

17.21 hrs.

HINDU SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of section 14) by  
Shri Subbiah Ambalam

Shri Subbiah Ambalam (Ramana-  
thapuram): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend  
the Hindu Succession Act, 1956,  
be taken into consideration."

This Bill was introduced on 2nd May, 1958 and it has taken nearly three years to reach the stage of discussion as a Private Members' Bill. The object of the Hindu Succession Act of 1956 was to confer a right on female heirs. Under the general Hindu law, female heirs have only a limited right. When a man dies intestate, leaving no male issue but leaving a daughter and a widow, the widow succeeds to the estate of the deceased inheriting the property as a limited owner. She has the right as a limited owner to enjoy the usufruct of that property during her lifetime. That has been the general Hindu law. After the death of that limited owner, the reversioners, if any, inherit that property as limited owners. But the Hindu Succession Act of 1956 conferred a special right on these female heirs, namely, widow, daughters, mother and other female heirs, an absolute right in the property of the deceased if he died intestate. That has been the object of the Hindu Succession Act, and such rights were conferred under the Act.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): On a point of order. The Law Minister is not here.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): He is coming in a minute. Meanwhile, I am representing him.

Shri Subbiah Ambalam: Under section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act:

"The property of a male Hindu dying intestate shall devolve ac-

ording to the provisions of this Chapter:—

"(a) firstly, upon the heirs, being the relatives specified in class I of the Schedule;

(b) secondly, if there is no heir of class I, then upon the heirs, being the relatives specified in class II of the Schedule."

Class I of the Schedule specifies son, daughter, widow, mother, son of a predeceased son, daughter of a predeceased son and other heirs. So the object of this Act is to confer equal rights on son, daughter, widow and mother. This has been greatly welcomed in Hindu society where the daughter or widow had no such right prior to the passing of this Act.

Section 14 of the Act, to which I have moved an amendment by my Bill, as it stands to day reads as follows:

"Any property possessed by a female Hindu, whether acquired before or after the commencement of this Act, shall be held by her as full owner thereof and not as a limited owner".

This section confers absolute right on the widow, who was hitherto till 1956, enjoying the property as a limited owner. This has created an unintentional, I should say, hardship and real hardship on other heirs, namely, a daughter living at the time of the commencement of this Act. I shall illustrate that. If a man prior to the commencement of this Act, died intestate leaving a widow and a daughter, the widow got life interest in the property and the daughter would succeed to his estate upon the death of the widow. But after the Act, both the widow and the daughter would, upon the death of the man intestate, simultaneously succeed and each would have half a share. That is the intention of the Parliament—to benefit the daughter as much as the widow. Section 14 denies this right to the daughter living at the commencement of this Act, when the widow who was in enjoyment as a limited owner gets absolute right. For

[Shri Subbiah Ambalam]

instance, in the case of a man who died before the commencement of the Act, leaving a widow and a daughter or a daughter by another wife, the widow would have acquired a limited interest in the entire estate of her husband. Now, by virtue of section 14, this limited interest would become transformed into an absolute interest and the widow gets power to give or transfer the property to whomsoever she likes. The natural tendency of a widow would be to defeat the interest of the step-daughter by gifting the entire estate of the deceased in favour of her brother or sister. This, I submit, would be prejudicial to the interests of the step-daughter and the interests of the daughter who under section 8 of the Act had been so favoured that they get an absolute right. In fact the scheme of the Act shows that Parliament assigns to the daughter a status even superior to that of the widow. This is evident from the fact that according to section 10 of the Act, if a man is survived by two widows and two daughters, the two widows together get only one third share in the estates whereas each of the two daughters will get one-third, both of them thus taking two-thirds share. So, it is abundantly clear that the daughter enjoys a status even superior to that of the widow. It would therefore follow that there is an unintended contradiction between section 14 of the Act and the other provisions of it. What section 14 has inadvertently done is to enlarge retrospectively the widow's life estate to the detriment of the daughter's expectancy. If section 14 is not amended at once great mischief will ensue. There were a number of cases pending in courts where the daughters had filed suits challenging the alienations by the widows or mismanagement by the widows but by virtue of this section all those cases have been dismissed and plaintiffs were unsuited. Therefore, I submit that my amendment to this section 14 should be acceptable to the Government. I therefore want to introduce an amendment as follows:

"After clause (1) of Section 14, the following provisoes shall be added:

\*  
 Proviso I: 'Provided that where a man has, before the commencement of this Act, died intestate, leaving a widow or widows and other female heirs mentioned in Class I of the Schedule, the widow and the other female heirs shall take the property absolutely in accordance with the provisions of Section 10.'

Proviso II: 'Provided that any alienation made by the widow without consideration after the commencement of this Act, shall be void to the extent of any share in excess of that prescribed in the proviso above.'

The first proviso is intended to put daughters and those who in respect of the deceased intestate's widow are step-daughters on an equal footing with the widow. This proviso does not inflict any hardship upon the widow. But it might be argued that whereas the widow previously had the entire estate to enjoy, the first proviso, as it is, gives only a portion of it to her. But this argument ignores the fact that she is getting now an absolute estate even though it may be a portion of the estate of the deceased to enjoy for life.

The second proviso is intended to rectify any mischief that might have been done after the commencement of this Act by advantage being taken of the unintended effect of the wording of Section 14 of the Act. Though retrospective in action, this second proviso only tries to redress the unintended injustice resulting from a change in law which itself has been retrospective in action.

The second proviso, I submit, does not work any hardship upon any transferee from the widow, because it hits only such transfers as are without consideration. Therefore, this proviso, must be acceptable to the Government. On the other hand, it is

absolutely necessary if the mischief and injustice that have already been done are to be rectified and not to be perpetuated and the benefit and the relief under the amendment now proposed by me are to be shared by all daughters, whether favourites of the widow or not, and her step-daughters who have been hard hit.

Therefore, I appeal to the Minister and to the Government through you to accept my amendment and thus remove the unintended effect of section 14 of the Hindu Succession Act of 1956.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 be taken into consideration."

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon." (1).

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this Bill. I think that it does not need much argument, because on the face of it, it is a measure which, I should say, is trying to take away the very rights of women which they have won after long years. First of all, the absolute right of inheritance to women, whether they are widows or daughters, is one of the main planks of the Hindu Succession Act. By hypothetical and rather fantastic arguments, this measure seeks to take away the very rights of women which were conferred on women when the Succession Act was passed.

I am sure that the Members of this House will agree with me when I say that a hypothetical case of a daughter or a step-daughter being brought into the picture to take away from the widow her rights of absolute inheritance can hardly be something to which we in these times can possibly agree. I am a woman and as a

woman I naturally oppose it, but I feel sure that the majority of men in this House and in the country outside, today, in 1961, will be of the same opinion. I do not know how this Bill was even allowed to be introduced. It is our fault that we allowed it to be brought before the House. We have been caught napping. I appeal to the mover of the Bill to withdraw the Bill. It is a measure which is retrograde; which goes back on the Constitution as it stands. Where men and women have equal rights, it naturally must include equal rights of inheritance also, just as the man, today, inherits his wife's estate if she has any. So, there is no reason, to take away from the wife or the widow her right for similar inheritance.

I am sure that the Deputy Law Minister will agree with me. I only appeal to the mover to withdraw this Bill at this stage, because it cannot be a Bill that can find any response not merely amongst women as such, but amongst the citizens of a country which is independent, which is going forward and whose people believe inherently that there must be justice to all citizens, men and women equally.

With these words, I again oppose this Bill.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (सीतापुर): सभापति महोदय, यह जो बिल रखा गया है इसका क्या उद्देश्य है मेरी समझ में तो आया नहीं है। कितना हमने समझाया कितने कानन हमने पास किए, सोशल लाज, और कितनी मुश्किल से किए, इस सब को प्राप्त बच्ची जानते हैं। लेकिन प्रजीव जानत है कि यह बिल किसी कोने से निकल आया है और कैसे निकल आया है मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है। अभी मेरी एक बहन बोल रही थी और उन्होंने

## [श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

भी यही कहा है। स्टेप डाटर और डाटर को आज फिर झगड़े में घसीटा जा रहा है, इधर से उधर घसीटा जा रहा है। मैं ममझती हूँ कि यह जो बिल आया है, गलत आया है। जो सोशल लाज हमने पास किए हैं, औरतों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए जो कानून हमने पास किए हैं, और उनका जो उद्देश्य था, उनके खिलाफ यह बिल जाना है। लेकिन हमें देखना है कि यह बिल किम मकनद से लाया गया है और जो इस बिल को लाये है, उनकी राय को जनना है। हमें उन मर्दों की राय भी लेनी है जो कि खामोश रहते हैं और देखना है कि वे क्या सोचते हैं। उनके दिल की बात कहीं न कहीं, किसी न किसी तरह से निकल ही आती है। हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि कोई हम पर इनायत करे, हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि कोई हम पर किसी तरह की मेहरबानी करे। हमारा जो हक है उसको हम मांग रहे हैं।

इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि जिन्होंने इस बिल को रखा है, इसको वह विदड़ा करके इस विषय पर अलग से बातचीत कर लें। यदि यह नहीं किया जाता है तो दूसरा तरीका यह है कि इसको सकार्युलिट कर दिया जाए, लोगों की राय ले ली जाए। मुनासिब यही होगा कि इसको सकार्युलिट कर दिया जाए। सकार्युलिट होने के बाद भी मैं बता देना चाहती हूँ कि जो सोशल लाज होने पास किए हैं, वे रहेंगे और उनसे एक भाष इंच भी हम इधर उधर जाने वाले नहीं हैं।

**Shri N. B. Muniswamy (Vellore):**  
Sir, at the outset, I congratulate the sponsor of the Bill on focusing our attention on certain legal laws, of lacunæ in the Hindu Succession Act. There are two classes of heirs mentioned. Class I gives the names of the persons who will inherit the property when the last male owner dies intestate. If there is no heir mentioned in Class I, heirs in Class II will inherit the property.

When the last male owner dies leaving behind a daughter by a predeceased wife and a widow, according to the present scheme, both of them take it absolutely, because the right has been conferred by the present Act that they take it absolutely half and half. But when the man has died intestate before the commencement of the Act, leaving behind a widow and a daughter, we are not able to make out whether the wife takes it absolutely or along with the daughter—she may be her own daughter or the daughter of a predeceased wife. What one can imagine is, what is applicable under the present Act will be bodily shifted and given effect to retrospectively, so that both the daughter as well as the wife take it absolutely. The present visualises the conferring of absolute right to wife as well as daughter. As regards retrospective effect, bodily it must be shifted and given effect to retrospectively, so that both the daughter and the wife get absolute right. It need not necessarily mean that only the widow gets the absolute right. I take it for granted that it must be given retrospective effect, giving absolute right, in the place of what was originally a limited right, for the previous period also, the period previous to 1956, to the daughter as well as to the wife, to the widow as well as the step-daughter. The courts will not give consideration to the interpretation and all those things. They are guided merely by the provisions of the Act. If they do not find the name of the step-daughter or daughter included in class I or class II specifically mentioned they will not apply the provision with retrospective effect. Therefore, it must be made clear so that there may be no misgiving, so that there may be no lacuna or legal flaw. The present amendment if incorporated will serve the purpose.

I am unable to understand how the hon. lady Member who spoke first got very much frightened. It is not as if we are taking away their rights. We

know that when a lady gets absolute right she begins to forget her own status.

**An Hon. Member:** No, no.

**Shri N. R. Muniswamy:** After all, this is a gratuitous windfall for them. I also took part in the debate when the original Bill was discussed in this House. I mentioned this point when Shri Pataskar was the Law Minister. He also replied that there was nothing to get frightened, because he said the spirit of the present Act will be made applicable to the old position also. When you read the debates you will find it. Therefore, I do not know why the hon. lady Member should be frightened. The right conferred on them is not taken away. It is only being shared with the daughters. We also fight for the rights of the ladies. It is only a matter of sharing between the mother and the daughter. Why should the mother alone have it? In fact, they should be happy. Why should the step-daughter be treated in a different way?

Therefore, they should not get frightened. Now both of them will have this gratuitous windfall. I only want that this Bill must be circulated so that we may be able to get the opinion of persons well-versed in law. I would not have suggested this move for circulation, but some doubt has been created and it is worthwhile sending it for circulation. But I say that this should be accepted.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** May I say, Sir, that the daughter has absolute right of inheritance along with the wife according to the Act as it stands?

**Shri Thanu Pillai:** Sir, the hon. lady Member would please care to read the Act and where the lacuna is in the application of clause 14 which we are now trying to amend. It has been brought to our notice by people affected, that daughters who are unmarried and also married have not got the inheritance because the step-mother or the widow has taken away

the whole or pawned it to somebody whom the father if he had lived would not have touched with a pair of tongs. Why should our lady Member be frightened that we are taking away a right that has already been conferred.

In this connection, Sir, I am reminded of the strong voices that were raised and the amendments moved by hon. Members at the time this Act was considered. It was said that we were conferring an extraordinary right on the women which we were not conferring on the men, because a man when he inherited something he inherited it subject to other rights of his sons getting a share according to the Mitakshara law whereas the women were given an absolute right. What induced some of us who were here then to agree to it is the fact that a man is capable of looking after himself in so many ways whereas a woman is not placed in such a position. Therefore we wanted to confer complete right on the women and we wanted to confer on them a better right than men. We thought that unless they are given the absolute ownership there would be somebody who would think that after the lady he would get something. In that case there will be nobody to look after her. Therefore, unless she is capable of exercising absolute right, this conferment of property rights will not have the effect of having conferred any right.

It is, therefore, the considered opinion of some of us that the daughter should not be left with limited rights. It is out of love for the daughter that this is being brought. It is not the case with the son, because he is a hardy fellow and he can lead his life in any way. But a daughter's life should be secure. Her honour and prestige is greater in our families than the prestige or honour of sons. We have been generous and good-hearted in conferring those rights. We will not take them back. This Bill should be considered carefully. I would not have objected if the hon. lady Member had stated that it needs further consideration and, therefore, it could be sent for

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

circulation. But to say that the mover and the supporters have got some ulterior motive, as if we are not concerned with our daughters, is not at all correct. I am more concerned with the daughters than with the wife. That is the whole point. The mover of this Bill has come across these difficulties and, therefore, he is moving it.

I have moved an amendment that it be circulated for public opinion for two reasons. Firstly, unnecessary opposition without understanding the implications should be avoided. Secondly, in a democracy it would be rather not proper to legislate something which purports to take away a right, even though it was conferred wrongly or by wrong people, without giving an opportunity for those affected people to make their representations. Parliament can consider it after circulation. So, I would request hon. Members to agree to the circulation of the Bill. We did something in this Parliament in 1956 as a result of which some difficulties have arisen. At least in 1961, let us remove the lacuna and make it perfect.

Shri Subiman Ghose (Burdwan): I congratulate the sponsor of the Bill and I welcome the spirit behind it. Because, under this Bill, the men are not reaping any benefit. It seeks to remove some injustice that has been done between a female and another female. Therefore, there should not be any excitement on the part of females.

Here the date is very important. If a man had died in 1956, after the passing of the Hindu Succession Act, his widow and daughter will get equal shares. But if the man had died before 1956, before the passing of the Hindu Succession Act, in that case the widow will reap the benefit and not the daughter. Why should there be this discrimination? This Bill aims at removing that discrimination. I do not think it will infringe any of the provisions of the Constitution. Rather, the Constitution has favoured the females much.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Do you grudge it?

Shri Subiman Ghose: No, I do not grudge it.

Because, one female inherits property as wife and inherits property as daughter, but a male inherits property from his father and not in any other capacity. Therefore, a female inherits property in double capacities.

Shri V. P. Nayar: They follow the Marumakkattayam law.

Shri Subiman Ghose: That is unconstitutional. In our spirit of chivalry and bravado we have given the females enough rights, more rights than the male possesses under the Constitution. Therefore, I think that this Bill should not wait a day longer. The spirit behind it so noble, namely, the removal of the discrimination between mother and daughter. Therefore, it should be accepted here and now.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Mr. Chairman, I fully support the Bill and, if necessary, it may go for circulation. The position is clearly understandable and I do not think anybody should oppose it.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Not even the ladies?

Shri Achar: Probably, they have not understood the scope of the Bill. So far as the Hindu law is concerned, as soon as a person died, the property vested only for life in the widow, if there are no sons. She had the life estate. After her death, the life estate passed to the daughters. They had only a life-estate. After the daughters, it went to the daughters' male issues. That was the position. The Hindu Succession Act amended it. The present position is that, after the Act came into force, there is no difficulty.

So far as that Act is concerned, the wife, that is, the widow, also gets a share. The daughter also gets a share.

Everybody gets a share. There is no difficulty at all. But there is this intervening period. That is the point that we have to consider. That defect this Bill seeks to remove. Under the new Act what happens is, that during the intervening period the widow gets an absolute estate, that is to say, the daughters do not get anything. If the last owner had died before the Hindu Succession Act came into force, the widow who had only a life estate became an absolute owner under the Act. She can give it to anybody. She can sell it. It may happen that the daughters will not get anything. Formerly that situation never arose because she had only a life-estate and after her, her daughters would get a life estate. That situation, this Bill attempts to remove.

At least so far as it is only to daughters, probably this problem may not be so difficult. The mother naturally may leave it to her daughter. But then there is an instance of the step-daughters. There may not be much love lost between the step-daughters and the widow. So by this new Act when she gets this absolute estate she may simply ignore the step-daughters and give it to anybody she likes. She can alienate it or do anything with it, with the result that the step-daughters would be deprived of it. I am really surprised how the hon. lady Members of this House have taken it into their head to oppose this Bill. With all respect to them I say that evidently they have not understood it.

**Shrimati Uma Nehru:** We are not opposing it. We say, let us examine it. Let us circulate it.

**Shri Achar:** I agree. I would even accept the Bill. But apart from that, as Shri Thanu Pillai has moved an amendment to that it may be circulated, I fully support that proposition for circulation.

**Shri Subiman Ghose:** It should be passed here and now.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Sir, I did not really want to participate in this debate but I am doing so because I could not share the excitement, nor the condemnation, which my hon. friend, Shri Subiman Ghose, chose to make about women inheriting the property. We know that it was due to them long, long ago and we men had prevented women from inheriting. Of course, it does not apply to the community from which I come because there women inherit as much as men do and perhaps more. We gladly give it. But we must remember that if by Hindu Law we made some concessions which were due to women long, long ago, it was not by the charity of men or, as he chose to say, by the chivalry or bravado of men. It was by the fight which the women put forward.

**Shri Subiman Ghose:** On a point of clarification. I have never meant to say that women should not get property. I said that they get property under the Hindu Succession Act in a double capacity, that is, as wife and as daughter, but a male cannot get property in a double capacity. That is my grievance.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** He forgets that although the Constitution has given equality to women they are still far, far away from getting equality along with men. Let us not forget that although in law they are equal, the opportunities which we give to our women nowhere come equal to that of men.

But that is not the point. The point here is that here is a case where an hon. Member wants to move a certain amendment. It is sprung as a surprise to the hon. lady Members of the House as Shrimati Renuka Ray expressed it. Shrimati Uma Nehru also says that possibly this is a matter for consideration by the entire country. I for one cannot commit myself to any opinion on this because I find that even the original provisions were discussed in detail. The entire country had an opportunity to express an opinion on the various measures and provisions. I feel that in view of the controversy

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

which this seems to have created in this House the hon. Mover could very well have discussed these issues with women Members of this House which he does not seem to have done. Even granting that this Bill has to be considered by us I feel that as a compromise there would be no harm in sending it for eliciting public opinion. I would request the hon. Minister in charge of Law to agree to this proposition, because by that we lose nothing. On the other hand we gain experience, we know the views of the various sections in the country. I, therefore, support in principle the amendment of Mr. Thanu Pillai.

17.56 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

**Shri Balasaheb Patil** (Miraj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment suggested to the Hindu Succession Act, because it is opposed to the very principle for which the Hindu Succession Act was passed. At the time of passing of the Hindu Succession Act there were two types of estates: one was limited estate and the other was full or absolute estate. The widow was the only person who could get a limited estate. At that time it was thought fit that this limited estate should be abolished once and for all. Therefore, after the passing and coming into force of this Act everybody got absolute estate. Let it be a widow; let it be a daughter; let it be a son. They got different shares. But there was no law existing at that time limiting the estate for those who were widows, whose husbands had died prior to the coming into force of the Succession Act. There was some discussion and it was thought fit at that time that there should be two types of estates, absolute and limited.

Sir, the Mover of this amendment forgot to consider one clause here, that is property possessed by a Hindu family. He thought that if the husband had died prior to the coming into force of the Hindu Succession Act, the

property first of all devolved on the widow. If the daughter were there she would be entitled to property; if daughter were married and had gone to another family, naturally it will come to the widow and her name will be entered and that will be possessed by the widow. If the widow is in possession of the property then she becomes absolute owner. Supposing there are other heirs also, successors, they are in possession. Then the widow will not get the absolute property.

Therefore, in making this amendment, first of all, we are bringing back the outdated idea of limited estate. Here as soon as the property is possessed it becomes clear property, just as *stridhan*. It becomes the absolute property of the widow. Sir, on principle I oppose this measure and request the mover to withdraw it.

**Shri Basappa** (Tiptur): I have listened carefully to the speeches of hon. Members who have opposed this Bill. I do not see any argument in them. The last speaker was trying to make out a case that the Bill should not have been brought forward. But he has wrongly understood the whole contents of the Bill. The mover has sufficiently explained the position prior to 1956 and has explained the purpose of his amendment.

18 hrs.

The hon. lady Members who have spoken do not also seem to have gone through the Bill carefully. They seem to have looked into it only after it was introduced here. Perhaps, they are not aware of the great injustice that is being done. In 1956 itself this lacuna could have been removed. Unfortunately, probably nobody noticed it then. The intention of the Act of 1956 also is clear that they wanted to give the daughter also an interest. That can be seen from the other clauses of the Act. Prior to 1956 the widow or the female



heir inherited a limited interest. But by the 1956 Act they wanted to see that both the daughter and the widow got a proper status in life. But unfortunately the position of the daughter, particularly of the step-daughter, was not taken into consideration. Usually a widow, if she has a step-daughter, would make over the property by gift to others. To avoid that and to protect their rights this amendment has been brought in.

The rights of women are not at all taken away. What has been given is given properly, without discrimination, to all the female heirs. It includes widows as well as daughters. If that is understood clearly, then this objection will not come in at all. And even in the new Bill no widow is harmed at all. But the daughters' rights are established and they are given whatever is given by the 1956 Act. If the intention is clearly to give effect to it, then this amendment is quite necessary and I hope the House will agree to it.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad) rose—

Mr. Speaker: We will continue this on the next day. We have to take up a half-an-hour discussion now.

18.02 hrs.

#### \*CIVILIAN PILOTS

श्री राजराज सिंह (फिरोज़ाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्राध घंटे की चर्चा उस सवाल नम्बर १३८८ को लेकर हो रही है जो कि मैंने ग्राज सिविलियन पायलेट्स के बारे में मंत्री महोदय से पूछा था। यह प्राध घंटे की चर्चा मंत्री महोदय के उन उत्तरों के परिणामस्वरूप हो रही है जो कि उन्होंने ग्राज सदन में दिये थे। उन उत्तरों में मिनिस्टर महोदय ने कहा था कि हमने एक साल से ऊपर हुआ डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री को पत्र लिखा था कि वह इन टूट सिविल अनएम्प्लायड

पायलेट्स को आई० ए० एफ० में ले ले और ऐबसाब करने से पहले उनको रिफेशर कोर्स दे सकते हैं। अब इसको लिये हुए साल भर से ऊपर हो चुका है और यह बड़े प्राश्चर्य का विषय है कि डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री ने उसके बारे में कोई जवाब नहीं दिया है और वह अभी भी उस पर विचार कर रही है। मंत्री महोदय ने अपने उत्तर में यह भी बताया है कि जो बेकार पायलेट्स हैं उनको हम किस तरह से काम पर लगायेंगे। अब इस प्रश्न पर पिछले साल या डेढ़ साल से चर्चा चली आ रही है और आपने ठीक ही इस तमाम मामले को एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के सुपुर्व किया था और उसने बहुत ही गम्भीरतापूर्वक इस समस्या का अध्ययन करने के बाद, २४ मार्च, सन् १९६१ को एक रिपोर्ट सदन की मेज पर रखी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय ने भी उसकी रिपोर्ट को पढ़ लिया होगा लेकिन कल उन्होंने अपनी मिनिस्ट्री की मांगों को लेकर जो भाषण दिया उससे तो ऐसा लगता है कि संभवतः उन्होंने अभी तक उस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ नहीं पाया है क्योंकि अगर उन्होंने उसे पढ़ लिया होता तो वह ऐसा नहीं कहते जैसा कि उन्होंने कल मेरे भाषण के बारे में कहा था। यह तो सही है कि मैंने ६२ पायलेट्स के बारे में कहा था कि वे बेकार हैं लेकिन जो कुछ मैंने कहा वह सिर्फ यही कहा था कि एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी ने यं अपनी रिपोर्ट में लिखा है :—

"The number of pilots recruited since 1958-59 was only 26 as against the number of 'B' Licences of 118 issued over the same period. The Committee regret that a complete record of the unemployed trained pilots is not apparently maintained."

\*Half-an-hour Discussion.