

Saturday, December 3, 1955

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

**VOLUME VII, 1955**

(21st November to 23rd December, 1955)



**ELEVENTH SESSION, 1955**

(Vol. VII contains Nos. 1 to 26)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

## CONTENTS

*Volume VII—From 21st November to 23rd December, 1955.*

	<b>COLUMNS</b>
<b>No. 1—Monday, 21st November, 1955</b>	
Members Sworn. . . . .	I
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 1 to 3, 5 to 25, 28, 29, 31 and 32 . . . . .	1—30
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 4, 26, 27, 30, 33 to 45 . . . . .	30—36
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1 to 24 . . . . .	36—46
Daily Digest . . . . .	47—50
<b>No. 2—Tuesday, 22nd November, 1955.</b>	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 46 to 51, 53 to 63, 65 to 69, 71, 72, 74 and 75 . . . . .	51—81
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 73, 76 to 83, 85 to 91 and 93 to 97 . . . . .	81—91
Unstarred Questions Nos. 25 to 54 . . . . .	91—104
Daily Digest . . . . .	105—08
<b>No. 3—Wednesday, 23rd November, 1955.</b>	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 98 to 105, 108, 136, 107, 109 to 111, 113, 117 to 122, 124 to 126, 128 . . . . .	109—36
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 106, 112, 114 to 116, 127, 129 to 135, 137 to 147 . . . . .	136—46
Unstarred Questions Nos. 55 to 68 and 70 . . . . .	146—54
Daily Digest . . . . .	155—56
<b>No. 4—Thursday, 24th November, 1955.</b>	
Oral Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 148 to 161, 163, 164, 167 to 170, 172, 174, 176 to 183, 185, 187 and 189 . . . . .	157—90
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 165, 175, 184, 190, 192 and 193 . . . . .	190—93
Unstarred Questions Nos. 71 to 81 and 83 to 90 . . . . .	192—202
Daily Digest . . . . .	203—04

No. 5—*Friday, 25th November, 1955.*

COLUMNS

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 194 to 196, 198, 199, 201, 204 to 206, 209 to 217, 220 to 225 . . . . .	205—34
--	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 197, 200, 203, 207, 208, 218, 219, 226 to 240 . . . . .	234—43
--	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 92 to 126 . . . . .	243—60
--	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	261—64
------------------------	--------

No. 6—*Monday, 28th November, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 242 to 246, 251, 252, 256, 258, 260, 262 to 264, 266, 269, 241, 247, 253, 257, 259, 261, 265, 267, 248, 255 and 249 . . . . .	265—94
--	--------

Short Notice Question No. 1 . . . . .	294—99
---------------------------------------	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 250, 254 and 268 . . . . .	299—300
---	---------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 127 to 148 . . . . .	300—10
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	311—12
------------------------	--------

No. 7—*Wednesday, 30th November, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 270, 271, 273 to 276, 278, 284, 279, 282, 283, 285 to 295, 297 to 301 . . . . .	313—42
--	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 272, 277, 280, 281, 296, 303 to 310 and 312 . . . . .	342—48
--	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 149 to 170 . . . . .	348—56
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	357—58
------------------------	--------

No. 8—*Thursday, 1st December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 313, 315 to 317, 319, 320, 322 to 324, 327 to 330, 332 to 336, 338, 339, 341 to 343, 345 to 347 and 349 to 352 . . . . .	359—92
---	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 314, 318, 321, 325, 326, 331, 337, 340, 344, 348 and 354 to 377 . . . . .	392—405
--	---------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 171 to 173 and 175 to 216 . . . . .	405—28
--	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	429—32
------------------------	--------

No. 9—*Friday, 2nd December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 378 to 381, 383, 385, 387 to 389, 391, 392, 394 to 399, 401, 403, 404, 406, 407, 409 to 415 . . . . .	433—63
--	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 382, 384, 386, 390, 393, 400, 402, 405, 408, 416 to 426 and 123	464—70
Unstarred Questions Nos. 217 to 237	470—80
Daily Digest	481—84

No. 10—*Saturday, 3rd December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 427 to 429, 431, 433 to 436, 439, 443, 444, 446 to 451, 454, 455 and 476	485—513
--	---------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 430, 432, 437, 438, 440 to 442, 445, 452, 453, 456 to 475, 477 to 484, 171, 188 and 191	513—29
Unstarred Questions Nos. 238 to 263	529—40
Daily Digest	541—44

No. 11—*Monday, 5th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 485, 488, 490 to 492, 494, 495, 497 to 501, 504 to 506, 512, 514 to 516, 518, 521, 522, 525, 530, 526	545—75
---	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 487, 489, 493, 496, 502, 503, 507 to 511, 513, 519, 520, 524, 527, 528, 529, 531 to 537	575—84
Unstarred Questions Nos. 264 to 307	584—606
Daily Digest	607—10

No. 12—*Tuesday, 6th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 538 to 540, 544 to 546, 548, 549, 551, 553, 554, 559 to 563, 565 to 568, 570 to 574, 577 to 583 and 547	611—43
---	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 541, 542, 543, 550, 552, 555, 556 to 558, 564, 569, 575, 576	643—47
Unstarred Questions Nos. 308 to 332	648—60
Daily Digest	661—64

No. 13—*Wednesday, 7th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 584 to 587, 589 to 598, 600 to 604 and 606	665—93
Short Notice Question No. 2	693—94

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 588, 599, 605, 607 to 630 and 302	694—706
Unstarred Questions Nos. 333 to 362	706—18

Daily Digest	719—22
--------------	--------

No. 14—*Thursday, 8th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 631, 632, 634, 635, 637, 639 to 641, 643 to 645, 647 to 649, 651, 653 to 659, 661, 663, 664, 681, 666, 668 and 669 . . . . .	723—54
--	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 633, 636, 638, 642, 646, 650, 652, 660, 662, 665, 667, 670 to 680, 682 to 687 . . . . .	755—65
---	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 363 to 397 . . . . .	765—84
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	785—88
------------------------	--------

No. 15—*Friday, 9th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 688 to 690, 692, 694 to 697, 699, 701, 703, 705 to 708, 711 to 713, 715 to 719, 698 and 702 . . . . .	789—818
---	---------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 691, 693, 700, 704, 709, 710 and 714 . . . . .	818—20
---	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 398 to 420 . . . . .	820—30
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	831—32
------------------------	--------

No. 16—*Monday, 12th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 721, 722, 725 to 732, 734, 738 to 740, 743 to 746, 748 to 750, 724, 735 and 723 . . . . .	833—61
---	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 720, 733, 736, 737, 741, 742 and 747 . . . . .	861—64
---	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 421 to 440 . . . . .	864—74
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	875—76
------------------------	--------

No. 17—*Tuesday, 13th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 752 to 761, 764 to 773, 775, 779, 780, 784 to 786, 788, 789 . . . . .	877—906
---	---------

Short Notice Question No. 3 . . . . .	907—08
---------------------------------------	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 751, 762, 770-A, 774, 776, 777, 778, 781 to 783, 790, 791 to 805 and 807 . . . . .	908—20
--	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 441 to 489 . . . . .	920—40
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	941—44
------------------------	--------

No. 18—*Wednesday, 14th December, 1955.*

## Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 808, 809, 815 to 817, 820, 824, 825, 828 to 832, 834 to 836, 838, 844, 842, 823 and 827 . . . . .	945—68
---	--------

## Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 810, 811, 813, 818, 819, 821, 822, 826, 833 and 837 . . . . .	968—72
--	--------

Unstarred Questions Nos. 490 to 522 . . . . .	973—90
---	--------

Daily Digest . . . . .	991—94
------------------------	--------

No. 19—*Thursday, 15th December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 840, 844 to 848, 850, 853 to 856, 858, 859, 861, 862, 864,  
865, 867, 871, 873, 874, 876, 878 to 880-A . . . . . 995—1024

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 839, 841 to 843, 849, 851, 852, 857, 860, 863, 866, 868  
to 870, 872, 875, 877, 881 to 899 and 173 . . . . . 1024—34

Unstarred Questions Nos. 523 to 561 . . . . . 1035—52

Daily Digest . . . . . 1053—56

No. 20—*Friday, 16th December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 891, 893, 894, 896, 897, 899 to 905, 911 to 913, 915,  
917, 919, 921 to 925, 927 to 931, 933, 935 to 940 . . . . . 1057—90

Short Notice Question No. 4 . . . . . 1090—92

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 890, 892, 895, 898, 906 to 910, 914, 916, 918, 920, 926,  
932, 934 . . . . . 1092—99

Unstarred Questions Nos. 562 to 627 . . . . . 1099—1136

Daily Digest . . . . . 1137—40

No. 21—*Saturday, 17th December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

**SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS**

Short Notice Question No. 5 . . . . . 1141—44

Daily Digest . . . . . 1145—46

No. 22—*Monday, 19th December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 944, 943, 945 to 948, 950, 951, 953 to 955, 957 to 959,  
961, 962, 964, 967, 969 to 971, 973, 975 . . . . . 1147—76

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 941, 942, 949, 952, 956, 960, 963, 965, 966, 968, 972, 974,  
976, 977, 978 and 979 . . . . . 1176—83

Unstarred Questions Nos. 628 to 655 and 657 to 666 . . . . . 1183—1200

Daily Digest . . . . . 1201—04

No. 23—*Tuesday, 20th December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 980 to 984, 986 to 988, 990 to 998, 1000, 1002 to 1011 . . . . . 1205—35

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 985, 989, 999, 1001, 1012 to 1044 . . . . . 1235—52

Unstarred Questions Nos. 667 to 714 and 716 to 723 . . . . . 1252—74

Daily Digest . . . . . 1275—78

No. 24—*Wednesday, 21st December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1045 to 1051, 1055, 1057, 1059, 1061 to 1067, 1070 to 1072,  
353, 1074, 1075, 1077, 1078, 1106, 1079 to 1085 . . . . . 1279—1311

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1053, 1054, 1056, 1058, 1060, 1068, 1069, 1073, 1076, 1086 to  
1105, 1107 to 1119, 517 . . . . . 1311—28

Unstarred Questions Nos. 724 to 825, 825-A, 826 to 845, 845-A, 846 to 863 . . . . . 1328—94

Daily Digest . . . . . 1395—1402

No. 25—*Thursday, 22nd December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1120 to 1125, 1127 to 1136, 1139 to 1151 . . . 1403—35

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1126, 1137, 1138, 1152 to 1162 . . . 1435—40

Unstarred Questions Nos. 864 to 914, 916 to 934 and 934-A . . . 1440—70

Daily Digest . . . . .

No. 26—*Friday, 23rd December, 1955.*

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1163, 1164, 1168, 1170, 1172 to 1183, 1185 to 1190, 1193 to 1195 . . . . . 1425—1505

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS—

Short Notice Questions Nos. 6 and 7 . . . . . 1505—08

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 1165 to 1167, 1169, 1171, 1184, 1191, 1192, 1196 to 1207 . . . . . 1508—17

Unstarred Questions Nos. 935 to 995, 995-A, 996 to 1012 and 1014 . . . . . 1517—54

Daily Digest . . . . .

INDEX . . . . .

1—257

— — — — —

485

## LOK SABHA

Saturday, 3rd December 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

## ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Chanakya Puri

**\*427. Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to refer to the reply given to unstarred question No. 550 on the 23rd August, 1955 and State:

(a) the present position with regard to progress of work in the construction of Chanakya Puri (Diplomatic Enclave).

(b) whether the work is proceeding according to schedule; and

(c) the names of foreign embassies which have so far acquired plots in that area?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** (a) The entire area of Chanakya Puri covering about 900 acres has been fully developed and provided with services with the exception of a patch of rocky area of about 92 acres which is being cut and levelled down.

19 plots have been sold to Foreign Missions, out of which 6 have commenced construction.

In the private sector comprising 185 plots, construction on 89 plots has been completed by their owners.

(b) Yes, Sir; so far as the Central Public Works Department is concerned. But the construction work being done by the Foreign Missions and private individuals on their own plots is not progressing as rapidly as it was expected.

(c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 36].

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** May I know whether there has been any increase in the estimated expenditure over this project, and if so, what is the extent of increase?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** I have not got the exact figures with me at the moment, but I do not think there has been any appreciable increase in the expenditure as compared to the original estimate.

407 L.S.D.—1.

486

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** May I know what is the total expenditure so far, and the extent of recovery so far?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** I would require notice. But I think these figures were given on an earlier occasion in the Lok Sabha.

**Shri B. K. Das:** What is the total cost of the outlay?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** That is repeating the same question.

## Modern Shopping Centres in Delhi

**\*428. Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a scheme for the construction in Delhi of modern shopping centres with shops-cum-flats has been approved;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the location of the centres; and

(c) the estimated cost of the scheme and the manner of its financing?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** (a) to (c). A proposal to construct shop-cum-flats in the newly developed residential colonies for Central Government employees is under consideration in this Ministry. The proposal envisages that the expenditure on construction should be, initially, borne by the Central Government, but would, subsequently, be recoverable from the New Delhi Municipal Committee whose responsibility it is to provide shopping centres.

As to the number of shops-cum-flats proposed to be constructed, their location and expenditure involved, a statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 37].

**Shri Radha Raman:** May I know when this proposal is going to be implemented and when construction is actually going to start?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** It will take some time before the construction actually starts.

**Shri Radha Raman:** May I know to whom these shop-cum-flats, when constructed, will be allotted, and what will be the procedure—whether they will be sold or rented?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** At the moment, the proposal is to rent them out and not to sell them. But if there is a good prospect of the prospective owners being able to build themselves it could also be considered as to whether the plots could not be leased out.

**Shri Radha Raman:** May I know whether in renting them, there will be any discrimination or consideration with regard to displaced persons and non-displaced persons?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** These shop-cum-flat units which are proposed to be constructed are in the general pool and not in the rehabilitation pool. Therefore there is not going to be any preferential treatment in the matter of their allotment so far as refugees are concerned.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** Since the Minister has said that the money spent on this will be recovered from the N.D.M.C. may I know what will be the procedure, whether they will hand over the flats as soon as they are constructed to the Municipality and they will recover the amount slowly as they get the rent, or whether the allotment, realisation of rent and all administrative things will continue to be done by the Government till such time as the Municipality find the capital for that?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** As I have already said, Government are coming in because the finances of the New Delhi Municipality Committee are not enough to start a project of this type. The proposal is to hand them over to the New Delhi Municipal Committee as they are completed. It is doubtful if they will be able to pay the entire expenditure in lump sum, and this will have to be recovered by instalments.

**Shri Radha Raman:** Have Government taken any decision with regard to the basis on which these shop-cum-flats will be rented?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** No, Sir; not yet.

दिल्ली में नया होटल

\*४२६. { श्री अमर सिंह डामर :  
श्री डामी :

क्या निर्माण, आवास और संभरण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि नावानगर के बाम साहब सरकार के सहयोग से दिल्ली में आधुनिक ढंग का एक बड़ा होटल खोलने वाले हैं; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसके तथ्य क्या हैं?

**निर्माण आवास और संभरण मंत्री (सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह) :** (क) और (ख). चाणक्यपुरी में अशोक होटेल्स लिमिटेड नाम की लोक सीमित कम्पनी (Public Limited Company) एक होटल बना रही है यह कम्पनी सरकार व नावानगर के जाम साहब के पारस्परिक सहयोग से स्थापित की गई है?

**श्री अमर सिंह डामर :** क्या में जान सकता हूं कि इस प्रकार के होटलों के खोलने के पीछे क्या उद्देश्य है?

**सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह :** लोगों के रहने के लिये जगह मुहूर्या करना, यही इसका आवजेक हो सकता है।

**श्री एम० एल० हिंदेंदी :** मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस होटल में जाम साहब के सम्मिलित होने के सम्बन्ध में क्या उनसे कोई बातचीत सरकार की तरफ से शुरू की गयी थी या उनकी तरफ से शुरू की गयी थी। और दूसरे लोगों को इस में सम्मिलित क्यों नहीं किया गया?

**सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह :** वह तो पब्लिक लिमिटेड कम्पनी है। जिसका दिल चाहे उसके हिस्से खरीद सकता है।

**प्रधान मंत्री तथा बैंकेश्वर कार्य मंत्री (श्री अब्दाहरलाल नेहरू) :** इस बात में गवर्नरमेंट को बहुत दिनों से दिलचस्पी है कि यहां कोई माकूल इन्तजाम ठहरने का हो। आजकल इस मामले में बड़ी परेशानियां हैं। आप जानते हैं कि आजकल बहुत सी कान-फरेंसेज़, कमेटीज़ वर्गीकृत होती रहती हैं। चुनावे गवर्नरमेंट ने इधर उधर के मुल्कों से पूछताछ की, पैसे के लिए नहीं, बल्कि इसलिये कि इस काम में जानकार लोग मदद करें। स्थान यह था कि इस काम को गवर्नरमेंट ही करे। किर इस सिलसिले में और लोगों से

वातें हुई जिनमें जाम साहब भी थे और यह तै हुआ कि यह हिन्दुस्तानी कम्पनी हो जिसमें हिन्दुस्तान का कंट्रोल हो, जिसमें गवर्नर्मेंट का भी कुछ इप्या लगे और गवर्नर्मेंट का भी इसके इन्तजाम में कुछ दखल हो। चुनाव यह मिली जुली कम्पनी बनायी गयी। उसमें जाम साहब का नाम आया है, लेकिन उसमें जाम साहब का जावें का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं होगा। मतलब यह कि वह खुद बोर्ड और डाइरेक्टर्स में नहीं होंगे। उनकी हूसरी हैसियत भी है, इसलिये यह मुनासिब नहीं समझा गया कि उनकी दोनों हैसियतों को मिलाया जाय। लेकिन भशविरा जरूर उन से किया गया था।

**श्री हेड़ा :** शूरू में कितने कमरों का इन्तजाम इस होटल में होगा?

**सरदार स्वराण सिंह :** ३५० की उम्मीद है।

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** What percentage of shares is being controlled by Government and what percentage is in the possession of the Jam Saheb?

**Sardar Swaran Singh:** Government are proposing to have 2600 'A' class preference shares of the value of Rs. 26 lakhs, out of a total capital of Rs. 1 crore.

**Shri Shree Narayan Dass :** May I know whether Government are going to advance any loan to this company also? If so what is the amount?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker :** All these questions were put on a prior occasion.

**Sardar Swaran Singh :** These were discussed at the time of supplementary demands.

#### Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose

\*431. **Shri Gidwani:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Government are considering the question of setting up a committee to enquire into the circumstances of the death of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Government have decided to send some persons to Japan to investigate into the circumstances relating to the death of Shri Subhash Chandra Bose. The

Japanese Government has been consulted, and they have promised us full cooperation in the enquiry.

**Shri Gidwani:** Who will be the members of the Committee?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru :** It is proposed to send three persons, one of them being a representative of the West Bengal Government, and two others; as we have not obtained the permission of those persons it would not perhaps be fair to mention their names.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh :** May I know whether those persons will also be requested to visit Formosa where this accident occurred?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** No, they will not be so requested. To begin with, there are various difficulties in the way. We cannot visit a place without the co-operation of the Government of that place. Secondly, in effect, if the hon. Member will see, there will not be much purpose in visiting there, because all the so-called evidence, witnesses etc., are likely to be in Japan, if they survive. It is a military airfield and all the Japanese have been sent away from Formosa long ago. So all the persons are really in Japan—those who can be approached. Merely seeing the airfield will not convey any information or help.

**Shri Kamath:** May I know if the attention of the Prime Minister has been drawn to a photograph published in a section of the Bengal Press some two months ago or a little later, reported to have been taken in Peking in May 1952 and published originally by the Workers' Press in Peking? Has he received a copy of this photograph? I will place it on the Table of the House or pass it on to you or to him. May I know if a person in that photograph bears a striking resemblance to Netaji or is it merely a double as doubles are; and may I know whether this would be placed before the Committee of Enquiry?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I have seen that photograph published in the newspapers. Personally I do not attach much importance to a vague possible resemblance. There are so many vague possible resemblances in such matters. I do not think it is a matter which is of very serious consequence; but all these facts would be considered, naturally, whatever they are.

**Shri Kamath:** Has our Embassy in Tokyo been asked to informally or officially contact or consult the Japanese Government as to whether they will associate themselves with this Committee of Enquiry in an Indo-Japanese Commission so as to through enquiry into this matter?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** If I may read the second sentence of my answer, it says:

"The Japanese Government have been consulted, and they have promised us full co-operation in the enquiry."

**Shri Kamath:** Will that be an Indo-Japanese Commission of Enquiry or what?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know about it. This raises matters of procedure. The point is that they are fully co-operating in this.

**श्री एम० एल० हिंदूदी:** इस बात में कितनी सच्चाई है कि जापानी सरकार ने भी इस सम्बन्ध में एक एनक्वायरी कराई थी और क्या भारत सरकार को इस बारे में उन्होंने कोई सूचना दी है?

**श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू:** मैं इसका ठीक जवाब नहीं दे सकता। मुझे तो ख्याल होता है कि उन्होंने कुछ एक निजी तौर पर तहकीकात कराई थी, किन्तु जाने से हमें उसकी कोई सूचना नहीं दी थी।

#### Caustic Soda and Soda Ash

**\*433. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to unstarred question No. 317 on the 15th September, 1955 in the Rajya Sabha and state at what stage the negotiations with China for the import of a Caustic Soda and Soda Ash stand at present?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** We are importing 5,000 tons of Soda Ash from China during the current half year. The Chinese Government did not make any firm offer for the supply of Caustic Soda.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** How does the price of these 5000 tons of Soda Ash, which is being imported from China, compare with that imported from other countries?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What percentage does it bear to the entire import?

**Shri Karmarkar:** It is about half; the total requirements have been estimated at 10,000 tons and it is, 5,000 tons.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** My question is how does the price compare with the price of the imported Soda Ash from other countries.

**Shri Karmarkar:** The prices are about the same, £17 per ton.

**श्री अंसोलाल:** क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि सांभर साल्ट में साल्ट विट्टन् स में साल्ट बहुत बड़ी तादाद में पाये जाते हैं और उनसे कास्टिक सोडा काफ़ी मात्रा में बनाया जा सकता है?

**श्री करमरकर:** मुझे इसका इत्यं नहीं है। ऐसा संभव हो सकता है। मुझे इसके लिए नोटिस चाहिये।

#### Coal

**\*434. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) how the target of 60m. tons of coal at the end of the Second Five Year Plan has been worked out;

(b) the quantity allocated to the private sector;

(c) the production per year at present from the State collieries;

(d) the improvements made or envisaged in the existing State collieries;

(e) whether any washeries have been established for State collieries to improve the quality of coal; and

(f) the number of new collieries which are expected to be established in the near future both in the private and public sectors?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) The target has been worked out taking into account the coal requirements of the Railways, of the existing industries, the expansion schemes of existing industries under consideration and the new industries likely to be set up during the Second Five Year Plan period.

(b) About eight million tons per annum over and above the present production in that sector.

(c) About 3 million tons in Central Govt. collieries. Production in Singareni collieries owned mainly by Hyderabad State is about 1.5 million tons.

(d) Two statements are laid on the Table of the House showing (1) the development schemes already sanctioned and (2) the schemes proposed to be taken up during the Second Five Year Plan period, to improve the working of the existing States Collieries. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 38].

(e) No coal washeries have actually been set up. Government have decided to set up a washery at Bokaro/Kargali Collieries and tenders received in this connection are now under scrutiny.

(f) Government's scheme is to establish new collieries in Korba, Karanpur, Central India and in Raniganj areas. It is difficult at present to give an indication of the actual number of new Collieries expected to be established. The private sector is expected to increase the production from existing mines and immediately contiguous areas and not from entirely new collieries.

**Shri S. C. Samanta** : May I know whether private producers were invited to the meeting in Delhi recently and if so, what were their reactions about the future production of India?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : Several discussions have taken place with the representatives of the local industry and by and large it may be said that they are in agreement with the proposals that are made by Government. At one stage, they said that they wanted to produce more in the private sector. Ultimately, Government have fixed 8 million tons for additional production in the private sector.

**Shri S. C. Samanta** : May I know if this 60 million tons of coal production per year can be decreased if sufficient washeries are established in the country? If so, what steps have Government taken to establish washeries by themselves or by the private sector?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : I have already indicated the steps taken by Government with regard to the establishment of washeries. The proposal of the Washerries Committee was to wash all the coal that is produced in the country but it has to be done in stages. But, I do not think it will be possible to decrease the targetted production of coal because of the possibility of the establishment of washeries.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao** : May I know whether this additional 8 million tons that is to be produced from the private sector will be from the existing collieries or from new mines which will be opened? If it is the latter, is it not necessary that we should modify the International Policy statement of 1949?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : I have already answered that question. I have said it specifically in answer to part (f) that—

"The private sector is expected to increase the production from existing mines and immediately contiguous areas and not from entirely new collieries."

**Shri Sarangadhar Das** : May I know if in estimating the increased production in the private sector the fact that there are certain collieries which are not fully exploited or are being reserved for future exploitation is taken into consideration? Have Government taken any steps to bring them in line with production immediately?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : In fact, that fact has also been kept in view. Discussions have taken place about these matters in detail with the representatives of the coal industry only last month on the 23rd; and the representatives of the coal industry have been asked to give their proposals with regard to the production of this additional quantity of 8 million tons in the private sector. These detailed proposals are expected to be received in about two months' time. The fact mentioned by the hon. Member will be kept in view by the representatives of the coal industry and also the Government.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad** : May I know if there is sufficient number of personnel, managerial or otherwise, available in the country to achieve the target of 60 million tons at the end of the Second Five Year Plan? If not, what attempts have been made by Government to train the personnel?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : That is a separate question at the most which is shortly going to be taken up. But, generally, I can answer that this very important aspect is borne in mind both by the Planning Commission and the Government, and steps are being taken to provide the necessary personnel for this increased production of coal during the Second Five Year Plan.

**Shri S. C. Samanta** : Is Government aware that there is a fear in the minds of the private sector that collieries will be nationalised and so the private sector is not establishing machinery to improve the quality of coal? If so, what has been done to allay this fear?

**Shri K. C. Reddy** : I do not think there is any fear of that kind in the mind of the coal industry. With regard to increasing production in the private sector, assurance will be given to the coal industry that whatever investments they may make hereafter for increasing the

production of coal will be paid in full by the Government in the event of nationalisation subject only to depreciation.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** The Indian Mining Association have demanded from the Government an assurance that the coal mines would not be nationalised for the next 20 or 30 years.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We are going away from one point to another. How does it arise out of this question?

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** If they want to increase the production.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I allowed one stray question. Whether it will be nationalised or not does not arise here.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I was submitting that production in that case will be impeded.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Many things may impede production. I am not going to allow such broad questions of policy to be raised by way of a supplementary question. Next question.

#### Compensation for Damages

\*435. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether the Pakistan Government have paid any compensation for the loss of life and property of Indian nationals by raids of Pakistani nationals or Armed Police on Indian territories since 1950?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** No, Sir.

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** May I know the number of persons killed and the value of cattle and goods lost by Indian nationals?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda:** There are innumerable such raids and it is very difficult for me standing here to give all the detailed information. If a separate question is put, I shall try to answer it, but questions were put by several Members previously and we have supplied all information we had.

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** May I know whether the compensation which the Government of India asked in respect of the persons killed at Nekowal has been paid or not?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda:** The compensation asked for has not yet been paid, but I may mention that on the seventh instant there is a separate question about it.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** The hon. Deputy Minister in reply to the original question stated that the Pakistan Government had not so far paid any compensation to the dependants of the persons killed. May I know whether the negotiations are still going on in regard to that?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** "By negotiations" is meant that we have sent a letter to which we have not received a reply.

**Shri M. L. Agrawal:** May I know what the Pakistan Government say in regard to the Nekowal incidents?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Speaking from memory, I think we have written three letters, apart from oral approaches made to the Pakistan Government—three long documents. After considerable delay, the first two elicited.

**Shri Kamath:** An acknowledgement.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** An answer. The last one did not accept our statement of the facts and certainly did not accept their liability to pay compensation. Thereupon we sent them again a long communication detailing all the facts and the circumstances and also raising the question of compensation. To that, which was sent some considerable time ago, maybe two or three months ago, we have had no answer yet. There the matter stands.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das** rose—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** We have not been able to receive an answer so far from the Pakistan Government and so what can be done? Next question.

#### All India Radio

\*436. **Shri Dabhi:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to refer to the reply given to starred question No. 321 on the 2nd August, 1955 and state whether Government have since communicated to the Estimates Committee their views on the recommendations made by the Committee in their Twelfth Report?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** Our views are being finalised and will be communicated shortly to the Estimates Committee.

**Shri Dabhi:** May I know how long it will take further?

**Shri Karmarkar:** There were in all as many as 92 recommendations and we asked for a report from the Director-General, All India Radio, and his suggestions have already been received. Action on most of the recommendations has been completed and action on the remaining few is expected to be completed shortly.

**Shri Dabhi** : May I know on which recommendations action is yet to be completed?

**Shri Karmarkar** : I should like to have notice.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi** : How many recommendations have been accepted and how many rejected?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker** : I think they may be placed on the Table.

**Shri Karmarkar** : When the matter is finalised, it will be ripe for questions to be asked.

#### Indian Settlers Overseas

\*439. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Lands of the Indian Settlers in Southern Sinkiang were confiscated;

(b) whether the Government of India had demanded the restoration or compensation of the land; and

(c) if so, the result thereof?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda)** : (a) In 1938, the Provincial Government of Sinkiang, by an order, directed their Administrative Commissioner to devise means to reacquire the immovable property of the then British Indian subjects in Sinkiang. As a result between 1938 and 1940, British Indian traders were forced to sell their lands and houses for a nominal price to minor officials of the Sinkiang Provincial Government.

(b) and (c). The demand for the restoration of the property was made in 1939 by the then Government of India through the U.K. Consul-General at Kashgar. It was pressed repeatedly, but there was no response from the Sinkiang Provincial Government. In June 1948, this matter was taken up by the Indian Ambassador at Nanking with the then Chinese Government, as a result of which the Provincial Government of Sinkiang announced that it would entertain claims for compensation. The final reply about the acceptance of the claims had not been received when the Government changed in China. The Government of India then took up this matter with the Government of the People's Republic of China through the Chinese Ambassador here, and the matter is still under negotiation.

**Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : May I know the total acreage of lands confiscated?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : I am afraid am unable to give this information, but is complicated by the fact that some of

the British-Indian nationals of those days happen to be Pakistanis also.

**Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : What is the total amount of compensation claimed?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : I am afraid I have not got the information.

**Shri Krishnacharya Joshi** : May I know the population of Indians in Sinkiang?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : I was in Sinkiang some time ago and when I made this enquiry there, I was told that there were only three people of Indian origin, but they have all acquired Chinese nationality.

**Shri Kamath** : The changeover in China took place, I believe, in 1949 and I heard the Deputy Minister to say that the matter was taken up with the new Chinese Government soon after that. Am I to understand that the matter was taken up in 1950 and that it is still pending?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : The matter is still under negotiation with that Government.

**Shri Kamath** : During the last few years, have not our Government taken this matter up at governmental level or other levels and was this matter not discussed on any of these occasions?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : This is a complicated issue because the question of nationality is involved as many of the persons concerned are Pakistanis.

**श्री कमल दर्शन** : क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि पिछले दिनों जब भारतीय सांस्कृतिक मंडल के नेता के रूप में हमारे माननीय वैदेशिक कार्य उपमंत्री सिक्यांग गये थे तो क्या इस परिस्थिति के सम्बन्ध में भी वहां के अधिकारियों से वारालाप हुआ था, और यदि हुआ था, तो उसका क्या परिणाम निकला ?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : I was there not in my capacity as the Deputy Minister of External Affairs of this country; I was only leading a cultural delegation and obviously I could not get involved in a political question of this nature.

**Shri Kasliwal** : I understand that the Sinkiang Province which had been closed by the Chinese Government has been re-opened. May I know whether there is any ban against Indian traders going to Sinkiang ?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda** : There is no ban, but there are no Indian traders in that area.

**Multi-purpose Institute of Technology**

**\*443. Shri Jhulan Sinha:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 473 on the 5th August, 1955, and state whether the grant sanctioned to the Bihar State for the setting up of a Multi-purpose Institute of Technology for Small Scale Industries at Sindri has been availed of by the State Government?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** Yes, Sir; a grant of Rs. 1,03,540/- has been accepted by the State Government.

**Shri Jhulan Sinha:** May I know how far the State Government has gone ahead with this grant or their own resources with regard to this scheme?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The States from their own resources will have to provide the extent of an equal amount.

**Shri Jhulan Sinha:** I want to know the progress made in the execution of this scheme?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The grant has been credited to the State Government's account only in June, 1955, and it is too early for me to call for a progress report.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** May I know what is the scope of this Multi-purpose Institute of Technology?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The scope is as wide as the nomenclature indicates.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** What are the purposes for which this institute has been set up?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It is a question of training people in different jobs and it does not necessarily mean one particular purpose. For example, there is glass engineering as the name will indicate. There are several branches of engineering works for which we need trained personnel.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** May I know whether the Institute of Technology for which this was given has been established because the grant was given in June, 1955? I want to know what is the position today.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** As I said, the grant was given in June and I have not yet got any time to ask for a report on the progress made. Actually, the hon. Member will understand, we wanted to set up a branch institute of our

own Institute which we have in Howrah. It was represented to us by the Bihar Government that it would be much better to start a multi-purpose institute of technology along with the Sindri college where they have got certain facilities and we finally agreed to allow them to do so. It is only three months since we gave the grant and, as I said, I have not yet called for a report in regard to that.

**नाहन फाउंडरी लिमिटेड**

**\*४४४. श्री भरत दश्मनः** क्या लोहा और इस्पात मंत्री १६ अगस्त, १९५५ को दिये गये तारांकित प्रश्न संस्था ६२६ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) नाहन फाउंडरी लिमिटेड के मामलों की जांच करने के लिये जो समिति कुछ दिन हुए नियुक्त की गई थी क्या उसने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी है;

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो क्या उसकी एक प्रति सभा के टेबल पर रखी जायगी; और

(ग) समिति की सिफारिशों पर इब तक क्या कार्यवाही की गई है?

**वाणिज्य और उद्योग तथा लोहा और इस्पात मंत्री (श्री दी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी):**

(क) जी, हाँ।

(ख) और (ग). समिति की रिपोर्ट पर विचार किया जा रहा है। रिपोर्ट पर सरकार जब कोई कार्यवाही कर लेगी, उसी के बाद उसकी एक प्रति सभा का टेबल पर रखने के प्रश्न पर विचार किया जायेगा।

**श्री भरत दश्मनः** क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि जब से इस कमेटी की स्थापना की गई थी तब से नाहन फाउंडरी की स्थिति में क्या कोई सुधार हुआ है या अभी भी वहाँ क्षगड़े चल रहे हैं?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I am afraid that the dispute in this particular industrial unit is endemic and there is no end to it.

बी भवत दृष्टिन : क्या यह सत्य है कि जो जांच समिति थी उसने यह सिफारिश की है कि वहाँ के लगड़ों का सब से बड़ा कारण यह है कि उनमें मैनेजर या इंजीनियर के हाथ का होना है । तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस लगड़े का कोई दूरकालीन हल नहीं निकल भाता, तब तक क्या सरकार अधिकारियों के लियाँ कोई कार्यवाही करने का विचार कर रही है ?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** That is only a suggestion for action.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** May I know whether there is one report or two reports and when the report or reports were submitted to the Ministry and for how long it has been that they have been considering that report ?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I am not in a position to reveal to my hon. friend, until I place the report on the Table of the House, if there are any differences in the report. The report was submitted to us a month back. So far as the duration, we require to finalise our arrangement and issue a Government resolution on the report concerned, I am afraid the problems are so difficult that I am not able to give a time-schedule.

#### Mill Cloth

**\*446. Shri R. N. Singh:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state :

(a) whether any proposal to fix a ceiling on the production of Mill cloth is under the consideration of Government;

(b) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the proceedings of the recent meeting of the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board, in which they have requested the Government for fixing the limit; and

(c) if so, the views of Government in the matter?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) to (c). For some years past Government have not been allowing any appreciable increase in the loomage in the mill sector with a view to help the handloom industry. During this period Government set up a Textile Enquiry Committee which *inter alia* made certain recommendations in this respect. Since then, there have been several recommendations on this subject by various bodies. Planning Com-

mission had considered the question in relation to the supply and demand for cloth during the Second Five Year Plan and the employment potential it will release but they have not reached any conclusion. Government have not yet taken up this matter for consideration.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. The hon. Minister for Production is here in the House. May I know why.....

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** It was changed.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** May I know whether it is a fact that while on the one hand the recommendations made in the report of the Karve Committee are under examination free licensing is being made in respect of mill spindles so that it may impede the effect of the Karve Committee's report in giving employment to the millions of our people?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I do not accept the premises of this question.

**Shri Radha Raman:** May I know whether there is any truth in the speech reported recently saying that the Minister for Commerce and Industry has kept an Amber Charkha in his House to be reminded always of the impediments in the future progress of Khadi?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I do not see how it relates to this question.

**Shri Kasliwal:** May I know whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to certain reports appearing in the press at the time of Diwali that there was an acute shortage of mill cloth at that time?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Well, Sir; we see reports from time to time about shortages occurring and at the present moment the supply position is such that the demand is being met. Whether there is enough stock available either with the mills or the dealers to meet an increased demand is a matter with which at present we are not concerned though we are watching the position.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** This question refers to mill cloth. Some time back it was announced that it is the policy of the Government not to allow power looms over any mills or separately. May I know whether that is the final conclusion they have arrived at and there is no possibility of a revision of that policy.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I am afraid what my hon. friend read some time back was not correct.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** I have not understood the answer, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The answer is that what the hon. Member says is not correct.

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** May I know whether the attention of the hon. Minister has been drawn to the resolution passed by the A.I.C.C. in the last A.I.C.C. session that there should be a ceiling fixed on the production of mill cloth and whether he has accepted that resolution or has rejected it?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Sir, I happen to be a member of the A.I.C.C. and, therefore, I know that no such resolution was passed.

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** I want to know whether the Minister is in agreement with that resolution or not?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Kamath:** Is it a fact that there has been for some time past an acute or a sub-acute conflict between the Planning Commission and the Industries Minister on this wider issue and, is it a fact that his recent publicly announced conversion to the philosophy of handloom has not led to any concrete change in his policy?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** My friend has a lively imagination. I would certainly not prevent him from indulging in those fantasies that his imagination creates.

**Shri Kamath:** Facts are facts; they will come to light some day.

#### Regional Designing Centres

\*447. **Shri Bibhuti Mishra:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 623 on the 10th August, 1955 and state the progress made so far to set up the four Regional Design centres?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** Administrative approval has been accorded for setting up the Centres and the recruitment of staff is in progress. The Design Centre at Bangalore has already started functioning. A small design Centre has been started in Delhi and the question of developing it into a full-fledged Centre is under examination. Design Centres at Calcutta and Bombay are expected to start functioning shortly.

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** यह जो कलकर्ते का सेंटर है, दिल्ली का सेंटर है और दूसरे जो दो सेंटर हैं, यह चारों डिजाइन सेंटर्स कितने दिनों में प्रक्षीप तरह से काम करने लगेंगे?

**Shri K. C. Reddy:** I have not correctly followed the question. To which centre does the question relate? I cannot give the exact period in which they can start functioning. All I can say is that they are expected to start functioning as early as possible.

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** इनकी स्थापना में सरकार को कितना सच्च करना पड़ा है?

**Shri K. C. Reddy:** Each centre is expected to cost about Rs. 71,000 out of which Rs. 61,000 will be annual recurring expenditure and Rs. 10,000 non-recurring expenditure.

**श्री बिभूति मिश्र :** क्या सरकार इन चार जगहों के प्रलावा और जगहों पर भी इस तरह के डिजाइन सेंटर बनायेगी?

**Shri K. C. Reddy:** The intention of the Handicraft Board is ultimately to start one Design Centre in each State. To begin with, they have proposed to start some regional centres. Four regional centres have been sanctioned, as I said already. The proposal to set up a Design Centre in Uttar Pradesh with its headquarters at Lucknow is also under consideration, and the U.P. Government has been requested to forward a detailed scheme stating the recurring and non-recurring expenditure for the staff required at the centre. After the reply is received, that also will be considered.

#### Jute

\*448. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of jute imported from East Bengal during the current year so far; and

(b) the highest and the lowest price of the imported jute?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) The total quantity of raw jute imported from Pakistan during 1955 (January to 22nd October) was 10.93 lakh bales of 400 lbs. each.

(b) Information is not available as regards the import price. The highest quotation for Pakistan jute (Jat Bottom) in the Calcutta market during 1955 is reported to have been Rs. 42/8/- per maund on the 9th February, 1955, and the lowest Rs. 25/- on the 1st September, 1955.

**Shri B. K. Das:** May I know what quantity of raw jute was imported before the devaluation and what quantity has been imported after the devaluation?

**Shri Kmararkar:** I have not got the figures for those days, but I have got figures for the whole years, 1952 and 1954. In 1952, we imported 1.51 million bales and in 1954-55 1.21 million bales.

**Shri B. K. Das:** May I know whether that quality of jute that is available in India has also been imported from Pakistan, what is the reason for the preference?

**Shri Karmarkar:** The fact is: it is not about the quality but about the quantity required. We anticipate that at the present moment our short fall will be about 1.2 million bales in addition to what we grow. We require this additional quantity and that is why the import is made.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** May I know whether the Government have entered into any agreement with the Pakistan Government regarding the total quantity of raw jute that the Government wants to import from that country during these years and, if so, what is that quantity?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** Any such agreement that we have had in the past, which you may take as being current, is only in regard to licence for import and not actually to import.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury:** What is the total quantity that the Government want to import from other countries during the current year?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** We are not importing any jute from any other country except Pakistan.

#### U.N.O.

**\*449. Shri Kasliwal:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the work of the U.N. Committee on Information from Non-Self-Government territories was proposed to be broadened; and

(b) if so, whether any of the colonial powers gave notice thereupon that they would withdraw from the Committee if such a proposal was accepted?

**The Deputy Minister for External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) Yes. During the discussion of the Report of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, the delegations of Burma, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Thailand submitted a joint amendment which sought to extend the powers of the Committee. Subsequently the sponsors withdrew the amendment and the Fourth Committee adopted a resolution extending the life of that Committee on the same terms of

reference as before for a further period of three years.

(b) Yes. The Administering Powers opposed this amendment and the representative of the United Kingdom declared that if the joint amendment was adopted by the Fourth Committee, this country would not take part in the work of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in future.

**Shri Kasliwal:** May I know whether, after the amendment by these four sponsoring powers had been withdrawn, this item is no longer on the agenda of the U.N. Committee on Information?

**Shri Anil K. Chanda:** I do not understand the question. The Committee has accepted the resolution and had dropped the amendment.

#### भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना

\*४५०. श्री के० सी० सोधिया : क्या सिंचाई और विद्युत मंडी यह बसाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) भाखड़ा नंगल परियोजना से बिजली उत्पन्न करने का अन्तिम लक्ष्य कब तक पूरा हो जायगा; और

(ख) १९५५ के लिए निर्धारित लक्ष्य में से कितनी बिजली उत्पादित की गई है?

**सिंचाई और विद्युत उपर्याप्ति (श्री हाथी) :** (क) २४२४ हजार किलोवाट बिजली पैदा करने वाली दो मशीनों के प्रतिरिक्षत जो इस समय चालू हैं, ६०६० हजार किलोवाट को पांच मशीनों के प्रीर २४२४ हजार किलोवाट की चार मशीनों के १९५६-६० तक चालू होने की संभावना है। बिजली की मांग बढ़ जाने पर जब कभी भी आवश्यकता होगी ६०६० हजार किलोवाट की चार मशीनें भी जोड़ दी जायेंगी।

(ख) अधिष्ठापित धारिता (इन्स्टालेट कैपेसिटी) और निर्धारित लक्ष्य दोनों ४८,००० किलोवाट हैं। जनवरी १९५५ के आरम्भ से नवम्बर १९५५ के प्रत्यत तक ११,७०,३०,००० के० डॉलर० एच० बिजली पैदा की गई।

श्री के० सी० सोविदा॒ : देहातों को इलेक्ट्रिकर्न करने के लिये भी कुछ विजली दी जाती है या नहीं ?

श्री हाथी॑ : जी हाँ, जरूर दी जायेगी ।

श्री के० सी० सोविदा॒ : कितनी लंब्धि हो रही है ?

श्री हाथी॑ : अभी तक तो एक पावर हाउस चल रहा है । उसमें से दस हजार किलोवाट तो दिल्ली को दी जाती है और कुछ भालड़ा प्रोजेक्ट में उपयोग होती है और कुछ पंजाब में उपयोग होती है ।

श्री के० सी० सोविदा॒ : देहाती क्षेत्र में कितनी विजली लंब्धि हो रही है ? क्या देहाती क्षेत्र में भी कुछ विजली दी जाती है ?

श्री हाथी॑ : अभी तक तो नहीं दी जाती है ।

श्रीमती कमलेन्द्र भट्टि शाह॑ : क्या मैं जान सकती हूँ कि भालड़ा बांध पर कितना लंब्धि हुआ है और काम किस तरह से चल रहा है ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : This relates to electric power.

श्री हाथी॑ : इलेक्ट्रिसिटी पर ३३ करोड़ ।

श्री बंसीलाल॑ : क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि राजस्थान में कितनी विजली दी जाती है ?

श्री हाथी॑ : राजस्थान को अभी विजली नहीं दी जाती । जब दूसरा पावर हाउस बन जायेगा तब राजस्थान को विजली दी जायेगी ।

श्री बंसीलाल॑ : राजस्थान को कब तक विजली मिल जायेगी ।

श्री हाथी॑ : १६५६-६० तक ।

सामुदायिक विकास कार्यक्रम

\*४५१. श्री भागवत श्रा आजाद॑ : क्या योजना भंडी यह बताने की हृषा करेंगे कि :

(क) प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में सामुदायिक विकास कार्यक्रम के अधीन निविदा

लक्ष्य में से प्रब तक कितने विकास लंड आरम्भ किये गये हैं; और

(ख) उन विकास लंडों के अधीन कितने गांव कार्यक्रम के प्रन्दर आ गये हैं ?

योजना उपलंब्धी (श्री एस० एन० मिश्न) :

(क) १२०० में से १०३१ लंडों ।

(ख) लगभग १,०६,०५० गांव ।

श्री भागवत श्रा आजाद॑ : प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के समाप्ति काल तक सम्पूर्ण देश के ग्रामों का कौन सा प्रतिशत इन विकास लंडों के अन्तर्गत आ जायेगा ?

श्री एस० एन० मिश्न : इसका लक्ष्य यह रखा गया है कि मूल्क का चौथाई हिस्सा इसके अन्दर आ जायेगा ।

श्री भागवत श्रा आजाद॑ : क्या आप बताता सकते हैं कि जन सहयोग आन्दोलन के अन्तर्गत ग्रामों द्वारा जो सहयोग दी गयी है क्या उसका रूपयों में मूल्यांकन आपके पास है ?

श्री एस० एन० मिश्न : अब साधन या और तरह से जो जन सहयोग प्राप्त हुआ है अगर उसकी कीमत लगायी जाये तो १५.२ करोड़ रुपये के करीब होगी ।

श्री भक्त बांझन॑ : क्या यह सत्य है कि जो विकास लंड खोले जाते हैं उनकी मियाद केवल तीन वर्ष होती है, जब कि व्यावहारिक अनुभव यह बतलाता है कि पहला एक वर्ष केवल तैयारी में ही बीत जाता है । इसलिये क्या गवर्नरेंट यह विचार कर रही है कि तीन वर्षों के बदले कम से कम पांच वर्ष तक उनको एक ही क्षेत्र में चलता रहने दिया जाय ?

श्री एस० एन० मिश्न : जहाँ तक राष्ट्रीय विस्तार सेवालंडों का सवाल है उनकी मियाद तो तीन साल की ही है, लेकिन सामुदायिक योजना लंडों के बारे में तीन साल से बड़ा कर चार साल की मियाद कर दी गयी है । माननीय

सदस्य ने जो सुझाव रखा है उसके ऊपर सो अभी हम कोई भी निर्णय नहीं कर पाये हैं।

श्री बंसल : क्या सरकार को यह मालूम है कि जहां के गांवों में यह कम्प्युनिटी ब्लाक्स नहीं लोले हैं वहां से बड़े जोर की मांग है कि वहां पर कम्प्युनिटी ब्लाक्स लोले जायें, न कि इनकी अवधि तीन साल से पांच साल तक बढ़ायी जाये।

श्री एस० एन० मिश्र : जी हां, इनके लिये बड़ी जोरदार मांग है और इनके लिये जनता में बहुत उत्साह है।

श्री बुसिया : क्या सरकार को मालूम है कि इस काम को करने वाले अफसर जिनको देहात में रहना पड़ता है वे गांवों में रहना पसन्द नहीं करते, और इसलिये गांवों की उतनी उम्मति नहीं हो पाती जितनी कि होनी चाहिये ?

श्री एस० एन० मिश्र : धीरे धीरे ही लोगों का विचार बदलेगा। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि अब काफी अफसरान देहात में लापते के सायक हैं।

श्री भागवत ज्ञा याजाव : क्या यह सत्य है कि यह जो विकास संड लोले गये हैं और जो कि सुदूर गांवों में हैं, उनसे उनके प्रधान कार्यालय या हैडक्वार्टर्स शहरों में सतर, पचहत्तर या अस्सी भील की दूरी पर हैं ? अगर यह सत्य है तो इसको हटाने के लिये कौन सी योजना कार्यान्वित की जा रही है ?

श्री एस० एन० मिश्र : इस दूरी के बारे में मेरे पास अभी कोई सूचना नहीं है। लेकिन अगर इतनी दूरी है तो जाहिर है कि उससे बड़ी कठिनाइयां होती होंगी।

#### Automobiles

\*454. Ch. Raghbir Singh : Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the demand for automobiles in the country has been at a low level;

(b) if so, the steps taken by Government to develop their demands; and  
(c) how far they proved successful ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari) : (a) Yes, Sir; but of late it is picking up.

(b) and (c). Government reduced the import duties on components and parts of motor vehicles; and the margin of profit to dealers has been brought down by a lower mark-up on ex-factory costs to reduce automobile prices. The number of types and makes of vehicles to be manufactured in the country has also been restricted and the cumulative effect of all these steps appears to be pushing up the demand.

Ch. Raghbir Singh : May I know the main reasons for this low level in demand ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari : I have said that the demand is now picking up. The demand for this year, 1955, up to the end of October, of cars and commercial vehicles on the basis of sales has been 18,774 as against 14,462 for the whole of last year.

Shri T. N. Singh : May I know what has been the reduction in the cost to the consumer as a result of the steps taken by the Ministry ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari : Maybe it is very negligible, but at any rate it has helped to stabilise prices.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : Sometime ago the hon. Minister stated that in a few years' time, we would be exporting automobiles from this country. May I know what progress, if any, has been made in that direction or is it that Hindustan's contract with Nuffield and Premier Automobiles' contract with Chrysler preclude any possibility of our exporting automobiles ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari : I think I merely expressed the hope that we might become an exporting country, sometime back. Now I do not think, the prices being what they are and the manufacturing costs being what they are, that in the near future we can develop an export market. But if the hon. Member is under the impression that the conditions of co-operation between the two foreign firms he mentioned and the local manufacturers preclude our developing an export market, I would say that it is not so. What precludes our developing an export market is the matter of manufacturing costs.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy : May I know what steps are taken to reduce the cost of the automobiles ?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Reduction of cost can happen only by reduction of manufacturing cost. I can see no immediate hope of it possibly being done.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** As a result of the reduction in the import duty on certain spare parts, what has been the result so far?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** In some cases reduction of import duty on parts may be of some advantage; but the deletion allowance that they get on a car which is normally brought in a c.k.d. condition takes away the advantage. As I said, with all the steps that we have been able to take, we have been able to stabilise the prices and no appreciable reduction has been effected. Anyway, we have referred the matter to the Tariff Commission with regard to the prices and we are expecting them to give a report.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** May I know if it is a fact that one of the automobile manufacturing companies has some difficulty about finance with the result that some costly machines remain idle? Is it because of that that the cost is going up instead of coming down?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Generally, finance happens to be a chronic factor in most of our industrial concerns; but I do not have any information with regard to any specific automobile concern.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** I request that Questions 455 and 476 may be answered together.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Yes; they may be taken together.

#### Construction of Pleasant Garden Market

**\*455. Shri Gopala Rao:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether construction of Pleasant Garden Market, opposite Red Fort, Delhi is completed; and

(b) the number of shops constructed so far and to whom these shops will be allotted and on what basis?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle):** (a) Construction work is almost completed but minor finishing touches are being given.

(b) 416.

These shops will be allotted to 'some of the eligible stall-holders of old Lajpat Rai Market.'

#### Lajpat Rai Market

**\*476. Shri Gopala Rao:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2388 on the 29th September, 1955 and state:

(a) whether Government have taken any steps to see that the Delhi State Government makes available the rest of the portion of Lajpat Rai Market for pucca construction;

(b) if so, nature of steps taken and when the work would commence;

(c) whether Government are aware that due to sector-wise construction work, shop-keepers are suffering financial loss; and

(d) if so, steps Government intend to take to complete construction of a pucca market as soon as possible?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle):** (a) Yes.

(b) The site being under lease with the Delhi Municipal Committee till the 30th September, 1955, it was not possible to take any coercive action against stall holders reluctant to vacate the shops. The Notified Area Committee, Red Fort were requested not to renew the lease in favour of the old lessor Delhi Municipal Committee. Eviction notices were served on the remaining stall holders in the rear Sector after the 1st October, 1955, only, the whole of which has since been cleared except 52 stalls. Proper construction work was started on the 25th July, 1955.

(c) Sector-wise clearance has actually minimised the loss to the stall holders, for in the event of complete clearance at one time, it would not have been possible to provide business premises to all the stall holders during the period of construction.

(d) Government intends to clear the site occupied by Stalls in two or three phases and take up construction work. The stall holders so removed would be temporarily lodged in shops in Pleasure Garden Market.

**Shri Gopala Rao:** May I know when this construction is expected to be completed and the shops allotted to those whose properties have been demolished? May I also know whether the Government will be able to meet all the requirements of all the shopkeepers whose shops have been demolished in the Lajpat Rai Market?

**Shri J. K. Bhonsle:** The Pleasure Garden Market is very nearly complete and by the end of this month the construction will be finished. After

that, we will make arrangements to allot the shop in the Pleasure Garden Market to those who have been occupying shops in the Lajpat Rai Market. Unless the stall holders are cleared of the shops which they are occupying at the moment, construction work in Lajpat Rai Market will take some time. We are making arrangements to give them Vacant Sites Temporarily in the nearby vicinity.

**Shri Gopala Rao :** In view of the fact that the construction of the Lajpat Rai Market will take a long time, several shopkeepers are prepared to construct temporary huts on the Pleasure Garden grounds; will Government accept that proposal?

**Shri J. K. Bhonsle :** I do not think it will be possible to consider that request, because as shops are vacant in the Pleasure Garden Market, we will be allotting them to those whom we propose to shift from the old Lajpat Rai Market.

**Shri Gidwani :** Will all the stall holders at the old Lajpat Rai Market be provided with shops in the new market?

**Shri J. K. Bhonsle :** No. The new Lajpat Rai Market will have 1,000 shops and the Pleasure Garden Market will have 416 shops. Therefore, roughly 1,500 eligible stall holders will be provided new shops in the two markets.

**Shri K. G. Deshmukh :** May I know what are the main features of this Pleasure Garden Market, especially in view of its name?

**Shri J. K. Bhonsle :** The place is called Pleasure Garden and so the market also has been named as Pleasure Garden Market.

**Shri Gopala Rao :** In view of the undue delay in the construction of the Lajpat Rai Market, may I know whether there is any interested party working anywhere in the State Government?

**Shri J. K. Bhonsle :** This was in the name of the Delhi Municipal Committee till now; but now that the place has been cleared, the Delhi State Government are very active and construction work is speeded up.

#### WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

##### **Sindri Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd.**

**\*430. Shri Barman :** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether the commercial accounts of the Sindri Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd. for the year 1954-55 have been finalised;

(b) what, if any, is the net profit and how it has been utilised; and

(c) whether the accounts have been audited and audit report published?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K.C. Reddy) :** (a) The audited Profit & Loss Account for the year ended 31st March, 1955 and Balance Sheet as at 31st March 1955 of the Sindri Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd. have been adopted at the Third Annual General Meeting of the Company held on the 5th November, 1955.

(b) A statement containing the information is laid on the Table of the Sabha. [See Appendix III, annexure No. 39].

(c) Yes; copies of the "Third Annual Report" of Sindri Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd. containing the Auditors' Report, have been placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha separately.

#### **Displaced Persons from Mirpur**

**\*432. Dr. Styawadi :** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that nearly 90 displaced families from Pakistan held territory of Mirpur (Kashmir) are awaiting rehabilitation in Amritsar; and

(b) if so, the steps taken by Government to rehabilitate them in Jammu?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle) :** (a) Yes.

(b) These families are proposed to be rehabilitated on land in Jammu and Kashmir State. Rural loan Rs. 500/- per family is also proposed to be given to these families.

#### **Documentaries**

**\*437. Shri D. C. Sharma :** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state whether the recent exhibition of Indian documentaries in foreign countries has brought about an increase in their export?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar) :** There has been a marked increase in the number of copies sent abroad, for non-commercial exhibition, to Indian Mission abroad, and by sales to educational and cultural institutions and private individuals.

#### **U.N.O.**

**\*438. Shri S. L. Saksena :** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that India abstained from voting in the U.N.O.

General Assembly when the question of Cyprus on the U.N. Agenda came up for discussion this year; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) and (b). India abstained on the vote as the Government of India did not wish to jeopardise the negotiations which were then in progress between Greece, Turkey and the U.K. by discussion on this question in the General Assembly.

### Coal

**\*440. Shri M. R. Krishna:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that with a view to increase the output of coal from 37 million tons per year to 60 million tons during the Second Five Year Plan Government are considering to train a large number of persons in the managerial posts; and

(b) if so, the number expected to be trained and within what period?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) Yes.

(b) A Technical Committee set up by the Government consisting of the various interests concerned including the representatives of the Central and State Governments and the coal industry have examined this problem and have made certain recommendations regarding the number of persons to be trained in managerial posts and the annual replacement required to increase the output of coal to 60 millions tons per annum by the end of the Second Five Year Plan. The Technical Committee's report is now under examination by the Government.

### Coffee

**\*441. Shri N. M. Lingam:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Coffee Board has any plans for the expansion of Coffee cultivations during the Second Five Year Plan; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The details of the Plan are still under compilation.

**Indian Armed Forces—International Commission for Supervision and Control, Cambodia.**

**\*442. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Indian armed forces personnel attached at present with the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Cambodia;

(b) whether it is a fact that their number has been recently reduced;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether the personnel rendered surplus have been brought back to India?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) The total number of Indian Armed forces personnel serving with International Commission, Cambodia on 1st November, 1955 is:—

Officers . . . . .	13
JCOs/NCOs/ORs . . . . .	95
Non-Combatants (Enrolled) . . . . .	9
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>117</b>

(b) Originally, 26 Officers, 142 JCOs/NCOs/ORs and 15 Non-Combatants (Enrolled) were despatched to Cambodia. This number has been reduced from time to time depending on the actual requirements.

(c) The elections in Cambodia having concluded, the work of the Commission in that State has been accomplished to a considerable extent.

(d) Yes. Personnel rendered surplus, after meeting the requirements of the other National Commissions, have been brought back.

### Automobile Products of India Ltd.

**\*445. Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the manufacturing programme of the Automobile Products of India Ltd., Bombay for the manufacture of Borg and Beck Clutches and Lockheed hydraulic brake assemblies (Car components) have been finalised;

(b) if so, when it is going to start production; and

(c) the time by which the complete range of these components will be manufactured entirely in this country?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari) :** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) It is expected that the firm will start production by the end of 1956.

(c) There are various models of vehicles on the roads. It is, therefore, difficult to say when the complete range of these components will be manufactured in the country.

### Penicillin

**\*452. Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury :** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to a press report appearing in 'The Statesman', dated the 4th October, 1955, to the effect that an indigenous medium for large-scale production of penicillin in India has been perfected by one Dr. H. Ghosh of Calcutta;

(b) if so, whether penicillin so produced by Dr. Ghosh has been tested in Government laboratories; and

(c) whether this penicillin has been found upto the required standard quality?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar) :** (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

### Import of Steel

**\*453. Shri V. P. Nayar :** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has decided to import one million tons of steel in the near future to meet the requirements of the country; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to invite global tenders for this purpose?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari) :** (a) Yes, Sir; near about this figure.

(b) No, Sir.

### Elections in Sudan

**\*456. { Sardar Iqbal Singh :  
Shri Raghunath Singh :**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state.

(a) whether it is a fact that India has been invited to join the Internationa

Commission for the supervision of elections in Sudan; and

(b) if so, whether India has accepted this invitation?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda) :** (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. The Government of India have nominated Col. B. H. Zaidi, M.P. as their representative.

### Indian Handicraft Products

**\*457. Shri H. N. Mukerjee :** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that recently certain countries in Eastern Europe have expressed their desire to import Indian Handicraft products; and

(b) if so, what steps have been taken for marketing such products in those countries?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy) :** (a) Government are aware that some Eastern European Countries are evincing keen interest in our handicrafts products. No definite proposal for imports, however, has been received by Government.

(b) Although no permanent marketing agency has yet been established in these countries, the possibilities are being explored through exhibitions of our handicrafts. An Exhibition of our Handicrafts recently held in Moscow has been a great success and the exhibits were sold for a sum of Rupees four lakhs. Steps are being taken to participate in the Leipzig Fair to be held in East Germany in March next year. Other steps are under consideration.

### Displaced Students of East Pakistan

**\*458. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh :** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state whether any amount has so far been sanctioned to aid educational institutions catering to the needs of displaced students from East Pakistan?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle) :** The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha.

रोडेशिया द्वारा आसालेंड में भारतीय

४५६. श्री श्री नारायण दात : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

उत्तर रोडेशिया, दक्षिणी रोडेशिया और न्यासालैंड के प्रदेशों को संघबद्ध करने की योजना को कार्यान्वित करने के बाद वहां एशियाईयों, विशेषकर भारतीयों की दशा में और उनके प्रति किये जाने वाले व्यवहारों में क्या सुधार की दशा में कुछ परिवर्तन हुये हैं?

**वैदेशिक कार्य उपमंत्री (श्री अनिल के० चन्द्रा)** : रोडेशिया और न्यासालैंड की केंद्रेशन में एशियाईयों, जिनमें भारतीय शामिल हैं, की हालत में कोई प्रत्यक्ष सुधार नहीं हुआ है। दरअसल, दक्षिणी रोडेशिया, उत्तरी रोडेशिया और न्यासालैंड की तीन प्रदेशी सरकारों ने भारतीयों के एक प्रदेश से दूसरे प्रदेश में आने जाने पर रोक लगाने के लिये कानून पास कर दिया है।

#### Eviction of Tenants in Delhi

\*460. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Delhi State Government have drawn the attention of the Union Government to the hardships caused to the tenants (*Kiraids*) and Amleldars (lease-holders) of Delhi due to evictions under the present law;

(b) whether the State Government have also made any proposals for the removal of these hardships; and

(c) if so, the decisions taken?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). Yes, Sir. The Delhi State Govt. had proposed that emergent legislative action may be taken to stay all ejection and eviction proceedings under the Delhi & Ajmer Rent Control Act, 1952. Such a step was not however considered appropriate and alternative positive steps which would help ease the basic trouble of such slum-dwellers are under examination in consultation with the Delhi State Government.

#### इन्दौर रेडियो स्टेशन

\*461. **श्री अमर सिंह ढापर :** क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) इन्दौर रेडियो स्टेशन पर जो पदाधिकारी नियुक्त किये गये हैं क्या वे राज्य सरकार की सलाह से नियुक्त किये गये हैं; और

(ख) क्या वे सब नियुक्तियां भरथायी अथवा स्थायी हैं या उनमें से कुछ अस्थायी हैं और कुछ रथायी हैं?

**बालिक्य मंत्री (श्री करमरहर) :** (क) और (ख). रेडियो स्टेशनों में अफसर और कर्मचारी राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से नियुक्त नहीं किये जाते हैं। इस समय रेडियो स्टेशनों के सभी स्थान अस्थायी हैं। बाद में नियमों के अनुसार कुछ स्थान स्थायी बना दिये जायेंगे। इनमें से कुछ स्थान पर, चाहे वे अस्थायी हों, नियुक्तियां अखिल भारतीय रेडियो के स्थायी अफसरों में से की जाती हैं।

#### Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi

\*462. { **Dr. Satyawadi:**  
**Shri Ram Dass:**  
**Shri B. D. Shastri:**

Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 205 on the 28th July, 1955 and state the number of designs received by Government so far for the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi at Rajghat?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** The number of designs received upto 30-11-55 is 40, besides one model.

#### American Surplus Goods

\*463. **Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to refer to page 21 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee Vol. 15 para 35 and state as to whom the surplus American goods were sold under the deal referred to therein?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** A statement showing the names of the

parties to whom the stores were sold is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 40].

### All India Radio

\*464. **Shri Dabhi:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) which of the programmes of the All India Radio Station, Delhi are made compulsory for the various Regional Stations;

(b) the total duration of such programmes during the twenty-four hours; and

(c) the reasons for making these programmes compulsory?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) None, Sir. But there are certain all-India and national programmes that originate from Delhi Station and are relayed by other Stations.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

### Marriage Officers

\*465. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to refer to page 34 of the Report of the Ministry (1954-55) and state:

(a) the total number of Indian Diplomatic and Consular Officers appointed as Marriage Officers for the purpose of solemnising marriages among the Indian citizens residing in foreign countries; and

(b) whether the draft rules for the guidance of the Marriage Officers have been finalised?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) 122 Indian Diplomatic and Consular Officers have been appointed as Marriage Officers for solemnising marriages among Indian citizens residing in various countries abroad.

(b) Yes. Copies of the Rules are available in the Library of the Parliament.

### International Tea Agreement

\*466. **Shri N. M. Lingam:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2025 on the 21st September, 1955 and state:

(a) whether the International Tea Agreement has since been renewed; and

(b) if so, the main features of the agreement?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

### Fruit Preservation

\*467. **Shri Jhulan Sinha:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state the position as to the manufacture and availability of pectin in the country which is required by the Fruit Preservation Industry?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** There is no indigenous production of pectin in the country and its requirements are met by imports.

भूमि को हृषि योग्य बनाना

\*468. **पंडित श्री एस० तिकारी :** क्या योजना मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सामुदायिक परियोजनाओं के अवधीन ५ लाख एकड़ भूमि को हृषि योग्य बनाया गया है?

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो उसका राज्यवार व्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) क्या भूमि पर सामुहिक रूप में लेती की जा रही है यथवा व्यक्तिगत रूप में?

योजना उपर्युक्ती (श्री एस० एस० तिकारी):

(क) जी, हाँ।

(ख) व्यौरा सदन की बेज पर रख दिया गया है। [वैज्ञानिक परियोजना, अनुबन्ध संख्या ४१].

(ग) इसकी सूचना अभी हमारे पास नहीं है।

### Bhilai Steel Plant

\*469. { **Shri K. P. Sinha:**  
**Shri Ibrahim:**

Will the Minister of Iron and Steel be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2351 on the 29th September, 1955 and state:

(a) the progress so far made in respect of the Bhilai Steel Plant Project;

(b) the number of Russian experts already working at Bhilai; and

(c) the expenditure so far incurred?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) The works that are being carried out at Bhilai at present relate to certain preliminary measures *vis*, prospecting of minerals, acquisition of land, construction of accommodation for construction staff and offices, arrangements for water and power supply etc.

(b) At present two Russian experts are working at Bhilai.

(c) The expenditure incurred by the project division up to the end of October, 1955 amounts to about Rs. 7,20,000.

#### Road Construction in Community Project Areas

**\*470. Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) the total mileage of roads constructed in the Punjab so far in the Community Project areas and National Extension Service Blocks giving the length completed year-wise; and

(b) the names of the localities where these roads have been constructed?

**The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra):** (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 42].

#### Foreign Demand for Indian Goods

**\*471. Shri Bishuti Mishra:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been any increase in the demand for the Indian goods in Canada after participating in the International Trade Fair held at Toronto, (Canada); and

(b) if so, the names of goods for which the demand has increased?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) and (b). It is difficult to estimate precisely the effect of our participation in the fair on our trade with Canada. The fair has, nevertheless, stimulated interest in our cotton piecegoods and jute manufacturers.

#### International Supervisory Commission, Indo-China

**\*472. Shri Kaaliwal:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state whether the status of the International Supervisory Commission in Indo-China is likely to be affected in any way by the deposition of Bao Dai as head of the South Viet Nam State?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** The status of the International Supervisory Commission in Indo-China is not affected by the change in the Head of the State of Viet Nam. The Commission is a creation of the Geneva Agreement which is not affected in any way by the recent change. The Commission, whose function is to supervise implementation of the Geneva Agreement, continues to deal with the civil administrations in the North and South Zones of Viet Nam for certain purposes.

#### Metric System of Weights and Measures

**\*473. Shri R. N. Singh:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the decisions taken at the last meeting of the Standing Committee for the Metric System of Weights and Measures;

(b) which of these decisions have been accepted by Government; and

(c) the steps, if any, taken or proposed to be taken to implement them?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) A statement setting out the recommendations made by the Standing Committee at its meeting held on 21st October, 1955 is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 43].

(b) Recommendations Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 14 have been generally accepted by Government while recommendations Nos. 2, 3, 4, 10 and 13 are under consideration. 15 concerns State Governments and 5, 11 and 12 are only procedural.

(c) The attention of State Government and business associations has been drawn to the recommendations which concern them. The conversion of drawings, specifications and maps in Central Government establishments, and the training of their existing technical personnel in conversion techniques are receiving attention. Conversion tables are under preparation. The prospective demand for metric weights and measures, as also the existing installed capacity for their manufacture is being assessed in co-operation with State Governments.

#### National Film Board

**\*474. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have since decided to constitute a National Film Board;

(b) if so, the main functions thereof; and

(c) whether it is to be a Statutory Body or an Advisory Board?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) to (c). The matter is still under consideration and the proposals in the form of legislation will soon be placed before the House.

**Sindri Fertilizer and Chemicals Ltd.**

\*475. **Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2366 on the 29th September, 1955 and state:

(a) whether Government have since considered the suggestion of the Estimates Committee that at least one member of the Board of Directors of Sindri Fertilizer and Chemicals Limited should represent agricultural interests; and

(b) if so, what decision has been taken by Government?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) and (b). Yes. It may be mentioned that one of the present Directors of the Board of Directors of Sindri Fertilizers & Chemicals Limited is an agriculturist. Further it is proposed now to add a representative of the Food & Agriculture Ministry to the Sindri Board of Directors.

**Universal Children's Day**

\*477. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposal to institute a Universal Children's Day for promoting the ideals and objectives of the Charter and the Welfare of the Children of the World for which the General Assembly of the U.N. adopted a resolution, has since been finalised; and

(b) if so, whether any day has been fixed for this purpose?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) November 14 from next year.

**Slum Clearance Schemes**

\*478. **Dr. Satyawadi:** Will the Minister of Health be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1357 on the 2nd September, 1955 and state the details of the recommendations made by the first meeting of the Central Council of Local Self Government held at Simla in June, 1955 regarding Slum Clearance and the decision taken by Government thereon?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** A statement is laid on the Table of the House containing the recommendations of the Council. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 44.] The question of subsidising slum clearance operations is still under the consideration of Government.

**Indians in U.S.A.**

\*479. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether domiciled Indians in the United States of America have been accorded franchise and other privileges of citizenship; and

(b) if so, the total number of such Indians in U.S.A.?

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** (a) The domiciled Indians in the United States of America do not enjoy the right to vote. The bulk of them have the status of Permanent residents, namely, persons permitted to reside permanently in the United States, but who either cannot or do not wish to acquire American nationality. A permanent resident does not claim re-entry into the United States as a matter of right like an American national.

(b) The number of domiciled Indians in the U.S.A. as on 1st July, 1954 was approximately 2477. (The latest information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course of time).

**Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd.**

\*480. **Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by Government to investigate into the causes of delay in the setting up of the Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd., as recommended by the Estimates Committee in para 14 of their Fourteenth Report; and

(b) whether it is a fact that delay has been caused due to negligence on the part of the Swiss firm of consultants *vis à vis* Messrs. Oerlikon?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) and (b). The Estimates Committee's report on the Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. is of a preliminary nature. The Committee have desired that Government should apprise them within a period of 3 months of the action taken on the recommendations of the Committee after which they will finalise their report. All the observations made by the Committee including those relating

to the delay in setting up the factory and the causes and responsibility therefor are under examination and Government's comments are expected to be furnished to the Committee shortly.

**Engineering Personnel for Second Five Year Plan.**

**\*481. Shri Bibhuti Mishra:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state whether Government have assessed the total requirements of engineers in the Second Five Year Plan?

**The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra):** The assessment is being made.

**Sindri Fertilizers**

**\*482. { Shri Gidwani:  
Shri Tulsidas:**

Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Estimates Committee in their Thirteenth Report has pointed out that the present system of distribution of fertilizers produced by Sindri Fertilizer Factory is not satisfactory; and

(b) if so, whether the system is proposed to be changed?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) and (b). The Estimates Committee have only suggested certain measures for improving the existing system of distribution. The Ministry of Food and Agriculture who are responsible for distribution are taking suitable steps to effect necessary improvements in the light of these suggestions.

**Uranium Deposits**

**\*483. { Shri D. C. Sharma:  
Shri V. P. Nayak:**

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the name of the place where Uranium deposits have been found in Travancore-Cochin;

(b) the quantity of Uranium found; and

(c) the measures proposed to be taken by Government to find out this mineral in large quantities?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** (a) Uranium has been found as a minor constituent of the mineral monazite at several places along the Travancore-Cochin beach.

(b) All the Uranium has been extracted from the monazite sands treated so far, and a few tons are in stock.

(c) Active prospecting work by the geologists of the Department of Atomic Energy is going on with a view to locating workable concentrations of Uranium.

**Nuclear Science and Engineering**

**\*484. Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether India has deputed any students to the new School of Nuclear Science and Engineering at Argonne in U.S.A.; and

(b) if so, the number of such students and the period and conditions of their training?

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** (a) Yes.

(b) One. The course is of seven months duration and the person deputed for this training will serve the Atomic Energy Establishment for a period of at least three years on his return to India.

**Trade with Pakistan.**

**\*485. Shrimati Maydeo:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the nature of imports from and exports to Pakistan carried on at Government to Government level during 1955; and

(b) the balance of trade and balance of payments position between the two countries so far during 1955?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) Trade between India and Pakistan takes place through normal commercial channels and not on Government to Government basis.

(b) A statement giving the available information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 45].

**Refractory Industry**

**\*486. Shrimati Maydeo:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) what is the present productive capacity of refractory industry in India;

(b) whether the capacity is expected to rise by 1960-61; and

(c) if so, to what extent?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) 3,29,410 tons per annum.

(b) and (c). A target of 1 million tons per annum during the Second plan period is under examination.

#### Industrial Development Targets

**\*191. Shrimati Maydeo.** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the industries in regard to which the target is not likely to be reached under the First Five Year Plan;

(b) the extent to which their production is short of the target laid down; and

(c) the main reasons for failure to attain the target in each case?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) to (c). The progress made by various industries with reference to the targets is published annually by the Planning Commission. The information for the year 1954-55 is being included in their Progress Report for that year which will be published shortly. As usual, a copy of the Report will be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha during the current session of the House.

#### Evacuee Agricultural Lands

**238. { Sardar Hukam Singh:**  
**Shri Bahadur Singh:**

Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1173 on the 26th August, 1955 and state:

(a) the number of cases in which proprietary *Sanads* have been granted to displaced allottees of agricultural lands in Punjab and PEPSU so far; and

(b) the area so made quasi-permanent?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle):** (a) 81,876.

(b) The area so made permanent (and not quasi-permanent) is 7,24,343 standard acres.

#### Trade Marks Enquiry Committee

**239. Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 294 on the 16th March, 1955 and state:

(a) whether Government have since taken any decision on the report of the Trade Marks Enquiry Committee; and

(b) if so, the important points of decision taken?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) and (b). No, Sir. The report of the Committee is still under examination by Government.

#### Slum Clearance Scheme

**240. Dr. Satyawadi:** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to lay on the Table of the Lok Sabha a statement showing the outlines of the proposed scheme for Slum Clearance in the Second Five Year Plan?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** No schemes as such for Slum Clearance have yet been formulated for inclusion in the Second Five Year Plan.

#### Arrears of Rent from Govt. Quarter

**241. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.** Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state out of the sum of Rs. 9,37,973 due from Government employees by way of rent, the amount which is due from those who draw more than Rs. 500/- per mensem?

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** The amount of arrears due has presumably been taken by the Hon'ble Member from the explanatory note to para 6(x) of the Audit report (Civil) 1952. The actual amount in arrears is likely to be appreciably less than the figure indicated. There is a time lag between the actual deduction of the arrears due from the pay of the officers and intimation of such deduction being communicated to the Estate Office. Until the communication is actually received, the amounts are shown in the books of the Estate Office as being in arrears even though they may in fact, have been recovered from the individual Government servants concerned. The amount due from officers whose pay is more than Rs. 500 will be of the order of Rs. 57,000.

#### सीमा पर साक्षरता

**२४२. पंडित डॉ एन० सिंहारी : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :**

(क) क्या यह सच है कि २४ सितंबर, १९५५ की रात को पाकिस्तान से कुछ सशस्त्र डाकूओं ने मुर्शिदाबाद जिले के चन्दपारा गाम में दो घरों पर आता किया;

(ख) क्या भारतीय सशस्त्र पुलिस तथा डाकूओं में मृठमेड हुई;

(ग) कितने व्यक्ति घायल हुए तथा मुठभेड़ में कितने व्यक्तियों की घायिक घात हुई; और

(घ) क्या कुछ पाकिस्तानी गिरफ्तार किये गये?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : (क) और (ख). २४ सितम्बर, १९५५ की रात को करीब १५ या १६ पाकिस्तानी सशस्त्र डाकुओं ने जिला मुशिदाबाद, पुलिस बौकी दमकल के अन्दरापारा गांव के कुछ घरों पर घावा किया। डाकुओं और भारतीय सशस्त्र पुलिस में कोई मुठभेड़ नहीं हुई, लेकिन गांव वालों और ग्राम रक्षक दल के कुछ सदस्यों ने, डाकुओं का, जिन्होंने अन्धाधुन गोलियां चलाई, मुकाबिला किया।

(ग) १४ भारतीय नागरिकों को चोटें आईं और तीन को माली नुस्खान पहुंचा।

(घ) तीन पाकिस्तानी डाकुओं को, जिनमें गिरोह का सरदार शामिल है, करीब ६५० रुपये के चोरी किये गये माल के साथ, मोके पर गिरातार कर लिया गया।

#### Residential Accommodation in Delhi

243. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the reserving of a good percentage of newly-built quarters for out-of-turn allotment is becoming very common thus reducing the chances of allotment of those who have long been waiting for their turn; and

(b) if so, the steps being taken to reduce the number of such out-of-turn allotments?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). It is not the practice to reserve any percentage of newly built quarters for out-of-turn allotment. Much as the Government would wish to do away with out-of-turn allotments, they cannot be avoided altogether. These are sanctioned only on grounds of genuine and serious hardship after the merits of each case have been examined either at Minister level

or by a Committee of officers specially constituted to scrutinise the applications for such allotments. Generally accommodation given as out-of-turn allotment is not upto or popular with the class of the officers to whom it is allotted. Every effort is made to keep down the number of such allotments to the minimum. As the accommodation position eases with the scale of construction that is now going on, the necessity for making out-of-turn allotments will progressively disappear.

#### Labour Attachés in Indian Missions

244. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether the foreign embassies in India have got Labour Attachés attached to their missions;

(b) whether any of our missions abroad have also been provided with such Attachés; and

(c) if not, whether it is proposed to do so now?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Only the United Kingdom High Commission in India have a Labour Adviser and an Assistant Labour Adviser on their establishment. No other diplomatic mission in India has such an officer on their staff.

(b) No. A Labour Welfare Officer-cum-Vice Consul has, however been attached to the Embassy of India, Rangoon.

(c) No.

#### Chinese Raw Silk

245. Shri Raghunath Singh: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of Chinese raw silk imported by Government during 1954-55; and

(b) the system of its distribution in the country?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Out of a total of 90 metric tons, decided to be imported, 64 metric tons were received during the Budget Year 1954-55 and the balance in April, 1955.

(b) The Central Silk Board distributes to the Actual Consumers either directly or through the State Governments, Co-operative Institutions and Recognised Consumers' Associations.

### Film Censorship

**246. Shri M. L. Agrawal:** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that representations have been made to Government regarding the display of the Hindi Film "Railway Platform" in its present form by the Marwari Community in India; and

(b) if so, whether Government have taken any steps to have the objectionable features removed from the film?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

### Displaced Persons in Jammu and Kashmir

**247. Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of tenements constructed for Displaced Persons in Jammu and Kashmir State and the places where they are located;

(b) the number of shops constructed; and

(c) the steps taken to find employment for Displaced Persons in the State?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bholse):** (a) Construction of 2000 tenements at Raulki in Jammu Province has been taken in hand.

(b) 39.

(c) Most of the Displaced Persons in the State have started their own business for which trade loans have been given in deserving cases. Small scales cottage industries and training centres are proposed to be opened in the new townships to provide gainful employment to the unemployed Displaced Persons.

### Handicraft Industries

**248. Shri Heda:** Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state;

(a) the grants given to Hyderabad and U.P. States for the development of Handicrafts during 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56 so far;

(b) the amount utilised by the States out of these grants; and

(c) the particular schemes for which grants were sanctioned?

**The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy):** (a) to (c). A statement is attached. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 46].

407 L.S.D.—3.

### Clock Factories

**249. Pandit D. N. Tiwary:**  
**Shri Amar Singh Damar:**  
**Shri Jethalal Joshi :**

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

(a) the number and the location of clock manufacturing factories in the country;

(b) the number of clocks manufactured annually especially in the years 1954 and 1955; and

(c) whether all the component parts are manufactured in India?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) Three, one each in Bombay, Morvi and Calcutta.

(b) 1954—10,859 Nos. (This includes the production figure of one firm which went into liquidation in the beginning of 1955).

1955—9,425 Nos.  
(upto  
September)

(c) Yes, with the exception of main springs.

### Copper

**250. Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state the present requirements of copper in the country?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** The country's requirement of copper has been estimated to be between 25,000 and 40,000 tons per annum.

### ताढ़ गुढ़

**२५१. श्री विभूति मिशन :** क्या उत्तराखण्ड मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) ३० सितम्बर, १९५५ तक भारत के विभिन्न राज्यों में किन-किन स्थानों पर ताढ़ गुढ़ बनाने के केन्द्र लोले गये हैं;

(ख) उन केन्द्रों में प्रतिमास कितना ताढ़ गुढ़ तैयार किया जाता है;

(ग) गन्ने से तैयार किये जाने वाले गुड़ तथा ताढ़ गुड़ के मूल्यों में कितना अन्तर है और

(घ) क्या दोनों प्रकार के गुड़ों में कोई अन्तर है, और यदि हाँ, तो किस प्रकार का?

उत्पादन मंत्री (श्री के० सी० रेडी) :

(क) से (ग). सूचना एकत्र की जा रही है और यथा समय सभा पटल पर रख दी जायेगी।

(घ) ताढ़ गुड़ तथा ईख गुड़ की रचना बताने वाला विवरण सभा पटल पर रख दिया गया है। [वेळिये परिशिष्ट ३, अनुबन्ध संख्या ४७]।

#### Indian Films

252. Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) whether any deputation led by women have represented to Government against the exhibition of allegedly harmful Indian films this year; and

(b) if so, the action taken by Government?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar) (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

#### First Five Year Plan of Nepal

253. Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether Nepal has submitted an outline of her First Five Year Plan to the Colombo Conference which was held at Singapore; and

(b) if so, to what extent India proposes to aid Nepal in the First Five Year Plan?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). The Nepalese delegation to the Colombo Conference held recently in Singapore put forth an outline of Five Year Plan for the development of Nepal. The Plan is under examination. The extent to which the Government of India can contribute to the implementation of this plan is under consideration and discussion. But it is not difficult to foresee that their assistance in the economic development of Nepal will be substantial.

#### Silk

254. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state the total production of silk in the country during the year 1954-55?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): The total production is 33,44,690 lbs. consisting of 25,24,863 lbs. mulberry raw silk and 8,19,827 lbs. of non-mulberry raw silk.

#### Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954

255. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of meetings held during August, September, October and November, 1955 by the Board constituted in connection with the administration of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954; and

(b) the decisions taken at these meetings?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) Five.

(b) The Board functions in an advisory capacity and does not take decisions. It is not in the public interest to disclose the recommendations of the Board.

#### Houses for the Displaced Persons

256. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the number of houses constructed for displaced persons by the Central Government in Punjab that have been sold so far; and

(b) the sale proceeds realised therefrom?

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

#### Community Projects Administration

257. Shrimati Maydeo: Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether Community Projects Administration has drawn up a programme to give training to State-nominated officers for undertaking administrative intelligence work in N.E.S. and Community Projects Areas;

- (b) what are the details of the scheme;
- (c) when will the training be given; and
- (d) how many persons are expected to be trained each year during the period 1956-1960?

**The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra) :** (a) to (d). The matter is under consideration.

### Refrigerators

**258. Shri D. C. Sharma :** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

- (a) whether during the current licensing period *ad hoc* licences have been given for the import of refrigerators;
- (b) if so, the value thereof; and
- (c) the names of the established importers to whom such licences have been issued?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. Krishnamachari) :** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Rs. 62,220.

(c) None. These licences were given for special type of Refrigerators to Public Bodies, health centres and laboratories.

### Foreign Films

**259. Sardar Iqbal Singh :** Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state :

- (a) the number of foreign films together with their titles whose exhibition was banned by the censors during 1955 so far;
- (b) the names of the countries to which these belong;
- (c) whether Government have received any representations against these decisions; and
- (d) if so, in how many cases and with what results?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar) :** (a) to (d). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 48].

### Maintenance Allowance For Displaced Persons

**260. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh :** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to refer to the reply, given to

Unstarred Question No. 160 on the 2nd August, 1955 and state :

(a) the total amount of money advanced from June, 1955 to date to displaced claimants or any members of their families as maintenance allowance; and

(b) whether this money will be deducted from the compensations due to them?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle) :** (a) Rs. 93513/-.

(b) No.

### Match Factories

**261. Shri C. R. Iyyunni :** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

(a) the number of factories which manufacture matches and allied products in India at present;

(b) whether the requirements of the country are fully met by these factories;

(c) the number of persons employed and the quantity of matches produced by Match factories and by Small Scale and Cottage Industry separately; and

(d) the steps taken by Government to encourage the manufacture of matches by Small Scale and Cottage Industry?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. Krishnamachari) :** (a) 184.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) No. of persons employed : 28,000 approximately.

### Quantity of matches produced :

Factories . } 1,284,631 gross 40's  
(A Class), } 18,322,842 gross 60's

Small Scale } 15,544,290 gross 40's  
Cottage Indus- } 1,497,537 gross 60's  
tries. (B,C & D)

(d) The following steps have been taken by Government :

(i) Small Scale match factories are allowed rebate in excise duty.

(ii) The All-India Khadi and Village Industries Board is already operating a Marketing Scheme for Match Industry. A proposal for the establishment of a Marketing Organisation in South India where the bulk of small scale match factories are working is at present under consideration.

(iii) The Government is helping the establishment of Small Scale Match Factories at various places on co-operative lines by giving financial assistance.

**Markets for Displaced Persons in Delhi**

**262. Dr. Satyawadi :** Will the Minister of Rehabilitation be pleased to state :

(a) the new markets recently built by Government for the refugees in the Delhi and New Delhi where electricity, *pakka* roads, sanitary arrangements and water etc. have not yet been provided; and

(b) the time that will take to complete these arrangements?

**The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle):** (a) and (b). A statement is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 49].

**Aluminium Factories**

**263. { Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha: Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Shri Asthana :**

Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state :

(a) the names and location of Aluminium factories in India;

(b) the installed capacity of each factory and their actual output during the last 5 years; and

(c) the number of employees working in each factory?

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** (a) to (c). A statement is attached. [See Appendix III, Annexure No. 50].

## DAILY DIGEST

[Saturday, 2nd December, 1955]

## COLUMNS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
485-513

S.Q. No.	Subject	
427.	Chanakya Puri . . .	485-86
428.	Modern Shopping Centres in Delhi. . .	486-87
429.	New Hotel in Delhi . . .	487-89
431.	Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose . . .	489-91
433.	Caustic Soda and Soda Ash . . .	491-92
434.	Coal . . .	492-93
435.	Compensation for Damages . . .	495-5
436.	All India Radio. . .	496-97
439.	Indian Settlers Overseas . . .	597-98
443.	Multi-Purpose Institute of Technology . . .	499-500
444.	Nahan Foundry Limited . . .	500-01
446.	Mill Cloth . . .	501-03
447.	Regional Designing Centres . . .	503-04
448.	Jute . . .	504-05
449.	U.N.O. . .	505-06
450.	Bakra Nangal Project . . .	506-07
451.	Community Development Programme . . .	507-09
454.	Automobiles . . .	509-11
455.	Construction of Pleasant Garden Market. . .	511
476.	Lajpat Rai Market . . .	512-13

WRIT ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
513-40

S.Q. No.		
430.	Sindri Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd. . .	513-14
432.	Displaced Persons from Mirpur . . .	514
437.	Documentaries . . .	514
438.	U.N.O. . .	514-15
440.	Coal . . .	515
441.	Coffee . . .	515
442.	Indian Armed Forces—International Commission for Supervision and Control, Cambodia . . .	516
445.	Automobile Products of India Ltd. . .	516-17
452.	Penicillin . . .	517
453.	Import of Steel . . .	517
456.	Elections in Sudan . . .	517-18
457.	Indian Handicraft Products . . .	518
458.	Displaced Students of East Pakistan . . .	518

S.Q.  
No.

## Subject

## COLUMNS

459.	Indians in Rhodesia and Nyasaland . . .	518-19
460.	Eviction of Tenants in Delhi . . .	519
461.	Indore Radio Station . . .	520
462.	Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi . . .	520
463.	American surplus goods . . .	520-21
464.	All India Radio . . .	521
465.	Marriage Officers . . .	521
6.	International Tea Agreement . . .	521-22
467.	Fruit Preservation . . .	522
468.	Land Reclamation . . .	522
469.	Bhilai Steel Plant . . .	522-23
470.	Road Construction in Community Project Areas . . .	523
471.	Foreign Demand for Indian Goods . . .	523
472.	International Supervisory Commission, Indo-China . . .	523-24
473.	Metric System of Weights and Measures . . .	524
474.	National Film Board . . .	524-25
475.	Sindri Fertilizer and Chemicals Ltd. . .	525
477.	Universal Children's Day . . .	525
478.	Slum Clearance Schemes . . .	525-26
479.	Indians in U.S.A. . .	526
480.	Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. . .	526-27
481.	Engineering Personnel for Second Five Year Plan . . .	527
482.	Sindri Fertilizers . . .	527
483.	Uranium Deposits . . .	527-28
484.	Nuclear Science and Engineering . . .	528
171.	Trade with Pakistan . . .	528
188.	Refractory Industry . . .	528-29
191.	Industrial Development Targets . . .	529

U.S.Q.  
No.

## COLUMNS

238.	Evacuee Agricultural Lands . . .	529
239.	Trade Marks Enquiry Committee . . .	529-30
240.	Slum Clearance Scheme . . .	530
241.	Arrears of Rent from Govt. Quarters . . .	530
242.	Border Raid . . .	530-31

**WRITTEN ANSWERS TO  
QUESTIONS *contd.***

<b>U.S.Q. No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>COLUMNS</b>
243.	Residential Accommodation in Delhi . . . . .	531-32
244.	Labour Attaches in Indian Missions . . . . .	532
245.	Chinese Raw Silk . . . . .	532
246.	Film Censorship . . . . .	533
247.	Displaced Persons in Jammu and Kashmir . . . . .	533
248.	Handicraft Industries . . . . .	533
249.	Clock Factories . . . . .	534
250.	Copper . . . . .	534
251.	Palm Gur . . . . .	534-35
252.	Indian Films . . . . .	535
253.	First Five Year Plan of Nepal . . . . .	535

<b>U.S.Q. No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>COLUMNS</b>
254.	Silk . . . . .	536
255.	Displaced Persons (Com- pensation and Rehabili- tation) Act, 1954 . . . . .	536
256.	Houses for Displaced Per- sons . . . . .	536
257.	Community Projects Ad- ministration . . . . .	536-37
258.	Refrigerators . . . . .	537
259.	Foreign Films . . . . .	537
260.	Maintenance Allowance for Displaced Persons . . . . .	537-38
261.	Match Factories . . . . .	538
262.	Markets for Displaced Per- sons in Delhi . . . . .	539
263.	Aluminium Factories . . . . .	540

Saturday, December 3, 1955

INDEX  
TO  
LOK SABHA  
DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

VOLUME IX, 1955

(21st November to 9th December, 1955)



ELEVENTH SESSION, 1955

(Vol. IX contains Nos. 1 to 15)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

## CONTENTS

[Part II Debates, Volume IX—21st November to 9th December, 1955]

No. 1.—Monday, 21st November, 1955—

COLUMNS

President's Assent to Bills . . . . .	1
Papers laid on the Table; . . . . .	2—4
Inter-State Water Disputes Bill; . . . . .	4
River Boards Bill* . . . . .	4
Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill . . . . .	5
Citizenship Bill; . . . . .	5,87
Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Bill . . . . .	5
Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill . . . . .	6
Companies Bill . . . . .	6—11
Press and Registration of Books (Amendment) Bill—	

Motion to consider . . . . .	12—87
------------------------------	-------

Consideration of Clauses—	
---------------------------	--

Clause 2 to 19 . . . . .	87—134
Daily Digest . . . . .	135—38

No. 2.—Tuesday, 22nd November, 1955—

Motion for Adjournment—	
-------------------------	--

Situation in Bombay . . . . .	139
Papers laid on the Table; . . . . .	139—40
Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill . . . . .	140

Press and Registration of Books (Amendment) Bill—	
---	--

Clause 19 . . . . .	140—43
Motion to pass as amended . . . . .	143
Companies Bill . . . . .	143—69

Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Bill—	
--	--

Motion to consider . . . . .	170—231
Clauses 2 to 5 and 1 . . . . .	231—43
Motion to pass as amended . . . . .	243—54

University Grants Commission Bill—	
------------------------------------	--

Motion to consider as reported by Joint Committee . . . . .	254—60
Daily Digest. . . . .	261—62

No. 3.—Wednesday, 23rd November, 1955—

Motion for Adjournment	
------------------------	--

Situation in Bombay . . . . .	263—68
-------------------------------	--------

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
--	--

Thirty-ninth Report . . . . .	268
-------------------------------	-----

University Grants Commission Bill—	
------------------------------------	--

Motion to consider as reported by Joint Committee . . . . .	269—382
Daily Digest. . . . .	383—84

No. 4.—Thursday, 24th November, 1955—

Papers laid on the Table . . . . .	385—87
------------------------------------	--------

## Business Advisory Committee—

Twenty-Seventh Report;	387
Statements <i>re</i> officers of All India Radio	387
Correction of answer to starred question	388
✓ University Grants Commission Bill—	
Motion to consider;	387—476
Consideration of clauses	477—481
Clause 2	477—483
Clauses 3 and 4	477—493
Clause 5	493—578
Daily Digest	519—521

## No. 5.—Friday, 25th November, 1955—

Papers laid on the Table;	521—522
Business Advisory Committee—Twenty-seventh Report;	522—529

## ✓ University Grants Commission Bill—

Clauses 6 to 12	529—589
Committee on Private Member's Bills and Resolutions—Thirty-ninth Report	569
Resolution <i>re</i> Regrouping of Railways	590—652
Resolution <i>re</i> Industrial Service Commission	652—64
Daily Digest;	655—56

## No. 6.—Monday, 28th November, 1955—

## Business Advisory Committee—

Twenty-eighth Report	657
Motion to consider	657—58
Manipur (Courts) Bill	658
Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Bill	658—68
University Grants Commission Bill—	
Consideration of clauses	668—86
Clauses 13 to 26 and 1	671—86
Motion to pass, as amended	687—704
Securities Contracts (Regulation) Bill—	
Motion to refer to Joint Committee	704—50
Indian Stamp (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider	750—53
Consideration of clauses	753
Clauses 1 to 9	753
Motion to Pass	753
Abolition of Whipping Bill—	
Motion to consider	753—80
Daily Digest	781—82

## No. 7.—Wednesday, 30th November, 1955—

## Motion for Adjournment—

Situation in Ratachera in Agartala	783—84
Correction of Answer to Starred Question;	784—85
Papers laid on the Table	785
Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill	785—86
Representation of the People (Second Amendment) Bill;	787

## Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Fortieth Report	787
-----------------	-----

## Business Advisory Committee—

Twenty-eighth Report	787—88
----------------------	--------

## Abolition of Whipping Bill—

Motion to consider	792—822
Clauses 1 to 4	822
Motion to Pass	822
Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to refer to Select Committee	788—92, 822—91
Manipur (Courts) Bill—	
Motion to consider	891—900
Daily Digest	901—92

No. 8.—Thursday, 1st December, 1955—

	COLUMNS
Papers laid on the Table	903—6,907
Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Bill	906
Insurance (Amendment) Bill	906—07
Point of order re use of objectionable expression	907—08
Point re Voting on Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Bill	908—12
Manipur (Courts) Bill—	
Motion to consider	912—26
Consideration of clauses	926—28
Clauses 2 to 46 and 1	926—28
Motion to Pass as amended	928—29
Railway Stores (Unlawful Possession) Bill—	
Motion to consider	929—1004
Consideration of clauses	1004—29
Clauses 2 to 4 and 1	1004—29
Motion to Pass	1029—30
Daily Digest	1031—34

No. 9.—Friday, 2nd December, 1955—

Papers laid on the Table	1035,1041
Motion for Adjournment	
Situation in Ratachera in Agartala	1035—39
Railway Stores (Unlawful Possession) Bill	1039
Correction to Answer to Starred Question.	1040
Part C States (Laws) Amendment) Bill	1040
Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill	1040
Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Amendment Bill.	1040—41
Citizenship Bill, as reported by Joint Committee—	
Motion to consider	1041—93
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Fortieth Report	1092
Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill	1092
Indian Converts (Regulation and Registration) Bill—	
Motion to consider	1093—1119
Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider	1119—53
Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill	1152
Daily Digest.	1153—54
No. 10.—Saturday, 3rd December, 1955—	
Papers laid on the Table	1155
Correction of Answer to Starred Question;	1155—56
Business of the House;	1156
Citizenship Bill, as reported by Joint Committee—	
Motion to consider	1157—1278
Daily Digest	1279—80

No. 11.—Monday, 5th December, 1955—

Message from Rajya Sabha	1281
Hindu Succession Bill	1281
Demands for Supplementary Grants, 1955-56	1281—82
Demands for Excess Grants, 1950-51	1282
Statement re Joint Statement by U.S. Secretary of State and Foreign Minister of Portugal	✓ 1282—83
Citizenship Bill, as reported by Joint Committee—	
Motion to consider	1283—1330
Clauses 2 to 10	1331—1418
Daily Digest	1419—20

No. 12.—Tuesday, 6th December, 1955—	COLUMNS
Papers laid on the Table . . . . .	1421—22
Rules Committee—	
First Report . . . . .	1422
Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—	
Forty-first Report . . . . .	1422—23
Business Advisory Committee—	
Twenty-ninth Report . . . . .	1423
Business of the House . . . . .	1423—27
Citizenship Bill—	
Consideration of clauses . . . . .	1427—1520
Clauses 3, 5, 8, 10 to 19 and 1 . . . . .	1427—1523
Motion to pass as amended . . . . .	1521—23
Insurance (Amendment) Bill . . . . .	1523—85
Motion to consider . . . . .	1526
Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill . . . . .	1586
Daily Digest . . . . .	1587—88
No. 13.—Wednesday, 7th December, 1955—	
Messages from Rajya Sabha . . . . .	1589—91
Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Bill . . . . .	1591
Papers laid on the Table; . . . . .	1591
Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirtieth Report . . . . .	1591
Twenty-ninth Report . . . . .	1592—1600
Business of the House . . . . .	1600—02
Insurance (Amendment) Bill—	
Motion to consider . . . . .	1602—92
Clauses 2 to 6 and 1 . . . . .	1693—1706
Motion to pass . . . . .	1106—10
Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill—	
Motion to consider . . . . .	1710—46
Daily Digest . . . . .	1747—48
No. 14.—Thursday, 8th December, 1955—	
Business Advisory Committee—	
Thirtieth Report . . . . .	1749
Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill . . . . .	1749—1814
Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill—	
Motion to consider . . . . .	1814—90
Clauses 2 and 3 . . . . .	1890—1916
Daily Digest; . . . . .	1917—18
No. 15.—Friday, 9th December, 1955.—	
Announcement re. discussion on S. R. C. Report . . . . .	1919—25
Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—Cyclone in Madras . . . . .	1926—30
Motion re. suspension of Rule 321 . . . . .	1930—45
Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill . . . . .	1945—46
Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Amendment Bill . . . . .	1946
Business of the House . . . . .	1946—47

	COLUMNS
<b>Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Bill—</b>	
Clauses 4 to 20 and 1	1947—93
Motion to pass, as amended	1993
<b>Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Amendment Bill—</b>	
Motion to consider	1994—2015
Clauses 2 and 1	2015—16
Motion to pass, as amended	2016
<b>Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill and Indian Tariff (Third Amendment) Bill—</b>	
Motions to consider	2016—32
<b>Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—</b>	
Forty-first Report	2052
Resolution re Industrial Service Commission	2032—56
Resolution re Appointment of a Committee to examine Community Projects and National Extension Service Schemes.	2056—94
Daily Digest	2095—96
Index	I—43

---

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1155

### LOK SABHA

Saturday, 3rd December, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

### PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

DELHI (CONTROL OF BUILDING OPERATIONS) REGULATIONS

**The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh):** On behalf of Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, I beg to lay on the Table, under subsection (3) of section 19 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Ordinance, 1955, a copy of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations, published in the Ministry of Health Notification No. S.R.O. 3487, dated the 11th November, 1955.  
[Placed in Library. See No. S-428/55]

### CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION

**The Deputy Minister of External Affairs: (Shri Anil K. Chanda):** The statement that, "No such representation for compensation was received" made by me in reply to part (c) of Starred Question No. 606 asked by Shri Dasaratha Deh in the Lok Sabha on the 7th March, 1955, was inaccurate, as subsequent enquiries show that two representations addressed to the Prime Minister, about payment of compensation to the victims of the Pakistan raid on Kamalpur, in

424 L.S.D.

1156

Tripura had actually been received and necessary action taken on them. I therefore, seek the permission of the House to correct my earlier statement which may be substituted by the following:

"Yes. Two such representations for compensation were received".

The position regarding payment of compensation to the victims of the raid, as already indicated in reply to part (d) of the question, is that as the Government of Pakistan had categorically denied participation in the raid by Pakistani forces, there was no purpose in approaching them for payment of any compensation to the victims of the raid. The Government of Tripura had provided immediate relief to the victims to the extent of Rs. 2 lakhs, besides cash doles, rehabilitation loans, ad hoc grants etc., and free gifts of woollen and cotton garments and blankets. They have recently reported that they would consider the question of grant of any additional relief to the victims of the raid in deserving cases.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed....

**Shri Kamath: (Hoshangabad):** Before proceeding to other business may I draw your attention to the fact that we have received a copy of the notification regarding *naya paisa*. May I know when it will be taken up for discussion in the House? There is no announcement at all.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I understand that the Business Advisory Committee

has allotted one hour for discussion. As to when exactly it will be taken up, it will be announced later.

**CITIZENSHIP BILL—contd.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further discussion of the motion for consideration of the Bill to provide for the acquisition and termination of Indian citizenship as reported by the Joint Committee.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** (Calcutta North-East): Last time, I was trying to explain the reasons why, along with some of my colleagues, I was constrained to append a minute of dissent. I was particularly intrigued by the continuing references in our law, our Citizenship law, to the position of the Commonwealth and of India *vis a vis* that association. I want specifically to find out from the Government as to why we go on having in our Citizenship law certain rather ambiguous expressions which suggest that we are perhaps entering into a kind of relationship with the British Empire countries, which may not redound to the interests of our people and to the dignity of our Republic. We thought that we had ceased to be a dependency of the British Empire when the Indian Independence Act was passed in 1947 by the British Parliament. Whatever suggestion of subjection or limitation was still there in our status must have been abjured entirely by India declaring herself a Republic in the Constitution. What worries me, however, is that, in the Citizenship law we have retained clause 11 which is absolutely redundant. It has no meaning as Shri Gadgil pointed out at an earlier stage of the proceedings. The recognition of the status of Commonwealth citizenship in India could only have been put in there as a sop to British Commonwealth ideas. I do not understand why in our repealing clause, clause 19, we refer to the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Acts, 1914 to 1943 and repeal them. I do not know why we go out of our way to repeal these British

Acts. Besides, the British Nationality Act of 1948, which we specifically omit to repeal, itself repealed these British Acts from 1914 to 1943. It can only be understood on the supposition—not a mere supposition, but it is, I think, a statement of fact—that we do recognise that certain British laws operate in India. These British laws are certainly not a part of the statute of our own country, but they are permitted to operate in this country. Reference has been made to the Prime Ministers' Conference held in April 1949 wherein India declared herself a Republic and a formula was evolved by which Republican India could also be a member of the British Commonwealth. I am prepared to agree that that declaration was extralegal and after the adoption of our Constitution, it has no legal significance whatever. But I do not see why this kind of thing happens in our Citizenship law. I read along with this what happened earlier when the India (Consequential Provisions) Act of 1949 was passed by the British Parliament. We went out of our way to print in our Gazette of India Extraordinary dated 16th January, 1950 this India (Consequential Provisions) Act of 1949 and we published also in our Gazette the British Nationality Act of 1948. This British Nationality Act of 1948 has been specifically omitted as far as the repeal clause is concerned. I suggest that all these matters have to be looked into very carefully. I know that in practice, if we choose to do so, we can be absolutely independent of whatever law the British Parliament might have passed. But, if in our law we incorporate the kind of clause to which I have tried to draw the attention of the House, then, surely, it suggests that something perhaps is wrong in the State of Denmark. I am very sorry that the Home Minister has not condescended to find some time from his confabulations in regard to the States Reorganisation schemes. I know and I highly appreciate the qualities of my friend the Deputy Minister. But, I feel that the Home Minister should have been present on this occasion

when this Bill is being discussed in this House unless, of course, he is unavoidably detained by physical reasons of some sort or other.

**The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):** Yes.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** But, I do feel that since the Home Minister is perhaps more likely to know inside information in regard to what happened at the time of transfer of power he owed it to the House to be present at the time of the discussion of this Bill.

Last time, I also referred to my grouse that even though the Joint Committee has improved upon the provisions of the original formulation of the Bill in regard to refugees from Pakistan, I would have very much preferred it if these refugees from Pakistan could be citizens by descent under clause 4 and were not compelled to register their claims under clause 5.

I explained how there are certain refugees who did not apply for relief or rehabilitation, who therefore did not go through all the red-tapish courses in regard to registration, and it is only right that they should have the opportunity of becoming full citizens of this country; it is only right that they should have that kind of emotional exhilaration which comes of the realisation that they are *ipso facto* accepted as citizens of this country on account of descent.

I referred also to our complaint that deprivation of citizenship in regard to registered citizens except for refugees is now left entirely to executive discretion and there is only a very remote association of the judiciary in an advisory capacity. I wish that this provision is changed by the House in the course of this discussion.

In clause 10, sub-clause (2) I also wish to suggest that though an improvement has been made by the Joint Committee by substituting the

"Constitution of India" for the "Government of India" I feel it would be very much better if instead of the word "Constitution", "the Republic" is substituted. Or, "India" as suggested by Shri Kamath might very well do. I say this because the Constitution established by law, I concede, certainly embodies the majesty of the people, but all the same there seems to be an idea that the Constitution is something which is, like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, absolutely immutable. In a dynamic society, in a changing society, even the Constitution has to change, and there are certain emergent situations where the people have to arrogate to themselves the right to change the Constitution. Therefore, I feel that if the words "the Republic of India" or simply "India" are placed instead of "the Constitution" that would be emphasising the inherent right of the people to change, to develop the Constitution if that is what the dynamic necessities of life demand. "The Republic" appears to me to be a very powerful and emotionally acceptable expression of the majesty of the people, and I wish that this small change is accepted by Government. It was perhaps inadvertence which made the Government first formulate loyalty to the Government established by law in India to be demanded of everybody who had to register himself as a citizen. This was a very wrong identification between the Government and the State, and some attempt has been made to improve the situation by putting in the words "the Constitution", but I feel that if we put in the word "Republic" or "India", it would be very much better.

Similarly, we find in the second Schedule that citizens who are registered have to take an oath of allegiance where they are required to take a pledge to observe the laws of India. Now, as I have said in my Minute of Dissent, laws certainly are meant to be observed, but there are occasions in the history of a people when certain laws have perhaps to be resisted, and remembering that we are only

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

going to have such people as citizens who would, I take it, be on the whole desirable people, acceptable people, the right kind of people, we should give them every opportunity to be faithful to the spirit of the citizenship of India and not to pledge themselves to obey all the laws of India which might happen to be on the statute-book at a particular time. There is no obligation to observe every single law at any particular point of time. If my friends on the Treasury Benches swear by the name of Mahatma Gandhi, surely part of the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi is that it is the very nature of governments, it is the very nature of the people in power sometimes to formulate laws, sometimes to push through the legislature laws which may have to be resisted—resisted in a particular fashion which Mahatma Gandhi tried to explain to his people and to follow by his own example. So, that right of resisting laws which happen to be on the statute-book but which do not coincide really and truly with the fundamental interests and desires of the people, that right must be given even to those who are registered as our citizens. If they are faithful to India, if they are loyal to the Republic, if they observe all that is necessary as far as the conduct of the citizens of India is concerned, then surely we should not ask them to give a pledge in regard to the laws of India.

I wish also there were in clause 4 a provision which would enable Indian women marrying foreigners to transmit Indian nationality to their offspring. We have been told that there would be a multiplicity of citizenships and it would cause a mass of complications. I feel in this Bill we have been pretty lavish in the offer of citizenship to different categories of people, and if only we add the very few Indian women who happen to marry foreigners, then surely the number of those who would be additionally entitled to citizenship would not be at all large, and therefore the complication would by no means be the kind of complication which it has

been argued it might be. And therefore I feel that this kind of change might very well be accepted by Government.

I wish also to tell the House that my feeling is—and I am sure a section of the House also feels that way—that the Bill should have comprised a separate section on the status of aliens, but we are given to understand that certain steps are in contemplation in regard to this by Government, and I hope that there would be some effort to define the status of aliens.

I have covered most of the points on which I feel that the report of the Joint Committee requires revision by the House. I shall only remind the House that we are performing now an obligation which was imposed on us by the Constitution in regard to the formulation of our law of citizenship and therefore I feel that we should try to make our law of citizenship as adequate, as fair and as much in conformity with the interests of our people and the dignity of our Republic as we can make it, and that is why I have emphasized perhaps at a certain length those clauses which deal with our Commonwealth relationship. I wish that Government comes forward with an explanation as to how certain ambiguities, certain perversities, to my mind, have crept into this legislation—because I feel that in regard to the Commonwealth we ought to make this very clear that it is only on the basis of like-mindedness that we can continue our association with any body of States, and if this Commonwealth continues to behave in the way that it does, then I do not see how our association with the Commonwealth can go on.

I wish also to say in conclusion that in regard to the First Schedule we agree entirely with the Home Minister when he spoke here at an earlier stage of the proceedings that we wish to give all the world the impression that we are by no means Chauvinists, that we want as wide an association of States as possible, that we want to throw open the ambit of our citizenship to Commonwealth countries be-

cause we believe in the idea of an ultimate world citizenship. If that is so, I do not see why Government cannot agree to the amplification of the First Schedule. We might mention the Commonwealth countries, but in that mention perhaps we ought to delete mention of countries like South Africa or of Australia which, my hon. friend Shri Kamath pointed out, is particularly democratic in its attitude towards coloured peoples. We might omit reference to these two countries, but we might add other countries, a country like Nepal, a country like Burma. In regard to Burma we have been given literature—I do not know how far it is exact—in regard to the difficulties of Indian citizens in Burma. At the same time, however, in Burma the position is such that one man is a Burmese citizen and a Minister of the Burmese Government and his brother is the Ambassador of India to Burma. If that is so, our relationship with that country is so obviously close that we can make it very much closer, and if we mention Burma in the First Schedule that would be a gesture to Burma, and that would be an opportunity for us to put our relationship with Burma on a very much better level and to remove those difficulties which, reportedly, Indian citizens in Burma are experiencing. We might also try and add on the basis of neighbourliness or on the basis of adherence to common principles in international life certain other countries which are now adhering to that principle, and on that foundation we can really make our citizenship law something which the whole world will look upon as model legislation of its kind. But, as it stands, however, it is vitiated by the shadow of the Commonwealth connection which, I for one, am not prepared to stomach in spite of the speeches made by the Home Minister, and I wish that Government in its answer comes forward with an explanation as to how certain very dubious clauses have got into the formulation of this Bill. I therefore wish that very careful thought is given by this House to consideration of this measure and then we can

formulate a citizenship law of which we shall be proud.

**Shri Barman** (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): At the outset, I wish to convey my thanks to the hon. Deputy Minister of Home Affairs and the Joint Committee for having made a change in clause 10, as was desired by the House at the time the motion for reference to Joint Committee was under discussion.

I have tabled an amendment to clause 5 which deals with citizenship by registration. I hope the hon. Minister will consider it sympathetically. I may not be able to place my case when the clauses are taken up, but I hope the hon. Minister will devote his careful attention to the submission that I am making now. It has been advocated by Shri H. N. Mukerjee just now and also by Shri N. C. Chatterjee yesterday that the refugees or displaced persons from Eastern Pakistan should be given the right of citizenship by descent. The hon. Deputy Minister while he opened the general discussion yesterday said that in the Constitution itself there is no provision under which conferment of such rights is contemplated. And he referred to article 6 according to which a displaced person from Eastern Pakistan had to put in a domicile of at least six months before he could apply for registration, and further that application for registration should have been before Government before the introduction of the Constitution. I quite agree with the hon. Minister. But then there is some difference between the position of the displaced persons then and the position of the displaced persons now. Formerly, the position of the displaced persons was such that they could at any moment cross the border and come over to India, and after staying here for a month or more, they could again go back to Pakistan if they liked. But that position has now been fundamentally altered by the imposition of certain restrictions both by India as well as by Pakistan. At present, no one can come over from Pakistan to India without having a migration certificate,

[Shri Barman]

if he wants to leave that country for good and wants to settle in India. So, the former position no longer obtains now.

Even in the Constitution a domicile of only six months has been prescribed for the displaced persons before they could apply for registration. So, I have tabled an amendment for the consideration of Government, that instead of one year as provided for in clause 5, the period should be reduced to six months, so that a displaced person who has lived here for six months would be entitled to apply for registration as a citizen. I would like to impress on Government once again that those persons who are coming over to India are coming with migration certificates, which means nothing else than this, namely that they have abjured their former citizenship, and they have come over to India for good. Now, to make these persons, who have once and for all renounced their right of citizenship not really on account of their choice, wait for a year till they could acquire the citizenship of any country whatsoever in the world would be a tyranny and injustice to them. So, I do not think there will be any valid objection on the part of Government to confer citizenship rights on such Stateless persons after they have put in a residence or domicile in India for at least six months. I hope the House as well as Government would consider this matter seriously and accept the amendment that I have tabled in this regard. I do not think there is any Member in this House who is not sympathetic towards the cause of the displaced persons who are leaving their hearth and home and coming over to India. If Government consents—I do not think there is any reason for not consenting to the suggestion I have made—I am sure that consent will prevail upon the House, and the House will also endorse the views of Government and agree to reduce the period from one year to six months.

I have tabled another small amend-

ment, namely amendment No. 70, to clause 18. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's name also has been bracketed with mine, and I therefore hope that he also concurs with my suggestion. Sub-clause (4) of clause 18 reads:

"All rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be laid for not less than fourteen days before both Houses of Parliament and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the session in which they are so laid."

The implication of this provision is that if during that session, Parliament does not make any modifications, then the rules that are placed before it will become final. I do not think that this is right, for due to several reasons the session may terminate abruptly. So, it is just possible that before the amendment suggested by somebody may be considered the session may come to an end. These things are not at all impossible. In such a case, the wording of the sub-clause at present would mean that if during the same session, Parliament has not made any modifications, then the rules as laid before it would become absolute, and Government can proceed with the working of those rules.

Further, it is also possible that after the rules have been approved with or without modifications by Parliament in the same session, later experience may require some modification in the rules. But according to the present provision, Parliament will not have any right to make modifications of that kind. I therefore feel that this provision limiting unduly the power of Parliament is not only unnecessary but uncalled for. Of course, it might not be the intention of Government to limit the power of Parliament, but that is the implication of the present provision. I would therefore suggest that this restrictive clause should be omitted.

Lastly, I would like to place one other view before Government, and

that is that the First Schedule should be amended a little. I also endorse the view expressed by other hon. Members that the name of South Africa could be deleted from that Schedule. I do not know whether there will be any difficulties if we delete that. Of course, Government will be the best judge on the matter. I find in the Schedule the phrase 'The following Commonwealth countries'. That means that there are some other Commonwealth countries which are not mentioned here. If those other Commonwealth countries could be omitted from the list, then what is the harm if we omit South Africa? My reasons for suggesting like that are as follows.

I do not know what are the advantages that flow from Commonwealth citizenship in fact. There might be many things in theory, but I do not know what are the practical advantages of Commonwealth citizenship, apart from citizenship proper. I hope the Government will explain the difference in the advantages that flow from Commonwealth citizenship as well as ordinary citizenship. If there be anything in the nature of Commonwealth citizenship that is advantageous for us at present in Commonwealth countries, then my next question is whether those advantages, those facilities, those privileges and rights are availed of by Indian citizens or citizens of Indian origin in South Africa at present. If those rights or privileges do not obtain there at present, then it is meaningless, or rather hypocritical on our part, to treat South Africa on the same level as other Commonwealth countries. I had one occasion to be present in a Commonwealth Conference and in that Conference the representative of South Africa blatantly and bluntly said before our face that the policy of South Africa, both of the Government of the time as well as of the Opposition, was one, and that policy was the paramountcy of the white race and also trusteeship by the white over the coloured people as well as people of Indian origin and

others, that is, non-white. If that be the policy declared by South Africa openly in a conference which is termed as a Commonwealth Conference,—I do not know whether that attitude has been changed by South Africa later on.....

**Shri Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Did any other delegate protest against that?

**Shri Barman**: Every member of the delegation protested, specially our leader, the hon. Speaker of the House.

**Shri Kamath**: That is very good.

**Shri Barman**: What I submit is that if that policy, that attitude of South Africa remains the same, as it was, then it will be shameful on our part to say that South Africa is one of the Commonwealth countries with which we want to maintain Commonwealth citizenship relations. If, of course, for practical reasons, it will be necessary for us, that is for Government to consider, but on general grounds, on grounds of prestige, I think South Africa may be omitted for the present.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram** (Visakhapatnam): Should be.

**Shri Barman**: If South Africa revises its attitude; there might be no harm and no difficulty in adding it to the list at any future time. I have suggested three amendments in regard to the First Schedule and they are for Government to consider.

**Shri Raghavachari** (Penukonda): I am not rising as any expert or a man with complete comprehension of the things about citizenship, but I am only concerned with one or two aspects which alone I shall place before the House.

As the House knows, this matter has been under consideration at the stage of the motion for reference to Select Committee when many Members participated and adduced all arguments. In the Joint Committee, there have been prolonged discussions.

[Shri Raghavachari]

sions, and again we have as much of it now. Therefore, repeating the same thing and taking the time of the House is, I feel, not justified. I would only suggest one or two points which I feel must be particularly considered by the House.

First, I shall refer to the risks that are involved in vesting in the executive absolute power of deprivation of a man's citizenship. I am more concerned with that portion. That is covered by clause 10(5). I have also listened to the arguments of the Deputy Minister in connection with this. His argument is that there has been some kind of association of a judicial officer at the time of the inquiry presided over by him; also in sub-clause (6) it is said that ordinarily, the Government will be guided by the report of that committee of inquiry, and if in spite of that, the Government make some kind of an order contrary to the recommendations, Government have a responsibility to this House, and it can always be turned down or upset—these are the arguments that have been advanced.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Is there any automatic bringing forward before the House? That is not there.

**Shri Raghavachari:** Of course. I just wish to examine that argument in its detail, and then submit my own fears. First and foremost, the contention now urged by other friends is that it must be presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court, that is a Judge who is a member of the highest tribunal and actually in office. But what is proposed here is "a chairman, being a person who has for at least ten years held a judicial office". May I very respectfully ask, what is the meaning of this 'judicial office'? It may be a District Magistrate, it may be a Third Class Magistrate, it may be a subordinate Judge, it may be anybody who has held a judicial office.

**Shri Kamath:** District Judge.

**Shri Raghavachari:** I am not saying anything against this whole body of judicial officers. Many of them are very honourable people. But the only thing that you have said is 'held a judicial office'. He might later on have become the worst bureaucrat. He might have held sometime this office. Therefore, that somebody who has held that office and who will preside over it will not really create any confidence in the people. We all know that the right of citizenship is a very valuable right and people have fought and fought, and many have sacrificed their lives for independence because being a citizen of an independent country is a valuable right. You take such a valuable right away. Deprivation of it is easy on any judicial officer's recommendation. Therefore, to my mind, this argument that some judicial officer is associated is not at all satisfactory. I would, therefore, submit very respectfully that the requirement that is urged by Members, that he must be a Judge of the Supreme Court—and I would prefer a Judge of the Supreme Court in office and not even one who has retired—must be satisfied. There is always this trouble. Now, we want experienced people. We are having ex-judicial officers presiding over many committees, commissions and all that. I am not saying anything against them. But human nature oftentimes being what it is, there will be an inclination to be helpful to the Government which might be seeking their services.

**Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru):** Serving themselves, but not the public.

**Shri Raghavachari:** Therefore, I say a man actually in office, would be the best.

The next thing is that the report will ordinarily be accepted by the Government. I dare say it will be.....

**Shri Kamath:** To be guided by' is not 'accepted'.

**Shri Raghavachari:** Being guided is accepting; otherwise, it is not guiding. They should ordinarily be guided by that. Suppose it is not 'guided'. I wish to examine the remedy. A very 'safe' safeguard is suggested and that is—you can turn out the Government—'turn down the Government' was the expression used. We know that constitutionally it is so, but really it is not so. Today you are in such a huge majority. Suppose on another occasion, you are in such a huge majority that all the Opposition Members may be deprived of their citizenship rights. We may turn you out, no doubt, but before we can do so, we are turned out.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma** (Meerut Distt.—South): You cannot be turned out. You are a citizen by birth. You cannot be deprived of citizenship.

**Shri Raghavachari:** This right that we may turn out the Government or turn down the Government is not a very real safeguard available. As a responsible citizen of this country, I expect a Government should always be guided by a recommendation of a committee. I perfectly agree. But when you say that you shall ordinarily be guided by the report of such a committee, you should also create confidence in the minds of the people that it is a Judge of experience who does preside over it and that you will be guided by the report of such a committee—I would even say instead of 'guided', 'accepted'. Under extraordinary circumstances, by all means retain the power as now provided in the clause.

One of the arguments perhaps is why burden the Supreme Court with all this kind of business. That means this. Do you expect that the Government will go on proposing to deprive the citizenship of almost every individual and therefore the number of cases in which these Judges will have to busy will be so numerous that their ordinary duties are disturbed? I do not accept it. It will be very rare and in very few cases. I have carefully considered all the arguments

for and against and I think it is best that the Government accepts these small amendments which really make for the greater dignity of the Government, for greater confidence in the administration and which will also allay even the imaginary fears—as the Government might say—or the possible risk of any individual losing his right. I do not wish to repeat any more arguments about it.

My friend Shri Kamath wanted Jammu and Kashmir to be specifically mentioned and I heard the Deputy Minister saying that if it is not excluded it is included. (*Interruption*). To that extent, the difficulty or apprehension is removed and, therefore, it extends to that portion also.

**Shri Kamath:** His interpretation.

**Shri Raghavachari:** It is not interpretation. India includes everything; that is the definition that we all know. The expression, 'It extends to the whole of India' is not to be found in this enactment though the word 'India' is used later on in several places. So, we find that it extends to the whole of India. I take the interpretation of the Deputy Minister as it is reasonable and accept that it is included and it is not likely to be argued that it has been excluded.

There is another point, about the definition of the word 'person'. There has been some long note that is added by way of dissent to the existing definition of the word 'person' as excluding corporations. I do not wish again to repeat the arguments which are in cold print here. But, I also feel, in the light of the Supreme Court decision and the observations in more than one case, the necessity and the requirement for corporations also to be in a position to hold, exercise and have rights over properties and for that it is necessary that at least in a restricted way the rights of citizenship, particularly with regard to these fundamental rights, may be mentioned in respect of corporations also.

[Shri Raghavachari]

Shri Nathwani, I think, has suggested a definition and a clause also to be added. To my mind it looks all right, though an individual and a corporation may not always be in all respects equal. There will be some differences. But, still, it is in the interests of all such corporations which are composed of Indian citizens only that this right is admitted.

Only one word about the rules. I am glad that the principle of laying down these rules before the House and the right of the House to amend or modify them has been accepted as a matter of principle. Though on some other occasions other Ministers were still hesitating to accept amendments of this kind on the ground that the Cabinet as a whole has not decided upon the policy, I am glad that in an important matter like this it has been conceded. I only wish to express what I feel—a little difficulty in the matter. You have only provided that the rules shall be placed before both Houses for not less than 14 days and any amendments should be made during the session in which they are so laid. It may so happen that there are not 14 days in the session in which they are so laid; there may be 13 days in that session and 1 day in the next session. But you have to dispose of them in the same session. I am only feeling the possibility of inconvenience. You may do it on the second or third day. I think it is unnecessary to do that except in cases of emergency. But there is some difficulty.....

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon):** It may be laid on the last day or one or two days before the end of the session.

**Shri Raghavachari:** That is the point. Then how can it be disposed of in the same session? That is why I think it would be better to have the words 'the same session' omitted. It may be in that session or the next session. I have put the matter as it appeared to me and I think the matter

may be amended suitably so that we may not have any unreasonable fears in our minds.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** So far as this Bill is concerned, I am very glad that some of the objectionable features of this Bill have been remedied by the Joint Committee. For instance, many of us pointed out at the time the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee that so far as refugees are concerned, there was discrimination against them, when they were made citizens, and others who were born citizens of this country. I am glad one of the objectionable features has been removed and I am thankful to the Ministry as well as the Joint Committee that they have taken away this provision which would have not only smacked of discrimination but which would have been felt very badly by the refugees. All the same I must submit even now there are certain provisions which are such as the refugees will not be thankful for to the Government.

In the first place, I very humbly beg to point out that the provisions relating to refugees relate to lakhs of people. In my estimate, at least about more than 20 lakhs and less than 30 lakhs of people will be affected by the provisions. Now, to accept that these 30 lakhs of people shall go to courts or to the authorities to make regular applications, giving affidavits required by the rules, put stamps and undergo all the trouble is to expect too much. I know that many of those who could be benefited by the provisions of section 6 did not take advantage of these provisions on account of these difficulties. I, therefore, suggested at the time the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee that we should arrange matters in such a way that so far as these refugees are concerned, they should be entitled to become citizens in the same manner as other citizens are here in India. It means that at least—if not more—something like 3 crores of rupees shall have to be spent by these refugees whom the Government is helping. Government have

spent about Rs. 250 crores over these refugees and yet they are in such a condition that they are unable even to incur an expenditure of Rs. 10 per head for this purpose. The result will be that as many of them are so ignorant and illiterate and do not know these rules that they will not be able to take advantage of the citizenship of this country although they happen to be as good citizens as any born in India. I would, therefore, submit with all the emphasis at my command that this House should come to the rescue of these refugees. The House can very easily come to the rescue of these refugees. When we enacted article 6 of the Constitution, so far as those persons who came from West Pakistan were concerned, we made a rule that up till the 19th July of 1948 if any refugees had come into India, they would be regarded as Indian citizens just as those who were born here.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Automatically.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Automatically they became the citizens of this country provided that after their migration they remained in India. In regard to those who came to India after the 19th July 1948, we enacted certain provisions which are of the nature of these very provisions before us, but at the same time I may inform the House that before the 19th July 1948, if not more, about 90 per cent. of the refugees had already come into India and out of the remaining 10 per cent. I understand that many of them have not yet applied and not got themselves registered. In regard to the refugees from East Bengal, my humble submission is that a similar provision should have been made by the Joint Committee applicable to them. We could say that those persons who have come from East Bengal before the 1st January, 1955 should *ipso facto* be regarded to have become the citizens of India without any registration, etc. The word "migration" is used in the Constitution to mean that they came to India with the pur-

pose of remaining in India and becoming citizens of India and those who were permitted to migrate to Pakistan would forfeit the nationality of this country and we made a provision in this regard in article 7 of the Constitution that they no longer would remain citizens of this country till they satisfied all the conditions stipulated there, got certificates of resettlement, etc., and also got themselves registered. I very humbly beg to suggest to the House that we can make a similar rule and say that those who have come from East Bengal before the 1st January, 1955 should *ipso facto* be regarded to have become the citizens of India without any registration, etc. In regard to the rest, we can say that such of them who are given permits for permanent return or resettlement or are entitled to the benefits of rehabilitation from our Government may be regarded as citizens of India. In that case they will require a certificate of permanent return or resettlement or certificate of getting rehabilitation benefit. These can be given by some officer appointed by our Government and it is very easy to do so. They have not to apply at all. Instead of asking lakhs of persons to apply, go to the court and have recourse to irksome and dilatory procedure, we can have a very clear rule here to the effect that those who have come from East Bengal for the purpose of becoming nationals of this country are allowed to become citizens of this country. We should not put obstacles in their way. As a matter of fact, you have got a very soft corner for those who, according to you, are of Indian origin. These persons of Indian origin have lost their citizenship of undivided India because you agreed to the partition of India. Those Hindus living in East Bengal are the potential citizens of this country. I know that our Government is unable to stem the tide of those who are coming from there into India. We have tried our best but we have failed and failed signally in this matter. Our foreign policy has failed in this matter and let us fully realise it. Those persons will be pushed out, if not today, to-

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

morrow or the day after. Pakistan is determined to see that not a single Hindu remains a national of Pakistan, and by stages it is giving the push. We have not been able to stem the tide of those who are coming out of Pakistan to India. If such persons want to come into this country, you should not put any obstacles because they are quite helpless and this helplessness has come to them because of you. Therefore, it is fair that those persons who have already come with the object of becoming the nationals of this country should not be put to hardships and no obstacles be placed in their way to become nationals of this country or full citizens of this country. Those who want to remain in Pakistan and be the nationals of Pakistan may remain so and we are not encouraging them to come here, but at the same time I do not see any justification for putting obstacles in the way of those who want to return to India; in fact, they should be allowed to become citizens of India with as little delay and difficulty as possible. They are likely to come here and they shall come and the best way for the solution of this problem is this. When we give them permit for permanent return or resettlement in this country and give them rehabilitation benefit, our officer makes all these enquiries before allowing them to come and at that time we can make them citizens of India. I very humbly beg the House and the Ministry not to enact these provisions made by the Joint Committee as regards registration, etc., so far as those people are concerned. At the time when the Bill was sent to the Joint Committee I submitted that I did not want that these refugees should be asked to register themselves. Registration is only for those who are not the real citizens of India, nor are rooted in the land of India, nor have a domicile in this country, not wanting to return to any other country.

**Shri Kamath:** I rise on a point of order. In spite of the Prime Minister's reported circular to all my Con-

gress colleagues to be present in the House, I am sorry to say that there is no quorum again.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** When do we close.....

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Even if the bell is rung, it will be 1 o'clock by the time the bring stools. It is almost 1 o'clock now. The ringing of the bell will take two to three minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let the bell be rung.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** What has the letter written by the Prime Minister to the Members of the Congress Party to do with the point of order here?

**Shri Kamath:** Has the Prime Minister's letter no value?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It may have value, but the point of order may not have much value. Fortunately, the hon. Member, Shri Kamath, was not present yesterday, in the latter half of the day. He came only after the business was over. I was looking to this side to see whether Shri Kamath was there to raise this question.

**An Hon. Member:** No official Bills were being discussed and so Shri Kamath was not here.

**Shri Kamath:** If nobody raised a point of order, that was not my fault. It was open to any one to raise a point of order then.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members ought to be here; it is not yet 1 o'clock. They may go for lunch after 1 o'clock. Whatever happens here is proclaimed to the world at large, to the country, to the constituencies from which all Members come. In order to make up quorum, have responsible Members who have spent much money and undergone trouble for representing 7½ lakhs of the population, if not more, to be invited to be present in this House? I am really sorry for this spectacle. If it continues like this, the only alternative for me will be that one day I will adjourn the House for want of quorum.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** *Sine die?*

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): So long as the Central Hall remains the place for supply of tea and coffee, the problem of quorum will remain. So some other arrangements should be made for..... 1 P.M.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Central Hall cannot be abolished. It is rather strange that hon. Members who are all above 21 or 24 years, who are all elderly gentlemen, should say that there is a temptation here because there are cinema halls and therefore abolish all cinemas otherwise we will go and sit there. Now, let us proceed.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Sir, Shri Kamath did well in drawing your attention to the letter of the hon. Prime Minister and we are all thankful to him. But, may I submit that very many times I have found that Members of other parties are not here and it is the duty of everyone of us irrespective of parties to be present here, attend to the business of the House and hear what others have to say?

**Shri Kamath:** Sir, you yourself ruled yesterday that it is not for the Opposition to keep the quorum. That was the ruling you gave. You said it is for the ruling party to maintain the quorum.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** What is the ruling party? We meet here as equals, as Members of Parliament.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I did not say that the ruling party was itself bound to maintain the quorum. Whoever wants to get through business must maintain the quorum. It is obligatory on every hon. Member who has taken the oath of allegiance to stand by the Constitution, who has pledged and has given an undertaking to his constituents that he will go and in the name of God and everybody serve his country properly, to be present here and not merely to go on raising objections which he is not observing himself. On many occasions I have found that hon. Members who raise such objections are themselves not

present in the House. Hon. Members must come 10 minutes in advance of eleven o'clock and rise only 10 minutes after five o'clock or the time at which the House adjourns which-ever is later. That is what we are all expected to do. I am not a teacher here to mark them absent or present. I am appealing to hon. Members again and again that even if they do not have an opportunity to speak, at any rate, they will be educated enormously in certain subjects with which they are not prepared. When others go on speaking they have got a right not only to speak but they have a duty to hear and also to maintain a quorum. It will be wrong for me to go on expatiating the whole thing. Let not an hon. Member think that it is the duty of others to maintain the quorum and not himself. Let him look to the back seats also.

**Shri M.S. Gurupadaswamy** (Mysore): rose—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it another point of order? Let us proceed with our work. Every hon. Member must observe that it is his duty to be here and maintain the quorum.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das** (Darbhanga Central): Sir, the Members who get an opportunity to speak immediately after delivering their speeches they go out. At least they should be present here after they have spoken.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not know I would only urge upon hon. Members to kindly come and tell me how to maintain quorum in the House or how to prevent hon. Members from going away soon after they have finished their speeches. Now, let us proceed—Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** Sir, I was submitting.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He must finish before the quorum is lost.

**An Hon. Member:** Now, no quorum is required, it is 1:05.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** If this is your order, I will finish by 2:30 p.m. because till then there is no need for a quorum.

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

I was submitting that, as a matter of fact, we should arrange matters in such a way that there is no difference whatsoever between those who are born citizens of the country and those people who were citizens of undivided India but on account of partition became citizens of Pakistan and are coming here. Now, I find, first of all every such refugee or every such person shall be fined Rs. 10. I submit that he ought not to be fined. Secondly, I find that though the Ministry and the Select Committee have very kindly agreed to take away some of the obnoxious provisions yet there are other provisions which make a distinction between the rights of those who are citizens by birth or descent and those who are citizens by registration. As I submitted last time when the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee, these refugees should be made citizens of the country equal to those who are citizens by birth. They should not be registered at all. There is no occasion for registering them. Article 11 of the Constitution has given us full powers to enact any measure modifying the provisions of the Constitution in this respect. The words in article 11 are:

"Nothing in the foregoing provisions of this Part shall derogate from the power of Parliament to make any provision with respect to the acquisition and termination of citizenship and all other matters relating to citizenship."

I, therefore, suggest that 1st January, 1955 may be regarded as the date. If any person migrated before that time then clearly he may be made a citizen automatically and become entitled to all rights as a born citizen. In regard to those persons who are yet to come, I can understand, of the time of entry they may be given permits for resettlement, benefits of rehabilitation etc. By virtue of those permits they may become citizens of this country and they may not be asked to have resort to registration etc. They should not be forced to take the oath of allegiance like citi-

zens by birth. They and their ancestors have lived in this country for thousands of years and with every breath oath pulsates in their blood. Then, I submit that such provisions as relate to persons who are registered will not apply to them—for instance, deprivation as a result of convictions etc. We have got in clause 10 a provision that if any such person who is registered is convicted for an offence for more than two years then he ceases to be a citizen and he loses his citizenship. I do not want that this should apply to the refugees.

Another suggestion I made at the time the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee was that we should arrange our matters in this country in such a way that our security is not jeopardized; that such situations do not arise in the country as arose at a time when a large number of persons from Pakistan from Mymensingh and other districts entered Assam and we had to make a Bill here for the expulsion of those persons. My humble submission is that if you make it a right in so far as citizens of any country in the world or citizens of Commonwealth countries are concerned, it may happen that a large number of people may try to enter Assam or any other part of the country and we may be helpless to refuse registration or it may not be possible to control the influx. I beg to submit that the first rule of law in a matter of this kind, in a matter of the question of making citizenship, is that our country remains safe and the economy of this country is not in any manner jeopardized. I remember, at the time when we passed this Bill about expulsion, a large number of people had come and to this day the provision of that Act has not been utilised and it has not been given effect to. What would happen in a situation like this? I, therefore, want to arm the Government with the power to refuse registration at their discretion. Though there is a clause here under which the Government can refuse registration it is not so specific. I want to see that specific power is

given to the Government to see that at their discretion they may refuse any person the right of registration etc., whether he belongs to a Commonwealth country or to any other country. Then again I do not see any reason for having the provision which is mentioned in clause 5 (b) which reads thus:

"persons of Indian origin who are ordinarily resident in any country or place outside undivided India."

My humble submission is this. This law of nationality or this law of citizenship is peculiar in one sense that we all belong to this broad world but still every nation has got its own territory. Without territory no nation can exist and, therefore, those who are rooted to the soil, who have got domiciled in that land, who propose to live and die and have their being in that land, they only are the nationals of that country. Those people who have gone away, those people who live outside, they may be technically called nationals of the country if they are nationals by virtue of a fiction contained in section 5 or section 6, but virtually those persons are the nationals who live in the country, who add to the wealth of the country, who enjoy the benefits of that wealth and who are, as a matter of fact, as the phrase goes, rooted in this land. In regard to such as unrooted the country there is already a rule under article 8 of the Constitution. In article 8 of the Constitution there is a provision for them. I fail to see why there should be another provision like clause 5(b) in this Bill for those persons.

Then again, as I submitted on the previous occasion, I do not understand why the mere ground of birth alone should give a right of citizenship of this country. Any foreign couple may come here and give birth to a child. Why should that child become a citizen of this place?

**Shri Kamath:** Couple cannot give birth.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** My friend is entirely wrong. But I am not taken away by this diversion which of course is made in a light mood. But, at the same time, my friend is quite wrong. He does not know that really it is a couple which gives birth. A woman by herself or a man by himself cannot give birth to a child. I leave it there.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is it necessary to record all these processes in a regular register—how children are born, etc?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I just referred in the same light mood in which interruption was made.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is wrong? What is the meaning of such interruptions? We forget that this is a serious business, that we are transacting here. A humorous remark may be allowed, but going into the question as to the author of the child and so on, are all matters which have to be avoided in future.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** In clause 3 of this Bill, we are saying:

"Except as provided in sub-section (2) of this section, every person born in India on or after the 26th January, 1950, shall be a citizen of India by birth".

My humble submission is that in the Constitution we had a different rule, a very good one and a very justifiable one. It is article 5. There, you will kindly see the words:

"At the commencement of this Constitution, every person who has his domicile in the territory of India and—

(a) who was born in the territory of India;" etc.

The first and foremost and the most important point is that the person must have his domicile in India, and so, unless he has that domicile in India, a person has no right to become a citizen of this country. Therefore, I say that only those per-

## [Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

sons who have got such *Animus Revertendi*, who live in this country, who would die in this country and add to the wealth of this country and are rooted in this country can be the citizens of this country. So, I would like to say that in clause 3, the principle which we have adopted under article 5 of the Constitution must be accepted and not birth only, as the basis of citizenship. Domicile plus birth should both be applied for the right of citizenship to every person who is born in India. Not only that. My humble submission is that if a person is out of India for a large number of years without *Animus Revertendi* according to me, the law of domicile must apply to him. If such a person is there, he has no right to be a citizen of India.

In regard to the question of descent also, I feel that we have gone too far. In article 6 of the Constitution, we have said that those persons whose parents or grand-parents were born in India will also be regarded as of Indian origin. Since we have made this provision, I only want to say that in the British Nationality Act, the distinction has been made clear. It only refers to the father alone, and not to parents or the grand-parents. According to me, the first ground for citizenship is that the person must have a domicile here or at least *Animus Revertendi* from the other place where he is resident. Both these two things are missing, and so, without either of these things, a person has no right to be a national of India.

**Shri Kamath:** What is that latin phrase?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** *Animus Revertendi*, that is, the person has got the ultimate intention of coming back.

From clause 11 onwards, we are dealing with Commonwealth citizenship, etc. It is not reciprocity but the actual rule for registration which should determine the matter. According to me,—and I know that—no citizen of India can go today, even

after seven years, to Pakistan and live there as a citizen, as our Pakistan brethren, if they come here, can live here in this country. Therefore, I am anxious to see that, if in any country the conditions of existence, the conditions of life, the facilities and restrictions are of such a nature—not by virtue of any rule or law but on account of the actual conditions obtaining—that a citizen from here cannot go there and become a citizen of that country, then the citizens of such countries should not be allowed to become citizens of this country. This will apply to South Africa, to Ceylon also and it applies to some other places also. I am not satisfied with the rule that by virtue of a certain law which is obtaining in some countries, our citizens can go and become citizens of those countries, at least in theory. I would rather like that equal conditions of law and order, facilities and convenience without any prejudice of any kind in any person's mind, should prevail in that country, whose citizens can become citizens of this country. If these conditions are prevalent in that country, then that is reciprocity.

**Shri Datar:** The hon. Member will kindly see the proviso under clause 5 (1), under which "the Central Government shall have due regard to the conditions subject to which", etc., they may "become citizens of that country by registration". The conditions are already there; it is not rules.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I have read this rule, and I have given amendments to this rule because I am not satisfied with what you have got here. I would beg of you kindly to go through my amendments and if you like them and if there is some thing more in them than what is contained in this rule, you should accept them. I am not satisfied if the rule is there. To say that you have got the rule does not justify the position. The conditions of living and the conditions in which a person becomes a citizen of that country should justify the conditions of reciprocity. Suppose

a Sikh or a Hindu from here goes to Lahore. He cannot live there for any length of time, whereas a gentleman from Pakistan can live here in India with peace and honour. This is the difference. Your rule does not think of those conditions.

There are some other matters which have been debated in this House and I want to say a few words about them. One question that has agitated the minds of some of my friends is that the judiciary should be able to adjudicate the question of deprivation of citizenship. Some of my friends have suggested that we must have a Judge of the Supreme Court to decide this question. Some others say that this rule must be made justiciable. Then again, there have been some suggestions about the oath also and that those persons who are registered citizens should not take this oath, namely, "I will faithfully observe the laws of India and fulfil my duties as a citizen of India". My humble submission is that in these two matters, as a matter of fact, these criticisms are misconceived. In my humble opinion, the executive of this country is charged with the duty of seeing that those foreigners who come here and who are registered or have become naturalised, must remain true to this country. The executive which has got the final power of registration or allowing naturalisation should, I should say, theoretically and justly, be given the powers of depriving such persons of their nationality, if those persons do not behave well. After all, as I submitted, this territory belongs to those who are the nationals of this country. If others are allowed to come here, it is by virtue of a rule which imposes upon all human beings the obligation to observe all the rules and laws of this country of which we are citizens. Is it then the courts which are to be given the power to enforce this rule? In my opinion, it is the function of the executive and so far as conditions in this country are concerned, so far as security, etc., are concerned, the executive should have the final word.

424 L.S.D.

What is wrong about this, when the authority which grants this permission can refuse it without any reason? We are accepting in one of the provisions that they can refuse it without assigning any reason.

**Shri Kamath:** It is sought to be amended.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** There is no amendment so far as I have seen. Even if there is an amendment, that amendment may not be taken as accepted. We would all oppose it. I submit that so far as the question of registration or naturalisation is concerned, it rests with the executive and the other thing also must rest with the executive. I am sorry that Shri Raghavachari has really misread this Clause. If he kindly reads clause 10, he will find that it does not apply to the nationals who are born here. Therefore, I submit that so far as refugees are concerned, they cannot be deprived of their nationality under clause 10. He was saying that Members of this House will be deprived of their nationality.

**Shri Kamath:** It was half in jest.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** At the same time, if refugees are allowed to become citizens of this country by registration, then clause 10 (2) (d) will apply to them. It says:

"(d) that citizen has, within five years after registration or naturalisation, been sentenced in any country to imprisonment for a term of not less than two years;"

Supposing a man who was born in this country is sentenced to imprisonment of, say, 5 years or even transportation for life, can he be deprived of his right of being a citizen of India? Why should a person who has earned his citizenship under clause 5 or clause 6, be deprived of it if he is imprisoned for more than two years? There is absolutely no reason for this kind of discrimination. When the other discrimination has been removed, this discrimination should also be removed. May I tell the hon. Deputy Minister

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava] that this discrimination of the right, so far as the refugees are concerned, should not remain as it is here?

Objection has been taken to the fact that the judicial authority should be a Judge of the Supreme Court. I submit that a matter of this executive nature relating to the security or maintenance of the economy of a country should not be referred to the Supreme Court. A committee presided over by an officer with the experience provided here and two other gentlemen should be enough. We are not dealing with nationals of this country; we are dealing with nationals of other countries. In the Constitution we have given rights of equality before the law, rights of property, etc., to all the citizens of the world. We have not made any discrimination. If we make any discrimination, we know that the other countries will do the same against us. They will retaliate against us. I do not want that our government should behave in such a manner that without any reason a person should be deprived of his nationality. The District Judge should be given the power to decide this matter. The District Judge is the Sessions Judge; he can sentence a man to death, only the order is to be confirmed by the High Court. Even in this case, the order will have to be confirmed by the Central Government. Even our election petitions go to the District Judges and they decide them. I submit that we should have more faith in our judiciary and in our District Judges. What is the difficulty in giving this power to the District Judges—only lack of faith in our judiciary. I can understand this provision if there is a similar provision in other countries. In other countries, do you find that only Supreme Court Judges decide this matter?

**Shri Kamath:** What about your fighting speech on article 14 of the Constitution?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I do not remember my speeches; my friend may remember. But, may I read out article 14 to my hon. friend?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does it refer to citizenship at all?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** No, Sir. It refers to equality before law.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has got a knack of diverting the speech. Unless there is something of citizenship involved, in that, he need not refer to it.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I take your advice, Sir, but I should not be interrupted like this. If he intervenes he shall get a suitable reply from me also. Article 14 of the Constitution says:

"The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India."

I heard Mr. Mukerjee say that we should be ashamed of ourselves if we enact a provision like this, because article 14 and the other articles giving fundamental rights apply to every person in the whole world. There is no discrimination at all. Therefore, in a matter of this kind where the security of India is involved, the executive should have the final word and they should be given the full right to see that the national of any other country may be deprived of his citizenship in proper circumstances. So far as nationals of this country are concerned, I do not want even the Government to be given the right of depriving any national of this country born here of his citizenship. He is a citizen by birth and not by naturalisation or registration; he has got as much right as any other person. Therefore, I submit that the Bill must be amended by this House in this particular respect which I have indicated. The House must look at it from the point of view of those who are rooted in this land and who have as much rights as any other person.

I submit that the provisions of this Bill must be changed in regard to the refugees, registration and certain other matters which I have pointed out. Thank you.

**Shri B. B. Pande** (Almora Distt.—North East): I am a supporter of this Bill, but I have to give some information and also receive some information from the hon. Deputy Minister. I live in the border district of the Himalayas and during the winter months the Lamas and Khampas come to my country, mostly for begging. They come and live here for six or seven months. We have not known what nationality they belong to and by whom they are governed. If they die here without any relation, their property goes to the police, because it is very difficult to transmit their property to their land beyond the Himalayas. Then there is the question of mountaineering. This has become a very great menace to the country. Whatever it may be, I want to say that so many persons go about here without passports.

Only recently, in my part of the border, near Taklakot, two Europeans, probably of U.K. domicile, were arrested. Who governs them? There is no passport. Why were they allowed without passports? It is on this point that I want to seek information. Of course the Home Minister Pandit G. B. Pant, who knows the conditions over there, is not here. I do not know whether Shri Datar knows the affairs of that part of the country. They come here. They have to be watched. In these days of trouble, they have to be watched: whether they are spies or whether they create any mischief in any part of our country. Who will watch them? That is the problem. Of course, you have the auxiliary force stationed there. There should be the passport system on that line of the border. They should not be allowed to come without any restraint or check. This is what I want to say, and nothing more. I am a supporter of the Bill. Who will govern these persons, how will they be governed, will they be allowed to come in with passports or without passports, that is the problem for the Government to solve.

**Shri B. K. Ray** (Cuttack): I am glad to voice my view that, after reading the Citizenship laws of various countries including the United States of America, United Kingdom and others, I pronounce that our Bill is as liberal as it can be. I have heard for the last two days various criticisms with regard to certain restrictive provisions which I consider to be essential, and which have been considered essential in the citizenship legislations in other countries which are proud of democratic institutions. But, these restrictions have been commented upon very seriously by certain hon. Members of this House. That is why I wish, initially, to go, not much in detail, but to a certain extent, into the history of the citizenship law in the U.S.A.

It will be admitted by all the Members of the House that citizenship is a subject on the law of which there is the greatest common measure of agreement amongst almost all the civilised countries. Besides, in order to impart universality and to avoid conflict of citizenship laws of different countries, there had been a convention at the Hague in the year 1930 in which they drafted certain articles and the Commonwealth countries—I do not know whether India is a party to it—have generally accepted it. One of the basic principles laid down there is that every country should see that its provisions do not make anybody stateless. Generally speaking, or I may go so far as to say, without exception, the modes of acquisition of citizenship are almost universal in all countries, namely birth, descent, registration, naturalisation and transfer of sovereignty of territories from one sovereign to another, which we call in this Bill as annexation of territory. In all these matters, broadly speaking, the principles are universal. When there is a provision for acquisition in the Bill, necessarily there should be a provision in the Act for termination and deprivation. In the matter of deprivation, in the matter of termination of citizenship rights, it has been

[Shri B. K. Ray]

claimed in this House by certain hon. Members that the right should be made freely justiciable, that the power of the State should be delimited and restricted as much as possible and there should be judicial brakes against the exercise of these powers. To this aspect of the criticism, I mainly address myself.

It must be admitted, as Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has just now said, that the Republic is concerned with its safety and security, both internal and external. That heavy responsibility lies more upon the executive and upon this House than upon the judiciary. So far as the citizens are concerned, they are the source of strength of the State. Suppose, as amongst the citizens, there are political or social institutions which have subversive activities, do they not naturally undermine the strength of the State?

So far as the U.S.A. is concerned, their citizenship law had a chequered career. In their first convention where their Constitution was framed, there was absolutely nothing about citizenship except that the Congress was empowered to make the citizenship law as universal as possible. Until 1860 there was no citizenship law in the shape of a statute. During all this time, how was the citizenship right, its creation or determination, being governed? It was governed by the common law which the Americans claimed they were carrying from their home. According to that, birth was a mode of acquisition; descent also. It so happened that the Supreme Court in Dredscott's case held that the Negroes are not citizens and they should not be taken to be native born within the meaning of the common law which the people were carrying with them. That roused the conscience of the Congress and they started making laws for the purpose of citizenship and gradually abridged racial restrictions and ultimately at the end of 1952 they said that nobody should be denied citizenship rights, non-citizenship rights should be abridged,

because of race. But, with regard to the character, with regard to the status, with regard to the conditions, with regard to the safeguards in respect of naturalisation or registration, they are still very careful. Even though ineligibility because of race has been abolished, ineligibility because of opinion has become a more prominent feature of the U.S.A.'s naturalisation process. Necessarily, this feature also essentially affects the law of deprivation of citizenship.

By way of addressing the critics who insist upon judicial justicability of the right and removal—removal of restrictions which empower the executive not to admit undesirable persons and to chalk out such persons, I should like to give a short history of U.S.A. Citizenship Law. First of all, in the (1916) Act of Nationality, the Congress of the U.S.A. excluded anybody who was a disbeliever in or opposed to organised Government or preached disbelief in Government. They thought that this doctrine will be quite sufficient to keep out persons who are believers in subversive activity. That was not found sufficient. They extended it by the Nationality Act of 1940 thereby excluding persons believing in or affiliated with groups working for the overthrow of the U.S.A. Government or killing its officials or the like; persons who give publicity to the doctrines mentioned above; persons who teach such doctrines, and persons who are members of such groups or associations as indulge in such acts. The intention was to exclude the Communist Party. By saying this I should not be understood to have any animosity against the Communists either in this House or outside. Still, I am giving the history of a particular chapter in the U.S.A. Citizenship Laws in order to convince my learned colleagues as to how far it will be proper to entrust the matter, which involves State policy and solidarity and safety of the State, to the judiciary.

The object of the law, according to Congress, was to exclude the Communist Party. Then, it received a

different treatment in courts. They also had brought out an administrative publication called *Nationality Manual* in which they enlisted the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and the Socialist Workers' Party of America as organisations, members of which were to be excluded from the naturalisation or registration process. But the courts refused to hold the Communist Party to be a proscribed organisation, as it did not fall within the meaning of the Act.

Congress made another attempt to remove this difficulty in the Internal Security Act of 1950. Here again, in interpreting this Act, the courts threw the burden upon the Government to prove that the organisation was a Communist action organisation. Ultimately, this difficulty was attempted to be removed in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 wherein it says that no person shall be naturalised who is a member of or is affiliated with the Communist Party of the U.S.A. As against this, something like article 14 of our Constitution was pleaded, namely that it was a discrimination between native-born citizens as opposed to those who were naturalised. There came a decision of the court which at least sub silentio confirmed the right of the Congress to treat native-born people differently from the naturalised citizens. Our Supreme Court has also laid down the principle that this equality clause under article 14 does not mean that every individual should be treated in the same manner and by the same law. It is open to the legislature to make different classes of people, to make different principles applicable to persons placed in different situations, and one particular person in a particular instance may constitute a class by himself. Therefore, there is no difficulty if we put some restrictions or if we are very strict in our law with regard to deprivation of the citizenship right in respect of persons who are undesirable. And the safeguard is there in the Bill namely that unless the Central Government is satisfied that it will be against the public interest or

that it will not be to the public good, the person can continue to be a citizen, and his citizenship should not be deprived. When all is said and done, there is that last safeguard and as the learned Deputy Minister has said, the Central Government is responsible to this House.

I am not a disbeliever in the judiciary. Rather, I am a strong believer in the judiciary, but with regard to matters of State policy, even in the United Kingdom, whose judiciary is held in high esteem all over the world, the Judges themselves have laid down certain propositions in which they say that the opinion of the Secretary of State is final in certain matters. It is held in England that so far as citizenship law is concerned, it is a national law, it is a municipal law, and even if it transgresses or is in breach of certain principles of international law, still the foreign country has to obey it, but not in such a manner as to compel His Majesty's Government to accept somebody as a citizen against their public policy. Therefore, the policy of the State is the final word, and with regard to that the only custodian is the Government which is responsible to the House. I submit that sufficient safeguard has been provided in our Bill, namely that a committee of enquiry presided over by a judicial officer having ten years' experience as a Judge may hold an enquiry and make a report, and also that the order of the prescribed authority is appealable to the Central Government. I think these two are quite sufficient to safeguard the valuable citizenship rights. To make it freely justiciable will be rather dangerous.

There is also another reason. There are certain matters, certain information papers, documents etc., which have to be kept confidential in the public interest and which cannot be produced in a public tribunal, which may contain the evidence for establishing the undesirability of the person to continue as a citizen of this country. If you make it justiciable, you will have to break through those

[Shri B. K. Ray]

confidential barriers and put everything before the court and thereby before the public and the world, causing extreme danger to the safety of the State. Therefore, in all countries, excepting a very few, such rights have not been made justiciable at large.

It has been said that the definition of "person" should include "companies" or "associations" incorporated or not or any corporate body. This again is a criticism with which I cannot agree. It has been stated on the floor of the House by a very eminent counsel and advocate that it is the opinion of the present Chief Justice of India in one of his judgments—then Mr. Justice Mukerjee—that companies are "citizens" entitled to fundamental rights enumerated in the Constitution of India. With great respect to him—I have read that decision—I say that that is not what the learned judge has said. What he has said comes to this, that the rights enumerated as fundamental rights and guaranteed under the Constitution are available to the company. That means a company can hold property and do this and that. He refrains from saying that they have been guaranteed to the companies. There lies a distinction between availability of rights and availability of guarantee. The rights are available. They were always available. They are still available, even if the companies are not citizens, but the guarantees are not available. The guarantees are only available to the citizens. At any rate, it is clear that within the Constitution the companies were never defined as citizens. So, how could the learned judge say that the guarantees were available to the companies? That is not the meaning at all.

Now, there is great difficulty in bringing them within the definition of a person, as Shri Datar has already pointed out. If we introduce them within the definition, I think we shall have to revise many other provisions of the Bill. As the hon. Minister has

pointed out, there will be great difficulty particularly with regard to defining termination or deprivation of citizenship rights in their case. Again, we shall have to make laws so as to deal with companies manned completely by Indian citizens, companies manned partly by Indian citizens and partly by foreign citizens and so on. There will be all these distinctions, and provisions will have to be made for all these cases.

If there is any fear or if anybody says that there is fear or apprehension that unless they are given citizenship rights they will not be entitled to hold properties, then I would say that he is completely wrong. I shall give you some simple examples. Suppose a deity, or a religious institution or a mutt is there, how can you give it citizenship rights? Can a deity be subjected to deprivation of citizenship? Can a deity be registered or naturalised? Yet, it can hold property like any citizen, and nobody can deprive a deity of its property without payment of compensation, even if it be that the Government have to acquire its property. So, in my opinion, the definition of 'person' is quite complete, and we cannot get in these organised corporate bodies into it.

I was a Member of the Joint Committee. I regret that I was late in attending it, or else I should have raised the question that I shall presently raise; I did not want to impede the progress of the Joint Committee by raising it later. With regard to acquisition by birth, the provision that is in the Bill is quite all right so far as it goes. We have said that every person born in this country, except children of diplomatic envoys and children of enemy aliens, will become a citizen of our country. But my point is that this provision is not complete. I have read very high authorities on this point. Suppose the Head of a State or a sovereign authority comes with his wife on a short visit to this country, and suppose while they are here, a child is born

to them; then, even though that person is not a diplomatic envoy or an enemy alien, yet his child cannot become the citizen of India. Now, what are the steps that have been taken by the other countries in this respect. In the U.S.A., in their fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, they have used the phrase 'born in the United States within its jurisdiction'. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, they have said 'born within the dominion of His Majesty and allegiance'. So, the word 'jurisdiction' in the U.S.A., and the word 'allegiance' in the United Kingdom save certain people who do not come within their jurisdiction from becoming their citizens. I should recommend this to the hon. Minister and I would request him to see whether some amendment could be made in regard to this matter. So far as these exceptions are concerned, they can only be stated as examples in the clause worded as 'born in India within its jurisdiction or allegiance'. I feel that the word 'jurisdiction' may be more appropriate. So, we may use the words 'born in India within its jurisdiction', and then give these two instances which are there by way of exceptions as illustrations, so that other cases that might arise may be considered accordingly.

Then, it has been urged that the form of oath which says that the person shall be bound to observe the laws of India is rather a restriction. I should say that it is rather less than what we should have. So far as citizenship right is concerned, it is not a right and privilege only; it also brings in certain duties. And what are the duties to be performed? The duties are amongst others to observe our laws. If somebody is not willing to observe our laws, then what does the word 'naturalisation' mean? The word 'naturalisation' should mean that he should be one of us in all respects, and particularly in respect of our loyalty to the State. He should perform the duties enjoined on him by the State, and so on.

In the United States of America, at one time it was a part of the oath that he shall not only bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution but also bear arms for military purposes. Of course, that has been subsequently modified in a sense, for with regard to certain conscientious objectors, the court ruled their ineligibility saying that since they were not willing to take part in war, they could not without mental reservation adhere to the oath. Therefore, they have changed the form of the oath subsequently so as to include those people also, saying that though they may not bear arms, yet they will act under civilian directions in the army and will do all other kinds of acts in furtherance and progress of the war.

The last point that I want to address myself to is in regard to the deletion of South Africa from the list of Commonwealth countries. In the law, as I have said already, the greatest common measure of agreement is found. In all other countries, the maintenance of good neighbourly feelings has been the basis of legislation. We have got sufficient safeguard in this Bill in the reciprocity clause. If the people of our country are treated by the other sovereign States in a particular manner, we shall treat their people when they come here for registration or naturalisation in the same manner. I think that is quite a good safeguard. It will not be in keeping with the dignity of this House to be revengeful and to cut down the name of South Africa from the First Schedule.

**Shri Barman:** Does this interpretation apply to clause 11 also, namely that there should be mutual reciprocity?

**Shri B. K. Ray:** Yes.

One word more with regard to justiciability. In other countries, it is said that in the matter of registration and naturalisation the Secretary has the final voice. That is the law in the United Kingdom. The Secretary is not compelled to assign any reason,

[Shri B. K. Ray]

nor is his order appealable. We cannot go further and consent to give it as much justiciability as possible.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What Shri Barman wants to know is this. In clause 11, the status of a Commonwealth citizen in India is different from that of an Indian citizen.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** So far as clause 11 is concerned, I think Shri Datar has given sufficient answer by saying that the status of Commonwealth citizenship has nothing to do with Indian citizenship.

**Shri Datar:** It cannot be equated with the other citizenship.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** He has already said that the two cannot be equated.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Is it double citizenship then?

**Shri B. K. Ray:** No, that question does not arise at all. Still there is some power in the hands of the Central Government under clause 12. Clause 11 says:

"Every person who is a citizen of a Commonwealth country specified in the First Schedule shall, by virtue of that citizenship, have the status of a Commonwealth citizen in India".

Then clause 12 says what will be the rights of Commonwealth citizens in this country. It reads:

"The Central Government may by order notified in the Official Gazette, make provisions on a basis of reciprocity for the conferment of all or any of the rights of a citizen of India on the citizens of any country specified in the First Schedule."

Then, there is the definition of the citizenship law of the Commonwealth country.

**Shri Datar:** That is there in clause 2.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** So, if in the official Gazette, our Government does not notify the citizenship law of South Africa as the citizenship law of a Commonwealth country, then South Africa is excluded. So, sufficient guarantee is there in this regard.

2 P.M.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is clause 11 governed by clause 12? Among citizens of foreign countries, there is a distinction made. One is about citizens of a member country of the Commonwealth—the Commonwealth countries are notified in the Schedule. The other relates to citizens of countries which are not in the Commonwealth. So far as citizens of non-Commonwealth countries are concerned, they can come in by naturalisation. So far as Commonwealth citizens are concerned, they have to get themselves registered. One becomes a citizen by registration and the other can become a citizen by naturalisation—of course, in the latter case, he has to give up the citizenship of his country. Now, in the case of clause 11, does that person have to undergo the process of registration himself or otherwise, independently of registration, has he got any rights here under the other clauses? Is it only for the purpose of differentiating him from a citizen of other foreign countries of the world, that clause 11 has been put in? Or is there any independent right attached to his status of Commonwealth citizenship in India, apart from the rights that have been conferred subject to the limitations imposed in the later clauses? That is the point.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** I will try to convince you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that in the provisions which are there already, we have enough safeguard without removing the name of the country of South Africa from the First Schedule.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am not on that point. All that I want to know is whether clause 11 confers on a Commonwealth citizen any rights apart from the rights that a citizen

of the Commonwealth can have under the other rules, or are they subject to those rights? If so, it is only a designation or a category. Otherwise, he has an independent status, apart from what is conferred in the earlier portion. Clause 5(1)(e) says:

"persons of full age and capacity who are citizens of a country specified in the First Schedule".

They are all Commonwealth countries. In their case, citizenship is acquired by registration unless citizenship is granted by naturalisation which applies to other countries. There are particular restrictions and advantages. Now, unless any member of a Commonwealth country registers himself under clause 5(1)(e), does he have, independently of clause 5, by being a member of the Commonwealth and having the status of a Commonwealth citizen in India, any right of citizenship here?

**Shri Datar:** No.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** Clause 5 does not refer to Commonwealth citizens.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes. Clause 5(1)(e) says:

"persons of full age and capacity who are citizens of a country specified in the First Schedule".

If they want to become citizens of India, they form a category of registered citizens. The world outside India is divided into categories—one, countries in the First Schedule, and the other, countries outside that Schedule. People of the First Schedule countries are entitled to certain privileges. They come by registration; others come by naturalisation. Naturalisation can be effected under the conditions prescribed in the Third Schedule.

**Shri S. S. More:** What is then the meaning of clause 12?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does the hon. Member follow what exactly I am trying to say? Shri Barman raised

the question. There is no doubt that there is a difference in the category of citizenship which may be acquired. Citizenship can be acquired by registration by a citizen of the Commonwealth; in the other case, it can be acquired by a person who does not belong to the Commonwealth, who is not a born citizen of India—in this case, he can become a citizen by naturalisation.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** Exactly.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Under clause 5, a citizen of the Commonwealth can become a citizen of India by registration. Then there are clauses 11 and 12. Now, let us take the case of an Englishman. Does clause 11 confer any right upon such a person who does not register at all? An Englishman comes here. Under clause 5, he does not register. What rights has he in this country? Are his rights the same as the rights enjoyed by a foreigner from any other country? Or does he have more rights in this country under clause 11? Similar to clause 11, there is no other clause relating to any person in any country other than a country of the Commonwealth. There is no doubt a difference made. The Commonwealth citizen must register himself whereas the non-Commonwealth citizen comes by naturalisation. In addition to this difference, is there another difference sought to be made in favour of a Commonwealth citizen under clause 11? There is no similar provision for a citizen of a non-Commonwealth foreign country. If he does not choose to come by naturalisation, what is the position? Has a Commonwealth citizen any rights in this country otherwise than by registration? Has that person of the Commonwealth who does not come by registration any special privileges by being a citizen of the Commonwealth under clause 11?

**Shri Datar:** It is true, as you have correctly pointed out, that there are two categories recognised by this law. One is the category of 'other foreigners' who can become citizens only

[Shri Datar]

through the process of naturalisation. But we have also recognised another category, the category of Commonwealth citizens. Now, merely because it has been so recognised, either in the First Schedule or in the various provisions, it does not mean that they have certain other rights or privileges in India. What has been done in clause 11? The mere recognition of the fact that one who is a citizen of a Commonwealth country shall have the status of a Commonwealth citizen in India does not mean that he has the status of a citizen of India at all. Therefore, what I submit to you is this, that clause 11 does not take the case any further except to this extent that under clause 12 as also clause 5, read with the definition in clause 2, they can come in and get themselves registered. Also, on account of the fact that in certain Commonwealth countries there is discrimination exercised, certain restrictive provisions have been put in. Therefore, my clear answer to your question is that merely because he has the status of a Commonwealth citizen in India, he does not acquire *ipso facto* the status of a citizen of India. For that, he has to pass through a certain process. He acquires the status of a Commonwealth citizen.

**Shri Barman:** If he gets nothing else then why this?

**Shri Datar:** We have not passed any law by which we have given any particular status to the Commonwealth citizen. That is why I stated it was symbolical citizenship.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He wants to know why then this clause 11 is necessary.

**Shri Datar:** Clause 11 is necessary, as I stated yesterday, only as a circumstance showing symbolic existence of certain feelings of comradeship between Commonwealth citizens. Beyond that there is no value at all.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We shall put it the other way. Only for the purpose of differentiating one category

from the other, clause 11 is put in there.

**Shri Datar:** In a way it is true. It is only for the purpose of showing that we are going to treat them in a different way—on a different basis—that in one case it is enough if he registers and in the other he gets it in accordance with Schedule III.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** If any person from Commonwealth countries comes, you cannot refuse his application for registration.

**Shri Datar:** If he is eligible for registration, if there is the recognition of the nationality law of their country. That is a condition precedent.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** That will be there; but if it is observed, the application cannot be refused.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** My feeling is that citizens of the countries mentioned in the First Schedule have a kind of midway position between an Indian citizen and a foreigner who can only become an Indian citizen by naturalisation and not otherwise. I say this because there was an Order made in 1950, on the 23rd of January, 1950, by the Governor-General under which article 367(3) of the Constitution was slightly amended and it was said—

“Subject to the provisions of any law made by Parliament, every country within the Commonwealth is hereby declared not to be a foreign State for the purposes of this Constitution.”

And, here, we have had umpteen answers to questions in the House where we wanted a list of foreigners in this country and members of the British Commonwealth were excluded from that list. Therefore, it seems to me that they are midway between Indian citizens and foreigners and they have therefore a certain differential advantage in that clauses 11 and 12 read together enable any Commonwealth citizen from any country in the British Empire to have the full rights of Indian citizenship, if, of course, reciprocity is there. That

is what Government says. I only wanted to clarify the position. There is certainly a differentiation between an ordinary foreigner and a Commonwealth citizen.

**Shri S. S. More** rose.—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no; I am not going to allow Mr. More. He never observes decorum and decency. When Shri Mukerjee is talking he gets up and starts speaking.

**Shri S. S. More:** I thought he had finished.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No; he has not finished.

**Shri S. S. More:** I was under the impression.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no question of impression. He seems to have developed a knack for interfering when others are talking. I have been noticing it. What is the hurry? We are not in a hurry; let the other hon. Member sit down.

**Shri S. S. More:** You are unnecessarily hard on me.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am really sorry. I cannot hear both the views here. I do not think hon. Members can hear all the Members who are speaking. I am not trying to make any unnecessary aspersion but I could not hear Hiren Mukerjee. He will have his say next. What is the impatience about? That is what I felt. Has Shri Mukerjee concluded?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I wanted to know the position and I gave you my reading of it.

**Shri Datar:** May I reply to his question? So far as the way in which he has described his concept, it is true that in a way the Commonwealth citizens are at a middling position. Under other Acts they are not recognised as foreigners and therefore they might get certain advantages. It is quite likely; I am not disputing that position at all. What I am placing before this House is that so far as the present Citizenship Bill is concerned,

it does not confer any special rights upon them at all except that they can come through the process of registration instead of through the naturalisation process.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may now conclude.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** I may add to what the hon. Deputy Minister has said in order to complete the answer to the criticism against the inclusion of South Africa in the First Schedule by saying that it is still in the hands of the Central Government not to treat South African citizens as Commonwealth citizens by using the power which is in their hands under clause 2 of the Bill, as it is the Central Government who only by notification can recognise their citizenship law as a Citizenship law of a Commonwealth country. Once their law is not recognised, a particular person who is a citizen in South Africa could not be called a citizen of a Commonwealth country here. So, that status under clause 11 can also be made unavailable to him.

With regard to registration, there is the proviso to 5(e) that the Central Government shall have regard to the conditions of treatment to our people in that country.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I shall be very brief in my observations. First of all I want to thank the Deputy Minister who is here and the Home Minister and the Select Committee for having gone a long way to meet my request in the speech which I made before the Bill was remitted to the Joint Committee that there should be an amendment to clause 9 to enable members of my community because they were unaware of the implications of acquiring U. K. citizenship from not being penalised. I am grateful for the amendment that has made because under this amendment it would mean that those persons who may have registered as U.K. citizens between Independence and the 26th January, 1950 will not be deemed to have renounced their Indian citi-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

zenship. Sir, I feel, however, that the Deputy Minister may consider going a little further in this matter. I had requested that this concession should be made to cover the whole period between Independence and the date on which this Bill comes into operation. There were two main reasons for my request. I said that if we draw a line in between, it will mean making some kind of distinction between those who may have registered between 1947 and 1950 and those who may, for some reason, equally misguided, have registered between 1950 and the coming into operation of this Bill. Since the Citizenship Bill has been delayed and since there has been this vacuum, I feel that if this concession is to be made Government should consider making it for the whole period between independence and the coming into operation of this Bill.

There was another aspect which I had in view when I made this plea and that was that the application of clause 8 should be made uniformly. Clause 8 envisages a very salutary principle that no one should be allowed to renounce his Indian citizenship unless he first makes a declaration and has that declaration registered. I feel that if this intervening period is not accounted for, then from 1950 to the coming into operation of this Bill, for this period of 5 years between 1950 and 1955, this clause will not be attracted and the effect will be this. Persons may have *sub rosa* acquired either U. K. citizenship or the citizenship of some other country which our Government may not be aware of. They may still continue in government service and Government will continue to keep them in government service without knowing that they have *sub rosa* acquired the citizenship of another country. That is why I felt that the period should cover all the years between 1947 and 1955 so that it would also protect Government so that no Indian will be allowed to be heard to say, 'I renounced my citizenship by voluntarily acquiring the

citizenship of another country', because there is no obligation to make a declaration. If this section 9 is amended there will be an obligation for those who may have acquired foreign citizenship between 1950 and 1955 to make a declaration. And perhaps there are people in Government service today who are masquerading as Indian citizens, who were of course employed as Indian citizens, who between 1950 and 1955 have voluntarily acquired U. K. or other citizenship and who are continuing to get the benefits of Indian citizenship, who are working in positions of responsibility and who, in fact, have surrendered their Indian citizenship. What control has Government got over such people? That is why I say that for this reason also the period should be extended from 1950 to 1955. No one will be allowed surreptitiously to renounce his citizenship, but if people want advisedly and deliberately to do so, let them do so, and I hold no brief for those persons. That is why I say that every person who may have acquired citizenship during the period 1947 to 1955 should only be able to renounce his Indian citizenship by making a declaration and having it registered. I want the Government to apply this provision in order to protect their own interests. I gave another example when I spoke it last time. I know what is happening in many of foreign firms. A number of people who were originally Indian citizens have acquired foreign citizenship. These firms are obliged to submit returns to the Government of India showing the number of Indians and foreigners employed. What do they do? Perhaps they are misled by the employees or perhaps they do it themselves deliberately, and in order to inflate the number of Indian employees, they include people whom they know and we know to have surrendered their Indian citizenship. What check can there be on those people? For that reason, clause 9 should be amended, so that clause 8 will apply uniformly with regard to

renunciation of Indian citizenship. No one will be deemed to have renounced his citizenship unless he makes a declaration and registers it, and then the Government will know where they stand and the person also will know where he stands. There may be people today who have renounced their citizenship by *sub rosa* acquiring foreign citizenship, who are getting all the benefits in Government service and in these foreign firms, and the Government is none the wiser.

There is only one other clause in respect of which I feel some observations should be made and that is clause 10. A great deal has been said by Members from both sides of the House on this particular clause. This is the clause with regard to deprivation. My hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, has said that in the interests of the security of the country, it is very necessary to have this deprivation clause vested under executive discretion. I agree partly with it, but I am in difficulties for several reasons. I do not know whether we are completely right in discriminating between citizen and citizen. I know that those who have become citizens by naturalisation or by registration are different from those who are citizens by birth, but when once they become citizens, are Government entitled to discriminate between them from the point of view of deprivation? After all, before a person is accepted as a citizen, Government has unqualified powers to say whether it should accept him or reject him. But once the person is accepted as a citizen, I feel that it is an unwarranted discrimination to be able to deprive a person of his citizenship purely by executive fiat. Very salutary amendments have been introduced and Government is to be congratulated. For instance, the appointment of the Enquiry Committee is there. But still I take a very serious view of the right of citizenship. What in effect happens is that when a person is deprived of his citizenship, it means that he is killed legally and I think it is far worse for a person to be killed

legally than to be killed physically. It is much more merciful to hang a person than deprive him of his citizenship in a wanton manner. Once a person has become a citizen of this country—if he is a citizen by birth, it is all right, but even if he becomes a citizen by naturalisation or by a process of registration, he is a citizen—and you have accepted him in your citizenship fold, should he then be exposed to be deprived of his citizenship by executive fiat? It means that you make him a Stateless person and what can be more terrible than the condition of a Stateless person?

**Shri B. D. Pande:** Only if he misbehaves, he will be deprived of his citizenship.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** That again is a fallacy. We have a whole string of reasons why a person can be deprived of his citizenship and I am not certain that many of those reasons cannot be abused by the executive. My friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, said that it is right and proper that when the security of the country is undermined, a person should be subjected to deprivation. I agree with him there entirely. But that is not the only reason why a person can be deprived of his citizenship. There is a large number of reasons; some of them are vague. For instance, take this particular reason—

“that citizen has shown himself by act or speech to be disloyal or disaffected towards the Constitution of India as by law established;”

I can understand if it had stated “towards the country or the Republic of India.” Every day the Government is disloyal to the Constitution of India and we cannot keep pace with the number of amendments that they have been making to the Constitution of India. What do you mean by “disaffection or disloyalty to the Constitution of India”? These words have acquired no specific legal connotation. Every day we are being told that the Constitution is sacrosanct. What is sacrosanct about the Constitution of

[Shri Frank Anthony]

India? After you have implemented your States Reorganisation Commission Report, somebody may say, and a whole lot of people are still there who may say, that they are not prepared to accept that report and that they want their own States. There may be so many agitations and there may be a specific agitation to amend a particular provision in the Constitution and people will say "No, it is an ill-conceived provision, it is an immoral provision, it is a monstrous provision" and so on and so forth. Will that be construed as disloyalty and disaffection to the Constitution? I do not understand it. I say that it is the normal right of any one to seek changes in the Constitution. If the Government can make changes in the Constitution, why should not a citizen have the same right? If the reason is "security of the State", I would have said "Yes" and I would have fully agreed because "security of the State" is an expression which has acquired a certain specific connotation, a certain recognised legal connotation. But we are using phrases which can be interpreted in many ways and which may be interpreted by way of an abuse of executive authority. We have an Enquiry Committee and that is a step in the right direction. Without pointing at any individual, I may say that a Sessions Judge may be a better man than a Supreme Court Judge because it is all a question of personality and of individual worth. Those of us who are practising as lawyers know that even with your Advisory Committees or even with High Court Judges on them there is abuse of executive authority, and still people are preventively detained by the executive for *mala fide* reasons and the Advisory Committees have not been able to operate as a check on the abuse of executive authority. This Committee, by itself is no guarantee that the executive may not abuse its authority.

We have this expression "public

good"; it may mean many things. The expression "public interest" was something which had completely diluted the whole concept of security. Judges of the Supreme Court have said that by using the expression "public interest" instead of "security of the State", a coach and four had been driven through the original provisions in the Constitution. There are so many reasons why persons can be deprived of their citizenship and now it will still rest essentially or entirely in the discretion of the executive. I feel that this matter of deprivation of citizenship is a vital matter. It amounts to killing a person legally and I am of the view—it is an unqualified view—that to kill a person legally is to do him much greater injury than to kill him physically.

There has been a suggestion that this matter should be placed entirely at a justiciable level and that a person who has been deprived of his citizenship should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I feel there is nothing wrong with that suggestion. One hon. speaker who preceded me, a distinguished jurist, said that it is not possible in these matters to remit the considerations which may have weighed with the Government for judicial scrutiny. There may be something to be said for that as the Government may have excellent reasons, reasons which cannot be disclosed for depriving a person of his citizenship rights. Here it is not a question of admitting a person to citizenship. I can understand, at the stage of admission the Government need not disclose reasons. But, here a person who has once been admitted as a citizen is being deprived of his citizenship and you are rendering him stateless; you are depriving him of the country. If the Supreme Court has said that its paramount function is to act as the guardian and the sentinel of the rights of the citizens of this country what would be illogical or irrational in saying that the deprivation of citizenship—which is the greatest of

all fundamental rights because from the fact of citizenship flows all other fundamental rights—should also be a matter over which the Supreme Court should stand as the sentinel. In article 32 we have charged the Supreme Court with the primary function of watching over the fundamental rights of the citizens of this country. Then what is there irrational in the plea that it should watch over the deprivation of citizenship also? That is the very basis of our fundamental rights. From citizenship flow all other fundamental rights. Why should not that also be remitted for final custody to the Supreme Court? There is nothing wrong in it. I say, if you look at it from an objective point of view there is nothing wrong because the ultimate consideration is that we are depriving a person of everything which makes his life worth living—his right of citizenship. If the Government is not prepared to go so far, because they say they will not be able, perhaps, to disclose everything for judicial scrutiny, then I would earnestly make the plea that this Committee should be presided over, I say, by a Judge of the Supreme Court. I am not impressed by the argument: "What are we going to do: are we going to make Judges of the Supreme Court chairman in every sort of committee?" This is not every sort of committee. I cannot conceive of any body which is more important than this. Depriving a person of his liberty is important enough. We are depriving him of his citizenship. That, I say, is something which we cannot compare with any other right. And, the cases are not going to be many. I cannot even think of the Government depriving 5 or even 6 people of their citizenship every year; I mean, these cases are going to be rare, very rare, because in the present conditions there cannot be many people who will acquire citizenship by naturalisation or registration. They will be a handful and from among them how many are likely to expose themselves to

deprivation? So, if the Government is not prepared to make this fully justiciable at least concede this request that has been made by a number of Members of this House that this Committee should be presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court.

**Shri N. P. Nathwani (Sorath):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as I differed with a majority of the members of the Joint Committee I have appended a note of dissent on the question of the status of an association or a body of individuals.

As the Bill has emerged from the Joint Committee the definition of the word 'person' has been further narrowed down. In my humble opinion this definition goes too far. I think that it would create a situation which would result in injustice and hardship to Indian corporations. In so far as it seeks to exclude associations of persons though unincorporated and though all its members are Indian citizens, it is rather a dangerous innovation. In order to appreciate the effect of this definition we should bear in mind that under our Constitution certain rights are conferred upon persons and some of them are available only to Indian citizens. Yesterday my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee spoke at length on this aspect of the matter and explained how it would work harshly to exclude associations of persons from the advantages which are being made available under our Constitution to such bodies.

Before I come to the question of incorporated bodies I shall like to deal with the question of associations of persons which are not incorporated ones. Take for instance the case of partnership firms, the case of a joint Hindu family firm or the case of clubs and such other associations. Let us also assume that all the members of such bodies are Indian citizens. Now, these associations do not constitute in the eye of law a distinct entity. They are a collection of Indian citizens and under article 19 certain rights, namely, the

[Shri N. P. Nathwani]

right to carry on business, right to own or dispose of property etc. are conferred upon citizens and it cannot be, I submit, our intention to exclude such associations from the advantages which are available to them under this article.

Then, what is the position so far as the judicial interpretation is concerned? In various cases which came up before our High Courts and where all the members of a partnership firm were Indian citizens it was never seriously suggested that a firm is not a citizen under article 19. Let no one remain under any doubt about this position. The matter has been set at rest by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case which is known as the case of United Motors. It was a case from Bombay in connection with the Sales Tax Act. There were 7 petitioners who invoked the aid of article 19, sub-clause (1) and complained that their right to carry on business was violated by certain provisions of the Sales Tax Act. The question arose in the High Court, in the first instance, whether the petitioners were citizens within the meaning of article 19. In that case out of the 7 petitioners 6 petitioners were limited companies but the seventh petitioner was a firm of whom all the partners were Indian citizens. The High Court, therefore, said that as the right was available to every one of them the question of companies being citizens or otherwise does not arise. They considered that the fact that partnership consists of Indian citizens was enough to entitle them to come under article 19. The matter did come before the Supreme Court and in that case also the point was argued. Of course, in the reported decision there is no reference but I have learned from the counsel who appeared on both the sides that no one even suggested at that stage that a firm of which all partners are Indian citizens, was not a citizen for the purpose of article 19.

Now, by this definition, we are seeking to exclude them which, I

submit, is a very radical departure from the existing position. It is true that so far as incorporated bodies are concerned, there is a divergence of opinion amongst the High Courts. But the majority of the High Courts before whom such a question arose, have emphatically decided in clear and unequivocal terms that a corporation of which all the members were Indian citizens, was a citizen. They said that it could never have been the intention of our Constitution-framers to exclude them from the fundamental rights guaranteed under article 19(1)—(f) and (g). Very recently only, the Allahabad High Court has taken a different view. But—I am speaking subject to correction—in that case, no reference has been made to the decision taken by the Bombay High Court in which the Court took the view that a corporation is a citizen.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** For what purpose?

**Shri Nathwani:** For the limited purpose of article 19(1)—(f) and (g). That was the only purpose, because the various courts which have held a corporation to be a citizen have followed the test laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Chiranjitlal v. the Union of India*. They said certain rights are conferred upon persons but those rights are not confined to natural persons. You have to see to the nature of the right and the language employed to find out whether such rights are available to corporations or not. Following this test or guidance, the various High Courts like Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, and even the High Court of Rajasthan, have taken the view that a corporation is a citizen.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** For all purposes?

**Shri Nathwani:** Only for the limited purposes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** How does it arise, so far as the citizenship right is concerned? In this naturalisation

law, how does it arise? Nobody deprives the citizenship right.

**Shri B. K. Ray:** Because of the definition of "person", it arose.

**Shri Nathwani:** If my hon. friend would bear with me and not interrupt me, I shall proceed to say that I referred to the decision of the present Chief Justice Mukerjee in the case of *Chiranjitlal v. the Union of India*. There, he said that in order to find out whether the rights which are guaranteed under Chapter III of our Constitution are available to corporations or not, you have to see to the nature of the rights. For instance, the right to vote is conferred on citizens under our Constitution. The corporations, being a pure fiction of law, cannot exercise that right. For instance, the right to become a judge of the Supreme Court cannot be given to a corporation. Can it ever be appointed as a judge? That is why the court says, "Look to the nature of the right". If we scan all the articles under which certain rights are conferred upon the citizens the only article which survives is article 19 (1)—(f) and (g). These are the only rights which can be made available to legal entities like corporations. That is why I am submitting that when we are trying to lay down the law rather exhaustively, we should avail of this opportunity to include them and not to exclude them, because, I shall presently refer to the trend of opinion both in England and U.S.A. to show that the trend is in favour of including corporations within the definition of citizens.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Have they done so?

**Shri Nathwani:** Yes; I will presently cite the United States Constitution. I will cite Mr. Willis' who is a very eminent authority on the subject. In every question dealing with the constitutional aspects which come up before the Supreme Court, Willis' authority is referred to.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wanted only seven minutes.

424 LSD.

**Shri Nathwani:** If I had not been interrupted, I would have finished now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** My interruption should not be counted.

**Shri Nathwani:** I want to point out that in the eye of international law, a corporation has both residence and domicile. Yesterday, my friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee referred to an English decision to show that even the status or attribute of nationality can be conferred and is contributed by English law to a corporate body. That is the English position. Let any one who wants to dispute that, argue out to the contrary and we shall deal with it.

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South):** For what purpose is it conferred?

**Shri Nathwani:** For nationality. England has not got a written Constitution. We have got a written Constitution where certain rights are sought to be conferred upon citizens. In U.S.A., I understand that corporations are not excluded in the definition of the word citizen. They have got a written Constitution, but there, the judiciary intervened and relaxed the rule and tried to put interpretations and extended the scope and made available various rights which were only available to citizens. In support of this, I want to read only a few lines from Willis to show what he has got to say on the subject.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Have they amended their nationality law?

**Shri Nathwani:** They have got dual citizenship in America and the learned author tries to point out that their original Constitution having been framed as far back as in the 18th century they could not have included corporations within the original Constitution. But then the power of reason prevailed over the reason for ritual and the Supreme Court intervened, expanded the scope and made certain rights available to the corporations. Here we are doing the

[Shri Nathwani]

very reverse of it. Even our High Courts and our Supreme Court made available those rights to associations, all of whose members were Indian citizens.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the advantage of introducing them in this Bill?

**Shri Nathwani:** We have now given a definition for the word 'person'. It excludes associations of 'persons'. Therefore, it should not exclude firms and joint family firms.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is not a General Clauses Act.

**Shri Nathwani:** But what is the effect?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the harm. The hon. Member has been arguing that the corporations have got only a right under article 19(1) (f) and (g) and, for a limited purpose they have been held to be citizens. Now, we are excluding them. The hon. Member said that for certain advantages other countries have included the corporations.

**Shri Nathwani:** Is it not a very valuable right to a citizen to carry on his business, to undertake and acquire property especially when the corporations, companies, etc., are increasing both in size and number, is it our intention that business activities of these companies should be restricted and that there should be no protection?

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** Yes, please.

**Shri Nathwani:** If you want to do it, you can do it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What are the rights given by the Constitution? No law framed by us here—unless it is an amendment to the Constitution—can restrict the rights conferred by the Constitution. The courts have declared that for the purposes of article 19(1)—(f) and (g), a citizen can acquire and possess the right. What are the rights that are taken away by this law?

**Shri Nathwani:** That is what I am trying to explain. You want to carry on a certain business. If I have partnership with you, then it is a firm and the firm does not enjoy the same right, though both of us are Indian citizens.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But the articles (f) and (g) would continue still.

**Shri Nathwani:** That was the position up till now. Now, you are seeking to take away that right.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not a General Clauses Act.

**Shri Nathwani:** Supposing I join with others to carry on business, in partnership, and some restrictions are sought to be placed on the business activity of my firm, I go and file a petition for a declaration that the impugned legislation is invalid and violates my fundamental rights, then you say, "You collectively own a particular property and have the right to carry on the business, and so you are not a citizen". That is what my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee tried to explain yesterday. That is my grievance.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** If there is no doubt, that can be done by amending the Constitution and not this Act.

**Shri N. P. Nathwani:** Is there any doubt at all? Only if there is a doubt, we can think of other alternatives. I say you are doing something which is not warranted by the Constitution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Will it be all right if we say, "except for purposes of article 19(f) and (g)"?

**Shri N. P. Nathwani:** I shall presently deal with the matter as to under what circumstances and in what cases you can confer citizenship rights on associations. But before that, I want to cite Mr. Willis to show that the present trend is to make available these rights of citizenship

to the corporations. I crave the indulgence of this House and I will not quote more than 10 or 15 lines.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The corporation is born here; why should it not be given citizenship by birth? There are four kinds of citizenship—by birth, by descent, by registration and by naturalisation.

**Shri N. P. Nathwani:** There are two opposite views here. If we are guided by article 5 of our Constitution, it refers to birth of a person and when a person is born, it implies a gender whether male, female or even neuter; but you cannot include legal entities like corporations. The other view is the view taken by the High Courts of Bombay, Rajasthan and Madras. They were guided by article 19 of the Constitution and they thought that it could not have been the intention to exclude corporations from the right to acquire property or carry on business. These are the two opposite views. In the case of the Bombay High Court, the learned Chief Justice lamented the serious omission in our law. But leaving that aside, to resume my argument, I was submitting that even the suggestion of Mr. Willis was that United States of America should make a corporation a citizen. At page 848 of his book on American Constitution, Will says:

"The young "Fathers" of the Constitution apparently never gave the matter of corporations a thought. This is one of the great omissions of the original document. Yet, by the Constitution which has been made by the Supreme Court, corporations today are protected in most respects as much as natural persons and in some respects more than natural persons."

The learned author goes on to say that shows:

"the extent to which the power of reason has prevailed over the power of ritual"

I am submitting this to those who are talking about birth, gender and rituals. The author goes on to state how the rights of citizen are made available to corporations there. He says:

"Corporations may have been given too much protection in some respects, to be referred to hereafter, but there are some respects, in which they have not been given enough protection and that protection as a citizen is one."

In his opinion, protection as a citizen should be given to the Corporations. He says further:

"All it would be necessary to do to accomplish this result would be for the Supreme Court to declare that corporations are citizens for this protection."

That is what the learned author says. According to me, we are reversing this process. The argument that has been given by the hon. Deputy Minister is this: He says that it would create anomalies and difficulties and that it would be difficult to find out how the alleged citizenship of a body is to be terminated. I say that if you lay down the conditions subject to which a corporate body or other association has to acquire citizenship, it is easy to decide as to when that status would terminate. For instance, take a partnership firm. If you confer upon them this status on the condition that all the partners or, say, three-fourths of the partners are Indian citizens, then when that condition is broken, certainly that association loses its character as a citizen. Therefore, I do not see any difficulty about this. If you say that all its members should be Indian citizens and it should be incorporated in India, where is the difficulty about termination of its status? As soon as any outsider becomes a member, that condition is broken and the company loses its character as a citizen. I, therefore, submit that the matter should be given a serious thought and we should at least modify the definition of the word "person"

[Shri N. P. Nathwani]

so as to include those associations, whether incorporated or not, all of whose members are Indian citizens. Thank you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak on this aspect of the Bill.

**Shri B. K. Das (Contd):** Sir, when the Bill was last considered, I pleaded that special provisions should be made for the migrants from Pakistan for acquiring citizenship. The matter was thoroughly discussed and Pandit Thakur Dasji and other friends also gave cogent reasons. Yesterday and today also some of my friends including Pandit Thakur Dasji have dealt with this matter thoroughly. As this matter concerns my part of the country also and the number of refugees who would be affected by the provisions of this Bill will be not less than 25 lakhs of people, I consider it necessary to go into further details of this matter. On the day of the commencement of the Constitution i.e. 26th January, 1950, the number of refugees in this country were those who came mostly from West Pakistan. At that time the number of refugees coming from East Bengal was only a few lakhs. Moreover, I think the number of those who came under the registration clause, article 6 of the Constitution, is also not large, because I do not know how many of the refugees took advantage of that clause, especially because they had to satisfy the six months' residence qualification in this country. So, lakhs of people are without any right of citizenship today in our country. The question that troubles us is how from the point of justice and from the point of practical consideration also, we can give to these people the Indian citizenship with honour without any disrespect or trouble to them.

3 P.M.

The provisions that are before us, that have undergone some changes in the hands of the Joint Committee are not adequate. Although we are happy

that under clause 10, these refugees, who will be admitted to citizenship by registration under article 6 (b) (ii) of clause 5(1)(a) of this Bill, are excluded from the deprivation clause, still the disadvantages under which the migrants from Pakistan will have to labour have not been remedied. Shri Barman, speaking earlier in the day, brought to the notice of the House one important point. Whereas the Constitution provides that only 6 months' residence would be necessary at the time of the registration, under clause 5(1)(a), one year's residence has been prescribed. We do not know why this period has been enlarged in this provision. We do not know why, at the time of the passing of the Constitution, it was thought that for a refugee who came at that time, six months' residence was quite enough and why, at the present moment, one year's residence is considered necessary. Further, when a migrant has to undergo the process of registration, he will have to adduce evidence or proof of his being a person of Indian origin. It is true that some of them would be holding migration certificates; some of them would be holding border slips and some of them may have been registered as refugees by this time. There was a time of vacuum when neither migration certificates, nor border slips were there. Again, there are people who have just crossed the border and come into this country without holding any proof of their coming to this country. Today, these people will have to give proof of their being genuine migrants from Pakistan. At this stage, I want to draw the attention of the House to a definition that has been given to 'refugees' in West Bengal for the purpose of their availing themselves of the benefits of rehabilitation. According to that definition, if a migrant produced an affidavit, it is not considered enough for the purpose of his being admitted as a genuine refugee. He has to adduce further evidence in support of that affidavit. Documentary evidence would be better. If

not, certain other evidences are necessary. If such evidence becomes necessary also in the present case, I think it would be a great hardship on the refugees to prove that they are genuine refugees. They have also to give proof of their residence for one year before they make an application. Further, all the persons of full age, persons of 18 years of age, will have to take an oath of allegiance. To take this oath of allegiance or to produce an affidavit, they will have to appear before a magistrate. On the last occasion when the hon. Home Minister replied to the debate, he pointed out that it would not be very difficult or impracticable for the refugees to undergo this process of registration. I do not know how the refugees, many of them illiterate persons, living in remote places, would take advantage of this process of registration when they will have to take—(all the adult persons both male and female)—the oath of allegiance and produce evidence of their being genuine refugees on affidavit, if necessary. The immediate right that would accrue from citizenship is the right of being enlisted as voters. I understand that the qualifying date for the coming elections has been fixed as 1st March 1956. Those who have come to this country one year before that date, if they acquire citizenship, will be able to enlist themselves as voters. There are only two months before us. If we want to give the right of franchise to these migrants from Pakistan after admitting them into our citizenship, I do not know how it will be possible for giving this right to them. There is a chance that these refugees, who ought to be given the right of franchise, may be deprived of their franchise, and may not be able to acquire citizenship and the right of being enlisted as voters. If, as the hon. Deputy Minister pointed out yesterday, we consider these people as Indians—they were Indians and they will be Indians—why not exempt them from all these rigours and oaths of allegiance, and proof of their being of Indian origin and genuine migrants, etc.?

**The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi):** Oath of allegiance is not a rigour; it is a privilege.

**Shri B. K. Das:** They will have to appear before a magistrate. How can illiterate people, males and females, living in remote places throughout the country, go before a magistrate and take the oath of allegiance? It may be a privilege for an educated person who is more suitably situated; not for an illiterate person, living in a remote village.

**Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South):** No, no; they must do it.

**Shri B. K. Das:** They may have been excluded from this clause. If their case had been considered separately, all these processes would not have been necessary. That is the plea that so many of us have been making, that the case of these refugees should be treated separately and they must be taken out of clause 5, namely, the registration clause. They should have been put in a separate category and a process evolved for their acquiring citizenship. That has not been done. That is my complaint. However, I would request that if it is found impossible or unacceptable to the Government that they should be treated separately and if they cannot be taken out of the registration clause, at least under clause 18 of the Bill rules should be so framed that there may be the least difficulty for these people getting themselves registered as citizens of India.

**श्री श्री नारायण दास (दरभंगा मध्य) :**  
नागरिकता विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में विचार करते समय इस बात पर मेरा व्यान जाता है कि आखिर नागरिकता का बंधन किस बात का बंधन है? नागरिकता का किसी राज्य के साथ व्यक्ति विशेष का कानूनी सम्बन्ध है। इस सम्बन्ध से राज्य के प्रति उस व्यक्ति के कर्तव्य का भी ज्ञान होता है और उस राज्य की भी जवाब देही होती है कि अवस्था विशेष में उस नागरिक का ब

## [श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

संरक्षण करे । ऐसी बात, ऐसा सिद्धान्त अगर हम अपने सामने रखते हैं तो सब से पहली बात जो मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हमें नागरिकता को बिलकुल सस्ता और सरल नहीं बनाना चाहिए । किसी दूसरे देश के नागरिक को, चाहे वह कामनवेल्य (राष्ट्रमंडल) का नागरिक हो, चाहे वह किसी दूसरे देश का नागरिक हो, ऐसा दरवाजा नहीं खुला छोड़ देना चाहिए कि जो चाहे हमारे देश में आकर इस देश की नागरिकता का अधिकार प्राप्त कर ले । अभी जैसा कि कल किसी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा था कि हमारे देश के नागरिक को जितने भी अधिकार है, हर नागरिक को बिना किसी भेदभाव के मिल जाता है । हर नागरिक को राष्ट्रपति का पद प्राप्त करने का अधिकार होना चाहिये जो कि सर्वोच्च सरकारी पद होता है । वह सब से बड़ा पद है, उस पद पर पहुँचने का उसको हक होता है । ऐसी हालत में अगर हम अपने देश का दरवाजा हर एक आदमी के लिये खोल देंगे, चाहे वह कामनवेल्य के किसी देश का नागरिक हो और चाहे और किसी दूसरे देश का नागरिक हो, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम एक उचित और समझदारी का कार्य नहीं करेंगे और मैं उसे मुनासिब नहीं समझता । इसलिये नागरिकता का कानून बनाने के समय हमको इस बात का पूरा ध्यान रखना चाहिये ।

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

और जैसा कि सभापति जी, आपने अभी पहले अपने भाषण में कहा था कि कोई भी विदेशी यहां हिन्दुस्तान में आकर बस जायें और किसी का जन्म यहां पर हो जायें तो वह हमारे देश का नागरिक हो जायेगा, चाहे हमारे देश के प्रति उसकी भवित हो या न हो, हमारे देश के प्रति अङ्ग हो या न हो । हमारे जो संविधान

के आदर्श हैं, उनको वह माने या न माने, लेकिन महज चूंकि उसका जन्म इस देश में हो गया और जब तक वह स्वयं स्वेच्छा से इस नागरिकता के अधिकार को छोड़ नहीं दे तब तक वह हमारे देश का नागरिक बना रहेगा । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित और ठीक नहीं है और कोई ऐसा रास्ता निकालना चाहिये कि कम से कम एक बालिग व्यक्ति को जिसका कि जन्म भारत में हो और जिसके माता पिता या दोनों यदि इस देश के नागरिक नहीं थे, तो उनको बालिग होने के बाद इस तरह की कोई धोषणा करनी चाहिये, कोई ऐसी शपथ लेनी चाहिये कि वह हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति वफादार रहेंगे और देश के प्रति श्रद्धा और निष्ठा रखेंगे । जो यहां जन्म लेते हैं और जिनके माता पिता यहां के रहने वाले नागरिक हैं, जैसे कि हम लोग हुये हालांकि हम शपथ नहीं भी लेते हैं, तब भी यह माना जाता है कि हम संविधान के प्रति भक्ति भाव रखते हैं । इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि कोई ऐसा रास्ता निकालना चाहिये कि कम से कम ऐसे व्यक्ति जिनका भारत में जन्म हुआ हो और जिनके माता पिता या दोनों अपर हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक नहीं थे, तो उनको बालिग होने के बाद कोई बाजाबदा कानूनी शपथ लेनी चाहिये कि वे हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति वफादार रहेंगे और देश के प्रति श्रद्धा रखेंगे और कोशिश करेंगे कि जिस तरह से और भारतीय नागरिक इस देश में रहते हैं उसी तरह वे भी यहां संविधान और देश के प्रति आदर और निष्ठा का भाव रख कर यहां पर रहेंगे, इस तरह का समावेश अगर विधान में होता तो ज्यादा अच्छा था ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ जैसा कि अभी बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान का विभाजन देश की जनता की राय से नहीं हुआ, चाहे वह आज जो

पाकिस्तान है उस पाकिस्तान के रहने वाले हों, या जो आज हिन्दुस्तान है, उसके रहने वाले हों, दोनों जगहों की जनता की राय नहीं ली गई और उस बक्त पर सारे अधिकारी भक्त हिन्दुस्तान के नेताओं ने यही मुनासिब समझा कि देश का बंटवारा कर दिया जाय और एक हिन्दुस्तान और एक पाकिस्तान बना दिया जायें, तो वह विभाजन कर दिया गया। अब वह गलत निर्णय था या सही निर्णय था, इस समय में उसकी बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता और न ही उसके लिये मेरे पास समय है। अधिकारी भक्त हिन्दुस्तान के जितने नागरिक हैं उनको स्वेच्छा से जहां वह रहना चाहें, उनको रहने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। अगर कोई व्यक्ति पाकिस्तान में रहना चाहें तो उसकी भी उनके लिये नागरिकता का दरवाजा खुला रहना चाहिये। कोई भी हिन्दुस्तान का आदमी अगर जाकर पाकिस्तान में बसना चाहे, तो विना किसी हिचक के, उसको वह तमाम नागरिकता के अधिकार जो वहां के पाकिस्तानी नागरिकों को प्राप्त हैं, उनका अधिकारी हो और पाकिस्तान में उसको बसने की छूट होनी चाहिये और उसके लिये नागरिकता का दरवाजा खुला रखना चाहिये। साथ ही अब पाकिस्तान से जो लोग यहां आकर के रह गये हैं और किसी कारण से, वे समझते हैं कि उन का वहां रहना किसी भी दृष्टि से, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, सामाजिक दृष्टि से या शासन के दबाव अथवा अनुचित व्यवहार होने के कारण वे वहां पर नहीं रहना चाहते और वहां से ऊब कर हिन्दुस्तान में आना चाहते हैं तो उस समय तक जब तक कि वह यहां पर आते रहेंगे, तब तक के लिये मैं समझता हूं कि उन के लिये नागरिकता का दरवाजा खुला रखना चाहिये। देश का विभाजन हमने कर लिया और उन की राय हम ने नहीं ली और यदि वह इस देश के नागरिक बनना चाहें और बसना चाहें और हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति वकादार हों तो

उन के लिये दरवाजा बन्द करना और उस को कामनवेल्य (राष्ट्रमंडल) के जो देश हैं, उन के नागरिकों के साथ बैकेट करना और रखना, मैं समझता हूं कि यह बहुत बड़ा अन्यथा है और उसे दूर करना चाहिये।

सभापति भगोदय, जैसा कि ।

और मैं भी यही समझता हूं कि कोई इस<sup>1</sup> म इस तरह का प्राविज्ञन (उपबन्ध) क चाहिये जिस से उन को बिना किसी हिच-किचाहट के अगर हिन्दुस्तान में वह रहना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति वकादार हैं, वकादारी की शर्त नम्बर १ है, और अगर कोई पाकिस्तान का आदमी यहां आये और वह वकादार न हो तो उस की वकादारी की जांच हमें बहुत कायदे और ध्यान से करनी चाहिये और उस की वकादारी संवित होने पर ही उसे यहां बसाया जाय और नागरिकता के अधिकार प्रदान किये जायें। अगर वह कहे कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान में रहना चाहता हूं और उस देश के प्रति भक्ति और श्रद्धा रखता हूं, तो उस को बिना किसी हिचकिचाहट के यहां की नागरिकता दे देनी चाहिये और इसलिये इस विवेयक में जिस तरह के परिवर्तन करने की ज़रूरत हो वह परिवर्तन करना चाहिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जांच करने का क्या ढंग हो ?

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : एक बात मैं और कहूँगा कि थड़ शेड्यूल में जो कवालि-फिकेशंस फौर नेचुरलाइजेशन, नागरिकरण के गुणों का उल्लेख किया गया है। नेचुरलाइ-जेशन की ठीक हिन्दी मुझे नहीं मालम “नागरिकरण” भेरी समझ में हिन्दी में उपयुक्त शब्द इस समय आता है, नागरिक-करण के सम्बन्ध में जो शर्तें आप ने रखती हैं और जो शेड्यूल नम्बर ३ में दी हुई हैं, ठीक है, लेकिन उन में एक शर्त और तीरखनी चाहिये और कामनवेल्य कंट्रीज (राष्ट्र-

## [श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

मंडल के देशों) के नागरिकों के रजिस्ट्रेशन के सवाल के लिये भी यह शर्त रही चाहिये कि अगर किसी देश में वर्णभेद वर्ता जाता है हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों के साथ, या हिन्दुस्तान के जो उद्भव व्यक्ति है उन के साथ प्रगर कोई वर्णभेद किया जाये, व्यवहार से या कानून से, तो उस देश के लोगों को चाहे वह कामनवेल्य के रहने वाले भी क्यों न हों, इस देश में रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीबद्वाता) के जरिये नागरिकता का अधिकार नहीं देना चाहिये, मैं स तरह की बात शेड्यूल (अनु-सूची) नवर ३ में जोड़ना चाहूंगा और जहां पर कामनवेल्य नागरिकों के लिये राजस्ट्रशन का चिक्र आया है, वहां पर भी एक शर्त रखना चाहिये कि अगर किसी कामनवेल्य कंट्री में वर्णभेद रंग के नाम पर या जाति के नाम पर किया जाता है या कानून से और व्यवहार से इस तरह की पालिसी (नीति) वर्ती जाती है, तब उस देश विशेष के नागरिक को रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीबद्वाता) का अधिकार भी नहीं देना चाहिये। इस तरह की शर्त अगर वहां पर जोड़ दी जाये और ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दी जाय तो मैं उस को ठीक और उचित क्रम समझूंगा . . . . .

श्री भूलेकर : चाहे उस देश के मञ्जलूम अगर भाग कर यहां पर भाग कर आये हों ?

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : मञ्जलूम अगर भाग कर यहां आते हैं तो उन के बास्ते रेफेयूजीज (शरणार्थियों) का कानून मीजूद है, फारनसं एक्ट (विदेशीजन अधिनियम) मीजूद है, उन तमाम कानूनों के अन्दर हम उन को शरण देंगे। सवाल तो यहां पर नागरिकता के अधिकार प्रदान करने का है और नागरिकता का अधिकार हम उन को जल्दी नहीं देंगे। नागरिकता का अधिकार तो उन को जैस कि नेचुरलाइजेशन के शेड्यूल नम्बर ३ में दिया हुआ है, इस देश में ४, ५ या ७ वर्ष रह जाने के बाद वह

अधिकार मिल सकता है और उस के अन्दर वे आ जायेंगे।

विधेयक के कलाज ५ के अन्दर जो सब कलाज २ है उस में ओथ आफ एली-जिएन्स (वकादारी की शपथ) के शब्द आये हैं। जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है पहले विधेयक में यह दिया गया था कि व्यक्ति केवल गवर्नरमेंट (सरकार) के प्रति वफादार हो, या वह गवर्नरमेंट के प्रति किसी प्रकार का असन्तोष न फैलावे। उस को हटा कर कान्स्टिट्यूशन आफ इंडिया एज बाई ला एस्टेट्लिशड (विधि द्वारा निर्मित भारत का संविधान) कर दिया गया है। मैं इस से सहमत नहीं हूं। जैसे कि माननीय सदस्य श्री एन्चनी ने कहा कि यद्यपि यह बात ठीक है कि हम लोगों ने संविधान के प्रति वफादारी की शपथ ली है, लेकिन इस का यह मतलब नहीं है कि हम उस संविधान में परिवर्तन नहीं चाहते हैं। इस देश के अन्दर सामाजिक, आर्थिक और राजनीतिक न्याय की स्थापना के लिये अगर कान्स्टिट्यूशन (संविधान) में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता होती है तो उस को करना चाहिये और हम भी करेंगे। इसलिये हर नागरिक को यह अधिकार प्राप्त है कि वह संविधान के अन्दर परिवर्तन करने के लिये प्रचार करे, जनता के बीच जाये, परिवर्तनों के पक्ष में प्रचार करे, ताकि समय पर संविधान में संोधन हो सके। इसलिये सब बलेड में न जा कर मैं यही कहना चाहता हूं कि “जो राष्ट्र के प्रति वफादार हो”, “राष्ट्र के प्रति भक्ति रखता हो” यह शब्द होने चाहिये न कि कान्स्टिट्यूशन (संविधान) या कान्स्टिट्यूशन आफ इंडिया एज बाई ला एस्टेट्लिशड’ (विधि द्वारा निर्मित भारत का संविधान) भारत के प्रति वफादारी तथा भक्ति की जो एलीजिएन्स (निष्ठा) है वही पर्याप्त होनी चाहिये। जैसे कि एलीजिएन्स टू दि किंग (सम्राट् के प्रति निष्ठा) होती है या एलिजिएन्स टू दि स्टेट (राज्य के प्रति निष्ठा) होती है। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं

आता कि जिस संविधान में रोज़ व रोज़ परिवर्तन हो सकता है, जिस में परिवर्तन करना जनता आवश्यक समझती है, उस के प्रति भक्ति की शपथ लेना कहां तक ठीक है। जहां तक संसद का प्रश्न है हो सकता है कि इस प्रकार की संविधान के प्रति शपथ लेना ठीक हो, लेकिन एक नागरिक के लिये इस प्रकार की शपथ लेना मुनासिब नहीं होगा।

**श्री बी० एन० मिश्र (बिलासपुर-दुर्ग-रायपुर) :** अगर कोई भारत माता की जय बोले तो क्या उस की वफादारी मालूम हो जायेगी और उस को नागरिकता दे देनी चाहिये?

**श्री श्रीनारायण बास :** स्टेट के प्रति भक्ति, कानून के प्रति भक्ति। जैसा माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि संविधान के प्रति शपथ लेने का मतलब है संविधान की रक्षा करना और उस के प्रति वफादार रहना, उसी प्रकार राज्य के प्रति शपथ लेने का मतलब होगा राष्ट्र के प्रति वफादार रहना और उस की रक्षा करना।

मैं वकील नहीं हूं, लेकिन मेरे कई वकील भिन्नों ने यहां बहस की कि (person) व्यक्ति की जो परिभाषा है उस के अन्दर कम्पनी (समवाय) या एसोसिएशन (संस्था) को भी लाना चाहिये। मैं ने संविधान को पढ़ा है, जब नववानी साहब बहस में भाग ले रहे थे उस समय भी मैं ने उन से सवाल पूछे, लेकिन जहां तक फ़ंडमेंटल राइट्स (मूल अधिकारों) का प्रश्न है, उस में जो अधिकार दिया गया है वह केवल नागरिकों को ही दिया गया है और नागरिकों की परिभाषा संविधान के अध्याय नं० २ की धारा नं० ५ में दी गई है। उस अध्याय के अन्दर जो परिभाषा दी गई है उसी के अनुसार मैं समझता हूं हाई कोर्ट स (उच्च न्यायालय) और सुप्रीम कोर्ट (उच्चतम न्यायालय) जे अपने निर्णय दिये हैं। उन्होंने कहा है

कि इस मरिभाषा के अन्दर जो नागरिकता की शपथ है वह बिल्कुल सीमित कर दी गई है, अर्थात् जिस का देश में जन्म इत्यादि हो, यह व्यक्ति विशेष के लिये, मनुष्य के लिये है न कि किसी संस्था या कम्पनी के लिये। अगर इस के सम्बन्ध में न्यायालयों में शक पैदा होता है तो उस के लिये जल्दी है कि जहां पर मूल अधिकार का अध्याय संविधान में है वहां सिटिजैन (नागरिक) का अर्थ इस प्रकार से साफ कर दिया जाय कि सिटिजैन के अर्थों में संस्था या कम्पनी भी आ सके। मैं समझता हूं कि यह जो विशेष पेश है उस में केवल मनुष्य के लिये है कि वह कैसे हमारे देश की नागरिकता को पा सकता है या किस तरह से हम उस को अपने देश की नागरिकता से बंचित कर सकते हैं। इसलिये इस विशेष के में संस्था या कम्पनी का जिक्र करना सभीचीन न होगा।

इस विशेष के अन्दर दिया गया है कि किसी हवाई जहाज में चाहे वह रजिस्टर्ड (पंजीबद्ध) हवाई जहाज हो या अनरजिस्टर्ड (पंजीरहित) यदि किसी महिला के बच्चा पैदा हो जाता है तो बच्चा उस देश का नागरिक होगा जहां समुद्री जहाज या हवाई जहाज रजिस्टर्ड हुआ रहेगा या जिस देश के वे जहाज होंगे। चूंकि हमारा देश और पाकिस्तान दोनों मिले हुए हैं और यहां की दोनों वहां जाती हैं इसलिये इस सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ नियम होना चाहिये कि दोनों (गाड़ियों) में पैदा हुए बच्चे की नागरिकता क्या होगी। मैं एक उदाहरण रखता हूं। अगर हमारे देश की दोन पाकिस्तान जाती हैं और किसी हिन्दुस्तानी महिला के पाकिस्तानी क्षेत्र में जा कर बच्चा पैदा होता है तो जो कानून हमारे यहां बनाया जा रहा है उस के अनुसार उस का बच्चा कहां का नागरिक होगा? मैं समझता हूं कि अगर वह हिन्दुस्तानी महिला है और उस का पति हिन्दुस्तान में रहता है तो भले ही

## [श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

पाकिस्तानी सेव्र में बच्चे का जन्म हुआ हो, उस को भारत का जन्मा हुआ बच्चा समझना चाहिये परन्तु मौजूदा धारा के अनुसार वह भारत का जन्मजात नागरिक न हो कर बंशोद्भव (by descent) नागरिक होगा। ऐसा संशोधन होना चाहिये जिस से भारत के नागरिक की सन्तान का जन्म अगर द्रेन के अन्दर पाकिस्तान में हो तो वह भारतीय नागरिक समझा जाये।

मैं इस बात की ओर भी व्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हमारे संविधान में यह तो दिया गया है कि हमारे देश का नागरिक किसी दूसरे देश की कोई उपाधि नहीं ले सकता है, लेकिन जहां तक मेरा ख्याल है किसी भी कानून में हम ने यह नहीं कहा कि यदि कोई व्यक्ति इस तरह से उपाधि प्राप्त कर ले तो उसे क्या दण्ड दिया जाय। मैं तो समझता हूं कि इस प्रकार की दण्ड व्यवस्था हर नागरिक के लिये हीनी चाहिये, पर यदि सब के लिये न हो तो कम से कम जो रजिस्टर्ड नागरिक हों या जो नेचुरलाइजेशन (देशीयकरण) द्वारा हमारे देश के नागरिक हो गये हों, उन लोगों के लिये तो जरूर होना चाहिये कि यदि वह किसी दूसरे देश की उपाधि ले लें तो वह हमारे देश के नागरिक न रह सके। देश की नागरिकता से वंचित करने की जो धारायें हैं उन के सहारे यदि कोई व्यक्ति नेचुरलाइजेशन द्वारा या रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीबद्धता) द्वारा भारत का नागरिक बन गया है और वह संविधान की धारा के खिलाफ किसी विदेश की उपाधि प्राप्त कर लेता है तो उसे या तो देश की नागरिकता से वंचित कर दिया जाये या उसे किसी प्रकार का दंड दिया जाये।

जो बाहर के रहने वाले हमारे देश में पंजीकरण अर्थात् रजिस्ट्रेशन के द्वारा नागरिक बन गये हैं वा जिन को देशीयकरण (Natura-

lisation) द्वारा हमारे देश की नागरिकता मिल गई है उन के लिये किसी अवधि तक यहां रहना कानून द्वारा आवश्यक करार दे दिया जाय। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि जितने भी समय के लिये चाहे वह हमारे देश में चले आयें और उतने दिनों के लिये नागरिकता के अधिकार ले लें। मैं समझता हूं कि एक निश्चित अवधि हीनी चाहिये कि वह इतने वर्ष तक यहां अवश्य रहें। साथ ही जैसा, सभापति जी, आप ने कहा, अगर हिन्दुस्तान का कोई नागरिक १५, २० वर्ष बाहर रहे और किसी समय यहां न आवेतो भी हमारे देश का नागरिक बना रहे, लेकिन उस का आना जाना यहां पर कुछ तो रहना चाहिये, इसलिये इस सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ समय निश्चित कर दिया जाय तो अच्छा होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी इस को स्वीकार कर लेंगे।

मुझे कई बातें कहनी थीं, लेकिन चूंकि अब समय नहीं है इसलिये अधिक नहीं कहूंगा। इन शब्दों के साथ जो विषेय हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने रखा था श्रीर जिस में कि संयुक्त समिति द्वारा कुछ सुधार किया गया है उस का समर्थन करता हूं श्रीर इस के लिये संयुक्त समिति के माननीय सदस्यों तथा मंत्री महोदय को धन्यवाद देते हुए यह उम्मीद करता हूं कि जो सुझाव मैं ने दिये हैं उन पर विचार किया जायेगा।

**Shri S. S. More:** I do concede that the Bill as it has emerged from the Joint Committee has undergone some appreciable improvement, particularly as regards clause 10(2) (b). Formerly, disaffection towards the Government of India was a ground for deprivation of citizenship, but now that has been replaced by disaffection towards the Constitution of India. But even this change does not appear to me to be a happy change.

Under clause 5(2), one has to take an oath for the purpose of getting the citizenship right by registration. Similarly, a person who wants to acquire the right by naturalisation also has to take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. Shri Frank Anthony has referred to this aspect already, and has pointed out that the Constitution is a changing document. It always undergoes mutations as the conditions in the country change. Sub-clause 2 (b) of clause 10 reads:

"that citizen has shown himself by act or speech to be disloyal or disaffected towards the Constitution of India as by law established."

If the disloyalty or disaffection to the Constitution becomes evident, then Government would be perfectly justified under this provision in depriving that man of his citizenship.

My submission is that many of us are disaffected to the Constitution. We are already disaffected to the Constitution. We find that this Constitution which seems to be a federal Constitution is really in the nature of a unitary Constitution, and as such, the autonomous powers of the State are frequently sacrificed for certain central purposes. But my disaffection to the Constitution, my dissatisfaction regarding the Constitution, has nothing to do with my loyalty to the country, I mean the State. I am not talking of the country as a geographical unit, but I am talking of the State, the legally constituted State. A State is something which continues State is something which does not undergo any mutation or change, and if I have got the seeds of patriotism in me, they will always be expanding and flowering, so that my loyalty goes on developing as the State goes on really becoming a Welfare State. But my regard for the Constitution, my satisfaction about the Constitution may not appear on the horizon. But it will unfortunately be a ground for depriving one of citizenship.

Now Shri Raghavachari made out the point when he spoke about clause 10 that keeping all this power in the hands of the State executive is something full of dangerous pregnancy. Theoretically, I would concede with many Members that the executive government ought to be the sole judge for the purpose of admitting foreigners to the citizenship of this country as well as the time or the grounds on which they might be deprived of that right. But theoretical concession is one thing and practical experience may be something different. Unfortunately, we are new to the democratic set-up. In England, one can trust the executive government much more freely and without any fear on his part because they have developed a democratic tradition. But take, for instance, a country which is new to the democratic set-up. Here in a country which has come out of feudalism, a country which has come out of some ancient customs and ancient autocracy, it frequently happens that men who are petty-minded, who are mean, somehow, unfortunately, climb into seats of power, and the moment they sit in the seats of power protected by those seats, they try to be vindictive, they do not like opposition, they do not like people who have backbone and can stand against them. As far as I am concerned or Shri Kamath is concerned, we do not run the risk of being deprived of our citizenship because we are citizens by birth, by origin. But take the case of a foreigner who has come to this country, naturalised and acquired citizenship, and has become perfectly qualified to be a candidate for Parliament. He comes to Parliament, he is elected to Parliament and somehow he remains in the Opposition Benches. I am not talking about the present executive government, but it is not difficult to visualise what some future government, in which some persons with petty mind happen to be the Ministers, will do. They have seen that a man who has become a citizen by naturalisation has crept into the seat of the opposition. They cannot

[Shri S. S. More]

unseat him because there is article 329 of the Constitution; he must be unseated by an election petition. There are no grounds on which an election petition can be launched or successfully fought. Then they will find out a way. Well, he has acquired citizenship by naturalisation or he has acquired citizenship by registration. The executive government have power under clause 10 to deprive that man of his citizenship. They will put that machine into operation, pull the necessary string. The result will be that the man will cease to be a citizen of the State. Under our Constitution, no person can be a Member of this House unless he is a citizen of this country. These things are not only the shadows or the creation of my imagination. No country is always fortunate in having men of tolerance, abundant tolerance, who can look to the Opposition with some respect.....

Shri Tyagi: As we have today.

Shri Kamath: Who are the 'we'?

Shri S. S. More: I request Shri Tyagi not to provoke me to make some unpalatable observations regarding himself.

Shri Kamath: Make them; he will stand it.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea-cum-Santal Parganas): He will be bold enough to face it.

Shri Kamath: He can take it.

Shri S. S. More: Such a case is quite possible. Therefore, though I theoretically concede that this matter ought to rest with the executive government, in the light of my own experience, I have a different conviction, because, unfortunately, I have developed the habit of standing like a rock against those who sit in power and receiving some knocks, whether deserved or underserved.

Shri Kamath: Giving knocks also.

Shri S. S. More: I do say that being non-violent, I never retaliate.

My submission is that such a case is possible and the executive government will have to think out whether some protection ought not be given by way of some justiciable remedy, because the courts only will be able to give the same protection.

As regards Commonwealth, I find that the different provisions in this particular Bill are rather hazy and do not give us a clear conception of the rights and privileges of Commonwealth citizens. They will require some chiselling because reading clauses 11 and 12 along with clause 2, I am not yet in a position to understand what are the real implications. And in my excitement, I did something: I tried to intervene and received a knock. All the same, even that knock has not brought any more light to me. I feel that this Commonwealth citizenship has to be placed on a more precise foundation so that we should know where that citizenship stands and what are the rights, privileges or disadvantages or the points of differentiation in regard to a Commonwealth citizen.

I will again revert to the point I made when I spoke last when the Bill was referred to the Joint Committee. I feel that we should not stick to this idea of Commonwealth, which gives us a stinking smell due to our past relationship with the Britishers. Even according to Mr. Eden, the Prime Minister of England, whose statement was read out by Shri Kamath, the queen still happens to be the connecting link between the Commonwealth countries. We have sworn allegiance to the Constitution of India. The President is the sole head of our Government here and I am not prepared to recognise, even for a pot of gold, my allegiance to the Queen. I would say that I am loyal to the President, because he represents this country, and whatever may be the

advantages accruing as a Commonwealth country, particularly by being associated with the UK, I am not prepared to say that I accept that authority—whether of the Queen or anybody else. But I will again say, why not develop a Panch Shila citizenship?

**Shri A. M. Thomas** (Ernakulam): Is it anywhere known?

**Shri S. S. More:** My hon. friend Shri A. M. Thomas, has asked me a question. But why should we not be the first in the field? We have developed this habit of going tamely after someone else. Here I am reminded of Shakespeare's drama 'Henry the V' in which Henry the V says "We are makers of manners and not tame followers". So let us set an example which other Asian countries can follow. Why should not India be followed by Asian countries? I find under the benign and sobering influence of Panditji's foreign policy, the whole of Asia is looking to us for guidance. If we have to give effective guidance to the whole of Asia which is trying to stand on its legs, we should develop this Panch Shila citizenship. The recent enthusiastic reception given to the Soviet leaders was due to the fact that they have signed the Panch Shila declaration along with our Prime Minister, and the people of India warmly responded not because they were Russian leaders, not because they were great revolutionaries, but because they were linked up with us indissolubly for the maintenance of peace as declared in Panch Shila. Why not give citizenship to a country which is linked up with us on the doctrine of Panch Shila? Why not give citizenship to Russia which is wedded to Panch Shila along with China which is also wedded to Panch Shila? Why confer Commonwealth citizenship on Australians and Canadians and the people of United Kingdom who are not sympathetic towards us so far as our Goa claim is concerned? They are remaining silent conveniently and against our own interests. We are

conferring citizenship on these souls who do not look kindly towards us while we are denying equal rights to those who are more indissolubly and more honestly and faithfully linked up with us for the purposes of maintenance of peace.

I do not want to take more time. I feel this Bill should be amended in this direction. Let us introduce something. Now the Panch Shila countries are developing into a firm brotherhood. Let us recognise that brotherhood and try to exchange citizenship with such countries because such exchanges will not be at our cost.

I need not go to the minor clauses to which you have already referred. Some of the minor defects will have to be removed. But, I am prepared to resume my seat after saying that Shri Datar and particularly the Prime Minister may take these suggestions into consideration and, if not in this Bill, at least in some other amending measure they may come out with Panch Shila citizenship and that will really be a constitutional beginning of a relationship which will go on extending and serve as a sort of guide and beaconlight to all Asian countries.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta-South-East): When I first saw this Bill before it was referred to the Joint Committee, I had a sense which was a kind of mixture of shame, exasperation and distress. Now, the Joint Committee has gone into that Bill. It has made certain changes, certain changes of a desirable character no doubt. But, as far as the fundamentals are concerned, it has made practically no alterations. When I speak of fundamentals, I mean the outlook of the Bill, firstly, regarding our displaced brothers from Pakistan and secondly regarding those who are called Commonwealth citizens.

The first impression one gets on reading the Bill is that it is a copy of the British Nationality Act, 1948.

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

That is only a first impression. When we read deep into the Bill, we find that it is not a mere draftsman's lethargy, not a mere inability to think out a better draft and therefore a copying of the British Nationality Act but it is done with a deliberate purpose, with a purpose that is unpatriotic, with a purpose that is slavish and so, the ultimate impression one irresistibly gets of this Bill is that slavery is writ large in every important provision of the Bill. This kind of slavishness, this kind of unpatriotic behaviour is to be found when we compare the treatment meted out to displaced persons with the treatment that is meted out to those who are called Commonwealth citizens.

India was partitioned on a two nation theory basis. Every Congress leader, from top to bottom, assured the minorities who were to remain in Pakistan that India would welcome them if they suffered in view of the partition. By such promises they secured the agreement of the minorities to the partition. I can say that regarding the minorities of my part of the country, the minorities of undivided Bengal. Their consent was secured exclusively on those promises. Those minorities had played a very honourable part in winning the freedom of the country. Their concurrence to partition was secured on the basis of that particular promise. So, it is crystal clear that when we were partitioning the country on the basis of the two nation theory, our country could never repudiate the claims of those minorities who were left behind in Pakistan to an honourable reception in this country should they desire to come out here. There can be no doubt about it that this was our human duty in view of the lurch in which we were leaving them. But it was also our sacred moral duty in view of their contribution to the achievement of freedom of our country and it was almost a legal duty in view of our repeated pre-partition promises. What have we given them

instead? What have we given them in this Bill? We have given them registration. They are not to be *ipso facto* citizens; they are to be citizens only by registration. People who had come to contribute so much to the freedom struggle are to become citizens only by registration. What kind of registration, I will come to it later. They are not recognised as *ipso facto* citizens. To add insult to injury, we put them in a similar category with foreign government servants.

If you look at clause 5 of the Bill, you will find that they are placed in the same class with citizens of foreign State in government service in this country and they are given the right to register. This kind of treatment is bad enough from the point of view of sentiment or emotion, particularly when we remember their contribution to the freedom struggle and the sentiments with which they agreed to partition. What did the refugees think when they made the contribution to our freedom struggle? Did they expect to be citizens of Pakistan or did they expect to be citizens of an undivided India or the India which remained after it was compelled to divide? There can be no doubt about it. It is grossly unfair, it is indecent, I would say, under these circumstances, in view of their contributions, in view of their expectations, to put them in a category of citizens who are inferior to the citizens of India and who have to come in only by the process of registration. This difference and the emotional considerations that it involves are bad enough. But, what we find is that it is not a mere matter of sentiment; it is a deliberate intention to treat our displaced brothers from Pakistan as foreigners and as a sort of semi-helots and inferior citizens and to suspect their loyalty all the time.

In the first place, we give them the right of registration and this right is not a very great right. It is a grace. Clause 5 says that the Government "may register". Any person from

Pakistan who has been displaced from there cannot claim citizenship as of right. He is to get it only by the grace of the Government. He has to abide by the grace of the Government. Is it a fair treatment to be accorded to them? Unlike citizens by birth or descent, they have to take an oath of allegiance. You and I have not to take an oath of allegiance, but a refugee has to take an oath of allegiance, allegiance of loyalty. It implies that the loyalty of that person is less than yours or mine. Is it a fair treatment to be given to the refugees? I say nothing about the worries of taking the whole family to register and to swear the oath, perhaps over very long distances; I say nothing of the fees that they may have to pay. Apart from these considerations, which are vital for people like the refugees, who are bound to be poor, who are bound to be of very limited means, the fact that they should be treated on a different footing from the way you or I or any other born Indian is treated is an invidious distinction: that is a distinction which no patriotic Indian can tolerate.

In the third place, unlike the citizens by birth or descent, one body of displaced persons or rather one body of persons who are covered by article 5(c), namely, those who were settled in the territory of India for a long time though they or their parents or grand-parents were not born in the territory of India, stand the risk of being deprived of their citizenship, sometimes even in a body. For example, many persons from East Bengal had been residing in Calcutta for a long time although they were not born in Calcutta or in any part in the territory of India—their parents or even grand-parents might not have been born in such territory. In my case, for example, I was saved only by the accident of the fact that my mother happened to be born in Gaya in Bihar; otherwise I would have fallen in that category. In that case, the Government would have been free to deprive me of my citizenship because I would have come under

article 5(c). These are the things we mete out to the refugees. In the British Nationality Act, provisions similar to these are applied to naturalised citizens and that is understandable, because a naturalised citizen is a foreigner and there is scope for doubting his loyalty and some safeguard is necessary. But why should the same provisions be applied to the refugees? Has the Government courage enough to declare that it suspects the loyalty of the refugees as a whole or even of a substantial portion of them? I assert that every person displaced from Pakistan, who wants to come to India, is an Indian citizen by birth-right and that he or she is every inch a citizen of India as any of us here, any of the Minister, of the Central or State Governments or any Member of Parliament or anybody here. I assert and affirm that to require or even to suggest proof of loyalty on their part before accepting them as citizens is presumption and I challenge the Government to proclaim this policy openly.

Before leaving this part of the subject, I cannot but record my apprehension and emphatic protest against clause 10(2)(b) which, though amended by the Joint Committee, nevertheless is objectionable and I hope to deal with it at greater length when I speak on the amendments.

I have shown you the treatment meted out to the refugees but the enormity of this treatment and the unpatriotic and slavish outlook is underlined by the provisions regarding Commonwealth citizenship. Clause 12 enables the Central Government to confer all or any of the rights of citizenship on Commonwealth citizens. Refugees must prove their loyalty by swearing an oath of allegiance, but a Commonwealth citizen, a legal or natural subject of Britannic Majesty is under no such obligation to prove his allegiance. He is not required to take an oath of allegiance, and yet he can have the right of citizenship. The Government is so sure of his loyalty that it has not considered it necessary

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

to make him renounce his other citizenship before taking up the citizenship of India. What is the justification for this? Reciprocity, it is said. The British Nationality Act provides for it, ergo, we too have provided for it. In the case of Britain Commonwealth citizens were former subjects and it flatters their imperial pride or vanity that they could still be taken in as citizens of their country. The British Nationality Act makes the position of Commonwealth citizens similar to that of British subjects. Even if you choose to call it their magnanimity, they run no risk from these citizens; they can at best be students or odd employees and all the damage that they can do is to increase the votes of an undesirable candidate to Parliament by a few thousands all over the country. In our case, it is only perpetuating the rights of a former master through the back-door. The Bill talks of reciprocity.....

**Mr. Chairman:** The persons who register themselves as members of the Commonwealth must also take the oath of allegiance.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta:** Under clause - 12, there is no obligation for them to take the oath of allegiance.

**Mr. Chairman:** Under sub-clause (2) of clause 5, "no person being of full age shall be registered as a citizen of India under sub-section (1) until he has taken the oath of allegiance in the form specified in the Second Schedule". A man who is registered must take the oath.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta:** I am referring to clause 12 and not to clause 5. I have started by saying that under clause 12 the Government could confer rights of citizenship and no oath of allegiance is necessary there, and no renunciation of citizenship is even necessary. For Britain, not much damage can take place, but in our case, it is only to perpetuate the rights of a former master by the back-door. The Bill talks of reciprocity. The British con-

trol Rs. 600 crores worth of investments in our backward country and that too in vital sectors of our economy. It has near monopoly in such important industries as coal, oil and jute goods. Can the Government ensure that we too will command the same position in the British industries, that we too will enjoy near monopoly in the production of oil, coal or iron and steel in the Britain? Without this what on earth is the meaning of reciprocity? A cat and a mouse may agree that there will be full reciprocity for each other and that they liked to hunt in each other's dens. But does the Government think that the Indian people will accept that as reciprocity? Why this special treatment for the Commonwealth? We communists have always been for complete severance of all connection with the Commonwealth. Inspite of all that the Prime

4 P.M.

Minister says about the advantages we have derived from it, we have demonstrated again and again that this association has by and large brought nothing but disgrace on us by compelling us to be accessories to predatory imperialist wars in Malaya and other places. Even so we can understand, though by no means we agree to or appreciate, the inability to leave the Commonwealth. But what we can neither understand nor appreciate nor be party to—is the attempt to perpetuate our Commonwealth association for all time to come through the medium of this. Why should we, irrespective of our relations with the countries of the Commonwealth be bound to treat them on a different footing from other foreigners. All this is not mere sentiment. As I said a little while ago the position of Britons and Indians vis-a-vis each other is radically different. It follows that Britain needs far less protection from ours than we may need from Britons. But, if they do they are much better placed than ourselves. A citizen of India enjoys cer-

tain fundamental rights which if exercised by persons who have allegiances elsewhere may place our country in great jeopardy. Our citizens enjoy the constitutional right to organise associations, to move freely throughout the territory of India, to reside and settle anywhere they please and to carry on any business or profession, to acquire, hold and dispose of property and so on. I understand that the same rights are enjoyed by Indians as a matter of reciprocity. There is, however, this important difference. Whereas the British Parliament can annul any such right in respect of such citizens our legislature cannot do so unless such annulment or restriction is interpreted to be reasonable. There is no authority to challenge any enactment of the British Parliament but any such enactment by our legislature may be declared *ultra vires* and may not affect these alien citizens. There is absolutely no ground moral or legal to treat this category of Commonwealth citizens on a different footing. If citizens of any country are thought desirable to be adopted as our citizens they should come in as naturalised citizens and the Government can advance no arguments except the arguments of slavery and national dishonour to justify the difference in treatment accorded to Commonwealth citizens. I defy the Government to show any benefit that we shall derive from this Commonwealth association as distinguished from associations with other countries. I do not, however, deny the necessity of according different treatment to citizens of certain countries. We are naturally expected to develop friendly relations with our neighbours. Such countries, whether they belong to the Commonwealth or not may be given different treatment. It is particularly so in the case of countries where there is a substantial Indian population such as Burma, Malaya, Ceylon and others. We may extend it to other countries with which our relations become closer; for example, countries like Afghanistan, Nepal or China. But, we Communists declare that we shall

424 L.S.D.

never be party to a treatment which is nothing but a heritage of our erstwhile subjection and the erstwhile suzerainty and overlordship of her Britannic Majesty.

Now, Sir, this Bill, I think, for all these considerations, is unworthy of being passed without substantial amendments. The Joint Committee could have made many amendments. It could have seen to it that refugees from Pakistan are given the honourable treatment which they deserve in view of their signal contribution to the struggle for freedom. It could have ensured that the difference in treatment given as between foreign nations is not based on slavishness but entirely on considerations of friendly contact and mutual benefit in particular. It could have done away with the clause and the schedule which provide for difference of treatment on the basis of membership of the Commonwealth and it could have provided that Indian nationals of any foreign pocket in India could *ipso facto* be recognised as citizens when the foreign pockets merge with India. It could have also provided many other salutary changes and unless these changes are made this Bill will not be a patriotic Bill and will be a shame to our Parliament. So, I recommend suitable amendments to the Bill which I hope to move in the course of the second reading.

**Shri B. K. Das:** May I have one clarification from the previous speaker, Sir? He pointed out that under clause 12 if the Central Government confers any right on the Commonwealth citizens they will not come under clause 5(e); that is to say, those citizens will not have to take any oath of allegiance. Is it the intention?

**Mr. Chairman:** I had asked that question and the hon. Member has already given his views. There is no use asking him again.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta:** I will just say that clause 5 deals with registration whereas clause 12 does not. Under clause 12 citizenship right is confer-

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

red irrespective of registration and clause 12 in fact contemplates the granting of rights of citizenship without having to register under clause 5. Therefore, there is no question of taking any oath of allegiance under clause 12.

सरदार इकबाल तिह (फाजिल्का-सिरसा) : यह तो मैं समझता हूं कि ज्वायेट कमेटी (संयुक्त समिति) ने इस बिल (विवेयक) में काफी तब्दीलियां की हैं और उस के बाद पहले से बेहतर बिल बन गया है, लेकिन सब से पहले तो मैं इस बिल को इस नुस्का नजर से देखता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के कोई ५० लाख के करीब आदमी दूसरे देशों में जा कर बसे हुए हैं और कोई हिन्दुस्तान की शहरियत का कानून, जब तक उन की बचत नहीं करता, उन को प्रोटेक्शन (तुरका) नहीं देता जोकि दूसरे देशों की मुदिकल हालत में जैसे हुए हैं, वह हिन्दुस्तान की बेहतरीन सिटिजेनशिप (नागरिकता) का कानून नहीं हो सकता। इसलिये कि यह ५० लाख के करीब हमारे आदमी दूसरी कामनवेल्य कंट्रीज (राष्ट्रमंडल के देशों) में और ऐसे देशों में भी हैं जोकि कामनवेल्य के अन्दर नहीं हैं जिन को हिन्दुस्तान के कानून के मूताबिक यहां की शहरियत के हक हासिल नहीं होगे अगर वह इस बिल के क्लाऊज (खण्ड) १०(२) के मूताबिक सात साल तक हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर रहें और हर साल अपनी रजिस्ट्री न करायें।

सब से पहले मैं उन देशों की बाबत कहना चाहता हूं जिन देशों में आज हमारे कन्युलेट (वारिग्य दूतावास) नहीं हैं, जिन देशों में ऐसी सुविधायें नहीं हैं कि वह अपने आप को रजिस्टर करा सकें या जिन देशों में वह ऐसी मुदिकल हालात में बैठे हुए हैं कि शायद वह रजिस्टर न भी करा सकें इस कानून के मूताबिक हम उन की शहरियत को वापस ले लेते हैं। जब हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर ही उन को अपने हक हासिल नहीं हैं

तो उन देशों में उन की क्या हालत होगी ? यह आप सूद जान सकते हैं। मिसाल के तौर पर मैं बेल्जियम कांगो का नाम लेता हूं। वहां करीब ३० हजार हिन्दुस्तानी हैं, जहां तक मुझे इस बात की इतला है हमारा जो कन्युलेट है वह बेल्जियम में तो है लेकिन बेल्जियम कांगो में नहीं है। क्या आप समझते हैं कि बेल्जियम कांगो की मुदिकल हालात में वह अपने को रजिस्टर करा सकेंगे ? इसलिये मैं चहता हूं कि यह धारा उन हिन्दुस्तानियों को जोकि दूसरे देशों में बसे हुए हैं ज्यादा नुस्सान पहुंचने का कारण न बन जाये।

इस के बाद मैं दूसरे देश अंगोना का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं। वहां पर करीब १२ हजार के हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं। आज वह मूल्क पुरुतगाल के कब्जे में हैं। जब तक उन से हमारे तालुकात अच्छे नहीं होते और गोद्या का मसला हल नहीं होता शायद कोई भी आदमी वहां अपने को रजिस्टर नहीं करा सकेगा। इन देशों के लिये आप का कानून यह कहता है कि हर साल रजिस्टर कराने की जरूरत है और अगर कोई आदमी सात साल तक गैरहाजिर रहेगा तो उस से हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी के हक्क वापस ले लिये जायेंगे।

इस के अलावा कुछ और देश हैं जोकि कामनवेल्य में नहीं हैं जैसे डच गाइना है। वहां भी हिन्दुस्तानी लोग हैं और वहां पर भी उन का अपने को रजिस्टर कराना मुदिकल है।

इस के अलावा यहां के लोग इंडोनेशिया-में हैं, वर्मा में हैं। जहां पर आज कन हिन्दुस्तानी यह कोचेश कर रहे हैं कि उन का उन देशों की शहरियत के कानून के हक्क हासिल हो जायें, एक देश ने दिये भी हैं। लेकिन कुछ वापस ले रहे हैं। जैसे आप साऊथ (दक्षिण) अफ्रीका को देखेंगे। साऊथ वेस्ट

अफीका में भी, यह मैन्डेटेड टेरिटरी (अधिदिव्य राज्य क्षेत्र) है, वहां पर भी हिन्दुस्तानी गये हैं और वहां पर भी रजिस्ट्री कराने की सुविधा नहीं है। इसलिये मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह जो क्लाज़ (खण्ड) है इस क्लाज़ से शायद उन भाइयों को ज्यादा नुकसान पहुँचेगा।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो ब्रिटिश टेरिटरी (अंग्रेजी राज्य क्षेत्र) है उन के और अगर कोई आदमी को आप यह कहते हैं कि उस के बाप को हक्क मिल गया और वह शहरी हो गया तो उस के माइनर (अवयस्क बालक) को हिन्दुस्तान की शहरियत के हक्क का आप नहीं देंगे, तो उस के जो हक्क है वह खत्म हो जायेंगे। मैं आप को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कनाडा के इम्पीयरेशन एक्ट (आप्रवास अधिनियम) के मुताबिक अगर कोई हिन्दुस्तानी जब वह १८ साल का था जबकि उस का बाप कनाडा में गया था और वहां का शहरी हो गया था तो उस सूरत में अगर वह आज कनाडा में जायगा तो उस को शहरी हक्क नहीं मिल सकेंगे। इसलिये क्योंकि वह उस बत्त बालिग था और आप यह कहते हैं कि जो उस के लड़के होंगे, जो छोटे होंगे, बेशक वह छोटे भी थे और १८ साल के नहीं थे, लेकिन वह कनाडा नहीं गये और आज जब वह बालिग हो कर कनाडा जायेंगे तब भी उन को शहरियत के हक्क नहीं मिल सकेंगे। इसलिये जो माइनर के केसिस (अवयस्कों के मामले) होंगे, जो इस क्लाज़ के मुताबिक माइनर होंगे उन के बाप को तो बेशक उन देशों के शहरियत के हक्क मिले हों लेकिन उन के बच्चों को शायद न मिल सके, उन के लिये यह एक बहुत मुश्किल बात होगी। इसलिये मैं यह आशा करता हूँ कि इस क्लाज़ में इस तरह से तबदीली की जाय कि अगर बाप को हक्क मिल गये हों और जब तक उस की श्रौताद को न मिले तब तक के लिये उन से हिन्दुस्तान की

शहरियत के हक्क आप वापस न लें। अगर आप ने ऐसा किया तो उन के लिये यह एक बहुत मुश्किल चीज़ होगी। इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ कामनवेल्य टेरिटरीज़ (राष्ट्रमंडल क्षेत्र) हैं। हम यह समझते हैं कि वहां पर हिन्दुस्तानियों की आबादी तकरीबन ३० या ३२ लाख होगी। उन में से कुछ को तो वहां की शहरियत के हक्क हासिल हैं लेकिन वाकी को अभी तक वह हासिल नहीं हुए हैं और वह इन हक्क को पाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। कुछ सीलोन (श्रीलंका) जैसे देश हैं जहां पर हिन्दुस्तानियों को कुछ हक्क हासिल थे जोर्क अब उन से वापिस लिये जा रहे हैं। आपको इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि अगर ऐसे लोगों के हक्क वापस लिये जाते हैं और इधर आप भी उन के हक्क खत्म कर देते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उनके लिये एक बहुत मुश्किल चीज़ हो जायगी और इसलिये उन का भी आप को ध्यान रखना है। ये लोग ऐसे देशों में जा कर बस गये हैं जहां पर कि उन का कोई ज़ोर नहीं है, उनकी कोई आवाज़ नहीं है और जहां पर ऐसे लाज़ (विविध) बन रहे हैं जिन से कि आहस्ता आहस्ता उन से शहरियत के हक्क वापस ले लिये जायें और इन में से सात्य अफीका एक ऐसा भुल्क है, ऐसी दशा में आप हिन्दुस्तान की शहरियत के हक्क उन को दें, तो अच्छा होगा। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि रिजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीयनदाता) से यह हो सकेगा तो फिर अगर आदमी पर मुकदमा चल रहा हो साउथ अफीका में या किसी और देश में तो इस कानून के मुताबिक वह इस देश का शहरी न रहे, तो फिर क्या सूरत होगी। ऐसी भी जगह हो सकती है जहां पर आप के कांस्टेट (वाणिज्य दूता-वास) नहीं हैं और वह अपने आप को रजिस्टर भी न करवा सकता हो, तो इन हालात में उस के बारे में भा आप को मोचना पड़ेगा।

आप ने बिल में जो य० के० (इंग्नेड) के बारे में लिखा है उस में आपने यह भी

## [सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

लिखा है कि इस में तमाम कालोनीज (उपनिवेश) आ जाती हैं जो कि बरतानिया को सलतनत में शामिल हैं। इसमें तमाम ब्रिटिश कालोनीज तो आ जाती हैं लेकिन कुछ मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज (अधिविद्युत राज्य क्षेत्र) भी हैं जैसे टैगानोका है या ब्रिटिश सुमानीलैंड है जो कि ब्रिटेन के कानून के मूलाबिक वह उसको कालोनीज नहीं हैं और मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज हैं और जो य० एन० एस० (मंयुक्त गण्डू मंच) के कुछ फैफलों के नीचे ब्रिटेन को मौजौदा गई हैं और वह वहां पर दुकमरान है और जहां पर हमारे नुमाइंदे भी नहीं हैं वहां के शहरियों के जारे में आपको मोचना होगा। इन सब मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज के हिन्दुस्तानी शहरियों को अगर आप कामनवैल्य शहरियत के हकूक नहीं दे सकते तो कम से कम जो बरतानिया की मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज हैं और उनमें जो हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं उनको कामनवैल्य (राष्ट्र-मंडल) शहरियत के हकूक मिलने चाहिये। मियाल के नौर पर कीनिया के रहने वाले हिन्दुस्तानी तो कामनवैल्य मिट्जन (राष्ट्र-मंडल नामांकित) हो सकते हैं लेकिन टैगानोका जो कि एक कालोनी (उपनिवेश) नहीं है और जो ईस्ट (पूर्वी) अप्रोका को एक मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरी है इस कानून के मूलाबिक वहां के रहने वाले हिन्दुस्तानियों को पूरे हकूक द्वायित नहीं हो सकते। इसलिये मैं प्रायंना करता हूं कि कामनवैल्य कंटरीज के माथ तमाम मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज को भी जोड़ दिया जाव। अगर ऐसा नहीं हो सकता तो कम से कम उन मैंडेटरी टैरिटोरीज को जहर ही जोड़ दिया जाना चाहिये जहां पर कि बरतानिया दुकमरान है। ऐसा करने में टैगानोका में जहां तकरीबन ५०,००० हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं उनको कायदा पहुंचेगा।

अब जो रिफ्यूजीज हैं उनके बार में मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि अब तक आप इस रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीनद्वाता) को रखेंगे

उनको बहुत ज्यादा मूल्यकात का सामना करना पड़ेगा। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि हर एक आदमी अपने आपको रजिस्ट्रर करवा ले क्योंकि कई किस्म के हालात होते हैं जिन में कि वह अपने आप को रजिस्टर नहीं करवा पाता है। हिन्दुस्तान को तकसीम के बाद जो लोग पाकिस्तान में रह गये हैं वे वहां पर ऐसे हालात में रह रहे हैं जिन में कि रहना उनके लिये मुश्किल नज़र आता है और इस वास्ते मजबूर होकर जब वे इस देश को आते हैं तो आटोमैटिकली (स्वतः) उनको भारत का शहरी समझा जाना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि उनको भारत की शहरियत का हकूक मिलना ही चाहिये। आप जानते ही हैं कि जब लोग पाकिस्तान से पहले भारत आये तो उनमें से कई लोगों ने अपने कलेम रजिस्टर नहीं करवाये बशक उनको ऐसा करने में आर्थिक फायदा होता था। इसलिये अब जो लोग आयेंगे वह भी हो सकता है अपने आप को रजिस्टर न करवायें। हमारा यह फँस है कि हम उनको भारत के शहरियों का दर्जा दें और यह चौज बाई रिजिस्ट्रेशन नहीं होनी चाहिये बल्कि आटोमैटिक (स्वतःही) होनी चाहिये। मैं मानता हूं कि सिलैक्ट कमेटी (प्रबर समिति) ने इस में कुछ सुधार किया है लेकिन मैं चाहता हूं कि यह कर दिया जाये कि पाकिस्तान से जो भी लोग भारत आयेंगे वे बगैर किसी किस्म के रजिस्ट्रेशन के हिन्दुस्तान के शहरी हो जायेंगे बशकि वे यहां पर परमानेटलो मैटल होने के लिये आयें। यह चौज आटोमैटिक होनी चाहिये न कि बाई रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीनद्वाता) द्वारा।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने जो डेफिनिशन (परिभाष्य) पेरेंट्स (जनक) और शांड पेरेंट्स (महाजनक) को दी हैं यह यीक नहीं हैं। इसके लिये मैं ने एक एमेंडमेंट (मंशोधन) भी दी है और मैं चाहता हूं कि जो बाप और दादा

की बात आप ने रखी है इससे मुम्किन है मुश्किलात पैदा हों। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो भी हिन्दुस्तानी हो उसकी श्रीलाल के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की शाहरियत के हक्क हासिल होने चाहिये और जो ईफिनीशन आपने पैरेंट्स (जनक) और ग्रांड पैरेंट्स (महाजनक) की दी है यह नहीं होनी चाहिये।

अब मैं एक बात उन हिन्दुस्तानी औरतों के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ जो कि किसी दूसरे देश के शाहरी से शादी करवा लेती है और उसके बाद वे अपने हिन्दुस्तानी शाहरियत के हक्क से मदरूम हो जाती हैं। यह चीज़ ठीक भी है। लेकिन ऐसा भी होता है कि अगर शादी कर लेने के बाद उसको तीन साल के अन्दर तलाक दे दिया जाता है तो उसको उस देश की शाहरियत के हक्क हासिल नहीं हो सकते। इस वास्ते अगर उसको उस देश की शाहरियत के हक्क हासिल नहीं होते हैं जिस में कि उसका खालिक रहता है और जहाँ का कि वह शाहरी है तो उसको इस देश का सिटिजन बने रहने का हक हासिल होना चाहिये। ऐसी मूरतों में उसको यह हक हासिल होना चाहिये कि दूसरे देश के कानून के मुताबिक वह उस देश की शाहरी नहीं रहती है तो हिन्दुस्तान की शाहरियत उसे आटोमैटिकली (स्वतः) मिल जानी चाहिये या बाई रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीबदता द्वारा) मिल जानी चाहिये।

इतना कहने के बाद मैं इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि उन इलाकों के लिये जहाँ पर हमारे कास्टेट नहीं हैं और जहाँ पर रजिस्टर करवाने की सहिलियतें नहीं हैं वहाँ के रहने वाले हिन्दुस्तानियों के लिये आप को कलाज (खण्ड) १०(२)(ई) में तबदीली करनी चाहिये ताकि उनको हिन्दुस्तान की शाहरियत मिल सके।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो आप टैम्पो-रेटी पासपोर्ट (अस्थायी पारपत्र) देते हैं

तो पांच साल के लिये देते हैं और फिर जब उस को दोबारा रिन्यू करते हैं तो भी पांच साल के लिये ही करते हैं। अब इस का नून के मुताबिक उस के लिये सात साल से ज्यादा किसी देश में रहना मुश्किल हो जायेगा क्योंकि अगर वह ऐसा करेगा तो उस की सिटिजनशिप स्वयं हो जायेगी। जिस आदमी का पासपोर्ट आप दोबारा रिन्यू करते हैं उस के जरूरी वह दस साल तक बाहर रह सकता है लेकिन सात साल के बाद आप उस के हक्क को खत्म कर देंगे। सलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि जब आप दोबारा पांच साल के लिये पासपोर्ट की रिन्यू करते हैं तो इस सात साल की मियाद को बढ़ा कर दस या ग्यारह साल कर दें ताकि वह आदमी वापस हिन्दुस्तान आ सके और हिन्दुस्तान का शहरी रह सके।

मैं समझता हूँ कि आप इन चीजों को इस बिल में शामिल कर दें तो आप इस को और ज्यादा अच्छा बना सकते हैं।

**श्री सिहासन सिंह :** यह विधेयक जिस रूप में भवन के सामने आया है उस का मैं अनुमोदन करता हूँ, लेकिन इस के सम्बन्ध में मैं चन्द शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ। जो दफाएँ (धाराएँ) इसमें रखी गयीं हैं उन को देख कर मेरे मन में कुछ सन्देह पैदा होता है आपने इस विधेयक के द्वारा चार प्रकार से शहरी हक्क (नागरिकता) देने की व्यवस्था की है। एक प्रकार तो वह है कि जिस में जो व्यक्ति भारत में पैदा होगा उस को नागरिकता का अधिकार दफा ३ के मुताबिक मिल जायगा। ऐसे लोगों के बारे में तो कुछ कहना नहीं है। लेकिन दफा ५ में आप ने उन लोगों के लड़कों के बारे में कुछ फर्क कर दिया है जोकि उन नागरिकों के बच्चे होंगे जिन को आप ने दफा ३ के अन्दर नागरिकता का हक दिया है। आपने नागरिकता प्रदान करने के चार तरीके रखे हैं। एक तो जम्म से, दूसरा रजिस्ट्रेशन से, तीसरा नेचुरेलाइजेशन (देशीयकरण) के जरिये और चौथा उस हालत में जब कि

## [श्री सिंहसन सिंह]

कोई नया भूभाग हमारे पास आवे। इन चारों प्रकारों में से एक जगह आपने प्रथम और द्वितीय प्रकार का समिक्षण किया है जो कि हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। दफा ३ में दिया गया है :

Except as provided in sub-section (2) of this section, every person born in India on or after the 26th January, 1950, shall be a citizen of India by birth.

अर्थात् जो कोई आदमी २६ जनवरी या २६ जनवरी, १९५० के बाद भारत में जन्म लेगा वह यहां का नागरिक बन जायेगा। लेकिन दफा ५ में आप कह रहे हैं जो लोग रजिस्ट्रेशन के द्वारा नागरिकता प्राप्त कर चुके हैं उन के बच्चों के लिये दूसरा नियम है। आप दफा ५ के कलाज ढी० में कहते हैं :

Minor children of persons who are citizens of India;

यह क्यों रखा गया है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। जब आप ने रजिस्ट्रेशन द्वारा किसी आदमी को अपने यहां की नागरिकता दे दी फिर उस के बच्चों के लिये यह नियम क्यों रखा है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जो भारतीय नागरिक हैं उन के नाबालिग (अवयस्क) लड़कों को रजिस्ट्रेशन कराने की नीति आवे, जबकि आप ने धारा ३ में रखा है कि भारतीय नागरिकों के लड़के जन्म होते ही भारतीय नागरिक हो जायेंगे। यह जो दो तरह की चीज़े इस विधेयक में रखी गई हैं वे मेरी समझ में नहीं आतीं। उन को होम मिनिस्टर (गृह मंत्री) साहब साफ करें।

दूसरा शुवहा मुझे एक और है जिस को उपगृह मंत्री जी साफ करने की कृपा करें। आज हमारे देश में आर सारे दिग्दिगन्त में यह आवाज़ उठी हुई है कि हम उपनिवेशवाद के विरुद्ध हैं और अपने देश

में या संसार के किसी भी भाग में उपनिवेशवाद का समर्थन नहीं करते। लेकिन जो आप ने शिड्यूल १ में यूनाइटेड किंगडम को डिफाइन (परिभाया) किया है उस में आप ने उस की कालोनीज (उपनिवेशों) को भी रिकागनाइज़ (मान्यता दी) किया है। यानी यूनाइटेड किंगडम में जो उन के उपनिवेश हैं उन को हम कानूनी रूप से भानते हैं। तो इस से हमारी नीति में कुछ विरोधाभास सा मालूम होता है। एक तरफ तो हम सब तरह के उपनिवेशवाद का विरोध कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ जब हम विधेयक बनाते हैं तो उस के किसी सम्बन्धित राष्ट्र के उपनिवेशों को मान्यता देते हैं। इन दोनों बातों में समन्वय कैसे होगा इस पर हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब प्रकाश डालने की कृपा करें।

अभी मेरे एक भाई ने कहा है कि जो हमारे भारतीय बाहर चले गये हैं अगर वे सात साल से अधिक समय तक बाहर रहते हैं तो वे इस विधेयक को धारा १० के सबकलाज़ (उपलब्ध) २ ई के अनुसार यहां के शहरी नहीं रह जायेंगे। किन्तु शायद यह बात नहीं यह धारा केवल उन्हीं व्यक्तियों पर लागू है जोकि रजिस्ट्रेशन (पंजीबद्धता) द्वारा यहां के नागरिक बने हैं। या जो नेचुरलाइज़ (देशीयकरण) हुए हैं या संविधान की दफा ५ मी० के अनुसार जिनको नागरिकता प्राप्त हुई है। यह दफा (धारा) १० में इस प्रकार दिया हुआ है :

"A citizen of India who is such by naturalisation or by virtue only of clause (c) of article 5 of the Constitution or by registration otherwise than under clause (b) (ii) of article 6 of the Constitution or clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 5 of this Act, shall cease to be a citizen of India...."

यदि यह उन भारतीयों पर भी लागू होता है जोकि बाहर बसे हुए हैं और अगर

वह सात बरस के अन्दर अपना रजिस्ट्रेशन नहीं करवा पाते तो उन को नागरिकता जाती रहेगी । अगर ऐसा होगा तो अन्याय होगा । अगर यह नियम उन भारतीयों पर 'भी लागू होता हो जो जन्म से संविधान की धारा ३ के अनुसार इस देश के नागरिक भाने जाते हैं तो यह न्याय नहीं होगा । अगर ऐसे लोगों पर इस कानून से कोई आधार पहुंचता हो तो होम मिनिस्टर साहब यह विचार करें कि ऐसा न होने पावे । हमारे कई लाख भाई बाहर पड़े हुए हैं । उन की नागरिकता किसी तरह से भी नहीं छोनी जानी चाहिये ।

दूसरा एक और सन्देह मेरे मन में है । आप कामनवैल्य (राष्ट्रमंडल) के सब देशों को दफा १२ के अन्दर रेसीप्रेसिटी का स्थाल रख कर नागरिकता का अधिकार देने को तैयार है, उन की मांग पर । इन देशों में कामनवैल्य के सारे देश आते हैं । सीलोन और पाकिस्तान भी कामनवैल्य के सदस्य हैं । लेकिम हम यह अधिकार उन देशों को देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं जिन से हमारे मित्रता के सम्बन्ध हैं जैसे नेपाल है, भूटान है, चीन है, थाइलैण्ड है, बर्मा है, इंडोनेशिया है । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती । इन देशों को हम वह भान्यता नहीं दे रहे हैं जोकि हम कामनवैल्य के देशों को दे रहे हैं । आज सीलोन का हमारे देश वासियों के साथ कैमा व्यवहार हो रहा है । वहां पर उन की नागरिकता छोनी जा रही है विला किसी लिहाज के । अभी एक सवाल का जवाब देते हुए सरकार की तरफ से बतलाया गया कि कई लाख दरखास्तें नागरिकता के लिये सीलोन में हमारे देश वासियों ने दी थीं लेकिन उन में से केवल फुच्छ हजार या कुछ सौ ही मंजूर हुई हैं । और सब लारिज हो गई । आज वहां पर हमारे लोग नागरिकता से इस तरह वंचित किये जा रहे हैं । ऐसे देशों को हम अपने

यहां नागरिकता प्राप्त करने की सुविधा देने को तैयार हैं, लेकिन जिन देशों से हमारे मित्रतापूर्ण सम्बन्ध हैं उन को हम यह सुविधा नहीं दे रहे हैं । नेपाल का और हमारा सम्बन्ध बहुत पुराना है । वहां से बराबर आना जाना लगा रहता है । अगर उस देश को हम यह सुविधा दें तो उस से बहुत ज्यादा सहूलियत हो सकती है बनिस्बत इस के कि हम यह सुविधा आस्ट्रेलिया, कनाडा या सीलोन को दें । इस विषयक में मित्र देशों को यह सुविधा नहीं दी गई है । इस प्रश्न पर भी विचार होना चाहिये ।

दफा (धारा) ६ में यह दिया हुआ है :—

"Any citizen of India who by naturalisation, registration or otherwise voluntarily acquires, or has at any time between the 26th January, 1950 and the commencement of this Act voluntarily acquired the citizenship of another country shall, upon such acquisition or, as the case may be, such commencement, cease to be a citizen of India."

आप ने उस के साथ जो एक प्राविज्ञन (उपबन्ध) लगा दिया है, उस से कुछ गड़बड़ी पैदा हो जाती है । ऊपर का स्वरूप बैरीर इस प्राविज्ञन के ठीक या कि इस एक्ट के पास होने के बाद अगर कोई भारतवर्ष की नागरिकता दूसरे देश में जाकर वहां की नागरिकता स्वतः खो बैठेगा । लेकिन प्राविज्ञन में हम ने यह रख कर कि :—

"Provided that nothing in this sub-section shall apply to a citizen of India who, during any war in which India may be engaged voluntarily acquires the citizenship of another country, until the Central Government otherwise directs."

## [श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

यह क्या बात हूई ? अगर लड़ाई के जमाने में कोई आदमी हम को बिट्टे (देश-द्वोह) कर के किसी दूसरे देश की नागरिकता कबूल कर ले, तो उस की भारतीय नागरिकता उस बक्त तक नहीं छीनी जायगी जब तक कि सेंट्रल गवर्नरेंट उस पर विचार न कर ले और अपना फसला न दे दे । यह तो संभव हो सकता है कि वह देश का द्वोही लड़ाई के खत्म होने के बाद यहां सजा पाये और किर यहां का नागरिक बन जाय, लेकिन एक ऐसा आदमी जोकि लड़ाई के जमाने में अपने देश से द्वाह कर के हूसरे देश में जा कर बस जाय और वहां की नागरिकता प्राप्त कर ले, उस का भारतीय नागरिकता का विषय विचारणी रहे, यह भेंटी समझ में नहीं आता । उस का अपराध तो धोरतम है, और गम्भीर है, और मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे देशद्वोही व्यक्तियों को नागरिकता की सुविधा मिले, यह अनुचित है और उन को यह अधिकार नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये और मैं आशा करता हूं कि सदन और सरकार इस विषय पर गम्भीरता से विचार करेंगी और प्राविकों (परन्तुक) में आवश्यक तबदीली करेंगी ।

कमेटी आफ इनक्वायरी । (पृष्ठान्त समिति) के बारे में हमारे दोस्तों की तरफ से काफी ऐतराज हुआ है । कमेटी आफ इनक्वायरी में एक जुडिशल अफसर (न्यायिक पदाधिकारी) और दो आदमी और नियुक्त होंगे जो किसी की नागरिकता को छीनने या न छीनने के बारे में अपनी राय सरकार को देंगे और उस राय के मुताबिक सरकार नागरिकता सम्बन्धी अधिकार लोगों से छीनेगी । अब यह जो कमेटी बन रही है, ब्रिटिश कानून में जो इस तरह की कमेटी के बारे में जो शब्दावली दी हुई है, विलकुल वही शब्द उस कमेटी के बारे में यहां भी रख दिये गये हैं, सिर्फ़ फ़र्क यह है कि यहां

की कमेटी में तीन आदमी होंगे । वहां पर कमेटी (समिति) सेकेटरी आफ स्टेट (राज्य सचिव) मुकर्रर करेगा । इस में लिखा हुआ है कि एक उन में में जुडिशल अफसर होगा, अब जुडिशल अफसर किस कैटेगरी (श्रेणी) का होगा यह इस में साफ़ नहीं दिया हुआ है । जुडिशल अफसर एक मूसिक से ले कर हाईकोर्ट (उच्च न्यायालय) और सुप्रीम कोर्ट (उच्चतम न्यायालय) का जज तक हो सकता है । किस श्रेणी का जुडिशल अफसर हो यह साफ़ हो जाय ताकि लोगों को इतमीनान हो जाय कि हमारे नागरिकता सम्बन्धी प्रश्न पर विचार करने के लिये जो कमेटी बनी है, उस में कम से कम ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिन के कि ऊपर पूरा इतमीनान कर सकते हैं । उन की ठीक से सुनवाई होगी और वह गवर्नरेंट के या किसी अधिकारी के किसी तरह के प्रलोभन में अथवा दबाव में नहीं आयेंगे और इनीलिये में इस चीज़ को चाहता हूं कि साफ़ कर दी जाय । न तो जुडिशल अफसर (न्यायिक पदाधिकारी) की डेफ़ॉनीशन (परिभाषा) में और न यहां पर यह कहा गया है जुडिशल अफसर की श्रेणी अगर हाईकोर्ट के जज की न हो तो कम से कम वह डिस्ट्रिक्ट जज (जिला न्यायाधीश) की श्रेणी का तो अवश्य हो, यह तो साफ़ डिफ़ाइन हो जाना चाहिये ताकि लोगों को इतमीनान हो जाय कि हमारे नागरिकता सम्बन्धी अधिकार को छीनने के बारे में विचार करने के लिये जो कमेटी बनी है, उस में कम से कम एक ऐसा व्यक्ति तो है जिस के कि ऊपर पूरा इतमीनान कर सकते हैं और जोकि पूरा इमाफ उन के साथ करेगा और जोकि किसी भी सरकारी दबाव में नहीं आयेगा । इस तरह का विवास लोगों को दिलाना बहुत जरूरी है और मैं आशा करता हूं कि जुडिशल अफसर की डेफ़ॉनीशन को साफ़ कर दिया जायगा और उस सम्बन्ध में मेरे सुझाव को स्वीकार कर लिया जायगा ।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ उस की ओर हमारे बहुत से भाइयों ने ध्यान दिलाया है और वह हमारे संविधान के प्रति वफादारी की शपथ लेने से तालुक रखती है। उस सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह कहना है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) तो एक बदलने वाली चीज़ है और हम ने देखा कि सन् १९५० से जब से हमारा संविधान लागू हुआ है, तब से अब तक ५ बार हम अपने संविधान में तबदीली कर कुके हैं और ६ व उवा संशोधन विधेयक इस समय हाउस के सामने पेश है जिस का मतलब यह हुआ कि आंसूतन संविधान में परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता करीब करीब हर साल आ जाया करती है। और कहा नहीं जा सकता कि अभी आगे बढ़ने पर और क्या क्या परिवर्तन करना आवश्यक महसूस होगा। संविधान तो परिवर्तनशील है और समय और परिस्थिति की आवश्यकता के अनुसार उस में संशोधन करना बांधनीय हो जाता है। जो वस्तु परिवर्तनशील है उस के प्रति शपथ ले कर के पुनः परिवर्तन का समर्थन करना स्टकने की बात है किन्तु हम ऐसा परिस्थितिवश करते हैं। अतः भक्ति और निष्ठा की शपथ देश और राष्ट्र के लिये होनी चाहिये। सेकेंड शेड्यूल (द्वितीय अनुसूची) में जहां पर “ओथ आफ एलिजिएंस” (निष्ठा की शपथ) का चिक आया है उस में यह शब्द दिये हुए हैं—

I, A. B.....do solemnly affirm (or swear) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India as by law established, and that I will faithfully observe the laws of India and fulfil my duties as a citizen of India.

मैं चाहता हूँ कि “कांस्टीट्यूशन आफ इंडिया” (भारत का संविधान) इन शब्दों की जगह पर “स्टेट आफ इंडिया” (भारत राज्य) यह शब्द रखते जायें, क्योंकि यह हमेशा कायम रहने वाली चीज़ है। संविधान

तो बदल सकता है और वह हुक्मत की तब-दीली के साथ भी अपना रूप बदल सकता है लेकिन देश और राष्ट्र तो हुक्मत और संविधान बदल जाने पर भी हमेशा कायम रहता है। संविधान तो समय की ज़रूरत को देखते हुए तबदील होता रहता है और उस की शपथ लेना एक बेमानी सी बात हो जाती है। एलिजिएंस की शपथ तो मुल्क और राष्ट्र के प्रति ली जानी चाहिये कि हम ईमानदारी से और देश के प्रति कृतज्ञता, निष्ठा और श्रद्धा का भाव रखते हुए रहेंगे और सदा उस के प्रति वफादार बने रहेंगे और हमारी वफादारी में कोई कमी नहीं आने वाली है। लेकिन संविधान के प्रति वफादारी की शपथ दिलाना जोकि परिवर्तनशील है और बदल सकता है और जोकि अगर दूसरा दल हुक्मत में आ जाय तो वह उस का रूप बदल सकता है और हमारी मोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने चुनाव के बहत यह ऐलान भी किया था कि हम संविधान में अमुक अमुक तबदीलियां करेंगे

**Mr. Chairman:** Efforts for changing of Constitution or criticism is not disloyalty to the Constitution.

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह :** कांस्टीट्यूशन को बदलने के बारे में प्रचार करना डिसएफेक्शन (अश्रद्धा) तो हो ही जाना है। अगर हम ने बाहर जा कर चोपायपत्र निकाला कि हम संविधान को बदलेंगे, तो इस एक्ट (अधिनियम) के मुताबिक तो वह हमारी कम से कम संविधान के बारे में डिसलाएल्टी हो गई।

**Mr. Chairman:** Disloyalty is different from legitimate criticism.

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह** डिसएफेक्शन (अश्रद्धा) तो हो ही गया उस से, वैसे डिसएफेक्शन (अश्रद्धा) और डिसलाएल्टी (अभक्ति) में बहुत योङा अन्तर है, माना कि वह डिसलाएल्टी की हद तक नहीं पहुँचा लेकिन डिसएफेक्शन की श्रेणी तक तो पहुँच-

**[श्री सिहासन सिंह]**

ही गया। इस संविधान के प्रति हम उस की भावना को प्रेरित नहीं कर सकेंगे, हम उस को उन पर लागू नहीं कर सकते। हम एक जनसमूह में जा कर इस संविधान के आंचित्य और अनांचित्य के ऊपर बातचीत करेंगे और अगर उस के अनांचित्य को हम ने साचित कर दिया तो उस के मानी यह हुए कि उस की तरफ जनता का जो प्रेम है उस को हम ने दूर कर दिया, मतलब यह कि हम ने उस हद तक संविधान के प्रति जनता में डिसएंफैक्शन फैलाया और उस हालत में संविधान के प्रति हमारी एलिजिएंस (श्रद्धा) की शपथ शलत हो जाती है। इसलिये मेरा सरकार से अनुरोध है कि वह इस विषय पर विचार करे और इस ओर मैं समझता हूँ और भी बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने सरकार का व्यापार दिलाया है और सरकार को उस पर व्यापार देना चाहिये और जब आज हम परिवर्तन कर रहे हैं तो ऐसा मूलभूत और सही परिवर्तन करें जो सही तथा मुनासिब हो और हमेशा के लिये कायम रह सके। कोई भी दल आये, किसी की भी हुक्मत आये, यह साफ़ है कि हुक्मत तो बदल सकती है और तबदीली के साथ लोगों की वफादारी भी बदल सकती है लेकिन देश और राष्ट्र तो बदलने वाली चीज़ नहीं है और हमेशा कायम रहेगा। भारत राष्ट्र के प्रति वफादारी की शपथ लेने के माने होंगे कि वह वफादारी हमेशा कायम रहेगी और बदलेगी नहीं और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार मेरे इस मुझाव पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक सोचेंगी।

विधेयक के १४वें संवेदन (धारा) के पार्ट (भाग २) में Disposal of application under sections 5 and 6 के बारे में ऐसा दिया हुआ है:

"the decision of the prescribed authority or the Central Government on any such application as aforesaid shall be final."

**अगर दफा ५ में किसी ने दरखास्त दी तो**

The Central Government may in its discretion, grant or refuse an application under section 5 or section 6 and shall not be required to assign any reasons for such grant or refusal. वह कोई रीजन (कारण) नहीं देगी और वह डिसीशन (निर्णय) उन का फ़ाइनल (अन्तिम) हो जाना है। फ़ाइनल डिसीशन हो जाने के बाद वह केवल एक अपील दफा १५ के अन्दर रिवीजन (पुनरीक्षण) के लिये सेंट्रल गवर्नरमेंट (केन्द्रीय सरकार) को दे सकता है और कहीं उस की अपील नहीं है, न कहीं कोट (न्यायालय) में जा सकता है और न कहीं और किसी जगह जा सकता है। अब आप देखिये कि एक आदमी भारत का नागरिक है, दफा ५ के मुताबिक़, एक वर्ष से वह यहाँ रह भी रहा है और वह प्रिमाइडल एंथारिटी को रजिस्ट्रेशन के बास्ते दरखास्त देता है और वह बिना वजह बतलाये उस की प्रार्थना को खारिज कर देते हैं और सरकार में उस के खारिज होने की कोई वजह नहीं दिखाई गई और ऐसी हालत में कुछ चारा नहीं चलता और परिणाम यह होता है कि वह भारत का नागरिक नहीं माना जाता। मैं चाहता हूँ कि फैसला करने वाली एथारिटी (प्राधिकारी) को उस की अर्जी को खारिज करते बहत वजह बतलाना चाहिये कि अमुक वजह से तुम भारत के नागरिक होने के योग्य नहीं हो या तुम्हें भारत की नागरिकता से खारिज किया जाता है। बिला वजह खारिज करना जरा दिल में खटकता है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस में यह जोड़ दिया जाय कि खारिज करने वाली एथारिटी वजह भी बतलाये। इसलिये मेरा अनुरोध है कि सरकार उस पर विचार करे कि आज्ञा देने वाले अफसर को फैसला देते बहत और खारिज करते बहत कारण जरूर देना चाहिये ताकि जब आप अपील करें तो हम आप से बता सकें कि यह जो रीजन दिया है, वह सही रीजन नहीं

है और बिना किसी रीजन के "रिजेक्टेड" लिख देना उचित नहीं होगा। जैसाकि आज सीलोन की सरकार कर रही है और हम देख रहे हैं कि वहां की सरकार हजारों लालों की तादाद में भारतीयों की नागरिककरण की दरखास्तों को बिना किसी वजह के खारिज कर रही है और हम सब उसके इस कृत्य पर आंसू बहाते हैं, अफसोस करते हैं और उस का निराकरण नहीं कर पाते। अगर वैसे ही हमारे यहां भी होने लगे और जिस बारे में हम दूसरों की बुराई करते हैं वही हम करने लगें तो हमारी आवाज बुलन्द नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये हम जो कुछ आज कहना चाहते हैं वह आवाज जनता की है, जनवाद की है। अगर हम हर एक आदमी को अपना समझें और फिर भी उस की दरखास्त को मंजूर न करें जिस में कि वह हमारी नागरिकता का अधिकार प्राप्त न कर सके, तो इस का क्या होगा, यह बात विचारणीय है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विवेक का समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इस पर विचार करेंगी क्योंकि हम लोगों का एमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) देना और न देना तो बराबर होता है। यह तो गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर होता है कि वह उन को स्वीकार करे या न करे। हम लोग धंटों विभिन्न विषयों पर बोलते हैं लेकिन वह सब बेकार हो जाता है और सारे हम लोगों के एमेंडमेंट बेकार हो जाते हैं क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट पर उन का कोई असर नहीं होता है उनको जो करना होता है वह तो पहले से ही निश्चित कर रखा जाता है। मैं ने यह मुझाव आप के सामने रखते हैं, उम्मीद है कि आप इन पर विचार करेंगे और विचार करने के बाद जो अच्छे संशोधन आप को लगें वह आप स्वीकार कर लेंगे। और जैसा कल भी मैं ने कहा था कि सरकार संशोधनों को स्वीकार करना भी सीखें, यदि इन संशोधनों को

स्वीकार कर लिया जाय तो हम को ज्यादा उत्साह हो समर्थन करने का।

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Last time when I spoke on this Bill before it was referred to the Joint Committee I made certain observations regarding Commonwealth citizenship. I said the Commonwealth citizenship is not free from some canker. I said on account of the British Nationality Act even today we are treated as British subjects. The Home Minister then was pleased to say that so far as we are concerned, we do not regard ourselves as British subjects whatever might be the intention of the British Parliament or the British Government. But, even today after the discussion I find that the British Government has not taken steps to see that such reference is removed from their statute, and I am sorry the Home Minister only stopped at merely saying that we have nothing to do with that reference. I had expected that the matter would be taken up on a high official level with the British Government and such reference removed from the British' statute. Unfortunately, it was not done. Even today it continues, and it will continue if we do not make any attempt, to take up the matter at the highest level.

Many Members have spoken many things about Commonwealth citizenship. I only aver that making special provisions about Commonwealth citizenship will be only encouraging feelings of suspicion and doubt in the minds of other countries—let alone others who are not associated with us, but those who are very much intimately connected with us. Especially we will be giving room for suspicion in our neighbouring countries. Even in the First Schedule you will see that Ireland is being mentioned separately. Ireland is not a Member of the Commonwealth and it has been mentioned separately. If the intention of the Minister is to treat this matter on the principle of reciprocity, I would ask him humbly: "why not you base the granting of citizenship rights on the

[**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy**]

dogma of reciprocity alone?" By giving Commonwealth citizenship status to Commonwealth countries, I feel you will be giving a go-by to the principle of reciprocity. If the principle of reciprocity is to govern the granting of citizenship rights, it is logical to expect of the Government to treat all the countries alike on the basis of this principle.

After all, in the Commonwealth we do not find equal treatment meted out to the various citizens. I think you find more discrimination there than you find in other countries. The racial discrimination and other forms of discrimination are more visible and in a more blatant form in Commonwealth countries than in others. I need not quote here particular instances. I may just refer to the case of South Africa which does not give our people fair treatment. So, in the so-called Commonwealth you find more discrimination, more prejudice and more intolerance than in any other part of the world. I do not know why the Minister is so anxious to be generous or catholic-minded and extend his goodwill even to those countries where there has been the worst discrimination taking place.

**Shri A. M. Thomas:** What do you say to the proviso to clause 5?

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** I am only concerned to point out that there should be one principle. Either you apply the principle of reciprocity or give a go-by to that. If you apply the principle of reciprocity, then you apply it to all the countries without discrimination. But here, our citizenship law as it has been presented to the House discriminates between countries and countries. Countries which are far away from us are treated as intimate to us. Countries which are very near to us like Burma and Nepal and Indonesia are treated as though they are very far away from

us, and as though they are more foreign than the Commonwealth countries. This discrimination is notorious. So, I would appeal to the Minister to reconsider this particular point, and at the amendment stage I would beg of him to remove this anomaly.

Many Members spoke about the refugees who have come from Pakistan and their status. On this point I may submit that the refugees from Pakistan should not be treated separately from the rest of the citizens of India. Merely because the refugees have come after a particular date, that should not bar them from equal treatment. We know the circumstances under which the country was divided. So, an arbitrary date should not be fixed for granting of citizenship.

It is true that we are not at all depriving them of citizenship. But I feel that we are conferring only an inferior status on them. The hon. Minister may argue that citizenship by descent or by birth and citizenship by registration are the same as far as rights are concerned. If they are one and the same, then why should you not grant them the right of citizenship by birth or by descent? Why should you not treat them as belonging to one undivided India and treat them as natural born citizens?

But as my hon. friend on the Communist bench has pointed out, citizenship by registration would require them to sign an oath of allegiance. So, there is a big difference in the case of citizenship by registration. Supposing the oath of allegiance is questioned later on, he has to prove that he is loyal and faithful to the country, and he has to go through all the painful processes of law. Any time, a member of Government or any official may question his bona fides, if he is registered as a citizen. That would create bitterness and bad blood in the minds of those citizens. From the point of view of developing homogeneity and from the point of view

of developing unity of mind and heart between the citizens of India and those who have already come and who are coming from Pakistan, it would be better to abolish the distinction and apply one citizenship law to them. In other words, all those persons should be treated as citizens by descent.

My hon. friend Shri Kamath has already referred to the question of divestment of citizenship. He has sent also an amendment to the effect that a Supreme Court judge should be on the committee of inquiry. I whole-heartedly endorse the suggestion contained in his amendment. I also feel that in such a vital matter as citizenship, a judge of the Supreme Court who is well-versed in the legal and technical aspects of citizenship should be there in the committee.

I agree that citizenship is vitally connected with our public life. It is also vitally connected with our Security. I am also aware that it is the responsibility of the executive to see that the citizens remain loyal at times, and no one betrays the country. That, no doubt, is the responsibility of the executive. But that does not mean that you should not provide a safeguard for the citizens. If a citizen's bona fides are questioned, naturally he must have the satisfaction that his case has been heard dispassionately by a judge. So, there should be a proper remedy provided for the aggrieved citizen. I would suggest therefore that this amendment is very important, and it should be accepted by the Government and the House.

I now dwell upon the question of bodies corporate. Some hon. Members have said that bodies corporate should be treated as citizens. I cannot understand why bodies corporate should be treated as such. Bodies corporate are formed and run by citizens only, and therefore they will enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, though they are not citizens. After all, citizenship is an individual right. It is a right conferred on persons as individuals and

not as bodies corporate. So, it would be unnatural to confer citizenship rights on these bodies corporate which are only legal entities and not natural entities. They are not entities in human form. In no country will you find that these bodies corporate have been given citizenship rights. So, it would be unusual and extraordinary, if you confer these rights on them.

Lastly, I would suggest that Government should accept some of the amendments moved on the lines suggested by us on this side of the House. I wish that the provisions relating to the Commonwealth citizenship are drastically changed. Our citizenship should be open to all the countries, of course, under certain restrictions; and those restrictions should be applicable uniformly to all the countries. In this connection, I would request the hon. Minister to extend the facilities of Indian citizenship to our neighbouring countries like Burma and Nepal. This has been pointed out already by many hon. Members. It would be very necessary in the larger interests to have a Commonwealth citizenship of our own. We should not be a satellite or subordinate of other countries. Let us develop a true Commonwealth citizenship of our own, giving scope for neighbouring countries like Indonesia, Burma etc., so that we may have a fraternity of our own, and in the long run we may achieve Pan-Asian unity.

With these words, I would commend my suggestions to the House and the hon. Minister.

सरदार ए० एस० सहगल (बिलासपुर) :

यह विधेयक सिलेक्ट कमेटी से हो कर आया है। इस के समर्थन में मैं कुछ कहने के लिये यहां खड़ा हुआ हूं। मैं यह देखता हूं कि नेशनेलिटी (राष्ट्रीयता) और सिटिजन-शिप (नागरिकता) इन दोनों चीजों को यहां पर मिलाया जा रहा है। इस में यह कहना कि सिटिजन के गड्ट (नागरिकता अधिकार) और नेशनेलिटी के राइट (राष्ट्रीयता अधिकार) एक जैसे हैं भेरे ख्याल

## [सरदार ए० एस० सहगल]

मैं ठीक नहीं होगा इन दोनों को मिला देने से मैं समझता हूँ, हमारा काम नहीं चलेगा। यहां हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इन दोनों चौजों को मिला कर रखने की कोशिश की। इस चौज को, जो हम ने कास्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) बनाई है, उस के मुताबिक यदि देखा जाय, तो पता लगेगा कि नेशनलिटी एक अलग बात है, वह अलग ही है और इस के साथ जो सिटिजन की परिभाषा है वही है जोकि पार्ट २ सिटिजन में दर्ज है।

अब हम देखते हैं कि जो यह विवेयक है इस के बारे में एक माननीय सदस्य ने यह बताने की कोशिश की कि हमारे यहां पर जो ज्युडिशल डिसिजन (न्यायिक निर्णय)

है वह हमारे सामने है। मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि इस के साथ ही साथ यदि अलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट के फैसले को शाप देखें तो आप को पता लगेगा कि उन का स्थान दूसरा है और इस के साथ अगर आप सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले को देखें तो उस फैसले में उन्होंने इंडायरेक्टली (अप्रत्यक्षतः) यह . . . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** I suppose the hon. Member will take more time. He may continue on the next day, that is, Monday.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 5th December, 1955.*

5-01 P.M.

---

## DAILY DIGEST

[Saturday, 3rd December, 1955]

## Columns

## Columns:

## PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE.

1155

A copy of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations.

## CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION.

1155-56

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda)

made a statement correcting reply to Starred Question No. 606 asked on the 7th March, 1955.

## CONSIDERATION OF BILL. 1157—1278-

Citizenship Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, was further considered. Motion to consider was not concluded.

—