

**SURVEY OF SURPLUS LAND ALLOTTEES
UNDER THE MAHARASHTRA
AGRICULTURAL LANDS
(CEILING ON HOLDINGS) ACT, 1961**

**MAHARASHTRA STATE: AURANGABAD
DISTRICT**

**AGRO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH UNIT
GOKHALE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS AND ECONOMICS**

AUGUST - 1980

**SURVEY OF SURPLUS LAND ALLOTTEES UNDER
THE MAHARASHTRA AGRICULTURAL LANDS
(CEILING ON HOLDINGS) ACT, 1961**

MAHARASHTRA STATE : AURANGABAD DISTRICT

**AGRO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH UNIT
GOKHALE INSTITUTE OF POLITICS AND ECONOMICS
PUNE 411004**

AUGUST 1980

C O N T E N T S

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	Surplus Land Distributed	1
II	Distribution of Surplus Land	30
III	Sample Grantee Families	48
IV	Land Development and Land Utilisation	83
V	Cost of Cultivation, Production and Cost Assistance	111
VI	The Estimate of Farm Business Income	142

Chapter I
Surplus Land Distributed

1.1 Introduction

Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961, (Maharashtra Act No.XIVII of 1961) came into force on 26th January 1962. It was expedient in the public interest to impose a maximum limit (or ceiling) on the holding of agricultural land in the State of Maharashtra and also to make necessary provisions for the acquisition of land held in excess of the ceiling and for distribution thereof to landless and other persons. The main source of the legal ideology for the abovementioned purpose is contained in the preamble and mainly in articles 38 and 39 of the Constitution. Articles 38 and 39 run as follows:

"38. The State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may, a social order in which justice, social, economic and political shall inform all the institutions of national life."

"39. The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing -

a) that the citizens, men and women, equally have the right to adequate means of livelihood;

b) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;

c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."

The said Act (Maharashtra Act XXVII of 1961) therefore prescribed ceiling area under Section 5 for various categories of land as given in the First Schedule to the Act and also decided upon the distribution of surplus land by Section 27 of the same Act. Section 27 while prescribing the priorities for distribution of surplus land refers to a person. The distribution of landholdings to the individual person is however not to be viewed as distribution to individuals but as distribution to a class of the society which because of its deficient economic and social status needed such a social and economic justice and this exactly is the aspect which is accepted by the legislature as stated in the preamble that the distribution is to subserve the common good.

The above given Act (Maharashtra Act XXVII of 1961) was operative, inclusive of the amendments the last of such amendment being Maharashtra 50 of 1973, until amended by Maharashtra 21 of 1975. This amendment (Maharashtra 21 of 1975) drastically changed the ceiling area by substituting the First Schedule to the earlier Act and also made certain changes in the distribution of the surplus acquired under the Act. Thus the Act operative upto 2nd October 1975 is referred to as the 'Principal Act' and the Act as amended by Maharashtra 21 of 1975 is referred to as the 'Revised Act'. The Act so amended was specifically with the object of lowering the maximum limit or ceiling on the holding of agricultural land in the state for making additional land available as surplus for distribution to landless and other persons. The 'Revised Act' did away with the 'local areas' as prescribed in the First Schedule to the 'Principal Act' and prescribed a uniform ceiling all over the state and for each class of

land falling under sub-clauses (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Clause 5 of Section 2. Under Section 5 of the 'Principal Act' the ceiling area in respect of each class of land in the local areas had been fixed regard being had to the soil classification of the land, the climate and rainfall of the area, the average yield of crop, the average prices of crops and commodities, the agricultural resources of the area and the general economic conditions prevalent therein and other factors. In discarding the 'local areas' the Act recognised only such differences in land as are spelt out by sub-clauses (a) to (e) of Clause 5 of Section 2 of the 'Revised Act'. By referring to First Schedule and Section 27 of the 'Principal Act' and the substituted 'First Schedule' and Section 27 of the 'Revised Act' it will be clear that the distribution of surplus land surrendered to the State Government by surplus land holders and its subsequent distribution by the State Government to various categories of persons according to priorities under the relevant provisions of the Act occurs in two distinct phases. The two phases are distinguished as distribution under the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act'. Such a distinction is essential as the proposed survey of surplus land grantees in Aurangabad district was to be conducted in respect of the grantees since the inception of the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act 1961.

The two phases of surplus land distribution are based on the date of enforcement of the 'Principal Act' and 'Revised Act'. The necessity to distinguish between the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act' arises in view of the differences in the maximum area allocable to individual grantees as per provisions of the respective

Acts. However this difference in maximum area allocable to individual grantees was not sufficient for the survey of surplus land grantees in view of the 'Financial Assistance' made available to 'new grantees' under the centrally sponsored 'Twenty Point' programme. Since the survey of surplus land grantees was to cover grantees under both the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act' it was necessary to distinguish between the 'new grantees' and the other grantees and this had to be with reference to eligibility to receive the financial assistance. The financial assistance contemplated under the central scheme of assistance, as per the State Government Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L.7 dated 1st November 1976, was made available to all the grantees from 1st January 1975. Since the 'Revised Act' was enforced after 2nd October 1975 this fixation of date for receiving financial assistance meant that all the grantees who received the grant of land under the 'Principal Act' after 1st January 1975 were eligible for such financial assistance and this is clearly stated in the above quoted Government Resolution. For the purpose of the survey, therefore, grantees under the 'Principal Act' were to include those grantees who received surplus land ending 31st December 1974, the rest of the grantees irrespective of the surplus land being granted under the 'Principal Act' have been included under the 'Revised Act'. Despite all this distinction between the grantees the present report furnishes results of the survey relating to the 'new grantees' only. For non-availability of detailed information regarding grantees under the 'Principal Act' it was decided to cover such grantees in the selected villages for the survey of grantees under the Revised Act

and it was found out that the extent of coverage of grantees under the 'Principal Act' was very inadequate to arrive at any worthwhile results.

1.2 The Surplus Estimate

The only purpose in trying to estimate the surplus agricultural land is to arrive at the probable composition of such an estimate in terms of cultivated area and uncultivated area. The declared surplus does not give this composition in terms of cultivated area and uncultivated area. To the extent the surplus estimate can lead no to some probable composition of the surplus land into cultivated and uncultivated area the exercise could be worthwhile. Not that such probable composition will, necessarily, be observable in respect of the surplus area declared and distributed but that probable composition may indicate to what extent cultivated and uncultivated areas likely to be surrendered as surplus over the prescribed ceiling. The composition of exempted and unexempted land cannot be taken note of since no information of these lines is available, nor can any further exemptions under relevant provisions of the Act be visualised. An element of speculation is quite likely while indulging in such an exercise of surplus estimates but as will be subsequently seen there is nothing speculative about such an exercise. At the same time it may be remembered that estimate of surplus is not with a view to judge the surplus declared being right or otherwise but has the only purpose of arriving at a probable composition of surplus into cultivated and uncultivated area.

The composition of surplus land into cultivated and uncultivated area assumes importance since under the relevant provisions of the Act the choice to retain

whichever lands upto the ceiling area has been given to the landholder and it can very well be accepted that it will be quite natural for any surplus landholder to surrender uncultivated area as surplus to the extent it is feasible to meet the situation without violating any provisions of the Act. Section 16 of the Act makes it sufficiently clear that the right to priority of lands to be retained is of the surplus landholder and the right to the extent of land to be surrendered as excess over ceiling is of the State.

The surplus surrendered and distributed and its composition in terms of cultivated and uncultivated area deserves attention on another count also. Depending upon the extent of surplus being previously cultivated or uncultivated the effects of bringing such lands under cultivation could affect the employment in agriculture, agricultural production and income in quite different directions. How significant or insignificant such effects will be is another matter depending not only upon the composition of the surplus but also upon the extent of the surplus as a proportion to total agricultural land falling within the purview of the Ceiling on Holdings Act. If the extent of land distributed out of the surplus surrendered is largely previously uncultivated area and brought under cultivation by the new grantees it would mean that much addition to total agricultural production and also in employment in agriculture and whether this will essentially amount to addition to the grantees income in the immediate period is difficult to say. On the other hand if the distributed surplus is largely out of the previously cultivated area it is more or less certain that, at least in the immediate period there is no

likelihood of increase in agricultural production, employment and income also or at best any changes in this will be quite marginal.

The surplus estimate will have to be based on the landholding data that would nearabout coincide with the data fixed by the 'Revised Act' forbidding any transfers or partitions etc. of land that are likely to defeat the objects of the Act. Thus the land holding data in respect of the 'Revised Act' will have to be around 26th day of September 1970 the date stipulated by Section 10 of the 'Revised Act'. The Revised Act had forbidden any transfers etc. after 26th September 1970 and the estimate will have to be based on the land holding near about the day stipulated. Districtwise data on number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings is available from the Agricultural Census 1970 and the same may be used for the purpose of the estimate.

Table 1.1 gives the number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of individual and joint holdings for Aurangabad district as per the Agricultural Census 1970. The presence of the joint holdings in the data creates some difficulties in estimating the surplus and this hurdle needs to be cleared before proceeding any further. Section 6 of the 'Revised Act' and the definition of the 'Joint Holding' as per the Agricultural Census 1970 may be of some help in clearing the hurdle. Section 6 of the 'Revised Act' allows lands held in excess of ceiling area deemed to be within ceiling area in certain circumstances as given below.

"Where a family unit consists of members which exceeds five in number, the family unit shall be entitled to hold land exceeding the ceiling area to the extent of

Table 1.1 : Number of operational holdings and area operated by size class of operational holdings (Aurangabad District)

Sr. No.	Size class of holding	Individual holdings		Joint holdings		Total holdings		(Area in Hectares)		
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	Average area		
								Individual	Joint	Total
1.	Below 0.5	7517	2115	1	-	7518	2115	0.28	-	0.28
2.	0.5 - 1.00	12256	9198	3	2	12259	9200	0.75	0.67	0.75
3.	1.00- 2.00	29422	43763	8	11	29430	43774	1.49	1.38	1.49
4.	2.00- 3.00	28555	70549	8	18	28563	70567	2.47	2.25	2.47
5.	3.00- 4.00	24950	86356	5	18	24955	86374	3.46	3.60	3.46
6.	4.00- 5.00	21119	94488	6	26	21125	94514	4.47	4.33	4.47
7.	5.00- 10.00	59095	420639	22	173	59117	420812	7.12	7.86	7.12
8.	10.00- 20.00	33598	453505	13	175	33611	453680	13.50	13.46	13.50
9.	20.00- 30.00	4827	113868	8	187	4835	114055	23.59	23.38	23.59
10.	30.00- 40.00	850	28661	5	178	855	28839	33.72	35.60	33.73
11.	40.00- 50.00	171	7434	1	49	172	7483	43.47	49.00	43.51
12.	50.00 ha. and more	93	7875	1	51	94	7926	84.68	51.00	84.32
Total all size classes		222453	1338451	81	888	222534	1339339	6.02	10.96	6.02

Source : Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State.

one-fifth of the ceiling area for each member in excess of five, so however that the total holding shall not exceed twice the ceiling area, and in such case, in relation to the holding of such family unit, such area shall be deemed to be the ceiling area."

In so far as the Agricultural Census 1970 is concerned the Joint Holding may include an outsider jointly sharing the economic and technical responsibility with another person. In thus defining the Joint Holding the Agricultural Census makes a proviso that it is not necessarily the holding of the family unit but at the same time does not explicitly or implicitly deny the existence of the holding of the family unit in the Joint Holding. It is, therefore, assumed that barring an occasional case the Joint Holdings are more likely to be the holdings of the family unit and could hold land upto twice the ceiling area as stipulated by Section 6 of the Act. If the joint holding, by and large, is not to be accepted as a holding of the family unit then it is impossible to arrive at an estimate of surplus that is likely to accrue from the joint holdings.

Another matters that needs to be considered relates to irrigated area of the holdings. In the light of the First Schedule to the Act the irrigated area is bound to affect the ceiling area of the holdings and thus increase the surplus area available. However, the irrigated area should not raise a very serious problem when considered in the light of the irrigation facilities as given below:

	1970-71	1974-75
Government canals	35	195
Private canals	-	-
Tanks	19	39
Wells	534	894
Other sources	8	10
Total net irrigated	596	1138
Total as % of net sown	4.80	9.20

The above given figures refer to net irrigated area in Aurangabad district for the two years 1970-71 and 1974-75. Wells had been the major source of irrigation and accounted for 78.5 per cent of net irrigated area in 1974-75. In the previous period 1970-71 well irrigation accounted for almost 90 per cent of net irrigated area. How much of this well irrigated area will fall within the ^{purview} previous of the ceiling is difficult to say and hence it may be assumed that most of this will not affect the available surplus available. Other sources were comparatively unimportant though area irrigated by Government canals is bound to increase the surplus available immediately and even in the future. Thus for all practical purposes it is assumed that the area of the holdings may be treated as dry land falling under sub-clause (e) of Clause (5) of Section 2 of the Revised Act. Such a bold assumption is quite certain to affect the surplus composition in terms of cultivated and uncultivated area and it is only hoped that this will be minimal.

In view of the foregoing assumptions the estimates of the surplus would be arrived at with the ceiling area

for individual holding at 22 hectares (instead of 21 hectares and 25.9 Ares) and twice that is 44 hectares for joint holdings. This will facilitate calculations and would not materially affect the surplus.

Table 1.1 along with the number of operational holdings etc. gives the average area per individual and joint holdings and this along with the assumptions forms the basis of the estimates. As will be seen from the table individual holdings under serial nos. 9, 10, 11 and 12 alone report a surplus over the ceiling area at 22 hectares. Similarly, only serial nos. 11 and 12 under joint holding report surplus over 44 hectares holding area of the family unit and the estimates of the surplus will be as given below:

Individual Holdings

Serial No. of holding	No. of holdings	Av. area of holding hectares	Surplus @ 22 hectares ceiling	Total surplus hectares
9	4827	23.59	-1.59	7675
10	850	33.72	11.72	9962
11	171	43.47	21.47	3671
12	93	84.68	62.68	5829
Total surplus	-	-	-	27137

Joint Holdings

Serial No. of holding	No. of holdings	Av. area of holding hectares	Surplus @ 44 hectares ceiling	Total surplus hectares
9	8	23.38	-	-
10	5	35.60	-	-
11	1	49.00	5	5
12	1	51.00	7	7
Total surplus	-	-	-	12

Total Surplus = Individual + Joint Holdings

27149.00 Hectares

As said earlier the estimate does not take note of exempted and unexempted land nor does it take any note of various exemptions that may be granted under relevant provisions of the Act.

This surplus estimate, however, does not give the break^y into the cultivated and uncultivated area and the exercise was mainly with a view to know the probable extent of cultivated and uncultivated area within the surplus. Surrendering of the surplus is under coercion and any landholder is unlikely to surrender land already under cultivation unless inevitable. Exceptions will always be there and cultivated land being surrendered is the result of the exigencies of the situation in which the landholder is placed. Area under different uses by size category of holdings will be of some use in this respect and Table 1.2 gives the same as per the Agricultural Census 1970 for Aurangabad district. The table gives the cultivated and uncultivated area for all the size groups but not separately for individual and joint holdings. To overcome the difficulty it will be fair to assume that the proportion of cultivated and uncultivated area is the same as that for the total cultivated and uncultivated area in respective size group of holdings. With this assumption it will be a simple calculation to arrive at an estimate of cultivated and uncultivated areas of the individual and joint holdings.

The Agricultural Census defines various concepts as per the Indian Agricultural Statistics, but has pooled all the uncultivated area into four categories one of which is 'other fallows'. According to Indian Agricultural Statistics the 'other fallows' were under cultivation

**Table 1.2): Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings
(Aurangabad District)**

Sr. No.	Size class of holding	Total holdings		Net sown area	Current fallows	Cultivated land	Uncultivated land	Other fallows	(Area in Hectares)	
		No.	Area						Culturable waste	Not available for cultivation
1.	Below 0.5	7518	2115	1980	55	2035	5	7	12	12
2.	0.5 - 1.00	12259	9200	8790	198	8988	13	29	20	58
3.	1.00 - 2.00	29430	43774	41970	967	42937	34	130	63	406
4.	2.00 - 3.00	28563	70567	67394	1756	69150	78	247	122	742
5.	3.00 - 4.00	24955	86374	82187	2362	84549	81	370	108	1017
6.	4.00 - 5.00	21125	94514	89445	2980	92425	75	472	189	1096
7.	5.00 - 10.00	59117	420812	395319	14981	410300	546	2368	1157	6062
8.	10.00 - 20.00	33611	453680	419684	20270	439954	841	3786	1851	6850
9.	20.00 - 30.00	4835	114055	103552	6342	109894	176	1408	623	1741
10.	30.00 - 40.00	855	28839	25209	2290	27499	43	378	376	466
11.	40.00 - 50.00	172	7483	6388	661	7049	11	139	88	175
12.	50.00 ha. and above	94	7926	5761	976	6737	52	349	652	124
Total all size classes		222534	1339339	1247679	53838	1301517	1955	9683	5261	18749

Source : Agricultural Census 1970 - Maharashtra State.

in the immediate past varying from one to five years and the query arises if such 'other fallows' need be included under uncultivated area. Considering the earlier assumptions etc. it is possible to decide the extent of cultivated, other fallow and uncultivated area for the relevant size group of holdings. Since there is no surplus in size groups 9 and 10 of joint holdings these are excluded and areas for individual holdings in size groups 9 to 12 and size groups 11 and 12 of joint holdings will be as given below:

Size category	Cultivated area Ha.	Fallow area Ha.	Uncultivated area Ha.	Total area of holding Ha.
9	109714	1618	2536	113868
10	27328	453	880	28661
11	7049	160	274	7483
12	6737	361	828	7926
Total	150828	2592	4598	157938

The horizontal totals of various size categories of holdings in Table 1.2 do not add up to total area of the holdings. The totals have been corrected by adjusting the uncultivated area and the above given figures are arrived at after necessary corrections in the table.

The proportion of uncultivated area (excluding other fallows) in the surplus estimates will be around 16.64 per cent and if 'other fallows' are included under uncultivated area it will increase to 26.19 per cent. Considering the surplus estimate along with uncultivated area and 'other fallow' it will be seen that substantial proportion of surplus surrendered is likely to be out of

the cultivated area at the aggregate level. Such an occurrence was more or less expected considering cultivated land as proportion to total area of the size category of holdings surrendering surplus.

1.3 Surplus Area Distributed and Land Use Previous to Distribution

The above exercise in estimates of surplus area and the probable composition of the surplus into cultivated and uncultivated areas suggests the likelihood of substantial proportion of surplus area surrendered being previously cultivated area. It will therefore be worthwhile to look into the composition of the surplus area that has been distributed. It will be obvious that such looking into the surplus distributed will have to be with reference to the survey numbers from which surplus was distributed in the sample villages. Total survey numbers from which land was declared surplus and distributed in the selected villages was 172 under the Revised Act and the details are given below.

Tahsil	Survey Nos. from which information collected	Survey Nos. from which information not available	Total survey nos.
1. Anbad	52	5	57
2. Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafraabad)	33	9	42
3. Silled) Soegaon)	5	26	31
4. Paithan	9	7	16
5. Vaijapur) Gangapur) Karnad)	25	1	26
Total	124	48	172

The sample survey for grantees under the Revised Act was conducted in the above given ten tahasils and these have been pooled into five groups as above. Detailed information regarding land use of 48 survey nos. could not be collected for want of adequate records with the Talathis and at times the non-availability of the Talathis despite efforts. The land use data was collected for a period of five years previous to the date of granting of land out of a given survey no. and wherever it was available for one or two years only such information was not of much use and was left out. The major shortage is in regard to survey nos. from which surplus was distributed in Soegaon and Silled tahasils and next to that in Paithan tahasil. In the other seven tahasils land use data of survey nos. could be collected for substantial proportion of survey nos. from which land was declared surplus and distributed. Considering the total survey nos. from which land was distributed it is clear that for 72 per cent of survey nos. information for five years previous to the date of granting land could be collected and it is felt that this will be sufficiently indicative of the extent of cultivated and uncultivated land that was distributed to grantees.

Table L.3 sets out the land use, for five years previous to the grant of land, of survey nos. surrendering surplus land by average land revenue per acre. As given previously the information pertains to 124 survey nos. only for which details for the requisite period could be collected. The choice of land revenue as an explanatory variable may not be a very happy choice but has some justification. Land revenue is primarily a cess and does take into account the quality of land. It

Table 1.3 : Land use, for five years previous to the date of grant of land, of survey nos. surrendering surplus land

(Area in acres)

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Area of survey nos	Land use 5 years previous to allotment			Land use 4 years previous to allotment			Land use 3 years previous to allotment			Land use 2 years previous to allotment			Land use 1 year previous to allotment			Surplus area out of col 2
		Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Upto 0.20	12-23	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	10-09
0.21-0.30	226-24	186-22	40-02	-	182-08	44-16	-	190-37	35-27	-	185-24	41-00	-	188-02	38-22	-	98-09
0.31-0.40	282-29	179-04	91-37	11-28	169-16	94-01	19-12	174-36	88-21	19-12	152-36	110-21	19-12	166-16	97-01	19-12	159-15
0.41-0.50	438-31	378-17	52-33	7-21	377-34	50-34	10-03	360-08	68-20	10-03	353-12	75-16	10-03	396-16	32-12	10-03	79-37
0.51-0.60	230-38	178-14	50-28	1-36	184-09	44-33	1-36	193-10	35-32	1-36	207-15	21-27	1-36	194-01	35-01	1-36	155-09
0.61-0.70	149-04	118-08	29-33	1-03	119-35	27-26	1-23	114-27	32-34	1-23	103-08	44-13	1-23	138-14	9-07	1-23	76-03
0.71-0.80	234-27	186-07	46-13	2-07	187-35	43-32	3-00	201-35	30-10	2-22	177-13	54-32	2-22	182-18	49-27	2-22	118-11
0.81-0.90	424-27	351-35	59-03	13-29	351-35	59-03	13-29	350-21	61-10	12-36	368-37	42-06	13-24	369-37	41-06	13-24	198-24
0.91-1.00	133-15	124-18	7-21	1-16	123-18	8-21	1-16	124-18	7-21	1-16	119-12	12-27	1-16	119-12	12-27	1-16	83-03
1.01-1.25	301-36	296-14	4-27	0-35	296-14	4-27	0-35	296-14	4-28	0-34	296-14	4-28	0-34	290-09	10-33	0-34	143-02
1.26-1.50	165-00	142-35	14-36	7-09	144-11	13-20	7-09	141-35	20-36	2-09	137-01	25-30	2-09	134-35	27-36	2-09	102-20
1.51-1.75	180-09	178-39	-	1-10	178-39	-	1-10	178-39	-	1-10	178-39	-	1-10	169-05	10-00	1-04	43-36
1.76-2.00	457-06	439-34	16-13	0-39	436-34	19-13	0-39	435-34	12-13	8-39	437-36	14-11	4-39	405-23	50-24	0-39	84-18
2.01-2.50	84-10	68-24	15-22	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	23-18
Total	3321-39	2842-14	429-28	49-37	2849-37	410-26	61-16	2860-23	398-12	63-04	2814-36	447-11	59-32	2851-17	414-36	55-36	1376-14

is, however, not a wholly satisfactory index. Land revenue once determined has remained fixed for a long time, long enough to render it unsatisfactory index of soil fertility because of its failure to take into account the changes in the quality of land in the subsequent period. Despite the deficiencies it is being used for want of any other index and also because the land revenue is to be the basis for calculating payment of compensation to previous landholders and the payment of occupancy price by the grantees.

Comparing the details given in Table 1.3 with that in Table 1.2, taken from Agricultural Census 1970, it is clear that no detailed information was available in any of the 124 survey nos. It is, in fact, unbelievable that there was no uncultivated area at all. While Table 1.2 gives details in respect of culturable wastes, not available for cultivation etc. no such details were available from the records with the Talathis. As it turns out except for the 'Pot-kharab' rest of the area of survey nos. had been under cultivation some time or other during the previous six years or so. 'Other fallows' cannot be included under uncultivated area for the obvious reasons that this area had been under cultivation before previous five years and had not been cropped for some reason or other. Again cropped area, current fallows and other fallows go on changing every year, some current fallows at the end of one year moving over to other fallows and may be some area from other fallows being once again brought under cultivation. In fact it is difficult to decide how much of area under 'other fallows' had not been under cultivation for a continuous period of five years. Similarly, increasing and decreasing Pot-kharab

is very difficult to fallow. Some decrease in Pot-kharab could be a possibility and hence understandable if some reclamatory efforts were undertaken by the previous landholder to bring more land under cultivation. Even this will be a very remote possibility. As a result of all these the cultivated area has moved within a small margin and even if cultivated area were to get reduced, the reduction will not be passed on to Pot-kharab or uncultivated area immediately since it will firstly be shown as current fallow and if not cultivated in the next year it will form the part of other fallows and only if this area is not cultivated for five years it will be transferred to uncultivated area and certainly not to Pot-kharab. Despite these deficiencies some broad conclusions can be reached on the basis of the available material.

Table 1.3 along with the total area of the survey nos. cropped area, fallow and Pot-kharab gives the surplus area declared, in each per acre land revenue group, in Column 18. The survey nos. have been divided into fourteen groups. It will be useful to look into the total area of the survey nos., fallow etc. area and the surplus declared in relation to each other. However, it will be a tedious job to look through all the groups and pooling these into four broad groups will be much more convenient and is not likely to vitiate the conclusions in whatever manner. The data in Table 1.3 is accordingly presented below in percentages in a summarised form in four groups.

The lowest fallow area in the below given percentages is inclusive of the Pot-kharab area. Since Pot-kharab area out of the surplus surrendered was distributed to grantees it had to be included in total fallows as uncultivated area. Choice of the lowest fallow was

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Lowest fallow as % of total area	Surplus as % of total area	Lowest fallow as % of group surplus	Group surplus as % of total surplus
1	2	3	4	5
Upto 0.40	27.49	51.31	53.20	19.46
0.41 - 0.80	13.50	40.77	33.12	31.21
0.81 - 1.25	8.76	49.97	17.54	30.83
1.26 - 2.50	4.79	28.68	16.66	18.48
Total	12.08	41.20	29.46	100.00

specifically with a view that it would give the extent of minimum area that had not been cropped for some specific period. This period is important as the compensation to be calculated under Section 23 has a specific provision that 'in case of land which is not cultivated for a continuous period of three years immediately before the commencement date, the price shall be twenty five per cent of the price calculated under Clause (a) or (b), as the case may be. Definition of 'other fallows' given by the Indian Agricultural Statistics can indicate the period over which this land has been uncultivated and the same is given below.

'This implies all lands taken up for cultivation but are temporarily out of cultivation for not less than one year and not more than five years. The reasons for leaving such lands fallow may be, (1) poverty of cultivators, (2) inadequate supply of water, (3) malarial climate, (4) silting of canals and rivers, and (5) unremunerative nature of farming'.

The reasons for leaving such lands fallow are of no interest for the present purpose in view. In the light of the above given definition whatever area out of these 'other fallows' was surrendered as surplus and subsequently distributed, that much area was not under cultivation for at least six years i.e. one year as current fallow and another five years as other fallow making a total of six years.

The percentages, fallow area to area of the survey nos. and surplus area to area of survey nos. and fallow area to surplus declared etc., presented earlier does not need much explanation. It is clear from Column 5 that maximum surplus area had been declared in the second and the third groups - Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25 - the remaining two groups, first and the fourth, having near about the same proportion of surplus to total area of survey nos. in respective groups. The lowest uncultivated rather fallow area was not reported in the same year and the reasons for choosing lowest fallow area have been stated earlier. Surplus declared as a proportion to area of survey nos. is the highest in the first group and the lowest in the fourth group and this is something not in the least striking. Since the land is being surrendered under coercion and the choice of surrendering uncultivated area being very meagre the previous landholders were bound to surrender the least fertile land, as depicted by the land revenue per acre, to the extent possible. Comparing columns 3 and 4 it will be seen that there is a likelihood of substantial proportion of fallow area being surrendered as surplus in the first group and to an extent in the second group. However, looking to the total picture it is clear that around 70 per cent of

surplus surrendered will have to be out of the area under cultivation. In view of the larger surplus accruing in the second and the third groups it is inevitable that large number of grantees will receive land in these two groups and these grantees will have the major part of the cultivated area distributed. As will be seen subsequently from the sample data the proportion of grantees in the second and third group taken together (per acre land revenue Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25) to total grantees in the sample was about 60 per cent.

The above refers to the survey nos. falling within the sample in the district comprising the ten tahasils given earlier. The survey nos. referred to are only those for which land use for five years previous to granting of land could be collected. It will be useful to look into the tahasils along the same lines as above since the above suggested conclusions may or may not hold good for the five groupings of tahasils depending upon the surplus declared, uncultivated area and the land revenue per acre that has surrendered surplus area etc. Tables 1.4 to 1.8 set out cropped area, fallow area and the Pot-kharab upto five years previous to granting of land and also the surplus declared in the respective tahasil grouping. Again instead of looking through the details in each per acre land revenue group it will be convenient to pool these as earlier and the percentage relationship between total area, fallow plus Pot-kharab and the surplus declared etc. for each of the group is given in Table 1.9. Some deviation in the relationship between various areas is observable as compared to the same in respect of the total sample for the district. In no tahasil except Ambad the proportion of surplus in each of the land revenue groups

Table 1.4 : Land use, for five years previous to date of grant of land, of survey nos. surrendering surplus land in Ambed Tahasil

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Area of survey nos	Land use 5 years previous to allotment			Land use 4 years previous to allotment			Land use 3 years previous to allotment			Land use 2 years previous to allotment			Land use 1 year previous to allotment			Surplus area out of col 2
		Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21-0.30	91-05	75-18	15-27	-	71-05	20-00	-	75-18	15-27	-	76-05	15-00	-	76-05	15-00	-	27-04
0.31-0.40	33-36	20-20	13-00	0-16	20-20	13-00	0-16	23-20	10-00	0-16	23-20	10-00	0-16	24-00	9-20	0-16	29-26
0.41-0.50	34-09	33-39	-	0-10	24-32	9-07	0-10	33-39	-	0-10	33-39	-	0-10	33-39	-	0-10	12-14
0.51-0.60	141-08	109-06	31-04	0-38	105-10	35-00	0-38	115-11	24-39	0-38	115-11	24-39	0-38	135-10	5-00	0-38	97-20
0.61-0.70	71-17	63-37	7-09	0-11	66-04	5-02	0-11	58-16	12-30	0-11	58-16	12-30	0-11	65-07	5-39	0-11	37-35
0.71-0.80	103-10	98-27	4-05	0-18	101-15	1-17	0-18	97-15	5-35	-	97-15	5-35	-	101-15	1-35	-	74-38
0.81-0.90	283-33	230-09	52-12	1-12	230-09	52-12	1-12	228-07	54-19	1-07	228-07	54-19	1-07	248-11	34-15	1-07	161-22
0.91-1.00	94-09	85-30	7-21	0-38	84-30	8-21	0-38	85-30	7-21	0-38	85-30	7-21	0-38	80-24	12-27	0-38	51-37
1.01-1.25	122-38	118-10	4-27	0-01	118-10	4-27	0-01	118-10	4-28	-	118-10	4-28	-	112-05	10-33	-	69-07
1.26-1.50	79-27	74-02	-	5-25	74-02	-	5-25	73-02	6-00	0-25	73-02	6-00	0-25	71-02	8-00	0-25	36-22
1.51-1.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.76-2.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.01-2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1055-32	909-38	135-25	10-09	896-17	149-06	10-09	909-08	141-39	4-25	909-08	141-39	4-25	947-38	103-09	4-25	598-25

Table 1.5 : Land use, for five years previous to grant of land, of survey nos. surrendering surplus land in Jalna, Bhokardan and Jafrahad Tahasils

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Area of survey nos	Land use 5 years previous to allotment			Land use 4 years previous to allotment			Land use 3 years previous to allotment			Land use 2 years previous to allotment			Land use 1 year previous to allotment			Surplus area out of col 2
		Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	Area cropped out of col 2	Follow out of col 2	Pot-kharab out of col 2	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21-0.30	100-31	76-16	24-15	-	76-15	24-16	-	80-31	20-00	-	74-31	26-00	-	77-09	23-22	-	61-10
0.31-0.40	142-17	89-24	41-37	10-36	93-04	38-17	10-36	93-24	37-37	10-36	93-24	37-37	10-36	93-24	37-37	10-36	103-29
0.41-0.50	275-19	233-31	35-00	6-28	248-30	20-01	6-28	252-30	16-01	6-28	245-22	23-09	6-28	243-30	25-01	6-28	49-18
0.51-0.60	68-09	47-27	19-24	0-38	57-18	9-33	0-38	57-18	9-33	0-38	57-18	9-33	0-38	38-31	28-20	0-38	38-12
0.61-0.70	35-06	32-06	2-08	0-32	31-26	2-28	0-32	31-06	3-08	0-32	32-06	2-08	0-32	31-06	3-08	0-32	14-05
0.71-0.80	13-21	13-21	-	-	13-21	-	-	13-21	-	-	13-21	-	-	13-21	-	-	13-21
0.81-0.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.91-1.00	15-04	15-04	-	-	15-04	-	-	15-04	-	-	15-04	-	-	15-04	-	-	9-22
1.01-1.25	18-13	18-13	-	-	18-13	-	-	18-13	-	-	18-13	-	-	18-13	-	-	11-32
1.26-1.50	52-19	37-19	13-20	1-20	37-19	13-20	1-20	37-19	13-20	1-20	37-19	13-20	1-20	32-19	18-20	1-20	52-19
1.51-1.75	31-16	31-10	-	0-06	31-10	-	0-06	31-10	-	0-06	31-10	-	0-06	21-16	21-16	10-00	7-00
1.76-2.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.01-2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	752-35	595-11	136-24	21-00	623-00	108-35	21-00	631-16	100-19	21-00	619-08	112-27	21-00	585-13	146-28	20-34	361-08

Table 1.7 : Land use, for five years previous to grant of land, of survey numbers, surrendering surplus land in Paithan Tahasil

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Area of survey numbers	Land use 5 years previous to allotment			Land use 4 years previous to allotment			Land use 3 years previous to allotment			Land use 2 years previous to allotment			Land use 1 year previous to allotment			Surplus area out of Col.2
		Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Upto 0.20	12-23	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	12-23	-	-	10-09
0.21-0.30	34-28	34-28	-	-	34-28	-	-	34-28	-	-	34-28	-	-	34-28	-	-	9-35
0.31-0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.41-0.50	106-23	92-27	13-13	0-23	92-32	11-27	2-04	63-19	41-00	2-04	62-11	42-08	2-04	99-27	4-32	2-04	13-37
0.51-0.60	21-21	21-21	-	-	21-21	-	-	20-21	1-00	-	21-21	-	-	20-00	1-21	-	19-17
0.61-0.70	22-05	22-05	-	-	22-05	-	-	22-05	-	-	22-05	-	-	22-05	-	-	3-27
0.71-0.80	21-00	19-17	-	1-23	19-17	-	1-23	9-17	10-00	1-23	18-17	1-00	1-23	16-00	3-17	1-23	9-04
0.81-0.90	12-31	12-31	-	-	12-31	-	-	12-31	-	-	12-31	-	-	12-31	-	-	3-37
0.91-1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.01-1.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.26-1.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.51-1.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.76-2.00	20-01	20-01	-	-	20-01	-	-	20-01	-	-	20-01	-	-	20-01	-	-	13-11
2.01-2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	251-12	235-33	13-13	2-06	235-38	11-27	3-27	191-25	56-00	3-27	204-17	43-08	3-27	237-35	9-30	3-27	83-17

Table 1.8 : Land use, for five years previous to grant of land, of survey numbers surrendering surplus land in Vaijapur, Gangapur and Kannad Tahasils

Land revenue per acre in rs.	Area of survey numbers	Land use 5 years previous to allotment			Land use 4 years previous to allotment			Land use 3 years previous to allotment			Land use 2 years previous to allotment			Land use 1 year previous to allotment			Surplus area out of Col.2
		Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	Area cropped out of Col.2	Fallow out of Col.2	Pot-kharab out of Col.2	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21-0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.31-0.40	78-08	41-08	37-00	-	28-00	42-24	7-24	30-00	40-24	7-24	15-00	55-24	7-24	21-00	49-24	7-24	23-00
0.41-0.50	22-20	18-00	4-20	-	11-20	9-39	1-01	10-00	11-19	1-01	11-20	9-39	1-01	19-00	2-19	1-01	4-08
0.51-0.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.61-0.70	20-16	-	20-16	-	-	19-36	0-20	3-00	16-36	0-20	-	19-36	0-20	19-36	-	0-20	20-16
0.71-0.80	96-36	54-22	42-08	0-06	53-22	42-15	0-39	81-22	14-15	0-39	46-00	49-37	0-39	51-22	44-15	0-39	20-28
0.81-0.90	27-20	26-32	-	0-28	26-32	-	0-28	27-20	-	-	26-32	-	0-28	26-32	-	0-28	4-17
0.91-1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.01-1.25	160-25	159-31	-	0-34	159-31	-	0-34	159-31	-	0-34	159-31	-	0-34	159-31	-	0-34	62-03
1.26-1.50	32-34	31-14	1-16	0-04	32-30	-	0-04	31-14	1-16	0-04	32-30	-	0-04	31-14	1-16	0-04	13-19
1.51-1.75	148-33	147-29	-	1-04	147-29	-	1-04	147-29	-	1-04	147-29	-	1-04	147-29	1-04	-	36-36
1.76-2.00	401-08	383-36	16-13	0-39	380-36	19-13	0-39	379-36	12-13	8-39	381-38	14-11	4-39	349-25	50-24	0-39	63-14
2.01-2.50	84-10	68-24	15-22	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	84-06	-	0-04	23-18
Total	1073-10	931-36	137-15	3-39	925-06	134-07	13-37	954-38	97-03	21-09	905-26	149-27	17-37	910-35	149-22	12-33	271-39

Table 1.9 : Proposition of fallow area, surplus declared etc. to total area of the survey numbers in tahasils of Aurangabad District

Tahasil	Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Lowest fallow as per cent of total area	Surplus declared as per cent of total area	Lowest fallow as per cent of group surplus declared	Group surplus as per cent of total surplus declared
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Ambad	Upto 0.40	19.91	45.39	43.87	9.48
	0.41 to 0.80	4.09	63.60	6.43	37.19
	0.81 to 1.25	10.94	56.41	19.40	47.21
	1.26 to 2.50	7.05	45.87	15.38	6.10
	Total	10.39	56.69	18.32	100.00
2. Jaina	Upto 0.40	28.29	67.83	41.71	45.67
Bhokardan	0.41 to 0.80	9.55	29.12	32.49	31.95
Jafrabad	0.81 to 1.25	-	63.87	-	5.91
	1.26 to 2.50	18.06	70.90	25.47	16.46
	Total	16.13	47.96	33.62	100.00
3. Silled	Upto 0.40	1.41	10.63	13.33	4.89
Seegaon	0.41 to 0.80	-	-	-	-
	0.81 to 1.25	15.20	40.36	37.67	82.36
	1.26 to 2.50	-	21.78	-	12.74
	Total	10.25	32.51	31.52	100.00
4. Paithan	Upto 0.40	8.45	42.51	19.90	24.09
	0.41 to 0.80	7.84	26.93	29.10	55.28
	0.81 to 1.25	-	30.72	-	4.70
	1.26 to 2.50	-	66.19	-	15.91
	Total	6.93	33.19	20.88	100.00
5. Vaijapur	Upto 0.40	47.31	29.41	160.87	8.45
Gangapur	0.41 to 0.80	32.36	32.40	99.88	16.65
Kannad	0.81 to 1.25	0.45	35.34	1.27	24.45
	1.26 to 2.50	3.08	20.56	14.98	50.43
	Total	9.65	25.34	38.11	100.00

is near about the same as for the total sample. In Ambad major proportion of the surplus occurs in the second and the third land revenue groups as was the case for the total sample. Only in Sillod and Soegaon tahasils and Vaijapur, Gangapur and Kannad tahasils the land revenue per acre beyond Rs.0.81 accounts for 75 per cent and more of surplus declared. In the remaining two tahasil groupings, Jalna, Bhokardan and Jafrabad and Paithan, it will be observed that near about 77-80 per cent of the surplus declared out of these survey nos. accrues from the per acre land revenue groups upto Rs.0.80. Comparing cols. 4 and 5 it will be seen that in all the tahasil groupings the substantial proportion of land already under cultivation being surrendered as surplus is inevitable.

Further detailed comment is unnecessary and the results given in Table 1.9 are quite clear to see. That a large proportion of surplus surrendered will have to come from area already under cultivation was more or less certain especially when it could be seen from Table 1.2 in respect of surplus surrendering size groups 9, 10, 11 and 12 that the proportion of area already under cultivation varied between 84.99 per cent of total area for size group 12 to 96.35 per cent of total area for size group 9. Besides considering the surplus estimate of 27149 hectares with the total uncultivated area of Table 1.2 for size categories 9 to 12, it was very clear even then that a large proportion of surplus, even if all the uncultivated area in the four size groups 9 to 12 in Table 1.2 could be surrendered, will have to be out of land already under cultivation.

Chapter II
Distribution of Surplus Land

The previous chapter dealt with the probable extent of cultivated and uncultivated area surrendered as surplus over ceiling area and the probable distribution of the same in various per acre land revenue groups. It was ~~ex-~~ contended therein that despite the non-availability of data on all the survey nos. from which such surplus was distributed the conclusions suggested would hold good to some extent. It is now proposed to examine very broadly the distribution of the surplus in the light of the provisions of the Revised Act. It was pointed out earlier that Maharashtra 21 of 1975 substituted Section 27 of the Principal Act and the substituted Section 27 in the Revised Act had a very telling effect on the maximum area allocable to a grantee. Since the main purpose in lowering the ceiling or maximum limit on the holding of agricultural land in the state was for making additional land available as surplus for distribution to landless and other persons it was quite natural that with the lowering of ceiling the maximum allocable area to grantees be lowered so that larger number of landless and other persons could be distributed lands. In fact, the immediate effects of the substituted 'First Schedule' to the Act and also the substitution of Section 27 of the Act was that a larger number of landless persons could be granted land for cultivation.

Pot-kharab and other uncultivable area do not raise much of a problem which may result into creation of a 'fragment' as defined under Section 2 of the Bombay

Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. It was concluded after examining the data pertaining to survey nos. from which surplus was declared and distributed that substantial proportion of surplus surrendered was likely to be land previously, i.e. almost in the immediate post of distribution of these lands, under cultivation. However, another matter that needs to be attended to refers to granting of a 'fragment' to grantees. Section 2(13) of the Act clearly states that the 'fragment' has the meaning assigned to it in Section 2 of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. Creation of a 'fragment' under the above mentioned Act had been prohibited and the introduction of Section 2 (13) in the original Act itself was essentially with the view of preventing creation of a fragment in the process of distribution of surplus land. The Act had made certain provisions in Section 15 to prevent creation of a fragment when ceiling area was decided and the surplus declared. These provisions further provide the proof that creation of a fragment was to be strictly prohibited when deciding upon the landholders surplus area over the ceiling.

2.1 Surplus Land Distribution

It was stated in the previous chapter that the surplus land distribution in the state occurs in two distinct phases and the two phases are distinguished on the basis of the enforcement dates of the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act'. It was also pointed out that this distinction was not sufficient to decide on the sample under the Revised Act in view of the financial assistance contemplated for allottees after 1st January 1975. In selecting the sample these allottees between 1st January

1975 and 2nd October 1975 could not be taken note of for want of relevant information and as a result it was decided to include such grantees i.e. getting allotment after 1st January 1975, wherever they occur. During the conduct of the survey very few such cases occurred and have been included in the sample. We are not much concerned with the sample data at the moment but this point needed to be stated at some point, especially when the quantum of maximum allocable area under the Principal Act and the Revised Act varies substantially.

There are two distinguishing features that affect the distribution of surplus land under the Revised Act as compared to the Principal Act. The first affects the quantum of land to be granted to each allottee and the second ensures the minimum allotment, out of the total surplus declared and available for distribution, to hitherto neglected Scheduled castes, tribes etc. backward classes.

Since the survey data presented will be mainly in respect of allottees under the Revised Act there should be no need to consider the maximum area allocable under the Principal Act. The need arises because of two allottees included in the sample who were given possession of surplus declared after 1st January 1975. The area allotted to these two allottees is in excess of the maximum allocable under the Revised Act but less than that allocable under the Principal Act. A few more cases of allottees receiving more than 7-20 acres or 3 hectares of surplus distributed occur under the Revised Act but these were essentially exceptions with a view to avoid creation of a loose fragment.

The maximum area allocable to a landless person under the 'Principal Act' was related to the ceiling area

in each of the local areas as given in the 'First Schedule' to that Act. Under Section 27(7) of the said Act the upper limit to such allocable area being one-sixth of the ceiling area. Since the ceiling area differed in various 'local areas' of the Principal Act, the variation in the maximum allocable area naturally followed. The ceiling areas under sub-clauses (a), (b) and (c) of Clause 5 of Section 2 were the same all over the state and the above variation in ceiling areas refers to one under sub-clause (d) of Clause 5 of Section 2 that is in respect of the dry crop land. With the substitution of Section 27 of the Principal Act, by Maharashtra 21 of 1975, in the Revised Act uniform upper limit to allocation of surplus land to a grantee (a landless person) was prescribed at 3 hectares or 7 1/2 acres of land under sub-clause (e) of Clause 5 of Section 2. The 'local areas' in the Principal Act were dropped. As was explained in the Principal Act the varying ceiling in 'local areas' was decided upon after giving due consideration to various factor such as soil fertility, main crop grown and their prices etc. and this suggested that the Government was aware of the differences in the economics of land in various areas of the state and in most cases within the district also. By discarding 'local areas' the Government measured all the agricultural land, save for existence of irrigation etc. facilities, by the same yardstick. This measure along with the lowering of maximum allocable area under the Revised Act was a very severe measure. However, with the professed purpose of distributing surplus land to larger number of landless and other persons such a drastic measure was inevitable.

Another distinguishing feature of the Revised Act refers to reservation of 50 per cent of surplus land under

Section 27(4), after excluding lands under sub-sections (2) and (3), for distribution to persons belonging to Schedule castes, scheduled tribes and other backward classes etc. So far as the lands falling under Section 27(2) are concerned the tenancy laws allowed resumption of half the land leased by the landlord. Therefore, there would be very few lands, if any, at all, which would come within the purview of the aforesaid Section 27(2). Similarly, in view of Section (19) of the Revised Act there would be no farms notified as was the case in respect of compact and mechanised farms under Section (19) of the Principal Act and therefore lands declared surplus under the Revised Act would not normally come within the purview of Section 27(3). This in effect would mean that area declared surplus under the Revised Act would be available for distribution under Sections 27(4) and 27(5).

Despite the reservation proposed by Section 27(4) of the Act no details were available either at the collectorate or the tahasil regarding the area reserved for backward classes and we, therefore, will have to rely on the distribution figures to these classes. Table 2.1 gives surplus distribution in the district ending September-October 1978. The total surplus distributed out the surplus taken possession of by the Government was 89 per cent, the balance of 11 per cent being under revision or undistributed so far. As per provisions of Section 27(4) the backward classes were to receive 50 per cent of the surplus available and the summary distribution is given below.

	<u>No. of grantees</u>	<u>Area granted (Hects)</u>
Backward classes	2526	4531.85
Others	1289	2433.92
Total	3815	6965.77

Table 2.1 : Surplus land distribution under the 'Revised Act' ending September-October 1978

Tahasil	Area declared surplus	Area taken possession and distributed	Area in Hectares													
			Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Vimukta Jati		Nomedic Tribes		Nav-Buddha		Others		Total	
			Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
1. Aurangabad	621-20	539-68	135	225-76	12	20-96	16	29-41	11	16-77	-	-	134	246-78	308	539-68
2. Paithan	948-29	769-81	217	427-15	53	109-03	-	-	10	27-51	-	-	114	206-12	394	769-81
3. Sillod	294-72	276-02	63	11-14	-	-	2	3-01	2	2-40	29	56-87	36	67-70	132	276-02
4. Soegaon	242-35	209-60	49	82-65	4	6-12	12	18-44	-	-	-	-	63	102-39	128	209-60
5. Jalna	979-23	834-40	210	363-99	11	32-54	9	18-97	27	48-26	13	19-75	184	350-89	454	834-40
6. Ambad	2049-63	1996-26	697	1160-24	48	122-00	39	78-00	65	129-10	-	-	278	517-02	1124	1996-26
7. Bhokardan	894-37	757-06	175	338-28	23	31-87	8	13-86	3	4-31	-	-	197	368-74	406	757-06
8. Jafrabad	273-04	266-34	52	101-46	5	8-52	-	-	-	-	2	4-40	75	151-96	134	266-34
9. Vaijapur	575-35	475-61	127	221-28	36	60-51	5	8-61	1	2-09	32	56-00	80	127-12	281	475-61
10. Gangapur	597-06	573-84	173	303-60	37	69-29	-	-	23	40-00	-	-	51	100-95	284	573-84
11. Kannad	273-14	224-10	49	76-75	15	24-81	1	2-40	1	1-22	3	3-72	66	115-20	135	224-10
12. Khultabad	73-83	72-95	18	37-25	3	6-65	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	29-05	35	72-95
Total	7822-21	6965-77	1965	3454-55	247	492-30	92	172-70	143	271-56	79	140-74	1289	2433-92	3815	6965-77

The total share of backward class allottees was 66.21 per cent of allottees with 65.05 per cent of surplus area distributed. This was certainly more than the 50 per cent reservation of surplus taken possession of and distributed. It is therefore clear that the backward classes received land grant out of the unreserved area also and have received more than a fair share of surplus allotted. Some backward class allottees getting land grant out of the unreserved surplus is quite in order since there is nothing in the Act to prohibit them from getting land out of the unreserved area so long as such distribution is in terms of priorities prescribed and not in violation of any of the provisions of Section (27). However, there were no complaints from the respondents in the sample on this account nor were any such complaints reported at the tahasil and district headquarters and can, therefore, be accepted as in good order.

Another matter that needs to be observed is that while the backward classes represented a fair proportion of allottees they got slightly less area of the total distributed. Tahasilwise averages are given overleaf.

The Government of Maharashtra Circular No. ICH.1376/5993-LY (Revenue and Forest Department) dated 29th January 1976 had suggested that 'even if there is a large demand, the effort should be to see that a landless allottee gets approximately 2 hectares of class (e) or equivalent land of other classes' and the averages almost suggest that the distribution has been more or less as per expectations. Some variations did occur but these necessarily result from the exigencies of the situation rather than the design. The actual area distribution could be very different from the averages given below. This could happen not only

Tahasil	Scheduled Caste	Scheduled Tribes	Other Backward	Others
1. Aurangabad	1.67	1.74	1.71	1.84
2. Paithan	1.96	2.05	2.75	1.80
3. Sillod	1.84	-	1.88	1.88
4. Soegaon	1.68	1.53	1.53	1.62
5. Jaina	1.73	2.95	1.77	1.90
6. Ambad	1.66	2.54	1.99	1.86
7. Bhokardan	1.93	3.56	1.65	1.87
8. Jafrabad	1.95	1.70	2.20	2.03
9. Vaijapur	1.74	1.68	1.75	1.58
10. Gangapur	1.75	1.87	1.73	1.97
11. Karnad	1.56	1.65	1.47	1.74
12. Khultabad	2.69	2.21	-	2.07
Total District	1.75	1.99	1.86	1.88

(Average area in hectares)

because of the class of surplus land distributed but also because of the maximum allocable area in a given class of land and the minimum area which should be a plot and not a fragment as per definition of a fragment stipulated by the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. Despite the averages given earlier it was seen from the sample that a few allottees did get a fragment and this needs to be looked into and is taken up in the next section.

2.2 Creation and Distribution of 'Fragments' to Allottees

The Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947, was enacted with the

specific intention ~~on~~ doing away with small strips and pieces of land that are ~~un~~improfitable for cultivation. The said Act after due consideration to fertility of the soil, crops grown and any other relevant factors in a given 'local area', generally a district, had decided upon the extent of area of a piece of agricultural land i.e. a plot which will be the minimum area (given separately for dry crop land and Bagayat land) necessary for profitable cultivation. Any piece of land or a plot admeasuring less than the minimum prescribed for the particular class of land as necessary for profitable cultivation would, therefore, be obviously a 'fragment'.

With a view to prevent the creation of a 'fragment' in the course of distribution of surplus land The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961, had made a specific provision by Section 2(13) that the 'fragment' has the meaning assigned to it in Section (2) of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. As will therefore be understood Section 2(13) of the Ceiling on Holdings Act, 1961, is very very clear on non-creation of a 'fragment' in the course of surplus distribution and any allotment of surplus area to a grantee, under any of the provisions of Section (27) of the Act, which does not meet the provision of Section (2) of the Bombay prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947, would be a 'fragment' and clearly in contravention of the said Act.

As said earlier in the previous Section 2.1, the average area allotment of surplus per grantee hides the creation of a fragment, if any, since the actual allotment to grantees had varied anything upto 7 1/2 acres, and at times a little more, the maximum allocable area

as per Section 27(7) of the Revised Act. The above maximum allocable area refers to class (d) land i.e. dry crop land of Section 2(5) of the Ceiling on Holdings Act, 1961. Since almost no irrigated or irrigable land had accrued as surplus in the sample the reference herein is invariably to class (e) land i.e. dry crop land. Whenever a little more area than the maximum allocable under Section 27(7) of the Revised Act was allotted such cases of allotment were very specific in that either there were no other aspirants for that particular piece of land or who so ever the other aspirants for such land they were found ineligible to receive the grant of surplus under the relevant provisions of the Act. Under the circumstances not allotting the whole piece or plot of surplus land surrendered could have created a loose fragment, after allocation, which is prohibited. On the other hand if less area out of this surrendered piece or plot of land, such as not to allot a fragment, was allotted the balance of area remaining unallotted would not have created a fragment but holding such acquired land in view of its being undistributed would have been against the very scheme of the Act and not permitted. This undistributed area was acquired as surplus over ceiling with the specific purpose of distributing it to landless persons, and was not forfeited to the Government under the relevant provisions for forfeiture. Forfeited land under the Act could be disposed of by the Government in the best manner it seems fit but not so in respect of lands acquired as surplus over ceiling.

All said and done creation and allotment of a 'fragment' is specifically prohibited. As said earlier the average area allotment does not expose the possibility

of such a fragment being created and allotted. However, the sample survey did bring out certain cases where the area allotted to a grantee was a 'fragment' when the allotted area is checked with the minimum area prescribed for the district i.e. the 'local area' for not being a fragment. Under Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947, the minimum area for a plot that would be a fragment for Aurangabad district was prescribed as given below:

Dry crop land	2 acres and 20 gunthas
Bagayat land	20 gunthas

The delimiting of the minimum area of a plot that is not a fragment had been under the relevant provisions of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. All the provisions of the said Act are not relevant to our purpose and only two provisions under Section 2(4) and 2(10) that define a fragment need to be looked into. Section 2(4) of the said Act is as given below.

'Fragment means a plot of land of less extent than the appropriate standard area determined under this Act'.

The definition of the 'fragment' is not clear and complete in the above quoted Section 2(4) of the Act and has to be derived by taking recourse to the expression 'appropriate standard area' which has been defined or explained in Section 2(10) of the said Act and is given below.

'Standard area in respect of any class of land means the area which the Government from time to time determine under Section (5) as the minimum area necessary for profitable cultivation in any particular local area, and includes a standard area revised under the said section'.

The key expression in the above quoted Section 2(10) is the 'minimum area necessary for profitable cultivation' and this expression alone has a direct bearing in deciding the 'standard area' which will not be a fragment. By applying this test, 'minimum area necessary for profitable cultivation', as prescribed for the district it is possible to decide on the creation and allotment of a fragment out of the surplus area distributed. The expression 'cultivation' has not been defined in the said Act but that should not bother us in the least. Similarly, Section 2(8) of the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961, which defines 'to cultivate' will have no application here. Section 2(13) of the Act takes precedence over Section 2(8) in this respect and the meaning given to 'to cultivate' by Section 2(8) can be made operative only when provision made by Section 2(13) of the same Act has been fully met and satisfied as per prescription and not otherwise. Whatever the definition of 'to cultivate' under Section 2(8) of the Act it has no relevance when a fragment has been created.

Coming to the sample allottees who were granted surplus area less than the area prescribed for a plot, not a fragment, in Aurangabad district it needs to be stated that almost no 'Bagayat' or irrigated land (11-12 acres irrigated or irrigable out of 1700 and odd acres of total area of the sample) was distributed, the minimum area to be allotted to a grantee should not be less than 2-20 acres of dry crop land and the grantees getting less area allotment than that are listed below.

Sr.No.of plot surrendering surplus	Surplus area acres	Area distributed acres	No.of allottees with area allotted to each (acres)	Remarks	
1)	22-10	22-10	1)	2-15	a fragment
			2)	4-15	-
			3)	4-15	-
			4)	5-22	-
			5)	5-23	-
2)	9-34	9-34	1)	2-18	a fragment
			2)	2-19	"
			3)	4-37	-
3)	27-16	27-16	1)	2-18	a fragment
			2)	4-00	-
			3)	5-00	-
			4)	5-00	-
			5)	5-00	-
			6)	5-38	-
4)	7-32	7-32	1)	2-16	a fragment
			2)	2-16	"
			3)	3-00	-
5)	14-17	14-17	1)	2-17	a fragment
			2)	3-00	-
			3)	3-00	-
			4)	3-00	-
			5)	3-00	-
			6)	3-00	-
6)	19-17	19-17	1)	2-04	a fragment
			2)	2-04	"
			3)	3-02	-
			4)	3-02	-
			5)	3-02	-
			6)	3-02	-
			7)	3-01	-

Sr.No.of plot surrendering surplus	Surplus area acres	Area distributed acres	No.of allottees with area allotted to each (acres)	Remarks
7)	14-04	14-04	1) 2-14 2) 2-14 3) 2-14 4) 2-14 5) 2-14 6) 2-14	a fragment " " " " "
8)	9-14	9-14	1) 2-13 2) 2-13 3) 2-14 4) 2-14	a fragment " " "
9)	2-14	2-14	1) 2-14	"
10)	2-04	2-04	1) 2-04	"
11)	2-00	2-00	1) 2-00	"
12)	2-19	2-19	1) 2-19	"
13)	2-13	2-13	1) 2-13	"
14)	2-08	2-08	1) 2-08	"
15)	2-10 } 0-21 }	2-10 } 0-21 }	1) 2-10 } 0-21 }	from two different survey nos. each piece a fragment

From the above list it will be seen that 26 fragments have been freshly created while distributing surplus land from 15 or 16 survey Nos. Total land distributed out of these survey nos. was 140-33 acres to 46 allottees, the distribution of the allottees being 20 allottees getting a plot each, not a fragment, with the total area of 79-39 acres and 26 allottees getting fragments with a total area of 60-34 acres. All the fragments need to be grouped since these do not fall within a single set and these can be put into four different groups as below.

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| a) Area that could be distributed without creating a fragment | Serial Nos.
1 to 6 |
| b) Area that could have avoided creation of a fragment by distributing it less number of allottees | Serial Nos.
7 and 8 |
| c) Fragment was the surplus surrendered and allotted as it was | Serial Nos.
9 to 14 |
| d) Total area allotted not a fragment but from two independent survey nos. each allotted area being a fragment | Serial No.
15 |

The four groupings need to be looked into separately and in the light of Section 27(7) and the 'Instructions for Lands Distribution Tribunal and other Revenue Officials' issued as accompaniment to Government circular, Revenue and Forest Department, No. ICH 1376/5993-47, dated 29th January 1976. Page 5, Para 9 of the above quoted circular has following to state under 'Quantum of land to be allotted to each allottee'.

'Section 27(7) lays down that Surplus Land Distribution Tribunals should ensure that as far as possible total land held by the allottee after granting of surplus land does not exceed,

- i) one hectare of land falling in class (a),
- ii) one and a half hectares of land falling in class (b)
- iii) two hectares of land falling in class (c) or (d), and
- iv) three hectares of land falling in class (e) i.e. dry crop land.

'The limits given above are thus upper limits and it is open to Surplus Land Distribution Tribunal to grant less land than the above limits whenever it is found feasible to do so. At the same time, it is not desirable to allot extremely small holdings. Even where there is a large demand, the effort should be to see that a landless allottee gets approximately two hectares of class (e) or equivalent land of other classes'.

The important expression in the above quoted extract is 'to grant less land than the above limits whenever it is feasible to do so'. This part of the statement, however, cannot be and should not be construed to mean that under its cover even a fragment can be granted so as to make it feasible to distribute land to more persons. Whether the above quoted statement was construed in the manner it should not be is not known. If it had been construed to mean that even a fragment can be granted so long as more persons can be granted land; then Section 2(13) of the Act will have little relevance. That Section 2(13) had the specific purpose of avoiding creation of a fragment cannot be questioned and how, therefore, the fragments were allotted is difficult to explain nor ^{was} ~~was~~ any explanation available whenever sought.

Considering the group (a) it will be seen that the same number of allottees could have been allotted land

without creating a fragment in each of the survey nos. under serial nos. 1 to 6 and such an allotment would have been more equitable. For whatever reasons this aspect of distribution was lost sight of and nine fragments with a total allotted area of 21-7 acres was created out of six survey nos. under group (a).

So far as surplus from two survey nos. under group (b) is concerned, all the allottees, ten with total allotted area of 23-18 acres, were granted a fragment. This was avoidable by reducing the number of allottees by one under each survey number. A large number of aspirants cannot be a sufficient reason for creating a fragment in violation of the provisions of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947.

Fragments under group (c) need to be looked into with reference to Section (15) of the Act. The provisions of Section (15) clearly point towards avoidance of creation of a fragment. After the landholder has selected, under Section 16 of the Act, the lands to be retained within the ceiling the balance of area shall go to be included under surplus. Circumstances contemplated in (a), (b) and (c) of Section 15(1) are likely to arise and in order to complete the ceiling area or the surplus area deductions from lands included in either of the two categories will be required to be made. The provisions become meaningful because such deduction from particular area creates an independent fragment and such creation of a fragment has to be avoided, and therefore the fragment is allowed to lie where it lies. This could increase the ceiling area or the surplus. Increasing the surplus has no legal objection but the increase in ceiling can be challenged under Sections 3 and 4(1). With a view to save

the ceiling area holder from consequences of holding more than the ceiling area provision in Section 15(2) is made to legalise the increase in his ceiling area by that extent. It will be clear from the above that the increase or decrease in the ceiling area will on most occasions be less than the minimum area prescribed for a plot for the given local area or the district.

Considering surplus area out of the survey nos. in group (c) it is clear that in every case it is a fragment and under provisions of Section 15 there are no possibilities of creating an independent fragment and this has still occurred. It is therefore suspected that these might have been the pre-existing independent fragments and for want of any specific provision in the Act for acquiring such fragments as surplus the authorities concerned allowed the landholders to surrender these to the Government as surplus. The Record of Rights, under relevant provisions of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947, was expected to keep a separate record of such independent fragments but this aspect could not be ascertained for want of securing the necessary records.

The lone case under group (d) as such is not a fragment the total area being 2-31 acres that is more than that prescribed for a plot in the district. The only point in this case is that this occurs as a result of allottee getting 2-10 acres and 0-21 acres of dry land from two different survey nos. Since the two fragments had a common boundary the allottee has a plot but how the two fragments arose despite Section 15 of the Act cannot be explained. This also could be like the earlier suspected cases of pre-existing independent fragments.

Chapter III

Sample Grantee Families

Previous Chapters I and II dealt with the surplus area surrendered and distributed and the distribution of surplus land under provisions of the Revised Act. No where were the sample grantees in the picture except for an occasional reference, as in Chapter II, where inevitable. The above given Chapters I and II were deemed necessary, for reasons explained therein, before taking ^{up} of the sample grantees and subsequent utilisation etc. of the lands allotted. It is now proposed to deal with the sample survey data and to begin with grantee families, derivation of sample and other matters such as land distributed to these grantees, livestock and agricultural implements, family members and occupational distribution of earners etc., will be looked into in this chapter.

3.1 Sample of Grantees

The sample survey, as in Yavatmal district, was to have covered surplus land grantees under both the 'Principal Act' and the 'Revised Act'. The distinction between the two sets of grantees as explained earlier was to be based on the eligibility to receive the benefits of the 'Central Assistance Scheme' to new allottees under the Twenty Point Programme. Thus, in view of the assistance contemplated all the grantees after 1st January 1975, irrespective of the surplus allotment being under either of the Acts, were included under 'Revised Act' as new grantees. All the other grantees getting surplus allotment previous to 1st January 1975 that is ending 31st December 1974 were to be included under the 'Principal Act'. This is in so far as the division of grantees in two sets for

the purpose of the survey. As it is, the present report refers only to grantees under the 'Revised Act' and not to grantees under the 'Principal Act' and the reasons for not presenting any data on these grantees will be explained in due course. The survey did collect some data about such allottees but the coverage was not considered adequate to be representative.

The survey of the surplus grantees was to start by December 1978 or early January 1979 and on that basis the sample should normally be derived from the distribution ending November 1978 or nearabout that period. The detailed figures of distribution available by the start of the field-work were ending July 1978. Further details regarding villagewise distribution had to be called for from the tahasil offices and this delayed the start by a fortnight or so. Considering that the detailed distribution made available for the period ending July 1978 and that ending March 1979 it will be seen that nothing was lost by using the early figures of distribution. The distribution for the two period being as given below.

<u>Period</u>	<u>Grantees</u>	<u>Area distributed (Ha.)</u>
Ending July 1978	3815	6965.77
Ending March 1979	3848	7022.69

The addition to allottees and the area distributed within the eighteen months July 1978 and March 1979 was quite meagre and it will be quite in order to assume that the major portion of the surplus had been distributed by end of July 1978 and these distribution figures were a good basis for drawing the sample for grantees under the 'Revised Act'.

The sample size was decided at 10 per cent of the grantees ending July 1978 with a proviso that any further grantees subsequent to July 1978 in the selected villages be covered during the survey. Ten per cent coverage of the distribution was with respect to each of the tahasils of the district excepting Khultabad tahasil where only 35 grantees were allotted land and it was therefore decided to drop it from coverage. For the purpose of drawing the sample all the villages with surplus distribution under the 'Revised Act' were arranged in an ascending order of number of allottees in the villages. Such ordered villages were then divided into 3 or 4 groups, depending upon the distribution, as upto 5 allottees, 6 to 10 allottees, 11 to 15 allottees and 16 and more allottees. The coverage again was to be 10 per cent of the allottees in each of the groups. By dividing the total number of allottees by the number of villages in the group average allottees in a village was decided and number of villages to be selected was decided by dividing the expected sample by this average allottees per village. Thus, the villages were randomly selected. The procedure adopted had the advantage of covering a village with one or two allottees who may be neglected by the operative agencies, specially so if such villages were remotely situated from the headquarters. The procedure adopted at times increased or decreased the total sample in a tahasil but such decrease was generally very marginal. In some of the tahasils it was inevitable that villages with more allottees and larger area distribution got selected and this has resulted into the sample coverage being only slightly more than 10 per cent of total distribution in the districts. However this was despite non-coverage of any allottees in two tahasils

Khultabad and Aurangabad. Khultabad tahasil was to be left out of the sample as decided earlier. Aurangabad tahasil had to be left uncovered at the last juncture in June-July 1979 because of the Cholera epidemic in the tahasil. Considering the coverage of allottees in the remaining ten tahasils it was hoped that already covered sample allottees will be sufficiently representative of the total distribution in the district and non-coverage of allottees in Aurangabad tahasil will in no manner affect the results adversely. Accordingly the data will be presented from 53 villages in tahasils the number of villages in a tahasil or group of tahasils is given below.

<u>Tahasils</u>	<u>Villages</u>
1) Ambad	13
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	18
3) Silled) Soegaon)	8
4) Paithan	6
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	8
Total for 10 tahasils	53

As said earlier surplus land allottees under the 'Principal Act' onwards of 1st January 1975 were to be included in the sample under the 'Revised Act' for reasons explained earlier. Since details were not available it was decided to cover any allottees receiving land after 1st January 1975 under the 'Principal Act' in the selected villages. During the survey only two such allottees were covered in one tahasil.

The above refers to surplus land distribution under the Revised Act only. Drawing a sample in respect of

grantees under the Principal Act was faced with the same difficulties as in Yavatmal district. Detailed information as was made available for grantees under the Revised Act was not forthcoming and it was impossible to draw a sample with whatever little was available. Distribution proceedings had changed hands from one authority to another and records were spread all over the district and thus it was impossible to collect the necessary information. Failing to get any detailed distribution it was decided that all the grantees under the 'Principal Act' be covered in the selected villages for the Revised Act. Such a procedure was inevitable for want of any detailed information and while any coverage with the method adopted would not strictly fit into the concept of a sample it was hoped that if we can get coverage say around 10 per cent of the total distribution out of the selected villages this could serve our purpose in some manner or other. Considering the number of villages to be covered for the Revised Act sample it was also decided that as far as possible no fresh additions will be made to the list of villages, unless the additions are likely to be the adjacent villages to the already selected ones, for getting additional coverage of grantees under the Principal Act. The actual coverage of allottees under the Principal Act from the selected villages is given below.

<u>Tahasil</u>	<u>'Principal Act' allottees previous to December 1974</u>
1) Jalna	12
2) Bhokardan	8
3) Jafraabad	10
4) Silled	10
5) Soegaon	4
6) Vaijapur	16
7) Gangapur	6
Total	66

It will be seen that out of the ten tahasils in which the survey was conducted only seven tahasils reported any Principal Act allottees in the selected villages and this was quite short of the expected 10 per cent sample of total distribution under the Principal Act given below.

<u>Period</u>	<u>Allottees</u>	<u>Area allotted (hectares)</u>
Ending October 1976	1301	2655.00
Ending March 1979	1337	2768.31

The coverage was considered quite inadequate apart from that this was not even a properly drawn sample and in the end it was decided not to present the data and results in the report as this cannot be considered representative for the district or even the tahasils from which such coverage had been possible.

Table 3.1 sets out the tahasilwise distribution of allottees (only 10 tahasils out of 12 of the district where the survey was conducted) and total area distributed ending July 1978, the basis for drawing the sample under the Revised Act. Similarly, Table 3.2 gives the distribution of the sample allottees. Instead of giving all the tahasils separately it was found convenient to pool the tahasils where the sample was comparatively small. The pooling has been on the basis of geographical continuity and belonging to the same administrative division of the district. The sample allottees were little more than 11 per cent of the total allottees in the ten tahasils given in Table 3.1 and only slightly more than 10 per cent of total allottees in the district. The increase was inevitable in view of the procedure adopted for selection of villages. Some cases of non-distribution were reported

Table 3.1 : Distribution of allottees in the tahasils under coverage of the survey under the 'Revised Act' in Aurangabad District

Tahasil	(Area in Hectares)							Total	Total area distributed
	Scheduled Castes	Scheduled Tribes	Vimukta Jati	Nomadic Tribes	Nav-Buddha	Defence services and ex-servicemen	Others		
1. Ambad	697	48	39	65	-	23	252	1124	1996.26
2. Jalna	210	11	9	27	13	61	123	454	834.40
3. Bhokardan	175	23	8	3	-	46	151	406	757.06
4. Jafrabad	52	5	-	-	2	36	39	134	266.34
5. Silled	63	-	2	2	29	14	22	132	276.02
6. Soegaon	49	4	12	-	-	-	63	128	209.60
7. Paithan	217	53	-	10	-	-	114	394	769.81
8. Vaijapur	127	36	5	1	32	34	46	281	475.61
9. Gangapur	173	37	-	23	-	10	41	284	573.84
10. Kannad	49	15	1	1	3	19	47	135	224.10
Total	1812	232	76	132	79	243	898	3472	6383.04

Table 3.2 : Distribution of sample allottees under the 'Revised Act' in Aurangabad District

Tahasil	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Vimukta Jati		Nomadic Tribes		Nav-Buddha		Other Backward		Other		Total	
	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area	Gran-tees	Area
1. Ambad	40	173-39	8	39-08	1	4-15	2	8-32	44	185-36	13	59-00	24	116-39	132	588-09
2. Jalna Bhekardan Jafrabad	28	125-02	4	21-29	-	-	-	-	22	111-25	17	75-14	27	126-33	98	460-23
3. Silled Soegaon	4	18-32	6	25-10	-	-	2	9-20	8	35-32	9	38-19	19	93-32	48	221-25
4. Paithan	14	53-19	6	17-20	-	-	-	-	8	32-25	9	32-31	3	8-31	40	145-06
5. Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	18	73-39	8	35-02	2	17-16	-	-	15	71-32	13	50-34	14	63-35	70	312-38
Total	104	445-11	32	138-29	3	21-31	4	18-12	97	437-30	61	256-18	87	410-10	388	1728-21

in the selected villages and these were essentially because the former landholders having gone into appeal and the matter was under revision before the concerned authorities and hence the distribution in these cases could not be proceeded with.

The Revised Act under Section 27(4) of the Act had laid special stress on distribution of surplus land to scheduled castes, scheduled tribes etc. backward classes by reserving 50 per cent of the surplus declared for landless persons from these classes. The reserved and unreserved area out of the surplus available for distribution were not available and will have to be looked into on the basis of the sample distribution of these class of allottees.

The distribution of the sample grantees was sufficiently well distributed and is fairly representative and quite comparable with the total distribution ending July 1978. Table 3.2 clearly shows that backward class grantees were the major beneficiaries under the sample distribution and this was quite in order and comparable with the distribution ending July 1978. For ready reference relevant data is given below in a summary form.

	Backward Classes		Total Distribution	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Ending July 1978	2526	4531.85 Ha.	3815	6965.77 Ha.
Sample	301	1318.11 acres	388	1728.21 acres

Backward classes under distribution ending July 1978 represented 66 per cent of allottees and received nearabout the same proportion of area distributed. Similarly, backward class allottees in the sample were 77 per cent and had

almost the same share of the total area of the sample allottees. Individual backward classes may not be represented in the sample in the same proportion as in the total distribution but this could be in order since caste and class did not form the basis of the sample. Backward classes had quite a fair share in the distribution and in fact more than what was reserved for them under Section 27(4) of the Revised Act. Some of the backward class allottees therefore must have received land out of the unreserved portion of the surplus and this is alright in so far as they meet the priorities as decided by Section 27. There is nothing in the Act that prohibits backward classes from getting surplus land grants from the unreserved area. Fifty per cent reservation out of surplus provided for by Section 27(4) was to ensure minimum distribution and nothing more need be seen into it. Since there were no complaints on these grounds the distribution can be accepted as quite fair and without prejudice to anyone.

3.2 Surplus Allotment to Grantees

Section 27(7) of the Revised Act stipulated that the upper limit to granting land would be 3 hectares or 7 1/2 acres of dry crop land falling under sub-clause (e) of Clause 5 of Section 2. This upper limit was to be observed after taking into consideration any land holding of the applicant at the time of allotment. However, when actual distribution was to be undertaken the Government of Maharashtra by its Circular No. ICH 1376/5993-L7 (Revenue and Forest Department) dated 29th January 1976 made it clear that the limits given for distribution of surplus to grantees in respect of lands under sub-clauses (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of Clause 5 of Section 2 were thus the upper limits and it is open to surplus Land Distribution

Tribunals to grant land less than the above limits whenever it is found feasible to do so. The circular further expressed the hope that allottees should get around 2 hectares or 5 acres of class (e) land. This was also the expectation of the State Government as seen from its 'Revenue and Forest Department' Resolution No. 1375/57403-L7 dated 7th April 1976.

The Government in the guidelines issued to officials suggested that the proceedings regarding selection of allottees under Section 27 etc. could be taken up by the SLDT immediately on receipt of the statement giving details of the land declared surplus under Section 21 of the Act. The Government further wished that the distribution programme be completed by 30th June 1976. Major part of the surplus land seems to have been distributed during the above stipulated period and the yearwise allotment of the sample grantees is given below.

Tahasil	1976		1977		1978	
	Grantees	Area acres	Grantees	Area acres	Grantees	Area acres
1) Ambad	118	548-25	13	35-12	1	4-12
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafraabad)	94	443-34	-	-	4	16-29
3) Silled) Soegaon)	46	212-25	-	-	2	9-00
4) Paithan	29	111-37	11	33-09	-	-
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	56	269-12	-	-	14	43-26
Total Sample	343	1586-13	24	68-21	21	73-27

Table 3.3 gives the distribution of grantees, in all the tahasils taken together, by size of area allotted and land revenue per acre. It will be seen from the table that grantees who will approximately get around 2 hectares or 5 acres of surplus allotted would belong to 4-01 to 5-00 acres group. It will be seen from the table that one hundred and thirty four grantees received 611-03 acres of surplus land with an average allotment per grantee of 4 ^{1.84} acres and 23 gunthas. All the grantees in the other two groups 5-01 to 7-20 acres and 7-21 and more acres also will get not less than 2 hectares of 5 acres of surplus land distributed. Considering the total distribution by size of area allotted it is clear that 60 per cent of the allottees, i.e. between 4-01 to 5-00 acres and 7-21 acres and more, have claimed ~~60 per cent of the allottees with~~ 70 per cent of the area distributed. The average holding of these allottees will be 5 acres and 9 gunthas. On the other hand allottees getting upto 4-00 acres account for 40 per cent of total allottees and only 30 per cent of the area distributed. The average size of area allotted to these allottees was 3 acres and 11 gunthas i.e. far less than the 5 acres that the Government expected to grant each allottee. The allotment is somewhat inequitable and whether this could have been avoided is difficult to say. The exigencies of the situation cannot be visualised at the moment but as suggested in Chapter II there might be something that had gone wrong in interpreting the Accompaniment to Government Circular, Revenue and Forest Department, No. ICH 1376/5993-L7, dated 29th January 1976, particularly second half of para 9 on page 5.

It was contended in Chapter I ^{that} the major proportion of surplus land distributed was quite likely to be from the

Table 3.3 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre for the total sample in Aurangabad District

Size of holding Land Revenue per acre in Rs.	Upto 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Upto 0.20	-	-	2	7-32	4	16-20	3	18-09	-	-	9	42-21
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	4	15-00	16	73-19	14	83-29	1	7-22	35	150-30
0.31 to 0.40	3	8-00	4	15-02	19	93-24	9	54-16	1	7-22	36	178-24
0.41 to 0.50	3	7-38	9	32-09	5	23-32	5	33-01	-	-	22	97-00
0.51 to 0.60	4	9-12	10	37-36	7	32-19	12	70-35	1	7-33	34	158-15
0.61 to 0.70	2	5-08	3	11-00	6	25-02	5	34-26	-	-	16	75-36
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	7	23-26	-	-	12	72-33	2	17-16	21	115-35
0.81 to 0.90	7	16-19	9	31-39	18	80-19	11	58-38	-	-	45	187-35
0.91 to 1.00	16	43-34	3	10-37	16	70-36	7	40-20	1	8-00	43	174-07
1.01 to 1.25	10	27-33	11	42-26	24	108-34	6	34-33	1	7-31	52	221-37
1.26 to 1.50	10	27-14	24	86-06	6	27-05	4	25-06	-	-	44	165-31
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	4	14-04	2	7-18	-	-	-	-	6	23-22
1.76 to 2.00	1	3-00	6	22-34	9	41-09	3	15-27	-	-	19	82-30
2.01 to 2.50	3	7-32	-	-	2	8-06	1	7-20	-	-	6	23-18
Total	59	150-30	96	354-11	134	611-03	92	550-13	7	56-04	388	1728-21

previously cultivated area and within that the larger proportion was likely to be from the two average per acre land revenue group, Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25. The choice of the average land revenue per acre as an explanatory variable has been explained earlier in Chapter I and need not be gone into again. As earlier in Chapter I it will suffice to look into the allotment in four average per acre land revenue groups and accordingly the distribution is given below for ready reference.

Land revenue per acre in Rs.	No. of allottees	Area granted in acres
Upto 0.40	80	401-35
0.41 to 0.80	93	447-06
0.81 to 1.25	140	583-39
1.26 to 2.50	75	295-21
Total	388	1728-21

Out of the total distribution lands with intermediate land revenue, Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25, accounted for almost 60 per cent of the total and these were allotted to 60 per cent of the total allottees. To the extent average land revenue per acre can be considered to indicate soil fertility it can be seen that around 51 per cent of the distributed area of the sample was from comparatively better soil fertility i.e. average land revenue per acre beyond Rs.0.81 and more, and around 55 per cent of the allottees received it. This was more or less expected after looking through the survey nos. surrendering surplus over ceiling.

Tables 3.4 to 3.8 give the distribution of grantees in the five groups as given earlier. This grouping of

Table 3.4 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre in Ambad Tahasil

Size of holding Land Revenue per acre in Rs.	Upto 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Upto 0.20	-	-	2	7-32	3	12-04	-	-	-	-	5	19-36
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	-	-	6	27-17	4	23-24	-	-	10	51-01
0.31 to 0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	25-01	-	-	4	25-01
0.41 to 0.50	-	-	2	8-00	1	4-25	-	-	-	-	3	12-25
0.51 to 0.60	-	-	10	37-36	-	-	9	52-38	-	-	19	90-34
0.61 to 0.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	29-10	-	-	4	29-10
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	3	11-05	-	-	4	24-30	-	-	7	35-35
0.81 to 0.90	7	16-19	6	20-36	16	71-36	8	42-38	-	-	37	152-09
0.91 to 1.00	4	9-06	-	-	11	49-05	4	22-29	-	-	19	81-00
1.01 to 1.25	2	4-27	1	4-00	4	18-31	3	18-01	-	-	10	45-19
1.26 to 1.50	4	9-15	5	16-21	2	9-09	-	-	-	-	11	35-05
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.76 to 2.00	1	3-00	2	6-34	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	9-34
2.01 to 2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	18	42-27	31	113-04	43	193-07	40	239-11	-	-	132	588-09

Table 3.5 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre in Jalna, Bhakardan and Jafrabad Tahasils

Size of holding Land Revenue per acre in Rs.	Upto 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	2	8-00	9	41-33	5	28-36	-	-	16	78-29
0.31 to 0.40	-	-	3	12-00	18	88-38	5	29-15	-	-	26	130-13
0.41 to 0.50	1	2-18	2	7-11	4	19-07	3	18-38	-	-	10	47-34
0.51 to 0.60	2	5-04	-	-	7	32-19	2	11-03	1	7-33	12	56-19
0.61 to 0.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5-16	-	-	1	5-16
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	13-21	-	-	2	13-21
0.81 to 0.90	-	-	-	-	1	4-06	1	5-00	-	-	2	9-06
0.91 to 1.00	4	12-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	12-00
1.01 to 1.25	2	6-00	3	11-38	7	30-00	2	11-21	-	-	14	59-19
1.26 to 1.50	-	-	5	20-00	3	13-19	1	7-07	-	-	9	40-26
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	2	7-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7-00
1.76 to 2.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.01 to 2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	9	25-22	17	66-09	49	230-02	22	130-37	1	7-33	98	460-23

Table 3.6 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre in Sillod and Soergaon Tahasils

Size of holding land revenue per acre in Rs.	upto 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	2	8-30	1	4-09	2	14-03	1	7-22	6	33-34
0.31 to 0.40	1	3-00	-	-	1	4-26	-	-	1	7-22	3	15-08
0.41 to 0.50	1	3-00	2	7-33	-	-	1	7-00	-	-	4	17-33
0.51 to 0.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.61 to 0.70	-	-	3	11-00	1	4-26	-	-	-	-	4	15-26
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	2	7-20	-	-	1	7-00	-	-	3	14-20
0.81 to 0.90	-	-	2	7-16	-	-	2	11-00	-	-	4	18-16
0.91 to 1.00	6	17-20	2	7-35	3	13-20	3	17-31	1	8-00	15	64-26
1.01 to 1.25	-	-	-	-	3	14-00	-	-	-	-	3	14-00
1.26 to 1.50	-	-	4	15-20	-	-	2	12-02	-	-	6	27-22
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.76 to 2.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.01 to 2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	8	23-20	17	65-04	9	41-01	11	68.36	3	23-04	48	221-25

Table 3.7 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre in Paithan Tahasil

Size of holding	Upto 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Upto 0.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	17-06	-	-	3	17-06
0.31 to 0.40	2	5-00	1	3-02	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	8-02
0.41 to 0.50	1	2-20	3	9-05	-	-	1	7-03	-	-	5	18-28
0.51 to 0.60	2	4-08	-	-	-	-	1	6-34	-	-	3	11-02
0.61 to 0.70	2	5-08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	5-08
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	2	7-01	-	-	1	6-00	-	-	3	13-01
0.81 to 0.90	-	-	1	3-27	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3-27
0.91 to 1.00	2	5-08	1	3-02	1	4-03	-	-	-	-	4	12-13
1.01 to 1.25	1	2-29	3	11-15	-	-	1	5-11	-	-	5	19-15
1.26 to 1.50	2	5-39	9	30-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	30-24
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.76 to 2.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.01 to 2.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	12	30-32	20	87-37	1	4-03	7	42-14	-	-	40	145-06

Table 3.8 : Distribution of grantees by area granted and land revenue per acre in Valjapur, Gangapur and Kannad Tahasils

Size of holding Land revenue per acre in Rs.	Up to 3-00 acres		3-01 to 4-00 acres		4-01 to 5-00 acres		5-01 to 7-20 acres		7-21 & more acres		Total	
	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area	Grantees	Area
Up to 0.20	-	-	-	-	1	4-16	3	18-09	-	-	4	22-25
0.21 to 0.30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.31 to 0.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.41 to 0.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.51 to 0.60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.61 to 0.70	-	-	-	-	5	20-16	-	-	-	-	5	20-16
0.71 to 0.80	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	21-22	2	17-16	6	38-38
0.81 to 0.90	-	-	-	-	1	4-17	-	-	-	-	1	4-17
0.91 to 1.00	-	-	-	-	1	4-08	-	-	-	-	1	4-08
1.01 to 1.25	5	14-17	4	15-13	10	46-03	-	-	1	7-31	20	83-24
1.26 to 1.50	4	12-00	1	3-20	1	4-17	1	5-37	-	-	7	25-34
1.51 to 1.75	-	-	2	7-04	2	9-18	-	-	-	-	4	16-22
1.76 to 2.00	-	-	4	16-00	9	41-09	3	15-27	-	-	16	72-36
2.01 to 2.50	3	7-32	-	-	2	8-06	1	7-20	-	-	3	15-26
Total	12	34-09	11	41-37	32	142-30	12	68-35	3	25-07	70	312-38

tahasils will be continued through out the report and reasons and the grouping of the tahasils has been explained earlier. As was seen in Chapter I the surplus accruing from each of the land revenue group varied in various tahasils and the distribution of the lands in the sample by and large varies accordingly. Whatever slight variations occur are essentially the result of non-availability of necessary data on survey nos. from which surplus was distributed to grantees. Such survey nos. could not be looked into in Chapter I and variations are largely to be explained on that account. In a few cases the allottees were not put in possession of the lands surrendered for one reason or the other but mainly because the earlier decisions were under revision and allotment could not be proceeded with. These cases also might have contributed to some variation but need not be taken note of.

All the grantees were from the landless families and except one grantee in Ambad tahasil none had any other land either in his name or in the name of the other members of the family. The single case was of an ex-serviceman who had purchased land in February 1979 and this area need not be considered for the purpose of the survey since these purchased 6 acres of land were not under the grantees cultivation in the survey year 1978-79.

3.3 Agricultural Implements

The State Government had endowed (though at a certain price) surplus land on the grantees and to undertake necessary tillage some implements like a plough, a harrow, seed drill etc. were quite essential. In the central sector scheme embodied in the preamble of the Government Resolution, Revenue and Forest Department, No. ICH-1375/57403-L7, dated 7th April 1976, the crop assistance of

Rs.250/- per hectare (all subsidy) also includes assistance for agricultural implements, the relevant extract in the abovementioned Resolution is as given below.

"The assistance contemplated is at the rate of Rs.250/- per hectare of such assigned land for each of the first two seasons, to enable the assignees to meet this immediate requirements of seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, agricultural implements etc. This assistance is, however, not available for the purchase of bullocks".

The Commissioner of Cooperation, however, brought to the notice of the Government (Quoted in Revenue and Forest Department, Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L-7 dated 1st November 1976) that purchase of agricultural implements is not a purpose which can be covered under 'seasonal agricultural operations' for which also short term credit is dispensed by the Primary Credit Societies in the State. As a result, the Government was, therefore, pleased to direct that item 'agricultural implements' should be treated to have been deleted from the items for which financial assistance was admissible under the scheme. Effectively no assistance for acquisition of agricultural implements was available and the grantees were on their own to acquire any of such implements.

Table 3.9 gives the agricultural implements with the grantees by size of area allotted. It is clear by comparing the extent of area in possession of the grantees in each tahasil group (given in Tables 3.4 to 3.8 for all the five tahasil groups in the earlier Section 3.2) that ploughs, harrows and seed drills etc. implements were quite inadequate in numbers for the grantees to meet their own needs even if these grantees in each village had decided to mutually help each other. For want of any such implements to undertake the necessary tillage the grantees were

Table 3.9 : Agricultural implements with the grantees by size of area allotted

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	No. of gran- tees	Wooden plough Nos.	Harrow Nos.	Seed drill Nos.	Bullock carts Nos.	Other imple- ments Nos.	Cash expenditure on agri- cultural implements	
								Number of grantees	Amount (Rs.)
1) Ambadga	Upto 3-00	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	31	5	5	3	-	2	8	340.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	1	3	1	-	1	3	82.00
	5-01 to 7-20	40	4	6	4	-	-	6	285.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	132	11	15	8	-	3	17	707.00
2) Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	Upto 3-00	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	1	4	3	2	3	2	30.00
	4-01 to 5-00	49	6	16	12	2	13	11	1,385.00
	5-01 to 7-20	22	-	6	4	3*	2	3	575.00
	7-21 and more	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	98	7	26	19	7	18	16	1,990.00
3) Bilload Boegaon	Upto 3-00	8	1	1	1	-	-	1	275.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	9	2	2	2	-	-	1	250.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	48	3	3	3	-	-	2	525.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	1	1	1	-	-	2	100.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	1	-	-	-	1	17.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	1	2	1	-	-	3	117.00
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	32	2	2	2	-	-	4	150.00
	5-01 to 7-20	12	2*	1	1	1	1	3	100.00
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	70	4	3	3	1	1	7	250.00

* Jointly owned by 5 families

* Of this 1 iron plough jointly owned by 3 families

almost wholly dependent on the other cultivators for use of such implements and such implements were, obviously, made available to grantees during spare time and non-use of these by owners of the implements. This, as almost all the respondents reported and rightly so, naturally affected the timely tillage of the land under cultivation. None of the grantees borrowed from the cooperative societies for purchase of implements and thus with no assistance from the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' or the State Government, the grantees were wholly on their own to acquire whatever implements they could. Referring to Table 3.9 it is clear that almost no grantees bothered to acquire agricultural implements and the total expenditure involved was Rs.1990 the highest in Jalna, Bhokardan and Jafraabad tahasils. The cash expenditure in all these cases was towards labour charges to various artisans. In one case an iron plough was purchased jointly by three families, all the three allottees, and that too an old and used one for years by the local cultivator.

All the grantees were landless persons and none had any implements previous to allotment of land. The bullock cart owning families were carters and none of these had acquired it after allotment. Five families in Jalna owned three bullock carts jointly and each had his own bullock to operate it jointly with other.

3.4 Livestock

As had been (oft) said earlier all the grantees were landless persons and normally would not be expected to possess any livestock for want of any assured fodder supply. However a few of the grantees did have some livestock previously, i.e. before allotment of land, mainly cows and sheep and goat. Few did report having a bullock or two and as explained in respect of bullock cart owners

under agricultural implements some of these were carters and some used bullocks as pack animals. Only two cases of farmer land owners with bullock holdings were reported. These two allottees had lost their lands under submergence of the 'Jayakawadi' dam and had shifted to these villages where they received the surplus land allotments.

It was pointed out in 3.3 earlier that the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' did not contemplate any advance of loan and the subsequent subsidy for purchase of bullocks by the grantees. Thus, so far as acquisition of livestock, particularly draught cattle for tillage, was concerned the grantees had to depend on normal taccavi loans from the State Government for such purchases or depend on their own.

The area granted to individual grantees was so small, in quite a few cases a plot not a fragment but in some cases as pointed out in Chapter II even a fragment as per the prescription for Anrangabad district under the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947, that however one may wish it was impossible to maintain a bullock leave aside a pair of bullocks for necessary tillage. The capacity of a bullock, as noted by the Maharashtra Government Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH 1375/57403-17 dated 7th April 1976 was to tend to approximately 6 hectares or about 15 acres of dry crop land. Considering the extent of area granted to the allottees and the class of land (the classes being a, b, c, d and e as given under Section 2(5) of the Revised Act) that was distributed to grantees it is well nigh impossible for them to maintain even a bullock for their own tillages the State Government, therefore, suggested that the groups of grantees should be encouraged to obtain

jointly the medium term loan from the cooperatives for the purchase of bullocks and for this purpose such grantees should be allowed to jointly offer the security of land granted to them. This suggestion of the Government does not seem to have been picked up by either of the parties, the grantees and the cooperatives, nor was it further pursued by the Government for whatever reasons and from what was made known by cooperatives the matter to the best of their knowledge did not move beyond the Resolution quoted above. In none of the sample villages any such move had occurred nor was acquisition of livestock by the grantees aided by the cooperatives.

The grantees were, therefore, wholly on their own to arrange for the necessary finance from whatever sources and purchase the bullocks if they deemed it fit to do so. Table 3.10 gives the livestock holding of the grantee families. It is quite natural that the main interest of the grantees will be in acquiring draught cattle for tillage of the allotted lands and acquisition of other livestock would be of secondary importance. As can be seen from Table 3.10 the number of bullocks owned had been on the increase in all the tahasils. All the increase is not accounted by purchases and the additional bullocks, i.e. over and above those purchased plus previously held, and some increase is the result of young calves previously held being full grown for use as draught cattle. The total draught cattle was once again not sufficient to meet the tillage needs of the grantees since the grantees acquiring draught cattle were few. In most cases of purchase only a bullock was purchased and even this in most cases as said previously is difficult to maintain in the light of the area allotment. So despite acquisition of draught

Table 3.10 : Livestock holding of grantees by size of area allotted

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	No. of grantees	Bullocks			She-buffaloes		Cows			She-buffaloes		
			Previous to allotment	Purchased	Present Number	Previous to allotment	Present Number	Previous to allotment	Purchased	Present Number	Previous to allotment	Purchased	Present Number
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	2	8	10	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	31	-	18	18	-	-	4	-	8	1	-	1
	4-01 to 5-00	43	1	19	22	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	40	2	23	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		132	5	68	76	1	1	6	1	11	1	-	1
2) Jalna Chokardan Jafrahad	Upto 3-00	9	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	3	6	9	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	49	4	39	43	-	-	4	-	4	1	-	2
	5-01 to 7-20	22	-	12	16	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1
	7-21 and more	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		98	7	59	72	1	2	6	-	6	1	-	3
3) Niloi Deegaon	Upto 3-00	8	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	4	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	9	2	2	4	-	-	6	-	6	-	1	1
	5-01 to 7-20	11	-	6	7	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		48	2	13	16	-	-	16	-	18	-	1	1
4) Raithar	Upto 3-00	12	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	1	3	4	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	6	6	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		40	1	10	11	-	-	1	10	11	-	-	-
5) Raifapur Bangapur Bannad	Upto 3-00	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	32	10	13	21	-	-	10	3	9	1	-	1
	5-01 to 7-20	12	2	2	4	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		70	12	15	27	-	-	12	4	13	1	-	1

Table 3.10: (contd.)

Tahasil	size of holding acres	Number of grantees	Calves		Buffalo young ones		Sheep and goats			Expenditure on livestock purchased Rs.
			Previous to allotment	Present Number	Previous to allotment	Present Number	Previous to allotment	Purchased	Present Number	
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	-	1	-	-	5	17	31	4,125.00
	3-01 to 4-00	31	-	7	-	-	9	5	17	9,610.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	-	3	-	-	15	1	12	10,610.00
	5-01 to 7-20	40	-	-	-	-	43	7	20	10,930.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		132	-	11	-	-	72	30	86	35,275.00
2) Jalna) Shokardan) Jafrabad)	Upto 3-00	9	1	1	-	-	-	2	2	1,350.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	-	1	-	-	4	2	7	3,680.00
	4-01 to 5-00	49	-	3	-	3	2	11	25	22,210.00
	5-01 to 7-20	22	-	2	-	-	2	8	25	8,530.00
	7-21 and more	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		98	1	7	-	3	8	23	59	35,770.00
3) Millod) Boegaon)	Upto 3-00	8	-	1	-	-	-	4	4	1,050.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	-	1	-	-	3	-	5	700.00
	4-01 to 5-00	9	-	2	-	-	8	-	5	2,250.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	4	6	-	-	24	3	9	5,790.00
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,100.00
Total		48	4	10	-	-	35	7	23	10,890.00
4) Paitnan	Upto 3-00	12	-	1	-	-	24	3	17	3,075.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	-	4	-	-	27	6	28	10,035.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	1	-	-	2	-	2	8,500.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		40	-	6	-	-	53	9	47	21,610.00
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	12	-	-	-	-	2	-	5	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	1	-	-	2	1	5	1,340.00
	4-01 to 5-00	32	3	8	-	2	2	1	5	7,350.00
	5-01 to 7-20	12	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2,400.00
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	150.00
Total		70	3	10	-	2	6	3	16	11,240.00

cattle even these grantees were more or less dependent on other cultivators within the village for meeting their tillage needs. One with a bullock was slightly better off in this respect as exchange was possible between two owners. Another advantage derived by these purchasers of draught cattle was that they could hire out the bullocks for tillage on other allottees lands and thus reduce or meet the cost of maintenance of draught cattle. The rest of the grantees were totally dependent on the other cultivators and timely tillage was not the rule but tillage as suits the convenience of the bullock and implement owners was the rule.

Some grantees had owned cows even before the grant of land but almost none reported any increase of bullocks on account of the progeny of such holding. In all these cases the reasons for acquisition of calves were least clear. One or two had been received as a gift from relatives and these were retained by the grantees after allotment of land.

Table 3.11 gives the sources of financing the investment in livestock by the grantees. Owned funds and the crop loan were by far the most important sources of finance. Owned funds are very large considering that almost all the grantees were landless persons and more particularly labourers and under the circumstances availability of funds out of post savings seems quite difficult and only explanation seems to be that these grantees were financing such purchases through current earnings and some savings in the form of gold and other ornaments etc. if any. Disposal of cattle also was reported as another source and this only amounted to replacement of one type of livestock by another type which may be better suited in

Table 3.11 : Investment in livestock, after grant of land, by source of finance

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	Sources of finance (Rs.)								Total investment in livestock	
		Owned funds	Crop loan	Taccavi	Land Development Bank	Scheduled Bank	Private loan	Sale of produce	Sale of cattle		Other sources
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	1725-00	1500-00	-	-	-	700-00	-	-	200-00	4125-00
	3-01 to 4-00	4035-00	3275-00	900-00	-	-	1100-00	-	-	-	9610-00
	4-01 to 5-00	6575-00	415-00	700-00	-	-	800-00	-	300-00	-	10610-00
	5-01 to 7-20	2775-00	4870-00	1375-00	-	-	-	-	1220-00	900-00	10930-00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1750-00	160-00	-
Total		15110-00	10060-00	2975-00	-	-	2600-00	-	3270-00	1260-00	35275-00
2) Jalna (Shokardan Jafraabad)	Upto 3-00	1200-00	150-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1350-00
	3-01 to 4-00	1005-00	600-00	875-00	-	1200-00	-	-	-	-	3680-00
	4-01 to 5-00	1790-00	-	6530-00	-	13000-00	-	890-00	-	-	22210-00
	5-01 to 7-20	2050-00	250-00	2530-00	-	3700-00	-	-	-	-	8530-00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		6045-00	1000-00	9935-00	-	17900-00	-	890-00	-	-	35770-00
3) Lilled (Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	575-00	-	475-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1050-00
	3-01 to 4-00	700-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	700-00
	4-01 to 5-00	950-00	-	-	-	1300-00	-	-	-	-	2250-00
	5-01 to 7-20	230-00	-	660-00	-	-	2500-00	2400-00	-	-	5790-00
	7-21 and more	1100-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1100-00
Total		3555-00	-	1135-00	-	1300-00	2500-00	2400-00	-	-	10890-00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	750-00	-	175-00	-	2150-00	-	-	-	-	3075-00
	3-01 to 4-00	1510-00	-	425-00	-	8000-00	-	-	-	-	10035-00
	4-01 to 5-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	1300-00	-	2700-00	-	4500-00	-	-	-	-	8500-00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		3660-00	-	3300-00	-	14650-00	-	-	-	-	21610-00
5) Vaifapur (Gangapur kannad)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	740-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	4450-00	400-00	-	1700-00	-	600-00	-	-	-	1340-00
	5-01 to 7-20	1500-00	-	-	900-00	-	800-00	-	-	-	7350-00
	7-21 and more	150-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2400-00
Total		6840-00	400-00	-	2600-00	-	1400-00	-	-	-	11240-00

view of some assured fodder availability with granting of land. The increase in sheep and goat holding (need) not be taken at their face value for quite a few of the young ones were sold in the market and funds from sale of these might have been reported as owned funds. The cost of maintenance of sheep and goat is almost nil and the grantees could afford to keep these under earlier conditions. The advantage of sheep and goat lied mainly in easy and certain marketability of the young ones and some of the grantees managed to use the loan from the banks and taccavi loans granted for purchase of bullocks to purchase sheep and goat rather than bullocks. Bank loans were mainly reported in Jalna, Bhokardan, Jafrabad and Paithan tahasils. A few of these were for purchase of cows and in these cases the funds made available were not misused. Taccavi as a major source features only in Jalna and other tahasils in that group.

All the explanation above fails to resolve the problem of large owned funds invested in acquiring livestock and still acquisition of such livestock seems quite reasonable though none of the grantees reported disposal of ornaments etc. for the purpose and of the possible sources for such funds sale of sheep and goat seems to be somewhat plausible considering ^{their} ~~the~~ earlier vocation and economic conditions of the grantees. Poultry was not reported by any grantee family and two families had donkeys used as pack animal and another a horse for the same purpose. These have been left out of the table being of little relevance.

3.5 Family Members and Earners in the Family

Table 3.12 gives the distribution of family members of the grantees for all the five tahasil groupings. The

Table 3.12 : Members and earners in the grantee families by size of area allotted

Tanasil	size of holding acres	No. of families	Family members				Earners in the family			
			Male adults	Female adults	Male non-adults	Female non-adults	Male adults	Female adults	Male non-adults	Female non-adults
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	29	19	16	11	28	18	4	-
	3-01 to 4-00	31	39	34	27	13	39	31	2	-
	4-01 to 5-00	43	77	56	22	29	69	47	4	1
	5-01 to 7-20	40	69	53	24	16	66	49	1	2
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		132	214	162	89	69	202	145	11	3
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafraabad)	Upto 3-00	9	19	14	5	6	15	8	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	35	25	17	9	28	20	3	-
	4-01 to 5-00	49	86	73	56	36	79	63	6	4
	5-01 to 7-20	22	35	28	25	13	33	23	4	1
	7-21 and more	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	-	-
Total		98	176	141	104	68	156	115	13	5
3) Sillod) Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	8	9	10	10	9	9	8	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	27	24	21	12	25	21	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	9	20	14	11	8	17	12	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	11	16	15	11	12	15	13	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	5	5	1	1	4	5	-	-
Total		48	77	68	54	42	70	59	-	-
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	18	15	14	8	17	13	1	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	32	25	22	14	30	22	1	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	12	11	7	5	10	11	-	1
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		40	63	52	44	28	58	47	2	1
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	12	15	14	4	12	15	10	1	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	22	15	15	4	21	13	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	32	51	45	33	18	46	37	4	1
	5-01 to 7-20	12	21	16	10	6	18	12	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	7	6	-	-	6	6	-	-
Total		70	116	96	62	40	106	78	5	-

distribution of these for the total sample is as given below.

	<u>Total numbers</u>	<u>Earners</u>
Total families	388	-
Male adults	646	592
Female adults	519	444
Male non-adults	353	31
Female non-adults	247	9

The total population of the grantee families was reported at 1765 persons and of this 1098 was economically active population. Non-adults, both male and female, formed an insignificant proportion of the total working force. The proportion of working male adults and female adults was nearly 91 per cent and 85 per cent respectively and this is a sufficient indication that females participated almost on par with the males in the economic activity. The working force includes only those engaged in some productive activity other than domestic work.

The working force being from the rural area the employment opportunities, whether self employment or wage labour employment, will be largely related to agriculture particularly when any opportunities as non-agricultural wage earners are not available on any significant scale. Table 3.13 gives the occupational distribution of earners in the grantee families. In so far as cultivation of surplus allotted land is concerned all those engaged as casual wage labour, permanent farm servants, salaried services etc. were not available for family cultivation and thus the number of workers in agriculture will be as given below.

Table 3.13 : Occupational distribution of earners in the grantee families by size of area operated

Tehasil	Size of holding acres	Number of families	Male adults								
			Agricul- ture only	Wage labour only	Permanent farm servant	Salaried service	Other occupation	Agricul- ture and wage labour	agriculture and salaried	Agriculture and other occupation	
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	1	5	4	-	1	16	-	1	
	3-01 to 4-00	31	1	5	5	1	-	23	-	4	
	4-01 to 5-00	43	4	14	7	-	6	36	-	2	
	5-01 to 7-20	40	3	12	6	-	3	37	1	4	
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	132	9	36	22	1	10	112	1	11	
2) Jalna Shokardar Jafrabad	Upto 3-00	9	1	-	1	4	2	4	1	3	
	3-01 to 4-00	17	-	6	2	-	3	13	1	3	
	4-01 to 5-00	49	4	11	9	3	6	32	3	11	
	5-01 to 7-20	22	6	1	1	2	-	16	2	5	
	7-21 and more	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
	Total	98	11	18	13	10	11	65	7	22	
3) Nillos Boegaon	Upto 3-00	8	-	-	1	3	-	2	-	3	
	3-01 to 4-00	17	1	3	2	1	4	5	1	8	
	4-01 to 5-00	9	-	1	1	1	-	11	2	1	
	5-01 to 7-20	11	-	-	2	-	1	10	1	1	
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	
	Total	48	1	4	6	5	5	30	5	14	
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	1	2	1	-	-	9	1	3	
	3-01 to 4-00	20	3	-	1	-	4	10	4	8	
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	1	3	-	-	6	-	-	
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	40	4	3	5	-	4	25	5	12	
5) Vaijapur Tengapur Mannad	Upto 3-00	12	1	-	1	1	2	8	1	1	
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	4	2	-	6	7	1	1	
	4-01 to 5-00	32	3	4	3	4	3	24	1	4	
	5-01 to 7-20	12	2	5	1	4	-	6	-	-	
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	1	
	Total	70	6	13	8	9	11	49	3	7	

Table 3.13 : (contd.)

Taluk	Size of holding acres	No. of Fami- lies	Male adults				Male non-adults				Female non-adults age labour only	
			Agricul- ture only	Wage labour only	Other occupa- tion	Agricul- ture and wage labour	Agricul- ture and other occupa- tion	Wage labour only	Perma- nent farm servant	Salaried service		Other occupa- tion
1) Umbad	Upto 3-00	18	-	10	-	8	-	1	1	-	2	-
	3-01 to 4-00	31	-	21	-	9	1	2	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	43	3	24	-	20	-	1	1	-	2	1
	5-01 to 7-20	40	1	30	-	18	-	1	-	-	-	2
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	132	4	85	-	55	1	5	2	-	4	3	
2) Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	Upto 3-00	9	1	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	1	9	-	9	1	2	-	-	1	-
	4-01 to 5-00	49	9	32	1	20	1	2	2	-	2	4
	5-01 to 7-20	22	1	14	-	8	-	1	-	-	3	1
	7-21 and more	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	98	13	59	1	40	2	5	2	-	6	5	
3) Paitna Millood Boegaon	Upto 3-00	8	1	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	2	3	-	15	1	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	9	1	1	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	11	-	-	(12)	12	1	-	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	48	7	6	-	44	2	-	-	-	-	-	
4) Paitnar	Upto 3-00	1	1	2	-	10	-	-	-	-	1	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	-	2	-	20	-	1	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	4	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	40	1	8	-	38	-	1	-	-	1	1	
5) Rajapur Dargapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	-	4	-	6	-	1	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	6	-	6	1	-	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	32	-	13	1	23	-	-	1	-	3	-
	5-01 to 7-20	12	1	5	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	70	1	31	1	43	2	1	1	-	3	-	

82

	<u>Total earners</u>	<u>Working in family agriculture</u>
Male adults	592	399
Female adults	444	252
Male non-adults	31	-
Female non-adults	9	-

The number of workers in family agriculture is composed of those reported as working in agriculture only, agriculture and wage labour or any other occupation or service etc. along with agriculture. The above given data refers to the total sample in the district and shows that majority of earners were engaged in family cultivation. The same is observable in respect of the tahasils with some minor variations. In none of the tahasils non-adult males and females were engaged in family cultivation.

Chapter IV

Land Development and Land Utiligation

Under 'Surplus Land Distributed' in Chapter I it was contended that there was every reason to believe, as was seen from the data on survey nos. presented therein, that large proportion of grantees would get land out of the cultivated area surrendered as surplus. It will naturally follow from the above observation that most grantees will have some portion of the land allotted to them under cultivation before it was surrendered and distributed. Besides, the other supporting evidence was also looked into by way of Table 1.2 in Chapter I giving 'Area under different land uses by size class of operational holdings' as presented by the Agricultural Census 1970 (Maharashtra) which also pointed towards the same conclusion that a substantial proportion of land surrendered as surplus will have to come from area already under cultivation at the time of 'Commencement date' of the Revised Act. It was further observed that medium fertility soils as depicted by the average land revenue per acre (Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25) will contribute the major share of the land distributed to the sample allottees and as a result major proportion of grantees will get lands in the above-mentioned intermediate land revenue groups. Detailed distribution of grantees by size of area allotted and by land revenue per acre has been given in the previous Chapter III and it will be clear from the total sample, i.e. all the tahasils taken together, that the two average per acre land revenue groups, Rs.0.41 to 0.80 and Rs.0.81 to 1.25, account for almost 60 per cent of the total grantees

and nearabout the same proportion of the land distributed to sample grantees. The summary distribution of grantees is given below.

Land revenue per acre Rs.	Ambad tahasil	Jalna Bhokardan and Jafrabad tahasils	Silled and Soegaon tahasils	Paithan tahasil	Vaijapur and Kannad tahasils	Total
Upto 0.40	19	42	9	6	4	80
0.41-0.80	33	25	11	13	11	93
0.81-1.25	66	20	22	10	22	140
1.26-2.50	14	11	6	11	33	75
Total	132	98	48	40	70	388

There are variations between tahasils and these are necessarily the result of the survey nos. from which surplus was surrendered. The consideration to the probable composition of the surplus surrendered and distributed was important on two counts and our immediate interests were in relation to land development wherever necessary and its subsequent cultivation. The Government was aware of the probable need for land development of the allotted lands and under the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' provision was made for advancing loan for such development, fifty per cent of such loan being an outright grant to the allottee after the duly constituted authority has certified the completion of the proposed land development. The loan assistance will be looked into along with the expenditure incurred by the grantees on land development. So far as the fifty per cent grant is concerned completion certificates were not issued by the time survey was completed and none of the borrowing allottees had been

sanctioned the proposed grant and the subsequent reduction in the loan amount.

4.1 Land Development

It was contended in Chapter I that around 70 per cent of the surplus distributed will have to be from the area that had been under cultivation in the immediate past. This was arrived at after giving due consideration to land use of the survey nos. from which surplus had accrued and was subsequently distributed. It was further contended that the rest of the surplus area (30 per cent) distributed cannot be taken to be uncultivated area since no detailed breakup of this area was available from the records with the talathis, this 30 per cent or around that area being shown as fallow in the concerned records. Such fallows have a different connotation as per definitions given in the Indian Agricultural Statistics and hence cannot be considered as uncultivated. Considering all these matters pertaining to surplus distributed it is clear that the problem of bringing these distributed lands would not be very difficult though the demand on the efforts and the necessary finance to put these under cultivation would be sufficiently high, though not staggering, specially when majority of the grantees were agricultural labourers and therefore cannot be expected to have such of any resources except their own labour.

Table 4.1 gives land brought under cultivation and the reasons for uncultivated area by size of area granted to grantees. Considering the land granted to sample grantees in each of the tahasil grouping it can be seen that grantees in Jalna, Bhokardan, Jafraabad and Sillod-Soegaon report 79 per cent and a little more of the allotted having been brought under cultivation. In the other three tahasils Ambad, Paithan and Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad the

Table 4.1 : Land brought under cultivation and reasons for uncultivated area

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	No. of grantees	Area allotted	Of Col.1 area under cultivation	Of Col.1 area brought under fresh cultivation	Of Col.1 area uncultivated	Reasons for uncultivated area						Total expenditure on land development in Rs.	
							Rocky and pot-kharab	Road etc. other uncultivable	Inconvenient	Forest and trees	Resident outstation	No. reasons		Other
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	42-27	25-25	13-20	3-22	1-14	0-28	1-20	-	-	-	-	1650.00
	3-01 to 4-00	31	113-04	82-30	25-03	5-11	1-20	-	3-31	-	-	-	-	2045.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	193-07	147-05	35-19	8-23	-	0-18	2-05	-	-	3-00	3-00	2820.00
	5-01 to 7-20	40	239-11	181-14	38-30	19-07	13-24	1-22	3-00	-	-	-	1-01	1860.00
	7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		132	588-09	436-34	112-32	36-23	16-18	2-28	10-16	-	-	3-00	4-01	8375.00
2) Jalna (Phokardan) (Jafraabad)	Upto 3-00	9	25-22	26-31	3-20	1-11	0-31	0-10	-	0-10	-	-	-	420.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	66-09	44-20	12-00	9-29	6-13	-	1-11	-	-	-	2-00	1435.00
	4-01 to 5-00	49	230-02	130-13	44-00	55-29	33-29	4-10	4-34	1-20	-	1-00	11-16	4459.00
	5-01 to 7-20	22	130-37	76-12	28-01	26-24	22-13	2-20	0-31	-	-	-	1-00	2779.00
	7-21 & more	1	7-33	5-00	-	2-33	-	-	-	-	-	-	2-33	-
Total		98	460-23	276-36	87-21	96-06	63-11	7-00	6-36	0-30	-	1-00	17-09	9093.00
3) Dilod (Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	8	23-20	19-20	-	4-00	1-00	-	-	-	-	3-00	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	65-04	48-34	9-10	7-00	2-05	-	1-20	-	-	3-20	-	1135.00
	4-01 to 5-00	9	41-01	17-00	11-25	12-16	2-20	-	0-26	0-10	-	-	0-00	3502.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	68-36	32-04	21-02	15-30	3-33	-	4-20	1-00	-	-	1-20	4603.00
	7-21 & more	3	23-04	10-00	7-20	5-24	4-02	-	1-00	0-22	-	-	-	1460.00
Total		48	221-25	127-18	49-17	44-30	18-12	-	7-26	1-32	-	6-20	10-20	10700.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	30-52	25-33	3-39	1-00	-	-	-	-	-	1-00	-	725.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	67-37	45-17	0-20	2-00	0-20	-	1-20	-	-	-	-	1785.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	4-03	-	2-00	2-03	-	-	-	-	-	2-03	-	100.00
	5-01 to 7-20	7	42-14	23-14	16-14	2-26	2-06	0-20	-	-	-	-	-	1000.00
	7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total		40	145-06	114-24	22-33	7-29	2-26	0-20	1-20	-	-	3-03	-	3610.00
5) Veljapur (Sangapur) (Pannad)	Upto 3-00	17	34-09	34-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	41-37	22-22	1-20	17-35	-	2-00	0-22	-	-	-	15-13	120.00
	4-01 to 5-00	32	142-30	123-26	14-28	4-16	4-16	-	-	-	-	-	-	925.00
	5-01 to 7-20	12	68-35	27-05	14-12	25-12	5-06	1-00	0-37	-	-	-	18-09	1550.00
	7-21 & more	3	25-07	7-31	12-00	5-16	5-16	-	-	-	-	-	-	710.00
Total		70	312-38	217-13	42-26	52-39	14-38	3-00	1-19	-	-	-	33-22	3305.00

proportion of area brought under cultivation is quite high the lowest amongst the three being in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad at 83.70 per cent of the allotted areas. The reason for this variation in the tahasils is initially to be seen in the area under cultivation previous to allotment to grantees. In the tahasil grouping Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad area under cultivation, before it was distributed to grantees, was around 70 per cent of allotted area and only additional 14 per cent of allotted area was cleared and developed by the grantees for cultivation. In Ambad and Paithan area already under cultivation at the time of allotment to grantees was as high as 76-78 per cent and area freshly developed and brought under cultivation was around 16 per cent of allotted area in both the tahasil. As against these three groupings in the other two tahasil groupings Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegaon land under cultivation previous to allotment was near about 69 per cent and the proportion of area brought freshly under cultivation was 19 per cent and 22 per cent of allotted area in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegaon respectively. As a result of area under cultivation previous to allotment and freshly brought under cultivation by the allottees, uncultivated area was at its lowest around 6 per cent and a little more or a little less in Ambad and Paithan tahasils. In the remaining ^{three} ~~these~~ tahasil groupings it was about 16 per cent in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad and more than 20 per cent in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegaon. This is in so far as the total area distributed to allottees in the sample in respective tahasils or tahasil groupings. Within the tahasil variations in area brought under cultivation do exist between size groups of area allotted. Even

in these cases the proportion of total area brought under cultivation varies with the area under cultivation previous to allotment, proportionately larger the area under cultivation previous to allotment proportionately. Smaller the area brought freshly under cultivation by the grantees.

As a result of area brought under cultivation the average area cultivated fluctuates in the same size group of area allotted between tahasils. It is not necessary to look into average area available for cultivation in all the size groups and it will suffice to look into allottees getting upto 3 acres of land allotment. The more important are the average area cultivated in Ambad and Paithan tahasils where the actuals are 2 acres and 7 gunthas and 2 acres and 20 gunthas per allottee in respective tahasils. The average allotted to a grantee in Ambad was 2 acres and 3 gunthas² that as per the prescription of area for a plot (2-20 acres of dry crop land as minimum for Aurangabad district) for the district the average allotted area itself amounts to creation of a fragment which is prohibited under relevant provisions of the Bombay Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1947. This has resulted specifically because out of the 18 grantees getting upto 3 acres of area allotment 17 grantees each received less than 2-20 acres that is each of these 17 grantees was allotted a fragment. Similarly 3 grantees in Paithan were allotted a fragment and the average therein is the result of the fragments. Creation and allotment of a fragment has been looked into in 2.2 of Chapter II and need not be dwelt upon again. Another matter pertains to size group of area allotted 3-01 to 4 acres in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. Herein the average area allotted to a grantee is 3 acres and 32 gunthas and the average

area brought under cultivation is 2 acres and 15 gunthas but this has resulted from 15 acres and 13 gunthas of allotted area of four grantees being uncultivated in view of the dispute and thus despite the average cultivated area being 2-15 acres possibility of creating a ^{fragment} ~~payment~~ does not arise.

The cash expenditure incurred on land development has been given in Column 12 of Table 4.1 but this really should not be considered with the total area under cultivation since all the grantees did not go in for land development nor did all the grantees bring fresh area under cultivation over and above the area previously under cultivation. Table 4.2 gives the expenditure incurred by the grantees along with area freshly brought under cultivation. Of the total sample grantees around 31 per cent incurred any cash expenditure on bringing fresh land under cultivation, the remaining 69 per cent grantees having not brought any further area under fresh cultivation beyond what was already under cultivation at the time of allotment. Number of grantees incurring cash expenditure on land development varies between the tahasil groupings from nearabout 42 per cent in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad to as low as 15 per cent in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. However, the more important aspect is the extent of area freshly brought under cultivation out of the total area allotted to these grantees. Considering the totals in respect of area allotted and area freshly brought under cultivation in various tahasil groupings it will be seen that area freshly brought under cultivation as a proportion of total area allotted to these grantees varied between 44 per cent in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad tahasils to nearabout 70 per cent in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. In the other

Table 4.2 : Cash expenditure on land development by grantees

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	No. of reporting grantees	Area allotted	Area brought under fresh cultivation	Expenditure on land development (Rs.)					Total expenditure on land development in Rs.	
					Clearing stones etc.	Removing stumps	Land levelling and soil replenishment	Bunding	Ploughing		Other expenses
1) Ambau	Upto 3-00	9	20-34	13-20	100-00	465-00	-	-	1085-00	-	1650.00
	3-01 to 4-00	15	54-18	25-03	12-00	758-00	-	-	1275-00	-	2045.00
	4-01 to 5-00	10	45-06	35-19	-	845-00	-	-	1975-00	-	2820.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	68-21	38-30	-	415-00	-	-	1445-00	-	1860.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	45	188-39	112-32	112-00	2483-00	-	-	5780-00	-	8375.00
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	Upto 3-00	2	4-31	3-20	-	120-00	-	-	300-00	-	420.00
	3-01 to 4-00	7	27-09	12-00	-	610-00	-	-	825-00	-	1435.00
	4-01 to 5-00	21	100-21	44-00	738-00	1085-00	-	70-00	2500-00	68-00	4459.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	66-08	28-01	400-00	654-00	-	-	1725-00	-	2779.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	41	198-29	87-21	1136-00	2469-00	-	70-00	5350-00	68-00	9093.00
3) Silice) Boegaon)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	4	15-10	9-10	120-00	415-00	-	-	600-00	-	1135.00
	4-01 to 5-00	5	22-01	11-25	942-00	535-00	-	250-00	775-00	1000-00	3502.00
	5-01 to 7-20	6	35-12	21-02	1835-00	1538-00	125-00	-	1105-00	-	4603.00
	7-21 and more	2	15-22	7-20	350-00	490-00	-	-	470-00	150-00	1450.00
	Total	17	88-05	49-17	3247-00	2978-00	125-00	250-00	2950-00	1150-00	10700.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	2	5-07	3-39	-	425-00	-	-	300-00	-	725.00
	3-01 to 4-00	1	3-13	0-20	-	625-00	1100-00	-	60-00	-	1785.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	4-03	2-00	-	25-00	-	-	75-00	-	100.00
	5-01 to 7-20	4	24-00	16-14	-	-	-	-	1000-00	-	1000.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	8	36-23	22-33	-	1075-00	1100-00	-	1435-00	-	3610.00
5) Valjapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	1	3-20	1-20	-	-	-	-	120-00	-	120.00
	4-01 to 5-00	4	17-28	14-28	-	-	-	-	925-00	-	925.00
	5-01 to 7-20	4	21-17	14-18	300-00	-	-	-	1250-00	-	1550.00
	7-21 and more	2	17-16	12-00	350-00	-	-	-	360-00	-	710.00
	Total	11	60-01	42-26	650-00	-	-	-	2655-00	-	3305.00

three tahsils Ambad, Silled-Sogaon and Paithan this proportion of area freshly brought under cultivation to allotted area was around 59 per cent, 55 per cent and 62 per cent respectively.

Table 4.2 also gives the itemised expenditure incurred by the grantees. The main items of expenditure were ploughing and removing of tree stumps from the allotted lands, and this taken together accounted for 55 per cent in Silled-Sogaon to 98 per cent of total expenditure in Ambad. Ploughing was the necessary tillage for sowing the crops and in most cases it cannot really be included under land development expenditure but should, in fact, form the part of current cost of cultivation. As was seen earlier in Chapter I most of the uncultivated area allotted to grantees was in fact 'other fallow' land and this meant that such area allotted to grantees had not been cropped during the previous five years i.e. previous to allotment but had been under cultivation earlier to that period. A large scale expenditure on ploughing as developmental expenditure, therefore, does not seem likely. If this expenditure on ploughing is excluded from the total then expenditure on land development comes down substantially. All this expenditure on land development was not incurred in a single year but was spread over three years 1976-77 to 1978-79 and yearwise expenditure in the tahsils is given below.

Near about 79 per cent of the total expenditure on land development, of the total sample, was incurred in the first year of allotment 1976-77 and this is quite in order as almost 88 per cent of the grantees received allotment in 1976-77.

Tahasil	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	Total
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1) Ambad	5485	2020	870	8375
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafraabad)	8523	250	320	9093
3) Silled) Soegaon)	8120	1235	1345	10700
4) Paithan	2510	-	1100	3610
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	3185	-	120	3305
Total	27823	3505	3755	35083

Table 4.3 gives the expenditure on land development by sources of finance. The major sources were crop loan and owned funds and in that order. Owned funds as a source of investment in land development are quite difficult to explain and have been commented upon in Chapter III under 'Livestock' and there is nothing that can be said any further in the matter. The only possible source of owned funds seems to be out of sale of produce which incidentally has not been reported on a significant scale, and the wage earnings and if it be so this would mean that grantees were undertaking capital expenditure by forgoing current consumption. However, nothing in this respect can be said for want of any data on consumption and family expenditure. The possibility of meeting such expenditure out of past savings either in the form of cash or gold ornaments etc. seems to be nil nor has any grantee reported it as a source of funds for any investment whether in livestock, agricultural implements or land development. Other sources of finance including 'Taecavi' contributed the least by way of funds for land development.

Table 4.3 : Sources of finance for cash expenditure on land development

Taluk	Size of holding acres	Sources of finance for land development (Rs.)								Total expenditure on land development in Rs.	
		Owned funds	Private borrowing	Crop loan	Nationalised Bank	Maccavi	Sale of produce	Sale of goats and cattle	Sale of farm yard manure		Other sources
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	1150-00	150-00	350-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1650.00
	3-01 to 4-00	970-00	-	1075-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	2045.00
	4-01 to 5-00	325-00	300-00	2195-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	2820.00
	5-01 to 7-20	500-00	-	1150-00	-	-	-	-	-	150-00	1860.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	3005-00	450-00	4770-00	-	-	-	-	-	150-00	8375.00
2) Jalna) Dhokardan) Jafraabad)	Upto 3-00	270-00	-	150-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	420.00
	3-01 to 4-00	520-00	100-00	615-00	-	-	-	200-00	-	-	1435.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1659-00	300-00	1950-00	300-00	250-00	-	-	-	-	4459.00
	5-01 to 7-20	889-00	200-00	910-00	500-00	-	-	100-00	180-00	-	2779.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	3338-00	600-00	3625-00	800-00	250-00	-	300-00	180-00	-	5093.00
3) Sillod) Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	960-00	-	175-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1135.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1300-00	-	1475-00	-	-	162-00	215-00	-	350-00	3502.00
	5-01 to 7-20	3543-00	-	1060-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	4603.00
	7-21 and more	700-00	-	760-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1460.00
	Total	6503-00	-	3470-00	-	-	162-00	215-00	-	350-00	10700.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	425-00	-	-	-	300-00	-	-	-	-	725.00
	3-01 to 4-00	1785-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1785.00
	4-01 to 5-00	100-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.00
	5-01 to 7-20	600-00	150-00	250-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1000.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	2910-00	150-00	250-00	-	300-00	-	-	-	-	3610.00
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	-	120-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120.00
	4-01 to 5-00	225-00	-	300-00	-	-	-	400-00	-	-	925.00
	5-01 to 7-20	450-00	250-00	850-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	1550.00
	7-21 and more	310-00	-	400-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	710.00
	Total	985-00	370-00	1550-00	-	-	-	400-00	-	-	3305.00

As said earlier the Government was aware of the likely need for land development of the grantees and had accordingly provided funds under the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' for the purposes. The Government of India had under its letter No. 26012/1/76-LRD dated 20th August, 1976, accorded administrative approval to the release of financial assistance for development and cultivation of land declared surplus as a result of imposition of land ceiling at a total cost not exceeding Rs.30,60,400/- only. (Quoted in Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L-7 dated 1st November, 1976.). The State Government as given in the above quoted Resolution allotted these funds to the four administrative Divisions of the State. The same Resolution further continues on Page 4 under (b) Developmental Assistance (grant portion), that 'since the Government of India have not released any funds for granting development loan (medium term/long term) to the allottees for the present no loan need be advanced for that purpose to any allottee from the state funds. The requirement of development loan should be met by the District Central Cooperative Bank and other financing agencies under their normal schemes. If in any district/districts such development loans have been or would be sanctioned hereafter by District Central Cooperative Bank or other financing agencies, the Collectors should forward to the respective Commissioner a list giving names of allottees and amount of development assistance sanctioned and paid to each such allottee'. As a result of the above no development assistance was sanctioned by the State Government to the allottees in the year 1976-77 and this can be very well seen from Table 4.3. Subsequent to this

the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture under its two letters dated 11/17th March 1977 and 18th March 1977 referred to in the preamble (Preamble to Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH-3277/15774/L-7 dated 4th August 1977) has sanctioned total amount of Rs.24,77,701/- as short term loan under the Central Sector Scheme for financial assistance (loan) to assignees of surplus land for the purpose of development of land i.e. land shaping, land levelling etc.

In view of the above letters from the Government of India and the Government of Maharashtra Resolutions quoted above development loans to surplus allottees could be granted only after November-December 1977 that is in the year 1977-78 onwards. The financial assistance contemplated under the Central Sector Scheme was not admissible, as per Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department, Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L-7 dated 1st November, 1976, to areas covered by Special Schemes such as Small and Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency, the Drought Prone Area Programme, the Command Area Development Agency, the Integrated Area Development Scheme (Paga Yojana) etc. Of the tahasils from which the sample of allottees was covered Vaijapur and Kamad tahasils were under 'Paga Yojana' from 1976-77 onwards and Gangapur tahasil was put under the same scheme in 1977-78. In view of this grantees in these three tahasils were not eligible to receive any developmental assistance under the Central Sector Scheme.

The development loan assistance disbursed during the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 is given below.

Tahasil	1977-78		1978-79	
	Grantees	Amount Rs.	Grantees	Amount Rs.
1) Ambad	243	100000	799	740000
2) Jalna	104	44000	373	276500
3) Bhokardan	123	30000	423	348500
4) Jafrabad	-	-	119	114400
5) Silled	70	13000	93	76100
6) Soegaon	41	10000	167	75000
7) Paithan	109	30000	145	150000
Total	690	227000	2119	1780500

The above given figures refer to the allottees in these respective tahasils and not to the sample allottees. The development assistance received by allottees in the sample is given below.

Tahasil	1977-78		1978-79	
	Grantees	Amount Rs.	Grantees	Amount Rs.
1) Ambad	56	26700	-	-
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	24	6150	49	39650
3) Silled) Soegaon)	29	6800	39	16850
4) Paithan	20	5400	26	13900
Total	129	45050	114	70400

Figures of distribution of developmental assistance in Ambad for the year 1978-79 could not be collected during the survey since disbursement had not been effected

by then. In most tahasils development assistance was disbursed in February-March of the given year. As will be clear from the foregoing while most of the land development was undertaken by the surplus land grantees in the year 1976-77 no assistance facility was available. As said earlier around 79 per cent of total expenditure on land development was incurred in 1976-77 and only the balance of 21 per cent in the subsequent two years. Some of these funds were utilised for purchase of livestock and the rest can be accounted by way of family expenditure on consumption etc. This is the only way in which this could be explained.

Proper utilisation certificates of these loans were to be obtained and kept on record as per the Government Resolution. However, no such completion certificates were reported by the tahasils or the collectorate. This may be because the proposed developmental works were still in progress and not completed as yet. The Government had advised that Authorised Officer (in charge of distribution of surplus lands) should immediately after handing over possession of surplus land to allottees, prepare and submit a report to the Collector through the Tahasildars, on the following points:

i) Whether land distributed by him are situated in the area covered by any special programmes;

ii) If not any of the lands distributed needs development viz. levelling, bunding etc. and if so the approximate cost per hectare of the improvement so needed;

iii) A statement showing the names of each allottee, extent and particulars of land allotted to him.

Only the instruction under Clause (ii) above had direct relevance to land development. Availability of such data would have given the size of the problem involved so that adequate measures could be put forth. However, no such information was available at the Tahasil or the District headquarters. In the absence of any such information the assistance was sanctioned to the grantees whenever asked for and obviously without any, even a broad, idea as to whether any such assistance was necessary at all. As said earlier the development that the allottees deemed necessary to bring the allotted area under cultivation had taken place much before the assistance was sanctioned and such late disbursement could afford the allottees to misuse the loans granted for the purpose. Referring to figures of actual expenditure incurred and the loan assistance sanctioned it is clear that the amount of loan sanctioned was almost three times the expenditure incurred. Not that all the loanees had incurred expenditure on land development earlier but the number of loanee allottees having already incurred expenditure on land development was sufficiently large at 39 out of the 111 grantees from Anbad, Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad, Sillod-Saegaon and Paithan tahasils.

Another matter pertains to any further land development needs of the grantees. The grantees were asked as to what further land development was necessary to cultivate the allotted land better and what was the nature of development they wished to undertake. Most of the grantees aspired to bring their lands under well irrigation and none of these had any other development in view such as land levelling, bunding etc. These aspirations were to an extent quite natural looking to cultivators with their own irrigation facility and the data is presented below.

Tahasil	Number of grantees	Estimated cost of wells Rs.
1) Anbad	76	547000
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	37	290200
3) Silled) Soegaon)	11	65000
4) Paithan	4	13000
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	14	174000
Total	142	1089200

More than 1/3rd of the sample allottees wished to have a well for irrigation purposes. Despite this only eight of these grantees have moved in the matter. Seven of the eight had applied for the loans amounting to Rs.58950 to Land Development Bank after fulfilling the necessary requirements. By the end of the survey none had been granted any loan facility. In the eighth case the grantee had been sanctioned Rs.10000/- and has actually lifted an amount of Rs.2000/-. The work was in progress and the total expenditure incurred by the grantee was around Rs.2400/- but had not struck water so far. In the remaining cases no efforts or inquiries were made by the grantees whether any loan facility was available from any financing agency and under the circumstances having a irrigation well might be more of wishful thinking than a positive intention which would have moved them to make the necessary inquiries.

4.2 Disposal of Surplus Land Granted

Previous Chapter III has given the distribution of grantees by average per acre land revenue and the size of surplus area granted in the tahasils. All the grantees were landless persons and the members of their families also did not hold any land either as tenant or owner. Thus the disposal of land pertains only to surplus land allotted to grantees. All the grantees did not cultivate the land allotted to them and none of the grantees leased in any land for cultivation.

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 give the disposal of surplus land by the allottees for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. Data in respect of cropping pattern, cost of cultivation etc. was collected for two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 with a view that surplus land allottees were entitled to receive current cost subsidy for the first two years, i.e. 1976-77 and 1977-78, and the survey year 1978-79 would not grant any current cost subsidy to grantees. Since majority of the sample grantees had been granted land by 1977 it was felt that it will be worthwhile to compare the results of the two years, 1977-78 with subsidy and 1978-79 without subsidy, to know as to how the cultivation by the grantees was progressing after stoppage of subsidy. However, Revenue and Forest Department by its circular letter No. ICH. 3279/433/L-7 dated 4th January 1979 informed the Collectors that payment of crop assistance during the current year 1978-79 was under consideration of the State Government and accordingly the same was granted to certain set of surplus grantees by the Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department, Resolution No. ICH. 3278/18423/L-7 dated 2nd March 1979. This provision actually changed the circumstances under which it was

Table 4.4 : Disposal of allotted surplus land by grantees (1977-78)

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	Number of grantees	Area allotted	Grantees cultivating allotted land	Area cultivated	Grantees leasing out allotted land	Area leased out	Grantees leaving allotted land fallow	Area left fallow
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	42-27	17	40-12	-	-	1	2-15
	3-01 to 4-00	31	113-04	31	113-04	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	42	188-35	40	180-05	-	-	2	8-30
	5-01 to 7-20	40	239-11	40	239-11	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	131	583-37	128	572-32	-	-	3	11-05
2) Jalna Shokardan Jafrabad	Upto 3-00	9	25-22	9	25-22	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	16	52-38	16	52-38	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	46	216-24	45	212-22	-	-	1	4-02
	5-01 to 7-20	22	130-37	22	130-37	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	1	7-33	1	7-33	-	-	-	-
	Total	94	443-34	93	439-32	-	-	1	4-02
3) Silled Soegaon	Upto 3-00	8	23-20	6	17-20	1	3-00	1	3-00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	65-04	16	61-24	-	-	1	3-20
	4-01 to 5-00	7	32-01	7	32-01	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	11	68-36	11	68-36	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	23-04	3	23-04	-	-	-	-
	Total	46	212-25	43	203-05	1	3-00	2	6-20
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	30-32	12	30-32	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	67-37	20	67-37	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	4-03	1	4-03	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	42-14	7	42-14	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	145-06	40	145-06	-	-	-	-
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	10	38-17	6	23-04	-	-	4	15-13
	4-01 to 5-00	32	142-30	31	138-14	-	-	1	4-16
	5-01 to 7-20	11	62-38	8	44-29	-	-	3	18-09
	7-21 and more	3	25-07	3	25-07	-	-	-	-
	Total	56	269-12	48	231-14	-	-	8	37-38

Table 4.5 : Disposal of allotted surplus land by grantees (1978-79)

Sahasil	Size of holding acres	Number of grantees	Area allotted	Grantees cultivating allotted land	Area cultivated	Grantees leasing out land	Area leased out	Grantees leasing allotted land fallow	Area left fallow
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	42-27	18	42-27	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	31	113-04	30	109-04	-	-	1	4-00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	193-07	43	193-07	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	40	239-11	39	233-37	-	-	1	5-14
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	132	588-09	130	578-35	-	-	2	9-14	
2) Jalna Bhokardan Jafrabad	Upto 3-00	9	25-22	9	25-22	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	17	66-09	17	66-09	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	49	230-02	47	221-26	-	-	2	8-16
	5-01 to 7-20	22	130-37	22	130-37	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	1	7-33	1	7-33	-	-	-	-
Total	98	460-23	96	452-07	-	-	2	8-16	
3) Silled) Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	8	23-20	6	17-20	1	3-00	1	3-00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	65-04	16	61-24	-	-	1	3-20
	4-01 to 5-00	9	41-01	9	41-01	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	11	68-36	11	68-36	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	23-04	3	23-04	-	-	-	-
Total	48	221-25	45	212-05	1	3-00	2	6-20	
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	30-32	12	30-32	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	20	67-37	20	67-37	-	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	4-03	1	4-03	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	42-14	7	42-14	-	-	-	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	40	145-06	40	145-06	-	-	-	-	
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	34-09	12	34-09	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	41-37	7	26-24	-	-	4	15-13
	4-01 to 5-00	32	142-30	31	138-14	-	-	1	4-16
	5-01 to 7-20	12	68-35	9	50-26	-	-	3	18-09
	7-21 and more	3	25-07	3	25-07	-	-	-	-
Total	70	312-38	62	275-00	-	-	8	37-38	

decided to cover cropping, cost of cultivation etc. for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. The two year data will be presented in the expectation that despite the fresh provision for crop assistance many allottees may not be entitled to receive it and the two years can still be looked at as one with cost subsidy and the other without cost subsidy.

It will be seen from Tables 4.4 and 4.5 that 367 and 388 grantees were covered during the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 (yearwise allotment of surplus land has been given earlier in Chapter III). In both the years only fifteen grantees did not cultivate the land allotted to them either because having leased it out or leaving it fallow for some reason or other.

(a) Leasing out Allotted Land

Any leasing out of the surplus land granted to a grantee under Section 27 of the Act was prohibited without the prior sanction of the Collector under Section 29(1) sub-clause (a) of the Act. The only exception to such leasing out of land was provided for in the Act by Maharashtra 21 of 1975, 5.23(b); the exception made being in favour of serving members of the armed forces etc. The relevant provision being as given belows:

'Provided that, no such sanction shall be necessary where land is to be leased by a serving member of the armed forces or where the land is to be mortgaged as provided in sub-section (4) of Section 36 of the Code for raising a loan for effecting any improvement of such land.'

The only case reported as leasing out granted surplus land in Silled-Soegaon fell under the abovementioned proviso. The grantee was a serving member of the armed forces and was granted land in 1976. His family was resident in the village

of land allotment and the land had been leased out from the year of the grant. This was quite in order as the grantee was stationed outside the village and there was no one else in the family to look after cultivation. The only objectionable aspect was that the grantee despite leasing out the land was granted crop loan in 1977-78 and 1978-79 and also received the subsidy as per provisions. Such grant of crop loan and subsequent cost assistance subsidy was against the very purpose since cost subsidy was not to be an endowment of income on the grantee for not cultivating the allotted land but assistance granted by the Government in the initial years to overcome the expected difficulties in bringing granted land under cultivation.

(b) Surplus Granted Remaining Fallow

In all only fourteen cases of granted land remaining total fallow were reported and the area involved was barely 3.6 per cent of the total area allotted to sample grantees in 1978-79. Reasons for leaving such allotted land all fallow and the area involved is given below.

Reasons for fallow	Number of grantees	Fallow area acres
1) Under revision	4	15-13
2) Landlords obstruction	3	18-09
3) Resident outside	2	8-16
4) No resources	4	16-30
5) Other	1	3-20
Total	14	62-08

The above refers to the year 1978-79 and is not much different from the previous year 1977-78. In four cases the matter was under revision before the proper authorities

as the previous landlord has gone into appeal and despite the possession being granted the cultivation could not be undertaken. In another three cases the dispute was between the previous landholder and the grantees, the landholder obstructing their passage to reach the area allotted to the grantees from the share ~~removing~~ in his possession. In fact while allotting land due care ought to have been taken to see that the grantees had free access to lands allotted to them. No complaints either written or oral were lodged by the grantees to the authorities and the lands continue to remain fallow since 1976 the year of allotment.

Two non-residents were allotted lands on the grounds that they belonged to the village proper. Their families were resident in the village and the grantees have never cultivated these lands as both were working as permanent farm servants in another adjoining village. There were no other family members to cultivate lands and these continued to remain fallow.

In the four cases under no resources the lands were allotted to two elderly widows and these for want of any one to look after cultivation remained fallow. In other two cases the grantees cultivated lands in 1976-77 at a loss and became defaulters as a result of not having received the subsidy having borrowed from a moneylender. They were unable to undertake cultivation after that. In the remaining single case the land needed development etc. being at the foot of the hill and no loan to undertake necessary land development has been sought. The grantee concerned had made no inquiries nor had he borrowed from the Tahasil as provided by the Government under development assistance and continues to work as agricultural labour.

4.3 Land Use and Cropping Pattern

Land development and area previously under cultivation out of the surplus granted and area freshly brought under cultivation by the grantees has been looked into in 4.1 of this Chapter. The area and the grantees considered therein referred to all the grantees who had been put in possession of the surplus land irrespective of the grantees cultivating the land themselves or leasing it out or leaving it fallow and uncultivated etc. The details in this respect have been given in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. Our main interest is in the grantees cultivating the allotted land and cropping pattern etc. will be looked into in respect of self cultivating grantees only. Leasing out of allotted land and reasons for leaving the allotted land completely fallow has been looked into earlier under 4.2 (a) and (b).

Total grantees who cultivated granted land on their own account was 352 and 373 in the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. Tables 4.6 and 4.7 give the cultivated and fallow area of the grantees and cropping pattern of the cultivated land. Total allotted area and cultivated area for the total self cultivating grantees for the two years is given below.

Year	Grantees	Allotted area	(acres)	
			Cultivated area	Fallow area
1977-78	352	1592-09	1399-13	192-36
1978-79	373	1663-13	1468-31	194-22

The extent of area cultivated out of the allotted area for both the years was almost the same at 87-88 per cent of the allotted area. There were variations between

Table 4.0: Cropping Pattern of Allotted Land to Grantees (1977-78)

(area in acres)

Tanasil	Size of Holding (acres)	Culti- vating grantees	Cropped area	Fallow area	Cropping Pattern									
					Jowar	Hy.Jowar	Bajra	wheat	Pulses	Hulga	Cotton	Oil- seeds	Other crops	Double cropped
1. Ambad	Upto 3-00	17	31-14	8-38	28-34	2-00	-	2-20	-	-	-	-	-	2-00
	3-01 to 4-00	31	102-03	11-01	81-11	-	4-00	-	-	13-27	3-05	-	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	40	173-33	6-12	120-07	3-11	16-25	-	-	7-29	14-19	11-22	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	40	213-06	26-05	155-19	18-23	6-01	-	2-00	9-38	10-35	12-10	-	2-00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	128	520-16	52-16	385-31	23-34	26-26	2-20	2-00	31-14	28-19	23-32	-	4-00
2. Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	Upto 3-00	9	24-11	1-11	9-00	9-31	-	-	-	-	2-20	3-00	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	16	55-20	7-18	29-20	14-20	-	1-00	-	-	3-00	6-20	1-00	-
	4-01 to 5-00	45	168-11	44-11	58-14	37-20	3-00	-	6-00	8-16	24-22	22-32	7-27	-
	5-01 to 7-20	22	101-13	29-24	37-15	23-02	9-36	-	3-20	-	12-12	7-38	7-10	-
	7-21 and more	1	5-00	2-33	1-20	1-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	2-00	-
	Total	93	354-15	85-17	135-29	86-13	12-36	1-00	9-20	8-16	42-14	40-10	17-37	-
3. Sillod Soegaon	Upto 3-00	6	17-20	-	2-00	8-00	2-00	-	4-00	-	1-20	3-00	-	3-00
	3-01 to 4-00	16	57-04	4-20	5-30	29-10	4-21	2-00	0-20	-	3-20	9-06	4-17	2-00
	4-01 to 5-00	7	28-25	3-16	4-20	5-36	2-00	-	2-09	-	3-20	5-20	5-00	-
	5-01 to 7-20	11	53-06	15-30	17-36	15-00	4-00	-	-	5-00	5-20	6-10	1-00	1-20
	7-21 and more	3	17-20	5-24	-	2-00	3-00	5-20	1-00	-	3-00	3-00	-	-
	Total	43	173-35	29-10	30-06	60-06	15-21	7-20	7-29	5-00	17-00	26-36	10-17	6-20
4. Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	29-32	1-00	25-08	2-00	2-24	-	-	-	-	2-39	-	2-39
	3-01 to 4-00	20	65-37	2-00	57-33	5-04	1-00	1-00	-	-	-	1-00	-	-
	4-01 to 5-00	1	2-00	2-03	2-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	36-28	5-26	14-03	-	13-20	-	-	3-34	-	2-11	3-00	-
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	134-17	10-29	99-04	7-04	17-04	1-00	-	3-34	-	6-10	3-00	2-39
5. Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	6	20-22	2-22	19-22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1-00	-
	4-01 to 5-00	31	137-14	1-00	94-01	3-33	20-09	1-05	1-11	4-08	9-07	3-20	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	8	38-23	6-06	23-07	-	14-00	-	0-16	-	-	1-00	-	-
	7-21 and more	3	19-31	5-16	2-00	1-00	16-31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	48	216-10	15-04	138-30	4-33	51-00	1-05	1-27	4-08	9-07	4-20	1-00	-

Table 4.7: Cropping Pattern of Allotted Land to Grantees (1978-79)

(area in acres)

Tehsil	Size of Holding	Culti- vating grante- es	Cropped area	Fallow area	Cropping Pattern										
					Jowar	Hy.Jowar	Bajra	Wheat	Pulses	Kulga	Cotton	Oil- seeds	Other crops	Double cropped	
1. Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	38-25	4-02	28-31	-	2-15	-	1-00	2-19	6-19	-	2-00	4-19	
	3-01 to 4-00	30	102-23	6-21	69-00	-	6-00	-	4-31	3-20	20-32	-	1-20	3-00	
	4-01 to 5-00	43	184-24	8-23	105-38	2-31	9-12	-	12-20	3-34	59-09	2-00	-	11-00	
	5-01 to 7-20	39	206-26	27-11	133-05	-	-	-	16-25	16-30	61-31	2-00	2-00	24-35	
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	130	532-18	46-17	336-34	2-31	17-27	-	34-36	25-33	148-11	4-00	5-20	43-14	
2. Jalna Bhokardan Jafra	Upto 3-00	9	24-11	1-11	9-00	10-11	-	-	-	-	2-00	3-00	-	-	
	3-01 to 4-00	17	56-20	9-29	28-20	9-00	-	1-00	-	-	6-20	9-20	2-00	-	
	4-01 to 5-00	47	172-35	48-31	54-14	27-00	2-00	-	4-15	15-20	34-15	42-04	2-24	9-17	
	5-01 to 7-20	22	101-13	29-24	48-13	12-12	4-20	-	8-07	8-10	18-31	6-00	-	5-00	
	7-21 and more	1	5-00	2-33	1-20	1-20	-	-	-	-	-	-	2-00	-	
	Total	96	359-39	92-08	141-27	60-03	6-20	1-00	12-22	23-30	61-26	60-24	6-24	14-17	
3. Silled Deegaon	Upto 3-00	6	17-20	-	2-20	9-20	-	-	-	-	2-00	0-30	2-30	-	
	3-01 to 4-00	16	57-04	4-20	4-10	17-10	15-37	1-00	-	0-36	11-10	7-21	-	1-00	
	4-01 to 5-00	9	37-25	3-16	16-00	7-30	4-06	-	1-09	2-00	1-20	4-00	1-00	-	
	5-01 to 7-20	11	53-06	15-30	12-24	16-00	3-20	-	2-22	-	11-00	5-00	2-20	-	
	7-21 and more	3	17-20	5-24	-	1-00	2-00	-	-	3-20	8-00	2-00	1-00	-	
	Total	45	182-35	29-10	35-14	51-20	25-23	1-00	3-31	6-16	33-30	19-11	7-10	1-00	
4. Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	29-32	1-00	24-28	-	-	-	-	-	5-04	-	-	-	
	3-01 to 4-00	20	65-37	2-00	45-23	-	2-20	5-14	1-00	1-20	9-27	0-13	-	-	
	4-01 to 5-00	1	2-03	2-00	2-03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	5-01 to 7-20	7	36-28	5-26	26-23	-	3-11	-	-	3-00	-	-	3-34	-	
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	40	134-20	10-26	98-37	-	5-31	5-14	1-00	4-20	14-31	0-13	3-34	-	
5. Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	34-09	-	34-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	3-01 to 4-00	7	24-02	2-22	23-02	-	-	-	-	-	1-00	-	-	-	
	4-01 to 5-00	31	137-14	1-00	95-34	3-33	14-16	-	2-08	4-18	9-25	5-00	2-00	-	
	5-01 to 7-20	9	43-23	7-03	29-07	-	7-00	-	-	6-16	1-00	1-00	-	1-00	
	7-21 and more	3	19-31	5-16	2-00	1-00	6-00	-	3-31	5-00	-	-	2-00	-	
	Total	62	258-39	16-01	184-12	4-33	27-16	-	5-39	15-34	11-25	6-00	4-00	1-00	

tahasils ranging from as low as 79-80 per cent to as high as 93-94 per cent of allotted area in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad tahasils and Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils respectively. No specific reasons for such variations can be stated.

Normally the cropping in a very broad way can be assumed to be the cultivator's own appraisal of his resources and considering that all the grantees were landless persons with labour as the main source of income, the resources as such cannot be expected to exist. While crop loan facility was made available to grantees by registering them as members of the village cooperatives, their major resource was their own labour. Another matter that needs to be noted refers to the class of land surrendered as surplus. Barring two or three cases surrendering some irrigable land all the surplus distributed was dry crop land with no prospects⁴ irrigation facility in the near future and the cultivation was wholly under rainfed conditions. Under the circumstances wide variety of crops could not be expected to be grown and the cropping that could be expected to be undertaken by the grantees would be directed mainly towards meeting the families demand for consumption etc. Considering the average area cropped by size of area allotted it is very much doubtful whether all the demand for the families food requirements could be met and despite this the approach towards cropping is likely to be towards meeting whatever food needs could be met out of the available land. The cropping pattern of the district for the period 1960-61 to 1971-72 shows that the food crops accounted for 71-72 per cent to 75-76 per cent of gross cropped area in various years. This proportion is inclusive of area under such

crops as sugarcane, fruit etc. and even when this area is excluded the balance of area under cereals, millets and pulses varied between 68-69 per cent to 72-73 per cent for various years. The cropping set out in Tables 4.6 and 4.7 broadly spells out the same tendency as observable for the district. In fact, no sugarcane, fruits etc. cropping was reported and this was naturally so for want of any irrigation facility and other ancillary resources.

Turning attention to the cropping pattern in each of the tahasil grouping it can be seen that jowar and hybrid jowar accounted for the major share of the gross cropped area in both the years. The area under these two crops was much higher in 1977-78 than in 1978-79 in all the tahasils except Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad. The decrease in area under jowar and hybrid jowar having mainly been absorbed by cash crops cotton and oil seeds. Cotton was more predominant in Ambad and Paithan tahasils while the increase in area under cotton and oil seeds was more or less equally shared in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegaon tahasils. Area under cash crops had remained almost static at 6 per cent of gross cropped area in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. Bajra was an important crop in Silled-Soegaon tahasils only the area under the crop in other tahasils was quite insignificant. Hybrid jowar was quite important in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegaon tahasils in both the years though the areas under the crop had fluctuated a little in the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. Variations between size of area allotted and within the tahasil are observable but even then the cropping pattern does not materially differ from the one observed in respect of the tahasils.

Chapter V
Cost of Cultivation, Production
and Crop Assistance

The extent of area brought under cropping and uncultivated area out of the area granted to self-cultivating grantees has been looked into in the previous Chapter IV. Availability of agricultural implements and draught cattle for undertaking necessary tillage etc. was given previously in Chapter III. Other inputs such as seed, fertilisers, insecticides and pesticides etc. were so far not looked into and it is necessary to take a look into some of these and then look into cost of cultivation. Consideration of availability of crop inputs actually amounts to looking into availability of crop loan facility either through the Primary Credit Society at the village level or alternately some other institutional agency such as a scheduled bank etc. As will be seen majority of the borrowing grantees lifted crop loan from the village cooperative and only very few, particularly in Jalna tahasil, from the scheduled bank.

The survey of allottees was conducted in a short period and the collection of data on costs was largely limited to out of pocket expenses on cultivation and to that extent the cost data is not capable of giving a detailed account but can only broadly spell out the cultivation expenses and the resulting production and surplus generated. This surplus should not be taken to mean income or profit from cultivation. Certain aspects of cost of cultivation could not be collected in the short period at our disposal during the survey and the results should be taken to be broadly indicative of the course of the surplus land distribution process.

While data on crop finance could be collected for the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79, the data on cost of cultivation is limited to two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 as in the case of cropping on allotted land. The reasons for collecting data for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 has been explained under 5.2 in Chapter IV and accordingly data on cost of cultivation, production and surplus etc. would be presented for the above given two years.

5.1 Supply of Inputs

The State Government was quite aware of the need for financing these surplus grantees and had accordingly issued instructions under Government Circular No. ICH-1376/5993-17, dated 29th January 1976, directing inter-alia that each allottee of surplus land should immediately be made a member of the village society. Since the assistance admissible under the Government of India scheme may not be adequate to cater to the entire requirement of the allottees and since in any case the allottees would have to look to the primary society after the first two seasons for his credit requirement, Government has decided that the crop assistance admissible under the Government of India scheme should be administered through the cooperative agency preferably through the cooperative society and given in kind to the extent feasible. Almost all the grantees therefore were enrolled as members of the cooperatives in all the tahasils and the necessary crop finance was provided by the Aurangabad District Central Cooperative Bank Ltd. in all the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79, the details of the amount disbursed to such grantees during the two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 are given below.

	(Rs. in lakhs)	
	1976-77	1977-78
1) Aurangabad	1.35	1.14
2) Jalna	1.53	1.10
3) Sillod	2.03	1.59
4) Paithan	2.22	0.33
5) Kannad	0.83	0.05
6) Bhokardan	1.94	0.03
7) Ambad	5.13	2.15
8) Vaijapur	0.97	0.52
9) Khultabad	0.24	0.01
10) Jafrabad	0.45	0.42
11) Gangapur	1.17	0.95
12) Soegaon	0.64	0.23
District Total	18.50	8.52

The above given disbursement refers to all the eligible and borrowing grantees in the tahasils of the district. Most of the grantees had received the surplus land in 1976 and very few did receive it in the subsequent years. Considering the total grantees, i.e. 3815, who received the surplus land by March 1978 as eligible in both the years 1976-77 and 1977-78 to secure the crop loan the average crop loan disbursed per grantee for the respective two years was Rs.484 and Rs.223 only. The average amount disbursed had been less than 50 per cent in 1977-78, of the same disbursed in 1976-77. The reasons are obvious that quite a large number of grantees had not repaid the loans of the previous year and were defaulters and thence unable to borrow in the second year 1977-78. While availability of number of borrowing grantees and those with over dues would have made the

above conclusion such more clear, the sample data as will be shown subsequently points towards nothing else but the above suggested conclusion. Alternately, if the subsidy paid during the two years is considered along with the crop loan disbursed and the number of allottees who were granted cost subsidy the conclusion arrived at suggests nothing else but that the large number of grantees at the end of the first year 1976-77 did not repay the loans and had become defaulters. Subsidy granted during the two years is given below.

Year	Grantees	Subsidy adjusted (Rs. in lakhs)
1976-77	1981	8.67
1977-78	1222	4.65

In the second year 1977-78 the number of grantees who were granted subsidy had gone down by 759 compared to the first year 1976-77. This reduction in total numbers and also the reduction in subsidy granted cannot be assumed to be on account of lack of the demand for crop loan facility. Along with this reduction in number of grantees and the amount of subsidy granted to them it must be noted that the total disbursement of crop loan also was less than 50 per cent of that in 1976-77.

The amount of subsidy adjusted against loan works out at almost 47 and 54 per cent of the crop loan disbursed in the two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 respectively. However, the above given proportion of subsidy to crop loan disbursed gives a somewhat vitiated picture of the subsidy granted. In the first year 1976-77 grantees in Kannad, Vaijapur and Khultabad tahasils were not eligible to receive

the subsidy as these three tahasils were under 'Page Yojana' and as per the Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH-3275/57403-L7 dated 7th April 1976 the grantees under the special programmes like 'Page Yojana' etc. were not eligible to receive the subsidy under the Central Sector Scheme. To the above three tahasils two more, Aurangabad and Gangapur, were added under 'Page Yojana' in 1977-78 and thus surplus grantees in five tahasils were not eligible to receive the grant under the Central Sector Scheme in 1977-78. Considering the subsidy disbursed along with the crop loan disbursed in the relevant tahasils in the two years it can be seen that the subsidy works out at 52 per cent and 79 per cent of total crop loan disbursed in the respective years 1976-77 and 1977-78. It was very well understood by the surplus grantees that the subsidy was to be paid only against the crop loan lifted and it does not therefore seem likely that the grantees despite being eligible to receive the benefit of subsidy will not seek and lift the crop loan. It may therefore be surmised that the decline in the average borrowing per grantee in the second year 1977-78 does not depict the true picture of the average crop loan lifted but may on the contrary suggest that while lower average crop loan per eligible grantee may or may not be the fact and at the same moment also suggests that the reduction in the number of borrowers is quite likely to be because of the ineligibility of some of the previous years borrowers to secure a fresh crop loan in 1977-78 in view of these being defaulters.

Considering that some amount of the crop loan lifted has been used for livestock purchase and land development in the sample it will be fair to assume that the same must have happened in the other tahasils and villages. On the

score of crop loan utilisation by the grantees it may be therefore quite in order to deduce that the funds made available to grantees from the first year 1976-77 itself were adequate to undertake cultivation of lands allotted.

The earlier narration was with a view to give the general picture of the crop loan facilities made available to surplus grantees. Data on crop loan disbursement to grantees in the year 1978-79 had not been compiled by the end of the survey and hence has not been given in the above narration. Its availability would have given a still better picture of the utilisation of crop loan and defaulters etc. Table 5.1 gives the crop loan disbursement by the cooperative

Table 5.1: Crop loan disbursed to sample grantees during the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79

Tahasil	1976-77		1977-78		1978-79	
	Grantees	Amount Rs.	Grantees	Amount Rs.	Grantees	Amount Rs.
Ambad	104	52837	89	39190	51	21570
Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafraabad)	63	47571	30	15667	9	3455
Silled) Soegaon)	44	26877	39	24829	28	15160
Paithan	16	9426	15	7510	9	3886
Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	35	15837	10	2610	11	1775
Total	262	152548	183	89806	108	45846

societies to sample grantees during the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79. The number of borrowing grantees had gone down during the three year period. In the first year 1976-77 the borrowing grantees were around 67 per cent of the total

sample with an average borrowing of Rs.582 per grantee. In the subsequent two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 the borrowing grantees of the total sample were 47 per cent and 27 per cent with an average borrowing per grantee of Rs.490 and Rs.424 in the two respective years. The drop in the number of grantees eligible to borrow again had been quite substantial by 1978-79 and this has essentially resulted from non-repayment of previous years borrowings. There are variations in the tahasils both in respect of number of borrowing grantees and the average amount borrowed per grantee and the data shows the same trend as seen for the total sample. The only exception being the grantees in Sillod-Soegaon tahasils where the number of borrowing grantees in the third year 1978-79 is quite high at 58 per cent of total grantees with the average amount borrowed per grantee having come down to Rs.540 in 1978-79 from Rs.610 in 1976-77. In the other tahasils Ambad, Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad, Paithan and Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad the fall in the number of borrowing grantees was from 78 per cent, 64 per cent, 40 per cent and 50 per cent of total sample grantees in 1976-77 to 38 per cent, 9 per cent, 22 per cent and 15 per cent in 1978-79. The average amount borrowed per grantee has come down heavily particularly in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils from Rs.806 and Rs.469 in 1976-77 to Rs.383 and Rs.161 in 1978-79 in the two respective tahasil groupings. Looking to the average amount borrowed per grantee in the years 1977-78 and 1978-79 and the cropping given in the previous Chapter IV it is clear that the amount lifted was quite sufficient to meet the input requirement of the grantees and non-availability of crop loan from the cooperative societies was not because of

non-availability of funds but on account of default in repayment by the borrowing grantees.

Besides the above grantees borrowing from the co-operative societies, fifteen grantees in Jalna tahasil borrowed for current agricultural expenses from the nationalised scheduled bank in the year 1976-77 and the data is given below.

Size of area allotted in acres	No. of grantees	Amount borrowed in	Out-standing in
3-01 to 4-00	1	50	50
4-01 to 5-00	11	642	642
5-01 to 7-20	3	200	200
Total	15	892	892

None of the above fifteen grantees has repaid the borrowings or interest on it by June 1979 and were defaulters.

5.2 Cost of Cultivation and Production

Availability of crop finance both for the whole district and also for the sample grantees had been looked into in 5.1 in this chapter. As in the case of cropping pattern given in Chapter IV, cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus over cost will be looked into for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. The reasons for looking into two years cultivation cost etc. had been explained earlier in Chapter IV and nothing needs to be added to it. Tables 5.2 and 5.3 give the out of pocket expenses for two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 respectively. Crop costing was not of any importance for the purpose of the survey and the costs, therefore, refer to the cost of all the crops taken by the

Table 5.2 : Out of pocket expenses on cultivation of self cultivating grantees for the year 1977-78

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	Self cultivating grantees	Cropped area (acres)	Fallow area (acres)	Cost of tillage Rs.	Seeds and manure Rs.	Fertilizers Rs.	Wages to hired labour Rs.	Total expenditure Rs.	Value of production Rs.	Surplus over expenditure Rs.
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	17	31-14	8-38	1775.00	559.00	-	-	2334.00	7710.00	5376.00
	3-01 to 4-00	31	102-03	11-01	4145.00	1514.00	-	-	5659.00	10289.00	4630.00
	4-01 to 5-00	40	173-33	6-12	6975.00	2682.00	-	-	9657.00	18478.00	8821.00
	5-01 to 7-20	40	213-06	26-05	6025.50	1835.00	-	-	7860.50	20660.00	12799.50
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	128	520-16	52-16	18920.50	6590.00	-	-	25510.50	57137.00	31626.50
2) Jalna Shokardan Jarrabad	Upto 3-00	9	24-11	1-11	1495.00	296.00	-	-	1791.00	3735.00	1944.00
	3-01 to 4-00	16	55-20	7-18	2365.00	990.00	390.00	-	3745.00	9398.00	5653.00
	4-01 to 5-00	45	158-11	44-11	6717.30	2645.50	630.00	-	9992.80	21237.00	11244.20
	5-01 to 7-20	22	101-13	29-24	4083.75	1172.00	-	-	5255.75	13976.00	8720.25
	7-21 and more	1	5-00	2-33	215.00	58.00	-	-	273.00	590.00	317.00
	Total	93	354-15	85-17	14876.05	5161.50	1020.00	-	21057.55	48936.00	27878.45
3) Sillod Scegaon	Upto 3-00	6	17-20	-	712.00	219.00	94.00	-	1025.00	4135.00	3110.00
	3-01 to 4-00	16	57-04	4-20	2510.00	1241.00	-	-	3751.00	8632.00	4881.00
	4-01 to 5-00	7	28-25	3-16	1275.00	699.00	162.00	-	2136.00	3708.00	1572.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	53-06	15-30	2405.00	2305.00	800.00	-	5510.00	12376.00	6866.00
	7-21 and more	3	17-20	5-24	970.00	215.00	285.00	-	1470.00	2450.00	980.00
	Total	43	173-35	29-10	7872.00	4679.00	1341.00	-	13892.00	31301.00	17409.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	29-32	1-00	1640.00	149.00	359.00	-	2148.00	7990.00	5842.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	65-37	2-00	2860.00	514.00	172.00	-	3546.00	9910.00	6364.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	2-00	2-03	25.00	10.00	-	-	35.00	15.00	-20.00
	5-01 to 7-20	7	36-28	5-26	1335.00	193.00	-	-	1528.00	3711.00	2183.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	134-17	10-29	5860.00	866.00	531.00	-	7257.00	21626.00	14369.00
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Nannad	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	6	20-22	2-22	850.00	145.00	-	-	995.00	2462.00	1467.00
	4-01 to 5-00	31	137-14	1-00	5077.00	1022.00	360.00	-	6459.00	20874.00	14415.00
	5-01 to 7-20	8	38-23	6-06	1800.00	313.00	-	-	2113.00	7845.00	5732.00
	7-21 and more	3	19-31	5-16	420.00	86.00	-	-	506.00	899.00	393.00
	Total	48	216-10	15-04	8147.00	1966.00	360.00	-	10073.00	32080.00	22007.00

Table 5.3 : Out of pocket expenses on cultivation of self cultivating grantees for the year 1978-79

Tahasil	Size of holding acres	Self cultivating grantees	Cropped area (acres)	Fallow area (acres)	Cost of tillage Rs.	Seeds and manure Rs.	Fertilizers Rs.	Wages to hired labour Rs.	Total expenditure Rs.	Value of production Rs.	Surplus over expenditure Rs.
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	38-25	4-02	1944.00	490.50	-	-	2434.50	10240.00	7805.50
	3-01 to 4-00	30	102-23	6-21	3860.00	1311.00	-	-	5171.00	15379.00	10208.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	184-24	8-23	7495.00	1651.00	745.00	-	9891.00	28281.00	18390.00
	5-01 to 7-20	39	206-26	27-11	6086.00	1939.50	-	-	8025.50	21806.00	13780.50
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	130	532-18	46-17	19385.00	5392.00	745.00	-	25522.00	75706.00	50184.00
2) Jalna Bhokardan Jafraabad	Upto 3-00	9	24-11	1-11	1291.00	293.00	-	-	1584.00	3809.00	2225.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	58-20	9-29	2438.00	668.00	-	-	3106.00	9075.00	5969.00
	4-01 to 5-00	47	172-35	46-31	6503.30	2386.00	160.00	60.00	9109.30	23309.00	14199.70
	5-01 to 7-20	22	101-13	29-24	3924.00	931.00	-	-	4855.00	12630.00	7775.00
	7-21 and more	1	5-00	2-33	215.00	62.00	-	-	277.00	440.00	163.00
	Total	96	359-39	92-08	14371.30	4340.00	160.00	60.00	18931.30	49263.00	30331.70
3) Sillod) Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	6	17-20	-	712.00	200.00	-	-	912.00	4857.00	3945.00
	3-01 to 4-00	16	57-04	4-20	2528.00	1198.00	335.00	-	4061.00	9040.00	5879.00
	4-01 to 5-00	9	37-25	3-16	1810.00	586.00	57.00	-	2453.00	5791.00	3338.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	53-06	15-30	2535.00	2407.00	-	-	4942.00	14784.00	9842.00
	7-21 and more	3	17-20	5-24	950.00	292.00	143.00	-	1385.00	4250.00	2865.00
	Total	45	182-35	29-10	8535.00	4683.00	535.00	-	13753.00	39522.00	25869.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	23-32	1-00	1290.00	165.00	-	-	1455.00	5015.00	3560.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	65-37	2-00	2830.00	1289.00	476.00	-	4595.00	11224.00	6629.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	2-03	2-00	25.00	10.00	-	-	35.00	400.00	365.00
	5-01 to 7-20	7	36-28	5-26	1335.00	217.00	-	-	1552.00	3977.00	2425.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	134-20	10-26	5480.00	1681.00	476.00	-	7637.00	20616.00	12979.00
5) Vaifapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	12	34-09	-	1765.00	122.00	-	-	1887.00	8520.00	6633.00
	3-01 to 4-00	7	24-02	2-22	1030.00	152.00	150.00	-	1332.00	2924.00	1592.00
	4-01 to 5-00	31	137-14	1-00	5335.00	1053.00	410.00	-	6798.00	16599.00	9801.00
	5-01 to 7-20	9	43-23	7-03	2000.00	280.00	-	-	2280.00	10190.00	7910.00
	7-21 and more	3	19-31	5-16	540.00	83.00	-	-	623.00	1450.00	827.00
	Total	62	258-39	16-01	10670.00	1690.00	560.00	-	12920.00	39683.00	26763.00

grantees. The same is true in respect of value of production and surplus over out of pocket cost. Almost no wage labour was employed by the grantees as can be seen from the tables. The extent of cash crops as seen from tables on cropping pattern in the previous chapter had shown an increase in the year 1978-79 over that in 1977-78 in almost all the tahasils except Valjapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. Paithan reported 11.23 per cent of cropped area under cotton (10.98 per cent) and quite meagre under oil seeds. However, even this was a substantial increase over the previous year 1977-78 with no acreage under cotton and 4.54 per cent of area under oil seeds. In fact cotton in 1978-79 had replaced the oil seeds almost completely. Similarly, in Ambad, Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad and Silled-Soegson tahasils extent of area under cash crop was quite worth a reckoning at around 25 per cent in 1978-79. In the previous year 1977-78 Ambad had about 10 per cent of cropped area of the grantees under cash crops. The other two tahasil grouping having around 23-24 per cent of cropped area under cash crops. Considering such area under cash crops specific information on wages paid to hired labour was sought from the grantee cultivators but all the grantees reported not to have employed any wage labour in any of the two years though employing wage labour especially during cotton picking season was a common practice in Jalna, Bhokardan, Ambad and Jafrabad tahasils. Silled-Soegson tahasils were not any different from the above tahasils in this respect.

It was pointed out in Chapter III that despite whatever agricultural implements and draught cattle the grantees possessed they were largely dependent on the other cultivators to meet the requisite preliminary and other tillage. Fertiliser supplies were available on the crop loan account

through the society and as is clear from the Tables 5.2 and 5.3 the fertiliser input was very very meagre in both the years. This was not because of non-availability but the misuse of the funds made available by way of fertilisers and insecticides pesticides etc. However, this will be looked into subsequently.

Some variations in per acre input are quite likely depending upon the area cropped, the crops sown and the type of soil as depicted by the average land revenue per acre. However, the variations are not of any major consequence to give the costs a detailed look and therefore we shall look firstly into the per grantee cost, value of production and surplus and then into average cost etc. per cropped acre by average land revenue per acre. Our ultimate interests are centered around the average surplus generated and accruing to the grantee family. In this respect the extent of land granted will be the more important factor and in view of this Tables 5.4 and 5.5 give the average cost, value of production and surplus over cost by size of area allotted for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 respectively. The average cost of cultivation, value of production and the surplus over cost per grantee in various size of area allotted and in the tahasils is the combined result of various factors enumerated. However it would be patently wrong to consider this average surplus as average profit and thence income. This surplus might at best be considered disposable income or might be approaching nearer the farm business income for the grantee family and even this will have to be considered with great many reservations. The essential reasons for such reservations are that the costs covered in deciding the surplus over cost are limited to out of pocket expenses actually

Table 5.4: Average per grantee cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus over cost for the year 1977-78

Tahasil	Upto 3-00 acres			3-01 to 4-00 acres			4-01 to 5-00 acres			5-01 to 7-20 acres			7-21 and more acres		
	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus
1) Ambad	137.30	453.53	316.23	182.55	231.90	149.35	241.43	461.95	220.52	196.51	516.50	319.99	-	-	-
2) Jalna- Bhokardan- Jafraabad	199.00	415.00	216.00	234.06	587.37	353.31	222.06	471.93	249.87	238.89	635.27	396.38	273.00	590.00	317.00
3) Sillod- Soegaon	170.83	689.16	518.33	234.43	539.50	305.07	305.14	529.71	224.57	500.90	1125.09	624.18	490.00	816.67	326.67
4) Paithan	179.00	665.83	486.83	177.30	495.50	318.20	35.00	15.00	-20.00	218.28	530.14	311.86	-	-	-
5) Vaijapur- Gangapur- Kannad	-	-	-	165.83	410.33	244.50	208.35	673.35	465.00	264.12	980.62	716.50	168.67	299.67	131.00

Table 5.5: Average per grantee cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus over cost for the year 1978-79

Tahasil	Upto 3-00 acres			3-01 to 4-00 acres			4-01 to 5-00 acres			5-01 to 7-20 acres			7-21 and more acres		
	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus
1) Ambad	135.25	568.89	433.64	172.37	512.63	340.26	230.02	657.69	427.67	205.78	559.12	353.34	-	-	-
2) Jalna- Bhokardan- Jafraabad	176.00	423.22	247.22	182.70	513.82	331.11	193.81	495.93	302.12	220.68	574.09	353.41	277.00	440.00	163.00
3) Sillod- Soegaon	152.00	809.50	657.50	253.81	621.25	367.44	272.56	643.14	370.88	449.27	1344.10	891.72	461.66	1416.66	955.00
4) Paithan	121.25	417.91	296.66	229.75	561.20	331.45	35.00	100.00	365.00	221.71	568.11	346.43	-	-	-
5) Vaijapur- Gangapur- Kannad	157.25	710.00	552.75	190.28	417.71	227.43	219.29	535.15	316.16	253.33	1132.22	878.89	207.66	481.33	275.67

paid by the grantee. Farm business income will have to be arrived at after deducting other costs, besides the out of pocket expenses given in the tables, such as (i) depreciation on owned bullocks and agricultural implements, (ii) land revenue, cess and taxes etc., (iii) interest paid on crop loan and (iv) miscellaneous other expenses. Out of the total expenditure that will make up for the total cost we have covered only a few items such as value of seeds and manure, fertilisers, tillage expenses etc. and quite a few we left out and assume these away is not proper. Under the circumstances this surplus cannot be considered as approaching nearer farm business income and has to be considered as disposable income out of which some items to meet the costs to arrive at a farm business income will have to be first arrived at. Despite these limitations the surplus generated per grantee holding does serve one purpose and that is indicative of the only conclusion that as of now the lands are capable of delivering a farm business income and may be able to do a little better given the proper management and necessary inputs. Whether such farm business income will be commensurate with the alternate employment in which the grantee and the other earners in the family were previously engaged is difficult to say.

Considering all the above limitations it will be seen that the average cost per grantee has varied in any given size holding within a small margin and still the differences in average value of production and the subsequent surplus are quite substantial. This could have resulted from the differences in average cropped area per grantee in each holding group between the various tahasils. Wider the differences in the average area cropped per grantee the average cost need not differ widely but the surplus does

vary widely. This variation alone certainly does not resolve the problem of wide variations in the surplus per grantee and the only other factor, since there are no major variations in average total cost, that can be thought of happens to be soil fertility. As said earlier average land revenue per acre as an index of soil fertility can broadly serve the purpose despite the known inadequacy of the same as a proper index of fertility in view of the factors enumerated in Chapter I earlier. Tables 5.6 and 5.7 give the average per acre cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus generated by size of average land revenue per acre for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. As earlier in Chapter I the land revenue groups have been ^{pooled} pooled into four broad groups with a view to convenience. The average per acre cost, value of production and the surplus varies worth noticing even in the same land revenue group between tahasils. These differences are difficult to explain except for the variations in season etc. Within a given tahasil it can be seen that variations in per acre cost are at times quite noticeable between various average land revenue groups but these are not very wide. While at the same time the differences in the value of production per acre are wide enough to yield a larger surplus in the two land revenue groups Rs.0.81 to 1.25 and Rs.1.26 to 2.50. This is broadly observable in all the tahasil groupings and for both the years 1977-78 and 1978-79. While this is not a sure proof of the land revenue as a proper index depicting the soil fertility, it can be considered a sufficiently adequate index if accepted with due circumspection.

Table 5.6: Average per acre cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus over cost by average land revenue per acre for the year 1977-78

Tahasil	Average land revenue per acre											
	Upto Rs.0.40			Rs.0.41 to 0.80			Rs.0.81 to 1.25			Rs.1.26 to 2.50		
	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus
1) Ambad	43.93	75.04	31.11	38.05	80.11	42.06	56.24	133.73	77.49	60.58	162.15	101.57
2) Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad	61.85	114.40	52.55	44.36	106.86	62.50	75.18	192.15	116.97	56.75	183.80	127.05
3) Sillod-Soegaon	80.61	78.43	-2.18	60.39	127.64	67.25	74.95	184.07	109.12	131.93	414.55	282.62
4) Paithan	46.49	154.18	107.69	40.39	108.13	67.74	52.05	146.17	94.12	80.58	254.23	173.65
5) Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad	-	-	-	46.48	112.44	65.96	42.03	122.28	80.25	48.95	177.75	128.80

Table 5.7: Average per acre cost of cultivation, value of production and surplus over cost by average land revenue per acre for the year 1978-79

Tahasil	Average land revenue per acre											
	Upto Rs.0.40			Rs.0.41 to 0.80			Rs.0.81 to 1.25			Rs.1.26 to 2.50		
	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus	Total cost	Value of production	Surplus
1) Ambad	48.43	104.47	56.03	37.87	95.74	57.87	52.99	165.66	112.67	54.02	246.57	192.55
2) Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad	63.54	110.48	46.94	46.68	127.80	81.12	48.89	179.03	130.14	39.92	166.84	126.92
3) Sillod-Soegaon	77.11	96.75	19.64	55.70	167.30	111.60	64.17	223.79	159.62	151.69	463.50	311.81
4) Paithan	46.89	139.73	92.84	41.88	124.98	83.10	50.36	127.37	77.01	91.03	229.79	138.76
5) Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad	-	-	-	45.62	79.12	33.51	48.63	102.69	54.06	52.51	208.54	156.04

5.3 Cost Assistance or Current Cost Subsidy and Repayment of Loan

The financial assistance contemplated under the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' was for all the surplus grantees under the Revised Act (as amended upto 5th October 1975) and also the grantees under the Principal Act who received the surplus land after 1st January 1975. The assistance contemplated to grantees under the scheme was at the rate of Rs.250 per hectare or Rs.100 per acre per season for two seasons. The Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH-3276/51225/L-7 dated 1st November 1976 issued instructions to concerned officials regarding the procedure to be adopted and the extent of subsidy payable to each grantee, the instructions being as below.

"The allottees of surplus land to whom crop loan has actually been granted by primary credit society should be held eligible to get the crop assistance. The Collector should obtain from the District Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies villagewise lists of allottees to whom crop loan has been sanctioned by primary credit society giving names, addresses, extent of land actually allotted and the amount of crop loan actually granted in each case."

The assistance was to be channelled through the District Central Cooperative Bank and the village level primary credit society. The payment of subsidy was thus to be equal to the actual loan amount or Rs.100 per acre whichever was less. Normally this would mean that the 'crop assistance' is essentially meant for the area cropped out of the area allotted to grantees. However, it seems in whatever cases the subsidy has been granted it was related to the amount of loan lifted by the grantee

and very sparingly to the area cropped by the grantee. Again there are reasons to believe that loans were granted on the basis of the 'Normal Credit Statement' and the area showed therein under various crops. The actual crops taken by the grantee and those reported as proposed in the Normal Credit Statement were rarely the same resulting in larger amount of loan being granted and lifted by the grantees. This would amount to an outright grant of Rs.100 per acre of land allotted to a loanee grantee irrespective of the area cropped out of the allotted land. It is certain that this was definitely not the purpose contemplated in the assistance scheme, since the subsidy was proposed to relieve the grantee of difficulties he may have to face in undertaking proper cultivation and not an endowment of income on the grantee.

Another matter related to payment of subsidy is as to whether mere lifting of the loan granted endows the privilege of getting the subsidy though the land allotted has not been given possession of to the proposed grantee. Some cases of allottees who were granted surplus land but were not put in possession even by March 1979 were noticed to have lifted loan and being granted the subsidy in 1976-77 and these are given below.

Size of area allotted Acres	Grantees	Area allotted Acres	Loan lifted Rs.	Subsidy Rs.
3-01 to 4-00	1	4-00	300.00	300.00
4-01 to 5-00	8	38-10	2900.00	2125.00
4-01 to 5-00 Total	9	42-10	3200.00	2425.00

How these proposed grantees managed to get the loan and the subsequent subsidy could not be explained by any of the officials the only explanation put forth being the matter needs to be looked into. The whole deal seems quite fishy and it is not possible to believe that this did happen without the knowledge of the parties concerned. One of the nine proposed grantees having repaid the loan was eligible to borrow again in 1977-78 and did lift a crop loan of Rs.798 but no subsidy was paid to him in that year. All the nine have not repaid the balance of loan remaining outstanding. The granting of loan and the subsequent grant of subsidy is contrary to the purpose of the assistance contemplated.

Table 5.8 gives the crop loan lifted, repayment, subsidy received and the amount outstanding in respect of the loanee grantees for the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79. As said earlier out of the grantees in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils those from Vaijapur and Kannad were not eligible to receive the assistance from the first year, 1976-77, of surplus allotment and grantees in Gangapur from the year 1977-78 under the Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICR-3275/57403-L7 dated 7th April 1976, as these tahasils were under the 'Paga Yojana' from these respective years. As a result there was very meagre subsidy payment in Gangapur tahasil in 1976-77. For all practical purposes, therefore, grantees from Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils were ineligible to receive any subsidy under the Central Sector Scheme and thus may be left out for the purpose of effects of subsidy.

Subsidy was to be paid to grantees in the first two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 only. At times it so happened that the subsidy granted for the year 1976-77 or 1977-78

Table 5: Crop loan disburse, repayment, subsidy and outstanding of loanee farmers for three years 1970-71 to 1972-73

Year	Size of holding		No. of		Borrowing		Cash		Borrowing		Borrowing		Borrowing		Borrowing		Borrowing		Borrowing				
	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of	Acres	No. of			
1970-71	Total		107	39029.00	13208.00	43927.00	40270.00	6850.00	69	2705.00	17785.00	22750.00	20555.00	45267.00									
	Up to 3-00	10	1788.00	511.00	1325.00	1120.00	1077.00	2200.00	13	70.00	1732.00	1700.00	1570.00	1570.00	3-01 to 4-00	26	6170.00	2257.00	9070.00	9305.00	727.00	9709.00	
1971-72	Total		107	39029.00	13208.00	43927.00	40270.00	6850.00	69	2705.00	17785.00	22750.00	20555.00	45267.00									
	Up to 3-00	10	1788.00	511.00	1325.00	1120.00	1077.00	2200.00	13	70.00	1732.00	1700.00	1570.00	1570.00	3-01 to 4-00	26	6170.00	2257.00	9070.00	9305.00	727.00	9709.00	
1972-73	Total		107	39029.00	13208.00	43927.00	40270.00	6850.00	69	2705.00	17785.00	22750.00	20555.00	45267.00									
	Up to 3-00	10	1788.00	511.00	1325.00	1120.00	1077.00	2200.00	13	70.00	1732.00	1700.00	1570.00	1570.00	3-01 to 4-00	26	6170.00	2257.00	9070.00	9305.00	727.00	9709.00	
1970-71	Total		63	22450.00	25121.00	28393.00	23760.00	19178.00	30	10130.00	5537.00	7075.00	6102.00	27830.00									
	Up to 3-00	6	282.00	1045.00	425.00	250.00	1500.00	7	100.00	1027.00	1882.00	1675.00	1675.00	3-01 to 4-00	17	4575.00	1532.00	3107.00	3095.00	1780.00	3107.00		
1971-72	Total		63	22450.00	25121.00	28393.00	23760.00	19178.00	30	10130.00	5537.00	7075.00	6102.00	27830.00									
	Up to 3-00	6	282.00	1045.00	425.00	250.00	1500.00	7	100.00	1027.00	1882.00	1675.00	1675.00	3-01 to 4-00	17	4575.00	1532.00	3107.00	3095.00	1780.00	3107.00		
1972-73	Total		63	22450.00	25121.00	28393.00	23760.00	19178.00	30	10130.00	5537.00	7075.00	6102.00	27830.00									
	Up to 3-00	6	282.00	1045.00	425.00	250.00	1500.00	7	100.00	1027.00	1882.00	1675.00	1675.00	3-01 to 4-00	17	4575.00	1532.00	3107.00	3095.00	1780.00	3107.00		
1970-71	Total		44	14720.00	12157.00	24525.00	17750.00	2453.00	39	16127.00	8705.00	19885.00	16807.00	7597.00									
	Up to 3-00	3	245.00	800.00	125.00	125.00	300.00	3	520.00	950.00	175.00	400.00	400.00	3-01 to 4-00	9	2470.00	3195.00	3195.00	3050.00	520.00	950.00		
1971-72	Total		44	14720.00	12157.00	24525.00	17750.00	2453.00	39	16127.00	8705.00	19885.00	16807.00	7597.00									
	Up to 3-00	3	245.00	800.00	125.00	125.00	300.00	3	520.00	950.00	175.00	400.00	400.00	3-01 to 4-00	9	2470.00	3195.00	3195.00	3050.00	520.00	950.00		
1972-73	Total		44	14720.00	12157.00	24525.00	17750.00	2453.00	39	16127.00	8705.00	19885.00	16807.00	7597.00									
	Up to 3-00	3	245.00	800.00	125.00	125.00	300.00	3	520.00	950.00	175.00	400.00	400.00	3-01 to 4-00	9	2470.00	3195.00	3195.00	3050.00	520.00	950.00		
1970-71	Total		35	12952.00	2775.00	1020.00	1020.00	1201.00	10	2010.00	2010.00	2010.00	10852.00										
	Up to 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3-01 to 4-00	2	1120.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00		
1971-72	Total		35	12952.00	2775.00	1020.00	1020.00	1201.00	10	2010.00	2010.00	2010.00	10852.00										
	Up to 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3-01 to 4-00	2	1120.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00		
1972-73	Total		35	12952.00	2775.00	1020.00	1020.00	1201.00	10	2010.00	2010.00	2010.00	10852.00										
	Up to 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3-01 to 4-00	2	1120.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00	1200.00		

(Amount in rupees)

(Contd.)

Table 5.c : (contd.)

Tahasil	Size of Holding acres	No. of borrowing grantees	1978-79				Outstanding ending 78-79
			Cash	Materials value	Loan lifted Repayment Principal	Subsidy	
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	9	1568.00	194.00	-	-	3424.00
	3-01 to 4-00	13	3800.00	1284.00	-	-	11125.00
	4-01 to 5-00	11	4050.00	1810.00	-	-	17621.00
	5-01 to 7-20	18	6400.00	2432.00	-	-	14084.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total		51	15650.00	5720.00	-	-
2) Jalna (Shokardan) (Jafraod)	Upto 3-00	-	-	-	-	-	2375.00
	3-01 to 4-00	2	700.00	-	348.00	-	4595.00
	4-01 to 5-00	4	1300.00	105.00	1221.00	209.00	12028.00
	5-01 to 7-20	3	1110.00	180.00	700.00	-	2417.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total		9	3170.00	285.00	2269.00	209.00
3) Dilled (Solegaon)	Upto 3-00	4	620.00	770.00	1270.00	1220.00	1505.00
	3-01 to 4-00	9	2870.00	999.00	41.00	-	4350.00*
	4-01 to 5-00	0	1750.00	939.00	240.00	25.00	4004.00
	5-01 to 7-20	0	3050.00	1112.00	1510.00	555.00	6571.00
	7-21 and more	3	1830.00	1370.00	-	50.00	3200.00
	Total		28	9950.00	5200.00	3051.00	1850.00
4) Balhan	Upto 3-00	1	180.00	410.00	-	-	1915.00
	3-01 to 4-00	8	1730.00	1558.00	601.00	-	5511.00
	4-01 to 5-00	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	-	-	-	-	-	1231.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total		9	1890.00	1978.00	601.00	-
5) Valjapur (Santapur) (Barnad)	Upto 3-00	2	1285.00	-	345.00	-	920.00
	3-01 to 4-00	-	-	-	-	-	1220.00
	4-01 to 5-00	3	490.00	-	50.00	-	10117.00
	5-01 to 7-20	-	-	-	-	-	3535.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	2120.00
	Total		11	1775.00	-	395.00	-

* Includes Rs. 101/- interest outstanding.

was granted and adjusted in the next year and in such cases the grantee while being shown as with outstanding loan was allowed to borrow after subsidy adjustment. As per the Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. ICH 3278/18423/L7, dated 2nd March 1979, grantees who were allotted lands in 1976 or in the subsequent year and could not avail of the subsidy for reasons explained in the above given Resolution were to be paid subsidy through the tahasildars in the year 1978-79 after looking into each individual case and making certain that the grantee concerned had not received the benefit of the 'Central Sector Assistance Scheme' for two years i.e. has not been granted subsidy for two seasons as per the Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Department Resolution No. 3276/51225/L7 dated 1st November 1976. Since the payment of subsidy under the Government Resolution of 2nd March 1979 was to be directly made to the grantees these subsidies are not included in Table 5.8 for the year 1978-79.

Before considering the subsidy received by the grantees it will be useful to look into the kind loan portion of the crop loan lifted during the two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 and the break-up of the kind loan into such, fertilisers and insecticides and pesticides etc. for the tahasils is given overleaf.

Out of the total kind loan disbursed during the two years fertilisers accounted for 83 and 88 per cent and insecticides and pesticides around 9 per cent and 5 of total kind loan disbursement in the two respective years 1976-77 and 1977-78. The distribution into seeds, fertilisers etc. of the kind loan disbursed in 1978-79 is not any different from the above given two years. Considering

				(Rupees)
Tahasil	Seed	Ferti- lizers	Insecticides etc.	Total kind loan
<u>1976-77</u>				
1) Ambad	487	11876	845	13208
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	1504	21871	1746	25121
3) Silled) Soegaon)	1415	8173	2569	12157
4) Paithan	436	4230	425	5091
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	448	2427	-	2875
Total	4290	48577	5585	58452

<u>1977-78</u>				
1) Ambad	492	10888	405	11785
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	659	4656	222	5537
3) Silled) Soegaon)	304	7863	538	8705
4) Paithan	440	3122	378	3940
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	-	-	-	-
Total	1895	26529	1543	29967

the total fertiliser input, given in Tables 5.2 and 5.3, which is much more than negligible it will not be unfair to assume that the fertiliser input was any different in the first year 1976-77. Use of insecticides and pesticides was not reported in any year and this raises the query as to what happened to these fertilisers and insecticides etc.

lifted by the grantees. As was reported by some grantees they never took possession of these fertilisers and insecticides etc. and disposed these off at a discount for cash at the point of delivery after going through the necessary formalities. Since non-use of fertilisers etc. has been clearly reported it is quite safe to assume that more or less all the grantees never took any fertilisers etc. though they had lifted the necessary loan for it and had disposed it off at a discount as said earlier. As a result the effective loan amount that must have been used to meet the current agricultural expenses will be largely limited to seed taken out of kind loan and cash loan lifted and the total loan that might have been thus utilised for current agriculture in the two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 is given below.

Tahasil	(Rupees)					
	1976-77			1977-78		
	Cash loan	Seed	Total	Cash loan	Seed	Total
1) Anbad	39629	487	40116	27405	492	27897
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	22450	1504	23954	10130	659	10789
3) Silled) Soegaon)	14720	1415	16135	16124	304	16428
4) Paithan	4335	436	4771	3570	440	4010
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	12962	448	13410	2610	-	2610
Total	94096	4290	98386	59839	1895	61734

The total utilisation of crop loan may not be expected to be beyond the respective tahasil totals and as will be seen from Table 5.2 was more or less near about the same

with only some minor variations between tahasils and hence for all practical purposes this was the maximum loan amount utilised to meet current agricultural expenses in the years 1976-77 and 1977-78. The balance of funds lifted as crop loan during these years must have been used for other purposes. Part of these funds were used for investment in livestock and land development and to that extent these may be accepted as being used for agriculture since investment in these could take some precedence before any cultivation could be undertaken. However, by referring to tables on sources of finance for investment in livestock and land development it can be seen that these investments do not resolve the problem of excess funds in the hands of the grantees and therefore these funds must have been used to meet mainly family expenditure or the investments reported as financed by owned funds may have been met out of these. These are only surmises and nothing can be said very definitely about utilisation of these funds. Considering all this it seems more certain that these excess funds falling in the hands of the grantees could be the major cause for outstanding loan amount. Since we do not have data on cost of cultivation for the year 1976-77 it will be fair to assume that the cost incurred would be near-about the estimated loan amount that may have been utilised to meet current expenditure on agriculture in that year. When this likely expenditure on cultivation for the two years 1976-77 and 1977-78 is considered along with the subsidy granted the results are worth looking into and the relevant information is given below.

Tahasil	(Rupees)			
	1976-77		1977-78	
	Likely cultivation expenses	Subsidy granted	Likely cultivation expenses	Subsidy granted
1) Anbad	40116	40210	27897	20535
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jafrabad)	23954	23460	10789	6102
3) Silled) Soegaon)	16135	17760	16428	16804
4) Paithan	4771	5563	4010	4175
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	13410	1020	2610	-
Total	98386	88013	61734	47616

The actual subsidy paid during 1976-77 is near about 90 per cent of likely cultivation expenditure and about 77 per cent of likely cultivation expenses in the year 1977-78. The actual cultivation expenditure in 1977-78 can be seen from Table 5.2 and the subsidy will be around 61 per cent of actual out of pocket expenditure on cultivation. Since the subsidy was not expected to be 100 per cent loan or cost subsidy the results are more than reasonable. These results point towards excess crop loan lifted as a major cause for outstanding loan since it will be seen that in majority of the loanee grantees subsidy was the only repayment reported in both the years. This can be very well seen from the following proportions of subsidy to repayment and repayment as per cent of loan lifted in various tahasils.

The repayment refers to principal repaid and excludes interest paid on the loan amount. The results are quite clear to see and nothing more needs to be said in the

Tahasil	Subsidy as % of repayment		Repayment as % of loan lifted	
	1976-77	1977-78	1976-77	1977-78
1) Ambad	92	80	83	57
2) Jalna) Bhokardan) Jaffrabad)	82	86	59	44
3) Sillod) Soegaon)	72	85	91	79
4) Paithan	89	78	66	70
5) Vaijapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	100	-	6	22

matter. With the stoppage of subsidy at the end of first two years the outstanding, in almost all the tahasils have shot up. Considering 1976-77 outstanding as the base period outstandings at the end of 1978-79 have shot up substantially in all the tahasils except in Jalna-Bhokardan-Jaffrabad and Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils. This was obvious as the crop loan borrowing by the grantees in the above given tahasil groupings was quite low in the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 as compared to that in 1976-77.

This was in respect of crop assistance under the central sector scheme. Since all the grantees could not take the benefit of the subsidy during the first two years, 1976-77 and 1977-78, the State Government decided to extend payment of such subsidy in the third year 1978-79 to those grantees who did not get the benefit for two years for some reason or the other and accordingly crop assistance was disbursed in 1978-79 as below in respect of tahasils where this information could be collected during the survey period.

(acres)	Jalna- Bhokardan- Jafrabad		Silled-Soegaon		Paithan	
	Gran- tees	Amount Rs.	Gran- tees	Amount Rs.	Gran- tees	Amount Rs.
Upto 3-00	4	1100	3	820	5	1300
3-01 to 4-00	7	1650	6	1820	14	4345
4-01 to 5-00	15	4350	3	1000	-	-
5-01 to 7-20	10	4450	4	850	3	1500
7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	36	11550	16	4490	22	7145

Grantees in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils were not eligible as said earlier and information in the matter could not be collected in Ambad tahasil as the survey was conducted in January-February 1979 when the State Government was giving thought to the matter and the Resolution to that effect was passed by 2nd March 1979. This payment of crop assistance was made directly to the grantees and not channelised through the primary credit societies and thus had no effect on repayment of borrowings in 1978-79. Whatever subsidy was adjusted in 1978-79 was the delayed payment for the previous years and not the subsidy for the current year 1978-79.

As a result of excess borrowing and subsequent non-repayment quite a large number of grantees had become defaulters by end of 1978-79. Table 5.9 gives loanee grantees, repaying grantees and defaulting grantees for the three years 1976-77 to 1978-79. The matter does not need any explanation except in respect of loanees rescheduled. There is a provision to reschedule the short term loan into three year medium term loan in respect of villages where 'Annewari'

Table 5.9 : Loanee grantees, repaying grantees and defaulting grantees for three years 1970-71 to 1978-79

Tahasil	Size of holding (acres)	Total grantees	1970-71						1971-72						Total Defaulting Grantees (7+13)
			Of Col.1 Borrowing Grantees	Of Col.1 Non-bor-rowing Grantees	Of Col.2 clearing loan	Of Col.2 Resche-duled	Of Col.2 with out-standings	Of Col.2 Default-ing Grantees	Of Col.1 Borrow-ing Grantees	Of Col.1 Non-bor-rowing Grantees	Of Col.2 clearing loan	Of Col.2 Resche-duled	Of Col.2 with out-standings	Of Col.2 Default-ing Grantees	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1) Anbad	Upto 3-00	18	10	8	5	-	-	5	13	-	9	-	-	4	9
	3-01 to 4-00	31	24	7	16	-	-	8	20	3	13	-	-	7	15
	4-01 to 5-00	43	39	4	30	-	-	9	27	7	10	-	-	17	26
	5-01 to 7-20	40	31	9	27	-	-	-	29	7	19	-	-	10	14
	7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	132	104	28	78	-	-	26	89	17	51	-	-	38	64
2) Jaina Unokardan Jafrabad	Upto 3-00	9	7	2	2	2	-	3	4	2	-	-	-	4	7
	3-01 to 4-00	17	13	4	3	-	-	10	5	2	1	1	-	3	13
	4-01 to 5-00	49	27	22	11	-	-	16	14	19	7(1)	-	-	8	23
	5-01 to 7-20	22	16	6	5	2	-	9	7	6	3	-	-	4	13
	7-21 & more	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	98	63	55	21	4	-	38	30	30	11(1)	1	-	19	50
3) Silled Dopegaon	Upto 3-00	8	6	2	1	-	5	-	7	1	1	5	-	1	1
	3-01 to 4-00	17	17	-	12	-	-	5	11	1	10	-	-	1	6
	4-01 to 5-00	9	7	2	5	2	-	-	7	2	4	-	-	3	3
	5-01 to 7-20	11	11	-	7	3	1	-	11	-	5	1	-	5	5
	7-21 & more	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-
	Total	48	44	4	28	5	6	5	39	4	23	6	-	10	15
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	3	9	1	-	-	2	3	7	1	-	-	2	4
	3-01 to 4-00	20	9	11	4	-	-	5	12	3	8(2)	-	-	6	9
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	4	3	-	-	-	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	4
	7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	16	24	5	-	-	11	15	14	9(2)	-	-	8	17
5) Vaijapur Hingapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-
	3-01 to 4-00	11	3	6	-	1	-	2	2	7	1	-	-	1	3
	4-01 to 5-00	32	23	9	2	-	-	21	5	6	3	-	-	2	23
	5-01 to 7-20	12	6	6	2	-	-	4	3	5	-	-	-	3	7
	7-21 & more	3	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Total	70	35	35	4	1	-	30	10	30	4	-	-	6	36

(1) One defaulter from previous year cleared

(2) Two defaulter from previous year cleared

(contd.)

Table 5.9 : (contd.)

Tahasil	Size of Holding (acres)	Total Grantees	1978-79					Total default- ers ending June 1979	
			Of Col.1 Borrowing Grantees	Of Col.1 Non-borrow- ing Grantees	Of Col.15 Grantees clearing loan	Of Col. 15 Grantees Rescheduled	Of Col.15 Grantees with out- standings		Of Col.15 Defaulting Grantees
		1	15	15	17	18	19	20	21
1) Hubad	Upto 3-00	18	9	-	-	-	9	-	9
	3-01 to 4-00	31	13	3	-	-	13	-	15
	4-01 to 5-00	43	11	6	-	-	11	-	26
	5-01 to 7-20	40	18	8	-	-	18	-	14
	7-21 & more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	132	51	17	-	-	51	-	64
2) Jaina) Chokardan) Jafrabad)	Upto 3-00	9	-	2	-	-	-	-	7
	3-01 to 4-00	17	2	2	-	-	1	-	14
	4-01 to 5-00	49	4	22	2(3)	-	4	1	21
	5-01 to 7-20	22	3	6	2	-	1	-	13
	7-21 & more	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	98	9	33	4(3)	-	6	1	55
3) Silled)) Soegaon)	Upto 3-00	6	4	1	1	-	-	5	6
	3-01 to 4-00	17	9	2	1(4)	-	-	8	12
	4-01 to 5-00	9	6	-	2	-	-	4	7
	5-01 to 7-20	11	6	-	1	-	-	5	10
	7-21 & more	3	3	-	-	-	-	3	3
	Total	46	28	3	5(6)	-	-	25	40
4) Raichan	Upto 3-00	12	1	7	-	-	-	1	5
	3-01 to 4-00	20	8	5	1(5)	-	-	6	12
	4-01 to 5-00	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
	5-01 to 7-20	7	-	3	-	-	-	-	4
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	9	16	1(5)	-	-	7	23
5) Vairapur) Gangapur) Kannad)	Upto 3-00	12	6	4	2	-	-	6	6
	3-01 to 4-00	11	-	8	-	-	-	-	3
	4-01 to 5-00	32	3	6	-	-	-	3	20
	5-01 to 7-20	12	-	5	-	-	-	-	7
	7-21 and more	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Total	70	11	23	2	-	-	9	45

(3) both defaulters from previous year cleared

(4) One defaulter from previous year cleared

(5) One defaulter adjusted with fresh loan.

has been less than six annas for a given crop and the season for which the grantee had borrowed funds against crop loan. Such rescheduled grantees were eligible to borrow in the immediate next year and had to repay the current loan with interest and also the first instalment with interest of the rescheduled loan by the end of the current year. Incidentally all the rescheduled grantees had become defaulters in the subsequent year not having met the necessary repayment.

The number of defaulters had continued to increase every year and only four-five defaulters have cared to clear outstanding amount in subsequent years. Total grantees who borrowed in any of the three years and the defaulters out of these ending 1978-79 is given below.

Tahasil	Borrowers	Defaulters
1) Ambad	115	64
2) Jalna-Bhokardan- Jafrabad	82	55
3) Sillod-Saegaon	45	40
4) Paithan	26	23
5) Vaijapur-Gangapur- Kannad	47	45
Total	315	227

Almost 72 per cent of the loanees have become defaulters by the end of 1978-79. Besides these 57 loanees in 1978-79 (51 in Ambad and 6 in Jalna) had some time available to repay 78-79 borrowings and are not included in defaulters. Looking to previous years quite a few may turn out to be defaulters taking total defaulters to any where around 80 per cent or near about.

Chapter VI

The Estimate of Farm Business Income

Previous Chapter V has indicated the surplus over cost and it was contended that this surplus could not be treated as net income or profit or even farm business income. The cost included therein referred to only material inputs and tillage expenses paid and did not take into consideration bullock labour input, apart from the one for which cash payment was reported, and interest on crop loan, depreciation etc. While no data on farm labour input was collected specific queries were made regarding employment of wage labour on the grantees' lands. It was made clear in 5.2 of Chapter V that almost all the grantees had not employed any wage labour and therefore no estimate of hired labour employed on the grantee lands need be worked out. So far as the family labour employed on the farm, this family labour input does not constitute as cost for arriving at the farm business income. Had some data on farm labour input in Aurangabad district been available it would have come handy to arrive at the farm business income a little more fairly. However, no such data as in case of Yavatamal district was available, nor was any data from a nearby district available on which to base the estimate of hired labour input and the family labour input on the grantees' lands. The family labour input while not forming the part of the cost to arrive at farm business income would still be useful to assess as to whether family labour, even without considering interest on own capital, rent of land etc, gets the average going wage rate for agricultural labourer. Despite the deficiencies it is felt that since the sample grantees have clearly stated that no hired labour was employed on ^{these} ~~the~~ lands the estimate of farm business income may be a good approximation. Even

this estimate is being indulged into with some reservation particularly with the firm belief that some hired labour must have been employed for picking of cotton and harvesting other cash crops.

Other sources of data on employment such as 'Rural Labour Inquiry Committee' report could not be meaningfully used as these sources while giving data on employment in agriculture, non-agricultural work etc. do not give the distribution by land holding if any. A mere mention as working on own farm and the number of days employed on own farm will not be sufficient for the purpose.

6.1 Estimate of Farm Business Income

The estimates of farm business income as said earlier is for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79 and the reasons for the same were given in previous Chapter IV and V though the distinction made on the basis of stoppage of subsidy at the end of the second year 1977-78 had become ineffective in view of the Maharashtra Government Resolution No. ICH-3278/18423/L-7, dated 2nd March 1979 along with the conditions laid down therein. However it was expected that not many grantees of surplus land would get the benefit of this extension as sufficiently large number of these grantees would have received the subsidy in the first two years but this had not necessarily come true. Despite this the estimates of farm business income for the two years do serve another purpose. It will be possible to see by looking into per family farm income and per acre farm income as to whether cultivation is benefiting them to some extent and it is showing any signs of progress.

Tables 6.1 and 6.2 give the total cost and farm business income of the grantees in two groups, upto 5-00 acres and 5-01 and more acres, for the two years 1977-78 and 1978-79. As was seen in Chapter V majority of the grantee cultivators

Table 6.1 : Total cost and farm business income of self-cultivating grantees for the year 1977-78

Item	Tahasils	Ambad		Jalna-Shokardan-Jafrabad		Sillod-Soegaon		Paithan		Vaijapur-Bangapur-Kannad	
		Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres
1) No. of grantees		88	40	70	23	29	14	33	7	37	11
2) Area allotted (acres)		333-21	239-11	301-02	138-30	151-05	92-00	102-32	42-14	161-18	69-36
3) Area cropped (acres)		307-10	213-06	248-02	100-13	103-09	70-26	97-29	36-28	157-36	58-14
4) Area fallow (acres)		26-11	26-05	53-00	32-17	7-36	21-14	5-03	5-26	3-22	11-22
5) Cost of tillage (Rs.)		12895.00	6026.00	10577.30	4298.75	4497.00	4375.00	4525.00	1335.00	5927.00	2220.00
6) Fertilizers (Rs.)		-	-	1020.00	-	256.00	1085.00	531.00	-	360.00	-
7) Seeds, manures, etc. (Rs.)		4755.00	1835.00	3931.50	1230.00	2159.00	2520.00	673.00	193.00	1167.00	399.00
8) Wages to hired labour (Rs.)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9) Depreciation on owned bullocks (Rs.)		3865.00	1930.00	3617.00	888.00	330.00	1246.00	200.00	-	1240.00	300.00
10) Depreciation on owned agricultural implements (Rs.)		34.00	23.00	113.20	46.00	42.00	-	8.00	1.00	12.00	-
11) Interest paid on crop loan (Rs.)		1469.00	1214.00	664.00	216.00	1218.00	1243.00	897.00	-	52.00	-
12) Total cost of cultivation (Rs.)		23018.00	11028.00	19923.00	6678.75	8502.00	10469.00	6834.00	1529.00	8758.00	2919.00
13) Value of production (Rs.)		36477.00	20660.00	34370.00	14566.00	16475.00	14826.00	17915.00	3711.00	23336.00	8744.00
14) Farm business income (13-12) (Rs.)		13459.00	9632.00	14447.00	7887.25	7973.00	4357.00	11081.00	2182.00	14578.00	5825.00
15) Subsidy received (Rs.)		11185.00	9550.00	4214.00	1888.00	7945.00	8859.00	4175.00	-	-	-
16) Total farm business income and subsidy received (Rs.)		24644.00	18982.00	18661.00	9775.25	15918.00	13216.00	15256.00	2182.00	14578.00	14578.00 5825.00
17) Per grantee family farm income (Rs.)		152.94	240.80	206.38	342.92	274.93	311.21	335.78	311.71	394.00	529.54
18) Per family subsidy received (Rs.)		127.10	233.75	60.20	82.08	273.96	632.78	126.52	-	-	-
19) Per family farm income and subsidy received (Rs.)		280.04	474.55	266.58	425.00	548.89	943.99	462.30	311.71	394.00	529.54
20) Per acre farm business income (Rs.)		43.77	45.19	58.42	74.18	77.23	61.67	113.39	59.45	92.64	99.82
21) Per acre subsidy received (Rs.)		36.40	43.86	16.98	17.75	76.96	125.39	47.72	-	-	-
22) Per acre farm income and subsidy received (Rs.)		80.17	89.05	75.40	91.93	154.19	187.06	156.11	59.45	92.64	99.82
23) Per grantee family area cropped (Rs.)		3-19	5-13	3-21	4-14	3-22	5-02	2-38	5-09	4-10	5-11
24) Cropped area as per cent of area allotted (per cent)		92	92	80	77	93	77	95	86	94	83

Table 6.2 : Total cost and farm business income of self-cultivating grantees for the year 1978-79

Item	Tahasil	Ambad		Jalna-Bhokardan-Jafrabad		Sillod-Deegaon		Paithan		Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad	
		Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres	Upto 5-00 acres	5-01 and more acres
1) No. of grantees		91	39	73	23	31	14	33	7	50	12
2) Area allotted (acres)		344-38	233-37	313-17	138-30	120-05	92-00	102-32	42-14	199-07	75-33
3) Area cropped (acres)		325-32	206-26	253-26	106-13	112-09	70-26	97-32	36-28	195-25	63-14
4) Area fallow (acres)		19-06	27-11	59-31	32-17	7-36	21-14	5-00	5-26	3-22	12-19
5) Cost of tillage (Rs.)		13299.00	6086.00	10232.30	4139.00	5050.00	3485.00	4145.00	1335.00	8130.00	2540.00
6) Fertilizers (Rs.)		745.00	-	160.00	-	392.00	143.00	476.00	-	560.00	-
7) Seeds, manures, etc. (Rs.)		3452.50	1939.50	3347.00	993.00	1984.00	2699.00	1464.00	217.00	1327.00	363.00
8) Wages to hired labour (Rs.)		-	-	60.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9) Depreciation on owned bullocks (Rs.)		4544.00	1930.00	5023.00	1558.00	395.00	1246.00	390.00	800.00	1470.00	300.00
10) Depreciation on owned agricultural implements (Rs.)		34.00	23.00	113.20	46.00	42.00	-	8.00	1.00	12.00	-
11) Interest paid on crop loan (Rs.)		-	-	173.00	90.00	198.00	267.00	78.00	-	40.00	-
12) Total cost of cultivation (Rs.)		22074.50	9978.50	19108.50	6826.00	8061.00	7840.00	6561.00	2253.00	11539.00	3203.00
13) Value of production (Rs.)		53900.00	21806.00	36193.00	13070.00	20588.00	19034.00	16639.00	3977.00	28043.00	11640.00
14) Farm business income (Rs.)		31825.50	11827.50	17084.50	6244.00	12527.00	11194.00	10078.00	1624.00	16504.00	8437.00
15) Subsidy received (Rs.)		-	-	7309.00 ¹	4450.00	4885.00 ²	1455.00 ³	5645.00	1500.00	-	-
16) Total farm business income and subsidy received (Rs.)		31825.50	11827.50	24393.50	10694.00	17412.00	12649.00	15723.00	3124.00	16504.00	8437.00
17) Per grantee family farm income (Rs.)		349.73	303.27	234.03	271.48	404.09	799.57	305.40	232.14	330.08	703.08
18) Per family subsidy received (Rs.)		-	-	100.12	193.47	157.58	103.92	171.06	214.29	-	-
19) Per family farm income and subsidy received (Rs.)		349.73	303.27	334.15	464.95	561.67	903.49	476.46	446.29	330.08	703.08
20) Per acre farm income (Rs.)		97.68	57.23	67.35	64.19	111.62	158.44	103.04	44.25	84.33	133.18
21) Per acre subsidy received (Rs.)		-	-	28.81	41.85	43.52	20.59	57.71	40.87	-	-
22) Per acre farm income and subsidy received (Rs.)		97.68	57.23	96.16	106.04	155.14	179.03	160.75	85.12	84.33	133.18
23) Per grantee family area cropped (acres)		3-23	5-11	3-19	4-25	3-25	5-02	2-38	5-09	3-36	5-11
24) Cropped area as per cent of area allotted (per cent)		94	88	81	77	93	77	95	86	98	84

1 Of this Rs.209 previous year's subsidy received late, and Rs.7100 crop assistance from tahasil
2 Of this Rs.1245 previous year's subsidy received late, and Rs.3640 crop assistance from tahasil
3 Of this Rs.605 previous year's subsidy received late, and Rs.850 crop assistance from tahasil

had to pay for the necessary tillage and in their case the cost of bullock labour etc. does not need to be freshly calculated for inclusion in the total cost. However, as will be seen from Chapter III some of the grantees had implements and draught cattle for tillage and depreciation of these needs to be accounted towards cost and the same is included at 20 per cent of value (rather purchase price) in respect of draught cattle and at 8 per cent of value of implements. The expenditure given in relevant tables on implements was in fact the value of the implements inclusive of any labour charges. Some of the grantees had draught cattle either before the land allotment or had got it as a gift and this was valued at the average price of the purchased draught cattle. Depreciation on owned bullocks differs in the two years as some grantees had purchased bullocks in the year 1978-79 and having paid for tillage in the previous year. The depreciation accounted in 1977-78 had obviously to be less than that in 1978-79. Maintenance cost of draught cattle and agricultural implements was not available and nor was income from renting them to other grantees etc. was reported though they did earn such income from undertaking tillage for others. It is, therefore, assumed that such income received and farm grown fodder will be sufficient to meet the maintenance cost⁴ bullocks and implements and this item is dropped from the cost calculation to arrive at the total cost and the farm business income in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for the two respective years 1977-78 and 1978-79.

The results are quite clear to see. Even without subsidy the per grantee farm business income is positive in both the groups; upto 5-00 acres and 5-01 and more acres, in all the tahasils. Addition of subsidy reduces the burden of cost of cultivation borne by the grantee and thus increases

the farm business income. Per acre farm business income varies quite a lot and has naturally resulted into higher or lower per grantee income along with per grantee area cropped in each of the acreage groups.

Comparing the per grantee farm business income for the two years, 1978-79 shows some improvement over 1977-78. Even in Vaijapur-Gangapur-Kannad tahasils where no subsidy under the 'Central Sector Scheme' was payable the results are quite comparable with those of the other tahasils with subsidy and in some cases even better. The results were to some extent not unexpected as the lands allotted were under cultivation previous to allotment and the extent of area cultivated and cropped has remained at the level observable for the district as given in Table 1.2 in Chapter I.

5.2 Summary and Conclusions

The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961, often referred to as the 'Principal Act' was amended by Maharashtra 21 of 1975, the so amended Act being referred as the 'Revised Act'. The main purpose of the amendment was lowering the maximum limit or ceiling on the holding of agricultural land in the State for making additional land available as surplus for distribution to landless and other persons. While the main purpose of the amended Act has succeeded this was achieved by introducing two measures; firstly, by prescribing a uniform ceiling in terms of various classes of land in place of ceiling by 'local areas' in the Principal Act, and secondly, by substitution of section 27 which reduce the maximum allocable area to a grantee. The economics of land would certainly differ from area to area in the State and within the district also and the creation of 'local areas' in the 'Principal Act' to decide the ceiling area was quite in keeping with the differences. For some reason or other these 'local

area' were found redundant and done away with in the 'Revised Act'.

Along with the uniform ceiling area in the State came the uniform maximum allocable area, $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres of dry crop land, all over the State. The 'Revised Act' denied the differences in the dry crop land between areas of the State and measured these with a single yardstick. In view of this single yardstick the composition of surplus surrendered into previously cultivated and uncultivated area becomes important. It was contended in 1.2 of Chapter I, that to the extent the land distributed out of the surrendered surplus is largely previously uncultivated area and brought under cultivation by the new grantees it would mean that much addition to total agricultural production and also in employment in agriculture and whether this will essentially amount to addition to grantees income in the immediate period is difficult to say. On the other hand if the distributed surplus is largely out of the previously cultivated area it is more or less certain, at least in the immediate period that there is no likelihood of increase in agricultural production, in employment in agriculture and income also or at best any changes in this will be marginal. Employment data of the grantee family's labour input on own farm would have come handy for the purpose and yet its non-availability need not deter us from arriving at some conclusions on the basis of available data.

It was seen earlier that major proportion of the surplus surrendered and distributed was out of previously cultivated area. It will also be seen from Tables 6.1 and 6.2 that the proportion of cropped area was almost on par with proportion of cropped area out of total area of the holdings in Table 1.2 in Chapter I and on the basis of this it should not be impossible to consider the changes in

income of the grantee families in the post-land allotment year. The surplus was distributed to landless persons and in the main to agricultural and other labourers and to that extent it should be possible to assess the changes in income, if any, from wage labour (both casual and permanent farm servants) in the post-land allotment years 1978-79 in relation to the immediate period previous to such land allotment. Table 6.3 gives the income by sources of the self cultivating grantee families only for the year 1975-76, ⁱⁿ the year immediately preceding land allotment, and the post-land allotment year 1978-79. Sources of income other than wage labour, permanent farm servant and agriculture are not of much consequence in the matter and hence we would limit ourselves to income from these three sources in 1978-79 and only the first two sources for 1975-76. The conclusions on this basis will have to ^{be} looked at with great circumspection since it cannot be expected of the grantee to give a very correct account of his earnings from various sources of the past period two three years afterwards in 1978-79. However, this past income as reported may be looked upon as the grantees feeling as to what he earned before land allotment and to that extent may be looked upon as an opinion survey. Even then it has some importance since it is the grantee's response to the new situation.

Before proceeding further income from 'Agriculture' in Table 6.3 needs to be explained. Actually what has been put here as income from agriculture is, in fact, the surplus over out of pocket cost as given in Kak Chapter V. This is neither net income from agriculture nor farm business income but can still be construed as dispensable income out of which other charges have to be met. These would include interest on loan, depreciation of drought cattle and implements, land revenue, cess and any other expenses

Table 6.3 : Income ^{by} ~~of~~ sources of self cultivating grantees for pre-land allotment year 1975-76 and post-land allotment year 1976-77

Tahsil	Size of Holding (acres)	Self Cultivating Grantees	Income by sources previous to land allotment (1975-76)						Total Income
			Wage Labour	Per. farm servant	Salaried services	Trade and business	Artisans and service occupations	Other income	
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	23110.00	4000.00	-	-	-	3250.00	31040.00
	3-01 to 4-00	30	34042.00	4000.00	4020.00	-	-	2500.00	40422.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	04700.00	5900.00	2000.00	3500.00	-	1750.00	78910.00
	5-01 to 7-20	39	03130.00	0150.00	040.00	3200.00	2000.00	3010.00	78330.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	130	185042.00	21470.00	6340.00	6700.00	2000.00	10550.00	234702.00
2) Jainn Bhokardan Jafraabad	Upto 3-00	9	0210.00	720.00	11800.00	-	2250.00	-	23080.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	2500.00	2050.00	950.00	-	-	050.00	28860.00
	4-01 to 5-00	47	55200.00	9600.00	9340.00	2700.00	3050.00	3000.00	63850.00
	5-01 to 7-20	22	23010.00	5250.00	6400.00	-	1400.00	1300.00	30220.00
	7-21 and more	1	300.00	-	3500.00	-	-	-	3900.00
	Total	96	112600.00	17700.00	32240.00	2700.00	6700.00	5750.00	177690.00
3) Billos Soegaon	Upto 3-00	0	5200.00	020.00	950.00	-	2000.00	2200.00	11800.00
	3-01 to 4-00	10	13000.00	2000.00	900.00	-	7900.00	1500.00	26800.00
	4-01 to 5-00	9	10070.00	1100.00	11900.00	-	980.00	-	30650.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	13000.00	2400.00	900.00	-	1200.00	1250.00	19090.00
	7-21 and more	5	2040.00	-	4000.00	1500.00	-	372.00	8792.00
	Total	45	52190.00	6920.00	18800.00	1500.00	12000.00	5466.00	97616.00
4) Falthan	Upto 3-00	12	11400.00	000.00	4000.00	-	-	5000.00	21920.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	19100.00	2000.00	15000.00	-	000.00	0100.00	42900.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	400.00	-	-	-	900.00	-	1400.00
	5-01 to 7-20	7	9250.00	4000.00	-	-	-	-	13530.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	40570.00	6700.00	19000.00	-	1500.00	11100.00	79050.00
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Hannad	Upto 3-00	12	11005.00	000.00	5520.00	1200.00	-	-	18585.00
	3-01 to 4-00	7	0510.00	-	4000.00	-	750.00	050.00	14910.00
	4-01 to 5-00	31	31100.00	0120.00	14100.00	4100.00	3700.00	900.00	60100.00
	5-01 to 7-20	9	9090.00	-	12000.00	-	-	-	21690.00
	7-21 and more	3	4400.00	1100.00	-	-	050.00	-	6210.00
	Total	62	64225.00	0020.00	37000.00	5300.00	5100.00	1030.00	121555.00

(contd.)

Table 6.3 : (contd.)

Tahasil	Size of Holding (acres)	Self Cultivating Grantees	Income by sources post land allotment (1978-79)							Total Income
			Wage Labour	Per. farm servant	Agriculture	Salaries services	Trade and Business	Artisans and service occupations	Other income	
1) Ambad	Upto 3-00	18	16120.00	5040.00	7806.00	-	-	-	3180.00	32146.00
	3-01 to 4-00	30	20625.00	4680.00	10208.00	5340.00	-	-	3995.00	44828.00
	4-01 to 5-00	43	38990.00	6720.00	18390.00	3950.00	3500.00	-	1150.00	70750.00
	5-01 to 7-20	39	37130.00	6130.00	13750.00	840.00	-	1300.00	1735.00	60915.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	130	110865.00	22550.00	50184.00	10114.00	3500.00	1300.00	10100.00	208639.00
2) Jaina Shokardan Jafrahad	Upto 3-00	9	7310.00	2150.00	2225.00	12120.00	1000.00	2250.00	-	27065.00
	3-01 to 4-00	17	14980.00	2050.00	5989.00	1320.00	-	400.00	2570.00	27289.00
	4-01 to 5-00	47	36455.00	13440.00	14200.00	8413.00	2200.00	2100.00	4790.00	81598.00
	5-01 to 7-20	22	14420.00	3520.00	7775.00	6160.00	-	1000.00	1100.00	34465.00
	7-21 and more	1	-	-	163.00	3600.00	-	-	-	3763.00
	Total	96	73235.00	21230.00	30332.00	31913.00	3200.00	501.00	8460.00	174160.00
3) Bilhou Soegaon	Upto 3-00	6	3000.00	820.00	3945.00	1320.00	-	2800.00	2280.00	14565.00
	3-01 to 4-00	10	10520.00	1100.00	5879.00	3120.00	-	8200.00	2400.00	31889.00
	4-01 to 5-00	9	15310.00	1100.00	3338.00	4320.00	-	700.00	1512.00	26280.00
	5-01 to 7-20	11	10050.00	2400.00	9842.00	980.00	-	1200.00	1254.00	25706.00
	7-21 and more	3	2500.00	-	2885.00	4080.00	1500.00	-	372.00	11377.00
	Total	45	42110.00	5420.00	25689.00	13800.00	1500.00	12900.00	7818.00	109417.00
4) Paithan	Upto 3-00	12	9550.00	1080.00	3560.00	1320.00	-	-	3940.00	19450.00
	3-01 to 4-00	20	12230.00	1100.00	6629.00	15000.00	-	3650.00	4950.00	43559.00
	4-01 to 5-00	1	360.00	-	365.00	-	-	600.00	-	1325.00
	5-01 to 7-20	7	7640.00	2950.00	2425.00	-	-	-	-	13045.00
	7-21 and more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	40	29780.00	5160.00	12979.00	16320.00	-	4250.00	8890.00	77379.00
5) Vaijapur Gangapur Kannad	Upto 3-00	12	8230.00	800.00	6633.00	5750.00	1200.00	-	-	22623.00
	3-01 to 4-00	7	8050.00	720.00	1592.00	4800.00	-	700.00	900.00	16762.00
	4-01 to 5-00	31	23265.00	3640.00	9801.00	14550.00	4200.00	3150.00	1190.00	59796.00
	5-01 to 7-20	9	5830.00	-	7910.00	14040.00	-	-	-	27780.00
	7-21 and more	3	5210.00	1100.00	827.00	-	-	6.00	-	7737.00
	Total	62	50585.00	8260.00	26763.00	39150.00	5400.00	4450.00	2090.00	134698.00

312

70,43,13

related to cultivation. Besides these provision will have to be made for repayment of loans incurred for investment in land development and purchase of livestock etc. However, very rarely are such provisions made by the grantees and hence it was deemed fit to consider disposable surplus by way of income rather than farm business income.

Total income ^{accruing} ~~occurring~~ to grantee families shows only slight changes either way. The major sources of income in 1975-76 were wage labour and working as permanent farm servants together accounting for anywhere between 60 to 88 per cent in various tahasils. In the post land allotment period 1978-79 income from agriculture besides the above two sources needs to be considered since the major source of labour in agriculture will have to come out of the earners who were previously engaged as casual wage labourers and ~~far~~ permanent farm servants. As will be seen the proportion of income from wage labour has gone down as has the absolute income from this source. With total income from wage labour (inclusive of permanent farm servant's earnings) in the pre-allotment period being more or less on par with the total income from wage labour and agriculture in the post-allotment year 1978-79 it will be fair to think that while income has not increased as a result of self cultivation, employment also has not increased part of the previous wage labour employment in agriculture having become family labour input in own cultivation. This is the result when surplus over cost is considered as dispensable income and the results definitely would be a little adverse if net income from agriculture could be arrived at and used.

This is broadly the result of the surplus allotment where major proportion of land allotted was previously under cultivation and continued to be so after allotment. While this cannot be assumed as a conclusive proof of the earlier proposition that 'if the distributed surplus is largely out

of the previously cultivated area it is more or less certain, at least in the immediate period, that there is no likelihood of increase in agricultural production, in employment in agriculture and income also or at least best any changes in this will be marginal', this may broadly be considered as maintaining the income status quo except for ownership of a piece of land and some unpaid debts in the wake of such ownership. While surplus available by way of farm business income is a good occurrence if things have to improve in terms of employment and income alternate employment opportunities need to be created either in occupations ancillary to agriculture or in wage labour employment. This is the outcome at the end of the short three year period and things could improve over a longer period, as seen in respect of Principal Act grantees in Yavatmal district, given the proper management and adequate knowhow.