr. Ramamurthi cannot move his amendment, as it is on the same lines as the present one."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" In the Joint Select Committee some hon. Members including myself and Mr. Viswanatham wanted that the Government should not encroach upon the freedom and the right of cultivating tenant to grow whatever crops he likes. The expression 'cultivating tenant' ordinarily means in Telugu 'kapu'. 'Kapu' means producer. Therefore it is natural and highly necessary that the producer should have the right to determine which crop he has to raise on the land. The landlord who is at a far distance cannot have and should not have the right to determine the crops that should be raised. It is the cultivator who knows what crop he

[Sri P. Pundarikakshacharyulu] [27th November 1952]

has to raise according to the seasonal conditions and raises the suitable crop at the right time. Therefore I humbly request the Government to accept my amendment."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఇది చాలా ప్రధానమైన విషయం. క్లాజ్, ఏ పంటను, ఏ పొలములో ఎంత వేయాలి అని ఎవరు నిర్ణయించాలి అనేవిషయం సమస్య ఉన్నది. ఎవరైతే పొలాన్ని గుత్తకుగాని, కాలుకుగాని తీసుకొంటారో, వారే ఫలానా పంటవేయాలి అని నిర్ణయించుకుంటే చాలా ప్రధానమైన విషయం. ఒక భూస్వామికి ఒక నూరో లేక మున్నూరు ఎకరాలలో ఉంటే, ఆ భూస్వామి తనకు కావలసిన పంట వివిధ రకాల పంటను వివిధ tenants చే పండించుటకు ప్రయత్నం చేస్తాడు. ఈ ప్రయత్నములో ఇది tenants కు లాభకరము కాదా అనేవిషయం విషయము ఆ భూస్వామి అలోచించడు. తనకు వద్దు కావలసినదే కొంత మంది tenants ను కొంత భాగము పొలములో వరి పంట వేయమని చెప్పుతాడు. తనకు వేరుకాక కావలసియుంటే, అది పండించడానికి, మరి కొంత మంది tenants ను నియమిస్తాడు. ఇంకా ఏదైనా పండించవలసినదే, వాటికి ఇంకా కొంత మందిని నియమిస్తాడు. భూస్వామి ఇటువంటి ప్రయత్నము చేసేటప్పుడు, ఆ tenants కు ఆయా పంటలవల్ల లాభము ఉన్నదా లేదా అనేవిషయం విషయము నిర్ణయించుకోవడానికి తగినటువంటి అవకాశము లేకుండాపోతుంది. అందుచేతనే ఈనాడు మనము tenants యొక్క హక్కులను కాపాడే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో ఈ బిల్లును తీసుకొనివస్తున్న పందర్బంబో ఇట్లు పంట పండించే హక్కును tenants కు ఇవ్వకుండా, land-holders కు ఇవ్వడమంటే ఇది ఏ రీతిగా tenants యొక్క హక్కులను రక్షించేటటువంటి బిల్లు అని అనిపించుకొను ప్రభుత్వము గమనించవలసియున్నది. సాధారణముగ, land lords అంటే, నాబోటివారే ఉంటారు. నాకు కొన్ని ఎకరాల భూమి గ్రామంలో ఉన్నాయి. కాని నేను ముక్రము ఎప్పుడు దేశమంతా తిరుగుతూంటాను. అయినా, నేనుకూడా ఒక land lord నే అనుపించుకొంటున్నాను. నా భూమిని సాగు చేసే పండించుటకు ఎవరికో వచ్చుచెప్పడం తప్ప మరేమీ అలోచించుటలేదు. ఆ రీతిగానే మిగతా land lords కూడా చాలా మంది ఉంటారు. అందుచేత భూమి తనది అన్నంత మాత్రంచేత, ఆ భూమిమీద లాభము రావాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో తనకు కావలసిన పంటను పండించమని tenants ను కోరుతాడేగాని ఆ పంట tenants కు ఉపయోగపడుతుందా, అది వారికి లాభదాయకముకాదా అనేవిషయం దృష్టి భూస్వామికి ఉండదు. అందుచేత ఈ పంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కును tenants కు ఇచ్చినప్పుడే, వారు అప్పటి మార్కెటుయొక్క ధరలనుబట్టి, తనకున్నటువంటి డబ్బునుబట్టి, తాను పెట్టుకోగలిగినటువంటి పెట్టుబడినిబట్టి, దానినుండివచ్చే ఆదాయాన్నిబట్టి ఆయా పంటలను పండించడానికి ఏమి ఉంటుంది. Tenants ను కాపాడవలసినట్లు, ఈ హక్కు వారికి వ్యవసాయ ఆవసరము ఎంతైన ఉన్నది. కనుక, ఈనాడు మనము tenants రక్షణార్థము ఈ బిల్లును తెస్తున్నామంటే కనీసము ఈ హక్కునా tenants కు ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. ఇది ప్రభుత్వము తప్పకుండా గుర్తించి తీరుతుందని నేను ఆశిస్తున్నాను. అలా గుర్తించకపోయినట్లయితే, ఈ బిల్లు భూస్వాములకొరకే, వారి హక్కులను రక్షించేదానికే తీసుకొని వచ్చినదవుతుందిగాని, tenants యొక్క రక్షణకు ఏమాత్రముకాదు. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రధాన మంత్రి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు గుర్తించవలసిన నేను కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Now, the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi can speak on his amendment."

27th November 1952]

* **SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—**"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given notice of the following amendment :—

"Omit sub-clause (a) and re-letter sub-clauses (b) to (g) as (a) to (f)."

It will be seen that this sub-clause was not in the original Bill and it has been incorporated by the Government themselves. Now, what is the purpose of bringing this amendment. Is it generally the practice in any part of our country or in any part of this State that when once a tenant takes a land on lease (Interruption) any kind of lease, *varam* lease or 'kuthagai' or cash 'kuthagai'—that the landlord should say that the tenant should grow such and such a crop on his land? It is not the practice in the Tanjore district; it is not the practice in the Coimbatore district; and it is not the practice in any other district whatsoever. Of course, customs are there. Usages from time immemorial have been there. If a landlord lets out a land on which it has been customary to grow, say for example, cotton, the tenant also grows cotton on it and if later on at a particular stage the tenant finds that it is of advantage not only to himself but also to all concerned to grow some other crop, then he will grow that crop. Therefore, fundamentally, the question as to what exactly is the kind of crop that is got to be grown thereon is decided by the tenant himself. This has been the practice from time immemorial. Now, to-day, that practice is sought to be put an end to and it is left to the landlord, by virtue of the fact that he happens to own the land, to dictate to the tenant as to what exactly is the kind of crop that should be grown on it.

"Sir, there is a fundamental distinction between the landlord and the capitalist and what is that distinction? The capitalist who owns a factory does everything connected with the running of the factory. He engages labour. He purchases the labour power of workers. He purchases all the implements that are necessary. He purchases raw materials and he conducts the operation with the help of the labour power of workers. Now the landlord does not stand in relation to his land in the same way as the capitalist stands in relation to his factory. Because the landlord does nothing beyond receiving rent in the shape of cash or grain. This has been the practice from time immemorial. As a matter of fact it is laid down in this Bill that the landlord has not to bear all the expenses of cultivation. He has also not to bear the entire cost of manuring; and he has not to bear the cost of seeds. So he does nothing beyond receiving the rent. Now, if Government really want to go behind this specific relationship of landlord and tenant, which has been existing for the last so many years, if they want to abolish this system of landlordism and put the landlord in the position of the capitalist or entrepreneurs, I can understand it. But, is that what they are doing in this Bill? No. Therefore, I say, if we have in this Bill the clause of the Government, it will throw the way open to the landlord to evict the tenant. For, if the landlord says to the tenant that he should raise a particular

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

crop on the land and if the tenant says that it will not be profitable to him, then, that becomes a ground for the landlord to evict the tenant. Why should we think that the landlord has more interest in production than the tenant. The other day, the Hon. Chief Minister was saying that for hundreds and thousands of years this system of landlordism has been going on, and all the same we have been having increased production. Sir, I submit this system of landlord and tenant has not been in existence for hundreds and thousands of years. It is a peculiar system born of the ryotwari system introduced by Lord Cornwallis introduced in this Presidency. It is then that land for the first time became a field for investment of money. From that time onwards we are having that system of land tenure, for the last 150 years and more under British rule. Thus along with that ryotwari system is born landlordism. Therefore to say that landlordism has been in existence from time immemorial is not correct. Can anybody say that more food has been produced and more land has been brought under cultivation under the present system of landlord and tenant? I can prove with facts and figures that it has not. In fact food production has been falling because of the fact that landlordism has been in existence for the last so many years. I am sure the Hon. Chief Minister cannot contradict me. Therefore, I ask, why should we entrust the landlord with more powers than the tenant? For hundreds of years the tenant has been choosing the particular kind of crop to be grown in the land. Now, if we give the landlord the right to determine the kind of crop to be raised on the land, what will happen is as follows. Here is a landlord who wants to get rid of the tenant. So he will dictate to him and say, 'grow cotton on my land.' But the tenant will say that it is unprofitable to him and he will therefore say, 'I can't do it.' Now this itself becomes a ground for eviction. Therefore the clause gives a loophole to the landlord to defeat the very object of this Bill. Here is a Bill which seeks to give protection to the tenants and pannaiyals, but that very object is defeated by the retention of sub-clause (d). Therefore I say the amendment moved by my hon. Friend must be accepted and the new amendment incorporated by Government in the Joint Select Committee stage has no relation whatsoever to the custom and practice obtaining in the country."

*SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR;—“ இந்தத் திருத்தத்தின் மூலம் சில விஷயங்களைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். சென்ற காலத்திலிருந்து எந்த மிராசுதாரும் நிலத்தில் இந்த பயிர்தான் போடவேண்டும் என்று இதுவரையிலும் தீர்மானிக்கவில்லை. குத்தகைக்காரர்கள்தான் அந்தந்த பிரதேசங்களில் அந்தந்த காலங்களுக்குத் தக்கவாறு பயிரிட்டு வந்தார்கள். எந்த சமயத்தில் எந்த பயிர் போடவேண்டும் என்பது அவர்களுக்குத்தான் தெரியும். அப்படித்தான் இதுவரையிலும் அவர்கள் போட்டு வந்தார்கள். மிராசுதார்கள் வரி வசூலிப்பதுதான் தங்களுடைய வேலையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தார்களே தவிர இந்தப் பயிர்தான் போடவேண்டும் என்று குறிப்பிடுவது இல்லை. எந்தப் பயிர் செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதில் பெரும்பாலான மிராசுதார்கள் கவனம் செலுத்துவதே கிடையாது. ஆனால் இப்பொழுது அதைப்பற்றிக் குறிப்பிட்டிருப்பது ரொம்பவும் ஆபத்தானது என்பதைக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். காரணம், 'கூறு தவரினால் கப்பையிர்

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Venkatesa Sholagar]

யேறுது' என்பதையொப்ப காலத்திற்குத் தக்கபடிதான் பயிர்களைப் போட வேண்டும். மிராசுதார்கள் ஊரில் இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். சில சமயங்களில் அவர்கள் வெளியூர்களுக்குப் போயிருப்பார்கள். சில மிராசுதார்கள் வெளியூரிலேயே இருப்பார்கள். அவர்களைக்கேட்டுக்கொண்டதான் பயிரிடவேண்டும் என்றிருந்தால் அதனால் காலதாமதம் ஏற்படலாம். தண்ணீர் வருவது 10, 15 நாட்கள் பிந்தி வரலாம் அல்லது முந்தி வரலாம். அப்பொழுது அவர்கள் ஊரில் இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டும், அவர்களை ஷிடம் கையெழுத்துவாங்கிக்கொண்டும் தான் பயிரிடவேண்டும் என்றிருந்தால் அதற்குள் காலம் தவிரிவிடும். அதனால் சாகுபடியாளர்களை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றுவதற்கு சௌகர்யமாக இருக்கும். சம்பா போடு என்றேன். வெள்ளை சம்பா எனப் போட்டாய் என்று கூறி நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்ற சௌகர்யமாக இருக்கும். இந்த மாதிரி ஏதாவது சாக்குப்போக்குச் சொல்லி விவசாயிகளை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றுவார்கள். இப்படி 'வேண்டாத பெண்டாட்டியின் கால் பட்டால்' குற்றம் கைபட்டால் குற்றம் என்பதைப்போல் ஏதாவது ஒரு காரணத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்ற சௌகர்யமாக இருக்கும். அதனால் நிரந்தரமாக வாழ வழி இருக்காது. மிராசுதார்கள் கரும்பு, வாழை, மஞ்சள் போன்றவைகள் போடவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லலாம். அதற்கு விவசாயிடம் மூலதனம் இருக்காது. அதனால் அளர்களால் அவைகளைப் போடமுடியாவிட்டால் இவர்களை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றிவிடுவார்கள். இதை ஒரு காரணமாகக் கொண்டு அவர்களுக்கு பாதகம் விளைவிக்கலாம். அதற்கு நான் என்ன சொல்லுகிறேன் என்றால் நிலத்தில் எந்தந்த சமயத்தில் என்னென்ன சாகுபடி செய்யவேண்டும் என்ற உரிமை சாகுபடியாளர்களுக்குத்தான் இருக்க வேண்டும். அந்தந்த காலத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு, அந்தந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு, அந்தந்த பருவத்துக்குத் தக்கவாறு பயிரிட சாகுபடியாளர்களுக்கு தான் நிச்சயமாக உரிமை இருக்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுதுதான் உணவு உற்பத்திக்கு குந்தகம் ஏற்படாமல் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயம் செய்யமுடியும் என்பதைக் கூறிக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இல்லையேல் சாகுபடிக்கு குந்தகம் ஏற்படும் என்பதைத் தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு நான் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

*THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose this amendment, and in opposing it, I have good reasons behind me. There is no difficulty as far as leases in which the exact terms, as so much kalams of paddy to be given, are specified. It is only in cases of varam where the exact amount of grain is not mentioned the difficulty will come. With regard to that, generally, in that district, where the soil of the land is fit for paddy alone being cultivated and where paddy is being cultivated there will be no difficulty. And even in other areas where some other grain will be cultivated, there will not be difficulty, because, all these years the thing was going on with the co-operation of the landowner and the tenant. So I do not see what or how difficulty will arise by having the sub-clause as it is. I should say, more than the tenant, it is the landowner who will be in a better position to decide what grain would be suitable for cultivation and all that. I do not know why so much should be said by the other side in favour of the tenant, that he should have the option to decide the crop to be raised, except that there should be some other motive behind their move. Beyond that I do not see any other motive. If I accept the amendment, it will be like facilitating the tenant of my house to use the bed room as kitchen room and the drawing room as some other room. (Laughter.) So I cannot accept the amendment."

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ Sir, as pointed out by Mr. Ramamurti it is a very dangerous sub-clause we have; for, it will serve as a ground for the landlord to evict the tenant. Further it also encroaches upon the custom and usage from time immemorial which enables the cultivating tenant to decide the suitable crop to be raised. Suppose the landlord wants to raise a rich and commercial crop like sugarcane and the tenant may not be in a position to raise it; then, the landlord has got under this sub-clause an excuse to evict the tenant. Therefore I once more request the Government to accept the amendment to omit the sub-clause.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Sir, I have nothing to say more than what I have already said.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ Omit sub-clause (a) and reletter the other sub-clauses.’ ”

The amendment was lost.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

Clause 7—cont.

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ శ్రీమంతులు,

‘ At the end of sub-clause (a) insert the following :—

“ When a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and the land owner the Conciliation Board’s order will be final.”

అనే నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ తీసుకురావడంయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యం విమిటంలే ఈ చిట్ట గురించి ఇంతకుముందు చొక్కమారు చర్చ జరిగిన తరువాత, ఇదివరకు లేనటువంటి ఈ కొత్త క్లాజును ఇప్పుడు తీసుకువచ్చారని భవవడిపోయింది. దానిని మరల తీసేయడం జరుగదుకదా. కనీసము వంటను నిర్ణయించుకొనేటటువంటి హక్కు వైస్ landholders కి కాకుండా tenants కు ఇవ్వడమనేది చాల ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిది. ముఖ్యంగా కొలదారుకే ఈ హక్కు ఇవ్వవలెనని అనుకొంటాను. ఈ సందర్భంలో ఒక విషయము ఆలోచించవలసియిస్తుంది. భూమిని rent కు ఇస్తున్నారా, లేక కొలుకు ఇస్తున్నారా అనేదాన్నిబట్టి వంట ఎవరు నిర్ణయించాలనేదాన్ని చరిష్కరించవలసియిస్తుంది. భూమిని కూలికి రేయించేటట్లయితే, అందులో వంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు భూస్వామికి చెందుతుంది. లేకుండా భూమిని కొలుకు ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఆ వంటను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు కొలదారుకే ఉండవలసియిస్తుంది. ఇప్పుడు ఈ హక్కును కొలదారుకు లేకుండా, భూస్వామికి ఇచ్చారు. ఈ హక్కు భూస్వామికి ఇవ్వడంవల్ల, ఈ వంట నిర్ణయం విషయంలో తన ఆధికారాన్నే ప్రధానంగా భావించుకొని, కొలదారుయొక్క సలహాగాని, అతని స్థితిగతులగాని గుర్తించడు. ముఖ్యముగా భూమి కొలుకు ఇచ్చినపుడు, ఈ వంటను నిర్ణయించేటటువంటి హక్కు ఆ రైతుకే అనగా కొలదారుకే అవుతుందిగాని భూస్వామికి మాత్రముకాదు. కనుక ముఖ్యమంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు ఈ విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించి, ఇప్పుడు ఈ హక్కు కొలదారుకు ఇచ్చేందుకు ఒప్పుకోలేదుకదా, పోని, ఈ రెండు వర్గాలకు సత్తు

27th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

తంగా న్యాయంగా నిర్ణయం ఇచ్చేందుకు conciliation board వైస్ ఈ ఆధికారాన్ని ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, కొలదారుకు ఎక్కువ అన్యాయము జరుగకుండా ఉండేందుకు ఏలంబుంది. కనీసము tenant కు ఈ అనుకూలమైనను కలుగజేయవలసిందని కోరుతూ ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ I second the amendment.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, while supporting the amendment which has been moved by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, I wish to point out at the outset that this Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is a Bill which is mainly intended for the tenants as well as the pannaiyals. It must be very clear to the House as well as to the people of the State that this Bill is not being brought forward to protect the interests of the landowners. Such being the case, if power under a provision like the one which has been passed in the morning is put into the hands of the landowner, I feel it will be a dangerous thing. The determination of the crop is mainly left to the landlord. I know that in practice as long as there is cordial relationship existing between the landowner and the tenant, or the cultivating tenant and the pannaiyal, the determination of the crop can be conveniently decided by the landowners. But, in cases where a dispute arises between the landowner and the tenant, we are in for trouble and we are purchasing the same in large quantities. A landowner who has got the wilful intention of victimising his tenant can use this provision to his advantage and demand of the tenant that a crop which is impracticable of being grown on the land be raised. Crops which are beyond reasonable possibilities of human effort may be asked to be grown on the land in the event of an amendment like this being lost. In the morning I was suggesting to the Hon. the Chief Minister that in cases where the crop to be grown is decided by mutual consultation between the landowner and the tenant, there will be an end to this and that in regard to cases where they do not agree upon the kind of crop to be grown, the decision may be left to the Conciliation Board. It is the usual practice and it has also been my experience that the tenant goes to the landlord before the seedling season and tells him the kind of crop which he, the tenant, will be raising. Sometimes, he also takes the advice of the landowner but, if a landowner wants to tease the tenant or wants to evict him from cultivating his land he can use this provision which is dictatorial in character and highly mandatory. I would therefore request the House to consider this amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah dispassionately and not as one emanating from the Opposition. We have no other prejudices in trying to force the Government to accept this amendment. The intention or the motive that is actuating us is that production should not be stopped or curtailed. In the preamble it is made very clear that this Bill has been brought forward to maintain cordial relationship between landlord and tenant in the Tanjore district. If that is the intention, the framers of the Bill must take

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [27th November 1952]

care to see that they do not help in increasing the misunderstandings between landlord and tenant and that they do not come in for more trouble from the tenants. "Thank you, Sir."

*** Sri PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—**“అధ్యక్షా, నేను 3-10 p.m. ఈ సభరణను వివరిస్తున్నాను. దీనిలో ఉన్న విషయము ఆతి స్వల్పముగా కనిపిస్తున్నప్పటికీ చాలా ముఖ్యమైందిగా తీసుకోవలసియున్నది. ఎందువల్లనంటే, ఏ రక్తమైన పంట వేయాలి అని నిర్ణయించే హక్కు ఇప్పుడు మిరాశీదారుకు అంటే భూస్వామికి వదలిపెట్టబడినది. దీని ప్రకారము మిరాశీదారు నిర్ణయించుకుంటే పంటను tenant వేయకపోయినట్లైతే, మిరాశీదారు ఆప్పుడు ఏమి చేస్తాడు, tenant ను భూమినుంచి వెళ్లగొట్టడానికి ఆవకాశమున్నదా, లేదా అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని అలోచించవలసియున్నది. భూస్వామి నిర్ణయించుకుంటే పంటను tenant వేయకపోతే ఏమిదమై పంటపంటి చర్య తీసుకోవాలి, ఏమి జరగాలి అనేదాన్ని గురించి దీనిలో ఏమీ లేదు ఇటువంటి సంఘటన జరిగిందంటే అవగా భూస్వామి నిర్ణయించిన పంటను tenant వేయకపోయినప్పుడు, దానికి పరిష్కార మార్గము ఈ బిల్లులో లేకుండా ఉండడము హాస్యాస్పదంగా ఉంటుంది. ఇటువంటి సందర్భములో భూస్వామి ఒకవేళ దీనిని కోర్టుకు తీసుకొని వెళ్లినట్లైతే, సర్వసాధారణంగా అక్కడ కాలదార్లకు వ్యతిరేకమైన తీర్పు రావడం జరుగుతుంది. అందువల్ల మిరాశీదార్లకు, కాలదార్లకు ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు, అభిప్రాయ భేదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు వీటిని పరిష్కరించే అధికారాన్ని Conciliation Board కైనా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, కొంతవరకు గాకపోయినా కొంతవరకైనా న్యాయమైన పరిష్కారం జరిగేందుకు అవకాశముంటుంది. ఈ విషయాన్ని నేరత్తు కమిటీలోనే చెప్పాము. కనుక నేను ఇప్పుడు గింగతా మొంట్ల, కంతా విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను—ఇటువంటి తగాదాలేమీ లేకుండా ఉండవలసినది మీ ఉద్దేశ్యమైతే మీరు తప్పకుండా ఈ సభరణను అంగీకరించాలి, లేకపోతే ముందుకు తగాదాలు వచ్చినప్పుడు ఇవన్నీ కమ్యూనిష్టులవల్ల వచ్చినవి, ఈ రీతిగా వచ్చినాయి, ఆ రీతిగా వచ్చినాయి అని చెప్పుటకు అవకాశము కలిగిస్తారు. కనుక ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు, ఆలోచనలు పని లేకుండా ఉండడానికిగాను ఈ సభరణ చాలా అవసరమైనది. ముఖ్యంగా పలానా పంట వేయాలి అనే నిర్ణయాన్ని ఎప్పుడైతే భూస్వామికి వదలి చేస్తారో, అప్పుడు తప్పని సరిగా భూస్వామి నిర్ణయించిన పంటను కావాలి వేయకపోతే ఏమి జరుగుతుంది అనేది నిర్ణయము చేయవలసియున్నది. దీనికొరకు ఇక ముందైన మరల దీనికి amendment తీసుకొని రావలసిన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడుతుంది. నిజంగా ఈ బిల్లును తీసుకురావడములోని ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరాలంటే, కాలదార్లకు రక్షణ ఉండాలి అన్నట్లయితే, కనీసము ఈ సభరణను అయినా అంగీకరించాలి. లేకపోయినట్లయితే, మీరనుకొన్నది ఒకటైతే ప్రతిఫలము మరొకటి అవుతుంది. కనుక ఇవన్నీ దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ఈ సభరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

*** Sri M. NARAYANASWAMI :—**“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులోని ఈ క్లాజు చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటిది. ఎందుకనగా ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రములో అన్ని జిల్లాలోను, ఎక్కడ చూచినప్పటికీ, కాలదార్ల అవగా రైతులే పంటలు వేస్తున్నారు. వారే ఈ పంటలను నిర్ణయించి అప్రకారము చేస్తున్నారు. వారికి ఈ హక్కు ఉన్నది. ఎందువల్లననగా, ఏ పంట ఏ season లో వేస్తే, ఎక్కువ లాభదాయకము అనేటటువంటి విషయము భూమి దున్నే రైతులే తెలుసును. వీరి ఇతర ఉద్యోగాలలోను, లేక వ్యాపారములోను నిమగ్నులై ఉండే భూస్వాములకు ఏ season లో ఏ పంట వేయాలి అనేటటువంటి విషయాలు, ఆ పంటలయొక్క సూతము

27th November 1952] [Sri M. Narayanaswami]

తెలియదు. ఒకవేళ, దీని ప్రకారము భూస్వామికి పంట నిర్ణయించే హక్కు ఇచ్చినట్లైతే, అప్పుడు పలానా పంట వేయాలనుకొన్నప్పుడు, ఆ పంటను కావలసిన నారు దొరుకుతుందా, లేదా, ఆ విత్తనాలు ఎక్కడ దొరుకునో, అవి దొరుకునో లేదో అనే విషయాలు భూస్వాములకు తెలియవు. అందుచేత వారు నిర్ణయించిన పంటను ఆనుకూల పరిస్థితులు లేనప్పుడు, ఆ పంట వేయక పోవడం జరుగుతుంది. అప్పుడు భూములు వృథాగా వదలి పెట్టబడి, పంట లేకుండా నష్టము సంభవిస్తుంది.

“రెండవది, ఈనాడు ఎక్కడైనాగాని ఈ పంటను నిర్ణయించేమువంటి హక్కులను గురించి, భూస్వాములను, రైతులను ఘర్షణల, తగాదాల ఉన్నాయా అంటే ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు చాలావరకు లేవనే చెప్పాలి. ఎందుకనగా అన్నిచోట్లను రైతే ఈ హక్కు గలిగి యున్నాడు. ఇది సాంప్రదాయంగా వచ్చియుంటుంది. దీనిని భూస్వాములుమాడా అంగీకరిస్తున్నారు. అంటున్నప్పుడు దీనిని తేలికతనై రైతులకు ఉన్నటువంటి హక్కును ఈ బిల్లుమూలకంగా భూస్వామికి ఇస్తున్నారు. ఈ బిల్లు విషయముగురించి కొంతమంది కాంగ్రెసు మిత్రులు మాట్లాడుతూ ఇది భూస్వాముల రక్షణ బిల్లు కాదని నాదించారు. కాని ఈ క్లాజును తీసుకురావడంబట్టి ఇది భూస్వాముల రక్షణ బిల్లేనని నిరూపించుటకు ఇంతకంటే వేరే రుజువు అవసరము లేదు. భూస్వాముల రక్షణ బిల్లేనని నిరూపించుటకు ఇంతకంటే వేరే రుజువు అవసరము లేదు. భూస్వాముల రక్షణ కొరకే మీరు ఈ క్లాజును సాంఘికపరచారని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ఈనాడు ఏటాంటి తర్జనభర్జన లేకుండా సాంప్రదాయంగా గ్రామాలలో రైతులు కలిగి యున్నటువంటి ఈ హక్కును వారికి లేకుండా, భూస్వాములకు ఇస్తున్నారంటే, ఈ బిల్లు ఎవరి రక్షణకై తీసుకొని రాబడిందో గ్రహించుకోవచ్చును. న్యాయంగా ఈ హక్కును రైతులకే ఇవ్వవలసి యున్నది. కాని ఇప్పుడు అది కావలసిన్నారగాదా, పోనీ రెండు పక్షాలు కలిసి, భూకామందులు రైతులు కలిసి నిర్ణయించుకొనేందుకైనా అవకాశ మివ్వాలి. ఈ విషయములో రెండు పక్షాలు అంగీకరించడం చాలా సబబుగా ఉంటుంది. ఈనాడు చాలామంది భూకామందులు ఇక్కడ హుస్సని ఉన్నారు. ఉంటుంది. ఈనాడు చాలామంది భూకామందులు ఇక్కడ హుస్సని ఉన్నారు. వీరికి ఈ హక్కు యిచ్చినచో వీరు అధికారహోత్స్వతి చేయగలరేమో చెప్పగలరా? వ్యవసాయము చేయకపోయినప్పటికీ భూకామందులుగా ఉన్నారు. వీరికి, ఎప్పుడు ఏ పంట వేయాలో, ఏ నాడు వేయాలో ఏ విత్తనాలు వేయాలో. కనుక ఏ ఎరువు వేస్తే అధిక పంట వస్తుంది అనేటటువంటి విషయాలు తెలియవు. కనుక స్వయముగా వ్యవసాయము చేస్తున్నటువంటి రైతులకే ఇవన్నీ తెలుసును కనుక వారికి ఈ హక్కు ఉండుట న్యాయము. అవిధంగానే అంగీకరించాలి. పోనీ కనీసము ఈ రెండు పక్షాలైనా ఈ విషయములో స్థానముండేటట్లయినా చేయవలసి యున్నది. అప్పుడు రైతుకు చాలా అన్యాయము జరుగుతుండా ఉంటుంది, పంట కూడా చాలా పండేందుకు ఏలుగా ఉంటుంది. కనుక ఇరు పక్షాలకు అంగీకారముండే టటువంటి ఈ సలహానైనా అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను.”

Sri S. VEMIAH :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this essential and most important amendment because the landowners usually do not know which crop is to be grown on a particular kind of land and the tenants who are the actual cultivators know it much better. Therefore, if this most important amendment is not properly considered, accepted and made part of the Bill, the entire spirit behind this legislation would be lost. Instead of helping the tenants it may go to help the landlords. My submission is that the Government should accept this very small but essential amendment and, with this, I resume my seat.”

[27th November 1952]

* SRI M. KUNE RAO :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ సవరణను బలపరచుట ఒక ప్రధాన మైతలువంటి విషయాన్ని నేను చెప్పదలచుకొన్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా కాలుదారు యొక్క స్థితి చూచినట్లయితే, కంటే గనుక తగ్గినట్లయితే భూస్వామి ఆ కాలు దారును తొలగించవచ్చు అని మరొకచోట ఈ బిల్లులో చెప్పబడియున్నది. అటువంటి పుడు, ఈ రోజు గనుక కంటేవేనే నిర్ణయము భూస్వాముల చేతులలోనే ఉన్నట్లయితే కాలుదారుని తన చేతులలో భ్రమకొనూలే భూస్వామికి ఇది గొప్ప అవకాశముగా విర్వచుతుంది. విలాగైనా చిక్కులు తీసుకొనివచ్చి కాలుదారును తొలగించే ఉద్దేశ ముతో తాను ఫలానా పంటవేయవలెనని నిర్ణయించినపుడు, అటువంటి సరియైన విత్తనాలు వేయకపోయినపుడు అటువంటి సరియైన కాలమాన పరిస్థితులు అనుకూ లంగా లేకున్నపుడు ఆ పంట సరిగాపండదు. ఎప్పుడైతే అవిధంగా కంటే తగ్గి పోతుంటే, ఆ కారణాన్ని సాకుగాపెట్టుకొని కాలుదారును భూస్వామి తొలగించవచ్చును. కనుక ఖచ్చితంగా కంటేను నిర్ణయించే హక్కు కాలుదారుకి ఉండాలి. సేపక్షంలో కనీసము, వీరుత్రురి మధ్య బేదాభిప్రాయాలు వచ్చినపుడు, దీనిని పరిష్కరించే అధికారము conciliation board కైనా యినే కాలుదారుకు ఎక్కువగా అన్యాయము జరుగదు. కనుక ఈ విధంగా చేయవలసినదని కోరుతూ, ఈ సవరణను బలపరచు న్నాను.”

3-20 p.m. * THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad to note the growing faith in the conciliation agency. I wish this feeling had been exhibited in the earlier stages of the discussion of the Bill. I submit that this amendment is not necessary because there is ample provision made in clause 13 for dealing with such matters. Clause 13 (1) states :

“ . . . any dispute between a landowner and a cultivating tenant or between either of them and a pannaiyal, including any matter which affects their mutual harmonious relationship in the cultivation of land, or any question which may arise as to the terms of a tenancy or the payment or non-payment of any rent or wages shall, on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.”

So there is no necessity for any amendment. I oppose the amendment of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.”

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, వినియోగ ముక్తిగారు ఒక క్లాజును ఇప్పుడు వదిలి వినిపించారు. కాని నేను ఏ point అయితే సవరణలో తీసుక వచ్చాకో ఆ point తప్ప సక్రమంగా అందులో ఉంది. నేను ఈ సవరణలో తీసుకువచ్చినటువంటి విషయము వారు వదిలివేటువంటి క్లాజుకింద పరిష్కారము చేసుకోవచ్చునన్నారు. అది ఎట్లు సాధ్యమో నాకు అర్థముకావడం లేదు. అసలు, భూమిలో ఏ పంటవేయడమనేదాన్ని నిర్ణయించే హక్కునుగురించి ఈ sub-clause (a) లో the landowner shall be entitled to determine the crop or crops which shall be grown on the land అని విశదముగా యున్నది. అయితే ఈ విషయములో tenant కు landowner కు అభిప్రాయ భేదముగాని, తగాదాగాని వచ్చినపుడు ఏమిచేయాలో తెలియదు. దీన్ని ఎట్లు పరిష్కరిస్తారో తెప్పలేదు. ముక్తిగారు 13 వ క్లాజు వదులుతూ

“ including any matter which affects their mutual harmonious relationship in the cultivation of land, or any question which may arise as to the terms of a tenancy or the payment or non-payment of any rent or wages shall on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.”

27th November 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

ఈ విధంగా Conciliation Officer కు సర్వాధికారము ఇవ్వబడిందని అంటున్నారు. అయితే నేను చెప్పేటటువంటి point ఇందులో లేదు. ముక్తిగారు గనుక ఈ point అందులో ఉందని చూపించి నన్ను convince చేస్తే చాలు. నాకు కావలసింది అసలు ఆ point గాని నా సవరణ సైగ్గుతుందా పోతుందా అనేదికాదు. దానిలో నా amendment యొక్క point లేదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. కనుక నా amendment ను బలపరచునూ press చేస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Mr. Speaker Sir, I know, under the Rules, I will not be allowed to speak. As Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah expressed his views in Telugu language many hon. Members may not have understood his views. The point which we are trying to put before the House is this. The Hon. Minister has drawn our attention to clause 13”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ We have understood what Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah had said.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ I only want all Members of the House to understand the views expressed by Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am not going to allow the hon. Member to speak. It is a wrong procedure. If the hon. Member wants to translate the speech of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, I will allow it.”

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ I am translating his speech. The Hon. Minister has drawn our attention to clause 13 (1) which states :

“ . . . any dispute between a landowner and a cultivating tenant or between either of them and a pannaiyal, . . . shall, on application by any party, be decided by the Conciliation Officer.”

This provision does not include the point which we want to be included in sub-clause (a) of clause 7, namely, that ‘ when a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and landowner the Conciliation Board’s order will be final.’ (clause 13 (1) includes every other difference of opinion between the landlord and tenant except the difference of opinion which would arise over the crop to be grown. That is the point which we wish to stress.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member Sri Vinayakam said that he would only translate, but I am afraid he did not translate. Sri Vinayakam should understand that clause 13 is so wide that it includes every dispute. If we put in a particular dispute, it will exclude other disputes. As it is clause 13 includes every dispute.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

“ At the end of sub-clause (a) insert the following :—

“ When a dispute arises about the crop to be grown between the tenant and the landowner the Conciliation Board’s order will be final.””

The amendment was lost.

[27th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ I beg to move—

- (i) Insert in the beginning of sub-clause (b) the words “ Subject to clause (c) below ” and change initial capital letter of “ The ” to small type.
- (ii) In sub-clause (c), third line, for the word “ including ” substitute the word “ and ”.
- (iii) In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, for the word “ lower ” substitute the word “ Other ”.

These amendments, I submit, are only for correcting drafting errors and are of a consequential nature.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me make the amendments quite clear. The hon. Members will see, reading sub-clauses (b) and (c), that it is not correct to divide them into separate clauses because sub-clause (c) cuts into sub-clause (b). Therefore the words “ Subject to clause (c) below ” are introduced in the beginning of sub-clause (b).

“ We have provided that the tenant shall be responsible for all labour and expenses of cultivation. We have also provided for manuring expenses to be divided. Therefore in sub-clause (c), third line, the word “ and ” has been proposed instead of the word “ including ” because groundnut cake is not an artificial manure.

“ In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, the word “ lower ” is not correct. It should be “ other proportion ”. Therefore the word “ other ” has been proposed instead of the word “ lower ”.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The question is—

- (i) Insert in the beginning of sub-clause (b) the words “ Subject to clause (c) below ”, and change initial capital letter of “ The ” to small type.
- (ii) In sub-clause (c) third line, for the word “ including ” substitute the word “ and ”.
- (iii) In sub-clause (c), in the seventh line, for the word “ lower ” substitute the word “ other ”.

The amendment was carried.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ I beg to move—

“ To sub-clause (c) of clause 7, add the following proviso:—

“ Provided that the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilizers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made only at the time of sharing the crop or payment of rent as the case may be.”

“ In the amendments that have been accepted by the Government, the principle has been accepted that if the entire cost of chemical fertilizers and other artificial manures and groundnut

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

cakes is to be borne by the tenant, it may not be possible for him, in the existing circumstances, to find the wherewithal to advance the cost of manures and therefore it was decided that the cost of fertilizers and other artificial manures and groundnut cake should be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the gross produce is divided between them. Having made that provision, there must be some provision by means of which the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilizers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made at the time of sharing the crop. The tenant's portion of the cost of manuring can be recovered from him by the landowner after the harvest is over. The amendment is suggested only with a view to see that manuring is actually done. If this amendment is not accepted, what would happen? The landowner may not have any responsibility whatsoever in meeting the entire cost of manuring. Of course the Government may say that it will be to the interest of the landowner to advance the money to the tenant for manuring. If it is said that the tenant must be able to find the money for his share, he may not be able to do so and the total production may go down.

“ Therefore, Sir, it looks very reasonable and in fact, it is reasonable that the landowner must be told to advance money for manuring, unless the Government themselves are prepared to advance money for the purpose to the tenant by way of takkavi loans and especially when the Government themselves do not want to ask the landowner to advance money to the tenant, we want the Government to advance takkavi loans. When we do not give the tenant even occupancy rights, how can he be given takkavi loans under the existing law unless the landlord stands guarantee for it? Therefore the Government should see to it that the tenant gets the wherewithal to advance money for the purpose of manuring the field. Some provision should be made for it. I therefore commend my amendment for the acceptance of the Government.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ అధ్యక్ష నేను ఈ (amendment) ను విలక్షణంగా ప్రభుత్వమువారిని దీనిని తప్పకుండా ఆమోదించమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఇది చాలా చిన్న (amendment) మరియు ఇది అవసరమైనది. ఇది లేకపోయినట్లయితే ఆయా పంటలకు తగిన (manure) వేయడం మొదలగు వాటికి చాలా ఖర్చు అవుతుంది. కనుక పంటలు భాగా పండాలుంటే ముఖ్యముగా ఈ (amendment) ను ఆమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ I am very glad that this amendment has been proposed—not that I accept it. I am very glad because it proves to the hilt the necessity for the landowner to co-operate with the tenant and all these claims that the landowner is a nobody, he is not interested in the land and he is a blackguard, fall to the ground. This shows clearly that at the present moment the tenants do depend upon the landowner and that is admitted by the Opposition. But that is not the point here.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

Sub-clause (c) entirely covers the ground. This amendment only wants to throw the burden on the landlord as creditor for lending money to the tenant. I submit this is quite unnecessary and we cannot go on laying down a compulsory condition for borrowing and lending. The obligations have been settled on the main provision and let us leave things to agreement and mutual understanding. As observed by Mr. Ramamurthi himself many people give loans and there is no reason why the tenant should be compulsorily made a debtor to the landowner. He may be an independent man; he may borrow from his neighbour or anybody else. We are here only to lay down obligations of the landowner and the tenants. As to how they could get accommodation from one another is not a thing which, I submit, should be introduced into this Bill.

"Secondly, if we put down the necessity of the landlord lending money, disputes will arise as to whether the fertilizer is at all necessary, or whether it is put on the land or not. So, all these issues will come in and complicate the situation. I wish to submit for the consideration of the Opposition, a political reason. This sharing of the cost of manure was not an obligation in the original Ordinance as it was issued or in the Bill as published. When the Joint Select Committee discussed the proposals, mirasdars and landowners met and wanted this thing to be done, namely, that the landowner should bear a share of the cost of manure. It was gracious on the part of the landowners to offer to bear a part of the cost of manure. As I said, it was not in the original Bill and the Government accepted the Landowners Association's proposal. Why should we spoil that grace by saying that a duty has been cast upon the landowner to lend money for manure? I think we had better leave it where it was. The landowners have come forward to bear the burden and we have put that burden on them."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"On a point of information, Sir. The Hon. Chief Minister was telling us that the landowner will advance such amount of cash as is necessary to purchase fertilizers or chemical manure."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"When did I say so?"

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"We presume that for the purchase of manure it is the landowner that will come to the aid of the tenant. In such a case, while collecting back the cost of manure will the landowner include the interest also for the money he has advanced for the purpose?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"God forbid."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, the reason why I am not able to accept the explanation of the Hon. Chief Minister is that he has got a tremendous faith in the landowner and he has got considerable distrust as far as the peasants are concerned. Unfortunately I do not share his view. I say that he has got a tremendous

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

amount of distrust as far as the tenants are concerned. I shall come to that later. It is said that somebody said that it is the landowner that has the responsibility of manuring and if it is put entirely as the responsibility of the tenant, then he cannot properly manure the land because he may not have the money to do that. That is taken to be the resolution of all the landowners . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is not somebody. They met in a conference over which Mr. Bhashyam presided and it is he that pressed for it."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Mr. Bhashyam might have pressed for it at the Select Committee . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"When I said you are putting a burden on the landowner, he said that it was their solid resolution at the conference and it was on their behalf he said it."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Then my position becomes simpler. Here are the landowners who according to the Chief Minister are anxious to see to it that they advance money. Then what difficulty is there in providing for it legally?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Your neighbour has pointed out the difficulty."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Probably because interest will be demanded. If the landowners are so very generous and have come forward of their own accord to share a part of the manuring charges, I ask, what difficulty is there in providing for the advance of the entire portion of the cost of manure by the landowner in a legal manner?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"As I have explained, why do you spoil the grace?"

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Merely because the landowners passed a resolution, is it to be thought that all the landowners are going to stick to it? A number of them do not have that view. I may tell the Hon. Chief Minister that he may have that faith in the landowners and I know that by and by his faith in them will get thoroughly disillusioned. If he looks at the problem in an objective way, he will disabuse himself of the trust which he reposes in the landowners. The fact is there that some association or somebody proposed something and he accepted it. Therefore, Sir, I would like to press my amendment because this does not entail any new responsibility but it is a responsibility which they themselves have accepted. Therefore take them by their word and make them responsible under law that they should contribute towards the cost of manuring."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, I think, this amendment is not desirable because as things stand

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [27th November 1952]

the landowners and the tenant know when to manure and the tenant is prepared to manure the land. That is customary. If you allow it to be postponed to a later stage, the tenant will spend away all the money and he will find it difficult to pay it and it will lead to a lot of litigation and it will also spoil the good relationship that exists between the landowner and the tenant. So, I cannot accept the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

To sub-clause (c) of clause 7, add the following proviso:—

"Provided that the entire cost of the artificial manures and chemical fertilizers shall initially be borne by the landowner and the division of the costs shall be made only at the time of sharing the crop or payment of rent as the case may be."

The amendment was lost.

Sub-clause (f).

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, namely:—

'Omit sub-clause (f).'

"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులో సబ్-క్లాజ్ (f) కింద భూస్వామి 5 సంవత్సరముల కాలము తరువాత కాలు ఒడంబడికను రద్దు చేసేదానికి అతనికి అధికార మివ్వబడినది. ఈలాగు భూస్వామికి అధికార మివ్వబడడమంటే రైతును నష్టము పాలు చేయడంతప్ప ఇంకొకటికాదు. సర్వదా భూమి తన ఆధీనములో ఉండి నప్పుడే రైతు ఆ భూమికి ఎక్కువ నేత తిసి కావలసిన ఎరువు వేసి దానిని విజ్ఞవర పోషిస్తాడు. తద్వారా ఆ భూమి సక్రమంగాను, హెచ్చుగాను పండ దానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. కాని భూస్వామికి ఈ ఒడంబడిక కాలాన్ని తగ్గించడా నికాని, ఆపుదలచేసేదానికిగాని అధికారమివ్వబడితే, రైతుకు అన్యాయం జరుగుతుంది. ఆ భూమికి తగిన ఎరువు వేయడానికి అవకాశములేకుండాపోతుంది. సరిగా పండడానికి వీలుండదు. అందువల్ల అధికాశరోత్పత్తిని దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని చూసినప్పుడేకాదు రైతుకు భూమిపై యిట్టి హక్కు వుండాలి. ఇటువంటి అధికారాన్ని భూస్వామికి ఇవ్వకూడదు. భూస్వామికి కావలసినదంతా భూమి సాగుచేయ బడుతున్నచో తనకు అందులో సరియైన భాగము వస్తున్నచో అనేగాని యితర విషయాలలో అతనికి జోక్యం వుండరాదు. రైతుల (tenants) ను తమ ఇష్టప్రకారం తొలగించేందుకు అధికారముండకూడదు. కనుక యీ సవరణను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

3-40
p.m.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I second the amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I am, afraid the hon. Member is seconding the amendment without understanding the implication. Omission of sub-clause (f) is the same as the proposal to make the tenancy automatically permanent. When that proposal was lost, this amendment has no place. Omission of sub-clause (f) means omission of even notice."

27th November 1952]

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు ఇంకా చట్టము కాలేదు. కాబట్టి, చివరనైనా దీనిని త్రోసివేసే అవకాశమున్నది. కనుక ముందుగా ఒక క్లాజ్ (clause) పాస్ అయినదని అందుకు విగుప్తముగావున్న నా సవరణను తీసికోరాదని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పడం సరిఅయినటువంటిదిగాదని నా అభిప్రాయము."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'Omit sub-clause (f).'

The amendment was lost.

* SRI K. RANGA RAO:—"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణ ప్రతిపాదించుచున్నాను—

'For the existing sub-clause (f) substitute the following:—

"The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of land unless otherwise decided by Court of law."

"ఈ బిల్లును తెచ్చిపెట్టినటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యం విమిటంటే, అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి పాతేరులను భూస్వాములు తీసివేస్తున్నారని, అటువంటిప్పుడు భూస్వాములకు కాలదార్లకు ఏ విషయములోనైనా తగాదా వచ్చినప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లు ప్రకారం 5 సంవత్సరముల తరువాత కాలదారును తొలగించే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో భూస్వామి కాలదారుకు ఒక సంవత్సరం ముందుగానే గడువు ఇస్తూ తప్పకుండా తొలగించవచ్చు. అటువంటిప్పుడు కాలదారు భూమినుంచి తొలగించబడి నిస్సహాయతతో ఉండుట జరుగుతుంది. అలాంటిప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లు కాలదారుకు రక్షణ ఇచ్చేటువంటిదని ఏ విధంగా అనిపించుకొంటుందో అలాచింతవలసియున్నది. భూస్వామికి ఇటువంటి అధికార మివ్వడంలో ఈ బిల్లు కేవలము భూస్వాముల రక్షణకొరకే తీసుకొని రాబడినదవుతుంది. కనుక కాలదారుకు నిజమైన రక్షణ కలుగాలంటే, 5 సంవత్సరముల తరువాత కాలదారును తొలగించే అధికారము భూస్వామికి ఇవ్వకుండా, ఈ అధికారాన్ని కోర్టుకే ఇవ్వవలసిందని కోరుతూ, ఈ సవరణను అంగీకరించవలసిన మనవి చేస్తున్నాను."

SRI S. VEMIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment for the following reason. If a notice of eviction at the end of the fifth year is served on the tenant at the end of the fourth year, the tenant will not apply sufficient manure to the land or will neglect cultivation in the fifth year itself. This will lead to lowering of production. If there is any deficiency in production, the Court will decide and if it finds that it is due to the negligence of the tenant, it will pass orders evicting him from the land. To avoid lowering of production, it is better to accept this amendment which proposes that the tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the land unless otherwise decided by a court of law."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, this amendment refers to a matter which has already been disposed of in a different form. This touches the question of permanency of tenure as it says that, unless a court of law decides otherwise, the tenant shall continue in possession of the land. Since this matter has already been disposed of, I oppose the amendment."

[27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ For the existing sub-clause (f), substitute the following :—

“ The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of land, unless otherwise decided by court of law.”

The amendment was lost.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

‘ Substitute the following for sub-clause (f) :—

“ The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands as tenant for a fresh period of ten years, subject to the terms and conditions under this Act or to such other terms and conditions not being less favourable to the tenant as may be duly agreed upon between the landowner and the tenant, provided the tenant gives six months’ notice in writing before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy.”

“ Under sub-clause (f) as it stands, the landowner is entitled to terminate the tenancy at the end of the fifth year by giving notice to the tenant at the end of the fourth year. After the fifth year, the tenant cannot claim any right whatsoever. That is the existing position. My amendment makes it obligatory for the landlord to continue to keep the tenant, unless the tenant chooses to quit by giving six months’ notice. My amendment is quite different from the other amendments moved earlier for giving either permanency or ten or fifteen years security of tenure to the tenant. They did not give the option of termination of tenancy to the tenant. But my amendment gives the option to the tenant to terminate the tenancy by giving six months’ notice at the end of four and a half years.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ After ten years, should he continue as a tenant or not? ”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Whether after ten years he should continue as a tenant or as a owner of the land, the history of this country will decide, and the tenant himself will decide. In a real democracy, the tenants will decide as to who should become the owner of the land. We need not bother about it now.

“ While opposing the principle of giving further security of tenure to the tenants yesterday, the Hon. Chief Minister said that we could not do it. He did not say that it was a bad thing to create certain interests as far as tenants were concerned. Creation of those interests is a very desirable thing. Nonetheless the creation of those interests is dependent on the sweet will and pleasure of the landowner. If a tenant serves his master well for four years and the master thinks that it is to his advantage to continue the tenant, the master will continue to keep him and not get rid of him. That seemed to be the line of argument that the Hon. Chief Minister

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

adopted yesterday. I do not want to-day to enter into the question of human relations. Certainly human relations are very sacred. We cannot talk of human relations in the abstract. Human relations have a particular meaning in a particular context. There is the human relation between the slave-owner and the slave! We cannot say that the human relation between the slave and the slave-owner is the same as that between two friends or that between father and son. It is entirely different. Co-operation and human relation get meaning only when they are used in the context of two parties who are in a position to co-operate. The parties must be equal in position. Equality of status must be there. That is the pre-requisite for co-operation. To-day a particular relationship is sought to be brought about between the landlord and the tenant. Even the relationship between the husband and the wife has not been the same from time immemorial—from the time of the Bhagavad Gita. We know the particular relationship that existed between Draupadi and her five husbands. There was the domination of man over woman, and, therefore, Sita was exiled. (Interruption.) Sita was exiled because she was suspected. What is the use of talking about these relations? What is the relationship to-day which we are interested in? Do we want that kind of relationship between the husband and the wife where the husband dominates the wife or do we want that relationship that exists between two parties who are equals? Sub-clause (f) says that at the end of five years the landowner can do anything he likes with the tenant. If this sort of relationship should exist between the tenant and the landlord, I submit that it certainly will not benefit the tenant in spite of all that was talked about. The tenant should have that relationship which alone would lead to co-operation. We talk of co-operation. I would like to ask what sort of co-operation we mean. Are the tenants and landlords engaged in a joint enterprise? Are they working together? I say that they are not engaged in any joint enterprise. As far as the landlord is concerned, he is only interested in receiving his rent. (Interruption.) The landlord’s interest is only to receive rent and he does nothing else. That is the situation. To talk of co-operation in these circumstances is meaningless. We must create an interest in the tenant which alone will ensure his utmost interest in the land. I frankly say that under the existing sub-clause, we cannot expect the tenant to give his utmost attention to the production of crops. There will be lot of disputes, and the tenant will not be sure that at the end of five years he will continue to be on the land. Let us also not deceive ourselves that the landlord will not understand the implications of this sub-clause. The more we discuss it here, the more the landlord will take it into his head to give notice to the tenant of the termination of the tenancy. Let us not imagine that the landlords do not know the position as to when they should give the notice of termination of the tenancy. To give this right to the landlord is a dangerous thing. We have to see that the landlord is not given this right. But the tenant must have the right at the end of five years to give notice to the landowner of the termination of the

3 50
p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

tenancy if he does not want to continue on the land. This alone will give security of tenure to the tenant. I want the Government to accept this amendment, and see that food production is increased."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I second the amendment, and in doing so, I wish to reiterate that the aim of the Bill is to give protection to the tenants. We want to protect the interests of the tenant by giving him discretionary powers to terminate the tenancy instead of giving the right to the landlord to terminate the tenancy. In all cases where notices are to be given, it is the landlord that is given the power to take the initiative, whereas the tenant is left to himself. Here we wish to give more power to the tenant. If the tenant wants to terminate the tenancy, let him give six months' notice at the expiry of the period."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, as a young student I have read the story of Jason and the Dragon. There, if one warrior was killed another warrior rose up. Here, substantially the same matter is in all the amendments. Though one amendment is disposed of, the same matter is raised in some shape or form in another amendment. I oppose the amendment."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, it is a reflection upon the Chair to say that the matter has been disposed of and that it is raised in another amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would just say that the reply of the Hon. Minister is really a reflection on the decision of the Chair. I made it clear that this amendment was quite different. It does not ask for permanent occupancy rights. It says that the tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands for a fresh period of ten years, provided he gives six months' notice before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy. It is not the same as the previous amendments. So, I press my amendment."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of information, Sir, మాచిక్క వేయకానికి తెలుగు చానె తెలుసు. Tamil మాచిక్క వేయకానికి తెలుగు చానె తెలుసుకుంటారు."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Obviously he does not want information. Otherwise he would not speak in Telugu."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"Bombay Tenancy Act క్రింద 10 సంవత్సరముల వరకు tenancy right ఉన్నదనే విషయాన్ని మాచిక్కవేయకానికి జ్ఞాపకం చేస్తూ, దానికి వారు ఏమీ సమాధానమిస్తారని అడుగుతున్నాను. Amendment ను press చేయడానికి ముందు వారి సమాధానము తెలుసుకోవాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Unfortunately, Sir, I do not understand the hon. Member's present Telugu." (Laughter.)

27th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

Substitute the following for sub-clause (f), namely:—

"The tenant shall be entitled to be in possession of the lands as tenant for a fresh period of ten years, subject to the terms and conditions under this Act or to such other terms and conditions not being less favourable to the tenant as may be duly agreed upon between the landowner and the tenant, provided the tenant gives six months' notice in writing before the expiry of the last year of the tenancy."

The amendment was lost.

Clause 7 as amended was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will now take up clause 8. Many hon. Members have given notice of amendments to sub-clause (1). I will allow the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan to move his amendment. Other hon. Members will then speak on the amendment."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"శాసనసభకు ప్రతిపక్షము."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member read his amendment to clause 7."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO:—"The amendments are—

(i) Omit sub-clause (a).

(ii) At the end of sub-clause (c) add the following, namely:—

"And the tenant at his discretion determines the quantity and the kind of chemical fertilizers to be used on the land"

(iii) In sub-clause (d) after the words "water rate", insert the words "land revenue surcharge and any other charges payable to the Government on such land".

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, clause 7 has been passed. If the hon. Member wanted to move his amendments to clause 7, he should have brought them to the notice of the Chair earlier. Now that clause 7 has been passed, we cannot re-open it and again discuss it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I gave sufficient time to the House to move amendments. The hon. Member did not move the amendments when I gave time. We are now on clause 8."

Clause 8.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan 4 p.m. will move his amendment."

* SRI K. P. GOPALAN:—"Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name:—

"In sub-clause (1) for the word 'two-fifths' substitute the word 'two-thirds'."

[Sri K. P. Gopalan] [27th November 1952]

"Sir, clause 8 (1) reads as follows:—

'Where the produce is to be shared between the tenant and the landowner, the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths (or such higher proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the gross produce.'

Here I want to substitute the word 'two-thirds' for the word 'two-fifths'. I want to submit that my amendment is a very reasonable one. According to my amendment, the tenant will get two-thirds of the gross produce and the mirasdar or jenmi will get one-third. Out of his share, the tenant will have to incur expenditure on seed, manuring, planting, etc. The balance only will remain for his livelihood. In fixing the share of the yield, for the mirasdar and the peasant, we have to bear in mind that the tenant must get a living wage. The Government may say that we want to give something more to the tenant than what he actually gets now. That is not the basis on which we should consider this issue. On the other hand, we must see whether the share that the tenant will get, will enable him to lead a decent life. If we take that into consideration, we will concede that the tenant must get two-thirds of the gross produce.

"Another thing that I want to bring to the notice of this House is this. The Congress Government have been in office in this State before and after August 1947. They were in office even before the British people left this country. All along they have allowed the exploitation by the landlords and the payment of low wages to the peasants. The Congress Government created such a condition and because of that, the peasants have become paupers and are not able to make both ends meet. After creating all these conditions, the same Congress Government have brought forward a Bill in this form which does not give a living-wage to the peasants.

"I repeat that this amendment is a very reasonable one. Further, this is a test whether this Government stand on the side of the peasants or on the side of the landlords. I do not want to say anything more. I move my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Hon. Members Messrs. Kune Rao, Lakshminarayana Reddi, Rama Rao and Rajagopala Rao have given notice of similar amendments. They may speak on the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Gopalan. They need not move their amendments."

SRI M. KUNE RAO:—"ఇప్పుడు మీరు K. P. Gopalan గారి సవరణ, నా సవరణ, శ్రీ లక్ష్మీనారాయణ రెడ్డిగారి సవరణ అన్నీ ఒకటి అన్నారు. అది సరి కాదు. నా సవరణ వేరు. అందుచే ప్రత్యేకంగా నా సవరణను గురించి మాట్లాడాలి."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have allowed the hon. Member Sri Gopalan to move his amendment and he has moved it. Other hon. Members may speak on it."

27th November 1952]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, one amendment fixes the share of the produce between the tenant and the landowner in a certain proportion, namely, 2:1. There is also another amendment . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Of course, there is some difference between the amendment which has just now been moved and the other amendments. Instead of 'two-thirds', Sri Kune Rao wants 'eleven-twentieths'; and Sri Lakshminarayana Reddi wants 'three-fifths'. These are all minor changes."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, there is the amendment of my hon. Friend Sri Kandasami also."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I want to make a submission. One of the most important features of this legislation is the fixation of the share of the produce between the landowner and the tenant. Let us assume that the House does not agree to 66 per cent of the produce for the tenant. Then, we will try to know whether it agrees to 60 per cent or something less than that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the discussion proceed."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The discussion may proceed, Sir, but you will please put each amendment separately to the vote of the House. It is possible that the House may agree, if not to 66 per cent, at least to a smaller figure."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let us take up the amendment which gives the largest share to the tenant."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, the House may be unwilling to give 66 per cent of the produce to the tenant. But it may be willing to give 60 or 55 per cent or some lower figure. So, each amendment may be put separately to the vote of the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then, we should have a separate discussion on each amendment."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Not necessary, Sir. But please give us sufficient time to discuss the amendments, but put them separately to vote."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"All the amendments may be discussed together but they may be put to vote separately."

SRI S. VEMIAH:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan. It is a very important amendment. The chief aim is to safeguard the interests of the tenants by giving them a bit more of the produce. But it is very regrettable that, even while the Subrahmanyam Committee has conceded a larger share to the tenant, this Bill gives only two-fifths of the produce to the tenant, which is quite inadequate. According to this Bill, if a piece of land yields 20

[Sri S. Vemiah] [27th November 1952]

tooms, the tenant will get 8 tooms, whereas the landowner will get 12 tooms. This is the share that the tenant will get, for all his hard labour. Therefore, if we really want to protect these tenants, we must improve their economic condition, and this amendment tries to do it. I second the amendment and request the Government to accept it."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'In sub-clause (1), for the word "two-fifths", substitute the word "two-thirds".'

SRI M. KUNE RAO:—"Sir, నేను ఇప్పుడు ఉన్న కాలు రేటు భాగాన్ని నాలుగు-ఆరు భాగాలు అంటే కాలుదారునకు నాలుగు వంతులు, భాస్వామికి ఆరు వంతులు అనే రేటుకు ఒక సవరణ ఇచ్చాను. అదేమిటంటే కాలుదారునకు వడకొండు వంతులు, భాస్వామికి తొమ్మిది వంతులు రేటు యివ్వాలనే నా సవరణ. ఎందుచేతనంటే, ముఖ్యంగా కాలుదారు యీ కాని పరిస్థితులలో, ముఖ్యంగా మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో యీ కాలుదారు చేసే అంకితపట్టి వారికి రోజురోజుకు వారి జీవితము కృశించిపోతున్నప్పుడు సంగతి యీ గవర్నమెంటువారికి పూర్తిగా తెలిసియుండినను శ్రీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని విషయము పరిశీలించినట్లు లేదు. ఈ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ లోగడ కాంగ్రెసు గవర్నమెంటువారివల్ల విర్పరచబడ్డదే. అటువంటి కమిటీ చేసిన నివార్యముకాదా పాటించబడలేదు. ఆ నివార్యము త్రోసివేసి మన మంత్రివర్గమువారు ఆరు వంతులు భాస్వామికిని, నాలుగు వంతులు కాలుదారునకునూ యివ్వడమనేది సజబుగా లేదు. సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రాష్ట్రములో భిన్నమువంటి పరిస్థితులు అన్నియు గమనించి ఈ నివార్యము చేసియున్నారు. అట్లాంటివి త్రోసివేసి యీ నాటి పరిస్థితులను గమనించకుండా భాస్వామికి ఆరు వంతులు కాలుదారునకు నాలుగు వంతులు రేటు విధిచేయవలెనని. ఈ విషయములో ముఖ్యంగా యీ నాటి కాలుదారు స్థితిగతులనుబట్టి కనీసము వారికి ఏ విధమైన relief అనేది లేకుండా చేస్తున్నారు. అసలు మేము దున్నేవానికే భామి వుండాలని అంటున్నాము కాని యిప్పుడున్న ఈ ప్రభుత్వం అది ఆమోదించదు సరికదా. కనీసం సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ వేసిన రేటువైనా అంగీకరించమని కోరుతున్నాము గనుక యీ విషయాన్ని కాలుదారు పరిస్థితులను యీ మంత్రివర్గమువారు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని రేటు పెంచవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను అందుకూను నిజంగా యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము బిల్లును కాలుదారు రక్షణకొరకే తెచ్చియుండినయెడల, శ్రీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులో చేసిన నివార్యము గుర్తిస్తూ నా సవరణలో ప్రతిపాదించినటువంటి రేటు అనగా భాస్వామికి తొమ్మిది వంతులున్నా, కాలుదారు నకు వడకొండు వంతులున్నా యిచ్చేటట్టుగా, నేను చేసిన సవరణ ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆమోదించుతారని అశిస్తున్నాను.

"నేను సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను.—In sub-clause (1) for the word 'two-fifths', substitute the word 'eleven-twentieths' అనే."

4-10 P.M. * SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMY AYYANGAR:—"On a point of order, Sir. This point has already been decided under clause 7. Sub-clause (c) of clause 7 says that the cost of manure shall be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the same proportion as that in which the gross produce is divided between them,

27th November 1952] [Sri P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar]

that is to say, of three-fifths to two-fifths. Therefore we have taken it for granted that the produce should be divided between the landowner and the tenant in the proportion of three-fifths to two-fifths. If at all this amendment had to be considered, it should have been moved before sub-clause (c) of clause 7 was taken up for consideration. They have not done it and therefore they have impliedly consented to the division of the produce in the proportion already agreed upon under clause 7 (c). So this amendment is not in order and cannot be allowed to be moved."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I would not like such a harsh and technical view to be taken, Sir."

* SRI A. VENKATARAMA RAJU:—"అధ్యక్షా, శ్రీ మానే రాత్తగారు తినికొనివచ్చినటువంటి amendment ను నేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా యీ కాలుదారి వట్టుము తినుకొనివచ్చిన సందర్భములో మన మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో ఉన్న కాలుదారు పరిస్థితులు అన్నియుకాదా పరిశీలించకుండానే యీ విధమైన బిల్లు తీసుకు రాబడింది. మన కాంగ్రెసు మంత్రివర్గము ఈ కాలుదారు పరిస్థితులు గమనించినట్లు లేదు. మన రాష్ట్రములోని కాలుదారులొరకై విర్పరచబడిన సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీవారు రాష్ట్రములోని పరిస్థితులన్నియు గ్రహించి కొన్ని నివార్యము చేసారు. ఈ నాడు మన మంత్రివర్గమువారు ఆ రిపోర్టులోని నివార్యము అన్నియు తోసివేసినట్లు రూఢియగుచున్నది. అందుచేతనే ముఖ్యంగా యీ నాడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు కాలుదారుకు సహకరముగా లేని బిల్లును తెచ్చారు. ఈనాడు ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లా కాలుదారుకు యీ బిల్లును అన్వయపరచుటకు తెచ్చారని, ముందుముందు రాష్ట్రమునంతటికీ అన్వయపరచుటకు తెచ్చారని, ముందుముందు రాష్ట్రమునంతటికీ అన్వయపరచుటకు తెచ్చారని గోచరమగుచున్నది. ఈ బిల్లువల్ల పెద్ద విప్లవం తెస్తూందని జేయుదురని ప్రజలకు గోచరమగుచున్నది. ఈ బిల్లువల్ల పెద్ద విప్లవం తెస్తూందని భావించనప్పటికీ ఈ సవరణతోవస్తే నామమాత్రంగా అయినప్పటికీ కాలుదారుకు ఉపయోగపడగలదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని నివార్యము రాష్ట్రములోని కాలుదారుకు అనుగుణంగా ఉన్నవి. ఈ విషయము శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలిసియుండును. అటువంటివాటిని యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము త్రోసివేసి వేరు విధముగా యీ బిల్లు తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. కాని తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కాలుదారుకునూ యీ బిల్లు ఉపయోగపడదని వచ్చుచున్నాను. కాబట్టి వేద రైతాంగమునకు చెందిన కాలుదారుకు ఉపయోగపడేటటువంటి మానే రాత్తగారు తెచ్చిన సవరణను ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుతూ వారి సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను."

* SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణ in line 3 of sub-clause (1) for the words 'two-fifths' substitute the words 'three-fifths' అని తెచ్చియున్నాను. ఈ సవరణ నేను మన తంజావూరు కాలుదారు వట్టుము పరిశీలించుటకు, దానిని ప్యాను చేసేటప్పుడు ఆలోచించమని కోరుతున్నాను. అన్నిటికంటే భాస్వామికి అయిదింటి మూడు యివ్వడము చాలా అన్యాయము అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు Select Committee stage లో ప్రభుత్వమువారికి మజారిటి వున్నదనే ఉద్దేశ్యముతో యీ కాలుదారుకు అన్యాయము చేసేవద్దతనే Select Committee లో యీ హిసాబు రేటును ప్యానుచేసి యీ బిల్లు ఆ సభ యొక్క ఆమోదమునకు తెచ్చారు. నిజముగా కాలుదారుకు రక్షణ బిల్లును తెచ్చే బదులు ఒకటి బిల్లును కమిటీవారిచేత నివార్యము పొంది సభవారి ఆమోదమునకు యీ

[Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi] [27th November 1952]

నాడు బైటకు తెచ్చారు. ఈ విషయములో ఒక విషయము గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఈ దేశములో కష్టపడేసి నిజంగా కొలుదార్ల అయినప్పటికీ యీ బిల్లులోని కొలుదార్లకు వారికి వివిధంగాను అనుకూలముగా లేదు. తరతరాలుగా ఖామిని వాగుచేసి వంట పండించే యీ వేద రైతులకు అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నది. ఖామి మీద కష్టపడే రైతుకు ఉపయోగముగా నుండుటకు తెచ్చిన యీ బిల్లు నిజంగా వారికి ఉపయోగ పడాలంటే యీ నాటి కాంగ్రెసువారు ప్రగల్భాలు చెప్పుతూ వచ్చారే కాని, యీ కొలుదార్లకు పయోగమైన బిల్లును తీసుకురాలేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు చెప్పుతున్నట్లు అయిదంట రెండుభాగములు యీ కొలుదార్లకు వెండిలే, యీ కొలుదార్లను ఏ విధమైన గిట్టుబాటు అగునో గుర్తించాలి. ఈ విషయములో కొలుదార్లకు యీ రేటు చాలా నష్టదాయకముని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ప్రభుత్వ రేటు ప్రకారము ఖాస్వామికి అయి దింట మూడు భాగములు, కొలుదార్లకు అయిదంట రెండు భాగములు యివ్వడకు చాలా అన్యాయము. ఇందుకు బదులుగా సవరణలో కొలుదార్లకు అయిదంట మూడు భాగములు ఖాస్వామికి రెండు భాగములు యిస్తేనే న్యాయమని చెప్పుచూ యీ సవరణ తెచ్చారు. యీ సవరణ ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారు ఆమోదించారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయములో యీ కొలుదార్లకిచ్చే రేటు నిర్ణయము పునరాలోచన చెయ్యాలి. దేశములో agrarian troubles నిర్మూలించుటకు యిదే ప్రధానమైనటువంటి సూత్రము. ఇదివరలో గాంధీగారు కూడా agrarian troubles విషయములో గూడా కొలుదార్లకు మూడు భాగములు యివ్వాలని సలహా యిచ్చారు. వైసాలో సన్ యాన్ సెక్ తర్వాత పాక్ గేట్ పరిపాలకు వచ్చినప్పటి వరకీ, హిందూ దేశంలో గాంధీ మరణము తర్వాత వరకీ ఒకటే. ఖామిమీద పాటుపడే రైతుకు ఎక్కువ వెండజేయవలెనని నా అభిప్రాయము. ఇది చాలా న్యాయమైన పద్ధతి. ఇదివరలో జరిగిన మహారత్న కమిటీ రిపోర్టులోని సిఫార్సులుగూడా దీనికి భిన్నము కావని చెప్పుచున్నాను. కష్ట పడేవారికి ఎక్కువ హక్కు ఉండవలెనని మీరు సలహా యిచ్చారు. అట్లు యివ్వక పోతే దేశములో అల్లర్లు జరుగుచుండును. ఈ విషయములో ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఎంతో బాంధవ్యముగా యీ కొలుదార్లకు సహాయకారిగా ఉండేవారులే చేపలని అంటూ వచ్చారు. కాబట్టి ముఖ్యంగా యీ 3/5 భాగము కొలుదార్లకున్నా, 2/5 భాగము ఖాస్వామికిని యిస్తేనే దేశములో కొలుదార్లకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు సమైన రక్షణ యివ్వగలుగుతారు. ముఖ్యంగా రైతు వాగుపడాలంటే కొలుదార్లకు ఎక్కువ భాగము యివ్వాలని కోరుతూ సాసవరణను అంగీకరించమని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరు తున్నాను."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈనాడు జరుగుతూ ఉన్నటువంటి యీ చర్చల సందర్భములో ప్రధానమైన విషయాలనుగురించి వచ్చినప్పుడు మనము ముందు యీ చట్టము అసలు యీ కొలుదార్ల కొరత లేమీన చట్టము అథవా కాదా అనే విషయము చర్చించవలసియున్నది. నా ఉద్దేశ్యములో యీ యాక్టు కొలుదార్లకు ఉపయోగించు చట్టమని చెప్పినప్పుడు యిది కాన్యావరణకు సాధ్యపడుతూ కాదా అని ఆలోచించవలసియున్నది. అందుమీద మనము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలియజేయవలసివది ఇదొక ప్రధాన విషయము. మనరాష్ట్రములో యీనాటి పరిస్థితులనుబట్టి ముఖ్యంగా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలుదార్ల పరిస్థితి పరిశీలి చి, యీ యాక్టులోని అంశములు ఎంతవరకు వారికి అనుగుణముగా ఉన్నవో పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. ఇప్పటి వరకీ తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో కొలుదార్లకు యిచ్చే కొలు రేటుకు అనుగుణముగా యీ యాక్టు రాయాకు చేయబడలేదు. ఇంకాని కొలురేటు అంగీకారయోగ్యముగా చేయబడలేదు. ప్రభుత్వము తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు వర్తింపజేయుటకు తెచ్చిన యీ యాక్టు

27th November 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

అక్కడ భూస్వాములకు ఉపయోగపడేదిగా ఉన్నది. కొలు రేటు అసాధారణముగా కనెడుచున్నది. ఈ చట్టములోని కొలురేటు కొలుదార్లకు నష్టం కలగజేసేదిగా ఉన్నది. ఇది భూస్వాములకే ఎక్కువ ఉపయోగి చేసే చట్టము. ఈ చట్టములోని అంశములు అడుగడుగుకు కొలుదార్లను నష్ట పరచేదిగా ఉన్నది. కొలుదార్లకు రక్షణ అనేది యెచ్చటను కనెడుటలేదు. సుబ్రహ్మణ్య కమిటీ చేసిన సిఫార్సులను సరించియుండలేదు. ఈ చట్టములో ఒక చిక్క విషయము కనబడుచున్నది. ఒక పంట (crop) లోని భాగము ఖాస్వామికి ఉండెనను catch crop వచ్చినప్పుడు గూడా ఖాస్వామికి భాగము తప్పకుండా యిచ్చి తిరలి అనేటటువంటి ఒక clause పెట్టియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము యీ పద్ధతిని అనం 4-30 బింపడము ఖాస్వామికి సహాయపడటమని చెప్పాలి. అందువల్ల ఇండలో కొలుదార్లు P.M. నకు రక్షణ అనేది కన్పించడములేదు. అట్లు చేయడములో సుబ్రహ్మణ్య కమిటీ సిఫార్సులకు కూడ యీ ప్రభుత్వము నిరాకరించారని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ కొలుదారి విధానాన్ని పరిశీలించుటకు ఏర్పరచిన సుబ్రహ్మణ్యము కమిటీ కొలుదార్లకు యివ్వవలెనే కనీస కొలురేటుగూడా యీ ప్రభుత్వము త్రోసిపుచ్చి, మరింత తక్కువ రేటు యీ కొలుదార్లకు ఏర్పాటు చేస్తున్నది. అటువంటిప్పుడు యీ ప్రభుత్వము కొలుదార్ల కిచ్చే రక్షణ ఎక్కడ అని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఈనాడు సభ్యులు చేసినటువంటి amendments కనీసము ఒక్కటిగూడా యీ ప్రభుత్వము అంగీకరించడములేదు. యీ కాంగ్రెసు సభ్యులు యీ కొలుదార్లకు ఒకానొకప్పుడు elections జరిగేముందు యిచ్చిన వాగ్దానములు ఒక్కటిగూడా జరుగుటలేదు. అనాటి వాగ్దానములు, యీ సుబ్రహ్మణ్య కమిటీ సిఫార్సులు అంగీకరించకపోతే, యీనాటి కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వమును ప్రజలు విశ్వసింపరు. ఈనాడు యీ కొలుదార్లకు యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము కృత్రిమ చర్యలకు దిగింది. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వము పునరాలోచన చెయ్యవలసియున్నది. కొలుదార్ల కొరకు రక్షణచట్టము ఏర్పాటుచేస్తామని వాగ్దానములు చేసిన యీ కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము అనాడరవేయమైన స్వభావమును అవలంబించుచూ, మరో విధముగా భూస్వాములకు రక్షణయిచ్చు యాక్టును యీనాడు తెచ్చింది. ఈపద్ధతి నాగరిక ప్రభుత్వమునకు లక్షణముకాదు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు యీ చట్టము పునః పరిశీలించి, కొలుదార్లకు అంగీకారయోగ్యమైన చట్టము చేయుటకు తగినమార్పులు చేసి, వ్యాసు చేయగలందులకు కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clause is in fact the life-clause of the whole Bill. As such, one ought to know on what principle this Bill has been drafted. Broadly speaking, as the title of the Bill says, is this Bill intended to protect the rights of the tenants and pannaiyals? If it is so, what is the right that the Government are going to protect under this Bill? I am afraid we cannot protect the rights of the tenants without fixing a fair-rent. The rent that is fixed according to this Bill ...”

MR. SPEAKER :—“Let the hon. Member move the amendment and then speak on it so that it may be clear.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“Sir, I move the following amendment:—

“In sub-clause (1), for the words ‘the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths’, substitute the words ‘the tenant

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [27th November 1952]

shall be entitled to 55 per cent under first-class irrigation sources, 60 per cent under second-class irrigation sources and 60 per cent in all commercial crops whether raised on wet or dry lands."

The rent fixed under this clause is not at all a fair rent. It is intended only to maintain the *status quo*. Apart from the very advantageous position that is given through the Special Officers and the Revenue Courts to the landlords and thus making the whole affair a great source of never-ending litigation for the poor tenant, in this important issue of providing fair-rent for the tenant, the Bill is lacking very badly. If the intention of the Government is to protect the tenant and to secure for him a decent living condition, then they should at least look into their own archives and find out whether their own officers had at any time made any suggestions on this subject. I am not asking the Government to make any radical change in their attitude. What I am asking the Government is to gain by the experience of their own officers and find out if they have made any recommendations at all. There has been what is called the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, which has submitted its report. The Government have spent the tax-payers' money on this Committee. In the report of that Committee, certain proposals have been made. Why are this Government not accepting those proposals? After a good deal of deliberations in the Select Committee itself, the Government should have accepted the proposals that were brought before them. But they have not done so. If the Government take steps to protect the tenants at least on the basis of the recommendations of their own Officers, surely I would have agreed to it. The Government ought to have accepted and adopted those minimum proposals at least. I would like the hon. Members sitting on the opposite side and who belong to the ruling party, to realize this. As a matter of fact, this legislation is brought in order to convince the people that the Government that has come into power to-day is interested in the middle strata of peasantry. Without beating about the bush, I wish to state plainly that if this Government are really intent upon convincing the middle strata of peasantry, now here is a very nice chance and a very fair and good opportunity, to put it into practice. As I have already stated, there is no principle involved in the present clause. The only principle is to do propaganda that the Government stand for the rights of the tenants and pannaiyals. I may tell this House that mere propaganda cannot fill the stomachs of the poor people and at the earliest opportunity such propaganda will be smashed and washed out. So, here and now I am giving a little bit of warning to the Government. They should not make an eyewash of the whole thing. If they do so, there will be total failure. If they are really interested in convincing the tenants, they should take effective steps to fix fair rent. We have made certain very concrete suggestions through our amendments to the various clauses, but all of them have been turned down. But the present clause is the life-clause of the whole Bill. Hence, I hope that the

27th November 1952] [Sri C. V. K. Rao]

Government will exhibit their sweet reasonableness—I repeat that word again—by accepting this very reasonable amendment. With these words, I conclude my speech, Sir."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“అభ్యుదయ, నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరచుచున్నాను. ఈ యాక్టు ప్రకారమే ద్రావు కమిటీ, ప్రభుత్వం కమిటీ రిపోర్టుల ననుసరించి తయారు చేసిన యాక్టుగా కన్పించుటలేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు మేము తెచ్చిన amendments అయినను ఆమోదించారు అని నన్ను నమ్మించుచున్నారు. సుప్రభుత్వం రిపోర్టులలోని సిఫార్సులను యానాడు విర్వదిన కాంగ్రెసు న్నాము. సుప్రభుత్వం రిపోర్టులలోని సిఫార్సులను నమ్మగోరుచున్నాను. కానీ నేను చెప్పమంటే ప్రభుత్వము ఎందువల్ల అనుసరించలేదో చెప్పగోరుచున్నాను. కారణము చెప్పమంటే ఆ సిఫార్సులను త్రోసివేయడము మాత్రము జరుగుచున్నది. మంత్రివర్గము (Cabinet) ఆమోదించిన ఏదైనా రాజ్య కలిగియున్నటువంటి విధానము ననుసరించి అయినా సరే ఎవరైనా రాజ్య కలిగియున్నటువంటి విధానము అనుసమానము చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము యీ యాక్టు విషయములో అనుసరించే వ్యక్తి మంచిదికాదు. చార్జ్ discipline కొరకు వ్యక్తిని చేతమని చెప్పడం మంచిదికాదు. సుప్రభుత్వంగా రిపోర్టులలోని సలహాలు ఎట్లు ఉన్నవో విచారణ కూడ జరిగింది. అందువల్ల వాటిని స్వీకరించి దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను. అందుకని ప్రస్తుత బిల్లులోని కలిగియున్నట్టి రైతుకు ముఖ్యంగా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో రైతుల ఖామలనుండి తరిమివేయడం యీ బిల్లు వలన వచ్చింది. దీని తర్వాత ప్రభుత్వం పాటించాలిగాని ఉపన్యాసంవల్ల కూడా బాధ పడుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లు లాభకరము అవునా కాదా అని చూచుకుంటే కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో లాభం కనబడుతున్నది మరి కొన్ని ప్రాంతాలలో ప్రమాదం కనబడుతున్నది. ఇదికూడా దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని ఈ బిల్లు administrative reasons తో తెచ్చాము. 4-30 p.m. భవిష్యత్తుగా మాకు దీనిలో ఇంత లాభము వస్తుంది ఇంత రామ అనే వివరాలు తెచ్చావి. కనుక ప్రభుత్వము యీ కాలిదారి తప్పును అనిపించుకొనెడు తప్పును వి principle మీద, వి basis మీద తేలిచిందో చెప్పగోరుచున్నాను. సుప్రభుత్వం కమిటీవారు గాని, రాష్ట్ర వేదరావు కమిటీవారుగాని, కుమరప్ప కమిటీవారుగాని, ఎవరు చట్టనను యీ కాలిదారు రక్షణ పాలుపడి వారికి నిజంగా చేకూర్చవలసిన benefits వారు సేపార్చుచేశారు. ఏటలో వివిధముగూడ ఎత్తుకొనక, యీ రిపోర్టులను పీఠంగాచూచి, వీరి ఇంకా విధానము అమలులోనికి తెచ్చున్నారు. కనుక యీ విధంగా చేసేవిషయం ఈ కాలిదారులకు నష్టము కలిగించేవిషయం, అసలు యీ యాక్టు లేకుంటేనే మంచిది అని నేను ముఖ్యంగా ప్రభుత్వం పాటించాలిగాని విశ్వవించుకుంటున్నాను. అందు నిజం యీ విషయములన్నియు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని కనీసము సుప్రభుత్వం కమిటీ వారు చేసిన రిపోర్టు ప్రకారమైనను అమలుపరచుటకు వీలు కలిగించాలని ఆశిస్తూ ఈ amendment ను బలపరచుచున్నాను.”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“Sir, కాలు భాగం నిర్ణయించడములో ప్రభుత్వం చేసిన ప్రతిపాదన సమంజసముగా కన్పించడములేదు. మొదట, మొట్టమొదటి పంటలో మాత్రమే భూస్వామికి భాగము అంగీకరించిన ప్రభుత్వం తర్వాత సకరణలో భూస్వాములకు మరింత లాభాలు చేకూర్చుటానికి, catch crop లాగా నూదా, అంటే రెండో పంటలోనూ భాగము యివ్వడం అన్యాయం. అంతేకాదు, ఈ రెండూ వారికే గట్టిలోనూ భాగం యివ్వమంటోంది. ఇన్నింటిలోను భూస్వాములకు భాగం తెచ్చిన ప్రభుత్వం మొదటి పంటలో భూస్వామికి ప్రత్యేకించబడిన పంటను తగ్గింపడానికి ఏమీ సకరణ తెచ్చిందా అంటే, అదీలేదు. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వం రిపోర్టు వచ్చిన మార్పు భూస్వాములకి లాభకరమైనది. వాస్తవానికి ఈ విధానంవల్ల కాలు

[Sri K. Rajagopala Rao] [27th November 1952]

దానిని చాలా ప్రభుత్వ వాటిల్లుతుంది. ఎందువల్లననగా highly developed delta area లో ఇప్పుడు అమలులోనున్న కాలు రేట్లతో ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయిస్తున్న చాలును పొలిచూస్తే రెండు ఇంచుమించు ఒకే రకంగా ఉన్నట్టు కనబడుతోంది. ఉదాహరణకు యకరం ఒకటికి ఇరవై బస్తాలు వందే భూమికి పదిహేను బస్తాలు కాలు రేటు ఉన్నది. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వం నిర్ణయిస్తున్నటువంటి share ప్రకారం చూడవంతులు భూస్వాములూ, రెండు వంతులు కాలుదార్లకు నిర్ణయించినట్లయితే, catch crop లో గూడా భూస్వామికి భాగం యిస్తే, ఇప్పుడు అమలులోనున్న కాలు రేట్లు ప్రభుత్వం చట్టబద్ధంగా యిప్పించే కాలు రేట్లు యించుమించు ఒకటే అవుతున్నాయి. కాలు రేట్లను ఇలా హెచ్చుగా నిర్ణయించి ప్రభుత్వం ప్రస్తుతమున్న వాటిని legalise చేస్తున్నది తప్ప మరేమీకాదు. దీనివల్ల కాలుదారుకు ఎలాంటి benefit కనిపించడం లేదు. అందుకే కాలుదారుకు సహాయపడాలంటే సుబ్సిడీని కిమిటి సేపార్సులను బట్టి కాలుదారుకు 55% basis మీద కాలు రేటును నిర్ణయించాలి. అప్పుడే కాస్తన్నా కాలుదారుకు మేలు కలుగుతుంది. ఇలాంటి వ్యయమైన విధానాన్ని అంగీకరించక ప్రభుత్వం తన పట్టే పట్టుకు మార్పుంటే, చిల్లు లేవడంలాగే సదుద్దేశాన్ని కనిపించాలనే వస్తుంది. కాబట్టి కాలుదారుకు మొదటి పంటలో హెచ్చు పంతు ఉండేట్టుగానూ, రెండో పైసలో భూస్వామికి భాగం లేకుండానూ ఈ బిల్లును పరిశీలించి వ్యాసుచేయ గోరుచున్నాను.”

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Members opposite have been charging the Government and the Congress party of saying one thing and doing quite a different thing; of saying that they stand for the tillers of the soil and the poor people and doing something advantageous to the few rich people. I want to submit, Sir, that years before, the Congress party has said that its policy was that the tillers of the soil shall eventually be the owners of the land. There is however one essential difference in the method proposed by Members sitting on the opposite side and the Congress party. It is that we believe in bringing about Communism in a co-operative way and not by coercion and chaos. With this essential difference the Congress party is moving towards the objective, namely, bringing welfare to the tiller of the soil and not chaos and confusion.

“Again I say this Bill is only intended to meet a particular situation that had arisen in the Tanjore district and not intended to introduce major land reforms throughout the State. If it was an enactment intended to bring in major land reforms then I would have agreed with the statements made by the hon. Members that the shares were not enough and all that. In this Bill the Government have only tried to maintain the *status quo* and not to create a new situation. We must realize that if the Government were to stipulate a different share it would affect conditions in the other districts of the State or even in the whole country. Till such time Government bring in a comprehensive legislation for land reform, let us not worry them over this question. I repeat that this Bill has been brought before us to meet a particular situation that had developed in Tanjore district and till such time they bring forward a comprehensive legislation, it is necessary that they should not create confusion in the rest of the State.

[27th November 1952] [Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi]

“I have said this just to refute the statements made by hon. Members on the Opposite side that the intentions of the Congress party are not for the welfare of the people. I say our intentions are for the welfare of the people but with a difference in the ideology. With that ideology we are going forward to achieve the results which would be for the good of all people.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment that has been moved by my hon. Friend Sri C. V. K. Rao. The previous speaker, the hon. Member Sri Venkatasubba Reddi, has done the best propaganda for us by his speech, that he has just delivered. Sir, here is a Government that has issued a pamphlet through its Publicity Department claiming that this Tanjore Ordinance is a fair deal to the tenants. When we talk of a fair deal we mean there was no fair deal before. It means, before the issue of this Ordinance, the tenants and pannaiyals were not enjoying certain rights which are sought to be conferred upon them now. It means, before the issue of this Ordinance, they were not getting a fair share of the produce that they were producing and therefore we are now conferring upon them a boon. This is the propaganda that is made by the Government. Now the hon. Member Sri Venkatasubba Reddi says that this Bill does not presume to do any such thing, it only maintains the *status quo*. It is a very good statement that he has made so far as we are concerned.

“Now let us look at the provisions of this Bill, the share allowed to the tenants and pannaiyals and examine whether that is fair so far as they are concerned.

“Now here is the Congress party which had been promising to the public that they would concentrate on agrarian reforms first and foremost. The Congress party was in power, for the first time, I think, in 1937. They were in office till 1939. Three years' time. What did they do in the three years in regard to agrarian reforms? No doubt they declared in their election propaganda that at that time that agrarian reform was their first problem. Can it be said that three years' time was not enough for them to undertake any land reform? What happened next? They were in office again from 1946-1951. Was anything done to effect radical land reforms? No. Several committees used to be appointed and their reports used to be shelved. There was a Congress Committee appointed by no less a person than the President of the Indian National Congress. That committee was asked to suggest suitable agrarian reforms. The Committee was known by the name of Kumarappa Committee. That committee produced a report. We have not seen anything of that report till now. As with several other previous reports, that too was shelved. Again recently the previous Congress Government appointed a committee called the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, presided over by an I.C.S. officer by name Mr. M. V. Subramaniam. The members of that committee were mostly Congressmen. I shall read out the names of the members. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi, one of the topmost landowners in the State, Mr. N. Ranga Reddi, who happens

4.40 p.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [27th November 1952]

now to be the Public Works Minister occupying the Treasury Bench, Mr. C. Subramaniam, who now holds the key-post of Finance Minister in the Cabinet, Mr. Alluri Satyanarayana Raju, a former Congress Member of the House, Mr. Sankaran Nair, who cannot by any stretch of imagination be misunderstood as having any sympathy with the Communist party and last of all Mr. V. I. Munuswamy Pillai, a veteran Congressman. Thus we see this Committee was one of the most conservative committees ever appointed and that too full of Congressmen. At that time let us see what the picture looked like so far as the peasant movement in Tanjore was concerned. It had not assumed its present phase. The leaders of the peasant movement were at that time incarcerated and were in jail. When such was the case and there were no effective persons to voice forth the grievances of the peasants, what did the Subramanyam Committee say with regard to the peasants? Even such a conservative committee had come to the conclusion that there had been too much of rackrenting of the tenants in this State. Have the present Government accepted that decision of that committee? No, they have not. They will not accept. They say that this is not the ripe moment for effecting any change. They will again come during the next election with the cry that agrarian reform is the first and foremost of all reforms which the Congress party is pledged to undertake if it comes to power. The usual slogan will always be there. I say this Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is only an eyewash. Here is their own Subramanyam Committee report. What all we ask is only a request to the Government to implement the recommendations of that committee. But they will not yield.

"Yesterday, my friend Mr. Vinayakam asked what had happened to the pledges of the Congress during the recent elections. Let me give him an answer that the same pledges will come in the next election manifesto of the Congress. They will once again say that agrarian reform is the most important problem facing the country. Even industrialisation can come only next. Even the Planning Commission had given the greatest priority to agrarian reform. That is how they will try to hoodwink the peasants. But let me say to the Congress Government in power now, that the peasants have now opened their eyes. They can no longer be deceived. They have come to realize their responsibilities. The tenants have realized their right to their share of the produce. Let not the Congress jubilate that the poor illiterate peasants can be easily passed over. They cannot simply pass this legislation fixing the tenants' share of the produce as only two-fifths, i.e., 40 per cent. Let them not think that they have given the tenants an equitable share. The tenants are there to judge for themselves. They will be no longer carried away by the cry that the Congress is there to do all in its power to make both the landowner and the tenant lead an amicable life.

"Let us see first of all what is it that has led to the present agrarian tension in Tanjore. From time immemorial it has been the practice there for the tenants who were working in the fields

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

to take 50 per cent of the produce. In some cases they used to take even more due to the magnanimity of the landlords. Gradually with the increase in population and the consequent impoverishment of the masses, the landlords grew more jealous of the tenants' share in the produce. They were ably assisted by the successive Congress Ministries. The tenants' share of the produce gradually lessened. This gradual rackrenting of the tenants practised by the mirasdars led to the agrarian tension. The tenants so long subjugated by their mirasdars awoke and demanded equitable share in their produce. Now comes this Tanjore Ordinance fixing two-fifths, i.e., 40 per cent share of the produce to the tenants and giving them some temporary security. The peasant movement will not be satisfied with this token grant. I am not saying that they will fight it out at once. They will finally do so gradually if some piece of legislation on the recommendation of the Subramanyam Committee is not brought forward. Let it not be taken as though I am in favour of the recommendations of the Subramanyam Committee. That is an entirely different matter. What all we ask is let the peasants be given the wages prescribed for them by your own conservative Congress-cum-Subramanyam Committee. Why are the Government fighting shy to implement the recommendations of their own Congress Committee? Let not the Congress Government go on repeating their old slogans that their main attention is on agrarian reform. The people are there to judge the merits of their slogans. As a temporary measure let them accept this amendment. Let them at least give the wages prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee, which is a committee predominantly conservative in outlook and composed of their own kith and kin."

* SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this amendment. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by my friend Mr. C. V. K. Rao and so ably supported by my friend, Mr. Ramamurthi. The ownership of lands ordinarily came about by two ways, viz., either by inheritance or by acquisition by payment of money. The person who has invested money in the land no doubt expects a return. When a person invests money in gilt-edged securities, he gets an annual interest of only 3 to 3½ per cent. But the same person when he invests money on land expects a higher rate of profit. But we have to take into consideration the other side also. I was told that Tanjore is a very fertile area and normally about three crops are grown in a year. When the landlord has got such a fertile land, it is but just and fair on his part to provide his tenants who make his lands yield such good crops with reasonable wages. I feel that the wages prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee are very reasonable. That committee had gone into the whole question and arrived at proper conclusions. I think it is just and reasonable that the tenants should be given wages as prescribed by the Subramanyam Committee. With these observations, I support the amendment moved by my friend, Mr. C. V. K. Rao."

[27th November 1952]

4-50 p.m. SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—Sir, I rise to support the amendment moved by Sri C. V. K. Rao. A similar amendment was moved before the Select Committee, but the Government did not think of accepting it then. But some time has elapsed and I believe they have been revolving this matter in their minds. The arguments in its favour have already been stated largely. I do not want to repeat them. I only want to draw the attention of the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue and the Hon. the Chief Minister that the Congress party appointed an Agrarian Reforms Committee and that Agrarian Reforms Committee suggested a much smaller share to the landlord. The Subramanyam Committee took into consideration the Bombay Act and the suggestions of the Agrarian Reforms Committee also; on page 54 of their report, the Subramanyam Committee stated:

"In this State, taking it by and large, the proportion constituting rent for ordinary irrigated land has been more or less the same as for dry lands, and for wet lands under good sources of irrigation it has been higher. Back of this idea is the principle that for fertile lands, and particularly for wet lands under first-class sources of irrigation, since the effort required in cultivation is proportionately less, the tenant's share can properly be made proportionately less. We think this background will have to be retained in any scheme of fair rents which we may fix. Some sets of crops are raised both on wet lands and dry lands. While in most cases wet crops are raised on lands classified as wet, in some cases they are raised on lands which are classed as dry on payment of a suitable charge for water. It is better therefore to let the scheme of rent have relation to the crops. We agree with the Board of Revenue that commercial crops also should be brought under the scheme of fair rents."

I have read out these few lines in order to impress upon the Government that the committee made a special distinction between first-class sources of irrigation and second-class sources of irrigation and commercial crops in arriving at the share on a somewhat realistic basis. Sir, if we look into the history of the fixation of this crop share, we will find that a Special Officer was appointed by the Government prior to the constitution of the Subramanyam Committee. That Special Officer fixed 55 per cent as the share of the landlord and the Board of Revenue reduced it to 50 per cent and the Subramanyam Committee came to the conclusion that the landlord should receive only 45 per cent. I am not going into greater detail over this matter. As the recommendations of the Special Officer, the suggestions of the Board of Revenue and the proportions fixed by the Bombay Government were all taken into consideration by the Subramanyam Committee, I submit, the Government should also, reading the spirit of the times, act upon the suggestions made in the Subramanyam Committee Report. It is reasonable to the tenant; it is reasonable to the landlord; and I believe the Congress Party Members should have absolutely no objection to accept them. As already stated by Sri P. Ramamurthi, two members of the Subrahmanyam Committee are actually Hon. Ministers to-day and they did not dissent from that share proportion. Excepting one dissenting minute by Sri B. Ramachandra Reddi, every other member of that committee agreed to this proportion; one of the biggest mirasdars of Tanjore was a member of the committee and he did not in his long dissenting minute, raise any objection to this proportion. I submit, therefore, Sir, that without going into actual costs of cultivation and the

27th November 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

family budgets of tenants and landlords of any category, all these considerations make it imperative on this House to accept the recommendations of the Subramanyam Committee.

"Sir, there is another point to which I would like to refer. This Subramanyam Committee was appointed by the previous Government and their report was before the previous Government and it is also under the consideration of the present Government. While the Report was under consideration, the Malabar Tenancy Act was amended and again the present legislation has come. Therefore, it is high time the Government should come to some conclusion and I believe there is no better opportunity than now to come to a conclusion at least on this portion of the Report. The proportion of shares is acceptable to most of the Members and I would ask the Government not to stand on points of prestige and not to drive us to a division. I would ask the Government therefore to satisfy themselves, the Members of the Opposition and also more important than all these, the large tenantry in the Tanjore district. It will give a lead to the entire State. Let us make a start with a good example."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—Sir, excepting the hon. Member representing North Mathurai, almost all other Members who spoke hail from a geographical area which is different from the one with which we are dealing. I am afraid they have no idea of the conditions prevailing in this district. Sir, they have been swearing so much by the Subramanyam Committee Report; but I wish to tell them that this Report was recommended to be applied to the entire State and not to Tanjore district in particular. Sir, this question was gone into very carefully and in great detail at the Select Committee stage. Excepting the hon. Gentlemen who dissented, all others agreed to this formula. And this formula goes a long way from the existing rent. In certain places, the existing rent is about one-fifth or so. In Kumbakonam and other places, it is about one-fifth and even in other places it is sufficiently lower."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, if the Hon. Minister does not mind my interruption, I would like to tell him that he should not take Kumbakonam as an example."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, Kumbakonam may not be taken as an example for certain other purposes. But we can take it as an example for this purpose and there is no harm. Sir, the hon. Member was referring to election pledges and other things. Of course, this formula of crop share does not come up to the slogan of 5 acres of land, two bulls, a pukka house and a milch cow. (Laughter.) I submit, Sir, this share is based on justice, equity and good conscience. I oppose the amendment, Sir."

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really at a loss to understand the reasoning of the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue. He has not met a single argument that has been advanced from this side that what is proposed in the Bill in this

[Sri C. V. K. Rao] [27th November 1952]

clause 8, which is the life clause, is not justice at all. It does not help the Government themselves who are saying from the house-tops—at least as seen from the books recently published—that they are working for the Tanjore tenants. Sir, I do not know to which profession the Hon. Minister belonged, but I am afraid that if he was a lawyer, he must have argued very poorly. I am not referring to him personally but to his arguments. What does he mean when he says that the rent that is fixed is sufficient for the tenant? Has he got any argument to show that Mr. Raghavendra Rao, the special officer, who was appointed by the Government, the Congress Agrarian Reform Committee, which in fact was a committee belonging to the party of the Government, and the Land Revenue Reforms Committee—all these persons and committees have made a mistake, that they have not gone into the *pros and cons* of this problem of rent for the tenant? Sir, he has not answered that point at all. He simply dismissed it by saying that they had in their minds the whole State of Madras. He could have as well said they had in their mind the whole world. Well, if they had in their mind the whole State of Madras, surely Tanjore is a part of that State. Does he mean to say that they had in their minds the State of Madras excluding Tanjore? If now the Government are saying that Tanjore is a special problem, it is a special problem both from the viewpoint of the relationship between the tenant and the landlord and also from the viewpoint of the Government themselves, and this is the problem that has to be dealt with straightaway now. If Tanjore has attracted the attention of this Government—the first Government that has been formed after the adult franchise—surely they must admit that when the Land Reforms Committee or the Special Officer, Mr. Raghavendra Rao, fixed a certain proportion as the rent for the tenant, they must have had in their minds the worst case, viz., that of the Tanjore district. Therefore, I am afraid that the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue is missing the bus. In fact, he is bringing about, through this Bill, a still-born child. A member from the other side has already said that they are just going to maintain the *status quo*. That is true; they are just going to maintain the *status quo*. But that does not help our countrymen. Let not our countrymen feel that they have a Government here which wants to maintain the *status quo* of starvation, to maintain the *status quo* of rack-rent. I submit there is still time for the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue to change his opinion and to change it in the manner—not of what we want him to do—in which his own officers themselves want him to do, with regard to the question of the fixation of rent.

“With these words, Sir, I close my speech; thank you, Sir.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“Sir, I have nothing more to add to what I have said; but I want to say this much; I admit that I do not belong to the profession to which the hon. Member who spoke just now belongs at present. (An hon. Member: ‘What is it?’) Whatever it

27th November 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

is, as already stated, this is not a very broad or general Land Reform Bill. It is only a special Bill relating to a particular area. We have taken a long stride in this matter; let us see how it works; we need not precipitate matters at this stage.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“There are several amendments. I shall put them to vote one by one. The first is Mr. Gopalan’s amendment. The question is—

‘In sub-clause (1) for the word “two-fifths”, substitute the word “two-thirds”.’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The second is Mr. Kune Rao’s amendment. The question is—

‘In sub-clause (1), for the word “two-fifths”, substitute the word “eleven-twentieths”.’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The next amendment is that of Mr. T. Lakshminarayana Reddi. The question is—

‘In line 3 of sub-clause (1), for the word “two-fifths” substitute the word “three-fifths”.’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“The last amendment is the amendment of Mr. C. V. K. Rao. The question is—

‘In sub-clause (1), for the words “the tenant shall be entitled to two-fifths”, substitute the words “the tenant shall be entitled to 55 per cent under first-class irrigation sources, 60 per cent under second-class irrigation sources and 60 per cent in all commercial crops whether raised on wet or dry lands”.’

The amendment was declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:

5-10
p.m.

Ayes.

Sri M. Muni Reddi.	Sri T. S. Ardhanari.
“A. Neeladri Rao Reddi.	“P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
“K. V. Ramasam.	“P. Narasimha Reddi.
“P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.	“N. Sivarami Reddi.
“M. Srungaram.	“D. Seetharamiah.
“M. Pentannaidu.	“C. H. Kanaran.
“M. Venkatasubba Reddi.	“K. Madhavan Nambiar.
“S. Pakkiriswami Pillai.	“B. Krishnan.
“K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.	“E. T. Kunhan.
“K. Venkatakurmi Naidu.	“M. Hanumantha Rao.
“G. Suryanarayana.	“C. V. K. Rao.
“M. Kalyanasundaram.	“K. Rajagopala Rao.
“K. T. Raju.	“P. Venkatasiviah.
“K. P. Gopalan.	“P. Rama Rao.
“C. Kandaswami.	“V. Rama Rao.
“V. Madanagopal.	“T. Potha Raju.
“S. Ramalingam.	“P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
“N. Sivaraj.	“K. Mahakondayya.
“A. K. Subbiah.	“M. Narayanaswamy.
“K. V. Ramaswamy.	“K. Venkaiah.

[27th November 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. Syamasundara Rao.
„ B. Lakshminarasu Raju.
„ G. Satyanarayana.
„ G. Anjaneyalu.
„ G. Joseph.
„ D. Lakshmayya.
„ M. Kune Rao.
„ G. Nageshwara Rao.
„ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
„ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
„ K. Ranga Rao.
„ K. Subba Reddi.
„ Chandra Ramalingayya.
„ C. Prabhakara Choudary.
„ G. Rama Rao.
„ K. Govinda Rao.
„ M. Veerabhadram.
„ K. Vinayakam.
„ M. Palaniandi.
„ K. Krishna Rao.
„ A. Veloo.
„ M. P. Subramaniam.
„ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
„ N. Paramasivam.
„ Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
„ G. C. Kondayya.
„ M. Manicka Sundaram.
Dr. G. Chitrambalam.
Sri B. Sankarappa.
„ K. R. Sambandam.
„ S. Kasi Reddy.
„ P. Chokkalingam.
„ Saka Venkata Rao.

Noes.

The Hon Sri C. Subramaniam.
„ Sri A. B. Shetty.
„ Sri M. A. Manickavelu Nalaker.
„ Dr U. Krishna Rao.
Sri K. Rajaram.
„ B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
„ C. Rajam Ramaswami.
„ P. G. Karuthiruman.
„ B. K. Nallasamy.
„ S. C. Virupakshayya.
„ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
„ P. G. Manickam.
„ R. Kuppuswami.
„ P. K. Thirumurthi.
„ V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.
„ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
„ A. K. Subbaraya Gounder.
„ P. S. Rangaswamy Naidu.
„ S. R. Arumugham.
„ K. H. Bomman.
„ Kempai Gounder.
„ T. M. Kaliannan.
„ M. P. Periaswami.
„ Ardhanareswara Gounder.
„ A. Sambasivam.
„ Lakshmana Kandar.
„ P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishna Nayar.
„ Dr. R. Nagana Goud
Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
„ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
„ K. Koti Reddi.

Sri T. Nagi Reddi.
„ Pillala Marri Venkateswarlu.
„ S. Deivasigamony.
„ Bojja Appalasamy.
„ A. Rathinam.
„ D. Dasarathan.
„ S. Vemiah.
„ R. Siddanna Gowd.
„ K. Ramiah Chowdry.
„ G. Bapanayya.
„ Y. V. Krishna Rao.
„ P. Kuahirama Kidav.
„ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
„ K. Bapanna Dora.
„ K. Ramiah.
„ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
„ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
„ C. Pulla Reddi.
„ T. Viswanatham.
„ P. Ramamurthi.
„ P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
„ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
„ K. R. Viswanathan.
„ V. K. Gopalakrishnan.
„ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
„ M. Palanimuthu.
„ A. Ayyaru.
„ V. Sankaranarayanan Menon.
„ K. T. Sridharan.
„ M. Narayana Kurup.
„ M. Narayana Nambiar.
„ O. Koran.
„ G. Yellamunda Reddy.

Sri A. M. Sambandam.
„ M. R. Ramachandran.
„ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
„ B. Parameswaran.
„ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
„ T. P. Elumalai.
„ S. Panchaksharam.
„ A. J. Arunachalam.
„ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
„ H. M. Jagannatham.
Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.
Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
„ R. Thangavelu.
„ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
„ L. Anandan.
„ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
„ G. Vagheesam Pillay.
„ A. S. Sahajanandam.
„ O. A. Nanjappa.
„ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
„ S. Arumugham.
„ K. S. Subramania Gounder.
„ A. M. Ratnaswami.
Janab Mahomed Salih Maraikayar.
The Hon. Sri V. C. Palaniswamy Gounder.
„ K. Venkataswami Naidu.
„ N. Sankara Reddi.
„ D. Sanjivayya.
„ Shanmuga Rajeswara
Sethupathi, the Raja of
Ramnad.
„ S. B. P. Pattabhi Ram
Rao.

27th November 1952]

Noes—cont.

Srimathi (Dr.) T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
Sri M. S. Muniswamy Pillay.
„ C. Chinnaaswami Naidu.
„ S. Chinna Karuppa Thevar.
„ V. S. Sivaprasadam.
„ V. Muthu.
„ A. S. Subbaraj.
„ Thinnakarasa Thevar.
„ R. Krishnasami Naidu.
„ S. Jayaram Reddiar.
„ Vaikuntam.
„ G. Govindan.
„ P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
„ S. Ramasami Naidu.
„ Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
„ P. Chellathurai.
„ N. Rajagopal.
„ A. Ramasami Thevar.
„ T. K. Rama.
„ T. V. Sannasi.
„ Antony Peter.
„ T. R. Varadan.
„ C. Muthiah Pillay.
„ Thiagaraja Pillay.
„ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
„ R. V. Swaminathan.
„ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
„ K. T. Kosalam.
„ P. Urkavalan.
„ R. S. K. Pandian.
„ M. G. Shanker.
„ S. Somayajulu.
„ Chinnathambi Thevar.
„ P. Selvaraj.
„ V. Arumugham.
„ K. Ramasamy Doss.
„ R. S. Arumugham.
„ A. Venkatramiah.
„ A. Rami Reddi.
„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.
„ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
„ K. Shanmugham.
„ P. Venkataswami Reddi.
„ Muthukumarasamy.
„ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.
„ S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.

Raja Sri V. V. Krishnam Raju.
Sri Thota Ramasamy.
„ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.
„ V. C. Chudamani Deo.
„ A. Venkatasubramaniam.
„ P. Gunayya.
„ L. Lakshmana Das.
„ K. Suryanarayana.
„ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
„ T. C. Atchannaaidu.
„ K. V. Vema Reddi.
„ S. Narayanappa.
„ K. Santhappa.
„ P. Ranga Reddi.
„ A. Appu.
„ B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
„ K. Varadachari.
„ D. Ramabrahmam.
„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.
„ M. Doraikannu.
„ H. Ramalinga Reddi.
„ G. Nagabhushanam.
„ Kotra Basavana Goud.
„ S. Parameswarappa.
„ T. Malleyya.
„ T. Anantha Pai.
„ Y. Manjappa Shetty.
„ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
„ N. N. Suvarna.
„ M. Jagannatham.
„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
„ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
Janab M. S. Mogral.
Sri T. Chinnayya.
„ L. C. Pais.
Mr. W. J. Fernandez.
Sri K. Veeranna Padal.
„ R. Lakshminarasimham.
„ Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.
„ K. Ramamurthy.
„ Ch. Indrayya.
„ N. Rathina Gounder.
„ M. Chadayan.
Janab C. Ahmed Kutty.
„ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
„ K. M. Seethi.
Sri G. Samia Koorayar.

6-20
p.m.

Ayes 106, Noes 155.

The amendment was lost.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“On a point of information, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Sri Subramaniam has voted against Mr. Subramaniam. I would like to have his explanation.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“Hon. Members, Sri Venkateswarlu, Sri Ramamurthi and Sri Kandaswami have given notice of amendments on the same lines. One of them may move the amendment and the rest may speak upon it.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Sri Kandaswami will move the amendment, Sir.”

[27th November 1952]

SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே ! என் பெயரில் இருக்கின்ற திருத்தத்தை நான் பிரேரிக்கிறேன். அந்தத் திருத்தம் என்னவென்றால்—

‘ (i) In sub-clause (1) for the words within brackets, substitute the following :—

“ or 20 per cent increase over his existing customary share percentage, whichever is more beneficial to the tenant ”,

and also omit the words in the third paragraph of sub-clause (1), beginning with the words “ and no portion of the produce ” up to the end of the paragraph.’

“ தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் திருத்தம் மிகவும் நியாயமானது, அவசியமானது என்பதை யாரும் மறுக்கமுடியாதென்பதை முதலில் தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்லலாமென்று இருக்கிறேன். ஏற்கெனவே சர்க்கார் தரப்பினரால் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டு சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபார்சை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டுதான் இன்றையதினம் இந்தத் திருத்தம் பிரேரிக் கப்படுகிறது. சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியில் அங்கத்தினராக இருந்தவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் மந்திரி சபையிலும் இருவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகையால் யாரும் எதிர்க்கட்சியில் இருப்பவர்கள் குழப்பத்தை உண்டு பண்ண இம் மாதிரி திருத்தத்தைப் பிரேரிப்பதாகக் கருதக்கூடாது. திருத்தத்திலுள்ள வாசகத்தை நன்கு படிக்கவேண்டும். அதேசமயம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் பலதரப்பட்ட வாரம் இன்றையதினம் அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டு வருகிற தென்பதையும் நாம் மறந்துவிடக்கூடாது. திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, கும்ப கோணம் தாலுக்காவில் 16 வாரம், 20 வாரம் அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கலாம். அதேசமயம் நாகைப்பட்டினம், திருத்தூரைப்பூண்டி, மன்னார் குடி தாலுக்காக்களில் தற்பொழுது நாம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிற 40% வாரம் ஏற்கெனவேயே அமுலில் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. இன்னும் சில இடங்களில் இதைவிட அதிகமாகவும் இருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்ட விவசாயிகளுக்கு இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் இன்றையதினம் யாதொருவிதமான நன்மையும் கிடையாது. திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியில் 16 வாரம் வாங்கியவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது 40 வாரம் கிடைக்குமென்று சொல்வது நியாயம். அதேபோல் கும்பகோணம், பாபநாசம் தாலுக்காவிலுள்ளவர்களுக்கு 20, 22% வாரம் வாங்கியவர்களுக்கு இப்பொழுது 40 வாரம் கிடைக்குமென்றால் சரியானது. ஆனால் முன்பே 40% டோ அல்லது அதற்கு அதிகமாக வாங்கிக் கொண்டு வந்திருந்தவர்களுக்கும் இப்பொழுது 40% தான் வாரம் என்றால் அது சரியா? நியாயமா? அங்குள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு நாம் நீதி செய்வதாக ஆகுமா? என்பதையெல்லாம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்த்தாகவேண்டும். விவசாய இயக்கத்தில் கிளர்ச்சி செய்தவர்கள் அவர்கள்தான். மிராசுதாரர்களால் பழிவாங்கப்பட்டவர்களும் அவர்கள்தான். அவர்களுக்கு இன்றையதினம் சரியாக நியாயம் வழங்காவிட்டால் அவர்களிடையே இன்றையதினம் இருக்கும் அதிருப்தி என்றைக்கும் இருந்துகொண்டேதான் இருக்கும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவதன் நோக்கமே, விவசாயிகள், மிராசு தாரர்களிடையே இருந்துவந்த தகராறுகளையெல்லாம் போக்கி, அவர்களிடையே நல்லுறவை வளர்த்து உற்பத்தி அதிகப்படுத்துவதற்காகத்தான் என்பதாகக் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அப்படி இருக்கும்பொழுது இப்பொழுது ஒரேவாரியாக ஒரு வாரத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்தால் அதனால் எல்லோருடைய குறைகளும் தீர்ந்துவிடுமென்று கருதினால் இது நாம் செய்யும் முட்டாள்தனமான காரியம் என்றுதான் நான் வருத்தத்துடன் சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இதைப்பற்றி பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியிலும் நான் பல விஷயங்களை எடுத்துச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன். இங்கும் அதையேதான் சொல்லுகிறேன். நியாயமாக எல்லாப்பகுதிகளிலுமுள்ள விவசாயிகள் நன்மை அடையத்தக்கவகையில் நாம் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டியது நம் கடமையாகும். அதற்காகத்தான் இந்தத் திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறேன். கும்பகோணத்திலுள்ள 20% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கும்,

[27th November 1952][Sri C. Kandaswami]

கும், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியிலுள்ள 16% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கும், இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் 40% வாரம் கிடைக்கும் என்று நாம் சந்தோஷப்படும்பொழுது இந்தச் சட்டத்திற்கு முன்னேயே 35%, 40% வாரம் வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருந்த மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தூரைப்பூண்டி பக்கத்திலுள்ள 5, 6 தாலுக்கா வாசிகளுக்கு எந்தவிதமான ஆதாயமும் கிடையாது என்னும்பொழுது வருந்தாமல் இருக்கமுடியாது. ஆகவேதான் இத்திருத்தத்தை ஒப்புக்கொண்டால் அவர்களுக்கும் கொஞ்சம் வாரம் கிடைக்கும். இது நியாயமா, அநியாயமா என்பதை வேண்டுமானால் நீங்கள் எல்லோரும் பரிசீலனை செய்துபாருங்கள். ஆங்காங்கேயுள்ள சர்க்கார் ரெவினியூ உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களுக்கும் தாக்கீது அனுப்பி அவர்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயங்களைக் கேட்டுப்பார்க்கலாம். இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் உண்மையில் சில தாலுக்கா விவசாயிகளுக்கு லாபமே கிடையாது. திருத்தூரைப்பூண்டி தாலுக்காவில் நிலம் அதிகமாகக் கேட்கலாமே தவிர பாசன வசதியில்லாததால் ஒன்றும் பலனில்லை. கும்பகோணம், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி தாலுக்காவில் நிலம் குறைவாகத்தான் கிடைக்கும். இருந்தாலும் பாசன வசதி அதிகமாக இல்லாத நிலத்தில் போட்டி அதிகம். நிலமும் ஒரு விவசாயிக்கு கொஞ்சம் தான் கிடைக்கும். இங்கே செலவும் குறைவு. ஆக மொத்தமாகக் கணக்குப் பார்த்தால் இன்றையதினம் 16%, 20% வாரம் வாங்கிவந்த விவசாயிகளும், 40%, 45% வாரம் வாங்கிவரும் விவசாயிகளும் ஒரே நிலையில் தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் கஷ்ட நிலைமை ஒரே நிலையில்தான் இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. குறைவான வாரம் வாங்குபவர்களைவிட அதிக வாரம் வாங்குபவர்கள் குறிப்பாக மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்களே தவிர ஒன்றும் மேலான நிலைமையில் இன்றையதினம் இல்லை. ஆகவேதான் எல்லோருக்கும் ஒரேவாரம் என்று இருப்பதைவிட அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது வாங்கிவரும் வாரத்திற்குமேல் 20% அதிகம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அதனால் நிச்சயமாகப் பல ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகளுக்கு அதிகமான நன்மையேற்படுமென்பதை நாம் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளத்தான் வேண்டும். பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் சொன்ன விஷயங்களையும், பலரும் இந்தச் சபையில் சொல்லிய விஷயங்களையே நான் சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்க விரும்பவில்லை. எந்த இடத்தில் கிளர்ச்சி நடந்தது, அவர்களுடைய குறைகள் என்ன? இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் அவர்களுடைய குறைகள் ஓரளவாவது நீக்கப்படுகிறதா என்பதையெல்லாம் நாம் கவனித்துப்பார்த்தாகவேண்டும். ஏதோ ஒப்புக் காக்க ஒரு சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தோம் என்று கொண்டுவந்துவிட்டால் போதாது. சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் சிபார்சுகள் என்னவென்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அக்கமிட்டியின் குறைந்தபட்ச சிபார்சுகளையாவது நாம் அமுலாக்காவிட்டால் ஒரு கமிட்டியை நியமித்து விஷயங்களை ஆராய்ச்சி செய்ததின் அவசியம் என்ன ஏற்பட்டது என்று பார்க்கவேண்டும். சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டி ரொம்பவும் பிரமாதமானதோர் சிபார்சை செய்துவிட்டவில்லை. மிகக் குறைந்த சிபார்சுகளைத்தான் செய்திருக்கிறது. அந்த கமிட்டியிலுள்ள அங்கத்தினர்களைப் பார்த்தாலேயே அவர்கள் அதைவிட ஒன்றும் சிபார்சு செய்ய மாட்டார்கள் என்பது தெரியும். எல்லோரும் ஒரு ஆயிரம் ஏக்கருக்கு மேற்பட்ட மிராசுதார்கள். அதோடு கமிட்டியில் சாட்சியம் கூற வந்தவர்களும் கூட அந்த ஜாப்தாவை எடுத்துப்பார்த்தால் தெரியும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வேலி நிலங்களை உடையவர்கள். சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியும் விவசாய தலைவர்கள் சிறைச்சாலையில் இருந்த காலத்தில், விவசாயப் பிரதிநிதிகளின் யோசனைகளைக் கேட்காமலேயே அந்த சிபார்சுகளைச் செய்திருக்கிறதென்றால் நாட்டில் இருந்த நிலைமை என்னவென்பதை அவர்கள் உணர்ந்தே அப்படி செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இதை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் நன்கு யோசித்துப் பார்த்தால் நன்றாகத் தெரியும். இதில் கட்சிப் போராட்டங்களுக்கு இடமேயில்லை. கட்சி மனப்பான்மையை அப்புறம் எடுத்து வைத்துவிட்டு விவசாயிகளின் நலனில் உண்மையாக சிரத்தையெடுத்துப் பார்த்தால் நான் பிரேரித்திருக்கின்ற திருத்தம் மிகவும் அவசியமானது, நியாயமானது என்பது முதலில் சொன்னபடி உங்களுக்குப் புரியும். ஆகவே இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை மிகவும் வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்லி இதை சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளவேண்டும், சபையினரும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய திருத்தத்தைப் பிரேரிக்கிறேன்”.

[27th November 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the amendment that has been moved by Mr. Manali Kandaswami. While seconding the amendment, I would like to point out certain basic principles underlying it. The Government have not accepted the recommendation of the Subramaniam Committee with reference to the percentage of share. But there is one basic principle underlying that Report and it has got a basis. That report made a distinction between what are called ‘ First-class lands ’ and ‘ Second-class lands. ’ In the case of ‘ First-class lands ’—due to the fertility of the soil, due to the availability of water and other circumstances prevailing in the various places—it proposed that the proportion should be in the ratio of 55 and 45. In the case of ‘ Second-class lands ’ it should be in the ratio of 60 and 40. That itself implies that a distinction ought to be made. So long as there is a system of sharing the crop or the system of contract—‘ kuthagai ’ as it is called—the tenant who is working on a more fertile soil may be able to get a lower proportion of the share than a tenant working on a less fertile soil for the labour that he actually expends. Therefore, in order to enable peasants who put in the same amount of labour to get more or less the same amount of remuneration, it proposed a certain different approach to the whole problem. Now, the Government may have their own difficulties. They may come forward with their own reasons for not accepting the percentages laid down by the Subramaniam Committee. I would now ask them, what is the reason behind their refusing to accept this different approach? It is well-known that in the district of Tanjore there are taluks like Papanasam, Kumbakonam, Tanjore and Sirkali—the last of which has got the Rajan Channel Irrigation—which are fertile. There, three crops are grown on the same kind of land and peasants will be able to produce more crops. But if you take the other taluks of the Tanjore district like Pattukkottai, Mannargudi, Nannilam and Mayuram, you will find an entirely different state of affairs prevailing there. There the soil is more difficult to till. It is more hard and there is not enough water available and it is less fertile. Therefore, even the existing proportion of the share in those taluks is higher than the existing proportion in the other taluks. This is a custom that has been prevalent from time immemorial, that is, ever since the system of crop-sharing has been in existence. In Mannargudi, for example, for a *mah* of land the *kuttagai* is about six kalams, whereas in the other taluks the *kuttagai* is 25 to 30 kalams. It is a case of difference in the fertility of the soil. This thing, the Subramaniam Committee has recognized; and when that Committee has recognized it, why should not that differential approach be adopted here also?

“ The second point I would like to urge is, what does the Preamble of this Bill itself say? It says:

“ Whereas in the district of Tanjore the relations between land-owners and their agents on the one hand and tenants and farm labourers on the other hand had become strained, resulting in the displacement of tenants and the dismissal of farm labourers and in agrarian crimes and disturbances; etc.”

27th November 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

So, Sir, it is in order to put an end to that state of affairs this Bill has been brought forward. Sir, where is it this agrarian unrest has been most acute? This agrarian unrest has been acute in the taluks of Mannargudi, Tirutturaipundi and Nannilam, and these taluks being the least fertile areas, the peasants were not getting anything at all. Why should the proportion of those who are now getting a higher rate be different from those who are tilling less fertile lands? Hence it is the unrest was acute where the proportion of the tenants was low. Now if the intention of the Government is really to put an end to this unrest, if the intention of the Government is to see that the peasants are satisfied, then, immediately the Government should come forward to satisfy them. I ask, ‘ Is this the way of satisfying them; is this the way of putting an end to that unrest, by saying that as you were all under the influence of the Communists, you will not get anything more, you will not get a single grain of paddy more than what you are getting to-day? ’ Surely this is not the object of this Bill, and so I submit to Government to translate their object into reality.

“ Then, Sir, the amendment suggested by Mr. Kandaswami is a very reasonable one. He wants to give a flat rate of increase over the existing share in all the areas irrespective of what exactly it has been all along there. What is the danger in adopting this suggestion? What other conclusion can we draw for the opposition to this amendment except the fact that those three areas were under the influence of Communists and so they should not get any benefit in the proportion of the sharing of the crop? I say, ‘ Do not adopt an attitude of political victimization; do not look at the problem from the point of view that they are peasants who have been under the influence of the Communists, and were carrying the struggle under the influence of the Communists. ’ Do not say, ‘ You have been under the influence of the Communists and therefore I will not do anything for you. ’ I say, let not that be the attitude of the Hon. Chief Minister. On the other hand, let the Hon. Chief Minister come forward and translate the very Preamble of the Bill, the very letter of the Preamble into action and make the peasants feel that the Bill carries out the very object for which this measure has been brought forward and that it does not remain a dead letter. The proportion in the sharing of the crop that is asked for is much lower than that recommended by the Subramaniam Committee. It does not ask for 55 per cent. Therefore, I submit, there should be no difficulty in accepting the amendment of Mr. Kandaswami. I therefore commend it to the acceptance of the entire House and particularly of the Hon. Chief Minister.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Sir, this subject was thoroughly discussed in the Joint Select Committee, where, the mover of this amendment was also an active member and whose assistance I constantly sought in finalizing matters there. I am grateful for the help he rendered. I do not object to his bringing up amendments now. But why I refer to it is this: that we have thoroughly discussed this matter before. The object of having select committees, joint or otherwise, is to sift

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [27th November 1952]

details like the one that is now under discussion, and not to go through the whole process in the Select Committee stage first and again in the open Assembly here. We have already gone into such details. We have discussed details like this in the Joint Select Committee, whether it should be two-fifths or three-fifths or eleven-twentieths and so on. Sir, I did not intervene in the debate on the previous clause. But now I rise because certain general arguments have been put forward including some political arguments. The general argument is that some lands are more fertile than other lands, and therefore there should be a differentiation in the sharing of the crops. Now I submit in all humility that this is a wrong argument. Mr. Ramamurti may know more about the peasants' case, but I am not quite ignorant of the general principles applicable to lands. If a land is more fertile it does not affect the share of the landlord or the share of the tenant. Both share in the fertility and both share in the infertility. The difficulty of tilling was referred to. There I could notice that Mr. Ramamurti did not stay long, because there was no substance in that argument. He was conscious of it; otherwise he would have dwelt on it at length. There is no difference in the difficulties of the labourers, in the different areas of the district. The difference is in the irrigation facilities; the difference is in fertility. Both share the benefit. Now what is the effect of this differentiation in fertility? It has an effect on the price of land. If land is more fertile in Tirukkattupalli or Kumbakonam area, on account of the land being at the head and not at the tail end of the channel, land value there goes up. The man who buys or sells land, pays or gets more money for the same acreage. It does not affect anything else. It increases the amount that has to be invested to get a particular return, which a fertile land gives. Whereas in the tail end, in Tirutturaipundi, land is cheaper; because fertility is not so good. But so far as tenants and landlords are concerned, with reference to their relative rights and liabilities and with reference to the outturn, they are sharing according to custom and practice there.

"Now, Mr. Ramamurti was saying, very rightly, that in Kumbakonam and Tirukkattupalli areas the share was much less to the tenant, and the share of the tenant in those parts for which Mr. Ramamurti and Mr. Kandasami are now pleading in particular was much more all the time. Now this sharing differentiation arose out of custom and out of other factors. I appeal to the House that we should not make such differentiation now. When we give a certain benefit to the areas where there was unrest, we should not deny that benefit to the tenants who did not participate in that unrest. Otherwise that would be paying a price for unrest; we would be bribing unrest, so to say. Unrest had merely brought matters to the forefront. We must appease unrest. Unrest in one area will spread to another area so long as men are active and act according to natural forces and desires. To give to those areas where there was unrest, more, and to give less to those areas where there was no unrest, I submit, would be wrong. That is why, I explained to Mr. Kandasami, even in the Joint Select Committee that we cannot agree

27th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

to make such differentiations. It is true that my friends on the other side were mostly active in the area for which they are now pleading, but for that reason, we should not give more favourable terms to that area than to the areas where they did not operate. If unrest did not spread to other areas, perhaps it is because numbers limited their operations. If they were larger in numbers, they would have operated in other areas also. Then, I have no doubt, there would have been no special plea for any particular area. Unfortunately or fortunately—unfortunately for some and fortunately for others, concentration of unrest was in a particular area, for in that particular area the concentration was easier for several reasons. It is easier to operate on people who are in distress; those who are hungrier and those who are poorer are easier material for fomenting unrest. It is therefore for that reason Government are asked to give more relatively to that area by raising the old percentages of sharing and not to give equal advantage to all. To ask to give more by just raising the percentage, so that the tenants' share in areas where there was unrest may continue to be bigger is merely asking us to pay a price for unrest, to which, I submit, Government cannot agree."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. The Hon. the Chief Minister has misunderstood what I stated. The Hon. the Chief Minister stated that we are pleading for the people in a particular area. Sir, we do not plead that the people in certain areas should be given more than the people in other areas at all. All that we say is give a uniform percentage of increase to all sections of the people. Therefore, there is no question of favour or disfavour to a certain set of people; there is only the question of equality to all people. We say, if you want to give, give to all people. That is what we have been pleading, and not what the Hon. Chief Minister sought to make out."

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே பொறுக் குக் கமிட்டியில் இதைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்கப்பட்டது உண்மைதான். அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் இதைப்பற்றி ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரமுடியவில்லை, அதை ஒத்தக்கொள்ள சர்க்கார் சார்பிலுள்ளவர்கள் மறுத்துவிட்டார்கள் என்பதும் உண்மைதான். அதைக் கொண்டுதான் இந்தப் பொதுச் சபையில் இதைப் பற்றி இப்பொழுது பேசவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டது என்பதைச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். வேறு ஒரு காரணத்திற்காகவும் இல்லை. கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட காரணங்களைக் கேட்பதற்கும்கூட என்னை பொறுத்தவரையில் அவை திருப்திப்படுத்தக்கூடிய அளவிலே இல்லையென்றுதான் நான் அபிப்பிராயப்படுகிறேன். ஏனென்று கேட்டால், உதாரணமாக நான் சொல்லுகிறேன், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, தஞ்சாவூர் போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள நிலத்தின் விலை அதிகம், ஆனால், மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தரைப்பூண்டி போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள நிலத்தின் விலை குறைவு. அதைப்போலவே, அங்கு இருக்கின்ற நிலத்தில் விளைவு அதிகம், இங்கு இருக்கின்ற நிலத்தின் விளைவும் குறைவு என்பதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளியில் நிலம் மிகவும் அதிகமான விலையாக இருப்பதினாலும், அதில் விளைக்கூடிய தானியம் அதிகமாக இருப்பதினாலும், பொதுவாக ஜனத்தொகை அதிகமாக இருப்பதினாலும், நிலத்திற்கு அதிகமான கிராக்கி ஏற்படுகிறது. அதனால் குடியானவர்களுக்கு கிடைக்கும் நிலத்தின் விஸ்தீரணமும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது. அதே சந்தர்ப்பம்

5-50
p.m.

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [27th November 1952]

பத்தில் மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தூறைப்பூண்டி போன்ற இடங்களில் நீர்ப்பாசன வசதி இல்லாமையால் நிலம் அதிகமாகக் கிடைக்கிறது. நிலத்தில் விளைவும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது. ஆக, மொத்தமாகப் பார்க்கப்போனால், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகள் 16% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும், தஞ்சாவூர், கும்பகோணம் விவசாயிகள் 22% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும், திருத்தூறைப்பூண்டி, மன்னார்குடி விவசாயிகள் 40% வாரம் பெற்றுவந்தாலும் இவர்களுடைய நிலைமையெல்லாம் ஒரே மாதிரியாக இருக்கிறதே தவிர, தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகளைவிட, மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தூறைப்பூண்டி விவசாயிகள் எந்த விதத்திலும் மேலான நிலைமையில் இல்லை. இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய சட்டத்தின் பிரகாரம் தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி விவசாயிகள் 40% வாரம் கிடைப்பதனால் அதிக நன்மை அடையலாமே தவிர, தஞ்சாவூர், திருக்காட்டுப்பள்ளி, விவசாயிகளைப்போலவே கஷ்டத்திசையில் இருந்துவந்த மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தூறைப்பூண்டி விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்த விதத்திலும் ஆதாயம் கிடையாது. அவர்கள் முன்போலவே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. அக்குறையை நீக்கவே இந்த திருத்தத்தை கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த அடிப்படையில் பார்த்தால்தான் உண்மை நிலவரம் நமக்குத் தெரியும். நிலவளம் அதிகமுள்ள இடங்களிலும் நிலவளமற்ற இடங்களிலும் உள்ள விவசாயிகளுடைய நிலைமை அவர்கள் பெற்றுவரும் வாரத்தில் வித்தியாசம் காணப்பட்டாலும் வாழ்க்கை அடிப்படையில் வித்தியாசம் இல்லை. ஆதலால்தான் ஒரேயடியாக 40% என்பதைக்காட்டிலும் எல்லா இடத்திலுமுள்ள விவசாயிகள் நன்மையடையும்படி இச்சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

“ ஏதோ நாங்கள் அங்கு வேலை செய்த இடம்; நாங்கள் அங்கு விவசாயிகளைத் திரட்டி போராட்டங்கள் நடத்தியிருக்கிறோம்; ஆகவே, அந்தப் பிரதேசத்திலுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு மற்ற இடத்தவர்களைவிட அதிக வாரம் கொடுக்கவில்லை என்று நாங்கள் சர்க்காரைக் குற்றஞ்சாட்டவில்லை. அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் அங்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய அமைதியின்மைக்கு வெகுமதியாகவும் கோரவில்லை. அமைதியின்மை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லும்போது, அந்த அமைதியின்மை ஏற்படுவதற்குக் காரணமாக அங்கு ஒரு சூழ்நிலை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை யாரும் மறக்கமுடியாது. வர்க்க நல்லுழைவை வளர்க்கக்கூடியவர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி வர்க்க வேற்றுமையை வளர்க்க கூடியவர்களாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய யதார்த்த நிலைமையை, அதாவது material conditions-ஐ அனுசரித்து காரியத்தைச் செய்தால்தான் நல்ல நிலைமை ஏற்படுமே தவிர இல்லாவிட்டால் ஏற்படாது. ஆகவே, அரசாங்கம் இதுவரையிலும் நடந்தவைகளையெல்லாம் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாமல், உண்மையாகவே கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டுவரும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மை ஏற்படுமா இல்லையா என்பதைப் பார்க்கவேண்டுமே தவிர, அம்மாதிரியான அரசியல் விஷயங்களை இதிலே கொண்டுவந்து புருத்தக்கூடாதென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இது அரசியல் கட்சிகளுக்கு அப்பாற்பட்ட விஷயம். ஆனால் நிலத்தில் உரிமை என்பதை வேறு இடத்தில் தீர்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டிய விஷயம். அது மக்கள் மத்தியில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டு அவர்களால் தீர்ப்புக் கூறப்பட வேண்டிய விஷயம்.

“ மன்னார்குடி, திருத்தூறைப்பூண்டி தாலுகாக்களிலுள்ள விவசாயிகள் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய வார விகிதம் சம்பந்தமாக அவர்கள் நிச்சயமாகக் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். இன்றைக்கு இந்தச் சட்டமானது அவர்களுக்கு அதாவது ஆதாயம் அளித்திருக்கிறதா, இல்லையா என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் நான் இதை வற்புறுத்திச் சொல்லுகிறேன். மீண்டும் போசனை செய்துபார்த்தால், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் இந்த 40:60 விகிதம் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கும் சாதாரண குடியானவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் வழங்கக்கூடியதாக இல்லை, இன்னும் சில மாதங்களுக்கு கழித்து அதை கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் உணரவேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்படும் என்று தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை வற்புறுத்த விரும்புகிறேன்.”

27th November 1952]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Sir, I am glad about the welcome change in the hon. Gentlemen who spoke on this amendment and who come from that area. In fact, the mover of the amendment raised this point at the Joint Select Committee where he was more eloquent than here. All the same, the Joint Select Committee by a majority took a different view and the hon. the Mover and others who dissented have appended their minutes of dissent. I, therefore, do not wonder that in pursuance of their dissenting views they are moving this amendment here. I submit, Sir, that this sharing of 60:40 was based, having as the starting point the Mayuram Award. We did not have very much in our mind the Report of the Subramaniam Committee and, as the schedule would show, we very much depended on the Mayuram Award. As far as the limited scope of this Bill goes, I think it is but right that we based the proportions of the respective shares on this Award. Of course, if it were to come up as a general question of land reform, we would have looked into the Subramaniam Committee Report and not based the proportions on the limited scope of the Mayuram Award. I, therefore, request the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Sir, on a point of information, I would like to tell the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue that the Mayuram Award granted an over-all increase of 5 per cent over the existing *varam* throughout the district. It was not a percentage sharing at all.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

“ In sub-clause (1) for the words within brackets, *substitute* the following :—

“ or 20 per cent increase over his existing customary share percentage, whichever is more beneficial to the tenant ”.

and also omit the words in the third paragraph of sub-clause (1), beginning with the words “ and no portion of the produce . . . ” up to the end of the paragraph.”

The amendment was lost.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Sir, what about my amendment? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member has not given notice of any amendment to this sub-clause.”

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Tuesday, 2nd December 1952.

The House then adjourned.

[27th November 1952]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 194 asked by Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 27th November 1952, page 783 supra.]

Classes of vehicles.	Rates of tax in force from 1st January 1948 to 30th June 1949.			Rates of tax in force from 1st July 1949.		
	For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres. (Per quarter.)	For other vehicles.		For vehicles fitted with pneumatic tyres. (Per quarter.)	For other vehicles.	
(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)	(5)	
Buses (General rates)—						
(i) For every seated passenger other than the driver and conductor which the vehicle is permitted to carry.	Rs. 17 0 0	A. P. 25 8 0		Rs. 30 0 0	A. P. 45 0 0	
(ii) For every passenger other than seated passenger and the driver and conductor, which the vehicle is permitted to carry.	5 11 0	8 8 0		10 0 0	15 0 0	
Private cars—						
(i) Weighing not more than 15 cwt. unladen.	17 8 0	25 0 0		21 0 0	30 0 0	
(ii) Weighing more than 15 cwt. but not more than 30 cwt. unladen.	25 0 0	37 8 0		30 0 0	45 0 0	
(iii) Weighing more than 30 cwt. but not more than 45 cwt. unladen.	32 8 0	50 0 0		39 0 0	60 0 0	
(iv) Weighing more than 45 cwt. but not more than 60 cwt. unladen.	40 0 0	60 0 0		48 0 0	72 0 0	
(v) Weighing more than 60 cwt. unladen.	50 0 0	75 0 0		60 0 0	90 0 0	

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 2nd December 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Tour of Ministers in Srikakulam district.

* 206 Q.—SRI K. GOVINDA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Ministers who toured Srikakulam district in the past three months;

(b) how many of them visited Kurupam for election purposes; and

(c) what is the amount spent for each of those Ministers from the State Exchequer?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“(a) & (b) Three Ministers were in the new Srikakulam district during the past three months but none of them visited the district for election purposes as alleged in the question.

“(c) The total amount drawn by these Ministers from the State Exchequer for these visits was Rs. 198.

Rs. 48 by Minister for Public Works.

Rs. 137 by Minister for Rural Welfare, and

Rs. 13 by Minister for Education.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO:—“ఈ మంత్రులందరూ పాక్షాత్తురం ఉన్నప్పుడు వారిలోని ఒక మంత్రుడు కర్నూలు, కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ అధ్యక్షుని సదనం వద్ద ఉన్నప్పుడు ఆయనకు ఆయనకు (కర్నూలు) మంత్రులు ఎరుగదురా! వారి ప్రచారానికి గాను ప్రభుత్వం నుంచి వినియోగించబడుతున్న వసతి ప్రజలు ఉద్దేశపరుతున్నారనే విషయం వారికి తెలుసా?”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Sir, I will answer the question that has been put but I was not able to follow the subsequent development of the hon. Member's argument. The question is whether I know that the Hon. Ministers did ask the people to vote for the Congress during the by-election. It is quite possible, Sir,—though I cannot say for certain—that when they are there on business they might be doing these things also but, to the point in the question whether they went there for election purposes, I say No.”

[2nd December 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఎంకే సమయం లోనే కురుపాం (కూర్కపూరి) నియోజక వర్గానికి ముగ్గురు మంత్రులు ఎందువల్ల వెళ్ల వలసివచ్చినదో తెలుతారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I would request my young Friend to tell me in English. He may be taken to have put the question in Telugu but let him tell me in English.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఇంకీ ఫలా మాట్లాడడం జరుగడం ప్రజాసామాజికానికి విన్నపించుకున్నాను. నాకున్నది తెలు తెలుతాను. ఎంకే సమయంలోనే ముగ్గురు మంత్రులు ఎందువల్ల కురుపాం వెళ్లవలసి వచ్చిందో తెలియజేసారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ No inference should be drawn from the fact that three Ministers were there during a particular month on various dates when a by-election was also expected there; but Ministers have to go in connection with their work and while they are there they talk to people also, I do not think that we can lay down a proposition, either by convention or otherwise, that when there is a by-election no Minister should go to that area but only the Opposition should be allowed to go.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, May I know what was the kind of work on which these Ministers went and whether the Chief Minister is aware of the fact that in a newspaper called the ‘Congress’, which is the official newspaper of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, it was stated that these Ministers made election tours, visited several villages and made election speeches? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I do not think that I can be either responsible for, or answer questions relating to statements made by newspapers in the locality but, if information is wanted as to what my colleagues did on various dates I can give them. But, I would like to know what exactly is wanted because I have quite a long list of facts here.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister was pleased to state that they went on their work and incidentally talked about the election.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Yes.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Now, I would like to know what was their work.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am thankful, Sir, for this inquisition. I hope that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when he becomes a Minister, will welcome such questions.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I will welcome them, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Hon. Minister for Public Works was in Srikakulam district on the

[2nd December 1952]

16th October and he departed from that district on the 18th of October. The halt between these two points of time was not for election purposes and he did not claim travelling allowance or daily allowance for the halt on the 17th of October. I am giving these particulars in stages. The Hon. Minister for Rural Welfare was there on the 3rd of October and left on the 6th of October. He halted at Kurupam for lunch. The Hon. Minister for Education was there between the 16th and 23rd of October. He halted at Kurupam from 6 p.m. to 7-30 p.m. During that time he received deputations from representatives of neighbouring villages and Harijans for opening fair price shops, and also regarding the Nagavalli Project and opening of new Schools. He visited Kurupam on the 17th of September between 10 p.m. and 10-30 p.m. He could not avoid that visit as the Raja of Kurupam had died recently and he was in honour bound to pay a visit and call on the mother.

Sir, I will take about fifteen minutes if I were to give all details about what each Minister did. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is really thinking that we used this sum of Rs. 198 for election purposes, I would deprecate such an assumption. I can give him a long list giving all details as to what the Ministers did.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I am sorry, Sir, that my question has not been answered. I asked what was the work on which they started from here. It is quite another thing to say that if they go, people certainly come and they make certain representations. I would like to know what was the work which carried these three Ministers all the way from Madras to that long distance just before a by-election? ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I have given the hon. the Leader of the Opposition the dates. ‘Just before’ is not right!”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ It was only ten days before and we call it ‘just before’.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ In a general way, I can say that they started on these tours because they are Ministers and they must be in touch with affairs all over and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition can see that, between the dates that I have given for the arrival and departure of each Minister, there was no conspiracy to go there for election work. Moreover, the Minister for Public Works is from Cuddapah. He had nothing to do with that constituency and was not likely to have been of much use at the by-election there. Really, I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to sympathise with my difficulty in reading all the tour programmes but, if he really requires it, I will give it to him in writing as to what exactly was done by each Minister. As I have said before in reply to the general question, the object was to keep in touch with affairs all over. For instance, so far as the Public Works

[2nd December 1952]

Minister is concerned, I can read out from his tour programme that he had visited the Vamsadhara Project site, went on to Nevagam or whatever the name of that place is, and held a meeting in regard to the Nagavalli right channel. He also visited the Dowleshwaram canals and the Public Works Department workshops. This is generally what I may call technical work from the Public Works Minister's tour programme.

10-40
a.m.

By that time, the Hon. Minister for Education arrived at Bobbili on the 16th September. He went there in connection with a High School. He received deputations about the high school and sites for Harijans. He gave interviews at Parvathipuram and received deputations from various people about the Nagavalli Project, being a Minister in the Cabinet. He visited schools and Harijan pettas near about Narasipur. He declared open a high school—a district board secondary school. He addressed also the Parvathipuram Bar Association and the panchayat board also met him. By the time the Hon. Minister for Education arrived at Kurupam, the nomination papers of candidates had not even been filed. I think, Sir, this is enough for the present."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, the Hon. Minister for Public Works visited Parvathipuram Constituency which is in no way connected with Vamsadhara Project, and the Hon. Minister for Rural Welfare visited Parvathipuram area though there is no development scheme working in that constituency and there carried on an election campaign in favour of the Congress candidate in that area. Is the Hon. Chief Minister aware that the Hon. Ministers including the Hon. Minister for Education while addressing public meetings asked the people to vote for the Congress, the party in power?"

"Is it not a fact that the Ministers did tell the people that by voting for the Congress only they could get all the things done and if not, nothing could be done?"

"Is it not also a fact that the Hon. the Chief Minister had given a telegram to the Rani Saheba of Kurupam stating, 'Sanjiva Reddi told me your sentimental fears. God is above to protect us all. Please allow Chinna Saheb to file nomination.'"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member should not bring in all these things."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" The whole question relates to the fact whether Ministers had used Ministerial influence in the by-election of Parvathipuram or not."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will not allow the second part of the question. The Hon. the Chief Minister may answer the first part of the question."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am not able to remember the first part of the question. I was trying to follow what he was saying. But without remembering the

[2nd December 1952]

first part of the question, let me say that we are political bodies and we are entitled to use every opportunity for furthering our own interests. But if the allegation or suspicion is that we used public money for purposes of carrying on our propaganda it is entirely wrong."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The Hon. the Chief Minister has said that they can use their power to further their own interests."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" No, no."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" It means that."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Will the Hon. the Chief Minister repeat his answer?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I could not have said, 'I used the power'. If I said, 'I used the power', he can go to an Election Tribunal immediately."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to repeat his answer?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I cannot remember what I said in answer to a supplementary question. The reporters will be able to say that."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Does the Hon. the Chief Minister consider that the use of Ministerial position to further the interests of the political party if which they belong is consistent with political morals?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The position of Ministers as Ministers is not and cannot be used for that purpose. But we cannot ignore facts. When I am influencing a body of people, my previous history, all my previous history has its effect; my present office has its effect, but what is relevant is, I do not use that position or that power."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" జై ఎన్ డి కే సమయంలోనే మంత్రిగారు పరవతిపూర్ పరిశీలనకు వెళ్లారు. అది సాధ్యమే అంటారు? అయితే దానికి కారణమేమిటి?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" All the assumptions on which the question is based are wrong. Did I go for election purposes? Or, can the Hon. Minister for Public Works who is from Cuddapah have a great influence there?"

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" మీరు చెప్పారని కాదు చెప్పేది. ఆ పార్టీ మంత్రుల ఆశయం అది సాధ్యమే అంటారు? అది అసాధ్యమే?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the result of the election shows that none of these things could have any effect. The result of the election was that there was an overwhelming vote for the party that succeeded. (cheers) If it is a matter of interpellations and arguments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Next question please."

[2nd December 1952]

Drinking-water supply to Cochin.

* 207 Q.—SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state whether the Cochin Municipality applied to the Government for a grant of a loan for the construction of a separate pipe line for drinking water from Thoppumpati at Mattancherry?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"The answer is in the affirmative."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN:—"May I know, whether the Sanitary Engineer to the Government of Madras visited the place and has submitted a report to the Government and whether the Government have considered the question of granting a loan to the municipality, and if so what is the amount?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"The Sanitary Engineer has inspected the existing water-supply scheme and he has suggested another scheme. The proposals in regard to this scheme have been sent to the Travancore-Cochin Government and their concurrence is expected."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN:—"May I inform the Hon. Minister that even though there is an agreement with the Travancore-Cochin Government, for the present only three thousand gallons of water are supplied in the place where there are more than 30,000 people living?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"I have already said that a different scheme is being thought of to provide more adequate supply of water. The proposals have been sent to the Travancore-Cochin Government and the concurrence of that Government is awaited."

Allegations against the Rationing Officer, Malabar district.

* 208 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a petition, dated 15th August 1952 from Sri C. P. K. Kurup of Vellaicode amsam in Malabar district making certain allegations against the Rationing Officer for having sold 25 bags of rice in blackmarket; and

(b) if so, whether the offence was investigated and with what result?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) No."

" (b) The question does not arise."

Site for a cancer hospital at Madras.

* 209 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras State Women's Cancer Relief Committee applied to the Government of Madras for the grant of a site for the founding of a Cancer Hospital within Madras City limits;

[2nd December 1952]

- (b) if so, on what date the application was made;
- (c) the extent of land required by the petitioners;
- (d) whether any particular locality was mentioned in the application; and
- (e) the action taken by the Government?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—" (a) to (e) A statement is placed on the Table of the House."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—"Sir, with reference to the statement placed on the Table of the House, may I know the extent of the plot granted, and whether this plot lies within the limits of the Madras City Corporation and also whether the three sites proposed to be given are adjoining and adjacent to the plot now granted?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"R.S. No. 7 of Kotturu village in Gandhinagar and No. 75 of Pallipattu village, Madras district, have been assigned to the Chairwoman, the Madras State Women's Cancer Relief Committee."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that the land granted to the Madras State Women's Cancer Relief Committee forms part of the grazing ground of Kotturu village as well as a thrashing ground for community purposes for Pallipattu village?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"A separate question may be put."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN:—"May I know the extent of the site granted?"

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY:—"About one and odd acres."

Appointment of dealers for Fair Price shops.

* 210 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

- (a) whether any priority list has been prescribed by the Government for the appointment of dealers for Fair Price shops; and
- (b) if so, the persons eligible for such appointment in order of preference?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" (a) The answer is in the affirmative."

" (b) The order of preference is as follows:—

- (i) Co-operative societies.

* Printed as Appendix I on page 975 infra.

[2nd December 1952]

(i) Licensees or exemptees under the Madras Foodgrains Control Order in the following order :—

(a) Harijans; (b) Displaced persons; (c) Ex-Abkari Contractors; (d) other licensees.

"If no suitable licensees or exemptees or co-operative societies are forthcoming, other suitable and reliable persons will be Selected."

10-50 a.m. SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO :—" Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to say who are the officers who are empowered to appoint these dealers? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The D.R.O. or the D.S.O. concerned has got the power to appoint."

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government would direct the Registrar of Co-operative Societies to permit weavers' co-operative societies to run the fair price shops, because they are not permitted to do so in spite of the fact that the D.S.Os. have permitted the weaver societies to run these shops? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I think this question should be addressed to the Minister in charge of Co-operation."

SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—" ಅನೇಕ ಕೃಷಕರೂ black market ವೆಸಿಸಿ Co-operative society ಮತ್ತು fair price shop ಮತ್ತು ಇವುಗಳ ನಡುವಣ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವೇನು? ಪ್ರಧಾನ ವಿಭಾಗವೆಂಬುದು? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I want to know what the policy of the Government is where cases are filed against co-operative societies. Will the permits be continued in their favour or will others be given permits in their place? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" If any person is found unsuitable, certainly he will not be given any preference. In the case of institutions also if the management misbehaves, those co-operative societies also will be penalized."

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—" ಅನೇಕ ಕೃಷಕರೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ private dealer ಮತ್ತು ಮಿಶ್ರಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಮಿಶ್ರಿತವಾಗಿ ಇವು ದಾ? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Notice, please."

Rayavaram, Modukuru and Jampapalem dams in Yellamanchili taluk.

* 211 Q.—SRI P. BAPU NAIDU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) how far the investigations of the Rayavaram, Modukuru, Latchirajupalem anicut in Yellamanchili taluk and Jampapalem dam of Yellamanchili have progressed;

[2nd December 1952]

(b) what is the cost of the estimate for these works and what is the area that will be brought under cultivation by them; and

(c) when the execution of both the works will be commenced?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) No such investigation is being made. There is already a dam existing across the Sarada river near Jampapalem village known as Jampapalem Dam and there is at present no proposal to improve this dam or to construct a new anicut."

"(b) & (c) Do not arise."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Will the Government take into consideration the question of conducting investigation of the said dam, Sir? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Which dam? I have already said that there is one dam there called the Jampapalem dam."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, in view of the answer given by the Hon. Minister that no investigation is being made, will the Government consider the desirability of taking up the investigation? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" It is not under the consideration of the Government at present."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Will the Government take that up for consideration? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" That will be considered, Sir."

Repairs to the tanks of the Munagala Estate.

* 212 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the six major tanks in Madhavaram, Taduvai, Singavaram, Munagala, Ganapuvaram and Komarabanda in Munagala Paragana were taken over by Public Works Department after the Munagala Estate was taken over by the Government;

(b) If so, whether any repairs were carried out by the department after the tanks had been taken over; and

(c) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) Yes."

"(b) No."

"(c) The tanks are in good condition and the masonry works are functioning well. Only minor repairs to the tanks are required and they will be carried out in due course."

[2nd December 1952]

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ చెరువులకు repairs లేక పోవడంవల్ల నీరు నిలువ ఉండుట లేదనే విషయం ప్రభుత్వం వారికి తెలుసునా? ఈ విషయమై ప్రభుత్వంవారికి మహజ్జర్లు వచ్చినవా? ఈ చెరువులను మరమ్మత్తు చేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఆలోచిస్తున్నారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“I am not aware of what the hon. Member says. It has a double meaning—both the language and the other thing.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ చెరువులు మరమ్మత్తులు లేక పాడైపోయినవి. చెరువులలో నీరు నిలువ ఉండక పోవడంవల్ల ఖాములు పాగు కావడం లేదు. ఈ సమాచారం ప్రభుత్వంవారికి ఇంతవరకు అంది ఉండనట్లే లే వెంటనే అధికారులకు శ్రాసి వాస్తవ పరిస్థితుల గురించి తెలుసుకొనుటకు ప్రయత్నిస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“As I said, I am not aware of the statement the hon. Member makes.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“Sir, the Hon. Minister was saying in reply to a question put by an hon. Member that it has a double meaning. I am afraid it is an insinuation.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“What the insinuation is, I do not see.”

Retrenchment as a result of decontrol.

* 213 Q.—**SRI G. RAMA RAO:** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of gazetted and non-gazetted officials retrenched on account of decontrol in the Civil Supplies department;

(b) how many peons were ousted and what provision the Government are going to make in respect of their re-employment;

(c) the total number of Non-Gazetted officers whose services were dispensed with for want of vacancies; and

(d) the procedure the Government propose to adopt to procure paddy hereafter?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) Four thousand four hundred and fifty-two persons were retrenched from the Civil Supplies Department up to 15th October 1952 as a result of decontrol. Details regarding the staff retrenched are given in the statement* placed on the table of the House for information. The above staff consists of (1) persons taken on loan from other permanent departments, (2) persons with no lien in any department of Government.

* Printed as Appendix II on pages 975-976 infra.

2nd December 1952]

(b) Presumably the hon. Member wants to have information regarding peons who had no lien in any department. The number of such persons retrenched as a result of decontrol in the office of the Board of Revenue (Civil Supplies) and in the districts other than Madurai is 530.

“Particulars regarding the staff retrenched in Madurai have been called for and they are awaited.

The question of absorbing these peons in other departments of Government is under consideration.

(c) The statement* placed on the table of the House shows the number of persons with no lien in any department of Government, who were retrenched in the office of the Board of Revenue (Civil Supplies) and in the districts other than Madurai, as a result of decontrol.

(d) The procedure to be followed in regard to the procurement of paddy has been set out in the Madras Foodgrains (Levy Procurement) Order, 1952, issued by the Government and published in the Extraordinary issue of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 20th November 1952.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO:—“ఇప్పుడు retrench చేయబడినవారికి మంచి అనుభవమైనవారు ఉన్నారని విద్యే సంవత్సరంలో వారు Service Commission పరీక్ష pass కావాలనే నిబంధనను సడలించి, వారిని regular services లోనికి తీసుకుంటారా?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Notice please.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“Sir, from the statement placed on the table of the House, it is found that out of the personnel who were retrenched from the Madras City Rationing Office, only a few people have been absorbed since, will the Government explain why in the absorption of the few people the question of seniority was not followed, because I know of some cases of people who though they have put in longer service, have been eliminated?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“A separate question may be put. If the hon. Member brings to my notice any case where an injustice has been done to any person, I will look into the matter.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“Revenue Secretariat లోను, Board of Revenue లోని వివిధ కాలంలోని ఉన్నత స్థాయిలోని unqualified ఉద్యోగులకు ప్రామాణికంగా retrench చేయబడినవారిలోను qualified personnel ను నియమించుటకు ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ప్రయత్నిస్తుందా?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“I want notice, Sir.”

* Printed as Appendix III on pages 976-978 infra.

[2nd December 1952]

Representations from the retrenched personnel of the Civil Supplies Department.

* 214 Q.—SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the personnel employed in the Ration and Supply departments were given individual notices before they were retrenched and, if not, why;

(b) how many persons were involved in the retrenchment and what the Government propose to do with them; and

(c) whether the Government have received any representations from them?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“(a) The persons retrenched from the Civil Supplies Department as a result of decontrol were not given individual notices. In lieu of the notice, they were granted an ex-gratia payment at the rates mentioned below:—

Persons with one year's service and less—One month's pay.

Persons with more than one year's service but not more than two years—Two months' pay.

Persons with more than two years' service—Three months' pay.

“(b) A statement showing the number of persons retrenched from the Civil Supplies Department as a result of decontrol has been placed on the table of the House for information with reference to Starred Question No. 213.

“(c) The retrenched personnel consists of:

(i) persons taken on loan from other Departments of Government; and (ii) outsiders with no lien in any Department of Government. The former, on the abolition of the posts in the Civil Supplies Department, have reverted to their permanent departments. As regards the latter they are mostly clerks and peons. Such of these persons belonging to the grade of clerks as had put in a service of three years on 1st October 1950, were permitted to appear for special Examinations for recruitment to Ministerial Services conducted by the Madras Public Service Commission in February 1952 and June 1952 and the candidates selected by the Madras Public Service Commission will be absorbed in the regular departments of the Government. The question of granting certain other concessions to these persons is under consideration.

“(e) Yes.”

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—“Have the Government any proposal to absorb this retrenched personnel, Sir?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Yes, certain of them will be absorbed, if possible.”

[2nd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“With reference to clause (c) enquiring whether the Government have received any representations, the Hon. Minister was pleased to give the very comprehensive answer ‘Yes’. When a question of that type is put, we expect the Hon. Minister to say something about the substance of the representation and what the Government propose to do with what has been represented. May I know from the Hon. Minister what the representation was and what action he is going to take on it?”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“Whenever such questions are put, hon. Members are already in possession of a copy of the representation. That was why I thought that it was not necessary to include the details in the answer. However, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants, I may say that the following are the important points made in the representations:—

(1) Steps should be taken to retain and absorb the retrenched personnel on the same pay and allowance which they drew at the time of discharge. For giving them immediate relief, orders may be passed to absorb them in the Community Projects Department.

(2) If it is not possible to absorb them, such of those who have been disbanded may be given some gratuity in consideration of the services rendered.

(3) Till all the officers are absorbed in regular service, further recruitment may be stopped.

(4) Steps may be taken to make provision for low-paid staff.

The Board has been consulted on these suggestions and its final report is awaited.”

Employees retrenched as a result of decontrol.

* 215 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state how many employees of the Government have been retrenched consequent upon the abolition of food control?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“A statement showing the number of posts retrenched as a result of decontrol, has been placed on the table of the House for information, with reference to question No. 213.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ఈ retrenched personnel నుంచి కమ్యూనిటీ ప్రాజెక్టులలోకి ఎంత మందిని తీసుకొస్తారో చెప్పగలరా?”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“How many of them have been absorbed in Government service and whether any of them have been absorbed in the Community Projects Scheme?”

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) Yes, to the extent of Rs. 27 lakhs.

“(b) In view of the subsequent improvement in seasonal conditions the Collector has since submitted a revised estimate for Rs. 7,60,000 and it is under the examination of the Famine Commissioner.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—ఈ సందర్భం విశాఖ జిల్లాలో కంటిని బాగా చెబ్బితిన్న కారణమువల్ల అక్కడ తీవ్రమైన తేమపరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడాయనే విషయాన్ని గమనించి, విశాఖ జిల్లాలో మరొక రాయలసీమ తయారు కాకుండా ముందుగానే తీవ్ర శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొని తీవ్రమువంటి డబ్బు ఇచ్చి దానిని famine area గా declare చేస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The hon. Member said that somebody was beaten. I do not know who was beaten.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“May I know from the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue whether the Government will consider the Collector's report and do something before the conditions become acute?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Yes certainly, Sir.”

SRI M. VEERABHADRAM :—“యీ సందర్భం కంటిని పొవడకు కాకుండా విశాఖ ముఖ్య కర్షణ ప్రాంతాలలో పనులు లేకుండా కాలానుది అవస్థలకు మన్నారు. కాబట్టి వెంటనే జిల్లా కలెక్టరు ఇచ్చినటువంటి proposals ను ప్రభుత్వం అంగీకరించి డబ్బు sanction చేస్తుందా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“I will look into it, Sir.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“కలెక్టరు ఈ ప్రాంతాలలోకి ఎన్ని నెలలంది ? దిన్ని మీరు ఇంకా ఎన్ని దినాలవరకు consideration లో పెట్టుకొంటుంటారు?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“Only days and not months.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—మౌలిక సౌకర్యములలో ఇంకొక ప్రకారం కొట్టారని అనుమానించాడు. అది నా ప్రక్కలాని లోకం కాదు. మౌలిక సౌకర్య భావపరిజ్ఞానములోనే తొలగిపోయిందని నా అభిప్రాయము.”

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“కలెక్టరు 27 లక్షల సూచనలు కావాలని వ్రాసినట్లు చెప్పారు. దానిమీద ప్రభుత్వము revise చేయమంటే కలెక్టరు revise చేసి వచ్చారా, లేక తనంతట తానే మరల 7 లక్షలకు revise చేసి వచ్చారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The Collector himself submitted the revised estimate.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“కలెక్టరు 27 లక్షల కావాలని వ్రాయడానికి, తరువాత మరల 7 లక్షలు సరిపాడుందని వ్రాయడానికి ప్రభుత్వము కలెక్టరుకు ఏదైనా ఇచ్చిన వుంటుందని జరిగిందా ? లేకున్నా, కలెక్టరు మరల 7 లక్షలకే వ్రాసివచ్చడానికి ఏమి కారణము.”

2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“No order emanated from us. The order came from the Rain God.”

“SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—ప్రభుత్వము దీనికి 7 లక్షలు ఇస్తారని నెల 11-10 విచ్చింది, అయితే దీనిని విభజించి విశాఖ జిల్లాలోని పర్లయింతుకున్న దో పెట్టుకుందా? a.m.

“Sir, the Hon. Minister said that a sum of about Rs. 7 lakhs has been sanctioned for meeting emergencies in the Visakhapatnam district. Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to say what concrete steps have been taken, and how the Hon. Minister is going to spend this Rs. 7 lakhs to improve the lot of the Visakhapatnam ryots?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The items on which the money is to be spent are—

	RS.
Gruel centres	24,000
Loans	7,00,000
Food production and tank improvement schemes	4,90,000
Minor irrigation works	4,00,000
Gandidran gedda reservoir project	10,00,000

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“The Collector originally reported that he required Rs. 27 lakhs, and in his revised estimate he has asked for Rs. 7 lakhs. What are the items which have been left out as a result of improvement in conditions?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“I am under cross-examination, Sir. I want some time to look into the matter.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“The word ‘cross-examination’ is facilely used. Examination, interpellation and cross-examination are all intended to elicit information. All that we want to know is what are the items of works which are now omitted.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“To give correct information, I want some time, Sir.”

Payment of municipal taxes by distressed weavers.

* 218 Q—

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member Sri A. J. Arunachalam is not in his place. The question and answer will be printed in the proceedings.”

SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—“I want to put a supplementary question on this question, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“No. The hon. Member who put the main question is not here. The question and answer will be printed in the proceedings.”

[2nd December 1952]

SRI A. J. ARUNACHALAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether it is a fact that some of the municipalities in the State have been instructed to write off the house and profession taxes due from the distressed weavers of the State?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" The attention of the Members is invited to the orders issued in G.O. No. 1036, L.A., dated the 25th May 1951, copies * of which are placed on the table of the House."

Tuberculosis Fund promoted by the former Pudukkottai State.

* 219 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) why the Tuberculosis Fund promoted by the former Pudukkottai State has not been used for the purpose for which it was collected; and

(b) if the amount is too small for a separate institution, whether the Government will utilize the fund for adding a "Pudukkottai Ward" to the Tiruchirappalli Tuberculosis Hospital buildings and reserve the same for Pudukkottai patients?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" (a) Prior to the merger of the Pudukkottai State with the State Government, the public of Pudukkottai had raised subscriptions amounting to Rs. one lakh for combating Tuberculosis. Out of this amount a sum of Rs. 15,000 was already spent on the construction of two wards for Tuberculosis cases in the Town General Hospital, Pudukkottai. In October 1952, the Government sanctioned the construction of an additional ward of 24 beds for Tuberculosis cases in that hospital at an approximate cost of Rs. 61,745.

"Does not arise."

Electricity supply to Jaggayyapet.

* 220 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposal to extend electric power supply to Jaggayyapet?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The answer is in the affirmative."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" ఈ విషయంలో ఎన్ని మేము విన్నానా తయారైందా? పని విన్నానా ఇప్పటికి undertake చేశారా? అయితే అది ఎంత వరకు progress అయింది? ఎంత దబ్బుకు దీనిని ఎస్టిమేటు చేశారు?"

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The estimate is under consideration."

* Printed as Appendix IV on page 979 infra.

[2nd December 1952]

Electricity supply to villages in Nandigama taluk.

* 221 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal for the supply of electricity to villages up to Jaggayyapet in Nandigama taluk; and

(b) if so, when the Government decided on this and how far the Government have proceeded in the matter?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) Yes.

"(b) After field investigation, a major scheme has been prepared by the department and submitted to the Government recently. It is under consideration."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" ఈ స్కీముకు డబ్బు ఎంత అవుతుందో చెప్పగలరా? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" This is only a tentative scheme, which is still under consideration. The scheme is estimated to cost Rs. 2,98,312."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" ఈ consideration అనేది తండ్రి ఎంత కాలము పీనుకొంటుంది. దీనికి 2 లక్షల రూపాయలు ఇవ్వలే సముచిత స్థితిలో ప్రభుత్వము ఉన్నదా? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" It is not a question of whether or not the Government are capable of supplying electricity to Jaggayyapet. The hon. Member should understand that these schemes cannot be taken up without proper scrutiny and estimates."

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI :—" ఈ స్కీము డబ్బు ప్రాంతాలగుండా వెళ్తుంది. ఇది గుంటూరు pumping scheme కున్నట్లు graphite తనులనుకూడా ఉపయోగపడుతుంది. ఇంత పెద్ద స్కీముకు ప్రభుత్వము 2 లక్షలు మాత్రమే కేటాయించిందంటే, యీ కొద్ది మొత్తము విలాస సరిహద్దులో వెళ్తుందా? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Sir, may I remind the hon. Member that the cost of the scheme is not Rs. 2 lakhs, but it is nearly Rs. 3 lakhs. He is harping on the presumption that it is Rs. 2 lakhs. The most important fact to be considered in connection with the estimates is that one of the prospective consumers is the Krishna Co-operative Irrigation and Agricultural Improvement Society. This society is the biggest consumer. This society has asked the Government that it should be taken over by the Government. This question also is under consideration. We should also examine the question whether the particular society has got the funds to purchase the equipment, and, therefore, we have got to consider all these things and then only decide."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" ఈ స్కీము గురించి ప్రభుత్వము వెళ్తుంది అంటే, అసలు ఈ స్కీమును ప్రభుత్వము execute చేస్తుందా? చేయడా అనే ప్రశ్న"

[2nd December 1952]

మాడ వస్తున్నది. ఆసలు దీనిని చేయడానికి ముందు కొన్ని విషయములు అలోచించి, వాటి పరిష్కారము పూర్తి అయిన తరువాత, ఎంతకాలము పట్టుతుంది అనేదాన్ని చెప్పలేదు. మంత్రిగారికి మరొక మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. Tamilలో వేసిన ప్రశ్నలకు తమిళ మంత్రులు Tamil లో సమాధానము యిస్తున్న మాదిరిగా మంత్రిగారు తెలుగులో వేసిన ప్రశ్నలకు తెలుగులోనే సమాధానమివ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Let me tell the hon. Member that my answer is not intended for the particular hon. Member but for the whole House. The original question is put in English, and hon. Members of this House expect further information also. Therefore, I will answer in English alone."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" ఇంతకుముందు అడిగిన ప్రశ్నకు సరియైన సమాధానము రాలేదు. మంత్రిగారు శాంతంగా సమాధానము చెప్పమని కోరుతున్నాను. ఆసలు ప్రశ్న విమిటంటే ఎప్పుడు ఈ స్కీము consider చేయాలని ప్రభుత్వము అలోచించింది. ఇంకా దీనికి ఎంతకాలము తీసుకొంటుంది. ఎప్పటికి పూర్తి అవుతుంది? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" I have already said that the scheme is under consideration. I cannot say when it is likely to be completed. I am not an engineer."

Periyaram Tuberculosis Sanatorium, North Malabar.

* 222 Q.—SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) when the construction of Periyaram Tuberculosis Sanatorium in Chirakkal taluk will be completed; and

(b) whether the Government have got any proposal for the supply of electricity to the sanatorium, and if so, through which route?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" (a) The construction of a Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Periyaram, Malabar district, is expected to be completed before 31st March 1953.

" (b) The answer is in the negative."

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN :—" May I know, Sir, what is the estimated number of beds in the sanatorium? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" It is 84 beds at present. Ultimately it will be 970."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Have the Government any plans for the construction, who is supervising and are the plans being implemented by the Committee which is at work now? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" Sir, I believe the work is executed under the supervision of the Public Works Department."

[2nd December 1952]

DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, have the Government any figures about the incidence of this fell disease in Malabar? "

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY :—" A separate question may be put, Sir."

Damages to Krishna Anicut.

* 223 Q.—SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Krishna Anicut was damaged due to the recent floods; and

(b) if so, what precautionary steps the Government took to prevent the effects of the damage?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The hon. Member's attention is invited to the report of the Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee placed on the table of the House. The damage is being repaired, and the question of permanent measures to protect the anicut is being examined."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" ఈ క్రిష్ణా అనకట్టు గురించి, దానిమీద నిచ్చినటువంటి రిపోర్టులో, రిజిస్ట్రార్‌కు కట్టాలని సూచించారు. దాని విషయము ప్రభుత్వము ఏమైనా అలోచిస్తున్నదా? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Notice."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" ఆర్యా, గత వది సంవత్సరములుగా క్రిష్ణా అనకట్టును ప్రతి ఏటా repairs చేయవలసివచ్చుచున్నది. అలాంటప్పుడు కొంత అనకట్టును, ప్రాంతపు కట్టకపోగా క్రిష్ణా అనకట్టుకూడ ఈ విధంగా పాడై పోతుంటే, ప్రభుత్వము ఎందుకు దాన్ని సరిచేసేందుకు శ్రద్ధ కనపరచలేదని అడుగు తున్నాను? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" Sufficient precautions 11.20 a.m. have been taken. So far as damage is concerned, I have already said that the damage is being repaired, and the question of permanent measures to protect the anicut, is being examined."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, the damage caused to the Krishna Anicut and the report of the Enquiry Committee are very important subjects. May I ask the Hon. Minister whether he would give us a day to discuss this subject. It involves the irrigation of about 11 lakhs of acres—very important areas—for the food supply of this State. The report is a long one, and has several implications. Will the Government be pleased to give us a day for discussing this subject? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" It will be considered, Sir."

SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—" ఈ క్రిష్ణా అనకట్టు విషయం చాలా ప్రాముఖ్యమైనది. Enquiry Committee Report కూడా వచ్చినది. మంత్రిగారు తెలుగువారు గానట్టి తెలుగులో సమాధానమిస్తే, సరే మెంటరీ ప్రశ్నలు వేయడానికి వీలువుంది. కనుక తెలుగులో చెప్పవలసినది కోరుతున్నాను."

[2nd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, the hon. Member says that he does not understand English, that several Members coming from the Telugu area are particularly interested—I know the whole House is interested—and that they want to put supplementary questions. Therefore, he requests the Hon. Minister to answer the question in Telugu."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have no objection to the Hon. Minister answering the question in Telugu. But he should answer it first in English, because the whole House should know it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The hon. Member does not say that the Hon. Minister should not answer in English at all. But he also wants the answer to be given in Telugu also so that it may enable him to put further supplementary questions."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" I have already said that my answers are intended for the benefit of the whole House and not only for the benefit of the particular Member who puts the supplementary question. If he wants the answer to be given in Telugu, let him ask me again, and I will do it."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" అంధరికి తెలియాలనే మా ఉద్దేశ్యంకాదు. అందుకే తెలుగులో సమాధానమివ్వని మంత్రిగారిని కోరింది. వది సంతకపరములుగా కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వము ఈ అనకట్టుకు repairs చేయకుండా, అశ్రద్ధవహించిన కారణమున ఈ రోజున దీనికి ఇటువంటి దుస్థితి కలిగింది. అందువల్ల ఇప్పుడు దీనికి repairs పెంపునే చేయడానికి ఎంత కాలము అవుతుంది. త్వరితగా దీనిని పూర్తిచేసి, తరువాత reservoir కట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వము ఆమోదిస్తుందా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక విషయమేమంటే, దీనిని గురించి చర్చించేందుకు స్పీకరుగారిని ఒక అరగింటి దీచేయి కావాలనికూడ కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is whether a full-dress debate on this subject will be allowed. Besides, I think some question has been put by the hon. Member."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" The premise of the hon. Member that sufficient attention has not been paid to the Krishna Anicut is not correct. On the other hand, sufficient attention has been paid to it. (Interruptions.) Does the hon. Member want an answer from me or not?"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member should not speak aside."

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" So far as the allotment of a day for a debate is concerned, I have already said that it will be considered."

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—" On a point of order, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will hear the point of order afterwards."

2nd December 1952]

Use of indelible ink in the recent municipal elections.

* 224 Q.—SRI R. KRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state why indelible ink was not used in the recent municipal elections?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Indelible ink was not used for elections to the municipal councils other than Madurai, Coimbatore, Salem, Tiruchirappalli and Vijayavada, as the wards of the municipalities were small and as the candidates and their agents could easily identify voters and thus prevent voters from double voting. It was also necessary to keep the election expenditure to the minimum and the expenditure involved on employment of additional staff required for the conduct of elections, if indelible ink was to be introduced, had to be avoided. Besides the above reasons it was also felt that it would not be possible to secure enough women for marking women voters, as the number of women booths was large and equal to the number of wards. For elections to the Municipal Councils of Madurai, Coimbatore, Tiruchirappalli, Salem and Vijayavada, the indelible ink was used as a special case."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" మంత్రిగారి సమాధానంలో కారణాలు చాలా విచిత్రంగా ఉన్నాయి. అందులో అడవాల్లు లేరు mark చేయడానికి అని అన్నారు."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The hon. Gentleman is making comments on the answer given by my Hon. Colleague."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is only a genius of the language! "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Also the genius of the man."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" That is apparent."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" As it is for you."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I cannot allow this sort of exchange of words between an Hon. Minister and an hon. Member. Let the hon. Member put his question."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" ఈ విషయం ప్రారంభించింది నేనుగారు. మంత్రిగారి దీనిని ముడలుకట్టింది. కనుక వారు చెప్పిన దానిపైన comment చేయకూడదు."

"మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన సమాధానము చాలా విచిత్రంగా ఉంది. అందులో mark చేయడానికి తగినంతమంది అడవాల్లు లేరు అన్నారు. ఇది నిజమేనా. ఆ నాడు general elections లోవున్న అడవాల్లు ఈ నాడు తక్కువవుతున్నారా? దీనిని నియమించేందుకు ప్రభుత్వమునకు అవసరంగా అయ్యే ఖర్చు ఎంత? దీనివల్ల ప్రభుత్వము ఎంత ఖర్చును మిగుల్పుకొన్నది?"

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"In respect of general elections to the Legislative Assembly, I think the booths were few and far between. But when the question of wards arises, a number of booths have to be set up and people have to be procured only from the area concerned. So, women are not forthcoming."

MR. SPEAKER:—"We have to cover the remaining questions in five minutes. So, I pass on to the next question."

Subsistence loans in Madanapalle.

* 225 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of applicants for subsistence loans in Madanapalle constituency; and

(b) the number of such applicants who have been sanctioned loans?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) & (b) Thirteen thousand six hundred and seventy-nine applications for subsistence loans have been received up to 16th October 1952 in Madanapalle constituency. Of these 1,689 applicants have been sanctioned subsistence loans up to the date above mentioned."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"మనపల్లి, వాయల్పాడు తాలూకాలలో ఉన్నటువంటి దుర్బర ట్రేసు పరిస్థితులను గమనించి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఇటీవల సబ్సిడెన్సు లోన్సు (subsistence loans) కై కొంత అలాటమెంటు (allotment) చేశారు. ఆ పైకమును ఎందుకగాను యిప్పుడు ఆపువలచేశారు."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member put only one question."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH:—"It is only a part of the question, Sir."

నేను చెప్పుచున్నది నా ప్రశ్నలో ఒక భాగము మాత్రమేనంది. ఈ రెండు తాలూకాలలో ఎన్నో applications పెట్టుకొన్నప్పటికీ, వాలావాటికి subsistence loans ఇవ్వడం లేదు. అంతేకాకుండా ఈ ప్రదేశాలలో ఎన్నో అకలికావులునూడ సరిగ్గా కాదు. ఎంతోమందికి ముఖాలు, కాళ్లు వాచి వనిపోయారు. వాలామంది ఇతర ప్రదేశాలకు కలసినట్లారు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ప్రజలకు సబ్సిడెన్సు లోన్సును (subsistence loans) ప్రభుత్వము తిరిగి యిస్తుందా?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"We are dealing with only Madanapalle, and Vayalpad is not within the purview of this question."

2nd December, 1952]

Remission of land revenue to Pedabilli village, Penukonda taluk.

* 226 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation from the ryots of Pedabilli village of Penukonda taluk in Anantapur district has been received regarding the remission of land revenue last year;

(b) whether it is a fact that remission of land revenue was granted to whole of Penukonda taluk except this Pedabilli village; and

(c) if so, why this village was excluded?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) No such representation has been received by the Government."

" (b) Yes.

" (c) As the average outturn of crops in the village exceeded four annas and as the extent that yielded below four annas was less than 25 per cent of the area cultivated by dry crops, the village was not eligible for remission during fasli 1361."

Financial help to South Madras Electric Corporation.

* 227 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have made any financial help to the South Madras Electric Corporation for extension of electricity to Alangudy Town in Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district; and

(b) if so, how much?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—" (a) & (b) In March 1950, the Government sanctioned a loan of Rs. 3.11 lakhs to the South Madras Electric Corporation, Limited, for taking up schemes for the extension of supply of electricity to the following villages in the area of supply of the Pudukkottai State Electric Licence:—

(1) Alangudi,

(2) Kilathur,

(3) Melathur, and

(4) Rajamangalam.

"The extension scheme relating to Alangudi was estimated to cost Rs. 2,01,000 while the scheme relating to the other three villages was estimated to cost Rs. 1,10,000."

* 228 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—"నా ప్రశ్నను రేపటికి వాయిదా 11-30 a.m. చేయాలని కోరుచున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి ప్రశ్న."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. Member wants that question No. 228 may be taken up to-morrow. Yes, I shall do so."

[2nd December 1952]

Bridge over Cherupuzhathodu in North Malabar.

* 229 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state whether the Government have got any proposal to construct a bridge for Cherupuzhathodu near Patichal, Payyannoor, North Malabar, and if so, what steps the Government have taken in this matter?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"The work of constructing a bridge on the Cherupuzhathodu is under execution. The bridge will be completed by 31st December 1952."

The Mid Pennar Project.

* 230 Q.—SRI S. NARAYANAPPA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether investigation of Mid Pennar Project is over in Anantapur district;

(b) if so, whether orders have been issued for preparation of the detailed plans and estimates; and

(c) when this project will be commenced?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI:—" (a) Yes.

" (b) Plans and estimates have been prepared and are under scrutiny by the Chief Engineer (Irrigation).

" (c) This will depend on the finances available for new schemes."

Reservation of seat for Scheduled Castes in Udamalpet Municipality.

* 231 Q.—SRI A. M. RATNASWAMY:—"Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that in the municipal election to the Udamalpet Municipality (Coimbatore) held recently no seat was reserved to the Scheduled Castes; and

(b) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—" (a) Yes.

" (b) The Udamalpet Municipal Council while submitting proposals for the revision of wards and re-allocation of seats in the council proposed among other things the reservation of two seats for women only and did not propose reservation of any seat for the Scheduled Castes. On the basis of population and voting strength the Scheduled Castes are entitled to only one seat in the Council. As they had absolute majority in voting strength in Ward XI and as it was considered that they could secure the non-reserved seat in this ward

[2nd December 1952]

in proposal of the council was accepted and no seat was reserved."

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS*Number of deaths due to malaria.*

72 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the number of malaria attacks treated in Government Hospitals in 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 and the number of deaths in 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952 in the State?

A.— Year.	Total treated.	Number of deaths.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1948	1,825,266	329
1949	1,189,335	364
1950	1,217,416	452
1951	1,191,496	321
1952	Figures will be compiled only in 1953.	

Scales of pay of Agricultural Demonstrators.

73 Q.—SRI M. P. SUBRAMANIAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a difference in the scale of pay of Agricultural Demonstrators in the General Administrative Department and those in the Engineering Department with the same qualification;

(b) if so, the reasons for the same;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Agricultural Demonstrators working in the Administrative Branch are not made permanent even after ten years' service, while in the Engineering Branch, the Demonstrators are made permanent soon after their recruitment; and

(d) if so, the reasons for it?

A.—(a) & (b) The scales of pay of the Upper Subordinates in the Agricultural Branch and the Engineering Supervisors in the Engineering Branch of the Agricultural Department are Rs. 100—5—140—(E.B.)—10—220 also are different.

(c) the answer is in the negative.

(d) does not arise.

Supply of boots to police constables.

74 Q.—SRI M. P. SUBRAMANIAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why in certain districts in the State, the police constables are supplied with war quality heavy leather boots, while in other districts the police constables are supplied with ordinary chappals; and

[2nd December 1952]

(b) what is the cost to Government of a pair of such chappals and a pair of such boots?

A.—(a) In 1950, the Government sanctioned the supply of black ammunition boots to head constables and constables of town and taluk police stations in all districts in the State. In order, however, to exhaust the stock of chaplis already purchased, the Inspector-General of Police has been supplying chaplis for use in the six districts of Kurnool, Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, Chittoor and South Kanara. Boots will be supplied to head constables and constables in these six districts also, when the existing stock of chaplis is exhausted.

(b) The cost of a pair of such boots is Rs. 21-4-0 and the costs of a pair of chaplis is Rs. 7-8-0.

Improvements of Gajulepalli tank, Penukonda taluk.

75 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when Gajulepalli tank in Penukonda taluk was constructed;

(b) what is the expenditure incurred on the construction of the tank;

(c) what is the acreage brought under cultivation under this tank; and

(d) whether there is any proposal to raise the level of the tank bund to increase the amount of water to be stored?

A.—(a) The restoration of the tank was completed during August 1946.

(b) Rs. 1,83,814.

(c) 38 acres so far.

(d) No.

Bifurcation of Nellore district.

76 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to bifurcate Nellore district for any purposes; and

(b) if so, when the Government Orders are likely to be brought into force?

A.—(a) There is no proposal to bifurcate the district for educational purposes; and

(b) does not arise.

[2nd December 1952]

Starting of a Secondary Grade Government Training School at Nellore.

77 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state whether there is any proposal with Government to start a Secondary Grade Government Training School at Nellore for women?

A.—No, Sir.

Kasturidevi High School, Nellore.

78 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government granted any amount as building grant to Kasturidevi High School, Nellore; and

(b) if so, what is the amount?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have sanctioned a grant of Rs. 30,000 to the management of the Kasturidevi Girl's High School, Nellore, towards the cost of construction of a new building for the school. Out of this grant, a sum of Rs. 20,000 has already been disbursed to the management. The question of disbursing the balance of the grant is under the consideration of the Director of Public Instruction.

Mining of manganese ore in Nellore district.

79 Q.—SRI S. VEMIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have investigated the question of mining manganese ore in Nellore district; and

(b) if so, at what stage the matter stands now?

A.—(a) No, Sir, since the ore is not reported to exist in the district.

(b) Does not arise.

Extent of waste land available in Kaikalur taluk.

80 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total extent of Government assessed waste and unassessed waste lands available in Kaikalur taluk for assignment; and

(b) the number of applications for assignment now?

A.—(a) An extent of 4,269 acres of assessed waste lands and 300 acres of other poramboke lands are available for assignment. No unassessed waste lands are available for assignment.

(b) The total number of applications now pending is 1,093.

[2nd December 1952]

Government Harijan Hostel, Masulipatnam.

81 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the total strength of the Government Harijan Hostel, Masulipatnam, at the end of the last academic year;

(b) the number of boarders belonging to (i) Mala, (ii) Madiga and (iii) other communities during the same period;

(c) the number of applications received this year for admission into the Hostel;

(d) the number of such applicants belonging to (i) Mala, (ii) Madiga and (iii) other communities; and

(e) the number of applicants finally selected from each of the above three communities?

A.—A statement* showing the particulars is placed on the table of the House.

Absorption of the former Pudukkottai State Forest Department staff into Madras State Service.

82 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the former Pudukkottai State Forest Department personnel have all been absorbed into the Madras State Forest Department;

(b) if so, from when and on what pay;

(c) if not, why not; and

(d) whether they are paid the Pudukkottai State pay or the Madras State pay at present?

A.—(a) The following statement indicates the staff employed in Pudukkottai prior to its merger and the staff retained in Madras Forest Department:—

Serial number and designation of post.	Number then existing in the Pudukkottai State prior to merger.	Number of subordinates retained.	Number of persons ultimately disposed of.	Remarks.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1 Ranger	1	..	1	Permanently absorbed in the Revenue Department as Upper Division Clerk.
2 Forest Guards	24	22	2	Two Forest Guards retired from service.

* Printed as Appendix V on page 980 infra.

[2nd December 1952]

Serial number and designation of post.	Number then existing in the Pudukkottai State prior to merger.	Number of subordinates retained.	Number of persons ultimately disposed of.	Remarks.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3 Forest Watchers including top watchmen.	72	33	1	Watcher died. Ousted for want of vacancies.
4 Peons	2	1	1	One peon taken over by the Revenue Department.
5 Mahant	1	..	1	Taken over by the Rural Reconstruction Department.
6 Range Mahant	5	..	5	Services dispensed with.
7 Coupe Mahant	1	..	1	
8 Coupe Watchman	1	..	1	
9 Others	226	..	226	

The question of absorbing the retained personnel by relaxing service rules to the extent necessary is under the consideration of the Government.

(b) The forests in the merged area of Pudukkottai were taken over by the Forest Department with effect from 16th August 1950 and from this date the staff indicated in column (2) in the above statement have been retained in the Forest Department. Two forest guards are drawing a monthly salary of Rs. 20, one forest guard Rs. 19, three forest guards Rs. 18, four forest guards Rs. 17, and 12 forest guards Rs. 16. In addition they draw Rs. 18 per mensem as allowances. The peons draw Rs. 20 per mensem and an allowance of Rs. 18 per mensem. The forest watchers draw Rs. 8 and Rs. 12-8-0 per mensem as allowances.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) All the staff retained are drawing pay at the rates obtaining in the Forest Department except nine forest guards who are drawing Pudukkottai State pay.

Number of unemployed persons registered in the Employment Exchanges.

83 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries and Labour be pleased to state how many unemployed persons have registered their names in the Exchange offices of this State in this year and within five years and how many persons were given employment by the Government?

A.—In 1952, 1,59,425 persons were registered of whom 31,286 were placed in employment. The corresponding figures for the past five years are 8,37,151 and 2,19,067.

[2nd December 1952]

Security deposit by the employees of Central Co-operative Banks.

84 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Registrar of Co-operative Societies instructed all Central Co-operative Banks to terminate the services of all their employees who failed to furnish cash security, irrespective of their length of service; and

(b) whether departmental employees whose services are 'lent' to Central Banks are exempted from payment of security of the type mentioned in clause (a)?

A.—(a) According to rule XXVII (B) (1) and (2) of the rules framed under the Madras Co-operative Societies Act, no society shall appoint any person as its paid officer or servant without obtaining from him such security as the Registrar may fix and no society shall retain in service any paid officer or servant if he does not furnish. Therefore, the Central Banks are bound to terminate the services of such of their employees as fail to furnish the securities before 30th November 1952.

(b) Yes, Sir.

Promotion of clerks in the offices of the Prohibition Department.

85 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is the system of promoting clerks working in the offices of the Prohibition Department to the Executive line as Sub-Inspectors in the same department; and

(b) if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, whether the Hon. Minister will be pleased to state the number of clerks so promoted in (i) 1950-51; (ii) 1951-52 and (iii) 1952-53 to date?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The number of clerks recruited as Sub-Inspectors was four in 1950-51, one in 1951-52 and nil in 1952-53.

Grant of subsistence loans and takkavi loans in Anantapur district.

86 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state what were the reasons for stopping subsistence loans and Takkavi loans in Anantapur district during the last three months?

A.—Disbursement of takkavi and subsistence loans was not stopped in the Anantapur district during the last three months.

[2nd December 1952]

Salaries of forest guards and watchers.

87 Q.—SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any proposal to increase the salaries of forest guards and watchers; and

(b) whether the watchers' posts are temporary or permanent.

A.—(a) No, Sir.

(b) Watchers' posts are temporary.

Refund of fees by the Madras Public Service Commission.

88 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state in the case of examinations conducted by the Madras Public Service Commission for Madras Ministerial Service—

(a) whether the application fee paid by a candidate, who applies for a competitive examination but who, for any reason, is not admitted to sit for the examination is refunded to him;

(b) how many were declared successful each year out of the candidates who sat for the examination in 1950, 1951 and 1952 and how many were selected for service and how many are still not absorbed in service; and

(c) whether it is a fact that candidates who have passed in the examination of the Madras Public Service Commission during any one year but who have not received orders of appointment, are required to sit for every subsequent examination until they receive an order of appointment?

A.—(a) The application fee paid by the candidates will be refunded in the cases referred to in G.O. Ms. No. 1612, Public (Services), dated 14th August 1940, a copy of which is placed on the table of the House.

(b) A statement is placed on the Table of the House.

(c) Candidates who have passed the examination and have been included in the approved list of the Commission need not appear for any subsequent examination.

Famine conditions in Pattukkottai taluk.

89 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any recommendation from the District Collector of Tanjore that certain areas in Tanjore taluk like Sengipatti, Vallam, Ulloor ranges and Gandarya-kottai range of Pattukkottai taluk are famine affected; and

(b) if so, what action do the Government propose to take thereon?

A.—(a) & (b) A report in the matter has been called for from the Collector of Tanjore and it is awaited.

[2nd December 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—PROGRAMME OF SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Sir, may I know the programme of sittings of the Assembly, whether we can have two days for discussing non-official business and whether we can have a debate on the present food situation in the State? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, as soon as the legislative programme is over, the Government intend allotting one or two days for discussion on the food situation.”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ On a point of order, Sir, కృష్ణా అనకట్ట నియమం Leader of the Opposition ఒక రోజు చర్చించాలి అని అన్నాడు. దానికి ప్రభుత్వం సరియైన సమాధానము ఇవ్వలేదు. తరువాత hon. Member కి చెప్పాలి.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think the hon. Member is saying that the Hon. Minister has not properly answered the question. But I may inform the hon. Member that the Hon. Minister has already said that the matter is still under consideration. So, let the hon. Member have a talk with the Hon. Minister and Hon. Leader of the House and then come to some conclusion.”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ ఒక విషయము మనది చేస్తున్నాను. దీని పై మరల చర్చ జరుగకపోతే, మేము అడిగిన వాటికి ప్రభుత్వం దగ్గరనుండి clarification సంతాపించడానికి వీలండదు. అందువల్ల కృష్ణా ఒక నిర్ణయమివ్వవలసిందని ఒక రోజు చర్చిస్తే ప్రయోజనముని కోరుకున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think it is not a point of order at all.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, may I suggest one thing? After the Tanjore Bill is over, of the two days Government may be pleased to allot, one day may be for the discussion of the food situation and the other day for discussing the Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee's report. If the Government want to give us two days for discussing the food and famine situation and also their recent order regarding levy procurement, which has caused some kind of disturbance in certain parts after decontrol, then the House will be anxious to have a separate day for discussing the report of the Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee, immediately after the Tanjore Bill is over. I think the Government will accede to this request.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I consider that taxation proposals are important. As I have already said, we intend allotting one or two days after the legislative work is over.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ Sir, a number of statements are placed on the table of the House. May I know whether these statements can be distributed to the hon. Members along with the questions on the previous day? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ They will be placed on the table of the House according to the rules.”

2nd December 1952]

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION RE FOODGRAINS LEVY PROCUREMENT ORDER.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member SRI T. Viswanatham has given notice of an adjournment motion which reads as follows :—”

“ I move for the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the heavy and discriminatory incidence of Levy. Procurement ordered under the Madras Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order, 1952, dated the 19th November 1952, issued in G.O. Ms. No. 1796, Food and Agriculture Department.”

The Hon. Leader of the House has just now said that one or two days may be allotted for discussing the present food situation. In view of this, I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition will not press his adjournment motion.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know from the Hon. Leader of the House whether a day will be allotted for discussing the report of the Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee, as all of us are anxious about it? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Hon. Minister should be given some time.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ A request has been made just now. We shall consider it.”

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAITAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952.
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952)—cont.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ We are now on clause 8, sub-clause (2). Sri Ramakrishna Reddi may move his amendment. (After a pause) I think the hon. Member is not in his seat. So Sri Rajagopala Rao may move his amendments to sub-clause (2).”

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

“ In sub-clause (2), for the words “ customary headloads ” substitute the words “ one headload of straw per acre.”

“ In sub-clause (2), for the word “ three-fifths ”, substitute the word “ two-fifths.”

“ In sub-clause (2), paragraph 2, for the word “ three-fifths,” substitute the word “ two-fifths.” ”

“ మొదటి మాడు సకరణలు ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను, ఆ మాడు యిది—

“ మొదటిది—అయిదింటు రెండువంతులు అనడానికి బదులు, అయిదింటు మాడు వంతులు కొలుదానికి మొదలైన సకరణ.

“ రెండవది—గడ్డికట్టే నియమములో “ Customary head-loads ” అను దానికి బదులు ఒక ఎకరాకు ఒక ముప్పి నెత్తువైన మాయగలినంత గడ్డికాపు తావున ఇవ్వాలి అనే సకరణ.

[2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let me suggest that Mr. P. Pundarikakshacharyulu also may move his amendment so that we can have a discussion on all the amendments. When putting to vote, I shall put the amendments separately."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, I move my amendments to clause 8—

(1) In sub-clause (2) for the word "three-fifths" substitute the word "one-third";

(2) In paragraph 2, line 2, of sub-clause (2) for the word "three-fifths" substitute the word "one-third"."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" On a point of information, Sir,

MR. SPEAKER :—" No. Let not the hon. Member disturb another hon. Member when he is on his legs. If he wants to say anything, let him say it on a point of order."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" I want information."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Not, in the middle."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" In moving the amendments, I wish to submit to the House that our Chief Minister, Mr. Rajagopalachari, time and again has said that the people should not leave their normal avocations and hereditary professions. I need not dilate upon his primary duty, as head of the Government, to see that he enacts such laws that people will not leave their hereditary professions and normal occupations. The agricultural industry or profession is one of the main industries in our country and, therefore, persons who are pursuing this profession should have a large share in the produce so that they can pull on with their occupation even somewhere near the standard of living. I would request the Government to accept the amendment to make the share of the landowner one-third. My amendments are in tune with the recommendations made by the Andhra Provincial Kisan Congress which can very well represent the cause of Kisans and in answer to a questionnaire issued in 1947 by the then Government regarding land reforms opined that the cultivating tenant should have two-thirds of the gross produce. It is curious that in the Select Committee, the Hon. Mr. C. Subramaniam and the Hon. Mr. N. Ranga Reddi, who were signatories to the majority report of the Subramaniam Committee, were not agreeable to and voted against the amendments moved by Mr. T. Viswanatham and others that the share of the tenant should be as recommended by the Subramaniam Committee. I need not once more point out that the landlords should not continue to get a large share for their mere ownership in the land and thus exploit the tenantry. This should be done in the interests of people taking to the agricultural profession and the agricultural industry and production itself. The landlord should not have a larger share than the tenant so that exploitation of the peasantry may stop. Therefore, I request the House to accept my amendment."

2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" Who is seconding the amendment?"

11-50
a.m.

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then the hon. Member, Sri Ramamurthi, may also move his amendment so that there can be a discussion on all the amendments."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" My amendments are consequential ones. I will omit such of those that have already been disposed of and move only the other ones."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let him move the first one now and the others can be taken up later with the other amendments."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I beg to move—

'In sub-clause (2), omit the word, "normal" occurring in the first paragraph of the sub-clause.'

"The present sub-clause provides for the following :—

'Where the tenancy provides for any rent, the tenant shall be bound to give to the landowner (in addition to the customary head-loads of straw, where there is any) three-fifths (or such lower proportion, if any, as may have been agreed upon between the parties) of the normal gross produce of the land, after deducting all harvesting and poradi charges in the case of paddy and the like charges, if any, in the case of any other crop.'

I ask the Government to omit the word 'normal' in the sub-clause in which case it would mean, 'Give to the landowner three-fifths of the gross produce of the land.' If we provide for his giving three-fifths of the normal produce, it will lead to lot of litigation. What exactly has been the normal produce on a particular land over a period of years or whether the produce in a particular year could be taken as normal produce, or whether an average has to be taken for finding the normal, all these questions would become the subject-matter of litigation. We must now try to see that we avoid litigation as much as possible. If the Government omit the word 'normal' and provide something definite under the terms of the contract, then the tenant is bound to pay it, provided it is not more than three-fifths of the gross produce. That is what I want. We want to give to the labourer a certain portion of the fruits of his own labour. Say, in a particular year, the total yield might be a hundred kalams. The tenant must be entitled to keep 40 kalams for himself out of the 100 kalams. If we say that he shall be entitled to 40 per cent of the normal yield, nobody knows what the normal yield is. It may be 120 or something else in which case the share of tenant will be much lower than the 40 per cent. In order to obviate the difficulties and see that the tenant is actually given the 40 per cent benefit I seek to move for the deletion of the word 'normal' from this sub-clause. If this is accepted a certain amount of justice can be done to the tenants."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in seconding the amendment moved by my hon. Friend Sri Ramamurthi I wish

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [2nd December 1952]

to point out that words such as ' normal ', ' customary head-loads ' which are ambiguous and which give scope for parties to disagree at the time of settlement ought not to be used in a legislation. The Hon. the Chief Minister would have noticed the fact that two or three days ago a conference of the landowners was held at Kumbakonam. A resolution was passed in that conference protesting against the Tenants Protection Bill now under discussion. The landowners went to the extent of even charging the Hon. Chief Minister that he was on the side of the Communists rather than on the side of the landowners. That evidently showed that though the intentions of the Hon. the Chief Minister were good in moving this kind of legislation, he was neither liked by the landowners nor wanted by the supporters of the tenants who were now moving these amendments to the Bill. I rather wish the Hon. the Chief Minister takes a definite side, either on the side of the landowners or on the side of the tenants. Now he is neither pleasing the landowners nor the tenants and their supporters. He is only trying to pacify them during this troubled period. He is trying to take away the winds from the sails of the Communists by bringing in such a half-hearted measure. In order to avoid all these misunderstandings I would appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister to delete such words which do not convey any definite meaning and put in proper words in their place, if he cannot drop them altogether. The framers of the Bill must always hit upon definite proposals instead of giving scope for such kind of misunderstandings in the future."

*SRI C. KANDASAMI :—“ கனம் சாரநாயகர் அவர்களை ! தோழர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்களால் பிரேரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் திருத்தத்தை ஆதரிக்கிறேன். அதன் சாரம் என்னவென்று நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். In sub-
-clause (2), omit the words 'normal' occurring in the first paragraph. அதாவது இப்பொழுது நூற்றுக்கு 40 வாரம் என்று சொல்லிய பிரகாரம் ஒரு வருஷம் நன்றாக விளைதாலும் விளையும். விளையாவிட்டாலும் இல்லை. அப்படி விளையாதபொழுது மிரகத்தார்கள் விவசாயிகளைக் கஷ்டப்படுத்தாமல் இருப்பதன் பொருட்டு திட்டப்பட்டதாக நாம் சட்டத்தில் ஒரு ஏராளத்தைச் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறோம். Normal என்று இந்தப் பிரிவில் உபயோகப்படுத்தியிருப்பதானது மிகவும் சிக்கலை விளைவிக்கக் கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. குறிப்பாக ஒன்றை இங்கேயுள்ளோரின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவரவிரும்புகிறேன். இன்றையதினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் ஏற்கனவே விளைந்த ஒரு கணக்கை வைத்தக் கொண்டு அதன் பிரகாரம் ஒரு அளவை நிர்ணயித்துக் கொண்டு இவ்வளவுதான் குத்தகை அளக்கவேண்டுமென்று நிர்ணயித்து விவசாயிகளிடம் நன்றாக எழுதி வாங்கிக்கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் அப்படிச் செய்ததன் காரணமே இந்த normal என்ற வார்த்தையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டோதான். இம்மாதிரி பல குத்தகைப் பத்திரங்கள் எழுதப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. எவ்வளவு விளைகின்றதோ அந்த விளைவில் நாற்பது சதவிகிதம் விவசாயிகளுக்குச் சேர்ந்தது என்று திட்டவுடமாய் நிர்ணயித்துவிட வேண்டுமெனத் தவிர சாதாரண விளைச்சலில் 40 சதம் என்பது அதிக பூச்சி உண்டுபண்ணும். அதன் காரணமாகத்தான் அந்தமாதிரியான சிக்கல் பின்னால் உண்டுபண்ணக்கூடாது என்பதற்காக இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை தோழர் ராமமூர்த்தி பிரேரித்திருக்கிறார்கள். சமரச மனப்பான்மையை வளர்க்க வேண்டுமென்பதே இதன் நோக்கம். ஆதலினாலேதான் இந்தத் திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். இதனால் கெடுதல் இல்லை என்பது சொல்வது சரியல்ல. இன்றையதினம் பல விவசாயிகளை பாதிக்கக் கூடிய வகையில் குத்தகைப் பத்திரங்கள் எழுதப்படுகின்றன. இதையெல்லாம்

2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Kandasami]

2nd December 1952] [SH. C. ...]
 லாம் தடுக்க இந்தத் திருத்தம் மிகவும் அவசியம். சர்க்கார் இந்த
 normal என்ற வார்த்தை நீக்க வேண்டுமென்ற ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தியின்
 திருத்தத்தை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை
 முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ ఇప్పుడు ‘customary and normal’ అనే పదాలు సమరంవక పోతే friction కు దారితీస్తాయి. ఒక case litigation కు దారితీయక పోయినను ఏ ఏజ్లెన్సును యీ customary and normal అనే పదాలు యీ క్లాజులనుంచి తీసివేసి వాటి పానములలో clear & define చేసే రుజువంటి సంఖ్యను చేర్చితే కానుంబుందని చెప్పతూ యీ సమరణను నెను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, 12 noon.
Sir, Mr. Vinayakam described my unfortunate position but let me say that any attempt to do justice must necessarily lead sometimes to that position and we need not worry about that. The various criticisms offered in the Press will help us sometimes to understand one another and sometimes to correct our wrongs. We need not always try to please anybody in particular which is what Mr. Vinayakam had asked me to do. We need not do anything to please this side or that side but continue to carry along as we have done hitherto. The points under discussion are two or three.

or three.

The first refers to the fact that the words 'customary' and 'normal' are too vague and should be removed and substituted by something more definite. With regard to the share payable to waram tenants, we have already finished that clause. The question now is whether with reference to cases where there is agreement between the landowner and the tenant that a certain rent should be paid, if amendments such as now proposed are carried out, it would mean that fixed rent tenancies are also to be reduced to the position of waram tenancy. Instead of doing that what we should do is to give as much predominance as possible to the agreement between the parties concerned and then correct any errors which might arise in its working. The second sub-clause to this clause provides that where there is agreement it shall be given effect to. But the clause is circumscribed by one condition that no landlord will be entitled to obtain an agreement from the tenant less favourable than the proportion already agreed upon. The provision now is only how to calculate that 'less favourable' clause. Sub-clause (2) says that it shall be calculated on the basis of the price at the previous harvest, the net quantity being the normal gross produce. The objection taken is that it may be fixed on the actual gross produce of that year rather than the normal produce and that by this fixation of the normal produce in that particular year the tenants' share would be seriously affected. The clause as it stands at present seeks to give to the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court the right to say what the normal gross-produce of that particular land under dispute is, apart from any special increase in the yield during the particular year. There is a certain amount of flexibility provided for in this sub-clause. To my view

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

2nd December 1952]

[Sri P. Ramamurthy]

give the stipulated amount under the agreement irrespective of the fact whether there has been a failure in the crops or not. The compulsion cast on the tenant to pay three-fifths share of the produce to the landowner irrespective of the failure of the crops should be removed. Therefore I say that the interpretation that is now being put by the Hon. Chief Minister is not correct. The term 'normal gross produce' will create another difficulty also. The mirasidars who previously used to follow the custom of *புள்ளிபார்க்கிறது* will not show such a concession now. Whether the particular crop has been a particularly bad one or not, it does not matter for them. They will insist that as the law provides that they should be given the three-fifths share of the produce, the tenants are in duty bound to pay the three-fifths share. The term normal produce will thus go against the tenants in the case of a year when there has been a failure of the crops. The mirasidars would try to harass the tenants to pay the usual rate of three-fifths of the produce. That is why I request that the present wording of normal gross produce, be deleted."

செலாபாடி :— "நா. சுவரகாம நேரு கீழ்க்கண்டிருப்பது

of three months. The present wording of normal gross production is—

SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—“ నా సవరణను నేను ఉపసంహరించుకొనడంలేదు. ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారి వాదనతో నేను ఏకీభవించలేకుండా యున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే ఈ customary headloads విషయం అతి సెలికగానే పరిష్కారమౌతుందని ముఖ్య మంత్రి చెబుతున్నారు. కాని విమర్శన practical knowledge ఉన్నా ఒక ప్రాంతానికి యింకొక ప్రాంతానికి, ఒక జిల్లాకు యింకొక జిల్లాకు ఈ మామూళ్లలో ఉండే తేడాలున్నట్లు అనేక చిక్కులు ఉత్పన్నమౌతాయనేది స్పష్టం. ఇప్పటికే భూస్వాములకు కాలుదార్లకు చుట్టూ చిక్కులు తెచ్చిపెట్టి క్లాజులు కాలా ఆదాయం దింపబడ్డాయి. ఈ క్లాజునుకూడా యధాతథంగానే ప్యాసుచేయించాలని ప్రధాన మంత్రి పట్టు బట్టి, గర్హింపకూడా భూస్వామికి భాగమివ్వడం సముచితంగా కన్పడటంలేదు. అందుకని నా సవరణను జోయికు తెట్టాలనే నేను కోరుతున్నాను. ”

MR. CHAKRABARTY :—“ Mr. Speaker,

SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—“ Mr. Speaker, 12-10
Sir, I am pressing my amendment.” p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I submit, Sir, that this is an interloper amendment if I may so call it. The clause as it stands deals with a certain matter. The hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi rightly said that certain very good customs are prevailing; but unfortunately we have disturbed all those customs and the faith in those customs is lost more or less; only we will have to revive them by a period of normal working; to-day we cannot depend upon them. Therefore it is that this Bill proposes that there should be a statutory limitation to the amount of rent which can be written down even in an agreement. The clause does not thrust aside any agreement among the parties concerned, but it says that it shall not be more than so much, and even if the parties agree, it shall be invalid. This clause as it stands deals with this. Now, what the hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi says and what Sri C. Kandaswami is supporting is that there should be provision for bad years by way of remission. It has nothing to do with the equating of the value 'beyond which' or 'below

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [2nd December 1952]

which ' the agreement should not be allowed to operate. That is not what this clause deals with. In substance, the suggestion of Sri P. Ramamurthi is; ' that although we do not trust one another and although we seek a legislative measure in order to force the landlord to act according to certain measure apart from custom, there should be a provision for remission in the case of bad years.' Now I have no objection to consider it. But it has nothing to do with this clause. It should be a separate proposal, that for bad years the revenue Court shall deal justly with the parties concerned. But, it cannot be introduced in sub-clause (2). This is the position, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am first putting Sri K. Rajagopala Rao's amendments to vote. The question is—

' In sub-clause (2) for the words " customary headloads ", substitute the words " one headload of straw per acre ".

In sub-clause (2), for the word " three-fifths," substitute the word " two-fifths ".

In sub-clause (2), paragraph 2, for the word " three-fifths ", substitute the word " two-fifths ".

The amendments were lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am next putting Sri P. Pundarikakshacharyulu's amendments to vote. The question is—

' In sub-clause (2), for the word " three-fifths ", substitute the word " one-third ".

In paragraph 2, of sub-clause (2), for the word " three-fifths " substitute the word " one-third ".

The amendments were lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am now putting Sri P. Ramamurthi's amendment to vote."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In view of the Hon. the Chief Minister's assurance that he will consider the amendment if moved at the appropriate place, I wish to withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

Sub-clause (4).

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Government have given notice of an amendment substituting a new sub-clause for sub-clause (4) (a). Let the Government move that amendment now. I will take the amendments given notice of by Sri G. Rama Rao, Sri D. Seetharamiah and Sri K. Rajagopala Rao as amendments to Government amendment."

2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment :—

' For sub-clause (4) (a), substitute the following :—

" (a) The tenant shall be entitled to raise at his own risk and cost any of the usual catch crops which he wishes, provided that he shall grow green manure on an area not less than that on which he grows the catch crop or on such extent as may be notified by the Government."

Sir, the tenant cannot grow catch crops all over the land. He can grow catch crops on about half of the land he cultivates and on the other half he is bound to cultivate green manure in order to keep up the fertility of the soil. This is the position, Sir."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, are the Government dropping their other amendment ' in sub-clause (4) (a), line 3, omit the words ' leguminous crops or '."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Yes, the Government are not moving that amendment. Motion moved—

' For sub-clause (4) (a) substitute the following :—

" (a) The tenant shall be entitled to raise at his own risk and cost any of the usual catch crops which he wishes, provided that he shall grow green manure on an area not less than that on which he grows the catch crop or on such extent as may be notified by the Government."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I am afraid the Hon. Ministers' explanation goes against the amendment. The original clause lays down, ' The tenant shall be entitled to raise at his own risk any usual catch crop which he wishes, provided that he shall grow leguminous crops or green manure on one-half of the land or on such other extent as may be notified by the Government.' I think the word ' land ' refers to the whole land."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Yes."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" So, if a tenant takes about 5 acres of land on lease and if he grows catch crops on about 2½ acres, he is bound to grow green manure on another 2½ acres. This is the position according to the original sub-clause. But, according to the amended sub-clause, if he grows catch crop on 2½ acres of land, he shall be bound to grow green manure on another 2½ acres of land. Sir, I now want to move a verbal amendment to the Government amendment ' that he is bound to grow green manure on an area equal in extent to that on which he grows catch crop.'"

* THE HON SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the sub-clause is flexible. In the sub-clause it is said, ' that he shall grow green manure on an area not less than that on which he grows the catch crop . . . ' So, it is not necessary."

[2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For sub-clause (4) (a), substitute the following :—

" (a) The tenant shall be entitled to raise at his own risk and cost any of the usual catch crops which he wishes, provided that he shall grow green manure on an area not less than that on which he grows the catch crop or on such extent as may be notified by the Government."

The amendment was carried.

12-20 P.M. MR. SPEAKER :—" We now come to Mr. Rajagopala Rao's amendment, namely, ' Delete sub-clause (4) '."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, you read in the amendment of the Hon. Minister the words ' shall grow green manure on an area not less than that on which he grows the catch crop '. Is it on ' any area ' or on ' an area ' ? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" We have already passed that amendment."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" I want a clarification whether the words are ' any area ' or ' an area '."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If the Hon. Minister wants to say anything, I have no objection."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, it is on the same land. So the area should be described as ' an area ' and not ' any area '."

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—" Sub-clause ను యిప్పుడు amend చేశారు కాదా? అయినా నాకది అవినీతికరంగాలేదు. యీ సార్లు clause ను మొత్తం గా delete చేయమని నా సవరణ ఎంపికంటే రెండవ పంటలో భూస్వామికి 3-వ భాగము యిచ్చేటప్పుడు, మొదటి పంటలో ఎంత తక్కువ పంట అయినా వుండాలా define చేసి వచ్చుడు కాబట్టి అందుకు అన్యాయం చేయబడింది. రెండో పంటలో కాబట్టి అందుకు ఏర్పాటు చేయబడిన ఆ భాగము కూడా అతనికి ఇట్టువంటి కాకుండా చేయడానికై ' సగటు భూమిలో green manure వేసితిరాలి ' అనే నిర్బంధపు షరతు ప్రవేశ పెట్టటం చాలా ఘోరం. ఈ clause లోన కాలుదారుకి ఎన్నికైన లాభములేదని నా ఉద్దేశ్యం. ఇలాంటి నిర్బంధపు షరతు ఎంపిక పెట్టవలసివచ్చిందో నాకు జోధ పడటంలేదు. భూమికి ఎంతవరకు వేసుకోవటంలో కాలుదారు ఎలాగూ శక్తి లేకుండా ఉంటుంది. ఎక్కువ పండించేదానికి ఆ soil ని బట్టి వేరువేరుగా రసాయనిక ఎంపికలు, వచ్చి ఎరువులూ నీ ఎరువు వేస్తే లాభకరమని చూడడం ఉపయోగపడతానని కాలుదారుకి option వుంటుంది. అలా కాకుండా నిర్బంధపు షరతులు కాలుదారు పలకుడ రుద్దే పని ప్రమాణంలేదు. అందువల్ల యీ నిర్బంధం తీసేయాలని నా ఆసాహుం యీ clause ను amend చేసినా ప్రమాణంలేదు. మొత్తం ఈ క్లాజునే తీసేయాలి "

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, the hon. Member has not convinced me as to the necessity for this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is ' Delete sub-clause (4) '."

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" We come next to Sri Seetharamiah's amendment."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" ఆధ్యక్ష, sub-clause (4) యొక్క (ఎ) సెక్షనులో యిప్పుడు కొత్తగా మంత్రిగారు ఒక సవరణ తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ఈ సవరణకూడా అంగీకారం కాదని నేను తెలియజేయవచ్చును. ఎంపిక చేతంటే రైతు పండించేటప్పుడు ఏ పంట ఎప్పుడెప్పుడు పెట్టాలా అనిపితే మంచిది. ఈ విషయములో నిర్బంధాలు పెట్టినయెడల అది రైతుయొక్క ఆదాయం పెరుగుతుందా లేదు. ఎంత విస్తీర్ణములో పచ్చని బిరువులు పెంచాలా నిర్ణయించే అధికారాన్ని ప్రభుత్వం తీసుకొని రైతు మెడకు గుది పడగా ననిచేయడంలేదు. మొదట పంటలో రైతుకు అయిదింటి రెండుభాగాలు మాత్రమే యిస్తూ రెండవ పంటను పూర్తిగా అతనికి యివ్వకుండా అందులోకూడా భూస్వామికి భాగమివ్వాలంటూ, నిర్ణయిస్తూ, ఆ రెండవ పంటను చేనేపిషయ్యలకూడా రైతును నిర్బంధించడం అక్రమం. అందుకే నేనీ సవరణను తిరస్కరించాను. క్లాజు 4 (a) లో ' The tenants share . . . which he wishes ' ఈ పదాలను మాత్రం తులచి తక్కిన భాగమును అంతా విడిచిపెట్టాలని నేను కోరుతున్నాను."

SRI N. SIVARAMI REDDI :—" I second it."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I am afraid the hon. Member does not know the actual conditions in the Tanjore district. I know more of it than he does—a little more. I think his amendment will not be useful, even from his own point of view."

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" ఆధ్యక్ష, మంత్రిగారు సంచావురు జిల్లా పరిస్థితులు నాకు తెలియవని తెలిపారు. వారికి ఎక్కువగా తెలియవని చెప్పుతున్నారు. ఏ జిల్లాలోనివారికి ఆ జిల్లా విషయము తెలిసినప్పటికీ, యితర జిల్లాల విషయములుగూడా తెలుసుకొనగలరని వారికి చెప్పుచున్నాను. తంజావూరు జిల్లా రైతుల పరిస్థితులు చాలా తక్కువగా తెలియవని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుచున్నారు. వారికి కాబట్టి కష్ట సుఖములు తెలిసియుంటే యీ క్లాజు పెట్టవలదు. నా amendment ను అంగీకరించాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I now put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

' In sub-clause 4 (a), omit the words " provided that he shall grow . . . by the Government " '."

The amendment was lost.

[2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" We now come to sub-clause (4) (b); Sri Seetharamiah may move his amendment."

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" నేను నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను :—
' Omit sub-clause (4) (b). ' "

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" అధ్యక్షా, ఇప్పుడు ఒక పథానమైన విషయం మనకు చర్చించి తీర్చుకోవలసిన అవసరం ఉన్నది. ఈ catch crop పంటలో భాగము భూస్వామికి యివ్వాలని మన రివిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. తంజావూరు జిల్లా యొక్క సంగతులు మన కందరికీ తెలియదని వారంటున్నారు. ఇటువంటి వారికిగూడా తెలియదని నేనంటున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు యీ విషయములో మనకు తంజావూరు సంగతులు ఎంత తెలుసుకో, వారికిగూడా అంత తెలుసును. కాని ఒక విషయము చెప్పాలి. ఏ పరిస్థితులైనా వారు అర్థంచేసుకోగలరు. ప్రస్తుతం మన అసెంబ్లీలో ఏ constituency లో ఉన్న వారికి ఆ constituency విషయములు మాత్రమే తెలుసునుగాని, ఇతర విషయములు ఎట్లా తెలుసునని అభిప్రాయపడి వారు ఎత్తిపాడుతున్నారా? అందులోను దా ఆ జిల్లా వారికిగూడా యింకా అనేక సంగతులు తెలియవనిగూడా అన్నారు. అట్లా అయితే వారికిగూడా ఆ జిల్లా సంగతి బాగా తెలియదనే చెప్పవలసి ఉంటుంది. నేను మాత్రం వారికి యేమీ తెలియదనే చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఏమిటంటే కృష్ణా జిల్లాలో ఉన్నటువంటి పరిస్థితులు వారికిగూడా తెలియదన్నమాటే. ఒక జిల్లావారికి మరొక జిల్లా విషయాలు తెలియవు అని ఎత్తిపాడితే లాభం లేదు. అన్ని జిల్లాల సంగతి తెలుసుకొనవలసి ఉంది. మా జిల్లా సంగతి నాకు బాగా తెలుసును. ముఖ్యంగా catch crop లో భాగము మా జిల్లాలో భూస్వామి తీసుకోడు. ఈ సంగతి నేను గట్టిగా చెప్పగలను. కారణమేమిటంటే మొదటి పంటలో వాటా వరకు ప్రకారం భూస్వామికి వల్లించి ఆ తర్వాత ఆ భూమిలో ఏ పంటబాగా పండుతుందని అనుకుంటాడో ఆ పంట పండుకుంటాడు. అంటే, రెండవ పంట క్రింద ఒకప్పుడు కిల్లివెసర వేస్తాడు. అందులో చివర గింజలు అప్పుతాడు. అంతే కాకుండా, పిల్లివెసర అకు ఎరువుగా చేసుకుంటాడు. గొడ్డెనకూడా మేపుకుంటాడు. అన్ని విధాలా లాభం చేసుకుంటాడు. అది లేకపోతే రెండవ పంట క్రింద జనము వేస్తాడు. ఎరువుగూడా ఉపయోగిస్తాడు. అదీ కూడా పండకపోతే నష్టముకూడా వచ్చే అవకాశం ఉంటుంది. ఇందులో పండినానూడా భూస్వామికి భాగము అనేది లేదు. ఒక్కొక్కప్పుడు జనపగింజలుగూడా అమ్ముకుంటాడు. ఈ విధంగా తన ఖర్చులు గిట్టుబాటు చేసుకుంటాడు. ఇటువంటివాటిలో కష్టములు వస్తే అది సాంప్రదాయానికి వ్యతిరేకమే అంటాను. అందువల్ల యీ సవరణను నేను విలపరుస్తున్నాను."

12-30 P.M. * THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member who has just concluded thinks he knows about conditions in Tanjore but unfortunately in his speech he has exhibited his complete ignorance of the matter. Customarily, the catch crops used to be shared in the proportion of half and half, but here it is provided that the bhooswamulu will only be given one-fifth which the hon. Member will grant is a great step forward in helping the tenant and hitting the bhooswamulu."

2nd December 1952]

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" అధ్యక్షా, 8 వ క్లాజులో తన్ను 4 (b) అనే సబ్-క్లాజును తొలగించి దానిని సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. ఈ సబ్-క్లాజు ప్రకారం రైతులు రెండవ పంటలో వాటా భూస్వాములకు పండించిన దానిలో అయిదింటి ఒక భాగం ఇవ్వవలసి ఉన్నది. రెండవ పంటలో భూస్వాములకు భాగమిచ్చే పద్ధతి దాచుకోలేదు. సర్కారు జిల్లాలలోనూ, రాయలసీమ జిల్లాలలోనూ రెండవ పంటలో భూస్వాములకు భాగమివ్వబడదు. పండించుకొన్నదంతా రైతులే తిందుతుంది. కాని కాంగ్రెసు మంత్రిగారి యిట్టి సహాయాన్ని తంజావూరు రైతులకు చేయ నిరాకరించుచున్నది. ఇట్టి భావముతో గట్టితమైన యీ 4 (b) సబ్-క్లాజును రద్దుచేయాలని కోరుచున్నాను."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—
For sub-clause 4 (b), substitute the following :—

" (b) Of the catch crops so raised the landowner shall be entitled to no share whatsoever."

" Catch crop లో ఏ విధంగాను భూస్వామికి భాగ మివ్వనూడదనేది నా amendment. యంతవరకు వర్ధించిన తరువాత మనకు కనబడిన tenants కు, వచ్చి యాళ్ళకు రక్షణల్నియ్య వత్తున్నాయి నాయి. నిజమైన ఉత్పత్తి దారులకు శ్రమ యోగ్యతకు రక్షణల్నియ్య వత్తున్నాయి. ఇట్లు తెచ్చినట్లు కనబడుచున్నది. వర్ధించిన తీరులకు కన్నీర్లు తుడవడానికి మాత్రమే ఈ బిల్లు తెచ్చినట్లు కనబడుచున్నది. చర్చించిన క్లాజులో తూట్టుపడినాయి. ప్రస్తుతం ఉన్న complicated భూస్వామ్య విధానానికి తీసివట్టు అంతకన్న ప్రజల్ని మధ్యపరచడానికి, complicate చేయడానికి యీ బిల్లు నిర్ణయించబడినట్లున్నది. నే నడిగేది ఒక్కటే.

" దేశంలో కరువుకాటకాలు పోవాలంటే మూలలో ప్రస్తుతం కలుగుతున్న అసంతృప్తి, unrest పోవాలంటే అధికాశోత్పత్తి కావాలి. ఉత్పత్తి దామృత కావాలంటే ఉత్పత్తిచేసే శ్రమజీవులకు తీవ్రమైన కలిగించాలి.

" Tenants కష్టయాలిలు కష్టపడి తీరించేవారు. అసలు ఉత్పత్తిదారు సామాన్యంగా తింటున్నాడు ఎకరాలు పొగుచేసుకుంటూ పండించే శ్రమజీవులు. వారు పండించడంతా భూస్వాములకు అప్పజెప్పితే ఉత్పత్తి తక్కువై శ్రమజీవులకు ఆధారమేది. వారికి encouragement లేదు. అందువల్ల ఉత్పత్తి కుంటుపడడం తిరిగి యీ బిల్లు వారికి encouragement లేదు. అందువల్ల ఉత్పత్తి కుంటుపడడం తిరిగి యీ బిల్లు నిర్మూలన జనం కావడంతప్ప వేరేకాదు. భూస్వామి తనకున్న పొలం ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ లో యింకాకున్నా ఆదాయం కలుపుకుంటే తాను లోగడ బ్రతుకుతున్నా దానికన్నా తాగా తీరించవచ్చు. కాని tenants దుస్థితిమాత్రం దివదీసం దాక్కువైపోతుంది. అందుకే ఈ రెండవ పంటలో బియ్యం కూడా భూస్వామికి భాగమివ్వనూడదు. అందుకని బలపరచుచున్నాను."

* SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—" అధ్యక్షా, శ్రీ రామా రావుగారు పెట్టినటువంటి సవరణను నేను విలపరుస్తున్నాను. నేనుకోరేది ఏమిటంటే అసలు కాలిబార్ల పక్షం బిల్లు అనే పేరితో తెచ్చిన ఈ బిల్లులోని క్లాజులున్నీ పరిశీలించిన మీదట కాలిబార్ల పక్షం బిల్లుగా తయారవుతుందని నా అభిప్రాయం. ఈ బిల్లులోని క్లాజులు అన్ని ప్యాసుచేస్తే చివరకు కాలిబార్లకు మిగిలేది గుండుమున్నా మాత్రమే అవుతుందని నా అభిప్రాయం. కాబట్టి రామా రావుగారు పెట్టినటువంటి ఈ సవరణ తప్పక మంత్రిగారు అమోదించాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry I cannot accept this amendment for the same reasons which I expressed some time back."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' For sub-clause 4 (b), substitute the following :—

" (b) of the catch crops so raised the landowner shall be entitled to no share whatsoever." "

The amendment was lost.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

' Add the following proviso at the end of clause 8 :—

" Provided always that where any rent is payable by the tenant to the landowner, the tenant shall have the option to pay the rent either in kind or in cash." "

This, Sir, is a very simple amendment. In paragraph (2) of sub-clause (2) of clause 8, it has been provided—

' In case the rent is to be paid in cash the value of the three-fifths or of the lower proportion aforesaid shall be calculated at the price prevailing in the year immediately preceding the appropriate five-year term.'

By this proviso, option is given to the tenant whether to pay the rent in cash or in kind. I submit, Sir, this option should be given to the tenant and he should be the person to decide which will be more advantageous to him and I press that advantage for the benefit of the tenant."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the amendment."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" If this amendment is accepted, it will lead to lot of trouble and friction and I therefore, oppose the amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know if the Hon. the Minister does not understand the import of the amendment but nonetheless he has come to the conclusion that if this amendment is accepted, it will lead to friction and trouble. He has not obviously understood the amendment. Let me explain, Sir, that this is a very simple amendment. The object is to leave the option of paying rent, either in kind or in cash to the tenant in any particular year. In a particular year, he will give it in kind but in another year, he may give it in cash whichever is advantageous to him. Let him pay whatever he feels is advantageous to him; let the discretion be left to him. That is the object of the amendment, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, let me tell the House how I have understood the import of this proviso. It is to be added to the whole clause 8. Whether it is the waram tenant or a tenant who has specifically agreed to give a

2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

certain amount in grain, Sri Ramamurthi wants such people to be given the right to say : ' I will not act according to the terms of my contract and I will not have the landlord's portion given to him at the threshing floor, I shall go away with all the grain and let him go to the lawyers and file a suit for recovery and for damages '. That is why he is pressing for the amendment and that is why we object to the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following proviso at the end of clause 8 :—

" Provided always that where any rent is payable by the tenant to the landowner, the tenant shall have the option to pay the rent either in kind or in cash." "

The amendment was lost.

Clause 8 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 9.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, 12-40
I move— p.m.

' In clause 9, sub-clause (1), line 3, after the word " from " insert the words " within a reasonable time ".'

This is required to make the drafting elegant and also fix a certain reasonable time."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In clause 9, sub-clause (1), line 3, after the word " form," insert the words " within a reasonable time ".'

The amendment was carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' Add the following proviso to sub-clause (1) :—

" Provided that if the landowner or the tenant refuses or delays unreasonably to execute the lease-deed, it shall be open to the tenant or the landowner, as the case may be, to lodge the deed in the taluk office with a declaration that the other party has refused or delayed unreasonably to execute it." "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following proviso to sub-clause (1) :—

" Provided that if the landowner or the tenant refuses or delays unreasonably to execute the lease-deed, it shall be open to the tenant or the landowner, as the case may be, to lodge the deed in the taluk office with a declaration that the other party has refused or delayed unreasonably to execute it." "

The amendment was carried.

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

'In sub-clause (3), for the word "contravenes", substitute the words "refuses to sign or fails to lodge the lease-deed in accordance with".'

"This is in consequence of the other amendments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (3), for the word "contravenes", substitute the words "refuses to sign or fails to lodge the lease-deed in accordance with".'

The amendment was carried.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I move the amendment that stands in my name—

'In sub-clause (3), omit the words "or the tenant" wherever they occur.'

Sub-clause (3) provides that 'in the case of any tenancy, if the landowner or his agent or the tenant refuses to sign or fails to lodge the lease-deed in accordance with the provisions of sub-clause (1), the Revenue Court may impose on the landowner or the tenant, as the case may be, a penalty which may extend to fifty rupees . . .'. My amendment wants to omit the words 'or the tenant'. It would look on the face of it that we are trying to give a certain concession to the tenant for his refusal to sign an agreement. It is not so because it is always open to the landowner—knowing as we do that he is a powerful party—to go to the court saying that the tenant refuses to sign the agreement. In the normal course it would be the tenant that would be called upon to pay fine because it would be very difficult to prove that he has not refused to sign the agreement. Normally what happens is that it is the landlord that refuses to sign the agreement. The law should provide for what is actually taking place and not for a hypothetical case which is not to-day the position. I, therefore, want that the words 'or the tenant' should be omitted."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, I second the amendment for this reason. In any matter of conflict arising between the landlord and the tenant, it is the landlord who is at an advantage as compared to the tenant because he belongs to that class which wields unusual influence in the locality. He commands the influence on the officials with the result that he is always at an advantage. Therefore, the words 'or the tenant' should be omitted."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The hon. Member who moved the amendment—he played cricket and broke his leg—is not playing cricket here. He wants to make a distinction in the legislation between a tenant and a landlord. We cannot do so."

2nd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" As the Hon. Minister said I played cricket and broke my leg. That is why I do not want to play cricket and break another leg."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (3), omit the words "or the tenant" wherever they occur.'

The amendment was lost.

Clause 9 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 10.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I move—
'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (a) and reletter the remaining items.'

This clause is one of the most important clauses in the Bill and whether the tenant is going to get, in actual practice, the benefits that are supposed to accrue to him under the provisions of this Bill, will depend to a very great extent on the working of this clause 10. Sub-clause (1) of clause 10 provides—

'No cultivating tenant shall be evicted except as provided in section 6, or unless—

(a) he has failed to divide the produce as laid down in section 8, sub-section (1), or has failed to make over to the landowner the quantity of the produce to which he is entitled under section 8, sub-section (3), in conformity with the provisions of that sub-section;

Here we are seeking to give the tenant certain right, certain interest and that interest is that he shall have security of tenure for a period of five years. It may be that, on account of certain reasons beyond the control of the tenant himself, in a certain year he may not be able to deliver the produce the landowner is entitled to get. Is the capital punishment the only kind of punishment that can be provided in the case of the tenant? After all, there are hundreds of ways for providing penalty. For example, in the case of the landlord if he refuses to execute the terms of the agreement or such other things, he is asked to pay a certain fine. But in the case of the tenant if he fails to pay a certain thing, he is given the capital punishment, namely, the withdrawing from him the only means—the means of carrying on his evocation—of his subsistence. Under the provisions of this Bill, the landlord is entitled to get a certain proportion of the produce and it is always open to him to go to a civil court if the tenant fails to make it over to him and even attach the crop as the first charge. Why to-day the Government go out of the way and punish the tenant because he is a defaulter in a particular year? There is the normal course of seeking redress in a civil court if he fails to give that portion of the produce a landowner is entitled to get. Therefore, I say, do not follow a separate procedure in the case

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [2nd December 1952]

of the tenant and thereby make the tenant run the risk of losing the land that he has got even during the course of five years. So I press my amendment."

12-50 p.m. MR. SPEAKER:—"The amendment of Sri P. Ramamurthi is as follows:—

'Omit from sub-clause (1) item (a).'

He has got also other amendments to omit items (b), (c) and (f) and reletter the remaining items."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, we are now on item (a) only."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member's amendment is a comprehensive amendment. Some other hon. Members have also given some amendments to this clause. As the hon. Member's amendment is a comprehensive amendment, he may move his whole amendment, and then discussion might take place on all the amendments, in which other hon. Members who have given notice of amendments may also speak."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Then, Sir, I shall move my other amendments."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Yes."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (b).'

Sir, item (b) reads as follows:—

'(b) he has failed to pay any rent accruing due after the commencement of this Act within two months of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed, within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village; or'

Sir, in the case of a waram tenant there is no difficulty whatsoever. For law provides that in the case of the waram tenant the produce shall be divided at the threshing floor. So in that case no difficulty will arise. But in the case of those tenants who have entered into an agreement to pay the landlord a fixed quantity of paddy or a fixed amount of money, sub-clause (b) provides that if a tenant does not pay that amount within two months of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village, he is liable to be evicted. Sir, the tenant is bound to pay his dues to the landlord under a contract, for the moment he executes the lease deed, a contract is formed, and that contract is an enforceable contract; it is not as if it cannot be enforced in a court of law. Therefore when there is a normal procedure to recover arrears of rent why should we provide a new procedure, here, by which the land itself can be taken away from the tenant. Therefore, I submit there is no need for a new procedure to take effect now.

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

"Now, Sir, I proceed to item (c). I move—

'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (c).'

Sir, what does item (c) say? It runs as follows:—

(c) he has done any act or has been guilty of any neglect which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land; or'

Here again, Sir, this is a very vague sub-clause. Mark these words:

'he has been guilty of any neglect. . . .'

What is meant by 'neglect,' Sir? Who is to define what 'neglect' is? For 'neglect' is a very comprehensive term. Unless it is defined here, it is open to the court to define it or interpret it in any manner it likes. Nobody knows exactly what it connotes. The landlord may come forward and say that his tenant has acted in such and such a way and that constitutes 'neglect'. Whether that constitutes 'neglect' has to be decided by the court. Therefore, Sir, unless we know what we are providing, (without defining the words we here use) if we use such comprehensive terms in this Bill and if we leave their interpretation to the courts we shall be allowing this term to be used as an instrument by the landlord for evicting the tenants.

"Then again, Sir, take the words—

'or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land'

Obviously, in the case of a waram tenant these words will not arise, for no waram tenant will cease to cultivate the land. Because he depends upon the cultivation of the land for his livelihood. But it is not the case in the case of the landowner. For he can afford to keep hundreds of acres of land uncultivated, as he has other sources of income. So in the case of the tenant why provide for certain things and say that if he does not do such and such a thing he shall be evicted. Again, Sir, this will happen only in deltaic areas; this will not happen in non-deltaic areas like Pattukottai or Arantangi, in which latter place not a drop of Cauvery water is available for raising crop. That whole taluk is dependent on rain water for cultivation purposes. Should there be no rain, the tenant will not be able to cultivate at all. Therefore, Sir, I submit this sub-clause will operate against the tenant detrimentally as the landowner will seek this sub-clause as an excuse to evict his tenant. Therefore, I say, whether it is intended or not, this sub-clause will nullify the benefits that are sought to be conferred on the tenants by this measure, by the large-scale evictions which will take place under it.

"Then, Sir, I go to my next amendment. I beg to move—

'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (f).'

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [2nd December 1952]

Let me read to the House what that item says before I comment on it. It runs thus—

'(f) his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation; or'

Sir, it is the Revenue Court that has to decide this question. It has to come to a decision as per its own sweet will, whether the conduct of a particular tenant is in the interests of good cultivation or not. What exactly is the sort of conduct expected from the tenant under this Bill nobody knows. What Government have in view by the word 'conduct' nobody knows. It may be that there is an organization of the peasants to-day, and a particular tenant may take a particular interest in that organization of peasants and that organization may ask for a higher wage for the peasants and the particular tenant may demand that. The court may say that constitutes a bad conduct according to sub-clause (f). What is there to prevent the Revenue Court from taking that view? After all we know what view these Revenue Courts are holding. They are influenced by the view of the Government of the day. They are influenced by the political opinions of the Government. They look at things with favour or disfavour as per the view of the Government. I am not prepared to say that Mr. Rajagopalachari's Government looks at certain things with disfavour. I am only saying this of any Government. I am only saying that here are the Revenue Courts which will take the cue from the Government and say that anybody actively associated with the peasants' movement is guilty of bad conduct, is guilty of misconduct and so his continuance as tenant will not lead to good harvest. Therefore, I say their decision is swayed by political influence; therefore, do not provide for political victimization of the tenants. All these sub-clauses are like Damocles's Sword hanging over the heads of the peasants ready to be used by the landowner for evicting the tenants. Therefore, whatever be the benefits sought to be conferred by this Bill on the tenants, whatever be the benefits accruing to them from the five-year term of lease,—all of them will be nullified by the operation of these sub-clauses. So, I submit all of them should be deleted."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the amendments moved by Sri P. Ramamurthi. In so doing, I would like to say a few words with respect to what is contemplated in sub-clause (f), that is, with respect to the eviction of the tenant on the ground of his conduct or behaviour. Sir, a new situation may arise. I will cite an example from the Tanjore district. A landlord lets out his land to a tenant. The landlord expects good behaviour from his tenant, in the sense that whenever the landlord comes to the village where the tenant lives, he expects the tenant to go to him or meet him at the common place where he expects him to come or, to give him the ordinary respects which the favoured few would expect from the haves-nots. In such matters, if the tenant who takes protection under

[2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

this Bill, does not give him that kind of usual respect, the landlord will misconstrue the behaviour of the tenant as if he is disobeying or disrupting the cordial relations existing in the land with the result that he will try to victimize him under other clauses though not under this clause of this Bill. In such an event, all the tenants will join together and will try to bring forward a good case against the landlords before the Revenue Court but the Revenue Court will subsequently be influenced by the 'haves', the favoured few, namely, the landlords in the district. This is the reason why we do not want such a dangerous kind of provision to be included in this clause."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, Sri K. Rajagopala Rao, need not move the amendment standing in his name as the hon. Member, Sri P. Ramamurthi, has moved a similar amendment. I now call upon the hon. Member, Sri K. P. Gopalan, to move his amendment to omit item (d) only in sub-clause (1) as items (c) and (f) are included in the hon. Member, Sri P. Ramamurthi's amendment."

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move that—
'item (d) in sub-clause (1) be omitted'

as my Friend, Sri P. Ramamurthi, has moved an amendment which includes the deletion of items (c) and (f). In doing so, I may mention that I want to say a few words especially regarding item (f). In regard to factory workers, there is a rule that they should be given notice before their dismissal but in every factory there is a Standing Order according to which, if the manager feels, or it is reported that a worker is misbehaving, the manager can dismiss the worker all of a sudden. In the same way, this clause is only intended to victimize the workers who are active in the peasant movement. This is the only thing I can understand about this clause. Moreover, this clause has been inserted on the assumption that the peasants will always misbehave whereas the landlords will never misbehave. This shows the class character of this Bill and that is also the reason why I object to this clause very much more than any other clause in the Bill as it has been included mainly to suppress the peasant movement. With these few words, I move this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, Sri K. Rajagopala Rao, may now speak on his amendment though he need not formally move it."

* SRI K. RAJAGOPALA RAO :—"అధ్యక్షా, నా సవరణలూ, రామ మూర్తిగారి సవరణలూను ఉన్న విషయం ఒక్కటే అవటంవల్ల, నేను నా సవరణను ప్రత్యేకంగా ప్రతిపాదించకపోతే. అయినా, యీ విషయమే నా అభిప్రాయంను తెలియజేస్తాను. ఈ 10 వ సెక్షన్లోని క్లాజ్ (d) ను తీసివేయవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. కాలదారు భూస్వామికి మహానుభావులూ కాలుకుంచి ఇవ్వకపోతే కాలదారుని లోలో చేయకచ్చనని చెప్పకంకచ్చి కాల చిక్కులు వస్తాయి. కాలదారుని

[Sri S. Ramalingam] [2nd December 1952]

தையை பாதுகாப்பதைவிட இன்னும் அதிகமாகப் பாடுபட்டு பாதுகாத்து, கண்ணிமைகள் எப்படிக்க கண்களைக் காக்கின்றனவோ அம்மாதிரி காத்துக் கொண்டுவரும்போது, நிலத்திற்கோ, பயிருக்கோ அது எப்படி குந்தகம் விளைவிக்கக்கூடிய விதத்தில் நடந்துகொள்வான் என்றோ கேடு விளைவிக்கக் கூடிய நிலையில் இருப்பான் என்பதை என்னால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவே யில்லை—'or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land' என்று க்ளாஸ் (வரி) யின் கடைசியில் இருக்கிறது. நிலத்தில் பாடுபட்டு சாகுபடி செய்தால் தான் அவன் ஜீவிக்கமுடியும் என்ற நிலைமையில் இருக்கக்கூடிய தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் பெருவாரியான விவசாயிகள் நிலத்தை எந்தக் காரணத்தை முன்னிட்டும் தரிசாகப் போடமாட்டார்கள். இயற்கையின் விபரீதத்தினால் மழை பெய்யாவிட்டாலோ அல்லது எதிர்பாராதவிதமான காரணத்தினால் நிலம் தரிசாகக் கிடந்தால் கிடக்கலாமே தவிர, சாதாரணமாக நிலத்தை எந்தக்காரணத்தைக்கொண்டும் தரிசாகப் போடமாட்டார்கள். ஆகையால் இந்த க்ளாஸ் தேவையில்லை. அப்படி இருந்தால் நிலச் சுவாந்தார இதை உபயோகப்படுத்தி பெருவாரியான விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடிய சந்தர்ப்பம் ஏற்படும். ஆகையால், இந்தக் க்ளாஸ் நீக்கப்படவேண்டும்.

“க்ளாஸ் (f)இல் குறிப்பிட்டிருப்பதாவது,

‘his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation.’

நிலச் சாகுபடிக்கு விரோதமாக அவனுடைய நடத்தையேர் அல்லது குணமோ இருப்பதாக ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு கருதினால், அந்த விவசாயியை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றப்படலாமென்று இருக்கிறது. எந்தக் கட்டுப்பாடும் இடையாது. குறிப்பாக, விவசாய சங்கத்தில் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய பல விவசாயிகள் இன்றைக்கு நிலம் குத்தகைக்கு எடுத்து சாகுபடி செய்யக் கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு அபிப்பிராயத்தில் அந்த விவசாயிகளின் நடத்தையோ குணமோ நல்ல முறையில் இல்லை யென்று கருதினால், அவர்களை நிலத்தைவிட்டு வெளியேற்றலாம். விவசாயிகள் ஏதோ ஒரு கூட்டம் போட்டார்கள், ஊர்வலம் நடத்தினார்கள், மிராசுதாரர்களுடைய நடத்தையைப்பற்றி பேசினார்கள், சர்க்காருக்கு விரோதமாக பேசினார்கள் என்ற ஏதாவது ஒரு காரணத்திற்காக அவர்களை வெளியேற்ற வேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தோடு அவர்களை நிலத்தில் சாகுபடி செய்யும்படி அனுமதித்தால், சாகுபடிக்கு இடைஞ்சல்கள் ஏற்படுமென்று ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு தீர்மானித்து, அவர்களை வெளியேற்ற இந்த க்ளாஸ் சந்தர்ப்பமளிக்கிறது. இது ஒரு பெரிய ஆபத்தான க்ளாஸ் ஆகும். எந்த நோக்கத்திற்காக நாம் இந்த ஒரு வாரமாக இந்தச் சபையில் போராடி வருகிறோமோ அந்த நோக்கம் ஈடுபடவேண்டுமென்றால், இந்தக் க்ளாஸ் நீக்கப்படவேண்டும். இல்லாவிட்டால் அந்தக் காரியம் வெற்றி பெறாது. அதனால், நிலச்சுவாந்தாரர்கள் இந்தக் க்ளாஸைக் காண்பித்து பெருவாரியான விவசாயிகளை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடும்.

1-10 P.M. “ஆகையால் இந்த நான்கு க்ளாஸ்களையும் நீக்கவேண்டுமென்று நண்பர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தத்தை நான் ஆதரித்து என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

*SRI C. KANDASAMI :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள், ஸ்ரீ ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள், அதாவது எப்-கிளாஸ் (1) இலுள்ள (எ), (பி), (சி), (எப்) என்ற நான்கு பாகங்களையும் நீக்கவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள், மிக அவசியமானவை. அதுவும், குறிப்பாக க்ளாஸ் (எப்)ஐப் பற்றித்தான் நான் அதிகமாக வற்புறுத்திப் பேச விரும்புகிறேன். ஏனென்றால், அதன் மிகவும் ஆபத்தான க்ளாஸ் இருக்கிறது.

[Sri C. Kandaswami] 2nd December 1952]

“க்ளாஸ் (எப்)-இல் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருக்கிற ‘Conduct or behaviour’ என்ற வார்த்தைகள் எந்த அளவுக்கு அர்த்தம் செய்யப்படும் என்பதை இந்தச் சபை ரூபகத்தில் வைத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். குறிப்பாக, ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டினுடைய அபிப்பிராயத்தில், குடியானவனுடைய ‘Conduct or behaviour’ எப்படியிருக்கின்றது என்பதைப் பொறுத்திருக்கின்றது. ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டினுடைய அபிப்பிராயம் எந்த அளவுக்கு இருக்கிறதோ, அந்த அளவுக்குத்தான் இந்தப் பதங்களுக்கு அர்த்தம் கொடுக்கப்படும். அதனால் குடியானவன் எவ்வளவு தூரம் பாதிக்கப்படுவான் என்று யோசித்துப் பார்த்தால், இன்று ஜில்லாக்களில் நடைமுறை யில் அதிகார வர்க்கம் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமையை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்த்துப்போது இது எந்த அளவுக்கு குடியானவர்களைப் பாதிக்கும் என்பதை இந்தச் சபைக்கு அதிகம் எடுத்துச் சொல்லத் தேவையில்லை.

“அடுத்தபடியாக, குடியானவனுடைய ‘conduct or behaviour’ என்று சொல்லும்போது, அவனுடைய நடவடிக்கை, அல்லது அவனுடைய வேறுவிதமான குணங்கள் இவைகளெல்லாம் வந்தால், ‘இவன் உட்கார்ந்திருந்தான்’, ‘மரியாதையாகப் பேசவில்லை’; அல்லது ‘நான் அந்தப் பக்கம் போகும்போது அவன் ஏதாவது செய்துகொண்டு இருந்தான்’ என்று இப்படியெல்லாம் பலவிதமான அபிப்பிராயங்களுக்கு இடந்தரும். அது மாதிரமல்ல. இன்றைய தினம் குடியானவர்களுக்கும் நிலச் சுவாந்தாரர்களுக்கும் உள்ள உறவு கெட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதற்காகத்தான் இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்று சட்டத்திலேயே ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்படுகிறது. அது தெரிந்த விஷயம். இன்றையதினம் பரம்பரை பரம்பரையாக நிலச் சுவாந்தாரர்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் இருந்துவந்த ஓளவு நல்லுறவு இல்லையென்பதையும் நாம் ஒத்துக் கொண்டாகவேண்டும். அப்படியிருக்கும் போது, இந்த க்ளாஸ் (எப்) மூலமாக வெகு அளவுக்குப் பலவித அபிப்பிராயபேதங்கள் ஏற்பட்டு, குடியானவர்களை வெளியேற்றவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு இன்று ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு முன்பாக மிராசுதாரர்கள் கேஸ்கள் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு ஏதாவது இந்தக் க்ளாஸ் இருக்கிறது. குடியானவர்களுக்கும், நிலச் சொந்தக்காரர்களுக்கும் எவ்வளவு பங்கு கொடுக்கப் படவேண்டுமென்று சட்டத்தில் வரையறுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. பங்கு எப்பொழுதெப்பொழுது கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்பதைப்பற்றியும் வற்புறுத்தப் பட்டிருக்கிறது. இன்னும், உரத்திற்கு ஆகும் செலவு, இன்னும் சாகுபடி நடக்கும்போது விவசாய சம்பந்தமாக ஏற்படக்கூடிய விஷயங்களும் ஓரளவு வரையறுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அந்த நிலைமையிலே இந்த ஒரு க்ளாஸ் அதிகப்படியாக அதிகாரத்தை ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு அளிக்கிறது. இந்த ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டானது நியாயமான முறையில் குடியானவர்களுக்கு ஒரு நன்மையைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற அபிப்பிராயத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டாக இல்லாமலிருந்து, வேறு ஏதாவது தங்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயப்படி அது நடக்கக்கூடியவிதத்தில் ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டின் மனப்பான்மை இருக்குமேயானால், நூற்றுக்கணக்கான குடியானவர்கள் இந்தக் க்ளாஸினால் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள். ஆகவே, இவற்றையெல்லாம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்த்துப்போது, இந்த க்ளாஸ் (எப்) ஆனது குடியானவர்களை வெகுவாக பாதிக்கும். ஆகையால், இந்த க்ளாஸானது நிச்சயமாக நீக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு நண்பர் ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்களை ஆதரிக்கின்றேன்.”

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment in respect of item (f) which item in my humble opinion, is not a piece of legislation at all. It has nothing to do with agrarian relations: it has nothing to do with the landlord-tenant problem and it has nothing to do with cultivation or collection of rent or the action to be taken in the event of failure on the part of the tenant to pay the rent due. All such cases have already been provided for in the other items of this

sub-clause but item (f) comes more or less as if, I may be pardoned for saying so, a political lesson for tenants. If in the opinion of the Revenue Court—luckily the Revenue Court has not got *suo motu* powers and it is something that under sub-clause (2) such eviction can take place only on application—it is not even in the judgment of the Revenue Court and not even after taking evidence, the conduct or behaviour of a tenant has been such as to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation, the tenant can be evicted. The word 'opinion' itself, as has been interpreted in some of the cases arising under the Preventive Detention Act, as the subjective view of the officer that presides over the Revenue Court. It has no relation to the objective reasonableness or otherwise of the matter and therefore, if the relations which obtain between the landlord and the tenant are taken out of the purview of the Revenue Divisional Officer's consideration in coming to an opinion, I submit that I am right in saying that this item (f) has nothing to do with the landlord-tenant problem though it may have something to do with any other thing. Do the words 'his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation' mean that the tenant has committed continuous default? There is no scope for continuous default for, in case of default, the man is evicted. Or, does it mean continuous default to divide the produce? In such a case, within two months' time the man is taken to the Court and is sent out. Even in regard to non-payment of rent it has to be paid within thirty days of the receipt of the notice from the Revenue Court. There is no other offence of default or other cause of neglect. I therefore submit that this item (f) is not good. It is not good in any piece of legislation to leave it to the Revenue Divisional Officer, who has nothing to do with the immediate problem which is the subject-matter of this legislation, to come to the conclusion whether a tenant's conduct or behaviour is such as in his opinion to render the tenant's continuance undesirable in the interests of good cultivation. The Government as well as the people and, as a matter of fact, both landlords and tenants have got the interests of good cultivation in their hearts. Therefore, it is not reasonable to suggest that only the Government or the Revenue Courts have got the interests of good cultivation in their hearts. The tenants also want good cultivation. The landlords are also interested in good cultivation. Why should we therefore assume something about 'conduct or behaviour' except with regard to problems arising in the main in the matter of production or in the matter of paying up the rents? Even the distribution question does not at all arise here. I therefore submit that this is an item on which there is more or less unanimity of opinion in the House that it should go out and I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister, who is smiling, will consider the removal of this item (f). I must summarise by saying that it has nothing to do with agriculture nor with the landlord-tenant problem as such and therefore ask him to consider and accept the amendment."

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர்

* SRI P. VENKATESA SHOLAGAR :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் திருத்தத்தில் குறிப்பாக ‘விரும்பத் தகாதவனை விலக்கலாம்’ என்று கூறப்பட்டிருப்பது மிகவும் அபாயகரமானது. இப்பொழுது விவசாயிகள் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாது என்று சட்டம் பொழுது விவசாயிகள் நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றக்கூடாது என்று சட்டம் செய்ய்கிறோம். இந்த விதமான சப்-க்ளாஸ்கள் இருந்தால் நாம் இயற்றும் சட்டம் எட்டளவில் தானிருக்குமே தவிர நாம் எவ்வளவு சட்டம் இயற்ற சட்டம் எட்டளவில் தானிருக்குமே தவிர நாம் எவ்வளவு சட்டம் இயற்ற இயற்றும் அது விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மையை விளைவிக்காது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராசதார்கள் என்ன செய்வார்கள் என்று அன்றையதினம் எங்களுடைய பிரசங்கத்தில் எடுத்துச்சொன்னோம். அந்தப் பிரசங்கங்களை எடுத்துக் கொண்டு பார்த்தால் மிராசதார்கள் விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்ற எவ்விதம் முயற்சிப்பார்கள் என்பது நன்குத் தெரியவரும். அதையும் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும்போது நியாயமாக காரணம் காரியங்கள் காட்டித் தான் விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்றவேண்டும் என்றும் மற்றபடி வெளியேற்றக்கூடாது என்று இருக்கவேண்டும். பல ஜில்லாக்களிலிருந்து நண்பர்கள் என்றும், கிளாஸ்டேட் என்றும் சொந்தக்காரர்களென்றும் பல அதிகாரிகளிடம் சிபார்சு கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது நடைபெற்று வரும் ரிவினியூ கோர்ட்டுகளிலும் கன்சிலியேஷன் கோர்ட்டுகளிலும் நடக்கும் நடைமுறையைப் பார்க்கும்போது ஆபீசர்கள் எந்த பாணியில் நடந்து கொள்ளுகிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியும். மிக குறைந்தவர்களே நியாயவாதிகள். அதை நாங்கள் பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம் அனுபவ பூர்வமாக. ஆகவே ‘விரும்பத்தகாதவன் என்று அதிகாரிகள் கருதினால்’ என்றிருப்பதை எடுத்துவிட்டு ‘சரியான காரணம் காரியம் காட்டினால்’ என்று மாற்றி இருந்தால்தான் நாம் செய்யும் சட்டம் நடைமுறைக்கு சாத்தியமாக இருக்கும். இப்பொழுது இருக்கும்படியாக இருந்தால் நாம் இப்பொழுது விவசாயிகளுக்கும் செய்யவிருக்கும் நன்மைகள் இல்லாமல் போய்விடும். அதனால் ஒன்றிரண்டு விவசாயிகளை பழிவாங்கும் நிலைமைக்குக் கொண்டுபோய்விடும். இதைக்காணும் மற்றவர்கள் பயந்து இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூலம் விவசாயிகளுக்கு நியாயம் கிடைப்பது என்பது இல்லாமல் போய்விடும். இது ரொம்பவும் கவனிக்கவேண்டிய விஷயம் என்று நான் கூறிக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN:—“മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർ, സർ, ഈ മേശഗതിയെ 1-20 p.m.
അനുക്രമിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ രണ്ടു വാക്കു സംസാരിക്കുവാൻ ആഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നു. ഈ ക്ലോസ്
കൂട്ടിക്കാൽ ദോഹകരമായ ഒരു ക്ലോസാണ്. ഇതിൽ “സി” ക്ലോസിൽ പറയുന്നത്
കൂട്ടിക്കാൽ അവരുടെ കൂടിക്ക് എന്തെങ്കിലും ദോഹകരമായ വിധത്തിൽ ഉപേക്ഷ വരു
ത്തുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അവരെ ഒഴിപ്പിക്കുമെന്നാണ്. കൂടിയിൽ വളം ചേക്കാൻ കൂട്ടിക്കാ
രുടെ കയ്യിൽ പണമില്ല. അങ്ങിനെ വളം ചേക്കാതെ വന്നാൽ വളം ചേക്കാനുള്ള
കൊണ്ടു കൂടിക്ക് ഉപേക്ഷ വരുത്തി എന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട്, ആ ഒരാൾ കാരണം
കൊണ്ടു guilty of neglect എന്ന അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ കൂട്ടിക്കാരെ ഒഴിപ്പിക്കാൻ
സാധിക്കും. അതുപോലെത്തന്നെ (d) ക്ലോസിൽ പറയുന്നത് കൂടിയിൽ നെല്ല് ഉണ്ടാ
ക്കുന്നതല്ലെങ്കിൽ, അത്ഭുതത്തെക്കുറിച്ച്, അത്ഭുതത്തെ വേറെ ഏതെങ്കിലും catch crop ഉണ്ടാക്കു
വാനാണ് കൊടുത്തതെങ്കിൽ, അത്ഭുതത്തെ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നില്ല എന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട് ഈ ക്ലോസ്
കൗണ്ടുകളിൽ അതു കൂടി കൊടുത്ത ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നില്ല എന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട് ഈ ക്ലോസ്
വെയ്യുകൊണ്ടു കൂട്ടിക്കാരെ ഒഴിപ്പിക്കാൻ കൂടി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ സാധിക്കും. അതുപോലെ
നന്നെ ക്ലോസ് F-ാം കൂട്ടിക്കാൽ വളരെ ദോഹകരമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. ഈ House ന്റെ
ഏകകണ്ഠമായ അടിപ്രായംതന്നെ ഇതു കൂട്ടിക്കാരെ ഉപേക്ഷിക്കുവാൻ വേണ്ടി കൂടി
ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ ഒരു വമ്പിച്ച ആയുധം കൊടുക്കുകയാണ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത് എന്നാണ്.
ഈ നിയമനിർമ്മാണകൊണ്ടു കൂട്ടിക്കാൽ വല്ല നന്മയും ചെയ്യുവാൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് ഉദ്ദേ
ശിക്കുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ അതു ഏകാന്തതയുടേതാണ് പര്യാപ്തമായ അത്രയും ദോഹകരമായ ഒരു
ക്ലോസാണിതു. ഇന്നു നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിൽ പൊതുവിൽ കൂടി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാർ കുടിയാന്മാരു
ടേയും കൂട്ടിക്കാരുടെയും പെരുമാറ്റത്തിൽ വളരെ അധികം വെറുപ്പു ഉള്ളതായിത്തീ
ന്നിട്ടുണ്ട്. പാവപ്പെട്ട കൂട്ടിക്കാരും കുടിയാന്മാരും അവരുടെ രാഷ്ട്രീയവേഷധ
രിയ്ക്കുന്ന്. അന്ത്യമര കണ്ടിട്ടു എഴുന്നീറ്റി എന്ന കാരണത്താലേതെ കുടിയാന്മാരെ തെങ്ങി
വെച്ചു.

[Sri N. Gopala Menon] [2nd December 1952]

is intended to promote the good cultivation of land and to get the maximum from the land. It is not the ordinary behaviour or the conduct of the tenant that counts but his behaviour in relation to the cultivation of the land."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The House will now adjourn for lunch."

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Ramamurthi, in moving his amendment, sought to delete some of the conditions for eviction of the tenants, particularly clauses (a), (b), (c) and (f); and another hon. Member has moved for the deletion of clause (d) also. So, except clauses (e) and (g), the proposition before the House is that all the other conditions should be deleted. Of course, I can very well understand the attitude taken by Mr. Ramamurthi, because he thinks that whatever might be the conditions and whatever wrongs the tenants might do, they should not be taken notice of in this Bill and they should have the exclusive and unrestricted right for five years and that whatever wrongs they might do we need not and should not take notice of them in this Bill, but they should be left to the ordinary civil courts for the rights of parties to be worked out. But, Sir, we should bear in mind for what purpose this Bill is being brought forward. It is not for the purpose of favouring the tenants or for the purpose of hitting the landlords by taking away their rights. But this Bill has been brought forward for the purpose of restoring peace in the agricultural industry, so that there may be good cultivation and as a consequence of that, increased production. That is the object of this Bill. Therefore, when we give five years right to the tenant, it is because we want that there should be peace in the agricultural industry and there should be increased production and good cultivation. If that be so, we could not give away the right to the tenant to be in occupation for five years and allow the tenant to behave as he pleases, because we are interested in good cultivation, and for good cultivation there should be peace in the industry and then only there can be increased production. That being so, we have to see what are the obligations which the tenants have to perform for the purpose of getting those rights. In the interests of good cultivation, we want peace in the agricultural industry. Can there be peace when there is fight between the landlord and the tenant with regard to arrears of rent after the coming into force of this Act? Certainly there cannot be. My friend, Mr. Ramamurthi says, let the landlord go to the civil court. And what are the consequences of going to a civil court? If he goes to a civil court, he can file a suit and he can ask for attachment of the standing crop—attachment before judgment or whatever may be, of the available property belonging to the tenant. Certainly, that will not be in the interests of the tenant himself. Mr. Ramamurthi does not know of the proceedings in a civil court and especially

2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

with regard to attachment before judgment, and the various consequences of it. Therefore, in the interests of good relationship between the landlord and the tenant, it is necessary that whatever rent we have fixed in this measure, should be paid then and there.

"With regard to clause (a), after all it refers to waram tenancy and that is, sharing the produce. We have fixed the liability on the tenant that sharing should be at the threshing floor and there is absolutely no justification for the tenant to say, 'No, I will not pay; you will have to go to civil court and take proceedings against me'. When Mr. Ramamurthi was arguing for clause (b), he was arguing against his own amendment in respect of clause (a) and in fact he was contradicting himself. Therefore, as far as clause (a) is concerned, there is a specific provision which has been agreed to in this House that it is the liability of the tenant to share the produce on the usual threshing floor and there is absolutely no justification to condone any lapses on the part of the tenant in sharing this produce. After all, we are not imposing any new liability. Therefore, so far as clause (a) is concerned, there is no case for its deletion.

"Then, we come to clause (b) which relates to lessees with fixed rent either in cash or in kind. After all, what are the provisions we are making in clause (b)? It says 'he has failed to pay any rent accruing due after the commencement of this Act within two months of the date stipulated in the lease deed or in the absence of a lease deed, within one month of the due date according to the usage of the locality or village'. So, it is not as if he should pay the rent on the date on which he has specifically entered into an agreement that he would pay. We give him two more months or in the absence of any specific agreement he is given a month's time from the due date according to usage of the locality or village and that usage of the locality or village will be according to convenience, that is, soon after the harvest the rent will become payable; and even after that he is given a month's time. Even after that, he cannot be evicted by the landlord without further proceedings. Sub-clause (2) provides that an application should be made to the Revenue Court for the eviction of the tenant and even the Revenue Court has no power to pass straightaway an order for eviction. But the Revenue Court has to give an opportunity to the tenant to tender this amount and only on failure of the tenant to tender this amount, the Revenue Court can pass an order for eviction. So, Sir, under these circumstances, we cannot certainly say that clause (b) is a very unreasonable provision. On the other hand, it is quite a just provision and it is necessary after all in the interests of the tenant himself. Once you say to the tenant 'you need not pay, there is no obligation to pay and there is no pressure upon him to pay', the debt will become accumulated, the tenant will become a greater debtor and the burden will become too great. It is therefore in his interest not to postpone his dues to the landlord which is a liability under the law. So, even in the interests of the tenant we have got to lay down conditions so that he may fulfil

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [2nd December 1952]

his obligations quite promptly, so much so it may not become an accumulated burden which he may not be able to meet later on. Therefore, even from the point of view of the tenant the condition is very reasonable and nobody can take objection to that.

"Then, Sir, with regard to clause (c), what does it say? It says:

'he has done any act or has been guilty of any neglect which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land.'

In this connexion, I would like to say one point. When a landlord wants to evict a tenant and goes to the Revenue Court for the purpose of evicting the tenant he has to allege the reasons for which he wants the tenant to be evicted. Then when he alleges certain reasons for eviction, the onus of proof is on the landlord to prove the lapses on the part of the tenant and what are the conditions in clause 10 which the tenant has contravened. So, the onus of proof will necessarily be on the landlord and that is the simple law of evidence with which the Leader of the Opposition will readily agree. Therefore, even with regard to clauses (a) and (b) if the landlord wants to go to a court of law, he has to prove that there has been default on the part of the tenant and that he has not fulfilled the conditions laid down in clauses (a) and (b) and therefore he is liable to be evicted. That being so, in respect of clause (c) also the same onus rests upon the landlord to prove to the satisfaction of the court that the tenant has done any act or has been guilty of any neglect which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon, or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land. Therefore, the landlord has to prove not only any act or guilt on the part of the tenant with reference to any neglect, but that the neglect or act was destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon. So, the onus of proof is on the landlord, and only if he proves all these things he will be entitled to get an order of eviction against the tenant.

3-10
P.M.

"Clause (d) says that no tenant shall be evicted unless he has used the land for any purpose contrary to that for which the land was let. The onus of proving that the land was used for a purpose contrary to that for which it was let is on the landlord.

"Clause (f) says that no tenant shall be evicted unless his conduct or behaviour has been such as, in the opinion of the Revenue Court, to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation. The main argument put forward against this clause is that we cannot trust the officers and the Revenue Courts. If we lose confidence or trust in the Administration, the remedies are quite different. In any law we cannot provide for the lack of confidence of the people in the Administration. We have got to have some amount of confidence and trust at least in the administrative machinery and the Revenue Courts that we are providing for here. There is no use of some people saying that the Courts will favour the landlords of the landlords saying that they will favour the tenants under

2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

pressure of numbers. When we are making a law, let us take it that it will be administered in a just manner. As far as possible, officers will not take sides. If they take sides, their misconduct can be brought to the notice of the Government and appropriate remedies sought.

"Then, it was said that this clause could be used to evict tenants who take part in peasant movements. I respectfully submit that this clause does not give room for any such apprehension. It is not as if every conduct or behaviour of the tenant can be made a ground for his eviction. That conduct or behaviour must be such as to render his continuance on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation. It is well known that joining a trade union movement or participating in its lawful activities is not bad conduct and is not a thing to be disapproved of. The powers conferred by this clause cannot be invoked against a person who is a member of a peasant or kisan association or for participating in its lawful activities, as that cannot constitute a ground rendering his continuance on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation. We need not have unnecessary fears with regard to the scope of this clause.

"The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that the opinion of the Revenue Court was final as there was no other authority to go into it and asked why the words 'in the opinion of the Revenue Court' should be there in the clause. I see some force in the argument. My own view is that no perverse opinion can stand in a court of law. But as a lawyer I can say that even without those words, the clause will be quite all right. So I request my Hon. Colleague the Revenue Minister in consultation with the Hon. Chief Minister to consider whether the words can be omitted.

"I do not see anything wrong in the conditions we have put down here. After all, we are interested in seeing that there is peace in the agricultural industry, good cultivation and more production. For attaining these objectives, we cannot give a free hand to the tenants. They should also be interested in good cultivation and in the maintenance of cordial relations between them and their landlords. Abolition of landlordism and making the tenants proprietors of the land is quite a different thing. That may be an ideal to be aimed at. When that ideal is achieved, different circumstances will prevail. So long as we recognize tenancy under a landlord, we have got to see that the relations between the landlord and the tenant are cordial and conducive to good cultivation. We cannot simply say that the tenant shall have the right of cultivating the land for five years without specifying the obligations which he should fulfil. We cannot take such an attitude. So, I respectfully request the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi to withdraw his amendment."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

"In clause 10, sub-clause (1), item (f), omit the words 'in the opinion of the Revenue Court'."

[2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

"In clause 10, sub-clause (1), item (f), omit the words
"in the opinion of the Revenue Court"."

The amendment was carried.

3-20
P.M. * SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard with attention the two speeches made on the other side, one by the hon. Member Mr. Gopala Menon and the other by my Friend the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam. After hearing both those speeches, I am convinced that this clause bristles with distrust so far as tenants are concerned. Had there been no distrust of the tillers of the soil, had there been the trust in them that they are the people who have been cultivating the land from time immemorial and providing for the entire country the food that is so much required by the people, none of the provisions in this clause will find a place here at all. The hon. Member Mr. Gopala Menon was talking about contractual relations. He told us that here was a piece of legislation which gave the go-by to all contracts, and a special law relating to all contracts was being enacted. He said, therefore, that the normal procedure in respect of contractual relations should find a place here and not summary procedure. I need not remind the hon. Member who is himself a lawyer that this Bill does not do away with contracts altogether. There are certain things even under contractual relations which are unconscionable. Society feels that in spite of the fact that certain contracts are entered into between two people by virtue of the fact that one of the parties who enters into the contract happens to be weak, the stronger party should not take advantage of the procedure for contracts and enforce unconscionable contracts on the weaker party. In such cases, society, in the form of the State, steps in and prevents certain unconscionable contracts. We know for example before the Act restricting the rests of interest came into force, it was open to money-lenders to take any amount by way of interest from the weaker people who, unfortunately, were so much in need of money that they probably were prepared to pay that interest. (Interruption by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.) Therefore, when usurious rates of interest were charged, the State stepped in and said 'no; you cannot charge such rates of interest'. When the State steps in and says that usurious rates of interest should not be charged, it does not put an end to charging interest whatsoever. In this case, unconscionable rates of *waram* or rates of *kuttagai* were prevalent in the Tanjore district. That is being sought to be put an end to by restricting the amount of *waram* or *kuttagai* by setting a limit. That is all that the Bill seeks to do. The question of taking away altogether any kind of contractual relation as such is not provided for in this Bill. Therefore, Mr. Gopala Menon's arguments that contractual relations are being sought to be done away with, and that the normal procedure should apply in the case of this Bill, cannot hold water.

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

"In regard to the other arguments which the Hon. the Finance Minister was advancing, let us take the first clause. My objection is that after all, there is already a provision which provides for the sharing of the crop at the threshing floor. Now, if a tenant does not share the crop at the threshing floor, but actually takes away the whole crop, then, obviously, he is guilty of theft. He can be prosecuted in a court of law, and he can be punished according to law. Sir, does it always happen that only the tenant takes away the entire crop? Does it not happen that the landlords—cussed landlords and vicious landlords—engage certain people and they take away the entire crop even without sharing? In such cases, what is the provision against the landlord provided for? I would be told 'you can go to the court of law; you can go to the police; you can charge that landlord with theft; you can lodge a complaint, and that complaint will be enquired into by a regular court, and if the landlord is guilty, he will be punished according to law.' Why in the case of the landlord, the Government are not providing for any punishment of this nature? Why should the Government mistrust the tenants alone? When they have provided that the tenant has got to share the crop at the threshing floor, why then go out of the way and make such a provision here, which only shows nothing but absolute distrust in the tenants. Therein lies my objection, and my objection has not been answered.

"I now come to the second question, namely, clause (b). Apart from the question of contracts, here is a case wherein the peasant has got to pay rent in cash. It often happens that in the months immediately following the harvest, prices are at a low level. The peasant might find it easier for him or more advantageous to him to sell his produce four or five months after the harvest when prices will be higher. Though in such obvious cases the tenant may not pay the rent immediately, the landlord will go to the court immediately and get him evicted. Such cases are not uncommon. Therefore, we should see that such evictions do not take place, and that this provision does not provide the landlords with an excuse for taking eviction proceedings against their tenants.

"The Hon. Mr. Subramaniam stated that we must have faith in the administrative officials. We are not here dealing with administrative officials. We are dealing with regular courts. In the Criminal Procedure Code and in the Indian Penal Code, offences have been defined. They have defined what is theft. In the Criminal Procedure Code for instance, there are sections—sections 102 to 111—wherein bad conduct or bad behaviour is defined. Will anybody ever make any legislation which does not define what constitutes 'bad conduct'?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, I was only answering the charge that these courts or these officers were likely to side the landlords. I was only answering that charge. I did not say anything with reference to definition."

[2nd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“When the courts are asked to administer certain laws, they are told what constitutes offences and what ingredients go to make up offences. These things are precisely defined so that courts may go into the matter fully and give their judgment. But in the present case nothing is defined. The Hon. Mr. Subramaniam was talking eloquently about these things. Regarding the question what constitutes bad conduct, for which the tenant is liable to be evicted, nothing has been stated. In fact, the Government are not in a position to say what exactly they have got in their mind. That is why I say that this question should be left entirely to the discretion of the officer. It would not do even if the words ‘in the opinion of the Revenue Court’ are removed. This should be left entirely to the discretion of the particular officer to decide whether the particular bad conduct of a particular individual is such as to injure cultivation. On his own discretion, he must come to a decision. (Interruption by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.) I am not saying that no evidence is to be let in. Sub-clause (c) says ‘he has done any act or has been guilty of any neglect which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon or has altogether ceased to cultivate the land; or’. What are the things that the tenant can do? Once again I say that this bristles with distrust of the tenant. I demanded the other day an amendment which would provide for the compulsory payment by the landlords towards the cost of manuring expenses. It was then stated that after all it was in the interest of the landlords to pay the manuring expenses, the more manure that they put in the land, the more produce they would get, and, therefore, we need not provide for that. It was also stated ‘why do you not leave it to the landlords’ good intentions; they are interested in better cultivation’. When we ask for provision against the landlord, we are told that we must leave it to the good intentions of the landlord. Here is the case of the cultivating tenant. Is it not his interest, I ask, to see that his crop is not destroyed? By destroying his own crop, who is it that is going to suffer? Is it not a fact that the tenant is going to suffer? Why should not the Government leave it to the good intentions of the tenant? Why should not the Government make him realise his own interest in the matter? In the case of the tenants, why should the Government say ‘no’? The Government say that it may be his interest, but out of spite towards the landlord, the tenant may destroy the crops. If that be the case, we have got to provide for such conduct on the part of the landlord also. Does it not often happen that the landlord hires people and destroys the crop? What provision is there against such acts? Why not the Government say that if such acts are indulged in by the landlords, the entire land will be taken away by the tenant? Only in the case of the tenants, we come forward and say that they are likely to destroy the crop or are likely to do something which is injurious to good cultivation. All these things are only against the tenant and not against the landlord. That is why I say that this entire clause bristles with absolute distrust as far as the tillers

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

of the soil are concerned. It is a bolt on the statute, and it has got to go. This blot to remain on the statute book is something unthinkable as far as we are concerned.”

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NATICKER:—^{2-20 P.M.} “Mr. Speaker, Sir, the basis on which this Bill has been framed is that the landlord is the owner of the land but the hon. Gentleman who spoke just now wants to proceed on the basis that the tenant is the owner. The amendment which he has moved will only amount to that. Now, one of the grounds for the eviction of a tenant is the tenant's failure to pay rent due for one year. Originally the expression used was ‘arrears of rent’. That would mean arrears of rent due for many years and not merely for one year. In the Joint Select Committee we made it clear that the tenant could be evicted if he failed to pay rent due for only one year. The second ground, on which a tenant can be evicted, is any neglect on his part which is destructive of, or injurious to, the land or any crop thereon or failure to cultivate the land. For instance, if a sit-down strike is advocated, then there will be no cultivation at all. Then, the tenant can be evicted also if his conduct or behaviour has been such as to render his continuance as a tenant on the land undesirable in the interests of good cultivation. This provision specifically limits the ground for eviction to anything done against the interests of good cultivation. The landlord cannot find fault with the tenant at random for doing something which is not connected with the land. His right to evict a tenant is restricted to the doing by the tenant of things which are injurious to good cultivation. If the whole of these provisions is not made, it will give ample scope to agents provocateur to do a lot of mischief. That is why we have provided for these things.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“I thought that the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue was not going to speak after the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam had spoken. That is why I exercised my right of reply at that time.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Sir, the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue has introduced some new items like sit-down strikes and agents provocateur which were not mentioned in the initial stages of the debate. They have provided new fields for discussion and, therefore, I think the Mover of the amendment has got a right to reply to the new points raised.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“He has got absolutely no right. But with the indulgence of the Chair, he can speak.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“Of course, with your indulgence.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“Sir, I am glad the Hon. the Land Revenue Minister has spoken out. This was the very thing that I wanted the Government to do. When I said that sub-clause (f) was a political sub-clause, I meant exactly this.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [2nd December 1952]

Here is a peasant movement. After all, this Bill does not say that the tenant can get a share of only two-fifths of the produce and nothing more. It is perfectly open to him to enter into a contract with the landowner to get a share of more than two-fifths of the produce. But we know that the landowners, of their own accord, will not give anything more. If, on the other hand, they do give anything more, then there would be no need for this Bill at all. Therefore, in spite of the existence of this legislation, there is bound to be agitation and there is bound to be concerted action also. Now, there is such a thing as collective bargaining. The principle of collective bargaining has been accepted in all civilized countries. The tenants will enter into a combination, organization or association, and collectively demand of the landowners in various places to give them a share of more than two-fifths of the produce. In such cases, it may happen that this agitation takes other forms. They may even enter into struggles. The object of sub-clause (f) is to prevent such things under the pretext that good cultivation is prevented. Again, the object of this sub-clause is to prevent the organization of the peasantry. Well, I am glad the Hon. Minister has spoken out openly and, therefore, I say that the House must reject this clause."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I wish to know whether the Hon. Minister wants to say anything on this matter."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"No, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Only a word about the last argument of the hon. Member. He has taken for granted that this clause is intended for such and such a purpose because one of the many instances that the Hon. the Land Revenue Minister could have given was given out in that form. After hearing the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi, I feel convinced without further argument that this clause should remain." (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"First I will put the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi to the vote of the House. Then I will take up the amendment of Sri Gopalan. The question is—

'Omit from sub-clause (1), items (a), (b), (c) and (f) and reletter the remaining items.' "

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I request that the amendment for the deletion of each of the items may be put separately to vote."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have no objection. The question is—
'Omit from sub-clause (1) item (a) and reletter the remaining items.' "

The amendment was lost.

2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—
'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (b) and reletter the remaining items.' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—
'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (c) and reletter the remaining items.' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall now take up the amendment of the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan. I shall come to the amendment for the deletion of sub-clause (f) afterwards. The question is—

'In sub-clause (1), omit item (d).' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—
'Omit from sub-clause (1), item (f) and reletter the remaining items.' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi may now move his next amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, please do me a favour. I would like to move it after somebody moves some other amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is no other amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I may tell the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi that the provision, which he suggests in the amendment for substitution of the sub-clause, is made in the last part of clause 10."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then let him not move his amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Yes, Sir, it is provided for in the clause itself and, therefore, I am not moving my amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then comes the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao."

* SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move the following amendment which stands in my name—

'Insert the following as new sub-clause (3) to clause 10:—
(3) Provided that in all cases of bone fide sale by the landowner, of all the land or any portion thereof, the tenant shall vacate the land sold to the purchaser thereof and if the tenant himself can pay the competitive cost for all the land or any portion thereof, he may be given preference.' "

[Sri Y. V. Krishna Rao] [2nd December 1952]

"Sir, my amendment is self-explanatory. It purports to say that when a landowner has to sell his land for a *bona fide* purpose like the liquidation of a debt or the performance of his daughter's marriage, and when his tenant is unable to buy the land, the landowner may be entitled to sell it to another, with vacant possession. If my amendment is considered to have the effect of drifting the land into the hands of non-cultivating landowners, it may be slightly modified so as to exclude the possibility of non-cultivators stepping into it by purchasing it. What I want is that some kind of facility should be given to the landowner to sell his land in case his tenant cannot purchase it. If this facility is not given, a small landowner will not be able to liquidate his debt, much less save a portion of his land for his use. As a result, the creditor will swallow the entire land and the landowner, particularly the small landowner, will be completely ruined.

"If my amendment is not accepted, there will be complete extinction of the small pattadars of Tanjore and, if it is accepted, it will be a bit helpful to them, and they can retain a fraction of their holdings. In addition the amendment will have the effect of speeding up sales by the big pattadars also. The result will be the liquidation of their large holdings which seems to be the goal of all agrarian reform.

"I suggest that my amendment may be adopted."

3-40
p.m.

* SRI N. VENKATARAMIAH :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 26th November, when we were discussing the amendment to clause 6 of this Bill, we advocated the conferment of permanent right of occupancy on the tenant. But the House rejected the amendment and by such an attitude the House has shown itself to be against the occupancy rights being conferred on the tenant. For a time, it may appear as though our present stand is inconsistent with the stand already taken by us while discussing the amendment to clause 6 of the Bill. But I may state that it is not so in fact. When we look at the Bill, it appears to be a more or less stop-gap arrangement. It is neither fish nor flesh. It does not envisage any land reform on any long-standing or long-enduring basis. The Government's policy seems to me 'let sleeping dogs lie'. It is something like section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code which says that for a period of two months or so, irrespective of the rights of the parties, a particular order has to be maintained. It does not confer occupancy rights on the tenants; it does not prevent the landowners from selling their lands. For a term of five years, they want to continue the present state of affairs. That seems to be their policy. The present amendment seeks to empower the landlord to sell in any particular case for *bona fide* purpose a portion of his land which is in the occupation of the tenant. Sir, it may be argued that if this power is given to the landlord every one of the landlords may try to sell away his lands and take them from the tenants. That will not be the case. There is a qualifying rider, viz., that the landlord must be permitted to sell the land for *bona fide* purposes, in which case, the tenant shall vacate the land

2nd. December 1952] [Sri N. Venkataramiah]

and give vacant possession to the landlord so that the purchaser may take possession of the same from the landlord. As I have already submitted, there is absolutely no prohibition against the landowner's selling the land and another taking possession of the same after five years. So, I feel it is better if this amendment is accepted. While the Bill recognized the right of the landowner to sell away his land, and while it recognizes his ownership of the land and while even according to this Bill the tenant can continue to be in possession of the land only for a period of five years, it is but fair and desirable that he should be allowed to have powers to sell his land, in which case, the tenant may be directed to hand over possession of the same. For these reasons, I support the amendment moved by hon. Member Sri Krishna Rao."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, I am afraid there is jumbling of many things in this amendment. I find there is a move for the right of pre-emption and it does not fit in well in the context of the provisions of this Bill. I think it will make the matter more confused. So I request the hon. Member not to press the amendment."

* SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—"Sir, I regret I cannot withdraw my amendment. On the other hand, I suggest once more that it may be accepted as it is a very simple and reasonable amendment. Where there is a *bona fide* case of the land having to be sold, the landowner must have the right to sell it. Unless he has a right to sell it to some other man who is not his tenant in case his tenant cannot purchase it for a reasonable price, the land value will depreciate and the landowner will be ruined. If we cannot help these small landowners and small pattadars of Tanjore, I do not know on whom else this Bill is going to confer some benefit. I think that if the Government and the House cannot accept my amendment, it will spell disaster to the small landholders of the Tanjore district."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'Insert the following as new sub-clause 3 :—

"(3) Provided that in all cases of *bona fide* sale by the landowner, of all the land or any portion thereof, the tenant shall vacate the land sold to the purchaser thereof and if the tenant himself can pay the competitive cost for all the land or any portion thereof, he may be given preference."

The amendment was lost.

Clause 10, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 11.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Sir, I move—

'Omit the words "according to custom" in the third line and the words "for days on which there is no work to be

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [2nd December 1952]

done" in the fourth line, and substitute the words "for days on which no work is actually done or on which, according to custom, there is no work to be done."

This amendment is intended only to make matters more clear and in substance it is the same as the original clause."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, most of us have not received a copy of the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" A few days ago, these amendments have been circulated. If the hon. Member has not brought them, it is not the fault of the office."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, most of us do not have a copy of this amendment. I think this is a new amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" No, I think this amendment was circulated last Thursday. Hon. Members should keep a copy of these amendments with them. However, if they want, I have no objection to read the amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, originally we were supplied with a compendious list of amendments. Subsequently, the Government circulated certain other small amendments in small slips. Probably, some of the Members might have lost them."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then, it is not the fault of the office."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I am asked to paraphrase the substance of the amendment. The original clause says, 'Wages shall be payable to pannaiyals and the members of their families, for each day of work done according to custom, as follows, but not for days on which there is no work to be done . . .'. The same idea is conveyed in the present amendment in a better language and of course with a slight difference, viz., the omission of the words 'according to custom' in the third line and the words 'for days on which there is no work to be done' in the fourth line, and the substitution of the words 'for days on which no work is actually done or on which, according to custom, there is no work to be done.'"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I explain the amendment to my hon. Friends on the other side? The change is small and is intended for this purpose. The landlord cannot refuse to pay when actually work is done by pleading that it is not customary work or that there is no work to be done at all. We want to make it very clear that when work is done, the pannaiyal concerned should be paid for it. That is all what we have done."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Amendment moved—

'Omit the words "according to custom" in the third line and the words "for days on which there is no work to be done"

2nd December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

in the fourth line, and *substitute* the words "for days on which no work is actually done or on which, according to custom, there is no work to be done." "

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I appreciate the intention but I wonder whether this amendment will carry it out. The amended version will be 'wages shall be payable to pannaiyals and the members of their families, for each day of work done as follows but not for days on which no work is actually done or on which, according to custom, there is no work to be done.' There is a mistake in the amendment. The amendment does not read properly at all. Then coming to the substance of the amendment, it would mean that on those days on which, according to custom, there is no work to be done but on which actually work is done, the pannaiyal need not be paid. That is the object and intention of the Government. Whether this object is served by the amendment is the question. Even though work may have been done, if he has not done any work as covered by the amendment, he need not be paid. But this is not clearly brought out in the amendment. This needs very careful consideration. I also feel that the latter portion of the amendment should be deleted."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I shall look into the original and see if there is any mistake."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall take up the next amendment. Mr. R. V. Jagga Rao will move his amendment."

SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO :—" I do not move the amendment given notice of by me."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Sri G. Rama Rao is not in his place. I shall pass on to the Government amendment next."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

In the last paragraph, for the words "an aruvadaippangu and the members of his family," substitute the words "his share in the aruvadaippangu (crop-share) of half-a-marakkal for every kalam of gross produce (or in the case of produce other than paddy, of one-twenty-fourth of the gross produce)"

It is now provided that a male pannaiyal will be entitled at each harvest to his share in the aruvadaippangu (crop-share) of half-a-marakkal for every kalam of gross produce (or in the case of produce other than paddy, of one-twenty-fourth of the gross produce). What I am putting before the House is the same as in the sub-clause but in a different way. It is the same thing in the proper form."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

In the last paragraph, for the words "an aruvadaippangu and the members of his family," substitute the words

[Mr. Speaker] [2nd December 1952]

"his share in the aruvadaippangu (crop-share) of half-a-marakkal for every kalam of gross produce (or in the case of produce other than paddy, of one-twenty-fourth of the gross produce) " " "

The amendment was carried.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, reverting to the previous amendment, I feel that if the words 'according to custom' and the words 'but not for days on which there is no work to be done' occurring in the third and fourth lines of clause 11 are deleted, the whole thing will be all right. It simply means 'for each day of work done as follows.' "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Then the clause will read—

'Wages shall be payable to pannaiyals and the members of their families for each day of work done, as follows.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall allow time to the Government till to-morrow. Let them bring in a clear amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Till to-morrow? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then, the Government may reopen the clause at 5 p.m. to-day. I shall allow an hour."

Clause 12.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Sir, I move—

'For sub-clause (4) substitute the following :—

"(4) If the landowner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer under sub-section (3), the Revenue Court shall on receipt of information of such failure direct the landowner to pay and continue to pay the pannaiyal, his wages in accordance with section 11 until the landlord has reinstated the pannaiyal." "

"Sir, the provision made in the Bill reads as follows :—

4 p.m. * If the landowner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer under sub-section (3), the Revenue court may, on receipt of intimation of such failure, after such inquiry as it considers necessary, direct the landowner to pay the pannaiyal such compensation as may be fixed by it, not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 300, whichever is less."

Here is a case of a landlord who has dismissed his pannaiyal alleging certain grounds, that he does not work properly or has been guilty of misconduct and so on. The Revenue Court goes into the allegations made by the landlord and comes to the conclusion that the allegations made are absolutely false and therefore on these alleged grounds the pannaiyal shall not be dismissed. If the Revenue Court or the Conciliation Officer as the case may be goes into those allegations made by the landlord and then comes to a conclusion and orders his reinstatement, what is the obligation imposed on the part of the landlord? He may respect the verdict

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

of the Court or may not. In the case in which he chooses not to respect the verdict of the Court, what is provided for is, Rs. 300 or six months' wages whichever is less, shall be paid to the pannaiyal as compensation. This is the penalty imposed on the landlord who refuses to accept the verdict of the Court. In spite of the verdict of the Court the landlord is sought to be condoned if he agrees to pay Rs. 300 or six months' wages whichever is less, or whatever it is. This I say is an atrocious piece of legislation. Here is a man who is guilty of contempt of court even. The grounds on which he has dismissed his pannaiyal have been found to be false. Even then he can have his own way. That is what is provided for in the Bill.

"Take for example industrial disputes. There are cases where workers are dismissed without any reasons whatsoever. There are Conciliation Courts and Tribunals. If the Court finds or the Tribunal finds that the worker has been unjustifiably or unlawfully dismissed and orders his reinstatement, what happens? The employer is bound to reinstate the worker and so long as he does not reinstate him that worker is deemed to have been reinstated and continued to be paid the wages. That is the provision of law when it is a question of dealing with industrial disputes, when it is a question of the relationship between the worker and the capitalist. That being so, why make an exception in the case of the relationship between the landlord and his pannaiyals? I am sure this sort of provision will not help the pannaiyals. As a matter of fact, I know all the small landlords will inevitably reinstate the pannaiyals. But it will not work in the case of the big landlords. They would see to it that the pannaiyals are removed. They would rather get rid of the man by paying the compensation provided for than reinstate him in service. They would say: 'These are Kisan Sabha men. We do not want to have them. Better pay off the compensation and get rid of them than reinstate them' "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" This is only intended to cover ordinary cases."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Even in respect of ordinary cases, I ask, have we provided such provisions in respect of the industrial disputes? Do we say that after the tribunal had gone into the case and found that the worker had been dismissed unjustly, the employer could pay off some compensation and get rid of the worker? Then, why make an exception in the case of the landlord alone? We cannot forget the existence of the Kisan Sabha. In order to see that this organization is smashed, which I say is their object, this provision has been made in the Bill. This is nothing more than a price for victimization. Here a price is being fixed for victimization and contempt of Court. Should we accept this position? Therefore the Government should find it a reasonable thing to provide here similar provisions as are provided in the Industrial Disputes Act. I would press this amendment for the acceptance of the House."

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, by way of a preliminary remark to understand the position

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the amendment be formally seconded, then the Hon. the Chief Minister can speak."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"శ్రీమంత్రి, నేను ఈ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. నేను తరువాత మాట్లాడవచ్చునని కోరుతున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"We should understand clearly the position before we make any amendment, accept or refuse any amendment. The position is: are we now trying to get through a measure by which no pannaiyal can ever be got rid of for sufficient reasons but the two must be wedded together for a life-time? No. Therefore, there must be some provision in the Bill for giving due and just notice ending with an agricultural year, after which the wage-earner should be asked to go. So the Hon. the Revenue Minister has given notice of an amendment for the addition of a new sub-clause (6). It reads thus:

'Any landowner or pannaiyal may terminate the engagement by giving notice of not less than 12 months ending with the expiry of the next agricultural year, or by mutual agreement, provided that where the landowner terminates the engagement under this sub-section, he shall be liable to pay to the pannaiyal, grain or money equivalent to six months wages or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon.'

This, I submit, is a just and proper condition to be added. It was omitted by oversight and it has now been proposed to be added. If this is added, then the question arises whether we really want the provision to which the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi objects. I can understand the argument that when there is an enquiry about a dismissal and an order is passed, it should be accepted. I would be quite prepared to ask the Hon. Revenue Minister to consider omitting the clause prescribing payment of compensation of Rs. 300 and getting rid of the pannaiyal if the other amendment is there in the Bill. Therefore, I would submit that the Government amendment may first be moved and then we can consider the validity of the argument of the hon. Member Mr. Ramamurthi."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then the Hon. Minister may move the Government amendment."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move—

'After sub-clause (5), insert the following as a new sub-clause (6) and renumber the existing sub-clause (6) as sub-clause (7):—

"(6) Any landowner or pannaiyal may terminate the engagement by giving notice of not less than 12 months ending with the expiry of the next agricultural year, or

2nd December 1952] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

by mutual agreement, provided that where the landowner terminates the engagement under this sub-section, he shall be liable to pay to the pannaiyal, grain or money equivalent to six months' wages or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I want to speak on the Government amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let me first put the Government amendment before the House. Then the hon. Member can speak. The amendment is—

'After sub-clause (5), insert the following as a new sub-clause (6) and renumber the existing sub-clause (6) as sub-clause (7):—

"(6) Any landowner or pannaiyal may terminate the engagement by giving notice of not less than 12 months ending with the expiry of the next agricultural year, or by mutual agreement, provided that where the landowner terminates the engagement under this sub-section, he shall be liable to pay to the pannaiyal, grain or money equivalent to six months' wages or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, from our side we suggest the following amendment to the Government amendment, namely, instead of six months' wages, it may be amended as twelve months' wages."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Where is his amendment? The hon. Member has not given notice of it."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"The Government have not given notice of their amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Government have given sufficient notice. The amendment was issued on the 26th November, and circulated to Members. If the hon. Member has not taken note of it, it is not the fault of the Government."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point of order 4-10 p.m.
అధ్యక్షా, సవరణలు తీసుకువచ్చిన గడువు అయిపోయిన తరువాత మళ్ళీ సవరణలు ఇవ్వవచ్చు? ఆ విధంగా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే వాటికి సభ్యులు తీర్మానం చేయవచ్చును. అలాగే వివాదం తీసుకు రిల్యు రిల్యు ఇవ్వగలము."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The hon. Member wants to know the procedure, Sir. The Government have given notice of the present new amendment. He wants to know whether he could move any further amendments."

MR. SPEAKER:—"This is not a new amendment. The Hon. the Revenue Minister had given notice of this four days ago. It was circulated on Thursday last. If the hon. Member wanted to move any amendment, he ought to have given notice of it before."

[2nd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" This may be kindly explained to the hon. Member."

MR. SPEAKER :—" How is it possible for me when the hon. Member speaks only Telugu? I do not know Telugu. (Laughter.)"

" The Government amendment is now before the House. Are there any hon. Members who want to speak on this amendment? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I want to speak first, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then let the hon. the Leader of the Opposition speak first."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, the amendment moved by the Government does not come up to the expectation of the Opposition. May I ask the Hon. Revenue Minister to pay attention to what we say? We are not disputing the rights of the landlords to dispense with the tenants or pannaiyals after giving due notice prescribed in this Bill or in accordance with previous custom or other supplementary rights which we confer on them. But the question now is what the landlord should do after the Revenue Court has declared the dismissal of the tenant or pannaiyal as wrongful. By the amendment which the Hon. Revenue Minister had moved, viz., giving the right to the landlord to dismiss his pannaiyal by giving proper notice, I may say that we give some additional security of service to the already poverty-stricken pannaiyal and raise his status. But let us view this amendment in conjunction with what is laid down in sub-clause (3) of clause 12. Sub-clause (3) of clause 12 says that the Conciliation Officer if he finds the dismissal as wrongful shall give in writing an award requiring the landowner to take back the pannaiyal and reinstate him to all the rights which would have accrued to him but for his dismissal. What has the landowner to do after the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court has given the verdict? He has simply to obey their instructions. The landlord should at once implement the judgment of the Revenue Court. He cannot simply be allowed to pay only Rs. 300 to the pannaiyal and not reinstate him. This virtually amounts to bringing the Conciliation Officer, the Revenue Court, the Government and above all the legislators who have made this law, into contempt. This should not be allowed to happen. I would ask the Government to clarify the position clearly."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I think both the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Ramamurthi have misunderstood the whole position. I think it was Mr. Manali Kandasami who wanted to raise the limit of Rs. 150 to Rs. 300 justifying the increase on the probability of an increase in the price of paddy. He said that an increase in the price of the grain must necessarily go with an increase in the wages of the pannaiyals also. So the limit was raised from Rs. 150 to Rs. 300. I think Mr. Manali Kandasami understands the full implications of the present amendment. Let me try to make the position still clearer."

[2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

" The Hon. Revenue Minister's amendment seeks to fulfil altogether a different purpose. It gives the right to a landlord to dispense with his pannaiyal by giving him twelve months notice ending with that particular agricultural year. Similarly the pannaiyal can also leave his service after giving twelve months' notice. But the present sub-clause (3) deals with an altogether different matter. It deals with cases of wrongful dismissal. If a landowner has dismissed a pannaiyal and if the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court finds that the dismissal had been a wrongful one, they may give an award requiring the landlord to reinstate the pannaiyal giving him as compensation what would have accrued to the pannaiyal but for his dismissal. Sub-clause (4) gives the right of appeal to the Revenue Court by the pannaiyal in case the landowner does not abide by the decision of the Conciliation Officer. Sub-clause (4) also fixes the maximum penalty for the landlord as Rs. 300 or any amount not exceeding six months wages. We have also made further concessions to the pannaiyal against his wrongful dismissal. Sub-clause (5) provides that in case the landlord disobeys the verdict of the Revenue Court, the accruing compensation shall be recovered from the landlord as though it were an arrear of land revenue and this would be paid to the dismissed pannaiyal. I think that considering the different sub-clauses (3), (4) and (5) the position is quite clear."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Even before hearing the Hon. Chief Minister, I know that he would put the interpretation which he had just now put. No doubt my friend Mr. Manali Kandasami fought hard in the Joint Select Committee to raise the limit from Rs. 150 to Rs. 300 taking into consideration the would-be increase in wages consequent on the increase in the price of the grain. No doubt the Hon. Chief Minister had explained that the present amendment of the Hon. Revenue Minister need not be clubbed with the penalty clauses, viz., sub-clauses (3), (4) and (5) of clause 12 of the Bill. But I want to make our position clear and remove one ambiguity that may arise. What does sub-clause (5) say? It says that in the event of the landlord refusing to accept the verdict of the Revenue Court, the compensation that would have accrued to the pannaiyal but for his dismissal, shall be recovered from him as though it were an arrear of land revenue. Herein under sub-clause (4) it had been laid down that the maximum compensation will be Rs. 300 or an amount not exceeding six months wages. Take a typical case. Suppose I were a pannaiyal and were dismissed from 1st April 1952. Of course my landlord ought to make a report of my dismissal to the Conciliation Officer within a week. After two months the Conciliation Officer may find my dismissal to be wrongful one. He may order the landlord to reinstate me giving me the necessary wages that would have accrued to me since 1st April 1952. But suppose he refuses. What shall happen? I shall take the case to the Revenue Court. But the Revenue Court has got to hear several thousands of appeals. Therefore in all probability when

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [2nd December 1952]

my case is taken up, some time *beyond six months* would have elapsed. If the Revenue Court were to abide by the proviso of sub-clause (4) the maximum that the landlord might be asked to pay is only Rs. 300, whereas in reality my wages ever since the date of my dismissal, i.e., 1st April 1952 may amount to something *definitely* more than Rs. 300. That is why I say that the provision that the landlord shall pay only Rs. 300 or any amount not exceeding six months' wages should be removed. On the other hand a special provision should be made so that the pannaiyal shall get all the right that would have accrued to him from the date of dismissal besides some compensation for his dismissal. The whole amount calculated on this basis, shall be caused to be recovered from the landlord as part of his land revenue."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"As I had previously stated, sub-clauses (3) and (4) deal only with cases of wrongful dismissal of the pannaiyal. Sub-clause (3) provides for the compensation because it is intended to provide for the loss in the wages of the pannaiyal subsequent to his dismissal. Sub-clause (4) gives him the right to appeal to the Revenue Court in case of the disobedience of the Order of the Conciliation Officer by the landlord."

4-20 p.m. * SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In that case, I wish to suggest that at the end of sub-clause (3) after the words 'and reinstate him to all the rights which would have accrued to him but for his dismissal,' the words 'and also direct him to pay compensation not exceeding Rs. 300' may be inserted. Sir, there are two ways of interpretation. A latter clause has got an overriding effect than the previous clauses. Unless the matter is clearly stated at the end of sub-clause (3), sub-clause (4) is likely to wipe out the benefit of sub-clause (3) or it will be treated as merely an alternative to sub-clause (3). But what the Hon. the Chief Minister says is that it is in addition to it. So, it must be made clear that this compensation is an additional remedy and not an alternative remedy. That is all what we want and any amendment from the Government side to carry out the intentions of the Hon. the Chief Minister is welcome."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"If that is all the doubt, I think that after the words 'and reinstate him to all the rights which would have accrued to him but for his dismissal' at the end of sub-clause (3), we can run on to the next sub-clause, 'if the landowner fails to comply with the award of the Conciliation Officer under sub-section (3) . . . and renumber the other clauses."

"Sir, it is not stated that the award is cancelled. Immediate proceedings are contemplated after dismissal and then there is the reinstatement order. There is nothing to be done for that little period. If, however, the landlord does not follow up the award by compliance, then we provide for compensation."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I wish to suggest the following. At the end of sub-clause (4) we can add a proviso 'provided

2nd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

this compensation does not take away from the pannaiyal the rights that accrue to him under sub-clause (3)'. So, even after the payment of compensation, the right of the pannaiyal to be reinstated still remains."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Instead, we can add 'without detriment to the rights . . .'"

[After some discussion, the Hon. the Chief Minister moved the following amendment.]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I move the following amendment to sub-clause (4):—

'At the end of sub-clause (4), for the words "not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 300, whichever is less", substitute the words "without detriment to the rights accruing to the pannaiyal under sub-section (3)".'

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Sir, I will just try to explain its effect so that there may not be confusion at least to the Members on this side. The sub-clause provides for compensation to be fixed by the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court for failure of the landlord to comply with the award. In addition to that, it also lays down that the payment of such compensation does not take away from the pannaiyal the rights that accrue to him, viz., the right to reinstatement which already accrued to him under sub-clauses (3). We accept the amendment, Sir."

The amendment of Mr. Ramamurthi to sub-clause (4) was by leave of the House withdrawn.

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have got to draw your attention to one point in the discussion between the Government on this side and the Opposition Members on the other side. I may point out to my respected leader the great mistake into which he has fallen. He has made a serious mistake and I have got the guts to remind him of his duty now. He has not gone into the correctness of the amendment which he has accepted. I have not been following the discussion on the amendments all along. Just by chance I happened to be here within the last one hour and a half. The intention, as I could see, in sub-clauses (3) and (4) is very clear and the Hon. the Chief Minister explains clearly and the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi accepts it. The question of relationship between the landowner and the pannaiyal and the question of compensation, etc., are very important, and proper provision should be made so that misunderstanding may not arise with reference to the payment of that compensation."

"Sir, the Hon. the Revenue Minister moved the amendment that both the parties can terminate the engagement by giving notice of not less than 12 months ending with the expiry of the next agricultural year, etc., and the Hon. Chief Minister also referred to Rs. 150 being raised to Rs. 300 in the Select Committee

[Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad] [2nd December 1952]

at the instance of Sri C. Kandaswami who knows the agrarian position well. Now, Sir, I find that this amount of Rs. 300 is sought to be omitted. Sub-clause (3) is no doubt a judgment. If the landowner is not able to comply with the award—if he is not able to implement the judgment, he is asked to do something else. The Government have now amended sub-clause (4) by introducing the words 'without detriment to the rights accruing to the pannaiyal under sub-clause (3) above'. I have no objection for the reinstatement of the pannaiyal and the question of reinstatement is always there. I only want the Hon. the Chief Minister to consider whether they are not going back on the intentions of the main provisions of the Bill so quickly and whether the new amendment does not go against the basic principle involved in the Bill itself. Certain provisions have been accepted in the Select Committee and we are all under the impression that we are going on that basis. Then, Sir, the relations between the landowner and the pannaiyal will be continuously embittered. There is no finality to this compensation and reinstatement. Do the Government provide for any other appellate Court on the decision of the Conciliation Officer if the landowner is not able to implement the award? Is there any provision in the Bill? It is nowhere mentioned. Therefore I would earnestly request the Hon. Chief Minister and the Government not to proceed hurriedly with this as it is a complicated clause. Let them take time and pursue it to-morrow. I am not an expert in legislative matters; otherwise I could have devoted some time on this. But now, Sir, I would entreat the Hon. Chief Minister not to accept any amendment to-day for sub-clauses (3) and (4), but to take time till to-morrow for considering them afresh. In the meanwhile we can go on with the other clauses."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, what is the mistake which the Hon. Chief Minister has committed, and what is the mistake now pointed out by the hon. Member who spoke just now?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, regarding the doubt raised by the hon. Member behind me, I may say his doubt is based on a possible ambiguity. I do not know if the hon. Member Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar kept before his mind the amendment which has been considered on the motion of the Hon. Revenue Minister, viz., that at any time the relationship between the landowner and the pannaiyal could be terminated by notice on either side, of one year, ending with an agricultural year. That being settled, that is one way of easily disposing of the question of relationship between the two. If however there has been a wrongful dismissal, there is provision made in clause 12 under which the pannaiyal may make a complaint if he wants the dismissal to be looked into. If it is proved to be wrong he gets the right of reinstatement, as if he had not been dismissed. And if that reinstatement order is not followed up by compliance, provision is made for speedy compensation to the pannaiyal through the Revenue Court. I do not see how there is any difficulty or contradiction here."

2nd December 1952]

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD:—"Why do you remove the amount fixed?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The removal of the amount is to provide for as much compensation for the purpose as each case may require. It has nothing to do with the length of service or any such thing. When there was no notice provision, we had fixed this and six months' notice. But now that separate provision has been made for notice, there is no reason to mix up this matter with that provision. That is all, Sir. In short, if the two people want to separate, there is a provision for that; but if there is a wrongful dismissal, there is also a separate provision for that."

MR. SPEAKER:—"We will now take up . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I suggest, Sir, that we first take up the amendment moved by me."

MR. SPEAKER:—"All right. The question is—

'In sub-clause (4), for the words "not exceeding six months' wages or Rs. 300, whichever is less" substitute the words "without detriment to the rights accruing to the pannaiyal under sub-section (3)".'

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will now take up Mr. Manickavelu Naicker's amendment. The question is—

'After sub-clause (5), insert the following as a new sub-clause (6) and renumber the existing sub-clause (6) as sub-clause (7):—

"(6) Any landowner or pannaiyal may terminate the engagement by giving notice of not less than twelve months ending with the expiry of the next agricultural year, or by mutual agreement, provided that where the landowner terminates the engagement under this sub-section, he shall be liable to pay to the pannaiyal, grain or money equivalent to six months' wages or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon."

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"We will now take up the last amendment of Mr. Venkateswarlu."

SRI PILLALAMARBI VENKATESWARLU:—"அரசாங்கம், பன்னாயல் உட்கார்ந்து, அவருடைய பணியை முடித்துக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும். அதற்கு ஒரு வருஷம் காலம் வேண்டும்."

MR. SPEAKER:—"That is, you want time to consider whether you should move it or not."

SRI PILLALAMARBI VENKATESWARLU:—"அப்படி."

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [2nd December 1952]

పట్టారు. కమ్యూనిస్టు పరిపాలన వస్తే కనిస్థితులు విలాసవంతమౌతాయో అనేదానికి ఇది మచ్చుతునక అనివారు ఆరోపించారు. శాసనోల్లంఘన చేసి నేడవారిని ఇబ్బందుల పాలు చేసేవారిని, ఎవరినైనప్పటికీ, శిక్షించడం ఏ ప్రభుత్వం అయినప్పటికీ సహించరాదనే మా అభిప్రాయం. కాని సుబ్బా రెడ్డిగారు అమాదిరిగా భావించారు. భూస్వాములయొక్క దొర్లనాల్లను మూసివేస్తుంటే వారు ప్రయత్నించినందుకల్లా ఫలితమేమీ ఉండదని వారు గుర్తించగోరారు. ప్రభుత్వ పోకడలను వారు గుర్తించాలి ఇంకెంత కాలమో నేడవారిని పీర్చి పిప్పిచేసే సాంఘిక వ్యవస్థ మనజాలదని వారు గమనించాలి. భూస్వాములు తమ నడవడికలను సరిచేసుకొని, జీతగాళ్లను పొందించకుండా ఉండవలసిన మా కోరిక. జీతయాల మధ్య సంబంధ బాంధవ్యాలు సక్రమంగా ఉండాలని, భూస్వామి జీతగాండ్రై దొర్లనాల్ల ఉపయోగించరాదని ఆశించుటవల్లనే ఈ సరిణాను ప్రతిపాదించాము. భూస్వాములు ఇంకను కాలగడిచి గుర్తించక పాత పద్ధతులనే అనుసరించుచుంటే వారు ఇంకను భూరిష్టైన శిక్షలకు పాత్రులుగావలసి వస్తుందని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. (ప్రతి పక్ష సభ్యుల హర్షధ్వనాలు) బాధ్యత పరిస్థితులను గుర్తించే రాజగోపాలాచారిగారివంటి ప్రముఖ రాజకీయవేత్త ఇట్టి శాసనం చేయుటకు పూనుకొన్నాడు. కార్మికులు, కర్షకులు తమ హక్కులను ఈనాడు, మున్నెన్నడుమకినీ హక్కుగా ఆర్జించుకున్నారు. సంఘంలో వారికిగల స్థానమేమో వాటికీ తెలుసు. కాని ప్రతిపక్షకు ఈ విషయాలను ఇంకను సరిగా ఆర్జించుకునేవారు లేరు. భూస్వాములు ఈ విషయాలను ఇప్పుడైనా గమనించవలసిన కోరుకూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుకుంటున్నాను." (ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యుల హర్షధ్వనాలు)

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" On a matter of personal explanation, Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Member for having confirmed my warning, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the arguments have proceeded on a higher level. (Laughter.) Now, coming back to the level of the Bill itself, I submit, Sir, it is well known that directly or indirectly we should have no punishments by way of imprisonment for breaches of contract of personal service on either side. Neither could we get a pannaial to go to prison for breaking a contract nor the landowner."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" అధ్యక్షా, రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు చెప్పిన ప్రత్యక్షతరం తృప్తికరంగా లేకపోయినప్పటికీ నేను నా సరళిని ప్రకటించితిని."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

Clause 12 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 11—cont.

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think we can go back to clause 11. I move—

'In paragraph 1, omit the words "according to custom" and all the words after "as follows".'

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, this amendment meets with the position taken up by the Opposition and I do not think, therefore, much discussion is needed over it."

2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—
'In paragraph 1, omit the words "according to custom" and all the words after "as follows".'

The amendment was carried.

Clause 11 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 13.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move 4-50 p.m.
the amendment standing in my name. I move—
'Add at the end of sub-clause (2) the following words :—
"subject to review on questions of law by the District Court having jurisdiction."'

We have had occasions to see in our discussion on clause 10 how on several questions either the landlord or the tenant may go up in appeal over the judgment given by the Revenue Divisional Officer. In the original scheme the Conciliation Officer was not the original court but now the Revenue Divisional Officer has been made the appellate court as it were. It must be remembered that the Revenue courts and the Revenue Officers act generally upon instructions from the Government. Whatever the law may be, they always receive instructions from the Government how to dispose of matters arising under the law. We knew these things when we appeared before Collectors with regard to Agency matters. We have the same experience in Survey matters and even in matters pertaining to the Zamindari Abolition Act when we go before Settlement Officers. Whatever the law may be, these officers being part of the Executive, proceed on the basis of confidential instructions from the Government. Further they are guided by Codes which are meant wholly for the use of the officers while the public, the lawyers and the litigants have no access to the Codes. While calling upon the parties and enquiring into their case, the officers have office notes for their guidance prepared by someone who may after all be a lower division clerk or an upper division clerk or a bench clerk. Even a lower division clerk prepares notes on the appeal that comes for hearing before the officer and when the litigant or his lawyer goes on explaining his case to the officer, very often the officer is reading the notes prepared by the office and the office generally deal not with the wording of the Act but only certain G.Os. just as it happens when the attention of the Chairman of the Municipal Council or the President of the District Board is drawn by the Manager to certain G.Os., when the matters are discussed by the Board or the Municipal Council, as the case may be. Just like that, the Revenue Divisional Officers and Collectors and Settlement Officers, where they do judicial work, they go by the instructions issued by the Government. They are a part of the Executive of the Government and the Government themselves cannot deny it. If the Revenue Divisional Officer is a Court of

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [2nd December 1952]

justice as it ought to be in matters like this, I should never have said that the power of revision must be given to the District Court. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know although our Constitution does not say so—the American constitution has said so—it deals with three aspects, the executive aspect, the legislative aspect and the judicial aspect. The Constitution makes a provision for all these things and the spirit of the Constitution is that the powers of the Court must be kept intact and separate as far as possible. The Constitution of course does not say that no legislature shall by any of its legislation deprive the ordinary Courts of their jurisdiction. But the spirit of the Constitution is that the Legislature cannot cut down the powers of the Executive nor can these two combine and cut down the powers of the Judiciary. That is a point upon which all of us must be agreed. The general argument that is advanced is 'we are dealing with matters pertaining to the relationship between the landlord and the tenant therefore, we should have summary procedure and we cannot have the dilatory procedure and we cannot resort to the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code because laws mean delays and Courts mean delays. This is a kind of argument put forward by those who have got the executive mind. The Hon. the Chief Minister and the Members of the Government may be great democrats but, when once they go to the official bench, they get the executive mind and an executive approach and thus get everything through. That is why the Executive always wants to take more power from the Legislature and the Legislature always tries to see that its sovereignty is not in any way affected and what really happens is that the Legislature always tries to restrict the powers of the Executive as far as possible and the Executive wants all the same as much power from the Legislature as possible. Also there are cases where the Legislature and the Executive have combined in their over-enthusiasm in an emotional moment thinking that they were doing good to the poor and the illiterate and thus robbed the third limb of the Constitution, resulting in cutting down the legitimate powers of the Judiciary. I submit, Sir, it is wrong for any democratic Legislature to deprive by means of legislation the rights of an ordinary citizen to go to an ordinary Court of law. I may agree with the Hon. the Chief Minister and those who are for summary and quick remedies to a certain extent and therefore I have agreed that the final power to go into facts might be reserved to the Executive. The Revenue Divisional Officer although he is called upon to do judicial work is still an Executive Officer and there are no rules compelling him to follow the Code of Civil Procedure or natural principles of justice or the fundamentals of fair play. Above all Constitutions, above all laws and above all enthusiasm, Sir, there is such a thing as fundamental fair play and natural justice and if the Revenue Divisional Officer by any means goes wrong, while discussing clause 10 was it not pointed out here on the floor of the House that there is no remedy? Speaking on behalf of the tenants, I submit, Sir, that the Revenue Divisional Officer cannot be given final powers even on questions of law. But on points of fact, I am prepared to go with the

2nd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

Government and with those who argue for quick and summary remedies and in those cases, I am prepared to leave jurisdiction in that behalf unaffected. But regarding questions of interpretation of the several clauses of the enactment, when questions of natural justice and equity arise and when problems which are not envisaged either by the Executive or by the Legislature arise when ambiguities and doubts arise regarding the interpretation of the enactment, it is necessary that the Civil Courts must have jurisdiction and it is wrong to deprive the powers of the Civil Courts in those matters. In such matters we should not say to the Civil Courts: You shall not discharge your legitimate functions.

"Sir, at the risk of repetition, I say, I am agreeable to the Revenue Divisional Officer having final jurisdiction over the question of fact. But on questions of law and interpretation if we say that civil courts shall not have jurisdiction, it will be a very unsafe procedure and it will be a dangerous beginning to make. I am pleading on behalf of the very illiterate persons for whom the Hon. Chief Minister says: 'Let there be no civil courts, appeal and dilatory proceedings.'"

"Sir, I remember what the Hon. Leader of the House once said that we must trust the Executive. Let me say, it is not a question of trust or distrust of the Executive. In this connection, I am reminded of what happened in England in the year 1876. They had the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876. Section 43 of that Act runs as follows:—

'The importation of arms, ammunition, gunpowder or any other goods may be prohibited by Proclamation or Order in Council.'

But in the year 1919, taking power under this Section of the Act, the Government passed the order prohibiting the importation of Pyrogallic Acid as it comes under the term 'any other goods'. The case went to the King's Bench Division and Appellate Court. The argument of the Government was that Pyrogallic Acid came under Section 43 of the Act. The Act said that rules made under the Act had the same effect as an enactment. Supposing the High Court of Judicature came to the conclusion that the order was really final, what would have happened? The materials which were absolutely necessary for war purposes should have been prohibited. Therefore the High Court declared that particular order as *ultra vires*. So it proves, how beneficial it is that on questions of law the civil court should have jurisdiction.

"Sir, if you look to Clause 10 which was passed, you will find that a tenant can be sent out at any time merely on an application by the landowner. The landowner might go and tell the Revenue Divisional Officer somewhere in the Club or in the train: 'My tenants are giving a lot of trouble. They are organizing this thing and that thing. I asked them to grow one thing but they say, they will grow another thing'. The Revenue Divisional Officer would simply say: 'Why can't you put in an application' and when the application goes to him, you know what sort of judgment he would give"

[2nd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Don't be unfair."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am not unfair to any particular officer. Your provision in this Bill is unfair. You are putting officers in that position. Supposing he goes wrong, what is the remedy you have provided for in this Bill? There must be a limit. You may declare a tenant as undesirable. But the undesirableness must be canalized. How can you canalize it if the Revenue Divisional Officer's opinion is final? There must be somebody to revise it and let the Civil Court have jurisdiction on questions of law. Otherwise, this might give a lead to other pieces of legislation in which you would take away the jurisdiction of courts."

" Sir, one other argument that is advanced is that if there is power of revision by the Civil Court, many people will go to court. I submit, many people will not go and only about 5 per cent of the people may go. On an argument like this, this is what the Lord Chief Justice of England has said :

' The real triumph of Courts of law is when the universal knowledge of their existence, and universal faith in their justice, reduce to a minimum the number of those who are willing so to behave as to expose themselves to their jurisdiction. . . . The knowledge (Here it is the knowledge that there is provision for review by civil courts) that the machinery exists, and that when it is employed it is employed with skill and without favour, has the effect of rendering its employment unnecessary save only in the exceptional case.'

This is not a statement made by a politician but it was made by the Lord Chief Justice of England. Therefore, I submit, that the fear there there will be rush of petitions to court or delay in the disposal of such petitions, is exaggerated. Also, in the near future we are going to have a comprehensive legislation applicable to other parts of this State, giving security of tenure to all tenants in this State. Large sections of tenants will stand to lose if the power of revision on the question of law is not given to the civil court. Therefore, I submit, that this amendment may be accepted."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, while seconding the amendment moved by Mr. Viswanatham, I wish to point out one or two things. Mr. Viswanatham has explained the entire implications of his amendment. Sir, when a dispute arises between a landlord and a tenant or a pannaiyal, who is the final authority to decide the dispute? It is the Revenue Court. Who presides over that Revenue Court? It is the Revenue Divisional Officer. After all, who is this Revenue Divisional Officer? He is part and parcel of the Executive. In most cases, he depends upon departmental instructions, demi-official letters and instructions or advice which he gets from his officers sitting above him. In this connection, the Hon. Minister for Finance characterized the remarks of Mr. Viswanatham as being very unfair to the Revenue Divisional Officer. May be, when we say it, it looks as if it is very unfair and undesirable. But the Hon. Minister for Finance must be aware of the conditions in the mufassal and what is the state of affairs there? In the mufassal towns it is the Revenue Divisional Officer who is looked upon as a demi-god by the people living in that locality. Who has got the opportunity to approach him very

[2nd December 1952] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

frequently and freely? It is only the landed gentry; it is only the rich merchants; it is only the capitalists; and it is only the favoured few that go to him and not the pannaiyals or the ordinary labourers or the men who do not know much about the implications of this Bill and other enactments. Of course, I wish the Revenue Divisional Officer had been unbiassed in his judgment. But does it often happen? He is liable to be influenced by club friends, as Mr. Viswanatham said. Also, I am afraid, this provision makes a prosecutor a judge also. The Revenue Divisional Officer is feared as a prosecutor in the villages. He is an authority, sitting upon them, in all matters of revenue.

" It is into the hand of such persons power is given to decide 5-10 disputes. It is likely that they may not be unbiassed in all cases. p.m. That is the reason why we want that a final appeal should lie to a civil court presided over by judges, subordinate or district judges, who are liable to be not influenced (as the Revenue Divisional Officers are likely to be influenced in mufassal towns) in any way but who will act freely according to the strict letter of law."

* SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, Government presume that their Executive are not fallible and so the jurisdiction of civil courts should be ousted. It is either to the landlords or to the tenants or to the pannaiyals that they should be left to the tender mercies of the Executive. It is represented on all sides—by the landlords, by the tenants and by the pannaiyals through newspapers that the jurisdiction of the civil courts should not be ousted. I therefore submit in all fairness to the parties concerned that the jurisdiction of the civil courts should not be ousted and that appellate powers should be vested in the judicial courts."

* SRI P. RANGASAMY REDDIAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting this amendment I wish to draw the attention of the Members on the Treasury Bench and also of the lawyer friends in this Assembly to two decisions, one of which has recently appeared in the Madras Law Journal and the other has appeared in the newspapers only two days back. Both these decisions deal with the impropriety of rejecting nomination papers of candidates by Revenue Divisional Officers. In one case, and that one was from Namakkal, the decision of the Revenue Divisional Officer was ultimately up to the Supreme Court. That was a decision which appeared in the newspapers some six or seven months back. In that case one candidate had filed five nomination papers, and for all the five nomination papers he had filed only one agent form. If he had appointed himself as the agent there would have been no difficulty at all. As he had not filed five agent forms for the five nominations, the Revenue Divisional Officer declared his nomination invalid. Now, it has been finally decided by the Supreme Court that it cannot interfere with the rejection of nomination. This decision has appeared in (1952) I M.L.J. and so let not any of my friends have any doubt of it. I am referring to the improper rejection of the nomination paper filed by Mr. Ponnusami Reddiar from Namakkal. I do not propose to go into the merits of that case;

[P. Rangasamy Reddiar] [2nd December 1952]

for my intention in referring to that case is only to draw the attention of the hon. Members to what exactly happened therein. According to the Representation of the People's Act the candidate is given choice to file more than one nomination form, a separate form for each nomination of candidate and an agent form for each nomination. Unfortunately in this particular case the candidate had filed only one agent form for all the five nominations."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no need for the hon. Member to go into the details of the election case."

* SRI P. RANGASAMY REDDIAR:—" Sir, it is no doubt finally decided. I am dealing with it at length as I fear some hon. Members may not be able to appreciate wherein the difficulty lies with respect to the impropriety of the rejection of the nomination paper. Anyhow I shall not go into the details of it. With respect to the appointment of the election agent there was only one form and it was held by the Supreme Court that it could not interfere. All the five nomination papers were in order. One agent form would do for all the five nomination papers. Here is a case where the Returning Officer had rejected the nomination as invalid, but the civil court would have held it as valid. This shows how improperly things are done by the Revenue Divisional Officers. Then, Sir, two days back in another election case in Madras State which was decided by the Election Tribunal, the nomination paper had been improperly rejected on a similar ground by the Returning Officer."

MR. SPEAKER:—" Let not the hon. Member go into the details of the case."

* SRI P. RANGASAMY REDDIAR:—" In that case also the Revenue Divisional Officer had rejected the nomination paper. Sir, in all these things how much expenditure was incurred and how much labour was spent just to show that the action of the Revenue Divisional Officer was wrong."

" Now, Sir, with regard to this Bill, already in the newspapers conflicting views are appearing. One set of people are canvassing against this Bill saying that it is an exproprietary measure affecting vested interests. Another set of views appear saying that this measure does not give as much benefit to the tillers of the land as it proposes to do. These two conflicting views are appearing in the newspapers. Now after the passing of this measure important questions will arise for decision. When that is so, I am sure no landowner or no cultivator would object to allowing civil courts to have jurisdiction over such matters. Now this two months' notice is already there in the Civil Procedure Code in Section 80 with respect to suits against Government. So there is nothing new in this amendment of Sri Viswanatham. Therefore I think it is a fair suggestion and it can easily be accepted by the Government."

2nd December 1952]

* SRI K. VARADACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I have to oppose this amendment moved by Mr. Viswanatham. What intricate questions of law would arise from this Bill on the decisions of the Revenue Divisional Officer have not been illustrated by him. Something about gunpowder and other things have been stated by him; they are not opposite to the discussion on the points raised in the amendment. Sir, I have been a lawyer for nearly 34 years now; and the material that we got in the Judiciary is deteriorating fast."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—" Question."

* SRI K. VARADACHARI:—" From time to time, under the rules of recruitment we have got now, we have got numerous 'paddy-tree' gentlemen in the Judiciary, who do not know anything of agriculture or any thing of the sort."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—" That is a different matter."

* SRI K. VARADACHARI:—" Sir, this is a legislation which does not undertake to modify land tenures in this province. But this is a unique legislation which seeks to regulate agricultural methods and agricultural work in general. For the first time in the history of legislation in this country, our State is the one State which has sought by legislation to cover even agricultural methods. That is the actual result of this Bill. Therefore it is better to leave matters which are covered in this Bill to be decided by persons who are intimately connected with agriculture and who know the difficulties of agricultural operations and matters connected with agriculture. So I would like that people who know these things well should decide disputes arising from these things than those gentlemen with no worldly knowledge who are on the benches of civil courts. Therefore, Sir, I oppose this amendment."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—" Sir, I rise on a point of order. Is my hon. Friend justified in casting aspersions on the Judiciary especially when he is a lawyer of 34 years standing?" (Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point is whether we should reserve the right for an appeal, by way of review or revision, to the civil courts. The first point that I wish to dwell upon briefly is that it is wrong to consider that the Revenue Court is not a court of law but only an Executive Officer. Hon. Members are not unaware, those who are lawyers and those who have had practice under the Estates Land Act, that the Revenue Divisional Officers have been operating for the last so many decades as courts dealing with or having jurisdiction over cases arising out of the Estates Land Act; and those cases were not disposed of on office notes. Lawyers are well aware of the fact that the cases were disposed of according to correct judicial procedure. It is a mistake to imagine that the Revenue Court designated by the term 'Court' will operate as an ordinary Executive Officer. It would operate as a court."

5-20
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [2nd December 1952]

"The next point to be considered is that the Leader of the Opposition was suggesting that as he limited his amendment to review on matters of law, there would be a considerable easing of the situation and we need not oppose it on the ground of vexatious litigation. Now, hon. Members who are lawyers as well as the Leader of the Opposition know what a question of law means. (Interruption: An hon. Member: The Leader of the House is also a lawyer). Yes, he is also a lawyer, but he is not one just now. As I said, lawyers know what a law point or an issue of law means. They are able to make everything an issue of law. If only we take up the second appeals in High Courts and see the grounds prepared, we could see now almost every case becomes an issue of law and the matter has to be decided finally by the Judge that it is not an issue of law after all the procedure is gone through. If you want further illustrations from modern times, we have the writs in the High Courts which would illustrate how a matter of law may be stretched and even a matter of the Constitution may be stretched. So, the argument still remains valid that this would lead to interminable litigation but the real thing that I want hon. Members who are interested in this legislation getting into correct form should attend to is this. I want them to focus their attention on this, namely, that if once we provide this loophole, if I may be allowed so to call it, this appeal or revision or application for review by a Civil Court and the series of appeals thereon, we had better close down this Bill as I said at the outset. The right will be exercised, not by the tenants so much as by the landlords, and the net result would be that the entire Act will be the subject-matter of numerous cases of litigation in the District Courts and in the appellate courts and so on, there will be no end to litigation and no relief would have been got by the tenant as a result of this measure. If I accept this amendment I would get a congratulatory message or, at any rate, a note of appreciation in the newspapers from the Mirasdars' Association of Tanjore. I have no doubt whatsoever about it and I submit, Sir, that hon. Members should not fall into this intellectual trap and we ought to restrict it as we have attempted to restrict it to Revenue Courts."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, I am sorry that in the limited time at my disposal I was not able to convince the Hon. the Chief Minister whose conclusion must be the result of a long process of holding office for years and years together."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"It is the result of long practice at the Bar!"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"I did not practice for a long time either. I would draw your attention to the Estates Abolition Act where also a similar provision making the decision of the Settlement Officer final was made. What was the result? Everyday you are hearing on the floor of this House interpellations and questions asking when the Government would bring in legislation to protect the tenants in the inam areas. Why does it happen?"

[2nd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

It is because we in the Legislature passed a legislation over which the Civil Courts had no jurisdiction and the Executive Officers gave absolutely conflicting decisions throwing the inamdars and the ryots into a state of confusion which has over-taken the peasantry particularly in the northern districts for the last four years. There was no Civil Court and nobody endowed with the training to apply the law and arrive at a judgment by due process of law was there in the scheme. The final power was given only to a mere Executive Officer. Lastly, it is not the inamdar and the landlord who are suffering. For every landlord and every inamdar that are suffering, there are ten ryots who are suffering. If we had at least the powers of revision on points of law in a Civil Court nearby, say the District Court, many of the troubles would have been set at rest. Neither the tenants on the one hand nor the landlords on the other would have been compelled to seek the extraordinary remedy provided by the Constitution with respect to writs in the High Courts. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we know that there is a provision in the Constitution, Article 226, which gives an extraordinary power, notwithstanding any other legislation, to the High Courts with certain limited jurisdiction to look into certain matters on applications for a writ of certiorari or other forms of writs. These are extraordinary remedies. It is wrong for the legislators to deprive the ordinary courts of their jurisdiction and compel the High Courts to use fully the extraordinary jurisdiction conferred on them. This extraordinary jurisdiction must be reserved for certain extraordinary purposes. We cannot flood the High Court with writ petitions from one district or from all the twenty-four districts together. The hon. Member, Sri K. Varadachari, with thirty-four years of practice at the Bar, which is much longer than what I have ever had in my life, said that the Civil Courts are now manned by—I am not able to repeat his language—men who were described in very uncomplimentary language, which does no justice to the reputation that has been built up by the judiciary of this State or to the members of the profession to which this gentleman professes to belong. (Hear, hear.) Sir, under the existing traditions of the law and Judiciary we cannot make such a wide and sweeping aspersion which the hon. Member chose to make from his privileged position in this House."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"He followed your footsteps."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"We have a right to cast aspersions on the Executive but no right to cast aspersions on the Judiciary."

MR. SPEAKER :—"Nor have the Judges any right to cast aspersions on the Legislature!"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Sir, the question does not rise because no Judge has come forward with any aspersions on the legislature. The question is whether we could not dispose of this Bill without unnecessary gratuitous insults offered to the Judiciary"

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [2nd December 1952]

of this State. To defend the position taken up in this Bill, it was not necessary to say that the Judges, Sub-Judges and the Munsifs and others who constitute the judiciary consist of some uncomplimentarily worded gentlemen. It is wrong and I deprecate that practice and I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister will not encourage it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I have ignored it. Why are you raising it?"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I thank the Hon. Chief Minister for ignoring it. In regard to the point raised by the Hon. the Chief Minister that the powers of revision will lead to interminable litigation, I submit that it will never be so. The very fact that such a power exists will put all Revenue Courts on their alertness and they will do things more properly and even if there is some little delay this right of going on revision to the District Court or other Civil Courts is a price worth paying for. I, therefore, submit that my amendment is in order and the Hon. the Chief Minister need not give up the Bill or depart from the salutary principle of retaining the jurisdiction of Civil Courts. It is not safe to remove the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts, for after all the judiciary is but a limb of our Constitution."

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"On a point of personal explanation, my remarks were confined only to the sort of material that we have now got in the judiciary."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not right on the part of the hon. Member to say so."

SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"I was only referring to their lack of experience of agrarian problems."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is an aspersion on the judiciary. The hon. Member need not repeat it."

5-30 P.M. THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am tempted to accept the amendment but the interests of tenants come and stand before my eyes." (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham withdrawing his amendment?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"No Sir. I cannot withdraw such an honest, good amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'Add at the end of sub-clause (2) the following words:—

"Subject to review on questions of law by the district court having jurisdiction." "

The amendment was lost.

2nd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

'For sub-clause (4), substitute the following:—

"(4) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court may entertain and dispose of any application made after the passing of this Act or review any order made by him or it before the passing of this Act on the ground that the application would have been entertained or the order would not have been made if this Act had been passed on the 23rd August 1952."

"The original clause which this amendment seeks to substitute is as follows:—

'Nothing contained in this section shall affect any decision of the Revenue Court which has become final under Section 13 of the Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 or of Madras Ordinance VI of 1952.'

"Sub-clause (4) of the present Bill seeks to put a bar on the entertainment by the courts of applications with reference to rights which would have accrued or which do accrue to the tenant or to the pannaiyal under the present Bill. Sub-Clause 4 seeks to put a bar to the entertainment of any applications in respect of certain rights which the tenant or pannaiyal gets under this Bill and which he would not have got under the original Ordinance. After all, the Ordinance was made when the legislature was not sitting. The Ordinance was passed without consulting the legislature. The Legislature after considering the whole question has come to certain decisions with regard to the rights that should accrue to the tenants and pannaiyals. After the Legislature itself comes to certain definite decisions, why should we also legislate that such rights shall not accrue to the tenant if an application had been disposed of earlier by the Conciliation Officer or by the Revenue Court under the provisions of the older Ordinance which was then in force. Such a provision of law would mean that we are legislating against ourselves. We are to-day legislating for giving certain rights to tenants and pannaiyals. Why should a tenant or a pannaiyal be deprived of his rights simply because he could apply only at a time when this Bill was not in force but an Ordinance more or less on the same lines as this Bill was in force—an Ordinance which was passed without consulting the Legislature and which could only be passed without consulting the Legislature. Now that we have got an opportunity to consult the Legislature, let us at least be generous enough to see that these rights accrue to the tenants and pannaiyals and that the Conciliation Officer or other people entertain those cases which they could not have entertained under the old Ordinance. This is a very reasonable amendment and I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister would accept it."

Sri S. Deivasigamany seconded the amendment.

[2nd December 1952]

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Mr. Speaker Sir, while supporting the amendment, I hear from the Treasury Bench that it is not proper to reopen all the cases that have already been decided by the authorities. After all I may point out to them that this Bill applies only to the district of Tanjore. By the time the Bill comes into operation not many appeals would have been disposed of. The number of appeals so disposed of would only be very few. If the tenants and pannaiyals feel that decisions already given are not proper and justifiable, they must be allowed to approach the courts once again for revision of the decisions. I appeal to the Government to consider the feasibility of accepting this amendment because the cases affected will be very few in number.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the case put forward in support of the amendment looks apparently reasonable. If we examine the provisions of the Bill and find out whether there are any cases like that for which a provision should be made I respectfully submit that it is absolutely unnecessary. In the Ordinance we have given a right to certain evicted tenants to apply to the Conciliation Officer for restoration of any land which was in his possession on the 1st day of December 1951. That is the only sort of application that has been provided for in the Ordinance. No other application either with regard to the sharing of produce or with regard to the sharing of rent or other things has been provided for in the Ordinance. No such application has been filed and no application has been disposed of. The only sort of applications which have come in for decision is with regard to restoration of lands of evicted tenants. What are the changes we have made in the Bill in respect of them which would require any provision for purposes of review? The only case is with regard to payment of arrears of rent due before the passing of the Ordinance. Under the provisions of the Ordinance we could lay down a condition for the payment of the entire arrears of rent not only for one year but the entire period of two or three or four years. Now we have made a provision in the Bill restricting the power of the Conciliation Officer to impose as a condition to a tenant's being restored to possession the payment only of one year's arrear of rent and not all the arrears due by him. It is now open to the tenant to apply to the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court with regard to any condition imposed before the passing of this Bill requiring him to pay any arrear of rent exceeding one year's rent for revision of the orders so as to limit the payment required to one year's rent. But there is also a provision that any payment made by the tenant before the passing of this Bill shall not be required to be refunded. In any case the amount already paid by the tenant is lawfully due to the landowner and he is not entitled for refund.

“ With regard to the time-limit allowed to cultivating tenants for applying for restoration to possession of land in cases which have not so far been reopened, we have also provided that an application may be received after the period of thirty days if the applicant satisfies the Conciliation Officer that he had sufficient

[2nd December 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

reasons for not making the application within the said period. The benefit of this provision is also made applicable to applications rejected before the passing of this Bill on the ground of their not having been presented in time.

“ Under these circumstances I do not think there is any necessity for a provision suggested in the amendment. Once we pass this amendment, all those things which have been decided will be re-opened and there will only be confusion. We should understand the scope of the Ordinance and the scope of this Bill, and these are the two types of cases for which a provision is necessary and for which we have already provided in the Bill. Therefore, I request the hon. Member Sri Ramamurti not to be carried away by the advice given by lawyers that a provision should be made for review. Such a provision will only lead to endless trouble. We know the Bill, we have studied the Bill and we are passing the Bill. It is not necessary to make any further provisions.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, without being a lawyer I may claim to know something of law and I take it that as far as the Government are concerned, the Government are not opposed to the principle underlying my amendment. What they feel is that they have already provided for certain cases and that my amendment is unnecessary. I would now like to point out one specific case wherein such an amendment will be absolutely essential. The Hon. the Leader of the House referred to two types of cases. One is in respect of those people who have been evicted. As far as my amendment is concerned it does not cover those cases at all because no fresh right accrues to the tenant under the Bill as we are now passing beyond what has been provided for in the old Ordinance. Therefore since no new right accrues to him there is no question of entertaining any application under the amendment which I seek to move. With regard to time-limit referred to by the Hon. the Leader of the House, my amendment does not at all re-open the question of time-limit because this Bill does not give any fresh time than what was given in the earlier Ordinance. But there is another thing for which we have provided. Now, 5-40
Sir, after the amendments have been accepted in the Select P.m.
Committee and in this House, sub-clause (3) of clause 12 says :
‘ After considering the representations, if any, so made, and after making such further enquiry into the case as he may deem fit, the Conciliation Officer may, if he finds that the dismissal of the pannaiyal was not just and proper, by an award in writing, require the landowner to take back the pannaiyal and reinstate him to all the rights which would have accrued to him but for his dismissal.’
These are the specific cases which have been provided for in the amendments accepted by the House. But there are also other cases in which pannaiyals have been dismissed for which a certain amount of compensation has already been ordered as per the provisions of the old Ordinance. Under the old Ordinance, if the compensation is paid to the pannaiyal he ceases to have all the

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [2nd December 1952]

rights that accrue to him under the provisions of this Bill. Therefore, my amendment seeks to cover those cases where new rights accrue in respect of pannaiyals even though such rights did not exit under the old Ordinance."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"No, there are no such cases of any such dismissed pannaiyals."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I may point out that there are already writs pending in the High Court in respect of compensation paid to dismissed pannaiyals. There are also other such applications in that respect. That is why I suggest when we are making a provision for dismissal of pannaiyals, we may make a provision in respect of such cases also."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I tried my best to follow the hon. Member. There is no necessity for it. I will only say this. It is better to accept a known quantity rather than accept an unknown quantity. As it is, the clause is clear enough and I do not know where it will lead to if the amendment is accepted. Moreover, I do not see the force of the argument of the hon. Member."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?"

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"No, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'For sub-clause (4), substitute the following:—

"(4) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court may entertain and dispose of any application made after the passing of this Act or review any order made by him or it before the passing of this Act on the ground that the application would have been entertained or the order would not have been made if this Act had been passed on the 23rd August 1952." "

The amendment was lost.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, with your permission I beg to move the amendment standing in my name, namely:—

'Add the following paragraph to sub-clause (1):—

"Where the tenancy provides for any rent an application may be made by a cultivating tenant under this sub-section for the remission of the whole or any portion of the rent payable by him, where there has been a total or partial failure of crops in any year due to causes beyond the control of the tenant; and the Conciliation Officer may, on such application, order such remission of rent as he may consider just in the circumstances of the case."

[2nd December 1952]: [Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker]

"Sir, I have brought forward this amendment in deference to the wishes of many hon. Members that provision should be made for what we call *vis major*."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I find that the wording of the amendment moved by the Hon. Minister is slightly different from the amendment, copies of which have been circulated. Of course, both mean the same thing."

MR. SPEAKER:—"For the benefit of hon. Members I will read the amendment—

'Where the tenancy provides for any rent . . . of the case.' "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, I want to congratulate the Government for bringing forward this provision."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I promised it some time ago."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"Sir, I wish to move an amendment to the amendment of the Hon. Minister—

'For the word "may" after the words "Conciliation Officer," substitute the word "shall".'

"అక్కడ నా సవరణ ఒకటి ఉన్నది. వారు యిచ్చినట్లుగా amendment కు నేను రెండు సవరణలు తెచ్చుచున్నాను. మొదటిది In any year అనే పదాన్ని 'tenants' అనే మాట పీరియడ్‌గా ఉంచండి. Beyond the control అని ఉంటే సరిపోతుంది. రెండవది Conciliation Officer may అనే పదము shall అని మార్చి Conciliation Officer నిర్ణయ చేస్తాడు. లేకుంటే లేదు. ఈ రెండో సది నా సవరణలు."

SRI K. VEMIAH:—"I second the amendment."

* SRI A. S. SAHAJANANDAM:—"కనామ్ తలైవర్ అవారకణే, తెయ్య కతియక మణై పెయ్యామల్ పోనతాల్ ఉత్తకై కొలొక్క ముడియమల్ పణర్ తవిక్కిన్రుక్కన్. ఇప్పొమొత్తి తిక్కామి తాణ్ణు కావొల్లున్ల ఘోరిణ్ణున్ల తరుమపుర ఆడినత్తిల్ చెక్కయిడి. పణామ్ కడి. నిలవకణేక్ ఉత్తకైక్కు ఁదెత్తార్కన్. అణ్ణుల్, తెయ్యవొణ్ణెమాక మణై ఇల్లవామల్ అవారకణ్ణెయ ఉత్తకైయిల్ పత్తిలొరు పక్కుడ విణ్ణయిల్లై. అవారకణ్ణె తరుమపుర ఆడినత్తిల్ నేరొలై పోయ్ ఉత్తకై యిత్ తణ్ణిక్కొడుక్కవేణ్ణెమెన్రు. కేడపాల్, తణ్ణిక్కొడుక్క మార్డొమెన్రు శొల్లొక్కిరున్ల. ఇంత నీలయిల్ అంత పయిర్పొవర్ కణ్ణెయ కతి ఁణ్ణెవొక్కుమెన్రు సింతిత్తు పార్క్కవేణ్ణెమ. అకైయొల్, తెయ్య కతియక ఇంతలితమాక మణై పెయ్యామల్ పయిర్కన్ కెడ్రుప్పొయిమొణ్ణుల్, ఉత్తకైతార్కణ్ణెక్కు అంత పయిర్పొడ్ అణ్ణెలైల వారమాక పిరిత్తుక్కొణ్ణెవేణ్ణెమ. ఇంత అమెణ్ణె మెణ్ణె నాన్ అమొణ్ణెక్కిన్రెన్."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion is that—

'For the word "may" after the words "Conciliation Officer," substitute the word "shall".'

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"I do not accept it."

[2nd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I will now put Mr. Vavilala Gopala-krishnaiah's amendment to vote. The question is—

‘ For the word “ may ” after the words “ Conciliation Officer ”, substitute the word “ shall ”. ’

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I will now put the amendment of the Government to vote. The question is—

‘ Add the following paragraph to sub-clause (1) :—

“ Where the tenancy provides for any rent an application may be made by a cultivating tenant under this sub-section for the remission of the whole or any portion of the rent payable by him, where there has been a total or partial failure of crops in any year due to causes beyond the control of the tenant; and the Conciliation Officer may on such application, order such remission of rent as he may consider just in the circumstances of the case.” ’

The amendment was carried unanimously.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ I hope, Sir, that this amendment of mine will be accepted by the Government, namely :—

‘ Add the following as sub-clause (6A) :—

“ (6A) Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.” ’

“ Sir, the reasons which prompted me to move this amendment are these. Now, we are dealing with certain relations between the tenant and the landlord and this piece of legislation, I must say, is analogous to pieces of legislation we are familiar with, namely, the relations between industrial labour and the employer. In all such cases, it is very very difficult for the weaker party, or the party which is financially weak to think of engaging lawyers for arguing their cases before the courts of law and it is always the landowner or the capitalist, as the case may be, who can afford to pay the lawyers fat fees and engage them. So, it is only such people that will get the benefit of engaging lawyers and the weaker party, the tenant will not be able to put up his case as well as possible for want of lawyers. Here is a pannaiyal who is not able to argue his case very well. On the opposite side, there is a leading lawyer of the district. We can imagine what exactly will happen to the case of the pannaiyal under those circumstances. In the Industrial Disputes Act, it is provided that lawyers shall not have the right to appear before the Industrial Tribunals; only the parties or their recognized agents who are not lawyers can appear. After hearing what the Hon. Chief Minister said about lawyers, how they could stretch points of law and make even points of fact appear like points of law and how they could make untruth appear as truth and *vice versa*, I am firmly convinced that

2nd December 1952]. [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

lawyers should not be allowed to appear in any proceedings before the Conciliation Officer or the Revenue Court. Only the parties or those in whom they have confidence must be allowed to appear. (An hon. Member: Even a political party leader can appear !) If a political party leader enjoys the confidence of the tenants, they may ask him to appear on their behalf.

“ There may be the apprehension that the decorum of the courts will not be kept up if all and sundry are allowed to appear. We have the experience of the Industrial Disputes Act from 1937. In this State and in the rest of India, trade union representatives have been appearing before the numerous Industrial Tribunals and Adjudicators that have been appointed under that Act. Has it ever been said that decorum has not been maintained on account of the fact that people who do not belong to the profession of law have been allowed to appear? No such case has come to light. Throughout the world, it is not the lawyers that have been appearing before the Tribunals, but the representatives of the parties or representatives or organizations that have been appearing. It is they who know the actual facts and who understand what exactly the agricultural conditions in the locality are. When we are providing for rendering justice to the weaker party who cannot afford the luxury of engaging a lawyer, what is provided for in the Industrial Disputes Act may be provided here also.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ ఈ amendment ను గురించి తర్వాత మాట్లాడుటకు నా speech ని నేను reserve చేసుకున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Sir, there are two aspects involved in this amendment. One is that the parties must be allowed in the proceedings before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court to be represented by one who is not a legal practitioner and is therefore not subject to the discipline of the High Court. The other is that legal practitioners should be excluded from appearing in such cases except where the parties by mutual agreement agree to be represented by legal practitioners. The two ideas are totally different from each other. One is to provide for misfortune and poverty, to provide for the proper representation of the case of a tenant. The other is to provide for wealth so to say, and impose a ban on the landowner from engaging a practising lawyer; he is to be represented only by a layman, and if a legal practitioner is to be engaged, though he is allowed by the High Court to practise, he should get the tenant's permission so to say to appear.

“ So far as the question of allowing unrepresented cases to be represented at least by an agent is concerned, I would request the hon. Members of the Opposition to accept the position that I am going to set out. In the Joint Select Committee, the Leader of the Opposition said that provision should be made at least for unfortunate cases, for cases where a party went without representation. I gave a kind of promise to him that we shall certainly make a provision giving discretion to the court to allow even a

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [2nd December 1952]

layman as against a legal practitioner to appear on behalf of a party in such cases. But I must make it clear that it shall not be by right but only with the permission of the court. To allow to appear in cases any one who is not subject to the discipline of the High Court will be an infringement of the present practice of advocacy in courts. Though hon. Members on the other side may think very poorly of the Revenue Courts, we call them courts; we treat them as courts and we expect them to act as courts. We cannot allow unlicensed people to appear in cases coming up before the courts. This is a minor matter and a matter of procedure. I think this can be dealt with under the rules, and by doing so we shall be giving better effect to the provisions of the Act. My request is: let this amendment be dropped, let the Bill stand as it is and we shall provide for unfortunate cases in the rules.

"As regards preventing lawyers from appearing, I think we cannot do that. I hope the hon. Member will not dwell further on this matter."

6 p.m.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన అమెండమెంట్. దీనిగురించి చాలామంది మాట్లాడుతున్నారు. అవకాశాలున్నాయి. యిప్పుడు ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు దీని విషయం చూడటానికి ప్రయత్నించారు. Unfortunate cases, suitable cases చూడడం కోసం rules provide చేస్తామని అన్నారు. అది ఎటువంటి తేలియజేయాలి. ఇప్పుడు time లేకందుక ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు వెళ్ళేవానికి సరియైన దృక్పథము లేకుంటే ఏమిండు. అందు వల్ల వాటినిగురించి పరిశీలించుటకు ఒక నిమిషముగాని, ఆయిదు నిమిషములుగాని చాలా ప్రయత్నం చేయడం కష్టమౌతూ ఉంది ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన అమెండమెంట్. కాబట్టి, దీనివిషయంలో ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు స్పష్టంచేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. విచారణకు స్పష్టముచేయరో వాటి విషయంలో చాలా ప్రయత్నం చేయాలి. అది అన్నియు స్పష్టంచేయక పోవద్దు.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The House will now adjourn to meet again at 10-30 a.m. tomorrow.”

The House then adjourned.

2nd December 1952]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 209 asked by Sri V. Balakrishnan at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, pages 870-871 supra.]

(a) to (e) The Chairwoman, Women's Indian Association, Madras Branch, applied to the Government several times for the allotment of a suitable plot of land in favour of the Women's Indian Association for the purpose of establishing a cancer hospital, clinic, museum, etc. The dates on which such applications were made specifying the area and the locality are as given below:—

Date.	Extent of land.	Locality.
(1)	(2)	(3)
9th April 1951	About 10 acres in R.S. No. 3892-2 of Mylapore.	Greenways Road, Adyar.
20th December 1951	Five acres of land in R.S. No. 4491-4 of Mylapore.	San Thome High Road.
31st January 1952	Two cawnies, 2 grounds and 94 square feet in T.S. No. 6578 of Mambalam.	At the junction of Dr. Thomas Road and Sir Thyagaraya Road in Mambalam.
31st August 1952	Not specified	Veterinary hospital and Poultry farm sites in Mount Road, Saidapet.
September 1952	3½ acres	At the junction of Greenways Road and Government Milk Factory, Mount Road.

The Chairwoman, Women's Indian Association, was informed that the lands in Adyar and Mambalam were required for Government purposes. As the land in San Thome High Road forms part of the Mandavalli, City Improvement Scheme, this land could not also be spared to the Women's Indian Association. The Veterinary hospital and Poultry farm sites have no vacant land for allotment and the other site at the junction of Greenways Road and the milk factory could not be allotted as the land belongs to the military department. The Association has, however, since been assigned, with their consent, one plot of land R.S. No. 7 of Kotturu village in the Madras district for the purpose of establishing a cancer hospital, clinic, museum, etc. The question of allotting three more sites in the Madras district to the Association is also under consideration.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 213 asked by Sri G. Rama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 874 supra.]

Statement showing the number of outsiders (i.e., persons with no lien in any Department of Government) retrenched from the office of the Board of Revenue (Civil Supplies) and in the districts other than Madurai, as a result of decontrol.

	Board's office.	Districts.
Rationing Officer, II Grade		1
Rationing Officer, III Grade		6

[2nd December 1952]

	Board's office.	Districts.
Rationing Officer, IV Grade	1	1
Upper division clerks including (Upper Division Checking Inspectors).	1	79
Lower division clerks	13	1,120
Checking Inspectors and enquiry officers	..	14
Stenographers	3	1
Loading clerks	..	2
Typists	5	7
Attenders	..	90
Peons	18	517
Jeep drivers	..	63
Cleaners	..	4
Head chowkidars	..	32
Chowkidars	..	132
Section writer	..	1
Total	35	2,202

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 213 asked by Sri G. Rama Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 874 supra.]

Statement showing the number of posts retrenched in the Civil Supplies Department from 16th June 1952 up to 15th October 1952 consequent on the decontrol of foodgrains.

I. Staff in the office of the Board of Revenue (Civil Supplies), Madras.

Gazetted—

(i) Deputy Commissioners (in the grade of Collectors)	2
(ii) Assistant Secretary to the Commissioner of Civil Supplies	1

Non-Gazetted—

Superintendents	10
Upper division clerks	27
Accountants	3
Lower division clerks	6
Typists and steno-typists	9
Attenders	4
Peons	14

II. District establishments.

(a) Gazetted—

(1) Deputy Collector—District Supply Officers converted into those of Civil Supplies Tahsildars.	3
(2) Special Deputy Collector for movement of rice from Orissa at Visakhapatnam.	1

2nd December 1952]

(b) Non-Gazetted—

Civil Supplies Tahsildars	2
Statistical Assistants	13
Taluk Supply Officers (Tahsildars)	12
Grain Purchase Tahsildars	6
Taluk Supply Officers (Deputy Tahsildars)	36
Deputy Tahsildar	1
Additional Huzur Head Clerk	1
Assistant Taluk Supply Officers (on Rs. 110 per mensem)	152
Loading clerks	4
Grain Purchase Supervisors	2
Manager	1
Firka Supply Officers	249
Food Inspectors	6
Movement Inspectors	4
Upper division clerks	9
Lower division clerks	208
Stenographers	7
Loading Inspectors	4
Head clerk	1
Section writers	433
Typists	3
Attenders	2
Peons	549
Special Revenue Inspectors	4
Marketing Assistant	1
Reorder	1

III. Special C.T. staff.

Assistant Commercial Tax Officer	1
Upper division clerk	1
Lower division clerks	5
Peon	1

IV. Statutory rationing staff.

Gazetted—

(i) City Rationing Officer	1
(ii) Personal Assistant to the City Rationing Officer	1

Non-Gazetted—

Rationing Officer, Grade II	24
Rationing Officers, Grade III	93
Rationing Officers, Grade IV	43
Superintendents	3
Upper division clerks	123
Upper division checking inspectors	41
Lower division clerks	900
Lower division checking inspectors	158
Enquiry Officers (lower division clerks)	308
Special Revenue Inspectors	3

[2nd December 1952]

IV. Statutory rationing staff.—cont.

NonGazetted—cont.

Stenographer	1
Typists	7
Attenders	108
Peons	259
Section writer	1

V. Anti-smuggling staff.

(a) Civil Supplies staff—Non-Gazetted—

Deputy Tahsildars	12
Revenue Inspectors	4
Lower division clerks	4
Peons	14
Head chowkidars	21
Chowkidars	286

(b) Police Staff—Non-Gazetted—

Inspector of Police	1
Sub-Inspectors of Police	2
Head Constables	5
Police Constables	50

VI. Transport staff.

Assistant Transport Officers	3
Upper division clerks	2
Lower division clerks	3
Foreman	3
Fitters	6
Drivers for lorries	42
Drivers for jeeps and land rovers	93
Watchmen	2
Cleaners	12
Total	4,452

Staff retrenched in the Food and Agriculture Department of the Secretariat—

Assistant Secretary to Government	1
Superintendents	2
Upper division clerks	2*
Typist	1
Peons	2
Nutrition Officer	1
Stenographer	1
Peons	2
Total	12
Grant total	4,464

* [In addition to these two posts one more post of upper division clerk was down graded into a post of lower division clerk.]

2nd December 1952]

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 218 asked by Sri A. J. Arunachalam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 882 supra.]

G.O. No. 1036, L.A., dated 25th May 1951.

[Tax—Property, house and profession taxes—Exemption of weavers—Instructions issued]

Several representations have been made to Government regarding the deplorable condition of the weavers in the mufassal and as one of the measures of relief to them, it has been suggested that the taxes payable by the weavers to the local panchayat or municipal council may be cancelled or that the payment of the said taxes may be postponed. The Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards has suggested that a general order may be issued to local bodies to exempt weavers from house tax or property tax, as the case may be, with the sanction of the competent authority for one half-year. The Government accept the suggestion of the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards and accordingly request municipal councils and panchayat boards to exempt weavers in deserving cases from house tax or property tax, as the case may be, with the sanction of the competent authority for one half-year, viz., either the half-year ending 31st March 1951 or, if the taxes due for that half-year have already been paid, the half-year ending 30th September 1951, subject to the following conditions:—

(1) That no dearness allowance grant will be claimed should there be any deficit in the budget of the local body consequent on the exemption;

(2) that no exemption should be given when the finance of the municipality or the panchayat do not warrant it. In deserving cases, time may be granted for payment of arrears of taxes by very poor weavers provided that no arrear is allowed to be outstanding for over two years; and

(3) that the concession allowed should be uniform and applied to all weavers paying less than a fixed sum of house tax or property tax, the limit being fixed by the panchayat or municipal council concerned.

2. The Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards is requested to bring this order to the notice of minor panchayats.

[2nd December 1952]

APPENDIX V

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 81 asked by Sri M. Rajeswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 894 supra.]

HARIJAN WELFARE -GOVERNMENT HARIJAN HOSTEL, MASULIPATAM—
PARTICULARS OF THE COMMUNITY OF THE BOARDERS.

Particulars of Boarders during 1951-52.

Strength of the Hostel.	Number of Malas.	Number of Madigas.	Number of other communities.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
190	155	32	3

Particulars of applications received and of the candidates selected during 1952-53.

Name of the community.	Number of applications received.	Number of boarders newly selected.	Number of old boarders who were promoted and continued during the year.	Total number of boarders.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Malas	125	38	105	143
Madigas , ..	37	20	20	40
Other communities	11	6	1	7
Total ..	173	64	126	190

APPENDIX VI.

(1)

[Vide answer to clause (a) of unstarred question No. 88 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 897 supra.]

G.O. Ms. No. 1612, Public (Services), dated 14th August 1940.

[Madras Public Service Commission—Chairman—Power to sanction refunds of fees paid for examinations and selections.]

In supersession of the orders issued in G.O. No. 964, Public (Services), dated 10th June 1938, the Government are pleased to authorize the Chairman of the Madras Public Service Commission to sanction refunds of fees paid by applicants for examinations and selections conducted by the Commission in cases,

(a) where they are not required to sit for the examination or to appear for the selection; or

2nd December 1952]

(b) where they are exempt from payment of any fees, or make double or excess payments; or

(c) where they are not allowed to appear for selections or examinations (i) owing to any change in the rules governing the conditions of eligibility introduced after they have applied or (ii) owing to applications having been made under a misapprehension of the rules or of the terms of the Commission's notifications or (iii) owing to any other causes for which the applicants were not responsible; or

(d) where the examination or the selection has been subsequently dropped; or

(e) where the candidates absent themselves from the examination or selection and the Commission is satisfied that their absence was unavoidable and due to causes for which they were not responsible; or

(f) where candidates die prior to the examination or selection; or

(g) where the applications of candidates are withheld by forwarding authorities; or

(h) where the candidates after paying the fees failed to send their applications to the Commission.

(2)

[Vide answer to clause (b) of unstarred question No. 88 asked by Sri K. Krishna Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 2nd December 1952, page 897 supra.]

Name of examination.	Year.	Number obtained qualifying marks.	Number selected.	Number not absorbed in service.	Remarks.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
The regular competitive examination for recruitment to Ministerial Services.	1950	6,536	2,935	484	Excludes candidates allotted supplementally.
Special Competitive Examination for regularization of temporary appointments of persons employed under the emergency provisions.	1951	1,368	1,368	Nil.	No regular competitive examination was held in 1951, pending issue of the revised order of reservation of appointments.
Regular Competitive Examination for recruitment to Ministerial Services held in February 1952 and Special Competitive Examination for persons employed in the Civil Supplies, etc., Departments held in June 1952.	1952	8304	3,597	The selection was made very recently.	..

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 3rd December 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Famine works in Palnad taluk, Guntur district.

* 228 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned any famine works, in the famine declared area of Palnad taluk, Guntur district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the roads from Thummurugodu to Macherla and Macherla to Ethipothala are sanctioned as the famine relief works; and

(c) why the Government have not yet started the above mentioned works?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“(a) One work relating to the formation of an earthen road from Durgi to Kakirala was sanctioned and has since been completed. Steps are being taken to increase the minor irrigation works.

“(b) & (c) The question of sanctioning the road for Thummurugodu to Macherla is still under consideration. The work of forming a road from Macherla to Ethipothala was sanctioned as a security work last year and a grant of Rs. 75,000 was also sanctioned to the Guntur District Board for executing the work. The work has not however been taken up. It is no longer required for security purposes. No application has been received for executing it as a relief work.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“ ఎప్పుడు కరువుతోటి భాగపడుతున్న టువంటి ఈ లాటాకాలో మేము కొన్ని Minor Irrigation పనులు, కొన్ని P.W.D. పనులు సూచించాము. వాటిని కనీసము ఈ సంవత్సరమైన ఆముఖంలో పట్టేదా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Yes, Sir. We are awaiting certain proposals from the Collector. The Famine Commissioner also has suggested some proposals.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“ కరువు పరిస్థితులు ఇంత తీవ్రంగా ఉంది ప్రజలు నానాభాధలు పడుతున్న పుటికినీ, ప్రభుత్వము ఇంకా ఈ యేసు నివారణపనులు తీసుకొనక ఉండడం చాలా విచారకరంగా ఉంది. కనుక ఇప్పుడైన వెంటనే ఈ పనులు ప్రారంభిస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—
“ The situation has improved a little after the last rains.”

[3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The Collector takes into consideration the conditions and figures of the price prevailing and then only he publishes the price in the Gazette.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ In view of the fact that the District Magistrate of Kozhikode did not publish the rate which he should have done according to the answer given by the Hon. Minister here, will the Government be pleased to take necessary action to see that the exorbitant amounts already received by the landowners, consequent upon the price of paddy to be given as waram not having been published under the Malabar Tenancy Act, are returned to the peasants concerned? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Let me have some time to verify the statement of the hon. Member.”

High Level Kattalai Canal.

* 239 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the plans and estimates are ready for the scheme called “ Mayanoor-Vallam High Level Kattalai Canal ”;

(b) what is the area which can be brought under cultivation under this scheme; and

(c) what is the estimated cost of the scheme?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ (a) Yes.

“ (b) 24,650 acres.

“ (c) Rs. 119 lakhs.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“ Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to execute the scheme immediately? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ This has been deferred for the present in view of the financial stringency and in view of the doubts about the availability of supplies for new schemes in the Cauvery region.”

10-50 a. m. SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—“ In view of the failure of monsoon in that area for the last four or five years, may I know whether the Government will take steps to execute this scheme immediately and thus afford some relief to the ryots of that area? ”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“ It is for that very reason we have to postpone the execution of that scheme, especially as we are not getting adequate supply.”

Instructions regarding Co-operative department employees to be members of co-operative societies.

* 240 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Registrar of Co-operative Societies instructed all departmental employees to cease to be members of any co-operative society?

[3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ According to the Government Servants Conduct Rules, Government servants employed in the Co-operative department are entitled to become members only in Co-operative Credit Societies registered exclusively for their benefit and in stores societies, housing societies and in the South India Co-operative Insurance Society. They can be members of primary land mortgage banks with the prior sanction of the Registrar. But they are prohibited from holding any office in any society except in a society registered exclusively for their benefit. Under the Government Servants Conduct Rules, Co-operative Sub-Registrars are prohibited to become members of even local Co-operative staff societies in the districts. The provisions of the rules are strictly enforced by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies has also issued a circular instructing the subordinates not to buy articles on credit from any co-operative societies other than those intended for them.”

DR. K. B. MENON :—“ May I know whether the Registrar has any right to prevent anybody from becoming a member of any society and in the second place, is it not better and in the interests of the co-operative movement to allow the workers to become members of the societies? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ Nobody is prevented from becoming a member of a co-operative society, excepting that the Directors of a Society have a certain amount of discretion in allowing a particular individual into their society.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ అనధికార సహకారోద్యోగులు వారికి ప్రత్యేకముగా విశ్వసనీయతలతో సంఘములలో చేరకూడదని ఇటీవల రిజిస్ట్రార్ ఆదేశములు ఉపబించారు, నిజమేనా? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ లేదండీ.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Is it not a fact that the present Registrar of Co-operative Societies happens to be a Director of the Madras Marketing Co-operative Society and do the Government Servants Conduct Rules not apply to him also? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ I do not know whether this contravenes the provisions of the Conduct Rules.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Perhaps he is there as an *ex officio* Director.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ Let the Hon. Minister say so.”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ There seems to be some statutory provision also.”

[3rd December 1952]

Assignment of lands to the poor.

* 241 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, regarding assignment of lands to the poor is in force now; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have so far taken to evict the landlords from the possession of Government assessed or unassessed lands under the above Government Order and what is the total extent so secured and granted to the landless poor in the State?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“(a) The hon. Member is referred to my answer on 6th November 1952 to question No. 80.

“(b) The Government have not issued any general instructions to the effect that all rich persons be evicted from the Government lands under their occupation. In cases where either a landless poor person or an ex-serviceman or a political sufferer, who is eligible for land grant under the revised orders, applies for any land under the occupation of a rich person, then the Collector will examine the relative claims of each and take steps to evict the encroacher if need be and grant the land to the applicant. The statistics asked for are not available.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO:—“ఈ 1523 సంఖ్య గ.ఓ. లో 5 వికరాలకు పై సున్న భూస్వాములను తొలగించాలని ఉన్నది. కాని, ఇప్పటికి 5, 6 సంవత్సరాలు సక్కుటికి, దీని ప్రకారం భూస్వాములను తొలగించి వేదవారికి ఆ భూములను ఇవ్వలేదు. ఇంతే కాకుండా 1952-వ సం॥ జూలై 7-వ తేదీగల ఇంకొక ప్రొత్తగా 1957 సంఖ్య, కొత్త G.O. ను వేస్తూ దానితో ముందు G.O. ను supersede చేస్తూ, వేదవారికి గవర్నమెంటు భూములు ఉచితంగా ఇవ్వరాదని, వాటిని market rate కు ఇవ్వాలని అందులో వెల్లడించింది. మొదట G.O. ను ఆ ప్రకారంగా issue చేసి, తరువాత దానికి contradictory గా ఎందుకు ఈ కొత్త G.O. ను వేశారని అడుగుతున్నాను?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“I cannot understand the figures in Telugu. I want notice, Sir.”

SRI B. SANKARAYYA:—“గ్రామాలలో వేదవారికి భూస్వాముల నుండి ఈ భూములను ఇప్పించే విషయములలో అక్కడి జిల్లా థర్డ్ క్లాస్సు ప్రభుత్వం నుండి మాకు యెట్టి సూచనలు రాలేదంటున్నారు. కనుక మేమునే ప్రభుత్వం వారు గ్రామాలలో సరిగా ఆములు జరుపమని సూచనలు పంపుతారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“The old Government Order is repealed. According to the new Government Order, the landless poor have got first priority. If the hon. Member brings to my notice any specific cases where it has not been adhered to, I shall examine them.”

3rd December 1952]

SRI C. PULLA REDDI:—“వీడ ప్రజలు భూములను ఆక్రమించుకొని పంటలు పండించుచుండగా, వారిపై వివరీతమైన penalties వేస్తున్నారు. వారికి పట్టాలు ఇవ్వడంలేదనే సమస్య ఆలోచించి, వారికి తగిన పట్టాలు ఇచ్చి, ఈ penalties రద్దు చేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వ మేమైనా పూనుకొంటుందా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“I want notice, Sir.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH:—“May I know, Sir, whether the Government propose to collect information regarding the extent of land lying waste in each district and take immediate steps for speedy assignment of those lands to landless poor and thus avoid clashes arising in their attempts to occupy the waste lands?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“The Government have already an idea of the waste lands available.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA:—“1523 G.O. కును 1957 G.O. కును contradiction ఎందుకు వచ్చినదో తమరు నెలవిస్తారా? ముందు G.O. లో వేద వారికి ఉచితంగా భూములు ఇవ్వాలని వెల్లడూ, తరువాత G.O. లో ఉచితంగా భూములు ఇవ్వకూడదు. మార్కెట్ value కు ఇవ్వాలని ముందు G.O. కు contradictory గా ఉత్తరువు ఇవ్వడం ఎందుకు జరిగిందో నెలవియ్యగలరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“If I understand the question aright, I may inform the hon. Member that priority is given to the landless poor, but with regard to any lands available in towns, market value is demanded.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ప్రభుత్వము బంజరు భూములను ఎవరికి ఇవ్వాలనే విషయంలో ఒక నిర్దిష్టమైన పద్ధతి అవలంబించక పోయినందున గ్రామాలలో ఎక్కడ riotings దానికి తగినట్లుగా ప్రజలమీద ఒత్తిడులు వస్తున్నాయి అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము గమనించి, ఇప్పుడైనా ఈ బంజరు భూములను రైతులకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు పంచివెట్టే పద్ధతి ఏదైనా ఆలోచిస్తుందా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“The first part of the question referred to by the hon. Member belongs to ancient history. Now there is no such trouble. We are trying as far as possible to obviate the trouble and assign lands according to the present rules.”

SRI B. APPALASWAMI:—“73 సంవత్సరాలుగా చాలా కృషిచేసి కాగా చేసినటువంటి భూములను చాకియ వాధీకులకు ఇచ్చారు. అది చాలా అన్యాయమైనటువంటిదని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించి ఇప్పుడైన వాటిని వేదవారికి ఇస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Wherever it is legally possible, we do it. But if the transaction had already been completed, we cannot interfere and we cannot do anything.”

[3rd December 1952]

(SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"Supposing a Harijan, an ex-serviceman and an ex-tapper, who are also landless poor, apply for the same land and at the same time, may I know who will get priority?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is a hypothetical question."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"The Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the Government have got complete details about the extent of banjar lands, cultivable waste lands available in the State. May I know whether the Government have any general scheme with regard to the assignment of these lands excepting the mere consideration of individual cases?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"The scheme is this. In certain places co-operative societies are encouraged to take lands and cultivate them on a co-operative basis. In other cases, lands are given to individuals."

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—"On a point of order, Sir, ఈ 1951 న సంవత్సరం 1952 వ సంవత్సరం జూలై 7 వ తేదీన G.O. లో single crop wet lands గూడా valuable lands క్రిందకు వస్తాయని ఆ భాముసు అప్పుడప్పుడు South Kanara జిల్లా విషయంలో వంశీన సందర్భంగా యిచ్చారు. దాన్ని మంజూరు చేశారని అంటున్నారు. వారి ఈ information పరి అయింది కాదని వారి అధికారి అప్పుడు మార్పు కోరినందున చెప్పుచున్నాను."

11 MR. SPEAKER :—"I want to know what the hon. Member a.m. says in Telugu."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"He alleges that the Minister is giving wrong information."

MR. SPEAKER :—"It is no point of order at all."

Supersession of the Central Co-operative Bank, Srikakulam.

* 242 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the term of supersession of the Central Co-operative Bank, Limited, Srikakulam, has been extended to one more year;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) what are the dates on which the last presidential election was conducted, the Co-operative Bank was superseded and the term of supersession was extended to a further period of one year, respectively;

(d) whether any representation was made to the Government for the reconstitution of the Bank or for the appointment of an Advisory Board; and

(e) if so, the action taken so far?

[3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" (a) It is a fact that the period of supersession of the Board of Management of the Srikakulam Co-operative Central Bank was extended for a further period of one year from 1st August 1952.

" (b) The period of supersession of the Committee of the Central Bank was extended chiefly for the following two reasons :

(1) vigorous action was called for to collect the overdues and arrest their growth.

(2) time was not opportune to hold a meeting of the general body for the election of Directors.

" (c) The last presidential election was conducted on 24th December 1949. The Committee of the Bank was superseded for a period of one year from 1st February 1951. The period was extended for six months from 1st February 1952. It was last extended for a further period of one year from 1st August 1952.

" (d) A representation was received by the Registrar from Sri Lakshmanaswamy and two others for the constitution of an Advisory Committee and for the restoration of the normal constitution of the Bank after a period of six months. Another representation has been received by the Government from Sri B. Rajagopala Rao, Member of the House of the People, for restoring the normal constitution of the Bank by holding the elections as soon as possible."

" (e) An Advisory Committee was appointed to advise the Special Officer of the Central Bank in carrying on the administration of the Bank. The representation from Sri B. Rajagopala Rao is under consideration."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"May I know the amount of overdues at the time of the supersession that was first ordered and at the time of the last extension of the period of supersession?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"I would like to have notice, Sir."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"May I know whether it is a fact that the Registrar, in reply to a letter from one Rajagopal Naidu, said that in Srikakulam, no one was found to be able to administer the affairs of the Central Co-operative Bank? If so, may I expect that elections will be ordered within one month or so?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"With regard to the letter purported to have been written by the Registrar to one Rajagopal Naidu, I have no knowledge. But with regard to the question of conducting elections, I am more anxious to do so than the hon. Member."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"I heard the Hon. the Minister say that the time was not opportune to conduct elections. What are the grounds for holding this view? If he thinks the time is

[3rd December 1952]

inopportune, I would like to know whether it is on grounds connected with the co-operative movement or on extraneous considerations?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"The considerations relate to the co-operative movement."

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—"In view of the fact that the business of the Co-operative Central Bank has fallen from sixty to fifteen lakhs during the official regime, will the Government take steps for the conduct of elections at a very early date?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"With regard to the business of the bank falling from sixty lakhs to fifty lakhs, I am not sure of the position. As regards the second part of the question, I have already made it clear that I am very anxious to have elections soon."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"In view of the fact that the Hon. the Minister is saying that he is anxious to have elections soon, may I know when he proposes to see that elections take place and the normal life of the institutions restored?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"Very soon."

Government claim to Kanur lanka in West Godavari.

* 243 Q.—SRI G. SATYANARAYANA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have laid a claim to the Kanur lanka in Kovvur taluk, West Godavari district, under the Estates Abolition Act, 1948?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (1) Kanur lanka is in Tanuku taluk, West Godavari district and not in Kovvur taluk of that district.

" (2) The Government had claimed the lanka as their own just as any other lanka and not under the provisions of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 which has been held as not applicable to the lanka as it did not form part of Elamaru estate. It has since been brought to the notice of the Government that the District Judge, West Godavari decided in O.P. No. 143 of 1947 that the lanka belonged to the Zamindarini of Elamaru."

SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—"కనుకం ఈ భూములు ఎవరి స్వాధీనంలో ఉన్నాయి చెబుతారా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Notice. Sir."

SRI P. RAMACHANDRA RAO :—"ఈ లంకలకు సంబంధించినటువంటి

(1) G.O. Ms. No. 406, dated 19th February 1951.

(2) Revenue Board No. S.E.F.-2-2329/51.

(3) G.O. No. 4872/E.W./51.

ఈ సమస్యలకు అందజేస్తారా?"

[3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"If figures are mentioned in Telugu, I cannot answer the question at all."

SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—"ఈ భూములు చాలాకాలంగా ఆ గ్రామ వాస్తవ్యులు పాగుచేసుకొనుటకు, కనీసం వాళ్లకు lease ఇప్పించడానికి, గవర్నమెంటు కయత్తు చేస్తుందా?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I said, Sir, that a decision of the Court, said that the estate belonged to the zamindarini."

Alleged failure of crops in Malabar.

* 244 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any reports have been received about the failure of crops on single crop lands in Malabar; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to issue orders remitting the land revenue for the areas where crops have failed?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" (a) The Collector has reported that rainfall is not quite adequate in Palghat and in parts of Walluvanad taluks, but that no appreciable difficulty is likely to be caused unless there are no showers at all during the next one and a half months.

" (b) The Collector is watching the situation and remission of land revenue will be granted wherever necessary."

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :—"When was the report of the Collector received?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"Some time back, Sir."

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—"May I know whether there is any law which gives protection to the tenant from indebtedness and from payment of waram even when his crops fail due to drought?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I was hearing the term 'waram' during discussions of the Tenancy Bill. I do not know how it comes in here when the question is about revision of ownership."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—"The Hon. the Minister was pleased to state that the Government would be kind enough to consider the question of remission wherever necessary. In view of the fact that the real occupants of lands are peasants and that these peasants as per contract previously entered into, are compelled to pay the waram in full, although the crops have completely failed, will the Government be pleased to consider some steps to see that these peasants are given remission in proportion to the amount given as remission to the landlords?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—"I think certain legal aspects are involved in the question. I have to consider them."

[3rd December 1952]

Complaints against local forest officials in Cuddapah district.

* 245 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 8th August 1952, from the villagers of Mittaneedipalle, Cuddapah district, was received by the Government complaining about the 'atrocities' of local forest officials; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) & (b) A copy of a petition, dated 8th August 1952, addressed to the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah South Division, was received by the Government. It has been ascertained that the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah South Division, who received the original petition, enquired into the allegations contained in the petition and has come to the conclusion that the petition has been the outcome of detection of a forest offence in which some of the signatories to the petition were involved. No action was taken by Government.”

11-10
a.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, the Hon. Minister said that the allegations contained in the petitions were enquired into. What were the allegations that were enquired into and what were the allegations that were not enquired into?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Sir, the allegations were that when the petitioners were driving their cattle home after grazing them in the forest, the forest guards and others wanted to drive the cattle into the pound. The other allegation was, the day after that, during the enquiry, these petitioners were beaten by the policemen, and the policemen and the guards were drunk. All the allegations were enquired into and found to be incorrect.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, is the Hon. Minister aware that this is a kind of allegation which is not peculiar to the particular place but similar things are happening . . .”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Similar allegations are made . . .”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Not allegations, but similar things are happening throughout the State. Will the Hon. Minister issue instructions to see that these things do not happen and also see that the forest guards do not violate the laws of the Government themselves, by drinking too much.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Sir, indeed the Government are anxious to see that the rules framed by the Government are obeyed by the servants of the Government.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఈ allegations ను enquire చేశారని తెలుసుకున్నాను. ఎవరు enquire చేశారు. ప్రజల సాక్ష్యం తీసుకున్నారా? లేకపోతే departmental enquiry తో తృప్తి పందారా?”

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The allegation was that the policemen and the forest guards were drunk. On hearing that, the Superintendent of Police asked the Circle Inspector of Police to take all the people on the very same day to the District Medical Officer to see whether they were drunk. On examination, it was found that they were not drunk.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ఇట్టి complaints ను నివారించడానికి తగ్గిన చర్యలు చేశారు మధ్య, ఫారెస్టు డివిజన్ లు మధ్య సహకారం కలిగి ఉంటుందా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“It will be considered, Sir.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“Allegations ఎప్పుడు చేశారని? వాటిని ఎప్పుడు enquire చేశారు? విచారణ జరిగిన ఎన్ని గంటల వారిని డాక్టరు వద్దకు తీసుకొనివచ్చారు? ఎన్ని గంటలకు డాక్టరు వారిని చరిక్షించి త్రాగలేదని చెప్పారు?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“I cannot give exactly the hour when these things took place. When the enquiry was going on, a complaint was made to the Superintendent of Police and he sent the policemen and the forest guards with the Circle Inspector of Police to the District Medical Officer, to find out whether they were drunk. The very same day, before nightfall, the District Medical Officer examined these people and found that they were not drunk.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“Sir, the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the men against whom the allegations were made, were examined by the District Medical Officer and found that they were not drunk. When was the allegation made that they were drunk? Was there a long interval between the time when the allegation was made and their actual examination and on what basis did the Medical Officer come to the conclusion that they were not drunk even though it might have taken a long time for the actual examination?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“On the same day while the enquiry was going on, the Circle Inspector was sent for and asked to take these people to the District Medical Officer, for examination. How the Medical Officer came to the conclusion that the people were not drunk, I think the hon. Member must address that question to the Medical Officer. The hon. Member seems to know better about it than myself.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“May I add, Sir, that the suggestion of the interpellating hon. Member is that we should always assume that people were drunk as soon as the allegation is made.”

[3rd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Without assuming anything, Sir, unless there is reasonable basis, may I ask, whether the Hon. Minister can tell me how long will the effects of drunkenness be on the man.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The question again is an elementary proposition as to the burden of proof. When it is charged that any man is out of order in his behaviour, the burden of proof is on those who allege, and if you are not able to produce evidence, it does not mean that we should presume that the allegation is true.”

American ‘ Hallet ’ Pumpsets.

* 246 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) how many American “ Hallet ” pumpsets were purchased in the years 1948-49, 1949-50, 1950-51 and 1951-52 and from whom;

(b) whether they were purchased with the necessary spare parts;

(c) whether the importers have the necessary original and genuine spare parts for the pumpsets supplied to the Government;

(d) how many engines are in working order; how many are condemned; and what is the life of the engine supplied when compared to other makes available in the market; and

(e) how many Petter Kirloskar sets were purchased and what is the cost of each set?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ (a) One-hundred and six numbers of American “ Hallet ” engines (96 numbers of 8-h.p. units and 10 of 18-h.p. units) were purchased by the Agricultural department in the year 1949-50 for hiring to ryots. There were no purchases of this make either previous or subsequent to this.

“ (b) No.

“ (c) Yes.

“ (d) No. As the repairs to the engines are carried out in the mufassal then and there when they fall into disrepair, it is not possible to give the number of engines in working order at any time. No engine has so far been condemned. The life of these engines is eight years as in the case of other makes.

“ (e) Fifty (50) numbers of AV. 2 Petter/Kirloskar sets of 6-h.p. were acquired during 1950-51 for hiring out to ryots, at a cost of Rs. 2,620 each exclusive of sales tax.”

Housing Scheme at Madanapalle.

* 247 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Housing Scheme at Madanapalle was taken up by the Co-operative department;

[3rd December 1952]

(b) at what stage it is to-day; and

(c) what steps the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ (a) The Madanapalle Co-operative Building Society has undertaken the Government-sponsored Housing Scheme at Madanapalle.”

“ (b) An extent of 33.61 acres of land has been acquired and handed over to the society. The land has been laid out into 165 plots; 96 plots have so far been allotted to the members and the rest are pending allotment. The society has got approved 20 type designs of houses and has worked out the necessary estimates. Construction of 12 wells had been completed and foundations have been excavated in respect of six houses. Loan applications are under preparation.”

“ (c) No action by Government is called for in the present stage of the affairs of the society.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ ఇప్పుడు మదనపల్లిలో రెండువేలమంది చేతిపనివారు అసగా బేలుదార్లు, కొయ్య పనివారు వసులు లేక నిరుద్యోగులై వస్తులు వండుకొంటున్నారు కాబట్టి, ప్రభుత్వం అన్ని కృషిచేయొక్క నిర్మాణం ఒకడపాలో వెంటనే శాంక్షన్ (sanction) చేస్తుందా? కరువుకాటకాలలో బాధపడుతున్న వై వారికి పని కల్పించే నిమిత్తం ఈ విషయమై శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొంటుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“ కరువులేక నిరుద్యోగులైన బాధ, ప్రభుత్వ వారికి వసులు కల్పించే నిమిత్తం ఈ కృషి నిర్మాణ ప్రణాళిక ఉదే శంకపడలేదు. వారికి పని కల్పించే నిమిత్తం అనేక ప్రణాళిక లున్నాయి.”

Collection of house tax by panchayat boards.

* 248 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state what are the reasons which prompted the Government to authorize panchayat boards to levy a new tax called house tax in panchayat board areas in this State?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The attention of the hon. Member is invited to section 63 of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950, under which the levy of house-tax, amongst others, by panchayats is obligatory.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Sir, in view of the fact that people are overburdened with so many taxes and there is so much unemployment in the country, will the Government be pleased to withdraw these new taxes? ”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“ The house tax is the main source of revenue for the panchayats. If they are to do some work and improve the villages, they have to tax the people there.”

SRI C. H. KANARAN :—“ Sir, may I know, whether the Government have received any memorandum from the people in

[3rd December 1952]

the panchayat area stating that the taxes are too heavy for them to pay and therefore these taxes should either be cancelled or reduced at least? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Sir, the rates are fixed by the panchayat board itself. So the question of heaviness does not come in."

11-20 a.m. JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—" May I know whether the Government propose to exempt distressed weavers and unemployed weavers from the payment of house-tax? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Wherever there is distress, I think deserving weavers are being exempted from the payment of house-tax."

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" Will the Government at least exempt for one year those panchayats which are not willing to impose the house-tax on their inhabitants? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" I think it is open to the legislature to do it."

Pudukkottai Land Mortgage Bank.

* 249 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state when the Pudukkottai Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank was formed in Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" The Pudukkottai Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank was registered on 11th April 1950 and started on 10th June 1950."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Is the governing body of the bank elected or nominated and if nominated, why? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" It is a nominated body, Sir."

Glass Bead Training Centres.

* 250 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state—

(a) how many Glass Beads Training Centres are conducted by the Government in this State;

(b) how many students were trained at these centres centre-war each year ever since their inception;

(c) how many students are undergoing training at Kasargod centre during the current year; and

(d) what is the annual expenditure on each centre?

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" (a) Two Glass Bangles and Beads Training centres are being conducted by the Department of Industries and Commerce—one at Kalahasti (Chittoor district) and the other at Kasargod (South Kanara district)."

3rd December 1952]

" (b) The number of artisans trained at the two Glass Bangles and Bead Training centres are—

Year.	Kalahasti Centre (started in 1947-48).	Kasaragod Centre (started in 1950-51).
	(2)	(3)
(1)		
1947-48	14	..
1948-49	14	..
1949-50	15	..
1950-51	14	7
1951-52	15	12

" (c) At Kasaragod 12 candidates are now undergoing training.

" (d) The annual expenditure of each of the centres at Kalahasti and Kasaragod is Rs. 26,000."

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—" May I know whether the Government propose to give financial or other aids to trained students who intend starting glass beading industries independently? "

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" This institute is specifically intended to give training to students in glass beading industry. I do not know why the students need any separate financial aid."

SRI L. C. PAIS :—" How many of the trainees have been able to secure employment after training, Sir? "

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" I want notice to give the exact figures, Sir."

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA :—" I want to know whether any Backward community students have been admitted to this training course? "

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" I suppose there must have been some students from the backward communities also. If the hon. Member wants exact figures, I want notice to furnish the same."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" I want to know whether there is any truth in the recent report that the Kalahasti glass beading industry is to be shifted to some other place and may I know also whether it is not necessary that the special board which has been set up to look into the industrial needs of the Rayalaseema area should have been consulted in the matter? "

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" There is no proposal at present to shift the training centre, Sir."

Shifting of Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory from Kodur in Cuddapah district.

* 251 Q.—SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government propose to transfer a portion of the Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory attached to the Government Fruit Canning Factory from Kodur (Cuddapah district) to Madras City;

[3rd December 1952]

Reorganization of Municipal Administration.

* 252 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state the decisions taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Committee constituted in G.O. Ms. No. 2313, L.A., dated 11th November 1949, in respect of the reorganization of the Municipal Administration in this State?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Government are still considering the report of the Committee and it will take some time to arrive at decisions thereon."

Grant of land to political sufferer in Unguturu Reserve Forest, West Godavari.

* 253 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government granted to political sufferer (Sri S. Bhagavannarayana of Bondada) an extent of 60 acres of forest in Unguturu Reserve Forest Block No. 2, in West Godavari district; and

(b) whether the same had been applied for by Harijans previously and had been refused?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" (a) An extent of 50 acres of forest land in Block No. 2, Unguturu Reserve Forest was granted in favour of Sri S. Bhagavannarayana on lease for kumri cultivation for a period of ten years.

" (b) No such application had come to the notice of the Government then."

Agricultural loans for Harijans and Harijan Christians.

* 254 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of applications received by the Government from Harijan and Harijan Christian ryots for agricultural loans (under all Acts providing such loans) in West Godavari district and the amount of loans granted during the years 1946-51 and 1951-52?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"The particulars are not readily available. They have to be gathered and compiled for the district. The work will involve considerable time and labour and will not be commensurate with the purpose served. The loans are granted to all applicants who satisfy the conditions of the grant and no distinction is made with reference to the community to which the applicant may belong."

3rd December 1952]

Agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division.

* 255 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the cost of running the agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district;

(b) the income to the farm by (1) sale of milk and (2) sale of vegetables; and

(c) the other activities of the farm, if any?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—" (a) The cost of running the agricultural farm in Pudukkottai since it was taken over by Animal Husbandry Department in June 1951 up to September 1952 is Rs. 56,469.

" (b) The income for the farm for the above period is by sale of:

(1) Milk—Rs. 6,742-1-9.

(2) Vegetables—Rs. 587-10-8.

" (c) The farm aims at the supply of good pedigree stud bulls to the ryots in the districts and also serves as a centre demonstrating the scientific breeding, feeding and proper management of cattle and cultivation and preservation of fodder. In addition to breeding work, the farm also runs a small-scale dairy. An artificial insemination centre has also been opened in the farm under the All-India Key Village Scheme of cattle improvement."

Removal of the President of the Phirangipuram Panchayat.

* 256 Q.—SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have ordered the removal of the President of the Phirangipuram Panchayat;

(b) if so, the date of the order; and whether it has been given effect to; and

(c) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—" (a) The order of removal was issued by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, by virtue of the powers vested in him under section 47 of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950.

" (b) The date of the order is the 5th October 1952, but it was not given effect to.

" (c) On a writ petition filed by the President, the High Court of Madras has stayed the proceedings of the Inspector, pending further orders on the petition."

[3rd December 1952]

Alleged application of the Rent Reduction Act in non-estate villages.

* 257 Q.—JANAB MAHOMED SALIH MARAIKAYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether it is a fact that even in villages declared as non-estates, the Rent Reduction Act is being applied by Officers of Government?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ Yes. There have been cases in which the Rent Reduction Act has been applied by mistake to villages which have been held by civil courts to be not estates governed by the Estates Land Act. Action is being taken to stop collection of rents under the Rent Reduction Act in such villages.”

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—RULES GOVERNING ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I hope the House will remember that at the last sitting I told the House that I would circulate a note regarding rules governing adjournment motions. Holidays intervened and so I could not do it. I will have it circulated in a day or two.

“ In the meantime I have received a number of adjournment motions. In this connexion I wish to read what the famous Speaker of the House of Commons, Mr. Peel, said in regard to adjournment motions. He said: ‘ What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency’. That is the principle laid down by him. I sympathise with hon. Members here, because they have not got as many opportunities to discuss matters as the Members of Parliament have in England. Every day they have got a half-hour debate. I have sent a suggestion for such half-hour debates to the Members of the Rules Committee asking them to give their suggestions. So, when the House accepts the Rules, there will be greater opportunities for Members for debate. That apart, the House would probably be anxious to know the number of adjournment motions admitted in England.

Session.	Number of motions.		
	Offered.	Refused by Speaker.	Allowed by Speaker.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1921 ..	11	3	8
1922 ..	14	10	4
1923 ..	13	11	2
1924 ..	7	5	2
1924-25 ..	6	6	0
1926 ..	10	10	0
1927 ..	1	1	0
1928 ..	5	3	2
1928-29 ..	1	1	0

3rd December 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

Session.	Number of motions.		
	Offered.	Refused by Speaker.	Allowed by Speaker.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1929-30 ..	7	4	3
1930-31 ..	6	5	1
1931-32 ..	6	6	0
1932-33 ..	6	6	0
1933-34 ..	4	3	1
1934-35 ..	4	4	0
1935-36 ..	3	2	1
1936-37 ..	4	2	2
1937-38 ..	2	0	2
1938-39 ..	4	4	0
	114	86	28
Annual average	6.0	4.5	1.5

So, from 1921 to 1939 both years inclusive, 114 adjournment motions were offered, out of which 86 were refused and only 28 were admitted by the Speaker in England.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ After 1939 the gentlemen there stopped giving any adjournment motions, I think.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“ So, on an average, six adjournment motions were offered every year and 4.5 were refused by the Speaker and only 1.5 allowed. But, I have been receiving in this House at least quarter dozen adjournment motions every day.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—“ అధ్యక్షా, మీరు ప్రతిపక్ష పార్టీ మెంబర్స్ adjournment motions ను గురించి statistics 1921 నుంచి 1939 వరకు చూశారు. ఆందులో recent గా ఎ.పి.ఎస్., అంటే 1945 నుంచి 1952 సంవత్సరాల వరకు dispose of అయినట్లునాంటిని వివరిస్తూ ఉంటే వెళ్ళండి.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The hon. Member may speak in English at least to me.” (Laughter.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ He wants to know the latest figures from 1945 to 1952.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ No, these figures are from the report of a Select Committee constituted to go into the rules and make new suggestions. Now, I will read out the adjournment motions.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ May I make a suggestion, Sir. If the Chair rules any adjournment motion out of order, it is not necessary to bring it to the notice of the House and ask the Members to explain it. Only in cases where there is likely to be some argument from the Members to convince you that it is in order, it need be placed before the House. Otherwise it will be regular waste of time, and perhaps the intention of

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [3rd December 1952]

the Member in giving notice of an adjournment motion is to get an opportunity to make a speech. I respectfully submit, therefore, that it is not necessary to bring all the adjournment motions to the notice of the House."

MR. SPEAKER:—"That is the procedure I used to follow hitherto. But at the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am bringing them to the notice of the House."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"In reply to what the Hon. the Leader of the House has said, I must say that I cannot agree with him. It is not for making a speech here, that we moved an adjournment motion, because we have lots of opportunities to make speeches. Therefore it is not because of a fatal temptation to make a speech that we give notice of adjournment motions. But as you are aware, the rules at present are not very clear. We have not been able to understand exactly what are out of order and what are in order. That is the reason why I have requested you, Sir, to read out these adjournment motions and tell us where we go wrong so that we may not repeat such mistakes. I think we can discuss these also in the Rules Committee and I am glad you have also suggested a half-hour debate every day. If that is done, it will minimize our difficulties. The smallness of the number of adjournment motions in England is due to the fact that there they have got greater opportunities to raise these matters in the daily half-hour debate. However, I would request you to take all these considerations into your mind and read out the adjournment motions and let us know where our motions are out of order."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Apart from that, in the half-hour debates there is no division at all; the matter is talked out."

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam has given notice of the following adjournment motion:—

(1) *Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer.*

'This House do stand adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance regarding the grave allegations made by the hon'ble Mr. Sarangadhar Das, M.P., in the House of the People about corruption charges against an Indian Civil Service Officer belonging to the Madras State and to institute a Committee to enquire into those alleged corruption charges.'

This is in regard to the allegations made by a Member in the House of the People against an I.C.S. Officer that he is corrupt and I do not know how it can be brought as an adjournment motion in this House."

11-40 SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I think, Sir, the Hon. Minister for Commerce also stated in Parliament that the charges were pending investigation. So, it is not as if it was a mere allegation that was made."

MR. SPEAKER:—"But it is not urgent."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"That is another point, Sir."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not as if I am trying to take an opportunity to speak in this House now, for, no day passes without a speech from me. I am now trying to make a *prima facie* case for allowing my adjournment motion. Sir, my adjournment motion reads thus:

'This House do stand adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance regarding the grave allegations made by the hon. Mr. Sarangadhar Das, M.P., in the House of the People about corruption charges against an Indian Civil Service Officer belonging to the Madras State and to institute a Committee to enquire into those alleged corruption charges.'

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have been quoting from the . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member must be brief; I will give him two minutes."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Ten minutes, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, only two minutes."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Sir, I have in my possession records to prove that the Member has alleged in the Central Parliament that the I.C.S. Officer against whom allegations of corruption have been made was shunted out to Madras and arrangements were being made to shield him."

(Sri C. Rajam Ramaswami rose to speak.)

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"I am not yielding, Sir. These allegations were made openly in the House, without anybody challenging him. If it is reasonably proved that the charges are true, it will affect the self-respect of this State administration, it will affect our self-respect; if the Hon. the Chief Minister has any respect for the Madras administration and for this House, I want him to take up the challenge from this side."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I rule this out of order. It is not an urgent matter. The allegation is pending before the Government."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"I have not spoken even for the two minutes you gave me, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have given my ruling. I have ruled it out of order."

(2) *Havoc caused by the recent cyclone.*

MR. SPEAKER:—"Here is another adjournment motion given notice of by Mr. Palaniandi. It reads as follows:—

'This House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite urgent matter of public importance, namely, the vast extent of havoc caused by the cyclone in Thanjavur and Tiruchirappalli and other neighbouring places on the 30th November and 1st December 1952, and the necessity on the part of Government to take immediate ameliorative measures to relieve the distress of the people.'

* SRI M. PALANIANDI:—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, 30-ம் தேதி அடித்த புயலின் காரணமாக ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய தேவகாளியில் பெரிசென்ற நாம் பார்க்க வேண்டும். நமது முதன் மந்திரி ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் ஒரு அறிக்கை விடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதாவது இந்தப்

[Sri M. Palaniandi] [3rd December 1952]

புயலையும், மழையையும் உண்டு பண்ணிய கடவுளுக்கு நன்றி செலுத்துவோம் என்பதாக மழையையும் புயலையும் வரவேற்று இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் எந்தப் புயலையும், மழையையும் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் வரவேற்று இருக்கிறார்களோ அதனால் ஏற்பட்ட கோரத்தாக்குதலினால்தான் இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா, திருச்சி ஜில்லா, சேலம் ஜில்லா நாமக்கல் தாலுக்கா போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள பல்லாயிரக்கணக்கான ஏழைகள் வீடிழந்து இருக்கிறார்கள். தங்கும் இடமின்றி நடுத்தெருவில் ஆகாரத்திற்கு வசதியின்றி தவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் நாம் விவசாய மக்களின் நலனைக்கருதியே சட்டம் வகுத்து விவாதித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். விவசாய மக்களிடையே சர்க்காருக்கு உண்மையாகவே அனுதாபம் இருக்குமானால் இன்றைய தினம் அம்மாதிரி புயலின் கோரத்தால் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் சேதங்களை தவிர்த்து, மிகவும் அதிகமாக நஷ்டமடைந்தோருக்கு என்ன சலுகை அளிக்கப்போகிறோம் என்பதை அவர்கள் உடனே அறிவித்தாக வேண்டும். உடனடியாக கட்டிக் கொடுக்க வசதி செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.” அவர்களுக்கு வீடுகள்

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am not going to allow a discussion on this matter.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I am not going to speak on the cyclone itself; I would only like to make a submission and try to convince the Hon. Speaker that this motion is perfectly in order. I will only try to convince, and I hope the Speaker will allow me to convince him. After all, the rule says that an adjournment motion can be moved on a ‘matter of definite public importance’.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ But this motion relates to the cyclone.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The cyclone is a matter of very recent occurrence and as a result of the cyclone, havoc has been caused, and thousands of people have been affected.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Government are not responsible for the cyclone.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ And we are not also responsible.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ But the rules say that unless the Government are responsible, it cannot be admitted.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ To-day we are concerned with what measures the Government should take. Normally speaking, it is the Government that should bring forward this subject before this House and take the House into their confidence. Since the Government do not themselves come before the House, there must be some way open to this House to express its ideas on the matter. What else are we here for, I want to know? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Unless the Government are responsible for the cyclone, this cannot be brought up before the House. Probably the hon. Member Sri Palaniandi in his speech meant that the Hon. Chief Minister wanted that we should pray to God to bring rain and as a result, the cyclone came. (Laughter.) That is what he meant, I think. (To Mr. Palaniandi.) நீங்கள் நம்முடைய பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் கடவுளை பிரார்த்தித்ததினால் தான் இந்த மாதிரி புயல், மழை, வந்தது என்று சொல்கிறீர்களா ?”

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI M. PALANIANDI :—“ நான் அப்படிச் சொல்லவில்லை. மழை பெய்வதற்குப் பிரார்த்தனை நடத்தட்டும். அதைப்பற்றி ஆசனப்பினியில்லை. ஆனால் மழை வேண்டுமென்று வேண்டக் கூடியவர்கள் மழை, புயல் வரும்பொழுது அதனால் அவதிப்படும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான மக்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய ஏன் முன் வரவில்லையென்றுதான் கேட்கிறேன். அப்படி முன் வரவேண்டியது சர்க்காரின் கடமையிலேயா என்பதையும் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். ஆகவே தான் அதைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, we are hungry for difficulties and distress. That is the unfortunate situation. The Government must be trusted to administer the country to the best of their ability. The Legislative Assembly is not an administrative body.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, in view of what the Hon. Chief Minister has said, I must crave your pardon for saying a few words. I must say that the rights of this House must be protected. If he says that the Government can be trusted to do what they want; they may as well dispense with the Legislative Assembly. It is part of our duty to draw the attention of the Hon. Ministers and of the Government from time to time as conditions of distress arise and ask them to attend to them and take certain measures.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ But not by adjournment motions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has listened to the wording of the adjournment motion. It says ‘the vast extent of havoc caused by the cyclone.’ The motion has not indicted the Government. The Government are not responsible for the havoc caused.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I just want to clear a doubt. The havoc is no doubt caused by an act of God, but then begins the responsibility of the Government to take immediate ameliorative measures.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The wording here is ‘extent of havoc caused by the cyclone.’ I rule the motion out of order.

“ Mr. Palaniandi has given two motions on the same subject. Having given my ruling on this motion, I need not take up the other motions.”

(3) Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Another adjournment motion has been received from Mr. P. S. Ramachandra Rao, and it reads :

This House do stand adjourned to discuss the serious situation of water scarcity to the cattle in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks in West Godavari district. We all know that the scarcity of water has been there for a long time, before we had the recent rains. But how are the Government responsible, I wish to know.”

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, scarcity conditions might have been there for a long time; but after some time, the cumulative effect of continuous scarcity conditions brings about a grave situation. Anyway I do not wish to argue with you, Sir, on that point. I would be glad to know from you, Sir, some examples of admissible motions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will give them. When we amend the rules, we shall also clearly say when Members can bring forward adjournment motions.

“ As regards this motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao, it is not an urgent matter, and therefore, I rule it out of order.”

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

- (1) THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952.
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952).

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Yesterday, Mr. Venkateswarlu was addressing the House in regard to his amendment to clause 13. He may now continue the speech.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ ఆద్యక్షా, విధాన మండలికి నా కోరిక—I want him to hear—

‘ఈ సమరణ ప్రధాన మైనటువంటి సమరణ. దీన్ని నేను వివరిస్తున్నాను. దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి విషయమేమిటంటే యిప్పుడు కోర్టుల యీ కాలిదార్ల తరపున, పన్నయాల తరపున ఎవరైనా మాట్లాడవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యం ఉన్నట్లు తెలిస్తే, అటువంటి ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు, అంతగా అవసరమైతే వాళ్లు చెప్పకోవడానికి తప్పకుండా ఆవకాశము యిస్తామని చెప్పాడు. అదిగూడా రూల్స్ లో వాళ్లకు representation ఉండేటట్లు చేస్తామని తెలియజేశారు. కాని యిది సరియైన పద్ధతికాదు. Act లోనే యీ విషయము ఖచ్చితముగా ఉండాలి. అంతేకాని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన దానికి యింకా మార్పులేమీనా రావచ్చును. అవసరమైతే చోట్లు ఉన్నప్పుడు అంతరికి అవసరమే ఉంటుంది. అసలు యీ యాక్టులో general గా tenants అందరికీ ముఖ్యంగా tenants అందరికీ యీ హక్కు ఉండాలి. ఎవరైనా చెప్పకోవడానికి ఏమి లేకపోతే చెప్పకోసేందకు వారి తరపున representation ఉండాలంటే వారికి తప్పకుండా యీ అధికారము ఉండాలని కోరుకు యీ సభరంగము వివరిస్తున్నాను.’”

11-50 a.m. * SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this amendment which seeks to add two sub-clauses to clause 13.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Only sub-clause (6-A) is now under the consideration of the House.”

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ There are five sub-clauses in the clause and a new sub-clause is proposed to be added. In that connexion, I wish to point out that even now under the Criminal Rules of Practice private agents may appear either on behalf of the accused or the complainant and this practice holds good in criminal courts, but of course it has to be done with the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

permission of the presiding Magistrate and he can at his discretion allow it. This practice has been in force in our State for a long time, for nearly fifty years. When such procedure is permitted even in criminal courts, I do not think this amendment is in any way objectionable. But in view of the new sub-clause (6-B) now proposed, I think that with some modification the Government can accept the new sub-clause (6-A). Instead of saying—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

a slight modification might be made so that it will lay down that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be represented by an agent including a legal practitioner or not necessarily being a legal practitioner.’

I submit that the exclusion of the legal practitioner sought to be made by this amendment is not a happy thing because either the tenant or the landlord may require the assistance of a legal practitioner. If the tenants want the assistance of a legal practitioner, we should not try to exclude such assistance; and therefore, I suggest that with the modification suggested by me it would be all right. I submit that in view of the fact that the practice of allowing private persons in criminal courts, has been in force in our State, the amendment is necessary and with the modification I have suggested, I support the amendment.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a matter of legal procedure. Let me take the first part. It is said that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

If we take the words ‘not being a legal practitioner’, a rule or law like this is totally unnecessary because for justice to be done a person should not be prevented from either appearing in person or being represented by an agent. A re-statement of the general law is I think wholly unnecessary. But on behalf of the Government I can promise that we shall be issuing rules in regard to this matter which will be on a line with what obtains under the Code of Criminal Procedure and I am thinking of a rule in these terms. My hon. Friend knows that it is not an amendment but it is going to be issued as a rule—

‘Whenever in any proceeding before a Revenue Court, where a party is represented by a legal practitioner and the other is not, the Court may, in its discretion, permit any agent or any person authorised by such party to plead on his behalf provided that the Court may at any stage cancel such permission.’

Hon. Members may like to know why it is proposed to frame a rule on these lines. Legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court and they are bound by certain rules of ethics and conduct. If any person other than a legal practitioner is allowed to appear on behalf of the party it will be allowing a person to take part in the proceedings of the court who is subject to no discipline. It is, therefore, necessary to provide for permission to be given when the court thinks it fit, and if afterwards the person's behaviour calls for it, the court should have the

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[3rd December 1952]

right to withdraw the permission. Otherwise he would have considerable difficulty. That is why provision is made for the cancellation of the permission at any stage of the proceedings. Even in the ordinary courts, those who are not legal practitioners are allowed under those conditions only. Suitable rules will be framed and that would be enough to cover the case. A statement of the law here that every one is entitled to be present is wholly unnecessary unless indeed the object of the Mover was as originally proposed to prevent legal practitioners from appearing in the court, which I think, must be given up—and it is likely to be given up because there is no question of a person not being entitled to be represented by a legal practitioner and that is always taken for granted. But the only thing that is wanted is to make provision for the presence of someone to be there on behalf of the tenants and that can be provided only with suitable restrictions. With these words, I oppose the amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am unable to understand why the Hon. the Chief Minister is so non-receptive to this idea. I put it very strongly, Sir, he is non-receptive to this idea. In his reply to the suggestion from this side of the House that a provision for revision by District Courts must be made, he made it quite clear that he was providing for a piece of legislation which will cost the least to the parties. If it is a question of costly litigation, whatever benefits are sought to be conferred upon the parties by the legislation cannot be availed of by the parties concerned, particularly by the tenants and the pannaiyals. So, here is a position wherein the ordinary procedure applying in the case of the civil and criminal courts cannot obviously apply because under the normal rules of practice in the criminal courts costly litigation results and only in a few cases are private parties allowed to represent particular parties. Those rules should not provide us with an analogy because we are thinking of providing for a machinery by means of which justice could be done cheaply and readily. This is one of the fundamental things that we have got to remember. Mention has been made about discipline and it has been said by the Hon. the Chief Minister that legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court. But in that connexion, I would like to point out to him that to my knowledge since 1937, in this State, there have been courts which did not deal with criminal questions nor with disputes pertaining to property but they dealt with disputes arising between employees and employers and they were clothed with all the powers of a civil court. These courts have been in existence for the last fifteen or sixteen years but during this long period of time, there was not a single instance brought to the notice of anyone where the people who represented the workers in the courts, and who were not legal practitioners subject to the discipline of the High Court, misbehaved. After all, Sir, why should they misbehave? Is it to their interests or the interests of the parties that they represent that they should do so? I am afraid,

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Sir, that the Hon. the Chief Minister has failed to appreciate one factor and that is, when I appear before a court, what would be my interest? It would be to see to it that I appeal to the better side of the court."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" That is the first stage."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" The Hon. Minister knows that I have appeared in a number of such cases in Coimbatore."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We have no personal spite against Mr. Ramamurthi."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" I am not talking about myself. A number of trade union representatives who are not legal practitioners and therefore, not subject to the discipline of the High Court, appeared in such cases.

" Sir, but there has not been a single case where it was stated that he has infringed the discipline of the High Court or has misbehaved. It is not in our interest to misbehave. On the other hand the question is that the law provides that lawyers alone can appear and a private practitioner can appear only under sufferance when the Revenue Court in its discretion allows him to do so. We are not certain that in every case the Revenue Court will allow him to appear on behalf of a tenant or a pannaiyal. There may be some cases where it may not allow him and what is the remedy? There is no remedy provided for in this clause. Is it provided, for example, that the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer can be changed in any other court? No. He can use his discretion not to allow a private practitioner to appear on behalf of a tenant or pannaiyal. Then where is justice going to be done?

" With regard to the draft rule mentioned by the Hon. Chief Minister, I must say that only in such cases where the landlord is represented by a legal practitioner and the tenant or pannaiyal is not able to engage the service of a lawyer, will the Revenue Court exercise its discretion. Now, it obviously happens in certain cases that the landlord himself directly appears. Then what is the position? The landlord, we know, in to-day's society and under the conditions that are existing to-day generally happens to be an educated man. He commands respect from the court and there is a greater amount of receptivity when the landlord speaks before a court. When the pannaiyal speaks, he is generally taken to be an illiterate person, and he cannot put forward his case as effectively as a landlord by virtue of the fact that the landlord happens to be a more educated man. The pannaiyal is placed at a tremendous disadvantage. As in the case of trade union disputes, the tenant or pannaiyal must have the right to choose his own representative irrespective of whether the landlord engages a lawyer or appears in person and the court must accept him. If he misbehaves in the court he can be sent out. I would, therefore,

12
noon.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

request the Hon. the Chief Minister to make such a provision in this clause, as otherwise justice cannot be rendered to tenants or pannaiyals."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I shall certainly have regard to all that has been urged by the hon. Member and the rule will be properly framed. I may omit the first condition if he wants it to be done straightway. As regards the discretion—whether it should be negative or positive prohibition—that also would be duly considered when the rule is framed. Eminently this question is concerned with the practice of law. We also come into conflict with the provisions made for legal practitioners under the Legal Practitioners Act. All these will be considered and we shall issue a suitable rule. I want the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In view of the assurance of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I do not press my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 13 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 14.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In view of what has happened yesterday, I am not moving my amendment."

Clause 14 was put and carried.

Clause 15.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, I move in clause 15—

(i) For the words "to areas outside Tanjore district" occurring in the head line, substitute the words "to areas other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

(ii) In sub-clause (1) for the words "in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district" substitute the words "in any area other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, by his amendment, wants to enlarge the scope of this Bill."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" I want that the provisions of this Bill should be extended to other districts in the State."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then it is out of order. Anyhow let me hear what the Government have to say on this amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I respectfully agree with what the Chair has said. The Bill is with reference to the Tanjore district and certain other adjoining areas where similar conditions prevail. This amendment seeks the extension of the Bill to the whole State."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I rule the amendment out of order but I allow the hon. Member to speak on clause 15."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, there is agrarian unrest throughout the State since 1947 when the then Government issued a questionnaire regarding land reforms and it has become more acute from the time the Agrarian Reforms Committee appointed by the Congress submitted its report and from 1949 when the then Government appointed the Land Revenue Reforms Committee and issued a questionnaire regarding the proposed land revenue reforms, the landlords, the inamdars and the zamindars apprehending some agrarian reforms conferring some rights on cultivating tenants are continuing to evict tenants. It can be seen from the report of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee that there has been large-scale eviction of tenants throughout the State. Sir, there is a lot of litigation going on in the civil and criminal courts. There is much agrarian unrest throughout the State and, therefore, I request the Government to suitably amend the Bill so that it can be extended to other districts also. If it is not possible to extend the Bill to other districts, at least let them issue an Ordinance or come forward with a similar Bill with such modifications and adaptations so that it may apply to the whole State. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not support 12-10 or oppose so far any of the amendments as far as this Bill is concerned because I am in full agreement with the general principles and the trend of the Bill. While referring this Bill to a Joint Select Committee, I expressed the hope that the Joint Select Committee would make sweeping changes in the Bill. But that has not happened. If I have to say anything of the Bill as it stands now, it is that it does not go far enough. In the first place it does not sufficiently protect the rights of the tenant. It does not make his position any the less precarious or his position more secure. It does bring about certain changes. But I feel it does not satisfy modern conscience. On the other hand, as far as the concessions to the landlord are concerned, I believe it has not done even what the Central Government recommends in their Five-Year Plan, where the landlord is not expected to get more than one-third. But the Bill, as it stands to-day, gives nearly two-thirds. To that extent, I believe the Bill is . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I interrupt the hon. Member for a second. I submit, Sir, Dr. Menon is under the mistaken impression that we are now discussing the Bill for the third time. It is not so. We are now on the discussion of the amendment."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, I thought that I could, while speaking on this clause, recommend to the Government that this Bill should be extended to other areas in this State and that I could point out also the defects in the Bill."

"Then, Sir, another criticism that I have to offer against this Bill is that the Bill differentiates between industrial labourer and

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [3rd December 1952]

farm labourer. That discrimination to my mind is not quite justifiable. Both of them should be treated alike; and all the privileges that the industrial labourer enjoys should be extended to the farm labourer. Finally I would say that it has not replaced individual capitalist holding by corporate or co-operative ownership. After all we are not interested in converting the tenant of to-day into the landlord of to-morrow. That does not solve the problem. Our social objective is co-operative ownership or corporate ownership. That also the Bill does not achieve. Even though the Bill is defective in very many respects, I do feel the extension of the Bill to other areas in this State would be beneficial and I wish the Government take the earliest steps to do it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, if the amendment is pressed . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, he is not moving it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I speak on clause 15, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is a Government amendment to it. Let the Hon. Minister move his amendment first."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid".

Sir, it is a matter of verbal amendment to make the clause more elegant."

*SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name is not necessary if I get certain information. Now, the clause says that the Government may, by notification, make rules to carry out, etc., etc. My object in giving notice of my amendment is that this is a piece of delegated legislation. We are empowering Government in this clause to make rules to carry out the purposes of this measure."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I take it, Sir, we are now on clause 15 and not clause 16. Mr. Ramamurthi is now speaking on clause 16."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am sorry, Sir."

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, on clause 15 I want to say that at present, as Government are aware and as Members also are aware, there is a fairly heavy demand in the country that the security of tenure to the tenant and other benefits conferred on the Tanjore tenants may be extended to the tenantry in the whole State. But Government have found some difficulty in making the provisions of this Bill suitable for general application. All the same they have introduced this particular provision in that,

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

they can extend them by notification. Sir, I was one of those who had always objected to giving extensive delegation of powers to the Executive, as the one, to extend the operation of the entire Bill to the entire State just by a mere notification. But I am glad to say that on our suggestions, the Hon. Chief Minister in the Joint Select Committee agreed to certain amendments and they now find a place in sub-clause (2). In so accepting those amendments I appreciate the action of the Hon. Chief Minister, for it serves to go as a precedent in legislative drafting. It also recognizes the right of the Legislature that whenever modifications are sought to be made hereafter they should be brought before the Assembly for its approval before they are put into operation."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to know whether this amendment now under discussion is to omit clause 15."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is now a general discussion on that clause. If the hon. Member wants to oppose this clause, he may do so."

*SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Sir, some years back when the Malabar Tenancy Act was passed we were told that that measure was intended to deal with the special conditions of tenancy prevailing in that particular area. Now we have got this Bill dealing with pannaityals and tenants in Tanjore district. Are we to understand that the provisions of this Bill are to apply to all portions not covered by the Malabar Tenancy Act? Are there only two sets of conditions prevailing in this State, one set of conditions in Malabar and another set of conditions in the other areas? I think this clause 15 itself is unnecessary. For all the provisions of this Bill cannot be extended to the other parts of this State. Because conditions in other parts are totally different from the conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. The system of pannaityals and the conditions of varam tenant are peculiar to Tanjore district. In Tiruchirappalli and Salem districts, we do not have such conditions. Therefore, I submit clause 15 itself may be omitted."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is no amendment. (Laughter.) I shall now put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

"In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid".

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Rajagopala Rao's amendment is out of order. So I shall now put clause 15, as amended, to the vote of the House."

Clause 15, as amended, was put and carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 16.

12-20
P.M.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion is—

'That clause 16 do stand part of the Bill.' "

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name may become unnecessary, if I just get certain clarifications. The purpose of my amendment is not to give delegated legislative powers to the Government. If I understand it aright, it is covered by sub-clause (2) of this clause where it is provided that—

'All rules made under this section after the 31st December 1952 shall be laid for not less than fourteen days before the Legislative Assembly of the State as soon as possible after they are made, and shall be subject to such modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment, as that Assembly may make during the session in which they are so laid.'

Therefore, all rules that are made, automatically and normally, come before the Legislature and the Legislature will have its own say in the matter. The only snag about which I want some clarification is this, namely, that it is provided in the explanation under sub-section (2) that—

'This sub-section shall not apply to any rules made on or before the 31st December 1952.'

I want to know, whether in the interval between the date of coming into force of this Act and the date, 31st December 1952, if some rules are made, they will not normally come before the Legislature or am I to understand that there is no intention to make any rules as some rules have already been made under the Ordinance or whether the Government intend to make rules under this clause only after 31st December 1952 which would then normally come before the Legislature."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, I may explain that generally it is intended that the rules already made are enough, but it is likely that we may have to make a few more rules. For instance, I have just mentioned about the appearance of agents and others. It may be necessary to make a few more rules but they will not be of a substantial nature but they will be rules which are necessary to give administrative effect to the Bill itself. We should, therefore, be satisfied with the rules as they are because more rules can be made afterwards. When rules are being added afterwards, they will be discussed and, if any suggestion is made then that an old rule should be modified, it will also be attended to. On this assurance, I think, the hon. Member may rest satisfied."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is already an Act called the Madras Buildings Lease and Rent Control Act. It was first enacted as an Order and then it was passed into an Act. I bring this comparison because the provisions in this Act are more or less similar in nature to the provisions in this Bill in regard to landlords and tenants. In the Rent Control Act there is a specific provision, that is section 9, enabling the Courts to execute orders and decrees passed, and I do not know why

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

in this Bill alone it has been delegated to the rule-making powers of the Government. I do not know what exactly is the object of the Government in not making a specific provision as part of the Bill itself for the execution or enforcement of any orders, decisions or awards passed under this Act or for the removal of any doubts or difficulties which may arise in giving effect to the provisions thereof.

"In this connection, I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister in charge to one other fact. The Prevention of Hindu Bigamy and Divorce Act came into force in May 1949 but the rules thereunder were framed in October or November 1951 and published in the Fort St. George Gazette and nearly two and a half years elapsed between the date of coming into force of the Act and the date of rules thereunder being published in the Gazette. Meanwhile, in the course of these two and a half years, neither the courts nor the lawyers nor the parties were properly guided by any rules. I therefore submit that, instead of delegating the matter of execution and enforcement of orders and decisions passed by the Conciliation Officers and the Revenue Courts to the rule-making powers of the Government, a separate clause may be incorporated in the Bill itself."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు ఖాసీ క్లౌజ్ 16 క్రింద రూల్స్ తయారుచేసేటప్పుడు, యీ క్లౌజ్ లో ఉన్న ప్రకారంగా మార్పులు ఏమైనా ఉంటే శాసనసభలోనే యీ మార్పులు చేయవలసియ్యవలసి ఉన్నది. మొదట గవర్నరుకు డ్రాఫ్ట్ రూల్స్ శాసనసభ టేబుల్ మీద 14 దినములు పువకరపనిస్తే, ఆ తర్వాత వాటికి amendments లేకపోతే అమలులోకి తేవచ్చుననే విషయములు ఉన్నవి. కాని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినట్లు "మీరు అందరు సభాసభ్యులు ఇస్తే, ఆ రూల్స్ డ్రాఫ్ట్ చేసేటప్పుడు చేద్దరాదున్నారు. ఇక్కడ నాకు ఒక అనుమానం వచ్చింది. ఏమిటంటే draft rules, Assembly Table మీద 14 దినములు ఉంచినప్పుడు, ఆ తర్వాత వర్చకు ఆవశ్యకమంటుంది. లేకపోతే గవర్నరుకు rule making powers క్రింద సభ్యులు వర్చింక దానికి అవశ్యము లేకపోవచ్చు. కాని notification వల్ల యీ తాము publish చేయవచ్చునని అని ఉన్నది. కాని మార్పులు ఏమైనా ఉంటే, అవి మార్పులు ఉంటే వాక్కు శాసనసభకు తప్పదు. అప్పుడు అందరు రూల్స్ revise చేయవచ్చు. దీని విషయములో ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినవిధంగా చేయకపోతే అనుమానం కలుగుతుంది. కాబట్టి, దీనివిషయమై ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు విని సమాధానము చెప్పితారని అడుగుతున్నాను."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The *Mulhya Mantri* is surprised that the hon. Gentleman, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, is more suspicious than even Sri P. Ramamurthi."

(Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member has had his say and he cannot be allowed to speak a second time."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, sub-clause (2) of this clause also was introduced at our instance. I said at the time of

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [3rd December 1952]

the Select Committee and, I also repeat it now, that I appreciate the action of the Hon. the Chief Minister in accepting it. But, there is one point which the hon. Member, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, wanted the Hon. Chief Minister to clarify. In this connection, I may say that there are two or three methods of the Legislature exercising control over the executive. One method of exercising such control is to make a provision that every rule or notification which Government make should be placed on the table of the House and that it would take effect only after a certain time, that is, after giving an opportunity to any and every Member to move any amendments to those rules. This is the position in regard to clause 15. If a notification is made by the Government extending the operation of this Act to other areas, this clause lays down that this notification must be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days. During those fourteen days any Member will have the right to give notice of an amendment and, if so, the amendment will be brought for discussion as part of the Official Business. It will not be treated as non-official business because the procedure is so provided in the legislation itself. If no amendment has been received or, if the amendment had been considered and disposed of by the House, the notification will come into effect fourteen days after it was placed on the table of the House. The effect of sub-clause (2) in clause 16 is slightly different. In this sub-clause we have consented to give power to the Government to make rules and bring them into effect as soon as they are issued because it is presumed that they generally do not relate to essential matters. They will also be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days and during those fourteen days every Member will have the right to move amendments. Here again these amendments will be treated as part of the Official Business and we have every right to modify those rules. The rules made under clause 15 do not come into effect in the first instance itself, but only when the House has disposed of the matter and fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. In the second set of rules made under clause 16, they come into effect at once but can be modified by giving notice of amendments within fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. These are two methods of the legislature exercising control over the executive. Hitherto it was not the practice of the Government to make such provisions. We have been fighting for them and, particularly, I have been fighting for the inclusion of such provisions. I was glad that we succeeded in persuading the Hon. the Chief Minister to do this at the Select Committee stage itself and, I hope, that hereafter in the drafting of Bills, the Government will introduce clauses to this effect in regard to rules and notification."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not followed the suggestions made by me regarding rules for delegated legislation. In the draft rules which have been sent to the Rules Committee Members, I have suggested that we should follow the Centre in this respect."

3rd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am very glad that the Hon. the Speaker has taken note of this matter."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall put clause 16 to the vote of the House."

Clause 16 was put and carried.

Clause 17.

MR. SPEAKER:—"As there are no amendments to this clause I propose to put the clause to vote." 12-50 p.m.

Clause 17 was put and carried.

THE SCHEDULE.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion is—

'The Schedule do stand part of the Bill.'"

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.'
Sir, the Schedule not only deals with wages but also with other ways of sharing of the produce. The heading 'Wages,' therefore, is misleading. I am, therefore, moving the above amendment."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, may I know from the Government what is the object of omitting the word 'Wages'?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I have only to explain that this Schedule is an agreement reached. It deals not only with wages but with maniams, manaikollais, etc. The word 'Wages' at the top of the Schedule is wrong and it should be removed. The law remains just as it is."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I suggest that some other heading like 'Schedule of Remuneration' may be adopted."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.'"

The amendment was carried.

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—"I beg to move—
'Omit sub-clause (2) (f).'

Sir, my amendment is a simple one and I think, the Hon. the Revenue Minister will accept it and will not oppose it as he is usually doing with amendments moved from this side. The object of the amendment is to see that the wages which a pannaiyal gets should not be restricted. Under sub-clause (f) of clause 2 each pannaiyal will get his share only on the yield from not more than one veti (6½ acres) of land belonging to the mirasidar. In clause 2 of the Schedule it has been provided that for harvesting, kalavadi,

[Sri P. B. Rajachidambaram] [3rd December 1952]

chindumani, etc., pannaiyals will be paid 1/7th of the gross produce on the plots on which they have worked as pannaiyals. I should like to know why a pannaiyal should get his share only on the yield from one veli of land alone? Suppose a pannaiyal is clever, hard-working, etc., and wants to work on more than one veli, why should such a person be prevented from working on more than one veli. I request the Government to accept my amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I expected the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram to help us. Instead, I am afraid, he is suggesting something which would make the thing go wrong. I shall explain. It is not generally the practice that plots are divided off for pannaiyals. There may be two or three or four pannaiyals working on a piece of land and they may be working generally more or less in co-operation and it would therefore not be easy always to find out the plot on which a particular pannaiyal has worked, but no one should be deprived of his proper share. There was a normal appraisalment as to the size of land which a pannaiyal and his family could look after. That was why this agreement was reached at Mayuram and it was a sensible agreement. It provides two conditions. One is that he shall have to work actually on the plot of land and the other is that he shall not in any case be denied his remuneration. It was thought that there should be no room for claiming that a person worked on an impossible area. That is why these two limits are there. In view of the existing circumstances it would not be right for us now to tamper with the agreement already reached."

MR. SPEAKER:—" May I take it that the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram is not pressing his amendment."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir."

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, what about my general amendment?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I am afraid that the amendment is out of order."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The hon. Member cannot move such an amendment."

SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of information! The Assembly passed clause 8 with all its amendments. I have now received notice of amendment given by the Hon. the Revenue Minister for clause 8, sub-clause (2). Is it right, Sir, for the Government to go on giving notice of amendments like this?"

MR. SPEAKER:—" They are only verbal amendments intended to correct grammatical mistakes."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, there seems to be some defect in clause (1) of the Schedule. The Government's intention according to this clause is that every pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and every woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal. But the wording of the clause, as it is, shows that the entire body of pannaiyals working under a mirasidar will only get one marakkal. If the intention of the Government is that each pannaiyal should be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal, the wording of this clause should be changed. It should be stated in the clause that each pannaiyal will get daily wages at so many marakkals, and that each woman labourer will get daily wages at so many marakkals. If this is not stated clearly, the landowner may say that all the pannaiyals employed by him will get only one marakkal. I am certain that such a thing is not intended by the Government."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" We have not invented this clause. We have only reproduced the Mayuram Award as a Schedule. The meaning of the clause is quite clear; each pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal."

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—" Why not we make a slight verbal alteration to make the position clear?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" We do not want to tamper with the Mayuram Award. We want to reproduce it as it is."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Now that it has been clearly stated in the House what is intended, we may not change the wording of the agreement reached. The matter has been explained on the floor of the House and that should be enough."

MR. SPEAKER:—" I shall put the Schedule as amended to the vote of the House."

The Schedule as amended was put and carried.

Clause 1.

MR. SPEAKER:—" Now, we will go back to the Short Title 12-40 and the Preamble to the Bill. First, we shall take up the Short P.m. Title. Regarding that, hon. Members have given notice of certain amendments for enlarging the scope of the Bill. I wish to inform hon. Members that if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they cannot do so at this stage. I am therefore ruling all the amendments out of order."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—" I would like to make one submission in this connection and that is, it was because we anticipated that some such thing will happen . . ."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—Even if the amendments had been brought forward at an earlier stage, I would have ruled them out of order. The hon. Member is new to the procedure of the Assembly and I would advise him to consult the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the matter. Even if the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, what they should do is, they must withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. That is why in the case of the other Bill, namely, the Motor Vehicles Bill, I advised the Government to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill because the Select Committee had no right to enlarge the scope of the Bill.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the Government to come forward with a Bill and another thing to enlarge the scope of a Bill which they themselves have proposed. Whatever might be the powers of the Government, I submit, this House, as a sovereign body, has always got the right to enlarge the scope of a Bill. We are a sovereign body and if we feel that a particular Bill must be enlarged, or for the matter of that, this particular Bill must be applied throughout the State, the House has got a right to take it up.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ There are methods by which they can do that, and the parliamentary method of doing it is to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. Whether the Government do that or the hon. Members do that, I have no objection to that.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ The point is this, Sir. We know the difficulties of non-official members and the non-official side of this House has not got equal opportunities with the Government. Of course, there are so many methods. We ourselves can bring forward a Bill and when the Government bring forward a Bill we, as a sovereign body, can change the scope of the Bill. It is, of course, open to the House to accept it or not.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ If the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, as I said, they will have to bring in a fresh Bill.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ The Speaker regulates the procedure in a sovereign body.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ What I want to submit to the Speaker is that we need not copy all that is being done in England. We can set our own traditions and settle our own precedents and we have got sufficient genius in the country to settle our own traditions and precedents. If we think that in the interests of all, it is necessary and expedient to discuss a particular Bill and the House itself agrees to the enlargement of the scope of the Bill, then nothing can stand in the way. Simply because a particular procedure is followed in the British Parliament, I do not think, we should be bound by that procedure.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ All Legislatures follow this procedure. If the hon. Member wants we can change this rule also. But till that is done, we will have to follow the existing procedure.”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Where are the rules saying that we cannot change the scope of the Bill? ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ If the hon. Member wants he can speak on the clause.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ Sir, in view of the large number of amendments proposed and rejected by the House I am sure that hon. Members will not propose extending this Bill to all parts of the State without very much more consideration. So, I do not think they will move the amendments at all even if permitted.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—“ Permit and then see.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఇక్కడ ఒక చిన్న విషయమున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రారంభములోనే దీనిని తీసుకోవలసివచ్చినది మేము చెప్పాము.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The hon. Member can speak in English at least for my sake.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ మేము ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొనినపుడు ప్రారంభంలో దీని పేరు తీసుకోవలసివచ్చినది చెప్పాము. దానిని మొదట తీసుకొన్నట్లయితే, బిల్లును ఆ ప్రకారంగా మార్చడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. అందుచేతనే మొట్టమొదట title ను, మొదటి క్లాజును తీసుకోవడం చాలా ముఖ్యమని, దాని ప్రాధాన్యతను గురించే మేము ఆ విధంగా proceed కావాలని చెప్పాము. కాని, సాధారణంగా Parliamentary ఆ విధంగా proceed కావాలని చెప్పాము. కాని, సాధారణంగా Parliamentary సాంప్రదాయాన్ని విట్టి మిగత క్లాజులన్నీ తీసుకొనిన తరువాతనే, title కాని, మొదటి క్లాజుగాని తీసుకోవలసియుంటుందని అభిప్రాయపడి ఆ విధంగానే ఇప్పుడు చేశారు. ఇదివరకు జరిగిన వర్సలలో, ఇతర క్లాజులన్నీ exempt చేస్తూ వచ్చాము. ఇప్పుడు చివరకు ఈ title కు మొదటి క్లాజుకు వచ్చాము. ఈ అనెంట్టి ఇప్పుడున్నటువంటి బిల్లును ఈ మానములూ మొత్తము రాద్ధిచేయవలసివచ్చింది. వర్తింపజేయవలసివచ్చింది. ఇప్పుడు ఆ విధంగా చేసేందుకు అనెంట్టికి అధికారమున్నదా, లేదా అనేటటువంటి point of order వచ్చినప్పుడు, దానికి మీరు రూలింగ్ ఇచ్చేటప్పుడు, ఈ అనెంట్టికి ఈమాత్రము అధికారం లేకపోతే, ఇంక ఏంకీ ఉన్న అధికారమేమిటి, అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని మీరు తరచిచూచి order ఇవ్వాలని కోరుకున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ I have heard enough of discussion on this matter and I am going to give my ruling straightaway. This Tanjore Ordinance was issued long ago and this Bill is the outcome of that Ordinance.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ ఈ బిల్లును extend చేయకూడదని ఎక్కడైనా rules ఉన్నవా? ”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ According to parliamentary practice, if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they should withdraw it. If the Government want they can withdraw it and bring in a fresh Bill.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ అందుచేతనే మేము మొట్టమొదటనే ఈ title ను వర్తిస్తామని చెప్పాము. అమాదిరి జరిగియుంటే, అప్పుడు ఇది viro అయ్యేదో లేక కొత్తగా వచ్చేదో ఉండేదో తెలిపాయి ఉండేది.”

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member is new to the House and if he listens to Mr. Viswanatham's advice, he will be convinced."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"In any case, I would say for the information of Mr. Nagi Reddi that it does not matter whether this clause is taken up first or later on. But the only point is whether we can extend the scope of the Bill. The accepted convention and the rule is that it is not open to the House to extend the scope of the Bill by way of amendment. That is the recognized principle. On the other hand, if it is intended to extend the scope of the Bill, the only thing that can be done is to withdraw the Bill and bring in another Bill. If the House feels that this Bill is not sufficient and that some other Bill with wider scope should be brought in, the only course open to the House is to throw out this Bill. It is not as if we are blindly following the British Parliament, but we are following a practice so that the business of the House can be got through properly and expeditiously. Therefore, when once we want to extend the scope of the Bill, all sorts of things will come in and we will not be able to transact the business of the House. That is why this Bill has been prepared with a limited scope. If that is not acceptable, it is always open to the House to throw it out and force the Government to bring in another Bill with an extended scope."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Now the motion before the House is that clause 1, 'Short Title and Commencement' do stand part of the Bill. I will allow speeches on this motion."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of order, Sir, 'In clause 15 it is stated "in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district"

అని ఈ విధంగా ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకునూ ఈ బిల్లును extend చేయవచ్చునని ఖచ్చితంగా అందులో ఉన్నది. దీనిని Tanjore జిల్లా బయట ప్రక్కన ఉన్నటువంటి జిల్లాలకునూ దీనిని extend చేసేందుకు ఒక మార్గము వీర్చాటు చేయబడినది."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Then it is a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"మీరు చెప్పింది మేము ఒప్పుకొంటాము. అయితే, దీనిని outside the Tanjore district అని clear గా చెప్పబడినది. కనుక దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు extend చేయడానికి వట్టి రీత్యాకూడా ఇది అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విధంగా చేయడానికి ఈ బిల్లు అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. అందువల్ల దీనిని రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తింపజేయు amendment move చేయడానికి ఇప్పుడు అవకాశమున్నది. కనుక ఆ ప్రకారము దీనిని సవరించి రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తింపజేయు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

12-50 p.m. * THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, the hon. Member has not spoken on the motion before the House. He has spoken on the amendment which has been ruled out of order."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"To be fair to Mr. Venkateswarlu, I must say that he was only making a request to the Chair to reconsider the ruling and he was not disputing the ruling."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think he said that the scope could be enlarged so as to make the Bill applicable to the whole State because sub-clause (2) of clause 1 said *inter alia* that the Act shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras. I think he is giving a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ విధంగా ఇది కూర్చున్నట్లుంటే బిల్లు, దీని విషయము మీరు చూచినట్లు ఇచ్చారు. మీరు చూచిన సవరించి మార్చాడున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ బిల్లును ఎక్కడైతే ప్రకటించుతో, రాష్ట్రమంతట అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములు కొలు దార్లను భూములనుండి తొలగించడం జరుగుతుందనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము దృష్టికి తీసుకువచ్చాము. కాని ఈ రోజున దీనిని సవరించడానికి అవకాశము లేదంటున్నారు. అయితే దీని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ఇట్లాగే వదిలిపెట్టినట్లయితే, అసగా, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని సమస్యలను పరిష్కారించేయకుండా, ఈ చట్టాన్ని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, భూస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను తప్పకుండా భూములనుండి తొలగించి, ఆ భూములను సంపూర్ణంగా వారి స్వాధీనం చేసుకోవడం జరుగుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు నా నియోజకవర్గములో ముత్యాలరాజు ఆనే భూస్వామి తన భూముల సన్నిహితుల స్వంతకమలానికి తీసుకొని, చాలా కొలముగా పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి రైతులను తొలగించి, ఆ భూములను అక్కుకోవడం జరుగుతుంది. ఇటువంటి దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తున్నాయి. ఈ విషయము గురించి మంత్రిగారికి కచ్చితముగా ఎంతోమంది చెప్పినప్పటికి లాభము లేకపోయింది. ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి కష్టపరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడినాయి, కనుక అక్కడనే దీనిని వర్తింపజేస్తున్నాము అని ప్రభుత్వము చెప్పడం సరియైనదికాదు. వల్లము తాలూకాలో చూచినట్లయితే, అక్కడ ఉన్న దారుణపరిస్థితులలో రైతులు జైళ్ళకు పోవడంకూడ జరుగుతుంది. కనుక నేను ప్రభుత్వానికి మనవిచేస్తున్నది ఏమంటే ప్రభుత్వము కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు extend చేయకుండా ఇప్పుడున్న రూపములోనే అమలుజరిపినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని పెద్ద పెద్ద భూస్వాములు తమ భూముల నుండి తప్పకుండా రైతులను తొలగిస్తారు, అనేక తగాదాలు, ఘర్షణలు బయలుదేరుతాయి. రైతులు నానాపథ్య పడుతారు. అప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము, కమ్యూనిస్టు లేదో గందరగోళము చేసినారు. అందుకే ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు వచ్చాయని అడడం సరికాదు. ఆ కారణము వి విధంగాను ఒప్పుకోవలసిందేకాదు. కనుక అలాంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు, తగాదాలు వివిధ కలుగకుండునట్లు, ఇప్పుడే దీనిని అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింపజేయవలసియందుండని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. చాలా జమీందారీ areas లో, కళా కేంద్రాల వలె భర్తలూ అన్నట్లు వారి జమీందారీ వట్టముద్దాగా, చాలామంది అసామములు భూస్వాములుగా తయారైనారు. అటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో అంతా గూడాను రైతులు ఎక్కడైతే చిక్కిరించుకుంటుంది. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును ఒక్క Tanjore జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసినట్లయితే, ఇతరచోట్ల చాలా దారుణపరిస్థితులు సంభవించినప్పుడు, తగాదాలు విపరీతమైనప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము పోలీసులను తుపాకులతో పిదప కమ్మంటుంది. ఇది అందరికీ తెలిసినవిషయమే. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడకుండా, ప్రభుత్వము ఈ చట్టాన్ని అంతటా వర్తింపజేయవలసిందని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పటిరూపములోనే ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, చాలామంది tenants చాలా యిబ్బందులు పడుతారనే విషయాన్ని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. కనుక దీనిని వారు ఘనారాలోచించి తగు మైన తీరి సవరించవచ్చునని తెలిజేస్తున్నాను."

[3rd December 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు ఏ పరిస్థితులలో ఈ నాడు amendment జరగకు వచ్చిందో, ఆ పరిస్థితులనుంచి మనకు బయటపడడానికి ఈ బిల్లు ఉపయోగపడుతున్నదా అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని మనకు చాలా జాగ్రత్తగా విచారించాలి. ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రములో ఉన్న పరిస్థితులు ఏమిటి, రాష్ట్ర మొత్తము మీద ప్రభావమైన ఆర్థిక దుస్థితిమూలంగా ఎక్కోచిక్కులును ఎదుర్కొంటున్న సమయములో వచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు ఇదియని గమనించవలసియున్నది. ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే అక్కడి భూస్వాములకు, కాలదార్లకు ఉధృత వచ్చినటువంటి తగాదాలమూలంగానే ఈ బిల్లు అక్కడికి వచ్చినది అనుకొనడం ఎంత ప్రధానమైనప్పటికీ, ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద ఉన్నటువంటి ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి వివిధంగా బయటపడడమూ అనే అలోచనతో, ఆ దుస్థితినుంచి బయటపడడానికి ప్రభుత్వము మార్గాలు అన్వేషిస్తూ ఇటువంటి బిల్లు తీసుకొనిరావడం ఇది ఒక మార్గమని దీనిని తీసుకొనివచ్చినది. ఈ నాడు దేశములో పరిస్థితి ఎట్లా ఉన్నది అని చూచినట్లయితే, గ్రామీణులలో ప్రజానికానికి తినడానికి తిండి, కట్టుకోడానికి గుడ్డ లేకుండా వారి కొనుగోలు శక్తి నశించినది. రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద, ఇప్పుడు ఒక్క పారిశ్రామికలకేగాక, వ్యవసాయదారులకేగాక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలందరికీ, అన్ని చోట్లాకూడా ఈ దుస్థితి పెరిగిపోయింది. ఈ సందర్భములో మనకు ఈ economic crisis నుంచి బయటపడడానికి మార్గము ఏమిటి అని అలోచించాలి. దీని కొరకు మనకు చేసేత గుడ్డలు కొనండి అని ప్రజకు చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలను కష్టపడి పనిచేయాలి అని చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక భూస్వాములకు కాలదార్లకు మధ్య సన్నిహితమైన స్నేహము, సౌభాత్యత్యము, లేదు పూర్వకమైన సంబంధాలు ఉండాలి అని అన్నంత మాత్రాన ఈ దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడం అసంభవము నేటటువంటి విషయము ఈ నాడు అందరికీ తెలుసును. కాబట్టి ఈ దుస్థితినుండి వివిధంగా అయిన తప్పించుకొనడానికి ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని రాబడినప్పుడు, ఈ బిల్లయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యమేమిటి. అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి వివిధ వర్గాల మధ్య వచ్చినటువంటి కష్ట పరిస్థితులనుంచి కొద్దిగా, తాత్కాలికంగా అయినా సరే, బయట పడడానికిని రెండవది ఈనాడున్నటువంటి ఆర్థికదుస్థితినుంచి మనసు రక్షించుకొనడానికి ఈ బిల్లు లేబడింది అంటే అందులో సందేహములేదు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లులో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రాధాన్యత ఏమిటంటే, మొట్టమొదటి సారిగా మన రాష్ట్రములో ప్రభుత్వము ఈ భూస్వాములకు కాలదార్లకు మధ్యన ఉన్నటువంటి తగాదాలను తొలగించడం చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదని గుర్తించింది. ఈ నాడు కాలదార్లకు అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నదని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించి, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడాయని ప్రభుత్వము అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నప్పుడు మేము ఈ వైపునుంచి ఈ పరిస్థితులు రాష్ట్రంలో అన్నిచోట్లాకూడ ఉన్నాయని కనుక ఈ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద వర్తింపజేయాలని, తదనుగుణంగా సవరణలు తీసుకురావలసి మేము ప్రయత్నాలు చేశాము. కాని ఇక్కడున్నటువంటి (procedure, rules) ప్రకారము మాకు అది సాధ్యముకాక పోయినందుకు చాలా విచారించున్నాము. ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రభుత్వము చేస్తున్నాము, త్వరలోనే చేస్తాము, అటువంటి రిపోర్టుకూడ మావద్దకు వచ్చినది, దాని పరిశీలన అయిన నరుణాత దీనికి పూనుకొంటూవుని (Land Revenue) మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. ఈ బిల్లు చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదనే సందర్భములో నేను వారికి కొన్ని సూచనలు చేయవలెవారు. ఈ బిల్లయొక్క scope) ఇంక ఎక్కువగా ఉండాలి అని కోరుతున్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము అందుకు ఒప్పుకో

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

లేదు. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులోని క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులే దీనికి కారణమని చెప్పారు. 1 p.m.
కాని ఈ నాడు మనకు ఈ ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడానికి ప్రజలలో కొనుగోలు శక్తి ఎక్కువ చేయాలంటే, ప్రజల ఎంత కష్టపడి పని చేస్తున్నారో ఆ కష్టానికి తగినటువంటి ఫలిత ముందాలి అనే దానికనుగుణంగా ఒక బిల్లును తీసుకురావాలి. అప్పుడే ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెరుగుతుంది. ఈ సందర్భములో కొన్ని సూచనలుచేస్తూ సుప్రభుత్వాభ్యం కమిటీ వారిచ్చినటువంటి రిపోర్టును (general) గా ప్రభుత్వము ఒక్క పోయినందుకు నేను చాలా విచారించున్నాను. ప్రస్తుత పరిస్థితులలో ఈ బిల్లుగురించి మేము, దీనిని ఇతరతాహద వ్యాపింప చేయాలని కోరగా, ఈ లోపల పరిశీలిస్తున్నాము. త్వరలో చేయబోతామని హామీ ఇచ్చినది కాబట్టి విషయాన్ని పరిశీలిస్తున్నాము. త్వరలో చేయబోతామని హామీ ఇచ్చినది కాబట్టి దీనిని త్వరలో ఇతర చోట్లకు కూడ తీసుకొని వస్తారని అనుకొంటున్నాము. లేక పోయినట్లయితే ఇతర జిల్లాలలో దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తాయి. రైతులు అనేక ఇబ్బందులకు గురి అవుతారు. ఎన్నో తగాదాలు కలుగుతాయి. కనుక అటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు వచ్చేవరకు ఊరక యుండి, అవి ఏర్పడిన తరువాత ఆ మంటలన్నీ ఒకేసారి అప్పతామంటే, అప్పుడు రైతులకు, తీరిన కష్టము సంభవించి యుంటుంది. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు రాకముందే, దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేసేందుకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—“Sir, I did not wish to interrupt Mr. Nagi Reddi. Both Mr. Venkateswarlu and Mr. Nagi Reddi spoke as if the motion before the House were that the Bill be passed into law. They made general observations which had nothing to do with the clause 1 that is before the House.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“The position is that their remarks are applicable to the third reading stage also.”

* **RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD:**—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall confine my remarks to the limit set down by the Hon. Chief Minister. The motion before the House relates to Short Title and commencement. I shall not take up the time of the House with reference to the Short Title. But with regard to commencement, I should like to say a few words. It has been argued that this Bill should apply to all parts of the State. The conditions in all parts of the State are not all alike. The extension of this Bill may not suit the conditions in many parts of the State, unless several clauses are modified and new clauses introduced. In taking power to extend the Bill to certain other areas, the Government have been careful and wise enough to use the words ‘in any other area in the adjoining districts’ in contrast to the words ‘in any other area in the outside districts.’ The use of ‘outside districts’ may mean that the Government may skip over one or two districts. But that is not the intention of the Bill. Conditions may be similar in adjoining areas like the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district, and Tiruchirappalli district. Even within the Tanjore district, the tenants in certain areas only will be benefited by this Bill, as in the other areas the tenants are getting more from the landlord than what this Bill provides for. Sri Venkateswarlu does not know as much about Tanjore as I know.

[Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad] [3rd December 1952]

I know several hundreds of instances where the pannaiyal or tenant wants the present practice to continue in preference to what is provided for in the Bill. I am not at all saying that the Bill should oust the present custom or practice if that is better and conducive to cordial relationship between the landlord and the tenant. I shall not discuss the general principles of the Bill, as we can discuss them in the third reading stage which will come up in the afternoon. With regard to the area of the application of this Act, I wish to say that it is better to watch the working of this Bill in the Tanjore district, study the reactions, and remedy the defects before extending it to other areas. We have got to deal with an enormous number of Conciliation Officers and Revenue Courts, we have got to see how their judgments are implemented and what the tenant-landlord relationship is going to be in the future. All of us are interested in more production and it is no use talking of more production without the co-operation of the landlord. It is well known that the pannaiyal or tenant has not got the wherewithal for carrying out agricultural operations. That being so, let us pray for the success of this Bill in the Tanjore district to which it is confined, with all the goodwill of this House and the good intentions of the Government. I am very glad that the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. Revenue Minister limited the scope of this Bill to Tanjore district. If the Government want to extend this Bill to other parts of the State, they should extend it very carefully. I would request them not to extend this Bill by notification. If they want to apply the principles underlying this Bill to Rayalaseema or the other Andhra districts or the southern districts like Tirunelveli, Madurai and Ramanathapuram, I would request them to bring in a separate legislation. Two-thirds of Ramanathapuram district is zamindari area belonging to the Raja of Ramanathapuram and the Zamindar of Sivaganga. When the zamindaris were there, the tenants were getting fifty per cent of the produce. After their conversion into ryotwari area, the ryotwari pattadars also are giving the tenants fifty per cent of the produce. I am pleading for giving fifty per cent to the tenant. Mr. Venkateswarlu is aghast at my pleading and it takes his breath away. Instead of extending this Bill by notification and discussing the notification on the floor of this House, we can bring in a new legislation and discuss it. It is quite possible that the working of this Bill in Tanjore may have the effect of making the landlords and tenants in the other districts to settle among themselves amicably and it may not be necessary to bring in any new legislation at all. While I am not against legislation for the other parts of the State, I only want that the legislation should take due note of the custom prevailing in each area.

"Finally, I congratulate the Government on the very wise step they have taken in bringing forward this measure. Let us wish all good luck to the Government in carrying out this measure successfully in the Tanjore district."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I wish to remind the House that the hon. Members have another opportunity of saying what they have

3rd December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

got to say on the Bill at the third reading stage. I shall put clause 1 to the vote of the House."

Clause 1 was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Government have given notice of some verbal amendments. Let the Hon. Minister for Revenue move them."

Clause 2.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

The amendment was carried.

Clause 6.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

This amendment only puts the clause in the proper form.'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

The amendment was carried.

Clause 7.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, 1-10
I move— p.m.

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'

The amendment was carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 8.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'After the words "tenancy provides for any rent", insert
the words "and not for the sharing of the actual produce
raised".'

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'After the words "tenancy provides for any rent", insert
the words "and not for the sharing of the actual produce
raised".'

The amendment was carried.

Clause 12.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'In sub-clause (3), for the words "to all the rights" substi-
tute the words "in all the rights".'

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (3), for the words "to all the rights" substi-
tute the words "in all the rights".'

The amendment was carried.

Clause 13.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words
"tenancy provides for any rent", insert the words "and
not for the sharing of the actual produce raised".'

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words
"tenancy provides for any rent", insert the words "and not for
the sharing of the actual produce raised".'

The amendment was carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'In sub-clause (4) omit the word "the" occurring before
"Madras Ordinance IV of 1952".'

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'In sub-clause (4) omit the word "the" occurring before
"Madras Ordinance IV of 1952".'

The amendment was carried.

3rd December 1952]

Clause 14.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'In the last line for the words "its scope" substitute the
words "its or his scope".'

The ~~court~~ can be called 'it', but a conciliation officer cannot be
called 'it', and hence this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—" The question is—

'In the last line for the words "its scope" substitute the
words "its or his scope".'

The amendment was carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" Sir,
I move—

'That the Bill, as amended, be passed into law.'

Let me thank all hon. Members for their co-operation and criticisms
on this Bill. I thank not only the Members who took part in the
debate but also other hon. Members who, though they did not take
part in the discussion, have intelligently followed the debate and
have voted on the various clauses and amendments. A criticism
was levelled that this Bill did not cover the whole State but it was
restricted to Tanjore district. It is so because it was rather urgent
that some legislation should be brought forward for that district.
There was already a sort of agreement between the landholders
and tenants in that district which was crystallised in the Mayuram
Agreement. So, we had a starting point on which we could
proceed. It is not so in the case of other districts. Hon. Members
asked why this Bill should not be extended to other districts. I
may tell them that only districts adjoining Tanjore can come
under the purview of this Bill. Other districts cannot come. I am
as anxious as other hon. Members are, regarding the plight of the
tenants in districts other than Tanjore. This is a subject for
separate consideration. We have not forgotten other districts.
We are as much alive to the situation in other districts as hon.
Members are. Under the parliamentary system, Opposition
Members are at liberty to suggest elaborate and far-reaching
reforms. But the Government have to examine them and formu-
late cautiously. Even to a small Bill like this, which is applicable
to only one district, there had been so much of opposition and
criticism. How much more will be the opposition to a Bill which
will be applicable to all the districts? I am so full of the discus-
sion that has been going on that I have no time to think clearly of
the potentialities of this Bill. Therefore, I do not want to
expatiate on this Bill. I am not a believer in talk. I am a believer
in actual results. Let us all hope that this Bill will bring about
that result which we all desire. Let us bless this Bill, and let us
hope that the relations between the landholders and the tenants
will hereafter be as good and cordial as they were in bygone days.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [3rd December 1952]

We shall hope that there will be a greater production in that district from now. Sir, I request hon. Members to pass this Bill unanimously."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I must tell the House that the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, and the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, were before the House for a very long time. I have allowed enough time for the hon. Members to give notice of amendments. I have already received hundreds of amendments. No more time will be allowed to hon. Members. If any hon. Member wishes to give notice of amendments, he must do so before 3 p.m. to-day. Now the motion before the House is—

"That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), as amended, be passed into law."

* RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister, belonging to the party to which I have the honour to belong, has moved that the Bill, as amended, be passed into law. The hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu need not think that I am opposed to this Bill. Sir, I am standing here only to give my fullest support to the Bill. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: 'As a Congressman?') I am really a Congressman. The hon. Member is not a Congressman. Both are true. The question of agrarian reforms has been engaging the attention of the politicians of South India for a long time. I am glad that we have not copied agrarian legislations in other States without reference to our own conditions in this State. I should like to congratulate the Hon. the Chief Minister and Hon. the Revenue Minister on their not having copied the Bombay scheme or any other scheme. They have brought forward a Bill which would suit our requirements.

1-20 p.m. "As regards the agrarian disturbances in the Tanjore district, nobody regrets them more than I. I shall not go into the causes of the disturbances. Let us only hope that this legislation will give the quietus to the disturbances and that this will not give any occasion for any people to disturb hereafter the peace and tranquillity of the place which is essential for increased production. Everybody in this country, right from the Prime Minister of India down to the villager, is anxious to increase production, particularly of rice. It will not be possible to increase production if these tenants and pannaiyals do not co-operate with each other in the Tanjore district. As regards the co-operation on the part of the landowners, I can say—though I do not own any land in the Tanjore district—on behalf of the people who are owning lands in that district, that they have been equally anxious to foster the best relationship between themselves and the tenants on the one hand and the tenants and the pannaiyals on the other. As I have already said, the terms and conditions on which the tenants and the pannaiyals are working in some places are more favourable than those provided in the Bill itself. In fact, in some places where terms and conditions provided in this Bill are sought to be imposed,

3rd December 1952] [Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

the tenants and pannaiyals do not like them but want the old conditions to continue. Therefore, persons, who have not been able to see eye to eye with all the provisions of the Bill, can have the consolation that the tenants and pannaiyals are not over-anxious about these provisions. Anyway, we are glad that we are giving statutory recognition to the rights and privileges of the tenants and pannaiyals. Let us only hope that they will also co-operate with each other and increase production.

"The Bill is necessary not merely for giving security of tenure to the pannaiyals and the tenants but also for giving the quietus to the disturbances in Tanjore. It is from that standpoint that I welcome this Bill and congratulate the Government on the wise step that they have taken. With reference to the agrarian situation in other parts of the State, I shall only repeat my request that in course of time the Government may consider the enactment of a legislation to suit particular areas. Let us hope that in the coming years rice production will go up to a considerable extent in this area in particular."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"అవ్వలూ, ఈ రిల్లలూ కొన్ని పాపములున్నప్పటికీ దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశ్యాన్ని గమనించి మొట్టమొదటిసారిగా ఇటువంటి రిల్లును ప్రభుత్వము తీసుకొని వచ్చినందుకు వారిని అభినందిస్తున్నాను. అయితే ఆ అభినందనను పూర్తిగా ఇవ్వలేక పోతున్నందుకు విచారిస్తున్నాను. కారణమేమిటంటే మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో, మొత్తంగా అన్ని చోట్ల భూస్వాములకు రైతులకు అనేక విధమైనటువంటి వివాదాలు, అరుగుతున్నప్పటికీ, వాటిని గురించి కుండా, ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే ఈ క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు విస్తృతంగా అక్కడ మాత్రమే దీనిని వర్తింప జేయుట సరియైంది కాదు. తాదాపరచేత ఒక నిజాయతీ వెళ్ళుచున్నాను సత్తెనపల్లి తాలూకాలో వడపల్లి గ్రామములో వంద సంవత్సరాలనుంచి భూములను దున్నుతున్నటువంటి రైతులను వారు భూస్వాములకు వ్యతిరేకంగా నడచు కొంటున్నారనే కారణంచేత ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అండగా పెట్టుకొని మూడువందల రైతాంగాన్ని పోలీసుల నుండి తొలగించుటకు మూడు మాసములు వారి మధ్య పెహరాపెహరీగా నాన్ని పోలీసుల నుండి తొలగించుటకు మూడు మాసములు వారి మధ్య పెహరాపెహరీగా పోరాటము జరిగింది. ప్రభుత్వము అండ తోటి ఆ రైతులను ఈనాడు పోలీసులనుండి వెళ్ళి పోరాటము జరిగింది. ఆ ప్రకారము వంద సంవత్సరాలుగా ఆ పోలీసులూ పని చేస్తున్నప్పటికీ కూడా, ఈ నాడు ఈ పోలీసులు, ముదీకాడు అని పిలువబడే వెళ్ళవలసిన పరిస్థితి విస్తరించి కనుక ఒక్క తంజావూరు తల్లెలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు విస్తరించాయి, కనుక అక్కడే దీనిని అమలుజరుపుచున్నాము అని అనుకోవడం చాలా పొరబాటు. ఈ రిల్లును గమనించు ఈ ఊరులలో అమలు జెట్టపట్టియితే, తప్పక ఇతర చోట్లంతా కూడా భూస్వాములు రైతులను తొలగించేదుకు ప్రయత్నం చేస్తారు, ఆ మూలకంగా ఎవ్వరికాదా తగాదాలు పుట్టవచ్చును, అప్పుడు (rioting) జరుగు తపని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను కనుక ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులేని విస్తరించుముందే దీనిని అన్ని చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేసేనే దీనియొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము సరిపడినట్లుంది. తరువాత ఈ రిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతుయొక్క హక్కును బలపరచి రైతుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వాలనే అను కోన్నావును, దానికి తగిన సౌకర్యాలు ఈ రిల్లులో కలుగజేయవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ రిల్లు ఇవ్వబడున్న ప్రకారం రైతుల హక్కులను సరిగా బలపరచకపోగా పంటలో వారి కిచ్చిన భాగము కూడా వారి హక్కున 40 వర్సెలు మాత్రము భాగమే వారికి కలుగ

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [3rd December 1952]

జేతారు. ఇది రైతులకు అంత ప్రోత్సాహకరముగా ఉండదు. వంటలూ ఎక్కువ భాగము భూస్వాముల కివ్వడమే కాకుండా ఆ పొలమునుంచి వచ్చే గడ్డిని గూడా అధిక భాగము భూస్వాములకే ఇవ్వాలని అంటున్నారు. ఈ ప్రకారంగా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఇంక రైతులకేమి గిట్టుతుందో, వారికి ఏమి ప్రోత్సాహముండగలదో ఊహించుకోవచ్చును. అంతేకాకుండా అనేక చోట్ల గుంటూరు క్రిష్ణా జిల్లాలోను, మరియు విశాఖ జిల్లాలోను దూపినట్లయితే చాలా పొలాలు అగ్రహారాలు క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు, లేక పోతే భూముల క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు మొత్తము మీద అక్కడ ఉన్న రైతాంగం తరతరాలుగా ఆ పొలాల మీద పనిచేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి రైతాంగాన్నంతా ఈ నాడు పొలమునుండి వెళ్ళగొట్టడం జరుగుతుంది. అటువంటివప్పుడు, మీరు ఇకముందు ఎప్పుడో వారికి హక్కు ఇస్తామంటే, అప్పటిలోగా ఎంతమంది రైతులను భూములనుండి తరిమివేయడం జరుగుతుందో వారి స్థితిగతులు అప్పటివరకు ఏమి గావాలో ఆ పోయినటువంటి భూములను మరల వారికి ఇవ్వగలరా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఒక సారి భూమినుండి తొలగించబడిన తర్వాత అతనికి హక్కు పోయిందని చివరకి దిక్కులేనివానిగా చేసినట్లు. వారిని రివిన్యూ మంత్రి శ్రీ మాణిక్యవేలు నాయకరుగారుకాని ముఖ్య మంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారుకాని రక్షించగలరా, వారి విడ్డంగలి, వారి కుటుంబ స్థితి, వారి హక్కుస్థితి విచారించగలరా తరతరాలుగా, ఎక్కి సంవత్సరాలుగా ఆ పొలముల పనిచేస్తూ ఉండినటువంటి tenants ను ఈ రోజు వెళ్ళగొట్టడం జరుగుతున్నదంటే, వారికి ఇప్పుడు రక్షణ ఇవ్వకుండా ఎప్పుడో ముందెవ్వతాడుంటే ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్య మెట్లు నెరవేరునో నాకు బోధపడడంలేదు. ఎప్పుడైతే తంజావూరు జిల్లాకుమార్తమే ఈ బిల్లు వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందో, అప్పుడు మిగతా ప్రాంతాలలోని భూస్వాములు తప్పకుండా వారి tenants ను భూములనుండి తొలగించి వారికి ఏలాటి హక్కులు లేకుండా చేయడం జరుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ఇతర జిల్లాలలో ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరము చేయుటకే సహాయపడుతుందని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఈ విధంగా tenants కు ఎక్కి కష్టనష్టాలు సంభవించిన తరువాత ఎక్కి తగాదాలకు గురియై పొలములనుండి తరిమివేయబడిన తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు ఆ ప్రాంతములలో అమలుజరిపేటాడా ప్రయోజనముండదు. అప్పటికి భూస్వాములంతా తమ హక్కులను ఛద్రపరుచుకొని ఉంటారు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పుడు అమలు జరుపకపోయినట్లయితే దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు విమూలము నెరవేరకలాగా ఇప్పుడున్న సాంప్రదాయక హక్కులుగూడ tenants కు లేకుండా పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరం చేయుటకే ఇది తోడ్పడుతుంది. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులో అటువంటి కిష్టపరిస్థితులు సంభవించి యుండిన చూట నిజమే. అక్కడ ఇటువంటి వట్టుము అమలు జరపడం అవసరమే కాని వేరే ప్రాంతాలయొక్క పరిస్థితులుగూడ అదే సందర్భములూ గుర్తించి అక్కడగూడ tenants కు ఇటువంటి రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. అట్లు గాకుండా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఇప్పుడు విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి. భూస్వాములకు, కాలదార్లకు పోరాటాలు జరిగాయి. కనుక ఆ జిల్లాలోనే ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని వచ్చాము. ఇతర జిల్లాలలోగూడ ఇటువంటి విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడితేనేగాని ఇటువంటి పోరాటాలు జరిగితేనేగాని ఈ బిల్లును అంతవరకు అక్కడికి తీసుకొని రాము, అనేటటువంటి విచిత్రమైన దృశ్యము సరియైంది కాదని దాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము తొలగించివేయవలసివచ్చినట్లు చెప్పుతున్నాను. లేకపోయినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో అనేక ఘర్షణలు, పోరాటాలు జరిగి, అప్పుడు మీరు అక్కడికి పోలినుండు చూపించి,

3rd December 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

riotings జరిగి, disorder ఏర్పడవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. అదంతా సంభవించిన తప్పదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మరియు ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క scope ను extend చేయకపోతే, మీరు వివిధంగా tenants కు హక్కు ఇస్తున్నారు. వారికి మీరు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నారని అడుగుతున్నాను. ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారిని, రివిన్యూ మంత్రి గారిని మా ప్రాంతాలకు వచ్చి పరిస్థితుల వివిధంగా ఉన్నాయో వచ్చి చూడమని అడుగుతున్నాను. Tanjore Ordinance pass చేసిన తరువాత ఎంతమంది tenants ను భూస్వాములు తరిమివేస్తున్నారు, వారికి ఎంత అన్యాయము జరుగుతున్నది చూడగలరు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో మీద రైతులకు ఈమాదిరి అన్యాయము అక్రమము జరుగుచుండగా, వారికి ప్రభుత్వము ఈ రోజు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నదని అడుగుతున్నాను. కనుక గాట్లములో మొత్తంగా కాలదారులందరికీ, మీద రైతులందరికీ న్యాయము, రక్షణ కలుగజేయవలసంటే, సంవత్సరముల తరబడి కష్టపడి పనిచేసినటువంటి పొలముమీద వారికి హక్కు కలుగజేయవలసంటే, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క scope ను extend చేస్తూ, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే కాకుండా ఇతర చోట్ల నన్నిటికూడ దీనిని వర్తింపజేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అప్పుడే ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరుతుందిగాని, ఈ బిల్లు ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు చాలా ప్రమాదకరమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The House will now rise and meet again at 3 p.m."

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I could not be present here because of the unprecedented cyclone that occurred in Tanjore, without notice perhaps to the Government and, of course, with notice to us. On the 30th morning at about 6 o'clock the weather was stormy in Tanjore and nobody thought that it would take such a turn. Towards the evening it was so bad that the people suffered a lot. Till the day before yesterday I tried my level best and even yesterday I thought of going to Tiruchi and catching the plane for Madras even though people said that the weather was bad. In view of these circumstances, I could not come here yesterday. In my absence the whole Bill has been passed and I do not know what amendments have been accepted and what amendments have been rejected. I can only presume that everything has been rejected. Now, before the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is passed into law, this cyclone has wrought havoc in Tanjore. For about 20 hours this was going on. I heard, when I was a young boy, of some such thing as cyclone. Some time back I heard about a cyclone in Andhra Desa. I happened to be the District Secretary of the Andhra Cyclone Relief Committee and I was able to collect large amounts. This time I have to collect amounts for the benefit of people of my own place and I have to appeal to others, not only to the Government but also to others. I have heard about some such thing as cyclone when I attended some cinema. This time I actually heard that sound and I saw in front of me Calicut tiles flying like kites."

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—"In the cinema!"

[3rd December 1952]

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" It happened in my own place, Sir. Many houses and huts have been destroyed. Thousands of people have been rendered homeless. (Interruption.) The Hon. the Chief Minister wants me to accept the Bill at once. How can I accept it at once in the light of what happened in Tanjore the day before yesterday? I appeal to the Government to treat Tanjore in a better way. There is no train from Tanjore to Mayuram. The railway line is all right but there is no telegraphic communication. However I was able to catch a train at Tanjore at about 3 o'clock and reach Mayuram last night at about 10-30. I took so much time to cover a distance of 50 miles or so. In the Nagapattinam line, one train capsized. Again, a big tree fell on the line before another train and the driver had to bring back the train. When he was doing so, one of the trees fell on the last carriage which was damaged. In Tanjore town itself, the District Collector and other officials tried to go round the various streets, but they could not do it as many trees had fallen on the road thus obstructing traffic. Yesterday, an urgent meeting was called for and the Collector was presiding over the meeting."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is referring to the cyclone in Tanjore district. How does he connect it with the Bill before this House? "

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" This is the connection, Sir. I want to point out that the present state of affairs in the Tanjore district is such and we are applying this Bill to that district. In that connection, we must know the havoc done to that district as a result of the recent cyclone, and to what amount of suffering the poor people of that district have been put. Now we are going to put into effect the provisions of this Bill for the benefit of those poor people. There was no rain at all. If there had been heavy rain, the havoc would have been greater. There was only the strong wind and gale that worked havoc. People could not go out for the whole day. Luckily for us, it was a Sunday and that too happened in day time. If it had happened during night or during day time on a working day when children might have gone to schools, then the casualties would have been greater. Most of the municipal school buildings in Tanjore have collapsed. Very many shops have collapsed. The Collector was telling me the other day that he was not able to move within the municipal limits and so he did not know the conditions obtaining in villages. Actually, none of them was able to move out of the municipal limits. I am told that in Nagapattinam, people experienced very great difficulty. The cyclone started in Nagapattinam. The Collector told me that some wireless message was received from Nagapattinam asking him to send some kerosene oil, maida and other things. But he could not send those things to Nagapattinam unless there was some aeroplane to carry them to that place. There is no possibility of taking these things to Nagapattinam by any other means. The District Medical Officer was telling that the hospital at Nagapattinam also collapsed, and that there was about 10 feet of water there. I asked him as to

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

what happened to the patients in that hospital. He said that he did not know anything about that, but they might have been removed to some other place. The fact is that he is not aware of the correct position. The officials are not able to ascertain the real damages in the villages. This is the state of affairs in the Tanjore district. As I said already, many of the tiles have been carried away and every person has been affected very badly."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" On a point of order, Sir. While we sympathise with those who have suffered from the recent cyclone, the scope of the Bill is very limited and I don't think it has any connexion with the Bill before the House."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" I have already replied to the Hon. Speaker that as the subject-matter of the present Bill is Tanjore and as we are at the third reading of the Bill, it is but fair and proper that we should take into account what happened in that district day before yesterday."

" Sir, even to-day, I am not convinced about the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant'. Even now, middlemen may come and claim that they are also cultivating tenants. If the matter is taken to court and if the court also says that the middlemen also come within the definition of 'cultivating tenant' then many tenants will be affected. The chief defects of the Bill continue to be there. For example, 'who is to harvest and who is to take the initiative?' All these difficulties will arise when the Act is actually put into force. Yesterday, before I started for Madras, a number of tenants came to me and expressed their difficulties. In a particular village, it seems, kuruvai harvest was over and paddy was on the threshing floor and the mirasdars were refusing to measure. When the matter was taken to Revenue Court, the mirasdars, it seems, told the Court that the tenants had carried away a portion of the produce after harvest without their knowledge. The tenants told me, 'Sir, the Revenue Court wants us to produce accounts for the last three years and if the accounts are not produced, the case will not be decided in our favour. Are we to keep accounts for three years? How is it possible for us, poor people, to keep accounts?' This is what they told me. The Chief Minister refused to give jurisdiction to District Courts to entertain revision petitions. He was very strong on this point, and in his anxiety to reject our plea, he said so many things against the Judiciary also. The Government do not have that much of confidence in the Judiciary as they have in the Revenue Courts."

" Sir, there is another difficulty. How are we to find out the total gross produce? Gross produce includes the yield obtained at the poradi. They do not have poradi immediately. If the relationship between the tenant and the mirasdar is not cordial, there will be lot of difficulty in this regard. Trouble will arise as to who is to take the initiative to have poradi and on what date it should be had and on what day the tenant and the mirasdar should share the produce and all that. All these difficulties will arise when the Bill is actually put into force. Of course, the Chief Minister says that

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [3rd December 1952]

he will look into these things and do the needful. He also says that there are the General Clauses Act and other Acts and the Government can also issue executive orders and rectify any wrong that may be committed. With all respect to the Chief Minister, I may state that so long as the present Chief Minister continues to be in office, everything will be all right and he can also claim that everything will go on well. But when a legislation of this type is brought forward, we have to consider so many other things. The present Chief Minister cannot be expected to be in office for ever and the moment another person takes up office, this Bill will be a weapon in his hands and much havoc will be done. It is in this light we have to carefully look into the several loopholes that are there in this Bill. These points should be carefully considered and we must see that there are no loopholes left. The way in which the Bill has been rushed through clearly shows that the Government are very anxious to push through this measure. Probably they have not taken into account the fact that much difficulty will be experienced by the poor peasants for whose benefit this Bill is intended. Therefore, I submit that it is not at all proper for the Government to push through this legislation which is imperfect."

3-20
p.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are in the third reading stage of this Bill after having gone through nearly three days of discussion over the various amendments that were moved. In the course of the discussion of some of these amendments, the Hon. the Chief Minister stated that he was surprised—I am not quoting his exact words; I am giving the import of what he said—at the opposition to some of the provisions of the Bill from us. At one time, he said that it was more or less what I myself had demanded in the last session of the Assembly when we discussed the Budget. He added: 'You mentioned during the Budget session about the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award; you mentioned a number of other things and I have incorporated them all in this Bill. And despite all this, you people are opposing some of the provisions of the Bill'. Sir, I would, first of all make it clear that this Bill does not contain what we asked for. Let me clear a doubt, whether it is born out of misunderstanding or out of short memory. In the last session of the Assembly, I never demanded that the Mayuram Agreement must form the basis of any piece of agrarian legislation. I never demanded that the Mannargudi Award of 1946 should form the basis of such a legislation either. What transpired in that session was this. We had repeatedly pointed out to the Government that the situation on the agrarian front was worsening day after day and that particularly after the publication of the Subrahmaniam Committee's report, cases of eviction were on the increase. Cases of eviction throughout the State not only with reference to the Tanjore district but other districts also were brought to the notice of the Government. District after district—in Andhradesa, in Malabar and in Tamil Nad—reported a number of evictions. During the course of the debate on the various items of the Budget, the Hon. the Minister for Finance repeatedly stated that the agrarian problem was the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

thing on which they were concentrating their 'immediate' attention, to the exclusion of all other subjects. Therefore, he assured us that we might rest assured that an agrarian legislation would be brought in covering the entire State. It was in that connexion, I repeatedly said to the Hon. the Chief Minister: 'Well, you may go on cogitating about agrarian reforms; but in the meantime, people are being evicted in large numbers; why not you first of all issue an Ordinance to prevent eviction and to reinstate all those people that have been evicted?' That was specifically pointed out and that was the pointed request that was made by me as well as other Members here.

" Secondly, when I mentioned about the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award, I pointed out that it was the landlords and not the tenants who had been repeatedly breaking the Award, violating the Agreement and going back on the solemn agreements that had been entered into. Therefore, when the Government charge the peasantry in Tanjore and other places that they are on the war path, they forget that the landlords go on evicting the tenants and subjecting them to all difficulty. Instead of taking action against such landlords, the Government take action against the peasantry. This is the specific point that I made then and make now. Therefore, it is not correct for anybody to say that we had demanded the incorporation of the provisions of the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award into a Bill. But, nonetheless, we do not want to go back on the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award. I want to make it clear that no wrong interpretation should be put on what I said. We had demanded a legislation for the whole State so that the situation might ease and that such a legislation should not be on the grounds of disturbances but should be on the basis of justice and equity. Is it not correct, is it not right and is it not just that I took the position I did especially when other people—the Congress committees inclusive—demanded justice to be rendered to the tenants and the peasants? Therefore, to bring forward this Bill which covers only Tanjore—apart from its merits—on the floor of the Legislature is a breach of promise that was made by the Government. I make this definite charge. It is a breach of promise. I had expected in the course of the debate on this Bill itself, when Member after Member raised this question, that one of the Ministers would come forward with an assurance that they were thinking of bringing in legislation for the whole State. Even that assurance has not been forthcoming. Therefore, I make bold to say that this is a breach of promise. The reason that is trotted out for confining this Bill to Tanjore district is that conditions there are peculiar. I would like to point out that it is not an excuse that can stand because agrarian conditions in Tanjore are not peculiar to that district. There is a general misunderstanding that the system of land tenure in Tanjore, namely, the pannaiyal system, is something peculiar there and that the other districts have got an entirely different system of tenure. It may be that the pannaiyal might be peculiar to Tanjore

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

but there are other aspects to this question. For example, the tenancy system is not something peculiar to it. Apart from that, there is also the question that the entire Tanjore district is not under wet cultivation. There are places like Pattukkottai and Arantangi where cotton is grown, tobacco is grown and such other things like chillies and other commercial crops are grown. The same is the case with Coimbatore, Tinnevely or Madurai. It is true, however, that in the Tanjore district, by virtue of the fact that it happens to be a deltaic district, the major portion of land is under wet cultivation. That does not mean that there is no wet cultivation in other districts. The same system of tenure obtains in all places. You may call it by different names. In Tanjore you call it *waram* and in Tinnevely you call it *pattam*. The nomenclature might change but the same system, namely, *waram* or *kuthagai*, obtains throughout. Therefore, to say that because conditions in Tanjore were peculiar and therefore a law had to be enacted affecting that particular place cannot at any rate hold water. What is it that the Government have made? In the Preamble to the Bill, they say that in Tanjore alone the relations between landowners and their agents and pannaiyals had become strained. Sir, we sought to move an amendment to the Preamble but unfortunately that was not accepted. The Preamble says:

'Whereas in the district of Tanjore the relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and Tenants and farm labourers on the other had become strained, resulting in displacement of tenants . . . and agrarian crimes and disturbances.'

So, are we to draw the conclusion that here is a Government which will move only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances? Inevitably, I would like to point out, this is the sort of interpretation that is likely to be put on the very Preamble. People would think that only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances the Government will think of effectively intervening and doing something which will alleviate distress. That is why, we want the Government to change their attitude. Let them not think that an agrarian legislation covering the whole State will be most urgently needed only when the situation in the State worsens.

3-30 p.m. "There are certain other things in the Bill. What is it that this Bill seeks to give to the tenants? There are three things that the Bill seeks to guarantee. Firstly, security of tenure for the tenants for a period of five years. Secondly, a certain amount of share in the produce. Thirdly, as far as the pannaiyal is concerned certain regulated wages. These are the three specific things that are sought to be conferred upon the peasants by this Bill. As has already been pointed out by me, the main thing is that with regard to the share which is fixed in the Bill, it will not satisfy a majority of the tenants in the district. As far as the wages are concerned we are not making any quarrel, because we ourselves realize that to-day in a number of cases where pannaiyals are engaged by small landowners and the tenants themselves, it would be difficult under the existing conditions, agrarian and economic, for these people to pay any higher wages. We never sought to move any amendment

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

with regard to the Schedule because we felt it was a thing that we agreed to. The Mayuram Agreement is a fair one considering the conditions in the district.

"But, with regard to the main problem, the question of sharing the produce and the question of tenure, on which the bitterest struggles have been there in that district, we want once again to emphasise that this Bill cannot guarantee to the tenants the minimum amount of security that is needed for them and secondly, it cannot guarantee to them the minimum amount of money that they would require in order to give their best for improving agriculture and thus increase food production. The other day we demanded that it must be laid down by law that the landlord must be compelled to advance money for the purchase of manures and applying it to the field. It was not for nothing that we said that. After all the Hon. the Chief Minister ought to know that the yield per acre in Tanjore is far less than the yield in other districts. It is not because of the agrarian trouble that the yield is low there. Then why is it less? In Tanjore it cannot be said that after the Kannambadi Dam was built and the Mettur Dam was built the silt does not come through and therefore the yield has fallen. If you take Trichinopoly district, on the banks of the Cauvery you will find that the yield is nearly one and a half times the yield in Tanjore. Why is it so? It is primarily because the landlords in Tanjore have not been paying sufficient attention with regard to the manuring of their fields. I am prepared to prove this fact. For example, chemical manuring of the fields is a rarity. It may be in a few areas, chemical manuring is common. But chemical manuring of the fields has never been predominant in Tanjore district. That is why we insisted on the landlord advancing money to the tenant to purchase chemical manure so that the tenant could easily procure the chemical manure, apply it to the field and increase the yield per acre. This has not been accepted by Government. But experience will teach them the folly of their not accepting it. To-day it is said: 'You the Communist agitators and for the purpose of agitation you might say anything'. But I say, Sir, these are hard realities which cannot be disproved. I am prepared to stand any enquiry to prove it.

"Since these things have not been accepted, my own feeling is that this Bill will not fulfil the expectations that have been raised by this Bill. It is expected that as a result of this Bill, food production in the Tanjore district will increase tremendously. I am not at all hopeful of that. (Interruption.) Because the main ingredient that is necessary for increasing the food production in that district has not been provided for in this Bill. Even though the landlord does not pay the money for making available the manure, if the Government are prepared to come forward and advance money,—I am not particular that the Government should do this—to the tenants, to purchase chemical manures and then recover the advance from the tenants, I would have absolutely no quarrel. All I am concerned about is that we must help the

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

tenants to purchase chemical manure and apply it to the land to increase the yield. I am not concerned whether the landlord advances the money or the Government. This is an ordinary thing which experience should teach if production had to be increased.

"With regard to the question whether this measure will really put an end to the disputes that are there in the matter of sharing the produce, as I have said, since the Government have not accepted the principle that there must be a fair and equitable share they will continue. Of course, the Hon. Minister Sri Subramaniam might say, 'Mr. Ramamurthi would want the land itself to be taken away by the tenant'. He himself admitted that it would be an ideal thing. What does he mean when he says, it would be an ideal thing? It is a thing to be desired by everybody. Therefore there is justice in that. If there is injustice, it cannot be ideal. Anyway I do not want to go into that aspect of the question now. Granting that within the framework of the Constitution regarding private property, the land is vested in the hands of the landowner, an equitable share should be assured to the tenants, a share which would be accepted by all people as fair. I have seen the draft of the latest Five-year Plan of the Planning Commission. Even that Commission has recommended that 75 per cent of the produce must be given to the tenants and only 25 per cent made available to the landlord. This is a specific recommendation made therein. I have seen this final draft report recently. When that is the recommendation of the Planning Commission itself, obviously the provision of only 40 per cent for the tenant in the Tanjore district, burdened with all other cultivation expenses, can by no stretch of imagination be called a fair share for the tenant. So long as there is no fairness or equity in this division of the produce, then inevitably people are bound to struggle for justice. Social forces are let loose, they are set in motion, because there is justice behind this social force. They stand for social equality, they stand for social justice. Therefore so long as we do not think in terms of social justice, social equality, we are bound to have these struggles. After all the peasants cannot be blamed for this. This is the one thing that I want to tell the Government. They cannot stop this struggle by means of this Bill. This will continue. The peasants have learnt already that only by means of struggle they can get anything and not by any other means. On that account I am not opposing this Bill. If the Government become wiser as a result of experience and bring forward an amendment to this Bill, well and good. Otherwise, let us wait and see what the peasants themselves will do."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have forgotten to tell the House that from tomorrow the House will meet from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. as the Upper House is also meeting. I must also inform the House that in the third reading of the Bill, speeches should be confined to matters contained in the Bill and no reference should be made to extraneous matters. Now I fix a time-limit of 10 minutes for each Member."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO:—అధ్యక్ష, ఈ చట్టం తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు సంబంధించినవారికి కొంతకొంత ప్రయోజనం ఉపయోగపడని వెళ్ళు వచ్చును. అయితే రాష్ట్ర మొత్తమును దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని చూచితే ఈ చట్టం వల్ల హెచ్చు ప్రాంతాలలోని కొలదార్లకు నష్టదాయకంగా పరిణమించినా వెళ్ళవలసింది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు, చాలేదొడ్డు రక్షణకలగజేస్తూ వినాడు అది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు ఇతర జిల్లాలోని భూస్వాములు ఆ రైతులను పాస్ చేయబడినదో ఆ సాటినుంచీకూడా ఇతర జిల్లాలోని భూస్వాములు తమకుకూడా ఇట్టి ఆర్డీనిచ్చి ఏ కుటుంబానికైనా రావచ్చుననే భయంతో, కొలదార్లకు అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం ప్రారంభించారు. ముఖ్యంగా మా పిఠాపురం తాటాకాలో అప్పుడే పెద్ద భూస్వాములు, అంటే వందలకొలది ఎకరాలు ఉన్న భూస్వాములు తమ భూములనుండి కొలదార్లను అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం నేను ప్రత్యేకంగా చూశాను. అందుచేత ఈ చట్టం ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకుమాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడంవల్ల ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని భూస్వాములందరికీ, ఇటువంటి చట్టం చేయాలన్నాం కనుక, మీరంతా జాగ్రత్త పడండి అని హెచ్చరించినట్లు పరిణమించినదని వెళ్ళవలసి ఉంది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు కలుగ జేసిన సదుపాయాలను ఇతర జిల్లాలలోని కొలదార్లకు వెంటనే గలగజేయకపోవడం చాలా శోచనీయమైనదానంటే విషయం. ఎట్టి ఆలస్యం లేకుండా ఇటువంటి చట్టాన్ని రాష్ట్రం మొత్తంగా వర్తింపజేస్తారని తద్వారా మన రాష్ట్రంలోని కొలదార్ల కందరికీ రక్షణ కలుగ జేస్తారని ఆశించినవారి కందరికీ ఆశాభంగమైనదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ చట్టాన్ని ఒక్క జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసే ఇతర జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు వర్తింపజేయకపోవడం న్యాయంగా లేదనికూడా ప్రభుత్వంవారి దృష్టికి తీస్తున్నాను.

"అంతే కాకుండా ఈ చట్టంలో పట్టయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన కూలి రేటుకూడా చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది. ఈ రేటు కనీస వేతనానికన్న కూడాకానాకన్నగా ఉన్నదని వెళ్ళుటకు విచారించున్నాను. ఈ విషయము చట్టంలో ఉన్నట్లుగా లోపాలన్నీంటికి ముఖ్యంగా ఒక లోపము లేనది. అది యిది. పట్టయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన కూలి రేటు కనీస వేతనమా, లేక నిర్ణయ ప్రమాణమో సరిగా నిర్ణయించబడలేదు. పట్టయార్లకు అందజేస్తూ ఉన్న కూలి రేటు ఇక్కడరాదని నిర్ణయంగా ఎట్టి provision విల్లులో లేదు. అందువల్ల పట్టయార్ల హక్కు కూలి రేటు అడుగుటకు హక్కు ఉన్నదో లేదో తెలియదు లేదు. రెన్యుయే మంత్రిగారు ఈ విషయాన్ని స్పష్టపరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. చట్టంలో కూలి రేటు, మగవానికి రెండు మరక్కాలు, స్త్రీకి ఒక మరక్కా వాళ్ళకు నిర్ణయించబడింది. ఇది చాలా తక్కువ కూలి అనిమాత్రం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ తక్కువ కూలితో వాళ్ళ సంసారం గడవడం చాలా కష్టం. దీనికి తోడు వారికి వని ఉన్న రోజులలోనే ఈ కూలి ఇవ్వబడుతుంది. వని లేని రోజులలో కూలి ఇవ్వరు. ఇది చాలా అన్యాయమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. పట్టయార్ అనే వ్యక్తి కూడా జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపురవంటివాడని నా అభిప్రాయం. అట్టివానికి సంవత్సరం హడుగున కేతం ఇవ్వడం మా జిల్లాలో అనాది దీర్ఘంగా వస్తున్న ఆచారం. కాని ఈ చట్టంలో ఇతర జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపుర కలిగి ఉన్న సదుపాయాలనుకూడా తంజావూరు పట్టయార్లకు కలుగజేయక పోవడం శోచనీయమైన విషయం.

"అంతే కాకుండా, ఇటువంటి చట్టం వస్తుందని భూస్వాములు 1949 వ సంవత్సరంలో తెలుసుకొనిన వ్యక్తమేనని కొలదార్లను కొలించి వేస్తున్నారు. అనేక సంవత్సరాలూ కొలదార్లకు భూస్వాములు కొలు ముచ్చలకాలు ఇవ్వడం లేదు. వాతమూలకంగా కొలదార్లు భూమిని సాగు చేస్తున్నట్లు ఎట్టి ఆధారాలు లేకుండా

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [3rd December 1952]

చేయబడుతున్నాయి. ఈ విషయము సరికొద్దము చాలా శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొనవలసి ఉంది. ప్రాతముకంటా ఉన్న రికార్డులనే నమ్ముతామంటే అనేకమంది రైతులు తొలగించి నేయబడే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. కాబట్టి ఒక్క రికార్డుల బట్టీ కాకుండా, ప్రభుత్వం నియమించే కమిటీలవారు యదార్థ విషయాలను వాకలు చేసి తెలుసు కొనవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను. పెద్ద పెద్ద ఘోషాస్తులు కాబట్టినా ప్రాతముకంటా వీ కాగితం ఇవ్వరు. ఈ విషయాన్ని గుర్తించి అధికారులు ఒక్క రికార్డులను బట్టీ తీర్పులు ఇవ్వకుండా మాత్రవలసి అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ఈ కాసనాన్ని ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు పరిమితం చేయవలసి, త్వరలో రాష్ట్రమంతటకీ దానిని వర్తింపజేస్తారని, కనీసం కొందరికైనా ప్రస్తుతం ఉచ్యూగం కలుగుతుందని ఉద్దేశపడుతూ దీనిని నేను వివరిస్తున్నాను.”

3-40
p.m.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Hon. Minister rises to reply to this debate, he may twit the members of the Opposition. It is true that there have been some Members in the Opposition who, while vehemently opposing and criticising the Bill, at the same time pleaded for the extension of its application to the rest of the State. To my mind such an approach by some Members of the Opposition appears to be somewhat legitimate, for it is due to the fact that the present Bill like the curate's egg is good in some parts though perhaps bad on the whole. What does this Bill seek to achieve? It seeks to achieve some immediate as well as some ultimate objectives. First of all the Bill seeks to provide some security of tenure for the tenant and a guaranteed wage for the pannaiyal. It is this particular aspect of the Bill which seems to be welcomed by one and all. But with regard to the other aspects of the Bill, viz., fixing the share of the produce, there has been no such agreement and no such welcome on the part of the Opposition Benches. The Bill fixes a certain minimum share of the produce for the tenant. It fixes a minimum wage, if we can call it a wage, for the pannaiyal. Even this temporary security of tenure and security of wages is set against the loopholes left for eviction on the one hand and dismissal on the other.”

“Let me come to the clauses dealing with disputes arising between the pannaiyal and the landlord and the consequent denial of appeals to courts of law. As one who is well-acquainted with this aspect, as one who has had experience of industrial tribunals, as a person who has followed the trade union movement very closely and last of all as one who has argued before the industrial tribunals for the reinstatement of dismissed workers, I can with some authority say that it is only the employers, in most cases, who take cases to the High Courts and sometimes to the Supreme Court also. In a majority of cases, the disputes are settled in the ordinary tribunals. To that extent I think that the bar on the jurisdiction of the civil courts envisaged in the Bill is particularly welcome. But, what is to happen in case any victimization of the pannaiyal takes place? Suppose the pannaiyals form themselves into an organization for the betterment of their lot and demand certain concessions for bettering

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

their conditions of service and security of tenure. It is but natural to expect victimization of the pannaiyals. This may constitute a grave danger to the security of service of the pannaiyals. What does the Bill provide to meet such an exigency? Unless some rules are framed by Government, which they of course are empowered to frame under the Bill, the whole administrative machinery will not be able to prevent such a victimization. The administrative machinery may tend even to encourage such victimization. But the recourse to a judiciary bred in the traditions of freedom of contract will not provide the sought for remedy. Only militancy and organized strength can thwart such victimization.

“Now, let me come to the ultimate objectives which the Bill seeks to pursue. The Hon. the Chief Minister issued a statement which is contained in the little pamphlet that has been given to us and which is entitled. ‘A Fair Deal to the Tanjore Ryots’. The Hon. the Chief Minister in one of his addresses to the mirasdars of the Tanjore district observed as follows:—‘Production should be your aim. Unless you give the tiller of the soil sufficient interest in cultivation, production cannot be improved. I am not advising you to give away the land to the cultivators. It is to prevent such a calamity that I have brought in this Ordinance’. Therefore, we see that there are two ultimate objectives in this Bill. First that production should be increased as a result of the implementation of the Bill and the other to avert the danger of the land passing into the possession of the tiller. This second objective comes from the Hon. the Chief Minister who is supposed to be the pillar of the Congress Party which has categorically stated that its objective is ‘land to the tiller of the soil’. I cannot understand, Sir, how an important and leading member of the Congress Party, in direct contradiction to the stated objective of the party, can say that the land going to the tiller of the soil is a calamity and that such a calamity should be prevented by bringing in this particular piece of legislation. If this is the ultimate objective of this Bill, Sir, then I would submit that this Bill which attempts to stave off what may be called a revolution by this minor reform, is wholly reactionary and the concession of certain security of tenure to the tenant and certain guaranteed wage to the pannaiyal is only a minor concession.”

3-50
p.m.

“Then, Sir, let us come to the other objective. It is supposed to increase production. I submit, Sir, that the present sharing of the crop will not act as an incentive to higher production. What does the Bill contemplate? The Bill lays down very clearly that two-fifths of the gross produce would go to the tenant and it also lays down in categorical terms the duties that are cast upon the tenant. The tenant is supposed to provide for the ordinary expenses of cultivation; he is supposed to incur expenditure in regard to manure and seed paddy; he is expected to maintain the water channels. So, Sir, if we take all these items of expenditure and if we also take the net produce after deducting all legitimate items of expenditure, then, I submit, the maximum that would be left to the tenant under this piece of legislation will only be approximately 20 per cent of the net produce. If 20 per cent is going to be given

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [3rd December 1952]

to the man who by the sweat of his brow works for increased production, I submit, with the authority on the subject of tenancy legislation not only in this country but in other countries also, there will certainly be no incentive for increased production. There are countries where Governments have given artificial manure and guaranteed a price for the produce. In places where the tenant's share has been as low as laid down in the Bill and where he has been given manure, the tenant has tended to sell away that manure rather than use it for the purpose of increasing production. If as a result of his own efforts the tenant should increase production by hundred per cent, we must assume that the total amount of expenditure that will be incurred in producing that extra amount of yield should be much more than usual. But what is promised to the tenant under this Bill? We assure him a bare 10 per cent of the increased net produce! The Bill is therefore a disincentive to increased production. We may welcome this measure to the extent that there is some measure of security provided to the tenant and the pannaiyal. But let us be very clear with regard to the ultimate objective. It is my submission that the ultimate objective, viz., increased production, will not be subserved by this Bill and that it will run counter to the prevailing trends in tenancy and agrarian reform."

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—"கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சாவூர் பண்ணையான் குடியானவர்கள் பாதுகாப்பு சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இறுதி கட்டத்தில் வந்து சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதைப்பற்றி சிலவார்த்தைகள் பொதுப்படையாகச் சொல்லுவதற்கு நான் முன் வந்துள்ளேன். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு சூழ் நிலை சமீப காலமாக ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது. அதற்கு நீண்ட கால சரித்திரம் இருந்த போதிலும் இந்த வருஷம் சாகுபடி ஆரம்பத்தில் ஒரு நெருக்கடியான கட்டம் வந்தது. அதன் காரணமாக இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்பது எல்லோரும் அறிந்த விஷயம். இந்த சட்டத்தைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் இந்த சபையின் அங்கத்தினர்களுடைய நோக்கங்கள் யார் யாருடையது எப்படி இருந்த போதிலும் கூட இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் விவசாயத்திற்கு ஏற்பட்டுள்ள நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்காக அரசாங்கம் முன்வந்து இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து நிறைவேற்றப் போகிறது. அதே சமயத்தில் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் எவ்வளவு தூரம் இந்த நெருக்கடியை சமாளிக்க முடியும், அது எவ்விதம் பயனடையப் போகிறது, எப்படி நெருக்கடியை தீர்க்க முடியும் என்பதை யெல்லாம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அங்கு ஏற்பட்ட நெருக்கடியின் காரணமாகவும் அதிலும் நெருங்காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வருவதாலும் அதை சமாளிக்க ஒரு திட்டவட்டமான ஒரு சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவே இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டது. அங்கு நீண்ட காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வந்த ஒரு நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்கும், அந்த நெருக்கடியால் நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்ட பஞ்சம், பசி, பட்டினி முதலியவைகளை தடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற ஒரு கருத்தை மனதில் கொண்டும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஏதாவது நல்ல ஏற்பாட்டை செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவும், அதற்காக நில சீர்திருத்தம் அவசியம் என்பதற்காகவும் இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. காங்கிரஸ் மகாநாட்டில் கூட காரிய கமிட்டி ஒரு ஐந்து வருஷ திட்டத்தைப் போன்று பல விஷயங்களையெல்லாம், குடியானவர்களுக்கு நிலம் கிடைப்பதைப் பற்றி, பேசிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் மக்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு சௌகரியங்கள் ஏற்படும் என்பதைப் பற்றி சொல்ல வேண்டாம். அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களை நினைத்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்களுடைய தலைவிதி என்ன என்பதை சிந்தித்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும் போது ஏதோ ஓரளவிற்கு தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின், நிலைமையை திட்டவட்டமாக வரையறுக்க கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது என்பது என்னுடைய

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Kandaswami]

அபிப்பிராயம். அதற்குத் தக்கவாறு நான் சில திருத்தங்களை அனுப்பியிருந்தேன். அந்தத்திருத்தங்கள் அவசியமாக இருந்த போதிலும் அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அரசாங்கம் அந்த திருத்தங்களை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளும் படியான நிலைமை ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாமல் இந்த சட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றியிருப்பது அவ்வளவு சரியானது அல்ல. இதை அடிப்படையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசும்போது தங்களுடைய ஜில்லாக்களில் தூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது என்று கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்றும், இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்குள்ள குடியானவர்களுக்கு அது பாதிக்கும் என்றும் சொல்லப்பட்டது. கனம் அங்கத்தினர் முதலையார் செட்டியார் அவர்கள் தன்னுடைய ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி மிகவும் பெருமையாகச் சொல்லிக்கொண்டார்கள். ஆனால் என்னைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் ராமனாதபுரத்தைப் பற்றி பேசிக்கொண்டிருப்பதில் அவசியமில்லை. ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து பெருத்த அளவில் விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய நிலத்தை விட்டுவிட்டு தங்களுடைய குடிசைகளை காலி செய்து விட்டு ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு ஜீவனம் பண்ணிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். அந்த அளவில் இருக்கும்போது ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி பேச வேண்டியது அவசியமில்லை. அங்குள்ள நிலைமை வேறு. மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களில் தூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது கீதம் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்றும் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்கு பாதிக்கும் என்றும் கூறப்பட்டது. அந்தந்த ஊர்களின் வழக்கத்திற்குத் தகுந்தபடி விவசாய சூழ் நிலைக்குத் தக்கபடி வாரம் முதலியவைகள் கொடுக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகம் கொடுக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம்தான். அதை ஒத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டியது தான். அந்த நிலைமையில் தஞ்சாவூர் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் குறைந்த பட்சம் வாரம் நாற்பது என்று கணக்கு வைத்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு மேல் அங்கங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய சூழ் நிலையை அனுசரித்து அங்கு இருப்பதற்கு தூற்றுக்கு இறுபது கலம் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து அதை வற்புறுத்தி சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டேன். அந்த திருத்தத்தை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அதை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அதை சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளும்படியான அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டாலும் ஏற்படும். அவ்விதம் அவசியம் ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னைப் போன்றவர்களுக்கு நன்கு தெரியும்.

"அடுத்தபடியாக ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவர்களுக்கு இந்த நிவாரணம் கிடையாது என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்கும் ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து அதையும் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளவில்லை. அதனால் என்ன பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்கள் என்பதும் தெரியவில்லை. இதனால் விவசாயிகள் பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்களோ இல்லையோ இதனால் சிறிய மிராசுதாரர்களுக்கும் ஏழை குடியானவர்களுக்கும் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் மோதல் ஏற்படுத்துவதைத் தவிர வேறு பயன் ஒன்றும் அடையப் போவதில்லை. அதற்கு வேண்டி கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தையும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. பின்னால் அதற்கும் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வரும்படியாக இருக்கும் என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

"அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டத்தை மாகாணம் பூராவிலும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும் என்றும் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்கு மட்டிலும் என்ன வென்றெல்லாம் கேட்கப்பட்டது. அதைப் பற்றி பல அபிப்பிராயங்களும் சொல்லப்பட்டது. இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் பொதுவாக நான்கு, விஷயங்களை மாகாணம் பூராவும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதில் ஒரு விஷயம் பண்ணையான் என்பது. இது தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்குத் தான் பயனுடையதாக இருக்கும். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின் பண்ணையான் முறை வேறு. அந்த முறை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு ஒத்ததாக இல்லை. அதற்குத் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து விட்டால் மற்ற விஷயங்கள் எல்லாம் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும் என்பதில் சந்தேகம் இல்லை. அந்தந்த ஜில்லாவிற்கு தக்கவாறு இந்த சட்டத்திற்கு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [3rd December 1952]

அதை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வரலாம். அப் பொழுதுதான் இது பல ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும். இதை அரசாங்கம் செய்திருக்கலாம். இனிமேலாகிலும் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களைப் பற்றி யோசனை செய்து அங்கும் இதைக் கொண்டுவரலாம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

4 p.m. “அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டம் இன்றையதினம் நிறைவேர்ப்போகிறது. இதிலுள்ள சில விஷயங்களினால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பயன் ஏற்படப்போகிறதோ இல்லையோ அது வேறு விஷயம். அது வேலை செய்யும் விஷயத்தைப் பொருத்திருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டம் சரியான முறையில் நடைபெறாதபடி இருக்க மிராசதார்கள் பிரயத்தனம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். 3 மீ பத்தில் மிராசதார்கள் கும்பகோணத்தில் மகாநாடு கூட்டி சில தீர்மானங் கள் நிறைவேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதை சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இந்த சபையில் சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதை அமுல் நடத்தும்போது மிராசதார்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை எந்த விதத்திலும் பிரயோசனப்படாமல் இருக்கும் படியாகவும் இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்தப்பட முடியாமலிருப்பதற்கு என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதைச் செய்வார்கள். இதை யெல்லாம் செய்வோம் என்று இன்று அந்த மகா நாட்டில் சவுால் விட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதை அரசாங்கத்தின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை போட்டுவிட்டு அந்த ஜில்லாவிற்குப் போன போது அங்குள்ள பெரிய மனிதர்கள் எல்லாம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் பெரிய சட்டத்தைப் போட்டு விட்டார்கள், இதைக்கொண்டு வந்து விட்டார்கள் என்று வாழ்த்தினார்கள். அன்று வாழ்த்திய வாய்களெல்லாம் இன்று மெளனம் சாதிக்கின்றன. அவர்களெல்லாம் இந்த சட்டம் பலனடையாமல் செய்ய திட்டமிட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்த முடியாமலிருக்க என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்வார்கள் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு வேண்டிய ஏற்பாடுகள் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் பேசுவதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் அளித்ததற்கு என்னுடைய வணக்கத்தை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, we see here universal appreciation of the Bill from all sides of the House, of course with some reservation with reference to certain details from some of the hon. Members of the Opposition. I was very carefully hearing the speech of the hon. Member Sri C. Kandaswami coming from Tanjore. I may say at the outset, though he belongs to the Opposition, he has generally accepted the principles underlying the Bill and has welcomed this measure. But the whole trouble seems to be based on a misconception—I do not mean to put it on any ignorance of facts, but rather on wanton misunderstanding purposely misconceived. The very object of the Bill, everyone knows, is simply to improve certain agrarian conditions which have deteriorated in the sense that of late for the last four or five years the relationship between the landowner and the tenant is getting strained, and there is displacement of tenants. That is the main object. Even during the last elections, everywhere it was stated by the Communist friends that tenants were being evicted on a mass scale in Tanjore district. That was the main grievance of the other side. To see that such a displacement is not allowed any longer and to restore the peaceful conditions and maintain a sort of cordial relationship between the landowner and the tenant, our Reverend Rajaji has come forward with great statesmanship and boldness by promulgating an ordinance. In the

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

beginning there was appreciation from the land owning people. But what do we find now? We know the resolutions passed at the mirasdars' conferences at Kumbakonam and Mayuram. Of course, I for the moment do not propose to say that there is much force in the contentions put forward in the resolutions passed at those conferences; but objections have been raised by the landowners against the latest provisions incorporated in the Bill. Of course, criticism is welcome. But criticism for criticism's sake is a thing that cannot be tolerated. But we have to see the provisions that have been newly incorporated in the Bill.

“Incidentally I may also refer to the speech made by the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam. Just as he came to-day after witnessing the severe storm at Tanjore, he perhaps wanted to depict what exactly took place in Tanjore. It appears to me that it has got a direct bearing on the question we are now discussing on the floor of the House. The situation, that has been created on account of the cyclone has to be seen from the point of view of how we are going to work this Bill when it becomes an Act and fulfil the provisions contained therein. As it is, the relations are already strained. Now, Nature also is against us. There is a storm and there is discontent everywhere. It is all the more reason that we have to work the Act in the spirit in which it is conceived. There is no use picking holes and lacunae here and there and saying that we have not gone far enough and that land reform has not been done in the way in which others would like to have it. There are some customary practices prevailing in the Tanjore district. Now, the tenants have been given 40 per cent and the mirasdars 60 per cent. Originally the tenants were getting only 20 to 25 per cent. Sir, hon. Members of this House barring a few individuals like Mr. P. Ramamurthi and some others may not know the actual conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. Previously the tenants were being given only 20 to 25 per cent and 30 per cent in very rare cases. Now they are given 40 per cent. The complaint is that they are not given 60 per cent. Even with regard to catch crop, they were previously getting 50 per cent. Now the landlord is given only one-fifth and I may even say that it is a pittance from the view point of the landholders. What is the reason for expropriating the landholders' share? Is it not expropriation? I am not holding any brief for the landholders. The amendment fixing 20 per cent to the landlord and 80 per cent to the tenant was moved by the Opposition and accepted by the Government. I only want to show as instance whether such amendments will go to settle the agrarian unrest or whether they will aggravate the disturbances. The Opposition Members also wanted to move amendments to the effect that if a pannaiyal is not reinstated as required by the Conciliation Officer, the landholder should be not only penalized by being made to pay damages, but he should also be imprisoned. Is it the way in which we should look at the problem?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let the hon. Member speak on the provisions of the Bill.”

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—" Sir, I only wanted to say to what extent our Revered Rajaji has gone to meet the demands of the tenants. The tenants have been given substantial concessions. Of course, landlords also may have their own grievances. We know how proprietary rights have been conferred on the ryots in inam and zamindari areas by giving ryotwari pattas to the tenants. Similar rights may be conferred on these tenants also."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many hon. Members want to take part in the third reading also. So I fix a time-limit of five minutes to each Member."

4-10 P.M. SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know why the Chair should be so very uncharitable when my chance comes to speak."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many Members want to speak; it is uncharitable on the part of Members to accuse the Chair."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, belonging as I do to the Opposition, I still venture to congratulate the Government on carrying through this measure; for they have taken the right step in the right direction, though the step is niggardly in scope. Sir, I should have expected the Government to be more liberal in their objective. What are the objectives in the Bill? Though the objectives are laudable to a certain extent, the remedy suggested in the Bill is only moderate in its scope. In the Preamble it is stated that in view of the disturbed conditions prevailing in the Tanjore district, the Government are bringing forward this Bill. Do they expect that such kind of disturbed conditions should prevail in the other districts also so as to enable them to give succour to the suffering tenants in those districts also? Sir, the very word 'pannaiyal' is a degrading one. It is an anti-social term; it is offensive to the decency of any citizen. It amounts to serfdom. Because we did not like the word 'Adi-Dravida', or to be plain, the Tamil word 'pariah', we have introduced a new word 'Harijan'. Such being the case, why do you want to perpetuate a degrading name by means of your legislation? I should have welcomed it if the Government had substituted this word 'pannaiyal' by the term 'agricultural farm labourer'."

(At this stage Sri C. Kandaswami occupied the Chair.)

"As regards general land reforms, a committee was appointed, over which Mr. Subrahmaniam presided, and the suggestions made by that committee were more liberal than the niggardly proposals of the Government to-day. There it was stated that 55 per cent and 45 per cent of the produce should be the shares of the tenant and the landowner. I do not see why our Government should stick to 40 and 60."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—" Is 'niggardly' parliamentary, Mr. Chairman? "

3rd December 1952]

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Sri C. Kandaswami) :—" It is parliamentary."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, my time is being taken up by the Opposition. (Laughter.) I wish that the landed gentry, like the mirasdars are liquidated instead of being killed inch by inch. I would rather welcome the Government to liquidate that class by even expropriating land or by giving them compensation or even by putting some restriction that so much of extent of land only should be owned by an individual, instead of a person possessing thousands of acres. That would have been more welcome instead of this *laissez faire* policy which is adopted to-day. I would also add that I expect other and better measures, such as one for liquidating the matadhipatis. They are all only absentee landlords; they have no interest in the land, nor in the production of foodcrops on their lands. I therefore suggest that such lands may be brought under co-operative cultivation which has proved successful—not in Russia, because they may not like that example, but—in America, on which country they depend mostly."

"Sir, our Government headed by Rajaji, should take the note of warning that I give them now. They are sitting upon a volcano to-day. The volcano is composed of the mirasdars of the Tanjore district. (Interruption.) No doubt, we are very good friends; but we only want to put them in the proper track. The mirasdars have convened a conference and they have objected to the levy system. They are saying they will even carry on a no-tax campaign against you. Why, they are even organizing to fight the next elections. (At this stage, the Chairman sounded the gong.) One minute, Sir. They feel that their cause is not at present championed properly in this House. So, I am sounding a note of warning in this House that this Bill has got to be worked properly and correctly. We are behind you in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. (Applause.) Sir, the same conditions as in the Tanjore district are obtaining in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district. If you come to our district and see things for yourself, you will find the conditions are very miserable. So, when you think of extending the scope of this Bill to other areas, please remember Madurantakam."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" Sir, I must register a strong protest on behalf of my party against the partiality shown towards the Tanjore tenants and against the Government having ignored the agitation that has been carried on for so many years in the other parts of the State, particularly the agitation carried on by this party for the betterment of the conditions of the tenants in the whole State. Sir, this is a very unhappy thing and it casts a gloom in the minds of not only the Members inside the Legislature, but of the people living in all parts of this State. I therefore submit that Government must very soon prepare a Bill comprehensive enough to satisfy the needs of all tenants occupying holdings in all parts of the State. This is the view expressed not only on behalf of the party, but I may say it is the view of all Members who have spoken one after another on this Bill."

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [3rd December 1952]

“ Coming to the merits of the Bill, Sir, I find there is little solace for the tenants even of Tanjore. For instance, the security that is afforded to them is only for five years which is a hardly sufficient period for instilling any enthusiasm or incentive in them to grow more food—which is the main object of this piece of legislation. The attempt on the part of the Opposition to confer occupancy right was unfortunately defeated, and even the amendment which sought to fix a period of ten years was defeated. That shows the mentality of the Government, viz., that they are not for giving proper protection and security of tenure to the tenants.

“Coming to the question of shares, I must say it is a most unfortunate provision that we have made now, so far I can see; for, if a tenant wants to grow more food for the benefit of the entire community, there must be sufficient incentive for him to do it in the shape of his getting a legitimate share of the produce, that is raised. Two-fifths of the total produce is insufficient to create a sufficient incentive in the tenant to grow more food in his holding.

“ Then again, the clause relating to eviction is unhappily worded. For instance, greatest power is conferred on revenue officers particularly in the matter of disposing of all applications for eviction. There is a clause giving power to the revenue officers to dispose of such applications summarily. It is really sad to think that an amendment which was sought to be made on behalf of the Opposition for carrying the matter to a district court was negatived. That shows the fear which the present Government have, regarding this aspect of the case. There should be an equal opportunity for both the tenant and the landowner to seek remedy in a civil court, particularly when, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, there is generally some difficulty of interpretation only on questions of law in regard to the various clauses; and a provision to that effect should have been incorporated in this Bill.

"Lastly, Sir, let me on behalf of the tenants of the Tanjore district, congratulate the Government on having extended to them at least this much of benefit, and I also appeal to the Government that similar benefits should be extended to the ryots in general in the other areas of the State within a very short period."

4-20
p.m.

* SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ Tanjore Tenancy Act ను తిసుకొనివచ్చినప్పుడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తము ఆనేక ప్రాంతాలలో కొలుదాన్లు అడరకుమాడా వర్తింపజేస్తారని చాలా ఆశో నిర్భీతులగుచున్నాము. కాని ఇప్పుడు యీ నాలుగు రోజులనుంచి జరిగినదాన్ని బట్టిచూస్తే ఇప్పుడు ఎన్నో సరళిలో చట్టము అయిన దానినిబట్టి చూస్తే యీ యాక్టు అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప జేయకపోవడము వారిలో చాలా నిరాశకృతం కల్పించుతుంది. ఇప్పటికే తంజావూరు Ordinance ప్రకటించినప్పుడే ఆనేక జిల్లాలలో యీ కొలుదాన్లును తొలగించడం ఆనేటలుతుంటేది జరిగింది. ఉదాహరణకు రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారి దృష్టికిని, ముఖ్యమంత్రికి రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి దృష్టికిని తిసుకొని రాబడినటువంటి విషయమే ఒకటి ఇక్కడ తెలుపుతున్నాను. గత పదిహేను సంవత్సరాలుగా ఒక రైతు భూములను తాగులేక పూడిస్తాడు. ఈ రైతు పొలములలోనే యిట్లు కట్టుకొని పొరుగు

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Satyanarayana]

చేస్తూ ఉన్నాడు. అటువంటి రైతును ఆ భూమిలో వేసుకొనియిస్తున్న యిల్లును పీకి వేసి బలవంతముగా ఆ భూములనుండి తొలగించడము జరిగింది. ఈ రైతు యితర రైతుల సహాయముతో ఆ భూమినుండి తొలగకుండా శ్రుండవలచినట్లు పోలీసు సహాయంతో భూమినుంచి తొలగించారని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారికి, ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారికి తెలియపరుచుకోవడంనూ జరిగింది. కాని యితరకు దానిపైన ఏమి చర్య తీసుకొనలేదు. అదే విధంగా రాష్ట్రములో అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో రైతులను, కాలదార్లను కరసగా వెళ్లగొట్టడము జరిగింది. ఈ Tanjore Ordinance ప్రకటించగానే యిది రాష్ట్ర మంతటను వర్తింప జేస్తారనే భయాందోళనలతో యీ భూస్వాములు రైతులను తొలగించారు. యింకను తొలగించడము జరుగుచున్నది. ఇట్లు జరుగుతుండగా రాష్ట్రములోని అనేకమంది రైతులు, కాలదార్లు మహాసభలు జరిపి కారీయొక్క కట్టములు ఇంటివద్దకుయొక్క దృష్టికి తీసుకొనిరావలసినప్పటికీ, యీ చట్టాన్ని దురదృష్టవశాత్తు రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ వర్తింపజేయకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడము ఆంధ్రసభ్యులైన పనిగా కనబడుతులేదు. అయితే యీ చట్టము ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించి వ్యాసు చేసినప్పటికీ, యీ చట్టాన్ని త్వరలోనే యీ రూపములో కాకపోయినా మరొక రూపములో మిగతా జిల్లాలలోని పరిస్థితులు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, ఈ వెళ్లగొట్టుటచే కాలదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు అమలుకు తీసుకొనివస్తే చాలామందిదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అటువంటి చట్టము యీ కాలదార్ల రక్షణకుగాను చాలా అభ్యవసరమని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయము నేను యీ కాలదార్ల తరఫున రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి మనది చేయచున్నాను. అందుచేత యీ చట్టాన్ని యిప్పుడు శున్నతు వంటి పదాలొనైనా, కొన్ని సవరణలతో తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు యిప్పటికైనను ప్రభుత్వమువారు వ్యాసుచేసినందుకు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అభినందింపక తప్పదు. ఇదే మాదిరిగా ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాష్ట్రములోని అన్ని జిల్లాలకు వర్తింపజేసే చట్టాన్ని త్వరలో తెస్తారనే ఆశ, యీ కాలదార్లలో శ్రుంతుంది. గనుక ప్రభుత్వము రాష్ట్రములో కట్టములకు పాల్పడినటువంటి యీ రైతులు, కాలదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకై మరొక చిల్లును త్వరలో వ్యాసు చేస్తారని ఆశనూ యింతటితో ముగిస్తున్నాను. ”

* **SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM** :—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமானது மூன்றாவது முறையாக இந்த சபையிலே விவாதத்திற்கு வந்திருக்கும் இந்தச் சமயத்தில் நான் ஒரு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாயிகளின் பாதுகாப்புக்காக கொண்டுவரும் போது அதில் என்னென்ன இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதைப்பற்றியும் குறிப்பாக ஒரு வேலிக்குட்பட்ட மிராச்தார்கள் பண்ணையர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் படியான கூலியில் சில குழப்பங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன அதைப்பற்றி விளக்கவேண்டுமென்றும், ஒரு வேலி நிலம் பல கிராமங்களில் இருப்பவர்களுக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக விலக்கு அளிக்கப்படுகிறதென்பதைப் பற்றியும் அப்பீல் இருக்கவேண்டும். அதாவது இப்பொழுது ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட் வைத்திருக்கும்படியான முறையானது சட்ட விவாதத்திற்குக் கட்டுப்படாமலிருப்பதால் அது சரியான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக்கூடியாடி, அவர்கள் அதற்கு மேற்கொண்டு அப்பீல் செய்ய வேண்டுமானால், ஹைகோர்ட்டுக்குதான் போகவேண்டிய நிலை இருப்பதை மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் திருத்தப் பிரேரப்பனை கொடுத்தும் சர்க்கார் அதை கவனிக்காதது வருந்தத்தக்கது.

“காம்பென்ஸேஷன் என்ற ஒரு முறையில் ரூ. 300 பணியாட்களுக்கு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று’ இருந்தது. அதில் ஏற்கெனவே உள்ளபடி ரூ. 50 என்று இருந்தால் செனாகரியமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தம்

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [3rd December 1952]

சொல்லப்பட்டது. இந்தப் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற முறையில் பார்க்கும்போது, அதே சமயத்தில் சிறிய மிராசதார்களைப் பாதிக்காத முறையில் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதை முக்கியமாக கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டால் அது ஏற்கனவே இருந்ததைப்போல் இருந்தது நலமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தப் பிரேரணை கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. ஆனால், அதை யெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை.

“குறிப்பாக, பார்க்கப்போனால் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் அதிக நிலம் படைத்தவர்கள் ஒரு சிலர்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதிலும் முக்கியமாக கவனித்தால் அங்கிருக்கும் பெரு நிலச் சுவாஸ்தாரர்கள் என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் திருவாவடுதுறை, தருமபுரம், திருப்பனந்தாளி போன்ற மடங்களுக்குச் சொந்தமான ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வேலி நிலங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அந்த நிலங்களை நேரடியாக குடியானவர்களுக்குச் சாகுபடிக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லியும், அங்கு middlemen என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் இன்னும் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமையில்தான் இந்த சட்டம் இருக்கிறதே தவிர, இது நடைமுறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதாக இல்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலம் சர்க்காரே மறைமுகமாக middlemenக்கு ஆதரவு கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறது.

“கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஒருவர் இப்பொழுது சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார் அந்த நிலங்களைக் கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் மூலமாக ஆங்காங்கே விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளின் மேற்பார்வைக்கு உட்பட்டு அந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கு பணம் வேண்டுமானாலும் சர்க்காரிலே கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டு விவசாயத்தை நடத்தி வந்தால் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயம் நடக்கும் என்று. உணவு உற்பத்தியும் அதிக அபிவிருத்தி அடையுமென்பதை சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவரப்பட்டும் அதையும் சர்க்கார் கவனிக்கவில்லை. ஆகையால் இந்தத் திருத்தங்களுடன் இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்தால்தான் மக்களுக்கு பிரயோஜனப்படக்கூடிய முறையில் இருக்குமென்பதைப்பற்றி சொல்லு முகத்தான் நான் இதை எதிர்க்கிறேன்.

“இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் வ வேண்டுமென்று இருந்தவர்களில் நானும் ஒருவன். ஆனால் அதே சட்டம் எல்லோருக்கும் பாதகமான முறையில் இல்லாமல் சுமுகமான முறையில் விவசாயம் நிரந்தரமாக நல்ல முறையில் நடக்க வேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணம் கொண்டவர்களில் ஒருவனாக நான் இருக்கிறபடியால், அந்த ஒரு சுமுகமான நிலைமை ஏற்படுவதற்கான ஆதாரங்கள் இதில் இல்லை என்பதைக் கண்டு நான் மிகவும் வருந்துகிறேன்.

“ஆந்திர தேசத்தில் ‘ஸைக்ளான்’ ஏற்பட்டதென்று கேள்விப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். அதே மாதிரி சென்ற சில தினங்களில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு ஸைக்ளான் ஏற்பட்டது. அதைப்பற்றி கனம் அங்கத்தினர் சுயம் பிரகாசம் அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார்கள். அதனால் அங்குள்ள விவசாயிகள் தான் மிகவும் அதிகமாகப் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய குச்சு வீடுகளெல்லாம் பிரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன, ஹரி ஜனங்களானாலும் சரி, மற்ற குடியானவர்களானாலும் சரி, அவர்களுடைய இப்பொழுது வீட்டில்லாமல் தவிக்கிறார்கள். கால் நடைகள் அத்தனையும் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு விட்டன. ஆனால், இந்தப் புயற் காற்றினால் விளைபொருள்களுக்கு அதிகமான சேதம் இல்லை, பயிர்ச்சேதம் இல்லை யென்று சொல்லலாம். சேதம் ஏற்பட்டதெல்லாம் கரும்பு, வாழை, தென்னை மாங்கள், ஆக இவைகளுக்குத்தான் அதிகமான சேதங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன.

“கடைசியாக, இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றி சொல்லும் போது இந்தத் திருத்தங்களில் முக்கியமானவற்றை அவர்கள் கொண்டு வரவில்லை, இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தும் அனால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்தவிதமான பலனும் ஏற்படாது. நாங்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள், அதாவது எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள் என்ற முறையில் அதை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும், கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் தரப்பி லேயே அந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கூடிய சீக்கிரம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தை நடைமுறையில் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரும்போது பல கஷ்டங்கள் ஏற்படலாம். அவைகளை நிவர்த்தி செய்வதற்கு சர்க்காரே இந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டுவருவார்களென்ற எண்ணத்தில் நான் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“அத்யட்ச, ఈ Tanjore లెక్కల పంజా 4-30

పూర్వ రూపాంగము అనేక చోట్ల పోరాటాలు జరిగినప్పుడు, రైతులకు, కాలుదార్లకు P.M. కొన్ని స్వల్ప హక్కులను యిస్తూ యీ బిల్లును తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ప్రభుత్వ సంస్థలు అందరుకూడ ఒక విషయాన్ని గురించి ఆసా యీ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రానికి అంతటకు అనుకరించజేయును కోరుచున్నారు. కాని గవర్నమెంటు ప్రస్తుతము ఆట్లా చేయటానికి అంగీకరింపడములేదు. దీనికి ఒకే ఒక్క కారణము ఉన్నది. అదేమిటనా, దేశములో వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలలో అలాంటి చట్టములు తీసుకొనివచ్చి కాశ్వత్తులకు వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలు పరిష్కరించుటకు ప్రభుత్వానికి ఒక సమగ్రమైన దృక్పథము లేదు. దేశములో రైతులు కాలుదార్లకు భూస్వాముల నుండి కష్టాలు, దాడులు, భూములనుండి తొలగింపడము, పోలీసు చర్యలు అనేవి ఎక్కువకష్టము జరుగుతున్న ఉన్నది. ఇందుకునా ప్రభుత్వమువారు తాత్కాలికంగా విశా కొన్ని కర్రలు తీసుకొనివచ్చా రేగాని దీనికి కాశ్వత్తు పరిష్కారము జరుగుట లేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంతవరకు Estates Land Act ఒకటి వ్యాసు చేసింది. యీ చట్టము ఎన్నో సార్లు వ్యాసుచేసింది. 1908 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1936 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1947 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1948 లో యింకొక చట్టము, యీవిధముగా ఎన్నో వ్యాసుచేసింది. అయినను ఏటియొక్క ఫలము నిష్పి యొజనముగా కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ estates విషయములో ఇంతవరకు కూడ తగాదాలు పరిష్కారము కాలేదు. ఈ చట్టము వచ్చిన తర్వాత దీనికి సంబంధించిన తగాదా ప్రాశస్త్యము కొన్నాళ్లు, సుప్రీం కోర్టులో కొన్నాళ్లు విచారణలో ఉన్నదేకాని కాటి అన్నిటిలో వివి జరుగుచున్నదో, యింత వరకు హక్కు పరిధిలో లేబుడలేదు. యిటువంటి యాక్టు వ్యాసు చేసిన ప్రయోజన మేమని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఒక ఉదాహరణ చెప్పుచున్నాను. మా తాలూకాలో కరివేస అనే గ్రామములో భువ్వటువంటి మూడువేల ఎకరాల భూమి యీనాందార్లకు రైతులకు హక్కు విషయములో తగాదాలు వచ్చినవి. స్పెషల్ అఫీసరు దానిని ఎప్పటిన్నాను. బ్రీబ్యూరల్ ఎప్పటిను కాదన్నాను. కరెక్టరు Rent Reduction Act apply చేసారు. ఏటన్నీ వల్ల భూములపై రైతుల హక్కు వివిధ పరిధిలో తెలియడంలేదు. ఈ భూమిపైన యీనాందార్లకు హక్కులును రైతుల హక్కు వివి అనే విషయము యింతవరకు లేబుడలేకండా యున్నాయి. ప్రతి సంవత్సరము ఈ భూమియొక్క విషయములో పోరాటము జరుగుచునేయున్నది. ఇటువంటి చట్టము రాష్ట్రమునంతటికి అనుకరించజేసినట్లయితే యీలాంటి తగా దాలు ఉండేవికావు. ఇప్పుడు యీ తంజావూరు లెక్కల యీ రాష్ట్రమునంతటకు వర్తింపజేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎందుకు నిరాకరిస్తున్నారో తెలియడంలేదు ప్రాచీనకాలావారెవరు రాష్ట్రములో భువ్వ రైతులకు అందరి రక్షణకొరకు వివి అనుకరింప చేయలేకపోతున్నారో బోధపడడం లేదు. తంజావూరులో భువ్వ పోరాటాలు, తంజావూరులో జరిగే కల్లూలూ రాష్ట్రమునంతట ఉన్నవి గురించి రాష్ట్రమునంతట ఈ విల్లు వర్తింపజేసినట్లయితే గ్రామాలలో ఈ విధమైన కల్లూ లూలు జరుగవు. మరొక్క ఉదాహరణం ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టిలోనికి తీసుకొని వస్తున్నాను. రెండు అనే గ్రామములో రెండువందల యేకరాలు అక్కడ భువ్వ పరిశ్రమలు ఇరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగుచేస్తున్నాయి. Tanjore Ordinances

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi] [3rd December 1952]

వచ్చినతర్వాత యిక్కడ జరిగిన విషయము యేమిటంటే యీ భూమి విషయములలో తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని భూసమస్యయే వచ్చింది, ఆ భూస్వాములు ఆ భూముల నుండి వెళ్లిపోవుచు అర్హులు జారీచేసారు. ఈ హరిజనులు నిరాశ నిస్సహాయులైపోయారు. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు, కౌలదార్లకు, పన్నయాలకు మాత్రము రక్షణ లభిచూచారు. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు యిక్కడనుండి యీ వట్టియు వర్తింపజేస్తే కాగుండును అని అంటున్నారు. ఈ గ్రామములో రైతులమీద 144 పెక్కును అర్హులు జారీచేసి వీరిని వెళ్లగొట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వమే యీ వర్తక జరుపుచున్నది. ప్రతి పక్ష సభ్యులు అందరు యీ హరిజనులకు యీ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రము అంతటకు అడుగు జరిగేట్లు చేస్తామని ఎన్నో వాగ్దానాలు హరిజనులకు చేసియున్నారు. ఆ వాగ్దానాలు అన్నియు యిప్పుడు నిష్ప్రయోజనము లవుతున్నవి. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము ఇచ్చి ఒక నిష్ప్రయోజనమైన బిల్లును తెచ్చిందని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకు వ్యాప్తితము చేయక పోవడము బహుశ శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి భుద్దేశము వేరుగా కనబడుచున్నది. బహుశ రాష్ట్రములోని భూస్వాములందరికీ తగిన సాంకాశము, వారియొక్క భూస్వాములను త్వరగా స్వాధీనపరచుకొనుటకును, వారికి వున్నటువంటి భూములకు సంబంధించిన రికార్డు అంతయు జాగ్రత్త పరచుకోగలందులకు తగిన సాంకాశము కలుగజేయటానికిన్నీ, తంజావూరు బిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకీ వర్తింపజేస్తే లోపల భూస్వాములు తగు జాగ్రత్త వుచ్చుకొని, మేల్కొన గలందులకునూ, వారు ప్రస్తుతములో రాష్ట్రమంతటకీ వ్యాపించజేయడములేదని బోధపడుచున్నది. బహుశ యీ భూస్వాములు వారియొక్క పరిస్థితులు చక్కబరచుకొన్నతర్వాత, యీ బిల్లును notification ద్వారా రాష్ట్రమున కంతటకు విస్తరింపజేస్తారని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. నిజముగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ఇద్దేశ్యము యిదే అయినట్లుయితే, వారు అట్లా జరిపేలోపున రాష్ట్రముగా వాలా లెవమైన పరిణామాలు ఏర్పడును అనే నమ్మకముతో వెళ్ళుచున్నాను. రాష్ట్రము విస్తరణయ సంబంధాలు కలిగిన ప్రదేశము అని వారికి ప్రూరిగా తెలుసును. చాలాకాలముగా జీవనమువల్ల కష్టించేటటువంటి యీ రైతులకు, కౌలదార్లకు వెంటనే తగిన రక్షణకు ఒక సమగ్రమైన చట్టాన్ని తీసుకొనివస్తేనేగాని యీ భూసమస్య పరిష్కారము కానేరదు. అందుకని నేను ముఖ్యముగా తారిన గోరేది యేమిటంటే యీ కౌలదార్ల రక్షణకు రాష్ట్రమంతటకీ వర్తింపజేయునట్లు మరొకదాన్ని తీసుకొని వచ్చి వర్తక సాయమునకు సంబంధించిన ఆర్థిక సమస్య పరిష్కారమునకు తోడ్పడుటకు ప్రభుత్వము వారు వెంటనే మరొక బిల్లును తెస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను."

[illegible]

3rd December 1952]

[Sri R. Krishnan]

മാരും തനിക്ക് സ്ഥിരവകാരം ഉള്ള എന്തും അത് കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ ഉണ്ടോ ഇല്ലയോ എന്ന് തനിക്ക് സംശയം ജനിക്കുന്ന ഭൂമിയിൽ താൻ കാൽനടയായി പ്രവേശിക്കുവാൻ കൂടിക്കാൻ മിനക്കിടയാ എന്ന കാര്യം സംശയമാണ്. സാധാരണ മലബാറിൽ കാണുന്ന വെറുമായ കടിയുണ്ടാക്കിയ സ്ഥിതി ഇതാണ്. എന്തെങ്കിലും തനിക്ക് സ്ഥിരവകാരമുള്ള സ്ഥാനം ഭൂമിയിൽ കാൽനടയായി വളം ചെയ്തി പണിയിട്ടുള്ളതും അതും സ്ഥിരവകാരം ഇല്ലാത്ത ഭൂമിയിൽ വളം ചെയ്തതും മിനക്കിടയാ ഇരിക്കുക. ഇത് കൂടിക്കാക്കിയ സ്ഥിരവകാരം. ഈ നിലക്ക് അഞ്ചു കൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞതിനുശേഷം ഭൂമിയിൽ തനിക്ക് യാതൊരു അവകാശവും ഇല്ലെന്ന് കൂടിക്കാക്ക് ബോധ്യം വരികയാണെങ്കിൽ തീർച്ചയായും ഇത് ഈ നേരിനെ നേരിട്ടുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന മകുടം കോടതിയിൽ ഒരു പരിഹാരം കാണുവാനുള്ള പ്രോത്സാഹനം കൂടിക്കാക്ക് കിട്ടുന്നു എന്ന കാര്യം സംശയമാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾതന്നെ മിറാസ് ഓഫീസും അതോടൊപ്പം കൂടി ഉടമസ്ഥന്മാരും ഈ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ടു വല്ല നന്മയും കൂടിക്കാക്ക് കിട്ടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതുകൂടി തട്ടിപ്പുകൊണ്ടു വന്ന കരന്തികൂടി പല ശ്രമങ്ങളും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടാകും. കോടതികളിൽ പലതും കേസുകൾ കൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ടാകും. അതിനെ കോടതിയുടെ വിധി അവസാനിക്കുമ്പോഴേക്കുതന്നെ രണ്ടുമൂന്ന് കൊല്ലം കഴിയുകയും, അതിനുശേഷം കിട്ടുന്ന പുതിയ കാര്യം മാത്രമേ കൂടിക്കാക്ക് ഭൂമി കൈവരും കിട്ടുകയുള്ളൂ എന്ന് വരികയും അത് കഴിയുമ്പോഴേക്ക് നിയമത്തിന്റെ കാലാവധിയും കഴിയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അത് യാതൊരു കാര്യം. ഈ ബില്ലിന് വന്നിട്ടുള്ള ഗുണമെന്തും കൂടിക്കാക്ക്, അയാൾ ഉള്ളതിലും കൂടി ഗുണമെന്തും വരുത്തുന്നില്ല എന്നു ഇരിക്കട്ടെ. എങ്കിലും സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു കൂടിക്കാക്കിയ കഴിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികൾക്കും ഇത് ഒരു നേരിയ അടിയുണ്ടാകുന്നതാണ്. ഈ ബില്ലുതന്നെ സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു കൂടിക്കാക്കിയ ബാധകമാകുവാൻ മേൽ പറഞ്ഞവർക്കും കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള വിചാരിച്ച നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾക്കു കാര്യങ്ങൾ തള്ളിക്കളഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണ്. അയാൾക്കും മറ്റും നേരിൽ മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിലും കൂടിക്കാക്ക് കഴിപ്പിക്കുകയും വീടുകളും വന്നും കയ്യെടുക്കുകയുണ്ടാകുകയാണ്. അവയെല്ലാംകൂടും പുറംഗതപരമായ ബില്ലുകൾ തയ്യാറാക്കി കിട്ടണം എന്ന് അവയുടെ ആവശ്യത്തെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാണ് ഈ ബില്ലിന് സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു കൂടിക്കാക്കിയതെന്നും അവയെല്ലാംകൂടും നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾക്കു കാര്യങ്ങൾ തള്ളിക്കളഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണ്. മലബാർ കടിയുണ്ടാക്കിയ നിയമ കോടതിയിൽ അത്തരം വരുമാനം പോകുന്ന എന്നുള്ളത് സന്തോഷവഹമാണ്. ഈ ബില്ലു കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ എത്രപക്ഷംഗങ്ങളും അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ കാര്യം ചെയ്താൽ തീർപ്പാക്കിയ പരിഗണിക്കുകയും ഈ ബില്ലിനെ കാണിച്ചുമാറ്റിയുള്ള ഒരു നിയമപാത്ര സമീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുള്ള ഒരു സ്ഥിതി ആയിരിക്കുകയില്ല എന്ന് ആശിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ സ്കൂൾ വിരമിക്കുന്നു."

* **SRI P. CHOKKALINGAM** :— “கனம் உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, 4-40 p.m.
சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கிற இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் எந்த அளவுக்கு இந்த மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் இருக்கக்கூடிய சாதாரண விவசாயிகள், குறிப்பாக அதிகப் பகுதியாக விவசாயத்தில் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கின்ற ஹரிஜனங்கள், என்ன எதிர்பார்த்தார் சீரோ அந்தப் பலன் பரிபூரணமாக இதன்மூலம் கிடைக்கவில்லை; அல்லது அவர்களைத் திருப்திபடுத்தக்கூடிய வகையிலும் இல்லை. இருந்தாலுங்கூட இப்போது சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டம் முன்னர் அம்சங்களைக் கொண்டிருப்பதனால் குறைந்தபட்சம் அவர் கூறுகிற நன்மை செய்யக்கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது என்ற முறையில் அதை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன்.

“குறிப்பாக, நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் இந்தத் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் என்ன எதிர்பார்த்தார்கள் என்பதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கொஞ்சம் யோசித்துப் பார்த்தால் நல்லது. சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ளவர்கள் பல காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி அபேட்சகர்களும் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் சுப்ர மணியம் சுமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பை சட்டபூர்வமாக இந்த மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் அதிசயமாக அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்படுமென்று பல இடங்களில் பேசினார்கள் என்பதை நான் அறிவேன். சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ளவர்களும் அறிவார்கள்.

[Sri P. Chokkalingam] [3rd December 1952]

“அது மட்டுமல்ல. சென்ற பட்ஜெட் கூட்டத்திலும்கூட சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் உள்ளவர்கள் சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பின் பிரகாரம் ஒரு சட்டம் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்படவேண்டுமென்று பல மெம்பர்கள் பேசினார்கள், என்பதையும் சர்க்காருக்கு ஞாபகமூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“முக்கியமாக இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய பெரும்பான்மையான விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமானாலும், அல்லது உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்றாலும், விவசாயத்திலே ஊக்கமும் நம்பிக்கையும் ஏற்படவேண்டுமென்றாலும், என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் இன்றைக்கு சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டி என்ன தீர்ப்பு அளித்திருக்கிறதோ அதில் ஒரு அம்சத்தை, அதாவது ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு பயிர் செய்ய அவர்களுக்கு உத்தரவாதம் அளிக்கக்கூடியதை நிரந்தரமாக்கி, மற்ற அம்சங்களையும் சட்டபூர்வமாகக் கொண்டுவந்தால் என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் பரிபூரணமாக அதை நான் ஏற்றுகொள்ளவேன். நம்முடைய மாகாணத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய ஜனங்கள் தற்கால ரீதியில் அதை பரிபூரணமாக வரவேற்பார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு ஓரளவு திருப்தியும் வாழ்க்கை சௌகரியமும் ஏற்படுமென்று சர்க்காருக்கு நான் உணர்த்திக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ஆனால், இன்னொரு விஷயத்தையும் நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதென்பதில் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், அல்லது சாதாரணமாக விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், இன்றிருக்கக்கூடிய நிலையில் இந்தச் சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் ஓரளவுதான் சௌகரியம் செய்திருக்கிறது. இது போதாது. ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஓரளவு விவசாயிகள் அந்த நிலத்திலிருந்து அப்புறப்படுத்தப்படமாட்டார்கள் என்று இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் இருந்தாலும்கூட மிராசதார்கள் அந்த விவசாயிகளை அப்புறப்படுத்துவதற்குப் பலவிதமான சாக்குப் போக்குகளைச் சிருஷ்டிக்க முடியும். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகாரங்களும் சௌகரியங்களும் இருக்கின்றன என்பதைப் பல திருத்தங்கள் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு அறிவிக்கப்படும் அதை சர்க்கார் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாதது வருந்தத்தக்கது. குறிப்பாக, தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விற்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்த சட்டமானது மற்ற எல்லா பகுதிகளிலும் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஏன் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதை என்னால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவில்லை.

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் குடியானவர்களுக்கு ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு உத்தரவாதம் இருக்கின்றது. இன்னும் அடுத்தபடியாக 40% குடியானவர்களுக்குக் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு சிறிய சலுகை இருக்கிறது. திருநெல்வேலி பகுதியிலே, குறிப்பாக என்னுடைய தொகுதியிலே, நீண்டகாலமாக விவசாயிகளின் மத்தியில் ஊழியம் செய்துவந்திருக்கிறேன். அந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் பல கிராமங்களில் விவசாயிகள் யுத்த காலத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட விலைவாசிகள் உயர்வின் காரணமாகவும் வேறு பல காரணங்களினாலும் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்கின்ற வருமானமானது போதவில்லை என்ற காரணத்தால் ஒரு பெரிய விவசாய எழுச்சி தாலாகா முழுவதும் ஏற்பட்டதென்பதை சர்க்கார் அறிந்திருக்கலாம். அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் குறிப்பாக சில பகுதிகளில். சுமார் 3, 4 கிராமங்களில் ஆங்காங்கே மிராசதார்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் மத்தியஸ்தம் செய்து, ஒரு 40% விவசாயிகளுக்கு கிடைக்கும்படியாக ஒரு சமர்தான ஒப்பந்தமாக ஏற்பாடு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். ஆனால், ஒரு ஆண்டு வரையில்தான் அது நிலைத்திருந்தது. அடுத்த ஆண்டில் மிராசதார்கள் பலவிதத்தில் அவர்களுக்கிடையே ஒரு பிளவை உண்டாக்கிக் கொண்டு, கொடுத்த அந்த சலுகையைப் பறித்துக்கொண்டார்கள். ஆகவே, இதைப்பெல்லாம் பார்க்கும்போது, சட்டபூர்வமாக 40% உத்தரவாதம் அளித்திருப்பதை நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் உள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு கிடைக்கும்படிச் செய்தால் விவசாயிகள் வரவேற்கக்கூடியதாக இருக்கும் என்று சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Chokkalingam]

“முக்கியமாக, இன்றைக்கு இது ஓரளவு வரவேற்கப்படுகிறதென்றாலும், சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் ஏற்கனவே கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதியையும், இன்னும் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பல காங்கிரஸ் அபேட்சகர்கள் கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதியையும், இன்றைக்கு இருக்கின்ற சாதாரண உழவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய வகையிலும், அடுத்தபடியாக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கான ஊக்கத்தையும் நம்பிக்கையையும் அளிக்கும் வகையிலும், இன்றைக்கு இதை இன்னும் மாகாணம் முழுவதிலும் விஸ்தரிப்பதோடல்லாமல், சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பைச் சட்டபூர்வமாக அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவை நான் வரவேற்று என்னுடைய பேச்சை இதன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.”

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“அத்யக்ஷ, ఈ శంజాళూరు విల్లుల ప్రధానమైన లక్ష్యము పెన్నుపట్టిని దీని నేను బలపరుచుచున్నాను. ఆయిదే గౌరవ నీయైన ఆనేక మంది సభ్యులు తమ తమ అభిప్రాయాలు తెల్పారు. అందుకు సభ్యులు తెప్పించిన ఒకే ఒక ముఖ్య విషయమున్నది. ఈ విల్లు శంజాళూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే తయారము చేసి ఉండి, రాష్ట్రముంతటకును దీని ప్రవేశమును పొందజేసే ప్రధానమైన యాచన కోరత. దీనిని గురించి ఇంకా నేను ఎవ్వరైనా తెప్పకలిన పని లేదు. ఈ రోజున ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి నేను చేసే విజ్ఞప్తి వివిధమంటే ముఖ్యంగా ఈనాడు యీ agrarian యాసస్సును గురించిన సంగతిని రాష్ట్రముంతటకును వ్యాపించి ఆనేక చోట్ల ఆనేక మైన దుస్సంఘటనలకు దారితీయుచున్నది. ఇది రాష్ట్రములో ప్రధానమైన సమస్యగా పరిణమించినది. ఇప్పటికే యీ యాసస్సునందలి ప్రాంతములలో దూరపుట్టి రైతులు కొలదారు ఆనేకమైన విక్షకులుగా విర్రడి తయారనాచునుండి తెలుగు జిల్లాలకు, రాయలసీమ జిల్లాలనుండి సర్కారు జిల్లాలకు, సర్కారు జిల్లాలనుండి మరొక చోటికి, యీ విధముగా ఒక ప్రాంతమునుండి మరొక ప్రాంతానికి జిల్లువాకిట్ల విడివిడిగా జీవనబృందాలకు వలసపోతున్నారు. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారికి గోచరముగా ఉన్నాయున్నది. ఈ విల్లు ఒక శంజాళూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రము యీ యాసస్సును పరిమితముచేయుచు వర్తించజేసామని ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆశ్చర్యపెట్టి చదవజునేది సమంజసము కాదు. ఈ సమస్య చాలా ప్రధానమైన యాచన. ఇది రాష్ట్రముంతటను వ్యాపించింది. అందుకనే రాష్ట్రములోని అన్ని జిల్లాలలో ఉన్న రైతల ప్రతినిధులతో యీ ప్రతినిధులు యీ విల్లు విషయములో ఆనేక మంది ఆనేక సూచనలు చేసి రాష్ట్రములోని ప్రతినిధుల కనుగుణంగా సవరణలను తెచ్చి ఉన్నారు. ఈ సవరణలు యిచ్చినచో అందుకూడా ఈ విల్లు రాష్ట్రవ్యాపితము చేస్తూనే ఉన్నదో నే సవరణలు ప్రతిపాదించారు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ విల్లుకు రెండవ రీడింగు ఆయిపోయిన తర్వాత దీనిని ఆమోదించకముందు, ఇంకను అన్ని కొన్ని ముఖ్యమైన లక్ష్యాలు తరలి వెళ్లవలసియున్నది. గానెన్ని సమావేశాలో ముగియాలి చేసిన వాగ్దానం మరిచి పోనూడదు. దీని చేసిన వాగ్దానాలయొక్క ప్రధాన లక్ష్యాలను రాష్ట్రముంతటికి వర్తించజేయుకుండా ఒక్క శంజాళూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే ఇప్పుడు వర్తించజేసాము అని సంశ్లేషణచేయునేది సమంజసము కాదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ విల్లు రాష్ట్రములోని కొలదారులకు కాశ్యత జీతాయిలనుకూడా రక్షణ లభ్యము చేయవలసిన యాచన యున్నది. ఇదే చాలా మంది కోరికలుకంటే విషయము. దురిదృష్టవశాత్తు చాశ్యత రక్షణ అనేది ఇక్కడ తరస్కరించడము జరిగింది. ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. రాష్ట్రములో కొలదారు యీ యాసస్సును ఉండి ఎన్ని ఇబ్బందులకు గురిఅగుచున్నారో ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించియు లేదు. పోలి, కాశ్యత రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసినను, ప్రతిఒక్క సభ్యులచేసిన వది సంతకముల రక్షణకుగాను సవరణ ఆమోదించుని కొన

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [3rd December 1952]

సవ్వటికి కనీసము యీ 10 సంవత్సరముల పద్ధతిగూడా కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ వారు అంగీకరించలేదు. అందుకు కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ కార్యదర్శి ఇచ్చినటువంటి సమాధాన మేమిటంటే కాంగ్రెసు ముందు ఎప్పుడో యీ రైతుల విషయములలో కాలిదాని దక్షిణము బిల్లు తెస్తాను, మీకు అందరికీ అంతా చేస్తాము, దీనికొరకు నిరీక్షించుకొని కూర్చున్నట్టి ఆని. కాని 6 సంవత్సరముల ప్రవాళపనిగా ఇంకవరకు నిరీక్షించుకొని కూర్చున్న యీ కాలుదాన్ని ఆకాళింపుంది. నేటికి ఈ పది సంవత్సరముల పరిమిత అయినను కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ అసి తప్పకునే ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించక పోవటము అన్యాయము. అలాగే ప్రభుత్వము కాలుదారులకు అయిదొమ్మి రెండు వతులు ఫలితం నిర్ణయించారు. ఇందుకుగాను ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు జియిఎస్ సి మోడు కురులు వాళ్ళా అనే సవరణ తెచ్చారు. కాని ఇదిగూడా అమోదింపబడలేదు. ఈ విషయములో సుప్రహృద్భం కమిటీవారుగూడా సిఫార్సుచేశారు. వారి సిఫార్సులు విషయము ప్రభుత్వము చాటించలేదు. రైతులకు ఈ కాన్సర్వేషన్ ఇవ్వకపోవటము చాలా అన్యాయము. ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు ఎన్నో విధాల శిరాజ్ గోపాలాకారానియ యీ సిఫార్సులు ఎందుకు నిరాకరించారని ప్రశ్నించగా సమాధానము వారు commit కాదనిన లేదు కాబట్టి పలకకుండా కూర్చున్నారు. కష్టజీవి అయిన రైతులకు కాలుదారులకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వమనేకదా ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులు కోరియున్నారు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఇటువంటి బిల్లును రాష్ట్ర శాస్త్రానికి చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI P. JEEVANANDAM:—“சட்ட மன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே !

***SRI P. JEEVANANDAM:—**“சட்ட மன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே ! இந்த மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக இந்த மன்றத்தில் இப்பொழுது வந்திருக்கிறது. இது வரையில் இதன்மேல் பேசாத நான் இரண்டு வாரத் தைகள் இந்த முறை சொல்வதற்கு நிற்கிறேன்.

“இந்த மசோதாவைப்பற்றி சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ள கனம் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் பேசுகிறபோழுது ஒரு உண்மையைக் கொண்டு வந்தார். அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள நிலைமையைப்பற்றி தஞ்சை ஜில்லா வாகிகளுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். எதிரி தரப்பிலுள்ள கனம் ராமமூர்த்தி, கனம் மணலி போன்றவர்களுக்கும் எனக்கும் மிகவும் நன்றாகத் தெரியுமென்று குறிப்பிட்டார்.

“இந்த மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக சபையின் விவாதத்திற்கும் வரும் இன்றளவும் என்போன்றவர்கள் பலர் பேசவேயில்லை. இருபது: முப்பது ஆண்டுகளாகவே என்போன்றோர்க்கு தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவையற்றிய விஷயங்கள் தெரியும், இருந்தும் கூட இரண்டு தரப்பிலிருந்து பேசிய பலருடைய பேச்சுக்களையும் கேட்டேன், சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து பேசிய கணம் வெங்கட்ராமய்யர், முத்தையா பிள்ளை, நாராயணசாமி நாயுடு போன்றவர்கள் பேசியதையும் கேட்டேன். அதாவது அந்தத் தரப்பு அபிப்பிராயத்தையும் இந்த தரப்பு அபிப்பிராயத்தையும் நான் கேட்டேன். இதை வைத்துக் கொண்டு கணம் வெங்கட்ராமய்யர் என்ன கருதுகிறார்கள். என்பதை மட்டும் சபையின் ஞாபகத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட மசோதாவும் அவர்களால் அடிக்கடி பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட திருத்தங்களும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராசதார் விவசாயிகளிடையே அமைதியை உண்டுபண்ணி உற்பத்தியை அதிகரிக்கச் செய்வலாம். ஆனால், அதே சமயத்தில் இந்தத் தரப்பிலிருந்து எதிர்க்கட்சியிலிருந்து திருத்தங்கள் பிரேரிப்பது எல்லாம் தகராறுகளை வளர்ப்பதற்கு, மிராசதார், விவசாயிகளிடையேயுள்ள உறவு நிலையைக் குலைப்பதற்கு என்பது அவர்கள் அபிப்பிராயம்.

“கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியும், சர்க்காரில் இருக்கின்ற தமிழ் பத்திரிகைகளுக்கெல்லாம் தெரியும். சபையிலுள்ள தமிழங்கத்தினர் களுக்கு எல்லாம் தெரியும் ; ‘மந்திரிக்கமுக வரும் பொருள் உரைத்தல்’ என்ற உண்மை.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

“நாளைக்கு நாட்டில் என்ன நடக்கும் என்பதை இன்றைக்கே உணர்ந்த உணர்ந்தற்கு ஏற்ற வகையில் நடப்பது அவசியம். இந்த மாதிரி எந்த மந்திரியாவது நடந்திருக்கிறார்களா ? 1952-ம் (ஸ்ர) தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலே யுள்ள மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் நிலைமை ரொம்பவும் சீர்கெட்டுப்போய்விட்ட தின் காரணமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்க வேண்டுமென்ப தற்காக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை கொண்டுவரப்படுகின்றது என்று இந்த மசோதா வின் பாயிரம் கூறுகிறது. மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது என்பதை 1946-ம் (ஸ்ர)த்திலேயே உணர்ந்திருக்க வேண்டாமா ? வரும்படித் தாங்களோ நிலச் சீர்திருத்தக் கமிட்டியின் அறிக்கை சமர்ப்பிக்கப் பட்டவுடன் ஏற்றப்பட்ட கொடூர நிலவெளியேற்றத்தைக் கண்டபொழு தாவது மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலைமை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது. ரொம்பவும் சீர்குலைந்து போய்விடும் என்று எதிர்பார்த்தார்களா ? அதிலும் காங்கிரஸின் துணைகள் போன்ற வானடையார், வடபாதி மங்கலம், குன்னியூர் ஐயர் இவர்களெல்லாம் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களை அப்பொழுதே அம் மாதிரி செய்யப்படாமல் தடுத்திருந்தால் இன்றைய தினம் இந்த விவசாயப் பண்ணையார் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதா கொண்டுவர நேர்ந்திருக்குமாவென்று கேட்கிறேன் ? அப்படி அப்பொழுது செய்யவில்லை. அந்தத் தவறல் இன்றைய தினம் ஏற்பட்டுப்போன ஒரு நிலைமையைச் சமாளிக்கக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டதுதான் இந்தச் சட்டம்; இது தப்பைத் திருத்திக்கொள்ளும் ஒரு செயலே தவிர இனிமேல் என்ன வரப்போகின்றது என்பதை உணர்ந்து எடுக் கப்பட்ட நடவடிக்கையல்ல : அதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். இன்றைய தினம் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென நாங்கள் திருத்தம் கொடுக்கும்போது அது எப்படி தகராறை வளர்க்கும் என்று கனம் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் சொல்வாரா ?

“ ஔவையார் சொன்னார்கள் : ‘சோழவன் நாடு சோழமுடைத்து’ என்பதாக. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா நமது மாகாணத்தின் நெற் களஞ்சியமென நான் பையனாக இருந்தபோதே படித்திருக்கிறேன். அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லா, தன்னுடைய தேவையோடு இரண்டரை லக்ஷம் டன் அரிசியை உபரியாக பிற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு அனுப்பி வைத்திருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் அந்த ஜில்லாவின் உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்குக் காரணம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிாசதார், விவசாயிகளின் உரவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதான். ஆகவே, அதைச் சமாளிக்கவேண்டும். அதற்கு ஒரு சட்ட வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இதைக்கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவின் பிரிவுகளையும், திருத்தங்களையும் விவசாயப் பண்ணையான நலனை முக்கியப்படுத்தித்தான் ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்க வேண்டும். சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து எதிர்க்கட்சியார் பிரேரித்த திருத்தங் கள் எல்லாம் நல்லுறவைப்பாதித்து குழப்பத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துமென அபிப்பிராயமுள்ளவர்கள் எல்லாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“இது பண்ணையாள் பாதகாப்புச் சட்டம், விவசாயிகள் பாதகாப்புச் சட்டம், மிராசுதாரர்கள் பாதகாப்புச் சட்டமல்ல. ஆகையால் சர்க்கார் தரப்பா ராலேயே குழப்பத்தை அடக்க சட்டம் கொண்டுவராமல் முடியவில்லை. சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்னும்பொழுது தோல்வியை ஒப்புக்கொண்டுவிட்டார்கள் என்றே யாகிறது. அதோடு சர்க்கார் தரப்பு வெங்கடராமய்யர் பேசும்பொழுது முன்பு ‘தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 20% தான் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. இப்பொழுது சட்டத்தால் 40% வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படும். 20% வாங்கிய இடத்திற்கு சர்க்கார் 40% தரவேண்டுமென சட்டம் போடும்பொழுது எந்திரப்பார் 60% தர வேண்டுமென சொல்வது அமைதியைக் காக்கவா’ என்று கேட்டார்; ‘60% தரவேண்டுமென சொல்வது நியாயமா?’ என்று கேட்கிறவர் இது வரையில் 20% கொடுத்த வந்தோம் என்று தங்களுடைய சுரண்டல் கொள்கையை ஒப்புக் கொண்டுவிட்டார். நாங்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 60% கொடுக்கவேண்டும். சுப்பி மணியம், தமிழியாரின் சிபார்சுப்படி 55% கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறோம். இப்படிச் சொல்வது தகராறை உண்டுபண்ணுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார். நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யப்போகிறோம், என்று பறைசாற்றி

[Sri P. Jeevanandam] [3rd December 1952]

கொண்டது காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியிலேயா? சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியை அமைத்திருக்கிறோம். அதன் சிபார்சை செய்யப்போகிறோமென்று தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பிரசாரம் செய்யவில்லையா? அதேசபார்களை எங்கள் பக்கத்திலிருந்து சொன்னால் அமைதியை சூலிக்கவேண்டு கருதுவது?

“கடைசியாகச் சொல்லுகிறேன். ஒரே ஒரு வார்த்தை. மசோதாவிற்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட பல திருத்தங்கள் நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன. விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்குப் போதுமான அளவு பாதுகாப்பு இல்லை. பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு மனைக்கட்டு உரிமையில்லை. அதோடு இதை எல்லா இடத்திற்கும் விஸ்தரிக்கவேண்டுமென்ற திருத்தம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப்போல குண்டூரிலும், கிருஷ்ணாவிலும் இதேபோல மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களிலும் உறவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்கும்பொழுதே இச்சட்டத்தை விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் தஞ்சையைவிட மிக மோசமாக அவைகளிலும் விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் கிளர்ச்சி நடக்கும். சட்டத்தை

*SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU:—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! இந்தச் சட்டம் கடைசி முறையாக விவாதிக்கப்படுகின்ற நிலைமையைக் கண்டு நான் மட்டற்ற மகிழ்ச்சியை அடைகிறேன். பென்ற ஐந்தாறு வருஷகாலமாக இந்தமாதிரியானதோர் சட்டத்தை இயற்றவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தில் மந்திரிசபை இருக்கும் இந்தத் திக்கை நோக்கியே மக்களை ஊக்கிவந்தவன் நான் என்ற முறையிலும் சந்தோஷம் அடைகிறேன். பிரசித்திபெற்ற மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தத்தின் நமது சில ஷரத்துக்களை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டதற்கும் அந்த ஒப்பந்தத்தின் ஆதி கிறேன். இந்தச் சட்டம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டு வளர்ந்து கொண்டிருந்த அநீருப்தியை மற்றவிடது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக மாத்திரம் இதை நான் வரவேற்கவில்லை. இந்தத் துறையிலே இது தான் முதன்முயற்சி. ரயில்வேயில் வேலை செய்துகொண்டிருந்தவர்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். Facing point என்று கொண்டிருக்கும் ரயில்வண்டித்தொடரை, அடுத்த லயனில் மாற்றிவிட வானத்தை வைத்து அடுத்த வினாடியில் திருப்பி விட்டுவிடுவார்கள். அந்த அபாரமானதொரு காரியத்தைப் போலவே தான் இன்றையதினம் பத்திலே, தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளையும், மிராசதாரர்களையும், கிருஷ்ணம், இன்றையதினம் வரையிலும் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாகச் செய்திருக்க அதிகமாகப் புறக்கணிக்கப்பட்டு வந்த விவசாயப்பெரு மக்களுக்குச் சட்டத்தோர், அபார செய்கையாகும். மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தம் தான் அந்தத் ஒப்பந்தத்தின் வெற்றியேதான் இன்றையதினம் இந்தச் சட்டசபையில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளின், பண்ணையாட்களின் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு அடிப்படையாக இருந்தது. அந்த வேலையை குறிக்கோள்களும் ஒன்றாகவே இருக்கவேண்டும். எந்த இடத்திலும் மிராசதாரர்கள், விவசாயிகளிடையே பூசல்கள் உண்டாக்கி விவசாய ஏதேனும் ஏற்பட்டால் அதை வளரவிடாமல் தடுப்பதற்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. இது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானதோர் சட்டமாகும். ஆகவே உணவு உற்பத்தியை பாதிக்கக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு இனி டியாகும் மிகவும் அவசியம். அப்படி அமைதியான முறையிலே, புதிய தான் முறையிலே, புதிய உற்சாகத்தோடு விவசாயிகள் பாடுபட்டு உழைத்தார்களேயானால் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தி மிகவும் பெருகும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் ‘மூட நெய் பெய்து முழங்கை வழி வார, கூடி யிருந்து’ உழவர், உரிமையாளர் எல்லோரும் ஆனந்தமாக உண்ணக் கிட்டுவது உழவர், உரிமை நிச்சயம் உண்டாக்கப்படும். அதில் ஐயம் கூடிய ஒரு கூட்ச நிலைமை நாளாக மிராசதாரர்கள், விவசாயிகள் வேண்டியதில்லை. இவ்வளவு நாளாக மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்து கொண்டே இருக்கின்றனவே ஏற்பட்ட பூசல் மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்து கொண்டே யிருக்கும் என்று யாரும் கவலைப்படவேண்டியதில்லை.

“போய் பிழையும், புகுதருவான் நின்றனவும்; தீயினில் தூசாகும்,” 5 டி. என்பதைப்போல சென்ற கால பிழைகளும் இனி ஏற்படும் பிழைகளும் அவைகள் யாவும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் நிச்சயமாக மறைந்து அழிந்து போகும். ஆதலினாலே புதிய பூசல்களை, பிரச்சனைகளை கிளப்பி விடாமல், வெகு ஜாக்கூதமாக இந்த உழவர் உரிமையாளர் இருசாராரும் நம் நாட்டு விவசாய உணவு உற்பத்தியில் அமைதியாக ஈடுபட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கும் படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிச்சயமாக நல்ல பலன் கிடைக்கும். ஆனால் அப்பொழுதுதான் நிச்சயமாக நல்ல மிராசதாரர்கள் எல்லோரும் ஒரு சங்கிலியில் குடந்தையில் கூடிய மிராசதாரர்கள் எல்லோரும் ஒரு அறிக்கை விடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் காலத்தான் அவர்களுக்கு அவர் களுடைய செய்கை சரியானதா, தப்பானதா என்பதை காலம் அவர் கொள்ளும்படி செய்யவேண்டும். நிச்சயமாக அந்தக் காலம் அவர் கொள்ளும்படி தெளிவையும், புதிய அறிவையும் கொடுக்கும்மென்றே நான் நம்புகிறேன். அவர்கள் ஏதோ தங்களுக்கு பலத்த சக்தியிருப் பதாக எண்ணி, தங்களால் இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கப்போகிறோம் என்பதாக நிறுமாந்து, வரிக்கொடா இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கப்போகிறோம் என்பதாக வெல்லாம் ஐந்து கண பூச்சாண்டி காணப்பிப்பதில் பயனில்லை. இந்த ஈர்க்கார் அந்த மாதிரியான பூச்சாண்டியைக் கண்டு பயப்பட்டுவா னாஜாஜி ஈர்க்கார் அந்த மாதிரியான பூச்சாண்டியைக் கண்டு பலிக்காது. சட்டம் இல்லை. இந்த சர்க்காரிடம் அவர்கள் பாச்சா எதுவும் பலிக்காது. சட்டம் இல்லாத பிறகும் மிராசதாரர்கள் பல புதிய புதிய தொல்லைகளை எழுப்பிக் கொண்டிருக்கவிடாமல் செளஜன்யமான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுடன் ஒற்றுமையாய் வேலை செய்து உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கும்படியாக ஒற்றுமையாய் வேலை செய்து கண்காணித்து கொண்டேயிருக்கவேண்டும். இன் ஈர்க்கார் எப்பொழுதும் ஜெயமா, மிராசதாரர்களுக்கு ஜெயமா என்பது பிரச் னைக்கு உழவர்க்கு ஜெயமா, மிராசதாரர்களுக்கு ஜெயமா என்று பார்த்து மார்தட்டிக் கிளையல்ல. எந்தத்தரப்பிற்குச் ஜெயம் என்று பார்த்து அதிகப்படுத்தி கொண்டிருப்பது தோல்வியுற்ற தரப்பாரின் கோபத்தை அதிகப்படுத்தி வதோடு மாத்திரம் அல்ல, எதிர்த்தரப்பாருக்கு கிடைத்தவெற்றியி னால் ஏற்படப்படுகின்ற பலனை ஏற்படமுடியாதபடி செய்யத்தான் வேண்டு மென்ற மன உணர்ச்சியை இயற்கையிலேயே இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும் ஊட்டும். ஆகவே இன்றையதினம் இருதரப்பாரின் கொள்கைகளும் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணம்தான். இதில் கொள்கைவேற்றுமை இருக்க அவசியமில்லை. இதற்கானதோர் சூழ் நிலையை ஈர்க்கார் உருவாக்கவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நிலைமை சீர் பட்டது. இந்த மாதிரியானதோர் நிலைமை மற்ற இடங்களில் ஏற் றும் பட்டது. இந்த மாதிரியானதோர் கொள்கைகளும், எங்களை தாராளமாக யடியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். எங்களை தாராளமாக வினியோகம் செய்யவேண்டும். நல்ல நஞ்சை பூமியில் வாழை, கரும்பு போன்ற தானியங்களைப் பயிரிடாமல் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். ஆக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கு என்னென்ன ஏற்பாடுகளையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்வதற்கு என்னென்ன ஏற்பாடுகள் தென்துடைய தேவை போக மிக மிக அதிகமான தானியத்தை வெளி தன்னுடைய தேவை போக மிக மிக அதிகமான தானியத்தை வெளி நாட்டிற்கு ஒரு காலத்தில் ஏற்றுமதி செய்து கொண்டிருந்திருக்கிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் தாராள கொடை மனப்பான்மையையும், வளத்தையும், தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் தாராள கொடை மனப்பான்மையையும் ஏற்பட்டிருந்த நாகரீகம், செழிப்பையும், வெள்ளாமைமையையும், மக்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டிருந்த நாகரீகம், செய்வ உணர்ச்சி போன்றவற்றின் சிறப்பையும் பாடாத புனைவர்கள் சில, தெய்வ உணர்ச்சி போன்றவற்றின் சிறப்பையும் பாடாத புனைவர்கள் சில, எனக்கு இப்பொழுது ஒரு பாடல் கவனத்திற்கு வருகிறது.

‘ஈதலும்பல கோலாலுழையும்
ஓத லும்குண ஆசார நீதியும்
ஈரமுக்குரு சோத சேவையும் மறவாத
எழ்த லம்புகழ் காவேரி யால் வினை
சோழ மண்டல மீதே,’ என்பதாக அவர் பாடியிருக்கிறார்.

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [3rd December 1952]

மற்றைய ஜில்லாவாசிகளான எனது நண்பர்கள் இன்றையதினமும் சோழமண்டலம் இப்படியிருப்பதாக யாரும் கருதக் கூடாது. இன்றைய தினம் ஈதலோ, ஓதலோ, நீதியோ, சேவையோ எதுவும் கிடையாது. வறுமைதான் எல்லோரிடையும் மிஞ்சிக்கிடக்கிறது. அரைபடி நெல்லுக்கு தகராறு போட்டுக்கொண்டு இன்றையதினம் ஆறு கோட்டுகள் ஏறியிருக்கிறோ கிறார்கள். இனங்கள் எல்லாம் உண்மையில் மறைந்தாகவேண்டும். நாட்டின் உண்மை நிலைம் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும்படியாகச் செய்ய வேண்டும். நான் படித்தகாலத்தில் ஒரு விஷயம் கவனித்திருக்கிறேன். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை. “சோழநாட்டு நெற்களஞ்சியம்,” என்பதாக அழைத்தார்கள். சொல்லிக்கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். தன் ஜில்லாவின் தேவையைமாத்திரம் அது பூர்த்தி செய்து கொள்ளவில்லை. மற்றும்பல ஜில்லாக்களின் தேவைகளையும் பூர்த்தி செய்ததால்தான் அதற்கு இந்தப் பெயர் வற்புண்டு. விவசாய, மிராசு, ஆகிய இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும்தான் ஊக்கம் குன்றிற்று. பூசல்கள் அதிகமாயிற்று. சோம்பேறித்தனமும், சுயநல நோக்கமுமே அதிகமாக வளர்ந்து விட்டது. அவைகள் எல்லாவற் றையும் ஒரு அதிர்ச்சிபை போல இந்தச் சட்டம் ஒரு தாக்கு தாக்கிவிட்டது. புதிய விழிப்பு, புதிய ஊக்கம் இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும் இப்பொழுது காணப் படுகிறது. ஆகவே விவசாய வளர்ச்சியைக் கருத்தில் கொண்டு இருவரும் பாடுபடும்படியாகச் செய்யவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டம் உழவருக்கு மிகவும் உதவியாக இருக்கும்படிச் செய்யவேண்டும். பல இடங்களில் பலமுள்ள மிரசுதார்கள் ஏழை விவசாயிகளை நசுக்கிவிடத்தான் பார்ப்பார்கள். அங்கே யுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு காட்டுவதைப்போல பலமிகக் விவசாயி காளால் மிராசுதார்களின் நலனும் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி அவர்கள் உரி மையை அவர்கள் அடையும்படி பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தால் பலவிடங்களிலும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு மிகவும் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. பெரிய குத்தகைக்காரராக இருந்தும்கூட நண்பர் சம்பந் தச்சைப் போன்றவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் குத்தகை ஒழியவேண்டுமென்று பேசுவதைக் கேட்டு மிகவும் அவர்களைப் பாராட்டுகிறேன். பலர் இம்மாதிரி இன்றையதினம் விவசாயிகளுடைய நண்பர்களாகப் பேசுவதைக் குறித் தும் மகிழ்ச்சி அடைகிறேன். இவைகளையெல்லாம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர் களின் வெற்றிக்கு அறிகுறியென்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் பல குறைகள் இருப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அந்த குறைகள் எல்லாம் நிச்சயமாக நடைமுறையில் வரும்பொழுது நிவர்த்தி செய்யப்படுமென நம்புகிறேன். அதோடு மிராசதாரீன், விவசாயிகள், பண்ணையாட்கள் இவர்களிடையே புதியதொரு ஊக்கத்தை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டும். யார் மிக அதிகமாக உற்பத்தி செய்கிறாரோ அவருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்க வேண்டும். எவ்வளவு நிலத்தில் பயிரிட்டார்கள், செலவு என்ன, என்பதையெல்லாம் வைத்தக் கொண்டு மிகக் குறைந்த நிலத்தில் யார் மிக அதிகமாக சாகுபடி செய்கிறாரோ அவருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்கவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தோடு அந்தமாதிரியாகவும் சீர்திருத்தங்கள் வந்தால் நிச்சயமாக மிகவும் அதிகமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்யப்படும்.

“ மிரசுதார்களின் சலசலப்புக் கண்டு இந்தச் சர்க்கார் அஞ்சாது என்று நான் கருக்கிறேன். ஆகையால் தைரியமாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாய மக்களின் நலனில் அக்கறையுடைய ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்ததற்காக நான் விவசாயப் பெருமக்கள் சார்பாக கணம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும், ரெவின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும், இந்தச் சபையினுள்ளோர் களுக்கும் எனது நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

[illegible]

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

എന്നാൽ 'ഓഡിയോവിഷ്ണു' കൗതുകപാത്രം കണ്ടുപോൽ' എന്നു പറയുന്നവേലം ഈ തത്ത്വവും സിദ്ധിനെ പററിയുള്ള ഗവർണ്ണമെന്റിന്റെ നിലപാടു കണ്ടുപോൾ വരാനിരിക്കുന്ന മലബാർ കടിയായു മേടഗതി നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഓഡിയോപററി 'കളം' എന്ന ഒരു വാക്കുകൊണ്ടു അതിനിട്ടു കളയേണ്ടിയിരിക്കും എന്നു ന്യായമായി സംശയിക്കേണ്ടതല്ല. ആൻ ഇത്രയും പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം വളരെ പ്രധാനമായ ഉപയോക്താക്കൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നതുകൊണ്ടാണ് ഈ നിയമം അല്ലാതെ; partial, experimental, temporary എന്നുള്ള വാക്കുകൾ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു തള്ളിക്കളയുകയും, ബില്ലിന്റെ ജീവശ്വാസത്തെ വെട്ടിത്തുറക്കുകയും ചെയ്തു എന്നുള്ളു മാരകമായിരിക്കുന്നു. തത്ത്വവ്യതിരിക്ത കടിയോടും ജന്മിമാരും തമ്മിലുള്ള ബന്ധത്തിൽ അല്പം അധവാനുള്ള restore ചെയ്യുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയാണ് നാല്പത്തിയഞ്ചി ഈ നിയമം കൊണ്ടുവന്നതു എന്നു പറയുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഏതൊരു നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശ്യം അതു അദ്ധ്വാനിക്കുന്ന കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു അവർ ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന ഉല്പാദനം അനുഭവിക്കുവാനുള്ള അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നും ഭൂമിയുടെ മേൽ അവനെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നാണ്. ഇതു രണ്ടും വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഈ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ടു കടിയന്മാർക്കു സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഒരു ഉദാഹരണം, Sir, ആൻ പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളട്ടെ. ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വതമായ അവകാശം കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഒന്നാണ് ആയുർ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരുന്നത്. അത് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ തള്ളിവേക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്യതു്. പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കുവേണ്ടി ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ നൂറുവന്മാരുടെ പന്യകയാണു്: അഞ്ചു രാജ്യമെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കുക, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ സത്യ വീര്യമുള്ളതെങ്കിലും പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കു കൊടുക്കണം. അതുവെല്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അഞ്ചു വീര്യമുള്ളവർക്കു കൊടുക്കുക എന്നായി. ഈ ആവശ്യം പോലും നിരസിച്ചപ്പോൾ ഒരു വീര്യമുള്ള അവർ കൊടുക്കണം എന്ന് ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അതുപോലെ നിങ്ങൾ കടിയന്മാർക്കു സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കുകയില്ലെങ്കിൽ പാവപ്പെട്ട കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു പത്തു കൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നാണ് ആയുർ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടതു്. എത്രയും തിരവും ന്യായവുമായ ഈ ആവശ്യം കൂടി നിഷ്കാരണം തള്ളിക്കളയുകയാണു് ചെയ്യതു്. സാധു കൃഷിക്കാർ അവരുടെ അവകാശങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടി പോരാടിയപ്പോൾ കോൺഗ്രസ്സും ഹിന്ദു മുന്നേറ്റം എന്നിവരും പറയാറുണ്ടു്: ഇതു കമ്മ്യൂണിസ്റ്റുകാരുടെ പ്രക്ഷോഭമാണു്, ഹിന്ദു യാണു് എന്നൊക്കെ. പക്ഷെ പത്തുകൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും ഭൂമിയിൽ സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അതിന്നു എതിരായി വോട്ടുചെയ്തു, കടിയന്മാർ അവന്റെ ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വത അവകാശം ഉല്പാദനം ചെയ്യുവാൻ വോട്ടു ചെയ്തു് മറ്റും ഹിന്ദു മെമ്പർമാരെയും മറ്റും മലബാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ നേരിടുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കും. ഇതു അവർ മറക്കുകയില്ല എന്നു ആൻ പ്രഖ്യാപിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടെ. മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു പോരാടിയ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ അതിന്റെ അനുഭവം ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇതു തെളിയിക്കുന്നതു കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ സംസ്ഥാനീയമേന്മയോളം സ്ഥാപിത താല്പര്യങ്ങളെ സംരക്ഷിച്ചുപോരുന്ന ഈ ഗവർണ്ണമെന്റ് സംഘടിപ്പിക്കുകയോ അവരുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടി അതോ അറും വോൾട്ടീസിന്റെ കീഴിൽ യാതൊന്നും ചെയ്യുവാൻ പോകുന്നില്ല എന്നതാണു്. ഇതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയാണു് സംസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിലേക്കും ഈ നിയമം വ്യാപിപ്പിക്കണം എന്നു ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ അതു് സംഭവ്യമല്ല എന്നു പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം. ഏതായാലും ഈ ലൈക്കിംഗ് വേളയിലെങ്കിലും ഇങ്ങനെയൊരു ബില്ലിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു മേന്മയോളം ആണു മൂലത അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ അറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കെ വരാനിരിക്കുന്ന മലബാർ കടിയായു മേടഗതി ബിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശങ്ങളും ഭൂമിയിലുള്ള സ്ഥിരാവകാശവും അനുഭവിക്കുവാൻ ഉള്ള ഒരു ഹൃദയം ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നു സവിനയം അറിയിക്കുവാൻ ആൻ ഈ അവസരം ഉപയോഗിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടെ !"

* SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ సందర్భము 5-10

విల్పమైన అనేకమంది అనేక సవరణలు పెట్టి మాట్లాడారు. అయితే వాటికి ఎంత ప్రాముఖ్యత నిచ్చారు! అనే విషయాన్ని అభ్యసించినట్లయితే ఒకదానికొకదా తగినటువంటి ప్రాముఖ్యతను ఇవ్వకపోగా, వాటిని చాలా అవమానకరంగా చూచారని నేను అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా ఉదాహరణకు మా శబ్దమ గోదావరి జిల్లా కువిజయములూ తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు కొంచెము హెచ్చుతక్కువగా సమపాలికగా, అదే పరిస్థితులు కలిగిఉన్నది. అలాంటిప్పుడుకూడా ఈ చట్టాన్ని ఆ జిల్లాకు వర్తపచేయ లేదు. మా జిల్లానుంచి ఈ విజయమును గుర్తించమని అనేక కిటీకనులు తెలు

[Sri B. Lakshminarasu Raju]

[3rd December 1952]

శాస్త్రుడు. కాని, వాటికి ఏమీకూడ సరియైనటువంటి సమాధానము ఇచ్చినట్లు లేదు. అక్కడ పరిస్థితులను చూచినట్లయితే, ఉదాహరణకు, 1949 లో ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రములో వచ్చినటువంటి cyclone గురించి పంటలుపోయి అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి రైతులు చాల ఇబ్బందులకు పాలైతారు. పంటలు పోవుటచే చాలామంది రైతులు చివరకు గ్రామాలలో వాళ్ళకు ఉన్నటువంటి అస్సినీ చిన్న చిన్న వస్తువులు పూసలు పువ్వులు మొదలుకొని అన్నిటిని అమ్మించి కోర్టులలో డిక్రీలు పొందారు యీనానందారులు. అక్కడ రైతులు అవిధముగా ఎన్ని కష్టములు పడుతున్నప్పటికీ ఇప్పుడు ఈ తంజావూరు Ordinance మా జిల్లాకుకూడ వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందని వారు గత కష్టాలన్నీంటిని మరచిపోయి ఆ రైతులు ఎంతో ఆనందిస్తున్నారు. వారి ఆశలన్నీ ఈ రోజుకో నిరాశరై పోయే పరిస్థితి వచ్చింది. అందుచేత ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఈ రిజ్ల్యూను సాధ్యమైనంత వరకు ఇతర జిల్లాలకును, ముఖ్యంగా పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లాలోంటివాటికి తప్పక వర్తింపజేసిట్లుగానైనా చూడాలని కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుచున్నాను."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Ordinance was first issued, I was one of those who welcomed it for certain of its provisions, namely, the provisions relating to the security of tenure. Of course, Sir, I do not like legislation by Ordinance but all the same, when it was once issued and it had a good provision giving security of tenure to the tenants who never had such benefit for centuries, I thought it was a good thing to that extent. Subsequently when it was announced that legislation would be introduced, I thought that legislation would be introduced to make it applicable to the whole State and I did not imagine that legislation will be introduced merely to regularize the Ordinance because, Sir, as you are aware, under the present Constitution no law is necessary to regularize an Ordinance and an Ordinance has got a certain period of life and if they want to make a general law, then general legislation could be introduced. But, Sir, unfortunately it has not been so done. You have heard from both sides of the House that several Members were anxious to have legislation applicable to the whole State. It is true that there is difference of opinion with regard to certain aspects, namely, with regard to sharing of produce and also the period of tenancy right. Some are inclined to give permanent occupancy right straightway and some are not willing to do so on the ground that it will amount to expropriation and so, this has to be very carefully looked into. You are aware, Sir, in the discussion of the clauses relating to that subject, there was more or less general agreement that at least a ten-year period of security must be given to the tenants and I really hoped that the Government would agree to that at least in respect of Tanjore so that hereafter they could come forward with a Bill which is applicable to the whole State. At that time, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister observed that if I gave him a Bill, he would consider it and you remember, Sir, that I told him that I would give the Bill. May I tell the Hon. the Chief Minister now, Sir, that I have given notice of a Bill already and I have handed it over to the office and if the Speaker is good enough and if the Hon. the Chief Minister is willing enough, he will please give me an opportunity to enable me to move for the first reading of the Bill tomorrow because tomorrow is a non-official day. Also, Sir, it is a formal

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

matter. I do not go to the very extreme, although desirable, step with which there is no general agreement and I am making a provision for a ten-year period of security as a temporary measure pending further agrarian legislation.

" Sir, I need not go into further details. I only hope the various clauses which are unduly weighted against the tenants will not be harshly worked. I also hope, Sir, that not merely the behaviour of the tenants but also the behaviour of the landlords will be such that clause 10 of the Bill will not be put into effect and there will be no need to go to the Revenue Divisional Officer or to the Conciliation Officer with applications for eviction. I hope, Sir, after this Bill there will be some contentment and if in the working of the measure the spirit with which the provisions are made are observed by the landlords and also the officers concerned, I hope the penal clauses of the Bill and the eviction clauses will not be put in operation. I hope that the best of luck will befall the tenants of Tanjore and I wish Godspeed to the Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to say not very much because the Bill has been discussed threadbare at every stage and I do not think there is any point remaining for further explanation or elucidation. We can only deal with the general prospect before us as a result of this legislation. On the one hand, I have been reading in the newspapers, as was referred to by some of the previous speakers, that landowners of Tanjore, at any rate landholders of certain parts of the district, have met and have expressed their severe displeasure in regard to certain provisions incorporated in the Bill and they have gone so far as to use pretty minatory language and they have said they will have to resort to methods followed for attaining the independence of the country. I am, however, not much disturbed by such threats. I am only grieved at the spirit behind such language. On the other hand, Mr. Ramamurthi is here and he says that there is no reason whatsoever for him after the passage of the Bill to wind up his agitation. And so, I was ruminating over the prospect. On the one hand landowners are thoroughly dissatisfied—I do not wish to minimise their dissatisfaction because it is a fact that they are thoroughly dissatisfied—nobody will deny that; it is not merely pretence. It is not merely a sort of strategy or anything like that; they are thoroughly dissatisfied. On the other hand, I must take it at full value what has been said in front of me here by Mr. Ramamurthi: he is not going to wind up his agitation. Not that I ever believed that the party which he represents will wind up its agitation; it is an international organization with a long life and with a history behind it of a series of events and programmes and it could not be wound up by the Tanjore Tenants Protection Bill. Their agitation is only a part of their general attitude to life and to Government; it is not only a part but a temporary phase. What I mean by this description is that this is not what they stand for and what they ask for here is not what they stand for.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

5-20
p.m.

" Sir, I know their philosophy fairly well—may be not so much as ardent and loyal members of the Party like Mr. Venkateswarlu and others do. They do not believe in the magic of property to which the old economists were wedded. When they argue now that the permanent interest in the land should be given to A or B or C or a tenant or whosoever it may be, in order that he may improve it and look after it well, they are talking only my language or the language of the Right and not of the Left. Really their doctrine is that property is not necessary, it is not essential and it is an illusion. They depend upon public interest, upon patriotism, upon general economic laws and the class struggle. They do not depend upon the magic of property. Yet, as a temporary phase, Mr. Ramamurthi unabashedly says, we must give an interest to any man if he is to look after production, to look after cultivation and the like. It is not that I do not like it. For the time being he agrees with me on that aspect of life. But that is not their final opinion. So, I say, the prospect is, on the one hand, the landowners are saying that this is a war upon them and Rajaji is in Ramamurthi's pocket and he has handed himself over, body and soul, to the Communists and that Ramamurthi, in fact, drafted this Bill and I have only adopted it by '*sweekaram*' and therefore their life is at stake and they must fight to death. On the other hand, at the end of all this trouble, Mr. Ramamurthi gives me the cheering information that they will continue their agitation. The whole object of my endeavour was not to kill any particular doctrine. Not that I believe that any doctrine could be stopped in this manner but I had hoped for calm, I had hoped for peace but he denies me that. And yet I know that in all our legislative and other efforts, really we make a great deal of noise while we are involved in it. But life will go on, apart from this legislation and apart from anything else we do. So many things are done in this world. There is a great deal of noise and tumult about it, and debate and discussion and hard swearing, but life goes on by the force of tradition and the force of habit. Luckily for us, in spite of every disturbance, the landowner by force of tradition takes some interest in the land. The cultivators too, by force of tradition and habit take some interest in the land. A man cannot keep quiet and he must work on something. Otherwise he cannot be happy. So, by force of habit and tradition, I believe that the lands in the Tanjore district and elsewhere will continue to be looked after in spite of us, either on this side or on the other side. I do hope, therefore, that in spite of what the mirasidars say at their meetings and in spite of what Mr. Ramamurthi says here, still there is something to protect us all by way of tradition and habit. Orderly life alone gives us happiness. Anything else might give us excitement, a little temporary joy but, what is called happiness will result only from permanent things. I think, the forces of Nature will help us in spite of the discussions that have been going on here. In spite of adverse criticism, Members desire the law to cover the whole State and not only Tanjore. It is curious that Mr. Anthoni Pillai drew a different moral from it for a different purpose. But it gave me continual satisfaction to

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

see Member after Member rising and speaking in various languages, that the Bill should have been extended to the whole of the State. A person might pick holes and make disparaging comments but ultimately when a man comes and says "Give me your daughter's hand", I know he is happy over and likes my 'daughter.' Therefore, I say, that this Bill, in spite of every criticism either on this side or on the other side, is welcomed by all. But, it is said that a mistake has been committed in not extending it to the other parts of the State. I feel an internal satisfaction that they really desire that it should be extended to other districts. So, there is something in my 'daughter.' (Laughter.)

" Sir, I accept the blessings of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition with very great satisfaction and pleasure. He has not only argued and he has not only set out points but he has wound up the debate like a true Brahman and wished good luck and God-speed to this Bill. Let us all disperse this evening saying God-speed to this Bill because it affects the lives of so many people.

" Now, the question is, what have I done and what this Bill proposes to do. Before I go to that, I know that people take sides. Yet I was greatly surprised at the mirasidars' discontent with my proposals. Even leading organs of the Press, whom I may count as my friends for all purposes in general, expressed grave dissatisfaction. Members have spoken here that 40 per cent is not good enough. But one of the most prominent supporters of the nationalist movement in India and one of the foremost newspapers of our land not only of this part of the country, was thoroughly dissatisfied with the proportion that we had adumbrated in the Ordinance itself, viz., two-fifths for the tenants. It was too much, they said, and there is reason for that. Mr. Venkatrama Ayyar pointed out that in most parts of Tanjore, in a large part of Tanjore, in a very important part of Tanjore, in a very fertile part of Tanjore, where land is very costly, where the channels are full of water and where the men are full of intelligence—both in mathematics and other matters they have been paying much less than what this Bill now proposes to give by law to the tenants. Only a fifth was the average in that area but we have doubled it, so to say. As I explained in the earlier phase of the discussion, that has given dissatisfaction both to my friends who do not want to wind up their agitation and to my friends on the landlords' side. The landlords say, 'We were paying only a fifth. Now it is suddenly raised to two-fifths.' Whereas my friends, the non-winders of agitation, say 'You are giving where we agitated only very little above what the people are already being given. You give much where we did not agitate.' I do not want to dilate upon it. I only want to say that people are discontented all round. Yet I hope, the whole of the House will hope for good coming out of the endeavours we are making honestly. I hope, at the end of the debate, my friends on the other side will give us the credit for having honest motives. They began by saying that it was intended

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

to kill this and kill that, but I believe that attitude was only temporary and that at the end of it, we all unanimously believe that we desire to do something well. Only some people think that we might have done more. Some people think that we might have done less. But that does not matter. Let us hope that something will come out of this. I firmly believe that by the force of habits and traditions, men will take interest not only in their land and the welfare of their families but also in the welfare of the people round about them. Ultimately, everything will come all right.

5-30 p.m. "Now what have we done in this Bill? I wish to dwell for a minute on this point. We have reinstated all the tenants who were turned out as a result of disappointed hopes and fears and frustrations after the publication of the Subramaniam Committee Report. We have reinstated all of them. Mr. Ramamurthi and others wanted us to go a stage further. When we referred this Bill to a Select Committee we took time to discuss this matter at some length and it is as a result of that we have given rights of reinstatement up to a certain date back. We have also given them fixity of term. Each term is fixed. The term which till now was one year has been made into a five-year term. The one-year tenant has now become a five-year tenant. Any one let in must be accepted for five years. We have also left no doubt as to his share. We have, I think, on the whole, made provisions here, in this Bill, for a fairly generous distribution of the produce. Some arguments were heard that two-fifths was not enough. Let us improve it later if necessary. Two-fifths is not an eternal fraction. We have put it now. Let us hope it will grow, adjust or alter later; it does not matter. We have begun well and I think not ill. We have provided that the produce, if there would be any dispute about it, shall be divided on the basis of two-fifths to the tenant, and not less favourable than two-fifths. If by any process of adjustment an agreement should be entered into, by which the tenant will get something more, this Bill will not stand in his way.

"It was mentioned that the power of collective bargaining should be retained. Both Mr. Ramamurthi and Mr. Anthony Pillai referred to it. Each referred to it in his own way. They said that we should retain the power to get more from the landowner. By all means let people bargain. But let us have peace. Much has been talked about trade unionism and collective bargaining. Each is intimately associated with the doctrine of property. It is only when Government's hands are off private enterprise that collective bargaining becomes a necessity in order that justice may be secured to the workers as against managements and capitalists. But now we are in the midst of an endeavour to establish a Welfare State where we are entitled to interfere in everything. In the management of production we are entitled to take over property, to control management, to control transport and to control movement, and all that. Therefore the State steps in in order to render justice, and there is democracy to make the State do the right thing. With the State taking care of all enterprises and of

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

production, at any rate, when our creed is that we may interfere in all things, in a Welfare State and with democracy to control the State, collective bargaining becomes an old-fashioned slogan which has to be given up. Trade-unionism has no more place. All that it can do is to create confusion in the minds of the people. It has some place as there is still property and private enterprise."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"They are retiring."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"But there should be some restriction on collective bargaining, and that is the issue of the mixed position in which we are now to-day. There can be what is called collective bargaining but it can be allowed only to the extent it is good for the State."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"It recedes to the extent there is a Welfare State."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"All things grow gradually. It is well known that we stand for a Welfare State. Collective bargaining has lost force as a slogan. It cannot have the force now as it had before. It may remain to supplement our efforts. I hope hon. Members when they work among the agrarian population will remember that a Welfare State is postponed to the extent that peace is disturbed. Welfare State and peace must go together. Otherwise we cannot produce a Welfare State. I must say here what I already said in another place. I think it is worthwhile to repeat it here and so I repeat it here; my Friends will excuse my playing the schoolmaster to some extent. It is this. Communists know that they have not a leg to stand on unless they yoke their doctrines, unless they yoke their policies to hard work, and lay down that every man should work according to capacity and fully. The doctrine of work is no less important to the Communist way of thinking than it is to the Bhagavat Gita way of thinking. Work is an essential duty and an essential condition for success according to the Communist organization. Now can we by slowing down and strikes, by encouraging a habit of not working or working less or ill, by asking the people not to work—can we produce an ideal condition of things? I would like to give here a thought to the Communists to work on. By doing something opposite to what they ultimately want they are postponing the goal to which they are moving. We must at every stage tell the people to work, we must at every stage emphasize the sacredness and the duty of working. Without disturbing that mentality they may do anything else according to their doctrines. Let my friends agitate; I have no objection. But I do not want them to tell anybody not to work, or tell anybody to stop work or slow down work. Provided they follow this advice, I do not mind what other trouble they may bring me or to the Government; I do not mind all that. (Laughter.) Work is essential."

"We have also done some minor things in this Bill. We have said that though it was the custom from time immemorial to debit

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

the entire cost of manuring and all that to the tenant's share, it has become now legalised that the landowner must bear half the cost of manuring expenditure and the tenant only the other half. No doubt this was suggested by the landowners, because they got nothing by putting a load of debt on the tenants; so they said 'let us legitimise this provision.' Mr. Ramamurthi wanted not only that the landowner should bear half the cost but that he should loan the other half to the tenant. I said it was left to them to accommodate as they liked; we cannot make it compulsory that the one should lend and the other should borrow.

"As for the catch crops, Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar has explained that what is given to the landowner is only a trifle; we have given them away almost entirely to the tenant. What is given to the landowner is mere symbolic trifle. The landowner wants *ulundu* and *payaru* for his iddli and other things he wants for his kitchen. It is absurd that a landowner who owns large extents of land, at least according to law, should have to go to the market to buy a little *ulundu* or to buy straw for his cattle. So I said, 'will you be content with one-fifth of the produce.' In this I have not given anything much. It is a trifling thing; the catch crop is grown in between crops and so it does not very much matter even if the tenant took the whole of it. But anyhow we have provided a share in it for the landowner.

"In this Bill something has been done for the landowners and something for the tenants. Much has been done for the pannaiyals, more than for the others. Mr. Vinayakam does not like the word 'pannaiyal.' One who knows Tamil need not object to it. 'Pan' or 'Pannai' means farm, field, cultivation and labour for the farm and 'al' means man. Therefore there is nothing wrong in the word. There is everything good in it just as everything is good in the word 'Pappan.' It is now used to mean a bad fellow. The word 'Pappan' means one who sees, one who can read, one who could explain the scriptures to others, one to whom we go if the calendar should be read, to know when Amnavasai comes, when it is a good day or a bad day and all that. It means 'one who sees.' But now it has come to mean the hated Brahman. The meaning of words changes according to conduct. Luckily the pannaiyal has not done anything wrong; he has not changed. Let not anybody object to it. It means no more than when one is called a bicycle man or a coachman or a postman. Pannaiyal is only a 'field man' or 'cultivation man.' There is nothing wrong in the word 'pannaiyal.' His position has been considerably strengthened in this Bill. He cannot be dismissed; he can take the landlord to court if he is dismissed, the tenant also may be taken to court if his pannaiyal is dismissed. His wages are fixed and made liberal.

5.40 p.m. "There is nothing wrong in any of the provisions and nobody has commented adversely on these points. He has got security of service. Apart from non-dismissal, there is the provision that he has to get twelve full months' notice before he can be sent away.

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

He has full twelve months ending with the agricultural year so that he can find his occupation elsewhere. So far as the pannaiyals are concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that this law has done well by them. As regards the tenants, it is a thing yet to be seen how co-operation will proceed. If my hopes are fulfilled there would be co-operation. Let me tell my Communist Friends, 'By all means do not wind up your agitation but I would request you not immediately to open the bag. Allow the Bill to have full play.' It is easy to create trouble. There is no difficulty. One man can create trouble among fifty or a hundred people. It is difficult to put down trouble because in the process of putting down trouble much other trouble arises. So, nobody wants to put down trouble by force. I hope that all Members will join and follow the lead of the Leader of the Opposition who is leading the United Democratic Front and I also hope that with the Leader, the rest also will say 'God-speed' to the Bill. Sir, this is all that I wish to say and I hope the House will accept the Bill unhesitatingly and without any mental demur."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be passed into law.'

The motion was carried *nem. con.* and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE INDIAN REGISTRATION (MADRAS AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

"It is a very simple matter. There were disputes between the French and British Governments as to which of them possessed sovereign jurisdiction over the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam. The British Government had asserted their sovereign jurisdiction over the loges in unmistakable terms. But documents relating to the properties in the loges have in some cases been registered in French registration offices as the parties concerned were under the mistaken impression that the French authorities had jurisdiction over the loges. As the loges have been specifically included in the territory of India by a Statutory Order of the Government of India (S.O. No. 6, dated the 23rd March 1948), it is considered desirable to permit these documents to be re-registered under the Indian Registration Act, 1908 (XVI of 1908), free of all charges, so that they may be admitted in evidence in Indian courts. Sub-section (1) of new section 23-B inserted by the Bill makes provision accordingly; and sub-section (2) provides for the application of sub-section (1) to other French Indian areas adjoining Madras territory, in respect of which similar difficulties may be experienced in future."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

"That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to have certain clarifications on this Bill. Why were these documents registered in French registration offices as the loges were specifically included in the territory of India by a Statutory Order of the Government of India in 1948 and why is it that the Government have not taken steps to get those documents registered in India? I also wish to know whether the French authorities have violated international law by getting such documents which ought to be registered in Indian territory, registered in French registration offices and what steps the Government of India have taken in this respect? I want a clarification on these points from the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" Sir, it was a genuine mistake because these patches of land were in the midst of French territory and the documents were registered by mistake in French registration offices. It would put the people concerned into great difficulty unless these documents are re-registered in Indian territory and that is the reason for bringing forward this Bill. We have also taken the permission of the Government of India for introducing this Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

"That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once."

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" We shall now take up the consideration of the Bill clause by clause."

Clause 2.

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Sir, I beg to move—

"That in clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c) omit the sentence
"and if any document is so registered, the registration
shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which
the document was originally registered by the official
referred to in clause (b)";"

This Bill proposes that documents relating to properties situated in areas which have been set out in the Schedule to the Madras (Enlargement of Areas and Alteration of Boundaries) Order, 1948, which are compulsorily registrable under the Indian Registration Act but have been registered in French registration offices be re-registered free of all charges, within such time and subject to such restrictions and conditions as may be specified in the notification; and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered in a French registration office. By this

3rd December 1952] [Sri K. R. Viswanathan]

particular sentence the Government propose to give retrospective effect to the registration of such documents effected in Indian territory. I do not know what is going to be achieved by this provision. In fact, it is meaningless."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If it is meaningless, why should the hon. Member insist on pressing his amendment? "

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Sir, as it is quite meaningless I want this sentence to be deleted from the Bill. A document is the evidence of a contract or a settlement arrived at between two or more parties. It is probable that the parties may break the contract or the terms of the settlement; or the document itself is liable to be lost. In order to prevent a breach of contract and, in cases of loss of the documents, to protect the interests of both the parties concerned, the Indian Registration Act came to the rescue of the people. By registering a document the Government recognize the validity of the terms of a contract enumerated in the document itself. The Government also recognize the contract between the parties and also give publicity to the contract. By registering a document, it becomes admissible in a Court of Law as evidence from the date of execution. This amending Bill has been brought forward to make admissible in evidence in Courts of Law in India by re-registering in Indian territory documents relating to property situated in the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam and such other areas as are in French territory, which were originally registered in French registration offices. Mere registration in Indian territory makes the documents admissible in evidence in Courts of Law in India. Therefore, there is no necessity to give retrospective effect to the registration of these documents from the dates on which they were registered in registration offices in French India. This is my object in moving this amendment."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am seconding the amendment moved by the hon. Member, Sri K. R. Viswanathan, having full faith in his arguments, as the hon. Mover of the amendment is talking from his personal knowledge as he also happened to be a Sub-Registrar once."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Amendment moved—

"That in clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c) omit the sentence " and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered by the official referred to in clause (b) "."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment really goes to the very root of this Bill. If the amendment is accepted the object of the legislation will be lost. Some people under a mistaken impression have registered documents in French registration offices. This, they should not have done. If those documents are now re-registered under the Indian Registration Act, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the documents were originally

5.50
p.m.

[Sri K. Venkataswami Naidu] [3rd December 1952]

registered. This legislation has been brought only for this purpose and I hope the hon. Member who moved the amendment will appreciate the purpose of this legislation. I request him to withdraw the amendment. The main idea of the legislation is to give retrospective effect so that the registration of documents under the Indian Registration Act shall have effect for all purposes from the dates on which they were originally registered in the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam and in certain other areas in French India."

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, once a document is executed, some conditions are imposed for registering the document. It has got to bear some stamps. It has got to be presented at the Registration Office within a particular period. The registration makes the document valid for purposes of evidence from the date of the execution of the document. Irrespective of the date of registration, it is admissible in a Court of Law as evidence. The fact that a document is registered in the Indian territory under the Indian Registration Act is enough to make it admissible as evidence in a Court of Law in India. It is not necessary to give retrospective effect to the date of registration in French India"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The legislation is only intended to make it doubly sure that retrospective effect is given from the date of registration in French India."

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Sir, let me make my point clear. The properties are situated in a disputed area. Till now the documents have been registered only in French India. They have now to be registered in the Indian Union territory, under the Indian Registration Act. It is enough if the documents are registered in the Registration offices in India and it is not necessary that the date of registration should be taken back to the date of registration in French India."

SRI K. RAJARAM :—" Let the hon. Member explain whether there is any harm in having that sentence."

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" I consider it unnecessary."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If the hon. Mover of the amendment presses his amendment, I will put it to the vote of the House."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question there is no political opposition. We would like to know what exactly is the difficulty of the hon. Member who moved the amendment. It is not clear whether this clause providing retrospective effect cures any defect in the originally registered document. As far as I am able to understand the Bill, that is the only point requiring clarification."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I wish to know from the hon. Mover of the amendment whether he is withdrawing his amendment."

3rd December 1952]

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" I am not withdrawing it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c), the sentence " and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered by the official referred to in clause (b) " be omitted '."

The amendment was lost.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" I beg to move—

' That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not claim any expert knowledge on this matter. In view of the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri K. R. Viswanathan having been defeated, I expect the Hon. Minister to explain why there is absolutely no necessity for such an amendment."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" It has been found, in actual practice, that a lot of hardship is being caused to people who have registered their documents in the French Registration offices. The Legal Department has brought to the notice of the Government that this legislation is absolutely essential. If this Bill is not given retrospective effect, it will cause great hardship to the parties concerned, and the Bill will serve no purpose."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.' "

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House will be meeting at 2 p.m. tomorrow instead of at 10-30 a.m. as stated in the Agenda. I now adjourn the House till 2 p.m. tomorrow."

The House then adjourned.

	PAGES
A—cont.	
Agricultural labourers— Question re minimum wages for —	857-859
Agricultural loans— Question re grant of — to Harijans and Harijan Christians in West Godavari district	1006
Anantha Pai, Sri T.— Resolution re Handloom Industry See Questions and Answers.	62-65
Andhra Desa Libraries Conference— Question re Resolutions passed by the — implementation of ..	21-22
Andhra Paper Mills— Question re working of the —	304
Andhra State— Adjournment motion re Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of the —	554-557
Anjaneyulu, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. Resolution re Handloom Industry	913 130-131
Anthony Pillai, Sri S. C. C.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	405-408 1050-1052
Appa Rao, Sri M. R.— See Questions and Answers.	
Appu, Sri A.— See Questions and Answers.	
Aranganathan, Sri K.— See Questions and Answers.	
Ardhanari, Sri T. S.— Resolution re Handloom Industry	133-134
Ari Gowder, Sri H. B.— Resolution re Handloom Industry	122-123
Arson— Question re commission of — in Chirakkal taluk in 1948-49.. ..	17-18
Artesian wells— Question re — in South Arcot district	680, 681 986-987
Artisans— Questions re supply of tools to — in Nellore district under Firka Development Scheme	547-548
Arts College, Cuddapah— Question re dramatic performances for collecting funds for hostel of —	679
Arumugam, Sri R. S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. See Questions and Answers.	174-175
Arunachalam, Sri A. J.— Resolution re Handloom Industry	71-77
Assignment of land— See Land.	
Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y.— See Questions and Answers.	

	PAGES
B	
Backward Classes— Question re Statutory Welfare Board for —	678
Balakrishnan, Sri V.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. Condolence resolution re death of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur. See Questions and Answers.	702 446
Bapanayya, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	716, 731 928-929
Bapu Naidu, Sri P.— See Questions and Answers.	
Basic Training School, Pallipad— See Schools.	
Beedi workers— Question re awards of Industrial Tribunals re —	450-452
Beypore Port. See Ports.	
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952— See Bills.	
Bills— Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law Message from the Council re —	424-428 472
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law Message from the Council re —	419-420 472
Cotton Control Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law Message from the Council re —	420-424 472
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law	250-274 405-419
Message from the Council re —	472
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law	473-486
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, question re dropping of —	447-448
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 — Considered and passed into law	1079-1083
Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952— Message from the Governor re —	31
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law Message from the Council re —	439-440 472
Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law	441
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law	488-500
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952— Considered and passed into law	486-487
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952— Message from the Governor re — Referred to Joint Select Committee	31 148-175 204-235, 236-249
Message from the Council re	472
Considered and passed into law	558-621 692-761, 796-863, 899-974, 1014-1079
Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory— Question re shifting of — from Kodur to Madras	1093-1005
Birth control clinics— Question re number, location, etc., of — in the State	26

B—cont.	PAGES
Bridge	
Question re—	
Construction of a — across Cherupuzhathodu (North Malabar) ..	890
Construction of a — across the Godavari at Alamuru ..	290
Construction of a — across Kanayangode Ferry (North Malabar).	456
Construction of a — across Venkajeru river ..	545
British Governors' portraits—	
Question re removal of — from Rajaji Hall ..	679
Bukkapatnam tank—	
<i>See</i> "Tanks."	
Bus Transport—	
<i>See</i> Transport.	
Business of the House—	
Change in the order of —	
Change of non-official day into official day (rule 24) ..	439, 441
Programme of — ..	690-691
	235-236
	898
C	
Calendering machine—	
<i>See</i> Handloom Industry.	
Calingapatnam Port—	
<i>See</i> Ports.	
Cancer—	
<i>See</i> Hospitals.	
Capital punishment—	
Question re award of — in Pudukottai before and after merger ..	106
Cars—	
<i>See</i> Transport.	
Cattle-breeding co-operative Societies—	
Question re — in Cuddapah district ..	180-182
Cement factory—	
Question re opening of a — at Pudukkottai ..	389
Chadayan, Sri M.—	
Resolution re — Handloom Industry ..	70-71
Chandra Chudamani Deo, Sri Vyricherla—	
Sworn in ..	653
Cherupuzhathodu Bridge—	
<i>See</i> Bridge.	
Chidanandam, Sri V.—	
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery ..	337
Chokalingam, Sri P.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	1063-1065
<i>See</i> Bills.	
Cinchona Plantations —	
Question re retrenchment in Government — in Anamalais ..	192-193
Civil Supplies Department—	
<i>See</i> Food.	
Coconut Research Station—	
Question re opening of a — at Chowghat ..	200
College(s)—	
Question re—	
Arts College, Cuddapah—Dramatic performances for collecting funds for hostel.	679
Law College, Provision of hostel for students of—	
Schools and — details re— ..	517-519
	464

C—cont.	PAGES
Committee—	
Question re—	
Constituted under G.O. No. 2493, Education, dated 28th September 1948 ..	24
Report of the — on the separation of Judiciary from Executive ..	94-95
Communal disturbances—	
Question re—in connexion with cow-slaughter at Payyoli ..	387-388
Communist prisoners—	
Question re—	
In Salem—Jail, transfer to jails in their own linguistic areas ..	765
Weekly searches of — in jails ..	96-98
Community Projects—	
Question re—in the State, details re— ..	8-12
	534-535
Condolence resolution re —	
Death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur (Raja of Karvetnagar) ..	445-447
Constitution of India —	
Question re —making of rules under article 166 (3) of the — ..	179-180
Contour Bunding Scheme—	
Question re continuance of — in Vayalpad taluk ..	984
Co-operative central bank (s)—	
Question re—	
Management of the Masulipatnam — ..	298-299
Security deposit of employees of — ..	896
Supersession of the Srikakulam— ..	994-996
Co-operative department—	
Question re—	
Employees of —, prohibition from membership of co-operative societies ..	990-991
Strength of gazetted officers in — community war ..	985-986
Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank, Pudukkottai—	
Question re date of starting of — ..	1002
Co-operative societies—	
Question re —	
Cattle breeding — in Cuddapah district ..	180-182
Field labour — in Krishna district ..	669-670
Indian Evacuees and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society, Yellamanchili, representation re maladministration of — ..	95
Khadi production and sale by — ..	282
Land colonization —, Ganapavaram ..	301-302
Motor Transport— for ex-servicemen at Cuddapah, organization of a ..	782
Prohibition of co-operative department employees from membership of — ..	990-991
Weavers —, adoption of a model by-law for appointment of clerks in ..	200
Co-operative union—	
Question re State Co-operative Union, annual grants made to ..	101-102
Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948—	
<i>See</i> Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Cotton Control Bill, 1952—	
<i>See</i> Bills.	
Court—	
Question re —	
Munsif's Court at Payanoor, opening of a ..	675
Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur, location of ..	660-661
Cow-slaughter—	
Question re Communal disturbances at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connexion with — ..	387-388

C—cont.		PAGES
Craft Instruction— See Schools.		
Crops— Question re failure of — in Malabar		997
Culinary essences— See Prohibition.		
Cyclone— Adjournment motion re havoc caused by — in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts		1011-1013
Dams— See Irrigation works.		
Dearness allowance— See Pensioners' Association, Cannanore. See Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department.		
Deida Hall Anicut— Question re execution of—		787
D		
Deivasigamany, Sri S. — Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 Resolution re Handloom Industry		849 66-67
Depressed classes— Question re lands reserved for — in Nellore district, alleged cultivation by caste ryots		680-681
Deputy Collectors— Question re abolition of direct recruitment of —		103
Devasthanam department— Question re Pudukkottai State — employees, grant of dearness allowance to		675
Development board— Question re constitution of a — for Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts		523-524
Dharmalingam, Sri M. — Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.		342-344
Dispensaries— Question re— Financial aid to — in panchayats Local fund dispensary at Hosdrug, conversion into a Government hospital Opening of a dispensary in Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk		404 516-517
Disqualification of a Member— High Court's judgment re the disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao		199 29-30 107-108
District and Sessions Judge— See Judiciary.		
District Board, Guntur— Question re Government's remarks on administration of —		12-13
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952— See Bills.		
Drainage Scheme— Question re estimated cost of Tenali		5-6
Drama— Question re ban on Telugu plays "Mahhoomi" and "Mundadugu".		90-93

E		PAGES
Educational concessions— See Adjournment motions; Government servants; School fee concessions.		
Elections— Question re— — to Udumalpet Municipality, Reservation of seat for scheduled castes. Election duties, delay in payment of travelling allowance to teachers in Waltuvanad for Holding of — to panchayat boards in South Kanara district Holding of — to panchayat boards under the Village Panchayats Act, 1950 Major and minor panchayats, mode of election to Municipal —, prevention of corrupt practices in Municipal —, use of indelible ink in Return of election expenses, expenditure incurred by the Government for action taken in cases of failure to lodge		390 538 14-16 539 16-17 548 887-888 549-550
Elections (Corporation and Municipal)— See Papers laid on the table of the House.		
Electoral rolls— Question re revision of — in 1952-53, allocation of expenditure between Government and local bodies		550-551
Electricity— Question re— Extension of — to Ottapalam, Malabar Extension of — to villages around Hindupur from Hindupur Supply Station Hydro-electric sites, investigation of Maehkund Hydro-Electric Project, details re Supply of — to Bapatla Municipality Supply of — to Hosur taluk Supply of — to Jaggaipet Supply of — to Nandigama taluk Supply of Jog electric power to South Kanara and Rayalaseema Survey for construction of a thermal station at Kadiri Thermal station at Nellore—Information re power generation, supply, etc Undertaking of distribution work by local bodies		537 536 465 528-530 537 786 882 883-884 286-288, 471-472 201 466-467 987-988 515-516
Employment Exchange— Question re number of unemployed registered in		895
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952— See Bills.		
Estates— Question re— Munagala Estate, enquiry into the dispute between the zamindar and tenants Vizianagaram Estate, application of Rent Reduction Act to under-tenure estates, etc., in the		182-184 292-293
Estates Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari Act, 1948— Amendment and rule under section 40 (1) of the —		436-439
Question re— Estates taken over under the — district war figures re Government's claim to the Kanur lanka lands in Kovvur taluk under the Inam villages which are not estates		467 186-187 996-997 467-493

D—cont.

Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill— See Bills.	
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act— Question re commutations rate of rent fixed under the —	452
Evacuees from Burma, etc.— Question re recovery of loans advanced to —	676
F	
Famine— Adjournment motion re — —in Kakinada taluk	792
—in Malabar	792
—in Nellore	791-792
—and food policy of the Government	792-793
Starvation death in Guntur district	791
Question re— —Condition in Pattukkottai taluk	897
Gruel centres in Rayalaseema, substitution of sangati for gruel in—	468
Nutritive value of gruel supplied in gruel centres	196-197
Opening of gruel centres in South Arcot district	675
Relief works in Palnad taluk	983-984
Relief works in Visakhapatnam district	879-881
Subsistence loans in Madanapalle, number of applications for	898
See Food; Roads.	
Fernandez, Sri W. J.— Bill: — Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952	440
Resolution re Handloom Industry	129-130
Ferry Service— Question re collection of excess fares by ferry contractors in Malabar	22
Field labour co-operative societies— See Lands.	
Filariaasis— Question re prevention of — in Kasargod, Cannanore and Baliapattam towns	12, 780-781
Fire station— Question re opening of a — at Ongole and Rajampet	402-404
Firka Development Committee— See Rural Welfare Committees.	
Fishermen— Question re grant of interest-free loans to — towards share capital for forming co-operative societies	298-299
Fishing tanks— Question re number of — in Livestock Research Station, Hosur	106
Five-Year Plan— Question re memorandum submitted by Government to Prime Minister of India re —	659-661
Food— Question re— Civil Supplies staff retrenched consequent on de-control of	874-878
Fair price shops for Government servants in Masulipatnam town	463
Fair price shops in Krishna district, number and off take after de-control	458
Fair price shops, procedure for appointment of dealers for	871-872
Price of rice in Tanjore district, checking the up-ward trend in	23
Rationing Officer, Malabar district, allegations against	870
Rice content of ration in Upland and D Ita areas	198-199
Rice export from Krishna district, prevention of	2-5
Rice export from Visakhapatnam district, prevention of	779-780
See Paddy.	

F—cont.

Food situation in the State— Debate on — requested	107, 236 557-558
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order— Adjournment motion re —	899
Foodgrains Movement Control Order— Question re prosecution under—	5
Question re	
Forest blocks— Question re auctioning — in Pudukkottai division for green, manure purposes	668
Forest officials— Question re— Complaint against—in Cuddapah district	998-1000
Forestguards and watchers, increase of salary of	897
Pudukkottai — absorption in Madras Forest service	894-895
Foresters— Question re instructions for transfer of —	107
Forests— Question re— Administration of zamindari —	988-989
Coupees leased out in Cuddapah South Forest Division, particulars	394
Disafforestation of 800 acres in Kothapalem Reserve Forest, application for	198
Permission for goat-browsing in zamindari —	389-391
Rights of people in zamindari — press note on	789
Fuel depot— Question re Government — at Pudukkottai, closure of	535-536

G

Gajapathi Raju, Sri P. V. R.— Condolence resolution re death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur	446
Gajulapalli tank— See Tanks.	
Ganapavaram Land Colonization Society— Question re organisation and working of—	301-302
Glass beads training centres— Question re particulars of—	1002-1003
Godavari bridge— See Bridges.	
Gopala Menon, Sri N.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	929-930
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	359-360
See Questions and Answers.	
Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala— Adjournment motion re Sri Potti Srimulu's fast for the formation of Andhra State	556
Bills— Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	425-428
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	422
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1953	251-253, 419
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952	474-475 479-480, 481, 482, 483, 486

G—cont.

Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala—cont.

Bills—cont.

Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	498-499
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	229-232
244 2 6, 712-713, 726, 728-730	
732-733, 739-740, 751-752, 757-	
759, 822-823, 826-827, 912, 928	
955, 971, 1023, 1039-1041	

Motion re—

Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, amendment and rule under	437-438
Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to—	433

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	307
Handloom Industry	39-43

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	815-817
927-928	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	77-79

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalan, Sri K. P.—

Adjournment motion re retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	552-553
554	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	742-744
747, 749-750, 837-838, 921	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	38, 65-66

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalan Unni, Sri K. C.—

See Questions and Answers.

Government Bus Transport.—

See Transport.

Government business—

Question re transaction in regional languages (Tamil)	665-666
---	---------

Government officers—

Question re number drawing Rs. 1,000 and above	187-189
--	---------

Government servants—

Question re—	
House-rent allowance for—	99-100
House-rent allowance for—in Hosdurg, grant of	180
Non-gazetted officers, educational concessions granted to the children of	524-525
Non-gazetted officers in the Revenue Department in Malabar, non-confirmation of	100-101
Number of — appointed under emergency provisions	684
Remarks in confidential files of—Communication to the person concerned	304
Ventilation of grievances of—through Legislators	83-87

Government Servants Conduct Rules—

Question re Government Servants, association with friends of the Soviet Union and with Peace Committees	1
---	---

Govinda Rao, Sri K.—

Bills—Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	488-499
499	
Resolution re—Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	360-362

See Questions and Answers.

G—cont.

Govindaswami Nayagar, Sri A.—

Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	262-265
Resolution re Handloom Industry	112-114

See Questions and Answers.

Grama sevaks—

Question re qualifications prescribed for—	683-684
--	---------

Grazing lands—

Adjournment motion re collection of rents for—in Kanigiri taluk	791
---	-----

Groundnut—

Question re inclusion of — within the scope of the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee	294-295
--	---------

Groundnut Market Committee.—

Question re constitution of a—for North Arcot and Salem districts	448-450
---	---------

Gruel Centres.

See Famine.

H

Habitual offenders settlements—

Question re particulars re —	543-544
--------------------------------------	---------

Handloom industry—

Question re—	
Installation of calendering machine in Rayala-seema	90
Number of handlooms in South Arcot, Chittoor, etc., districts	788
Resolution re—	32-813
108-148	

Handloom weavers—

Question re exemption of — from payment of house or property tax levied by local bodies	881-882
---	---------

Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	723-724
814, 1065-1066	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	120-122

See Questions and Answers.

Harijan Hostel—

Question re—	
Masulipatnam, number of boarders etc	894

Harijans—

Question re—	
Grant of Agricultural loans to—and Harijan Christians	1006
Harijan Inspectors of Police promoted as Deputy Superintendents of Police in 1951-52, number of	551
Promotion of — to the Tahsildars' grade	773-774
Weavers' co-operative societies, exclusively formed, for —	104

Harijan Welfare Department.

Question re —	
Communities eligible for help by the—	301-302
District Welfare Officers, supply of jeeps to	548

High Court—

Question re—criminal appeals pending in the — on 1st April 1952	471
---	-----

Homoeopaths.

Question re registration of—under the Medical Registration Act, representation re	531
---	-----

Hospital (s)—

Question re—	
Cancer hospital at Madras, allotment of site for	870-871
Government Headquarters—in Mangalore, facilities for tuberculosis patients	532-533
Government—in Munagala, working of a	95-96

H—cont.	PAGES
Hospital(s)—cont.	
Question re—	
Government — in Nandigama, extension of	538
Government — at Nuzvid, improvement of	463
Headquarters Hospital, Badagara, extension of	7-8
Labour cases treated in Government—during 1949-52, number of	29
Malaria cases treated in Government — in 1948-49, number of	891
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Ranees Hospital, augmenting the bed strength of	777-778
See Dispensaries.	
House rent allowance—	
Question re—	
—sanctioned for Government servants	99-100, 180
—to menials of Tenali Municipality	23-24
House tax—	
Question re levy of — by panchayat boards	1001-1032
Housing Scheme—	
Question re progress of — at Madanapalle	1000-1001
Hydrogenation Factory, Kozhikode—	
Question re management of —	785
I	
Inam villages—	
See Estates (Abolition, etc.) Act.	
Indian Civil Service Officer—	
Adjournment Motion re allegations of corruption against —	1010-1011
Indian Evacuees and Dependents Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society.	
See Co-operative Societies.	
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952—	
See Bills.	
Industrial dispute—	
Question re Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat, memorandum re	674
See Shri Shaib Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities.	
Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Internal security measures—	
Question re expenditure on — during 1950-53, details re.	26-28
Irrigation works—	
Question re—	
Amount spent on — in Atmakur taluk	788-789
Erection of new — in Pudukkottai Division	525-526
Rayavaram, Modukuru and Jampapalam dams, investigation of	872-873
J	
Jails—	
Question re—	
Diet supplied in —, nutritive value of	105
Weekly searches of Communist prisoners in —	86-88
Jayarama Reddiyar, Sri S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	604
Jeevanandam, Sri P.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1086-1088
Resolution re Handloom Industry	39, 59-62
Janmi pattadars—	
Question re — in Malabar, details re	26

J—cont.	PAGES
Jog Falls—	
Question re power supply from — to Rayalaseema and South Kanara	286-288 471-472
Judiciary—	
Question re—	
District and Sessions Judge appointed by direct recruitment recently	526-527
Report of the Committee on the Separation of the — from the Executive	94-95
Reservation of posts for Revenue staff in the Scheme of Separation of — from the Executive	450
K	
Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.—	39
Resolution re Handloom Industry	126-128
See Questions and Answers.	
Kanaran, Sri C. H.—	79-80
Resolution re Handloom Industry	
Kanayangode Ferry—	
See Bridges.	
Kandaswami, Sri C.—	211-217
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	856-857, 861-862, 904-905, 924-925, 1052-1054
Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen	30
See Questions and Answers.	
Kanupur Scheme—	291-292
Question re details regarding —	
Karuthiruman, Sri P. G.—	562-565
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	695
Kasturidevi Girls' High School—	
See Schools.	
Kattalai High Level Canal—	990-991
Question re —	
Khadi—	282
Question re production and sale of — by co-operative societies	
Khosla Committee Report—	653-657
Question re—	
Kolkebail, Sri S. S.—	730-731
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	
Kondayya, Sri G. C.—	208-209
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	307-315
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	
See Questions and Answers.	
Kosalram, Sri K. T.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Kotaiah, Sri Pragada—	
Resolution re—	307
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	352-353, 376
Handloom Industry	114-119 147
See Questions and Answers.	
Kotamma Reddi, Srimathi Thamma—	30
Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen	
Krishna Anicut—	885-886
Question re damages to —	

K—cont.

PAGES

Krishna Aicut Enquiry Committee Report— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Krishna Ayyar, Sri V. R.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	801-803 315-321
Krishna Motor Workers' Union— Question re representation from the — re violation of the Motor Vehicles Act by bus owners	774-775
Krishnamurthy Rao, Sri B.— See Questions and Answers.	
Krishnamurthy Gounder, Sri D.— See Questions and Answers.	
Krishnan, Sri R.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 See Questions and Answers.	2620 1062-1063
Krishna Rao, Sri K.— See Questions and Answers.	
Krishna Rao, Sri Y. V.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	700-701 796-797 939-941
Krishna Rao, the Hon. Dr. M. V.— Adjournment motion re students' strikes in Andhradesa against detention system in high schools	795
Krishna Rao, The Hon. Dr. U.— Adjournment motion re retrenchment of workers in Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar Motion re Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931—amendment of Schedule II to the	553, 554
Resolution re Handloom Industry	429-431 433-435
Krishnaswami Ayyangar, Sri P. S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	32-37 703, 803- 804, 840- 841, 1027
Kumar Industries, Palghat— Question re— Industrial dispute in —memorandum re State aid granted to	674 455-456
Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur, Sri— Leave of absence to Condolence resolution re death of	31
Kune Rao, Sri M.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	445-447
Kunhi Muhammad Shafee, Janab— See Questions and Answers.	826, 840
Kunhirama Kurup, Sri C.— See Questions and Answers.	
Kutti Krishnan Nair, the Hon. Sri K. P.— Bills— Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952 Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952	419-420 441

L

PAGES

Labour Unions— Question re—municipal workers' —, refusal of recognition in certain cases	400-401
Lakshmana Das, Sri L.— See Questions and Answers.	
Lakshmanaswami, Sri M.— Bills— Sugar Factories (Control (Amendment), Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	491-492 754-755
Lakshmayya, Sri D.— See Questions and Answers.	
Lakshminarasa Raju, Sri B.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1071-1072
Lakshminarayana Reddi, Sri T.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 Resolution re Handloom Industry See Questions and Answers.	753, 841— 842 57-59
Land(s)— Adjournment Motion re assignment of—to landless labourers Question re— Assignment of, to landless poor Assignment of, to political sufferers	791-792 676, 992— 994 193-195 284-285 291, 878— 879, 1006
Darimila inam —, kattubandi, collection from Dispossession of Aborigines of — in Wynad Encroachment on Government — by Dondapadu village ryots Eviction from — of some villagers of Kottur Illegal alienation of — by zamindars Kanur Lanka in West Godavari, Government's claim to— under the Estates Abolition Act Lanka—leased out to field labour co-operative societies, Krishna district Pattas for — applied for and granted in West Godavari district, number of Poramboke — brought under cultivation in Gingee taluk in 1951-52 —reserved for depressed classes in Nellore district, alleged cultiva- tion by caste ryots Waste — in Kaikalur taluk, extent of Waste —etc. —in Kasargode taluk, extent of	778-779 296 766-768 296-298 783-784 996-997 669-670 682 98-99 680-681 893 468
Land colonization co-operative societies— See Co-operative Societies.	
Land mortgage bank— See Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank.	
Land revenue— Question re— Dry and wet assessment in Malabar Remission of — in Pedabilli village, Penukonda taluk	464-465 889
Landless poor— Adjournment motion re eviction of landless poor in Musaneli village in Tanjore district	685-687
Latchanna, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	157, 160- 162, 578- 580 203
Translation of Proceedings of the Assembly See Questions and Answers.	

	PAGES
L—cont.	
Law College, Madras— See Colleges.	
Leave of absence to member— Motion re — Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur	31
Legislative Assembly— Translation of the Proceedings of—	203-204 305-306
Legislative Assembly staff— Question re overtime allowances paid to — during Budget Session (June-July 1952)	668-669
Legislators' Hostel— Question re thefts in the—	661-662
Libraries— Question re purchase of books on Soviet Union and China, Circular of the Director of Public Instruction re See Andhra Desa Libraries Conference.	19-20
Library Committees— Question re— Librarians under District — State — action taken on the resolutions of	671-672 544
Library Service— Question re scheme for extension of—	278-279
Lignite— Question re mining of — in South Arcot district	452-453
Livestock Research Station, Hosur— Question re— Cost of maintenance and popularizing the results of experiments in— Number of fishing tanks in—	24-26 106
Loans— Question re— Agricultural — grant of, to Harijans in West Godavari Interest-free — grant of, to fishermen Madras Government's 'Five Crore loan' Recovery of — granted to dependants of Indian nationals in Burma, etc., during the war Takkavi and subsistence — disbursed in Nellore district in 1932	1006 288-289 786-787 676 544
M	
Machkund Hydro-Electric Project— See Electricity.	
Madanapalle Theosophical High School— See Schools.	
Madras Electricity System (Medical Officer)— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Mahamed Salih Maraikayar, Janab— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 See Questions and Answers.	232
Malabar Tenancy Act— Question re fair rent for pepper gardens fixed under the — reduction of See Papers laid on the table of the House.	537
Malaria— Question re Anti-Malarial operations in Divi talu, conduct of See Hospitals.	286
Mampuram Tile and Clay Works, Malabar— Question re lock-out in	201-202

	PAGES
M—cont.	
Maneru Project— Question re investigation of—	784-785
Manganese ore— See 'Mines'—	
Manickavelu Naicker, The Hon. Sri M.A.— Bills— Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 233-234, 249, 558, 561, 617-621, 705-706, 710 714, 721, 724, 730, 732, 742, 747, 750, 759, 797 807-809, 812, 814-816, 821, 826, 828, 833, 836 851-853, 863, 909, 911, 912, 914-916, 933, 937 941-943, 946-947, 966, 970, 971, 1020, 1025, 1027 1035-1038.	424, 426 427, 428 486-487 148-149 705-706, 710
Motion re Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, amendment and rule under	436-438
Manjaya Shetty, Sri Y.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	206-208
Market Committee— See Groundnut Market committee.	
Maternity and child welfare centres— Question re number of — in the famished areas of the State in 1952	469
Medical officers— Question re— Particulars regarding — deputed to Hyderabad State Pudukkottai State — absorption into Madras Medical Service	304 469-470
Medical Practitioners— Question re of Indigenous Medicine in rural dispensaries, grant of subsidy to—	550
Menon, Dr. K. B.— Adjournment motion re eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 Resolution re Handloom Industry	685-686 247-248 1019-1020 124-125
Message from the Council re— Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952 Cotton Control Bill, 1952 District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	472 472 472 472 472 472
Message from the Governor re— Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	31 31
Mid Pennar Project— Question re — investigation of	890
Milk— Question re supply of free — to expectant mothers, etc., through maternity and child welfare centres	466
Milo— Question re nutritive value of — supplied in gruel centres	196-197
Mines— Question re manganese ore in Nellore district, mining of—	893

M—cont.

Minimum wages— See Agricultural labourers.	
Ministers—	
Question re—	
Pay and allowances of—	467
Tour of— in Srikakulam district where a by-election was pending	865-869
Tour programmes of —	673-674
Mogral, Janab M. S.—	
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	580-581
See Questions and Answers.	
Mohamed Shafee, Janab K. K.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	56-57
Mohan Industries Limited., Tenali—	
Question re grant of State aid to —	392-394
Moidu, Janab K.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Motor Transport Society—	
See Transport.	
Motor Vehicles Act, 1939—	
Question re violation of the — by bus owners, representation re	774-775
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.—	
Amendment of Schedule II to the	429-436
Question re exemption of mobile motion picture vehicles of American — Consulate from taxation under—	201
Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952—	
See Bills.	
Muni Reddi, Sri M.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Municipal administration—	
Question re reorganization of—	1006
Municipal workers—	
Question re labour unions of — refusal of recognition in certain cases.	400-401
Municipalities—	
See Elections.	
Munsif's Court, Payyanoor—	
See Court.	
Muslim prayers—	
Adjournment of the House on Fridays for	40.
Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad, Raja—	
Bills—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	272-274
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	951-952
1033-1034, 1038-1039	
Muthiah Pillai, Sri C.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	209-211
Muthu Sri V.—	
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	334-337
Muthukumaraswami, Sri—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	241-244

N

Nagabhushanam, Sri G.—	
Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	253-255
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	355-357
Nagan Gouda, the Hon. Dr. R.—	
Bills—	
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	420-422
424	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	488, 500
Nagarajan, Sri V. R.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	123-124
See Questions and Answers.	
Nagi Reddi, Sri T.—	
Bills—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	410-412
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	712, 725
729, 818, 842-843, 955-956, 1029, 1032-1033	
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	326-331
Nallasivam, Sri K. R.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	227-229
Nallaswami, Sri B. K.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	53-55
Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Narasimha Raju, Sri Appala—	
Question re recovery of loan granted under Well Subsidy Scheme to—	396-397
Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	162-164
721-723	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanan Nambiar, Sri T. C.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	714, 1070-
1071	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	37-38
44-45	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanappa, Sri S.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	67-68
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanaswami Naidu, Sri G.—	
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	217-227
701-702, 1068-1070	
Narayanaswamy, Sri M.—	
Adjournment motion re elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	691
Bill — Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	598-601
824-825	
See Questions and Answers.	
Neeladri Rao Reddi, Sri Asi—	
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	358
Nellore district—	
Question re bifurcation of — proposals for	892

INDEX TO MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THIRD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Volume V (Nos. 1 to 11).

3rd to 7th and 24th to 27th November and 2nd and 3rd
December 1952.

	A	PAGES
Aboriginals—		
Question <i>re</i> dispossession of lands of— in Wynaad		296
Adjournment of the House on Fridays for Muslim prayers		405
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> —		
Agrarian discontent in the Romperu Drain area		792
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer	1010-1011	
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1011-1013	
Educational concessions to backward class students		792
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands		687-690
Famine and Food policy of the Madras Government		792-793
Famine and unemployment in Kakinada taluk		792
Famine in Malabar district		792
Famine in Nellore district		791, 792
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order		899
Landless labourers, Government Order <i>re</i> grant of lands to—	791-792	
Landless poor, eviction of — in Musaveli village in Tanjore district		685-687
Potti Sriramulu's fast on the Andhra State issue		554-557
Price of varam paddy		792
Rent for grazing lands in Kanigiri taluk, forcible collection of—		791
Retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar		552-554
Starvation deaths in Guntur district		791
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in schools		793-796
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovur taluks (West Godavari)	1013-1014	
Adjournment Motions—		
Rules <i>re</i> —		789-790
Administrative Machinery—		1008-1010
Resolution <i>re</i> Economy and efficiency in —		306-376
Agrarian discontent—		
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> — in Romperu drain Area		792
Agricultural College, Bapatla—		
Question <i>re</i> lands acquired for — inadequacy of compensation for		20-21
Agricultural Demonstrators—		
Question <i>re</i> Scales of pay of —		891
Agricultural farms—		
Question <i>re</i> —		
Particulars of—in Pudukottai division		1007
Starting of model — in each district		195-196

N—cont.

Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association— See Service Associations.	
New Deal for Tanjore Ryots' Pamphlet— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Nippatipadu tank— See Tanks.	
Non-gazetted officers— See Government servants.	
Non-Gazetted Officers' Association— See Service Associations.	
Nurses—	
Question re deputation of — for training in the United Kingdom, particulars re	29
P	
Paddy—	
Adjournment Motion re price of varam paddy	792
Question re—	
Machines for thrashing—manufacture of	549
Particulars of price of — paid to janzis in Malabar	989-990
Procurement price of —delay in payment of	777
Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri M. K.— See Questions and Answers.	
Pais, Sri L. C.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	164-167
Palaniandi, Sri M.—	
Adjournment motion re — cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirapalli districts	1011-1013
Palaniswami Gounder, Sri V. K.—	
Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	412-413
Palaniswami Gounder, the Hon. Sri V. C.—	
Bill—Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952	439-440
Panchaksharam, Sri S.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	125-128
Panchayat Act—	
Question re changes in — suggestions by Cabinet Sub-Committee re	6-7
Panchayat Board, Phirangipuram—	
Question re removal of president of	1007
Panchayat Board, Yellamanchili—	
Question re supersession of —	87-90
Panchayat boards—	
Adjournment motion re elections to minor — by show of hands	687-690
Question re—	
Elections to — in South Kanara district, holding of	14-16
Elections to major and minor —	16-17, 539
Levy of house tax by —	1001-1002
List of trained executive officers for — maintenance of	202-203
Panel of Chairmen—	
Announcement re —	30
Paper—	
Question re — used in Government Offices, whether Indian or foreign	666-667

P—cont.

Papers laid on the table of the House —	
Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948— Amendment to G.O. No. 2408, dated 10th October 1952)	17
Elections to Corporation Council, notice for fresh elections to seven divisional seats (G.O. No. 1720, dated 26th August 1952)	82
Elections to Municipal Council, Coimbatore, seats reserved for Anglo-Indians (G.O. No. 1964, dated 6th October 1952)	82
Elections to Municipal Councils, stopping of elections for seats reserved for Anglo-Indians (G.O. No. 1752, dated 30th August 1952 and No. 1993, dated 9th October 1952)	82
Krishna Ancient Enquiry Committee Report	761
Madras Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited, balance sheet as at 30th June 1952	500
Malabar Tenancy Act, 1929, amendment to rules under	81
Medical Officer, Madras Electricity System, exclusion of post from the purview of the Public Service Commission (G.O. No. 2408, dated 10th October 1952)	175
Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, amendments to rules under	81
Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking, acquisition and absorption of staff in Government service (G.O. No. 3602, dated 27th August 1952)	500
'New Deal for Tanjore Ryots' Pamphlet	500
Salem Jail Shooting incident, Report of the Committee on	81
Special Armed Police Units in West Godavari district, answers to starred questions	81
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, Report of the Select Committee on	82
Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923, amendments to rules under	81
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance and amending Ordinances, 1952	82
Pavoli (North Malabar)—	
Question re communal disturbances in connexion with cow slaughter in	387-388
Peace Committees—	
See Government Servants' Conduct Rules.	
Pension—	
Question re counting of officiating service and pay for —	682-683
Pensioners, removal of the cut in dearness allowance and other reliefs for	662-664
Pepper gardens—	
Question re fair rent for—fixed under the Malabar Tenancy Act, reduction of	537
Pincha project —	
Question re investigation of — In Cuddapah district	469
Planning Commission—	
Question re — Report of the Technical Committee of — (Khosla Committee)	653-657
Police—	
Question re—	
Allegations against the Karula —	785-786
Costables, Supply of boots to —	891-892
Konduri Sathanarayana's death while in Police custody	459-461
Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of — Directly recruited between 1st April 1937 and 31st March 1951, number of	548
Sub-Inspectors of Police, direct recruitment of	279-280
Police camps—	
Question re—Number and work of Armed —	462
Political sufferers—	
See Lands.	
Polytechnics—	
Question re construction of buildings for—	546-547
Poramboke lands—	
Question re—Fines collected for cultivation of—during 1951-52 in Gingee taluk	98-99

	P—cont.	PAGES
Ports—		
Question re—		
Development of Beypore Port	197-198	
Improvement of Calicut Port	447	
Special Officer's report on the improvement of minor	293	
Poultry farms—		
Question re particulars re — in the State	546	
Preventive Detention Act—		
Question re implementation of	397-399	
Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question	763-764	
Procurement bonus—		
Question re—Payment of—in certain villages of Bapatla taluk	775-776	
Prohibition—		
Question re—		
Ameliorative measures for ex-toddy tappers	302-304	
Culinary essences, sale at blackmarket prices of	399	
Number of vans supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram	283	
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
See Bills.		
Prohibition department—		
Question re clerks in — promotion of	896	
Public Administration.		
See Administrative machinery.—		
Public Prosecutors.		
Question re—Pay and daily fees of—representation re	682	
Public Service Commission, Madras —		
Question re —		
Refund of fees to rejected applicants and selections in 1950	282-283	
Viva voce examinations by the —, stenographic recording of	897	
Pudukkottai—		
Question re—		
Devasthanam employees of — grant of dearness allowance to	675	
Forest officials of — absorption in Madras Forest Service of	894-895	
Medical officers of — absorption in Madras Medical Service of	469-470	
Irrigation schemes in—execution of	525-526	
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Rance's Hospital, augmenting the bed strength of	777-778	
Pulla Reddi, Sri C.—		
Bill—		
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	255-257	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1061-1062	
Pumpsets—		
Question re—American 'Hallet', purchase of	1000	
Pundarikakshacharyulu, Sri P.—		
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	750, 801	
	817-818	
	822, 903	
	1018-1019	
Questions and Answers —		
Anantha Pai, Sri T.—		
Question re—		
Electricity, supply of Jog power to South Kanara	471-472	
Municipal elections, prevention of corrupt practices in	548	
Appa Rao, Sri M. R.—		
Question re —Government Hospital at Nuzvid, improvement of	463	

	Q—cont.	PAGES
Questions and Answers—cont.		
Appu, Sri A.—		
Question re—		
Bus fares in Kozhikode—Kakkodi route, revision of	672-673	
Hindu temples in Malabar, appointment of Non-caste Hindus as executive officers of	454	
Aranganathan Sri K.—		
Question re—		
Deputy Collectors, Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars who were reverted on 15th August 1952	29	
Groun nut Market Committee for North Arcot and Salem Districts, constitution of—	448-450	
Poramboke lands, fines collected in 1951-52 in Gingee taluk for cultivation of	93-99	
Separation of judiciary from the executive, reservation of posts for Revenue staff in the scheme of	450	
Vans supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram, number of	283	
Arumugam, Sri R. S.—		
Question re Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police directly recruited between 1st April 1937 and 31st March, 1952 number of	548	
Arunachalam, Sri A. J.—		
Question re handloom weavers, exemption from payment of house or property tax levied by local bodies of	881-882	
Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y.—		
Question re Pincha project (Cuddapah district), investigation of	469	
Babu Naidu, Sri P.—		
Question re—		
Rayapuram, Modukuru and Jampapalam dams — Investigation of	872-873	
Yellamanchili Panchayat Board, suspension of	87-90	
Balakrishnan, Sri V.—		
Question re—		
Agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division, particulars re	1007	
Cancer hospital at Madras, allotment of site for	870-871	
Capital punishment, award of—in Pudukkottai before and after merger	106	
Cement factory at Pudukkottai, opening of	389	
Forest blocks in Pudukkottai division, auctioning for green manure purposes	668	
Government fuel depot at Pudukkottai, closure of	535-536	
Land Mortgage Bank for Pudukkottai division, date of starting of	1002	
Medical officers of Pudukkottai State, absorption into Madras Medical Service	469-470	
New irrigation schemes in Pudukkottai Division, execution of—	525-526	
Pudukkottai Forest staff — Absorption in Madras Forest Service,	894-895	
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Rance's hospital, bed strength of	777-778	
Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department, grant of dearness allowance to employees of	675	
Ranalingam Chettiar Retrenchment Committee recommendations, implementation of	765-766	
South Madras Electric Corporation, financial help to	889	
Tuberculosis Fund of Pudukkottai State, disposal of	882	
Chandra Ramalingiah, Sri—		
Question re—		
Anti-malarial operations in Divi taluk, conduct of	286	
Buses permitted to run a second trip each day, number of	7	
Motor Vehicles Act, representation re violation of section 65 of, by bus-owners.	774-775	

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Dasaratharamiah, Sri D.— Question re Thermal station, Nellore, particulars re	987-988
Gopala Menon, Sri N. Question re Communal disturbances at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connexion with Cow slaughter	387-388
Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala— Question re— Puthrangipuram Panchayat Board President, removal of Planning Commission, Report of the Technical Committee (Khosla Committee) on	1007 655-657
Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.— Question re drinking water-supply to Cochin	870
Gopalan, Sri K. P.— Question re— Bridge over Cherupuzhu thodu, construction of Communist political prisoner in Salem Jail, transfer to their linguistic districts of Employment Exchange number of unemployed registered by Filaria-sis, control in North Malabar of— House tax, levy by panchayat boards of Hydrogenation factory in Kozhikode, management of Labour unions of municipal workers, refusal of recognition in certain cases Munsif's Court at Payyanur, opening of— Paddy price paid to Jenmis in Malabar Pensioners' Association, Cannanore, memorial from the —	890 785 895 780-781 1001-1002 785 400-401 675 989-990 664
Gopalan Unni Sri K. C.— Question re—Crop failure in Malabar	997
Govinda Rao, Sri K.— Question re— Famine relief works in Visakhapatnam district Foodgrain export from Visakhapatnam district, Prevention of Minister's tour in Srikakulam district for election purposes Rent Reduction, application of — to under-tenure estates and darmila inams in Vizianagaram Estate Sarada river (Visakhapatnam district), letting of molasses from the Thummapala Sugar Factory in the Secondary Schools, promotion from Lower Grade to Grade I Telugu Pandits in Well subsidy scheme, recovery of loan granted to Sri Appa a Narasimha Raju	879-881 779-780 865-869 202-293 533-534 781-782 396-397
Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.— Question re— Assignment to political sufferers of land occupied by the poor, disputes arising out of Mohan Industries Limited., Tenali, grant of State aid to Panchayat boards major and minor, mode of elections to Preventive Detention Act, implementation of Tenancy legislation, enactment of Village Panchayat Act, changes suggested by Cabinet Sub- Committee in the Water-tax of excess collection from cultivators of termieric in Krishna Western Delta	294-285 392-394 16-17 397-398 280-281 6-7 104-105
Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.— Question re retrenchment as a result of decontrol —	877-878
Kandaswami Sri C.— Question re rice, steps taken to check the rise in price in Tanjore district of	23
Kondayya, Sri G. C.— Question re irrigation works in Atmakur taluk, expenditure on	788-789

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Kosalram, Sri K. T.— Question re— Five-crore loan of the Government for financing electricity and irrigation schemes Five-year Plan, memorandum re, submitted by Government to Prime Minister of India	786-787 659-661
Kotaiah, Sri Pragada— Question re— Interest-free loans to fishermen, grant of Khadi production and sale by co-operative societies Weavers' co-operative societies, exemption from levy of audit fees Yarn for making fishing nets, procedure for supply of Yarn, reduction in the price of	288-289 282 103 461 462-463
Krishna Rao, Sri K.— Question re— Andhra Desa Libraries Conference, implementation of the resolutions of Armed Police camps, number and activities of Birth control clinics in the State, number, location, etc. of Central Co-operative Bank employees, Deposit of security of Committee constituted under G.O. No. 2483, Education, dated 28th September 1948 Community Project Executive Officers, names, qualifications, etc., of Co-operative department employees, prohibition from member- ship of co-operative societies of Co-operative weaver's societies, adoption of a model — by-law for appointment of clerks in Electoral roll revision in 1952-53, allocation of the expenditure between Government and local bodies Electric power supply from Jog Falls to Rayalaseema and South Kanara Government servants' association with friends of the Soviet Union and with Peace Committees Government servants, Ventilation of grievances through Legis- lators Government servants working under emergency provisions, number of Habitual offenders settlements, particulars re Handlooms in South Arcot, Chittoor, etc., districts, number of House rent allowance sanctioned for Government servants Hydro-electric sites, investigation of Internal security measures, expenditure on, during 1950-53 Kanupur scheme, details regarding Librarians under District Library Committees Libraries, purchase of books from or about Soviet Union and China by Library service, scheme for extension of Madras Public Service Commission, refund of fees to rejected applicants and selections in 1950-52 Madras Public Service Commission, stenographic recording of viva voce examinations by Munnetru Project, investigation of Maternity and child welfare centres, number of, in famished areas of the State in 1952 Milk, free supply through maternity and child welfare centres to expectant mothers, etc. Minor Ports, report on the improvement of Pension, counting of officiating service and pay for Prohibition Department, promotion of clerks in Rayalaseema, steps taken for the economic development of	21-22 462 26 896 24 9-12 990-991 200 550-551 286-288 1 83-87 684 543-544 748 99-100 465 26-28 291-292 671-672 19-20 278-279 282-283, 897 682 784-785 463 466 293 682-683 896 539-543

Questions and Answers—cont.	Q—cont.	PAGES
Krishna Rao, Sri K.—cont.		
Question re—		
Report of Committee on the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive		94-95
Rural Welfare Committees, nomination of non-officials to		684
Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks, qualifications prescribed for		683-684
Ryotwari areas, increase or decrease in the extent of wet areas in		520-523
Service Associations, recognition by Government		456-458
State co-operative unions, annual grants made to		101-102
State Library Committee, action taken on the resolutions of		544
Stores, purchase of, in England		677-678
Thermal station at Nellore, information re power generation, supply, etc., in		466-467
Water rates charged under different irrigation systems		465-466
Krishnamurthy Gounder, Sri D.—		
Question re Ministers, pay and allowances of		467
Krishnamurthy Rao, Sri B.—		
Question re Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur, opening of—		660-661
Krishnan, Sri R.—		
Question re—		
Kumar Industries, Palghat, grant of State aid to		455-456
Kumar Industries, Palghat, memorandum re industrial dispute in		674
Municipal elections, use of indelible ink in		887-888
Kunhi Mohamed Shafee, Janab—		
Question re—		
Election duties, delay in payment of travelling allowance to teachers in Walluvanad for		538
Non-gazetted officers in the Revenue department in Malabar, non confirmation of		100-101
Tirurkkad Anakkayam road (Malabar), bus route, opening of		102-103
Kunhirama Kurup, Sri C.—		
Question re—		
Bridge across Kanaya goda Ferry (North Malabar), construction of		456
Ferry service, collection of excess fares by ferry contractors in Malabar for		22
Headquarters Hospital, Badagara, acquisition of a site for extension of		7-8
Lakshmana Das, Sri L.—		
Question re—		
Calingapatnam Port, improvement of		447
Model agricultural farms, starting of		195-196
Lakshminarayana Reddy, Sri T.—		
Question re—		
Bridge across Venkajeru river, construction of		545
British Governor's photos, removal of, from Rajaji Hall		679
Bukkapatnam tank (Anantapur district), improving the water supply resources of		469
Forest guards and watchers, increase of salary of		897
Gajulapalli tank, improvements to		892
Gruel centres in Kayalascema, substitution of sangati for gruel in		468
Takkavi loans in Anantapur district, grant of		896

Questions and Answers—cont.	Q—cont.	PAGES
Latchanna, Sri G.—		
Question re—		
Backward classes, constitution of statutory Welfare Board for		678
Bus route permits, proceed re for issue of		28
Co-operative Central Bank, Srikakulam, supersession of		994-996
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, dropping of		447-448
Estates taken over under the Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, district war figures re		467
Ex-toddy tappers, employment for		302-303
Inam villages which are not estates after the passing of the Estates Land (Amendment) Act, 1936		467-468
Indian Evacuees and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society, Yellamanchili, representation re mal-administration of		95
Kanur Lanka in West Godavari, Government's claim to— under the Estates Abolition Act		996-997
Kattubandi collection from darimila inam holders		778-779
Land, illegal alienations by zamindars of		783-784
Machkund Hydro-Electric Project, details re		528-530
Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts, constitution of a Development Board for		523-524
Mahamed Salih Maraikayar, Janab—		
Question re Rent Reduction Act, alleged application of— to non-estate villages		1008
Mogral, Janab M. S.—		
Question re—		
Culinary essences, sale of— at blackmarket prices		399
Filaria, prevention in Kasaragod town		12
Glas, Boat Training centres in the State, particulars re		1002-1003
Government Headquarters Hospital, Mangalore, facilities for tuberculosis patients in		532-533
Panchayat boards in South Kanara district, holding of election to		14-16
Political sufferers, assignment of land to		878-879
Moidu, Janab K.—		
Question re Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities, adjudication of industrial dispute in		470
Muni Reddi, Sri M.—		
Question re—		
American 'Hallet' pumpsets, purchase of		1000
Artesian wells in South Arcot district		986-987
Dedda hall Anicut, execution of		787
Electricity supply to Hosur taluk		786
Lignite mining in South Arcot district		452-453
Livestock Research Station in Hosur, cost of maintenance and popularizing the results of experiments in		24-26
Live stock Research Station in Hosur, number of fishing tanks in		106
Non-gazetted officers, grant of educational concessions to the children of		524-525
Schools and colleges, details re		464
Nagarajan, Sri V. R.—		
Question re gruel centres in South Arcot district, opening of		675
Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—		
Question re—		
Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory, shifting of— from Kodur to Madras		1003-1005
Fire station at Rajampet, opening of		402-404
Land assignment to landless poor, applications for		676

Q—cont.

PAGE

Questions and Answers—cont.
Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—

Question re—

Beypore port, development of	197-198
Coconut Research Station at Chowghat, opening of	200
Communal disturbance at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connection with cow-slaughter	387-388
Dist. let Board, Guntur, remarks regarding administration of	12-13
Dry and wet assessment in Malabar	404-405
Electricity, extension of — to Ottapalam, Malabar	537
Jenmi pattadars in Malabar, details re	26
Local bodies, running of bus transport and electricity services by	515-516
Lock-out in Malabar Mampuram Tile and Clay Works	201-202
Paddy procurement price, delay in payment of	777
Yarn purchase under card system, temporary suspension of	23

Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.—

Question re—

House-rent allowance, grant of — to Government servants in Hosdurg	180
Local Fund dispensary at Hosdurg, conversion into a Government hospital	516-517
Schools, opening of — in certain villages of Kasargod taluk	532
Waste land, forest land and land cultivated with coconuts, arecanuts and pepper in Kasargod taluk, extent of	468

Narayanan Nambiar, Sri T. C.—

Question re—

Arson in Chirakkal taluk in 1948-49	17-18
Malabar Tenancy Act, reduction of fair rent for pepper gardens fixed under the	537
Mobile motion picture vehicles of American Consulate, exemption from taxation of	201
Staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control	876-877
Tuberculosis Sanatorium, Periyaram, North Malabar, completion of work on	884-885

Narayana Nappa, Sri S.—

Question re—

Calendering machine, installation in Rayalaseema	90
Dispensaries in panchayats, financial aid to	404
Foodgrains Movement Control Order, prosecutions under	5
Land revenue remission in Pelabilli village, Penukonda taluk	889
Mid-Pennar Project, investigation of	890
Teachers, revision of the salaries of	290
Tungabhadra High Level canal, inclusion in Five-Year Plan	199-200
Village panchayats, list of trained executive officers for	202-203

Narayanaswamy, Sri M.—

Question re—

Fire station at Ongole, opening of	402
Nippatipadu tank (Ongole taluk), repair of	519
Tobacco barns, coal allotment to	787-788
Tour programmes of Ministers, particulars re	673-674

Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri M. K.—

Question re Indian nationals in Burma (Burma evacuees), repayment of subsistence allowance paid to	676
--	-----

Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question

Rajam Ramaswami, Sri C.—

Question re

Panchayat boards, holding of elections to—under the Village Panchayats Act, 1950	539
--	-----

PAGE

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.—

Question re—

Agricultural loans granted to Harijans and Harijan Christians	1006
Construction of a bridge across the Godavari at Alamuru	290
Fair price shops, procedure for appointment of dealers for	871-872
Grant of land in Unguturu Reserve Forest, West Godavari, to political sufferers	1006
Harijan Hostel, Masulipatnam, number of boarders, etc., in	894
Harijans, promotion to the Tahsildar's grade	773-774
Pattas, number applied for and granted in West Godavari district	682

Rama Rao, Sri G.—

Question re—

Deputy Collectors, abolition of direct recruitment to the posts of	103
Fair price shop for Government servants in Masulipatnam town	463
Higher Elementary School, Dokipparru, Krishna district, conversion into a middle school	531
Land, assignment to poor people	992-994
Land, encroachment by ryots of Dondapadu village	766-768
Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Madras, separation of the Andhra Non-Gazetted Officers' Association (Central), Eluru, from	520
Police Sub-Inspectors, direct recruitment of	279-280
Staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control	874-875
Waste land in Kaikalur taluk, extent of	893

Rama Rao, Sri P.—

Question re—

Administration of zamindari forests	988-989
Goat-browsing in zamindari forests, permission for	389-391

Rama Rao, Sri V.—

Question re—

Drama—Ban on Telugu play "Mundadugu"	90-91
Drama—Ban on Telugu play "Mahhoomi"	91-93
Fair price shops in Krishna district, number and offtake after decontrol	458
Government Hospital, Nandigama, extension of	538
Lanka lands leased out to field labour co-operative societies, Krishna district, remission of rentals	669-670
People's rights in zamindari forests, press note on	789
Ration in upland and delta areas, rice content of	198-199
Rice, Export from Krishna district, prevention of	2-5
Well Subsidy Scheme, recovery of advances under the	190-192

Ramalingam, Sri S.—

Question re—

Craft Instructors of aided secondary schools, enhancement of salary of	13
Famine condition in Pattukkottai taluk	897
Kattalai High Level Canal	990-991
Lands, cancellation of assignments of — to some political sufferers in Tanjore district	291
Tanjore Municipal scavengers strike, action taken by Government re	87

Ramaswami, Sri V. V.—

Question re—

Government business, transaction in regional languages (Tamil)	665-666
Municipal administration, reorganization of	1006

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Rangasami Reddiar, Sri P.—

Question re—

Bus permits, recipients of — during 1947–52 in Tiruchirappalli district	471
High Court, number of criminal appeals pending in the — on 1st April 1952	471
Police authorities in Karur, allegations against	785–786

Ratnaswamy, Sri A. M.—

Question re—Udamalpet Municipality, Reservation of seat for scheduled castes in	890
---	-----

Satyanarayana, Sri G.—

Question re Rural Medical training centres, number of	675
---	-----

Seetharamiah, Sri D.—

Question re—

Beedi workers, implementing the awards of Industrial Tribunal	450–452
Contour Bunding Scheme continuance, in Vayalpad taluk	984
Diet supplied in Jails, nutritive value of	105
Estates taken over in Chittoor district, number of	186–187
Housing scheme at Madanapalle, progress of	1000–1001
Madanapalle Theosophical High School, taking over the management of — by Government	277–278
Nutritive value of gruel supplied in gruel centres	196–197
School-fee concessions for poor Brahman students, grant of	395–396
Subsistence loans in Madanapalle, number of applications for	888
Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles, taking over by Government	22–23
Weekly searches of Communist prisoners in jails	96–98

Sivasankara Reddi, Sri G.—

Question re—

Electricity, extension of power to villages around Hindupur from Hindupur supply station	536
Thermal station at Kadiri, construction of	201

Sri Krishna, Sri D.—

Question re—

Agricultural College, Bapatla, compensation for lands acquired for	20–21
Disafforestation of 800 acres in Kothapalem Reserve Forest, application for	198
Electricity supply to Bapatla Municipality	537
Harijan Welfare Department, Communities eligible for help by	301–302
Romperu Ryots' Association, representations from	776–777
Tank bed lands, assignment to political sufferers in Guntur district	193–195

Subba Reddi, Sri K.—

Question re—

Famine relief works in Palnad taluk	983–984
Registration fee, complaints about levy of — in Guntur district	667–668

Subramanian, Sri M. P.—

Question re—

Agricultural demonstrators, scales of pay of	891
Police Constables, supply of boots to	891–892

Swayamprakasam, Sri S.—

Question re District and Sessions Judge, information re —

appointed by direct recruitment recently	526–527
--	---------

Syamasundara Rao, Sri P.—

Question re agricultural labourers, minimum wages for	657–659
---	---------

Thangavelu, Sri R.—

Question re Harijan Inspectors of Police promoted as Deputy

Superintendents of Police in 1951–52, number of	551
---	-----

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Urkavalan Sri P.—

Question re Vayali Malayadipatti tank, repair of	984–985
--	---------

Vemiah, Sri S.—

Question re—

Andhra Paper Mills, working of	304
Artesian wells in South Arcot district, number and amount spent on	690–681
Artisans, supply of tools to — in Nellore district under Firka Development Scheme	547–548
Basic Training School, Pallipad, Nellore district, cost of building the	680
District Welfare Officers, supply of jeeps to — to speed up Harijan uplift work	546
Ex-toddy tappers, ameliorative measures for	303–304
Government servants, remarks in confidential files of	304
Kasturidevi High School, Nellore, building grant sanctioned for	893
Labour cases treated in Government Hospitals during 1949–52, number of	29
Lands reserved for depressed classes in Nellore district, alleged cultivation of — by caste ryots	680–681
Malaria cases treated in Government Hospitals in 1949–1952, number of	891
Manganese ore in Nellore district, mining of	893
Medical officers deputed to Hyderabad State	304
Medical practitioners of Indigenous Medicine in rural dispensaries, grant of subsidy to	550
Nellore district, bifurcation of	892
Nellore district Inferior Servants' Association, representation from	548
Nurses deputed for training in the United Kingdom, particulars re	29
Paddy thrashing machines, manufacture of	549
Polytechnics and technological institutes, construction of buildings for	546–547
Poultry farms in the State, particulars re	546
Public Prosecutors, pay and daily fees of	682
Return of election expenses, expenditure incurred by the Government for action taken in cases of failure to lodge	549–550
Rural Industrialization Scheme of Visveswarayya, Sri M., implementation of	681
Rural Welfare Committee for Nellore district, composition of	545
Secondary grade Government Training school at Nellore, starting of	893
Starvation deaths in 1951–52, number of	678
Sulphuric acid industry, starting of — in Chittoor district	545
Takkavi and subsistence loans disbursed in Nellore district in 1952, amount of	544
Treasure trove in Singapet, Nellore district, alleged discovery of	680
Village Vaidyas, number and remuneration of	470–471
Water-supply, improvement of — in Tirupati town	550

Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.—

Question re—

Cattle-breeding co-operative societies in Cuddapah district, formation of	180–182
Co-operative Motor Transport Society for ex-servicemen at Cuddapah, organization of	782
Cuddapah South Forest Division, number of coupes leased out in	394
Dispensary in Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk, opening of	199
Foresters, instructions regarding transfer of	107

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.—cont.

Question re—

Roads laid under Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema, maintenance of	670-671
Weavers' co-operative societies exclusively for Harijans, number of	104

Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—

Question re—

Arts College, Cuddapah, dramatic performances for collecting funds for hostel of	679
Community projects, expenditure on and staff for	8-9
Drainage scheme for Tenali, estimate of cost	5-6
Electricity supply to Jaggayapet	882
Electricity supply to Nandigama taluk	883-884
Government Hospital, Munagala, working of	95-96
Government officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and above, number of	187-188
House-rent allowance, withholding of payment to menial staff, Tenali	23-24
Krishna Anicut, damages to	885-886
Law College, Madras, provision of a hostel for the students of	517-519
Legislative Assembly staff, overtime allowances paid to—during Budget session (June-July 1952)	668-669
Motor buses and cars, rates of tax from 1948 onwards	783
Munagala estate, enquiry into the dispute between the Zamindar and tenants	182-184
Tanks in Munagala estate, repair of	87,873-4
Water-supply scheme for Jaggayapet, sanction of	93

Venkiah Sri K.—

Question re—

Chinakula Sesha Sastri of Bapatla, death of	184-186
Guntur Tobacco Market Committee, inclusion of groundnut within the scope of	294-295
Lands, assignment of—to political sufferers	285
Procurement bonus, payment of—in certain villages of Bapatla taluk	775-776
S.S.L.C. Examination results, announcement of—in due time	527-528
Tobacco, fixation of minimum prices for	293-294
Tobacco re-drying plant at Guntur, setting up of	295-296

Vinayakam Sri K.—

Question re—

Co-operative department, strength of gazetted officers communitywar in	985-986
--	---------

Viswanatham, Sri T.—

Question re—

Community projects in the State, details re	534-535
Commutation rates of rent fixed under the Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act	452
Eviction of villagers of Kottur	296-298
Forest officials in Cuddapah district, complaint against the	998-1000
Government bus passenger tickets, printing of	300-301
Homeopaths, request for registration under the Medical Registration Act	531
Konduri Satyanarayana's death while in Police custody	459-461
Krishna Co-operative Central Bank, Masulipatnam, management of	298-299
Lands of aborigines in Wynad, dispossession of	296
Legislators' Hostel, thefts in the	661-662
Paper used in Government offices, whether Indian or foreign	666-667
Pensioners, removal of the out in dearness allowance and other reliefs for	662-664
Planning Commission, Report of the Technical Committee of— (Khosla Committee)	653-654

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Viswanatham, Sri T.—cont.

Question re—cont.

Rajagopal Naidu's death while in Police lock-up	188-189
Rationing Officer, Malabar district, allegations against	870
Ravula Subba Rao's death while in Police lock-up	768-772
Rules under article 166 (3) of the Constitution	179-180
Taluk Supply Officer, Guntur, allegations of misconduct against	773

R

Raghava Mudaliar, Sri E. L.—

Resolution re Handloom Industry	480
---	-----

Rajachidambaram, Sri P. B. K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1045
	1026

Rajagopal Naidu—

Question re death of—while in Police lock-up	188-189
--	---------

Rajagopala Rao, Sri K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	719, 808-
	809, 837, 845-846
	899-900, 907, 910
	921-922.

Business of the House, discussion re	898
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	307

Rajagopalachari, the Hon. Sri C.—

Adjournment motion re—

Andhra State, Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of	556-557
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1013
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	689-690
Eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district	687
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	795-796
Assembly proceedings, translation of	203-204
	305-306

Bills—

Cotton Control Bill, 1952	423
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	405, 408-
	409, 419
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952	485
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	493-494
	497-498
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	560-561

806, 609-615, 617, 693
696, 702-704, 706, 708-
709, 714, 716-717, 722
725-729, 739, 750, 756-
759, 798, 804-806, 811
827-832, 859-861, 901
905-910, 914-915, 938
942, 944, 946, 948-953
956, 963-964, 978-974
1016, 1018, 1022-1023
1025-1027, 1029-1030
1033, 1073-1079.

Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	30, 108
--	---------

Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to the	431
--	-----

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	314-315,
	367-375
Handloom Industry	39, 135-
	146

	PAGES
<i>R—cont.</i>	
Rajam Ramaswami, Sri C.— Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. See Questions and Answers.	259-261
Rajan, Sri P. T.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	724-726
Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar— Adjournment motion re retrenchment of workers in — ..	552-554
Rajaram, Sri K.— Leave of absence to Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur ..	31
Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.— See Questions and Answers.	
Raju, Sri K. T.— Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	321-324
Rama Rao, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	913 307, 353- 355, 375
See Questions and Answers.	
Rama Rao, Sri P.— See Questions and Answers.	
Rama Rao, Sri V.— See Questions and Answers.	
Ramaiah Choudary, Sri K.— Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	331-334
Ramakrishna Reddy, Sri B.— Adjournment motion re students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools .. See Questions and Answers.	798
Ramalingam, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. 804, 814, 900-901 910, 922-924.	170-172
Ramalingam Chettiyar Retrenchment Committee— See Retrenchment Committee.	
Ramalingiah, Sri Chandra— Bills—Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. See Questions and Answers.	497
Ramamurthi, Sri P.— Adjournment motion re— Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts .. Famine and food policy of the Madras Government .. Retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar .. Adjournment motion, rules re .. Bills— Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952 .. Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 ..	1012 793 552-553 100 475-477, 479 1082

R—cont.

Ramamurthi, Sri P.— <i>cont.</i> Bills— <i>cont.</i> Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. 561, 570-578, 692- 693, 696, 706-707, 709- 712, 714-715, 717-718 724, 726-728, 735-737 744-747, 755, 798-800 806-807, 810-812, 819- 820, 828-831, 834-836 847-849, 858-859, 861 863, 903, 906-909, 914 916-920, 924-938, 943- 945, 949-951, 967, 969- 970, 972-973, 1016-1018 1022, 1027-1029, 1044- 1048.	489-491 558-559
Condolence resolution re death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur ..	445-446
Ramasami, Sri V. V.— See Questions and Answers.	
Ramasami Thevar, Sri A.— See Questions and Answers.	
Ramesaro, Sri K. V.— Bills— Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	496-497 173-174 729, 928, 1057-1058 52-53
Resolution re Handloom Industry ..	
Ranga Rao, Sri K.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	246-247 833
Rangasamy Reddiar, Sri P.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. See Questions and Answers.	961-962 1014-1015, 1021- 1023
Rao, Sri C. V. K.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952 .. Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 .. Tanjore Tenants Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. 607-609, 754, 816 843-845, 851-852 236	251-252 473, 475 1080 492-493 236-237 236
Food situation in the State, debate on ..	
Motion re Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, amendment of Schedule II to the .. Resolution re—Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	432-433 307, 337- 342, 376
Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh— Question re communal disturbances at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connexion with the anti-cow slaughter campaign of —	

	PAGES
Rathinam, Sri A.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	269-272
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	605-607
Rathnaswami, Sri A. M.— Resolution re—economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	347-349
See Questions and Answers.	
Rayalaseema— Question re steps taken for the economic development of —	539-543
Registration fee— Question re complaints about levy of — in Guntur district.. .. .	667-668
Rent Reduction Act— Application of—to under-tenure estates and darimila inams in Vizianagram Estate	292-293
Question re alleged application of—to non-estate villages	1008
Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952— See Bills	
Resolution re— Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	308-370
Handloom Industry	32-31, 108
Retrenchment— Question re staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control.	-148
Retrenchment Committee— Question re recommendations of the Ramalingam Chettiar — implementation of	874-878
Rice— See Food.	765-766
Roads— Question re maintenance of — laid under Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema	670-671
Rules— Question re making of — under article 166 (3) of the Constitution	179-180
Rulings— Bills—Amendments—Scope of the Bill— Amendments to enlarge the scope of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill so as to make it applicable to all the other districts in the State also, are out of order. The scope of a Bill can be enlarged only by withdrawing it and bringing in a fresh Bill	1018, 1019 1027-1029
Bills—Select Committee Report—Presentation— Select Committee Report need not be presented to the House if it is decided to drop the Bill	31
Rural Industrialization Scheme— Question re implementation of the — of Visweswarayya, Sri M.	681
Rural Medical practitioners— See Medical practitioners.	
Rural Medical Training Centres— Question re number of —	675

R—cont.

	PAGES
Rural Welfare Committees— Question re— Nellore district—composition of	545
Nomination of non-officials to —	684
Rural Welfare Officers— Question re qualifications prescribed for —	683-684
Ryotwari areas— Question re increase or decrease in the extent of wet areas in —	520-523
Sahajananda, Sri A. S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	591-592
Salem Jail— Question re Communist (political) prisoners in — transfer to their native districts	765
Salem Jail shooting incident— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Sambandam, Sri K. R.— Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	187-189
Resolution re Handloom Industry	565-570, 720, 1059-1061
Samia Koorayar, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	237-239, 593-594
Sankara Reddi, the Hon. Sri N.— Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	250, 256 415-418
Sankarayya, Sri B.— Adjournment motion re elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	687-688
Sarada river— Question re letting of molasses from the Thummapala Sugar Factory in the —, prevention of	533-534
Satyanarayana, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1058-1059
See Questions and Answers.	
Satyanarayana, Sri Konduri— Question re death of—while in Police custody	459-461
Scavengers— See Strikes.	
School-fee concessions— Question re— Grant of — to Brahmin students	395-396
—for the children of non-gazetted officers	624-625
Schools— Question re— Basic Training School, Pallipad, cost of the building of	680
Craft Instructors in aided secondary — in Tanjore, enhancement of pay of	13
Higher Elementary School, Dokipparu, Krishna district, conversion into a middle school	531
Kasturidevi Girls' High School, Nellore, building grant sanctioned for	893
Madanapalle Theosophical High School, taking over the management of—by Government	277-278
Opening of — in certain villages of Kasaragod taluk	532
and Colleges, details re	464
Secondary Grade Government Training School at Nellore, starting of	893
Telugu Pandits in secondary—promotion from lower grade to Grade I	781-782

R—cont.

S—cont.

PAGES

Secondary School-Leaving Certificate Examination— Question re announcement of results in due time	527-528
Seetharamiah, Sri D.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	731-735
Resolution re — Handloom Industry	741-742, 813-815, 832, 833, 911-913
See Questions and Answers.	110-112
Selvaraj, Sri P.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	587-589
Service Association— Question re	
Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association, representation from	343
Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Madras, separation of the Andhra Non-Gazetted Officers' Association (Central), Eluru, from	520
Recognition of — by Government, rules re.	456-458
Services— See Government servants. See Public Service Commission, Madras.	
Sesha Sastri, Sri Chinakula— Question re death of —	184-186
Shanmugam, Sri K.— See Questions and Answers.	
Shanmugam, Sri T.— Resolution re. — Handloom Industry	123-129
Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities— Question re adjudication of industrial dispute in —	470
Siddanna Gowd, Sri R.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	265-267
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	801, 905
Sivaprakasam, Sri V. S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	901
Sivaraaj, Sri N.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	601-602
Sivasankara Reddi, Sri G.— See Questions and Answers.	592-593
Soundaram Ramachandran, Dr. T. S.— Resolution re Handloom Industry	119-120
South Madras Electric Corporation— Question re financial help to —	889
Speaker, Mr.— Adjournment motion re — Agrarian discontent in Romperu Drain Area	792
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer.	1010, 1011
Andhra State, Sri Potti Srimulu's fast for the formation of —	554-558

S—cont.

PAGES

Speaker, Mr.— cont. Adjournment motion re — cont.	
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1012-1013
Educational facilities to backward class students	792
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	687-690
Eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district	685, 687
Famine and food policy of the Madras Government	792-793
Famine in Kakinada taluk	792
Famine in Nellore	791, 792
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
Landless labourers, Government order re grant of land on pattas to	791-792
Rent collection for grazing lands in Kanigiri taluk	791
Retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	552, 553, 554
Starvation deaths in Guntur	791
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	793, 794, 795, 796
Varam price of paddy	792
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari)	1013, 1014
Adjournment motion, rules re	789-790
Assembly proceedings, translation of	1008, 1010
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	305, 306
561, 692, 693, 718, 733, 738, 742, 751, 797, 798, 808, 837	
Business of the House, information re	559, 560
Condolence resolution re death of Kumaraswamy Rajah Bahadur	561, 692, 693, 718, 733, 738, 742, 751, 797, 798, 808, 837
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on.	898
Panel of Chairmen, announcement of	445, 447
Privilege motion re incorrect answer of a Minister to a supplementary question	446, 447
See Rulings.	558
Special Armed Police Units— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	30
Sri Krishna, Sri V.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	763, 764
See Questions and Answers.	
Srikakulam district— Question re Development Board for Visakhapatnam district and —, constitution of	204-206
716, 733-734, 740-741	
Sriramulu, Sri Potti— Adjournment motion re fast of — for the formation of the Andhra State	523-524
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	554-557
Starvation deaths— Question re number of — in 1951-52	678
See Adjournment motions and Famine.	
State aid to Industries Act— Question re grant of loan to Mohan Industries, Limited, Tanali under —	392-394

S—cont.

State co-operative unions— Question re annual grants made to —	101-102
State Library Committee— See Library Committee.	
Stores— Question re purchase of — in England	677-678
Strike— Adjournment motion re students' — in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	793-796
Question re Municipal scavengers' — in Tanjore, action taken by the Government re	87
Sub-Magistrate's Court— See Courts.	
Subba Rao, Sri Ravula — Question re death of — while in Police lock-up	768-772
Subba Reddi, Sri K.— Bills— Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	734
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	499-509
See Questions and Answers.	
Subbiah, Sri A. K.— Bills — Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	594-595
Subramaniam, the Hon. Sri C.— Adjournment motion re Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
Bills— Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	427-428
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	262, 267-269, 415, 417, 418
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952	473, 474, 477-479, 480-481, 484, 486
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	560, 605, 606, 930-933, 935, 968-969, 1018, 1030
Business of the House— Change in the order of —	439-441
Programme of —	235-898
Condolence resolution re death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur	445
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	108
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on	107-558
Motion re change of non-official into official day (rule 24)	690
Subramaniam, Sri M. P.— See Questions and Answers.	
Subsistence allowance— Question re repayment of — paid to Indian Nationals in Burma	676
Subsistence loans— See Famine.	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952— See Bills.	
Sulphuric acid— Question re starting of — industry in Chittoor district	545

S—cont.

Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952— See Bills.	
Suryanarayana R. ju, Sri Raja Sagi— Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	409-410
Swaminathan, Sri R. V.— Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen	30
Swayamprakasam, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	151-157 584-587, 612, 694 696-699, 703-706 710-711, 1041-1044
See Questions and answers.	
Swearing-in of Member— Chandra Chudamani Deo, Sri Vyricherla	653
Syamesundara Rao, Sri P.— See Questions and Answers.	
T	
Takkavi loans— Question re — in Anantapur district, grant of	896
Taluk Supply Officer, Guntur— Question re allegations of misconduct against the —	773
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952— See Bills.	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance— See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Tank — Question re— Bukkapatnam — in Anantapur district, improving the water-supply resources of	469
Gajulapalli tank, improvements to	892
Nippatipadu — in Ongole taluk, repair of	519
In Munagala Estate, repairs to —	873-874
Vayali-Malayadipatti tank, repair of	984-985
Tank bed lands— See Land.	
Teachers— Question re revision of the salaries of —	290
Technological institutes— Question re construction of buildings for certain—	546-547
Telugu Pandits— See Schools.	
Temples— Question re Hindu — in Malabar, appointment of non-caste Hindus as executive officers of	454
Tenancy Legislation— Question re enactment of — for the entire State	280-281
Thangavelu, Sri R.— See Questions and Answers.	
Thermal station— See Electricity.	
Thimma Reddi, Sri P.— Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	257-259
Condolence resolution re death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur	446
Nominated to the Panel of Chairman	30
Resolution re— Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	344-347
Handloom Industry	55-56

	PAGES
T—cont.	
Thinakaraswamy Thevar, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	169-170
Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles— Question re taking over of — by Government ..	22-23
Tobacco— Question re fixation of minimum prices for — ..	293-294
Tobacco barns— Question re coal allotment for each tobacco barn, quantity of ..	787-788
Tobacco Market Committee (Guntur)— Question re inclusion of groundnut within the scope of — ..	294-295
Tobacco redrying plant— Question re setting up of a — at Guntur ..	295-296
Transport— Question re— Bus route permits, procedure for issue of ..	28
Bus route permits, recipients of — during 1947 to 1952 in Tiruhipappalli district. ..	471
Buses permitted to run a second trip each day, number of ..	7
Co-operative Motor Transport Society for ex-servicemen at Cuddapah, organization of a ..	782
Government Transport bus passenger tickets, printing of ..	300-301
Revision of bus fares on Kozhikode-Kakkodi route ..	672-673
Running of bus — services by local bodies ..	515-516
Tax on cars and buses, rates from 1948 onwards ..	788
Tirurkkad-Anakkayam (Malabar) bus route, opening of ..	102-103
See Motor Vehicles Act.	
Treasure-trove— Question re alleged discovery of — in Singaper, Nellore district ..	680
Tuberculosis Fund— Question re disposal of Pudukkottai State— ..	882
Tuberculosis Sanatorium— Question re — in Periyaram, completion of construction of ..	884-885
Tungabhadra High Level Canal— Question re inclusion of — in the Five-year plan ..	199-200
Turmeric— Question re collection of excess water-tax for cultivation of — in Krishna Western Delta ..	104-105

U

Udamalpet Municipality— See Elections	
Urkavalan, Sri P.— See Questions and Answers.	

V

Vadivelu, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	239-241
	803
Vans— Question re — supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram ..	283
Varadachari, Sri K.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	595-598
	963, 964
Resolution re Handloom Industry ..	49-51
Veerabhadram, Sri M.— Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question ..	763, 764
Veloo, Sri A.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	602-604

	PAGES
V—cont.	
Vema Reddy, Sri K. V.— Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery ..	324-326
Vemiah, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	233, 825
	833, 839
	840, 900
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkaiah, Sri K.— Resolution re— Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery ..	307, 375
Handloom Industry ..	69-70
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkajeru river— See Bridges.	
Venkata Jagga Rao, Sri R.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	1049-1050
Resolution re Handloom Industry ..	80-81
	108-110
Venkatarama Ayyar, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	581-584
	1054-1056
Venkatarama Raju, Sri A.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	841
Venkataramiah, Sri N.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	747, 940-941
Venkata Rao, Sri Saka— High Court's judgment re the disqualification of — ..	29-30
	107-108
Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri T. N.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 ..	411
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	755-756
	846-847
	955
Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.— Resolution re Handloom Industry ..	132-133
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkataswami Naidu, the Hon. Sri K.— Bills—Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 ..	1079-1083
Venkatesa Sholagar, Sri P.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	589-590
	800, 820-821, 927
Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri — Adjournment motion re students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools ..	793, 794, 795
Adjournment motions, rules re ..	1008
Assembly proceedings, translation of ..	305
	482-483
Bills— Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 ..	494
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	693
	713-715, 726, 728
	737-739, 824, 829
	836, 845, 914-956
	974, 1014, 1030-1031

V—cont.	PAGES
Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—cont.	
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	30, 108
Resolution re—	
Handloom Industry	38, 45-48
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	307
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkatrama Ayyar, Sri S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	157-160
Village Vaidyas—	
Question re number and remuneration of—	470-471
Vinayakam, Sri K.—	
Adjournment motion re allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service officer	1011
Bills—	
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment), Bill 1952	1081, 1083
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	699-700, 704
	823-824, 827, 830
	836, 903-904, 916
	920-921, 947, 960-961
	968, 1025, 1058-1057
Resolution re Handloom Industry	48-49
See Questions and Answers.	
Visakhapatnam district—	
Question re Development Board for Srikakulam district and—, constitution of	523-524
Viswanatham, Sri K. R.—	
Bills—Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952	1080-1082
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	349-352
Viswanatham, Sri T.—	
Adjournment motion re—	
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service officer ..	1010
Andhra State, Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of ..	555-557
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiru-hirappalli districts ..	1013
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands ..	688-689
F. odgrains Levy Procurement Order ..	899
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools ..	791, 795
	796
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari).	1014
Adjournment motions, rules re	790, 1008
Assembly proceedings, translation of	203-204
	305-308
Bills—	
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952	429
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	421-422
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	260-262,
	413-415, 416, 417, 418
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	495-498
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952	487
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	149-151
	233, 234, 249, 560, 561, 605
	606, 615-617, 695, 72, 704
	738, 752-753, 759, 811
	850-851, 925-26, 948, 950
	957-960, 964-966, 1021-
	1021, 1023-1024, 1072-1073

V—cont.

Viswanatham, Sri T.—cont.	235, 898
Business of the House, programme of	
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao, High Court's judgment on	29-30
	107-108
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on—	107, 557-558
Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to the	431-434
Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question	764
Resolution re—	
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	314, 315, 362-367, 369
	135
Handloom Industry	
See Questions and Answers.	
Vizianagram Estate—	
See Estates.	
Water scarcity—	
Adjournment motion re— in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari) ..	1013-1014
Water supply—	
Question re—	
Drinking — to Coshin, provision of ..	
Improvement of — in Tirupati town	
Water supply scheme—	
Question re sanction of — for Jaggayyapet	
Water tax—	
Question re—	
Collection of excess — from cultivators of ..	104-105
Western Delta ..	465-466
—charged under different irrigation systems ..	282
—in Artesian well areas in South Arcot	
Weavers' co-operative societies—	
Question re—	
Exemption of — from payment of audit fees in 1951-52 ..	103
Number of — exclusively for Harijans	104
Well-Subsidy Scheme—	
Question re—	
Recovery of advances made under —	190-192
Recovery of loan granted to Sri Appala Narasimha Raju under —	396-397
Yarn—	
Question re—	
Purchase of — under card system, temporary suspension of ..	23
Reduction of price of —	462-463
Supply of — for making fishing nets, procedure for ..	461

Zamindari forests—
See Forests.