

**MANIPUR STATE HILL PEOPLES  
(ADMINISTRATION) REGULATION  
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

**The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):** I beg to move :\*

"That this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that leave be granted to withdraw the Bill to amend the Manipur State Hill Peoples (Administration) Regulation, 1947, for the purpose of making provision for elected village authorities and for matters connected therewith, which was passed by Rajya Sabha on the 21st September, 1954 and laid on the Table of this House on the 23rd September, 1954."

Sir, this Bill is going to be withdrawn and another immediately introduced. Certain important changes had to be made and that is the reason why that Bill is sought to be withdrawn.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore):** Sir, may I know under what rule of the Rules of Procedure this motion has been made? So far as I can see under Rule 147 this Bill cannot be withdrawn in that fashion and the Rule has not been changed though it is sought to be changed.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** Sir, I want to make a request to you that whenever any Bill is sought to be withdrawn it should be laid down—though not as a rule but at least as a convention—that the Government should circulate a statement giving the reasons why the Bill is being sought to be withdrawn, because simply saying that they seek permission of the House to withdraw one measure and then introducing another one is not a desirable practice. We should have more cogent reasons before we grant permission to withdraw a measure. That has been the practice observed everywhere. Some such practice ought to be introduced and it is for you now to introduce such a practice.

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** So far as this matter is concerned I would like to submit one thing. Shri Ramachandra Reddi has submitted that the Rule is sought to be amended but it has not yet been amended. The point simply is this. Because of this procedure of Joint Select Committees and Bills introduced in one House go to the other House this difficulty at the time of withdrawal arises. The new procedure has not been visualised in all its as-

pects and the rules are not completed yet. This is one of the Bills which have been introduced and passed in the other House. If that is to be withdrawn then it must be done in that House. Therefore, we cannot do it. The other House has passed the Bill and therefore it is to be withdrawn from there. Under these circumstances, it is said that till the rule is amended, we cannot create an obstacle in the natural course of things. Therefore my submission is that, though it would be exactly under no rule. This matter has to be permitted.

**Shri Datar:** Sir, may I explain the position? In this case what happened was, the Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha and the Rajya Sabha passed the Bill. After the Bill was passed, as the motion itself makes clear, this House is now seized of the matter and hence the request is made to this House that in view of the fact that the Bill has been passed by Rajya Sabha we might request the Rajya Sabha to allow the withdrawal. So, there are certain peculiar circumstances due to which this motion has been made here.

So far as the objection taken by my friend Shri S. S. More....

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** What are the circumstances?

**Shri Datar:** That is what I am coming to. So far as that point is concerned I have no objection to the matter being held over for two or three days and I would submit a small statement giving the reasons why the Government think it necessary to withdraw this Bill and introduce another Bill.

**Shri Gadgil (Poona Central):** Could you not have done the thing you want to do by amending the Bill, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, here?

**Shri Datar:** Anyway I shall place a clear statement before the House and it shall be in the hands of the House very soon.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** In addition to the unclear statement now.

**Shri Datar:** I could not hear the hon. Member.

**Mr. Speaker:** Such side remarks need not be taken notice of.

Therefore, this matter will stand over. The hon. Minister will give a date when he is ready with the statement. In the meanwhile this suggestion may also be taken into account and in the statement

\* This motion was subsequently amended by the Speaker—vide Part II Debates, dated, 11-5-56, cols. 7983-84.

[Mr. Speaker]  
the practical reasons may be set out so that hon. Members can look into the matter and come prepared.

Now, we will go to the next item :  
“Bill to be introduced.”

**Shri Datar:** Sir, that follows the previous one. That also will have to be postponed because a new Bill is sought to be introduced.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. That will also stand over.

The House will now take up the discussion on General Budget.

### GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore):** Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a Budget which is cleverly manipulated. It is an election-year Budget laying more burdens on the people than visible at first sight. This Budget is a Budget which aims at national development at the cost of the common man. You can call it national advance only when there is no constant threat of unemployment or retrenchment, when multitudes of people do not starve and suffer and the rich people do not prosper at the cost of the country and the people.

Sir, nobody will deny that there had been an increase in the national income and that there had been an increase in industrial and agricultural production also. But, the question is, how far this increase in the national income as well as the increase in both the industrial and agricultural production have helped the producers and how far they have been able to raise their standard of living?

I shall first take up agricultural production. 4·2 million tons over and above the target had been produced. This is due to the Japanese methods of production and also other technical methods. Though the increase in production is relatively less there had been an increase this year also and it is said that it is due to the Japanese method of production. It has not been said whether the monsoons had anything to do with that increase in the production.

Anyhow, in spite of the increase in production of 4·2 million tons, *per capita* per day availability of food consumption comes to only 16·3 ounces.

Last year it was 14·8 ounces. We need not be satisfied with this. The report of the Food and Agriculture Ministry shows a very good picture and I think such a complacent picture should not be given.

As far as agricultural labourers are concerned there had been fall in prices for the last two years and due to the fall in prices they have lost about Rs. 1000 crores. These prices are now going up. There is fluctuation in the prices, the prices going up and prices coming down. Unless the Government checks it up both the sectors will suffer. When the prices go up one sector will suffer and when the prices come down another sector will suffer.

The next point that I would like to bring forward is about the agricultural labourers and their minimum wages. In 1948 the Minimum Wages Act for the agricultural labourers had been passed. It is not implemented in many of the States and where it is implemented it had been implemented only in some of the localities. On the plea that the prices have fallen down in 1952—1955 wages have been decreased in some of the States. Therefore, the increase in production has not helped this section of the population which constitute 50 per cent of the rural population. It has only increased the income of a few other sectors.

Coming to the Second Five Year Plan and the Report of the Planning Commission, as far as the tenants are concerned it is very clearly said that very little has been done to provide land for the landless agricultural workers. The intentions of the land reform legislation have not been fulfilled to the extent hoped for because of inadequate administrative action and weakness in organisation at the village level. It is also said that during the past two or three years there had been instances in some States of large-scale ejection of tenants and voluntary surrenders of tenancies. Most of the voluntary surrenders of tenancies are open to doubt as *bona fide* transactions and it is desirable that reviews of cases of alleged voluntary surrenders over a period of three years should be taken and to the extent necessary action should be taken to restore it to the tenants.

It is recommended that action should also be taken to stay the ejection of