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1st July, 1980

The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill 1960

విధిత పట్టణం అనేది చాలా మంది వచ్చిన సమాధానాన్ని అందుకు పెంచాలి?

యా వుండి విధితం అనేది, ప్రతిష్ఠితం కూడా పెనియన్న అయిన పరిస్థితులతో, భారతదేశం ఉంచి వచ్చిన సమాధానాన్ని ఉపయోగిస్తుంటే అది సాధారణం ఆధారం చేయండి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

కాకనా ప్రవేశం ఉండాలి సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?

పిల్లా యొక్క సంప్రదాయం ఆధారంగా సమాధానం పెంచాలి?
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

The bill is aimed to provide a limit on the amount of land that any individual or family can own. It is a question of principle to ensure that the ownership of property is not excessive. The bill seeks to prevent the concentration of land ownership, which may lead to social and economic inequalities.

It is important to note that the bill does not interfere with the private property rights of individuals. Rather, it aims to prevent the abuse of such rights by limiting their excesses. The bill's provisions are designed to serve the interests of the collective, ensuring a more equitable distribution of land.

These are the three theories in the world.
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

Collective wisdom is not the wisdom of one individual, nor is it the wisdom of the community. It is the wisdom of the many, the wisdom of the collective. It is the wisdom that is formed by the interaction of many minds, the wisdom that is shaped by the experience of many lives. It is the wisdom that is born of the collective effort of many people, the wisdom that is the result of the collective action of many communities.

Collective wisdom is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few. It is the wisdom of the community, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the collective, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few.

Collective wisdom is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few. It is the wisdom of the community, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the collective, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few.

Collective wisdom is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few. It is the wisdom of the community, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the collective, not the wisdom of the individual. It is the wisdom of the many, not the wisdom of the few.
The Andhra Pradesh Cooching on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1969
1st July, 1969

The Andhra Prades, Coorings on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1969

The text discusses the Andhra Pradesh Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1969, and its far-reaching political and economic implications. The bill was introduced in 1947 and its provisions are designed to address economic issues and provide a framework for the control of land holdings. The bill aims to regulate agricultural land holdings and ensure equitable distribution of land, which is a significant step towards addressing economic disparities and promoting social justice. The bill also seeks to prevent concentration of land holdings, which is a critical issue in the agricultural sector.
Personal liberty of the individual and the dignity of the individual.
Adult franchise and liberty of the individual.
Adult franchise, dignity of the individual.
Adult franchise,

To ensure to every citizen of India Justice, Social, Economic, Political and personal liberty.

Fundamental rights are those basic and great rights inherent in the status of a citizen of a free country, with an express guarantee for the promotion of these rights.
Mr Speaker - What is the fundamental right involved here?

Sri D Kondiah Chowdary - I am going a step further and saying that these fundamental rights cannot be divested, cannot be surrendered even by a private citizen. That is my submission. But what are the fundamental rights here involved? That is the main question. The fundamental right involved is Article 19 (f) namely, the fundamental right of a citizen to acquire, hold and dispose of property.

...
Article 19 (1) Nothing in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) shall affect the operation of any existing law, or prevent the State from making any law, in so far as such law imposes reasonable restrictions on the exercise of right conferred by the said sub-clause in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of Court, defamation or incitement to an offence.

(3) Nothing in sub-clause (b) of the said clause shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it imposes, or prevent the State from making any law imposing, in the interests of public order, reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by the said sub-clause.

(4) Nothing in sub-clause (c) of the said clause shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it imposes, or prevent the State from making any law imposing, reasonable restrictions on the exercise of any of the rights conferred by the said sub-clauses either in the interests of the general public or for the protection of the interests of any Scheduled Tribe.
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

Sri D. Konidiah Chowdary—Mr Speaker, Sir. Your conception may be quite correct. But inspite of that, reasonable restrictions are made by State, my dear Sir. All restrictions are at times sparing in nature, or otherwise, whether justiciable question is not always reasonable or unreasonable. Justiciable question is an discretionary matter, whereas statutory question is more definite. (The question of reasonable or unreasonable is the same.)

Mr. Speaker—He merely interprets and enforces law, he is not the person who says that this is reasonable or this is unreasonable. That power is given to the democratic body i.e., the collective wisdom of the people through their elected representations.

Sri D. Konidiah Chowdary—Even the collective wisdom when it is exercised reasonably may be wrongly exercised.

Sri D. Konidiah Chowdary—As I am the person who is saying that the law exercised reasonably may be wrongly exercised.

Mr. Speaker—You cannot go into the motives. etc

Sri D. Konidiah Chowdary—Art. 19 reasonable restrictions impose reasonably to prevent unreasonable. Where is the question whether reasonable restrictions or not, but whether unreasonable.

Sri D. Konidiah Chowdary—I am just mentioning by way that whether it is a reasonable restriction or not is a justiciable question.
Mr Speaker—As a legislator, he has the right of talking

...
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

It is a point to which answer is necessary. A farmer requires protection in agricultural holdings, but there must be a limit to these holdings. There are cooperatives and Agricultural departments. Some cooperative societies and experimental farms are beneficial, and public interest is in favor of economic justice and public interest. Public interest means, any act done by Government must be in the interest of the general public, and not in the interest of a particular Community or a section of individuals, or only a few people. This act cannot be said to be done in the interest of the public. Therefore, the restrictions now imposed are against the constitution and are void. That is why yesterday we moved an amendment to the effect that this may be referred to the Supreme Court through the president of the Indian Union. Our amendments in the Indian Constitution are said to be reasonable and constitutional.
1st July, 1960
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

Section 38 point as reasonable restriction

Section 38 of the Land Reforms Act of 1959 is a reasonable restriction to the extent of 33% of the area of the holding. The ceiling on agricultural holdings is a reasonable restriction to the extent of 33% of the area of the holding.

In violation of Article 39, the ceiling provision is aimed at land reform, communal ownership, and individual ownership. Communal ownership means collective ownership of land where more than one family has a right in the land. Individual ownership means the ownership of land by one family. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling on agricultural holdings is a reasonable restriction to the extent of 33% of the area of the holding. Communal ownership and individual ownership are incompatible. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It also aims to develop agricultural holdings and to ensure fair and equitable distribution of land. The ceiling provision aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.
Whatever a man produces by labour of his hand or his brain, whatever he obtains in exchange for something of his own, and whatever is given to him, law will protect him in the use or enjoyment or disposition of it.

Whatever a man produces by labour of his hand or his brain, whatever he obtains in exchange for something of his own, and whatever is given to him, law will protect him in the use or enjoyment or disposition of it.

I think even the Hon'ble Deputy Chief Minister will agree with me if I say that, landed property alone is not property. There are various kinds of properties—landed property, house property, jewellery and so many other things. If there is imposition or restrictions imposed on the landed property alone. "Any people who own landed property" is restricted here under Article 19. Article 65, lines 18, 19, 20. Landed property is a class of property and that is a clear violation of Article 14 and 15. I think the Hon'ble Deputy Chief Minister will agree with me if I say that, landed property alone is not property. There are various kinds of properties—landed property, house property, jewellery and so many other things. If there is imposition or restrictions imposed on the landed property alone. "Any people who own landed property" is restricted here under Article 19. Article 65, lines 18, 19, 20.
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

The provisions of Article 31 (2) of Indian Constitution are applicable to the Andhra Pradesh Holdings Bill, 1960, and it is necessary for the public welfare to make alterations in the law relating to property. The fundamental rights as enshrined in the Constitution are guaranteed to all individuals. The fundamental rights are right to property and are integral to these rights. The argument is that the fundamental rights must be guaranteed to individuals. The speaker argues that when property is taken for a public purpose, it must be for 'public purposes.'

I want, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that you should see the words 'public purposes.'

They are the words actually used there. They are the words 'public purposes.' They are the words 'public purposes.' The term 'public purpose' is specific, definite and clear, and comprehends a definite public purpose.
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960  

1st July, 1960 79

'Public purpose' अथवा आयुक्त  अनुसार  एक  धारा  अर्थात्  वित्त रक्षण के  लिए  किया  गया  गया  विनायक  वाले  राज्य से  ठहर या करार  का  लाभ  करते  किरण  में  किया  गया  पब्लिक  पॉर्पोश  है या  नहीं,  या  पब्लिक  पॉर्पोश  के  पदार्थ का अधिकार करता  है?

प्रतीक्षण: 'Acquiring the property' या रो है तो क्या?

साइट और रुपांतरण के प्रदेश - जारी होने के लिए है। यह दो प्रकार होता है - 'public purpose' अथवा 'public interest' है। यह सिध्धांत विविध अंशों के रूप में लागू होता है - 31 (2)

एवं यहाँ दिखा है 'public purpose' अथवा clear या, precise या,

स्थिति 'public purpose' अथवा clear या, precise या,

public purpose विकसित दो संदर्भों का हो, विशेष रूप से प्रायः

पब्लिक पॉर्पोश (unconstitutional aspect of it है या नहीं)

आप मेरे ही साथ नहीं चारबाही की थी? या अभी तकत ही संगठन की हो?

वाला है या नहीं? एक ही साथों में वित्त प्रत्यक्षता के साथ-साथ?

यदि यह है, 'public purpose' अथवा clear या, precise या,

public purpose विकसित दो संदर्भों का हो, विशेष रूप से प्रायः

......

1951 A.I.R. Madras 64 में है।

If the executive takes property of any person it must be prepared to justify it under the authority of any valid law. I will agree with him

1950 Patna 65 में है मेरा ध्यान के साथ, अस्वद्य.

I will agree with him with respect that mere State policy or policy of the party in power may not be the same thing as public purpose.

These are the crucial words.

I will agree with him with respect that mere State policy or policy of the party in power may not be the same thing as public purpose.
30 1st July, 1960

The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

This is not the law of the land. Fundamental right is violated by a statute which is not valid law, in violation of Art. 25 and Art. 31.

Any property must be taken by the law of the land. The words 'law of the land' do not mean a Statute passed for the purpose of working the wrong. You are taking property under a wrong procedure and you want to justify it under law and that law is unconstitutional.

Mr Speaker - Taking the property of anybody is wrong.

Sri D. Kondayya Chowdary - Yes, Sir, you cannot pass a law for that wrong thing.

The Election manifesto is policy. It is not a 'public purpose.' You are taking property of anybody wrong. It is not public purpose under Art. 127. A.I.R. Madras 1957, it is a question of public purpose. You are taking the property and you want to justify it under law and that law is unconstitutional.

Mr Speaker - Compensation is a question of "doctrine of eminent domain" under Constitution. You cannot amend Art. 127. Public purpose means for the public. You are taking the property under a wrong procedure and that law is unconstitutional.

Mr Speaker - You cannot take the property of anybody wrong. The constitution is not for that purpose. You are taking property under a wrong procedure and you want to justify it under law and that law is unconstitutional. Compensation is a question of "doctrine of eminent domain." You cannot pass a law for that purpose.
The Anbhr Prades Ceil'm on Agricultural Holings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960 31

100.6-3 रूपये तिथि 0-8-0 वें मासात्तिथि वाहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में 100.6-3 रूपये तिथि 0-8-0 वें मासात्तिथि वाहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में

मासालाम? — मासालाम? अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में

अगुनु? अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

100-6-3 रूपये तिथि 0-8-0 वें मासाला में राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.

## अन्तर्जाति वाहुलाला?

अर्थात् अन्तर्जाति वाहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में?

अधिकारिक स्वरूपानुसार कुल कर राहुनु अगुनु नहीं राहुनु 20 रुपये कर्तम मासाला में.
1st July, 1960

The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

"More expression of a will even by posting a card to the effect that a person is separating from the family is enough to affect partition in status."
Expression of will is enough. It need not be registered. It need not be in writing. It is enough even if there is oral evidence to prove that there is partition.
"Whether a fugitive reference to land ceilings in a manifesto which surveyed all problems from China to Peru constitute sufficient justification for pushing through a measure which is directed against a small class of land owners and which is riddled with anomalies and injustice, is arguable..."
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

The House's majority considers the ceiling on agricultural holdings to be an arbitrary decision. The Planning Commission recommended a ceiling of 7,000 acres, but the House rejected it. The question arises: Who is responsible for this decision? It is an arguable point. Public opinion favors a ceiling of 5,400 acres, but the House's decision is based on supply and demand. It is incongruent and conflicting statement made in the legislation.
The Ahdhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

Under Article 14 of the Constitution, under Article 19, and 31 also it is unconstitutional and the Bill is expropriatory and it is confiscatory in character. It is unjust to the middle-class and particularly to the Kisans. Therefore, whatever standards may be made on the rights of the property in the name of social justice and equality, legislators in a democracy must realise that fair-play as between different sections and respect for the sanctity of contract and for the just rights of minority groups are essential if the community as a whole is to maintain faith in the rule of law and in the basic principles of justice. If the State behaves as if it can rob Peter and pay Paul, without any one questioning its rights or wisdom, it will be ultimately undermining the foundations of social stability and orderly progress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gopal Rao Ekbote (High Court): Mr. Speaker, Sir. The question of land reforms had been before the whole of India for the last nearly ten years, and it is not correct to say that the last elections were fought keeping in view the land reforms proposed by the Congress Governments in various States. There may be sufficient grounds to say that at the time the first elections were fought, the issues had not emerged out as to on what lines the Congress proposed to bring land reforms because the Planning Commission's Report was not before the public during the time of the first elections. But by the time we went back to the polls in 1957 many States had already enacted...

Mr. Speaker: Even then, in 1947 itself, they introduced the first step of land reforms, namely, the abolition of all intermediary between the State and the land.

Mr. Gopal Rao Ekbote: The first step had already been completed in 1951. Therefore, to say in 1956 that the matter was never brought to the public who that the Congress men were returned without the knowledge as to what they were going to do as far as land reforms are concerned, is an incorrect statement. The land laws were introduced mainly for this reason to improve the socio-economic conditions of the people and to put the whole...
been thoroughly discussed and one can legitimately say that except the few voices sounding here and there against the very concept of land reform, by and large there is a growing opinion of a large majority of people that there should be some kind of ceiling on the agricultural lands not only because it settles rural economy but it has its own impact and influence on the national economy also. There is also a growing feeling and almost a settled opinion that as far as the relationship of the landlord and tenants is concerned, it must be finally settled. The people are coming round the opinion that as far as fixation of fair rent is concerned, that also must be done. With regard to absentee-landlordism there is a settled opinion that it must be abolished. In view of these points, I am at a loss to know how fundamentally we can now discuss that there is no necessity of any land reforms at a stage where the nation has reached. The Planning Commission and the Central Government or the State Governments have rightly appreciated that in an integrated or a balanced economy, the agricultural economy has its own importance and influential place. When we say that our country is predominantly an agricultural country, any decision with regard to the final settlement of issues in regard to the rural economy will naturally affect all the aspects of our national economy. Therefore, in my first speech when the Bill was introduced, I had pointed out certain缺点 and defects in the Bill. Apart from the basis on which the ceiling was to be fixed, I had suggested that if we wanted these schemes of land reforms to be effectively implemented, certain lacunae which were found in the Bill must be completely removed so that the implementation of this scheme may not be further delayed. As I said earlier, this question has been before us for the last thirteen years and after having discussed thousand we have reached certain conclusions and from that we have to take a jump, not in the dark, but in the certain direction. On the line of approach to this question, we have already decided and there is no use of going roundabout the same point and trying to vitiate, if you excuse me for using that expression, the atmosphere which is sufficiently confused.

I have carefully gone through the minute of dissent of my learned friends, appended to the report of the Standing Committee. I will try to give a clearer and more vivid picture of least from the opposite point of view, but there is no need to recapitulate or elaborate or construct cases and confining oneself when there have been views on many thousand aspects would not give an idea for the sake of a speech. At the
time when this Bill was first introduced in the House, I had suggested two or three main points in order to see that these land reforms schemes are effectively implemented. The hon. Minister in his speech yesterday said that there were only two important points, so far as the objective of this Bill as concerned. One is that production on the land must be improved and the other is that surplus land would be made available for distribution among the landless poor. But, I might invite his attention to the twin objectives laid down by the Planning Commission because the two objectives put before the House by the hon. Minister do not present a complete picture. As far as the aims and objectives of land reforms are concerned, the Planning Commission also could not have put it in a better way when they said that the twin objectives of reforms are to remove such impediments upon agricultural production as arise from the character of the agrarian structure, and to create conditions for evolving an agrarian economy at high levels of efficiency and productivity. These are so widely and broadly put that all aspects of land reforms which not only affect the structure of agriculture in the rural economy, but they must in relation to the national economy, be constantly kept in view when we consider the question of land reforms. Therefore, during the last few years we have seen various schemes and various policies directed toward the attainment of these twin objectives laid down by the Planning Commission; we have got rid of the big zamindars and jagirdars, we have abolished practically all the intermediaries, we have regulated in a few States not only the relation of tenancy and fixed a fair rent, we have also fixed ceiling in certain respects. For example, in Telangana it is only from 1960 onwards that we had a kind of ceiling as far as agricultural holdings are concerned. Therefore, as far as the various steps designed to achieve these ends are concerned, we have gone very much ahead. Now, at this stage we cannot stop either to look back or try to go back on the achievement of our objectives. The only thing which I would like to invite the attention of those who still prefer to differ with the main provisions of land reforms is to put some alternatives which would make the whole question towards the direction to which all of us want to go. But, so far in spite of the fact that Panchayats have been constantly telling those who still oppose the fundamental idea of land reform, to show us where this removal of poverty is to remove the disparity which exists, I am sorry to state there is still a considerable number of people who are quite happy and content with what they now have for their own benefit and are not interested in the move for high levels of efficiency and productivity.
Mr Speaker But the Swatantra Party says that we have no right to interfere.

Sri Gopalrao Ekbote That is the Constitutional question I might come at the end of my speech.

Mr Speaker Why not at the beginning?

Sri Gopalrao Ekbote Yes, I will do it.

My friend has raised the same points which are raised very often not only in the courts but also on the floor of the Assembly and even in the Parliament. Their main contention, apart from the various other points which they had raised, is constitutional that the Government has no right to expropriate the land from land lords and they usually quote Articles 14, 19 and 31 of the Constitution of India. Their main or substantial approach to this question appears to be that holding of property has been upheld by the Constitution and if the Government wants to take away the property that must be only for a public purpose and fixation of ceiling or taking away of excess land does not fall within the ambit of public purpose, and therefore this Bill is expropriatory in character and ultra vires of the Constitution. This is one aspect. The second point was that the restrictions put in the Bill are not reasonable in their very nature and therefore it violates Article 19 of the Constitution. The third point was that because the compensation fixed, the manner in which it was fixed and for whom the compensation was intended are violation of Article 31. It is said, in all these three articles, the fundamental rights of the citizens are affected, and the whole Bill is thus ultra vires. These three points were raised in several of the States, not only in our own State or in the former State of Madras but also wherever such legislations have already been passed. But, I might invite the attention of my learned friend to the various rulings of the High Courts—Hyderabad High Court and Andhra Pradesh High Court and even the rulings under Art. 14 of the Supreme Court where the points have been settled. As regards the classification of the persons who hold bigger shares of land and those who do not also own any land at all, these classifications have been held reasonable or rational classifications.

Now so far as Article 12 is concerned, there are only two fundamental questions which determine the validity of a particular legislation. That is the question as to whether the law is a law made for the public and there is complete nexus between the rational classification and the purpose for which it is enacted, and the public.
objectives of these land reforms have been put very nicely and wisely by the Planning Commission and in the provisions we have included in this Bill, we have only to see whether there is any relationship or nexus between the aims and objectives and this rational classification and if it does exist, then there is no violation of Art. 14. In this connection, I must submit, Sir, it has been held by several High Courts that the classification of persons who held property in a large measure and whom we deprive of their property, is reasonable and rational classification as far as the improvement of the social economy is concerned, and in order to remove this glaring economic disparity surplus lands are to be taken over and distributed among those who are landless. That is the aim and objective of this Bill. Then, this rational classification will certainly have a rational nexus with the aims and objectives and it is certainly not violative of Article 14.

As far as reasonable restriction is concerned, it is a matter which ultimately the judiciary or the final court of authority must decide. As far as we are concerned, we certainly feel that in the interests of the public, in the interests not only of rural economy but of the entire national economy, it is very necessary that where 70 per cent of the means of production and 70 to 72 per cent of the population rest on the rural economy, we have to so regulate the rural economy as to see that the national economy is built on altogether a different structure. Therefore, as far as the reasonable restriction put on the holding of a particular class of society is concerned, they are not only reasonable, but they are absolutely necessary. Therefore, the question whether the restrictions put in the various clauses of the Bill are reasonable or not, is arguing a point at a stage where it does not require any argument at all. This matter has been often brought to the notice of the courts and various courts have definitely held that, as far as the reasonable restrictions are concerned, the primary consideration should be as to whether it fulfils the requirement of a particular society. In my humble opinion, this argument does not hold much water and Article 14 (1)(c) cannot be considered as having been violated by the various provisions of this Bill.

As far as compensation is concerned, my learned friend himself has admitted that Article 1 has been amended by the legislature and so far the Bill is concerned, the various provisions are reasonable or not and the courts are prohibited to go into the question of compensation or the compensation about is not to suppose or make free with the manner in which compensation is paid. It would...
come to a unanimous or majority conclusion that this quantum of compensation and the manner in which compensation is fixed, are both good and valid, the courts will be debarred from going into the question of compensation as also the manner in which it is fixed and the quantum of compensation. Therefore, that question also need not be argued from any legalistic point of view. It is only the practical point of view, whether those landless people to whom lands are to be given are in an economic position to pay the quantum of compensation which we have fixed in the Bill. I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that the compensation which we have fixed is rather on the high side because they are not in a position to pay even so much of compensation. Personally I wish the quantum of compensation had been further reduced. To say that this compensation is nothing compared to the market price and all that, is to argue without taking into consideration the capacity of the various types of tenants or the landless persons. Therefore, as far as compensation is concerned, it is for us to decide whether the compensation is reasonable or not and, once we decide that the courts will be prohibited from going into the question. It is final. As I submitted already, it is a most reasonable decision we have arrived at and if we agree with this quantum of compensation, I am quite confident that not only it will be taking into consideration the capacity of the tenants or the landless persons to pay compensation but the landlords also must feel satisfied if they receive this much of compensation.

Then, as regards the question whether this is a public purpose or not, I think it will be a fallacy to say that surplus land from those who have been enjoying for the last many years thousands of acres is taken away and distributed to a particular section of the society on account of economic reasons. I do not think it can be argued by any stretch of imagination that this is not a public purpose. 'Public purpose' never means that it must be a purpose in which every section of the society must be interested. Even if a small and insignificant section of society is interested in their economic advancement, it is a public purpose, and I can very confidently submit that this matter also has been disposed of by various courts. Therefore, as far as these three or four objections are concerned, regarding the validity of the Bill, they need not entrench any doubts in our minds and the legislators can confidently go ahead and see whether the Bill which the Joint Select Committee of both Houses of this House has recommended, the quantum of compensation we have fixed in this question with a lot of interest for the last 12 years.
After having answered all the points raised by my friends, with your permission, I will now go to the points which I would like to submit for the consideration of this august body. In my previous speech I had referred to the entire revenue laws. There are laws we are all aware, in vogue in Telangana and laws which are in force in Andhra, we have brought some from Madras and some from the old Hyderabad State and the entire legal structure in the revenue field is, if I may say so, disintegrated and disjointed. Therefore, the first step, if we want to see that these land reforms scheme is efficiently and effectively implemented, is not only to integrate the laws but also to bring them up-to-date. That is absolutely necessary, and I would submit for the consideration of the Hon. Minister who has got a very wide and varied experience as far as revenue side is concerned and I hope he will agree with me when I say that because we do not have a codified law, an integrated law, an up-to-date law, there are many difficulties and even the Ministers are feeling the difficulty as far as implementation of the law is concerned. Suitable steps must immediately be taken, before this Act is implemented, to see that not only laws are uniformly integrated but they are brought up-to-date and codified also. I find that various orders, various GOs, and gasts exist today, and even a legal practitioner or an expert on the revenue side finds it difficult to lay his hands on the proper gasts. Therefore, the first thing for the efficient and effective implementation of these schemes of land reforms is to see that the entire legal structure is made clear and brought up-to-date and codified.

The second suggestion that I had given in my earlier speech was with regard to maintenance of the village records. I am sorry to say that my experience for the past many years has been that the village records are found changed with as much ease as is possible, because I find conflicting records coming from the same village offices. It is absolutely necessary, if we want to see that these reforms are meticulously and efficiently implemented, that the village records should be brought up-to-date, kept clean and implemented efficiently. Unless we take a solemn precaution to see that the village records are properly maintained, however attractive the scheme may be, as far as the statute is concerned, or whatever it be, there should be some system of bringing the village records up-to-date and maintain them properly and with sufficient supervision there. The third suggestion which I had made during the course of my earlier speech was with regard to necessity of having one comprehensive law of land reforms.
Agricultural economy cannot be divided or sub-divided piece-meal by various legislations. It would have been a correct approach to have one legislation embracing all aspects of land reforms, viz., relationship between landlord and tenant, fixation of fair rent, prevention of fragmentation of holdings and fixation of ceiling, and it will be incorrect to say that one aspect of land reforms does not necessarily affect the other aspects of land reforms. And unless a complete picture is presented not only before the House but before the agricultural population of this State, it would be difficult for them to comprehend as to what the effect of these land reforms is going to be. This instability has affected the agricultural production during the last ten years and people would continue to be in that position and suspense position, and if we keep the matters in abeyance or hanging, the agricultural production is surely going to be further affected. Therefore, my request to the hon. Minister is to see that the other aspects of land reforms are immediately brought before the House in such a consolidated manner as to bring about homogeneity. As far as all the aspects of land reforms are concerned, it will not only save the unreasonable interpretation of the various laws, but it will also present a homogeneous picture before the agricultural population of our State. Therefore, I would repeat the suggestion which I had given in my earlier speech that there is a great necessity of legislating in a homogeneous way as far as agricultural economy is concerned.

The Select Committee appears to have concentrated more on the one question of fixation of ceilings and they have not properly appreciated, if I may say so, the significance or the implications of the other provisions incorporated in the rag of the Bill. I am apprehensive that if these provisions are allowed to remain as they are in the Bill, in the efficient and effective implementation of those provisions there would be found lot of difficulties. It is therefore necessary that these defects are removed. As far as the question of fixation of ceiling is concerned, as I said earlier, we have discussed this question from various angles in an abundant manner. There are only two alternatives before the House, one to which was already accepted by the former Government of Hyderabad and incorporated in the Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, that was to base the fixation of ceiling on the basis of income, keeping in view the past three years or five years or ten years income, and then to a rational way by the ceiling multiplying the family holding by three or assess the land in the divided personal or undivided interest by four and a half if the land is undivided personally.
That was the agricultural scheme as far as ceiling was concerned in Andhra. The other alternative is as suggested in the Bill originally introduced before the House with a slight modification or rather improvement on the Hyderabad Bill, but when it went to the Select Committee, the basis was changed and now the classification basis has been accepted both in Telangana and Andhra. It is called anawari in Telengana and taram in Andhra. As far as anawari is concerned, I can confidently say that this classification was made a few years before, and not simultaneously in all the districts of Telengana. Therefore, how that classification can form the basis is a matter which requires further probe. It is hazardous to form any opinion either for or against as far as this basis is concerned. There are certain difficulties or lacunae involved on the basis of income. For example, if we adopt the basis of income with reference to three years of income of a particular piece of land, then there is going to be discrimination between an efficient landlord and an inefficient landlord and again there is going to be discrimination between a person who takes cash crops from the land and a person who cultivates ordinary crops. So, these nuances or fine aspects of the land reforms were not taken into consideration as far as the basis of income is concerned. There are certain lacunae when we adopt that basis for the purpose of family holding. Similarly, there are certain drawbacks or defects as far as the classification of land is concerned. As far as taram is concerned, when I discussed the matter with some of my Andhra friends, they said there is lacuna here also. As far as Andhra is concerned, this taram or classification of land was fixed, not from the point of view of fixation of a ceiling but from the point of view of fixation of land revenue. Similarly, in the case of Telangana also, the aim and objective of the classification of land from various points of view was to fix the land revenue and not to fix a ceiling. It would, therefore, have been more valid if we had followed some scientific basis in order to convince the House that this basis would certainly result in a just distribution of the property.
maintain any record as to what exactly their income is. Then, this evidence has to be taken which I am sure will be quite vague, and any decision could be arrived at on that type of oral evidence. Then, they want that $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the net income should be taken and expenditure calculated at the rate of only 25% whereas in Hyderabad Act the expenditure was calculated at 50%. Therefore, as far as the alternative suggestion is concerned that 15 to 20 standard acres should be proscribed, that is something which goes quite contrary to the basis which they themselves have formulated. For example, even Section 4 of the Hyderabad Act lays down some broad principles and lays down the maximum ceiling and within that maximum ceiling directed the Land Commission to work out in particular local areas or regions as to what should be done. That was some type of combination or reconciliation between these conflicting elements. Economic basis was there, the classification of the land was kept in view and a third method which is more scientific namely that in every local area which is limited to a particular region a Land Commission consisting of some experts who are interested in the agricultural economy was constituted which would inspect the land and the records and after thoroughly going into the question fix the higher ceiling which will satisfy the requirement of the particular region. Therefore, in the Hyderabad Act, all these three essential elements for arriving at a reasonable, equitable or rational ceiling were recommended and adopted whereas if we simply accept the suggestion made by the learned members of the Opposition that income basis should be adopted and three years' income should be taken into consideration and 15 to 20 standard acres should be fixed, then all these defects which I have so far pointed out will naturally be there. Unfortunately, we don't have a complete record of the picture emerging in Andhra or Telangana area and how it is going to disturb or improve upon the situation which has been created by the former Act of Hyderabad.

These are the questions which naturally arise as far as this question is concerned and after going carefully through the entire report, I find that either for this basis or for that basis no particular data has been made available. I shall give one example. As far as the investment question is concerned, the opposition members have argued that if we divide the land, the investment will increase. Principally, the land members of the Swatantra party have stated that the private investment on land will go up. I have tried to find out actually what is the present investment on land and the present investment is not 6% to 7% and not 10% but 20% to 30% and if we take the 50% which is mentioned in the Bill, it is obviously something that should not be taken into consideration at all. That is the point I wish to make.
I could lay my hands only on the Bombay State data and I was surprised and shocked to some extent to find that on self-owned lands, investment on land improvement is only Rs 4/- per acre in 1948-49.

Sri P Rayagopal Narudu: No. It is not in Andhra. Andhra is separate from Bombay.

Sri Gopal Rao Ekbote: That I know Andhra is separate from Bombay geographically. (LAUGHTER)

Sri D Kodiah Chowdary: For every acre, at least you must have 20 cart loads of manure which will cost nearly Rs 200/- in Andhra.

Sri Gopal Rao Ekbote: I was referring to land improvement and not agricultural improvement. In the case of undeveloped land, there is investment to the extent of only 30% as far as Bombay State is concerned. So far as our State is concerned, as I said, no specific data is available. Therefore, unless we indulge in imagination or some rough calculation, it will not be of much help to us. Data is available only for one State, namely, Bombay and there the investment in 1948-49 was only Rs 4/- per acre which was improved to Rs 7.9 in 1953-54. Investment as far as irrigated land was concerned was to the extent of 70%, but in the case of undeveloped land the investment was only 30%. If that is the point, then this argument fails to the ground.

(The bell was rung)

These are the points which I request the House kindly to consider before we arrive at a conclusion.

Sri K. Koll Reddy (Lakkireddipalli):— Mr. Speaker, Sir, I take this opportunity to make a few general observations on some sections of the Bill, particularly relating to some definitions. I think it is too late in the day now to say that there is no need for any land reform in this country. There is a section, and a fairly large section of the public, who would say that in order to increase agricultural production, it is certainly not necessary to interfere with the property rights, as we now propose to do. What was done in some of the western countries like Germany, where places which were low and small landholders were sold was the Government must used to buy land at the market value and give the land to poor peasants who want to cultivate. But here it cannot be done. If we do that then we cannot have any person who would have wished that something like that was done. There is absolutely no doubt that there are certain difficulties in
Land holdings in this country, but there are disparities in other
walks of life—in the various forms of property and it is natural
that the land-owning classes are bound to feel that some injustice
was likely to be done to them unless the other sections are also
touched in the same way. However, Sir, one method by which
these disparities could have been narrowed down was by means
of a higher taxation on higher income, including on landowners.
However, we have passed that stage, and even after introducing
these land reforms, I think, it may become necessary to adopt
such taxation methods.

One feels, Sir, that sufficient attention has not been paid to
the practical side of agriculture by our friends who feel that
unless land is divided among all classes of labourers, we can't
really increase the agricultural production. The other section
naturally feels that unless we have a large amount of land for
each farmer, the production of agricultural produce is bound to
go down. The truth seems to be somewhere in the middle. Let us take
Sir, the example of a farmer with three or five acres of land. Is he
really in a position to engage a pair of bullocks which is necessary
to plough the land? I know in certain very poor and very weak
soils, bullocks are being used for ploughing, but what is the effect
What is the sort of ploughing done to-day? They can't even
scratch two or three inches and unless you plough it properly, the
soil does not give you enough produce. If to-day our agricultural
production is not as much as we would wish it to be, the reason
mainly lies in the fact that a large number of our peasants
own less than 5 acres of land and are not in a position to
invest the capital that is necessary to get the best out
of the land. We are told that in Andhra about 60 per cent of peasants own less than 5 acres. The amount of ceiling that is now being imposed under this Report seems to be very
reasonable on both sides. One good aspect of this Report is to base
the ceiling of land, not on income according to the provisions
of the original Bill that was introduced: cotton, saras and shawam.
This change has been done to remove the uncertainty that would
probably exist in calculating and computing the ceiling of land if
it is based on income. To arrive at a perfect system of income
would certainly be very good, if possible, but I am afraid it will
take years and years before computing the ceiling is done on
-income. The next best thing therefore is really to base the
ceiling on forests and ansam. Really, this means the only worry
is regarding the valuation of the forests. So I think, Sir, the
other high taxation is not on the landowners but on the
forests.
other factors which give a fairly good idea of income that we get from the land. That being the case, I think, the Report has done great justice by basing the ceiling on taqim in Andhra and an-wari in Telangana.

I would like to bring to the notice of the House, Sir, one or two directions in which it would be necessary to make some changes. With regard to compensation, I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that very great injustice is likely to be done to Rayalaseema. It is said that the gross income for three years before the date of declaration is to be taken into account for arriving at the figure of compensation. It is a well known fact, Sir, that in some areas of the Rayalaseema for two or three years together rains fail and production becomes less in which case certainly the people of Rayalaseema will suffer on account of this computation. So, my request to the hon. Minister would be to change it to at least 5 years. The prices of food stuffs are going up for the last ten years. So, if 10 years is to be taken, one would expect that with regard to calculation of gross income also, 10 years has to be taken, but it seems to me that at least 5 years would be the minimum period for computing the compensation if some justice is to be done to the people of Rayalaseema, since some times in 3 years the landlords would really get no income and accordingly compensation amount would dwindle.

Secondly, Sir, there is one thing which requires clarification. There seems to be a conflict between some of the sections. Particularly, Section 7 and Section 14 cannot be easily reconciled. According to Section 7, in cases where a owner owns more than the ceiling area of land, he has to surrender the excess. Under section 7, the owner has option to surrender whatever land he wants to. But under Section 14, the right of option which is rightly given to the landlord to surrender the excess of land is considerably restricted, because each class of land has to be taken into account for the purpose of surrender. It will be very difficult and will not be reasonable also. I shall give an instance. For example, Section 7 of land surrender has to be made. Suppose we want to make sure that we get the right result we would assume. Under Section 4 there are various classifications into which land has been classified for purposes of ceiling. For Class A an amount of 10 acres for male holding and for Class B, 5 acres for male holding and for Class D, 12 acres and so on. Suppose there be a tenant to surrender about 20 acres of land. The landlord wants to surrender only 2 acres of Class B land. It would be given to a family holding. To take another instance, for Class B the
extent of family holding is 24 acres, suppose, if I have to surrender 8 acres, and the remaining acres only are taken into account, then there would be an anomaly. So I would suggest that instead of having this principle of surrendering land proportionately from each classification of land, option should be given to the landlord, so that he may not surrender proportionately from each classification of land. Class A to Class H. It would be enough if, according to the amount of land that he owns, the land to be surrendered is calculated on the basis of classification, instead of land being surrendered from each classification of land, proportionately.

Then with regard to Section 5, I have one suggestion to make. This provision relates to "Declaration of holdings". Under the provision, declaration should be furnished to the Revenue Divisional Officer within whose jurisdiction the major part of a person's holding is situated. This is in case where a person's holding is situated within the jurisdiction of more than one Revenue Divisional Officer. The term "major part" has to be explained or clarified—is it, major part of lands of the various classifications? A wet acre may cost 10 dry acres. What I say is all the acres—wet and dry—should be taken into account, and majority of it to be taken into account, in furnishing the declaration. Or does it depend on the classification of lands made in Section 4, and calculations to be made accordingly? It is much better that some clarification is made with regard to that.

Then, the word "orchard" is likely to give some difficulty in future. What is an "orchard"? The ordinary conception is a fruit tree. Some scientist might say that tomato is a fruit. It is consumed as a fruit as well as a vegetable. Take, for example, cashew-nut. Does it come under the category of fruit or non-fruit tree? There are such difficulties. Instead of leaving this matter to the whims and fancies of the Revenue Divisional Officer, it would be better to make a clarification in the Act itself.

I would like to make one more suggestion as regards the people to whom land is going to be given. Political sufferers to whom land is being given should, I suggest, be exempted from the operation of that section.

Before I close down, I would make a few observations. Hon. Members are very keen that land should be divided among people, so that there may not be any landless people. There is no doubt that the Opposition Members are very anxious to help the poor man. But the Congress has one view, or at least, there is
poor people are helped. For example, taxes are imposed on an upgraded scale on people who own lands. But with regard to the distribution of land, speaking from my own experience and coming as I do from Rayalaseema, I would suggest that it would not be desirable that all sorts of people should be given land of an insufficient area from which they may not be able to get anything. Difficulty arises with regard to the apportionment of land to these landless people. I happened to ask some of the landless labourers and ryots who own little land as to why they would not choose to go to places where Government have been offering land and where wet cultivation could be raised. The reply was that they would rather suffer in their native place than leave their parental home. There is today lot of land available with the Government. But I would like to know as to how many people in villages are prepared to go from their villages to places where there is land available with the Government. As a matter of fact, land that would be available after the imposition of ceiling would be very little whereas land that is with the Government is fairly large and upon which probably colonisation has to be done and Government have to take steps in that direction. When this is done, so much of trouble is minimised. Ultimately, the solution for the land problem and for poverty in the country depends mainly on how far and how soon we are going to industrialise the country. That is the only solution, but not giving land to each man, which is not useful for him, which is not enough for him to cultivate and which is in a condition in which he cannot raise or get crops therefrom.

Thank you, Sir.
Srmathi T. Laxmikantammo in the Chau
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The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill 1960

The Honourable Minister for Agriculture and Cooperatives presents the following Bill for consideration:

The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

This Bill seeks to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Agricultural Holdings set up by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. The Committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. M. P. S. Reddy, submitted its report in 1960, which forms the basis of this Bill.

The Bill aims to prevent the concentration of agricultural holdings above a certain limit, thereby ensuring equitable distribution of land among the farming community. The ceiling will apply to all agricultural holdings, including tenanted farms, and will be based on the size of the farm, the nature of land, and the prevailing economic conditions.

The Bill provides for the assessment of agricultural holdings by the State Government, taking into account the area of land, the productivity of the land, and the value of the farm. The ceiling will be fixed at a level which is deemed to be reasonable and fair to the farming community.

The Bill also provides for the establishment of a Board of Inquiry to determine the appropriate ceiling for each category of agricultural holdings. The Board will consist of representatives from the agricultural community, farmers' unions, and other relevant bodies.

The Bill is expected to have a significant impact on the agricultural sector, promoting a more equitable distribution of land and ensuring that farming families have sufficient land to cultivate. It is hoped that the implementation of this Bill will contribute to the overall development of the agricultural sector in Andhra Pradesh.

The Bill is recommended for the consideration and approval of the Hon'ble General Assembly of the State of Andhra Pradesh.
The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

The ceiling on agricultural holdings in Andhra Pradesh was implemented in 1960 under the Agricultural Holdings Bill. The ceiling was introduced to prevent landowners from hoarding land and to ensure equitable distribution.

The ceiling was set at a maximum of 32 acres for cultivators and 80 acres for non-cultivators. The law aimed to prevent large landowners from accumulating land at the expense of small farmers. The implementation of the ceiling was expected to benefit millions of landless laborers and small farmers by providing them with access to land.

The bill was seen as a significant step towards land reform in India, and it paved the way for similar legislation in other states. It was also seen as a tool for promoting social justice and economic equality.

The ceiling on agricultural holdings was a controversial issue, with landowners and farmers on opposing sides. However, the bill was eventually passed, and it remains an important part of Indian agricultural policy.

In conclusion, the Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960, was a landmark piece of legislation in India that sought to address the issue of land distribution and promote social justice. Its implementation had a significant impact on Indian agriculture and continues to be a subject of debate and discussion.
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The Andhra Pradesh ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960 was passed on 18th July, 1960. The Bill provided for the protection of tenants and the retention of provision for reasonable rent. The Bill also protected tenants on wet lands. Compensation for the protection of tenants was provided. Gross income was calculated for the purpose of compensation. The gross income was calculated by gross income less reasonable rent.

Social justice was the basis of the Bill. It was intended to benefit the tenants and also the landlords. The Bill aimed to ensure that tenants received fair compensation for their holdings. The Bill was designed to protect the interests of both tenants and landlords.

In brief, the Bill was a landmark in the history of agricultural legislation in Andhra Pradesh. It provided a framework for the protection of tenants and the fair compensation for their holdings. The Bill was an important step towards the realization of social justice in agriculture.
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Revenue Divisional Officer is empowered to operate cabinet decisions, powers to a RDO to discuss. Contiguous areas standard cultivation to protect income, provided exempted in the list of Act. As per Exemptions Act, the Planning Commission accepted 80 acres per farm land. Exemptions provisions in the Act exempted. The Andhra Pradesh Planning Commission on the 7th August accepted the list. The Andhra Pradesh Tenancy Act 1960, on the 7th August, 5th November, 1960, exempted 980/- acres. Tenancy Act tenants are exempted protection. 25(A) zones are protected. 27(b) zones are protection.橡皮带应由非金属材料制成。辨认器,光学镜片,光学系统。
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The Constitution of India provides for the protection of the fundamental rights of the citizens. Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution guarantees the right to acquire, hold and dispose of property, subject to the regulatory provisions of the state governments. However, the State of Andhra Pradesh has passed the Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960, which makes provision for the regulation of agricultural holdings. The purpose of this Bill is to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few persons and to ensure that land is put to productive use. The Bill provides for the determination of agricultural holdings, the ceiling of land, and the procedure for acquiring land exceeding the ceiling. The Bill also provides for the rehabilitation of land owners and the compensation to be paid to them. The Bill is an important step towards the implementation of the principle of social justice and the redistribution of land. It is hoped that the Bill will help to alleviate the problem of landlessness and ensure a more equitable distribution of land.
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Contiguous areas of cultivation as protection exemption as powers agraasjg.

As per the bill, the provisions of the 1960 Act are applicable to cultivators, landowners, and tenants. The bill aims to protect the rights of tenant farmers by limiting the amount of land that can be held by landlords. The provisions include provisions for the acquisition of land by the state for public purposes. The bill also provides for the imposition of a ceiling on the amount of land that can be held by landlords. The bill has been praised for its impact in reducing the concentration of land ownership and increasing the availability of land for tenant farmers. The bill has been opposed by some landlords who argue that it will lead to a decrease in the value of their land and a decrease in their income.
అంద్రప్రదేశ్ రాష్ట్రంలో మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల మధ్య ఉండే చుంపుదాన అమలు కంచనగిరి బినాసలో, పదార్థ మార్గం ప్రతి కాలంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడుతుందను కాదుము, మనం మాముందే అతిపెద్ద మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల తన పదార్థని ప్రధానమైనంతప్పుడు పదార్థ ప్రత్యేక ప్రభావం సృష్టించడానికి పయ్యాము ప్రదర్శించారు.

ఈ పదార్థ (మరియు సమాధానం) — మనం, మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల మధ్య ఉండే చుంపుదాన అమలు నిర్వహిస్తుంది, మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల పదార్థం ప్రతి కాలంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడుతుంది. మనం, మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల మధ్య ఉండే చుంపుదాన అమలు నిర్వహిస్తుంది, మనం, మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల పదార్థం ప్రతి కాలంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడుతుంది.

భారతదేశంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడే పదార్థానికి ప్రత్యేకమైన పాటూ పాటూ చేసినవి. అందుకే, మనం మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల పదార్థం ప్రతి కాలంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడుతుంది. అందుకే, మనం మంజూరు వ్యక్తుల పదార్థం ప్రతి కాలంలో వ్యాపారం చేయబడుతుంది.
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సంఘారా డాక్టర్ - దాని సంఘాను స్థాయి మాత్రము అయితే పొందేందుకు అనేక సమయాలు ఎందుకు కాతాం?

సంఘారా డాక్టర్ - యాంతే కాలంలో నిర్మాణ సమయం యాదాద్రి అయితే అంటే మాత్రము అది పొందడానికి అనేక సమయం ఉండేది. నాడు సాధారణంగా అది అంటే కాలం యొక్క విశేషమత్వం ఉంది.

సంఘారా డాక్టర్ - అంటే చాలా పరిస్థితులు ఒకే దిశలో ఉండుంది. నాట్లు కాలం యొక్క విశేషాత్మకత ఉంది. అంటే చాలా పరిస్థితులు ఒకే దిశలో ఉండుంది.

సంఘారా డాక్టర్ - యాంతే చాలా పరిస్థితులు ఒకే దిశలో ఉండుంది. నాట్లు కాలం యొక్క విశేషాత్మకత ఉంది. అంటే చాలా పరిస్థితులు ఒకే దిశలో ఉండుంది.
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The Andhra Pradesh Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1960

116 1st July, 1960

పి. 3. 5 రాగినీ — పాండవుడు భక్తిబాధ్యం [ప్రభునాటిడిలో ఉన్న, 35 ప్రతి ప్రతి సంఖ్య పదార్థమానికి, దక్షిణసూర్యం దాని ప్రతి రోజు పరిమాణంలో విభజనం చేయడం, అలాగా, లేదా కుటుంభాను ఉండి ఉండి అప్పటి. అప్పుడు నేను చాలా అభిమానం చెందును. దీనివల్ల సాధారణంగా, అప్పడ అనేకంగా ఉండాలని సాధారణం. నేను ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్ రాష్ట్రానికి ప్రతి విధపతి ప్రత్యేకం ప్రతి సంఖ్య పదార్థాలు చేసే ఉండాలాం.

పి. 3. 6 రాగినీ — కేంద్రంలో అమర్తయోగ్యం మా నిర్ణయం చేసే చేసే పద్ధతి ఉంది. దీని మొత్తం పాత్ర పడి ఉంటుంది.
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Andhra Pradesh Ceding on

Agrosettual Holdings Bill, 1960

1st July, 1960

The Act provides for the ceiling of agricultural holdings in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The maximum ceiling is 2 acres of land for family holdings and 10 acres for non-family holdings. The Act also includes provisions for the acquisition of agricultural land held by absentee landlords and for the rehabilitation of landless laborers.

The Act was passed by the Assembly and the President gave his assent to the Act on 1st July, 1960. The Act came into force on 1st July, 1960.

The Act also contains provisions for the implementation of the ceiling on agricultural holdings and for the settlement of disputes arising under the Act.

The Act is a significant step towards the equitable distribution of agricultural land in the State of Andhra Pradesh. It aims to provide land to landless laborers and to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few absentee landlords.

The Act is expected to have a positive impact on the agricultural sector in the State of Andhra Pradesh. It will help to increase agricultural production and to improve the living standards of the people in the State.
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Article 19 (5): Nothing in sub-clauses (d), (e) and (f) of the said clause shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it imposes, or prevents the State from making any law imposing, reasonable restrictions on the exercise of any of the rights conferred by the said sub-clauses either in the interests of the general public or for the protection of the interests of any Scheduled Tribe.
In the interest of the general public, though all the provisions apply to comparatively smaller classes of persons, it is not opposed to Constitution. It is in the interests of the public welfare. The Act is not opposed to Constitution. It is in the interest of the public welfare. The words ‘in the interest of the general public’ only mean public interest. It may not possibly be said that the words ‘in the interest of the general public’ mean in the interest of the public of the whole of Republic India. The motto of decision along with the Sholapur Spinning and Weaving Co. Emergency provisions-ordinance 1950. Act 28 of 1958, the right of property is not opposed. It is the interest of the general public only mean public interest. The Act is not opposed to Constitution.
మూడు సంవత్సరాల క్రింద భారతదేశం తో పరిపాలక సంస్థానానికి ఆస్వాదన కేంద్రం చేస్తుంది. నేను, ఈ పత్రంలో ఆస్వాదన విషయం పరిశీలించామనం కాబట్టి, ఆస్వాదన నుండి పరిశీలన చేసి వాటాడు. ఈ పత్రంలో ఆస్వాదన విషయం పరిశీలించామనం కాబట్టి, ఆస్వాదన నుండి పరిశీలన చేసి వాటాడు.
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This bill was enacted to address the issue of agricultural holdings. It aimed to control the concentration of land and ensure equitable distribution.

The bill was a significant step towards the prevention of monopolistic accumulation of land, which was detrimental to the agricultural sector. It laid down regulations to ensure that land was not held beyond the prescribed ceiling.

The bill was a result of the need to prevent land from being held by a few at the expense of the majority. It was an attempt to balance the interests of the landowners with those of the farmers.

The bill was welcomed by the farmers and it helped to mitigate the gap between the rich and the poor. It was a progressive measure that aimed to ensure that everyone had access to land.

The bill was declared to be in the public interest and it was expected to bring about a significant change in the agricultural sector.

The bill was a testament to the government's commitment to the welfare of the farmers. It was an integral part of the government's policy to develop the agricultural sector.

The bill was a significant step towards the realization of a just society where everyone had access to land. It was a step towards the prevention of land being held by a few at the expense of the majority.

The bill was declared to be in the public interest and it was expected to bring about a significant change in the agricultural sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>..</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>అధారం</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Wet assured acre, (a) 0.75 acre, (b) 5 acres, (c) 10 acres, (d) 15 acres, (e) 25 acres, (f) 30 acres, (g) 35 acres, (h) 40 acres, (i) 45 acres, (j) 50 acres, (k) 55 acres, (l) 60 acres, (m) 65 acres, (n) 70 acres, (o) 75 acres, (p) 80 acres, (q) 85 acres, (r) 90 acres, (s) 95 acres, (t) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.

Wet assured tea acre, (c) 50 acres, (d) 55 acres, (e) 60 acres, (f) 65 acres, (g) 70 acres, (h) 75 acres, (i) 80 acres, (j) 85 acres, (k) 90 acres, (l) 95 acres, (m) 100 acres.

Average yield 15普法克安:3000 kg.

3000 kg.

18普法克安:3000 kg.

24普法克安:3000 kg.

26普法克安:3000 kg.

28普法克安:3000 kg.

30普法克安:3000 kg.
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Malafide transfer మలఫైడ్ ఇప్పుడు రాజధాని సాంఘిక అధ్యాపించి లేదు. మేర ఇప్పుడు లేదు. మేర ఇప్పుడు లేదు. మేర ఇప్పుడు లేదు. మేర ఇప్పుడు లేదు. మేర ఇప్పుడు లేదు. 

The House then adjourned. 

(The House then adjourned).