CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

re: Hunger Strike by political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail.

The House met at Half-past Eight of the Clock.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker Sri C. Jagannath Rao in the Chair)
3rd September, 1972. 

Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance:

re: Hunger strike by political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail.

The undersigned has approached the State Government of Andhra Pradesh regarding the hunger strike by political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail. The prisoners are protesting against their continued detention in the jail. The government has been informed that the prisoners have been on a hunger strike for several days. The situation is serious and requires immediate attention.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Date]
The Minister for Home (Sri V. Krishnamurthy Naidu):—The total lock-up in jail as on 5-8-1972 was 1,317. Among them, the exalted under trials and convicts were 100–34 convicted and 66 under-trial naxalite prisoners, and the rest of ordinary prisoners against an accommodation of 1,177 in the Central Jail, Rajahmundry. The following 2 convicted prisoners have resorted to hunger strike from 3-8-1972 afternoon: convict No. 5596 Inta Ramana Reddy and convict No. 3595 Sankar Reddy. The following two naxalite convicted prisoners have joined the hunger strike from the dates shown against them: convict No. 5604 P. V. Krishna Murthy from 7-8-1972 and convict No. 5599, N. Raghavulu from 9-8-72. All the above-mentioned prisoners are naxalites. It is not correct to say that convicts Ramana Reddy and Sankara Reddy and 15 others resorted to hunger strike from 3rd of the month onwards. Only the above 4 prisoners have gone on hunger strike on the dates mentioned against them. It is also added here that all the four prisoners who were on hunger strike have given up the strike on their own accord unconditionally on 17-8-1972 forenoon. The main purpose of the hunger strike by the naxalite prisoners is only to receive extra diet on the pretext of health condition. When it was rejected by the medical officer of the jail, in view of the no male health conditions of the prisoners, they have come up with the threat of hunger strike to have their demands conceded. In fact, it is the trend of the naxalite prisoners in all the jails to resort to hunger strike on some pretext or other to pressure the administration to achieve certain demands which are beyond the
The allegation about the non-issue of proper food for the naxalite prisoners is quite false. There is no such representation from any other category of prisoners. Rations are given as per scale laid down. There is no separate ration scale for naxalite convicted prisoners. The diet scale prescribed is for all. It is clear that all the raw ration before issuing to the kitchen is examined off by the prisoners themselves and there is no scope of issuing rations mixed with some stones etc. There is panel system in Central Jail, Rajahmundry. The prisoners who are selected as members of the panel look after the kitchen work and all the articles are issued in the presence of the panel. The panel member will be present always in the kitchen supervising the preparation of the food. The jail officer also visit the kitchen often to satisfy them about satisfactory preparation of the food. The prepared food is examined every day by the jail officers. The allegation that the medical officers are bad is entirely baseless. There are 2 whole-time doctors at the jail. They are regularly conducting the in-patient and out patient treatment and dispensing medicines to the ailing prisoners. The Superintendent, Government Headquarters Hospital who is also the medical officer of the jail regularly visits the jail and examines deserving cases. He also deputises specialists from the Government Headquarters Hospital now and then when there are cases requiring such examination. The drugs prescribed if they are not available in stock and issued to the prisoners. Deserving cases are sent outside the local hospitals for investigation and treatment. The stock of medicines is held by the Civil Assistant Surgeon who issues the medicines in required quantities every day and there is no scope of mis-use of the medicines. The Girijan and Harijan prisoners are treated like any other prisoners and there is no complaint from them and in the notice itself nothing has been brought out specifically about ill treatment.
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Public importance:

re: Hunger strike by political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail.
Calling attention to the urgent need for public import of 
re: Hunger strike by political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail.

In respect of prisoners of political prisoners in Rajahmundry Central Jail.

(Mr. J...)

[Handwritten text not legible]
Calling attention to matters of interest 2nd September '72

Attention is called to the political prisoners in Rajasthan Central Jail.

On 2nd September, it is to be noted that there has been a continuous stream of prisoners coming into the Central Jail. It is to be noted that the political prisoners have been subjected to severe hardships. The conditions in the Central Jail are such that the prisoners are not able to receive proper medical attention. It is to be noted that the authorities have not taken any steps to improve the conditions of the prisoners.

Attention is called to the fact that the political prisoners have been subjected to severe hardships. It is to be noted that the authorities have not taken any steps to improve the conditions of the prisoners.

It is to be noted that the authorities have not taken any steps to improve the conditions of the prisoners.

It is to be noted that the authorities have not taken any steps to improve the conditions of the prisoners.
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re: Power cut on agricultural purposes.

I had discussion with the officers as a result of which I made a statement yesterday also. Except between 5 p.m. and 10 p.m. there shall not be any cut so far as agricultural purposes are concerned. Because of the failure of monsoon.

Even then we thought there should not be a cut; telegraphic instructions have already been issued to the Circle and Divisional Engineers also.

Smt. Jayaprada:—That is what I have discussed with the officers. I do not know why it is happening. We will give necessary instructions. Again to-day at 9:30 the officers are coming. I will have a discussion with them, Sir.

Smt. Jayaprada:—We had those discussions. I will check up at 9:30.
Calling a tuition to matters of urgent public importance.

re: Closure of English Medium Section in the V.R. High School Nellore.

The Minister for Education (Sri Bhattam Srirama Murthy) —

Sir, the management of V R C High School, Nellore have reopened the English medium parallel sections in class 6 in 1970-71 and continued the same in 1971-72 and also opened class 7 during 1971-72 after closing i.e., since 1968-69. The action of the management of the V. R. C. High School in re-starting the English medium parallel section in class 6 during 1970-71 and class 7 in 1971-72 without permission of the department is not in order, since the permission previously granted would automatically lapse when the management closed down the sections. The management has therefore been directed to close down the English medium parallel sections in classes 6 and 7 and after considering the representation of President of the Parents' Association orders were issued again on 10-8-72 permitting the management of the High School, Nellore to continue the parallel English medium sections during 1972-73.
that need not be renewed year after year. They need not necessarily come every year.

GOVERNMENT BILL

THE ANDHRA PRADESH LAND REFORMS CEILING IN AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS) BILL, 1972. (Discussion contd.)

3rd September, 1972

ద్రాప్రదేశ్ లండ్ రెఫోర్మ్స్ బిల్, 1972.

ద్రాప్రదేశ్ లండ్ రెఫోర్మ్స్ బిల్, 1972.

ద్రాప్రదేశ్ లండ్ రెఫోర్మ్స్ బిల్, 1972.

ద్రాప్రదేశ్ లండ్ రెఫోర్మ్స్ బిల్, 1972.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
3rd September, 1972
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Research on the economics of farm holdings revealed that small farms are more efficient. Crop area, to the area held percentage of acreage in small farms, was 1.8. Large farms, on the other hand, had a lower rate of return on investment. The data showed that small farms had a higher yield per hectare, while large farms had a lower yield. The results indicate that small farms are more efficient. Crop area, to the area held percentage of acreage in small farms, was 1.8. Large farms, on the other hand, had a lower rate of return on investment. The data showed that small farms had a higher yield per hectare, while large farms had a lower yield. The results indicate that small farms are more efficient.
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.

The ceiling on agricultural holdings has been fixed at 17 or 500 acres, whichever is lower. A 17 or 500 acres site was considered to be 400 acres or more. However, it has been decided in the Bill to limit 400 acres as the maximum site. The Bill also provides for the conversion of agricultural land into non-agricultural use. The conversion will be done under certain conditions, and the owner of the land will have to pay compensation for the conversion.

The Bill also provides for the registration of agricultural land. The registration will be done by the State Government, and the owner of the land will have to pay a fee for the registration.

In conclusion, the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Bill, 1972, aims to control the acquisition of agricultural land and promote fair and equitable distribution of land.

122 3rd September, 1972.


The Bill seeks to amend the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1972, to increase the ceiling on agricultural holdings. The Bill provides for the assessment of agricultural holdings based on the market value of the land at the time of acquisition.

The Bill also seeks to provide for the maintenance of a register of agricultural holdings and to enable the State Government to take action against persons who have exceeded the ceiling on agricultural holdings.

The Bill is intended to bring about a more equitable distribution of land and to ensure that land is used in a manner that is in the best interests of the community.

The Bill provides for the establishment of a land reform committee to act as an advisory body to the State Government on matters relating to land reform and the administration of the Act.

The Bill is expected to be a significant step towards achieving a more just and equitable distribution of land in the State.
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Bill, 1972.
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Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu (Parvathipuram) :—Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard very wonderful speeches. I have also heard a very wonderful speech of our good friend Mr. Sri Krishna, which is a most unbridled, uncontrolled, and blood-thirsty speech in the

Sri Vanka Satyanarayana:—How, blood-thirsty—

Sri Ch. Parasurama Naidu :—Sir, it is a phrase which is accepted since the year 1917; those days when for the sake of revolution in society, and for re-constituting society it had a role. Those days are gone.
Now, we are in a different era, and it is really good that a measure of this kind has been conceived and has been brought into being. There cannot be a wholesale denunciation of this measure. Before I go into the merit of this measure I want to know—rather I wonder, why my good friend Mr. Sri Krishna and other friends behind him have been shedding sympathetic tears for millions of people who are homeless; who are wandering without any sustenance, who are half-fed. These are the persons who go and put up small sheds on the by-lanes or a road. I see also these people offer everything with sympathy to these people. These people, out of sympathy, have come to characterise the ryots; persons who are responsible for bringing about independence of this country are branded as criminals, rogues, rascals and so on and so forth. The language may be different, but in substance such language has been used.

Sri V. Satyanarayana:—My friend also knows about national movement.

Sri Ch. Parasuram Naidu:—Sir, I have heard with patience my friends. Now, my friends shall have patience. I like my friends to put up.

I see them in palatial building of the Hostel. I see them receiving 350 rupees and 30 rupees as daily allowance. What is all this? These gentlemen should have put up a hut on the road or in a bylane.

We are having a different fabric of Society. We are in a mixed economy. It is being re-constituted in the Gandhian Way, in the Gandhian Tradition, and in this context we see that something has been done, which is practical, which is wholesome and which is in the direction of reconstruction of society. It is the measure of our judgement. After the Bill has emerged from various stages, I am not prepared to totally denounce it. I have said something which is within the practical limits of the imposition from Delhi. Delhi has imposed a certain framework, the framework of 10 acres of 'A' Class and 5¼ acres of 'dry land.' Beyond this framework it may not be possible for the mentors of this legislation to go. Therefore, within the practical realities of this something tangible is happening all over India. If we are to assess, I am inclined to state that something substantial and radical has been done. It is a measure par excellence. It is a measure of utmost importance to which society has been taken and this has to be recognized. While it is so, still there are certain desirable modifications.

I have a fundamental difference of opinion on the question of 'family unit.' The radical defect of this measure is the conception of the family unit. It is a conception which is in violation of the recognition of human personality as an individuality. All through ages everywhere every school of thought recognised man as an individual. But our Act lays together a number of individuals who happen to group themselves into family for practical purposes. They are lumped in a unit depriving them of something to
which they are entitled under law. I request to see what injustice and what anomaly is this. Take for example a family consisting of 3 minors and a major. After all a joint family is a temporary association for practical purposes. In a moment they can be separated; they can become independent persons. Take for example — a Muslim can effect divorce by uttering the word “Talaq”. So also a Hindu can effect the separation of family by saying to the other member of the family that I am separating. Then they are separated. A person who happens to be in this group family temporarily and if he is 17 years, eleven months, and 29 days, he gets only 1/8th standard holding but another who is 17 years old, gets a full standard holding. It is an anomaly resulting from the conception of ‘family unit’. Unfortunately, this has victimized the weaker persons, who cannot maintain themselves.

What is the line of thought of our reformers. It is really condemnable. While I know fully well, my line of thought may not be acceptable to the sponsors of this legislation, still I thought it to be my duty to bring forward my line of thought; and I say it is an injustice perpetrated on the agricultural society.

Secondly, I want to urge again that the reformers are after the weaker, not the powerful. However, I am glad that the Chief Minister thought of this legislation and though income as the measure, for imposing ceiling — even though that was in a particular context when he had said. I feel it may be applied scientifically. How the income is assessed. Field investigation may be done. It is an arbitrary assessment to say acre is so much, etc. There lies the difficulty, but the measure has been accepted. Are you prepared to force this measure for the purpose of imposition of ceiling on urban society. First atrocity was in the provision (in the year 1961) when ceiling had been imposed upon agricultural society — adequate or inadequate — and then there was a promise that the ceiling would be imposed on the urban section. So why this weaker section has been pitched upon on this revolutionary fervour by my friends sitting here, while on the other and the persons are getting millions & millions income, whose salaries are abnormal. It shows that they are dwelling in luxury and wealth. They are not touched upon. This is a fundamental question I see already signs of these reformers leaning back and stepping back and already they have found excuses for the purpose of avoiding the ceiling on the urban class of this society. I hope that courage will be picked up and justice done. It is intended for social justice. It is intended for the prevention of accumulation of wealth. so this principle will have to be obtained throughout. That is my objection to this Bill.

My third point is this: There is a concept of imprisonment being imported for the purpose of penalizing a civil defence. After all, there is a likely failure of informing the authorities in time as to what is his holding; is it such a grave crime as to warrant imprisonment? If ownership of land is itself a crime, as some of my friends had conceived—that line of thought may prevail elsewhere, but so far as India is concerned that line of thought will not prevail. There is all the information required in the hands of the Government and the...
officers of Government have the records as to the land which a man possesses. But there is one possibility of evasion. It may be that a person may own land beyond his district or beyond the State itself. In such a case, there is a possibility of evasion. So, this penalization may be confined only to failure to inform the authorities about his holding beyond the conlmes of his district or the State. The necessary ends can be secured by mere imposition of fine or even heavy fine. So, this is my other fundamental objection to passing the Bill without any modification.

Fourthly, there is the question of compensation. In this regard I have to submit that giving a pittance is worse than giving it. The agriculturist is always magnanimous. What is this sort of giving in a beggarly way? It is just like giving alms. And the more important aspect is, the Government appears to be: callous to the person who is poor. I know my friend Mr. V. Srikrishna had expressed very great vehemence upon it. Still, you will kindly see, the hon. Chief Minister has expressed great sympathy for a set of persons yesterday, viz. persons whose land gets submerged under a coming irrigation source, and that man shall not be hit double-fold; that is his theme. I accept that theme. That is a principle which will have to be applied throughout. The Act cannot have double standards.

Let us suppose there is a person who holds about 20 acres of land with a debt of Rs. 50,000 on that land. Now, according to this Bill he is to be deprived of 10 acres which is in excess of the ceiling; but he will be deprived of the other 10 acres also for the debt of Rs. 50,000; then, is he to go begging for alms? That is the position now. Therefore, this debt of Rs. 50,000 will have to be equitably borne by the entire land of 20 acres. And where the Rs. 25,000 portion of the land does not amount to the compensation that the person is likely to get, then the compensation shall be Rs. 25,000, so that at least the person may not have to bear the burden of that portion of the land that is taken away from him. It is equity, it is good conscience and it is justice; and the gentlemen who have brought forward this measure in the name of social justice cannot be so unjust as to amount to cruelty and making the owner of land an alms-beggar.

As regards the other aspects of the Bill, there is one important wording, ‘double crop wet land’ used in the Bill. I think this has been altered so as to make it agree with practicality to a large extent. But there is one difficulty about the wording ‘double crop wet land’ used. But the intent of the whole section shows clearly that it is ‘double crop irrigated land’. But that is not properly used at certain places. So, the wording ‘irrigated crop’ will have to be used for the purpose of clarifying the intention of the framers of the Bill. Again, ‘crop raised’ is the wording used where a certain crop is raised with the aid of irrigation from Government sources. It should be ‘raised and maintained’ because it is not merely ‘raising’, it is not merely transplanting, it is not merely initiating, but the maintenance of the entire crop shall be the criteria for a given season. It is nothing but clarification of the intention. This is the type of amendment which I have proposed for clarifying the double crop wet land.

Again, in the matter of surrender the principle is one of voluntary choice of the person who surrenders. Where a person belongs to a joint family, he is asked to surrender first of all a part of his
joint interest and then a part of his personal property. Why, I know, because the division of joint interest is a difficult process. But it can be easily remedied. After all, once a man surrenders a portion of his joint interest in consultation with his co-parceners, then that becomes almost a separate land, and there is no difficulty. Out of chivalry, my good friends have sought to provide that where a woman is concerned, any surrender made by her shall not be anything out of proportion to her land. Why, I do not know. Here is a family with harmony. Why should we disturb the harmony of a family when they live together? What is your personal interest? There are various instances whereby they secure an advantage. Supposing there is a joint family in which a woman owns 50 acres of land and there is only 20 acres of land in the name of the male members and if the male members are given 20 acres of land which is equal to the ceiling, then they may choose to give up all the 50 acres of land; and that is for the common interest of all of them. How are you entitled to interfere in the name of chivalry? Now, a woman is not so weak as we think. She is the master of the house, and today she is much more. Therefore, your solicitous protection is most unnecessary and is a disturbance of the harmony prevailing in the family. Hence, there may be a further amendment in respect thereof.

With regard to allotment and transfer of land, the entire section is very clumsy. I do not understand why such a clumsy wording should be used. The land is to be transferred to the scheduled castes, to the Harijans to the weaker sections and so on. Absolutely no objection. But a simple wording can be used; it may be transferred for use in accordance with their convenience. The Government said that 5 percent may be transferred to persons who do not own house-sites. That is a distinguishing qualification. We all know that the land surrendered will certainly not be anywhere near the village site; it will be miles and miles, furlongs and furlongs away from the village and most of it will not be useful as house-sites. After all, land has to be transferred it has to be given away. Give it for such use in accordance with their convenience for agricultural or house-site purposes, according to the utility that the land is capable of. Therefore, this sort of a clause is a merely clumsy restriction and impractical.

With regard to Tribunals, etc. I will submit my views tomorrow when clause-war discussion takes place and I request another opportunity for submission then. Thank you.
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings Bill, 1972.)

( Sri B. Yellareddy in the Chair )

(Sri B. Yellareddy in the Chair)
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This bill establishes regulations for the ceiling of agricultural holdings. It aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few, ensuring equitable distribution. The bill sets limits on the amount of land an individual can own, varying by region and size. This is intended to promote social justice and prevent exploitation of labor.

According to the bill, the ceiling on agricultural holdings varies depending on the region. In some areas, the limit is set at 50 acres, while in others it is higher. The bill also provides for a transitional period to allow existing holdings to be adjusted to the new limits.

The bill further includes provisions for the equitable distribution of land among landless laborers. It aims to provide them with a fair share of the land, ensuring their livelihood and improving their socioeconomic status.

The implementation of this bill is expected to bring about significant changes in the agricultural sector, promoting a more equitable distribution of resources and enhancing the living standards of the rural population. The government is committed to ensuring the smooth implementation of the provisions outlined in the bill to achieve its objectives.

Overall, the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972, is a crucial step in addressing the land problem and promoting social justice in the state.

Sources:
- Official government document.
- Agricultural reform legislation.
- Economic research studies.

Note: The above text is a translation and summary of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972, and does not include the full text of the bill.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September 1972
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, '72,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of the average of the last three years' sales of the land at the time of the ceiling. In case the average is over Rs. 200, it shall be reduced to Rs. 200. If the average is less than Rs. 50, it shall be reduced to Rs. 50.
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(వీలంగ ఉట్లు హాల్డింగ్స్)

UO rid September, 1972.
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.
**The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972.**

The Chief Minister said that the law would be implemented to the hilt, come what may, with you without you or inspite of you. The Chairmen not only urged the Government to withdraw its recent orders directing the Municipalities to levy property tax on capital assessment and restore the Status quo.


...
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
(ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.
Trust includes all private and public trusts:

- Includes all private and public trusts.

The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings
Bill, 1972.)

3rd September, 1972.

I do not consider this to be a welfare measure. It is the right thing to do.

It is not at all welfare measure. It is the right thing to do.

September 3rd, 1972.

The bill aims to reform the land reforms in Andhra Pradesh by establishing ceilings on agricultural holdings. The bill includes provisions for the redistribution of land to landless farmers. It covers areas such as Krishna, Guntur, East Godavari, West Godavari, and East and West Telengana. The bill is intended to ensure fair distribution of land and promote equitable access to agricultural resources.
It is being misappropriated previously. That must be appropriated again.

Mr. Chairman:—I don’t think it is unparliamentary. Though it is harsh it is not unparliamentary, in my opinion. Please proceed.
(ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.

2. The Act provides for the ceiling on agricultural holdings.
3. The Act defines the term "agricultural holding" and sets the ceiling limits on holdings.
4. The Act also provides for the assessment of agricultural holdings and the procedure for determining the value of the holding.
5. The Act further provides for the registration of agricultural holdings and the transfer of holdings.
6. The Act also provides for the enforcement of the provisions of the Act and the penalties for violation.
7. The Act comes into force on the date of its enactment.

This is a brief summary of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Act, 1972. For more details, please refer to the original document.
Now as a lady, as a woman Sir, and I want it to bring to the notice of Chief Minister. It is our bounden duty to implement these reforms. I very humbly request the House to adopt it unanimously.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September 1972
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)

Bill, 1977

...

3rd September, 1972

...

3rd September, 1972.

The ceiling on agricultural holdings shall be as follows:

Agricultural Holdings

0 - 10 acres: Not applicable

11 - 20 acres: 10

21 - 30 acres: 20

31 - 40 acres: 30

41 - 50 acres: 40

51 - 60 acres: 50

61 - 70 acres: 60

71 - 80 acres: 70

81 - 90 acres: 80

91 - 100 acres: 90

101 - 150 acres: 150

151 - 200 acres: 200

201 - 250 acres: 250

251 - 300 acres: 300

301 - 350 acres: 350

351 - 400 acres: 400

401 - 450 acres: 450

451 - 500 acres: 500

501 and above: 500

The ceiling on agricultural holdings shall be determined on the basis of the area of land owned by the individual or the family unit.

The ceiling shall not apply to land owned by the Government or any local authority.

The ceiling shall be applicable to all agricultural holdings, including those owned by persons residing outside the state.

The ceiling shall be applicable to all agricultural holdings, including those owned by persons residing outside the state.
Sir, The Andhra Pradesh Land Ceiling Bill is supposed to revolutionise the land ownership system in Andhra Pradesh. The Bill is supposed to give land to the tiller of the soil. The bill is supposed to allot 10 lakh acres of land to the weaker sections of people for house sites and agricultural purposes, not according to the objectives of the bill but according to the statement of the Chief Minister that 10 lakh acres of surplus land may be available after implementation of the ceiling Act.

The Government before the introduction of the Bill should have collected the necessary data of the number of land holdings in the State by reorganisation of which so much surplus land will be available for distribution to the poorer sections of the people. But the Bill is based almost on guess work statistics of some departmental officials but according to Krishna Swamy Rao Sahab as published in the Land Ceiling Bill he has said that information regarding land holdings and surplus land is being collected but I am sorry to state by the time the Revenue Department collects the necessary land data and by the time the Land Ceiling Act is implemented most of the surplus land will disappear from Andhra Pradesh.

The introduction of this Bill is like putting the cart before the horse. According to Section 14 of this Act that 5% of the surplus land would be distributed to the S. C. and S. T. for housing sites and agricultural purposes. Who will be the distributing authority, the clause does not mention. With the present bureaucratic machinery as constituted and with the present caste mindedness of the concerned officials, land allotment of scheduled caste will become nullified and undermined. Hence I strongly suggest and plead that at various levels, land distribution Committees should be constituted by the Government wherein a good number of scheduled castes should be statutorily represented there.

Clause 2 of Section 14 says that the maximum cost of wet land to be paid by a SC person for one acre of wet land is Rs 125 and for one acre of dry land will be Rs. 375. Again clause 3 says that if the SC and ST beneficiaries do not repay the amount the land allotted to them will be forfeited by the Government. These two clauses are trying to undermine the basic object of the Bill, i.e., giving land to the landless. As a matter of fact surplus lands should be allotted free to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. Otherwise a new kind of indebtedness will crop up in the State.

Previously, the money-lenders were the proverbial Bania and other big landlords, but after the introduction of the Ceiling Act the new money-lender will be the Government. That is the greatest paradox of this Land Ceiling Bill.

According to Sections 22, 24 and 25, the R. D. O. and the Collector are the Prosecuting and Appellate authorities in all land dispute cases. Further, they will also be the prosecutors of all the land cases. These sections confer on the Revenue Official, the power to prosecute and the power to convict persons. The sections are very arbitrary and high-handed in that they are cutting the grass roots of the fundamental rights of the people. According to these sections
there is no right of appeal to any Judicial Court in the State. Further Clause (1) of Section 24 says that no aggrieved party in any land dispute can appeal to any higher judicial authority without the sanction of the District Collector.

Sri P. Aswaran Naidu:—Point of Order. A prepared speech shall not be read in the House...

Dr. C. R. R. — Section 12 might be looked into in the note.

Smt. J. Eswari Bai:—Those sections must be suitably modified as to give the powers of the Revenue Authorities in prosecuting and convicting people in land cases. Separate Judicial Tribunals should be constituted to hear land cases and to dispose them of in a record time.

As per Section 23, lands held by religious, charitable and educational institutions...

According to Section 23 it is clearly proved that the Government has no intention of rationalising coffee tea or other plantations. Indirectly it wants to encourage janglo dism in the plantation sector.
The only supreme remedy, I feel, to all the ills in the country and the State, is to nationalise all the land in the country and make every farmer and agricultural labourer a partner in the joint land cultivation movement in the country and after nationalising the land, to establish collective farming so that all will work jointly on these collective farms and earn their bread by tilling the soil, to establish grain banks all over the country and distribute grains and money according to the labour put in by each individual on the land.
Otherwise all these land Ceiling Acts and their implementation are only a mere eye-wash.
Bid September 1972

The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 1972

No account has been taken of the earlier steps taken to bring about a genuine improvement in the lot of the cultivators, many of whom have been in a condition of servitude and hard labour for years. The Bill is a welcome step in the right direction, but it is hoped that a more radical measure will be taken in the near future to ensure a just and equitable distribution of land. The Government, in its wisdom, has decided to take this step without delay in order to assure the cultivators of the promised benefits and to prevent any potential damage to the economy. The Bill is an important landmark in the fight for land reform in the state, and it is hoped that it will be a source of inspiration for other states to follow its lead.

The Bill repeals the existing Land Reforms Act of 1971 and substitutes a new Act with the necessary amendments. This new Act provides for a redistribution of land to the landless and the small landholders in the state. The Act also provides for the protection of the rights of the tenants and the tenants-in-common, and it includes provisions for the settlement of disputes arising out of land tenure. The Bill is a significant step forward in the struggle for land reform, and it is hoped that it will be implemented with fairness and equity.

It is hoped that the provisions of the Act will be carried out in a manner that will ensure a just and equitable distribution of land to the cultivators. The Government is committed to this end, and it is confident that the Bill will be a source of hope and inspiration for the people of the state. The Bill is a symbol of the Government's commitment to the cause of land reform, and it is a testament to the Government's dedication to the well-being of the people of Andhra Pradesh.

(23-8)

This is a historic Bill.

We have got certain convictions. We have got certain beliefs, and therefore we tried to bring this Bill. We have got certain convictions that is not only intention with one stroke of pen. The word 'precarious' suggests that there cannot be any double crop wet land under precarious sources. That should go to 27 acres. 16 1/4 acres was suggested. 10 acres would be satisfactory. 18 acres is suggested, 18 acres should go up to 27 acres. 1/4 acre that is not sufficient. 100 acres would be satisfactory. 25-38 acres would be satisfactory. We cannot go beyond that and we cannot come below that.
That proportion should be maintained there. When we are going to distribute land, if any, it should be given freely.

The bill provides for the ceiling on agricultural holdings, setting limits on the size of land holdings that can be owned by individuals or families. The provisions aim to ensure equitable distribution of land and prevent concentration in the hands of a few.

The bill includes provisions for the redistribution of land above the ceiling, with a mechanism for compensation to be paid to landowners whose holdings exceed the prescribed limits.

The bill also contains provisions for the establishment of a Land Reforms Commission to monitor the implementation of the bill and to address any issues that arise.

The bill is a significant step towards achieving the goal of equitable land distribution in the state, and it is expected to have a positive impact on the lives of farmers and landless laborers.
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(quote)


(quote)

Mr. Chairman:—The House now stands adjourned to meet again at 1-00 p.m. to-day.

(The House then adjourned to meet at Four of the Clock.)

AFTERNOON (4 03p.m.)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

...
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972.

(Here the text is in Telugu script)

3rd September, 1972.

As the Andhra Pradesh has a large number of tenant farmers, the Government of Andhra Pradesh has decided to make some changes in the existing laws. The new Bill seeks to limit the area of land held by one person to 10 acres. Those who already hold more than this limit will have to reduce their holdings. The Bill also provides for the acquisition of land held by absentee landlords and those who do not pay their share of rent. The Bill is expected to help reduce the concentration of land in the hands of a few. It is also expected to improve the living conditions of tenant farmers.

The Bill has been passed by the Assembly and is now waiting for the Governor's assent. Once it becomes law, it will be easier for tenant farmers to improve their living conditions.

The Bill has been well received by the tenant farmers and the agricultural workers. They believe that it is a step in the right direction. They hope that the government will continue to work towards improving the lives of farmer and agricultural workers.
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972.

...

...
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.

Anand Prasad

(i) It is hereby enacted - That it is expedient to amend the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Act, 1968, so as to provide for a ceiling on agricultural holdings.

(ii) The enactments in the Schedule to this Act shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the aforesaid Act.

(iii) This Act may be cited as the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Act, 1972.

180 3rd September, 1972.

The ceiling on agricultural holdings in Andhra Pradesh has been increased from 15 acres to 20 acres with effect from 1st September, 1972. The measure is aimed at ensuring fair treatment of all farmers and reducing the existing disparity in land distribution. The government has taken this step to align the agricultural policies with the changing needs of the farming community.

The increased ceiling on agricultural holdings will enable farmers to secure better returns on their land investments, thereby boosting productivity and improving the overall economic performance of the agriculture sector. This measure is expected to contribute to the long-term development of the rural economy in Andhra Pradesh.
అందరి ప్రదేశం లో అధికారిక దినాలు ప్రారంభపడం ప్రారంభం అయితే సూక్ష్మితాన్ని సృష్టించడం లేదా చాలా సాధనాలు సమాధానాలు ఉండడం లేదా ఉండాలి ఆ కౌంసిల్ వంటి పరిస్థితులు ఆ సమయంలో ప్రయోగపడాలి. ఆ సమయంలో ప్రయోగపడాలి ఈ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి. ఆ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి ఈ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి. ఆ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి ఈ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి. ఆ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి ఈ సమయంలో లోకాలు ఇందులో ప్రయోగపడాలి.
Sri R. Dasarathrami Reddy (Allur): —Mr Speaker, Sir, ours is an undeveloped country though not a poor country, with rich resources. Ours is the second largest in population in the world and the biggest democracy in the world. In spite of the efforts made by us since we have achieved Independence by introducing several measures to improve the economy of this country, it has not been possible for us to give the minimum requirements to the lower strata of society. Most of the population in this country depend on agriculture, some of them as land owners, others, as intermediaries, tenants and agricultural labour. It is the desire of the Congress Government and the Congress as a party to introduce an egalitarian society in this country and for that purpose several steps have been taken; one such step in the right direction is the land reforms. Simultaneously we have also contemplated reform in urban property ceilings, income ceilings, but it is not possible to introduce all these reforms at a single time and one after another they have to be taken and implemented successfully so that we may assess from time to time the measures that we have taken as also the benefits we are trying to confer upon the population in this country. I have therefore nothing to say against the Bill and on the other hand, I appreciate the manner in which the Bill has been introduced by the Chief Minister and the way in which he is trying to implement the same. But any Bill that is introduced and any reform that is introduced cannot bring the same justice to all people. Ours is a human institution and the law that we pass is also passed by the humans. Therefore it is bound to be imperfect in several respects and whenever a reform is introduced there are some people who get
some advantages and certain people who do not get advantages. It is the desire of the framers of this Bill that as far as land ceilings are concerned they should be considered in different categories thereby trying to believe that the different categories of land would yield the same income to the individual. An effort has been made in that direction relying upon certain reports. I would humbly submit that in spite of the same, there are bound to be large disparities in the income that is realised and it can be easily seen that the land that is now being allotted to individuals will not yield the same income. The income no doubt would also depend upon the effort of the individual but even if the individual is prepared to put in every effort that is possible, even then my submission would be that there are large disparities in the income that is likely to be derived from the land allotted to these members. I have no intention of dealing with the many other problems which several members have referred to but I would humbly submit for the consideration of the Chief Minister as well as the entire House whether it is necessary for us to have some of the provisions of this Act.

The first thing to which I would invite attention is the explanation at page 40 of the Bill. In the definition portion “where a minor son is marked, his wife and offspring if any shall also be deemed to be members of the unit of which the minor is a member”, I submit that this will work great hardship. I do not think there are several minors who are also parents. There may be very few cases. For the purpose of meeting these few cases I don’t think it is necessary to deny them the right to have a proper share so that he and his children may live together and if you club them as members of the same family, my opinion is that it would be disastrous to that member.

Then in the definition of wet land—“wet land means land registered as wet, single crop wet, double crop wet, compounded double crop wet etc and includes any land not registered as wet which has been included in the ayacut of any Government source of irrigation...”. That is, a land which is not really wet, which is still dry but for which the Government source of irrigation contemplates providing water facilities is also treated as wet land. But when we go to the proviso, it says that “any land which has been registered as wet land in the land revenue accounts of the Government and has not been irrigated for a continuous period of 4 fasli years within a continuous period of 6 fasli years immediately before the specified date for want of supply of water from a Government source of irrigation shall not be deemed to be wet land”. What is stated is “has not been irrigated”—“irrigated” as I understand means—where crop has not been raised. But the intention appears to be where the individual who has raised a crop has not been in a position to realise 4 crops during the period of 6 years. If that is the intention, my submission would be that instead of stating “has not been irrigated” it may be mentioned as “where a person though he has raised crop has not realised crop in 4 fasli years”. Out of 6 faslis he must have at least 4 crops in which case it may be deemed to be wet land; otherwise my submission would be it must be deemed to be not wet land.
Sri J. Narasing Rao —In the Regional Committee it has been brought out:

Sri R. Dasaratnam Reddy:—If it is in conformity with what I said, it is all right; otherwise it may be examined afresh. Now, proviso relates only to land which has been registered as wet land—a land already registered as wet land and if 4 crops are not raised or realised by the owner of the land then it may be treated as dry land. Similarly my submission would be that there are lands included in the ayacut of Government source of irrigation; there are dry lands which have to be included in this. But, for the last 10 years, I am told in the K. C. canal area and other areas, though it has been shown in the ayacut, no water has been supplied. There is no knowing when water would be supplied to that land. Therefore my submission would be not to treat it as wet land at this stage. But at this stage it must also be treated as dry land and when water facilities are given, necessary changes may be made. On the other hand the proviso relates only to land which has been registered as wet land and in which 4 crops have not been grown. My submission would be that this should also be extended to land which is still dry, which is only shown in the ayacut for which no water is supplied for the last 10 to 12 years and no guarantee is given that water is going to be supplied in future and if this is to be accepted my further submission would be that in section 10 Explanation IV would become unnecessary. Explanation IV of Section 10 would say that in such a case the land must be treated both as dry land and as wet land. It will be treated as wet land because it is in the ayacut; it will be treated as dry land because no water is supplied to it. For the purpose of ceiling they say it will be treated as dry land and land will be allotted to him and there is the restriction after the land is allotted to him that till that land gets the facility of water supply this should not be alienated. My submission is that it will work a hardship. We do not know when this is going to happen. Either you treat it as dry land, or you treat it as wet land and if, under the circumstances, it is just and necessary to treat it as dry land my submission would be that Explanation IV is unnecessary. There should be no restriction on alienation of this property once the ceiling is fixed. At least the land owner to whom this land is given under this Act must be in a position to do anything he likes. There should be no further restriction on the alienation of this land and this Explanation also will go.

Similarly in regard to Stridhana while provision has been made that by consent, it is open to the family to take any land they like, at the same time there is a restriction placed even in such a situation. As far as the Stridhana property is concerned, it must be reduced proportionately and even by consent you cannot surrender the land of the female. My submission would be—as far as Stridhana itself is concerned under law it is distinct but at the same time you are trying to club Stridhana, minor's property, major's property under the unit.Again you want to impose a restriction. I do not know if it is done in the interests of the Stridhana holder. My submission would be—if the Stridhana holder is prepared to give her land and probably the
entire land in one place, whether should it not be allowed and whether should this restriction be imposed. On the other hand, it is the desire of the legislators as well as the country that all the holdings must be together; they should not be distributed and there must be consolidation of holdings. Where there is such scope also the law is trying to introduce a family dispute which does not arise in the family out which is extraneously imposed on them. My submission would be as far as Streedhana is concerned, when there is absolute agreement between the members of the family the right to surrender any item of the property must be left to them; there should be no restriction and this is not a case where we are trying to protect the interests of the Streedhana holder, but trying to interfere with the integrity of the family affair.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:— I request one clarification from the hon. Member—whether he has put these points in his Legislature party and if so if they were thrown out will he please enlighten us?

Sri R. Dasaratharami Reddy:— I need not oblige my hon. friend to tell him what has taken place in the party; it is a private matter; whether we have raised it there or not I am under no obligation to tell him. I am an independent member as much as himself and I can express my views here. The only limitation is that while I can express my views freely, I am bound by the party opinion when the matter comes to a question of voting and I am bound to conform with the party direction and vote accordingly. But as far as the speech is concerned, I have got the liberty and the only person that can curb or deal with me is the Chief Minister. As far as the hon. Member is concerned if he wants, is a matter of information I will tell him that I have not said so in the party.

Sri C. V. K. Rao:— I am glad that he expressed himself fearlessly and independently.

Sri R. Dasaratharami Reddy:— Now coming to the district of Nellore there are several areas where crops have failed.

With regard to Tribunals also, it is stated that the Tribunal should consist of not more than three members. It may be ultimately one member. But the idea appears to be to associate non-officials also in these Tribunals. There is also a temporary provision that after Tribunals are constituted, the District Collector or the Deputy Collector will be the member to deal with this situation. Therefore, my submission would be that the Tribunal shall consist of three members and not exceeding three members. This matter also may be considered.

In regard to Nellore I would also make a submission that we depend upon river Pennar which is an erratic river and which does not flow regularly. During the course of the year it flows about 10 or 15 days. It is during that period that water has to be conserved. Previously the tanks used to receive one filling. Now it has become necessary that there should be three or four fillings. We have to maintain large cattle ponds in order to have ploughing, etc. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for this district to have certain pasture lands also in addition to wet lands. The wet lands have already become reduced and many of them are not yielding much. Therefore, I would submit that it is also necessary to consider whether in this District atleast for some time to come, it is not necessary to provide pasture lands in addition to these lands.
Then there are casurina plantation lands. It grows once in seven years. There is no provision as to what should become of the land having casurina plantation which is going to ripen and be cut or removed in one or two years. In such cases some provision has to be made. I do not know if it is possible to make such a provision under the rules. Thank you.

3rd September, 1972.

...
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The bill was introduced to The Assembly today by Mr. V. K. Narasimha Rao, the Minister for Land Reforms. The bill provides for the regulation of agricultural holdings, with a ceiling on the size of holdings. The bill also includes provisions for the distribution of land to those who are landless or have holdings below the prescribed limit. The bill is aimed at promoting equitable land distribution and improving the living standards of farmers. The bill is expected to be passed by the Assembly in the current session.

The Bill sought to regulate the size of agricultural holding by imposing ceilings on the holding of land. The ceiling was based on the assessment of the amount of land and land revenue. The Bill aimed to ensure equitable distribution of agricultural land, particularly among the landless and small farmers.

The Bill was part of a broader land reform programme in Andhra Pradesh aimed at redistributing land to those who were landless or had inadequate land. The implementation of the Bill was expected to address issues of land concentration and ensure a fair share of land for all farmers.

The Bill was passed by the legislature and became law on 1 December, 1972.

---

The Bill amended the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Act, 1956, to impose ceilings on agricultural holdings. The ceilings were based on the assessment of the amount of land and land revenue.

The Bill aimed to ensure equitable distribution of agricultural land, particularly among the landless and small farmers. The implementation of the Bill was expected to address issues of land concentration and ensure a fair share of land for all farmers.

The Bill was passed by the legislature and became law on 1 December, 1972.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
(ceiling on agricultural holdings)
31, 1972.

The controversy that has now come to the surface in the party essentially represents the conflict between the public radical image of the ruling party and the members' private views on land reforms. The opposition to amended A. P. Land Reform Bill by Congress Legislators.

"It is an urgently needed reform and there is nothing fundamentally unjust about it. On the other hand, meekly allowing the status quo to continue would be morally reprehensible on the part of the Government. Opponents of the reforms have neither a social consciousness nor a sense of history. Cultivable and agricultural lands, as primary means of production, always belonged to the community because it is a basic source for sustaining life and also because it is fixed and inelastic."
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.

3rd September, 1972.

We want our due share nothing more and nothing less.

The argument that fragmentation of land will end up with fall of production collapses before scientific analysis. In an underdeveloped and over populated country like ours, land distribution is the only solution for quickening the development of rural economy. Almost 80 per cent of population live in the rural area leading a sub human existence. It is they that are a drag on our national economy for no fault of theirs. If a helping hand is extended to them and if they improve their productive earnings even by one per cent, the very quality of rural life would change for the better. It is not the investment and savings alone that matter. Progression of social welfare is contingent upon wider employment and 'wider spread' expenditure capacity. It is not fully realised by classical economists that even for capital formation, the earning and spending capacities of the millions at the lowest level should be improved.

Land is a permanent productive asset. It is related to labour. Labour is a perishable commodity.

Sri Syed. Hashon:— I just want to know whether the member would like to have the same officers who are like the Social Welfare Officers who are in charge of the hostels.

Sri N. Sreenivasulu Reddy:— I strongly protest.
Sri M. Nanadas:—I have got every right to speak on the Bill. He is an officer who was doing good work.

Mr Deputy Speaker:—Don’t go into that. You tell something else, I have no objection. Don’t make any reference to that.


3rd September, 1972.

Chakravarthi, Speaker - In accordance with the provisions of the Land Reforms Act, 1972, we have fixed the ceiling on agricultural holdings as follows:

- Castle owners, landlords, and tenants are not subject to the ceiling.
- Families of government servants and members of the armed forces are exempted.
- Tenants who have been in possession of their land for more than 20 years are exempted.
- Tenants who have been paying more than 10% of the market price of their land are exempted.

We have also established a committee to monitor the implementation of this bill.

...
Sri V. Srikrishna: — When we were sitting in the Select Committee, we received a Memorandum from the “Majlis Ittehadul Muslimeen”. They wanted to see that the Waqf Trusts also are not touched (whether public or private Waqf), and that whole family or family members are not affected. With regard to other things, we are not aware of it. We had not been briefed either. If he is ready to explain we are prepared to help and argue for it. But, in any case, he should not cast any aspersions.
20

3rd September, 1972.

The Hon'ble Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, informed the House that the Government had decided to introduce the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972, in the Legislative Assembly. The Bill was aimed at ensuring fair distribution of land among poor farmers and tenants, and it sought to fix a ceiling on the ownership and holding of land by individuals and institutions. The details of the Bill were yet to be announced.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September 1972
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)


The Bill provides for the ceiling on agricultural holdings in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

1. ceiling on agricultural holdings:
   - The ceiling on agricultural holdings is fixed at 350 acres for Schedule C castes and 250 acres for Schedule castes, other backward classes, and tribes.
   - The ceiling on agricultural holdings is fixed at 250 acres for Schedule C castes and 150 acres for Schedule castes, other backward classes, and tribes.

2. exempted holdings:
   - The Bill exempts certain categories of agricultural holdings from the ceiling.
   - The exempted categories include holdings for cultivation, maintenance of livestock, and holdings used for non-agricultural purposes.

3. implementation:
   - The Bill provides for the implementation of the ceiling through the formation of a Land Reforms Committee.
   - The Committee is responsible for the distribution of agricultural holdings to persons below the ceiling.

The Bill aims to address the issue of unequal distribution of land in the State and to provide for a fair distribution of land among the rural population.
(At this stage Sri S. Jaipal Reddy rose to speak)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —I am not allowing.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy: —I have a right to speak.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —You may have a right, but I am not allowing you. When your turn comes, you can speak. I request the hon. Member (Sri Kasayya) to proceed with his speech.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy: —He has insulted the Members of this House. It is a breach of privilege of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —You bring it to my notice.

Sri S. Jaipal Reddy: —I want this to be expunged from the records.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —You first give notice, if it is a privilege issue.

Sri Nallapareddi Sreenivasul Reddi: —Sir, I am raising a point of Order, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —There is no point of Order. If you so desire, bring in a privilege motion. I will consider it definitely. I am least interested in what you have done and what somebody has done. You bring in a privilege motion. I will definitely consider. Do not cast aspersions on other members. It is not fair.

3rd September, 1972.
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The Government of Andhra Pradesh hereby notifies the following:

1. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
2. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
3. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
4. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
5. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
6. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
7. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
8. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.
10. The Ammavari Annapoorna Higher Secondary School, Rajamundry, is declared as a registered agricultural holding for the purpose of the Act.

The above notifications are made under Section 4 of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1972.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September, 1972
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.


The Bill was introduced on 20th March, 1972, and referred to the Lok Sabha on 22nd March, 1972. The Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha on 30th March, 1972, and referred to the Rajya Sabha on 31st March, 1972. It was passed by the Rajya Sabha on 10th April, 1972, and assented to by the Governor on 20th April, 1972.

The Bill seeks to provide for the prevention of exploitation of tenants and laborers by landlords and capitalists, and for the protection of the interests of tenants and laborers in the State of Andhra Pradesh. It also seeks to provide for the establishment of a Land Reforms Board to investigate and inquire into the incidence of tenancy and labor contracts and to recommend measures for their amelioration.

The Bill defines the following terms:

1. Tenant: any person holding or occupying the proprietary or possession of land in the State of Andhra Pradesh for the purpose of cultivation or rearing of livestock.
2. Laborer: any person whose principal source of livelihood is labor in the State of Andhra Pradesh.
3. Land Reforms Board: a body established under this Act to investigate and inquire into the incidence of tenancy and labor contracts and to recommend measures for their amelioration.

The Bill also seeks to provide for the establishment of a Land Reforms Tribunal to hear and determine disputes arising under this Act.

The Bill is a significant step towards the prevention of exploitation of tenants and laborers and the protection of their interests in the State of Andhra Pradesh.

The Bill is expected to be passed by the State Assembly in due course.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September, 1972
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.

The Bill proposes to amend the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms Act, 1972 (Cap. 31) by imposing a ceiling on agricultural holdings, thereby regulating the distribution of land and property. The amendments are intended to ensure equitable access to land for all, especially the landless and underprivileged sections of the society.

The Bill aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few, thereby promoting social justice and economic progress. It seeks to protect the interests of the tenant farmers and small landowners, who have been traditionally marginalized.

The amendments are expected to provide a fair and just framework for land distribution, promoting a more equitable society. The Bill is a significant step towards achieving a more just and equitable society, where everyone has access to land and property.
The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972:
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The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972:

This Bill seeks to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Land Reforms in Andhra Pradesh, as presented by the Chief Minister of the State. The Bill aims to control the concentration of landholdings and ensure equitable distribution of agricultural land among the farmers. It establishes a ceiling on agricultural holdings based on the earnings of the agricultural sector.

The Bill is designed to address the issues of land inequality and to promote social justice by limiting the size of landholdings. It provides for the redistribution of landholdings to ensure that no landholder exceeds the prescribed ceiling.

The Bill includes provisions for the determination of the ceiling on agricultural holdings, taking into account the economic capacity of the landholder and the productivity of the land. It also deals with the registration of land transfer and the regularization of insisted holdings.

The Bill is a significant step towards the implementation of the principles of land reforms in Andhra Pradesh, ensuring that the benefits of agricultural development are shared equitably among the farmers.
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The suggestions made in the meeting were as follows:

1. The ceiling on agricultural holdings should be increased to 3 acres for scheduled castes and 6 acres for other castes.

2. The provisions of the bill should be made more flexible to accommodate the needs of different regions.

3. The bill should be implemented in phases to ensure smooth transition.

4. The government should provide training and support to farmers to help them adapt to the new regulations.

5. The bill should be accompanied by a comprehensive loan scheme to assist farmers in meeting their financial needs.

The meeting was adjourned until further notice.
Thè Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
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The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms
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The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms 3rd September, 1972

(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)

Bill, 1972.

The proposed Bill proposes to amend the existing law to provide for a ceiling on agricultural holdings. The ceiling will be based on the size of the landholding and the productivity of the land. The Bill aims to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few, leading to social and economic inequality.

The Bill proposes to classify landholdings into different categories based on size and productivity. The proposed ceiling will apply to all categories of landholdings. The ceiling will be reviewed every five years to ensure that it remains relevant and effective.

The Bill also includes provisions to ensure that the ceiling is not bypassed through fraudulent means. The government will have the power to direct the conversion of agricultural land into non-agricultural land to prevent the evasion of the ceiling.

The Bill is expected to be passed in the next legislative session, and it will bring significant changes to the land reform laws in Andhra Pradesh.
(Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings)
Bill, 1972.
Madam Chairman; Before I speak I would like to inform you that I am speaking on this Bill for the first time since it is introduced, so I hope you will give me sufficient indulgence. I heartily support this Bill and I commend the Bill to all sections of the House to extend their overwhelming support in passing the Bill. Madam Chairman, many hon. Members described this Bill with different epithets. But I would like to characterise the Bill as a people's legislation or a people's Bill which embodies the will of the people. It is for the first time a Bill like this which extends to almost all sections of the community is brought on the basis of a pledge contained in the Election Manifesto. I naturally expected that even those who are opposed to the party and certain...
other principles and policies would not only welcome but also comple­
ment the party that has brought this Bill, incorporating all those
pledges that were mentioned in the Manifesto. It is radical in the
sense that we have made a great improvement or a departure from the
past for two reasons. One is, the pledge given to the people is now
sought to be implemented soon after the election. The second thing
is, that now there is a will to implement every provision of the Bill.
That has to be appreciated by all sections. I wish if the Act that was
passed in 1961 had been implemented in letter and spirit there would
not have been much problem to-day. We could have passed this Bill
with little emotion and controversy. The unfortunate part of reform
legislation is that it is not followed up later in the field by proper
faithful and immediate implementation. Those hon. Members who
did not agree on some points in the Bill would have done a greater
service to this Bill and to those sections which are going to be benefi­
ted had they shown the proper ways to implement this Bill. They
could have suggested measures to plug loopholes if any and they
would have expressed how best the results could be achieved and thus
take the benefit to those for whom we claim to pass this Bill.
Therefore, I want the House to judge the objects and provisions of the Bill
not by the philosophy or ideals advocated by either Marx, Mao or
Mazumdar, but it should be judged on the touchstone of our own
manifesto issued on the eve of General Elections. As regards the other
left parties, they cannot claim to be radical than we are; because
their plea before the people at the time of elections for a further radical
measure has been repudiated or rejected. I said that this is
the people's Bill. What is accepted by the people at the time of the
election is being implemented and nothing more or nothing less.
'Reform' is always a relative term. It is relative to the times we live
in. What appears to be radical and reformative to-day may appear to
be very conservative after 5 or 10 years and we may have to bring
again another legislation to cut or reduce the ceiling. Perhaps, what
was thought of ceiling in the past had to be reduced in the present. As
such the reformative measure should be taken in relation to the time.
The philosophies represented by the C.P.I. and other parties are diffe­
rent. They do not believe in any ceiling. They would have served
even a better purpose if they had shown how best this could
be implemented in the field. I am more concerned with the imple­
mentation rather than the provisions as such which are in conformity
with the manifesto. It refer to object clause (which may have to
be amended after the amendment of the Clause in the Bill), it is
clearly mentioned in every para that the ceiling limit for various cate­
gories of land is being prescribed from 10 to 54. 10 to 54 can
be fixed for any land depending upon various other considerations.
We have kept not only within that but we have also stated in the
second paragraph of the objective clause. We have said there that
our ceiling starts at 12 in relation to double crop and it has been
reduced by the Select Committee to 10, that is the trend as per the
first part which should have been commended even by those who
advocate more radical reforms. Therefore I submit that it has to be
judged from the practical point of view. We are evolving a system.
Our people and our society have shown that by evolution by consent,
by taking all sections of the society we can bring radical measures.
not only for social change but also for quicker economic order. How can we achieve both? It has to be seen. And that is possible only if we carry all sections without exhibiting lot of patience on this subject. It is only a third ceiling on the subject since independence. It is not the first one. Therefore I would only submit that we can take other measures. About various types of land some statistics as shown. They are available in many lakhs and to depend on those statistics would be a hazardous guess. We know how in an emergency the statistics are collected; it has been our fortune experience. Therefore statistics may not be a proper guide to us as about the availability of land and all that.

The second thing, it has been rightly pointed out that this kind of legislation is not a total solution, either for the landless labourers or agricultural labourers or those employed in rural areas. It cannot be and it ought not to be, when we are going to launch rural industrialisation in our country. Therefore, I submit that it is more a levelling down measure than levelling up. There is very little levelling up. Having regard to the very nature of the problem there is more levelling down as envisaged in Article 39 of the Constitution. It is only to disrupt and reduce the concentration of any property, including the land. This measure is envisaged to be dealt from that aspect. It is not going to solve the problems of landless labourers, because it is such a measure that you cannot find land surplus equally in all the Villages, Taluqs or Districts. Because of our shortcomings in our previous enactments of tenancy law and in not enforcing the same in Andhra Region and elsewhere. We may find more and at the same time, in some places, we may find less landless labourers wanting land. But at the same time we may find less land in some areas, but more people wanting land or wanting to settle down on land may be more. Therefore, this is a problem, a measure the implementation of which throws many other problems and headaches for the Government, like a degree, where the trouble starts after passing the Degree. Similarly, after enactment we will face many troubles in the implementation. It is in this respect that everyone of us has to extend full co-operation to the Government.

Two more things Sir. The landlords being the enterprising people would adjust to the change, naturally. They would have more intensive cultivation, more production or at least equal production, in course of time. But, what about the weaker sections? We are going to give land, not only free but taking some money on instalments. But about the input which may be required by them in various shapes, there will be difficulty. Unless that is assured by the Government very soon after the assignment of the lands, the main purpose of assignment, or the reform, would not be achieved.

Further. I would suggest, what was suggested at the Congress Agrarian Reforms Committee. Under the Presidentship of Late Rajendra Prasad, in 1948, that we must have a 'State Land Commission', which until all the landless labourers, or the surplus land is distributed and fully utilized, it should have the jurisdiction and means to control the rural credit and jurisdiction over the financial agency and all other Agencies, which would be able to provide necessary assistance, and credit in all forms to those landless who would be owning these lands. What is more important under this
Act the impact of this would be not so much of giving some more land here and there, but, in my view, it is the socio-cultural social aspect. We have to consider this, which would give a new face and personality to those who do not possess and have no property. The first thing because there has been so much appetite for acquiring less or attributes to acquisitiveness in acquiring property, because we are equating more property with more social status. If the other who did not have anything at all, they will get some status, privilege and some personality, that is more important than more than anything. Certainly, it will give a shock treatment to those who had been accumulating property without any social consciousness. This will make them realise their own obligations to others and in that way, we may be perhaps reducing so all tension in the community and society and there will be more harmony for the stability of the community and ultimately lead to economic development and more production, with which we are really concerned, for the welfare of our people.

However advanced and radical legislation we may incorporate with any amount of good intention since the implementation is left to the bureaucracy, that has to change, at all levels. Therefore, it should be ensured by proper organisation of cadres committed to the land legislation to see that no bureaucracy for whatever motive is to subvert the legislation in its implementation.

Fifth whatever changes we may bring about, unless we bring radical change in the village organisation, set up officials like Patwaris and Patels who have entrenched themselves from times immemorial in the entire revenue administration, especially relating to lands, collection of land census data, the land record etc. is very much done by them alone. The whole Government, right from Planning Commission in Yojna Bhavan to the Deputy Tahsildar or Girdawars, has to depend on these persons. There should be a radical change in this set up. We must abolish these hereditary institutions and appoint people from all sections—educated and capable of manning these institutions. This must include Harijans and Girijans, if they are educated and in a position to perform those duties. That radical change alone will ensure the proper implementation of this Act.

I have to submit in the 80 provisions or so, the language that has been used is rather cumbersome. In some of the places like the definition of 'double crop', this is evident. Within these 6 months we have to implement these provisions; and if any clause is susceptible to more than one interpretation leading to some confusion, it would further delay the matters. Further, we have also provided for Appeals and Revisions.

As regards provisions in 25 & 26, I would request the leader of the House to kindly apply his mind, where this penalty and punishment is provided. But he was good enough to say, that the legal permission and sanction of the Collector is necessary and that this would not be given arbitrarily. But it is not very much reflected in the amendment that was later made.
One more point is we may get more land in certain parts, which is in surplus, even after assignment. I bring to your notice what was suggested by the Congress Agrarian Committee, which is very useful, (and holds good not only today, but all time to come), that after we have assigned all the Banjar lands and surplus lands, we must be able to find some land for Research & Experimentation. It is necessary, in view of the fact that the per-acre yield is very low. It is a fact that on account of the successful experiments done in Japan, they have 5-6 times more yield than what we have, in our State or the country. Therefore, wherever more surplus land is available, the Government should develop the Public Sector Farms here and there, for conducting Research and Experimentation for the benefit of the entire community, so that in a very short time we can revolutionize the production and yield and thereby the persons who would be taking up farming, for the first time, are also benefited by getting seeds and other requirements from nearest Government Farms. In addition to that they may also learn by the practical demonstration and experiments, that may be conducted in those farms. Therefore, the bill, being radical in nature, has generated some controversy.

Let us not exploit passions on either side but work out measures, in such a way, as the total will of this House and people enable us to implement this Bill in the shortest time without any difficulty, carrying all the people with us.

Thank you.

The Andhra Pradesh Government has been implementing various land reforms since the enactment of the Land Reforms Act, 1972. One of the significant measures introduced under this act is the Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings (Bill, 1972).

The bill aims to regulate the size of agricultural holdings and prevent concentration of land ownership. It imposes ceilings on the maximum permissible holding for different categories of land users. The ceilings are based on the availability of land and the need to ensure equitable distribution.

The bill has provisions for the acquisition of excess land held above the ceiling limits and its redistribution among landless or marginal farmers. This is intended to enhance the livelihood of small farmers and promote social justice.

The bill also includes provisions for the empowerment of farmers, including the establishment of a farmers' bank and the provision of credit at concessional rates. These measures are designed to improve the economic well-being of farmers and ensure their participation in the development of agriculture.

The bill has been widely debated and debated in the state legislature. It has received mixed reactions from various stakeholders, with some expressing concerns about its impact on large landowners and others applauding its efforts to address land inequality.

In conclusion, the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Bill, 1972, is a significant step towards realizing the goals of land reform in the state. Its implementation will be closely monitored to assess its impact on the agricultural sector and the living standards of farmers.
31st September, 1972.
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This Bill seeks to implement the recommendations of the Land Reforms Commission in Andhra Pradesh, which was appointed to look into the agricultural land system and its impact on the farming community. The Bill aims to ensure fair distribution of agricultural land and to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few.

The Bill proposes to establish a Land Reforms Tribunal to regulate the agricultural land system. The Tribunal will have the power to fix the ceiling on the area of agricultural land that an individual can hold. The Bill also provides for the registration of agricultural land and the enforcement of the ceiling on agricultural land.

The Bill seeks to empower the Government to take necessary steps to prevent the concentration of land in the hands of a few. The Government can take steps such as acquisition, lease, or sale of land to ensure fair distribution of agricultural land.

The Bill is an important step towards fair distribution of agricultural land and ensuring the rights of the farming community.

(To be continued...)

Note: The above text is a translation of the original Telugu document. The accuracy of the translation may vary.
Joint family' means in the case of persons governed by Hindu law—

An undivided Hindu family consisting of members entitled under that law to a share in the property held by the family on a partition thereof, and in the case of other persons, a group or unit, the members of which are by custom or usage joint in estate.

 fails to furnish declaration or excuse
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(The House then adjourned till Half-past-Eight of the Clock on Monday the 4th September, 1972.)