

**LAND SPECULATORS AND ABSENTEE
BUYERS IN THE TUNGABHADRA
PROJECT AREA—
FORMS OF STATE CONTROL IN MADRAS AND ABROAD**

By
K. G. SIVASWAMY

THE SOUTH INDIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS' UNIONS

8, West Cott Road, Madras, 14

Object.—The establishment of a socialistic economic order within democratic state.

DEMANDS

The demands of the Federation shall be:—

ZAMIN RYOTS

1. Abolition of zamindaris on the basis of ex-gratia payments or reasonable compensation.
2. Survey and settlement of lands in zamindari areas.
3. Approximation of ryots' rent to land revenue in ryotwari areas.
4. Government control of communal lands, cultivable lands, pastures, forests, irrigation works, etc.

RYOTWARI CULTIVATING OWNERS

5. Reform of land revenue on the basis of a graded tax.

FARM TENANT AND FARM LABOUR

6. Abolition of private property in land in the case of non-cultivators with provision for compensation and grant of the same land to existing cultivators; or fixation of a fair rent with security of tenure for the tenant.
7. Prohibition of sale of land or mortgages or lease of land either by Government or by others, to all except to cultivators.
8. Grant of land by the state, only to cultivators.
9. Penalising habitual sub-letting except for legitimate purposes by transfer of all rights in land from the lessor to the lessee.
10. Provision for a wage-fixing machinery for each region to regulate wages, overtime pay, board and housing, and perquisites.
11. Regulation of hours of work, leave and holidays.
12. Workers' committees for controlling conditions of work in large-scale farms.
13. Abolition of contract systems of recruiting labour through middlemen.
14. Provision for collective agreements, conciliation and arbitration.
15. Provision in State and Local Board contracts for fair conditions of work for labour and particularly for women and children.
16. Abolition of all forms of agricultural servitude.

DEMANDS—GENERAL

17. Cancellation of debts not repayable by cultivators to landholders and others.
18. (a) Redistribution of lands from the point of view of creating properly sized holdings and prevention of their sub-division.
(b) Organisation of State farms wherever practicable.
(c) Promotion of collective farming.
19. Right of the state to resume private land if not properly used.
20. State control of crop-planning and production.
21. Promotion of soil building and soil-conservation practices.
22. State schemes for a comprehensive reclamation irrigation policy. Prevention of speculation in land prices, creation of proper holdings, and fixing of water charges by legislation before the commencement of a project.
23. State organisations for colonisation and settlement.
24. State schemes for crop and livestock insurance.
25. State regulation of internal marketing, trading in futures, prices, and international trade.
26. State facilities for credit, and purchase of agricultural and domestic requirements.

State Control of Absentee and Speculative Ownership in the Tungabhadra Project Area

Nature of new ownership

We made an enquiry into land sales in February 1947 to find out the nature of the ownership which is expanding in the Tungabhadra Project area. Our investigation was restricted to a few villages in Sirugappa Hospet and Bellary Taluqs. My colleague Mr. K. L. N. Rao assisted me in the enquiry in Siruggappa Taluq. We have listed a few sales in some villages in the appendix. These indicate the following. A number of investors have hailed from Guntur, Tenali, Bezwada, Bapatla, and Nidubrolu and purchased lands in the Project villages. Certain owners who have bought lands in the same area are merchants as Mr. Mahabaleswarappa, or doctors as Dr. Veeraswami Naidu, or Government servants, or lawyers. Some hide their domicile in other districts by giving Bellary as their place of residence. In the village of Yemmiganur most of the sales are local. Sowcar Sri Chinnabasappa has purchased a lot. Further two transactions have taken place for the same land on a single day which indicate the land boom in the area.

Increase in sales since 1941

An examination of the figures of sales and mortgages in the district of Bellary where the Tungabhadra Project has been started will indicate the extent of the land boom. The number of sales increased over the previous years by 1,316, 1,262, and 2,700 in the years 1941, 1943, and 1945. The aggregate value of transactions rose in Bellary district by about ten lakhs between 1942 and 1943. It again rose from Rs. 86.77 lakhs in 1944 to Rs. 123.26 lakhs in 1945.

The increase in 1941 is explained as due to the settlement of accounts by creditors. In 1943 it is said that the purchase of lands by ryots having surplus money was the cause of increased sales. In 1944 and 1945 the increases are distinctly traced to the purchase of lands in the Project area by land speculators and absentee owners who came from outside.

Average price

The average price of these lands ranges between Rs. 5 and Rs. 50 per acre. It is strange how owners parted with their lands which will be irrigable in a short time for such paltry sums.

However with a growing knowledge of the project, the owners are parting with their lands in later years at a higher price than before. A large number of these sales are of small tiny plots possibly belonging to poor peasants.

Causes of the land boom

If all the purchasers have bought solely with a view to be good farmers, one need not be alarmed at these purchases. Some have purchased so that they might resell at a higher price with the development of irrigation facilities. But many have purchased thinking of the safety of the investment, and the fair return they can get by leasing out the lands to cultivators. Industrial investments are not to-day so much attractive owing to the various taxes collected by the Government of India from out of the gross profits which reduce consequently the net profits and the dividend on shares. The high prices which agricultural commodities are fetching to-day are an inducement for investment in land. The guarantee of a definite price by Government for essential food commodities is another. The proposal of a canal project for irrigation itself raises the price of lands in the Project area.

Why speculation and absentee investment should be prevented

Purchases by speculators who buy so that they may resell at a higher price, and by absentee investors who are thinking of a steady rental income from lands should be prevented on many grounds. The Congress party have declared in their election manifesto that they will eliminate all middlemen between the Government and the cultivator. If this is their fundamental agrarian policy in regard to existing cultivated lands, it becomes all the more incumbent on them that the evil of intermediaries is not allowed to grow in new project lands. The aim of irrigation projects is to develop food crops and other *essential crops* for commerce and industry. The advent of new owners of land in such project areas should be viewed from the point of view of how far they will be helpful to promote this aim. If speculators buy and sell, land values will rise abnormally. The consequence will be that the small cultivating owner will be forced to utilise his little assets and incomes in paying a high price for any land he buys. His surplus incomes will be less available to enrich his equipment for agriculture. The absentee owner will ever be thinking of maximum returns for his capital and will adopt every device to rack-rent his tenant. The big capitalist farmer will stint in improving the condition of his labour so that he may accumulate a reserve for paying the high values demanded for farms. In periods of depression all these purchasers will get into trouble. Their lands will get encumbered with debts. The State

will have to intervene and rescue them by enacting Debt Relief Acts. Further, speculative prices will make impossible purchase of lands by small owners and the landless classes. Also a new class of absentee owners who are only interested in their rents, and who will be a disturbing factor to the agricultural community of interest prevailing among the traditional classes will be expanding in these project areas. Finally the soil will be impoverished under the management either of investors intent on quick profits or of tenants who are rack-rented.

Freeze all kinds of transfers

It is no reflection on the purchasers if they have taken time by the forelock and tried to get-rich-quick. Both law and the moral standard of the existing society tolerate such transactions. Some of them have not benefited by these purchases. They have leased the lands in Srigeri and Manur for mere assessment. Some are paying assessment for lands lying fallow. Freedom of disposition of land has long been exercised by the public. But it has to be understood that freedom to buy farms cannot be claimed as a birth-right to be guaranteed as against the State. It is conditioned by the existence of established Government which secures the right of title to land through its survey and registration departments. Government therefore has every right to control investments in land if it injures public interest.

Rural land use regulation

Government should first map out through a special department the lands that will respond to irrigation, lands for pasture, lands for house sites, lands for civic purposes, and lands fit only for growing trees. Just as Government has to approve places of residence and occupation in a municipality, it should equally regulate land use in rural areas. It can effectively do so in project villages.

One has to remember that malaria follows every irrigation project. And a cultivator should have sufficient nourishment to resist this disease. Even normally the South Indian diet is highly deficient in animal proteins. The breeding of cattle and goats along with the raising of crops should be actively promoted in order to prevent malnutrition among the cultivating classes. This is easy of achievement in project areas where Government may enforce the setting apart of sufficient pasture land in each holding for raising fodder crops.

Restriction of irrigable area

Having mapped out the irrigable lands, Government should further map out the types of soil and their capacity to hold

water. With a view to provide maximum service to the largest number of holders, the area which an owner could irrigate should not be more than a family farm which will make cultivation economic and provide employment for the members of a family. One should appreciate the generosity of the family of the Hon. Minister of Industries, Mr. H. Sitarama Reddy, his other brothers, and cousins who each hold between 1,000 and 2,000 acres in the irrigable area, when they stated before the Famine Code Revision Commission their willingness to part with excess over fifty acres to the State, if only the Tungabhadra Project were taken on hand. Legislation enforcing the surrender of such excess lands will be greatly helped by such handsome attitude on the part of landholders. However, there may be big farmers willing to undertake large-scale farming, but these are special and exceptional cases who may be granted exemption from the general rule. But invariably the principle of providing water only for family farms should be rigidly adhered to. Big owners should part with their remaining area, if it is in the irrigable tract, to the State.

Surrender of surplus lands by landholders

There is a proposal to compel every ryot to part with his lands in a certain proportion, to the State. This is based on the argument that, inasmuch as the value of the land improves in consequence of irrigation, every owner of such land should contribute a portion of its unearned incremental value to the State. And instead of paying this fee in money, he is asked to pay it as a portion of his lands. And only those owners are to be asked to transfer to the State parts of their lands who own above a certain minimum of area. In the State of Mysore a capital contribution ranging between one-third and one-fifth of the difference of price between the original dry and the new wet is collected as inclusion fees to entitle a owner of land to irrigate from a new project.

While this argument supplies an additional reason for commandeering excess land over that of a family farm from big owners, the compulsory transfer of lands only in a certain proportion will yet leave many landholders with large areas commanded by the irrigation source and which they may not be able to cultivate. Further a contribution out of the unearned increment can easily be obtained and that too year after year, if the irrigation cess is increased to such a maximum which will at the same time deter no ryot from using the water for his crops.

Control of land sales above 50 acres

When Government supplies water for the irrigation of crops, it has every right to see that its full benefit reaches the cultivator but not the intermediaries. It should therefore look into all sale transactions whether the purchaser is a speculator, or absentee

rentier, or a cultivator. It should encourage sales only among cultivators. The proposed bill to prevent speculation in the Tungabhadra Project area provides that permits should be taken from Government, by purchasers for purchase of lands from October 1944 and thereafter which will bring their acquisitions above a maximum of fifty acres. The principle of permits for purchase of lands is a wholesome one which will help the regulation of a sound use of agricultural lands. But the bill unfortunately fixes a limit of area below which purchases do not require a permit. This limit is fixed at 50 acres. The idea underlying this limitation seems to be that purchase of lands of areas below 50 acres need not be considered as speculation in land. In a wet land area there is no need to permit of large holdings upto fifty acres for family farms. The small owner will hardly be able to digest this large area under irrigated crops. Three acres of double crop wet or six acres of single crop or 18 acres of dry crop may be roughly estimated as the minimum holding for the maintenance of an average family in these areas. It should also be noted that the limit applies only to the area purchased and not to the total holding a person may own. Not that a total holding of a purchaser, after making the purchase should amount to 50 acres. Any person owning any extent of land at present may buy upto fifty acres. Such a provision puts no bar to purchases of lands by big holders with the idea of selling them at a higher price at a later period. It passes therefore one's comprehension why the fifty acre limit was fixed in the bill.

Need for protection of small purchases

Even granting that permits are made necessary only in the case of all purchases which increase the *total area* of a holding owned by a person above a prescribed limit, is it supposed that protection is unnecessary in the case of all purchases of land by small holders below this prescribed limit? Protection is more urgently needed in the case of the small holder who buys small plots in order to create a properly-sized holding for his operation. Does it mean that sellers can sell at high prices to the small and uneconomic holders? Every sale therefore will require examination from the point of view of price.

Sale of land at current values

When a Government builds a dam, stores water, and supplies it through canals, land values will naturally shoot up. It is unfair that individuals should profit out of State's investments. Sale of land at high prices will equally affect the small owner-purchaser whose surplus incomes from land will be swallowed by the purchase price. All sales should only be on *current values of land*. Government appraisers should fix the value for the area

sold. Those having large extents under an irrigation scheme over and above the area of a family farm for which Government will supply water should hand over the excess area to Government. The latter should fix a price for it at current values.

Distribution of lands by the State

The State should distribute the surplus land to owners of uneconomic holdings in the area. It should also distribute it to the owner cultivators whose lands have been submerged for the construction of the water reservoir.

Permit system essential

The system of permits for transfer of lands therefore requires stiffening that it should apply to all the lands in the project area so that Government might check up that sales are only to cultivators, and not speculators and rentiers, might regulate by sale and exchange the creation of properly-sized family holdings, and might fix a reasonable price which will not encumber the owner with a high capital charge at the very start.

Penalise habitual letting

For what period is the system of permits to continue? If the idea of permits is to conserve the lands in the hands of cultivators, it automatically follows that *the permit system should continue permanently*. A person admitted as cultivator to-day may become the rentier of to-morrow. One may understand the need for *legitimate sub-leases* when a cultivator has to be temporarily absent from his land. But the object of permits to conserve the lands in the hands of cultivators will be defeated if *habitual* leasing is not prohibited. The bureau granting the permits should have powers of settling the land on the tenant in the case of habitual lessors as provided in Sec. 40 and 41 of the C. P. Tenancy Act. Secondly sale of lands in the future will have to be scrutinized whether they are sold only to bonafide cultivators. Such a provision will also enable the Government to see that the prices for which lands are sold are reasonable.

Transfers through courts to be regulated

When once all transfers are regulated by permits, it automatically follows that transfers through Courts in lieu of debts should equally be controlled.

Restriction of the period of usufructuary mortgages

One method of evasion would be the granting of lands by owners on usufructuary mortgage to money-lenders who will lease

them back to the same owners in the status of sub-tenants. Such sub-leases by mortgagees should be declared illegal. A higher rate of interest by way of rent is also collected by such mortgagees from the small owners. In order to prevent the growth of such creditor interests on the land, the period of usufructuary mortgages during which the principal and interest will get extinguished will have to be defined in law and the rate of interest on such mortgages should equally be defined. Such a provision will limit the profits which creditor interests can realise from small holders. Another method of evasion would be for the owner to take an advance rent and call a lease as a mortgage with possession. This too should be prevented.

The period for which speculation should be controlled

The proposed bill of the Madras Government allows sale of land by purchasers authorised to purchase lands under the permit system, after a period of ten years from the date on which water from the Tungabhadra Project is made available for the irrigation of the land. We have mentioned in the previous para that all future sales should be examined and approved by Government with a view to ensure that land passes only to cultivators at a fair price. But sales by speculators stand on a different footing. The object of the bill is to deter speculators from land investments by prohibiting resales of land within a period of ten years. If we have passed the necessary legislation enforcing the permit system for sale of all lands at the time of announcement of the project, there would be no necessity for this special provision. Speculators have no doubt stampeded the market. They have bought extensive lands at low prices. They are sure to sell them at a higher price or let out the lands for rents. We have to examine whether the present provision of prohibition of alienation for a period of ten years will in any way prevent these two evils. Prices of irrigated land are sure to increase only after a period of ten years. Speculators will therefore find this provision very convenient for them, as they disallow land sales when it is not beneficial for them to do so, and allow such sales just when they can make a high profit.

Resale tax

The only way in which the profits from future sales by speculators can be controlled is by introducing a resale tax. This tax may be levied on resales of lands which were bought from a specified date. All the purchases of land in the Tungabhadra area commenced since 1943, and not from Oct. 1944 which is the date line proposed in the bill. The date proposed in the bill should be therefore advanced to Jan. 1943. There may be a progressive resale tax on the difference between the purchase and sale price of all lands for a period of twenty years. The tax may be very high for the first five years and thereafter be gradually reduced from year to year.

The collection of an excess contribution like that of a resale tax is implied in the proposed bill. Clause 8 of the bill provides that lands may be sold before the period of ten years 'on such payment as may be prescribed'. Instead of taking such wide powers under the bill, definite provisions of a resale tax may be included in the bill for a period of twenty years commencing from 1943.

But a resale tax by itself may not stop all speculative sales. There may be sales of land which were not transferred since 1943. Further, speculators may prefer permanent investment and be satisfied with a steady rental from a tenant. But the proposals we have made already relating to the permit system will cover such cases.

Fair rent legislation

It becomes equally necessary that, along with the permit system for all transfers of land, fair rents and compensation for improvements should be fixed for the lands in the project area if the rentier group of speculators is to be prevented from exploiting the benefits of an irrigation project. Neither will the soil be conserved and developed when there is no security of tenure for the tenant. The tenant also will be afraid to improve the land and increase the yields if the consequence of such efforts is only an increase in the levy of rents by his superior landholder. Every project should therefore be preceded by tenancy legislation.

Minimum wage for labour

Another group of buyers comprises capitalist farmers who plan large-scale farming in project areas. Lest they may be misled in undertaking such investments in the hope that cheap labour may be available, it will do well for Government to enact the necessary measures from the very start enforcing minimum wage, and social security measures for agricultural labour.

Restrictions on credit

Restrictions on sale of lands may affect the credit of the cultivators. The latter may sell a portion in order to raise funds for preparing their other lands for wet crops. They may require credit to meet cultivation charges, to buy cattle and manure, and to deepen and level the lands. The State should come forward to render these aids in project areas so that creditor interests may not grow on the land and appropriate a major portion of the profits of cultivation, and land too may not remain uncultivated for want of long-term credit for developing the land and buying the necessary equipments.

CERTAIN SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE TUNGABHADRA PROJECT VILLAGES

Economic Holdings

Elsewhere we have given certain statistics relating to the size of holdings. It will be found therefrom that most of the holders own only below 8 acres. Water should be made available as far as possible to these small holders. They should be helped from State funds to increase the area of their holdings to an economic size. This will mean purchase of sufficient areas by the State from big holders and their distribution to small holders. Not only economic holdings should be created but legislation should provide for their impartibility in the future. Secondly the irrigable area may not include wet lands with single or double crops in the case of every holder. These wet lands will naturally lie at the lower portion. They will have to be equally distributed so that each holder may have the advantage of raising a wet crop in a small portion.

Soils and watering

The proposal seems to be to provide water for four months only for a single dry crop. Two inches of water will be supplied once a fortnight and thus eight irrigations will be provided in four months. Under the scheme an area of 86,000 acres of Mungari crop and another area of 65,000 acres of Hingari crop is to be irrigated each for four months. Is it wise to expand the area of irrigation under the project on the basis of a single crop, or restrict the irrigable area but supply water for 8 months for the crops for the smaller area? The latter course has certain superior advantages over the former. The ryot may take one good crop and grow green manure as a second crop which will help to improve the texture of the soil. Where only a single crop is raised, there may not be enough work for labour and cattle during the second half of the year. When a dry area is made irrigable, you are sure to double the number of men and cattle required for the cultivation of the original area. Single wet crop irrigation creates therefore the problem of maintaining during the off-season double the number of men and cattle maintained for dry irrigation.

If the first crop and the second crop lands are contiguous to each other, then it is possible to utilise man labour and cattle labour and thus give them work for about 8 months in a year. But that will mean that water will be irrigating only a set of lands between June and September, and another set of lands between October and January though one adjoins the other. There will be a lot of wastage of water in extensive irrigation over a large area for particular periods.

When once water is available only for four months for a crop, every cultivator should be commandeered to sow according to prescribed dates so that he may not delay supply to other cultivators. There is also the further problem of water not reaching the tail villages within the fortnight fixed for each irrigation. Water will be supplied during nights too when a ryot will have to be ready with a lantern and waking up during odd hours to receive it. But this difficulty may be to some extent solved. Inasmuch as the ryots raising wet crops will be smaller in number than those raising dry crops, supply of water during nights may be restricted to the former, thereby making it possible for the ryots of dry crops to receive water for their lands during the day.

Provision should be made to prevent the accumulation of drainage water as the latter will breed malarial mosquitoes. Drainages should be provided for from the very start.

Water should equally be given for pasture lands. That is the only way of developing cattle-breeding. The latter will supply manure to the fields. The fertility of pasture lands will thereby increase.

Soil preparation

It is too much to expect a poor ryot to be ready with his lands prepared in advance to receive the Tungabhadra water. The lands are of poor soil in the project area. Only patches are good. The majority of the lands is eroded. A great deal of bunding and levelling will be required. Bunds will have to be planted with grass sods to keep them together. Just as large areas were levelled, ploughed, and cultivated with food crops and vegetables during war time, a similar campaign should be undertaken in this area. An army of men from the agricultural department should be recruited and the whole area handed over to them for levelling and bunding. Small tractors should be used for the purpose. This work can hardly be done after water has been let into the canals. It is hoped that Government will put immediately into action a regular plan of soil preparation in the project area.

Right type of colonists

One has to ponder over the reasons why the Kurnool Cuddapah canal has not attracted colonists and why lands for which water can be supplied are not irrigated under this canal. Possibly this is an exaggeration. One often hears of supply of water not being entered by village officers with a view to avoid canal rates. The soil is better under this canal than in the proposed project. The water table is higher. One gets good water within 15 feet whereas in the Tungabhadra area water is saline even after 50 feet. Of course it is possible to remove the salinity in the soil in the project

area by using the Tungabhadra water. It is necessary to examine the causes of the failure of the Kurnool canal so that we may avoid them under the new project. Much will depend on the right type of settlers, and the availability of labour. The State should provide every facility towards recurring and non-recurring expenses of cultivation particularly for the small holder. It is not easy for a dry area ryot to be transformed overnight into a wet land cultivator. Labour will have to be settled from neighbouring areas. New colonists used to wet cultivation should be settled in the area.

Before I conclude, let me thank Mr. K. N. Anantaraman, I.C.S., the Collector of Bellary, and the Special Officer of Tungabhadra Project, Khan Saheb Muhamad Nakkuda Saheb Bahadur, M.A., B.L., for discussing with me the Tungabhadra Project, and Mr. K. L. N. Rao, B.Sc., my colleague who was good enough to stay in the Sirugappa area and collect the necessary data about the growth of land speculation and absentee landlordism. A list of land purchases in different taluqs is given at the appendix. Let me also thank Mr. W. F. Dickson, Agricultural Attache of the American Embassy, New Delhi, who was kind enough to help me with every information about the prevention of land speculation in irrigation projection areas in the U.S.A. His note on the steps taken in the U.S.A. to prevent speculation is published in the appendix. I have also appended a short note on the control of land market in other countries which I hope will prove useful in the shaping of Indian legislation. I have further appended relevant extracts from the Columbia Basin Project Act, U.S.A., to indicate the lines of legislation regarding prevention of speculation, planning of land-use and settlements for new settlers. I only hope that all these experiences will help us in the immediate enactment of a law providing for efficient land-use planning in project areas.

Summary

1. Government should plan rural zoning of each of the project villages by classifying lands for crops, pasture, trees, and civic purposes.
2. They should at the same time enforce setting apart of a portion of land by each small holder for pasture.
3. All excess land of big holders over a minimum family holding should be handed over to Government. Where an owner desires to undertake capitalistic large-scale farming, and therefore wants a large area, he should be specially exempted from the general rule of cultivating only a family holding.
4. The proposal of enforcing surrender of a certain proportion of land from big holders, free of cost, to Government, will not achieve the transfer of all surplus lands to Government for economic distribution to the needy cultivators according to certain priorities. If Government want to tax unearned incremental value due to the supply of water for irrigation, the better method would be to increase the water cess to the maximum.
5. The bill to control speculation limits the need for permits for purchase of lands to acres purchased in excess of fifty acres. It has no provision to control sales below fifty acres. All sales should be approved by the State and the price paid for lands should not be based on prospective values due to irrigation but current values of dry lands.
6. The State should buy the necessary extent of lands in order to settle those who are evicted from submerged lands, and to provide the excess land for owners of uneconomic holdings, and also to organise joint farming under State direction and control.
7. The system of permits for sale of land should be made a permanent feature of land administration in project areas so that future sales may be made only to cultivators or capitalist farmers.
8. At the same time *habitual* letting should be penalised if the cultivators of to-day are not to become the rentiers of to-morrow.
9. All forced sales of lands through courts should also be approved under the permit system as otherwise absentee owners and speculators may become owners of such lands.

10. The period and the rate of interest of usufructuary mortgages should be defined in law so that money-lenders may not transform themselves into mortgagees. At the same time sub-leases by mortgagees should be declared illegal. The conversion of leases into mortgages should equally be prevented.
11. The proposed prohibition of sale of lands for a period of ten years from the date on which water from the project is made available will hardly deter speculators. It should be extended to twenty years. Also the date line relating to speculative sales should be advanced to 1943. A resale tax declining from year to year should be levied on all resales of lands purchased from January 1943.
12. Fair rents and minimum wage legislation should precede all irrigation projects.
13. The State should hold itself responsible to grant every form of assistance in kind and cash to the cultivators in project areas.
14. The State should help towards the creation of economic holdings and legislate to prevent their subdivision in the future.
15. A certain area of wet land should be reserved for each holder in the project villages.
16. The supply of water for a longer period for a smaller area instead of vice versa should be explored. Devices for eliminating disadvantages in extensive irrigation of single crops for only a period of four months should equally be found out.
17. A scheme of engaging men and cattle newly brought for a canal area, in useful employments all the year round should be explored.
18. All problems of regulation of supply of water by turns for all cultivators should be fully worked out.
19. Drainage courses should be provided for from the very start.
20. The State should undertake soil preparation by way of breaking, levelling and bunding by appointing a large staff for the purpose and not leave it to ryots.
21. A proper scheme of aids for recruiting colonists and labourers to settle in the new project should be worked out.

Size of Holdings

An examination of the figures relating to the size of holdings in the Tungabhadra Project villages will indicate the concentration of lands in the hands of a few owners. In Alur and Adoni taluks 232 and 386 owners hold 24,593 and 40,848 acres respectively which works to more than an average area of 100 acres for each owner. In Hospet, Bellary and Siruguppa taluks 69, 278 and 330 owners hold 13,824 acres, 25,217 acres and 29,679 acres which works to an average ownership extent ranging between 70 and 85 acres. Government has certainly a right to insist that all these lands in excess of a minimum irrigable area should be handed over to them for distribution to owners of un-economic holdings and those dispossessed from the areas submerged for the creation of the reservoir. The average extent of land owned by pattadars holding between 12 and 50 acres works to about 20 acres per owner. This itself is a large area for a single family if it is irrigated with canal water. A certain portion of land of this class of holders also should equally be available for distribution to the needy cultivators. The group of pattadars holding lands of 12 acres and less own an average area of about 5 acres. Many of these owners will require an additional area to make their holdings economic. Government may also utilise the surplus lands of big owners for running state farms under its auspices. It is hoped that the existence of large unmanageable holdings by single landholders will not be lost-sight-of by Government and that every effort will be taken towards the re-distribution of lands and their equalisation as far as possible among family farmers.

APPENDIX. I

Land Market Control in Foreign Countries.

BY

DR. G. GOSTANZO.

*(With kind acknowledgements to the International Review of
Agriculture, International Agricultural Institute, Rome)*

[May 1941, No. 5]

GERMANY.

In the following pages we will give a brief outline of the direct and indirect forms of control of the land market already existing in some countries.

The control of the land market was introduced in Germany by the decree dated January 26, 1937, concerning trade in farm and forest land. The starting point of the measure is to be found in the changed concept of Grund und Boden in its relation to the national community. In the light of this concept, every form of enjoyment of the land is subordinate to general interest. The right of the owner to the use of his property, as well as his right to its disposal is dominated by his duties towards the national community of which he forms a part. The result is that the transfer of a piece of land is no longer considered as a simple transfer of property from the seller to the purchaser, but rather as an act which interests the community, and with regard to which the States and rural classes may advance certain claims, so that the change of ownership may not adversely affect the established order in agriculture. Any such transfer must rather contribute towards the consolidation of this order.

The decree referred to above consequently submits to state authorization every contract contemplating the purchase, usufruct, donation or exchange of land in the case of farm or forest land with an area exceeding 2 hectares. The competent authority decides in this respect on the basis of the opinion expressed by the head of the peasants, (Bauern) organization in the

circumscription. The initial price offer made in case of the sale by the auction of a property must also be authorised. Authorization may also be made subject to certain conditions. In some cases such authorization is not required, as, for instance in the case of a legal act coming within the scope of internal colonization, or of the establishment of small gardens or dwellings by a public institution or by a public utility concern.

Authorization may be refused only in the case when the legal act in question runs counter to some important public interest; this might occur especially;

(1) If the execution of the act were to compromise the regular exploitation of the property to the detriment of national food supplies.

(2) if a farming property were to be transferred into the hands of a person whose chief occupation was other than farming.

(3) if the act were to involve an anti-economic parcelling of the land in question, or if it were to lead to such parcelling.

(4) if the execution of the act were to constitute a threat to the economic independence of a farm as the result of its incorporation with another farm.

(5) if the price were considerably out of proportion to the value of the property in question.

Moreover, the sale or removal of live or dead stock may also be prohibited if this might compromise the regular operation of the holding to the detriment of national supplies.

Fines and imprisonment of terms up to one year are contemplated in the case of those who fail to comply with the provisions of the decree.

In substance, the control of trade in land, as described above has for the state three essential objectives, all closely interrelated; in the first place, given the character of public

interest now attached to agriculture, it is desired to prevent holdings from passing by various legal transactions into the hands of speculators or of non-farmers. It has been remarked with justice (I) that the principle of supply and demand in purchase and sale is replaced by the idea that the land must not come into the hands of the highest bidder, but into those of the person capable of increasing its yield in other words, in the first place into the hands of the peasant (*Bauer*) who possesses the well-known juridical characteristics offering a guarantee that results tseful to the nation will be attained in full.

Another objective aimed at by this measure is that of ensuring the national food supply, by means of the effioient exploitation of the property by prohibiting its anti-economic parcelling and also by prohibiting its incorporation with another estate, should this involve the loss of its economic independence.

Lastly, the third basic objective in view is that of controlling the prices of holdings. Given the agricultural policy adopted by the state intended to guarantee the nation's food requirements and to protect the peasants class (*Bauerntum*), it was no longer logically possible to leave the land market free it was no longer admissible that the price might be influenced by artificial causes. The new system of prices has gradually been molded on the basis of these criteria. The disproportion between value and price forms the motive as we have seen, of the refusal to authorise the sale of a holding when said disproportion is considerable.

In order to put the four year plan concerning the formation of prices into execution, the Government of the Reich has created a "Reich's Commissioner for the formation of prices", giving him special powers under the law of October 29, 1936. The prices of farm properties have also been protected against speculative rises. The commissioner has therefore been called upon to intervene to a great extent in the very delicate field. But he does not confine his work merely to fixing maximum prices for aiven properties and services and to controlling them he has also the task of determining whether the price proposed

for the purchase of a property is economically and socially justified or whether it is dictated by personal and selfish considerations. In this case, as the trustee, for the execution of the four-year plan has said "steps will be taken regardless of persons". The price justifiable from the economic and social standpoint is the one which is not formed exclusively according to the criteria of private economy. In other words, there is tendency to free prices from the influence of the general business trend and to give to land transfers a direction corresponding to the objects of the State's agricultural policy. The concept of the owner's absolute liberty to use and exploit the land at his own pleasure has been done away with in the practice of positive German law.

In line with the task assigned to the Commissioner of Reich for the formation of prices, the decisions taken by him are given particular force. They comprise; (1) the possibility of subjecting to revision all juridical procedure in connection with the formation of prices and of taking all the necessary steps for their effective control; (2) the exclusive competence of the Commissioner in the juridical sphere of price formation, with the highly important consequence from the practical point of view that the decrees issued on the basis of the law of October 29, 1936 are binding on the courts and administrative authorities i.e., that they are not subject to either revision or alteration.

SWITZERLAND.

The decree issued by the Swiss Federal Council on January 19, 1940 (I) is inspired by the same principles. This decree contains provisions directed against speculation in land and against over-indebtedness as well as for the protection of farmers. After declaring that the validity of any contract involving the transfer of ownership of real property is subject to ratification by the competent authority, the decree contemplates three groups of cases, i.e., those in which the ratification of such contracts must be refused, those in which ratification may be refused and those in which it may be granted.

The first group comprises the cases in which; (1) the sale price agreed upon for real property exceeds the return established for an economic period of a certain length, increased if necessary by a maximum of 30 percent; this price is determined after due account has been taken, as the case may be, of accessory services such as housing accommodation, supply of products and others; (2) the transfer adversely affects the country's food supply (3) the price indicated in the deed of transfer is below that really paid.

The second group is represented by the case in which there is reason to fear that the operation constitutes a transfer economically injurious especially when (1) the purchase leads to the parcelling of the land or to the merging of independent farms; (2) the alienation of allotments or of parts of the property would compromise the vitality of the farm by reducing it to the parcels remaining after the transfer; (3) the purchaser is not a farmer and the purchase does not serve to maintain and consolidate the existence of a peasant family.

The third group includes the two following cases; (1) when the person alienating the property has acquired it by forced sale and sells it at a sum not exceeding the purchase price; (2) if the transfer takes place because the owner has contracted a disease which renders him obviously incapable of carrying on the operation of the farm.

In connection with the problem which is being studied in this article, mention may also be made, because of their practical interest, of the restrictions embodied in the same decree concerning the exercise of the profession of real estate agents. Only persons licensed by the authority appointed by the canton may exercise the activity of paid agents for the negotiations of contracts involving the transfer of real estate. The granting of this concession is subordinated in each case to the condition that the applicant has a good reputation and supplies a suitable surity. The concession must be refused if certain facts lead to the presumption that the activities of the applicant might result in harm to the country's economic interests. The

cantonal Governments may even establish a form of contract for dealings in real estate, compulsory to both parties.

NETHERLANDS.

In this country the general secretaries of the three departments of agriculture and fisheries, finance and justice, promulgated a decree on November 27, 1940, according to which it will be necessary, in each case of alienation of farm land to produce a declaration from the competent Bureau of leases (1) attesting that there is no objection to the price asked, to the conditions of sale, and to the person of the purchaser and also that the general or particular agricultural interests are in no way prejudiced. The price may not exceed that obtained in 1939 for similar land in the same district. The said bureaux must also, see that the sale price is not considerably higher than the return value; in other words, that is not much in excess of the capital value of a reasonable rental. Transfer must be refused if the purchaser is not in a position to give adequate guarantees that he will manage the farm himself and without intermediaries and also that he possesses the necessary technical, financial, moral and other qualifications for its management. Lastly the transfer of allotments and parts of farms may only take place if this does not lead to an uneconomic breaking up of an existing farm. In the case of public sales, the Bureau of Leases will fix the maximum sale price in advance this must automatically restrict the number of sales in which prices were driven to excessively high figures.

ITALY.

The three instances cited above represent forms of direct State intervention on the land market. An instance of indirect intervention is furnished by Italy where, in order to prevent speculation in land, a special measure has been promulgated (decree-law No 643, June 14, 1940, converted with amendments into law No. 1511 on October 21, 1940). This measure is justified by the need to check the growing tendency towards the

investment of capital in the purchase of real estate, whose price, due to increased demand, was showing an excessive increase which disturbed the normal course of business. This tendency, which was increasingly accompanied by speculation, constituted among other things, an incentive to inflation. In order to eliminate or check this movement, the registration tax on deeds of transfer of real estate against compensation between living persons was altered as follows:—The amount of the tax itself was maintained unaltered at 6 per cent of the value of the real estate transferred as of January 1st 1939, at which time the tendency described above had scarcely become manifest; on the other hand a surtax of 60 per cent. was added for the amount by which the value of the property had increased from the above date until the date of transfer, such increase being attributed for the most part to the abnormal causes described above. In the case of real estate transfers effected after the date when the measure came into force, two distinct appraisals of the value of the real estate concerned on the open market must be made, one referring to January 1st, 1939 and the other to the day of transfer. A special tax of 60 per cent. was to be paid on the difference between the two appraisals. Failing specific agreement to the contrary, this tax must be paid by the purchaser. In the interest of the regular course of transactions in real estate, in accordance with normal economic and social requirements, however, numerous mitigations of the strict application of the law have been admitted.

Among these, exemption from the new tax is allowed for transfers for which the market value at the time of the transaction, is below 50,000 lire, while exemption up to that figure is granted for transfers exceeding this figure as long as their duly ascertained value is not above 300,000 lire.

This exemption is obviously intended to encourage the creation of small holdings. Instructions have also been given to the fiscal authorities to ascertain whether the increased value may not be partially attributed to improvements made to the property after January 1st 1939, In this case the value to be attributed to the improvements must be added to the value

fixed for the real estate as of January 1st of 1939, only the remainder of the difference being attributed to extraordinary causes and subject to the payment of the 60 per cent. surtax.

II.

The German Homestead Law.

Germany has recently definitely abolished the *Jus Abutendi* for approximately fifty per cent of the land by subjecting it to a revised form of entail plus homestead law. Property in any of these homestead yeoman farms is no longer an absolute title in the hands of an individual, but a restricted functional right of usufruct which can be held by the farmer only if he fulfills the duties imposed upon him by the nation. The domestic domain remains intact as a sort of credit established currently as obligations are fulfilled. First among these obligations is the duty to use the land as a good husbandman according to contemporary standards. The concept of a functional property is not confined to Germany. For several years France has considered a reform of its radically liberal interpretation of property rights in land. In general, the tendency seems to gain strength to re-establish or introduce the marked differentiation between agricultural land and all other goods that was indigenous to Germanic law but not to Roman law.

Germany adopted a law which provided that only professional farmers could buy farms and that every transfer of farm property required the approval of the proper authorities. The same set of laws provided for the expropriation with compensation of agricultural land which was left idle, or improperly used, or infested with noxious weeds. Other countries have adopted similar laws, which together tend to force more intensive and conservative use of land. Agricultural land has slowly acquired a position distinctly different from that of all movable goods.

(Extract from Public control of land use by Karl Brandt—Food Research. Institute, Stanford University with kind acknowledgments to journal of Farm Economics. V. 21 1939).

III.

The U. S. A.

Copy of letter from Mr. W. F. Dickson, Agricultural attache to American Embassy, New Delhi to Mr. K. G. Sivaswamy dated, 5-2-1947.

(We are thankful to Mr. W. F. Dickson for permitting us to reproduce this letter).

This will acknowledg your letter of Jauuary 25 in which you requested information regarding laws designed to prevent speculation in the purchase of lands under the reclamation projects in the United States.

I am sorry that I do not have this specific law to quote to you but it works in the following manuer :

"The development and construction of storage dams and distribution facilities for the purpose of irrigating lands in the United States is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior. Under the basic laws under which the Bureau of Reclamation acts, individual holdings of irrigated lands are limited to 80 or a maximum of 160 acres which is deemed to be the limit for a family size farm under irrigation. If a man owns, say, 640 acres of land in an area which is to be irrigated by a Bureau of Reclamation project, the owner can apply for water for only a maximum of 160 acres. He may retain ownership of the balance of his land but it can never come under irrigation. However, he may sell it to the Government or to a buyer at an appraised price established by the Government. The Government requires land owners, who may so desire, to sell their land in excess of the specified maximum acreage at prices fixed by Government appraisers on the basis of current values of the land. This is one of the protective measures which the Government has taken to prevent land speculation. The theory upon which this act is predicated, I believe, is that when the Government builds a dam and the distribution facilities at public expense, it does so for the purposes of developing a

national resource and to make possible the development of family size farms so that the land owner cannot sell his land at prices which would capitalize on the public's investment in the irrigation facilities. For example, in the Grand Coulee Project in the State of Washington the following conditions must be agreed to in a contract by each land owner before water is delivered. Briefly these conditions are:

1. Repayment in instalments without interest, over a period of forty years, of irrigation costs.

2. Conforming of tract of land, [through purchase, to the sale or exchange, at Government appraised values, to the area and boundaries laid out in advance by the Secretary of Interior.

3. Agreement to dispose of excess land at appraised values, with an option to buy it on the part of the United States.

4. Agreement not to sell any land for more than appraised value for five years after water becomes available. When land is sold, an affidavit must be filled with the county auditor describing terms of sale and the consideration involved.

These conditions have been laid down to keep out land speculators, to prevent corporation farms from intruding where family size farms of a maximum of 160 acres are intended, and to make sure that the homesteader gets a useful piece of land at reasonable prices. The tracts of lands so irrigated must conform to the area and the boundaries as laid out in advance (item 2 above). The conforming of the tracts to a pattern is necessary where such extensive irrigation is involved. It is the rural equivalent of city-zoning and building restrictions. The Government also intends to sell to homesteaders, on the same conditions, federally owned lands which it itself holds or which it may purchase from land owners who own and desire to sell acreage in excess of the maximum irrigated area. The program is not mandatory. The land owner can stay out entirely if he wishes. He must, however,

serve official notice of withdrawal before a specified date and once his land is withdrawn (that is—the land owner does not wish his land to come under irrigation) it can never become a part of the irrigation project unless it is first sold at the appraised values to the Government which then proposes to resell it in parcels. Each parcel will contain 160 acres to conform with Government's project restrictions that no one farm receiving Grand Coulee water can exceed 160 acres in size and no farmer who contracts for water can own more than 160 acres of irrigated land.

The Bureau of Reclamation has mapped the whole area in detail. The maps show which parts will respond to irrigation and which will not. They tell the types of soil and their capacity to hold water. From these maps the relative worth of any given piece of land can be determined. *Appraisals are made at values arrived at independently of the value arising from prospective irrigation.*

I hope that this explanation proves helpful to you. If you need any further information, please let me know what it is and I will obtain it for you if I do not already know the answer.

IV.

Extracts from the Columbia Basin Project Act 1943.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allotted for the construction of the project or for the reclamation of land in connection with the project, shall be expended in the construction of any irrigation features of the project, exclusive of Grand Coulee Dam and appurtenant works now under construction and of the pumping plant and equalising reservoir and dams, until after the following provisions have been complied with :

Appraisal on the basis of pre project values of land.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands proposed to be irrigated under the project shall have been impartially appraised by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter called the Secretary) for the

determination of their value at the date of appraisal without reference to the proposed construction of the said irrigation works and without increment on account of the construction of the project. In the administration of sections 2 and 3 hereof it may be necessary from time to time to reappraise such lands. In such reappraisals the Secretary shall take into account, in addition to the value found in the first appraisal, improvements made after said appraisal and such construction charges on the land as have been paid. The term 'appraised value' as used in sections 2 (b) and (c) and 3 shall mean appraised values determined as provided in this subsection. Reappraisals may be made at any time upon the request of the landowner concerned accompanied by an advance to the United States of fifteen dollars (15) for each quarter section or fraction thereof involved, on account of expense thereof.

Government to decide the allotment of lands for each holder.

2 (b) (1). Prior to the initial delivery of water to each irrigation block, as said term is defined in section 2 (k) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, the Secretary shall establish and shall file in the office of the county auditor of the county or counties in which such block is located a farm-unit plat setting forth the farm units within such block in sizes and with boundaries which are in accordance with his findings of the respective areas sufficient in size for the support of an average-sized family at a suitable level of living, in view of the various classes and combinations of classes of land within such block, of the land's topography and its relation to an economical distribution system and of other factors which, in his judgment, should be considered.

A family farm of 160 acres

"No farm unit shall contain more than one hundred and sixty (160) or less than ten (10) acres of irrigable land, except that, whenever the actual irrigable area of any nominal quarter section exceeds one hundred and sixty (160) acres, the full

quarter section may be included in one farm unit, and except that on lands owned by the United States in each irrigation block, units of lesser size may be established for part-time farming purposes."

"To the end that such farm unit plats may be laid out within each irrigation block in a manner best promoting the successful settlement and economical development of the project, notice of the intention to establish a given farm unit plat shall be given not less than sixty (60) days prior to the filing of such farm unit plat by publication in the county or counties in which the irrigation block is located. Each owner of land within the irrigation block to which the notice relates may, at the time or the times and place specified in such notice, examine the farm unit plat proposed, and in cooperation with the United States or other landowners, may conform the lands so owned by him, to the fullest extent practicable in the Secretary's judgment, by purchase, sale or exchange at the appraised values, to the area and boundaries of the farm unit or units shown on said proposed plat or revisions thereof. The Secretary, with the consent of the owners of all farm units affected, may revise from time to time the established farm unit plats to the extent necessary or advisable to meet conditions that may arise during the development of the project.

**Land owners owning more than family farms to part
with them in favour of the state.**

"As to land held by an owner who had equitable or legal title thereto on May 27, 1937 or heir or devisee of such owner, the farm unit or units, as established or revised, shall be laid out to afford such owner or heir or devisee, to the fullest extent consistent, in the Secretary's judgment, with successful settlement and economical development of the project and subject to the other provisions of this subsection (b), an area comprising said lands of not to exceed the maximum irrigable acreage permitted in this sub-division (1).

No land owner to hold more than one farm unit.

2. (b) No water shall be delivered from, through or by means of the project works to or for lands not conforming in area and boundaries with the area and boundaries of the pertinent unit or units established in the farm unit plat or plate applicable to the lands involved. Water shall not be delivered from, through or by means of the project works to or for, more than one farm unit held by any one landowner, except as to lands held as permitted by the last paragraph of sub-division 2 (b) (i) while held by an owner, his heirs or devisees as therein defined. Lands within the project in excess of one farm unit held by any one landowner shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, be deemed excess land :

Land acquired other wise than by sale also subject to rules prescribing farm units.

Provided, That if excess land is acquired by fore-closure or other process of law, by conveyance in satisfaction of mortgages, by inheritance or by devise under will, water therefor may be furnished temporarily for a period not exceeding five years from the effective date of such acquisition, thereafter ceasing until the transfer thereof to a landowner duly qualified to secure water therefor.

Contract to conform to farm units.

Sec. 2 (ii) (c). As a condition precedent to receiving water from the project and in consideration thereof, each landowner shall be required to execute a valid, recordable contract.....
" Each such recordable contract shall provide, "(i) That in the event the landowner's lands within the project do not conform to the pertinent farm unit or units shown on the plate filed under subsection 2 (b). he will conform them by purchase, sale, or exchange at the appraised values to the area and boundaries of said farm unit or units and will dispose of excess land then or thereafter owned by him at its appraised value ;
.....provided,

that no sale under such power or such option shall, except with the written approval of said owner, be upon terms other than cash or require relinquishment of possession until when, by reason of similar or other sales of other excess land owned by the same landowner, he will be enabled to transfer substantially contemporaneously the possession of all excess land which is both owned by him and operated as a single operating unit for dry farming or grazing purposes.

No conveyance of land over appraised values for ten years permissable.

(ii). That in the period from and after the date of execution thereof and to a date ten (10) years from the time water becomes available for the lands covered thereby; no conveyance of or contract to convey a freehold estate in such lands, whether excess or nonexcess lands, shall be made for a consideration exceeding its appraised value.

Such conveyances invalid.

3. (c) Should any freehold estate in lands subject to the recordable contract made under subsection 2 (c) hereof be conveyed or contracted to be conveyed, after the date of execution of such recordable contract and within ten 10 years from that time water becomes available for such lands, at a consideration in excess of the appraised value of said estate, the transaction, and any mortgage or other lien covering any deferred consideration thereunder, shall be invalid and unenforceable by the vendor or grantor, his successors or assigns as to that part of the consideration in excess of the appraised value of the estate involved.

Preparation of lands under the project by the state for receiving water.

"Sec. 4 (a) For the purposes of providing opportunities for permanent settlement of farm families rehabilitating farmers in the land, protecting project, lands preventing speculation in project lands, and providing for the general welfare, the Secretary

is authorized to administer public lands of the United States in the project area and lands acquired under this section: to sell or lease such lands; to improve such lands or other lands in the project area by clearing, leveling, and preparing them for the handling of irrigation water; to make provision for domestic water for farms in the project; to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands or interests in lands, within or without the project area, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development or improvement of the project; to accept donations of real and personal property for the purposes of this Act; and to disseminate information by appropriate means and methods. Any moneys realized on account of donations for purposes of this Act shall be covered into the Treasury as trust funds and are hereby appropriated for expenditure for such purposes.

Rural zoning and crop-planning powers of the Secretary.

"(b) In connection with any lands acquired under this section or any reserved lands of the United States in the project area, the Secretary may, (1) establish and lay out town sites of such size and location as will, in his judgment, best serve the needs of orderly and economical development of the project, and in connection with any town sites so established and laid out, dedicate to public purposes upon such conditions respecting operation and maintenance as he deems proper, streets, alleys, school sites, cemeteries, and town or municipal parks and recreational areas; (ii) establish and dedicate to public purposes in rural areas, parks, recreational areas, school sites and cemeteries; and (iii) with respect to any such lands as, in his judgment, are not suitable for irrigation farming, establish dry farming units, grazing units, or other units in accordance with his findings as to the uses to which such areas should be devoted consistent with the orderly development of this project.

Purchase price of land returnable in Forty years.

"(c) Each contract for the sale by the United States of land for irrigation farming shall provide for the return in periodic instalments over a period of not to exceed forty (40) years.

The graduated farm land transfer stamp tax.

By J. A. BAKER,

*(with kind acknowledgments to journal of Land and Public
Utility Feb. '40.*

A capital gains tax to effect the control of land speculation was recommended by the President's Committee on Farm Tenancy :

"As a further means of controlling speculation, it is recommended that the Federal Government at an early date insert a provision in the Federal income tax law imposing a specific tax on capital gains from sales of land made within 3 years from the date of purchase. Due allowance should be made for improvements including soil enrichment, beautification, reforestation, or other enhancement of value brought about by the owner. A capital gains tax, taking a large percentage of the unearned net increment, would materially discourage buying land merely for purpose of early resale, and would tend to keep land values on a level where farmers could better afford ownership. Special safeguards should prevent evasion through fictitious forms of ownership, and also prevent the tax working severe hardships in cases of unavoidable resale."

By this procedure each transfer of agricultural real estate would be subjected, as at present, to a federal tax; the proposed amendment would provide that this tax be graduated in two directions: an increased rate of taxation (1) as the length of time since the previous transfer took place became less, and (2) as the percentage increase in the sales price of the land over the next preceding transfer increased, with allowance for the unexhausted value of improvements made during the period.

Any falsification of information in the sworn statement would be subject to a penalty of fine and imprisonment. This procedure would make it desirable for both buyer and seller to present fully, truthfully, and accurately the information needed for determining the tax rate and levying the tax.....

An alternative proposal which would effect almost identical results would be a provision for a flat capital gains tax which would allow deductions for past taxes paid by the seller to state and local governments. Thus all land transfers would be subject to a capital gains tax of, e.g., 95% with deductions allowed for all real property taxes paid to any governmental unit or agency. The net effect of this tax would be similar to the preceding proposal.....

An obvious example of a type of evasion that must be prevented is the transfer of 99-year or other long-term leases. Article 108 of the regulations provides that leases of real property are not taxable.

Some difficulty is likely to arise in preventing tax evasion through the allocation of a fictitiously high value to unexhausted improvements. This difficulty could be reduced in two ways: (1) by not allowing the deduction; and (2) by strict administrative review and enforcement. Both from the economic and the practical standpoints it is clear that this deduction should be allowed. Therefore, it will probably be necessary to depend on strict enforcement of the tax to overcome this possibility of evasion.

Economic effects of the stamp tax.

The primary result desired is the prevention of farm purchases at prices higher than "the normal productive value" of the land. Moreover, the effect of the law should not be such as unduly to burden justifiable farm land transfers or to place unnecessary handicaps of any kind on bonafide operating farm owners. It has been pointed out earlier that the failure of sale prices to equal normal productive value of farm land is attributable to speculative activity grounded on the psychological propensity of market operators to be over-optimistic in their estimate of prospects for the immediate future. The secondary objective of the plan should be elimination of the exploitative management of farm land frequently associated with a rapid turnover in its ownership.

An ungraduated farm land sales tax, such as the stamp tax on deeds of conveyance, creates a burden of cost on all transfers alike. A sales tax graduated in indirect relationship to the length of the period of ownership would place an increasing burden of cost as the rapidity of ownership turnover increased. Under a land transfer tax, graduated or ungraduated, the land must be worth more to the buyer than to the seller by at least the amount of the tax. The graduation feature would penalize quick sales of land and would tend to reduce the number of such sales, thus effecting directly the secondary objective desired.

When a graduated sales tax and a graduated capital gains tax are combined, as in the proposed revision of the stamp tax on deeds of conveyance, it appears fairly certain that the desirable effects of both would be obtained. The double graduation principle would alleviate many of the objectionable features of each of these measures. As a land transfer tax, the proposed plan would place a burden of cost on certain types of land transfers; with the double graduation, quick sales with large profits would be forced to carry a heavier burden than sales made after a long ownership, with little increase in price over preceding sale. It appears fairly certain that the land transfer stamp tax would effectively remove speculative demand from the land market.

If the tax should result, as appears most likely, in sales prices of land more closely following its long-time earning capacity, the security of long-term credit should be increased. Greater value stability should, in turn, result in more liberal lending policies by credit institutions, thus increasing the ability of prospective owner-operators to obtain the necessary credit with which to purchase the needed farm land. Bringing farm land prices into a closer alignment with the normal earning capacity of the farm should increase the ability of farm operators to pay their debts, thus again increasing the security of long-term agricultural credit.

List of references :

1. Emergency Control in the Farm Real Estate Market—by M. M. Regan and Fred A. Clarenbach—November 1942 issue of the Journal of Farm Economics.
2. Land Market Regulations by M. M. Regan and Fred A. Clarenbach—in the February 1943 issue of the Journal of Farm Economics.
3. Public control of land use by Karl Brandt—Journal of Farm Economics 1939.
4. The graduated farm land transfer stamp tax by J. A. Baker, Journal of Land and Public Utility Feb. 1940.
5. The Agricultural land Market and its control by Dr. G. Gostanzo May—1941—Monthly bulletin of Agricultural Economics and Sociology.
6. Land Boom controls by William G. Murray—Pamphlet No. 9 on Wartime Farm and Food Policy—Iowa State College Press.
7. Hearings on the Columbia Basin Project Act—1942. United States Government Printing Office, Washington.

APPENDIX
Land Sales in Tungabhadra Project Villages
(Siruguppa Taluq)
NADIVI

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Acs.	Rs.		
1946	20	@ 30 per acre	Mr. Tekur Subramanyam, Advocate.	
	13	@ 15/30 per acre	„ P. Venkatasubba Rao, Advocate.	
1945	300	@ 5/15 per acre	„ Mahabaleswarappa	
	32	@ 25 per acre	„ Meti Doddappa	
	165	@ 25/40 per acre	Mrs. Satyavani Veeraswami	
	40	26 @ 30 per acre	Mr. Srinivasa Rao	} joint
		14 @ 15 per acre	„ Panyam Prahalada Rao.	
	34	@ 32 per acre	Mrs. Yellapalli Annapurna (Circars) Guntur	
	35	@ 40/50 per acre	Mr. Sambasiva Sastry Ravikampadu Sivaru Cropa, Tenali Tq.	} Bought also 20 acres at Udegola
	37	@ 40/50 per acre	„ Lakshmi pathi Avadhani BEZWADA.	} "
	57	@ 50	„ Mantravadi Narasimham, BEZWADA.	
	42	@ 20/30	„ Akkeswara Rao, GUNTUR.	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.	
	Acs.	Rs.			
	12	@ 25	Mr. Satyanarayanamoorthy		
		per acre	GUNTUR.		
	72	@ 60	„ Uppadatti Chenchura-		
		per acre	mu, TENALI.		
1945	88	} 200	„ N. Vembu of Adoni.		
	cents				
	3 Ac. 74				
	cents				
	Ac.Cents				
1946	14 25	400	„ „		
	6 41	} 900	„ Chenchuramia, S/o		
	5 52				Upadrishta
	0 88				Kumaraswami
	0 42				CIRCARS
	3 80				
	2 09				
1946	4 83	200	„ „		
	3 34	} 500	„ P. R. Ramachandra Rao,		
	3 44				C/o P. Venkatasubba
	3 76				Rao, B.A., B.L.,
			Vakil, Bellary.		
1945	3 74	} 300	„ Akkeswara Rao,		
	1 95				S/o Subramanyam
	2 38				GUNTUR.
1946	1 18	} 550	„ Valiah, S/o Sivaru Kapu		
	0 20				Venkatappaia,
	2 33				Ravikampadu,
	5 78				TENALI.
	SUGUR (Manur)				
	10 67	100	Mr. P. Venkatasubba		
			Rao, Vakil, BELLARY.		
	15 29	not known	„		
	5 05		„		

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
	7 58	not known	Mr. P. R. Ramachandra Rao C/o P. Venkatasubba Rao, Vakil, BELLARY.	
1946	11 76 } 16 96 } 20 45 } 11 38 } 16 98 } 20 93 }	not known	Mrs. Hamsavenamma, Muddukrisnam Naidu, Dt. Probation Officer.	
25-5-45	7 68	300	Mr. S. Kameswara Rao, C/o Sri. C. Venkatappaiah M.A.B.L., Governorpet, BEZWADA.	
	21 19 1 85 3 85 5 10	250	Mr. Guntur Ranga Rao, C/o Suryanarayana Rao, BEZWADA.	
BAGWADI				
1945	3 68 } 3 74 } 4 50 } 12 75 } 25 27 } 5 90 }	5000	Mr. Bhramanandam Venkatlakshminarayana, BAPATLA	
	4 79 } 10 95 } 6 58 } 4 55 } 6 00 } 0 99 }	1,500	Mrs. Rasineni Singarappa's wife Puspavalliamma, BAPATLA.	
	7 91	120	Mr. Subba Rao.	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
HALEKOTA.				
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
7-7-45	4 18	188	Mr. P. Prakasa Rao, C/o T. V. Krishna Rao, Hindu Paper Agent, BELLARY.	
9-10-45	7 47 } 67 }	363	„ V. Venugopalu, S/o Srinivasa Chetty, Kuppam, village, Chittoor Dt.	
21-5-46	5 00	300	„ Gnananandalu, S/o Kappagantula Ramakrishniah, Editor, MADRAS.	
	3 04 } 2 29 }	300	„ „	
TAKKALAKOTA.				
20-2-46	5 77	500	Mr. Venkata Appa Rao, S/o Kandrika Ramesa, NIDUBROLU, (GUNTUR).	
14-5-46	6 50	650	Mrs. Mantravadi Venkata- ratnamma, wife of Venkata Ganesam, BEZWADA.	
	3 84	375	„ Lalitamba, W/o Kaku- manu Nagabhushanam, TENALI.	
17-4-46	6 44 } 2 32 }	800	Mr. Valiah, S/o Venkata- ppaia, Ravikampadu Sivary village, TENALI TQ.	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
2-9-46	3 9 } 12 63 }	1500	" Vupadrusta Lakshmi Narasimha Sastry, S/o Chinna Venkiah, Kuchelupadu village, Tenali Tq. Guntur Dt.	
10-9-46	9 50	900	" "	
17-5-46	3 73 } 3 77 }	172	" Venkatappaia, S/o Paludugu Krishnaia, Muppalla village, Vinukonda Tq. Guntur Dt.	
2-5-45	6 31	260	Mrs. Lakshmi Narasamma; Mother of Vumamahe- swara Rao, TENALI.	
HAGALUR HOSALLI.				
1-6-46	2 74 } 2 68 } 4 00 } 1 32 } 2 31 } 0 39 } 10 96 } 1 99 } 4 08 }	1000	Mr. Vserappa, S/o Paludugu Appaia. GUNTUR	
	3 24 } 3 18 } 5 02 }	200	"	
	1 49 } 2 51 }	100	"	
MUDDATANUR.				
1946	4 72 } 6 40 }	1000	Mr. Kotia, son of Gujjala Venkatasubba Rao, Gujjanagondla village, GUNTUR.	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
1945	14 19 } 0 54 }	800	Mrs. Parvathamma, wife of Dommeti Sri Ranganayakulu, Brucepet, BELLARY.	
	8 33 } 6 33 } 4 28 }	1000	"	
SRIGERI.				
1945	18 66	600	Mrs. Satyavani Devi, wife of Veeraswami Naidu, Retired S. A. S., Bellary.	
1945	7 93	400	"	
1945	18 71	600	"	
1945	12 86	500	Mr. Linga Rao of Bezwada.	
	33 42 } inam 17 54 }		Mrs. Hamsavenamma, wife Registered of Muddukrishnam for Rs. 5000 Naidu, Dist. Probation Officer, 'Camera Home' Bellary.	
	58 28	600	Mr. Y. Mahabaleswarappa, Merchant, BELLARY.	Subject to Takavi loans.
	39 34	400	"	"
	6 06	150	"	"
	4 30	100	"	"
	6 89	200	"	"
	41 60	@ 50/- per acre	Mrs. Satyavani Devi, wife of Veeraswami Naidu, Doctor, BELLARY.	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
KARUR				
	A. c C.	Rs.		
1945	6 28		Mrs. Krishnavenamma, Bellary.	
1946	11 80 } 4 02 } 4 96 }		Mr. Guntur Shamrao.	
1945	1 03 } 4 53 }		Mr. Guntur Lakshmi Narayana.	
	0 73 } 0 08 } 2 11 } 8 59 }		Mrs. Satyavani Devi W/o Dr. Veeraswamy, BELLARY.	
	9 14		"	
	0 77 } 11 18 }		Mr. Guntur Lakshmi Narasimham,	
	10 03		Mrs. Satyavani Devi, wife of Dr. Veeraswamy, BELLARY	
	7 67		"	
	2 54		"	
	3 61		"	
	5 34		"	
	8 19		"	
	8 63		"	
	4 18		"	
	5 68		"	
	6 12		"	
	5 34		"	
	26 86		"	
	8 41		"	
	6 93		"	

Year of Sale.	Area	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
	15 64		Mr. Tenali Linga Rao,	
	10 79		Mr. Tenali Venkataramayya,	
	15 00	50 per acre	Mr. Tenali Gopala Rao,	
GOSWALLI				
	11 0	50 per acre	Mr. Tenali Linga Rao,	
	6 20	75 per acre	"	
BHAIRAPUR				
	13 20	55 per acre	Mr. Tenal Linga Rao,	
	12 00	} 55 per acre	Mr. Bezwada Subba Rao,	
	6 00			
	10 00			
	6 00	65	Mr. Tenali Linga Rao,	
	12 00	50	"	
MALAPURAM				
1944	9 48		Mr. Mahabaleswarappa, Merchant, Bellary.	
	2 70	40	"	
	12 49	} 400	"	
	7 66			
	8 59	} 400	"	
	7 78			
	7 61	100	"	
	7 99	100	"	
	4 33	100	"	
	2 98	} 100	"	
	2 23			
	14 71	not known	Local purchaser,	

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
	8 85	not known	Mr. S. Venkobanna of Hospet, Merchant.	
	25	800	Insurance Agent, BEZWADA.	
	13 40	30 to 40 per acre	Mr. Y. Mahabaleswara, Merchant, BELLARY.	
YEMMIGANOUR				
29-3-46	4 50 } 3 79 } 5 81 }	800	Mr. Nagappa, Yemmiganoc	
11-3-46	6 68	300	Mrs. Basalingamma & Rachia.	"
	6 68	400	Mr. Jadappa,	"
"	4 52 } 8 71 } 6 17 } 1 73 }	400	" Chennabasaiya,	"
15-7-46	6 57	200	Mr. Chennabasappa, (Sowcar)	"
18-11-45	8 67 } 6 62 }	400	" Nagappa,	"
"	3 37 } 2 29 } 10 27 }	400	Mrs. Eramma,	"
7-11-46	3 85 } 3 04 } 11 17 }	400	Mr. Linganagowd,	"
"	2 19 } 2 51 }	200	Mrs. Siddamma,	"
"	3 60 } 3 40 } 2 00 }	300	Mr. Nagappa,	"

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
11-12-45	5 98	300	„ Batri Channa-basappa,	Yemmiganoor.
„	3 00	100	„ Batri Sugappa.	„
„	10 08 0 22 7 28 8 82	500	Mrs. Lingamma.	„
	12 61	400	„ Iyyamma	„
	3 85 3 04 11 17	400	Mr. Chennabasappa.	„
	4 94	100	Mrs. Veeramma.	„
	3 72 4 14 5 00	200	Mr. Chennabasappa.	„
	2 19 2 51 8 18 16 31	500	„	„
	1 05 0 21 1 86 1 07 0 20 9 64 6 36		„	„
8-5-46	3 98	300	Mr. K. P. Patel, BELLARY.	
	6 49	300	„ Timmareddy,	
10-8-45	0 04 0 18 6 23	not known.	Nagappa, B.	„

Year of Sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac. C.	Rs.		
	10 77	300	„ Basavanagowd	Yemmiganoor.
	11 92 } 8 81 }	300	„	„
	2 23 } 1 98 }	400	„ Krishnagowd	„
	1 60 } 8 15 }	300	„ Chennabasappa Sowcar	„
	6 59	100	„	„
	6 39 } 4 49 } 2 77 }	600	„ Siddappa	„
	8 34	600	„ Angadi Yerrappa	„
18-11-45	6 72 } 0 33 } 1 76 } 3 25 } 2 97 } 0 89 }	1000	„ Sugappa	„
	2 56	1000	„ Chennabasappa	„
11-12-45	3 50	100	„	„
	8 53 } 0 40 } 1 51 } 2 81 } 2 60 }	300	Hanumantha	„

Printed by R. R. Bakhale at the Bombay Vaibhav Press, Servants of
India Society's Home, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4
and
Published by K. G. Sivaswamy, Servants of India Society, Madras 14.

APPENDIX II.
LAND SALES IN THE TUNGABHADRA PROJECT VILLAGES.
BELLARY TALUQ.

Guttiganur.

(The following information has been collected from the indexes and registry of holdings of Kampli and Bellary registration offices. The writer gratefully acknowledges with thanks the help which the Government of Madras has been pleased to give by permitting him to peruse certain records in the Registration department without payment of fees.)

Year of sale.	Area.		Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
	Ac.	Cent.			
1944	15		300	Mr. Varadareddy Lingana Gowd, Guttiganur.	
	16		100	" Pattada Sivaanna, Guttiganur.	
	6		100	" Pattada Sivaanna, Guttiganur.	
	66		2,800	" Veerasubbareddy, Landlord, Sugnahalli.	
	17		300	" Karibasappa, Landlord, Gonahal.	
1945	16		1,500	" Tekur Krishnamoorthy, Head- master, Alur.	
	7		100	" Anniveerappa, Merchant, Guttiganur.	
	7		300	" Raghava Reddy, Landlord, Nemakal (Alur Taluq).	
	16		200	" Pattada Veerappa, Ryot, Guttig- anur.	
	8		400	" Kuregodu Pattanasetty Veerabhadrappa Ryot, Pat- tanasaragu.	
	24		1,000	" Sridharamoorthy Rao, Vakil Bellary.	
	11		400	" Keatreddy Timmappa, Mer- chant, Kampli.	
	11		100	" Bilibayappa, Ryot, Guttiga- nur.	
	8		800	Mrs. Penugonda Bangaramm. D/O Komaraswamy, Brucepet, Bellary.	
1946	7		500	Mr. Bettegeri Chennabasappa, Sow- car, Yemmiganur.	

Year of sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
Guttiganur—Contd.				
	Ac.	Cents.	Ra.	
1946	9		250	Mr. Pattanasetty Basappa, Ryot, Guttiganur.
	18		800	" Bettengeri Sugappa, Sowcar, Yemmiganur.
	15	88	200	" Veerappa.
	5	54	800	" Veeramaheswarappa.
	5	55		
	2	99		
	4	38		
1947	3	40	1,000	Mrs. Eswaramma.
	4	13		
	7	45		
	8	41		
	7	15		
Pattanasaragu.				
1945	4		100	Mr. Karibasappa, Landlord, Gonahal.
1946	2		100	" Karibasappa, Landlord, Gonahal.
	13		600	" Palyam Sivareddy, Landlord, Sugnahalli.
Orvai.				
1944	6		500	Mr. K. Basavantappa, Terikeri (Mysore State).
	14		300	" Karibasappa, Merchant and Landlord, Gonahal.
1945	22		1,737	Mrs. Tatireddy Salyavanidevi, Ghandhinagar, Bellary.
	14		200	" Hospet Siddamma and others, Orvai.
	28		1,250	Mr. Hanumantappa, Landlord, Kallukamba.
1946	14		400	" Doddabasavanagowd, Merchant, Bellary.
	13		500	" H. Hanumantappa, Ryot, Kallukamba.
	10		500	" H. Hanumantappa, Ryot, Kallukamba.
	17		300	" Pattanasetty Saugappa, Ryot, Guttiganur.
Dammur.				
1945	5	68	2,000	Mr. Chickkanagowd.
	1	24		
	1	6		
	1	77		
	5	38		
	1	29		
	1	9		
	1	13		

Year of sale.	Arca.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.
Dammur—Contd.			
	Ac. Cents.	Rs.	
1946	8 24 } 8 43 }	1,000	Mr. Palakshreddy.
	18 14 }	1,250	" C. Bhimappa Chowdry, Merchant, Bellary.
	17 62 }	3,350	" Veerabadrappa and Seetharamareddi.
Sindigeri.			
1946	12 87 } 12 66 }	2,500	Mr. K. N. Janaki Devi.
	4 58 } 5 96 }	1,000	" H. K. Timmanna, Proprietor, Amba Bhavan 'A'.
Hirehadagalli.			
1945	6 83 } 6 6 }	1,000	Mr. Linganagowd.
	3 24 }		
	5 85 }		
	6 78 }		
Sridaragadda.			
1946	8 5 }	800	Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao.
Moka.			
1946	5 2 } 16 89 }	2,200	Mr. Ramiah.
Tolamamidi.			
1946	3 }	200	Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao.
Bennikallu.			
1945	11 92 } 11 27 }	1,000	Mr. H. Doddabasavanagowd.
	10 71 }		
	11 55 }	1,300	Mr. H. Doddabasavanagowd.
	3 23 }		
	5 87 }		
	4 98 }		
	5 51 }		
	1 88 }		
Veerapuram.			
1946	23 41 } 5 92 }	3,000	Mr. Ramanagowd.
D. Kaggal.			
1946	10 77 } 4 18 }	1,000	Mr. Veerabadrappa.
	17 66 }		

Year of sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.
	Ac. Cents.	Rs	
Chaganur.			
1946	2	81	1,000 Mr. Parameswarappa.
		18	
	2	10	
	10	43	
	1	25	
	2	74	
	3	47	
Upparahal & Kaytalam.			
		1,000	Mr. Joshi Rangachar.
Handihall.			
1946	12	83	1,000 Mrs. Savithriamma.
	1	35	
	2	19	
		40	
	1	85	1,000 „ Chennamma.
	16	40	
Nalludi.			
16-11-1945	14	79	800 Mr. Mahabaleswarappa.
	6	67	
	5	15	
18-11-1945	20	83	2,000 „ B. Channabasappa.
	0	88	200 „ B. Channabasappa.
	11	71	2,000 „ Narasimhappa.
	1	17	300 „ H. A. Krishna Rao.
	1	38	
	1	50	
	1	78	1,000 „ Chennabasappa.
11-12-1945	6	21	270 „ Chennabasappa.
	15	10	500 „ G. Krishna Rao
	2	99	100 „ Chennabasappa.
	2	95	
18-11-1945	2	56	1,000 „ Chennabasappa.
31- 3-1946	1	05	1,350 „ Mareppa,
	1	73	
16- 4-1946	7	16	800 „ Madarbi.
	0	15	400 „ Ragoji Venkatappa.
16- 7-1946	6	88	100 „ Javerchand, Bellary.
	5	94	
	9	94	
	16	00	100 „ Stiddappa.
	0	56	300 „ Yenkappa
	31	75	
1-12-1946	4	83	
	11	40	400 „ Kavithalada Chennabbsappa.
	3	73	
	21	29	
	8	0	
	9	85	200 „ Maria.
	4	04	100 „ Amaragowd.
	4	20	
	0	63	

Year of sale.	Area.	Cost	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks
Kallukutikanhal.				
	Acres. Cents.	Rs.		
1855 Fasli	4 01	1,400	Mr. Chinnabasavangowd.	
	2 81			
	0 85			
	3 38			
	1 03			
	1 04			
	1 08			
1856 Fasli	1 09			
	1 17			
	3 87			300
	2 88			
	1 88			
	0 57			
	0 48			
	1 35			
	0 99			
	1 01			
	0 56			
	0 50	250	„ Peddaveeria.	
	5 75			
	5 78			
	14 68	300	„ Iyyappa.	
	10 96			
HOSPET TALUQ.				
Hampadevanhalli.				
1944	19 23	100	Mr. Lingappa.	
1945	25 61	900	Mrs. Dinnapaty Venkatalakshamma, Anantapur.	
	17 33	700	Mr. T. Panchakotarayya and Gangadarayya of Harapanahalli.	
1946	1 43	1 000	Mr. Korlagundi Basappa son of Amarappa.	
(Javaku)	7 29			
	3 33			50
Kanivi Timmapuram.				
1945	4 8	300	Mr. Veeravenkata Suryaprakasa Rao son of Javadi Munirai, P. W. D. Contractor, Dowleshwaram, Rajahmundry Taluq and Ansari Raja Hussain Saheb, Merchant, Kampli.	
1946	9 0	400	Mr. Bollahalli Seshagiri Rao, Hospet.	
Gonahalu.				
1944	44	2,000	Mr. Blmaneni Somappa of Suganahalli.	
	40 16	2,500	„ Jadhya Subba Rao, Merchant Bellary, Cowl Bazar.	

Year of sale.	Area.	Cost.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
Jayaku. 138				
	Acres, Cents.	Rs.		
1945	6 85	800	Mr. Katte Basappa and Ayappa—subsequently sold in 1946 for Rs. 200 to Kamareddy Thimmappa.	
ADONI TALUQ.				
Badnehal.				
1944	10 18	500	Mr. Hussain Peer Ansar, Brucepet, Bellary.	
1945	19 76½	2,700	Mr. Anthapuram Raghavendra Rao, Bellary.	
SIRUGUPPA TALUQ.				
Agasanur.				
1944	11 78	800	Mr. Thovi Narayanareddi, Agasanur	
1946	5 85	500	„ M. Veerareddi, Agasanur.	
Sirigeri.				
1944	14 15	1,000	Mr. Sirigeri Krishnamurthy Rao, Brucepet, Bellary.	
1946	26 85	4,000	„ Kodandarama Iyer, Madras.	
1946	26 85	4,000	„ S. V. Sivaram, Madras.	
1946	1 50 & House.	700	„ Uppaladu Lingappa, Sirigeri.	
Devalapuram.				
1945	13 12	1,200	Mr. Varanasi Lakshmi Narasimham, Masulipatam.	
Hagalur.				
1945	32 56	1,000	Mr. Nadivi Veerabasappa, Chana-Vasapur.	
Halekota.				
1945	13 4	429	Mr. Turlapati Bhimarathamma, Kurnool.	
1945	19 44	777-8-0	Mr. Turlapati Bhimarathamma, Kurnool.	
Hasahalli.				
1945	18 44	400	Mr. Paladuyula Irappa, Brucepet, Bellary.	
1945	7 75	400	Mr. Paladuyula Irappa, Brucepet, Bellary.	
Bagavadi.				
1946	15 87	400	Mr. Bangalore Kali Veerappa, Bagavadi.	
Bommalapuram.				
1946	2 79	500	Mr. Gudadar Laskhmareddi, Bommalapuram.	

Year of sale.	Area.	Value.	Buyer's name and address.	Remarks.
SIRUGUPPA TALUQ.—cont.				
Desahur.				
	Acres.	Cents.	Rs.	
1946	10	25	5,400	Mr. Gindalappa Govindappa, B. Pet, Bellary.
1946	0	88	950	„ Hussain Sab Syed, Millerpet, Bellary.
Hosalli.				
1946	10	4	690	Mr. Golada Lingappa, Brucepet, Bellary.
Hachelli.				
1946	4	56	1,000	Mr. Halvikotti Mallanna, Padala-Kunta.
Malapuram.				
1946	32	56	1,300	Mr. Sagarodu Subba Rao, Brucepet, Bellary.
Seedaragadda.				
1946	41	73	3,000	Mr. Neilkallu Maremma, Adoni.
Taluru.				
1946	21	10	1,000	Mr. Basavana Gowd, Talur.
1946	30	77	4,500	„ Swami S. V, Theagarayanagar, Madras.
1946	30	75	4,500	Mr. Kodandarama Iyer, Madras.
ALUR TALUQ.				
Chintakunta.				
1945	12	35	1,000	Mr. Bommonahal Venkataramanappa, Chintakunta.
Thimmapuram.				
	101	12	5,000	Mr. Agraharam Subhadramma, Nema kal.