

[Shri Karmarkar]

I will try to reply to Shri Bhakta Darahan. I hope his argument will be appreciated in the appropriate quarters. He complained about the name. There is no particular advantage in removing old names unless they are so offensive. We do not want to substitute new names. We can have new names for new things. Anyhow, his observations will receive due consideration in due course. Anyhow, it is not a very important point. All the observations made on the floor of this House will receive due attention. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

POINT RE EXPUNCTION

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi) May I submit . . .

Mr. Speaker: Is it relating to this Bill?

Acharya Kripalani: No I am sorry, I have to interrupt the proceedings of this House. I have to refer to another matter. On the 27th November, I delivered a speech.

Mr. Speaker: Hon Members should always give some notice to me regarding these matters.

Acharya Kripalani: I gave you notice 13 days ago. You said that you will consider this matter. For 13 days nothing has been done. This is the last day and so I have ventured to raise it here. This is the first time that I have ever interrupted the proceedings of this House. Is it not a fact that I too am a representative of the people? Things were said against me which, I think, would prejudice my reputation. I very much hesitate to interrupt the proceedings of this House. As you know, though for years I am here, I have never, even once, raised a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: He should have met me this morning. He could have told me that since he did not receive any reply, he will raise this matter in the House.

Acharya Kripalani: On my statement you yourself said, if you remember it, that you will consider this question and let me know. Now 13 days have passed and as yet I have not heard anything from you. Let me make my point clear. You were good enough to expunge the word that I had used. I have submitted to you that earlier with an oblique reference this very word was used by the Finance Minister. You said that you will look into the matter.

Some Hon. Members: What is the word?

13 hrs.

Acharya Kripalani: The word was very innocent. It only meant in the dictionary, I think, spurious.

We are not great scholars in English. Sometimes we do not know what the word meant exactly. But, a friend of mine, Shri Feroze Gandhi referred to the dictionary and found out that the word that I had used meant only spurious. I think I am entitled to say that the ability of the Finance Minister is spurious.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Acharya Kripalani: Even then, if the word that I used was objectionable and you have ordered its expunction, you are within your rights. I cannot question your authority there. But, I submit that the word that the Finance Minister used with oblique reference to me also should be removed in fairness to me.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri S. K. Patil): I made a request to you that my Bill be taken now and I had also requested the Deputy Minister of Home Affairs. She has no objection.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill stands as No 4. Four and a half hours in all have been allotted for it. We must take all these Bills today. There is no harm if we take this now.

Shrimati Bena Chakravarty: May I just point out, Sir, if this is taken in precedence, it will create much confusion. Because, Members are functioning in parties. We have set apart certain Members to speak on these Bills. If constantly the order of business is changed like this, the Member who is supposed to speak on behalf of the party may not be present in the House. That is the difficulty. I do not want to say anything more.

Mr. Speaker: What is the hurry about this Bill?

Shri S. K. Patil: It is a non-controversial Bill. All the Bills have to be finished today.

Mr. Speaker: It is true. It may be that some Members may expect that this Bill would be taken up later on in the day and may come to the House only then. Unless the hon. Minister is going away somewhere else immediately.

Shri S. K. Patil: I cannot make that an excuse. If the House requires my presence, I must be present.

Mr. Speaker: I will call Pandit G. B. Pant.

CITIZENSHIP AMENDMENT BILL

The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shrimati Alva). Sir, I beg to move

"That the Bill to amend the Citizenship Act, 1955, be taken into consideration."

This is a very small amending Bill by which we want to list three more independent countries that have become independent within the Commonwealth: Ghana, Federation of Malaya and Singapore. Singapore has already informed us that reciprocal arrangements have been made for the naturalisation of citizenship. As to the other two countries that we are putting on the list, we are anticipating reciprocal arrangements with them.

313 LSD—3

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is made very clear that in order to enable the Government of India to notify on a reciprocal basis, the citizenship or nationality law of these countries as and when it becomes necessary, it is proposed to amend the Act to include these countries also in the First Schedule.

I do not want to say anything more as this is of a routine nature. I have explained why the three countries are proposed to be listed in the Schedule A.

Motion moved.

"That the Bill to amend the Citizenship Act, 1955, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Speaker: The motion is before the House. What about the amendment?

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-East): Sir, I beg to move

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 17th day of February, 1958."

I have moved this motion for circulation because, I am opposed to the spirit of the Bill and I want to refer it to the country so that the country may give its verdict on a very important matter, namely, whether the country would support the maintenance and reiteration in this instance of the Commonwealth tie.

13 06 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let me make it clear that I am not opposed to granting facilities to the citizens of other countries to become citizens of our country on a reciprocal basis. I am not opposed to that principle. When we have to live in an international community, it is always better that we foster friendliest relations between the different countries. But, what I am opposed to is this: the slavish outlook of basing our citizenship law on a tie of which we need not be proud, or we need to be ashamed of our Commonwealth tie. It has been said repeatedly from the Government side that