

having transport services spread out; we are having irrigation ranals which are meant only for villages. Crores of rupees have been spent on these items. Many new projects which are being set up are being set up in rural areas, so that the rural areas are benefited. We want to see the development of the rural areas to an extent that people would want to go to rural areas rather than to urban areas. But there should be no contradiction, or any question of a wrong competition between villages and cities. The two are complementary to each other. We have got to see that they complement each other rather than exploit each other. That is how we look at the development of city areas and the development of rural areas.

I hope that the Finance Bill, as it has ultimately been approved by the hon. House will be satisfactory to all concerned, on the whole, as far as a Finance Bill can be satisfactory.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

14.27 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTY-THIRD REPORT.

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th April, 1961."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th April, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Bills to be introduced. Shri Aurobindo Ghosal—absent.

14.28 hrs.

PREVENTION OF HYDROGENATION OF OILS BILL—Contd.

by Shri Jhulan Sinha.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would like to inform the House that on the 24th March 1961, Shri Jhulan Sinha moved the following motion:—

"That the Bill to provide for prevention of hydrogenation of oils in India and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

On the 7th April, 1961 when further discussion on the motion was resumed and after the discussion had concluded, the House wanted to divide on the motion. As there was no quorum voting on the motion was postponed till today.

Now I submit to the vote of the House the following motion moved by Shri Jhulan Sinha on the 24th March, 1961.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for prevention of hydrogenation of oils in India and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan): Have I the option to withdraw the challenge I made that day?

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): How can he do it? It has to be put to the vote of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, he can ask for the permission of the House.

Shri Jhulan Sinha: I am not asking for permission to withdraw the Bill. I made a challenge for division the

[Shri Jhulan Sinha]

ier day. Is it open to me to withdraw the challenge that I made on that day?

An Hon. Member: He does not want the division.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put it to the vote of the House and we can decide it by the voice vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for prevention of hydrogenation of oils in India for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived.

—
14.31 hrs.

HINDU SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

(Amendment of section 14 by
Shri Subbiah Ambalam)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion of the following motion moved by Shri P. Subbiah Ambalam on the 7th April, 1961:

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

Out of one hour allotted for the discussion of the Bill, 41 minutes have already been taken up on the 7th April, 1961 and 19 minutes are now available.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): I rise to support the Hindu Succession (Amendment) Bill moved by my hon. friend Shri Subbiah Ambalam on the 7th April, 1961. The statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Bill has clearly explained the purpose for which this amending Bill has been brought. Many hon. Members have addressed themselves pointedly

to the specific prosions of this Bill, excepting one or two hon. Members who, I must submit, had some misconceptions about the intention of the Bill. Otherwise I do not think they would have raised the objection that they did.

I would like to reiterate that the Hindu Succession Act of 1956 conferred, for the first time, property rights on women, both widows and daughters. As the House is aware, the British Succession Act provides equal rights to men and women alike, that is to sons and daughters. If X dies intestate leaving a widow and children, according to the British practice the widow will be entitled to one-third and the children to two-thirds of the estate irrespective of whether they are males or females. Where a person dies intestate leaving only the widow, half of the estate will go to the widow and the other half to the Crown.

The question did arise on the actual definition of "widows" particularly in the colonial countries, because in the colonies under the British Empire in those days there were men who were having more than two wives. In Malaya, the Chinese nationals who were British subjects then had generally more than two wives. The riches of a rich Chinese Malayan were tested by the number of wives he possessed. There was also a Privy Council decision in a famous case known as The Seven Widows Case. A Chinese millionaire died, leaving seven widows and some children. The question arose whether the one-third share, to which a widow was entitled, was to be shared equally among all the seven widows, or whether it was to be given only to the primary widow, because under the Chinese practice there were primary wives and subsidiary wives.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Good God, what is this?

Shri Tangamani: This was some time in early 1905. This Privy Council decision is there. Their Lordships