

meeting recently with the Rehabilitation Minister, we discovered that there was not an inconsiderable number of people who did not register themselves as refugees. They did not seek rehabilitation; they did not ask for any special assistance or relief because, for accidental reasons, they happened to be, comparatively speaking, in a more comfortable situation economically. Therefore, there is a certain number of refugees who have not so far gone to the extent of having to ask for registration of their names in order to seek relief and, therefore, it is that class of refugees in particular who might find great difficulty in securing citizenship rights.

Turning to another point, I wish to say what has been said already by my friends Mr. Chatterjee and Mr. Kamath that as far as deprivation of citizenship is concerned, it should be made justiciable and this should not be left to the discretion of the executive. In regard to this, I wish to make one point very clear. We were told that after all those who are citizens by registration do not stand in the same category as citizens by descent. The refugees, of course, have luckily been given a kind of immunity from such liabilities of citizenship by registration as far as deprivation is concerned. I do admit there is a difference between citizenship by registration and citizenship by descent. But, what is the kind of people that we envisage would be our citizens by registration? What is the kind of people coming from abroad who might have reasons for making this country their home and becoming our citizens? Take the case of Prof. J. R. S. Haldane, a very eminent scientist. He made a speech in Calcutta that if he had his choice he would be a citizen of this country. It is generally that kind of person with a feeling for the good things of life, who knows the real values of existence, who would feel a sort of attachment towards India and ask for our citizenship. Now, to deprive that kind of person of Indian citizenship by a process which is purely executive, where the judi-

ciary can come in only in a remotely advisory capacity is, to my mind, rather objectionable and I think that so far as deprivation of citizenship is concerned, it should be made justiciable. Otherwise, there might be all kinds of undesirable consequences ensuing from this kind of deprivation of citizenship.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member wish to continue for some time more?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I shall continue tomorrow, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: Now, the House will take up Private Members' Business.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTIETH REPORT

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Fortieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th November, 1955."

Mr. Chairman: The question is: "That this House agrees with the Fortieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th November, 1955."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Dr. Khare is not here to introduce his Bill. Then I will take up the Bill for withdrawal.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

(INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 294B)

Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha (Hazaribagh East): I beg to move for leave to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That leave be granted to withdraw the Bill further to amend