

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Even then, Sir, how many more minutes have I got?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have no more minutes.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: In fact, we began the debate only from 8-20.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have taken in to account the two minutes provided for the short notice question. And they know all the arguments. Don't you?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The arguments of the Government are also well-known.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, I would like you to give me two more minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just two minutes? All right.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Sir, the picture which he gives is one of increasing the exports, which is no solution whatsoever. Why don't we increase the purchasing power of our own people? Whatever we produce, why don't we think in terms of consuming it in our country? Their economy is not planned on that basis, and as such they are never going to solve the problem. Then, for every suggestion we give, the categorical answer is 'no'. When we asked them for Rs. 50 crores for free rations and for unemployment relief, he said 'no'. When I asked him, 'Are you going to stop retrenchment and evictions', his answer was again 'no'.

SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH: I did not say that.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Yes, subject to some limitations. We know what those limitations are. Practically it will mean that the Government is not going to do anything to stop retrenchment and evictions. Then we

asked him: 'Are you going to take over the stocks of handloom cloth? Are you prepared to take over those stocks and sell them so that the cottage industry could be subsidised?' For this also the categorical answer was 'no'. Similarly whenever we ask other questions, the categorical answer is 'no'. How many decades you want to solve this unemployment problem? How many centuries will you want?

SHRI C. D. DESHMUKH: Ten years.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: You have already had six years and from the way in which you are proceeding, I am sure even if ten more years were allowed to you, you would not be able to solve the problem of unemployment, but you will starve millions and millions more to death. You don't deserve even a single moment of respite and the people will remember that when they demanded unemployment relief, they got stones from the Government and they will see that this Government have no right to exist. The earlier they go the better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now take up the Estate Duty Bill.

THE ESTATE DUTY BILL, 1953— *continued.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause by clause consideration. Clause 41. There is an amendment to this by Shri J. R. Kapoor.

PETITIONS COMMITTEE'S REPORT (ESTATE DUTY BILL)

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): May I, Sir, first present the Report?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, on behalf of the Committee on Petitions, I present the Report of the Committee relating to a petition on the Estate Duty Bill. The signatory to the petition is the proprietor of a company of income-tax and death duty advisers in Delhi. The petition prays that clause 83 of the Estate Duty Bill, 1953, may be amended so that income-tax practitioners may also be allowed to represent the public before the Estate Duty authorities. The petition is in conformity with the rules of procedure. We have directed that the petition be circulated. Sir, a copy of this petition will be immediately circulated to the hon. Members.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The copy will be circulated.

THE ESTATE DUTY BILL, 1953—
continued

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

"That at page 23, line 40, after the word 'times' the following words be inserted, namely:—

'and after giving to the occupant such reasonable notice'."

This is a very simple amendment and I hope the hon. the Finance Minister will be pleased to accept it. Of course, it is not possible, as he has said, to accept these amendments in order to incorporate them in the present Bill, but I would submit that if he finds his way to accept the propriety of this amendment, he might just incorporate the substance of this amendment in the rules which the Central Government would prescribe.

The object of my amendment is this. Clause 41 authorises the Controller to authorise somebody else on his behalf to inspect any property in order to find out the value thereof. Now, the necessary provision has been made in this clause that in the rules it would be prescribed at what

reasonable times the inspector may go and inspect the property. I suggest, Sir, that the rules should also prescribe that before the inspector goes to inspect the property he should give due notice of his intention to do so to the occupier of the property. This, I submit, is very necessary. I should think that even ordinarily a notice would be given to the occupier of the property, but then since it has not been mentioned in this clause, I would like that it might be mentioned herein or failing that it should be seen that in the rules which are prescribed by the Central Government it might also be specifically prescribed that the inspector before going to inspect the property shall give due notice of his intention to do so that if there are any *purdah-nashin* ladies in the house, they might withdraw to some particular portion of the house and no unnecessary harassment may be caused to the occupier. This is my simple amendment.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M. C. SHAN): Sir, I cannot accept the amendment, but I assure the hon. Member and the House that this will be included in the rules. These are matters of detail—the time of inspection, giving of notice, etc.—and all these things will be included in the rules and it will be seen that no harassment is caused to the assessee, that is, their heirs.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press your amendment, Mr. Kapoor?

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: I would beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 41 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 41 was added to the Bill.