

**CO-OPERATIVE FARMING
IN
GUJARAT**

**(A STUDY INTO THE WORKING OF THE
CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES IN GUJARAT)**

Prepared by

**The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee,
Ahmedabad.**

1959

**AN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
BOMBAY 1.**

**CO-OPERATIVE
IN
GUJARAT**

(A STUDY INTO THE WORK
CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES IN GUJARAT)

Prepared by

**The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee,
Ahmedabad.**

1959

THE INDIAN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

46-48, Esplanade Mansions,

Mahatma Gandhi Road,

BOMBAY 1.

PUBLISHED JUNE 1959

Price Rs. 5/-

Printed by V. G. Moghe B.A., at the
Bombay University Press
Fort, Bombay 1 and

Published by S. G. Tejura for the
Indian Society of Agricultural Economics at
46-48, Esplanade Mansions, Bombay 1.

FOREWORD

A network of co-operative institutions at various levels and for various activities have been envisaged as a pattern for future rural organisation. Village Panchayats and Co-operatives have become symbols of a new social and economic order in the rural area. The Indian National Congress at its 64th Session at Nagpur passed a Resolution on "Agrarian Organizational Pattern" which stated that "the future agrarian pattern should be that of co-operative joint farming, in which the land will be pooled for joint cultivation." It was further stated that "as a first step, prior to the institution of joint farming, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country. This stage would be completed within a period of three years. Even within this period, however, wherever possible and generally agreed to by the farmers, joint cultivation may be started."

The decision to adopt joint co-operative farming as the future pattern of agricultural organization has given rise to a bitter controversy. While the question is being debated, an objective study of the working of the existing co-operative farming societies in a region would be of great value in taking an informed view on the subject. It is not suggested that the experience of the working of the existing co-operative farming societies should be considered as conclusive; but neither can it be totally ignored. As a part of a National programme and with proper planning and guidance, the pattern will certainly yield better results.

In 1955, the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission approved a scheme for the study of co-operative farming societies in Gujarat. The Survey was conducted under the guidance of a Committee of Direction and advice of the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics. The Committee of Direction consisted of persons with very intimate contact with the people of rural Gujarat and some of them had long association with the co-operative movement. Shri Vimal Shah, the convenor of the Committee of Direction, had himself sponsored a co-operative farming society. In all, the working of 83 societies was examined and 24 out of them were selected for intensive study. The enquiry related to the period from 1949-50 to 1955-56. Detailed case studies of the members of 10 societies were undertaken with a view to finding out the impact of co-operative working on the economic conditions of the members.

This study was sponsored by the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission and was financed by a grant from it. The Research Programmes Committee has also been good enough to meet the cost of printing and publishing this report.

FOREWORD

The general pattern of investigation, organisation and technique was recommended to the Committee of Direction but the actual technique of study, analysis, etc., followed by the Committee are largely of their own and that the Planning Commission or the Research Programmes Committee accept no responsibility for the facts and opinions stated in the report.

The Indian Society of Agricultural Economics has pleasure in publishing the results of the Survey and hopes the publication would make some contribution to the dispassionate study of this controversial issue.

M. L. DANTWALA.

PREFACE

The Bombay State was foremost in launching the Co-operative farming movement in the country. It is still leading other States in this respect, because it has provided in the Second Five Year Plan both for consolidation and expansion of the movement. While the total provision made for the purpose in the First Five Year Plan was of Rs. 20,89,000, in the Second Plan a provision of Rs. 27,75,000 is made for it. The emphasis in the Second Plan is on consolidation of work. At the same time registration of 100 new societies is also envisaged. Some of the features in the Second Plan Scheme, are in consonance with our recommendations, as mentioned in the body of the report, and deserve appreciation. For example, the recommendation to give trained and efficient managers to the societies or to provide for training of the members of the societies is already there in the Second Plan Scheme. Another important provision made in the scheme is of intensive development of 25 societies. These would serve as models for other societies and agriculturists of surrounding localities. What we would now emphasise is creation of both official and non-official permanent bodies to provide continuous guidance to the societies, active association of the agricultural department with the activities of the societies and to make definite arrangements for crop finance. It would also be in the interest of the movement, if the existing societies which have done pioneering work and which are undergoing setback owing to defective schemes are given a helping and encouraging hand and put on an even road thus clearing the clouds of fear and suspicion for the future movement; and if certain areas as a whole are intensively developed, and a large number of Co-operative Farming Societies are organised there. This would help in creating the necessary psychological atmosphere. Our present study is important not so much for showing the bright careers of successful farming societies, but for discovering from the failures of some societies the defects in the old schemes of co-operative farming. We hope it will serve as a lighthouse for the ships of co-operative farming which are just preparing to emerge into the ocean of Indian economy.

The Co-operative Farming movement has, in our humble opinion, a bright future in the country because it is the need of the day. To develop the co-operative farming movement on right lines it is obvious that a phased programme will have to be planned. To begin with, in view of the perfectly voluntary character of co-operative farming societies insisted upon by all concerned in the country and considering the present psychology of the agricultural population, organisation of service co-operatives to cover all villages will naturally be the order of the day. At the same time however, the function of service co-

PREFACE

operatives need not be restricted to minor services as in the case of better farming or tenant farming societies. In fact all attempts should be made right from the beginning both at the government level at the top and more so at base level by the agriculturists themselves to adopt all pervading co-operative activities, to cover even higher forms of co-operation such as pooling of resources, joint management, unified crop planning, bulk purchase of farmers' needs ; bulk sale of all their agricultural produce, catering to the social needs of the members, their families and even those of others in the village with a broader outlook as to the interests of the country and the humanity at large. It is therefore hoped that service co-operatives shall become the pilot cars of the co-operative farming movement in our country, and lead ultimately to higher forms of co-operation such as joint farming.

The terminology "Co-operative Farming Society," it may be noted at this stage, is understood in the ordinary parlance and the text-books on this subject as including co-operation in production. This is therefore distinguished from "service co-operative" which is only "resources society," which does not undertake any production activity and does not employ its funds in any joint production enterprise. In this study however, the term "co-operative farming society" has been used for examination of the working of collective farming society and the joint farming society on the one hand and the tenant farming society on the other hand. But the collective farming and the joint farming societies could also be termed as genuine co-operative farming societies. Tenant farming societies should be known and treated as service co-operatives henceforward.

To develop the whole movement of co-operative farming on right lines it would require periodical assessment as done in this study.

We would like to thank all those who have given their active co-operation in this study. Particular mention must be made of the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission who sponsored this study and gave us a very liberal grant of Rs. 9735/- for it. Prof. M. L. Dantwala who acted as our guide, the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics and its President, Shri Manilal Nanavati who associated themselves with our work, the Registrar of the Co-operative Societies in the Bombay State who gave necessary instruction to his officers to give their co-operation in the study, Dr. C. H. Shah, Lecturer in the School of Economics, University of Bombay, who is also a member of the Committee of direction for the study, and Shri M. H. Patel, another member of the Committee, Miss Vishakha Mehta, its office-secretary, and office-bearers and managers of all the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat who have supplied us all information very willingly. We thank them all.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iii
Preface	v
Chapter	
I Introduction	1
II Growth of the Movement	6
III Membership	22
IV Land	24
V Financial Resources	28
VI Development	37
VII Intensive Study	41
VIII Administration and Management	83
IX Conclusion	89
Appendices	99-138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Genesis :

The first conference of the workers and representatives of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat was held at Rasulabad (Dist. Baroda) in 1954. A Committee was appointed in this conference to go into the working of these Societies with a view to study their problems and suggest measures for future development of Co-operative Farming movement in Gujarat. In order to undertake the study systematically a detailed scheme was prepared and submitted to the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission. The scheme was approved in October, 1955.

Objects :

The main objects of the study were to find out

- (a) which of the four types of Co-operative Farming Societies viz.,
 - (1) better farming
 - (2) tenant farming
 - (3) joint farming and
 - (4) collective farmingis most suitable to our conditions ;
- (b) whether Government help given to these Societies was justified and adequate, and
- (c) whether any contribution was made by these Societies towards the solution of sociological problems such as relations between landlords, tenants and agricultural labourers, relations of agriculturists with cattle breeders ; rehabilitation of displaced persons etc.

Committee of Direction :

A Committee of Direction was formed for the purpose of this inquiry with following members:—

Sri Jugatram Dave, *Chairman*
Sri M. H. Patel, B.Sc. (Agri.), G.D.C.A.
Sri S. J. Patel, M.Ag.
Sri G. B. Patel, M.Sc. (Agri.) (California Uni.)
Sri H. M. Desai, M.Sc. (Agri.) (Cornell Uni.)

Sri B. M. Patel, B.Sc. (Agri.)
Sri G. G. Mehta, B.A. (Hons.), LL.B., Bar-at-Law.
Dr. C. H. Shah, Ph.D.
Sri Vimal Shah, M.A., *Secretary*.

Most of the members of the Committee were closely connected with one or more of the Co-operative Farming Societies either as promoters or as office-bearers. One of them viz. Sri M. H. Patel worked as its officer-in-charge for Gujarat Region right from the beginning of the Co-operative Farming Scheme of the Bombay Government.

The Scheme :

The scheme was approved by the Research Programmes Committee subject to two conditions:—

- (a) only the Co-operative Farming Societies properly defined should be studied, and
- (b) either Prof. Dantwala or the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics should keep in close touch with the survey and give needed technical guidance. The Committee of Direction has received technical guidance from both of them at every stage of the inquiry.

As for the first suggestion, the Committee decided to restrict its study to the working of tenant farming, joint farming and collective farming societies. The better farming societies were excluded from the study as they were not accepted as Co-operative Farming Societies under the Scheme of Co-operative Farming of the Bombay State. Societies in Amreli District were also excluded from the scope of the study as that District does not form a part of the Gujarat Region, though administratively included in it.

Period :

The inquiry relates to the period from 1949-50 to 1955-56. The Co-operative Farming Scheme of the Bombay State was started in 1949-50.

Design :

The whole inquiry was divided into two parts viz.,

- (a) general survey
- (b) intensive survey.

For the purpose of the general survey all the working societies were considered. The general survey included the basic data of the village where the society was working as well as the basic data of the society itself.

For the intensive survey, out of the total, 24 societies were selected. The method of selecting these societies was purposive sampling. The idea was to take a number of societies for intensive study in order to bring out the peculiar problems of co-operative farming. Those societies which offered these possibilities were selected. Every care was taken, while making this selection, to include societies of different types, class, districts and size as seen from the following table:

TABLE NO. 1
Selection of Societies for intensive study

	Total No. of Societies	Societies selected for intensive study.
(a) Typewise :		
(1) Tenant	39	8
(2) Joint	16	6
(3) Collective	28	10
Total ...	83	24
(b) Classwise :		
(1) Backward	55	17
(2) Non-backward	28	7
Total ...	83	24
(c) Sizewise (size according to membership) :		
(1) Below 15	23	5
(2) 16-30	26	7
(3) 31-45	19	7
(4) 46-60	5	1
(5) 61-120	6	3
(6) above 120	4	1
Total ...	83	24
(d) Districtwise :		
(1) Ahmedabad	15	3
(2) Baroda	31	9
(3) Surat	13	3
(4) Others	24	9
Total ...	83	24

All the same, it has been on the whole a sort of a case study in order to get a microscopic view of the whole problem. To fulfil this objective, a provision was made in the intensive survey for the study of the life of the members. For this purpose a sample of 5% of the total membership was taken, and the sample was selected according to the random sampling method. Thus, a study of 150 members was made. A questionnaire was also prepared to know the reactions of the non-members residing in the villages of the intensive survey on the working of the societies. Thus 56 non-members were interviewed.

Schedules :

Detailed schedules were prepared both for general survey and intensive survey. Before finalising these schedules a study tour of the members of the Committee was arranged. 11 societies were visited during this tour.

Two schedules were prepared for the general survey out of which the first was meant for the basic information of the village in which the society was working and the second was meant for the basic information of the society. These two schedules were filled in for all the 83 working societies.

For the intensive survey, 8 schedules were prepared out of which six related to the working of the societies, while out of the remaining two, one was for the information about members, and the other was meant for the non-members. All the 10 schedules are given in Appendix 3.

Sources :

Basic data for the village was obtained from village records while that of the society from the records of the society. It was supplemented by the records of the Co-operative Department of the State.

Limitations :

It must be noted here that the records maintained by the societies were found to be quite inadequate, and the records that the department wanted the societies to maintain were also inadequate for the purpose of economic analysis. The system of maintaining records requires a thorough investigation. Records should be so devised as to give a clearcut picture of the working of the societies. Proper training in maintenance of records will also have to be imparted. The societies could not maintain the records for want of trained staff.

The difficulty about the maintenance of proper records was experienced the most in case of the tenant farming societies. Their working is such that they are required to maintain very few records. Even such basic data as cropping and production were not maintained by some of them.

The entire data was checked by Sri M. H. Patel, a member of the Committee, who was also Special Assistant Registrar for Co-operative Farming during the period of inquiry.

Chapter System :

The report has been divided into nine Chapters. They are as follows :—

- (1) *Introduction*
- (2) *Growth of the Movement* :—In this Chapter a short outline of the growth of the movement of Co-operative Farming in

the Bombay State and in the Gujarat region in particular is given. It also includes a short description of the different types of Co-operative Farming Societies, as also different special schemes under which they were organised.

- (3) *Membership* :—In this Chapter, type of membership of the societies is discussed. Size of the society according to membership is also discussed.
- (4) *Land and other Resources* :—In this Chapter the position of the societies in respect of land and other resources is discussed.
- (5) *Financial Resources* :—In this Chapter the financial position of the societies is discussed. Government assistance to the societies is also discussed in this Chapter.
- (6) *Development* :—In this Chapter different development activities undertaken by the societies are discussed.
- (7) *Intensive Study* :—In this Chapter results of the intensive study of 24 societies are given. Case studies of 10 societies out of them are also given in this Chapter.
- (8) *Administration and Management* :—In this Chapter administrative problems are discussed.
- (9) *Conclusion* :—In this Chapter a summary of the observations is given in the beginning. It is followed by important recommendations.
- (10) *Appendices* :—Three appendices are given. In the first, six statistical tables are given. In the second, a list of all the working societies with their important particulars is given along with a list of societies selected for intensive study. In the third, schedules used for the inquiry are given.

In the beginning of the report a map of Gujarat is given showing the location of the societies.

CHAPTER II

GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT

Traditional Co-operation :

Co-operative farming, in its present form is of recent origin in Gujarat as also in Bombay State. This, however, does not mean that our peasantry was not aware of co-operative efforts in agricultural production. Certain agricultural operations such as ploughing, sowing, harvesting, thrashing etc. used to be and even now are occasionally carried out by mutual aid. In fact, many of these operations call for joint efforts. Instances of joint farming by two or more persons with inadequate holdings of land and/or limited resources for ensuring scale economy and efficiency are not rare. It should, however, be accepted that co-operative farming with its modern concept was not systematically taken up by our peasantry. Co-operative farming, in its present form, calls for a high degree of comprehensive co-operation involving joint efforts by larger groups in almost all the processes of agricultural production while the traditional methods of co-operative efforts in certain operations only are more or less segmental in their nature and function.

First Attempts :

Historically speaking, first attempts for the formation of co-operative farming societies in the Bombay State were made as early as in 1921. One such experiment was carried out in that year by Dr. H. Mann in Ahmednagar District and another in Sholapur District. In 1925, two more societies were organised in Dharwar District. Between 1930 and 1940, however, only 9 more societies were organised in the whole State, while the number of societies organised between 1940 and 1947 is 21. These societies were, however, mainly confined to better farming and land improvement activities. These societies were generally on limited liability basis and their area of operation covered a village or a group of villages. Thus, though 9 societies were registered as joint farming societies in 1945-46, none of them had undertaken joint cultivation. They had, thus, hardly any considerable results to show so far as joint farming was concerned.

Real Beginning :

Certain factors of a nationwide character such as the Post-War Reconstruction plans and especially the advent of freedom were responsible in starting the real movement of co-operative farming in the Bombay State. The Government thought that retired soldiers who were used to hard work and strict discipline could conveniently be re-

habilitated on lands through formation of farming co-operatives. The partition of the country brought to the fore the problem of rehabilitating the agricultural population coming from Pakistan. The Grow More Food Campaign was also one of the reasons for encouraging co-operative farming as a means for enhancing agricultural production. The measures adopted for carrying out land reforms further encouraged the movement. These measures, while attempting to do away with landlordism in all its various forms, brought to light the question of the most profitable pattern of land utilisation, the question as to whether to continue the old system of individual farming or to organise it on co-operative basis. Furthermore, the cause of co-operative farming was advocated by a number of delegations and committees. The Indian Delegation to Palestine recommended in its report in 1946 to conduct experiments in co-operative farming. The need for co-operative farming was strongly advocated by the Agrarian Reforms Committee of the Indian National Congress which recommended that the holdings below the basic size (consisting of one-third of the economic holding) should, in course of time, be brought under a scheme of co-operative joint farming. The Co-operative Planning Committee known as Saraiya Committee also made similar recommendations and outlined the various types of agricultural co-operatives. In the First Five Year Plan, while envisaging co-operative village management as an objective, it was advocated, as an immediate measure, to encourage and assist both small and medium farmers to group themselves into co-operative farming societies.

Captain Mohite's Report :

These developments obviously had their effect on the policy of the Bombay State in promoting co-operative farming. Thus the State Government consulted the Provincial Rural Development Board on the advisability of introducing co-operative farming on a larger-scale. The opinion of the Board was favourable. The Government further appointed in 1946 Capt. S. P. Mohite to report on the possibility of expanding co-operative farming activities in the context of the conditions then obtaining in the State. In the meanwhile the Government sanctioned a scheme for the organisation of co-operative better farming societies on 22-4-47. The object of the scheme was to consolidate fragmented and uneconomic or inadequate holdings by pooling the ownership into a co-operative society of all the holders and to rationalise cultivation by redistributing the land in suitable economic units of cultivation for increased production and elimination of waste. It was spread over a period of 5 years and was estimated to cost Rs. 3,60,000/-.

Subsequently Capt. Mohite's report was available, and the Government, after considering it, decided to encourage very actively co-operative farming experiments. It was, thus, in light of the recommendations of this report that the Government in supersession of the

existing scheme sanctioned a scheme for organisation of four different types of co-operative farming societies on 16 May, 1949.

Co-operative Farming Scheme :

The main objects of the scheme were to increase the yield of the land, and to secure better returns to the cultivators by consolidation of holdings and by adoption of methods of improved farming and marketing of agricultural produce. It was also envisaged to introduce cottage and small-scale industries as well as subsidiary occupations to supplement the income of the members. The area selected for application of the scheme was the whole of the province with special reference to Thana, Surat, Kanara, Dharwar and East and West Khandesh districts in the first instance where there was scope for organising co-operative collective or tenant farming societies by taking land from the Government and/or private landlords. The scheme visualised organisation of 112 co-operative farming societies spread over a period of 5 years and was estimated to cost Rs. 20,89,000/- for granting loans and subsidies to these societies for (1) purchase of seed, manure, agricultural implements etc. (2) contribution towards share capital, (3) purchase of heavy costly agricultural implements, (4) land development, (5) construction of godowns, and (6) meeting the cost of management.

For execution of the scheme, the State was divided into 3 linguistic units, viz. Gujarat, Maharashtra and Karnatak and each unit was placed under the charge of a District Co-operative Officer who was assisted by one agricultural officer, one surveyor and other clerical staff. It may be added here that the targets envisaged in the scheme were reached much earlier, and it was later included in the First Five Year Plan. No targets, however, were subsequently fixed and only such societies which did not depend upon Government assistance were registered. The Government also issued orders for consolidation of the farming societies already registered rather than expansion. Having regard however, to the possibilities of organising new societies both on Government waste lands and on occupied lands it was decided to resume the scheme and was therefore included in the 2nd Five Year Plan. This scheme visualises organisation of 100 co-operative farming societies. 50 societies on Government waste lands for settling the new grantees and 50 co-operative joint farming societies of persons whose holdings are small and who would benefit by increasing the unit of cultivation. A provision of Rs. 27,75,000/- is made to assist these societies.

Different Types of Co-operative Farming Societies :

It was in accordance with this scheme that the work relating to organisation of different types of co-operative farming societies was taken up in Gujarat in 1949. The scheme provided for organisation of the following four types of co-operative farming societies :—

- (i) A co-operative better farming society.
- (ii) A co-operative joint farming society.

- (iii) A co-operative tenant farming society.
- (iv) A co-operative collective farming society.

Later on, the Government, however, decided to exclude co-operative better farming societies from the purview of the scheme and further directed that those already registered should be converted into co-operative multi-purpose societies if they have no definite programme for undertaking agricultural improvement. The remaining three types of societies, as described in the Government resolution approving the scheme, are as follows:

(i) *Co-operative Joint Farming Societies :*

This type of society envisages pooling of land by small land owners. Members work jointly on the pooled lands and receive wages for their labour. The ownership of each member in his holding, however, continues and is recognised by the payment of dividend (*i.e.* property-income) in proportion to the value of the land. All the farm expenses are incurred by the society and all farm proceeds are also received by it. These proceeds after meeting all expenses of cultivation, property-income, wages, cost of management etc. and providing for a reserve fund are shared by the members in proportion to the wages earned and/or property-income received by them. The society plans the crop programme, raises funds on security of lands, crops and other movable and immovable assets of the society for land development, purchase of machinery, payment of agricultural expenses, land improvement and all other activities calculated to promote development of agriculture.

(ii) *Co-operative Tenant Farming Society :*

This type of society takes land on freehold or leasehold and the land is divided into holdings of suitable size for being leased to members for individual cultivation as tenants. The society thus replaces the superior landlord. Each tenant pays a fixed rent for his holding. The whole area is cultivated according to a plan laid down by the society but each member is at liberty to execute the plan in the manner he likes. The society arranges to supply credit, seed, manure, costly implements and arranges for the marketing of the members' produce. The profits, after meeting all expenses and providing for a reserve fund, are distributed among the tenant members in proportion to rent paid by each of them.

(iii) *Co-operative Collective Farming Society :*

This society, ordinarily formed of landless agriculturists, takes land either on freehold or leasehold and also owns all the means of production. It undertakes joint cultivation and the members pool their resources for the purpose. They receive wages for work and the profits, after meeting the agricultural expenses, wages, cost of management etc. and providing for a reserve fund, are divided in proportion to wages earned by each member.

As will be observed from above, the joint farming and collective farming societies are of similar type except for ownership of the land, payment for property income and distribution of profits. Again the tenant and collective farming societies hold lands in the same manner but basically differ in their working.

Help from the legislation :

Certain administrative and legislative measures adopted by the State Government also greatly assisted in accelerating the progress of the scheme and facilitating the working of farming co-operatives. Thus the Government decided that the Government waste lands admeasuring 100 acres and more and situated in compact blocks should be reserved for formation of co-operative farming societies, first preference being given to the landless agricultural labourers belonging to backward classes. It was also subsequently decided that other lands owned by the Government such as tank-bed lands, river-bed lands should also be granted to co-operative societies in preference to the individuals. The Government also encouraged formation of co-operative societies for reclamation of khar lands and granted large amounts of loans over and above the financial assistance granted under the Khar Land Reclamation Scheme. Thus preferential treatment in grant of Government land and availability of financial assistance not only for development of these lands but also for other resources greatly accelerated the pace of the movement with a result that the targets fixed under the scheme could be reached much earlier than the prescribed period.

The Bombay Co-operative Societies Act and the Bombay Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act were also suitably amended to facilitate formation of co-operative farming societies. A scheme for co-operative farming essentially requires co-operation of all persons interested in the agricultural lands. Cases may, however, arise where a large number of persons interested in the scheme may agree to form a co-operative farming society but there may be a small minority which refuses to fall in line with the scheme. In such cases compulsion may have to be brought to bear on the recalcitrant minority to join the scheme. This provision has been incorporated in Chapter eleven of the Bombay Co-operative Societies Act under which co-operative farming societies could be formed if 66 per cent of the landholders in a compact area owning not less than 75 per cent of the land agree to join the society. The remaining minority could then be compelled to join the society after the procedure mentioned in Chapter eleven is gone through. This provision is, however, not quite free from ambiguity and lays down a very cumbersome, and lengthy and complicated procedure. In fact, none of the societies organised so far in the Gujarat region has either thought it essential or desirable to avail of this provision. The Bombay Co-operative Societies Act also, now,

provides for definition of a co-operative farming society and its types so as to distinguish their classification from other types of societies.*

The movement of co-operative farming suffered certain setbacks on account of certain restrictive provisions in the Bombay Tenancy Agricultural Lands Act. These defects were brought to the notice of Shri V. L. Mehta, the then Minister for Co-operation, during his visit to one of the co-operative joint farming societies in the year 1948. Consequently the Tenancy Act was suitably amended in the same year, as a result of which it has been made possible for a tenant to become a member of a co-operative farming society and to sublet, assign, mortgage or create a charge on his interest in the land in favour of such a society. The more significant amendment is, however, with regard to the protection given to the tenants who form co-operative joint farming societies on the leased lands. The original act provided for the landlord's right to terminate tenancy for personal cultivation even if his tenant has become a member of a co-operative farming society. The amendment made in the Act provides that in no case a tenancy shall be terminated if the tenant has become a member of a co-operative farming society and as long as he continues to be such. This provision enabled the tenants to form co-operative farming societies and the Government to grant loans for development activities.

Efforts of Social Workers :

Co-operative farming in Gujarat was fortunate in receiving active support from a band of constructive workers. A special mention may be made of the pioneering efforts made by Sri Jugatram Dave and his colleagues in organising co-operative farming societies of the adivasis even before the introduction of the regular co-operative farming scheme. Similar efforts were also made by the Gujarat Goseva Sangh, the Bhal Nalkantha Gopalak Mandal and the Gujarat Harijan Sevak Sangh for organisation of co-operative farming societies of cattle breeders and backward classes. Several other social workers also enlisted themselves as members of the co-operative farming societies and actively participated in their working.

* "A 'farming society' means a society formed with the object of promoting development of land and better methods of cultivation by means of improved seeds, manure, irrigation, bunding, tractor ploughing, gully plugging, and soil conservation. A farming society shall be of two classes : (1) a better farming society and (2) a co-operative farming society. (1) A farming society shall be classed as a better farming society if the predominant object is the application of improved methods of cultivation. A better farming society includes a crop protection society (2) a farming society shall be classed as a co-operative farming society if the predominant object is the application of co-operative methods by the holders of lands and in respect of cultivation."

Yearwise Growth :

Systematic and organised attempts for the formation of the co-operative farming societies were made in Gujarat after the adoption of the scheme by the Government on 16-5-49 on the basis of Captain Mohite's report as seen from the following table:

TABLE No. 2
Growth of Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat
from 1947-48 to 1954-55
(Societies in numbers)

Year of Registration	Collective Farming Societies			Joint Farming Societies			Tenant Farming Societies			Total of all types			
	Working	Stagnant	Total	Working	Stagnant	Total	Working	Stagnant	Total	Working	Stagnant	Total	
1947-48	—	—	—	2	3	5	—	—	—	2	3	5	
1948-49	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	2	2	1	3	
Total	...	—	—	2	4	6	2	—	2	4	4	8	
1940-50	2	1	3	3	—	3	1	1	2	6	2	8	
1950-51	2	2	4	6	—	6	13	—	13	21	2	23	
1951-52	2	1	3	1	1	2	8	—	8	11	2	13	
1952-53	5	1	6	2	—	2	7	—	7	14	1	15	
1953-54	5	—	5	—	—	—	3	—	3	8	—	8	
1954-55	12	—	12	2	—	2	5	1	6	19	1	20	
Total	...	28	5	33	14	1	15	37	2	39	79	8	87
GRAND TOTAL	28	5	33	16	5	21	39	2	41	83	12	95	

It is seen from this table that there is a sudden rise in the formation of co-operative farming societies of all types after May 1949 as a result of the organised attempts of the co-operative department. The Government had fixed a target for the formation of 112 societies for the whole state and of 40 societies in Gujarat during the five-year period of the scheme. This target was exceeded before the end of three years and the co-operative department had to slow down its pace for the formation of co-operative farming societies. It continued to register only those societies which were organised on their own, and which promised not to expect any financial assistance from the Government. Yet the organisation of new co-operative farming societies continued throughout the period. This was mainly on account of the Government policy of giving government lands to co-operative farming societies preferably.

Failures :

It is seen from the table No. 2 that out of 12 societies that have become stagnant, 4 had become so prior to the introduction of the scheme. Only 8 out of 87 societies formed during the period of the scheme have stopped working. Considering the fact that it was alto-

gether a new type of organisation, and also remembering that there was a succession of bad agricultural years, the percentage of failures which works out to be 9 does not seem high.

Geographical Distribution :

A majority of the societies have been formed in three districts of the whole region *viz.* Ahmedabad, Baroda and Surat as seen from the table No. 3. This table shows that the largest number of societies have been formed in Baroda District. Reasons for this geographical concentration are: (1) easy availability of Government land, (2) Introduction of Special schemes and (3) efforts of social workers.

TABLE No. 3
Districtwise Distribution of Co-operative Farming
Societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-1955

Name of the District	Collective Farming Societies		Joint Farming Societies		Tenant Farming Societies		Total of all No. of Societies	Types of No. of Mem- bers
	No. of Societies.	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Mem- bers.		
Baroda	16	562	2	44	13	591	31	1197
Ahmedabad	1	20	5	123	9	257	15	400
Surat	2	850	7	141	4	812	13	1308
Kaira	4	248	1	40	4	70	9	358
Sabarkantha	—	—	—	—	5	130	5	130
Broach	4	108	—	—	1	22	5	130
Mehsana	—	—	1	10	3	66	4	76
Banaskantha	1	16	—	—	—	—	1	16
Total	28	1304	16	358	30	1048	88	3010

As will be seen later, a large majority of the societies have been formed on Government lands. This depended naturally upon easy availability of Government lands. They were easily found in Baroda and Ahmedabad districts. Then there were special schemes such as Vaghodia colonization scheme, Amroli Rehabilitation scheme, Dabka Shikarkhana Scheme and Tankbed and Riverbed Schemes in Baroda District, Khar Land Scheme in Surat District and cattle breeder's colonization schemes in Ahmedabad District which largely contributed to the formation of co-operative farming societies. Efforts of social workers such as Sri Jugatram Dave and his colleagues also accounted for the large number of societies in Surat District. 8 out of 13 societies were organised by them.

Classwise Distribution :

Again a majority of the societies have been formed of backward class people as seen from table No. 4. This is because of the Government policy of giving Government lands preferably to the backward class people. Backward class here means those defined by

the Government of India as well as those exceptions made by the Bombay Government for the specific purpose of grant of Government lands. Displaced persons have also been grouped under this head, as they are very backward in techniques of cultivation. Adivasis who were mostly tenants formed co-operative farming societies to protect their tenancy rights, a protection given under the Tenancy Act of 1948.

TABLE. No 4
Classwise Distribution of Co-operative Farming Societies
in Gujarat as on 30-6-1955.

Name of Class	Collective Farming Societies		Joint Farming Societies		Tenant Farming Societies		Total of all types		
	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	
Backward*	17	457	8	171	30	988	55	1616	
Non-backward	11	847	8	187	9	900	28	1904	
Total	...	28	1804	16	358	39	1948	83	3610

* This includes displaced persons' societies.

This was also true of the non-backward class people who were tenants. Landlords also made unsuccessful attempts to form the co-operative farming societies with a view to defeat the purpose of the Tenancy Act. This was because the Act exempted the co-operative farming societies from some of its important provisions such as regulation of payment of cropshare to the landlord. This provision was made in order to allow the co-operative farming societies some freedom in working out their own method of payment. But it was certainly not meant for depriving the tenants of their just share. Such attempts did not get any encouragement from the department and proved abortive. But there were other landlords who joined with their tenants in forming the co-operative farming societies with a view to develop their lands and to be assured of their income. Such societies were registered and given every encouragement by the department.

Khar land development was found to be an impossibility without co-operative effort. Therefore these societies were also formed by the non-backward class people. Similarly river-bed and tank-bed societies were formed. In all these cases conditions of work were such that it was not possible to work individually. Formation of co-operative farming societies for them was a sort of inevitability.

Type of Land :

The types of land on which these societies have been formed also throw important light on their nature. Less than one-fifth of them

have been formed on cultivated lands. Rest of them have been formed on Government lands which are either waste lands, Khar lands, river-bed lands or tank-bed lands. Details are given in the following table.

TABLE No. 5

Distribution according to the type of land of co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-1955

Type of land	Collective Farming Societies		Joint Farming Societies		Tenant Farming Societies		Total of all types	
	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members	No. of Societies	No. of Members
Wasteland	10	388	8	31	33	1115	46	1484
Kharland	1	335	—	—	4	794	5	1129
Forestland	1	15	—	—	—	—	1	15
Cultivable land	2	76	13	327	—	—	15	403
Riverbed and Tankbed land	14	540	—	—	2	39	16	579
Total	28	1304	16	358	39	1948	83	3610

Most of the joint farming societies (13 out of a total of 16) have been formed on cultivated lands. Out of a total of 15 societies formed on cultivated lands, only two are formed by the tenants or agricultural labourers who have taken these lands on lease from the landlords. The rest of them have been formed by landlords and tenants by pooling their lands. These thirteen societies (*i.e.* one-sixth of the total) formed by actual pooling of their lands, could be considered the real co-operative farming societies. The rest are a direct result of the Government policy of giving lands to co-operative farming societies.

Types of Societies :

Of the three types, the tenant farming seems to be the most favourite. Members get land on account of the society, but do not have to undertake joint cultivation. Large number of collective farming societies have been formed either on account of the Government insistence as in the case of Amroli or Dabaka Schemes or on account of certain natural conditions as in the case of tank-bed and river-bed societies. Out of 28 collective farming societies 4 have taken to tenant farming though they continue to be known as collective farming societies.

The joint farming society, as we have already seen is the least favoured; as it demands greater loyalty from its members. Members are required to pool their resources as well as to agree to work jointly. Therefore, even if once formed, great efforts are required to

be made to keep the members together. If some unfavourable circumstances crop up, forces of disintegration immediately start. It is therefore not surprising to find 10 out of 16 co-operative joint farming societies resuming individual farming. These societies had to face great difficulties in their working, and had therefore, compulsorily, to suspend joint farming. The most common difficulty which these societies had to face was about their legal position. Landlords filed suits against the tenants who joined the joint farming societies and transferred their tenancy rights to the societies. The Tenancy Act had given a protection to the tenant that if he became a member of a co-operative farming society he could not be evicted even if the landlord required land for his personal cultivation. This provision had frightened the landlords that they would never get back their lands if they once accepted the transfer of the tenancy rights from the tenant to the society. They therefore tried their utmost to stop this transfer. This resulted in long litigations. 10 societies had to pass through this ordeal. In some cases (4 societies) they were forced to surrender the lands transferred to them by the tenants on technical grounds. In some cases one court decided in favour of the tenant members, a higher court in favour of the landlords, and a still higher court once again in favour of the tenant members. This state of continuous litigation succeeded in breaking the morale of the members.

Another difficulty which these societies had to face came from an unexpected corner. While joining the society, members expected an easy flow of credit from the co-operative banks, but these hopes were not realised. In the scheme, the Government had not provided for working capital to be given to the co-operative farming societies, but it had expected the co-operative banks to perform this function. The banks, in their turn, became reluctant in advancing credit to these new organisations whose future was not very certain. They thought it safer to advance credit to individual farmers through multipurpose or credit societies than to these co-operative farming societies, because the Government had also advanced loans to them for development purposes and had taken the property of the societies under their charge. They, therefore, felt it would be difficult to recover dues in cases of default. Result was that whatever credit members would have received individually was not available when they formed a co-operative farming society.

These two factors broke the spirit of the members and helped the process of disintegration greatly.

Some of these difficulties, particularly financial, were also experienced by the members of the collective farming societies, but as most of them had received Government lands, they could not change the mode of their work as they liked. They had to abide by the provisions of the societies. Therefore the effect was not so obvious as in the case of joint farming societies.

Special Schemes :

As already referred to, apart from the general scheme there were special schemes under which the co-operative farming societies were organised. These are:

(i) Vaghodia Colonization Scheme (District Baroda) :

This scheme was launched by the Bombay Government soon after the merger of the then Baroda State in 1947. Government lands in 10 villages of Vaghodia Taluka and in one village of Baroda Taluka were reserved by the State for haymaking for feeding the State cavalry horses. On the merger of the State, however, the cavalry establishment was disbanded which offered opportunities for the utilisation of these lands for cultivation. The Bombay Government thought it advisable to rehabilitate displaced persons and local landless agricultural labourers on these lands.

The scheme was sanctioned in the beginning of 1950. It provided for the organisation of co-operative farming societies of the displaced persons as well as of the local landless labourers. After making a provision of lands for public purposes at all the eleven villages, the remaining 4656 acres of land were made available for the purpose of the scheme. Eleven co-operative tenant farming societies—4 of entirely local landless labourers, one of entirely displaced persons and the remaining six of both of local landless labourers and displaced persons were organised. Lands were granted to the societies concerned who, in turn, allotted them to their members on the basis of 10 acres per member for individual cultivation. It was, thus, possible to rehabilitate 280 families of displaced persons and 195 families of local landless agricultural labourers under this scheme.

The scheme also provided for grant of rehabilitation loans to the displaced persons @ Rs. 1,162/- per family, the total amount of these loans being Rs. 3,25,360/-. Besides, a sum of Rs. 25,000/- was set apart for construction of wells for the provision of drinking water. The local members were granted tagavi loans by the revenue department for purchase of bullocks and agricultural implements. Subsidies for purchase of seeds, manures etc. were also granted to these societies during the initial years. Services of Government tractors were also made available to some of them for reclamation of grass lands.

The main object of the scheme was of rehabilitation and the medium of co-operatives was considered to be best suited for the purpose. Even though the displaced persons experienced great difficulties in the beginning in adopting agriculture as their occupation, most of them have by now adjusted themselves to this new way of life. Local persons, being agricultural labourers, have, however, taken up their work very enthusiastically and made considerable progress not only in development of the lands with their own meagre resources, but also in efficient utilisation of these lands.

(ii) *Amroli Village Rehabilitation Scheme*
(District Baroda):

Amroli is a small village situated at a distance of about 50 miles in the east of Baroda and is connected by the Baroda-Tankhala Section of the Western Railways. This is a backward and undeveloped tract mainly inhabited by the Adivasi cultivators who used to be exploited by the moneylenders on account of the formers' illiteracy, ignorance and backwardness. The Scheme covers 3 villages of Amroli tappa namely Khodia, Pochamba and Pala situated within a radius of 2 miles from Amroli, the Headquarters of the Scheme.

Investigation into the condition of these Adivasis led the Baroda State Government to decide that something drastic should be done to safeguard their interests since their lands had gone into the hands of non-residential, capital-owning outsiders who had done little to develop these lands. A Committee appointed by the State Government to examine the scheme for debt-relief and rehabilitation of these Adivasis opined that a beginning might be made by selecting some villages for the purpose. Subsequently, the three villages mentioned above were selected. This scheme was launched by the Baroda State Government with the help of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi in the year 1945, and was financed by them on 50 : 50 basis. The actual work, however, commenced in the year 1946.

The objects of this scheme were :—

- (1) to relieve the Adivasi cultivators from indebtedness ;
 - (2) to rehabilitate and re-establish these farmers on lands wherefrom they were once ousted by the moneylenders ;
- and (3) to study the economic results and the influence on the cultivators themselves on different forms of land tenures and farmings on lease-tenancy, proprietary, collective and co-operative basis.

It was also envisaged under the scheme that the State should acquire the lands situated in the 3 villages referred to above and further develop them in the interest of the Adivasi cultivators. Accordingly, 2,410 acres of land were acquired at Government cost. 1,612 acres of these lands were put under plots, each plot measuring 11.7 acres (20 bighas) which was considered to be an economic holding for this tract. 30 families were thus established in Khodia and the farmers were treated as proprietors. 47 families in Pochamba were also similarly established and they were treated as tenants in perpetuation. The lands in Pala village were, however, divided in 2 parts namely Pala East, and Pala West, each consisting of 353 acres. Each division had 30 families and farming in Pala East was done collectively while that in Pala West co-operatively. This Scheme was due to terminate in July 1951, but was extended, though on modified basis, for a

further period of 3 years. According to these modifications, the 2 schemes at Khodia and Pochamba which were more or less of similar nature were amalgamated by forming a single co-operative tenant farming society while the 2 schemes at Pala were amalgamated by forming a single co-operative collective farming society. Both these societies formed part of the Bombay Co-operative Farming Scheme and were registered in July, 1951.

For execution of this Scheme, a fairly large staff was engaged in consideration of its experimental value. This staff was, however, suitably reduced when the scheme was modified. Suitable measures were also taken for redemption of old debts contracted by the member-cultivators. The scheme has succeeded in relieving the Adivasis from indebtedness and exploitation, and it has also enabled them to undertake various land development activities and to raise the standard of agricultural production. They have also been able to repay an amount of Rs. 3,96,152/- till 1956 towards the cost of acquisition of lands which amounts to about Rs. 6,00,000/-. This is one of the oldest experiments in the field of co-operative farming, and its results, therefore, call for detailed and critical study. Hence case studies of both the societies are included in the chapter on case studies.

(iii) *Dabka Shirkarkhana Collective Farming Scheme*
(District Baroda):

The village Dabka is situated at a distance of about 22 miles in the west of Baroda. The then Baroda State Government had shooting preserve lands which are situated on the left bank of the river Mahi and are spread over 5 different villages namely Dabka, Mahmedpura, Sultanpura, Pawda, and Chokari. The Maharaja of Baroda having relinquished his shooting rights in the entire area of these lands, the Bombay Government decided to give out the same for cultivation on co-operative collective farming basis. Even though the total area of these lands measures 5,795 acres, some 1,770 acres have been entirely washed away in the heavy floods of the river Mahi, while a considerable portion of this area is saltish and therefore unfit for cultivation. Thus hardly 1,000 acres are available for cultivation. This is also not uniformly fertile. There are very rich lands which can grow luxuriant crops, while there are lands which are hardly remunerative.

The Government further directed that six co-operative collective farming societies namely, two at Dabka and one each at the remaining four villages should be formed. It was also decided to absorb the staff of the Maharaja and the persons affected by the prohibition policy of the State in this scheme. A Committee was appointed for selection of members according to the priority fixed by the Government. Subsequently these societies with a total membership of 269 were registered in the beginning of the year 1954. The Government sanctioned a loan of Rs. 1,35,000/- for purchase and maintenance of

bullocks, construction of cattle sheds, purchase of agricultural implements and subsidies towards cost of management. These societies were further assisted in land development by giving the services of the Government bull-dozers and tractors for reclamation works. Thus, about 825 acres of lands were developed by June, 1955. The Government also arranged for the organization of a Union of these societies and provided it with services of an agricultural officer free of cost. This Union is expected to supervise, guide and assist the member-societies in their technical and administrative works. It is also expected to undertake supply of agricultural and domestic requirements and marketing of farm produce. Shri Jashwantlal Shah, a social worker from this village and now Deputy Minister for Co-operation, took keen interest in initiation and execution of the scheme.

(iv) *Rabari Bharwad Rehabilitation Scheme*
(District Mehsana):

The Rabari and Bharwad communities are nomadic professional cattle breeders of Gujarat who have maintained the majestic breed of the Kankrej cattle in its pure form. They have been following this important occupation since generations, and have a natural aptitude, love and devotion for this work and have gained considerable skill and knowledge from long and continuous experience. They are mainly concentrated in the North Gujarat districts. They were able to carry on their profession undisturbed as long as there were vast areas of pasture lands for grazing their cattle. However, due to increased pressure of population on the land these pasture lands have mostly disappeared. This state of affairs has created certain basic problems for these cattle rearing communities. Since the cow has a unique and indispensable place in our agrarian economy, it is essential to create favourable conditions so as to enable these cattle breeders to continue the profession.

The problem of settling this nomadic communities attracted the attention of the former Baroda State which initiated a special scheme for their rehabilitation and colonization in Mehsana District by reserving a vast area of about 1,25,000 bighas of lands spread over some 118 villages. Subsequently several attempts were made both by the Government and the social agencies for socio-economic improvement of these cattle breeders. These attempts did not yield expected results for certain reasons. It was in order to solve these problems, that the Government of Bombay sanctioned a special scheme in the year 1955. This scheme provides for the organization of co-operative cattle breeding-cum-farming societies on government lands so as to settle them and to encourage them in undertaking breeding activities by making them self-sufficient in food and fodder production. The scheme provides for not only free grant of government lands but also for financial assistance for land development, purchase of seed, manure, implements etc. for breeding activities and towards the cost of management. The scheme was, further, modified and incorporated as an in-

tegral part of the Second Five Year Plan. The significant factors of the modified scheme are: grant of larger amounts of financial assistance, organisation of co-operative cattle breeding-cum-farming societies on privately owned lands to be purchased by obtaining Government loans and organisation of co-operative multi-purpose societies for the cattle breeders who have already settled on the lands. The scheme has been applied to all the nomadic professional cattle breeders and its area of operation has been extended to the entire Bombay State. A provision of Rs. 24,73,000/- is made in the 2nd Five Year Plan for this scheme.

CHAPTER III

MEMBERSHIP

Size :

Total membership of the 83 societies is 3,610 giving an average of 43.5 per society. But this average does not give a true picture, because 5 Kharland societies claim amongst themselves 1,129 members giving each an average of 226. Therefore if we take out all the Kharland societies which are a type by themselves, the average membership would work out to be 32 (see Table No. 5).

After taking out the Kharland societies, the average membership in the collective farming society works out to be 36, in the tenant farming society 33, and in the joint farming society 22, as shown in the following Table.

TABLE NO. 6

**Membership of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat
as on 30-6-1956 after excluding the 5 Kharland societies**

Type of the Society	No. of Societies	No. of Members	Average No. of Members per society
Collective	27	970	36
Joint	16	358	22
Tenant	35	1158	33
Total	... 78	2481	32

The size of the society on government lands depends largely on the availability of land. But even then there is a trend for small-sized societies, as out of 28 collective farming societies, 22 are of less than 45 members; and out of 39 tenant farming societies 30 are of less than 45 members (see Table No. 1 in appendix). Joint societies naturally tend to be small sized. As the lands have to be pooled, members do not come forth in large numbers to form these societies. There is not a single joint farming society which has a larger membership than 45. The tenant and collective farming societies have almost the same membership.

Out of the total of 83 societies 68 societies (82%) have less than 45 members. It is therefore found that size of the societies in all the types generally varies from 22 to 45 members. The minimum number required for the registration of a society is 11. Considering this, the

average size of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat is neither very small nor very big. They are, so to say, medium-sized societies.

This holds true of the societies formed in different districts as well as of the societies of both backward and non-backward class people if Kharland societies are excluded.

Type of Membership :

Analysis of the type of membership reveals that mostly landless labourers have joined the co-operative farming societies. They constitute 78% of the total membership as seen in the following Table.

TABLE NO. 7
Ownership status of members of the Co-operative Farming
Societies in Gujarat

(In percentages)

Type of the Co-operative Farming Societies	Khatedars	Tenants	Agricultural Labourers	Total membership
Collective	8	8	89	100
Joint	52	84	14	100
Tenant	9	5	86	100
Total	... 14	8	78	100

Of the rest, a large majority (64%) are small holders holding less than 10 acres. (see statistical table No. 2 in appendix). This shows that the co-operative farming societies have mainly (90%) been formed by agricultural labourers and small holders.

There have been very few cases of members having left the societies. Only in one collective farming society mainly formed of nomadic people frequent membership changes occur.

CHAPTER IV

LAND

Size according to Area :

In this analysis also we will have to exclude Kharland societies to get a correct picture. These societies possess very large areas of land. Amongst themselves they possess 13,233 acres of land (35%) out of the total land of 35,390 acres. Excluding them, the average area commanded per society is 284 acres, while average cultivated area per society is 188 acres as shown in Table No. 8.

TABLE No. 8
Size according to total and cultivated area of the
Co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on
30-6-56 (excluding 5 Kharland societies)

type of Co-operative Farming Societies	No. of Societies	Total area in acres	Average total area per society in acres	Cultivated area in acres	Cultivated area per society in acres
Collective	27	4740	175	3097	115
Joint	16	4710	294	3216	201
Tenant	35	12707	363	8401	240
Total	78	22157	284	14714	188

We can see from this Table that the tenant farming societies have the largest area under command as well as the largest area under cultivation per society. Then comes the joint farming societies. The collective farming societies have the smallest area commanded as well as cultivated. This is because a large number of collective farming societies have been formed on river-bed and tank-bed lands which naturally have small acreages.

The gap between the area under command and area under cultivation is the largest in the case of tenant farming societies. This is because most of them have been formed on waste lands which require great efforts, large investment and sufficient time to be brought under cultivation. It was also because some of these societies had been formed in the later years and had therefore little time to work.

As between different types of land, though the area commanded by the Kharland societies is the largest, they have not been able to bring any land under cultivation (see statistical Table No. 3 in the

appendix), because these societies have recently been formed, and Kharland reclamation requires still longer time. Bunding work has been undertaken by these societies on an extensive scale as a first step towards reclamation.

There is some gap found though very small, between the area under command and area under cultivation in the case of societies formed on cultivated land. This is explained by the fact that they also possess some grass lands kept for grazing purposes. This gap in the case of river-bed and tank-bed societies is explained by the fact that every time some of this land remains under water and therefore not useful for cultivation.

Area under command and area under cultivation per member in different types of societies (excluding Kharland societies) is as follows :

TABLE No. 9
Total and cultivated area per member in the Co-operative farming societies of Gujarat as on 30-6-56 (excluding 5 Kharland societies)

Type of the Co-operative Society	No. of Societies	No. of members	Total area in acres	Area per member in acres	Cultivated area in acres	Cultivated area per member in acres
Collective	27	970	4740	5	3097	3
Joint	16	858	4710	13	3216	9
Tenant	35	1153	12707	11	8401	7
Total	78	2481	22157	9	14714	6

In the collective farming societies area per member is the smallest. We have already seen its reasons. Though area per society is larger in the tenant farming society than in the joint farming society, area per member is smaller, because the average membership of the tenant farming society is larger than that of the joint farming society.

Cultivated area per member, if compared with the average cultivated holding per Khatedar in the village shows that the average holding of the member is smaller than that of the Khatedar (see statistical Table No. 4 in the appendix). The difference becomes more striking when we consider the kind of land on which these societies have been formed (see statistical table No. 5 in the appendix). Most of it is dry waste land of jarayat type.

Ownership of Land :

As already seen most of the land on which the co-operative farming societies have been formed has been given by the Government. This percentage comes to about as much as 70%. The Table No. 10. shows other sources from which rest of the land is obtained.

TABLE No. 10

Sources from which the land is obtained by the Co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-56.

Type of the Co-operative Society	No. of Societies	Contributed by the members	Taken on lease from non-member	Purchased by the Societies	Taken on lease from the government	Total
Collective	28	—	46	—	9486	9532
Joint	16	1772	944	1129	865	4710
Tenant	39	—	—	6688	14460	21148
Total	83	1772	990	7817	24811	35390
Percentage		5	8	22	70	100

It is seen that members' own land is only 5%. Members owning land have pooled almost all their lands in case of joint farming societies, but the members of tenant and collective farming societies have not pooled their lands in the societies. It is true that lands owned by them are very small. They continue to cultivate them as before.

Rent and Terms of Lease :

Land rent paid by the societies was found to be very excessive in some cases. The Government had fixed Rs. 20/- per acre as maximum rent to be paid to the landlord under the Tenancy Act. 10 societies had to pay rent higher than this. 3 societies had to pay as much as Rs. 50/- per acre. This payment had to be made to the Government itself by the tank-bed and river-bed societies. It is true that the Government was getting still higher rents from individual cultivators before it granted these lands to co-operative farming societies. But considering the type of membership of these societies, these rents seem to be very excessive.

Generally speaking, the terms on which the government lands have been given are quite liberal. In case of waste lands the government had exempted the societies from paying rents from 1 to 4 years according to the merits of the case. Lease was also given for sufficiently long periods.

Other Resources :

Out of a total of 83 societies, only 13 societies kept bullocks ; while the rest of them allowed the members to maintain them, and called them on hire when required. This was quite understandable in the case of the tenant farming societies, because the cultivation was also done by members individually. But the joint and collective co-operative farming societies were naturally expected to maintain the bullocks on behalf of the society and to try to eliminate waste of bullock power occurring in case of individual maintenance of bullocks. But this did not take place, because the societies did not think it advisable to take over this responsibility. Most of the farming of the

societies being dry, it was not considered advisable to keep them for the whole year when there was hardly work for them for more than six months. Lack of extra capital required both for construction of a cattleshed and for maintenance for the whole year has also dissuaded the societies from undertaking this responsibility. 9 out of 28 collective co-operative farming societies and 4 out of 16 joint co-operative farming societies maintained bullocks on behalf of the society. They owned amongst themselves 58 pairs of bullocks. Most of them had undertaken irrigation and land development work which enabled them to keep the bullocks occupied for longer time. The general experience of these 13 societies is that they have found it practicable and economical to maintain bullocks jointly. This has enabled them to undertake land development programmes more rapidly. Bullocks called on hire from the members were generally paid from Rs. 2½ to Rs. 7/- per day per pair depending upon the nature of work and season.

Societies owned tractors. These societies had extensive land and therefore they could make good use of them. Out of these five, three were joint farming societies, while two were collective farming societies. Tractors were used both for cultivation work as well as for transport work. One society also used it for lift irrigation work when required.

Only 15 societies could undertake irrigation. Source of irrigation was as follows :

TABLE No. 11
Source of irrigation (Societies in numbers)

Source of Irrigation	Collective Co-operative Farming Societies	Joint Co-operative Farming Societies	Tenant Co-operative Farming Societies	Total of all types
1. Well Irrigation	—	1	—	1
2. Canal Irrigation	—	—	2	2
3. Lift Irrigation	3	6	3	12
Total	3	7	5	15

Out of 12 societies that made use of lift irrigation, 11 societies had installed 17 pumping plants worked with oil engines. The remaining society obtained water from the government lift irrigation scheme.

CHAPTER V

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Overall resources :

Looking into the overall financial resources of the societies, we find that out of the total, 14.3% is on account of share capital ; 18.8% on account of owned funds including reserve funds ; while as much as 66.9% is on account of funds obtained from outside sources such as government loans and loans obtained from co-operative banks as well as from private sources. (see Table No. 12)

TABLE NO. 12
Funds—(liabilities) of the Co-operative farming societies
in Gujarat as on 30-6-56

Type of the Co-operative farming society	No. of Societies	Share Capital	Owned Funds	Other liabilities	Total liabilities
(1) Collective co-operative farming society	26	60,920	1,33,057	4,11,748	6,05,725
(2) Joint co-operative farming society	15	85,560	1,13,466	1,95,559	3,04,585
(3) Tenant co-operative farming society	33	1,00,993	80,511	5,59,012	7,40,516
Total ...	<u>74</u>	<u>2,47,478</u>	<u>3,27,034</u>	<u>11,66,319</u>	<u>17,40,826</u>
Percentages		14.8	18.8	66.9	100

(These figures are of 74 societies. 9 have not reported).

Share Capital :

Share capital amount shown in Table No. 12 includes government assistance given to backward class societies by way of loan to raise their funds. These societies could not raise sufficient share capital from their own funds. Government therefore helped them in raising their share capital by giving them free of interest loans for this purpose to be repaid in five annual instalments. Thus 19 societies out of a total of 55 backward class societies were given this assistance. They received Rs.43,750/- till 30-6-56 out of which they had repaid Rs.19,600/-. Therefore, the total amount of share capital which is Rs.2,47,473/- includes Rs.24,150/- received from the government. The remaining amount of Rs.2,23,323/- is raised by the members themselves.

The average share capital per society is of Rs. 3,702/-. (See Table No. 13).

TABLE No. 13
Liability per society of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-56

Type of the co-operative farming society	Share Capital	Owned funds	Other liabilities	Total liabilities
(1) Collective co-operative farming society	2,843	5,117	15,386	23,296
(2) Joint co-operative farming society	5,704	7,564	13,037	26,305
(3) Tenant co-operative farming society	3,060	2,430	16,930	22,438
(4) Average of all the types	3,702	5,040	15,271	24,018

Amongst the types, the joint co-operative farming society shows a higher average of share capital because it includes the value of implements, bullocks and other resources contributed by the members to the societies. Resources other than land contributed by the members to the society in case of joint farming society are usually converted into share capital. Land is not taken to that account generally but its book value is maintained to facilitate the accounting of property income.

Owned Funds :

Owned funds include reserve fund, depreciation fund, charity fund and such other funds created out of the working of the society. Average of owned funds per society comes to Rs. 5,040/-. In this case also the joint farming societies have the highest average, because of their initially strong position. Collective farming societies show a higher average than the tenant farming societies because of their nature of working. The tenant farming societies maintain lesser equipment on behalf of the society as such and therefore have not to create depreciation funds etc. to the same extent. Hence this difference.

It could be seen that within a period of 8 years the societies have built up a total fund of share capital and owned funds of an amount of Rs. 5,75,000/-, the average per society being Rs. 8,742/-.

Other Liabilities :

Other liabilities include government loans, short term credit obtained from co-operative banks and private sources, and loans obtained from Kharland Board.

Government Assistance :

The government, while sanctioning the scheme, had provided for assistance both by way of subsidy and loan to the co-operative farming societies for different purposes. Some of this was for current agricultural requirements, while the rest was for development activities as shown in Tables No. 14 and 15.

Out of 83 societies, 64 societies received assistance from the Government for different purposes. Total assistance received for current agricultural requirements was of Rs. 2,44,913/- out of which Rs. 1,20,560/- (49%) were by way of loan, while Rs. 1,24,353/- (51%) were by way of subsidy.

Main items for which the assistance was given were (1) share capital contribution, (2) subsidy for manure and seeds and (3) manager's salary. 39 societies received subsidy for the purchase of manure and seeds and 29 societies for manager's salary. Six societies coming under Dabka Scheme were given special assistance for other current expenses such as maintenance of bullocks and payment to members towards agricultural labour during the first year. This was a special case. This assistance was not given to any other society.

As between the types, the collective farming societies, and between the classes, the non-backward class farming societies received larger assistance. This was on account of the six societies under Dabka Scheme. All of them were collective farming societies and 5 out of 6 were of non-backward class.

Government assistance for development activities was also given to 64 societies. Total assistance given to them on this account was of Rs. 7,24,446/- out of which 79.6% was by way of loan and 20.4% by way of subsidy. Main items of this assistance were (1) land development (2) lift irrigation (3) purchase of tractors and other agricultural implements, (4) construction of cattle sheds and godowns and (5) purchase of bullocks. Seven societies of displaced persons in Baroda District were also given rehabilitation loans. Two societies under Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme were given loans for payment of past debts. These societies were also given loans for milch cattle. It could thus be seen that the Government gave development assistance to the societies practically for all purposes.

Though the assistance is spread over a number of items recipients for each item are not many. Excepting for land development, number of societies receiving development assistance from the Government for different purposes is small. Even for land development, only 36 societies out of a total of 83 received assistance. Only 9 societies received assistance for irrigation.

This happened because the Government stopped giving financial assistance to the societies after 1952. An undertaking was taken

TABLE No. 14

**Government assistance given to the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat
for current agricultural requirements as on 30-6-56**

Type of the co-operative farming society	Share capital		Tagga- vi Loan	Maintenance of bullocks		Labour charges Loan	Manure & seeds subsidy	Manager's salary subsidy	Salary to engine driver subsidy	Total		Grand Total
	Loan	Sub- sidy.		Loan	Subsidy					Loan	Subsidy	
1. Collective co-operative farming society.	10000 (4)	—	1000 (1)	27000 (6)	—	48000 (6)	7500 (6)	9764 (6)	—	86,000	17264	1,03,264
2. Joint Co- operative farming society	18750 (7)	—	810 (1)	—	480 (1)	—	19893 (12)	13600 (9)	1800 (1)	19,560	35773	55,333
3. Tenant Co- operative farming society	15000 (8)	—	—	—	5700 (5)	—	46275 (21)	19341 (14)	—	15,000	71316	86,316
Total	43750 (19)	—	1810 (2)	27000 (6)	6180 (6)	48000 (6)	73668 (39)	42705 (29)	1800 (1)	1,20,560	1,24,353	2,44,913 (64)

Figures in brackets show the No. of Societies receiving the assistance.

TABLE No. 15

**Government assistance given to the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat
for development activities as on 30-6-56.**

Type of the co- operative farming society	Cattleshed & godown		Implements & machinery		Irrigation		Land Devel- opment		Bullocks		Milch cattle		Old debts loan Loan	Total		Grand Total	
	Loan	Sub- sidy	Loan	Sub- sidy	Loan	Sub- sidy	Loan	Sub- sidy	Loan	Sub- sidy	Loan	Sub- sidy		Loan	Sub- sidy		
1. Collect- ive co- operative farming society	28500 (10)	8500 (4)	23245 (13)	—	5933 (1)	5933 (1)	47430 (8)	6410 (6)	25000 (6)	—	5000 (1)	—	6000 (1)	—	141108	15843	156951
2. Joint co- operative farming society	16350 (5)	3500 (3)	12000 (1)	8710 (2)	50960 (4)	39420 (4)	16340 (3)	4900 (2)	—	1200 (1)	—	—	—	—	95650	57730	153380
3. Tenant co-operat- ive farm- ing society	10500 (3)	4375 (4)	2000 (1)	1915 (1)	32850 (4)	6000 (3)	135775 (20)	52452 (16)	16000 (2)	2000 (2)	9500 (1)	7600 (1)	7500 (1)	125648 (3)	339773	74342	414115
4. Total	55850 (18)	11375 (11)	37245 (15)	10625 (3)	89743 (9)	51353 (8)	199545 (31)	63762 (24)	41000 (8)	3200 (3)	14500 (2)	7600 (1)	13500 (2)	125648 (3)	576531	147945/724446 (64)	

Figures in brackets show the No. of Societies receiving the assistance

from the societies registered after 1952 that they would not expect any financial assistance from the Government. The Government had to take this decision, because the funds allotted for the scheme were limited while the number of societies coming forth for registration was large. The Government's land policy was also such as to encourage the organisation of co-operative farming societies but its financial resources did not allow it to give assistance to all of them. Government aid given both for current requirements and for development activities, works out to be Rs. 32/- per acre. This average applies to 64 societies which have received financial assistance from the government. Considering the fact that most of the land on which these societies are formed is waste land, this figure cannot be considered high.

Co-operative Banks :

During the period of inquiry 23 societies in all received credit from co-operative banks, and during one year at no time more than 16 societies received credit from them. During 1955-56 only 13 societies received a credit of Rs. 85,195/- from these banks. This was at a rate of Rs. 27/- per acre. Cultivated land of all the co-operative farming societies being 14,784 acres in 1955-56; they would require at this rate a credit of Rs. 3,70,000/-. Maximum credit made available to the co-operative farming societies by the co-operative banks during any year was Rs. 1,10,129/-. Aggregate credit which they received from them during the entire period was Rs. 5,24,204/- (see Table No. 16).

All these figures would give an idea of the very meagre credit received by the societies from the co-operative banks. The Government had expected short-term finance to flow easily from them to the co-operative farming societies, but this expectation was not realised. This was because the co-operative banks did not think it safe to advance credit to co-operative farming societies mostly formed on Government waste lands, land security in this case being quite insufficient. They also felt it risky to advance credit to this new type of organisation whose future was quite uncertain. Both the type of land and the type of membership were such as not to encourage the co-operative banks in advancing credit if the risk involved in it was not covered in any other way. Most of the societies were, therefore, found handicapped on this account, and had to experience great difficulties in meeting their short-term finance requirements.

Private Sources :

Some of them met it from raising deposits from their own members, while some turned to non-members who were sympathisers of this new movement. Thus 7 societies raised deposits from members, as much as Rs. 1,77,282/-. Deposits raised by 14 societies from non-members were of Rs. 86,335/-.

TABLE No. 16
Credit given by the co-operative banks to the co-operative farming societies
in Gujarat from 1949-50 to 1955-56.

Type of the co-operative farming society	No. of Societies	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	Total
(1) Collective co-operative farming society	28	—	—	2000 (1)	8500 (2)	12200 (2)	21000 (4)	20840 (4)	64540 (5)
(2) Joint co-operative farming society	16	19740 (2)	54041 (5)	90405 (7)	67478 (7)	81474 (6)	45463 (4)	51815 (4)	408416 (7)
(3) Tenant co-operative farming society	39	—	1000 (1)	2750 (2)	3000 (2)	12455 (6)	15503 (8)	12450 (5)	47248 (11)
Total	83	19740 (2)	55041 (6)	95155 (10)	78978 (11)	106129 (14)	81966 (16)	85105 (13)	520204 (23)

Figures in brackets show the No. of societies receiving credit from the co-operative banks.

TABLE No. 17
Assets of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-56.

(in rupees)

Type of the co-operative farming society.	No. of Societies	Machinery	Other farm equipment	Cattle	Land improvement	Land purchase	Wells	Buildings	Dead Stock	Advances to members	Investment in shares	Miscellaneous	Total
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1. Collective Co-operative farming society	26	78703	11731	16801	13641	144570	5913	29034	3683	69836	16251	192548	582711
2. Joint Co-operative farming society	15	107951	16059	18245	8353	5685	16112	25711	1833	48503	10709	25726	285087
3. Tenant Co-operative farming society	33	29632	3392	1240	20182	239841	9043	26859	2120	165577	42574	160104	700564
<i>Total ...</i>	74	216286	31182	36286	42176	390096	31068	81604	7636	283916	69534	378378	1568362
<i>Percentages ...</i>		14.00	2.00	2	3	25	2.00	5	.5	18	4	24.5	100

Assets :

Total assets of 74 co-operative farming societies are of Rs. 15,68,362/-. Average per society works out to be Rs. 21,200/-. Averages of all the types are almost the same. Distribution of these assets between different items is shown in table No. 17. We can see that about half of the assets (from column No. 1 to 8) are fixed assets while the other half are liquid assets. Miscellaneous assets (column No. 11) include stock of goods, cash on hand, deposits in banks and advances against goods.

In the fixed assets about one-third of the amount is invested in machinery. Machinery includes pumping plants and tractors. About half of the total amount is invested in purchase of land. This amount is mostly on account of the two societies of Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme. Government had purchased the lands of these two societies on their account and they were required to pay this amount in instalments. Till 30-6-56 they had paid about Rs. 3,74,000/-.

In the liquid assets, advances to members account for more than one-third. We find that it is more prominent in the case of tenant farming societies. This is because all the farm work is done by members individually for which they take advances from the societies. In the joint and collective farming societies members take advances for unusual occasions such as sickness, marriages etc.

Overall picture of the assets reveals the poor condition of the societies in general. This is natural, because most of them have been formed by members who had no resources of their own.

CHAPTER VI

DEVELOPMENT

Land Development :

As we have already seen most of these societies being formed on Government waste lands land development was the first and the most important task they had to undertake. Much of it was land reclamation rather than land development, because land was being brought under cultivation for the first time.

Financial help from the Government by way of loans and subsidies, mechanical help from the Government in form of tractors and bull-dozers, and very hard labour put in by the members enabled the societies to undertake this activity on a very extensive scale. During the period of inquiry as much as 11,885 acres of land were brought under cultivation by 66 societies.

Government assisted the societies in this activity to an extent of Rs. 2,63,307/- out of which Rs. 1,99,545/- were by way of loan and Rs. 63,762/- were by way of subsidiary. This assistance was given to 37 societies. Remaining 29 societies had to do it out of their own resources. Societies, while doing this work, paid their members at very low rates. Some of them paid them as low a wage as 10 annas a day to males, 8 annas to females and 6 annas to children. Bare figures could not give a full account of the heroic efforts put in by the societies for doing this work. Suffice it to say the societies seized every opportunity and put in maximum efforts to bring land under cultivation. Still more could have been done, if larger finances would have come forth. Most of the societies have shown their readiness to undertake this activity as soon as their resources permit them.

Bunding :

Bunding was undertaken by 17 societies in 9,345 acres of land. Out of this, bunding by department was done in 393 acres only. Rest of it was done by members themselves. A major part of it was done by Kharland societies. These societies as they have been recently formed, had to undertake construction of dams as their first activity for reclamation to be followed immediately by bunding. Four out of five Kharland societies have constructed mile-long dams and have now started bunding operations. They received from the Government an assistance of Rs. 95,000/- for this purpose while the Kharland Board gave Rs. 16,033/- for the same purpose to one of them as a special case. Entire assistance is in form of loans.

Irrigation :

11 new wells were constructed by 10 societies at a total cost of Rs. 41,578/- and 7 old wells were repaired at a cost of Rs. 1,576/-. 11 societies had installed 17 pumping plants at a total cost of Rs. 1,61,347/- out of which they received from the Government Rs. 1,41,096/-. Out of this amount, Rs. 89,743/- were by way of loan, and Rs. 51,353/- were by way of subsidy. Remaining amount was invested by the societies from their own resources. These 11 societies with the help of their own pumping plants undertook lift irrigation while one society undertook it by taking water from the Government lift irrigation scheme. One society did irrigation by leather moat. 2 more societies got canal waters for irrigation. Thus in all 15 societies undertook irrigation bringing an area of about 1,000 acres of land under irrigation. But the area in which irrigation was actually undertaken was much smaller. Land under actual irrigation is shown in Table No. 18 yearwise.

TABLE NO. 18
Land irrigated by the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat
from 1949-50 to 1955-56
(in acres)

Year	Land irrigated
1949-50	80
1950-51	78
1951-52	48
1952-53	188
1953-54	197
1954-55	75
1955-56	222

It could be seen that the maximum area under irrigation in 1955-56 was 222 acres. Lift irrigation schemes started working from 1952-53, and from that year land under irrigation started increasing. But again there is a sudden fall in 1954-55. This was as a result of sudden slump in prices which made irrigation totally uneconomic.

All the same, area under irrigation is very very small. Area shown under irrigation here means area from which crops were raised completely with the help of irrigation. But in addition to this there was a large area of land where irrigation was used as a famine relief measure. Whenever there was shortage of rain water, irrigation was resorted to. In order to save crops from complete ruin one or two irrigations were given and crops were saved. This kind of irrigation was given to crops like paddy, groundnut and cotton. All the societies, undertaking lift irrigation, have taken to it mostly as a measure of famine relief. And periods of short rains have not been rare during this period. Three out of eight years were actually declared famine years. In these years irrigation facilities came to their help greatly and saved them from complete ruin.

Factors such as lack of financial resources, lack of sufficient water supply, lack of technical skill and guidance, uncertainty of prices especially when cost of irrigation is considerably high have not allowed other societies to undertake irrigation. 40 societies have expressed their willingness to undertake lift irrigation provided they get financial assistance from the Government. This proves that lack of financial resources has been a great impediment. Lack of sufficient water supply is also an important factor. Two societies had actually to leave the scheme for this reason. Technical know-how has also played an important part, because most of the members come from backward classes and they have naturally very little knowledge of the mechanical working. Lack of the mechanical knowledge has prevented the societies from undertaking lift irrigation. It has also put into great difficulties those who had undertaken it without knowing its working. Uncertain prices have also played a great part in discouraging the members from undertaking irrigation. (see Table No. 6 in appendix 1). Not being sure of realising even the cost of production, they are naturally disinclined to incur irrigation costs. Restrictions about growing non-food crops have also worked as a disincentive.

Improved Techniques :

Most of the societies were found to follow improved methods of farming such as proper rotation of cropping, sowing at sufficient distance, doing interculturing etc. Insecticides were also found to have been used for prevention of pests and diseases. Use of improved seeds for cotton crop was quite common, while that for other crops such as groundnut, jowar, paddy etc. was not so common. The fact is that in these crops there was very little by way of improved seeds to recommend.

Use of manure, both organic and inorganic, was made by the societies generally, but the quantity used was not considerable. This was because most of the land of the societies was being brought under cultivation newly. Hence large-scale use of manure was not required. Another factor that did not encourage the societies in making increased use of manures other than compost was that they were dependent upon rains and were not sure of their crops. But an awareness for the necessity of increasing the use of manures was generally found in all the societies.

Use of improved implements such as Gandhi Allen Hoe, iron plough etc. was made by some of them ; but here also as a matter of fact there was very little to recommend, as improved implements.

Land Under Cultivation :

Out of the total land under command of these societies which was 35,390 acres, 13,233 acres of land were Kharlands which could not be brought under cultivation immediately. Out of the re-

maining 22,157 acres, 14,714 acres of land (67%) were put under actual cultivation in 1955-56. Here it must be remembered that most of the societies were formed on waste lands and also that some of these societies (e.g. societies under Dabka Scheme, and Rabari Bhawad Rehabilitation Scheme), were formed in the later part of the period under inquiry. This would explain the gap between the area under command and area under actual cultivation. (see Tables No. 19 and 20).

TABLE No. 19.

Details of development activities undertaken by the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat upto 30-6-56.

Item	Acreage
(1) Land under command excluding Kharland societies	22157
(2) Land under actual cultivation in 1955-56	14714
(3) Land reclaimed for cultivation.	11885
(4) Land in which bunding was done.*	9345
(5) Land under improved seeds in 1955-56.	5282
(6) Land under irrigation in 1955-56.	222

* This includes bunding done by 1 Kharland society in 6688 acres.

TABLE No. 20.

Details of investment made for development activities undertaken by the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-56

Item	No.	Cost in rupees
(1) Construction of new wells.	11	41,578
(2) Repair of old wells	7	1,576
(3) Installation of pumping plants.	17	1,61,947
(4) Purchase of tractors.	5	60,992
(5) Purchase of improved implements	195	8,900

CHAPTER VII

INTENSIVE STUDY

As mentioned in the introduction, 24 societies were studied intensively. This study was undertaken with a view to examine in greater detail the working of co-operative farming societies in Gujarat, particularly their cropping pattern, yield per acre, cost of production and their financial condition. Individuals, both members as well as non-members, were interviewed during this study, to know their reactions upon the working of these societies. Findings of this study are given in this chapter.

Cropping Pattern :

Main crops of these societies are Jowar, Paddy and Wheat amongst food crops and cotton amongst non-food crops as shown in Table No. 21.

Cropping pattern of last three years of these societies reveals that there is an obvious trend in favour of raising non-food crops, as in the case of villages. Only it is stronger in the case of societies as seen in Table No. 22.

Economic forces have fully worked, and led the societies in search of cash crops. Considerations of balancing the economy of the society have played a considerable part in bringing about this change consciously.

Output :

Gross output of 16 societies (8 tenant societies had no records of production) show a total gross output of Rs. 4,71,377 during 1955-56. Average gross output per acre in collective farming society comes to Rs. 168, while in joint farming society it comes to Rs. 115. Difference in the outputs of these two types is because collective societies have been formed on new lands which give good yields in the initial years. Gross output per acre for these two types from 1953-54 to 1955-56 is shown in Table No. 23.

This Table shows that output in collective farming societies has gone on increasing while that in joint farming societies has decreased in the second year but increased again in the third year ; but on the whole it has decreased.

Average yields per acre of three main crops also show a number of variations as seen from Table No. 24.

TABLE No. 21
Area under different crops in 1955-56 of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat

Type of society	No. of Societies	Jowar	Paddy	Wheat	Bajri	Other food crops	Vegetables	Cotton	Tobacco	Oilseeds	Others	Total
(1) Collective Co-operative farming society	10	362	256	149	90	98	24	716	35	74	50	1854
(2) Joint Co-operative farming society	6	220	91	23	—	23	3	691	—	35	52	1138
(3) Tenant Co-operative farming society	8	321	340	74	0	132	—	980	—	—	112	1965
<i>Total</i>	24	903	687	246	96	253	27	2387	35	109	214	4957
Percentages		19.0	14.0	4.9	1.9	5.1	0.06	48.5	0.07	2.2	4.3	100

TABLE NO. 22
Changes in cropping pattern of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat

(a) (In percentages)

Type of Society	Food Crops			Non-Food Crops		
	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
(1) Collective Co-operative farming society	71.2	62.8	51.5	28.8	37.7	48.5
(2) Joint Co-operative farming society	44.2	88.2	84.2	55.8	61.8	65.8
(3) Tenant Co-operative farming society	65.2	53.0	45.5	34.8	47.0	54.5
<i>Total :</i>	60.2	51.2	43.7	39.8	48.8	56.3

(b) (In percentages)

Changes in cropping pattern of the villages in which these societies are working.

Food Crops			Non-Food Crops		
1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
54.9	45.4	42.9	45.1	54.6	57.1

TABLE No. 23.
Gross output per acre in the Co-operative Farming Societies
in Gujarat
(In Rs.)

Type of society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
(1) Collective Co-operative farming society	101	108	108
(2) Joint Co-operative farming society	121	112	115

TABLE No. 24.
Average yield per acre in Co-operative Farming Societies in
Gujarat (yield in pounds).

(a) *Cotton*

Type of society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	Average of three years
(1) Collective farming society	405	377	437	406
(2) Joint farming society	868	375	414	886
(3) Tenant farming society	842	430	445	406
Average of all types	870	388	430	396

(b) *Jowar*

Type of society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	Average of three years
(1) Collective farming society	528	554	512	531
(2) Joint farming society	476	386	511	458
(3) Tenant farming society	437	395	684	505
Average of all types	488	444	527	486

(c) *Paddy*

Type of society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	Average of three years
(1) Collective farming society	400	506	467	458
(2) Joint farming society	1832	1851	1554	1412
(3) Tenant farming society	509	445	497	484
Average of all types	910	904	1154	989

But on the whole they have increased. As between types there are large differences in yield, but this is due mainly to the difference in type of land on which these societies have been formed ; and indicate little as the effect of the type of co-operation.

Cost of Production :

Like the gross output per acre cost of production per acre has also varied from year to year, but not in a uniform manner, though on the whole it has increased. Similarly, gross profit per acre has also increased on the whole. (See Tables No. 25 & 26).

TABLE No. 25
**Cost of production per acre in the Co-operative Farming Societies
 in Gujarat**
 (In Rs.)

Type of Society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
(1) Collective farming society	102	88	126
(2) Joint farming society	96	79	101

TABLE No. 26
**Gross profit per acre in the Co-operative Farming Societies
 in Gujarat**
 (In Rs.)

Type of Society	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
(1) Collective farming society	-1 (loss)	25	42
(2) Joint farming society	25	83	14

Analysis of production costs shows that the main items of production expenditure are land revenue and wages. Expenditure on irrigation and manures is quite insignificant. (See Table No. 27). It is also found that overhead expenses form a very small percentage (4.6) of total expenses. Overhead expenses include expenses on establishment such as salaries to manager or such other permanent staff such as accountant, engine driver etc. Production expenses include all expenses except overhead costs plus interest on loans.

Financial Condition :

In 1955-56 out of 24 societies, 20 were working with profit, while 4 were working at a loss. In 1953-54, 18 societies were making profits while 3 were making losses out of a total of 21 societies. In 1954-55 number of societies making profits was 15 while that of societies making losses was 7 out of a total of 22. Accumulated profit or loss position for 24 societies shows that on 30-6-56 18 societies had made profits on the whole while 6 societies had incurred losses. (See Table No. 28).

Audit Classification :

Audit classification of these societies shows that in 1955-56 out of 24, 3 were placed in A Class, 18 in B Class and 3 in C Class. Audit classification takes into consideration the financial condition of the societies as well as their overall working according to the bye-laws. If accounts are not properly maintained or if loans are not paid in time or if any other serious breach of bye-laws is committed the society is placed in B class even if its financial condition is good. C class in audit classification suggests both weak financial condition as well as irregular working of the society.

TABLE No. 27
Distribution of the cost of production of Co-operative farming societies in Gujarat
as in 1955-56 (In percentages).

Type of Society	Land Revenue	Seeds	Manures	Wages	Hire of Plough	Fodder	Repair of Implements	Water Charges	Depreciation	Others	Total
(1) Collective farming society	19.2	3.7	0.3	55.7	1.8	2.1	2.9	1.8	5.5	7.0	100
(2) Joint farming society	28.7	1.6	6.4	42.6	2.4	3.8	5.0	1.4	2.4	5.7	100
Average of both the types	23.9	2.6	3.8	49.1	2.1	2.9	3.9	1.6	3.9	6.4	100

TABLE No. 28

Financial condition of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat

(In rupees)

S. No.	Type of Society	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	Accumulated Profit or loss as on 30-6-1956	Audit as on 30-6-56 Class
1.	Collective	—	—	—	+46	+5081	+2833	+8467	+32242	+48669	A
2.	"	—	—	—7511	—5119	+2898	—973	—383	+8010	—3078	B
3.	"	—	—	—	—2753	+2360	+1259	+6475	+14285	+21626	B
4.	"	—	—	—	—	+7	+12090	+6914	+1584	+20595	B
5.	"	—	—	—	—	—1925	—4017	—2584	—4362	—12888	B
6.	"	—	—	—	—	—	+5696	+2068	+1429	+9193	B
7.	"	—	—	—	—	—	+22017	+24893	+59842	+106752	A
8.	"	—	—	—	—	—	—	—418	+6472	+6054	B
9.	"	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2138	—2138	B
10.	"	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	+10776	+10776	B
11.	Joint	—	—	—5144	—17707	+815	—5338	—5457	+11289	—22042	B
12.	"	—	—	+2648	—2504	+2541	15451	+9386	+6592	+84114	A
13.	"	—	—	—	—3090	+2829	+16616	+7994	+7993	+32342	B
14.	"	—	—	—	+1303	—3604	+4048	—3280	+1170	—363	B
15.	"	—	—	—	—	—256	+902	+527	+711	+1894	B
16.	"	—95	+7517	+5215	—9133	—444	+12487	—884	+14	+14677	C
17.	Tenant	—	+1088	+838	+190	—999	+164	—1465	+4106	+3422	B
18.	"	+2657	—980	—146	+1339	+5266	+5212	+3584	+4823	+21755	B
19.	"	—	—	—7874	+1570	+2497	+943	+1084	+1473	—307	B
20.	"	—	—	—	—	—10	+885	+1067	+1378	+3320	B
21.	"	—	—	—	+879	+393	+594	+397	+495	+2258	B
22.	"	—	—	—	—	+864	+1059	+1346	+1169	+4438	B
23.	"	—	—	—	—	—1514	+2334	+1386	—559	+1597	C
24.	"	—	—	—	—	—	+113	+1154	—446	+821	C

Total : 87804 profit Total : 60622 profit Total : 2,05,561 profit.
Average : 4608 " Average : 10108 " Average : 20550.

Case Studies :

We shall now take up a few case studies which would enable us to look into the working of these societies still more closely.

(1) Rehmalpur Co-operative Collective Farming
Society, District Ahmedabad

TABLE NO. 29

Statistical Abstract

	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
1 Membership	16	16	16	16	20
2 Total area (acres)	327	387	387	387	387
3 Land under cultivation (acres)	159	335	341	374	374
4 Share Capital(Rs.)	3840	3440	3770	3420	3190
(a) Members' contribution	1840	1840	2570	2620	3190
(b) Government's contribution	2000	1600	1200	800	—
5 Reserve Funds(Rs.)	16	16	17	263	2276
6 Profit	—2753	2360	1259	6475	14285
7 Government Help (Rs.)					
(a) Loan	5000	—	4230	—	—
(b) Grant	2580	750	4030	—	578
8 Bank Credit (Rs.)	2000	6000	8200	4000	9540
9 Capital Investment (Rs.)	4110	8573	13418	13418	13470
10 Gross income per acre (Rs.)	11	32	32	62	92
11 Cost of production per acre (Rs.)	23	21	27	35	46
12 Net income per acre (Rs.)	—12	11	7	27	46
13 Income per member (Rs.)	365	500	612	913	1041
14 Employment per member (days)*	—	275	174	235	231
15 Audit Classification	B	B	B	B	B

* This includes employment of family members.

Registration :

This society is situated in village Rehmalpur which is at a distance of 3½ miles in the south of Viramgam, a taluka town in Ahmedabad District. There were government waste lands in this village. These lands were first given to the people of this village by the Government on the condition that they should be developed in one year, but even after 3 years they were still lying waste. The Government was therefore compelled to take back these lands from the village people. Subsequently Harijans of this village, under the guidance of the Gujarat Harijan Sevak Sangh applied for these lands for cultivation on a collective basis. The Rehmalpur Co-operative Collective Farming Society was registered for this purpose on 3-2-51, and it was granted 387 acres of land. The society was exempted from payment of land assessment for the first three years.

Membership :

At the time of the registration 16 members had joined the society. This number later on increased to 20. Average holding per member works out to be 19 acres which can be considered an economic holding. These members also continue to cultivate individually 59 acres of their own land and 124 acres of land taken on lease. These lands are not contiguous to the lands of the society.

Land Development :

Development of the lands given to the society was a very hard task as they were lying waste since years and were covered with deep-rooted shrubs and weeds. But the members put in very hard labour and took up the development work quite seriously. It was on account of their hard labour that within four years they could bring 374 acres of land out of a total of 387 acres under cultivation. In order that the development expenses might not go high, members had agreed to work at very low wages. Men were paid at 12 annas per day, females at 10 annas and children at 8 annas. Land development cost to the society was of Rs. 7,915. Per acre cost comes to Rs. 21/-.

The Government also came to their help in this task and gave them a loan of Rs. 4980 and a grant of Rs. 1660 for land development.

The society constructed a pucca well with a view to protect their crops in famine years ; the first year of its working being famine year. But the water of this well was breakish, and therefore not suitable for irrigation. The society therefore thought of constructing an artesian well, but could not do it because it did not receive assistance from the Government for this purpose. It has still not left the idea of undertaking irrigation and proposes to dig wells in the lands of the society with a hope that they may somewhere find suitable water for irrigation.

The society had also constructed a bund 3,000 ft. in length at a cost of Rs. 485 in order to preserve rain waters in a plot of 35 acres of land where it proposed to raise wheat crop. Unfortunately this bund was destroyed by heavy rains. The society now proposes to undertake pucca construction for this purpose.

Production :

Per acre yields of the main crops of the society were as follows:—

		1951—52	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1	Jowar	Failed on account of famine	Not available	81	99	365
2	Bajri	"	"	88	215	631
8	Cotton	"	105	196	350	258

During the very first year there was famine, and therefore all the crops of the society had almost failed. Second year also had insufficient rains. Moreover there was a severe attack of locusts. Third year was a year of very heavy rains washing away the entire kharif crop. Uncertain natural conditions have played a very important part. Yet there is a rise in production as well as an increase in efficiency as seen from the net income per acre which is Rs. 46 per acre in 1955-56.

There is a marked change in the cropping of the society during this period. In 1951-52 area under cotton was 59 acres while that under Jowar and Bajri was 97 acres. In 1955-56 area under cotton was 231 acres while that under Jowar and Bajri was 132 acres only. This change was consciously brought about by the society. In 1953-54 it worked out the economics of these crops and came to a conclusion that under present conditions it must increase the area under cotton if it wanted to survive. This decision was based on the following facts.

TABLE No. 81
Net income per acre of different crops

	Area in acres	Cost of cultivation Rs.	Gross output Rs.	Profit or loss per acre Rs.
Jowar	140	4047	2383	-12
Bajri	36	1170	234	-20
Cotton	97	5431	8665	+34

When it worked out these figures (1953-54), kharif crop had almost failed on account of heavy rains. Still, however, the prices of non-food crops like cotton being higher than those of food crops the society went on increasing its area under cotton.

Co-operative Spirit :

In 1953-54 the kharif crops had almost failed on account of heavy rains. Resowing had to be done. The society could resow its crops on the entire lands while the village people could not do it. This was made possible by the collective efforts of the members of the society.

Other Activities :

The society started a primary school in the village of its own. There was no school in the village. The village people did not send their children to this school in the beginning, because it was started by the society composed of Harijans. But gradually they changed their attitude and accepted the school as of the whole village. This was a great experience for the society. It ran this school for about four years after which the district school board took it over. The society also arranged for further studies for the children of the members and helped them financially. It ran a first-aid centre for

the village. It had installed a hand pump on the village drinking water well out of its own resources. It had started a khadi production centre to supplement the income of its members. The society has prepared a housing scheme for its members.

Economic Improvement:

Column No. 13 in the statistical abstract given in the beginning speaks much about the economic improvement of the members. Within a period of five years average income per member has risen from Rs. 365 to Rs. 1041 i.e. three times. Before they joined the society most of them were resourceless agricultural labourers. Today they are not only getting enough to eat but also are about to construct their own houses and are able to send their children to high schools. Members were a little hesitant about this type of organisation when they joined it. Today, they are all out for it.

Help from social workers:

This society has been quite lucky in getting very good help as well as active guidance from social workers of the Gujarat Harijan Sevak Sangh and the Bhal Nalkantha Prayogik Sangh. The society passed through several crises because of successive bad years, but it was because of active help from these institutions that it could safely pass through them. The society had also received very inadequate bank credit throughout the period, but it was these institutions that came forth to help it, and did not allow it to experience any difficulty on this account.

This society is a very good example of co-operative effort, intelligent planning and good leadership.

(2) *Mahisagar Bhatha Co-operative Collective Farming Society at Gambhira District Kaira:*

TABLE NO. 32

Statistical Abstract

	53—54	54—55	55—56
(1) Membership	176	176	200
(2) Total area (in acres)	274	234	234
(3) Area under cultivation (acres)	240	204	204
(4) Irrigated area (acres)	71	71	85
(5) Share capital (Rs.)	1760	1760	2050
(6) Reserve Fund (Rs.)	4360	7965	24208
(7) Profit (Rs.)	22017	24504	50842
(8) Government help (Rs.)			
(a) Loan	—	—	—
(b) Grant	—	—	—
(9) Gross income per acre (Rs.)	377	488	806
(10) Cost of production per acre (Rs.)	278	347	576
(11) Net income per acre (Rs.)	99	141	230
(12) Income per member (Rs.)	281	268	527
(13) Audit Classification	B	B	A

Registration:

The society is situated in village Gambhira and a number of other villages surrounding it. These villages are on the right bank of the river Mahi at a distance of 20 miles in the north-west of Baroda.

These villages contained large area of fertile bhatha land (river-bed land) and grew important crops like tobacco, pearl millet, oilseeds and pulses. Parts of this area were privately owned by the cultivators of these villages most of whom were of backward classes belonging to communities like Barias and fishermen. Rest of these lands were owned by the Government. The Government used to auction this land annually for cultivation and get on an average Rs. 175 per acre. The contractors who kept these lands in auction rented them to the cultivators of these villages for tobacco cultivation usually on half share basis.

The heavy and repeated floods in the river Mahi in 1927, 1941 and 1949 washed away large tracts of privately owned bhatha land and deposited deep layers of sand and rendered large parts of them useless for cultivation. As a result large number of cultivators in these villages became landless.

In 1951 the Government granted 246 acres of land to 176 cultivators of these villages distressed by the floods. These cultivators were cultivating these lands in small plots of an acre or so. This helped them but little since most of them were resourceless and had to take water for their crops from the owners of the pumping plants on half share system. Again some of these lands were saltish and yielded nothing. The Government's efforts to rehabilitate them had thus failed. Thereupon it was suggested to the Government by the local social workers of the area that these cultivators might be organised into a co-operative collective farming society, and these lands might be given to the society for cultivation on a collective basis. This suggestion was accepted, and the society was registered in October, 1953.

Membership:

Members of four villages viz., Gambhira, Kothiakhad, Nani Sherdi and Bilpad have joined the society. Out of 206 members, 198 are Barias (a community, though not accepted under the classification of backward classes is in fact both economically and socially backward), 5 are fishermen, 2 Harijans and one Patidar. All of them are landless labourers.

Land:

The society was granted 274 acres of land, but 40 acres of land out of it was washed away in 1954-55. The society had therefore 234 acres of land under its possession in 1955-56 out of which cultiva-

tion was done in 204 acres. But the total cropped area was 289 acres, as 85 acres of land were under double cropping.

Area per member comes to about one acre which is very inadequate. Some of this land is saltish, but most of it is very fertile. Irrigation facilities also enable the society to take more than one crop. But with all this, area per member is very inadequate. Had it not been for a crop like tobacco which had earned for the society a very good income, it would not have been possible to run the society with such meagre land. It must also be pointed out here that the society had to pay exorbitant land rent to the Government. It is true that the Government used to get more income from the auction of these lands before it gave them to the society. But the burden of the land rent became very heavy for these landless members when they had to pay as much as Rs. 70 per acre. Heavy land rent is one of the factors which compel the society to grow tobacco.

Other Resources :

The society had installed four pumping plants for irrigation and purchased a tractor with a plough and trolley both for cultivating the lands and for transport purposes. The society built up these resources out of its own income during a period of three years. It had not received any assistance from the Government for them. It also did not require to take loans from the Co-operative Bank. The entire working was financed by the society from its own resources, which it built up during this period. Bullocks and other implements were maintained by the members themselves.

Total investment made by the society till 30-6-56 was of Rs. 28,547. The society also built up till this date a reserve fund of Rs. 24,208.

Method of Work :

The most important feature of this society is its method of work. It has successfully solved the main problem of the collective farming societies viz., getting over the sense of having become wage-earners. Members in this society worked on crop share basis instead of on daily wage basis as in other collective farming societies. For the convenience of management and proper distribution of work the members divided themselves into 17 groups each consisting of 5 to 18 members. The main criterion in forming these groups was maximisation of mutual co-operation amongst the group members to ensure smooth and efficient working. Every member was at liberty to join any group he liked. There were already leaders amongst them, and naturally the members formed their groups around these leaders.

These groups were allotted blocks of land varying from 7 acres to 19 acres each. Variation in size of the block was both on account of the number of members as well as the difference in soil productivity.

Each group cultivated the plot given to it with the labour of its members and the resources owned by them. With a view to avoid any accounting within the group it was so arranged that every member in the group put in equal labour. The group leader distributed the work amongst the members. Out of the total produce half the share was paid to the society while the other half the members equally distributed amongst themselves. The society paid out of the share it received from the groups, land rent to the Government and met other expenses. The rest was used in building up the resources of the society. The society provided seeds, seedlings, manure etc. free to the groups and irrigation at half the cost. Later on it supplied water for irrigation to the groups completely free of cost. It also supplied tractor ploughing facilities for which it charged Rs. 10/- per acre. As the society was able to build up the necessary resources it started from 1955-56 to give bonus to the members from the profits in proportion to the income earned by them by way of half crop share. Thus they received on an average Rs. 119/- by way of bonus in 1955-56.

Cropping plan was decided by the society in consultation with the group leaders. Seeds and manures were also purchased by it, and seedlings for tobacco which was the main crop were also raised and supplied by the society. Sale of tobacco and other produce was done by the society collectively.

Thus the society undertook to supply all the production requisites as well as to market the produce, while the day-to-day farm work was distributed amongst groups who within themselves carried it out collectively. That is to say, the society worked as a whole for certain operations while it divided itself into groups for the rest. And the relation between the group and the society was based on crop sharing. This method ensured efficiency and preserved incentive.

Management :

The society was lucky in getting the selfless services of local workers like Shri C. M. Patel and others who managed the affairs of the society very efficiently. Management costs had been kept to the minimum. It was 2.5% of the income of the society.

Improved Farming :

The society used K-49 variety of tobacco seed which gives a very good yield.

Development :

The society constructed two new tube-wells and installed 4 pumping sets for irrigation. It could thus irrigate more than one-third of its land. It had also prepared a scheme to reclaim adjacent Kharlands so that it could increase its area.

Production :

Yield per acre of the main crops were as follows :

TABLE No. 38

Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Bajri	612	272	1000
Paddy	680	720	1360
Tobacco	1292	850	1160

Though the area under cultivation has decreased, total agricultural income of the society has almost doubled within a period of three years. This was made possible by increasing the yields as well as by increasing the area under tobacco which was the most important source of income. For example, of the total produce in 1953-54, income from tobacco was 44%, while in 1955-56 it was 68%. In 1953-54 area under tobacco was 19% of the total cropped area while in 1955-56 it was 47%.

The society could fetch very good prices of its tobacco because of its bulk sale. While other farmers in the village had to undergo many hardships before they could sell their tobacco, the society's tobacco was sold by auction. Merchants came to purchase this tobacco to the society of their own and whoever gave the highest bid could purchase it. This brought a great change. This indirectly helped the farmers of these villages also to get higher prices of their tobacco. Thus the society's activity proved to be of great benefit to these villages as a whole.

Other Activities :

The society took active interest in developing other activities of general interest. For example, it was due to its efforts that three embankments costing Rs. 10,000/- were built. 50% of the cost was obtained from the Government, while 50% was contributed by Shramdan. Similarly a Dharmashala was built at a cost of Rs. 8,000/-. The contribution of Rs. 2,400/- for the school building was paid in advance to the school board.

The society gave free books and scholarships to the children of the members who wanted to proceed with their studies.

Result :

Landless members who were living on the verge of starvation got a stable source of income and became owners of valuable resources which were bound to improve their economic condition. For example, they got only Rs. 229/- per member in 1953-54, but in 1955-56, they got Rs. 527/- per member. In 1956-57, they got Rs. 596/- per member. Thus economically their condition has considerably improved, and is bound to improve further.

Organisationally they have built up a fine organisation which not only enables them to undertake all sorts of development activities, but also have given a positive contribution in the solution of the most burning problem of co-operative farming movement as a whole. The happy mean that they have struck between collective effort and group effort is bound to be useful to other societies also.

TABLE NO. 84

(3) Rasulabad Co-operative Joint Farming Society, Dt. Baroda
Statistical Abstract

	1950—51	1951—52	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1. Membership	18	23	23	26	29	31
2. Total area (acres)	335	442	442	442	442	436
3. Land under Cultivation (acres)	326	340	428	426	436	429
4. Land under irrigation (acres)	20	20	20	53	29	30
5. Share Capital (Rs.)	15000	16800	16800	16800	16800	16900
6. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	18	12122	12200	18547	22723	25071
7. Profit (Rs.)	2648	-2505	2541	15451	9385	6592
8. Government help (Rs.)						
(a) Loan	—	15000	12000	7834	—	8250
(b) Grant	15000	10740	1350	6026	400	1800
9. Bank Credit (Rs.)	8000	30000	40000	40000	40000	40000
10. Total Investment (Rs.)	18543	27200	44018	80242	85580	88495
11. Gross income per acre (Rs.)	99	83	99	153	136	133
12. Cost of Production per acre (Rs.)	55	80	87	71	66	109
13. Net income per acre (Rs.)	44	3	12	82	70	24
14. Income per member (Rs.)	Not available	Not available	Not available	1085	928	879
15. Employment per working member (days)*	„	„	323	382	321	275
16. Audit class	—	B	B	B	A	A

* Includes employment of family members.

The striking success of this society is due to (1) fertile bhatha land (2) tobacco as a cash crop (3) homogeneous group and (4) good leadership. Out of these four, the first two are very important. It must be recognised that these lands are under constant danger of being washed away. Therefore the area of the society must be increased to put it on sounder ground. Area per member is also very inadequate. If the condition of the members is to be improved sufficiently it could not be done with so little land. It is also dangerous

to remain dependent upon a single crop. Today the entire working of the society is dependent upon tobacco which is not a very healthy sign. It must therefore have a diversified cropping pattern for which the area of the society would have to be increased by immediate adoption of reclamation measures.

Registration :

Rasulabad is situated in Vaghodia Taluka of Baroda District. It is at a distance of 15 miles in the north-east of Baroda, and is connected with it by a pucca road.

Sri R. B. Rao of this village and his brothers took an initiative in organising this society. According to them the Co-operative farming scheme of the Bombay State was offering good opportunities of developing lands by undertaking land development measures as well as irrigation schemes as also to minimise cost of production. They owned considerable land in this village and in neighbouring villages. Some of these lands were cultivated by them personally, while the rest was cultivated by their tenants. Their relations with their tenants were very cordial and therefore they could persuade them easily in accepting this idea. Some other landlords of the village also joined with them, and thus Rasulabad Co-operative Joint Farming Society was organised and registered in April, 1950.

Membership :

At the time of registration there were 13 members which later on in the same year increased to 18. Out of them 8 were land owners while 10 were tenants. This number had increased to 31 in 1955-56, out of which 16 were landowners while 15 were tenants. 24 of them were from non-backward classes while 7 were from backward classes. Thus it was not a homogeneous group. Members from different classes and of unequal status had joined to form the Co-operative farming society. For example out of 31 members, 12 did not own any land. The rest were distributed between different groups as follows :—

(1)	Members owning less than 5 acres	5
(2)	" "	5 to 10	" ...	5
(3)	" "	10 to 15	" ...	8
(4)	" "	15 to 25	" ...	2
(5)	" "	25 to 50	" ...	2
(6)	" "	50 to 100	" ...	2
				19

Out of 31, 15 members were active while 16 were inactive. Most of the inactive members were absentee landowners.

Land :

Land under possession of the society in 1955-56 was 436 acres out of which 33 acres were kyari land, 10 acres were bagayat

land and the remaining 393 acres were jarayat land. Out of 436 acres, 266 acres of land were members' own lands while 170 acres were lands held by members on lease.

These lands were situated in Rasulabad and in neighbouring villages, though most of them were in Rasulabad. Moreover, these lands were not in one single compact block, but distributed over a number of blocks. Out of these, there were 10 blocks of a size varying from 15 to 50 acres each. Rest of the land was distributed in small holdings. All the land was not of the same fertility, and required land development measures to be adopted.

Other Resources :

Besides land, all other resources of the members were also pooled in the society, and their value credited as share capital in their accounts. Thus the members contributed 22 bullocks valued at Rs. 10,876/-. agricultural implements valued at Rs. 4,416/-. 2 oil engines valued at Rs. 3181/-.

Other implements such as winnowing fan, chaff-cutter, hoeleveller etc. were purchased by the society. It also purchased a 37 H.P. tractor together with a disc plough, a cultivator and a trailer. It made use of the tractor for all heavy work as well as transport. Rest of the work continued to be done by bullocks. The experience of this society in the joint use of tractor and bullocks is quite happy. It could immediately reduce the number of bullocks from 22 to 18. These bullocks were fully employed throughout the year. It could also undertake land development work as also could cultivate land more intensively. It also made available to the village the services of its tractor for heavy cultivation work as well as for transport of goods.

Development Activities :

The society installed 2 pumping sets on two wells. One well was already there. It constructed the other. It brought 110 acres of land under irrigation. But the actual irrigation never exceeded 53 acres which was the highest. In 1955-56, irrigated land was only 30 acres. A total investment of Rs. 36,459 was made in irrigation scheme till 30-6-56. Looking to the investment made for this purpose, its full utilisation was not made by the society. The main difficulty in its proper utilisation was lack of a sufficient system of underground pipeline. The society received a loan of Rs. 4,500/- from the Government during 1955-56 for this purpose, and laid a pipeline of 2,300 feet. It would now be in a position to make fuller use of the irrigation scheme. Another difficulty was in respect of uncertain prices. Irrigation costs under lift irrigation scheme are generally very high. It becomes a great risk to raise irrigated crops under these circumstances when prices are also very uncertain. For example, in 1954-55 though total production of the society in all crops was much higher than in previous years it realised less income. In 1953-54, it had

realised a total agricultural income of Rs. 61,953/-, in 1954-55 it realised only Rs. 57,282/- even though actual production was higher by at least 25 per cent. As long as fuel costs are high and consequently total irrigation costs become high, it would act as a check upon the societies in making fuller utilisation of the irrigation facilities.

The society also constructed bunds on 120 acres of land which were being eroded and saved them from any further erosion.

Improved Farming :

The society acted as a pioneer in the Taluka in the introduction of improved methods of farming. It introduced improved varieties such as Vijay A grade, Co₂ and Co₁ in cotton, Kenfad wheat, early varieties of paddy, improved variety of groundnut etc. It also introduced Japanese method of paddy cultivation. It started giving two irrigations to cotton crop. It constructed a silo pit for preservation of green fodder. It made use of all types of improved implements such as iron plough, chaff-cutter, winnowing fan, soil leveller etc. It won prizes in all the competitions. For example, it won second prize in the taluka in the preparation of good quality of organic manure. It won third prize for giving largest quantity of paddy in Government levy. It twice won first prize in the taluka for bringing largest area under Japanese method of paddy cultivation.

Production :

Yields for different crops were as follows :

TABLE No. 85
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1950—51	1951—52	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
(1) Cotton	102	122	226	316	317	229
(2) Jowar	250	313	478	310	408	551
(3) Paddy	500	Famine	242	1842	2240	1271
		Year				
(4) Groundnut	460	„	28	1200	1040	597

Though climatic conditions have brought about large variations in the yields, it is found that they have considerably increased. For example, yields in paddy and jowar over a period of six years have doubled, while in cotton and groundnut they have increased by about 30%. At the same time cost of production has also considerably increased.

Financial :

Financial condition of the society was very good. It was lucky enough in getting Government help by way of loans and grants to a very good extent. It was also lucky in getting adequate short-term finance from the co-operative bank. It had adequate land also for its working. It was therefore comparatively easy for it to build up good resources. It had made a total investment of Rs. 88,495/- till 1955-56. It had also built up a reserve fund of Rs. 25,071/-.

Other Activities :

The society took an initiative in organizing similar co-operative farming societies in the neighbourhood and helped them and guided them in every possible way.

It also sponsored a group m.p. society for the village and helped the village people in getting easy and cheap credit. The society took part in all the other activities of the village e.g. cleaning of the pasture, cleaning the village well etc. It also ran a first-aid centre for the village. The society's resources were always put at the disposal of the village whenever required. The society was also responsible in creating a healthy atmosphere in the village for raising agricultural production and introducing improved methods of farming. The society had also played host to the first conference of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat.

Management :

The society was lucky in getting the active services of Rao brothers. In fact, they were the promoters. Sri R. B. Rao, a blind yet very respected and enlightened man, acted as the Chairman of the society throughout the period and guided the affairs of the society very efficiently. He surrendered his ownership rights over 10 acres of land in favour of 4 members of the society. His two younger brothers were also active members of the society. One of them worked as manager and the other as accountant.

Economic Improvement :

There was considerable improvement in the condition of the members. There was enough work throughout the year for all the members and their families. As a matter of fact the society had to engage considerable outside labour. Members were paid Rs. 1½ per day for farm work. For skilled work like tractor driving they were paid higher. Over and above this, they were paid bonus at the end of the year in proportion to the wages earned by them during the year. Thus they were paid bonus at the rate of 9 annas for every rupee earned by them as wages during 1953-54. In 1954-55 and 1955-56 the bonus was paid at a rate of 5 annas.

Members were given morning tea free of cost. Vegetables and green fodder were also provided free daily. School-going children of the members were provided with books free of cost. The society also gave first-aid medical help to the members free of cost. It also undertook, on account of the members, to get a reduction in the land rent of the lands held by the members on lease and succeeded in it. In case of a serious accident, the society gave leave with pay to a member and arranged medical treatment for him at the expense of the society. The society also distributed one woollen shawl free of cost to each of its members.

In spite of all these advantages an element of discontent existed in the society on account of large disparities of income. We have already seen in the beginning that the members did not form a homogeneous group and possessed unequal lands. Now property income paid for lands owned by the members and bonus paid on property income earned by them created this disparity in incomes. For example, 4 members owning more than 25 acres earned among themselves an income of Rs. 9856 out of a total distribution of Rs. 26915 among 29 members in 1954-55. Some of the members who owned less land grew jealous of others, who owned more land and therefore earned more income. Large disparities in income acted as a disintegrating factor in case of this society. Some of the dissatisfied members became inactive. Proportion of inactive members in the society increased considerably because of this. Out of 31 members, as many as 16 members were inactive in 1955-56. This factor had disturbed the working of the society to some extent.

A Model Society:

Excepting this, there was good spirit of co-operation amongst the members. Its relations with the village also were very good. It has rightfully earned a good name in the whole province as one of the

(4) *Jarod Co-operative Joint Farming Society (Dist. Baroda):*

TABLE No. 36
Statistical Abstract

	1951—52	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1. Membership	18	18	18	18	18
2. Total area in acres	150	214	214	214	214
3. Land under cultivation in acres	145	209	209	209	209
4. Share Capital (Rs.)	11125	10725	11000	11275	11325
(a) Members' contribution	9125	9125	9800	10475	10925
(b) Government's contribution	2000	1600	1200	800	400
5. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	18	18	2269	2626	4624
6. Profit (Rs.)	—3090	2828	16615	7993	5472
7. Government help (Rs.)					
(a) Loan	7680	—	—	2000	—
(b) Grant	7470	495	1605	450	1450
8. Bank Credit (Rs.)	6000	6000	4000	4000	8000
9. Investment (Rs.)	6417	10667	11158	11602	10476
10. Gross income per acre (Rs.)	63	80	128	106	112
11. Cost of Production per acre (Rs.)	82	64	56	70	83
12. Net income per acre (Rs.)	—19	16	72	36	29
13. Income per member (Rs.)	Not /available	Not available	552	648	757
14. Employment per member (days)*	..	295	160	225	241
15. Audit class	B	B	B	B	B

* Includes employment of family members.

best managed joint farming societies; and is accepted as such by all concerned. The co-operative department arranges its training classes in this society as it serves as a model.

Registration:

Jarod is a Railway Station on the Dabhoi-Timba Road branch line of the Western Railways. It is at a distance of about 20 miles in the north-east of Baroda. It is also a good market centre.

After the introduction of the Tenancy Act of 1948 of the Bombay State landlords here as elsewhere had started taking possession of their lands under the pretext of personal cultivation. Members of this society were cultivating lands as tenants of a single landlord and were faced with this difficulty. They saw before their eyes in their neighbourhood the example of Rasulabad Co-operative Joint Farming Society, and realised that that was the surest way of saving their lands for cultivation. They received guidance and help from the organisers of that society in this matter and decided to form a joint farming society. The society was registered in March 1951.

Membership :

At the time of the registration 10 members had joined the society, but later on 3 more members joined making a total of 13. All of them were tenants of the same landlord and, all except one belonged to the same community, viz. Vasava adivasis only. One member belonged to the non-backward class. Thus they formed a homogeneous group.

Land :

Total area in possession of the society was 214 acres, all of which was in one compact block. The entire land was held on lease by the members. Average per member comes to 16.5 acres which can be considered adequate.

The landlord of these lands had right from the formation of the society started litigation against the members which continued till 1955-56. The members also sought the help of the Tenancy Act and got land-rent reduced from Rs. 19/- per acre to Rs. 12.5 per acre. Continuous litigation for a number of years had put the society to much inconvenience and involved it in economic loss. The society could not get sufficient credit from the bank on this account, because the bank did not think it prudent to advance big loans for lands in dispute. The society succeeded in all the cases against the landlord. The members were individually saved from all the worries as well as expenditure on account of litigation. The society carried the whole burden and incurred the costs.

Other Resources :

The society constructed a well and installed a pumping set on it, as it wanted to irrigate its lands, but unfortunately water in the

well was found to be very inadequate for the purpose. A bore in the well was attempted, but because of hard rocks the attempt had to be dropped, and the irrigation project of the society thus failed.

In the beginning the society had taken over bullocks and other implements from the members along with the lands, but it did not find this arrangement workable, and therefore returned the bullocks to the members for individual maintenance.

It constructed a cattle shed and a godown.

Development :

As already seen the irrigation scheme failed, but it undertook other development activities such as construction of bund, conversion into Kyari etc. Bunds of 1,200 feet in length were constructed, and 2 acres of land were converted into Kyari land.

Improved Farming :

The society used improved seeds of cotton and paddy. It also made an experiment of transplanting a coarser variety of paddy and obtained encouraging results.

Difficulties :

Tenancy litigation was its difficulty number one. Second difficulty was the acute shortage it experienced for short-term finance. For lack of adequate security the bank did not advance adequate credit to the society, even though it was very regular in paying the amount with interest. It would be interesting to compare the credit it obtained from the bank with what Rasulabad society obtained. In 1955-56 Rasulabad Society obtained a credit of Rs. 93 per acre while Jarod Society could obtain a credit of Rs. 38/- per acre only.

Production :

TABLE No. 87
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1951—52	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Jowar	264	391	486	299	513
Paddy	—	278	1017	1326	1200
Pulses	164	191	171	325	434
Cotton	100	190	318	290	262

Yields had increased during the period more than two times in all the crops ; while the cost of production had remained almost the same. With little resources what it obtained was a proud record.

Economic Improvement :

That the tenants who were on the point of being evicted from the lands and turned into landless labourers could retain the

lands was the most important economic advantage that they received from the society. Not only could they retain the possession of lands, but the land rent that they had to pay was also reduced by Rs. 7/- per acre. The members received these advantages at the expenses of the society.

Even though the Society could not undertake irrigation, it distributed an average income of Rs. 757/- in 1955-56. It distributed a bonus of one rupee on a rupee earned in wages in 1953-54. Bonus distribution in 1954-55 and 1955-56 was annas 10 on a rupee. This compares favourably with that of Rasulabad society which could distribute a maximum bonus of 9 annas till 1955-56.

Other advantages that the members received were: (1) Purchase of food grains at concession rates. (2) Obtaining books for primary education free of cost from the society, (3) Educational facilities for their children for about 2½ months at the expenses of the society till other arrangements were made etc. For lack of irrigation facilities the society was not able to provide enough work to its members.

This society presents a bright example of resourceless tenants making rapid progress through the co-operative organisation in spite of heavy odds.

(5) *Pala Co-operative Collective Farming Society (Dt. Baroda).*

TABLE No. 38
Statistical Abstract

	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1. Members	60	60	60	60
2. Land under cultivation (acres)	706	706	706	706
3. Share Capital (Rs.)	600	1200	1200	1200
4. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	60	146	4077	10694
5. Profit	6	4412	6918	1584
6. Government help (Rs.)				
(a) Loan	—	—	6000	11000
(b) Grant	—	—	—	1500
7. Income per acre (Rs.)	—	97	111	96
8. Cost of production per acre (Rs.)	—	77	85	78
9. Net Income per acre (Rs.)	—	20	26	18
10. Income per member (Rs.)	—	911	1004	918
11. Employment per member (days)*	—	—	—	700
12. Audit class	B	B	B	B

* Includes employment of family members.

Registration :

Village Pala in Naswadi Taluka of Baroda District is situated at a distance of 1½ miles from Sandhia, a Railway Station on Baroda-Tankhala line of Western Railways. It is at a distance of 52 miles in the South-East of Baroda. This village forms a part of the

Amroli village Rehabilitation Scheme launched under the joint auspices of the then Baroda State and the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. As already seen in the chapter on "Growth of the Movement," this scheme was reorganised in 1951 and brought under the Co-operative Farming Scheme of the Bombay State. Accordingly, this society was registered in July, 1951.

Membership :

Membership in this society is on the basis of an economic holding which happens to be 11.7 acres (20 bighas) in this case. Hence 60 members have been taken up in this society. All of them are adivasis. Before they joined the society, they were all landless labourers.

Land :

The Baroda Government had acquired lands of the three villages under the scheme at a cost of Rs. 6 lacs. This society had paid till 30-6-56 Rs. 1,50,845/- towards the cost of the land under its command which is 706 acres. Repayment for land value has been to the extent of about 57%.

Method of Work :

The whole of the farm is treated as one unit for purposes of joint farming and various agricultural operations are carried out under the instructions of the managing committee. Members are paid at the rate of Re. 1/- per day for man, As. 12/- for woman, and As. 8/- for child, and Rs. 2/- for a pair of bullocks which are maintained individually by members. Members are generally paid in kind, but occasionally in cash also when necessary.

Land Development :

The society got 225 acres of land tractor ploughed in 1951-52 for eradication of deep-rooted weeds. A scheme for soil conservation was also prepared and is under execution at present. The society has also received assistance for converting 20 acres of Jirayat land into Kyari land. All the lands of the society are Jirayat lands. The society has also prepared a scheme of irrigation by wells. Till now the society had concentrated towards the repayment of the purchase price of land. This did not permit it to invest its resources in irrigation or land development measures. But now it has decided to undertake both. Bunding has already been started.

Improved Farming :

The society uses improved varieties of seeds for all the crops which it obtains from the Department of Agriculture. It had taken an initiative in introducing Co₂ variety of cotton in the area. It also uses both farmyard manure and chemical fertilizers.

Production :

Per acre yields of the main crops of the society during last four years were as follows:

TABLE NO. 39
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Cotton	339	432	565	341
Paddy	126	400	506	467
Jowar	529	376	592	637
Groundnut	44	69	191	119
Tur	623	952	970	1440
Bajri	196	197	114	106

Yield from year to year varies greatly due to different climatic conditions, but crop-cutting tests in the area have shown that yields of the society have been higher from 30 to 90% during all these years than those obtained in the neighbouring fields. This had enabled the society to win a prize of Rs. 600/- in the 'Grow More Food Campaign.'

Economic Improvement :

The Baroda Government arranged for redemption of debts right from the beginning of the scheme and the amounts were being settled. Just at that time merger took place, and the case of past debts was reopened under the Bombay Agricultural Debtors' Relief Act, and the claims were settled at Rs. 25,000/- for both the societies of the Rehabilitation Scheme. The Bombay Government further granted an interest free loan of Rs. 6,000/- to this society to repay the debts. With this help the members have now become completely debt free. The society also has paid back the Government loan fully.

When the members joined the society they were landless. Now they are collectively owners of 706 acres of land, half of the land price being already paid. Members have never required loans for maintenance, or social purposes since they joined the societies because they have enough deposits to draw upon as and when required. There were Rs. 11,057/- on members' deposits account as shown in the balance sheet of the society on 30-6-56. Members have also prepared a housing scheme and site has been selected for it. Construction will be undertaken in near future. Thus they will soon become owners of good houses also.

Comparison :

It now remains to take note of the working of this society in comparison with that of the other one *viz.* Khodia-Pochamba tenant farming society. As far as agricultural production is concerned, yields

per acre of jowar and paddy are higher in the tenant farming society, while those of cotton and tur are higher in the collective farming society. So nothing definitely can be said on this account except that the types of land in the two societies might be more suitable for the respective crops.

But there is another ground which is much stronger, which raises this question, and that is, members' own reactions. Members of the Pala Society had been forced into the collective type of organisation, at the beginning of the scheme, and that had created a great dissatisfaction amongst them. They resent the fact that their brothers in the neighbouring villages i.e. Khodia and Pochamba enjoy freedom of work while they have to work according to the instructions of the managing committee, when both of them have the same advantages in all other respects. This psychological factor has created great dissatisfaction amongst the members, and has helped in creating a false impression that the working of the collective farming society is inferior to that of the tenant farming society. Working of both these societies has been supervised by one agency, and there has been very little difference to show between their working. But this sense of dissatisfaction is there in the minds of the members of this society.

(6) *Khodia-Pochamba Co-operative Tenant Farming Society:*
Dt. Baroda.

TABLE No. 40
Statistical Abstract

	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1. Members	77	77	77	77
2. Land (acres)	906	906	906	906
3. Share Capital	770	1580	1580	2350
4. Reserve Fund	77	150	649	7381
5. Profit	-10	884	1067	1378
6. Government help				
(a) Loan	—	—	12000	11500
(b) Grant	—	—	1500	—
7. Audit Class	B	B	B	B

Other figures are not available, because it is a tenant farming society.

Registration :

This society was also registered in 1951 after the reorganisation of the Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme. Area of operation of this society is entire lands of the two villages, Khodia and Pochamba. These are situated quite adjacent to village Pala. As a matter of fact, the three villages form a compact group.

Membership :

In this society also membership was based on the basis of economic holding i.e. 11.7 acres (20 bighas) as in the case of Pala

society ; and hence 77 members were enrolled in this society. Out of these 30 members were from Khodia village and 47 members were from Pochamba village. All of them are adivasis. Before joining the society all of them were landless labourers.

Land :

Land under command of this society is 906 acres out of which 353 acres are in Khodia while 553 acres are in Pochamba. These lands were also acquired on account of the society by the Government, and the society was required to pay back the purchase price of the land in instalments. The society had paid back till 30-6-56 Rs. 2,30,807/- i.e. exactly 50% of the land price.

Method of Work :

Apparently the members seem to work independently of each other. Lands have been divided into plots of equal size and have been allotted to members for individual cultivation. But they are actively helped and guided by a central authority which happens to be the officer in charge of the scheme. Agricultural operations are carried out individually by each member while marketing of cash crops, supply of seeds and manures and fertilizers are effected through the agency of the society. Cropping plan is prepared by the officer in charge. Live-stock and implements are owned and maintained by the members themselves.

Land Development :

In 1951-52, 305 acres of land were tractor-ploughed. In 1954-55 bunding activities were started. The society has also undertaken a scheme of converting 20 acres of Jirayat land into Kyari land ; and has received Rs. 6,500/- as loan for this purpose from the Government.

Improved Farming :

Improved seeds are used, and manures and fertilizers are also used.

Live-stock Improvement :

The society maintains Kankrej bull for improving local stock. Every year arrangement is made by the society for vaccination.

Production :

Per acre yields of the main crops of the society during last four years were as follows :

TABLE NO. 41
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Cotton	264	320	388	330
Paddy	272	664	650	721
Jowar	456	560	638	685
Groundnut	—	280	613	—
Tur	108	200	509	168

Members are always enthusiastic to take part in agricultural competitions and exhibitions. One of the members got the first prize both in 1953-54 and 1954-55 for taking highest yield of jowar in the taluka. In 1953-54 his yield of jowar per acre was 60 B. mds ; while in 1954-55 it rose to 84 B. mds. In 1954-55 village Khodia received second prize in the district in 'Vanmahotsav' programme.

Economic Improvement :

On account of the Debtors' Relief Act of the Bombay State and on account of a loan of Rs. 7,500/- that they received from the Government, members became completely debt free. From landless labourers they have turned into cultivators of economic holdings and would soon become owners of these lands.

Before the inauguration of the scheme members were very poor. They hardly got enough to eat. Now they are much better. They are no more required to incur debts either for agricultural activities or for domestic purposes. They have sufficient deposits in their accounts in the society to draw upon as and when required. This is over and above the amount that they have paid towards land purchase price. Members of the two villages have decided to have a housing society separately for each village. They have also decided to undertake cattle improvement and irrigation schemes.

(7) Adalwada Co-operative Collective Farming Society, Dt. Baroda.

TABLE No. 42
Statistical Abstract

	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
1. Membership	41	41	41
2. Total area (acres)	352	352	268
3. Land under cultivation (acres)	272	222	215
4. Share Capital (Rs.)	360	410	410
5. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	36	2625	3258
6. Profit (Rs.)	5696	2068	1429
7. Government help (Rs.)			
(a) Loan	—	—	—
(b) Grant	—	—	—
8. Bank Credit (Rs.)	—	1000	—
9. Gross-income per acre (Rs.)	90	85	96
10. Cost of production per acre (Rs.)	64	71	87
11. Net income per acre (Rs.)	26	14	9
12. Income per member (Rs.)	207	212	316
13. Audit Class	B	B	B

Registration :

The society is situated in village Adalwada which is 21 miles in the north of Baroda. Jarod and Samlaya situated at a distance of 5 miles are its marketing centres.

The Bombay Government had made it a policy to give tank-bed lands to co-operative farming societies, preferably of local landless backward class people. The society was registered in accord-

ance with this policy and it was granted tank-bed lands of this village. A part of these lands gets submerged under water during monsoon. But the remaining lands are available for Kharif crops which suffers if the tank gets filled upto its capacity. A part of the submerged land is available for rabi crop when the level of the tank water recedes, it being utilised for irrigation. Area under submergence varies every year according to the total rainfall and its distribution. Members of the society therefore thought it better to organise the society on collective farming basis. The society was registered in March, 1953.

Membership :

Only those who were landless or landholders holding less than 5 acres were admitted as members in the society. 22 of the 41 members were landless, while the remaining 19 were landholders of less than 5 acres.

Land :

As we have already seen both area under command and cultivation vary from year to year due to natural conditions. Area under cultivation per member works out to be 5 acres. Even though there is considerable scope for land development work it could not be undertaken, because it has been proposed to raise the level of the tank-bank with a view to increase its utility for irrigation. When this is done area available for cultivation now will be completely submerged, and consequently the society will have to close its working. In the beginning the society had to pay very high rent for these lands. It was as much as Rs. 55/- per acre. Later on, on representations, it was reduced to Rs. 22/- per acre. Now it has been decided to take only one-tenth of the total produce.

Production :

Cotton has been the only constant crop of the society, all other crops depending upon natural conditions. It is therefore not possible to compare their yields nor to judge the efficiency. Yield of cotton per acre (in lbs.) during three years was as follows :

	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Cotton	497	290	264

Yield of this crop was also completely dependent upon natural conditions.

The society did not receive any assistance from the Government.

Economic Improvement :

Though much was not expected on account of precariously uncertain conditions of farming of this society, it enabled the members to earn as much as Rs. 316/- per member in 1955-56. This was an additional income for them, because they continued to work as agri-

cultural labourers in the rest of the season. They could also raise reserve fund of Rs. 3,258/-.

Organisational Strength :

The society has promoted a strong sense of unity amongst the members. They could effectively make representation for reduction of land rent. They managed the affairs of the society without any external help. They only engaged a part-time manager at Rs. 150/- per year for writing their account books. All other work was managed by themselves. They have also decided to ask for alternative lands in case these lands are submerged. It is on account of the society that they could make this united move.

(8) Naika Co-operative Tenant Farming Society, Dt. Kaira.

TABLE NO. 43
Statistical Abstract

	48—49	49—50	50—51	51—52	52—53	53—54	54—55	55—56
1. Member-ship	11	11	11	11	15	15	15	15
2. Total area (acres)	265	265	265	265	265	265	265	265
3. Area under cultivation (acres)	—	8	57	60	106	123	120	115
4. Share Capital (Rs.)	650	650	1200	1200	1830	1810	1810	1810
5. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	13	13	13	18	226	4308	5611	6507
6. Profit (Rs.)	2567	-960	-146	1339	3266	5211	3584	4823
7. Government help (Rs.)								
(a) Loan	8000	6000	—	—	—	—	—	—
(b) Grant	3500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Gross income per acre	—	—	71	115	200	292	132	206
9. Audit Classification	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

Registration :

Village Naika is situated at a distance of 20 miles in the south of Ahmedabad. The society of this village has been formed by professional cattle breeders belonging to the Rabari community. They used to keep large herds of cattle in the past, but under present circumstances it was increasingly becoming difficult to do so because of the shortage of large tracts of grazing land. The society was formed with a view to provide lands to the cattle-breeders both for cultivation and grazing purposes. The society was registered in 1948, and was given 265 acres of land half of which

was to be brought under cultivation while the remaining was to be kept for grazing purposes.

Membership :

There were 15 members in the society in 1955-56. Area per member comes to 18 acres.

Land :

Lands granted to the society, though fairly fertile, were lying waste for years. About 120 acres of land were developed and brought under cultivation. This land was divided into sub-plots and allotted to members for individual cultivation. Members were required to give one-third of the produce to the society. Land for grazing purpose however was jointly managed and cattle owned by the members were grazed on this land. Even though the area was coming under the command of a canal, irrigation could not be undertaken, as the water channel passing through it was not in order. This was later on repaired and crops such as wheat, paddy and cotton could now be irrigated.

Production :

Cattle breeders, generally, are not used to farming. It was, therefore, with great efforts done through the society that the members could be induced to take to farming. Their standard of cultivation has also improved considerably. For them it has been almost a new profession. Yields per acre of the two main crops of the society are as follows.

TABLE No. 44
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	1952—53	1953—54	1954—55	1955—56
Wheat	456	188	811	411
Rice	455	580	415	342

Cattle-breeding :

The number of cattle owned by the members is 276 out of which there are 200 adult cows. The society maintains 2 pedigree bulls. All the cows are of Kankrej breed. There has been considerable improvement in the milk yields also. The grazing area was to be put under rotational grazing, but it has not been done so far ; even though government assistance was received for this purpose.

Economic Improvement :

The society, after meeting different costs such as repayment of government loan, payment of land assessment etc. has been able to construct 16 residential houses for the members at a cost of

Rs. 17,347/-, out of the land share that it received from the members. It has also built up a reserve fund of Rs. 6,507/-. As farming is done individually it is not possible to give figures of members' income, but there is sufficient external evidence of this type to show that their condition has considerably improved. Gross income per acre has also risen from 71 in 1950-51 to 206 in 1955-56.

There is another positive advantage that has accrued to the members. Formerly their cattle used to trespass into the fields of the cultivators giving rise to continuous litigation. This has completely stopped now and relations of the cattle breeders with the cultivators have considerably improved.

(9) **Bamania Co-operative Joint Farming Society, Dt. Surat**

TABLE NO. 45

Statistical Abstract

	51-52	52-53	53-54	54-55	55-56
1. Membership	20	20	20	20	20
2. Total area (in acres)	177	177	140	140	140
3. Area under cultivation (in acres)	117	117	130	130	130
4. Share capital (Rs.)	3850	4100	4100	4100	4140
5. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	20	1023	1023	1463	1463
6. Profit (Rs.)	1303	-3000	4040	-3280	3870
7. Government help (Rs.)					
(a) Loan	4500	—	—	—	—
(b) Grant	2500	750	900	1200	—
8. Gross income per acre (Rs.)	182	153	180	112	130
9. Cost of production per acre (Rs.)	190	160	106	132	120
10. Net income per acre (Rs.)	-8	-7	83	-20	10
11. Income per member (Rs.)	746	641	914	834	726
12. Employment per member (days)*	Not available	405	617	578	500
13. Audit class	B	B	B	B	B

* Includes employment of family members.

Registration :

Village Bamania is situated in Mahuva taluka of Surat District. It is at a distance of 12 miles from the nearest railway station viz. Anaval on Waghai-Bilimora Section of the Western Railway and 24 miles from the nearest marketing centre viz. Navsari. It is mostly inhabited by adivasis.

The Sarvodaya Scheme of the Bombay State had been working in this area since 1948, and people of this village were taking part in its various activities. With the introduction of the Tenancy Act of 1948 of the Bombay State, landlords here, as elsewhere, had started evicting tenants under the pretext of personal cultivation. Adivasi tenants of this village also came under this danger. They therefore sought guidance from the workers of the Sarvodaya Scheme. The provision in the Tenancy Act of 1948 that members of a Co-operative Farming Society could not be evicted from the lands under any circumstance, even for personal cultivation, was

explained to them, and they were advised to form a co-operative farming society. These tenants were a little hesitant in the beginning about this new type of organisation about which they were till then quite ignorant. They were therefore shown the working of a few co-operative farming societies recently formed round about Swaraj Ashram, Vedchhi (Dt. Surat). After seeing their working personally, they were convinced, and the society was registered in October 1951.

Legal Difficulties :

In spite of the protection given by the Tenancy Act, the society had to pass through a long trial in which it suffered both economically as well as psychologically. Landlords could persuade 4 members for voluntary surrender of lands held in lease by them, and succeeded in getting possession of these lands with crops standing in the fields. The society had to go in appeal against this order, and ultimately succeeded in getting the judgment in its favour ; because according to the bye-laws of the society, no member could resign his membership nor could he take back the possession of his lands for a period of 10 years after he joined the society. But, in spite of this judgment, the society could not get back the lands, as the members who had joined with the landlords took up a defiant attitude against the society and did not give up their possession. According to a later judgment, the society had to give up these lands. In addition, landlords filed criminal cases for breach of law and order against the members and their wives as well as against the social workers who were sympathetic towards them. These cases lasted for 5 months in Navsari court which is at a distance of 24 miles from the village. Though the cases were dismissed, it placed a very heavy financial as well as mental burden on the members.

Membership :

At the time of the registration, there were 20 members. Though the membership on roll continues to be 20, active members are 14. 3 are sympathiser members, while the remaining 3 have become passive. As a matter of fact 4 had become passive after they joined with the landlords, but one of them subsequently returned to the society and became active. 8 of the members are owners of 14 acres of land which they have contributed to the society. Rest of the land is held by the members in lease as tenants. All the members are adivasis of Dhodia Community.

Land :

Lands originally held by the society were 177 acres, out of which they had to surrender 37 acres of good Kyari land with a good well. At present the society holds 140 acres of land with 4 wells on these lands. These lands, though not situated in one block, are in small, but fairly compact blocks, and are situated in 2 villages namely Bamania and Gundswel which are adjacent to each other.

The society had obtained ample waters in one of the wells in its possession with a bore made into it, and was thinking of installing pumping set on it. But unfortunately the same well had to be surrendered; and the lift irrigation scheme had to be given up. The society continued moat irrigation with the help of the remaining wells. These wells do not have adequate water supply. Area under irrigation varies from 3 to 7 acres. Crops such as sugarcane, potato, turmeric etc. are raised with the help of irrigation. The members are irrigation-minded, and possess the required skill for it; but do not have proper facilities for it.

Method of work :

All the farm work is done by the members. Males are paid @14 annas, females @12 annas, and children @8 annas a day. Except land, other resources are not pooled. The members keep bullocks and implements individually and are paid for them when brought to work for the society.

Employment :

A total number of 72 persons from the families of 14 active members were working on the society's land during this period. Out of them 36 were men, 33 women and 3 children. They worked on an average for 112 days during a year. The society could not take any land development activity on account of the uncertainty of lands consequent upon tenancy litigation. Inadequate land, want of irrigation facilities and inability to take land development activities had prevented the society from giving additional work to the members.

Production :

Yield per acre of the main crops of the society are as follows:

TABLE No. 40
Yield per acre in pounds

	51—52	52—53	53—54	54—55	55—56
Jowar	—	518	546	238	200
Paddy	567	1002	1832	1304	1578
Cotton	192	207	245	262	240
Oilseeds	689	450	1171	543	1199

Climatic conditions as well as other factors such as continuous litigation, absence of irrigation facilities, shortage of short-term finance had had their influence upon production. All the same, there is a marked rise in yields of the last three years over those of first two years.

Economic Improvement :

Had it not been for the society, the members would have been reduced to the position of mere agricultural labourers. Though a part of the lands had to be surrendered (that also, because of the

consent of the members concerned) a major part of the lands could be retained. Continuous litigation in which the members were forced to be involved acted as a long shadow over the entire working of the society and did not allow it to undertake any major development activities. Yet it tried to do whatever little it could. For example, it arranged for supply of food grains to the members at concession rates; it also supplied vegetables to the members raised on the lands of the society at reduced rates and allowed them to cut green fodder from the field boundaries free of cost. The society also constructed a pucca godown to store agricultural produce. The society had introduced hand spinning to make the members self-sufficient in respect of their cloth requirements. It has now decided to start poultry and dairy industries.

(10) Banaskantha Co-operative Collective Farming Society,
Dt. Banaskantha

TABLE NO. 47
Statistical Abstract

	52—53	53—54	54—55	55—56
1. Membership	27	16	18	16
2. Total area (in acres)	283	283	283	283
3. Land under cultivation (acres)	74	90	149	200
4. Irrigated Land (acres)	18	17	24	24
5. Share Capital (Rs.)	10180	15260	13820	13920
6. Reserve Fund (Rs.)	46	60	5600	6665
7. Profit (Rs.)	-1924	-4017	-2584	-4362
8. Government help (Rs.)				
(a) Loan	12115	—	4899	1034
(b) Grant	2150	—	6724	2245
9. Gross income per acre (Rs.)	53	73	33	Individual farming.
10. Audit class	B	B	B	B

Registration :

Banaskantha Co-operative Collective Farming Society, Ltd., is situated at Mahadevia, a place about one mile away from the Railway Station, Shri Amirgadh, on the Meter-Gauge Line of the Western Railway between Ahmedabad and Delhi. The Village Shri Amirgadh is situated in the extreme North-East of Gujarat, at a distance of about 100 miles from Ahmedabad, 21 miles in the North from Palanpur and 10 miles in the South from Abu Road. This is a hilly tract, surrounded by the Arvalli Hills near Mt. Abu and is mostly inhabited by the Adivasi people, including Bhils and Kolis.

The Society was founded by Shri G. G. Mehta, and Smt. Vimlaben Mehta, both social workers from Bombay City. They came in contact with the Adivasis and other backward class people of this most backward area. In order to work amongst them they decided to organise a Co-operative Collective Farming Society, and secured 283 acres of land in the village Shri Amirgadh from the Government of Bombay.

Membership :

Membership of this society has been of a peculiar character. Most of it has gone on changing every year. The Bhil community of this tract is a nomadic community and is not much agricultural minded. It cannot stay for long at one place. However, a few of them stuck in the society and availed of many opportunities provided by it. The society was not allowed to take anyone else except Bhils as its members till recently. Only lately it has been allowed to take Kolis also as members. Kolis are a little more stationary and more progressive in agriculture. On account of this difficulty membership of the society has undergone many changes. In 1955-56 there were 16 members on the roll of the society out of which 15 were active. The society also wanted to take sympathiser members from outside in order to increase its financial resources but was not permitted to do so.

Land :

The society was granted 283 acres of land out of which 190 acres of land had been previously brought under cultivation though at the time of the registration of the society it was not under cultivation. The remaining 93 acres of land were waste land. The lands granted to the society on the basis of new and impartible tenure were in a compact block, and of medium black type. Though the soil is not of poor quality, it is not so rich either. It was moisture retentive and got hard during the dry season. A part of the lands was heavily eroded. The society constructed earthen bunds on some of the lands to stop soil erosion, but these bunds were washed away. The society then undertook bunding and levelling work in consultation with the soil conservation officer. The society was exempted from payment of the land assessment for the first four years.

Lands that were previously brought under cultivation were out of use for a considerable time. The society therefore was required to develop all the lands to make them cultivable. In the first year of its work it could bring under cultivation 74 acres only. In 1955-56 this figure went upto 200 acres. Cultivated area per member in 1955-56 was 12.5 acres.

There were two wells on these lands. On of them had adequate water for working a pumping plant as it was bored while the other had very little water in it. The society installed a pumping plant on the well having adequate water. But it could not make full use of this plant as the area under irrigation was only 24 acres in 1955-56. Looking to the investment for this purpose (Rs. 15,609/-) this seems to be quite disproportionate.

Resources :

The society had to purchase all equipment as the members who joined it had none. Shri Mehta invested a very big amount of

his own. Later on he donated most of it to the society. He thus gave Rs. 30,000/- as donation to the society. He also brought deposits from the non-members. The society also received Rs. 18,000/- as loan, and Rs. 11,000/- as grant from the Government. With these resources it made an investment of Rs. 55,000/- out of which Rs. 17,349/- were invested in tractor and its implements; Rs. 15,609/- in irrigation project; Rs. 2,845/- in other implements; Rs. 2,543/- in livestock and Rs. 13,764/- in buildings. The working capital of the society was Rs. 80,000/- as on 30-6-56.

The Society also received crop loans from the Bombay State Co-operative Bank Ltd. to the extent of Rs. 2,500/- in 1952-53, Rs. 4,000/- in 1953-54, Rs. 6,000/- in 1954-55 and Rs. 7,500/- in 1955-56. Thus the Society suffered from no difficulty on account of funds both for short term or long term requirements.

Production:

Yields of different crops were as follows:

TABLE No. 48
Yield per acre in Lbs.

	52—53	53—54	54—55	55—56
Jowar	26	21	37	47
Bajri	28	112	90	90
Wheat	1188	1028	698	578

The main reasons for low crop yields and losses incurred by the Society are as enumerated below in order of their importance and degree of their effectiveness.

(i) Tremendous damage was caused to the standing crops by wild animals such as blue-bulls. Various measures such as rifle parties of policemen and vigilance parties from among the members for night patrolling, use of poison pills stuck up on the castor plants and purivox equipment proved ineffective in putting a stop to this menace with a result that the Society's crops were frequently devoured by these animals.

(ii) The lack of co-operative spirit and sense of partnership on part of the members also contributed to the low yields of crops and the consequent financial position of the Society. One of the reasons for this state of things is that the urge for organization of this society did not come from the members themselves and therefore they almost failed to understand their duties and obligations.

(iii) Loss by accidental fire to the extent of Rs. 4,000/- was another cause that was beyond human effort to ward off.

(iv) The use of tractor for ploughing, sowing, irrigation etc. proved to be expensive in consideration of the low sale proceeds of

food crops which were also heavily damaged by the blue-bulls. Similarly the working of the lift-irrigation scheme proved to be very expensive due to high prices of diesel oil and spare parts and heavy repair charges.

(v) Lack of agricultural experience on the part of Shri and Smt. Mehta in the initial stages, low calibre of the agricultural assistant placed at the disposal of the Society by the Government from the agricultural department and also the primitive knowledge of members in agricultural matters proved a serious handicap to the society.

Being discouraged by the results it was decided to change the methods of work. Instead of cultivating the land on a collective basis it was distributed amongst the members for individual cultivation during 1955-56. Attempts are now being made to associate good cultivators in the neighbourhood with the work of the society. The recent change in the policy of the Government of allowing the society to admit Kolis as its members also, it is expected, might prove helpful.

Even though the society could not make satisfactory progress so far as its economic aspects are concerned on account of a variety of reasons as stated above, it has made good progress in providing several amenities to the members and their families. The Society thus undertook to provide free milk or wheat rab, clothing facilities and credit facilities for social functions. It conducted classes for spread of literacy among the adults and the children. Besides, it took a very keen interest in promotion of development activities such as construction of roads in the neighbouring villages through shramdan. Shri and Smt. Mehta also took active interest in the activities of students, youths and women of the surrounding villages. Steps were also taken by them for removal of untouchability and introduction of cottage and village industries such as weaving, spinning, oil ghani etc. in this area. All these activities have created a favourable atmosphere for offering of two villages in gramdan and for organisation of three multipurpose co-operative societies which have been working well and have been rendering valuable services such as cultivation of river-bed lands, running of grain shops and fair price shops and supply of other requirements of the members. It may further be noted that the gramdan and nav-nirman work through co-operative societies in this area as aforesaid have very good repercussions in the whole of the district ; where nearly 73 gramdans have been secured and where nav-nirman work is being organised on similar lines through service co-operatives in 6 centres in all.

Results of the Case Studies :

Certain things come out very prominently from these case studies. For example, they have shown that the organisation of co-operative farming society can convert very rapidly the landless labourers into good cultivators as in the cases of Rehmalpur, Mahisagar Bhattha, Pala and Khodia-Pochamba societies, or it can prevent the

likely conversion of tenant cultivators into landless labourers as in the case of Bamania and Jarod societies. It has also accelerated the rehabilitation of cattle breeders as in the case of Nayka society.

Secondly, it has provided a stable source of income to the members, provided them with more employment and increased their income besides giving them other benefits such as foodgrains at concession rates or free books to their children or free first aid medical treatment.

Thirdly, it has created a desire for better living in the members and enabled them to fulfil it as in the case of Nayka and Rehmalpur societies who have constructed houses for the members. Pala and Khodia-Pochamba societies have undertaken these schemes.

Fourthly, it has helped the general process of development in the village. For example, Rehmalpur society started the Primary school for the village and ran it for about four years at its own cost. Mahisagar Bhatha society constructed three embankments and a dharmasala, and contributed the required amount for school building. Rasulabad society organised a multi-purpose society for the village and helped other co-operative farming societies in the area, and took a lead in promoting agricultural development in the area.

Fifthly, it has, in spite of bad years, built up good resources and created a strong development potential as is found from the heavy investment it has made or big funds like reserve funds and such other funds that it has created. This is likely to pay better returns in the future years.

Factors for success :

These case studies have also brought out the factors responsible for their successful working. One of them is good and adequate land. In the following table relation of land with income is shown as seen in the case of these 10 societies.

TABLE NO. 49

Relation of land per member with income per member in 1955-56

Name of the society	Land per member in acres	Income per member (in Rs.)
1. Rehmalpur	19 (dry land)	1041
2. Jarod	16 (dry land)	757*
3. Rasulabad	14 (partly irrigated)	879*
4. Pala	117 (dry land)	918
5. Bamania	7 (partly irrigated)	726*
6. Adalwada	5 (dry land)	316
7. Mahisagar Bhatha	1 (irrigated and very fertile land)	527
8. Nayka	18 (partly irrigated)	Not available
9. Banaskantha	18 (partly irrigated)	Not available
10. Khodia-Pochamba	117 (dry land)	Not available

* Includes property income.

It is seen from this table that the societies which had adequate land were generally better placed and could progress rapidly. Out of the last three societies whose data is incomplete but which had good acreage per member, Nayaka and Khodia-Pochamba were able to distribute a good amount though exact figures are not available. The only exception is that of Banaskantha which in spite of good acreage could not progress well because of very inferior quality of land and inexperienced management. Mahisagar Bhatha society could distribute as much as Rs. 527/- per member even though area per member is only 1 acre because the land was very fertile, irrigated and could grow valuable crop like tobacco. Rasulabad society though it has higher acreage of land as well as a part of its land is irrigated, has a lower average of income per member than Pala society, because it has a large proportion of inactive membership. Inadequate land as well as uncertainty about that land have retarded the progress of societies as in the case of Bamania and Adalwada societies.

The second factor which has contributed to their successful working is availability of sufficient resources as in the case of Rasulabad, Rehmalpur, Pala, Khodia-Pochamba etc. Insufficiency of resources affected their working as in the cases of Jarod, Bamania and Adalwada.

Other factors are: (3) good management and (4) homogeneous groups. Good management has played a very important role in their successful working as in the case of Rasulabad, Rehmalpur and Mahisagar Bhatha. Similarly even though the Banaskantha society had enough land and sufficient financial resources it could not make good use of them because of inexperienced management.

Homogeneity of membership was also an important factor. Absence of this was one single factor which did not permit Rasulabad society to progress to its full capacity. In contrast, Jarod society which had a homogeneous group made a more rapid progress even though its resources were very poor compared to those of Rasulabad society.

To recapitulate, four factors have contributed to the success of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat. They are (1) Adequate land (2) Adequate financial resources (3) Good management and (4) Homogeneous group of membership. Absence of any one of them had seriously affected their working.

Opinion Data :

As stated in the beginning of this chapter an attempt was made to study the reactions of members as well as non-members about the working of these societies. They were selected at random ; and were given a set of questions. 150 members (a sample of 5% of the total membership) from 24 societies which were studied intensively were asked these questions. A summary of their answers is given in the following Table :

TABLE No. 50

A statement of opinions of the members of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat.

Question	Yes.	No.	No opinion
1. Whether days of employment have increased after joining the society ?	114	27	9
2. Whether income has increased ?	106	35	9
3. Whether income from the society is adequate ?	57	87	6
4. Do you want change in the administration ?	14	136	—
5. Do you want change in the method of distribution of income ?	8	142	—
6. Are the relations amongst the members cordial ?	149	1	—
7. Is the relation of the society with the village cordial ?	148	2	—

They were also asked to make suggestions to improve the working of the societies. Their important suggestions were : (1) Increase in area under irrigation, (2) increased use of manure, (3) increase in area under cash crops, (4) introduction of industries, (5) better marketing facilities, (6) godown facilities, (7) reduction in land revenue and (8) reduction in administrative expenses. Industries suggested by them were: (1) amber spinning, (2) weaving, (3) dairy, (4) poultry, (5) brick-making, (6) coal making, (7) construction activity, (8) oil ghani, (9) tailoring, (10) leather work and (11) toy-making.

Similarly 56 non-members from the villages of these societies were also asked a few questions. A summary of their answers is given in the following Table :

TABLE No. 51

A Statement of opinions of the non-members of the villages in which the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat are working

Question	Yes.	No.	No opinion
1. Do you think members of the society have received following advantages ?			
(a) More income	31	15	10
(b) More land	29	16	11
(c) Irrigated land	14	18	24
(d) Rise in social status	26	18	17
(e) Adequate resources	29	18	14
(f) Government help	40	4	6
(g) Improvement in farming	46	4	6
2. Are the society's lands well managed ?	27	14	15
3. Do you think that the future of the society is good ?	41	9	6
4. Are the relations of the society with the village cordial ?	55	1	—

They were also asked as to why they did not join the society. Out of 56, 22 expressed their willingness to join, but could not do it because they were not admitted. 7 had no definite opinion, while out of the remaining 27, 7 said they did not join because they had adequate land, and the rest because they were still not convinced of the advantages of co-operative farming.

CHAPTER VIII

ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

Delegation of Powers :

Administration of the co-operative farming society plays a very important part in its working ; particularly so in the case of joint and collective co-operative farming societies. The tenant farming society is not required to face this problem to the same extent, because the procedure and method of work in this type of society is totally different from that of the other two types of societies. In the tenant farming society delegation of powers to the general body by the members is for limited operations such as land reclamation or land development or irrigation schemes, credit arrangements, and for sale and purchase activities. For the rest, members take decisions themselves. For example, they are completely at liberty as to when to go on work or how long to stay on work. Therefore the impact of administration is not so great over the members of this type of co-operative farming society. In the case of other two types, delegation of powers by the members to the different organs of the society is complete, and therefore the impact is also very great. The following table shows as to who takes decisions for different matters in the three types of co-operative farming societies. It clearly reveals the difference in the nature of their working.

TABLE NO. 52

Delegation of powers in the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat
(Only of societies which have been studied intensively)

(Societies in Nos.)

Kind of work	(Total No. of societies studied : 10)			By Chairman	By Manager
	By general body	By managing committee	By supervision board.		
1. Cropping Plan	1	6	—	1	2
2. Development Programmes	1	5	—	1	3
3. Distribution of funds	—	7	—	2	1
4. Banking transactions	—	—	—	7	3
5. Assessment and distribution of work	1	6	—	2	1
6. Purchase and sale :	—	5	—	3	2

Kind of work	(Total No. of societies studied : 6)				
	By general body	By managing committee	By super- vision board	By Chairman	By Manager
1. Cropping plan	—	6	—	—	—
2. Development programmes	—	6	—	—	—
3. Distribution of funds	—	5	—	—	1
4. Banking transactions	—	—	—	6	—
5. Assessment and distribution of work.	1	3	—	—	2
6. Purchase and sale	—	5	—	—	1

Kind of work	(Total No. of societies studied : 8)				
	By general body	By managing committee	By super- vision board	By Chairman	By Manager
1. Cropping plan	—	—	—	—	1
2. Development programmes	1	6	—	—	1
3. Distribution of funds	1	6	—	—	1
4. Banking transactions	—	—	—	6	2
5. Assessment and distribution of work	Not applicable in these societies				
6. Purchase and sell	4	3	—	—	1

This difference is also made clear in the bye-laws of the Co-operative farming societies framed by the Government. Leaflet QQQ which gives these bye-laws, states: "In the case of a tenant farming society each member will be given a plot for which he has to pay annual rent fixed by the society and he will cultivate the holdings with his own and his family labour and according to the plan of cultivation laid down by the Managing Committee of the society." In the case of Joint and Collective Farming Societies each member working on the society's land will be "bound to carry out all directions of managing committee or a person or persons authorised by the managing committee in respect of every matter connected with production and protection of crops."

General Body :

Let us now probe this problem in greater details in its actual working. First is the general body which is expected to meet at least once in a year, but may meet more than once. It is the supreme body with which final decisions rest. It elects the managing committee every year, decides about the distribution of profits and lays down a general plan of work execution of which is delegated to the managing committee. These functions were generally well performed by this body. A study of the managing committees of the societies revealed that very few changes had taken place in their composition. Same persons were re-elected. This happened because the leader who had taken an initiative in organising the societies commanded confidence of the members and were naturally called upon to serve on the committees. In the initial stages it is quite natural that members would not like to change their leaders depending upon whom they

have joined the society. This has mostly been the position in case of backward class societies. In case of mixed type of societies i.e. where members come from different classes it was found that members who belonged to higher classes or higher castes were generally elected on the managing committees.

Managing Committee :

Managing Committee is delegated with almost all the powers by the general body. Once the committee is elected, it is the sole agency which has to take decisions on all matters. Decisions which were taken individually before the organisation of the society have now to be taken by this body. In order to perform these functions properly this committee is expected to meet frequently. As mentioned in the bye-laws, "subject to the provisions of bye-laws and directions conveyed in resolutions of general meetings, the managing committee shall have full authority to carry on the business of the society. The committee may meet as often as it considers necessary for the transaction of the business, but it shall meet at least once every month."

Managing Committees were generally found to meet quite frequently; but they were found to delegate powers given to them to the Chairman or the Manager whoever was competent amongst the two. In order to perform properly the functions given over to them, committee members should have a sufficient knowledge of the methods of improved agriculture and should have a proper understanding of market conditions. Not possessing either of these, they were naturally inclined to delegate these functions in their turn to the two above-mentioned office-bearers.

Assessment and distribution of daily work was expected to be done by the managing committee, but this responsibility was also passed on in many cases to the Chairman and/or the Manager; because the committee members did not have enough time for this work. After a day's hard work they felt reluctant to perform any extra duties. Assessment and distribution of daily work is a very important function in the administration of joint and collective farming societies. A faulty assessment can affect the entire working of the society. Factors other than a genuine mistake of judgment were sometimes found to enter into the performance of this duty. In order to provide work to all the members of the society, more persons were sent to do the task. To illustrate, 15 persons were sent for weeding a farm of 2 acres, even though it could have been weeded with the labour of 10 persons only. This was done to accommodate all the members.

Supervision of work also could not be done very strictly, because it created dissatisfaction amongst the members. But, on the whole, chairmen were found to perform their duties quite well; and were able to get good co-operation from members. This was because they were their real leaders.

Managers :

But all of these chairmen did not have sufficient knowledge of improved agriculture or market conditions. Some of them, therefore, in their turn, passed on their responsibilities to their managers. Ultimately, it was this man who was required to perform many of the important functions. Government had also foreseen this situation. It therefore stated in its scheme, "the success of these societies will largely depend upon availability of expert and technical staff well trained in agricultural practices. It is accordingly proposed that each of these societies should be given the services of a trained agricultural assistant."

But what was the actual position? Many of the societies did not get competent and qualified managers as seen from the Table No. 53.

TABLE NO. 53

Qualifications of the managers of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat

(a) Educational Qualifications	No. of Managers
(1) Nil	5
(2) Vernacular final pass	40
(3) Matriculate	20
(4) Undergraduate	4
(5) Graduate	2
Total	80

(b) Special Qualifications	No. of Managers
(1) Co-operative training	11
(2) Agriculture	5
(3) Accounts	2
(4) Nil	62
Total	80

Either before their appointment or after it, no steps were taken to equip them to perform their duties. They were paid very low salaries as seen from Table No. 54.

TABLE NO. 54

Salary of the managers of the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat

Monthly Salary	No. of Managers
(1) Nil	16
(2) Below Rs. 25	26
(3) From Rs. 26 to 50	18
(4) From Rs. 51 to 75	13
(5) From Rs. 76 to 100	5
(6) Above Rs. 100	2
Total	80

(8 societies had no managers)

In some cases (22 societies) managers were selected from amongst the members. It was found that if managers selected from amongst the members, were not competent, they became an object of

envy, and affected the working of the society adversely. But, as in the case of Rasulabad Joint Farming Society, if he was really competent, he proved a great asset for the society. Inherently there was no advantage to the society merely because he was a member; it entirely depended upon his capability. There was no evidence to suggest that there was tension in the society because the manager was a non-member. This factor had no bearing on his position.

Government Subsidy:

The Government had accepted the policy of subsidizing the cost of managerial expenses for a period of two years fully, and for a further period of three years for half the amount. Only one-third of the societies received help on this account, most of them being backward class societies as seen from the Table No. 55. Out of 30 societies

TABLE No. 55

Statement of subsidy paid by the Government to the co-operative farming societies in Gujarat

Period for which subsidy was paid	<i>Backward class societies</i>		<i>Non-backward class societies</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	No. of societies	Amount paid	No. of societies	Amount paid	No. of societies	Amount paid
(1) Nil	29	—	22	—	51	—
(2) Subsidy for one year	9	4836	3	4090	12	8926
(3) Subsidy for two years	5	6090	—	—	5	6090
(4) Subsidy for three years	8	15250	1	1800	9	17050
(5) Subsidy for four years	3	10639	—	—	3	10639
Total	54	36815	26	5890	80	42705

(3 societies had no managers)

receiving aid, only 5 are non-backward class societies. As provided in the scheme, subsidy was not given for the full period. Out of 30, only 17 received subsidy for more than one year. This fact would largely explain the incompetence of many of the managers. For want of enough resources and sufficient government help, societies could not afford to engage really competent persons as their managers.

Board of Supervision:

As stated in the bye-laws of the Co-operative Farming Societies, "the Board of Supervision shall consist of 5 persons. The Agricultural and the Co-operative Departments may nominate one member each to serve on the Board." The duties of the Board are, "generally to supervise, guide and watch over the affairs of the society." Main idea behind this Board was to make available to the society expert technical guidance from the two departments whose representatives were to be nominated on the Board.

This Board was not found to have given any guidance to the societies. They were found to meet very rarely. Government nominees also hardly took any interest. The purpose of associating the two departments with the working of the society would be better served by nominating their representatives on the managing committee which, as already seen, meets quite frequently.

Agricultural Department :

The scheme is executed through the Co-operative Department. At the time of organising the society preliminary data are collected by the officers of this department. The technical aspect including the feasibility of the scheme is examined by the Agricultural Department. After the registration, the Co-operative Department arranges for the inspection and supervision of the society. The Agricultural Department is also expected to make at least one inspection every year. Since the Co-operative Department is neither equipped nor competent to advise and guide the societies in technical matters of agricultural improvement, and since the Agricultural Department is not made directly responsible for the successful working of the societies, the latter hardly received any technical guidance. The Agricultural Department was generally not found to perform its function of making even one inspection of these societies. Almost all the societies had complained of getting very inadequate help from the Agricultural Department.

Method of Work :

As already seen in the beginning, members of joint and collective farming societies are daily allotted specific tasks by the managing committee or the manager, and are paid "according to the scale of wages fixed by the committee with the approval of the Board of Supervision."

This method of work was found to make the members wage-earners instead of co-partners, even though they were entitled to a share in the profits. Freedom of work, in this method, was very much restricted. As already seen, attempts were made to solve this difficulty by allotting work to teams and giving them freedom in its execution. (Mahisagar Bhatha Co-operative Collective Farming Society). Another solution that was suggested was of devising different norms for different operations as in China. The Co-operative Department had considered this problem and was trying to devise norms but these do not seem to have been finalised nor tried anywhere. If, however, they are successfully tried, it is expected that much of the managerial work would be minimised. It would also allow more freedom to the members in their work. Both in the joint and the collective co-operative farming societies this problem of introducing a sense of partnership in the minds of the members is receiving serious attention.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

Summary :

In the beginning, we shall try to summarise important observations made during the report in order to give an overall picture of the working of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat.

(1) On account of the government policy and due to the efforts of non-official agencies such as the Harijan Sevak Sangh, the Raniparaj Seva Sabha, and the Gujarat Goseva Sangh and also on account of special interest taken by some of the constructive workers in Gujarat like Shri Jugatram Dave, the Co-operative Farming Movement received an enthusiastic response in Gujarat after 1949. Targets fixed by the Government for the registration of the co-operative farming societies for Gujarat were attained much earlier than the stipulated period. At the end of the plan period more than double the number of societies were registered.

(2) A large majority of them (71%) have been concentrated in three districts viz., Baroda, Ahmedabad and Surat.

(3) A large majority of them have been formed on government fallow lands. Only one-fourth of them have been formed on cultivated lands.

(4) A large majority of them are of collective and tenant types. Of these two, the tenant type is preferred.

(5) A large majority of them are of backward class people.

(6) Membership has generally varied from 22 to 45. Large-sized societies have been exceptional as in the case of Kharland societies. Total membership of all the societies is 3610.

(7) Membership has mainly (90%) been drawn from agricultural labourers and very small landholders.

(8) Average commanded area per society is 284 acres, while average cultivated area per society is 180 acres. A gap of about a hundred acres is found, because most of the societies have been formed on government waste lands.

(9) Average cultivated holding per member is of 6 acres, it being smallest (3 acres) in the case of collective farming societies.

(10) Land rent to be paid by the societies was very high in some cases. 3 societies paid as much as Rs. 50 per acre.

(11) Government lands were granted to the societies on very liberal terms.

(12) In most of the societies, bullocks were maintained individually instead of being pooled.

(13) Only 15 societies had undertaken irrigation.

(14) Total funds of the societies were more than 17 lacs of rupees. Out of these, 14.3% were share capital 18.8% were owned funds including reserve funds, and 66.9% were other funds obtained from the Government, Co-operative banks and other private sources.

(15) The Government assisted the societies both for current requirements as well as for long-term capital investments. Total government assistance was of Rs. 9,69,359/-, out of which 64% was by way of loan, while 36% were grants. Main purposes for which this assistance was given were (1) Share capital contribution, (2) Subsidy for managerial expenses, (3) Subsidy for seeds and manures, (4) Land development, (5) Irrigation, (6) Purchase of implements, (7) Purchase of bullocks and (8) Construction of godowns and cattle sheds. Though the list of purposes for which the assistance was given appears to be fairly exhaustive, number of societies receiving them is quite small. The largest number of societies (36) receiving government assistance was for land development measures. The scheme had not made any provision for crop finance.

(16) Crop finance was expected to come from the Co-operative banks. During the period of inquiry, only 24 societies received crop finance from them ; but in any one year not more than 16 received it. Most of the societies suffered from shortage of sufficient crop finance.

(17) Total assets of 74 societies were of Rs. 15,62,362/- out of which 25% were invested in land, while 14% were invested in machinery. General picture of the societies is that they are poor in resources.

(18) Land development programmes had been undertaken by many (66) societies. 11,885 acres of new land were brought under cultivation. Bunding was undertaken by 17 societies in 9345 acres of land. Irrigation was undertaken by only 15 societies bringing 1000 acres of land under irrigation. But actual irrigation never exceeded 222 acres of land in any one year. Irrigation was undertaken by most of them as a famine relief measure and not for taking second crops.

(19) Improved techniques of cultivation were generally followed by the societies. Use of improved seeds and implements was also made wherever found useful. Use of manure was on a small scale because most of the societies were formed on new lands.

(20) Though the Managing Committee was expected to take decisions on all important matters they were generally taken by the Manager in consultation with the Chairman, and subsequently endorsed by the Committee. Neither the Chairman nor the Committee members were generally found to possess special knowledge of improved farming.

(21) Most of the managers were found to be unqualified for the task they were called upon to do. They were also paid very low salaries.

(22) One-third of the societies were paid subsidies for managerial costs, most of them being backward class societies.

(23) Board of supervision was found to be almost ineffective and redundant.

(24) Very little guidance was received from the agricultural department.

(25) Very few societies had undertaken cottage industries programmes.

(26) Excepting cattle breeding societies, no other society had undertaken dairy industry or cattle rearing industry.

Results of Intensive Study :

(27) A trend in favour of cash crops was observed from the study of the croppings of these societies during last 3 years.

(28) In spite of wide fluctuations in yields per acre from year to year, on the whole they had increased.

(29) Gross profit per acre had also increased.

(30) Main items in the cost of production were land revenue and wages (73%).

(31) Overhead expenses were very moderate (4.6%).

(32) In 1955-56, out of 24 societies, 20 were working with a profit, while 4 were working at a loss. According to audit classification in the same year, 3 were placed in A class, 18 in B class and 3 in C class.

(33) Case studies of 10 societies out of 24 have shown that as a result of the working of the co-operative farming societies considerable change in the economic condition of the members had taken place. Their income increased along with an increase in employment. They also received other advantages such as free medical aid, free primary

schooling for their children etc. The societies also played a leading part in the general development of the village. The most important result of their working had been speedy rehabilitation of agricultural labourers as cultivators. They also helped the tenants from being evicted out of their lands.

Case studies have also brought out the causes of success. They are: (a) adequate land, (b) adequate financial resources, (c) good management and (d) homogeneous membership. All these factors were found to be essential for the successful working of the co-operative farming society.

The only question that now remains to be answered is: which is the most successful type of the three? Judged strictly by financial results, it can be said that the tenant farming societies have been the most successful. But it must be mentioned here that their contribution as co-operative farming societies has been almost negligible. They had been formed only with a view to get government lands. After getting land, and distributing it amongst their members, they hardly undertook any activity as such.

These societies may be continued to be registered as "service co-operatives" instead of "tenant co-operative farming societies" in order to distinguish them clearly from the genuine co-operative farming societies viz. joint farming and collective farming societies and they should be persuaded and encouraged to undertake activities such as crop planning, marketing, supply of agricultural and other requirements, irrigation, land development, pooling of resources other than land such as bullocks to eliminate waste and organization of cottage and village industries to provide additional employment to the members. These societies should be enabled to adopt more and more activities involving co-operation with a view to prepare the members ultimately to pool their lands also and to undertake joint farming. These societies should be treated as preparatory societies for the ultimate objective of joint farming.

As between the remaining two, the collective farming societies have been more successful. But that was because most of them were formed on government waste lands which were given to them on very liberal terms. Again they had not to face the problem of uncertainty of land which many of the joint farming societies formed of tenants had to face. This uncertainty not only involved the joint farming societies in economic loss on account of litigation but also stopped them from getting any credit from the banks.

The two types of societies have different origins. The collective farming society is formed on lands obtained from the Government or from absentee landlords. The joint farming society is formed by pooling of the lands held by members either as owners or as tenants. The difference therefore is in respect of the ownership of the land.

Otherwise the method of work in both of them is the same. Therefore there is no question of superiority of one type over the other. Individual circumstances may influence their working. Type as such has nothing to do with it.

Recommendations :

With a view to improve and facilitate the working of the co-operative farming societies we are led to make following recommendations which, as a matter of fact, directly follow from the study.

Promotion of non-Official Agency :

(1) We would urge the formation of a non-official agency to promote and further the growth of this movement in the region. Just as the Gujarat Goseva Sangh, the Harijan Sevak Sangh, the Raniparaj Seva Sabha and such other institutions are working in their respective spheres and doing the pioneering work for the cause they are serving, similarly the Gujarat Sahakari Kheti Sangh should be formed to take up the responsibility of promoting and guiding the Co-operative Farming Movement in Gujarat.

Organisation of Planning Committee :

(2) We would similarly urge the formation of an official agency known as planning committee for co-operative farming. Such committees are already there for forest labour co-operatives and Sarvodaya Schemes. This committee should be constituted of the ministers for co-operation and agriculture, officials from these two departments and other non-officials interested and actively associated with the movement. The committee would advise and guide the societies, the government and the financing agencies in the day-to-day working and enable the Government to assess the progress of the movement periodically and to adopt suitable measures to improve the working of the societies.

Joint Responsibility of Co-operative and Agriculture Departments :

(3) We feel that the successful running of the Co-operative Farming Societies should be made a joint responsibility of both the Agricultural department and the Co-operative department. Today it is only the latter that is made responsible for it, but in the co-operative farming society it is agriculture that is to be made successful and therefore active association of the agricultural department in their working should be considered absolutely essential. This association would encourage the societies in adopting improved methods of farming as also help them in solving many agricultural problems that they are required to face. If only the agricultural department is made responsible it is generally seen that only productoin and technical sides are emphasised and the social co-operative side is overlooked. Therefore a separate portfolio may be created composed of personnel well-versed in both the departments.

Preparation of Five-Year Plan :

(4) Every co-operative farming society should be helped in preparing a detailed five-year plan indicating the targets to be reached every year. The plan should aim at integrated development of the members, and should therefore include programmes of village industries, housing, education etc. in addition to that of agricultural development. The plan should be based on estimates of manpower and capital resources available to the society, the capital which could be obtained from outside, the estimates of increased production and the stages of repayment. The plan should aim at maximum utilisation of its human and material resources and their development. Government assistance to the society should be according to this plan. Every year the progress of the plan should be assessed and necessary steps be taken for its fulfilment in the next year. In case of unexpected failures of crop or similar setback, the plan should be suitably modified and all forces—societies, the government etc. striving in co-operation to tide over the difficulty.

Satisfactory Arrangement for Crop Finance :

(5) Proper and satisfactory arrangements should be made for crop finance. If it is to come from the co-operative banks as at present, the Government should give them necessary security against losses. This would meet the requirements of the banks and encourage them in advancing credit to the co-operative farming societies. On account of land reforms and acceptance of the concept of "gramdan" generally, a considerable reduction in land prices has taken place. Land has therefore ceased to be a sufficient security for bank loans. This also necessitates a guarantee from the government for securing adequate bank loans to these societies too as in the case of the Forest Labour Co-operative Societies and the Sugar Co-operative Factories.

Experienced and Trained Managers :

(6) Experienced and trained managers should be given to societies. As we have seen, this man holds a key position in their working, and much depends upon his efficiency. We are pleased to note that the Bombay Government has accepted this position and is doing its best in this direction. It has decided to depute agricultural officers as managers. Before deputation, they would be given training, both practical as well as theoretical, lasting about 6 months. This would go a long way in improving the working of the societies.

Training of the Members :

(7) Training of the members of the co-operative farming societies is equally important. As most of them belong to backward classes, the need for their training is still greater. In order that they may actively participate in the working, they should be instructed about their rights and responsibilities. They should also be instructed sufficiently in improved methods of farming. This would greatly help

the societies in raising their agricultural production. Here also we note with pleasure that the Bombay Government has accepted this proposal, and has already started implementing it. The only thing that we would like to suggest in this respect is that this task of educating the members should be entrusted to men or institutions really capable for such work. Let it not become a mere propaganda measure, as it is likely to become if it is left in the hands of routine people.

Members to Become Co-partners, not Wage-Earners :

(8) Development of suitable techniques of work distribution and work supervision which are of the greatest importance to co-operative working should receive the highest priority. Experiments such as made by the Mahisagar Bhattha Society deserve all encouragement. The sense of having become wage-earners should be removed as early as possible. It should be replaced by a feeling of having become co-partners in a big enterprise. Method of work and sharing of the produce are two main factors which have a direct relation with this feeling. If more freedom is given in day-to-day work, and payment by crop share instead of daily wages is introduced, the necessary psychological change may be brought about. Active association of all the members' in decisions regarding distribution of daily work would also increase their responsiveness as well as their sense of responsibility. Large-scale experimentation in the field of splitting up of agricultural operations and leaving them to individuals or groups of individuals should be welcome.

Payment to be a Share in the Earnings, not as Wages :

(9) We would also recommend the introduction of the practice of making advance payments to the members for their daily requirements instead of paying them wages and distribute the income between the members in proportion to the labour put in by them at the end of the year after making necessary provisions for expenses. This would bring about that sense of partnership in the members which would provide them with the necessary incentive.

Agricultural Labourers to be Enrolled as Full Members :

(10) In order to protect the interests of agricultural labour in the joint farming societies a provision should be made to enroll landless labourers as members and should be treated as such for sharing the profits if they have worked on the farm, say, for more than 100 days in a year. It is also necessary in this context to refer to the knotty problem of unequal sharing of the profits in such societies. We believe that in order to remove the natural dissatisfaction and heart-burning caused by the disparities in income as well as to give the maximum of return to labour, profits should entirely be distributed in proportion to the quantum of labour put in by the members. Distribution of profits in proportion to the lands owned by them should be stopped because the reasonable return for land is given to them by way of property income.

Another wrong practice of considering the salary of the managerial staff as wages in order to enable it to take a share from the profits should also be stopped. It can of course be given bonus if necessary and if possible.

Assuring Guaranteed Prices in Advance :

(11) Satisfactory arrangements would have to be made for the sale of agricultural produce of the society. The government should be prepared for its wholesale purchase at reasonable prices fixed and announced in advance in good time to give a spurt particularly for growing more of food crops.

The trend in favour of cash crops can only be checked by changing the price structure in favour of food crops. Assurance of guaranteed prices on the basis of cost of production for food crops in advance and supply of required commodity prices fixed on parity basis might go a long way in persuading the co-operative farming societies to change their cropping in favour of food crops.

Mechanization to be Undertaken with Care :

(12) As revealed in this study, particularly the intensive study of the selected societies it is obvious that mechanization of farming in itself is not taboo while "co-operative farming" does not necessarily mean "mechanization" as commonly understood by the layman. For example, only 3 societies out of 83 had purchased tractors. Tractor becomes very useful for all heavy work such as bringing new land under cultivation, levelling and bunding, but is found economic only when its other uses such as for transport or for lift-irrigation are possible. Another important factor to be taken into consideration in this respect is of the displacement of human labour. In a country like ours where there is a tremendous surplus of man-power, mechanization of farming should be resorted to after very careful consideration of the human factor.

Introduction of Irrigation on a Large Scale :

(13) Special efforts must be made to make the societies adopt irrigation. As a matter of fact, most of them are eager for it, provided necessary financial facilities and technical guidance are made available to them. This should be given the highest priority. Attempts must also be made to encourage maximum use of the irrigation facilities already created. It may be necessary to subsidise a part of the fuel costs for this. Timely technical guidance and supply of spare parts at reasonable prices might also help.

Use of Manure :

(14) Use of compost-manure and adoption of green manuring should also be popularised in all the co-operative farming societies.

Programmes for Full Employment :

(15) In order to provide full employment to the members, organised efforts should be made. Programmes of land development along with that of processing of the raw materials should be undertaken by all the societies. They should be included in the five-year plans of the societies and proper facilities should be given by the Government for their execution. Such programmes assume greater importance in case of societies having inadequate land or inferior type of land.

Programme of Dairy Development :

(16) Dairy development and cattle development should also be included in the activities of the co-operative farming societies. This would enable them to get sufficient manure as also to provide additional employment to their members.

Consolidation of Holdings :

(17) Consolidation of holdings should be undertaken by all the co-operative farming societies without any delay. The Government should enable them to do so by adopting suitable measures for this purpose.

Reduction of Land Rents :

(18) Excessive land rents demanded by the Government in case of river-bed and tank-bed lands compel the societies to grow non-food crops such as tobacco. It would be desirable to reduce these rents and give these lands on the basis of land assessment particularly when they are given to landless labourers.

Problems of Individual Societies to be Solved :

(19) Problems of all the existing societies should be individually studied and their solutions sought. It is necessary that existing genuine societies should be made to succeed, for nothing succeeds like success. Their success would help the future progress of the movement.

Extension of Schemes like Amroli Rehabilitation Schemes to other Areas :

(20) Comprehensive Schemes like Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme should be undertaken by the Government on a large scale for rehabilitation of landless families. These would help in settling them very rapidly.

Organisation of Co-operative Farming Schemes on Forest Land :

(21) Good land having sufficient water supply should be obtained from forest areas and co-operative farming societies be organised there. These societies may be encouraged to grow fruit trees and fuel

trees in large numbers in order to minimise the disadvantages of deforestation. These societies would greatly help in settling forest labour.

Organisation of Intensive Blocks for Co-operative Farming :

(22) The spread of movement would also require a psychological atmosphere. This can be created by developing intensive blocks of co-operative farming societies. Some areas should be selected for this purpose, and intensive efforts be made there to bring as many people as possible under the co-operative organisation. This would generate a congenial atmosphere in which it would be easier for the co-operative farming societies to function and to make progress.

JUGATRAM DAVE,
SHIVABHAI J. PATEL,
BHULABHAI M. PATEL,
G. G. MEHTA,
M. H. PATEL,
VIMAL SHAH,
H. M. DESAI,
G. B. PATEL,
C. H. SHAH.

Ahmedabad,
10th April, 1959.

APPENDIX 1.

TABLE NO. 1

Size according to membership of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-55.

Group according to No. of members in the society	Collective Farming Societies	Joint Farming Societies	Tenant Farming Societies	Total of all types
From 1 to 15 members	6	7	10	23
From 16 to 30 members	12	5	9	26
From 31 to 45 members	4	4	11	19
From 46 to 60	2	—	3	5
From 61 to 120 members	2	—	4	6
Above 120 members	2	—	2	4
Total	28	16	39	83

TABLE NO. 2

Distribution according to land owned by Khatedar members of The Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat.

(In Percentages)

Type of Co-operative Farming Societies	Less than 1 acre	From 1 to 5 acres	From 5 to 10 acres	10 to 15 acres	15 to 25 acres	25 to 50 acres	Above 50 acres	Total
Collective	5	58	24	7	5	1	—	100
Joint	3	19	25	18	17	11	7	100
Tenant	3	51	22	19	5	—	—	100
Total	3	87	24	16	11	6	3	100

TABLE NO. 3

Total and cultivated area per society of the Co-operative Farming societies in Gujarat as on 30-6-56

Type of land of the Co-operative Farming Society	No. of societies	Total area in acres	Average area per society in acres	Cultivated area in acres	Average cultivated area per society in acres
Waste-land	46	15506	337	9187	199
Kharland	5	13233	2646	—	—
Cultivable land	15	4479	298	4062	271
Riverbed and tankbed land	16	2024	126	1440	90
Forest land	1	148	148	25	25
Total	83	85390	426	14714	177

TABLE No. 4

Comparison between cultivated area per member of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat and cultivated area per Khatedar in the villages of these Societies (excluding Kharland Societies).

Type of the Co-operative Farming Society		Total No. of members or Khatedars	Cultivated area in acres	Cultivated area per member or Khatedar in acres
Collective	Society	970	3097	3
	Village	7901	39972	5
Joint	Society	858	3216	9
	Village	2566	34714	14
Tenant	Society	1153	8401	7
	Village	5511	54131	10
Total	Society	2481	14714	6
	Village	15978	128817	8

TABLE No. 5

Comparison between the kind of the land of the Co-operative Farming societies and of the villages where these societies are situated

Type of the Co-operative Farming Society		Jarayot	Bagayat	Kyari	Grass land	Others	Total
Collective	Society	79	—	—	6	15	100
	Village	61	5	1	1	32	100
Joint	Society	91	1	5	3	—	100
	Village	59	—	10	5	26	100
Tenant	Society	73	—	3	19	5	100
	Village	78	1	3	7	11	100
Total	Society	79	—	2	11	8	100
	Village	66	2	4	4	24	100

TABLE No. 6

Price variations of important agricultural commodities in Gujarat during the years 1952-53, 53-54, 54-55 and 55-56

Commodity	(Per B.md.)		(In rupees)	
	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
1. Bajri	16.00	12.00	6.00	12.50
2. Jowar	14.00	10.00	6.75	11.00
3. Wheat	22.00	20.00	11.00	17.00
4. Gr. Nut	20.00	19.00	11.50	25.00
5. Cotton Vijay	Not available	32.00	28.00	37.00
6. Cotton Kalyan	"	30.00	26.00	Not available
7. Tobacco	70.00	60.00	40.00	"
8. Vegetables	11.00	9.00	8.50	9.16

* Source :—Asst. Marketing Officer, Ahmedabad.

APPENDIX 2.

(a) A List of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat undertaken for General Survey

S. No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Year of Registration	No. of members	Total Land (Acres)	Cultivated land (Acres)	Profit or loss on 30-6-56	Audit Class on 30-6-56
1.	Collective	Bhuvel Co-op. Collective Farming Socy. Ltd.	Kaira	1949-50	14	45	45	Not available	C
2.	"	Panetha Co-op. Collective Farming Socy. Ltd.	Broach	1949-50	28	125	65	+ 82,242	A
3.	"	Baroda Harijan Co-op. Collective Farming Socy. Ltd.	Kaira	1950-51	14	125	124	+ 8,010	B
4.	"	Rehmelpur Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Ahmedabad	1950-51	20	387	374	+ 14,285	B
5.	"	Pala Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	1951-52	60	839	706	+ 1,585	B
6.	"	Shri Banaskantha Co-op. Collective Farming Socy. Ltd.	Banaskantha	1951-52	16	283	60	- 4,363	B
7.	"	Adalwada Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	1952-53	41	268	215	+ 1,420	N.A.
8.	"	Shri Jayabharat Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1952-53	15	35	26	- 3,373	C
9.	"	Shri Thakkarbapa Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1952-53	20	71	61	- 1,107	N.A.
10.	"	Muval Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1952-53	19	76	N.A.	- 326	C
11.	"	Chitresar Samudayik Kheti and Gopalan Mandli Ltd.	Kaira	1952-53	15	44	44	+ 955	C
12.	"	Mahisagar Bhatha Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1953-54	206	234	200	+ 59,842	A
13.	"	Dhanturia Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	Broach	1953-54	20	215	55	+ 6,872	B
14.	"	Karachia Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	Baroda	1953-54	37	168	142	- 1,637	B

S. No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Year of Registration	No. of Members	Total land (Acres)	Cultivated land (Acres)	Profit or loss on 30-6-56	Audit on 30-6-56	Class.
15.	Joint	Indore Backward Class Collective Co-op. Farming Society Ltd.	Broach	1958-54	23	102	25	+ 3,738		C
16.	"	Velugam Collective Co-op. Farming Society Ltd.	"	1953-54	36	51	42	+ 1,719		B
17.	"	Mahikantha Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	1954-55	61	193	115	- 2,138		N.A.
18.	"	Tulsipura Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	20	168	122	N.A.		B
19.	"	Manjrol Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	24	96	96	+ 2,103		C
20.	"	Manopura Tank Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	"	1954-55	37	148	142	+ 1,259		C
21.	"	Dipak Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	68	322	100	+ 3,035		B
22.	"	Navchetan Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	56	192	100	+ 34		B
23.	"	Prabhat Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	21	65	41	- 937		B
24.	"	Sultanpura Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	14	43	22	- 3,150		B
25.	"	Pawda Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	29	129	54	- 537		B
26.	"	Amalpura Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	34	136	128	+ 242		C
27.	"	Bhagal Malvan Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Surat	1954-55	335	4800	Nil	+ 1,058		B
28.	"	Kaprada Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1954-55	15	148	25	- 829		B
29.	"	Ambach Self-help Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	"	1947-48	32	251	221	+ 14		C

80	"	Kokanwad self-help Co.op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	"	1947-48	28	88	76	- 1,580	C
81.	"	Shri Govind Co-op. Joint Farming Socy.Ltd.	Ahmedabad	1949-50	12	576	576	+11,289	B
32.	"	Rasulabad Co.-op. Joint Farming Socy. Ltd.	Baroda	1949-50	31	436	429	+ 6592	A
33.	"	The Tantej Pioneer Co.op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	Mehsana	1949-50	10	177	106	- N.A.	B
34.	"	Shri Jarod Samyukta Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	1950-51	13	214	209	+ 7,993	B
35.	"	Juda Gopalan Ane Ekatra Kheti Karnari Mandli Ltd.	Ahmedabad	1950-51	28	385	111	- 201	C
36.	"	Mahisa Dhendi Bid Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	Kaira	1950-51	41	250	232	- 539	B
37.	"	Moritha Joint Farming Socy. Ltd.	Surat	1950-51	11	42	42	- 3,129	C
38.	"	Balethi Samyukta Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1950-51	14	130	130	- 1,965	N.A.
39.	"	Luharwad Samyukta Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1950-51	25	152	152	- 77	N.A.
40.	"	Bamnia Apbal Samyukta Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1951-52	20	141	130	+ 1,171	B
41.	"	Saras Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	"	1952-53	11	335	119	711	B
42.	"	Jayhind Joint Farming Society Ltd.,	Ahmedabad	1952-53	43	1129	600	N.A.	D
43.	"	Varna Joint Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1954-55	25	480	No cultivation.	- 123	B
44.	"	Kanaiye Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1954-55	15	124	124	+ 420	B
45.	Tenant	Asamli Ekatra Kheti Karnari Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Kaira	1948-49	31	590	147	+ 4,106	B
46.	"	Nayaka Ekatra Kheti Karnari Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1948-49	15	265	115	+ 4,823	B

S. No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Year of Registration	No. of Members	Total land (Acres)	Cultivated land (Acres)	Profit or loss on 30-6-56	Audit Class on 30-6-56
47.	Tenant	Harijala Ektra Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Kaira	1949-50	12	184	60	+ 1,456	A
48.	"	Ghanshyampura Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Baroda	1950-51	65	643	643	+ 1,472	B
49.	"	Amratpura Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1950-51	17	170	160	+ 489	N.A.
50.	"	Karmsia Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1950-51	15	150	150	+ 258	B
51.	"	Vyankatpura Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1950-51	32	308	306	+ 603	N.A.
52.	"	Sanoli Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1950-51	110	1100	1040	N.A.	N.A.
53.	"	Harani Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1950-51	36	360	358	+ 248	N.A.
54.	"	Kamrol Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	"	1950-51	46	451	449	- 79	N.A.
55.	"	Shri Kotambi Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1950-51	74	740	728	N.A.	C
56.	"	Rahkui Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1950-51	31	310	310	+ 452	N.A.
57.	"	Balol Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Kaira	1950-51	12	53	53	N.A.	B
58.	"	Dandi Bivhag Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Surat	1950-51	563	6688	Nil.	- 5,711	B
59.	"	Kavas Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1950-51	43	215	5	- 21	N.A.
60.	"	Naj Jetalpur Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Ahmedabad.	1950-51	20	125	78	+ 1,168	N.A.
61.	"	Shri Mahijda Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1951-52	15	145	96	+ 2,026	B

62.	"	Miroli Pachhatvarg Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1951-52	24	120	120	+ 1,802	B
63.	"	Vasai Pachhatvarg Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1951-52	40	98	92	- 559	C
64.	"	Khodia Pochamba Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Baroda	1951-52	77	1055	906	+ 8,378	B
65.	"	Rayantalavadi Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	"	1951-52	25	247	247	+ 496	N.A.
66.	"	Khadoda Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Sabarkantha	1951-52	43	435	209	+ 1,169	B
67.	"	Pinjarat Khari Jamin Sudharnari Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Surat	1951-52	36	165	Nil	- 54	B
68.	"	Shri Gokulpura Ganotiani Sahakari Mandli Ltd.	Mehsana	1951-52	40	571	N.A.	- 446	C
69.	"	Sodhi Vibhag Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Ahmedabad	1952-53	22	720	N.A.	+ 301	N.A.
70.	"	Shri Bakrola Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Baroda	1952-53	43	533	447	+ 424	N.A.
71.	"	Ganpatpura Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	"	1952-53	20	188	187	+ 194	C
72.	"	Sakkarpore Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Broach	1952-53	22	85	85	+ 80	C
73.	"	Badodra Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Sabarkantha	1952-53	48	472	371	+ 210	B
74.	"	Thakkarbapa Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	"	1952-53	14	200	120	+ 240	B
75.	"	Matwad Vibhag Khari Jamin Sudharnari Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Surat	1952-53	170	110	Nil	+ 18	N.A.
76.	"	Delwada Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Mehsana	1953-54	11	141	20	N.A.	B
77.	"	Sankhalpur Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	"	1953-54	15	120	28	N.A.	B
78.	"	Bhanpur-Vekara Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Sabarkantha	1953-54	12	372	200	- 546	C

S.No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Year of Registration	No. of Members	Total land (Acres)	Cultivated land (Acres)	Profit or loss on 30-6-56	Audit Class on 30-6-56
79.	Tenant	Mahijda Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	Ahmedabad	1954-55	26	110	95	+ 304	B
80.	"	Dhanala Harijan Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	"	1954-55	37	535	250	- 1	B
81.	"	Kharad Harijan Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1954-55	57	1109	852	- 61	B
82.	"	Ganoli Pachhat Varg Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	"	1954-55	16	147	147	- 234	B
83.	"	Padhyada Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Sabarkantha	1954-55	13	168	Nil	- 337	B

(b)—A List of the Co-operative Farming Societies In Gujarat undertaken for Intensive Study

S. No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Remarks.
1.	I <i>Collective</i>	Panetha Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.,	Broach	River-bed society of non-backward members.
2.		Baroda Harijan Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.,	Kaira	Harijan members' Society.
3.		Rehmalpur Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.,	Ahmedabad.	
4.		Pala Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A society under Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme.
5.		Shri Banaskantha Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.,	Banaskantha.	Backward and floating membership.
6.		Adalwada Samudayik Sahakari Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A society formed on tank-bed lands.
7.		Mahisagar Bhatha Samudayik Sahakari Mandli Ltd.	Kaira	A society formed on river-bed lands well-known for its original method of work.
8.		Dhanturia Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	Broach	A society of fishermen.
9.		Mahikantha Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A society under Dabaka Scheme.
10.		Tulsipura Samudayik Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A society formed by landless labourers against local opposition.
1.	II <i>Joint</i>	Shri Govind Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	Ahmedabad.	A majority of the members were passive members.
2.		Rasulabad Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	Baroda	A genuine joint farming society with the combined membership of landowners and tenants as well as of backward and non-backward classes.
3.		Shri Jarod Samyukta Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A genuine joint farming society of adivasi tenants.
4.		Bamania Aphal Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Surat	A joint farming society of tenants compelled to go through hard rigours of long litigation—working without any outside help.
5.		Saras Co-op. Joint Farming Society Ltd.	Surat	Completely non-backward membership.
6.		Ambach Self help Co-op. Collective Farming Society Ltd.	Surat	Adivasi tenant-cum-owners society—one of the oldest societies.

S.No.	Type	Name of the Society	District	Remarks.
1.	III Tenant	Asamali Ekatra Kheti Karanari Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Kaira	Cattle breeders' rehabilitation society.
2.		Nayaka Ekatra Kheti Karanari Tenant Farming Society Ltd.,	Kaira	"
3.		Ghanshyampura Co-op. Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Baroda	Displaced persons' rehabilitation society.
4.		Khodia Pochamba Ganotiani Sahkari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	A society under Amroli Rehabilitation Scheme
5.		Rayantalawadi Ganotiani Sahakari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Baroda	Local landless persons' rehabilitation society.
6.		Khadoda Ganotiani Sahkari Kheti Mandli Ltd.	Sabarkantha	A mixed society of backward and non-backward members.
7.		Vasai Pachhat Varga Tenant Farming Society Ltd.	Ahmedabad	Harijan members' Society.
8.		Shri Gokulpura Ganotiani Farming Society Ltd.	Mehsana	Displaced persons' rehabilitation society.

In the last column under "remarks" prominent features of the societies selected for intensive study are given.

APPENDIX 3

SCHEDULES

**Survey of Co-operative Farming Societies
Conducted by the Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee
General Survey
Schedule No. 1**

Information about the village :

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| 1 Name of the village :— | Taluka : | Dist : |
| 2 Nearest Railway Station : | Distance (Miles) : | |
| 3 Nearest Bazar : | Distance (Miles) : | |
| 4 Distribution of lands : | | |

Type according to the ownership of land.	No. of families	Total land (acres)
1 Landless peasants :		
2 Below 1 acre :		
3 1 to 2½ acres :		
4 2½ to 5 acres :		
5 5 to 10 acres :		
6 10 to 15 acres :		
7 15 to 25 acres :		
8 25 to 50 acres :		
9 Beyond 50 acres :		
Total		

5 Caste-wise distribution of Khatedars :—

Caste	No. of families
<i>Non-backward castes :</i>	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
<i>Backward castes :</i>	
5.	
6.	
7.	

6 Total land assessment :—(Rs.)

7 Types of lands :—

Types of lands	Area in acres.
1. Black :	
2. Besar (Medium black)	
3. Goradu (Sandy Loam)	
4. Sandy.	
5. Tank-bed or river-bed :	
6. Others :	
Total :	

Kind of land :

Kind of land.	Area in acres.
1. Jarayat (dry lands)	
2. Bagayat (irrigated lands)	
3. Kyari (paddy lands)	
4. Grassy lands.	
5. Total :	

9 Utilisation of lands :—

Utilisation of land	Area in acres.
1. Cultivated :	
2. Fallow :	
3. Waste :	
4. Grazing lands :	
5. Total :	
1. Under one crop :	
2. Under two crops :	
Total	
1. Under Irrigations :	
1. Under Kharif Irrigation.	
2. Under Rabi irrigation.	
3. Under Summer irrigation	
4. Under Perennial irrigation.	
Total	
1. Under one irrigation :	
2. Under double irrigation :—	
Total :	

10 Means of irrigation (1955-56) :—

Means of irrigation.	Number	Area under irrigation.
1 Wells : (used for irrigation purposes.)		
2 Tank : (used for irrigation purposes.)		
3 Canal : (under use)		

11 Lands under different crops : (1952-53 to '55-56) :

Crop.	Area under the crop.			
	1952-53 (Acres)	1953-54 (Acres)	1954-55 (Acres)	1955-56 (Acres)

12. Type of years :—

(1949-50 to 1955-56)

Year	Anawari%	Good.	Fair.	Bad.
1949-50				
1950-51				
1951-52				
1952-53				
1953-54				
1954-55				
1955-56				

- 13 Arrangement for marketing the agricultural produce of the village :—
- 1) Through private Agencies :—
Percentage :—
 - 2) Through Co-operative Agencies :—
Percentages :—

- 14 Is there a Co-operative Society in the village ?
- 1) Name :
 - 2) Type :
 - 3) No. of members :
 - 4) Working capital :—(Rs.)
 - 5) Loans advanced in 1954-55 (Rs.) :—
 - 6) Total loans advanced :—(Rs.)
 - 7) Recoveries outstanding (Rs.) :—
 - 8) Over dues :—
 - (i) Authorised (Rs.) :—
 - (ii) Unauthorised (Rs.) :—

- 15 Land development activities undertaken in the villages :

(Excluding the society)

Year	Develop- ment of virgin lands (acres)	Soil conser- vation works (Acres)	Brought under irriga- tion (acres)	Particulars of wells.		No. of pump- ing plant	Other improve- ment if any
				No. of new wells.	No. of old wells repaired		

- 16 (1) Use of improved seeds :—

Name of the crop.	Name of improved seeds	State of utilization		Complete.
		Initial	Extensive	

- 16 (2) Use of improved implements :

Names of the implements and their types.	Number

- 16 (3) Use of manures :—(1955—56.)

Name of manures.	Quantity utilised.
(1) Compost.	
(2) Green manure :	
(3) Oil cakes :	
(i) Groundnuts :	
(ii) Castor :	
(iii) Others :	
(4) Chemical fertilizers :	
(i) Ammonium sulphate :	
(ii) Super phosphate :	
(iii) Others :	
(5) Bone meal :	
(6) Manure mixture :	

16 (4) Change in methods of cultivation
(Russian, Japanese, etc.)

Type of change :	Remarks.
------------------	----------

17 Any other useful information relating to
agriculture of the village :—

- (1) Advantage derived due to the proximity of the Bazar :—
- (2) Advantages of agricultural improvements on account of the village being included in the Sarvodaya Scheme or Community Project or the N.E.S. Areas :—
- (3) Others :—

18 Cattle and other resources : (1955-50) :—

CATTLE

Numbers.	
Bullocks :—	
(i) Working :—	
(ii) Other :	
Total :	
Cows and buffaloes :—	
Cows :—	
(i) Milky :	
(ii) Dry,	
Buffaloes :—	
(i) Milky :	
(ii) Dry :	
Heifers :—	
Calves :—	
Total :	
Hens and ducks :—	
(i) Hens :	
(ii) Ducks :	
Total :	

Numbers.

Ploughs :—	
(i) Wooden :—	
(ii) Iron :—	
Total :—	
Carts :—	
(i) For transport of goods :	
(ii) " " " persons :	
Total :—	

Engines :—

Signature of
Investigator : _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Schedule Form No. 2

General information about the Society :

1. *Introduction :—* No. 1
- (1) Name of the society.
 - (2) Name of the village.
 - (3) Taluka.
 - (4) District.
 - (5) Type.
 - (6) Number of members.
 - (7) Is it formed of backward class ?
 - (8) Area of lands held by the Society ?
 - (9) Area of operation of the Society.
2. *Date of Registration :—*
3. *Date of commencement of work :*
 If delayed, state reasons :—
- (1) Financial difficulties.
 - (2) Administrative difficulties.
 - (3) Difficulties relating to land.
 - (4) Others.
4. *Type of the society :*
- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | <i>In the beginning</i> | <i>At present.</i> | |
| | Joint : Collective : Tenant | Joint : Collective | Tenant |
- (1) State changes (if any), in its type.
 - (2) Reasons if there is any change in its type.
 - (3) Is the society's liability limited ?
5. *Types of members :—*
- | S.No. | Type | In the beginning. | Numbers | At present('55-56) |
|-------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|
| (1) | Scheduled tribes | | | |
| (2) | Scheduled castes | | | |
| (3) | Other non-backward class. | | | |
| (4) | Backward class. | | | |
| (5) | Displaced persons. | | | |
6. *Audit classification for all the years :—*
 Years : 1949-50, 50-51, 51-52, 52-53, 53-54, 54-55, 55-56.
 Classification :

No. 2

MEMBERS

- 7 **The main class to which the members belong (1955-50).**
 Information about land owners :
- 8 **How many members have left the society ?**
 Why ? e.g.
- (1) Inadequate income from the society.
 - (2) Unwillingness to work in accordance with the constitution of society.
 - (3) Due to quarrels.
 - (4) Others.

upto 1 acre; 1 to 5: 5 to 10: 10 to 15: 15 to 25: 25 to 50: 50 to 100 More than
100 acres
Total

Land-owners-
cum-tenants.
(Land on lease)
Total :
Tenants :—
Landless
Agricultural
Labourers.
Total :

- 9 (1) Is the society required to employ outsiders ?
- | Type of agri-
cultural work | No. of non-members employed | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | Men
Days | Women
Days | Children
Days |
| To what extent ? | | | |
- (2) Rates of wages paid to the members (1955-56)
- | Wages | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Type of work | Men Rs. | Women Rs. | Children Rs. |
| (3) Rates of wages paid to the non-members (1955-56) | | | |
| (4) Rates for a pair of bullocks : | Type of work | Rates | |
10. (1) How many members are actively working in the society ?
- | | In the beginning | At present ('55-56) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| (2) How many members are inactive ? | | |

No. 8

Land Improvement, Production and Sale

11. *Type of the land with the society :—*

Type.	In the beginning (Acres)	1955-56 (acres)
(1) Black.		
(2) Basar (Medium black)		
(3) Goradu (Sandyloam)		
(4) Sandy		
(5) Others (Bhatha, river bed lands).		
(6) Total :		

Utilisation of the Society's Land :—

Utilisation of the land	1949-50,	50-51,	51-52,	52-53,	53-54,	54-55,	55-56.
	(Acres)						
(1) Cultivated.							
(2) Fallow.							
(3) Waste.							
(4) Under other use.							
(5) Total :							
(6) Under 1 crop.							
(7) Under 2 crops.							
(8) Under irrigation.							
(9) Under Kharif irrigation							
(10) Under Ravi irrigation.							
(11) Under Summer irrigation							
(12) Under Perennial irrigation.							
(13) (A) Area under single irrigation.							
(B) Area under double irrigation.							

Means of irrigation :—

Means.	No.	Area under the command.	Area irrigated.
Wells.			
Tanks.			
Canal.			

*Type of lands :*Area in Acres

In the beginning : 1955-56

- (1) Kyari (paddy lands).
- (2) Jarayat.
- (3) Bagayat.
- (4) Grass land.
- (5) Bhatha (river-bed lands)

Total :

- (1) Tank-bed lands.
- (2) Forest land.
- (3) Waste lands.
- (4) Other lands (Khar land)

*Total :*12 (4) *Ownership of Land (1955-56)*

Ownership of land.	<u>Area</u>		<u>Land assessment</u>		<u>Land Rent</u>	
	In the beginning	At present	In the beginning	At present	In the beginning	At present
(1) Owned by the Scy.						
(2) Owned by the Govt.						
(3) Owned by members.						
(4) Owned by private owner.						
(5). If it belongs to absentee landlords, conditions of lease :—						
(1) About period of lease :						
(2) About amount of lease :						
(3) About land improvement :						
(6) If it belongs to the Govt., conditions regarding to it :—						
(1) About period of lease.						
(2) About Amount of lease.						
(3) About land improvement.						
(4) Others.						
(7) If it belongs to members, conditions regarding its grant to the society,						
(1) According to the bye-laws.						
(2) On the basis of a cash-rent.						
(3) On the basis of crop-share.						
(4) Other conditions (if any).						

13. (1) (1) Has the society adequate land ?
If not, how much additional land is required ?
- (2) Efforts made by the society to get the additional land ?
- (3) Is it possible to get it from the neighbouring area ?
If so, how much ?
- (4) Is it possible to get it from the members ? If so, how much ?

14. Crops Raised on the Co-operative Farming (From 1949-50 to '55-56)

Area (in acres)	
Name : 49-: 50-: 51-: 52-: 53-: 54-: 55-: of Crop. : 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56 :	
Yield (in B.M.S.)	Value Realised (in Rs.)
49-: 50-: 51-: 52-: 53-: 54-: 55-: 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56	49 : 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 ; 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56

Type of year	Good	Fair	Bad
1949-50			
50-51			
51-52			
52-53			
53-54			
54-55			
55-56			

16. Arrangements for marketing the agricultural produce : (1955-56)

Name of Crop : Wheat : Cotton : Jowar : Bajri : Tobacco : Paddy : Grams : Gr. Nuts : Others
(B. MDs.)

Through private agencies.

Through the society.

Others :

Total :

Retailed :

Whole-sale :

Total :

- 17 (1) Can the society arrange to get highest prices for its produce ?
(2) Is it required to sell off its produce due to financial difficulties ?
(3) If so, what is the difference in the rates ?
(4) Is it possible to get better prices if adequate financial provision made for the society ?
(5) Has the society got storage facilities ?
18. To what extent are the wages, lease and profit paid in cash to the members ?
To what extent in kind ? (1955-56)

Lease rupees			Wages Rs.			Profit Rs.		
In kind	In crop	In qty.	In kind	In crop	In qty	In kind	In crop	In qty.

No. 4

Management and Financial Condition

19. (1) Who works as a Manager ?
(2) Is he a member ?
(3) Educational qualifications :
(4) Experience in agriculture.
(5) Experience in accounts.
(6) Is he appointed by the Govt. ?
(7) Is he selected by the society ?
(8) Does the Government subsidise towards his pay ?
20. How much is the cost for the management of the society ? (salary of the manager, supervisor, as also their travelling expenses).

Year	Cost of management Salary Tr. Exp.	Total cost of the society
------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------

1949-50
50-51
51-52
52-53
53-54
54-55
55-56

21. *Control of the non-members in the working of the society :—*

- (1) Control of Govt. Officers :
- (2) Control of central financial agency :
- (3) Control of Others (if any) :

22. *Loans received from the co-operative bank :—*

Year	Pur- pose	Amo- unt	Rate of In- terest in pay- full	Period of re- ment	No. of instal- ments	Amo- unt repaid	Repaid in time or not?	Remain- ing amount.
------	--------------	-------------	---	--------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

23. *Loans obtained through other resources :—*

Loan obtained from.	year	purpose	Amount	Period.	Rate of Int.
------------------------	------	---------	--------	---------	--------------

24. *Financial Assistance received from the Govt.*

Date of receipt	pur- pose	Loan	Sub- sidy	Rate of Int. on loans.	No. of instal- ments	Parti- culars of instal- ment paid, dt. amount	Amount remain- ing to be paid (Rs.)
--------------------	--------------	------	--------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	---	---

25. *Any other assistance received from the Government :—*

- (1) Remission of land assessment.
- (2) Services of Agricultural Assistant.
- (3) Other assistance (if any).

No. 5

Agricultural Implements and Method of Farming

26. *Implements owned by the society :—*

Imple- ments	Bullocks Nos.	Imple- ments Value	Machi- nery Nos.	Machi- nery Value	Other Particulars Nos.	Other Particulars Value	Cattle Nos.	Cattle Value	Wells		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Cattle- shed.	Build- ings No. Value.	Other No.	Value	
							13	14	15	16	17

- (1) In the beginning.
- (2) In 1955-56

14. Crops Raised on the Co-operative Farming (From 1949-50 to '55-56)

Area (in acres)	
Name : 49-: 50-: 51-: 52-: 53-: 54-: 55-: of Crop. : 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56 :	
Yield (in B.M.S.)	Value Realised (in Rs.)
49-: 50-: 51-: 52-: 53-: 54-: 55-: 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56	49 : 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 50 : 51 : 52 : 53 : 54 : 55 : 56
Type of year	Good Fair Bad
1949-50	
50-51	
51-52	
52-53	
53-54	
54-55	
55-56	

16. Arrangements for marketing the agricultural produce : (1955-56)

Name of Crop : Wheat : Cotton : Jowar : Bajri : Tobacco : Paddy : Grams : Gr. Nuts : Others
(B. MDs.)

Through private agencies.
Through the society.
Others :
Total :
Retailed :
Whole-sale :
Total :

- 17 (1) Can the society arrange to get highest prices for its produce ?
(2) Is it required to sell off its produce due to financial difficulties ?
(3) If so, what is the difference in the rates ?
(4) Is it possible to get better prices if adequate financial provision made for the society ?
(5) Has the society got storage facilities ?
18. To what extent are the wages, lease and profit paid in cash to the members ?
To what extent in kind ? (1955-56)

Lease rupees			Wages Rs.			Profit Rs.		
In kind	In crop	In qty.	In kind	In crop	In qty.	In kind	In crop	In qty.

No. 4

Management and Financial Condition

19. (1) Who works as a Manager ?
(2) Is he a member ?
(3) Educational qualifications :
(4) Experience in agriculture.
(5) Experience in accounts.
(6) Is he appointed by the Govt. ?
(7) Is he selected by the society ?
(8) Does the Government subsidise towards his pay ?
20. How much is the cost for the management of the society ? (salary of the manager, supervisor, as also their travelling expenses).

Year	Cost of management Salary Tr. Exp.	Total cost of the society
------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------

1949-50
50-51
51-52
52-53
53-54
54-55
55-56

21 *Control of the non-members in the working of the society :—*

- (1) Control of Govt. Officers :
- (2) Control of central financial agency :
- (3) Control of Others (if any) :

22. *Loans received from the co-operative bank :—*

Year	Pur- pose	Amo- unt	Rate of In- terest in pay- ment	Period of re- ment	No. of instal- ments	Amo- unt repaid	Repaid in time or not ?	Remain- ing amount.
------	--------------	-------------	--	--------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

23. *Loans obtained through other resources :—*

Loan obtained from.	year	purpose	Amount	Period.	Rate of Int.
------------------------	------	---------	--------	---------	--------------

24. *Financial Assistance received from the Govt.*

Date of receipt	pur- pose	Loan	Sub- sidy	Rate of Int. on loans.	No. of instal- ments	Parti- culars of instal- ment paid, dt. amount	Amount remain- ing to be paid (Rs.)
--------------------	--------------	------	--------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	---	---

25 *Any other assistance received from the Government :—*

- (1) Remission of land assessment.
- (2) Services of Agricultural Assistant.
- (3) Other assistance (if any).

No. 5

Agricultural Implements and Method of Farming

26 *Implements owned by the society :—*

Imple- ments	Bullocks Nos.	Value	Imple- ments Nos.	Value	Machi- nery Nos.	Value	Other Particulars No.	Value	Cattle Nos.	Value	Wells
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
							Cattle- shed.	Build- ings No.	Other No.	Value	
							13	14	15	16	17

- (1) In the beginning.
- (2) In 1955-56

27. *Land improvement activities undertaken by the society :—*

Year	New land under cultivation (acres)	Bunding (acres)	Land brought irrigation (acres)	Others		Pumping plant
				New wells Nos. Val.	Old wells Nos. Value	
1949-50						
50-51						
51-52						
52-53						
53-54						
54-55						
55-56						

28. *Use of improved seeds :—*

Year	Name of crop.	Kind of improved seeds.	Initial	Utilisation state	
				Extension	Complete

28. (i) *Use of Manures :*

Name of the manure	Quantity in the beginning	1955-56
1. Compost.		
2. Green manure.		
3. Oil cakes. v		
(1) Gr. nuts.		
(2) castor.		
(3) Others.		
(4) Chemical fertilizer.		
(4) (1) Ammonium, Sulphate		
(2) Super phosphate		
(3) Others.		
(5) Bone manure.		
(6) Manure mixture.		

28 (4) *Change in the Improved Method of Cultivation:—*
(Russian, Japanese etc.)

Year	Method of cultivation	Area	Notes
1949-50			
50-51			
51-52			
52-53			
53-54			
54-55			
55-56			

No. 6

Other activities

29 *Industries :—*

- (1) Milk and butter.
- (2) Cattle breeding.
- (3) Poultry
- (4) Wool (sheep and goats)
- (5) Spinning and weaving.
- (6) Others.

30. *Facilities provided by the Society to the members :—*

- (1) Financial :
 - (1) Supply of free vegetables.
 - (2) Supply of free milk.
 - (3) Supply of free grass.
 - (4) Others.
- (2) Educational :—
 - (1) Scholarships.
 - (2) Books.
 - (3) Slate etc.
3. Social :—
 - (1) Help in sickness.
 - (2) Help in accident.
4. Others :

No. 7

A detailed note on the common problem of the Society:

(General Questionnaire)

31. *Difficulties Experienced by the Society :*

(give nos. according to importance)

- (1)
 - (1) Relating to financial aspects.
 - (2) Relating to agricultural.
 - (3) Relating to the management.
 - (4) Others.
- (2) Suggestion for their removal.

32. *Important Mistakes committed by the Society :*

(give in details)

- (1)
 - (1) Relating to planning of crops.
 - (2) Relating to cultivation.
 - (3) Relating to its financial aspects.
 - (4) Relating to its sale.
 - (5) Relating to accountancy matters.
 - (6) Relating to employment of the salaried staff.
- (2) *Give Reasons :*
 - (1) Due to inexperience.
 - (2) Due to delay.
 - (3) Due to carelessness.
 - (4) Due to circumstances out of control.
- (3) *Steps taken for its removal :*
 - (1) Re-arrangements of the work.
 - (2) Training taken.
- (3) Suggestions got from outside.

33. *Future programme of Agricultural Development by the Society :*

- (1) Land improvement.
- (2) Increase in irrigation.
- (3) Seeds.
- (4) Manures.
- (5) Implements.
- (6) Bullocks.
- (7) Milk of cattle.
- (8) Increase in membership.
- (9) Additions in land.
- (10) Other industries.

34. Is the constitution of the society different from the one approved by the Department ?
If so, give the important changes.

Information regarding individual members

- 85 (1) Have the members contributed all their lands to the society? If not, obtain the following particulars :—

Name of the member	Particulars of land not contributed to Society.		
	His own (acres)	Held in lease	Total acres

- (2) *Lands Contributed in the society :*

S.No.	Name of the member	Area of Land	
		His own	Held on lease

Signature of Investigator _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule No. 3 (1)

Membership

1 Introduction :

- (1) Name of the society :—
- (2) Village :—
- (3) Taluka :—
- (4) District :—
- (5) Type :—
- (6) No. of members :—
- (7) Is it a backward class society ?
- (8) Area :—
- (9) Area of operation :—

2. Classification of members

S. No.	Name of the member	Designation, i.e., Chairman, Managing Committee member.	Age	Caste	Date of joining	Is he educated ?	How far	No. of family members. M.F.C.	No. of family members. working in the Society	No. of family members working outside the Society.	Permanent M.F.C.	Occasionally M.F.C.
--------	--------------------	---	-----	-------	-----------------	------------------	---------	-------------------------------	---	--	------------------	---------------------

(3)

Land contributed by him to the Society	Lands other than those contributed to the Society	Share	Cash and Agri. Equipments contributed to the Society				Agri. Equipments other than those contributed to the Society.			
			Cash contribution Deposits	Bullocks No. Value	Implements Ploughs No. Val.	Carts No. Val.	Others No. Val.	Bullocks No. Val.	Ploughs No. Val.	Carts No. Val.

(4)

Details of Income : 1954-55											
Loans taken from the Society		Are there other dues ? Rs.	Is he an active member? If active, what type of work does he do? If he is not active what does he do now ?	Rent of the land contributed to the Society. Rs.	Less the amount paid by him to the landlord. Rs.	Net income from land.	Income from labour		Bonus Div.	Other income viz. vegetable Milk etc. Rs.	
Amount of loan taken. Rs.	Amount of loan taken. Rs.						From human labour Rs.	From bullocks labour Rs.			

3. Number of working days of the Members

(5)

Name of the member.	Name of the family member working in the Society.	Years			Number of working days (1954-55)												
		52-53	53-54	54-55	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18

4. Which Agricultural Operations are done on contract basis ? Is there any increase in output of work by adopting this method ?

Type of work.	Rates of labour charges		Remarks. (in which year)
	For Members	For Non-Members.	

From which year was the system of contract work adopted ?
Has it resulted in increasing the efficiency ?

5. Is outside labour employed for the farm-work ?

If so, give particulars :—

Kind of Agricultural work.	No. of persons employed Maximum Nos.	Man days.
----------------------------	---	-----------

Signature of the Investigator :—

Date :—

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule No. 3(2)

Administrative and Financial aspects

1. Introduction :

- (1) Name of the society :—
- (2) Village :—
- (3) Taluka :—
- (4) District :—
- (5) Type :—
- (6) No. of members :—
- (7) Is it a backward class Society ?
- (8) Area :—
- (9) Area of operation :—

2 I Administration :

- (1) Name of the Manager.
- (2) Is he a member ?
- (3) Educational qualifications.
- (4) Experience in agriculture.
- (5) Experience in accounts.

- 3
- (1) Does the manager attend to day-to-day supervision, inspection and verification work ?
 - (2) If not, who else attends to this work ?
 - (3) Is he a member ?
 - (4) His designation.
 - (5) Is he paid ?
 - (6) How much ?

- 4 Who assesses the work done on the previous day and distributes the work for the next day ?
His designation :—

- 5 Who takes important decision ? viz. regarding :—

- (1) Cropping scheme.
- (2) Land development.
- (3) Funds.
- (4) Receipt of funds and their utilisation.
- (5) Purchase and sales.
- (6) Bank transactions.
- (7) Others (give particulars)

6 *Loyalty of members towards the society :—*

(give particulars viz.)

- (1) Voluntary and honorary services.
- (2) Working more than expected of him.
- (3) Willingness to work at odd hours.
- (4) Others.

7 *Number of meetings of the Board of supervision held :—*

Year	No. of meetings held	Important decisions taken in the meetings.
------	----------------------	--

1940—50
50—51
51—52
52—53
53—54
54—55
55—56

Out of these meetings how many were attended by the Govt. nominees ?

S.No.	Name of the Dept. appointing the nominee.	1940-50	50-51	51-52	52-53	53-54	54-55	55-56
-------	---	---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

1	Co-operative Dept.
2	Agricultural Dept.
3	Any other Dept.

8 Are the members supplied with breakfast or tea when on work ?

II *Financial aspects.*

9 Is the society running in loss ? If so, reasons for the loss.

(give full particulars, and rank them.)

- (1) Partial or complete failure of crops.
- (2) Excessive cost of managements.
- (3) Could not receive fresh loans as the previous dues were not repaid ?
- (4) Non-use or partial use of the resources obtained.
- (5) Negligence and inefficiency of the members.
- (6) Financial hardships.
- (7) High rates of the labour charges.
- (8) Heavy land rent.
- (9) Mismanagement.
- (10) Low type of land.

10 I. *Loans received from the Co-operative Bank :*

(Short-term loans.)

Year	Amount asked for Rs.	Amount sanctioned Rs.	Reasons for total or partial refusal.
------	----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

10 II. *Medium and Long-term Loans :*

Year	Amount asked for Rs.	Amount sanctioned Rs.	Reasons for total or partial refusal
------	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Signature of the Investigator :—

Date :—

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Society Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule Form No. 3(3)

Production and Sales

I Production

1 Introduction

- (1) Name of the society ?
- (2) Village
- (3) Taluka :—
- (4) District :—
- (5) Type :—
- (6) No. of members.
- (7) Is it a backward class Society ?
- (8) Area :—
- (9) Area of operation :—

2 I Production :

Year	Name of crop.	Stock on hand in the beginning year of the year. Qty.Value	Production during the year Qty. Value	Utilisation for seeds Q. : Val.	Given to members Q. : V.	Land Rent in form of crop share Qty. Val.	Payment in kind for wages to outside labour in kind Qty.Value
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
					Sales Qty. Val.		Stock on hand at the end of year. Qty. Value.
					9	10	

- (1) 1st year of the society.
- (2) 1955-56.

3 (1) Yield of crops 1955-56 :—

Compared to the yields of the previous year.	Name of the crop	Equal	Less	More	Why ?
--	------------------	-------	------	------	-------

- 3 (2) Compared to the Yields of the other cultivators of the village.**

- 4 Which new crops can be introduced here ?
Why are they not introduced ?**

- 5 (1) Any increase in the area of cash crop ?**
- (2) If not, why not ?**
- (3) If introduced, why ?**
- (4) Is it possible to increase the area still further ?**

6 **II Sales (1954-55)**

Sold through	Crop	Quantity	Amount
--------------	------	----------	--------

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| (1) Trade merchants. | | | |
| (2) Village Commission Agents. | | | |
| (3) Co-operative Socy. | | | |
| (4) By public auction. | | | |

7 Scy. sales are not made through co-operative Societies, or by auction ?

8 Selling prices of the society compared to those obtained by other farmers :—

Farmers	Equal	Less	More	Why ?
---------	-------	------	------	-------

9 **Stock and sales :**

Year	Stock in the beginning.	Production during the year.	Sales during the year.	Stock at the end of the year
------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------

Signature of the Investigator : _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule No. 3(4)

*Agricultural Resources and Development of Agriculture*1 **Introduction :**

- (1) Name of the Society :—
- (2) Village :—
- (3) Taluka :—
- (4) District :—
- (5) Type :—
- (6) No. of members :—
- (7) Is it a backward class society ?
- (8) Area :—
- (9) Area of operation :—

2 **I Agricultural Resources****Bullocks :**

Year	Total No. in the beginning of year	Purchased during the year.	Sold	Died.	No. at the end of the year Total Value Nos.	Amount of depreciation set aside during the year.
1949-50						
50-51						
51-52						
52-53						
53-54						
54-55						
55-56						

Ploughs :

Year	Total No. in the beginning of the year	Value Rs.	No. of ploughs purchased during the year No. Value	No. of ploughs sold during the year. No. Value	No. and Value at the end of the year No. Value. (Rs.)
1949-50					
50-51					
51-52					
52-53					
53-54					
54-55					
55-56					

Year	Carts Nos. Value	Other implements Nos. Value	Tractors Nos. Value	Engines Nos. Value.
1949-50				
50-51				
51-52				
52-53				
53-54				
54-55				
55-56				

Are the tools kept by the Society ? or
Are they kept by the members individually ?
Details of Bullocks :—

Year	Total bullocks owned by Society from outside.	No. of working days
1949-50		
50-51		
51-52		
52-53		
53-54		
54-55		
55-56		

- (1) Does the society own more bullocks than it actually needs ? (explain in details) How many ?
- (2) If the bullocks are owned by the members are they more than those actually required by the society ?
How many bullocks are required by the society ?
- (3) Is it possible to reduce the number of bullocks ?
If so, how many ? Have they not been reduced ?
Are they used in non-agricultural work ? for examples :—
 - (i) Used for non-agricultural purposes viz. Cartage.
 - (ii) Social prestige.
 - (iii) Desire to supplement the income

3 Tractors : (H.P.)

Years	Working days		Working hours.
	In the society	outside society.	
1949-50			
50-51			
51-52			
52-53			
53-54			
54-55			
55-56			

Reasons for less work :—

- (1) Breakages.
- (2) Absence of facilities for repairs
- (3) Due to lack of work on hand.

4 *Engines : (H.P.)*

Year	Working days in the society.	Working Days outside the society.	Working hours.
1949-50			
50-51			
51-52			
52-53			
53-54			
54-55			
55-56			

5 *Capacity :—*

I	Crops	Area under command (Acres)	Area actually irrigated. (Acres)
	Kharif		
	Rabi		
	Summar		
	Perennial		

II *Reasons for less irrigation :—*

- (1) Breakages.
- (2) Absence of facilities for repairs.
- (3) Nos. are available for irrigation.
- (4) Financial difficulties.

Is the work adequate for tractors or engines? If inadequate steps taken to have full work :—e.g.

- (1) On hire.
- (2) For transport of goods.

What were the results?

Do you intend to sell off the engines/tractors?

II *Agricultural Improvement*1 *Is the work of land development not completed as yet?*

If not, why? e.g.

- (1) Lack of credit facilities.
 - (2) Lack of resources.
 - (3) Lack of human labour.
 - (4) Other difficulties (mechanical)
- (Rank the above reasons, according to their importance).

Use of Improved seeds :—

- (1) Is good seed collected on the Co-operative Farm?
- (2) If so, for which crops?
- (3) Does the society use improved types of seed?
- (4) If so, how much area?

Crops	Type of seed used	Area	
		In the beginning	At present.

Why is the society not using improved types of seeds?

For which crop? Why? For example, e.g.

- (1) Due to non-availability.
- (2) Due to lack of reliability.
- (3) Due to financial difficulties.

Name of crops	Reasons for not using improved seed.

2 *Manures :*

- (1) Change in the use of manure :—
 (i) How much was used in the beginning ?
 (ii) How much is used at present ?
 Change in the method of its use :—
 (i) throwing in rows of crops only :—
 (ii) Giving to plants only.
- (2) Change in the production of manure :—

Year	1949-50	50-51	51-52	52-53	53-54	54-55	55-56
------	---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

(Quantity)

3 Does the society has adequate quantity of manure ?
If not, Why ?

- (1) Financial difficulties.
 (2) Non-availability of manure.
 (3) Risks of disproportionate returns.

Name of crop	Type of manure	Area		Manure purchase		Production		
		In the beginning	At present	In the beginning	At the present	In the beginning	At the present	Quantity
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
						Value Rs.	Reasons for inadequate use	
						10	11	

Change in the system of cultivation :

- (1) Is there rotation of crops ?
 (i) For which crop ?
 (ii) For how much area ?
 (iii) At what intervals ?

Year	Crop under rotation	Period of rotation	Area under rotation of crops.
1949-50			
50-51			
51-52			
52-53			
53-54			
54-55			
55-56			

3 *Change in the Agricultural Operations :*

- (1) Increase in the No. of preparatory tillage operation :
 (2) For which crops ?
 (3) For how much area ?

4 *Increase in the Number of inter-culturing operations :*

- (1) For which crop ?
 (2) For how much area ?

5. *Introduction of new method of cultivation :*

- (1) Japanese method.
- (2) Russian method.

Year	Crop	Method adopted	Area	Aeres	Gunthas
1949-50					
50-51					
51-52					
52-53					
53-54					
54-55					
55-56					

6. *Is the Thinning of crops done ? If so, for which Crops ?*

Details :

Name of the crop.	Whether thinning of crop done ? In the beginning : At present	If not, why not ?
-------------------	--	-------------------

7. *Give details of experiments conducted in the agricultural methods of improved farming :—(rank them).*

- (1) Introduction of totally new type of seed.
- (2) Manures.
- (3) Method of cultivation.
- (4) Others.

Cattle :

- 12 (1) Is there a pucca cattleshed with the Society ?
- (2) Does the society keep ordinary medicines for prevention of cattle diseases ?
- (3) Is the veterinary dispensary used by the society, when necessary ?
- (4) Diseases suffered by the bullocks during the last 3 years.

Year	Name of disease	No. of bullocks	No. of deaths	Steps taken for curing the diseases.
(1)				
(2)				
(3)				

13. *Production of Crops :*

What kind of damage is done to crops ?

- I (a) Harassment by wild animals.
- (b) Thefts.
- (c) Insects and pests.

II Extent of damage :—

Year	Extent of damage. Crop Area	Yield.
1949-50		
50-51		
51-52		
52-53		
53-54		
54-55		
55-56		
Total		

III What steps have been taken to stop these damages ?

- (1) made forcing arrangements.
- (2) Arranged for watching by members.
- (3) Arranged for watching by hired labour.

Year	Total watching charges (Rs.)
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	
(4)	
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	

Did you succeed, on taking the above steps ?

Do you utilise any medicines to prevent insect diseases ?

If so, what medicines ? If not utilising, Why ? If yes, what was the result ?

Damage done due to the floods and steps taken to prevent them :

Details of damage.	Year	Name of crop and acres

Signature of the Investigator, _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule No. 3(5)

Productional Activities

1 Introduction :

- (1) Name of the society ?
- (2) Village :—
- (3) Taluka :—
- (4) District :—
- (5) Types :—
- (6) Number of members :—
- (7) Is it a backward class Society ?
- (8) Area :—
- (9) Area of operation :—

2 Has the Society undertaken milk production ?

Cattle	Nos.	Heifers	Aged	Milking	Animal pro- duction 49-50 ; 50-51; 51—52	Value realised from this production. 49-50 : 50-51 51—52

Cows :

Buffaloes :

3 *Other village industries :*

Types :

Whom started ?

Production	Labour charges of members.	Non-labour charges of Non-members	Other expenses	Depreciation Profit : Loss.
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

4 *Poultry Birds :*

When started ?

S.No.	Type of Birds.	Annual production (Rs.)	Used for other (consumption)	Sales.
-------	-------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	--------

5 Have you undertaken Fishery ? If so, when ?

6 Have you undertaken processing of the farm produce ? If so, when ? e.g.
(1) Clenning of food grains.
(2) Hand pounding and hand grinding.7 Has the society undertaken labour contract work ?
If not, is it willing to undertake it, if available ? Is there bad effect on the
farm work, if the contracts are to be taken ?8 What other industries do you propose to introduce ?
Does the society propose not to introduce any other industry but to concen-
trate on agricultural activities only ?

Signature of the Investigator : _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule No. 3(6)

Future Programme of the Society

1 *Introduction :*

- (1) Name of the society.
- (2) Village.
- (3) Taluka.
- (4) District.
- (5) Type.
- (6) Number of members.
- (7) Is it a backward class society ?
- (8) Area.
- (9) Area of operation.

2 *What is the future programme of the Society for next three years ?*(1) *Land Development :—*

Type of work	Particulars	Total expen- diture	Investment by the Secy.	Amount to be obtained from Government.
-----------------	-------------	------------------------	----------------------------	---

2 *Agricultural Resources* :—(Wells and Machinery)

Machinery	Details of work	Expenses Rs.	Investment by the Secy. Rs.	Amount to be obtained from the Govt. Rs.
-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------------	--

3 *Change in Crops* :—

- (1) Change in administration.
- (2) Pertaining to sales.
- (3) Pertaining to new industries and other activities.
- (4) Pertaining to increase in membership and distribution of income.
- (5) For development of co-operative spirit.
- (6) For building up better relation with the village.
- (7) Others.

3 (1) *Impact of the society on the village* :—

- (1) Has the grazing area of the village, reduced due to the formation of the society ?
- (2) If so, how ? Has it strained the relation of the Society with the village ?
- (3) What steps have been taken for improving the relations ?
- (2) Is there scarcity of labour on account of the Society ? If so, what arrangements have been made by the village for adequate labour supply ?
- (3) What is the effect on the village regarding the agricultural improvement activities undertaken by the society ? Also what is the effect on the society regarding the agricultural improvement activities of the village ?
- (4) Does the society take interest and participate on the public activities of the village ?
- (5) Social improvement affected on account of the Society ?
- (6) Relation of the society with the village :—
 - (1) Strained.
 - (2) Fairly good.
- (8) Friendly.
- (4) Fully co-operative.

4. *Co-operation and health activities* :

- (1) First aid facilities for the members.
- (2) Does the society keep medicines for certain simple and common diseases ?
- (3) Is any financial help given to members in sickness ?
- (4) Do the members attend to the sick ?

Cultural activities :

- (1) Are any festivals celebrated ?
- (2) If so, which ones ?
- (3) What programmes are arranged ?
- (4) Are the members taken to tours ? If so, where ?
- (5) Are the tours arranged for the purpose of progressive farming ?

5 *Co-operative spirit* :

- (1) Members' Co-operation : Do they work at odd hours ?
- (2) Honorary services : e.g. undertakes watching work regularly, prevents damages and takes steps for development agriculture at his own initiative.
- (3) Voluntarily gives his resources to the Society.

6 *Difficulties experienced by the Society :*
(Give ranking)

- (1) Financial hardships.
- (2) Sulemarginal lands.
- (3) Stray cattle.
- (4) Inexperience in farming.
- (5) Defective management.
- (6) Lack of co-operative spirit amongst the members.
- (7) Excessive burden of work.
- (8) Remedies for the above difficulties
 - (1) Financial assistance from the Government.
 - (2) The society should get more lands.
 - (3) More irrigation and fruit crops.
 - (4) Better manager.
 - (5) Technical guidance in agricultural matters.

Signature of the Investigator : _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES

(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive Survey

Schedule Form No. 4(1)

For Members

1 *Introduction*

- (1) Name of the Society.
- (2) Village.
- (3) Taluka.
- (4) District.
- (5) Type.
- (6) No. of members.
- (7) Is it a backward class society ?
- (8) Area of land held by the society.
- (9) Area of operation.

2 (1) Name of the Head of the Family :—

Age

Caste :—

Education :—

(2) Occupation of the family :—

(1) Main source of income :—

(2) Other occupation :—

(i)

(ii)

(iii)

3 *Original village :*

- (1) Is he a member of any other society ?
- (2) Which society ?
- (3) From when ?
- (4) Is he a member of any other institution ?
- (5) Which ?
- (6) From when ?

4 *Family members :*

Sex.	Doing farm work in the society.	Doing other work in the society.	Doing other work outside the society	Remarks
Men :				
	(1)			
	(2)			
	(3)			
Women				
	(1)			
	(2)			
	(3)			

5 *Employment of the working members of the family :—*

Employment in the Socy.				Employment outside the society	
In farming	Other work	Nature of work		Days.	Amount(Rs.)
Days	Rs.	Days	Rs.		

6 *After joining the Society :—*

- (1) (1) Have the days of employment increased ?
- (2) Has the income on account of employment increased ?
- (3) Do you try to seek employment elsewhere ?
- (2) Is the income from labour work inadequate? Is there deficit of money for meeting the current expenses ?
What do you do if there is simultaneous urgency of work on your own farm as well as in the society ?

7 *Land and Resources :*

Total land	Land contributed to the Society
------------	---------------------------------

- (1) Why have you not given all your lands in the society ?
- (2) In case of lands held on lease, is the owner not willing to do so, Why ?
- (3) Is it away from the lands of the society ?
- (4) Do other members of the family cultivate the lands ?

8 *What is the difference between the management of your own lands and those of the society ? Due to what ?*

- (1) Does the society use improved seeds, more manure etc. on account of its adequate resources ?
- (2) Has the society been able to undertaken more land development works and irrigation ?
- (3) Irrigation

Irrigation	Manure	Improved seeds	Bunding	Rotation of crop.	Intercultur-
Area	Area	Area	Area	Area	ing Area

- (1) Private Farming.
- (2) Society's Farming.

9 *Is there a well on your Lands ?*

- (1) Is there a well in the lands contributed by you to the society ?
- (2) Whether the society has constructed the well ?

10 *Other resources :*

Your own land	Contributed to the Society.
(1) Bullocks.	
(2) Implements.	
(3) Ploughs.	
(4) Carts.	
(1) Why do you keep bullocks and agricultural implements if you have no land ?	
(2) How do you manage for fodder for your bullocks ?	
(3) Even if you have inadequate land, why do you keep bullocks, implements ?	

Or

- Do you utilise the resources of the society when required ?
- (4) Would you like to pay for reasonable rent to the society for using the resources ?

11 *Crop production and Sales :*

Name of the crop	Sales from your own Land			Share received from the society		
	Produ- ction.	Aver- age yield per acre.	Sale val.Qty.	Total Qty.	Qty. Sold.	Value

- 12 (1) Do you directly participate in the working of the Society ? If so, how ?
 (2) Is it necessary to effect changes in the administration of the society ?
 If so, what changes ?

(Arrange according to importance)

- (1)
 (2)
 (3)

- 13 What suggestions do you make for making the financial position of the society sound ?

(give ranking according to its importance)

- (1)
 (2)
 (3)

- 14 What types of steps should be taken to increase the production of the society?
 (Give ranking according to importance)

- (1)
 (2)
 (3)

- 15 What industries and employments other than agriculture can be introduced ?

16 *Co-operation of members :*

- (1) Mutual relations amongst the members and their families :—

- (1) Strained.
 (2) Fair.
 (3) Good.

- (2) What further steps should be taken to have still better relations ?

- 17 Relations of the members of the society with the villagers ; whether.

- (1) Strained.
 (2) Fair.
 (3) Good.

Why ?

18 *Impact of the Society on the village :*

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- (5)

19 Is it necessary to make changes in the present method of distribution in regard to :—

- (1) Property income.
- (2) Wages income.
- (3) Interest.
- (4) Dividend.
- (5) Bonus.

20 Do you prefer to have contract system of work, instead of daily wages ?
If so, why ?

Signature of the investigator : _____

Date : _____

SURVEY OF CO-OPERATIVE FARMING SOCIETIES
(The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee)

Intensive survey

Schedule Form No. 4(2)

For Non-members

Introduction :—

- (1) Name of the non-members ?
- (2) Name of the Society.
- (3) Village.
- (4) Taluka.
- (5) District :
- (6) Does he belong to the backward class ?
- (7) Area of land held by him.

1 Name of the Head of the Family :

- (1) Age.
- (2) Caste.
- (3) Education.

2 Main occupation of the family :—

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

3 Are you a member of a Co-operative Society ? If so, which ?

4 Are you a member of any other institution ? If so, which ?
And from what period ?

5 Why have you not joined the co-operative farming society ?

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

6. Do you intend to join the co-operative farming society and contribute your lands and resources to it ?

7 Owned acre.	<u>Lands</u>	Held on lease.	Lands given out on lease	Total area
	Held on crop share basis.			

8 *Total land under cultivation (Area) :—*

9 *Waste land :—*

10 *Land under irrigation :*

(Production (1955-56)

(1) Area under different crops.

(2) Production.

(3) Yield per acre in lbs.

Improved Farming :—

Crop.	Kind of seed	Manure	New method of cultivation, Type : Area	Rotation of crops.
	Variety : Area	Type : Area		

11 *Marketing of crops : (1955-56) :*

Agency.

Percentage.

Private Agency :—

Co-operative Society :—

Which ?

12 *Defects of Lands :*

(1) Saltish.

(2) Eroded.

I (3) Undulated.

(4) Rocky.

(5) Others.

II (1) What steps have been taken to remedy these defects ? What steps do you propose ?

13 *Protection of Crop :*

Nature of
Estimate and damage

Steps taken.

What steps do you
propose to take ?

14 *Resources :—*

Bullocks	No. of bullocks	Value Rs.	Remarks.
No. of implements		Value.	Remarks.

Implements :

(1) Ploughs.

(2) Carts.

(3) Others.

Total :

Machinery

15 (1) What advantages do you find to have been derived by the members of the co-operative farming society in your village ?

- (2)
- (1) More income.
 - (2) More land.
 - (3) Irrigated land.
 - (4) Help in difficulties.
 - (5) High social status.
 - (6) Efficiency.
 - (7) Adequate resources.
 - (8) Government aid and consequently better farming.

(3) *Disadvantages* :—

- (1) The lands are not well maintained.
- (2) Misappropriation of funds.
- (3) More labour, but proportionately less income.
- (4) Land-owners have become farm labourers.

16 What future of the society do you predict ?

- (1) Bad.
 - (2) Fair.
 - (3) Bright.
- Why ?

Reasons :

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

17 How are the relations of the society with the village ?

- (1) Strained.
- (2) Fair.
- (3) Good.

Signature of the Investigator _____

Date : _____

**SOME OF THE PUBLICATIONS OF
THE INDIAN SOCIETY OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS**

	Rs. nP.
1. THE INDIAN RURAL PROBLEM, 4th and Enlarged Edition, (1951) by Sir Manilal B. Nanavati and Prof. J. J. Anjaria. (<i>out of stock</i>)	14.00
RURAL LIFE SERIES	
2. RURAL PROBLEMS IN MADRAS, Prepared by the Government of Madras. (1947)	6.75
3. A DESIGN FOR THE LAYOUT OF INDIAN TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM (1949) by Dr. G. B. Deodikar, Ph.D., LL.B.	8.00
READINGS IN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS SERIES	
4. Vol. II, REHABILITATION OF LOW-INCOME GROUPS IN AGRICULTURE (1951)	9.00
5. Vol. IV, RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA (1950) (Revised and enlarged Edition) by Dr. A. R. Desai.	20.00
6. Vol. V, READINGS IN LAND UTILISATION (1957)	10.00
7. CO-OPERATION IN KODINAR (1952). A Socio-Economic analysis of the Co-operative Movement based on the field-study conducted by the Society	6.00
8. RAINFALL AND FAMINE. A STUDY OF RAINFALL IN THE BOMBAY DECCAN, 1865-1938 (1955) by Dr. Harold H. Mann	2.00
SEMINAR SERIES	
9. Vol. I. RATIONALE OF REGIONAL VARIATIONS IN AGRARIAN STRUCTURE OF INDIA (1957)	4.50
10. REPORT ON AN ENQUIRY INTO THE WORKING OF THE BOMBAY TENANCY AND AGRICULTURAL LANDS ACT, 1948 (AS AMENDED UPTO 1953) IN GUJARAT (EXCLUDING BARODA DISTRICT)(1958) by Dr. M. B. Desai	4.00
11. REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE SURVEY OF THE SURAT DISTRICT (1958) by N. B. Desai	12.00
12. PROBLEMS OF SMALL FARMERS—REPORT ON AN ENQUIRY INTO THE PROBLEMS OF LOW-INCOME FARMERS IN KODINAR TALUKA (1958) by Dr. C. H. Shah	5.00
13. STUDIES IN INDIAN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS. Edited by Dr. J. P. Bhattacharjee. Souvenir Volume issued on the eve of the Tenth International Conference of Agricultural Economists (Mysore, India—August 24—September 8, 1958)... ..	18.00
14. CO-OPERATIVE FARMING IN GUJARAT. (A Study into the working of the Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat) (1959) Prepared by The Gujarat Co-operative Farming Survey Committee, Ahmedabad.	5.00

Nos. 5, 6, 11 and 13 can be had from
VORA & CO., PUBLISHERS (PRIVATE) LTD.,
8, Round Building, Bombay 2.

The rest can be had from
THE INDIAN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
46-48, Esplanade Mansions, Mahatma Gandhi Road, BOMBAY 1.

REPORTS ON RESEARCH SCHEMES

Sponsored by :

THE RESEARCH PROGRAMMES COMMITTEE PLANNING COMMISSION

1. **Poona : A Re-Survey** (The changing pattern of Employment and Earnings). By N. V. SOVANI, D. P. APTE and R. G. PENSE. (Published).
2. **A Socio-Economic Survey of Hyderabad—Secunderabad City Area.** By S. KESAVA IYENGAR (Published).
3. **A Socio-Economic Survey of Baroda City.** By H. C. MALKANI. (Published).
4. **Small Scale Industries in Sivakasi and-Sattur.** By E. K. WARRIAR. (Published).
5. **Small Scale Industries in Delhi.** By P. N. DHAR (Published).
6. **Working of Bombay Tenancy Act, 1948.** Report of Investigation by V. M. DANDEKAR, C. H. KHUDANPUR. (Published).
7. **Economic and Social Effects of Jagirdari Abolition and Land Reforms in Hyderabad.** By A. M. KHUSRO (Published).
8. **An Enquiry into the Effects of the Working of Tenancy in Baroda District of Bombay State.** By V. Y. KOLHATKAR (Published).
9. **An Enquiry into the working of the Bombay Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act 1948 (as amended upto 1953) in Gujarat (excluding Baroda Distt.).** By M. B. DESAI (Published).
10. **Problems of Small Farmers—An Enquiry into the problems of Low-Income Farmers in Kodinar Taluka.** By C. H. SHAH (Published).
11. **Report on the Administrative Survey of the Surat District.** By N. B. DESAI (Published).
12. **Studies in Economics of Farm Management in U.P. 1954-55** By G. D. AGRAWAL (Published).
13. **Studies in Economics of Farm Management in West Bengal 1954-55.** By K. C. BASAK, B. K. CHOUDHARY (Published).
14. **Studies in Economics of Farm Management in Bombay, 1954-55.** By P. N. DRIVER, D. K. DESAI (Published).
15. **Studies in Economics of Farm Management in Madras, 1954-55.** C. W. B. ZACHARIAS (Published).
16. **Studies in Economics of Farm Management in Punjab, 1954-55.** By AJAIB SINGH, GURDIT SINGH (Published).
17. **Beggar Problem in Delhi State.** By M. S. GORE (Under print).
18. **Report on Socio-Economic Survey of Jamshedpur City.** By B. R. MISRA (Published).
19. **A Report on Hubli City : A Study in Urban Economic Life.** By B. R. DHEKNEY (under print).
20. **Study of the Economy of Fisher-folk in Travancore-Cochin.** By V. R. PILLAI (under print).
21. **Influence of Mettur Project on Agriculture in Tanjore District.** By S. KRISHNAMURTHY (Approved for publication).
22. **Report on Urban Employment and Unemployment Survey of Assam.** By V. D. THAWANI, S. SARANGPANI (Approved for publication.)
23. **Working of Grain Banks in the Five Districts of Marathwada.** By N. P. RANBISE (Approved for publication).
24. **Socio-Survey of Kanpur City.** By D. N. MAJUMDAR (Approved for publication).
25. **Report on Economic Survey of Madras City, 1954-57.** By R. BALAKRISHNA, K. S. SONACHALAM (Approved for publication).
26. **Study of Some Economic Aspects of Bhakhra Nangal Project.** By K. N. RAJ (Under print).
27. **Study of the Working of Co-operative Farming Societies in Gujarat, Secretary, Inquiry Committee, Ahmedabad.** (Report approved for Publication).
28. **Ex-criminal Tribes in Delhi State, Delhi University, Delhi, Dr. P. C. BISWAS.** (Approved for publication).