

(iv) REPORTED RELAY HUNGER STRIKE  
BY WORKERS OF HUTTI GOLD MINES  
IN KARNATAKA

**SHRI RAJESHEKHAR KOLUR** (Rai-  
chur): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I am  
thankful to you for allowing me to  
raise a point under Rule 377 on the  
relay hunger strike by workers of  
Hutti gold mines in pursuance of their  
demands. The Hutti Gold Mines  
Workers Union submitted a memoran-  
dum on 17-4-1978 to the Government  
of Karnataka listing the demands of  
their workers which included revision  
of pay scales, provision of promotional  
avenues and removal of stagnation in  
service. There was a wide disparity in  
the pay scales between the workers of  
Hutti Gold Mines and those of Kolar  
Gold Fields. While the workers of a  
particular category are getting Rs. 370  
in Kolar Gold Fields, their counter-  
parts in Hutti Gold Mines are getting  
only Rs. 223. The main demand of  
the Hutti Gold Mines is for maintain-  
ing parity with Kolar Gold Fields in  
the pay scales.

The demands of the workers of  
Hutti Mines for enhanced pay scales  
etc. are estimated to cost an addi-  
tional amount of Rs. 64 lakhs. Nego-  
tiations with the State Labour Minis-  
ter on 23rd June, 1978 had not been  
fruitful. During the discussions with  
the management on 5th July, 1978,  
the Union had come down in respec-  
t of its demands to Rs. 32 lakhs.  
The management agreed to this and  
made a favourable recommendations  
in the matter, but the proposal has  
not yet been approved by the State  
Government.

The Company has been able to turn  
out profits with the hard work and  
cooperation of its workers and dur-  
ing 1978-79, it is estimated to earn  
a profit of Rs. 45 lakhs. About 1247  
workers are on its rolls with service  
ranging from five to fifteen years.  
Most of them have reached the ma-  
ximum of their salary scales and have  
been stagnating without increments  
and promotion.

To press for the acceptance of  
their reasonable demands, the work-  
ers went on a one-day strike which  
was a total success with hundred per  
cent participation. Since 23rd June,  
1978 a relay hunger strike with ten  
workers per day has been going on.

The demands of the workers of  
Hutti Gold Mines are reasonable and  
the Labour Minister's intervention is  
urgently requested. The workers de-  
monstrations have all along been  
peaceful but they are feeling restive  
and the situation may go out of hand  
if negotiations are not urgently start-  
ed for the satisfaction of the reason-  
able demands of the workers of Hutti  
Gold Mines.

14.37 hrs.

**MOTION RE. RESOLUTION PASSED  
AT CONFERENCE OF CHIEF MI-  
NISTERS OF SOUTHERN STATES  
REGARDING LANGUAGE POLICY**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** The  
House will now take up the motion  
on language policy by Shri Vasant  
Sathe.

Shri Vasant Sathe

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** (Akola).  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to  
move.

"That this House takes note of  
the resolution passed at the Confer-  
ence of the Chief Ministers of the  
Southern States regarding the lan-  
guage policy".

While speaking on this motion re-  
lating to the anxiety which the con-  
ference of the Chief Ministers of  
Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pra-  
desh, Kerala and Pondicherry re-  
cently expressed on the question of  
language policy, the manner it is be-  
ing implemented, I would like to  
submit, at the outset, that this whole  
issue of Hindi has to be looked at in

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

a right national perspective. We cannot be over-charged by emotional considerations. After all, a language essentially and primarily is a medium of communication of thoughts of ideas, a link of dealing with others, and that is why it becomes important

Now that India, that is Bharat, has, for the first time, after our independence emerged as a nation in the long history of five thousand and odd years, the first question is: are we going to remain a nation, a strong nation, a harmonious, united and strong nation or not? Once we accept this basic premise, then obviously all those factors which lead towards this unity, towards this harmony must be borne in mind. And one factor that unites people anywhere in the world, has been language. A common language for a nation is the most important uniting factor. There is no other. Tell me any nation in the world which has, as a nation, different languages and no link language. Take even the federal States that you know of in the world. In Soviet Union, for example, there is one language which is known by all the people of that country.

**SHRI A. BALAJANOR (Pondicherry):** That is not a democratic country; it is a communist country.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Take another democratic State like the United States. Even in Canada, there are two languages. But all the people know both the languages. All Government documents are always translated and published in both the languages.

**SHRI A. BALAJANOR:** No, no.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Therefore, if you want to remain a nation, it is my honest belief that you cannot rely—you can choose which language you want; but you cannot rely on a language which is known hardly by

1 per cent of the population. (Interruptions) You will have to think of one common link language for this country. And that language, in my humble opinion, has a utility and a use; and it can only be Hindi. I cannot think of any other. And when I talk of Hindi (interruptions). I am not thinking of Hindi as a monopoly of any particular people. Hindi itself can evolve and grow; and I am thinking of Hindi as expressed by Gandhi—he used to call it Hindustani. Common words can be used or retained I feel that the greatest wrong to the advancement of Hindi as a national language has, unfortunately, been done by those who in their over-enthusiasm tried to propagate and push Hindi, not only the ordinary Hindi but the Raghuvirian Hindi, making it more difficult and more Sanskritized. They have done the greatest damage to Hindi. (Interruptions).

At the time we became independent, I know that even in the South, there was a general fervour among the non-Hindi speaking people to learn Hindi. But it is because you put it in the Constitution that within 15 years Hindi must become the official language, that the real trouble started. As regards English, it took nearly 150 years even for that 1-1/2 per cent of the population to learn it. Any language must grow with the people. I have always believed that if we had allowed Hindi to grow from the primary stage, that is, to grow with the people all over the country, right upto the college stage, you would have today all over the country graduates even from the Southern States speaking Hindi, even better than those whose mother-tongue happens to be Hindi.

But that chance you do not give. You wanted to do it at the top. You said: the clerks must learn enough of Hindi to draft letters and communicate which is impossible. They may just learn enough to sign, but

any drafting, any communication, particularly Government communications or enactments or orders is not that easy. Therefore, I feel that the right stand was taken by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru followed by the Prime Ministers later on that Hindi should be imposed only when it is accepted by the non-Hindi speaking people and States. That is the crux of the matter.

You have to take the people of this country with you. If you want to take the people of this country with you, then you cannot impose it on anyone. You must create facilities and that can only be done by love and affection and not by a sense of coercion or imposition. I would submit, Sir, that the assurance which was given by Jawahar Lal Nehru first and followed by the Prime Minister later on that English will continue to be the associate language, that Hindi will be imposed only when the non-Hindi speaking people and States want, that assurance must stand; and if necessary, must get a constitutional guarantee.

Now the fear of the Southern States is that it is being imposed. All the non-Hindi speaking States have expressed the fear that it is covertly imposed by the Hindi speaking States or by the Government. This is the apprehension. I can give you an example why this apprehension has grown. Recently, in Bihar, as far as the Act is concerned, it is well-known.

Section 3, proviso 2 says:

"Provided further that where Hindi is used for purposes of a communication between one State which has adopted Hindi as its official language and another State which has not adopted Hindi as its official language, such communication in Hindi shall be accompanied by translation of same in English language."

What happens to the over-zealous and champions of Hindi? In Bihar,

the Bihar Government has recently issued an order prohibiting the use of English in any form by its officers and even making the use of English by any officer is liable to disciplinary action. The State Chief Minister supplements this order through a fiat that Hindi should be the sole medium of communication not only with the Centre but also with all other States. Apparently, this is contrary to the Act which is the Official Language Act itself. There are examples of this. Why does it hurt the people? I shall give you a concrete example. Recently it was pointed out in the House that even Central Government agencies like the post offices and postal departments send forms only in Hindi—money order forms, telegram forms and so on. It was contradicted here that that was not correct. But here I have a letter from Gujarat sent by Mr. V. S. Rameshwar and he has enclosed a form—Bharatiya Dak Tar Vibhag. This form is only in Hindi. At least on one side it should have been in English; but it is completely in Hindi; no other form is available. What can a person who does not know Hindi do? Communications department, public sector undertakings, departments like the customs are sending communications and even some of my Hindi speaking friends will find it difficult to understand the language. Morarjibhai is of course an expert and he may, but let me read out the language; this is a language which I have not been able to understand. This is a letter dated 3 April 1978.

"घायको सूचित किया जाता है कि इस कार्यालय के दिनांक 5-1-78 के सब संव्यक्त पत्र द्वारा जो न्यून प्रचार की भाषा की गयी थी उसे वापिस ले लिया गया"।  
 न्यून प्रचार की भाषा का क्या मतलब है, राज नारायण जी को पता होगा।

श्री कृष्णलाल (गिज़नौर) : साठे की धर्रेकी जागते हैं, जो धर्रेकी गहीं जागते हैं उनके बारे में उनका क्या विचार है ?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** The signature is in English; the gentleman who signed the communication does not know Hindi; somebody had drafted it. He is some Nahata or somebody. Then what is the designation? This is from Bombay. This is the type of Hindi.

कूले साह सीपाकूलक समाहर्ता ।

श्री वाचनेन्द्र दत्त (बीनपुर) : ठीक से पढ़ो तो कम से कम । कूले होगा ।

श्री बलराज साठे : बिल्कुल ठीक पढ़ा है; कूले । 'वही' लिखा हुआ है ।

Is it not like the famous Dr Raghuvira's कण्ठ लगेट for the necktie.

श्रीजी जी कहा करते थे कि भाई रेडियो, कार, पुलिस, लासटन आदि सब अपनी भाषा में जा जाए तो क्या बिबकता है ।

For signal, you cannot have signal; you must have: बलि एष नमनानमन  
सूचक नोहताम वदिका

By the time you say that the signal is down in this manner, the train would have gone. Let us not be fanatical about the language. As I said, language has a purpose and that purpose has to be served if you want to consolidate the whole country. In the south, how many Hindi films are being seen by people every day? Hindi films are more popular than even the films of the matinee idol Ramachandran-. MGR... (Interruptions)

**SHRI A. BALAJANOR (Pondicherry):** Because of Hemamalini people of the south are also interested.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Hemamalini speaks in Hindi in those films... (Interruptions) We adopt Hemamalini.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Let us not discuss Hemamalini here... (Interruptions)

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** My friend Shri Bala Pajanor is fond of films; but he must know that they are championing Hindi. He should follow them and he should learn that.

**SHRI A BALAJANOR:** I know Hindi but you do not know Tamil; that is the trouble.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Language will be learnt, not by force. It will be learnt because it is necessary; it is essential in day-to-day life. All those people who have gone to the south from the north speak Tamil very well. They speak Telugu. They speak Malayalam. Why? Because they have to deal with the people there. Similarly people have come to North India. I am sure many people who come from North India and South India speak Hindi very well. It is a day-to-day necessity. I am saying let Hindi grow with the people. Let it not be imposed and, therefore, I am more in favour of the three language formula and I have seen from reports that majority of the Chief Ministers of even Southern States are in favour of the three language formula where they want to encourage Hindi but to grow with the people. It is only in Tamil Nadu, unfortunately, I have not understood, it is another copy of Bihar. Bihar is a chauvinist, narrow minded State. They try to violate even the official language by saying that even in inter-State relations, only Hindi must be used and, therefore, abolished the use of English altogether. The same thing is being done in Tamil Nadu.

**SHRI V. ARUNACHALAM alias 'ALADI ARUNA' (Tirunelveli):** No Sir.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARAGAM (Chengalpattu):** In Tamil Nadu we are following English as well as Tamil.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** In Tamil Nadu they are adopting another two language formula and that two language formula is only English and Tamil.

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record if three Members speak simultaneously. Three members cannot speak at a time. Mr. Mohanarangam, you are going to make a speech. You can say whatever you want to speak then.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Mohanarangam, if you keep on consuming time, then you will lose your time when you speak.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Bihar is narrower than your State.

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Mohanarangam, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Tamil Nadu is adopting only two language formula.

(Interruptions)

The two languages are Tamil and English. I am told that....

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Mohanarangam, please hold your peace now. At every sentence if you get up, there is no point in continuing with the discussion.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** He should not say that we are narrow minded.

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** When you speak you reply to him. You can say whatever you want.

**SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM:** After all we cannot ask you to shift Parliament from Delhi to Madras.

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Do not get excited.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** In Tamil Nadu you have asked all officers (you can correct me) to sign, I am told in Tamil. Is that correct?

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** Do not compare Bihar with Tamil Nadu.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I am told you have asked all officers to sign in Tamil than in English.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** Yes. Because of you people—Madam Gandhi.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM:** Mr. Sathe cannot be a hero of the House.

(Interruptions)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Mr. Mohanarangam, nothing that you say will go on record if you go on like this. Please sit down.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I have heard a statement from one of the Chief Ministers who has participated in the Conference. What does he say? I am quoting from the National Herald of 1-8-1978.

"Mr. Antony told the State Assembly during question-time the State had stressed that the assurance given by the late Prime Minister Nehru on the language issue should be kept up in its true spirit that there should be no imposition of Hindi and the three-language formula should be 'meaningfully implemented' everywhere".

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

15 hrs.

Therefore, this is the view of the Karnataka Chief Minister, this is the view of the Andhra Chief Minister and this is the view of the Kerala Chief Minister. Now I would plead with my Tamil colleagues let this issue not be politicalised. Do not think that this issue will help. I think, they also should accept that today or tomorrow, Hindi should grow and develop as a link language. Let it take its own time, I am not saying that you rush it. Let it grow from the children till they become graduates.

I can understand their fear because in Government service the people from non-Hindi speaking area feel that in English they are on equal advantage with the Hindi speaking people. Therefore, throughout the country, if as a national cadre of administrators or inter-State cadre of administrators or we draw from the State cadre, they feel that they will be on equal footing with the Hindi speaking people in English. Tomorrow, when they also learn Hindi as well, with one generation learning Hindi to grow with the children, I assure you many of us present here from the South can speak and will speak Hindi better than those who are born in the so-called Hindi belt. That opportunity must be given.

**SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM:** Can anyone of you here from North India compete with me in Tamil? You cannot because this is my mother tongue. I cannot compete with a person whose mother tongue is Hindi.

**MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** But these ideas you can put when you will be speaking.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I have been practising three-language formula. I come from Maharashtra, a Marathi speaking area. My mother tongue is Marathi.

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM (Palani):** It is a sister language.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** It is not at all.

I can speak as good or as bad or as I do in English as in Hindi.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANORE Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** what he says must be understandable to others. You understand me when I say something in Tamil. Mr. Speaker also can understand me. For 30 years we have been fighting for our rights.

**MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I am understanding you. Please resume your seat.

\***SHRI A. BALA PAJANORE:** Why should my "brother-in-laws" be afraid of what we are saying?

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** My dear friends, when they talk in English, they feel quite proud.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANORE:** Not at all. We are ashamed of speaking in English in this country because we have not been provided an opportunity to speak in our mother tongue. Many people from my Party cannot follow either Hindi or English.

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** There is no question of being ashamed in talking in a language.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** If this question of language is to be resolved in a dignified, graceful and patriotic manner, then, no effort should be made to impression should be allowed to prevail overtly or covertly. And I would beg of my Hindi-speaking friends to realise that they will be doing a disservice to Hindi if in their enthusiasm, they do anything to let an impression grow in the country, in the non-Hindi-speaking areas, that there is some effort made covertly or overtly

\*Spoke in Tamil



## [श्री० रामजी सिंह]

knowing people, and also the assurance of the late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the former Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the present Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन पाँचों राज्यों के मुख्य मन्त्रियों को यह तो विश्वास है ही और इस सरकार के भी प्रधान मंत्री ने जो उन्हें आश्वासन दिया है उससे उनकी सहमति है। हाँ, इस के बाद वह कहते हैं

"There has been attempt in certain Ministries of the Union Government to covertly impose Hindi and this Conference is strongly opposed to attempts to impose Hindi"

बस, इतनी ही बात के लिए उन्होंने पाँच राज्यों के मुख्य मन्त्रियों का यह सम्मेलन बुलाया। हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के इसी सदन ने इस का स्पष्टीकरण किया था कि सचमुच में अगर ऐसी बात होती है तो बमत है और उसको ठेका जायदा। लेकिन उस के बाद भी वह हुआ।

भाषा का सवाल कोई धातु का नहीं है। यह भारतवर्ष के स्वतन्त्रता संकट में हमारा जो बाधा था उस के प्रति प्रतिक्रिया है और इसीलिए पाँचों राज्यों के मुख्य मन्त्रियों ने जो कुछ कहा है उस पर विस्तृतान टाइम्स ने अपना यह मतलब दिया है :

"As for Centre-State relations, Mr. Ramchandran mooted the idea of a Southern Chief Ministers' Conference not because he had any differences with the Centre, he had hit upon the Conference idea only to bolster up the sagging image of his party and there is no better way of doing it in Tamil Nadu than raking up the language issue."

इसलिए सचमुच में इस का ही कारणवशिक कारण है और इसी कारण ने कहा। अभी हमारे उपाध्यक्ष जी ने

साठे वाक्य में बताया कि दक्षिणी राज्यों के जो लोग मुख्य मंत्री हैं उन का एक विशेष विरोध नहीं है और यहाँ तक कि मुख्य कारमुले की बात है, मैं बहुत विनमता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि सम्पूर्ण भारतवर्ष में अगर किसी एक राज्य में उस की मुसलमानता की है तो वह तामिलनाडु है। यह स्टेटमेंट बिलकुल सत्य है। लेकिन इस के बाद भी वस्तुतः हम वह नहीं चाहते कि तामिलनाडु के ऊपर या तामिल भाषा के श्रेष्ठियों के ऊपर कोई चीज अव्यवस्था लायी जाये।

वस्तुतः सवाल हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी का नहीं है। सवाल राष्ट्र के स्वाभिमान का है और इसीलिए हम जानते हैं कि किस प्रकार से हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के सम्बन्ध में बातें हुई थीं। लार्ड मैकाले ने अपने "मिन्द्स आफ एन्ग्लिश" में वह कहा था, अंग्रेजी भारतवर्ष में माने और लायने का उन का उद्देश्य था :

"to create a class of Indians who will be Indians in blood and colour, in blood and flesh but will be English in mind"

अंग्रेजों के मानस-मुर्कों को यहाँ माने का उनका उद्देश्य था किन्तु उन के प्रयासों को वह बना सके। 1784 ईस्वी में लार्ड कानिगलिस ने कहा था :

"only those who know English will be taken up in the Government services"

1827 में इंग्लिश विस्तृतान की राज-बाध हो गई और परसिद्ध को राज कर दिया गया। लेकिन उस के बाद भी वह स्वतन्त्रता श्रेष्ठियों ने भारतीय राष्ट्रवादा के लिए आन्दोलन किया तो उस समय बहुत धारि करी हुई। यद्यपि उस समय इंग्लिश को राज्दा के रूप में अंग्रेजिक कर दिया गया था लेकिन बहुत धारे विचारविचारियों के श्रेष्ठियों में बहुत प्रयत्न था कि जो लोग की कोई अन्वयान श्रेष्ठियों को श्रेष्ठियों



कहा कि हिन्दू और उरदू दोनों में हिन्दी को, वेदनापत्ती रिफ्ट को राजभाषा के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित सरकार ने भी प्रसिद्धा दी थी। बात कर उनीसवीं शताब्दी के अन्त में भाषा के विचार का जो स्वरूप प्राया उसे जान देंगे। तब 1920 में जब राष्ट्रपिता बापू का भारतीय राजनीति में प्रविष्टान हुआ तो उन्होंने हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा और राजभाषा के रूप में प्रतिष्ठित करने के लिए काफी बकासत की। और उसके उन्होंने बार कारण बताये थे। उन्होंने कहा कि हिन्दी साधारण हिन्दी होनी चाहिए। मैं साठे साहब का समर्थन करता हूँ कि हिन्दी बिल्कुल सीधी और सरल होनी चाहिए। ऐसी हिन्दी नहीं होनी चाहिए जिसको कोई समझे नहीं। इसीलिए बापू ने भी कहा कि हिन्दी सरल होनी चाहिए। कमीर से लेकर कन्याकुमारी तक और रामेश्वरम् से लेकर द्वारका तक सभी तीर्थ स्थानों में सभी लोग हिन्दी समझते हैं। इसलिए कि हिन्दी सरल है। यदि बकासत के लोग चाहें तो तीन महीने में हिन्दी सीख सकते हैं। यदि तमिलनाडू के लोग चाहें तो तीन महीने में हिन्दी सीख सकते हैं। मैं काम बकासत हिन्दी की बात कह रहा हूँ, बिछतापूर्ण हिन्दी की बात नहीं।

बापू का दूसरा कारण यह कि हमारे राजनीतिक और आर्थिक कार्यों से भी हिन्दी को राजभाषा के तौर पर स्थान देना चाहिए। उनका तीसरा कारण यह कि भारतवर्ष के बहुत अधिक लोग, 42 प्रतिशत लोग हिन्दी बोलते हैं।

जो भी हो, यह चीज तो बलबी रही और उसके बाद भी बहुत घरी बर्से हुई। 1929 में जब आन्दोलन चला तो 1925 में कांग्रेस के संविधान में संशोधन हुआ और वह संशोधन में कहा गया :

"The proceedings of the Congress shall be conducted as far as possible in Hindustani."

इसके बाद बापू बर्से हैं, नेहरू कमेटी की एक रिपोर्ट आई जिसमें उन्होंने भी कहा :

"The language of the Commonwealth shall be Hindustani which may be either Nagri or Urdu"

इसके बाद 1935-36 में जब 6-7 राज्यों में कांग्रेस सरकारें बनी तो गांधी जी ने कहा कि मैं देखना चाहूँगा कि एक वर्ष के अन्दर कांग्रेस के मुख्य मन्त्री तथा मन्त्रिमण हिन्दी में अपना काम करने लगे। गांधीजी कोई हिन्दी भाषा भाषी नहीं थे, गांधी जी हिन्दी साम्राज्यवादी नहीं थे, गांधी जी हिन्दी कैनेटिक नहीं थे, गांधी जी गुजराती थे। हिन्दी को तो सचमुच में प्रहिन्दी भाषियों का धाडीबाद मिलता रहा है। स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती हिन्दी भाषी नहीं थे। नेता जी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस जब आचार्य हिन्द फौज की कमान करते थे तो वे हिन्दुस्तानी में करते थे। वे तो हिन्दी भाषी नहीं थे। इसलिए हिन्दी की बकासत सचमुच में प्रहिन्दी भाषियों ने की है। पं० नेहरू ने 1940 में आस इण्डिया कांग्रेस कमेटी के प्रविष्टान में कहा था

"The policy governing the State education should be that Education should be given in a language of the student in each linguistic area, education from the primary to the University stage will be given in the language of the pupil"

इसी प्रकार से जब संविधान का निर्माण होने लगा और जब आर्टिकल 120, 210, पार्ट 17 और अनुच्छेद (8) के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा होने लगी तो बापू जानते हैं श्री गोपाळा स्वामी आर्यगर ने संविधान सभा में एक प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया था और हिन्दी को माना गया। मुझे कुछ तब होता है जब कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि एक बोट से हिन्दी को पारित किया गया। बावद में इतिहास नहीं जानते हैं। हिन्दी को तो माना गया लेकिन जब इन्टरनेशनल स्तर पर की बात आई तो यह एक बोट से हुआ। हिन्दी को ही सही रूप में समझौता

[डा० रामजी सिंह]

करके माना क्योंकि लोग जानते थे कि भाषा का प्रश्न बड़ा संवेदनशील है। भाषा के प्रश्न पर बंगला देश टूट कर भ्रमण हो गया। इसीलिए भारत के संविधान निर्माता जानते थे कि हम लोगों की भाषा के सम्बन्ध में समझौता करके कोई प्रस्ताव रखना चाहिए और उस समय यह प्रस्ताव श्री गोपालास्वामी आचर्य ने किया। डा० अम्बेदेकर की मन्मथ में इसमें सहमति नहीं रही। डा० अम्बेदेकर ने कहा कि भ्रमण-भ्रमण राज्यो में भ्रमण-भ्रमण भाषा नहीं हुई। डा० अम्बेदेकर ने 19 अप्रैल, 1947 को कहा था

"I am of the opinion that Hindustani shall be the language of the State, i.e., of the Union, as well as of the units. If each unit is given the liberty as the clause does, to make any language as the official language, the objection of having a national diversity will make Indian administration impossible.

"The units shall be put under an obligation to adopt Hindustani as an official language at the very start."

यह तो डा० अम्बेदेकर का विचार हो सकता है लेकिन सब लोगों ने यह माना है कि हर प्रान्त में उसकी अपनी भाषा होनी चाहिए और इसके आधार पर हम लोगों ने विविध प्रकार के प्रोविन्सियल का निर्माण किया है। भाषा के आधार पर जो मद्रास प्रेसिडेंसी थी, वह तमिलनाडु, आन्ध्र, केरल और कर्नाटक में बंट गई। भाषा के आधार पर प्रशासन करने से जनता को नजदीक लाने का काम होता है और जब मातृभाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा दी जाती है तो शिक्षा का बोझ आने से कम हो जाता है। "कमेटी ऑन सीडियम आफ इन्डियन" जब 1948 में बनी थी, तो उसके सदस्य थे : डा० तारकान्ध, सर सी० आर० रेड्डी, श्री एन० रत्नास्वामी, आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव, डा० डी० एन० कोकरी, सर जॉन्स

स्वल्प नटनगर, प्रो० हुमायूँ वकीर, डा० एन० मुशासिबर, डा० जाकिर हुसैन, प्रायि।

इन लोगों ने कहा था :

"English as the medium of instruction should be replaced within five years"

विश्वविद्यालय में केवल पांच वर्ष में कहा था और इसीलिए इन्होंने कहा था

"The university should adopt the language of the region or province."

मीलाना आचार्य जो प्रथम शिक्षा मंत्री थे, उन्होंने कहा था

"We have accepted the recommendation of the University Commission. The higher education should be imparted through the regional languages."

इसके अलावा जो एजुकेशन कमीशन बनाया, उस ने जो चार कर्तें रखी थीं, उनमें एक बात यह भी थी कि सारी शिक्षा का माध्यम हमारी क्षेत्रीय भाषाएं होनी चाहिए। इसी तरह से औरों ने भी कहा है जैसे "सेन्ट्रल एडवाइजरी बोर्ड आफ एजुकेशन" जो 1956 में बना था और रिपोर्ट ऑन पार्लियामेन्टरी कमीशन का इतिहास भी हमने पढ़ा है। केवल 9 प्रांतीय उसमें हिन्दी भाषी थे। बाकी सब अहिन्दी-भाषी थे। लगता था कि भारत का संसद् ही उस कमीशन में वर्तमान था और उस कमीशन ने भी यह कहा गया था शिक्षा का फार्मूले के बारे में। मुझे दुख होता है कहने में, मैं कोई बचने की भावना से या किसी को चिढ़ाने की भावना से नहीं, कि 1968 में तमिलनाडु की विधान सभा में पास किया गया था कि केवल दो ही भाषाएं रहेंगी। सम्पूर्ण भारतवर्ष में जब कि शिक्षा की फार्मूले की बात थी तो तमिलनाडु में ऐसा नहीं था।

इसके बाद 1960 में डा० बीयाली, जो हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री थे, उन्होंने भी क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को हमारे पाठ्यक्रम का भाग बनाने का और हमारे जो दूसरे शिक्षा मंत्री उनका सहज थे, उन्होंने इसी लोक तर्जान में 1964 में एक बयान दिया था :  
 "The medium of instruction of the University will be in regional languages."

उन्होंने यहाँ तक कहा था :

"That must be the logical evolution of our policy."

डा० त्रिवुण सेन, वे भी हिन्दी भाषी नहीं थे, ने जब शिक्षा मंत्री होकर आए, तो उन्होंने कहा था :

"It is no good trying to impose the instruction for young people which is not their mother-tongue. The big gulf between 90 per cent of the masses and 2 or 2.5 per cent of the English-oriented people exists."

हमारे राजाजी का उदाहरण सत्य हमारे मिला है कि हिन्दी के बारे में जब उनके हृदय में सिकता की भावना थी। चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचारी ने जो उसमानिया यूनिवर्सिटी में दीक्षान्त भाषण किया था, उसमें उन्होंने कहा था :

"I am one of those who is of confirmed opinion that the students' mother tongue should be the most fruitful instruction."

और कलकत्ता यूनिवर्सिटी में, जब वे यहाँ के राज्यपाल थे, उन्होंने उस वक्त जो दीक्षान्त भाषण दिया था, उस में उन्होंने कहा था :

"The English language sits on our thoughts even as the academic robe sits upon us. This robe may be beautiful and may sometimes protect us against weather but, on the whole, it is inconvenient."

1964 LS-11.

उसके बाद जो एकेडमिक्स कमीशन था और उसके सम्बन्ध में बीयालीवालेट में काफी बहस हुई थी, उसमें भी इस बात को रखा गया था ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो अपने देश की बात हुई। जब हिन्दी को लाया गया, उस समय 'मैनचेस्टर नाचियन' ने कहा था -

"It was difficult to see how the Committee's proposals could be better. The very pressure from the people which compelled India to match the states with linguistic boundaries makes it more urgent that Hindi should become established as a common language to all—while English will remain a great help to Indians, parity for English and Hindi would have gone against the Indian feeling of nationhood".

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह 'मैनचेस्टर नाचियन' का कहना है। इस प्रकार सारी जनता के दृष्टिकोण हमारे सामने हैं। किसी भी दृष्टिकोण से भाषा देखें, सभी दृष्टिकोणों से हम समझते हैं कि एक प्रजातांत्रिक देश में जनता की भाषा ही प्रशासन की भाषा होनी चाहिए ।

"Democratic Government cannot continue to function in the language which is understood by only a small fraction of the population".

इसलिए हमें सोचना होगा कि क्या किसी प्रजातांत्रिक देश के प्रशासन में दो परसेंट की भाषा प्रशासन की भाषा हो सकती है? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यही कारण है जब रामचन्द्रन साहब ने भी लोक सभुल्ला को एक का निमंत्रण दिया तो लोक सभुल्ला ने कहा कि हिन्दी, उर्दू और अंग्रेजी का प्रत्यक्ष करना पड़ेगा। इसी प्रकार से शिक्षाओं को भी तीन भाषाओं का ज्ञान रखना होगा? यह कह कर उन्होंने भी रामचन्द्रन साहब के निमंत्रण को अस्वीकार किया।

[बा० रामजी सिंह]

कर दिया। खेब झकुटका एक राष्ट्रीय स्तर के नेता हैं और हर राष्ट्रीय स्तर का नेता यह समझेगा कि देश में हिन्दी का क्या स्थान है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जितनी बातें हो रही हैं, उनमें एक बात यह कही जा रही है कि मद्रास या दूसरी जगह पर हिन्दी का विरोध है। हम तो यह देखते हैं कि तमिलनाडु के जो हमारे मित्र हैं वे भी हिन्दी से प्रेम रखते हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सभी मद्रास क्रिश्चियन कॉलेज में सर्वे हुआ था। उस सर्वे का विवरण बहुत इंटरिस्टिंग है। उन सर्वे की रिपोर्ट में है कि—

वहाँ के 54 परसेंट लड़कों ने कहा—  
Hindi should be optional.

27 परसेंट ने कहा—  
Hindi should be compulsory.

68 परसेंट लोगों ने कहा  
Hindi is necessary.

मद्रास कोलेजियम में 75 परसेंट ने कहा कि हिन्दी उपकीर्ण है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर समय रहता तो मैं आपसे कहता। मैं केवल यहाँ कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी का सवाल नहीं है। यह सवाल केवल सांस्कृतिक राजनीतिक बुद्धि का है। गांधी जी के शब्दों को मैं अर्थ में उद्धृत करना चाहूँगा :

"If I had the power of a despot, I would today stop the tuition of our boys and girls through a foreign medium, and require all the teachers and Professors on pain of dismissal to introduce the change forthwith. I would not wait for the preparation of text books. They will follow the change. It is an evil that needs a summary remedy."

"The foreign medium has caused brain-fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made

them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them for sitting their learning to the family or the masses."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह स्पष्ट बात है कि भारतवर्ष में राष्ट्र की भाषा केवल हिन्दी ही नहीं है। इस देश में जितनी सारी भाषायें हैं, सभी राष्ट्रीय भाषायें हैं, नेशनल लैंग्वेजज हैं। लेकिन इन सब में कोई एक लिंक लैंग्वेज, कोई सम्पर्क भाषा भी होनी चाहिए। क्या दो प्रतिशत लोगों की भाषा अंग्रेजी सम्पर्क भाषा होगी। मुभाव चन्द्र बोस ने कहा था, गांधी जी ने कहा था और श्रीमान् दयानन्द सरस्वती ने कहा था कि इस देश में ज्यादा से ज्यादा हिन्दी को सम्पर्क करो। इसलिए हिन्दी ही सम्पर्क भाषा हो सकती है। अंग्रेजी को अपनाये की आवश्यकता है। हमें राष्ट्रीय स्वाभिमान के रूप में भी हिन्दी को अपनाना चाहिए और साथ ही क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को भी अपनाना चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तमिलनाडु के भी विधानमण्डल में कहा है :—“अंग्रेज रहे, अंग्रेजी हटे”।

कनाटक विश्वविद्यालय के उपकुलपति ने कहा है कि बी० ए० तक के सबके अंग्रेजी नहीं सपनाते हैं। इसलिए जब देश स्थिति हो तो क्या हमें इसके बारे में नहीं सोचना चाहिए ? मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सांस्कृतिक राजनीतिक बुद्धि को छोड़कर हम इन प्रश्न पर विचार करेंगे तो हमें हिन्दी भाषा और क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं को अपनी भाषा स्वीकार करना होगा।

15.30 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM (Palani):  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to participate in this debate with a sense of responsibility because we are dealing with a

very complicated, complex, controversial and a very sensitive subject. Unfortunately, neither the Mover of the Resolution nor the Secunder of the Resolution has made my task easier.

Mr Sathe was pleased to say that Members from Tamil Nadu should not take an anti-Hindi posture I want to give this assurance to the House that, while I speak for the non-Hindi-speaking people, I am not speaking as an anti-Hindi-wala. I have been associated with Gandhiji's movement even from the 1920s and later on as a humble freedom fighter, for the spread of what Mahatmaj called Hindustani; being the common link language for India. But unfortunately we have strayed away from Gandhiji as far as language is concerned because it is not the Hindustani which Gandhiji conceived which is now becoming the official language but something else, something completely different. But that is beside the point. Apart from that, I want to tell particularly my Hindi friends here that, for more than 15 years, I have been, and I continue to be, the President of the Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, Tamil Nadu Branch, even though I had to pay a heavy political price in 1967 for this in the anti-Hindi atmosphere. Therefore, I am sure, none would consider me as anti-Hindi. Still the case of the non-Hindi-speaking people will have to be put forward in this House, particularly in this Parliament, as comprehensively as possible so that there might be no misunderstanding about it.

We are considering the Resolution passed by the Chief Ministers of the southern States. Unfortunately or fortunately, they do not belong to the Janata Party. But even if Mr. P. Ramchandran, instead of Mr. M. G. Ramchandran—as he was hoping to become—were the Chief Minister, he could not have taken a different stand from what the Chief Ministers have taken. Therefore, let us not impute political motives to the Chief Ministers with regard to the Resolution that has been passed by them.

This Resolution has a background, has a history. Unless we understand this background, perhaps, we are likely to mistake the motive behind the resolution, particularly persons like Mr. Raj Narain and others as a sort of political kite-flying or some such thing. It is not so.

This was one of the most controversial subjects which were discussed in the Constituent Assembly of which I had the privilege of being a Member along with many other distinguished Members who are present in this House. It was discussed not only in the Assembly but, perhaps, more outside the Assembly, in the Congress Party meetings. And it was not as if the Congress Party itself was united on this; there were sharp divisions within the Congress Party with regard to the approach. Ultimately, a compromise decision was taken—not a unanimous decision but a compromise decision—and that is now found in Part XVII of the Constitution read with the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. We are dealing with a multi-lingual nation, which is likely to persist for a long time to come; I do not see the end of it in the foreseeable future. It is not, as in other cases, a question of two or three or four languages. We have more than a dozen languages—important languages—and each of them is important in its own region, rich in history, rich in culture and rich in literature. Therefore, we had to take a practical decision with regard to the official language and also the status of the other languages and the first decision was that all the Indian languages were national languages and in the VIII Schedule the more important national languages were listed in the alphabetical order. Something was added later on...

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Fifteen are there now.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Those languages have been listed in the alphabetical order. No language is superior to the other in any way whatsoever. They were given equal status of being the main national languages.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

Then the question arose as to what should be the official language of the Union. It was easy to decide the official language for the State because each State had its own language; particularly later on after the division of the States on the linguistic basis, it became an easy matter even though before that, there were some problems. Now, it was a question of deciding what should be the official language of the Union and we came to the conclusion and the Constituent Assembly accepted it and it is now in the Constitution, that Hindi shall be the official language of the Union. I do not think any Chief Minister or anybody here is now pleading. Let us get rid of this provision in the Constitution. It is not my stand anyhow and I do not think that anybody has taken that stand and even the Chief Ministers have not taken that stand including Mr. M. G. Ramachandran ...

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR: I do not think.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Therefore, when we took that decision, we had to face certain practical realities. Two factors we had to take into consideration. One was that Hindi had to develop adequately to take the place of English in administration. Secondly—this is more important and this is the subject matter we have to deal with now the disability which would be faced by the non-Hindi speaking people when Hindi is adopted as the sole official language. This is the second important factor and this is what we are discussing today....

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: That is the crux.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: There is no use of saying that that does not create any disability and 'after all you can learn it in no time'. I am glad Panditji has put it categorically to answer this point that this disability is real disability. I am quoting

from a speech made by him on the floor of this House. This is what he said:

"I take it that the real basic opposition comes from a fear that if Hindi comes in, it will mean a disability to the non-Hindi knowing areas. I say it will undoubtedly be a disability. Let us face that. Let us not try to get over it and say, 'anybody can learn it in a fortnight or in a month or in a year'. It will be a disability for a considerable time. I say a rule must be laid now by which we do absolutely nothing which creates a disability to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to services and like matters. Let that be quite clear."

Therefore, this was the problem that faced us and, therefore, another compromise decision was taken that, for the next fifteen years English shall continue to be used for the purpose for which it was being used earlier.

After that what would happen? If it was left as it was, automatically after fifteen years Hindi would become the sole official language and English would drop out of the picture. But the framers of the Constitution were not sure that such a thing was possible and, therefore, they went further and provided in the same Article that Parliament may make law for the use of English language even after fifteen years. So, these were the considerations and that was why, if I may say so, an escape clause was put in there.

Then I would like to refer to Articles 343 and 344. Article 344 contemplates the appointment of Language Commissions periodically. In that you would find that in making the recommendations under Clause (2), it is laid down that 'the Commission shall have due regard to the industrial, cultural and scientific advancement of India'. Why this was put? Not without any purpose. That was because the development of Hindi to meet this require-

ment should take place. Otherwise, merely making Hindi on an emotional basis the language of the Union would create difficulties. That was one aspect of it. The second is the problem which we are discussing and that is "the just claims and interests of persons belonging to the non Hindi speaking areas in regard to Public Services"

So, these were the points which were taken into account by the Constituent Assembly when they framed the Constitution and put down these provisions with regard to the languages. Then the next milestone came when the first Language Commission was appointed and it made its recommendations. I am sure the hon Prime Minister is aware of the discussion of the First Language Commission's Report in the Gauhati Congress meet. The Commission had made a recommendation that the time had come to restrict the use of English at least in some areas and we should begin with that and the attempt was to have that recommendation accepted by the Congress Party. I am sure the Prime Minister would recall that on the same platform I put forward, on behalf of the non-Hindi speaking people that this thing should not happen. I categorically demanded that English should continue to be available for administration as it was and there should be no restriction. And it was Morarji Bhai then sitting behind me on the platform put the question—For how long? I said "as it was necessary" And I went further and said that how long it was necessary would be decided by the non-Hindi speaking people and not by the Hindi-speaking people. That was how this point of view of the non-Hindi speaking people was put forward on the Congress platform. Fortunately, the Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, and various other statesmen there were good enough to accept this point of view and that was how, later on, you would find this language was given by the then Prime Minister at various forums. I will come to that.

So, the question arose even then—if there was restriction in the use of English. It was going to create difficulties for the non-Hindi speaking people. It was on that basis, apart from the development of Hindi, that a decision was taken. It was in that connection that Pandit Ji gave the assurance in various places. The first assurance was given in a meeting at Madras—naturally, because that was the place where the sentiment was very much in evidence.

Some points were raised with regard to the medium of instruction. There is no controversy with regard to the medium of instruction. I had been Education Minister for nearly ten years in my State and there was no question of any controversy in regard to the medium of instruction. Kindly don't try to confuse this issue by bringing in the medium of instruction. As a matter of fact, it was the Tamil Nadu Government, Madras Government which took the first step to make the Tamil the official language and also made Tamil, the medium of instruction. So let us not get confused by that. I am quoting Panditji again "What is important it seems to me quite clear is that having decided on the medium of instruction in schools the argument is really limited to the language of communication between the States. The Constitution has laid down that after a certain period Hindi should replace English. In this respect the question that is being considered in Parliament and else where is this. I am quoting from Jawaharlal Nehru's speeches, Volume IV page 49.

'We should avoid rigidity in our approach to the question of language. We have to proceed with a certain flexibility and with a very large measure of common consent. There can be no compulsion in a matter like this. We cannot compel large numbers of people to do something which they do not like to do. I have no doubt that difficult, as the problem is, it will be solved step by

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

step. It is important that no decision should be arrived at which creates any kind of disability for people of one part of India in comparison with those of another. In regard to Hindi it is quite natural for people in the non-Hindi speaking areas to feel that it might create disability for them in the services and in other ways. It is legitimate for them to express their fears. The matter should therefore, be considered bearing in mind that there really can be no compulsion. Whatever our decision, it should be arrived at through general consent and it should be flexible."

This was the first statement he made after the Gauhati Congress. It was made in Madras when he was releasing the Tamil Encyclopaedia, Fifth Volume. Then, there was a resolution in this Parliament by Shri Frank Anthony that English should be included in the Eighth Schedule. I am not going into the merits of that whether it should be included or not. I will deal with English a little later. But, in that connection, this question of assurance came and Panditji has put it quite categorically in his speech on the floor of this House. And this is on page 55 of the same volume.

"I suggest two things. Firstly, as I have said there must be no imposition. Secondly, for an indefinite period . . .

I would like the Prime Minister to note-

"I do not know how long, I will have English as an associate additional language which can be used for official purposes. I would have it not mainly because of the existing facilities but because I do not wish the people of the non-Hindi areas to feel that certain advantages are denied to them by being forced to correspond in Hindi language. They can correspond in English. I would have English as an alternate language as long as the people require it

and I would leave the decision not to the Hindi knowing people but to the non-Hindi knowing people."

This was the first categorical assurance given on the Floor of the House by the Prime Minister. Then the question arose about the future when these 15 years ended, what would be the position. So, an official Language Act had to be passed in 1963 in which the provision was made that even after the completion of 15 years English could continue to be used for all the purposes for which it was being used at that time. This was the essence of the 1963 Act.

Therefore, the constitutional obstacle for the use of Hindi had been removed by this House by an Act of Parliament. Even at that time fears were raised. Would the assurance given by the then Prime Minister would be honoured later on. If some enthusiastic person takes into his head to push Hindi what will be the position? These questions were raised but Panditji categorically gave the assurance but that it would be wrong to put it in the Act itself. He thought it would be better to leave it to the good sense of the government regarding its implementation. But we found in 1965 when Lal Bahadur came to power as Prime Minister and there was, if I may say so, an enthusiastic Home Minister—an over enthusiastic Home Minister—he tried to force the pace of Hindi and this was how we had anti-Hindi eruptions in Tamil Nadu. It was at that time that myself and my colleague, Mr. Alagesan had to submit our resignations from the Council of Ministers Mr. Speaker you made a mention about it in another connection. But there is a slight difference. Our resignations were not accepted. So, there was an eruption and then the Cabinet had to reconsider it and the whole question was again settled on the basis that unnecessarily Hindi should not be forced on the people. That was how a decision was taken. Unfortunately, since 1967 onwards S. Ja. Jagan and his predecessors—I do not know what to call



them—DMK or Anna DMK—are having all the advantages by the anti-Hindi posture in Tamil Nadu. That is mainly because of an attempt by an over-enthusiastic Home Minister to put forward Hindi at one point. This is the lesson we have got to learn and we have not been able to get out of this situation in Tamil Nadu and I do not know how long it will continue. That is another aspect of it.

But I am only pointing out the dangers involved in this. We should be forewarned with regard to this.

Then, later on, there were occasions to consider this,—particularly in 1967,—when we considered an Amendment to the Language Act of 1963.

That Resolution, Sir, was passed for the purpose of promoting the use of Hindi more and more. But, at the same time, it was also laid down that the Three Language Formula should be strictly followed in all the States. No doubt, unfortunately, the Tamil Nadu Government has stuck to the two language formula, Tamil and English only. But leave that alone. Have the other Hindi States followed, both in letter and in spirit, the Three Language formula, I will put this to you.

Now, Sir, that Resolution specifically says that the Third Language should be one of the Modern Indian Languages, particularly, the South Indian Languages. I would like to have statistics from the Government how much of Southern Languages is being taught or being adopted or what is the proficiency that they have attained in these languages. Then one can point an accusing finger at the non-Hindi States saying that they have not acquired proficiency in Hindi. (Inter-*ruption*) They have not taken it seriously. About our Hindi friends, I naturally could very well understand their enthusiasm; emotionally they are more than satisfied that their language has become the official language. More than that, they also have the confidence—now that Hindi is going to be the official language—that they

would have all the advantages in the Services. The Hindi people should realise that when they press for Hindi more and more, the suspicion grows more and more that they want to take advantage of it.

If the three language formula was sincerely followed and implemented in the Hindi-Speaking States, if any of the South Indian Languages or Bengali for instance, had reached a reasonable level of proficiency, then, they could tell to the non-Hindi people: 'Look, we have taken a completely alien language, in the sense that it is not akin to our language; but still we have attained this proficiency. And, in spite of the fact that this is an official language in the Constitution you have not made any effort to learn Hindi.' I want to tell our Hindi friends that they have no right to make such a kind of charge because they have not in any way fulfilled the obligations put on them particularly when they ask us to adopt Hindi as the official language. The point is this....

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Subramaniam, there are a large number of speakers.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I know, Sir. I want to make this quite clear. At least there should be one comprehensive speech bearing on all the problems. If necessary I would like to ask my friends in my party to be brief. Kindly do not cut short my speech, Sir.

SHRI A. BALAJANOR: The hon. Speaker has stated in the Business Advisory Committee that the non-Hindi speaking people will be given the fullest chance to express their views. We want to put an end to all misunderstandings once and for all. All misunderstandings must be cleared and there must be understanding. I must also get full time, Sir.

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): If necessary we can take it up tomorrow.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am not blaming anybody. I am only assessing

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

the whole situation with regard to the position of Hindi in the whole of India.

Why did we put in this transitional provision of 15 years? Why did we have a certain clause providing for the use of English even after 15 years? We envisaged the possibility of the disability of the non-Hindi speaking people not being removed within this period. That was why these provisions were made. Therefore you cannot just fix a date and say that after 15 years, whatever might be the condition, Hindi alone will be the sole official language. I would like to put a question to the hon. Prime Minister. Can we honestly say that the level of the learning of Hindi has advanced so far—leave alone Tamil Nadu—in other non-Hindi speaking States that we can say that administration could be carried on in Hindi alone? I am afraid the same disability continues to be there. You cannot blame the people for the fault of the Government and for the fault of the politicians. All of us are parties to that. But you cannot punish the people for that. You cannot tell the youth who are standing there after education for employment opportunities, that with regard to the employment opportunities available in the Central Government, "Oh, you do not know Hindi therefore you are barred." What would be the situation if I am to tell the youth in the non-Hindi States "You do not have sufficient knowledge of Hindi, therefore, you do not have employment opportunities in the Central Government"

It is glibly said that now we do not want to insist on the knowledge of Hindi in the stage of recruitment. I would argue that point. Suppose a stage is reached—and that is the stage you want to reach quickly—where Hindi becomes the sole official language, then there is a non-Hindi youth, he gets recruited to the Central Service, he goes into the Secretariat, what does he find? The boards would be in Hindi, he does not know Hindi

re. Language Policy, (Mots.)

You grant that he need not have the knowledge of Hindi; if now all the persons sitting there would be dealing with the files in Hindi, whom would he get the training? He would be completely blind-folded there. Therefore, even for a recruit to get into the mode of working, unless the two language formula is there, anybody who does not know the Hindi language cannot get into the groove at all. Therefore it would be absolutely necessary for anybody to have this knowledge of Hindi if Hindi alone is the official language. Therefore, getting over this by saying that in the initial stage you need not have the knowledge of Hindi has no meaning because what would he do there? He goes there and there should be a language which is being used which he knows. Unfortunately, it is only the English language.

I could very well understand the views of Shri Raj Narain and other people like him that English is a foreign language. I also concede that this is a foreign language.

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR No, no

SHRI C SUBRAMANIAM I am prepared to concede this, wait, I am coming to the point. How many people know English? They say, it is one and a half per cent or two per cent or whatever it is. But this is the only language which is more widespread than any other language. Take the English knowing people in Tamil Nadu or in Kerala or in any other non-Hindi State or even take the English knowing people in Hindi States and compare it to their knowledge of other languages. If you take India as a whole, this is one language which is more widespread than any other language, more widely known than any other language. Even now it continues to be learnt and with great enthusiasm our children are sent to English medium schools.

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR All the Ministers send their children to convent schools.

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** I would like to know from the Prime Minister where his grand children are having their education.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** As also from the other Ministers. I have all the statistics.

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** Therefore, there is no use of just pushing it aside by saying that this is a foreign language. Whether this is a foreign language or not, that is the instrument available today. We have learnt it, our sons and grand-sons are learning it and it is necessary to learn it to keep abreast of world developments. Are you going to be secluded in an exclusive area without keeping track of the events and happenings outside? Therefore, the knowledge of a foreign language is absolutely necessary. Are you going to say that we will bring Russian in place of English or French or some other language leaving all the advantages which we already have in English. Therefore, here is English available not only for the present generation, the coming generation is also learning it, therefore, why discard it.

Now, the question is, have we reached a stage where in any area of central operation, you could say that we would use only Hindi and no English whatsoever. What would be the position? I would like to start from the functioning of this House. Suppose in your enthusiasm, you say that Hindi will be the sole official language, if not today, tomorrow, day after tomorrow or two years hence, what would be the position? You will be making us a dumb-opposition; a really dumb-opposition. We would not be knowing what you are saying. There would not be English translation available because English is a foreign language and it should not pollute this House. And you cannot have it as the qualification for election to, or membership of the House. You cannot say that they should have a knowledge of Hindi, in order to get elected. What would happen to this House then? How would you trans-

act any business here, unless you say: "We are the most important people here—the Hindi-knowing people, people from the Hindi-speaking regions do not count. We will carry on the Administration for you also. You can go home." Unfortunately you cannot have all the 14 languages as the official languages and start translation into all the 14 languages. That is the unfortunate position.

16 hrs.

**SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj):** You very easily see Hindi films and sing Hindi songs; and your actor acts in Hindi films

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** Unfortunately, we are not acting in films here. We are transacting business as far as Hindi films are concerned, even if we don't understand them, we see some beautiful faces. Do you want to reduce this House into a cinema? I hope that is not the intention of the Janata Party.

This is the thing which we will have to take into consideration in coming to a decision in the matter of making Hindi as the sole official language

Coming to the next level, namely the institution of Cabinet, suppose it is all in Hindi. I am told it is all in Hindi. I do not know how my friend Mr. Ramchandran manages it there. (Interruptions). And, therefore, it becomes difficult for a non-Hindi-knowing person. It means we all become disqualified; it is not a constitutional disqualification, but a disqualification imposed by people from the Hindi-speaking areas. Therefore, we have to take the realities into account. (Interruptions). You will have an opportunity, if you want to answer my points as effectively as you can. Can the Cabinet and the Parliament function—apart from the Administration? if the Administration is carried on purely in Hindi, and the Members on this side do not know what is

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

happening in the Administration, how do we function here? And, therefore, leave alone the officials who enter the service, even with reference to the functioning of Parliament and the Cabinet, unless there is some language which would at least for some time be available to enable people to understand what is happening, it would again become a dumb House and a dumb opposition; and you can have an authoritarian regime. You cannot have any discussion. You can go on taking decisions. This, in effect would be what it would be reduced to.

It is in this context that you have to look at the resolution of the Chief Ministers. You might ask: "Why did these Chief Ministers not pass these resolutions earlier?" There is a reason. It is because of the character of the Union Government today. I am not blaming anybody for this. Unfortunately, it has got only a regional representation. I am not trying in any way to belittle the importance of my good friend, Mr. Ramaschandran; and people think that one person cannot adequately represent the non-Hindi-speaking people. Not only that. People also look upon the Prime Minister—although of late he has also changed a little—who is known to be a staunch supporter of Hindi; all along he had that reputation; and he used to congratulate himself on that. That is still there. And we have got the pronouncements of various Ministers like Mr. Raj Narain—I mean when they were Ministers. And many of them haunt Hindi. Then there is another thing and that is the anti-Nehru phobia in the Janata Party; not of the Janata Party but in the Janata Party. I do not say that it is all pervasive, but there is an anti-Nehru phobia in the Janata Party. There is an apprehension naturally even with regard to the assurance Nehru had given with regard to non-Hindi speaking States. This would also be thrown out by saying that Nehru had no

business to give this assurance. These are all real apprehensions in the minds of the people.

Take the case of our Foreign Minister making a speech in Hindi in the UNO. I felt emotionally elated that for the first time an Indian language had been spoken in the UNO, in the international forum. But when I went to Madras, do you know what questions were put to me. The question was put to me was this. Is it not any indication or a warning to us that Janata Party going to eliminate English from all spheres, even international spheres, and therefore this is going to become ...

(Interruptions)

It is not mine. Very responsible people put that question to me. If you say that they are all fools, that is quite a different thing. But we have to deal....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you becoming emotional? On the motion, everybody will have a chance to speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not get....

(Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Some derogatory remarks were made against the late Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. They should be deleted.

(Interruptions)

Some derogatory remarks have been made.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given instructions to the Reporters that whoever unnecessarily interrupts them, they have not to record it at all.

(Interruptions)

No interjections.

(Interruptions)

**SHRI A. BALA FAJANOR:** You must give direction.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR** (Gandhinagar): I am on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have given guidance that if more than one person speaks at a time simultaneously, they should not record; they cannot record anyone excepting the person who has been permitted to speak. Sometimes, 3 to 4 persons have been speaking. So, whom is he going to record?

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** Quite right. My point of order is this. I quite understand that if more than two persons speak at a time and even that too without your permission, you are absolutely right to say that....

(Interruptions)

But my point of order is very limited. You are quite right, when more than one of us speak and all of us speak without your permission, that is not to be recorded. I quite appreciate your point. But that may be recorded as interruptions. What I am objecting to, with great respect to you, is this? When you say that you have given instructions to the Reporters to the effect that when all of us speak: do not record, how the Reporters know whom to record and whom not to record. That is my point.

(Interruptions)

How the Reporters know whom to record and whom not to record? Therefore, you kindly say something about it, but do not leave it to the Reporters.

(Interruptions)

**MR. SPEAKER:** You cannot go on speaking without my permission. No. Do not record.

(Interruptions)\*\*

**SHRI RAJ NARAIN** (Rae Bareilly): I am on a point of order.

मेरा ब्यवस्था का प्रश्न है कि अगर कोई असंसदीय शब्द हो तो उसको कार्यवाही से निकाल सकते हैं। इन्टरप्शन पार्लियामेण्टरी प्रैक्टिस है और इधरिय दि इन्टरप्शन अगर कोई ओपिनियन रजिस्ट्रिस करता है तो

You have got no authority to expunge them. (Interruptions) It is May's parliamentary practice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Mr. Raj Narain may please resume his seat. I am on my legs. The instructions given are: if more than one person simultaneously speaks without permission, then it will not be recorded. Instructions were also given that interjections are part of the proceedings; they have to get in. But if interjections are made by twenty people, it cannot be recorded.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** They can write 'Interruptions'.

जी कल्याण जैन (इन्दौर) : मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। प्वाइंट आफ क्लेरिफिकेशन।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it a point of order? Under what rule you want clarification?

जी कल्याण जैन : मैं स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ आपने कहा है कि जो मैं बोला हूँ हाउस के अन्दर उसको प्रोसीडिन्स से निकाल दिया जाय। जब मैं बोला था उस समय कोई सप्लाइडरट नहीं कर रहा था। सिर्फ मैं ही एक मात्र सदस्य था जो इन्टरट कर रहा था। मेरा निवेदन है कि उसको प्राय रिकार्ड से न निकालियेना।

**MR. SPEAKER:** Yours was not an interruption of a speech; yours was a speech and not an interruption.

श्री कल्याण शंभु : मेरा इंटरप्शन  
रिकार्ड होना चाहिये ।

MR. SPEAKER: Your speech is not going to be recorded; you will be called in your own time

श्री कल्याण शंभु : नाट स्पीच, इंटरप्शन ।  
घाफने इंटरप्शन को रिकार्ड नहीं कराया है ।  
मेरी स्पीच नहीं थी । मेरा इंटरप्शन  
था । इंटरप्शन रिकार्ड होना चाहिये ।  
अगर इंटरप्शन रिकार्ड नहीं हुआ तो यह ठीक  
नहीं होगा ।

MR. SPEAKER: You can make an interruption

PROF. DILIP CHAKRAVARTY  
(Calcutta South): You had just now  
stated two things: firstly, in case of  
unnecessary interruption, you are not  
to record ...

MR. SPEAKER: Who has said?  
Where did you get that.

PROF. DILIP CHAKRAVARTY:  
Who is going to decide what is a ne-  
cessary interruption or what is an un-  
necessary interruption? Secondly, you  
have stated that if the same member  
interrupts more than one, that also  
should not be recorded (Interrup-  
tions)

MR. SPEAKER: Neither of these  
things had been said by me

PROF. DILIP CHAKRAVARTY:  
These are things on which should  
like to draw your attention and re-  
quest you to give proper direction.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not my  
direction; you have not heard it.

SHRI PURNANARAYAN SINHA  
(Tezpur): If a person is speaking  
anything continuously and we contin-  
ue to listen as dumb listeners with-  
out interrupting, posterity will laugh  
at us when it reads the proceedings.

rs. Language Policy, (Mots.)

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN (Arko-  
nam): Today you have laid down a  
very dangerous proposition. You have  
said that if it is necessary interrup-  
tions, it will be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: I have never said  
that; I do not know where you get it.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Who is  
going to be the judge? Is the Repor-  
ter going to decide? (Interruptions)  
Who is going to be the judge? The  
Reporters cannot be the judges of  
what to record and what not to record  
It is a dangerous thing. Either you  
should say, 'don't record'—you can say  
that—or you may expunge it. In  
other words you are giving the right  
of expunction to the poor Reporters.

MR. SPEAKER: You have eviden-  
tly not heard me. I never said, ne-  
cessary or unnecessary; I do not  
know how it came in. If there is an  
interruption it can be recorded, but if  
the interruption is by several persons,  
you cannot record the interruptions.  
Nothing more than that.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Parti-  
cipants of many conferences were  
here in Delhi recently; participants  
from the various state governments  
were just walking away from those  
conferences, saying: we have not been  
able to following anything; all the  
proceedings are going on in Hindi;  
therefore we are not able to follow.  
What is the use of being here? This  
I have heard from ever so many per-  
sons. That is going to be the state  
of affairs.

I want to know whether Delhi is a  
Hindi territory or the capital of India  
belonging to everybody, every lan-  
guage group. Is Delhi functioning that  
way? Is Delhi administration func-  
tioning that way? We go to the tele-  
phone, telegraph office, railways;  
everywhere we are made to feel we  
are second class citizens. That is un-  
fortunately the situation. There-  
fore, it is not just this issue which is

important but the Prime Minister and his Government have grave responsibilities because language is not only a matter, it could be a divisive force also and empires have fallen on the issue of language. Therefore, we have got to be careful about it. Therefore, I would like to again quote Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru:

"The purpose of the assurance that I gave, and which I hold today, was that no change of this kind will be effected in English or Hindi without the full approval of the non-Hindi speaking people. I wanted to remove any apprehension that possible by a majority in Parliament or elsewhere, we would make changes which are not approved by them. As a matter of fact, such a thing cannot be done, apart from my assurance because it will raise such difficulties that no government would conceivably want to do it that way."

And again—

"Dates have very little significance except to see whether we are going along the right lines or not. It is important that we should give a certain direction to our movements."

What is important is what is the situation today in the non-Hindi speaking areas? Is there sufficient knowledge and proficiency in Hindi that you could switch over to the sole use of Hindi language? This is the question before us and if an impartial judgement is to be made, I have no doubt in my mind, it will be in favour of the non-Hindi speaking people and English should continue to be used. It is my prayer and all of us believe in the unity and integrity of India. We want to preserve it at any cost. Enthusiasm or over-enthusiasm for Hindi give a handle to the fissiparous and divisive forces in the country which are still lurking. This is my submission to the House and particularly to the Prime Minister.

श्री कंबर नाथ कृष्ण (दिल्ली सदर):  
प्रथम महोदय, यह दुःख की बात है कि देश को 31 साल स्वतन्त्र होने के बाद भी भाषा की हवाई देश में भाषा का सवाल बना हुआ है। मैंने अभी दो भाषण सुने— एक माननीय साठे का और दूसरा माननीय सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब का। माननीय साठे ने भी बात कही वह तर्कपूर्ण भी और संतुष्टता वा कि देश के हित में है और उनकी ईमानदारीवा राय है। लेकिन श्री साठे माननीय सुब्रह्मण्यम ने कही, मैं कह सकता हूँ कि वह पोलिटिकली मोटिवेटेड भी और देश में टुकड़े करेकी एक साजिश भी। मैं यहाँ पर जो

(अवधान) मैं यहाँ पर जो बड़ा हुआ है वह हिन्दी-भाषा-भाषियों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए नहीं बड़ा हुआ है। मैं यहाँ पर एक भारतीय के नाते बड़ा हुआ हूँ। मेरे लिये हिन्दी भी प्रिय है, तमिल भी प्रिय है और तमिल भी प्रिय है। मेरे लिये देश की हर एक भाषा समान है। मैं जब यहाँ पर बड़ा हूँ तो मुझे यही है कि यह देश एक है और देश में बहुत सारी भाषायें हैं, इसमें मतभेद भी हो सकते हैं, संदेह भी हो सकते हैं ईमानदारी से।

मुझे याद है कि जब हमारा विधान बना था और उस समय भाषा का सवाल था 1949, 1950 में तो प्रायः कंबर साहब ने एक बात कही थी, मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ और किस तरीके से हिन्दी भाषा निकल लेंगे एज बनी यह कन्सेन्सस से होना पड़ेगा। उसमें मतभेद था, यह मानना पड़ेगा क्योंकि जिस देश में अनेक भाषायें हों, जिस देश में बहुत सारी डाइलेक्ट्स हों तो मतभेद हीना स्वाभाविक है। लेकिन 31 साल के बाद भी क्या जो भाषा निकल लेंगे एज हिन्दी को माना गया वह किसी एक पार्टी का निर्णय था? नहीं, बल्कि सारे देश का निर्णय था।

[श्री कंचर लाल गुप्त]

मैं श्री ब्रायंवर की स्वीच पढ़ रहा हूँ जो उन्होंने कांस्टीट्यूट संसदमन्त्री में दी थी :

"Now in considering this draft, I wish to place before the House one or two facts. The first that I wish to place before the House is that this Draft is the result of a great deal of thought, a great deal of discussion. It is also—what has emerged—a compromise between opinion which were not easily reconcilable and therefore, when you look at this draft, you have to take it not as a thing which is proposed by an individual member like me. It is not to be looked upon as something which we have put forth. It is the result of a compromise in respect of which great sacrifices of opinion, of very greatly cherished views and interests, these have been sacrificed for the purpose of achieving this draft in a form that will be acceptable to the full House."

मैं यह मानता हूँ कि मतभेद हो सकते हैं, ईमानदारी से भी मतभेद हो सकते हैं, लेकिन उन मतभेदों को उखाड़ना और उस चीज को उखाड़ना, यह देश के हित में नहीं है, यह मैं मानकर चलता हूँ।

यह पांच राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्रियों की जो कॉन्फ्रेंस हुई है, माघ यह 30 साल में पहली बार हुई है, मैं इसे दुर्लभपूर्ण मानता हूँ। उन्होंने रज्जुबन्धन में एक ही बात कही है, और वह यह है—

"The Chief Ministers considered the language policy as it is being implemented today and regrets to note that notwithstanding the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to the effect that English would continue as an associate additional language and that the decision for the

change over to Hindi should be left to the non-Hindi knowing people and not to the Hindi knowing people, and also the assurance of the late Prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, the former Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the present Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai that Hindi will not be imposed on the non-Hindi speaking people, there have been attempts in certain Ministries of the Union Government to covertly impose Hindi ...."

उन्होंने यह एक ही बात कही है कि जो जवाहरलाल जी, लाल बहापुर जी, इन्दिरा जी और मोरारजी देसाई जी ने कहा है वह इम्प्लीमेंट होना चाहिए। हो सकता है वहाँ पर कुछ सैन्सेट है, कुछ एक्ट्स साफ कमीशन एंड प्रोमीशन हुये हों जो कि नहीं होने चाहियें।

मैं मानता हूँ कि यह एक नेशनल क्वेश्चन की चीज है, यह कोई उस पार्टी या इस पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। जो जवाहरलाल जी, लाल बहापुर जी और इन्दिरा जी ने कहा, यह सरकार सैन्सेट के मामले में कही पालिसी अपना रही है, उनमें कोई डेबिएशन नहीं है। हमने कभी नहीं कहा कि हिन्दी इतनी जल्दी से लागू होगी, साथ जब तक चाहेंगे अंग्रेजी शैली काफ़ी भाषा। जब तक टािमिलनाडु के लोग नहीं कहेंगे कि अंग्रेजी वहाँ से भाषी चाहिये, तब तक आप अंग्रेजी, रखिये, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं। आप बतायें कि कितने कहा, कौन से अंग्रेजी ने कहा ?

लेकिन एक सवाल आपके दिमाग में साफ होना चाहिये कि अंग्रेजी को आप बिदेसी भाषा मानते हैं या नहीं ? अगर अंग्रेजी बिदेसी भाषा नहीं है तो आपकी अपने विचार को साफ कर लेना चाहिये कि अंग्रेजी को ज़ाते प्रायः अंग्रेज के और वह बिदेसी भाषा है। इस भाषा को



भाषा नहीं तो कम, कम नहीं तो परसों, 10 साल, 15 साल में जाना है और जाना होगा, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि अंग्रेजी का कोई रोल नहीं है। भाषा भी अंग्रेजी का रोल है, अंग्रेजी जाने के बाद भी अंग्रेजी का रोल इंटर-नेशनल लैंग्वेज की हैमियत से बना रहेगा। हमारे बच्चे अंग्रेजी सीखते हैं, उनको सीखना चाहिये। वह फ्रेंच, जर्मनी और दूसरी भाषाएँ सीखते हैं, उनको अंग्रेजी भी सीखनी चाहिये, उसको बढ़ावा भी मिलना चाहिये, लेकिन जो यह कहते हैं कि यह बिदेसी भाषा नहीं है, मैं उनसे एतराज करता हूँ, मेरा इसमें मतभेद है। क्या आप कहते हैं कि इंडियेंडेंस अंग्रेजी की बचह से आई? मैं समझता हूँ कि आबासी की सबसे बड़ी लड़ाई 1857 की लड़ाई की यह कितने ने की, क्या अंग्रेजी बोलने वालों ने की? उन सबके मन में भारत माता के लिए प्रेम था। उनके दिलों में देश के लिए एक भाव थी। उन भाव ने उन्हें प्रेरित किया कि अंग्रेजी को यहाँ से खदेड़ देना चाहिये। उन लोगों की भाषा अंग्रेजी नहीं थी।

आपको यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि यह भाषा बिदेसी है, और इसको जाना है। लेकिन हम यह नहीं चाहते कि इस सवाल पर फटुता पैदा हो। इस भाषा को जाना कम है, यह आपको लग करना है, यह बात साफ है। इसलिए, जगता पार्टी ने भाषा की जो नीति अपनाई है, उसमें पहले की सरकार की नीति से कोई भेद नहीं है।

मैंने इस प्रस्ताव को पढ़ा है। उसमें ऐसी कोई बात बात नहीं है। हो सकता है कि किसी जगह स्थान पर हिन्दी में नाम लिखा गया हो। नाम जोड़िये कि किसी स्थान पर अंग्रेजी में नहीं लिखा है कि नाम हिन्दी में लिखा है, तो योंही कि नाम कुछ कहा गया है, जहाँ

कुछ से लोग हिन्दी नहीं जानते, वहाँ अंग्रेजी में भी लिख देना चाहिये। आप जगह बता दें, वहाँ अंग्रेजी में भी लिख दिया जायेगा। जहाँ ज्यादा लोग तामिल जानते हैं, वहाँ तामिल में भी लिख दिया जायेगा। सब लोगों के ज्ञान के लिए जो जरूरी है, वह कर दिया जायेगा। लेकिन अगर आप यह चाहें कि अंग्रेजी हमेशा रहे तो यह अतर्नाक बात होगी, और इनको मन से निकाल देना चाहिये।

कुछ भाई कहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी बिदेसी भाषा नहीं है। मेरे पास इस विषय पर अजाहर-लाल जी, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री और इन्दिरा जी के भाषण हैं। मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि आप कौन से काग्रेसी हैं—इन्दिरा जी वाले हैं, या दूसरे हैं। मैं आप को दोनों के भाषण पढ़ कर सुना देता हूँ। पहले मैं काग्रेस की आखिरी प्रधान मंत्री का भाषण सुना देता हूँ :

“The country needed a link language and that link language could be only Hindi because the largest number of people spoke it. That was the reason why it was chosen. Since it was chosen there was no doubt that it had spread and with a little bit of goodwill from all sides it could spread faster and it should spread as a uniting link language, not as something that divided or created suspicions and doubts in the mind of any Indian.”

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayin-  
 kil): Which is the quotation?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:  
 This is quoted from the Rajya Sabha Debates dated 20th December 1967—  
 speech by Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

हम

Now let me take from the speech of Lal Bahadur Shastri:

“The protagonists of Hindi should not forget that haste would get us nowhere; action had to be taken

[Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta]

gradually to replace English by Hindi. haste only gave rise to adverse reactions among the non-Hindi speaking people who wanted time to learn the language.

English was a good language which could teach us many things but it could never be our mother-tongue nor could it be continued eternally. It had to be replaced eventually by Hindi."

AN HON. MEMBER: From where the quotation is?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: This is from the Debates of Third Lok Sabha, 1962—4th Session

उन्होंने बर्द लॉक गया के 1962 के कॉर्बेशन में यह कहा। जवाहर लाल जी हिन्दी के बारे में कहते हैं—

"Hindi had been suggested by our Constitution as the link language for Central and official purposes. It was not because of any superiority of that language but for the simple reason that it was the most feasible for that purpose. The normal link language could not be English for a long time though it might continue to be a link language between thinkers, authors, etc."

मेरा कहना यह है कि जहाँ तक जनता पार्टी का संबंध है, जनता पार्टी ने जवाहरलाल जी को, श्री जवाहरलाल जी को, श्रीर वहाँ तक कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को भी, जो नीति चली आई है . . . . .

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: But you are imposing Hindi on the southern people.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I also say that we do not want to impose at all. It is the official policy. Let the Prime Minister reply. If there

is a changeover from English to Hindi, it is you who are to decide, not we; we will not decide. I want to make it clear. That is the policy of our party.

मध्यम महोदय, साहे साहब ने एक बात कही, तामिलनाडु में एक यह जो किया गया है कि हस्ताक्षर केवल तामिल में होंगे उन पर उन्होंने एतराज किया।

If Tamil Nadu were to change from English to Hindi, it is the Tamil Nadu Government itself which will decide it, not the Centre. May I tell them that if some circulars, some orders here and there, if they come, that is bound to come and that will continue.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Then how do you justify the action of the Chief Minister of Bihar in saying that even for inter-State correspondence it should be only in Hindi, and not even English translation?.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM: In Tamil Nadu we have decided that only inside Tamil Nadu area we will use Tamil, not in correspondence with some other States.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Even signature, whether inside or outside the State, will be in Tamil.

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM: Why do you worry about the signature? Worry about the matter.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I want to congratulate you. I do not want to take any objection, because Tamil is also a language of our country. It is my language as well as your language. I want to congratulate him. I do not want to take any objection, as Shri Sathe did. I am sorry, I do not know Tamil. I wish my children learn Tamil. This is not a dispute between Hindi and other regional languages. Whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Marathi or Bangla or

Hindi, they are supplementing and complementing each other. So far as we from the Hindi-speaking areas are concerned....

MR. SPEAKER: He should conclude now.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Give me another ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Ten minutes? You have already taken 15 minutes.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: We have two national anthems—Janagana mana and Bande Mataram. Is there any person in the whole country who will raise a question of language about them? We all respect them, whether we belong to Tamil Nadu or other States whether we speak Tamil, Telugu, Marathi, Malayalam or Hindi. It is not a question of language. We all belong to one country. It is people like Shri Devraj Urs who want to make political capital out of it. I can understand Shri Ramachandran. I have read the press reports.... (Interruptions). When the pressmen asked him. "Is this any confrontation between the Centre and the States over the language issue?" he said "there is no confrontation; there are certain grievances; we have expressed it." Everybody has a right to express his grievances. So, I have nothing to say against it. But what Shri Devraj Urs has said, you cannot take it that way. Kindly excuse me... (Interruptions)

You do not belong to Cong. So, why do you worry?

What has he said? He said that so long as Shrimati Indira Gandhi was there as Prime Minister, there was no problem of language. But, since the Janata Party took over, the problem has arisen in the last one year. May I ask this question? Are you not playing with fire, with the integrity of the people, by arousing the feelings of the people on the question of language? 1968 LS—12

re. Language Policy (Mots.)

You have failed, your programme has failed and you have been rejected by the people. All other things are over; only language is left.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do not try to play with this.... (Interruptions).

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन के पास कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं है । इन के पास कोई भी कार्यक्रम नहीं है । क्या आप बोट लेने के लिए देश की एकता की कुर्बानी करने ? यह सवाल है ।

मुझे एक बात और हिन्दी के लोगों से भी कहनी है कि हिन्दी बढ़ती हुई भाषा है । इस में अंग्रेजी के शब्द भी आ सकते हैं, तामिल के शब्द भी आ सकते हैं । आने चाहिए । स्टेशन का मुझे मालूम नहीं उन्होंने क्या बताया, मेरी भी समझ में नहीं आया, लेकिन अगर ऐसा कुछ उस के लिए कह दिया तो कोई गलत बात नहीं है । इसे बढ़ती हुई भाषा बननी चाहिए और हमें कोई काम ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए जिस से कुछ लोगों को यह मीरा मिले । मैं जानता हूँ आज मतभेद क्या है । तामिलनाडु के लोगों को मतभेद नहीं है ।

I have been to Andhra, I have been to Karnataka during elections.

लोगों को कोई मतभेद नहीं है, यह तो कुछ वेस्टेड इन्टेलिजेंट्स हैं जो बोले जाच हैं, कुछ पोलिटिकल वेस्टेड इन्टेलिजेंट्स हैं, कुछ ब्यूरो-क्रेट्स हैं जो इस चीज को उभाड़ना चाहते हैं । मैं चाहूँगा हिन्दी वाले उन लोगों को हैरिबल न हों । मैं चाहूँगा यह मंत्री भी बतायें कि हिन्दी प्रचारिणी सभा, जिसके सुबह-सुबह साहब 15 साल तक अध्यक्ष रहे, उसको पहले कितनी ग्रांट दी जाती थी, हिन्दी प्रचार के लिए और अब कितनी दी जाती है । क्या यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि राज्य की स्टेज में हिन्दी के प्रचार के लिए और ज्यादा

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता]

पैसा देना चाहिए और जो हिन्दी पढ़ना चाहते हैं उनको इन्स्ट्रुमेंट देना चाहिए, उनको रिताब देनी चाहिए, बच्चों को एनकरेज करना चाहिए, नीकरी में डालना चाहिए ! लेकिन नूनं दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस सरकार ने उसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया । जनता पार्टी की सरकार को इसकी तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए । हमें इस देश की इंडिपेंडेंसी को किसी भी कीमत पर कुबाल नहीं करना है । भाषा का सवाल तो हमारे सामने है ही नहीं । भाषा के सवाल को जनता पार्टी या कांग्रेस पार्टी का सवाल नहीं बनाना चाहिए, यह तो देश का सवाल है और अगर कहीं पर कोई मतभेद हों तो प्रधान मंत्री जी मुख्य मंत्रियों को बुलाकर बात कर लें ।

If they have certain objections and grievances, and if they genuinely feel about them, let them contact the Prime Minister and get their grievances redressed. I am sure that the Prime Minister will redress their grievances. There is absolutely no doubt about this. May I request Mr. Hitendra Desai....

SHRI HITENDRA DESAI (Godhra): Let the Prime Minister call them. That will be better.

SHR KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Yes. Let him call. But, may I request you not to play up this issue?

SHRI HITENDRA DESAI: We are not playing up this issue.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: There is a certain section. So far as Mr. Ramachandran is concerned, I have no objection to what he said in the Press Conference. But if you say that since the Janata party took over, this difficulty is there, then it is politically motivated. (Interruptions).

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: The same thing was done during your time. I take an independent view of everything. Don't forget it.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : एक बात मैं यह जो कहूँगा कि हिन्दी की प्रगति के साथ साथ हमारी क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं की भी प्रगति होनी चाहिए । अगर प्रजातंत्र को जिया रहना है तो जब तक रीजनल लैंग्वेज और लोक लैंग्वेज बोलों धारा नहीं बढ़ेगी तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में प्रजातन्त्र नहीं हो सकता है । हम चाहें इन्टर बेंडें या उन्नर बेंडें, हमें भाषा के नाम पर ऐसा कोई काम नहीं करना चाहिए जिससे इस देश का एकता और एकत्वता को खतरा पहुँचे ।

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mohanaragam.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I have given you intimation that I will speak first.

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARAGAM: Tomorrow, I will speak.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANORE: What about CPM? They are not speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: I will call them. You are more interested in this.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I thought that I will get my chance a bit later because we usually maintain an order.

MR. SPEAKER: If you want, I will call you later.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: No, no. Certainly not.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: We want to listen to you.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Not only listening, but if you understand my feelings. I will be very happy.

एक भाषाईय सङ्घ : आप तमिल में बोलें जिसमें आपने बोट मारा

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** Mr. Speaker Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity of participating in the discussion on the motion moved by Mr. Sathe. Practically, it was a question of Calling Attention on the Conference held by southern Chief Ministers, last month.

I am not going to take the advice of the other member to express my nationality or my affection or my sincerity or my conviction in the unity of this country. Let the hon. member also understand that I have not come to this House on his oath but on the oath of the people on our side in the southern corner.

Let me recall the speech I made immediately after Mr. Morarji Desai took over this Government. Some hon. members and, I think, it was Mr. C. Subramaniam who said, south vs. north has been decided. But on that date when I made the speech—some said that it was a classic statement— I said, there is a division between Vindhyas. I never said, a cultural division—a turn of things between us.

Even before I started the hon. member there called me to speak in Tamil. What for? Let him understand. I understood Gandhi in English, I understood Tagore in English, I understood Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in English, I understood Mrs. Indira Gandhi in English, I followed Lal Bahadur Shastri in English, I still follow Mr. Morarji Desai in English, Mr. Kaushik in English Mr. Biju Patnaik in English and also many others in English. Rightly or wrongly, I had an opportunity to go through the Official Languages Act. None of the members has touched it. I am strictly going to confine myself to the limited sphere of the resolution adopted at the Conference of the southern Chief Ministers. I will read out the resolution first and come to that later on.

I hope, you will give me some time, not considering the time allotted to my party because our feeling is to be

understood once and for all, to put an end to any misunderstanding of the august House. You know pretty well that in my party we are 19 members. Seven of them cannot follow; others can follow to an extent and express either in English or in Hindi also. We are putting up with this kind of a thing for the simple reason that one day there will be a chance for us to express our feelings, not only feelings but voice the people's views in this House. But we have not made an agitation. All throughout we have been seeing for the past 15 months. What is the reaction? They provoke us. Many members come and ask me, why it is. As the representatives of the people naturally, they are bound to represent to our Chief Minister, the General Secretary of the All India Anna-DMK—Mr. MGR naturally expressed the same view to the other Chief Ministers of the southern States and they, in turn, consulted many of the members.

Mr. Sathe was very vocal. But he cannot ask Mr. Ramamurti to speak on the same lines. This is a ticklish issue. We are not politicalising it. Today, I must confess before you that I am going to be very straight and simple. When I came to this House, I remember what Mr. Sharad Yadav said. But people never listened to his views. I still remember, Mrs. Indira Gandhi told Mr. Sharad Yadav, "I can understand your feelings." But later on, Mr. Sharad Yadav was taken in. And the country paid for it, the Congress party paid for it.

Similarly, I place before you, not warn you a reasonable, sensible, consideration of feelings of the southern and non-Hindi speaking people. Some people referred to Sheikh Abdullah. I am not going to refer to Sheikh Abdullah Kashmir is always exempted, even in 1976, when the rules were made during the peak of the Emergency. I have no concession for Mr. Sathe. I view the issue independently and according to the best judgment of our thinking.

[Shri A. Bala Pajantor]

When you take the resolution of the Conference, what is stated there? Some people tried to analyse it according to their convenience and they wanted to interpret it as if the southern Chief Ministers were not aware of certain things. I want to go on record saying that Mr. MGR is not that simple, he is quite intelligent. Not only that. The other Chief Ministers of the southern States also understood it correctly. This is what the resolution says:

"On language issue, this Conference of the Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu, Karnataka... regret to note that notwithstanding the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to the effect that English would continue as an associate additional language and that the decision for the change-over to Hindi should be left to the non-Hindi knowing people and not to the Hindi-knowing people and also the assurance of the late Lal Bahadur Shastri, the former Prime Minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi and the present Prime Minister, Mr Morarji Desai..

—I hope Mr. Desai is listening to my speech in his room at least—

"that Hindi will not be imposed on non-Hindi speaking people, there have been attempts by certain Union Ministers to covertly impose Hindi, and this Conference strongly oppose such an attempt to impose Hindi contrary to the provisions of the Official Language, Act 1963 as amended in the Official Languages Act of 1967"

And here comes the crux of the Conference resolution—because Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta could not follow that, and I am sorry to say this.

"This Conference desires that immediate steps should be taken to stop such imposition of Hindi on non Hindi-speaking people and voices its apprehensions that any further attempt to impose Hindi is

likely to erode the confidence of the non-Hindi-speaking people in the Union Government".

That is what we wanted. That is why I said that the Tamilnadu Chief Minister and others are very clear about the statement: for that simple reason, nobody touched it.

As I said earlier, we take independent judgments. Whenever you are right we come and congratulate you; whenever you are wrong we point it out and if you are not prepared to listen, we oppose it: we strongly and vehemently oppose it.

In the peak of Emergency, these rules were made. In the year 1967, this Act was passed, in 1967 it was amended, in 1969 once again they gave colour to it and kept quiet, in 1971 they had a thumping majority and nothing was done and, in the year 1978, in the peak of Emergency, Parliament was not taken into consideration because, in the official Languages Act, Section 3 gives power to make Rules. So, they made Rule: What Rules? Let me ask this patriotic Member who wants me to speak in Tamil what is the Rule he speaks about? This Rule is not applicable to Tamilnadu. Why? Is it like Kashmir? It was so covert even during the period of Emergency: even during the period of emergency this was done. I know what the Rules are threadbare, and I may read out because you don't know what is really taking place. By this Resolution we want to protect the interests not of Mr. Ramchandran—who is in the Cabinet but who is not able to follow the Cabinet proceedings—but of the people of this country—the people who come from Karnataka, people who come from Kerala, people who come from Tamilnadu and Pondicherry, people who come from non-Hindi-speaking States who are not qualified in it and who have to take it up. I will deal with every portion of the Rules. What is the justification you have prescribed? If you do not follow it take the Oxford dictionary. Covertly you are trying to impose

Hindi on the non-Hindi-speaking people. It is said 'we are not going to impose it on these people' but the first portion of the Rules says that they shall extend to the whole of India except the State of Tamil Nadu.

These are the Rules. I do not know how many Cabinet Ministers know about these Rules.

**THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK):** What is that book?

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** This is the official Languages Act and the Rules framed thereunder. These Rules were made under section 82 of the Official Languages Act.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** In which year?

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** In 1976, in the peak of Emergency, in the month of June. You are supporting without knowing what is what *(Interruptions)*

The Hon. Member, who is very enthusiastic, is going to dig the grave of the very cause he is enthusiastic about. We are not even 1 per cent less than him in patriotism. I sacrificed my father and entire family for the cause of this country. *(Interruptions)* Not only I but many Members from this side have done that. Members who talk like this and create chaos in the country don't know what are the Rules. It is the tragedy of this country that, without knowing the Rules, people speak about them.

I am reminded of Shri Krishna Meemon who said 'Let not people speak about Hindi and English if they do not know both if they know both, let them talk about it.'

I am speaking in English not out of fascination but because I want to be understood—understood in the sense, as I said earlier, that I understood Gandhi and every patriot of this coun-

try. The unifying spirit, as expressed by Shri Subramaniam, is knit well over and spread in this country—not because of majority; because, as I mentioned last time, majority in this country is a question of relative theory. It need not always be a majority. Your community may be in a minority in my place. These linguistic minorities, these caste minorities and even religious minorities—I do not believe in that. We are Indians to the first and Indians to the last. There is no question of minority or majority. I recall my statement: 'Downstream, beyond the Vindhya, the people gave different results in the last elections'. Take note of it; beware of it.

I have also reminded last time—this is something which I told Mrs. Indira Gandhi a number of times—that, by praising and shouting, patriotism will not grow, we have to show by action

Now, why has it been said in the Conference, that covertly Hindi should not be imposed on those people? We want to protect the people of our area in the sense of people of non-Hindi-speaking areas. For example, from these rules, you have excepted Tamil Nadu out of fear. If you had the guts, if you had the sense of responsibility for governing this nation, you ought to have included Tamil Nadu....

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** What has the Janata Party done? *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** Just now Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta said that this was not a matter for a particular political party. I do agree with him. It is a national problem. What I say is that, now, the Janata Party that is ruling this country, our beloved country, this great country, is implementing vehemently taking shelter under these rules. Whatever is convenient for you, you take that and implement it vehemently quoting Gandhiji

[Shri A. Bal, Pajamor]

and other big people, and whatever is inconvenient to you, you delete that I say, you are the most dishonest people on the earth. It should not be a question of convenience. It should be a question of conviction if you go by conviction, I am prepared to surrender and prostrate before you. But, if you say that it is a question of convenience, then you are going to balkanize this country, and it is only on our blood that you will do it. We will not allow you to balkanize this country. Our beloved leader, Shri M G Ramachandran, is for the unification of this country, nothing less than that. Therefore, do not force these circumstances out of enthusiasm (Interruptions)

Now, what does the rule say? For a particular time, proficiency qualifications are made. A person is supposed to have proficiency in Hindi if he has passed the Matriculation examination with Hindi as the medium of instruction. An employee shall be deemed to have acquired working knowledge of Hindi if he has passed Matriculation with Hindi as one of the subjects. After some time he can also pass the Pragma examination. Then it is said that his knowledge of Hindi is enough. If 80 per cent of the staff working in a particular office under the supervision of the Central Government have acquired working knowledge of Hindi, then you can say that that particular region or area has full knowledge of Hindi and you can declare it as a Hindi-speaking area. This is what the rule says.

This is covert imposition. You have excluded Tamil Nadu from this.

These are the Rules:

"The Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976

Ministry of Law Justice and Company Affairs (Department of Official Language)

"G.S.R. 1952—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 read with sub-section (4) of section 3 of the Official Languages Act, 1963 (19 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules, namely

1 Short title, extent and commencement—

(1) These rules may be called the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976

(2) They shall extend to the whole of India except the State of Tamil Nadu

(3) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette " etc

Then I refer to paragraph 6

"Use of both Hindi and English— Both Hindi and English shall be used for all documents referred to in " etc, etc.

"Any application, appeal or representation referred to in sub-rule (1) when made or signed in Hindi shall be replied to in Hindi

"Where an employee desires any order or notice relating to service matters (including disciplinary proceedings) required to be served on him to be in Hindi, or, as the case may be, in English, it shall be given to him in that language ."

You have omitted Tamil Nadu. I am coming to the question of Central Government offices and public sector undertakings in Tamil Nadu. They are all transferrable posts. They will be serving in Tamil Nadu for five years, not permanently. Then they may be transferred to Bihar or Orissa. Then what will happen? By that time that area would have become a Hindi-knowing area.

Why do I speak for bilingualism? Because that is contemplated in the Act of 1963. This assurance has been given by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru



followed by all the other Prime Ministers including the present Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. But for that, they could not have continued. The assurance was given because they wanted to maintain the unity of this country.

Now I will come to another point. I hope they have followed this classification principle. Take that a person is located in a non-Hindi area and the State is considered a 'C' State—now they have classified the States. 'A' States are those States where Hindi alone is the major language. 'B' States are States like Gujarat, Maharashtra, Punjab, etc., 'C' States are Bengal, Andhra, Karnataka and Kerala, excluding Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu is not at all a 'C' State. I do not know in what category they are now going to put Tamil Nadu. . .

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN  
(Badagara): 'D'.

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR: They need not have it. It is a workable thing. This is Hindustani coming in in a peculiar manner. Now what happened in 1965? There was an agitation. Why? Because in the Constitution you have contemplated 15 languages. That was well explained by Mr. Subramaniam. He said it was found not practical and so for that, there was an Act in 1963 and in 1967 it was amended after an agitation. You know how? My friend over there, Dr. Ramji said that people have accepted it, the Congress Party has accepted it, but perhaps he has forgotten the history of Tamil Nadu and our past efforts. We have sacrificed seven souls in 1939. Agitation during the Rajaji regime against the imposition of Hindi, when Rajaji was a protagonist of Hindi. I will quote what Rajaji said later on also, because to change is growth, to change is evolution and to change is improvement. If you do not change, you do not make improvement at all. You do not prosper at all. You cannot be stagnating. I do not understand how now Mr. Morarji Desai has changed.

Mr. Subramaniam has said that Mr. Morarji Desai has changed. That means that he is able to understand the spirit of democracy. Some people, when they see me, greet me in Tamil. Sir, I know when Sir Archibald Nye and Lord Mountbatten used to come to Tamil Nadu, they also use to greet people by expressing 'Vanakkam', 'Namaskaram' and 'Varuhiren'. But, Sir, what Mr. Raj Narain did in the Rajya Sabha was an insult to our Tamil language. I challenge these Ministers. I put a question to you. How many of the past Prime Minister could speak for two minutes in any one of the South Indian languages? Name one of them. I ask you. I do not want him to speak in Tamil. Not one of them could speak. Any one of you could speak? Show your courage by action and not by words. (Interruptions) I know, Mr. Ravindra Varma is a man from Kerala. He is a man of the south. He contested from Ranchi. He can speak beautiful Tamil. I know Mr. George Fernandes. I do not go by constituencies. If you take my constituency, I have to speak five languages. My constituency is not from Tamil Nadu. I have to speak Tamil in Pondicherry. But when I go to other places in my constituency, say, to Kallaraj in Kerala, I have to speak Malayalam. In Yanam I have to speak Telugu. Our official language was not English. It was French, Baba, it was French. *Bon Matin*. But do I speak French here? I speak English. *Thoda, thoda* Hindi also I know. I am trying to learn Hindi also here in this House but by your fanaticism, your arrogance and sometimes your force against me push me out. I tell you this is not the method. . . (Interruptions) Why do I say this? I know Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta. I can quote, if he permits me, what he told me in the Central Hall. He speaks very good English. Then why not you speak English? He says, 'No, no, I will be misunderstood in my constituency.' So are you not politicalising the issue? I ask you this thing. I touch upon your conscience and ask

[Shri A. Bala Pajanor]

you, can you argue in your court in Hindi? No. Then, Sir, only ten members used to speak here. I never used to question the procedure. I never used to question the quorum. Dr. Ramji speaks good English. Why not you speak in English, Dr. Ramji? This question of speaking is a question of action. I want to take from you how you behave in this House, not only in this House but outside also. We are very frank. When I speak out of emotion, I have no ill feeling towards you, because all of us are equals. I have seen Mr. Morarji Desai from the gallery. He used to sit as Deputy Prime Minister of the country. Now I am proud to see him sitting there as the Prime Minister of the country. That is the reason why my Chief Minister says that in his time this question must be settled because he has worked as Minister, then as Deputy Prime Minister and Opposition Member. I do remember how I hooted him also once. But you do not know because you have come by chance. I remember him once telling me, 'What are you saying?' What I spoke he could not follow. Then I told him, 'Please make a provision for Tamil also to be understood immediately. That is what I am asking.' But what is it that you have done? You are very patriotic. You have not made any provision...

17 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pajanor, you have taken 20 minutes.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Please do not remind me of the minutes. The country is on the minutes. You must help us. If you remember correct—I was very happy when you came to the Chair during in the Business Advisory Committee meeting you said, when I asked for 3 days, that you would give me as much time as possible. I do not know if you are going to cut short off me. I cannot advocate my cause; I cannot be that sincere. And so I shall be happy only if I can get into the papers and throw

out the points and then get out. I rely more on that. That as the reason why I request that I should be given more time.

My trend is not lost. I admit it. The Chief Minister's conference, I do not think, they tried to divide us. I think you will give instructions to the Deputy-Speaker to give me time.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no instruction to him.

17.01 hrs.

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the difficulty for the people, especially coming from non-Hindi speaking areas, is this. It is a question of our being understood here. When we say that we have to give respect of Nehru's assurance you all think that you are going to Macaulay and other people of London. We are not taking shelter. I want to ask—many of you are sincere. Then why are you having English pants and English shirts? Why do you take bread and butter? It is not a question of taste. It is a question of being understood. When I speak English don't you follow me? When we speak in English you tell me that I am an Angrez? Are you promoting national unity in our part of the country? This is not the way to get the unity. So, I appeal at this moment that we on our side should make clear one thing on this issue. Please go through the records of the Constituent Assembly. I want to quote Dr. Ambedkar. There was a division. As the Chairman of the Committee he attended the Congress Party meeting and in the discussion vote—was 78—78. This was what Dr. Ramji Singh said. I say it was wrong. It was not unanimous. Dr. Ambedkar categorically said that, Subsequently, on persuasion it was 77 to 78—one fell short of unanimity. Why I say this is because in 1953 Pandit Nehru and Mr. Subramanian and all the great people who were members of the Constituent Assembly changed their ideas to suit the condi-

tion. How that had developed? They brought forward this Act of 1963. Then it was subsequently amended in 1967 and in 1968, when our great and beloved Anna took over as the first Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, he made it clear. Some people very sarcastically made a remark. That was the sorry state of affairs. Subsequently there was a resolution. Is it not the duty of the Legislative Assembly to reflect the voices of the people and to give colour and substance to it? Are we to dictate our own wishes? I would plea to this House that we on our side wanted to challenge this. Let it be Mr. Stephen's party or let it be Mr. Chavan's party or the Janata Party. Let them come and tell that Tamil Nadu will have three languages, but Hindi will be there. I may tell you that you will not get a single seat. When Mrs. Gandhi tried that at the airport you know what she got out of that. Kumari Anandam, Mr. Dhandayudapani and Shri P. Ramachandran are three members from South. Did they open their mouth in South. Why don't you convince your party? Let them go to Cape Comorin or Madura and say what they want to do about the language. They cannot. Because the feelings of the people are too much there. You may say that we are capitalising. Don't say that. Our leader MGR is not an air-conditioned politician. He and others like him are reflecting the voice of the people. We are for Food, Clothing and Shelter for our people. Land legislation is not the issue at the moment. We are for giving our people house, food and cloth. A young man, the average man, studies in order to become an I.A.S. Officer in the Central Government or he wants to reach the highest echelon of the country. Article 14 gives equality before the law. I do not want to repeat it. But, don't misunderstand me. Clive and others came here not to conquer this country. They used this language for their trade and commerce. Later on in 1827 or something like that they imposed it not for the purpose of unifying this country but to run the administration. Later on—I am sorry

to say—many of us adopted the English language as a fanciful and fashionable language in our homes, towns and shops. Same thing will happen to our children. Let posterity not blame me that I was a party to the slavery of my people in some other language. I tell you in this country there is no mother manuscript. There was only mother tongue. Eighty per cent of our people were illiterate and they never had the chance. The other day it is a joke and a fact also one Member said: I want to see Andhra. Where is it? Then he said: I want to see Andhra and learn Malayalam. See the knowledge! Now, Malayalam is spoken in Kerala and not Andhra. I do not want to have an intelligence test with you people but it is a fact. Such people when they come to this country they will be second class citizens of this country.

Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, please take Article 14 of the Constitution—Equality before Law. Even now that is going to happen. Article 14 of the Constitution clearly states that all of us are equal before law. What will happen is once you impose it for the first fifteen years then after some years you switch over to some other language. That is the reason you are covertly introducing and debarring us to take the equal advantage as per the Article of the Constitution as framed by forefathers of this country.

Sir, I give you another example. To be a Union Minister you take the present position. For me to become the Union Minister I must qualify either in English or Hindi whereas for a member from Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh he need not learn anything. It is enough that he can put his thumb-impression because he can answer the questions in Hindi. Is it possible for any one of the members on this side to do so unless he learns English or Hindi? Is it equality? Then why not scrap Article 14 of the Constitution. Why it is there? You are not able to do it. I am not talking of IAS and other service officers but of Members. That is the

[Shri A. Bala Pajonor]  
reason my leader says that even Prime Ministerahip should be by rotation. The composition of this country is not that simple. Do not under-estimate my Chief Minister, MGR. He knows. Perhaps he has not gone through the college education as many of us have and got degrees. These degrees are only initials. I can tell you it is out of experience and education that he knows what it is. He is now saying what is this country's fate. Only a man from Uttar Pradesh can become Prime Minister of this country. I do not want to name the Member but even in this Cabinet one hon'ble Minister told me Uttar Pradesh is the Pradesh that is India (Bharat). So, he alone can lead this country and not Morarji. I differ from him. (Interruptions)

I will name him. Do not provoke me to that. (Interruptions)

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS  
Name him

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR: I do not want to do it. Now, Morarji Desai is from Gujarat. He is also to be taken of because he is not from the main area. But fortunately he is able to speak Hindustani or Hindi because he had the privilege to be under Gandhiji. But for MGR to become Prime Minister of this country or for Mr. Anthony to become Prime Minister of this country or for Mr. Dev Raj Urs to become Prime Minister of this country—as things stand on the political position of this country—it is next to impossible. Do not claim that the Janata party is a national party. You are nowhere in South. You are a regional party consisting of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan. Nothing else. Do not call me a regional party. You are for name's sake in all-India but our composition is all-India. We have our units in Bombay and Calcutta whereas you are a magnificent pier. You know the results of Madurai. They are coming to me and telling me that they are a national party. India is from Kashmir to Kanyakumar.

mar. You are neither in Kashmir nor in Kanyakumari, nor in Punjab, nor in Bengal, you are only in the Centre. Therefore, what I raise is a serious issue. I am challenging them. Mrs. Gandhi covertly introduced it with the help of these people in the year 1976 and you have taken shelter under of it. What is it? I go in the Official Languages Committee, and I can tell you this. There are some over enthusiastic Members. (Interruptions) We don't require your certificate because my performance and my affection is to be seen and my All India nature is to be seen by our activities, by our actions and we are proving it. We are not tiki-ish. We are not politicalising the issues. We are not taking shelter as conveniently as you are doing it, may I say? We are very honest; we are very sincere; we support you whenever you do good things.

Is it not a fact, Sir, that in the Central Hall we did this in the Joint Session of Parliament? Did we not support you? We are not bargaining. We are no; on that I say this because you say about the letters that have come in the Hindustan Times. I don't have the time because the hon. Deputy Speaker is pointing out to the time. Out of the eight letters how many people are there from the northern States? Therefore, Sir, English has unified us. We are asking for it because we want to unify this country. When it was pointed out that the 1976 rules were badly made and that you are taking advantage of them, some of the over-enthusiastic people came to Bangalore and when I went to Kerala, many representations came to me and I told them: 'This Committee is not imposing Hindi'. I told them this Committee has come to review the progressive use of Hindi, how far you have made progress'. That is what I told them. Take it from me. You won't believe me. You ask the Chairman of the Committee and other Members, how I convinced my people.



**SHRI A. BALA PANJANOR** Not at all interruptions) The historical developments have been cited by Mr. Subramaniam and others and there is no point in repeating them. There should be a review. You leave it to the future generations. There are many more problems for us to solve. Let there be English and Hindi. But do not be completely, and do not impose Hindi covertly.

In the Railway offices in Bangalore all reservations are made only in Hindi. The Railway is the worst example. I know that one Member asked the station master there to speak in Hindi. That station master came to me. I told him 'I will protect you.' A lot of imposition is there indirectly in the case of Government servants.

This country requires a review of this policy. By this review, I mean let the future generation tackle the problem because we have some emotions on this matter. We can leave it to the future. We request the Prime Minister not only to give a categorical assurance on the floor of this House, we also request that he must say that a constitutional guarantee will be given.

In the last session a bill has been introduced to say that Hindi must be there in the Union Territory of Pondicherry also. For what? Not even 1 per cent of the people there understand it. Do you want a small Union Territory to waste its money on translation instead of giving food and other essentials to the people? I appeal to you let us put an end to this controversy and let us leave it to the future generations. Thank you.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** (Howrah) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir. The debate is now going on, on the basis of the resolution passed in the Chief Ministers' meeting. The resolution reflects the feelings of the non-Hindi-speaking people, particularly of the people of these 5 States whose Chief Ministers gathered there. But I should

say that this feeling is not limited only within these States. This is a wide-spread feeling among all non-Hindi-speaking people. If the Janata Party does not change, or intervene without delay, then may be, more Chief Ministers will meet in a subsequent conference and take a more strong resolution. So, this is a sufficient warning. I expect that the Janata Party and the Government will take this warning seriously.

The complaint is not about policy. The complaint is about implementation. And here the main complaint is about imposition of Hindi. Various methods have been used to impose Hindi. Some examples have been given by Mr. Sathe. One circular was read out. I have also brought one circular. But I was told that in Andhra in the villages in the interior, the milestones were written only in Hindi. What is this people do not know what is Hindi but the milestones are written in Hindi?

The names of the railway stations are written in Hindi. The lists of reservation are also in Hindi.

कई जामनीय सचिव - जामनी के भी रहते हैं, आप जा कर देखिये ।

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** Just now he had complained that they were only in Hindi.

**SHRI NIRMAL CHANDRA JAIN** (Seoni) They are also in English. You go and see there.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** I am not talking of Delhi only.

(Interruptions)

I do not accept it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the spirit in which I am raising this question is this. If there are only Hindi sign-boards in non-Hindi areas at some stations, you should be careful about it. You should see that it should not be done because it creates an adverse reaction.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It is also your duty to bring it to the notice of the Government.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:** I am coming to that also. You have to think that it creates an adverse reaction and so your cause will be defeated if these realities are not understood by the Hindi speaking people. That is the main thing. That is why they must be made more responsive, more sober and so on. There are various methods of popularising Hindi, but why impose Hindi? This imposition must be completely stopped.

Just now I have got a copy of the Report of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare This Report is relating to the year 1976-77. I do not know whether your Government has prepared it or it was prepared by the past Government. Yes, it was prepared by the past Government.

**AN HON MEMBER** During the last year's budget

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:** This point was raised by Mrs Vibha Ghosh during her last budget speech. She has just now brought this book to me to draw your attention. Some friends were also asking her to draw your attention. So, she had drawn your attention to this propaganda of Hindi. This is on page 11 of the Report (1976-77) Dr. Chunder might have known that he raised this question last time during the budget. This is about the propaganda of Hindi, giving facilities for encouraging it and prize and all that. The written instructions have also been issued on the recommendations of Official Language Implementation Committee of the Department to the members of the staff saying that they should write at least 10 notes in Hindi every month. Thus the staff is being forced to use Hindi. You may give any interpretation you like, but what will be the fate of the staff who do not know Hindi. They will be removed from their jobs. They will lose promotion facilities and other things. My point is—I hope you will try to understand it—that if you impose Hindi, it will create very adverse feelings among the non-Hindi speak-

ing people who are working there in the staff. If you do not change this view and justify this, the result will be just the opposite. That is why we have drawn the attention of the Government to these things. But, unfortunately, there has been no remedy yet.

Now I am going to refer to one letter written by comrade Namboodiripad to the Prime Minister. I want the Prime Minister to listen. This letter is dated 14th August, 1977 by Shri Namboodiripad to the Prime Minister, the General Secretary of our Party. He says:

“I am enclosing a copy of an office order issued by the Accountant-General on 17 6 1977 from Gwalior imposing the use of Hindi in all correspondence emanating from his office.”

This order has been issued under rule 3(1) of the National Language Act 1976 whereby it has been enjoined that correspondence from the central government offices to the states of Hindi belt, Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and New Delhi shall be in Hindi. On the basis of this provision of the Act it has been ordered by the Accountant-general without recording his specific reason for acting otherwise, no correspondence from his office shall emanate in English and all branch offices and section officers have been asked to scrupulously adhere to these instructions.” In these states these are many non-Hindi speaking employees who are working in these departments. Whether it is imposition of Hindi or not, you should give a reply. . . . (Interruptions). From the reaction of some of our friends, it appears they have not understood the significance of this thing; this is unfortunate.

**AN HON MEMBER:** We have understood.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:** If you have understood it, you should rectify it. The language issue is a very

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

sensitive issue. Our country is not a uni-lingual country, it is a multilingual, multi-national country .. (Interruptions). You may not accept multi-national'. But it is a historical fact. I am not quarrelling over that word multi-national', but it is a multi-lingual country and the states have been divided on the basis of the language for the development of each linguistic group of people. According to us it is linguistic nationality. Full scope must be given to all the languages to develop freely and fully to keep the unity of the country .. (Interruptions) we will discuss the definition of nationality later on. But India, like the Soviet Union is also a multi-national country, each nationality having its own language. The states are divided on the basis of the language, linguistic nationality, so the state structure is federal. To keep the unity of India it is very essential that all the languages must have equal opportunity, equal status for their full development and growth.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What about China?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Do not divert me; I will talk with you about China. The question of language must be considered in this background. That is why all nationalities, all linguistic people must be given full scope to express their views in their own mother tongue. This arrangement must also be made inside Parliament. They should not simply say that some of the languages will be allowed and others will not be allowed; that condition must be changed.

PROF. R. K. AMIN (Surendranagar): Can I ask for a clarification?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; if you ask, he will take more time.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: If I get time, I can explain.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not want members to put questions and allow more time to you to reply to them.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: So this question is to be seen in the broader sense of the overall unity of India. That is why the question of revision of the Centre and State relationship has also come in this context. Do we want full growth of all the linguistic nationalities of India or not? And for the full growth of the linguistic nationalities full autonomy for each linguistic State is absolutely essential. That is why the question of real federation has become the demand arising out of all the linguistic States and it is becoming an issue for national discussion and national debate. So the question of language must also be viewed in the context of this multinational composition of India.

Despite drawing the attention of the Government things have not changed and one stern reality must be admitted that there are Hindi chauvinists. Hindi chauvinists are there even inside the Janata Party. If this reality is not admitted, you will not be able to fight this chauvinism. Unless you fight Hindi chauvinism, the peaceful advance of Hindi will be more and more obstructed by the chauvinist stand by antagonising the non-Hindi people, rising against Hindi, and taken advantage of by disruptive elements. This does not mean that we do not want encouragement of Hindi. We are in favour of encouragement of Hindi but Hindi should be allowed to be gradually accepted by other non-Hindi speaking people.

It should be absolutely on the basis of voluntariness. The question of emergence of a link language will be solved. It is our party's stand that link language should gradually emerge due to the far more closer inter-course—economic, political, cultural, social. And gradually people will develop one common language. It may be Hindi along with various other vocabularies integrated in Hindi or it



may be something different. But that process must be encouraged, so that voluntarily some link language emerges out of growing inter course in the people of different languages. That is why for the bigger interest of the integration of India as a whole which is composed of multi-national linguistic people and where the States are reconstructed on the basis of languages, there should be real federal structure and the relation of Centre and State should be reviewed and the question of language should be absolutely on the principle of voluntariness. It should be left to the non-Hindi speaking people to decide whether they will accept Hindi or not or how much time they will take.

In this respect I want to draw your attention to two things. One is the question of Urdu language. Here also Urdu speaking people have a very bitter feeling—that they had been discriminated against. We raised this question repeatedly that where more than 10 per cent of these people speak in Urdu, Urdu should be considered as a second language such as in U.P. But that status has not been given to Urdu language. We think that Urdu language must be given the due status. There is the question of other languages also.

So is the question of Nepalese language. West Bengal Government has accepted Nepalese language in Darjeeling area. Unanimous Resolution has been passed by the West Bengal Assembly supported by Janata, Congress, all Opposition and the ruling party. They have unanimously supported the demand of the Nepali people who are residing in India that Nepali language shall be incorporated in the Eighth Schedule. It should be given the status of one of the national language. We have brought non-official Bills in the last Parliament and certain non-official Bills were also brought in this Parliament. The Sikkim Assembly unanimously passed this Resolution demanding that Nepali language should be given the status of a national language.

age to be incorporated in the Eighth Schedule. Recently—I have got a copy Tripura Assembly passed a unanimous resolution. So, three Assemblies passed unanimous resolutions. Now, it is high time that the Government should accept their view and incorporate Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule and give the Nepali language the status of a national language.

The question of language is very sensitive. It is very touchy. That is why, when the question of unity of India is involved, the Janata Government should give serious consideration to the Resolution passed by these five Chief Ministers Conference.

श्री राज नारायण (रायबरेली)

श्रीमान्, आज इस भाषा सम्बन्धी विवाद के भाग लेते हुए मुझे प्रसन्नता हो रही है क्योंकि बहुत सी चीजें जो दबी हुई थीं वह उभर कर के ऊपर आ गईं। सबसे पहले मैं धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ अपने मित्र श्री साठे को, उन्होंने एक बहुत ही सही खोज की है जिसके लिये वह धन्यवाद को पाते हैं। और उन्होंने यह कहा कि अनुच्छेद 343 के अनुसार संघ की राजभाषा हिन्दी और लिपि देवनागरी होगी। इनका कहना कि जो 15 साल का समय दे दिया गया वह गलत था, श्री साठे के मुखारविन्द से यह भाव प्रकट होना अद्भुत ही वह धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं। और वह गलती को सहस्र कर रहे हैं जो गलती अब तक के पूर्ववर्त शासकों ने की। उनको सोचना चाहिये कि आखिर यह गलती हुई क्यों? यह चीज टपक गई कहीं से? हमारे यहां इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट ने जस्टिस मुथम ने यह कहा जब उनकी बिदाई होने लगी और तत्पश्चात् ऐडवोकेटस ने उन को फेयरवेल दिया तो उन्होंने कहा कि मुझे इस बात का बड़ी दुःख है कि जब अंग्रेजी राज्य ही टूट गया तो अंग्रेजी भाषा भारत की अदासतों में क्यों चले? वह इंग्लिशमैन थे, वह जानते थे कि किस तरह से डेमोक्रेसी भेदने होती है, इसलिये उसने ऐसा कहा।

[श्री राज नारायण]

अब इसी के साथ साथ मैं साठे जी को यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह अनुच्छेद 351 को पढ़ें :

“हिन्दी भाषा की प्रसार-वृद्धि करना, उस का विकास करना ताकि वह भारत की सामाजिक संस्कृति के सब तत्वों की अभिव्यक्ति का माध्यम हो सके, तथा उस की आत्मीयता में हस्तक्षेप किये बिना हिन्दुस्तानी और अष्टम अनुसूची में उल्लिखित अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं के रूप, शैली और पदावलि को ध्यात्मसात करते हुए तथा जहाँ आवश्यक या बांछनीय हो वहाँ उस के शब्द-भंडार के लिये मुष्यत संस्कृत से तथा गणत शैली उल्लिखित भाषाओं से शब्द ग्रहण करते हुए उस की समृद्धि सुनिश्चित करना सब का कर्तव्य होगा।”

इस बारे में भारत सरकार ने क्या किया ? श्री अन्नर इस कर्तव्य का पालन भारत सरकार ने किया होता तो हमारे माननीय अतिथि जी ने जो अपने हृदय के उद्वारो को रखा, शायद न रखते । श्री हमारे माननीय मुख्यमन्त्री, मंत्री अकस्मिंत हैं कि वह इस समय यहाँ से चले भये, ए. 5 संसदीय प्रथा की यह श्रुती है कि जब कोई कहे तो इनमें की भी सुनें । कम से कम उन्होंने बार बार मेरा नाम लिया, और बिना हमको सुन वह चले भये । उनको सुनना चाहिये या कि हम क्या कहते हैं । मैं यहां इस बात को साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं कभी भी नहीं चाहता कि हिन्दी किसी पर लादी जावे । हिन्दी के लाने जाने के हम सत्ता विरोधी हैं और अगर जबसंती किसी राज्य पर यह लादी जायेगी तो उसकी मढ़ाई मढ़ने के लिये भी मैं तैयार रहूँगा ।

हमारे देश में हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी है, तमिल है, तुलु, उड़िया, मलयालम, बराठी, गुजराती, बंगला, आत्मीय और उर्दू है । इस राष्ट्र के अन्तर जिसकी भी भाषाएँ हैं वह सब राष्ट्रीय भाषाएँ हैं । इसलिये

इसमें किसी को मुतायता नहीं होना चाहिये कि हम तमिल को हिन्दी के अन्तर्गत देखें हैं या तुलु, उड़िया, कन्नड़, गुजराती को कम महत्व देते हैं । हम बराबर यह मानते जाये हैं कि हिन्दी और तमिल दोनों बनी बहिन हैं, एक बहन बड़ी है और एक छोटी है । छोटी बहिन की तरफकी में बड़ी बहिन मत्स्य होती है । अगर बहिन अच्छी है तो छोटी पूले, फले, विकसित हो, बड़ी बहिन की यह सदासयता बराबर रहेगी । इसलिये बड़ी बहिन और छोटी बहिन में कभी झगडा नहीं होता है । जो कसही होती है, वह झगडा करती है । हिन्दी और तमिल कसही नहीं है । वास्तव में झगडा है कहाँ ? झगडा वहाँ आकर बडा हो जाता है, जहाँ अयेजी लादी जाती है ।

“अ” को हिन्दी में प्रमुख मानते हैं, उनका नाम “अ” से शुरू होता है इसलिये मैं कहना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन हमारे सम्मानित सचस्य श्री अरविन्द ने जो सारी बातें नहीं (अव्यवधान)

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR Let him call me Bala Pajanor' This is a beautiful word in Tamil Let him pronounce Pajanor'

श्री राज नारायण : क्या जाना कहूँ ?

अब हम इनकी बातों का अर्थ दे रहे हैं कि वह हिन्दी आभिनियम नहीं है । हम साठे साठह से भी कहना चाहते हैं कि भाषण तो उन्होंने बहुत लाभमय भाषा में किया, पर बात ज्यादा कर दी, जिसका अर्थ यह बिना नहीं राहा जा सकता । उन्होंने यह बिना कि बिहार संकुचित राष्ट्रियता का है, संकुचित राष्ट्रवाद, आभिनियम का प्रतीक हमारे मित ने किया जिसको बाद में बोलने बडा हुआ हूँ ।

बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, दिल्ली, हिदवाभा, पंजाब, त्रिभाषण प्रदेश, राष्ट्रवान और मध्य प्रदेश हमारे मित इसको आभिनियम कहते हैं । हमारे वहाँ 3 सबसे प्रधान सब हैं—पठना पत्र प्रधान नहीं का है, उस पर

हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र का कल्पित नहीं है, राष्ट्रपति हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र का नहीं है, इस सभ का अध्यक्ष हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र का नहीं है और इस सभ का उपाध्यक्ष हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र का नहीं है ।

अब हमारे अयोजितान के सम्मानित सदस्यों ने जो कुछ बाले कही हैं, मैं उनका जबाब दे रहा हूँ, श्रीरज के साथ सुनना चाहिये । अगर हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार राज्यों में समिक नी प्राप्तीयता होती या संकुचित राष्ट्रीयता होती तो क्या उसका यहाँ उदाहरण होता ? प्रत्यक्ष देखो, कर्म से ।

श्री बल्लभ साठे : अब आप पछता रहे हैं ।

श्री राज नारायण : जिर्नजात को हमने किया, उसमें पछतावा क्यों ?

इसी के साथ-साथ यह भी बतला देना चाहना है कि जब मे जनता पार्टी की सरकार आई है, जो बड़ी बड़ी सविसेख हैं, फाइने-नियल इंस्टीट्यूट हैं, आप इसे जरा खोलकर देख लेना, कि वह कौन लोग हैं ? हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र का शायद एक भी नहीं है । जिनकी फिनांस इस्टीट्यूशन हैं, उनमें वीर-हिन्दी-भाषाभाषी क्षेत्र के लोग हैं । वह हिन्दी-भाषा भाषी क्षेत्र की नहीं विशाल छाती है—यह उबारता है, जिन को हिन्दी-भाषाभाषी क्षेत्र अपनाता है ।

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI.** It is not a concession. It is on account of their talent. Because they are talented.... (Interruptions).

श्री राज नारायण : बजट को जो देख लिया जाये कि बजट का कितना हिस्सा किस राज्य को दिया जाता है । भारत के स्वाधीनता संघाम में उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में क्या किया ?

श्री कृष्ण चक्र इत्यादि (गुर्गापुर) : संघाम के कुछ नहीं किया ।

श्री राज नारायण : इस में सब का भा जाता है—उत्तर-पूर्वी भारत, मध्य भारत, पश्चिमी भारत । यानी मैं सटीय क्षेत्र की बात नहीं कहता ।

अगर साठे साहब अपने तर्क में ईमानदार हैं, तो कांग्रेस की जो तीस साल की सरकार रही है, उस की भर्त्सना होनी चाहिए कि उस ने संविधान के अनुच्छेद 351 के अनुसार हिन्दी के पैठ को बाढा क्यों नहीं किया, उर्र ने हिन्दी में सब भारतीय भाषाओं के कर्ष्यों का समावेश क्यों नहीं कराया । अगर ऐसा किया जाता, तो कितना बडा काम हो गया होता ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि भाषा के सवाल पर मुझे बार-बार जेल काटनी पड़ी है । मैं लखनऊ जेल से हाई कोर्ट में आया । मैंने कहा कि मैं अपनी मातृभाषा में अपने मुकदमे को खुद धार्यु करूंगा, मैं कोई बकील नहीं रखूंगा । मि० ए० एन० मुल्सा जब ये, जो यहा आ गये हैं । उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं, हाई कोर्ट की भाषा अंग्रेजी है । मैं जानता हूँ कि मामलीय सभ्य कीडर आप दि आपोजीशन हैं सा ग्रेजुगट है वह अंग्रेजी में बोलना चाहते है तो अंग्रेजी में बोलें । मैंने कहा कि आप उर्दू के अरुठे साथर है आप हिन्दुस्तानी जानते हैं इस लिए आप मुझे अपनी मातृभाषा में बोलने बीजिए । फिर यही हुआ कि मुझे कनेटेक्ट आफ कोर्ट में तीन महीने की सजा कर दी गई और मैंने काटी ।

मैं तिहाड जेल से सुप्रीम कोर्ट में आया । मैंने श्री हिदायत उल्ला से कहा कि अपने मुकदमे की वीरवी मैं खुद करूंगा । उन्होंने कहा कि किसी प्रबोकेट से करा बीजिए । मैंने कहा कि वीरवी मुकदमे की जान होती है और वीरवी बही कर सकता है जो मुकदमे की खूबी को जाने, अगर मैं किसी बकील, एडवोकेट को रखूंगा, तो वह बही करेगा, मैंने उमे कनाऊंगा, मैं अपने मुकदमे को



SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: But he also said, "Don't close the windows."

श्री राम नारायण : अब मैं जरा सट्टे साहब को एनवाइटेन करना चाहता हूँ । यह सब मैंने एक जगह नोट करके रखा है क्योंकि यह प्रबलन रोज ही फेस करती पड़ती है :

The vehemence of Gandhi's opposition to English to our life can be illustrated from another source. In a letter dated 24th July, 1918 to Balvant Rai Thakore, Gandhi wrote:

"I see that it will be necessary to agitate for introducing a new section in the Penal Code when we have a Parliament of our own "

When two parties know the same language and one of them writes to others or talks with him in English, the party so doing will be liable to a minimum of six months' rigorous imprisonment "

SHRI A BALA PAJANOR Did Gandhi write in Hindi or English?

SHRI RAJ NARAIN English

यह सब के लिए लिखा है । अगर आप दो भाषमी हैं, दोनों गुजराती जानते हैं और अंग्रेजी भी जानते हैं (अव्यवधान) अगर आप फेंच जानते हैं तो मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि मैं पैरिस हवाई अड्डे पर मास्को जाने के लिए उतरा । मैं जानता था हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी । मैं गया मैनेजर के पास । मास्को का हवाई जहाज उड़ गया था । मैंने मैनेजर से अंग्रेजी में कहा कि आप कृपया मेरा कन्डोबस्त कर दीजिए । उसने सुना ही नहीं । (अव्यवधान) तो इंग्लिश के प्रति फेंचने में इतनी हेटेरेड है । कोई भी फेंचने में अंग्रेजी सुनना पसन्द नहीं करता । (अव्यवधान) वहाँ पर मैंने एक भाषमी देखा जो भारतीय मातृम हुआ । मैंने उससे कहा सुनिये, आपका क्या नाम है, उसने कहा कृष्ण कुमार । मैंने पूछा कहाँ के रहने वाले हैं,

us without allying the discriminatory use of English literature ... Tilak and Ram Mohan would have been far greater men if they had not had the contagion of English learning. Ram Mohan and Tilak were pigmies who had no hold over the people compared with Chaitanya, Sarkar, Kabir and Nanak."

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBALAH (Nandyal): Which Sarkar?

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJ NARAIN If you have want to know something, then have patience

यह जो नानक हैं, कबीर हैं, चैतन्य महाप्रभु हैं, ये सब तिलक से, राम मोहन राम से कहीं ज्यादा बड़े हैं, उन के मुकाबिले में ये पिही, हैं बौने हैं, पिगमीज हैं ।

(Interruptions)

वहाँ पर जितने बड़े हुए हैं, इक्विडिग एवरी-बाडी, इन से सबसे अच्छी अंग्रेजी गाँधी जी लिखते थे । आप उनकी किताब पढ़ें, तो आपको मालूम हो जायेगा कि वे बहुत अच्छी अंग्रेजी लिखते थे । (अव्यवधान) आप सुनिये ।

A third argument favouring the continuance of English was that it maintains the unity among the Indians as it provides them with a medium to exchange views "

This is your argument, this is the argument of Mr Subramaniam.

"Countering this argument Gandhi wrote.

If it was the question of a few thousands of our educated men, English would certainly do But I am sure you will not be satisfied with that. You and I want millions of people to establish inter-provincial contacts, and they cannot obviously do so through English for generations to come, if ever. There is no reason why they should learn English."

[श्री राव नारायण]

उसने कहा बम्बई का रहने वाला हूँ। मैंने पूछा कि तबे दिन से यहाँ पर हैं उसने कहा 6 साल से हूँ। मैंने कहा आप कौन जानते हैं, उसने कहा जी हाँ, क्लक। मैंने कहा कि ऐसा मामला है, आप मैनेजर से बात करके ठीक कर दें। तब उसने मैनेजर से कौन से कहा थीर विधिन प्यू मिनिट्स उसने धरौज कर दिया। उसने कहा यस, यह मेरी ड्यूटी है, आप बियना होते हुए मास्को चले जायें। तो यह है भाषा का मामला। (ब्यबधान)

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ जनता पार्टी के सम्मानित सदस्यों से कि राजघाट, गांधी जी की समाधि पर उन्होंने जपथ ली है (ब्यबधान) मैं भी वहाँ था तभी बोल रहा हूँ, यह जपथ ली है कि गांधियन बे, गांधी जी के रास्ते पर चलकर समाजवाद का निर्माण करेंगे। गांधी ने कहा है—जब अपनी पालियामेन्ट होगी, तो हम तरह से भाषा के सवाल को हल करना है। अब यह पालियामेन्ट गांधी की विचारधारा के अनुकूल है या नहीं—इस प्रश्न का उत्तर हमें जनता के सामने देना है।

'Gandhi was also opposed to the use of English in legislative bodies and even in Congress meetings (Interruptions).

SHRI O V. ALAGESAN (Arkonam): Sir, we would like to know from what he is reading.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Please don't disturb

श्री राव नारायण : मैंने गांधी जी के कोटेशन का संकलन किया है—भाषा सम्बन्धी मसले पर थीर उस की हवाई एक मिनट ने "लैम्बेक प्रावधान इन इंडिया—गांधी जी" के नाम से एक छोटी बुकलेट के रूप में छपा दिया है। आप चाहें तो यह आप को भी मिल जायगी, लेकिन मेरा समय बराब मत कीजिये, मेरी बात सुन कीजिये।

re. Language Policy (Contd.)

'Gandhi was also opposed to the use of English in legislative bodies and even in Congress meetings. About the 1920 Congress meeting he said:

"The Presidential speech suffers from being in English. It was painful to see him labouring through his speech spoken in the foreign language before an audience of 15000 people. Not more than one-seventh of them could follow his English."

प्रो० पी० जी० नाचलंकर (गांधीनगर) . आप यह सब किस कांटेक्स्ट में बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री राव नारायण : मेरी जितनी स्पीच हुई है, वह अंग्रेजी के बारे में है।

प्रो० पी० जी० नाचलंकर : लेकिन कांटेक्स्ट क्या है—यह तो बतलाइये।

श्री राव नारायण : 1920 में कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन हुआ था, उस में प्रेसिडेन्ट का एड्रेस अंग्रेजी भाषा में था। गांधी जी ने कहा—अंग्रेजी भाषा में देने के कारण इन्होंने अपने एड्रेस का चार्ज जो दिया है थीर 15 हजार जनता जो वहाँ पर उपस्थित है, उस का 1/60 हिस्सा भी उस भाषण को समझ नहीं पाई है। यह गांधी जी का कहना है।

मैं तबिलनाबु के बारे में बतलाऊँगा।

"The proceedings of the Congress shall be conducted, as far as possible, in Hindustani"

अब कांग्रेस की प्रोसीडिंग्स के बारे में गांधी जी कहते हैं . . .

श्री सरस्विका बाना कन्नौर : यह जो पुरानी स्टोरी है।

SHRI VASANT BATHI: I would like to know how long we are sitting. If the debate is to continue tomorrow (Interruptions), Let us take the consent of the House.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I am very sorry, but the Business Advisory Committee's report says we shall sit till 8.00 p.m. today on this Motion and this was adopted by the House. Therefore, there is no question of taking consent. We will sit late, and whether it should be....

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** The House can also reconsider. I believe that, instead of sitting till 8 o'clock, we may have it tomorrow and continue. After all, going on indefinitely is also a strenuous thing.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** If we don't sit late, we won't get any other time: every day we are having business.

**SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:** In any case, this debate will spill over to tomorrow.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** That is a different matter. As far as today is concerned, we are sitting till 8 o'clock: whether you want to extend it further after 8 o'clock to tomorrow is a different matter. The Speaker will come here and he will decide.

Mr. Raj Narain, you may continue.

Please finish it as early as possible

**SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI (Agra):** This discussion was to be taken up at 2.00 p.m., but it was not taken up at 2.00. If that decision could be changed, then this decision also could be changed.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** It was changed with the consent of the House. We did not stop the discussion; we did not postpone the discussion. Did we? Because we started late by half an hour, we may sit for another half an hour. Is that your point? I can take the sense of the House if you want. I may tell the hon. Members that, if they postpone the discussion now, it will be very difficult to find enough time again for the discussion. You may sit for half an hour more or one hour more. Keeping what I have said in mind, you can decide whatever you want.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** May I submit, Sir, that we have already decided to sit upto 8.00 p.m.? Therefore, I request that we may continue upto 8.00 p.m. and then at 8.00 p.m. we may decide, in view of the debate being important, whether we want more time ...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** That is a different question. We can decide that at 8.00 p.m. But are the Members prepared to sit upto 8 o'clock?

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** We have already agreed to that.

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we very well understand the importance of the subject. But when the matter was brought up before the Business Advisory Committee, it was made very clear that, in view of the schedule of work that this Session has to get through, it will be possible to provide only six hours for this. It was, therefore, a unanimous decision of the Business Advisory Committee that the House would discuss this subject from 2.00 to 8.00 p.m. today. This report, as you have pointed out, has been accepted by the House. If it is the pleasure of the House to go on changing the decisions as suggested, then it becomes very difficult for the Government to arrange the business that it has to get through in the House. Therefore, I appeal to the hon. Members through you, Sir, in spite of the importance of the subject and the feelings, that we continue this discussion upto 8.00 p.m. Government, at least, will not be in a position to accept the proposal to extend the time or postpone the discussion for another day. It may be extended upto 8.30 p.m., but the discussion must conclude today.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Shall we continue till 8.00 p.m.?

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:** Yes.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** The sense of the House is that we sit upto 8.00 p.m.

MR. BAJ NARAIN: Please conclude in another five minutes.

श्री राज नारायण श्रीमन्, यह जो बीच में डिस्टर्बेंस हुआ और उस में हमारा समय चला गया, उस को हमारे टाइम में से काट दीजिए और हमें और समय दीजिए।

सभापति महोदय : आप का समय तो पहले ही खत्म हो गया था लेकिन आप को पाच मिनट और दे दिये हैं।

श्री राज नारायण मेरे मित्र सुनें। मैं गांधी जी को कोट कर रहा हूँ

"It was at his instance that Kanpur Congress made a Constitutional amendment The amendment laid down

"The proceedings of Congress shall be conducted, as far as possible, in Hindustani"

यह तो गांधी जी ने कांग्रेस के कांस्टीट्यूशन में एम्बेडेट करवाया।

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Bardagera) Hindustani.

श्री राज नारायण: गांधी जी कहते हैं कि हमारी हिन्दुस्तानी वह है जो देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी जाए, तो हिन्दी और पश्चिम में लिखी जाए, तो उर्दू। गांधी जी इसमें फर्क नहीं करते थे। ये तो कांग्रेस के लोग करने लगे।

अब मैं गांधी जी को फिर कोट करता हूँ -

"To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them", wrote Gandhi in Hind Swaraja. Thus English was to be replaced forthwith and this could be done, Gandhi was convinced ...."

गांधी जी कहते हैं कि अगर हम करोड़ों, करोड़ों, करोड़ों लोगों को अंग्रेजी सिखा देंगे तो सब

का मतलब यह हुआ कि हम उन को बसान बनाना चाहते हैं। यह इम्प्रेसिवन भीच है, यह नहीं हो सकता।

अब मैं जल्दी जल्दी कुछ अपनी बातें कह देना चाहता हूँ।

देखिये अब हमारी बात भी प्रा रही है। यह नेशनल इन्टरनेशन की बात है। इसको हम सब समझते हैं। माननीय कर्ण सिंह जी जरा इसको सुन लें। नेशनल इन्टरनेशन अंग्रेजों के पहले से यहा है। आज भी ब्रिटीश का पुजारी केरल का राबल है। ब्रिटीश का गंगाजल रामेश्वरम पर जा कर चढ़ता है। धम्म, कायकप से कामला का पुजारी आज भी कन्नोज का मिथा है। जगन्नाथपुरी का पुजारी आज भी बनारस का पण्डा है। यह है देश में राष्ट्रीय एकता, सांस्कृतिक एकता और सामाजिक एकता। इन तमाम एकताओं के बारे में हमारे मित्र कहते हैं कि आप पुरानी बात क्यों करते हो। वह देश और समाज प्रगति नहीं कर सकता है जिसमें अपने भूत की धनभूमि न हो, वर्तमान का ज्ञान न हो और भविष्य का स्वप्न न हो। हम ये तीनों चीजें रखते हैं और कहते हैं कि जो जितना भी पिछड़ा है, उसकी उतनी ही सहायता कर के उसे आगे बढ़ाओ।

यह जो आपके सामने मामला है, इसका हूबें चार तरह से हल निकालना है। जरा देखिये, इसका किस हल निकलेगा। हमारे बुजुर्गप्यम जी अभी बोले, हमारे दूसरे मित्र बोले और अभी जो हमारे पूर्व कला बोले उन्होंने भी केन्द्रीय नौकरियों की बात कही सारा झगड़ा था कर बढ़ा होता है केन्द्रीय नौकरियों पर। हम ने एक मतवा 'अंग्रेजी हटाओ' सम्मेलन मद्रास में किया था और इंदिराबाय में कहा था कि हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्र के लोग यह फैसला कर लें कि पाँच लाख तक या साठ लाख तक केन्द्रीय नौकरियों में अंग्रेजी भाषा-भाषी लोग जिसे चाहें,



उच्च के बाद हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी लोग बिदे जाएँ। अमर पांच साल या सात साल बाबी बात मंजूर न हो तो उन्हें पापुलेसन के आधार पर डिप्रेजेन्टेन दे दो। आखिर कहीं न कहीं तो हल निकलना चाहिए, यह खिन्नर्षी हमेशा हमेशा कैंबे चलेगी।

इस सम्बन्ध में इस सदन के सामने चार पहलू हैं। आप चाहे कोई तटभाषा देस भाषा बना दें। किसी भी तटभाषा को चाहे वह तमिल हो, तेलुगु हो, कन्नड हो, मलयालम हो, बंगला हो, किसी एक तटभाषा को राष्ट्र की भाषा बना दे।

अगर यह नहीं करते हैं तो दूसरा पहलू ले लें। देश बहुभाषी बना दें। केन्द्र में बहुत सी भाषाएं रखें। हिन्दी भी रखें, तमिल भी रखें, तेलुगु भी रखें, बंगला भी रखें। यह हमने एक साथ दो हल आपके सामने रखे।

धन तीसरा हल बीजिए—देश हिन्दी-भाषी अने संरक्षण के साथ। हिन्दी को केन्द्र में रखो, अमर संरक्षण के साथ अहिन्दी भाषा-भाषी लोगों के लिए संरक्षण हो।

चौथा बीजिए। मध्य प्रदेश से अंग्रेजी फ़ोरम हटायी जाए, मध्य प्रदेश से, तार, पलटन इत्यादि से भी हटायी जाए, चाहे तटवेस केन्द्र में अंग्रेजी चलाएँ। अमर तमिलनाडु के, केरल के, पाण्डिचेरी के कर्नाटक के, आंध्रप्रदेश के, पश्चिम बंगाल के लोग चाहते हैं कि केन्द्र में अंग्रेजी चले, तो आप केन्द्र में अंग्रेजी चलाएँ।

मे हमने चार विकल्प आपके सामने रखे हैं। इसमें चौथा विकल्प यह भी है कि हिन्दी किसी पर लायी न जाए। आप तक कभी भी किसी की यह कल्पना नहीं रही है। हमारे बारे में चार चार कहा गया कि हम हिन्दी लागूना चाहते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब अंग्रेजी हटाओ का नारा देते हैं, हिन्दी लागूने की बात नहीं करते हैं। किसी भी एंगल जाल विधान से, किसी भी दृष्टिकोण से, किसी

भी नुस्ते नजर से अगर आप देखें तो अंग्रेजी देसी भाषा नहीं है, मातृभाषा नहीं है, राष्ट्रीय भाषा नहीं है। किसी राष्ट्रीय नेता ने आज तक अंग्रेजी को देस की भाषा नहीं माना है, बिदेसी भाषा ही इसको माना है। इसलिए मैंने चार सम्भावनाएँ बताई हैं। इनके अलावा और कोई सम्भावना नहीं है। इन चार सम्भावनाओं पर किसी दूसरे दिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि विचार हो।

एक अंतिम बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। अनावश्यक ढंग से और कुछ लोग जाने अनजाने में मूझ पर चोट करते रहते हैं। मैं जानता हूँ उनकी चोट कहा है और यह भी जानता हूँ कि हम पर ही चोट क्यों करते हैं। वे चोट वही करते हैं जहा सबस्टान्स फोर्स होती है। उसी पर वे चोट करने, पिडिबियों पर चोट वे नहीं करेंगे। इसीलिए राज नारायण, राज नारायण, राज नारायण का हल्ला मचा हुआ है। क्यों मचा हुआ है? क्यों उनकी छाती फट रही है? क्या इंदिरा गांधी को हराने वाला कोई और ना? उनको हराने से अमर देस और बिदेस में राज नारायण की सोहरत हुई है तो उनको जलन क्यों हो? जलन से छाती क्यों फटे? इन सब बातों को और किसी मीके पर मैं विस्तृत रूप से रक्खा।

तमान उर्दू के अखबारों में प्रचार हो रहा है हमारे खिलाफ। कुछ खानदानी गुलाम हैं, परम्परागत गुलाम हैं जो ऐसा करते हैं, कहते हैं कि राज नारायण उर्दू का विरोधी है। उर्दू के लिए छः बार मैंने कहा है कि हमने हिन्दी जानने से पहले उर्दू जानी थी। हम लोगों के अपने घरों में मुंशी रखे जाते थे उर्दू पढ़ाने के लिए, फारसी पढ़ाने के लिए, पहले हम अलिक, बे, ये, ते, टे, से, जीम, ये हे ओ आदि पढ़ते थे और बाद में क, ख, ग, घ, ङ। लेकिन मैं क्या कहूँ . . .

श्री ग्नीलाल (विजगीर) : आप उर्दू में नाम लिखना जानते हैं ?

श्री राज नारायण : जहाँ मैं रहता हूँ मेरे घर के बाहर हिन्दी उर्दू दोनों में नाकपट्ट है।

बुधा की जान है, नाबीज, बीज बन डीठे, बी बीसकर से से बामकर बन डीठे ।

एक धीर बात कही जाती है कि राज नारायण नोटकी करते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस भाषण में आपने हुमे नोटकी करते हुए पावा ? नोटकी का नाटक कहाँ मने किया ?

श्री धरने मिन श्री समर मुखर्जी को विस्तृत उत्तर देना नहीं चाहता हूँ। उनको बोधा सा जबाब देना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने धरने भाषण में — नैमान धीर नैमनैमिटी का कर्क नहीं समझा है। उन्होंने इन दोनों को एक कर दिया है। कह दिया है —

'Nationalities are referred to a nation India consists of many nationalities This is not multinational ! There is a vast difference between nationality and nation

This is the definition of nation'

1943 का जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का रेजोल्यूशन है उसको धारण देखें। उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि वेग को कई टुकड़ों में बांट दो। बिहार बिहारियों के लिए, राजस्थान राजपूतों के लिए, पंजाब पंजाबियों के लिए उस तथ्य को वे यहाँ न लाएँ। मैं एक नेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ। गांधी जी को नेतृत्व में राष्ट्रीयता पनपी थी। जब तक राष्ट्रीयता की भावना प्रबल थी तब तक क्षेत्रीयता और भाषा का सवाल नहीं उठा। मैं बराबर चाहता हूँ कि हर राज्य में उस राज्य की भाषा राजकाज और शिक्षा का माध्यम हो और उसमें उसका काम चले। तमिलनाडु में तमिल राजकाज और शिक्षा का माध्यम हो, पश्चिमी बंगाल में बंगाल में राजकाज क्यों न चले, क्यों न वह वहाँ पर शिक्षा का माध्यम हो, केरल में कन्नड़ क्यों न चले, असमनाम क्यों न चले ? मसयलम चले, कन्नड़ चले, यानी उस राज्य की ही क्षेत्रीय भाषा

ही उसमें सम्पूर्ण राजकाज चले, कन्नड़ी का काम चले, शिक्षा का माध्यम उच्चतम शिक्षा का माध्यम वहाँ की क्षेत्रीय भाषाएँ हों, सबके सिधे हुमे बराबर लभते रहे हूँ। तमिलनाडु में भी हुमेने जा कर

उपाधयल महोदय . माननीय राज नारायण जी, धन धाप खाल कीजिये ।

श्री राज नारायण जो हुमेने चार विकल्प रखे हैं मैं निवेदन करना उनके ऊपर फिर किसी दिन बहुत ही धीर समस्या का समाधान निकले। बरना एक दिन के विबाध से समस्या का समाधान नहीं निकलता है। इस भाषा के सवाल को धरने किसी ने समझा तो वह डा० लोहिया से धीर उन्होंने सपोड किया पठित जवाहर लाल नेहरू को सदा इन मामले में धारण देखें उनकी कुशलता भी वह जाते हैं दक्षिण में तो वहाँ कहते थे कि धरने मैं प्रधान मंत्री नहीं रहूंगा तो हिन्दी भाषा लादी जायेगी। चलो दक्षिण धा गया। उत्तर में धारणे तो बोलते थे धरने मैं प्रधान मंत्री नहीं रहूंगा तो दक्षिण चलन हो जायगा। चलो उत्तर को भी फसा लिया। यह पठित जवाहर लाल नेहरू से। हुमेना कहा, नये लागो को नहीं मानूय है पुराने लागो को मानूय है एक रिटिन धीर धर्ना टिन एपीमेंट या पठित नेहरू धीर ब्रिटिन इपीरियामिन्स के बीच की धरिजी बराबर कायम रखेंगे। उसी एपीमेंट के मुताबिक भीमती इन्धिरा गांधी चलीं। धन धाज के मासकों से कहूंगा कि इन्धिरा गांधी गई, उनके रास्ते पर चलने की कोशिश मत करो।

SHRI M N GOVINDAN NAIR  
(Trivandrum): Mr Deputy-Speaker,  
Sir, before I start my speech I want  
to remind you of the motion which  
we are discussing:

"That this House takes note of  
the resolution passed at the Con-  
ference of the Chief Ministers of  
the Southern States regarding the  
language policy"

So, when I was hearing the speeches made here, I felt that we were going to discuss the entire language issue de novo. That is not the intention of this motion. The Chief Ministers of the Southern States had passed a resolution drawing the attention of the Union Government to certain apprehensions which they are having in mind and here we have to discuss whether the apprehensions noted in their resolution are genuine and what steps have we to take to redress them. I think that is the scope of the discussion and not bringing in the entire issue of language.

Here I find everything—from the very history of the language issue—is being discussed excepting examining what the Chief Ministers have pointed out as to whether that is correct or not. Now, my friend who spoke here quoted certain rules and said under the cover of those rules different department are taking action and that is affecting a large number of employees employed in different Central Government departments. Shri Samar Mukherjee quoted about the Education Department. Other letters were quoted by other members. Even today during the Question Hour the Railway Minister had to tell us that he will be instructing the Station Masters or railway authorities that the list of reservation will be published both in English and Hindi.

Sir, again, during the Question Hour, the difficulties felt by other people were pointed out.

Therefore, from all these, one thing is very clear.

Utilising the rules which were quoted by my hon. friend from Pondicherry.... (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: ...Mr. Aravinda Bala Pajanon....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is a long name.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Sweet name—Aravinda, Bala, Pajanon. It is a sweet name.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unlike the person.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It is a sweet name. He is a sweet person. He can speak in a sweet tone. All that I agree. But the point is this. The hon. Member, Shri Samar Mukherjee quoted a letter which has been sent by me. The point is, in the A.G.'s office, people from different States are there. If noting is to be done in Hindi, what will be their future, Sir? The same is the case with regard to the Postal Department. Not only that. The promotions are, in the main, decided on the basis of their understanding of it. This is the chief handicap which imposition of Hindi is placing on them. The view held by them is not merely the view of only the five Chief Ministers who met in Madras, but this is the view which is being shared by all the non-Hindi speaking States. So this is a serious question. The instance of Bihar has been pointed out. There are many people from other States who are there in Bihar. Therefore, the apprehensions pointed out by the Chief Ministers Conference are genuine and these should be removed.

Secondly, what is it that they have demanded? The controversy of language is one thing which has been going on for a long time. And finally the nation has come to an agreement on certain formulations accepted by the previous Prime Minister, especially, Jawaharlal Nehru. That is the Three Language Formula, and the guarantee that 'English would continue as an associate additional language.' And the decision for the changeover to Hindi should be left to the non-Hindi knowing people and not to the Hindi knowing people. That was the agreement. That was the assurance which was made by the other Prime Ministers also.

Now, this assurance has been thwarted by the imposition of Hindi in

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

some States and some departments. So, what the people of the Southern States expect is a re-assurance that this assurance given by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru would be continued, and that Hindi will not be imposed on the non-Hindi-speaking regions without their consent. My point is that instead of going into the entire question of language....

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj): When Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit presented her credentials in English, do you know what was the reaction of the Government of USSR? Do you remember how she was humiliated?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I do not know. You are unnecessarily provoking me, because I did not say that Hindi should not be learnt. I come from a State which is loyally following the 3-language formula. In our schools, upto the School Final, the teaching of Hindi is compulsory. We are trying to transact business in our regional language, and we want to have even college education to be given in our language. I am not saying that we should not learn Hindi. Hindi should be learnt. That is why I said that on all these questions, after long discussions and struggles, a certain agreed formula was there. That is the 3-language formula. You could not impose it in Tamil Nadu, because you created a situation whereby the Tamil people had to revolt. That is why even when the rule was made, you made an exception in the case of Tamil Nadu. You have to persuade them in a loving manner to learn Hindi and definitely they are the people who will be amenable to reason, and they will also take to the learning of Hindi. But the way you are behaving, the way you are trying to impose it, and the disabilities you are creating.... (Interruptions)

रस संभालन में राज्य संजी (बी सिव कारावण) : किस ने हमपौच किया है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Sheo Narain please do not interrupt.

बी सिव कारावण : आप बेवर में हैं । कय दे कय आप को तो कंडोल करमा बाहिए । किस ने हमपौच किया ? हु इच हमपौचिन ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is very difficult to conduct the House, with you speaking like this.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: If so elderly and so mature a person cannot differentiate between a friend and an enemy, what can I do?

AN HON. MEMBER: And he is a Minister!

बी सिव कारावण : क्या मिनिस्टर होना कोई जुर्र है ? अवर में मिनिस्टर हो गया, तो क्या मैंने अपनी आत्मा को बेच दिया है ? तामिल में बोलें, तेलुगु में बोलें, मलयालम में बोलें ।

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I do not want to provoke my friend; but I tell you that if this is the attitude that you take.... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Sheo Narain, please do not interrupt like that. This is not the way to behave in this House.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I never expected this kind of interruption from him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not know why he is doing it. He should not be doing it. He is a Minister.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: When some Ministers went out, I thought.... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He seems to be excited.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Mr. Subramaniam gave reasons why English should continue as an associate language for some time more. As he also pointed out, we are in a fast developing age.

Our communication with the rest of the world is as important as our communication between our various people. Rightly or wrongly, we happen to inherit a network of English schools all over and to have an international language is expected to be something good for our country and for our growth. Therefore, our prejudice against English should go.

Now I come back to the resolution. I would appeal to the hon. Member to look into this matter and do something about it.

(Interruptions)

If he is not there, somebody else is there to report to him.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not discuss among yourself. This is not the way to conduct the Parliament. I am sorry there has been so much of cross-talk with the result that the speaker cannot just make his point.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I request the Government that they should assure the Chief Ministers of the Southern States that English will continue as an additional associate language till the change-over of Hindi is accepted by the non-Hindi speaking States.

Secondly, the circulars and the rules which have created the impression of imposition of Hindi should be immediately withdrawn so that the non-Hindi speaking people feel that they are not discriminated against in the execution of their jobs. If these two guarantees are given, I think that will satisfy not only the Chief Ministers of the five States and the people there but also the non-Hindi speaking States.

श्री राम बिकास बालबान (हाजीपुर) :  
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अपनी काफी अच्छे अच्छे बक्तव्यों के सारी बात कही है। मैं आप का ब्याज इस बात की तरफ खींचना चाहूँगा कि प्रसिद्धि इस देश की लिख भाषा रहे या हिन्दी रहे या कोई और भी राष्ट्रीय भाषा है

यह रहे, इसके संबंध में जो बर्षाएँ बली हैं और जितने भी भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री हैं चाहे वह स्वर्गीय जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी हों या श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी हों या लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी हों या हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री जी हों, इन सब लोगों को उद्धृत किया गया है। मैं एक बात स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने भी प्रधान मंत्री हैं उनके बक्तव्य को आप देखें तो यह सही बात है कि उन्होंने एक बात कही है कि देश टूटने न पाए, न तो साउथ के लोगों को दुख हो न नाथ के लोगों को दुख हो, लेकिन एक मंशा सब की रही है और वह यह कि इस देश में जल्द से जल्द अंग्रेजी को खत्म कर के जो समृद्धिवादी भाषा हिन्दी है उस को पनपने का मौका मिले (अव्यवधान) . . . तमाम लोगों की तमाम जितने भी प्रधान मंत्री थे उन की यही मंशा थी। कास्टीट्यूशन को आप देख लें? और जो प्रमैडवेंट राजभाषा संशोधन विधेयक, 1967 में आया था उस समय की प्रोसीडिन्स को देख लें, तमाम लोगों ने उसका विरोध किया था और स्वयं कांग्रेस के जो लोग थे, सर्वसम्मति से कांग्रेस के लोगों ने पास किया था कि नहीं, हम लोग उसके विरोध में जाएंगे। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहता हूँ कि आप प्रोसीडिन्स को उठाकर देखें, उसने श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जो उस समय प्रधान मंत्री थी, उन्होंने भी विरोध में बोट दिया था। बाद में कांग्रेस के लोगों ने फैलेज किया तो उन्होंने कहा कि गडबडी हो गई थी, हमने इटेशनली विरोध में बोट नहीं दिया। लेकिन आप पहले के बक्तव्य देखें तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हमेशा से कह रही थी कि नहीं यह इस के प्रति, हम लोगों के प्रति, अनन्य होगा। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो मंशा थी और उद्यम जो विधेयक पास हुआ था, उसके कारण पंत और महादेवी बर्मा जी ने पद्म-भूषण की लौटा दिया था।

पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू की बात भी यहाँ पर कही गई है। मेरे जैसा आदमी जो नीति है, जो कार्यक्रम है, उसी को अपना

## [श्री राम विद्याल पाठशाला]

मेला नाम कर चलता है। हनु लोग जबाहर नाम नेहक या इन्दिरा गांधी को मेला नहीं मानते। लेकिन फिर भी जबाहर नाम नेहक का नाम दिया जा रहा है, तो मैं उनकी वह पंक्ति पढ़ता हूँ जो मैं समझता हूँ—इस हराज में नहीं आई है। सन् 1959 में जब श्री जेक एम्बनी विधेयक लाये थे, तो उनके बयान में पं० जबाहर नाम नेहक ने कहा था कि अंग्रेजी भारतीय भाषा ही नहीं सकती, अतएव जेडयून में अंग्रेजी को सम्मिलित करना विमज्जुल वेददा और मान्यत्व होगा। वह पं० नेहक का बयतम्ब है। फिर उन्होंने कहा था कि मैं यह नहीं भूल सकता कि हमें अपने साथ 40 करोड़ जनता को साथ लेकर चलना है, न कि कुछ हजार या एक-दो लाख प्रमुख लोगों को। ध्याने चल कर उन्होंने स्पष्ट किया था कि प्राय अंग्रेजी को रख सकते हो, प्राय उस को पसन्द कर सकते हो। मैं भी पसन्द करता हूँ, लेकिन वास्तविक भाषा, जिसमें जनता अपना विकास करती है, वही है जिस में जनता अपना विकास करती है, जिस को वह समझती है और जिस के प्रति उसकी भावनात्मक प्रतिक्रिया होती है। यह बात पं० जबाहर नाम नेहक ने कही थी।

महात्मा गांधी की बात कही गई—  
महात्मा गांधी की भी उस बात को मैं कहता हूँ, जो सचन मैं नहीं आई। महात्मा गांधी ने 1918 में कहा था कि भाषा माता के समान है और माता पर जो प्रेम होना चाहिये, वह हम लोगों में नहीं है। हम अंग्रेजी के लोह में पति हैं। हमारी प्रजा प्रजाण में कबी है। हमें ऐसा उद्योग करना चाहिये कि एक वर्ष में राजकीय सभाओं में, कांग्रेस में, प्रांतीय सभाओं में तथा अन्य सभा-सभाय में व सम्मेलनों में अंग्रेजी का एक भी शब्द सुनाई न पड़े। हनु अंग्रेजी का व्यवहार विमज्जुल त्याग दें। उन्होंने पुनः कहा था—अगर स्वराज अंग्रेजी कोलनेवाले भारतीयों और उनकी के लिये होने वाला हो, तो निःसन्देह अंग्रेजी

राज्य भाषा होगी। लेकिन अंग्रेज स्वराज अंग्रेजी करने वाले, करोड़ों निरक्षरों, निरक्षर बहनों, बहिनियों, बालकों का जो और इन सब के लिये होने वाला हो, तो मैं कहूँगा कि एक भाषा राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी हो सकती है। वह बात महात्मा गांधी ने कही थी।

असपूर्व प्रमाण अंग्रेजी इन्दिरा गांधी की बात लीज कहते हैं, उन्होंने 13 अगस्त, 1967 की स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा था कि एक राज्य के अंग्रेजी हट के कारण, समस्त देश में हिन्दी की प्रगति को रोक नहीं जा सकता है। श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने इसी के बाद कहा था कि लोग स्वबिक से बोट में और उनका जो स्वयं का मत था, वह विरोध में पड़ा था। श्री बी० बी० गिरी ने कहा था कि हिन्दी सम्पूर्ण भाषा बन कर रहेगी।

मैं अभी देख रहा था कि नेता जी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस ने हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा है, उन्होंने कहा था—“सबसे पहले मैं एक अक्षतकम्ही दूर कर देना चाहता हूँ। कितने ही सज्जनों का बयान है कि बंगाली लोग या तो हिन्दी के विरुद्ध होते हैं या उस के प्रति उपेक्षा करते हैं। यह बात असपूर्व है। इन का अण्डन करना मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ। मैं व्यर्थ प्रथिमान नहीं करना चाहता, परन्तु इतना तो आवश्यक कहूँगा कि हिन्दी साहित्य के लिये जितना कार्य बंगालियों ने किया है, उतना हिन्दी भाषी प्रान्त छोड़ कर और किसी प्रान्त के निवासियों ने साक्य ही किया हो। मैं इस बात की आशा हूँ कि बंगाली लोग अपनी मातृ-भाषा से अत्यन्त प्रेम करते हैं और वह कोई अपराध नहीं है। साथ-ही-ही मैंने कुछ प्रायणी ऐसी भी हैं, जिनमें इस बात का डर हो कि हिन्दी जाने हमारी मातृ भाषा बंगाली को बुरा कर उसके स्थान पर हिन्दी रखवाना चाहते हैं। यह अज्ञ भी निराधार है। हिन्दी प्रचार का उद्देश्य वही है कि जो लोग आज अंग्रेजी से विदा पाएँ, वह अपने चल कर हिन्दी से विदा पायें।” वे विचार मेरा ही सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के थे।

की शिक्षण षण्ड ऋट्टेभाष्याय की कीय षण्डे हैं । उन्हेने षणने एक षायष षे षण्डा षा कि षरेषी के षिषय षे लोषी की षो षुछ षावना षो, षर षे षाने के षाय षह षकता षू कि हिन्दी के षिना षुवारा षार्य षही षत षकता है । षो षुष्यन हिन्दी षाषा षारा षारत षे एकता षैषा षरना षाहते हैं, षे निषिषत षी षारन षन्धु हैं । षु षव षो षंगठित षो षर षस ष्येय षी ष्राप्त के लिए षवषत षरना षाहिए ।

न्यायमूर्ति षारषा षरण षिष ने षहा षा—“हिन्दी षमस्त षार्याषरन की षाषा है ।”

षुवारे षाषी दषिण की षात षरते हैं । दषिण षे—नामिलनाडू षे 1958 षे “लैण्वेज षन्वेगन” षुई षी, षिस के ष्वा- षषायषष षी के० षाष्यमूषे षीर षुस षरिषषु के षष्यषष षी के० सन्तानम् षे । उन्हेने षहा षा—

Then it was pointed out that imposition of Hindi will lead to disruption of the country. It is correct.

उन्हेने षणने षायष की षुषयान षी षन्हीं षण्डे से की षी ।

षरुणाटक षे एक षन्वेगन षुई— षुई एक षस्ताव षास षिया षया । उईषा के षटक षे एक षम्मेलन षुषा, षिस के षष्यषष षे—षी षारतवल्षष षोहन्दी । षुई षी एक षस्ताव षास षुषा षा, षिस षे षहा षया षा—“षह षम्मेलन षरेषी षाषा षिषा षा षिरोष न षरते षुए षी षरेषी षाषा षो षनिषिषकाल के लिए, हिन्दी के षाय षहूषीषी षा षतिरिषत षाषा के षुष षे षुषय षरने का एकान्त षिरोषी है । षधि षरेषी षो षतिरिषत षाषा के षुष षे षुषय षरने का षवोषय षो, तो उसे केवल

1965 से षांष षर्य षर्याषु 1977 ई० तक रषा षा षकता है ?”

उषाष्यष षहोदय, उस षमय षुई ष्वाषी षिषिषालन्य षास ने एक षंषोषन रषा षा, षिस षे दस षाल के लिए षरेषी षो रषने की षात षही षई षी, षेकिन षिसी ने षी उस षंषोषन षा षमर्यन षुई षिया, षिसी ने षी उस के षष षे षोट षुई षिया ।

उषाष्यष षी, षह षी सत्य षही है कि षुषेषा दषिण षालो ने हिन्दी षा षिरोष षिया है षीर षह षात षी सत्य षही है कि षुषेषा उत्तर षालो ने हिन्दी षा षाय षिया है । षरेषी षुछ लोषो की षाषा षन षई है, उन षे षाहे उत्तर के लोष षुई षा दषिण के लोष षुई, षिन षो षरेषी से षोढा-षा षी लष षिलता है, षे षरेषी के षन्ता षन षाते हैं ।

1963 षे षैषूर षिष्वविषालय के षषकाष ष्राप्त ष्रो० षन्दहासन दिल्ली षघारे षे । उन्हेने एक षन्तव्य षे षहा षा—“षगर षरेषी षो षबरदस्ती लादा षा षकता है, तो ष्या षारण है कि हिन्दी षो षही लादा षा षकता । षब कि षात ऐसी षही है, हिन्दी तो षारत की षाषा है, षारत की षधिक षनसंष्या षारा षमषी षीर षोली षानेढाली षाषा है ।” उन्हेने षह षी षहा षा—“डी० एम० के० दल हिन्दी षा षिरोष षरता है, षरन्तु षह तो षारत की षषषण्डता षा षी षिरोषी है । षह षलग से षविड ष्रान्त षाहता है, उसे षेढ षी एकता षे षिष्वास् षही है ।” . . . .

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I am not a DMK man. D.M.K. is a recognised political party. It is wrong that D.M.K. is against the unity of India. An Hon. Member Shri Asithambi represents DM.K. party in this House. It is a very derogatory remark which may be expunged. Can I say that the

[Shri Vayalar Ravi]

Janata Party is against the unity of India? Can I say that the Janata Party is a regional party. But I do not want to say so.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सब मैंने अपनी तरफ से नहीं कहा है, मेरे पास ये 1963 की प्रेस-कॉन्फ्रेंस है, आप इनको देख लें। मैसूर विश्वविद्यालय के प्रवक्तृत्व प्राप्त प्रो० चन्द्रहासन जब दिल्ली पधारे थे, उस समय उन्होंने यह वक्तव्य दिया था, मैं उन के वक्तव्यों को ही पढ़ रहा हूँ। मैं न केवल दक्षिण भारत बल्कि उत्तर भारत के भी अनेक विद्वानों के नाम भी गिनाऊंगा। डा. बालिब साहब महा-राष्ट्रियन थे। उन्होंने कहा था—“हिन्दी एक संगठित करने वाली शक्ति है। जनसाधारण को एक विशाल जीवन की तरफ ले जाने का मार्ग है।”

मैं देण के लोगों की ही बात नहीं कहता, विदेश के लोग भी हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में क्या कहते हैं, आप को सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा। विदेशों में भी चार ऐसे देण हैं जहाँ हिन्दी बोली जाती है—बे देण हैं—मॉरिजस, क्रिजी, सुरिनाम, गियाना और ट्रिनिदाड। मैं अभी हाल में इण्डोने-शिया गया था। वहाँ मैंने देखा—उन का राष्ट्रीय चिह्न मछड़ है और उस को मछड़ ही बोला जाता है। भारत में हम अपने लड़के को पुल कहते हैं, वहाँ भी पुल कहा जाता है, मछड़की को पुवी कहा जाता है, पुस्तक को पुस्तक कहा जाता है। मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य है कि विदेशों में भी वहाँ की भाषाओं में भारत के शब्द भर पड़े हैं। आप वहाँ के धर्म-स्वामी को जा कर देखिए, जितने बौद्ध मन्दिर हैं, उन को जा कर देखिए। और वहाँ पर जो बुद्ध का स्तूप है, वह मैं समझता हूँ कि शब्द का नया आविष्कार है। आज हिन्दी अकेले और आज

अंग्रेजी अकेले, मैं इसको नहीं समझता हूँ। मैं प्यारिस्टवाइज कहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी ठगने वाली भाषा है। नेता की ने जैसा कहा है कि आप कोर्ट में जाते हैं या हज कोर्ट में जाते हैं, तो हम वहाँ हिन्दी बोलते हैं लेकिन हमारा जो बकील है, वह वहाँ पर अंग्रेजी में हमारी बकालत करना और हमारे विषय बकालत करता है या हमारे पक्ष में करता है, इसका हम को पता नहीं चलता है। इसी तरह से जब हम डॉक्टर के पास जाते हैं तो वह एक रिस्पेस मे अंग्रेजी में प्रेस्क्रिप्शन लिख देता है। अब वह हम को अहूर दे रहा है या टेरासासीन या डाइक्रि-स्टिनीन दे रहा है, इसका हम को पता नहीं लगता है। इस तरह से यह अंग्रेजी भाषा जो है, यह ठगने वाली भाषा है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि आज तक जितनी भी योजनाएं रही हैं, उन के अंग्रेजी में होने से कोई फायदा प्राप्त हुआ है। मैं अग्रिमय नहीं समझता हूँ लेकिन यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम सेक्रेटेरियेट में टेलीफोन करते हैं और हिन्दी में बोलते हैं तो वहाँ पर जो ऊंचे पद पर बैठे हुए लोग हैं, वे हिन्दी नहीं समझते हैं। एक भी आदमी ऐसा ऊंचे पद पर नहीं है, जो हिन्दी समझता हो। एक परसेण्ट लोग भी ऐसे नहीं हैं उन ऊंचे पदों पर जो हिन्दी में बात समझते हैं और जब उन से हिन्दी में बात करते हैं तो वे कहते हैं “बाई कास्ट फोरो हिन्दी”। तब उनको समझाना पड़ता है। मैं यह सेक्रेटेरियेट की बात बतला रहा हूँ लेकिन आप किसी भी डिपार्टमेंट कोने में, वही बात है। आज अंग्रेजी में देण नहीं भी से एक प्रश्न पूछने वाला था। मैं देण बंगाल की एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी का मेम्बर हूँ और मैं धारि से आज यह कह रहा हूँ कि देण मेम्बर के किसी भी डिपार्टमेंट के देण को आप



SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHN-  
AN (Combatore): Please do not libel  
me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The very  
fact that you are reacting shows that  
you understand Hindi.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHN-  
AN: I heard the English translation.

देश में, एक ही भाषा की कार्य का नहीं  
मिलेगा और सब भाषा के यहाँ के हैं।  
इस के बारे में हमारे मन में कोई क्युता  
नहीं है लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप  
अपनी भाषा, अपनी मातृ-भाषा, अपनी माँ  
का सम्मान करें। क्या आप क्यों विदेशी  
भाषा के बंगुल में पड़े हुए हैं। आप क्यों  
नहीं अपनी भाषा के लिए प्रोत्साहन मांगते  
हैं। हम पार्लियामेंट में आप का साथ देने  
के लिए तैयार हैं। आप तेलगु को बढ़ाएँ,  
आप तमिल को बढ़ाएँ और आप अपनी  
भाषाओं को बढ़ाएँ, आप क्यों अंग्रेजी के  
बककर में पड़े हुए हैं। मेरे कहने का  
अतलब यही है कि आप अंग्रेजी के बककर में  
मत पड़िये। यह सही बात है कि आज  
अंग्रेजी को कितने परलेष्ट लोग जानते हैं।  
मैं भ्रास गया था और मुझे मालूम है कि  
वहाँ का जो शहरी भाग है, वहाँ पर लोग  
अंग्रेजी जानते हैं, लेकिन देहातों में जो लोग  
हैं वे अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते। न वे अंग्रेजी  
जानते हैं और न हिन्दी जानते हैं लेकिन  
अंग्रेजी से ज्यादा वे हिन्दी को समझ लेते  
हैं। वे हिन्दी बोलते नहीं हैं लेकिन  
वे उसको समझ लेते हैं। (अपवाह)...

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार के  
मुख्य मंत्री के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया कि बिहार  
के मुख्य मंत्री ने यह कहा। आप बिहार और  
उत्तर प्रदेश ...

SHRI A. C. GEORGE (Mukanda-  
puram): This is an example of colos-  
sal ignorance

श्री राम विनास पासवान : मैं तो  
आप के सम्बन्ध में जानता हूँ कि आप लोग  
अपनी हिन्दी जानते हैं, बहुत बड़िया हिन्दी  
जानते हैं। हमारी भीमती पार्वती कृष्णन,  
जब हमारे साथ बैठकों में बैठती हैं, तो वे  
बहुत बड़िया भाषण हिन्दी में दे सकती हैं,  
वे बहुत बड़िया हिन्दी जानती हैं। लेकिन  
प्रश्न को दर है कि कब वे ....

श्री राम विनास पासवान : मैं यह  
कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे विरोधी दल के  
कोई भी सदस्य हों, वे जब बोट मांगते  
केलिये जाते हैं तो अंग्रेजी में बोट नहीं मांगते  
वे तमिल में बोट मांगते हैं, वे अपनी भाषा में  
बोट मांगते हैं। आप वहाँ पर अंग्रेजी में  
बोट क्यों नहीं मांगते हैं? आप वहाँ पर  
अंग्रेजी में भाषण दीजिए और उन से  
कहिए कि हमें बोट दीजिए? आप जिस  
भाषा में चुन कर जाते हैं, जिस भाषा में  
वहाँ जा कर लोगों को समझाते हैं, उसी  
भाषा की आप बकालत कीजिए। आप  
अंग्रेजी मत पढ़िये। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि  
आप हिन्दी सीखिये। हमारे जैसा प्रायमी  
तो यह चाहता है कि आप अपनी भाषा हम  
को दीजिए और हमारी भाषा आप  
लीजिए और दोनों को मिला कर गया  
बढ़ाएँ। आप के यहाँ बड़े बड़े विद्वान  
हूए हैं। श्री रामस्वामी नाइकर जैसे  
विद्वान आप के यहाँ हुए हैं और हम उन की  
पूजा करते हैं। आप के यहाँ जो बड़े बड़े  
विद्वान हुए हैं उन की हम पूजा करते हैं  
लेकिन आप का नेता देश का नेता नहीं  
बन सका, आप का नेता साऊथ का नेता ही  
बन सका। इस का कारण क्या है? हमारे  
राज नारायण जी ने, हमारे नेता ने जैसा  
बतलाया है कि इसर के, उत्तर भारत के  
लोग बहुत चापसूस होते हैं। वे लोग  
उत्तर भारत में तो हिन्दी बोलते हैं लेकिन  
साऊथ में अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं और आप  
लोग कट्टरपंथी हैं, हिन्दी को चुन नहीं  
सकते। आप को चाहिए कि आप अपने  
बिल में उधारता लाएं। आप बड़िया

[ श्री राम बिलास पासवान ]

के लोग उत्तर की भाषा सीखें और हम उत्तर के लोग दक्षिण की एक भाषा सीखें। आपकी जो प्रतिज्ञा होती वह हम लेंगे और हमारी जो प्रतिज्ञा होगी, वह आप से और तब देल मे रंगा बहादुर और तब एक किस्म से सब की पूजा कर सकते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप हिन्दी सीखें। आप हिन्दी को गाली देते रहेंगे और हम आपको अंग्रेजी का सिम्बल समझते रहेंगे, तो काम नहीं चलेगा। हमारी यह भूखेंता है कि हम आप को अंग्रेजी का सिम्बल समझते रहें। मेरा कहना यह है कि आप अपने को अंग्रेजी का सिम्बल मत बनाइए और मैं चाहता हूँ की उत्तर की भाषा दक्षिण वाले सीखें और दक्षिण की एक भाषा उत्तर वाले सीखें और इस को कम्पलसरी कर दिया जाए। आप की भाषा हम पढ़ें और हमारी भाषा आप पढ़ें और समान रूप से रंगा बहादुर, यही मेरा कहना है।

\*SHRI A V P ASAITHAMBI (Madras North) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am happy to participate in the debate on the Language problem and I am proud too to belong to the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, a political party at the vanguard for protecting the linguistic rights of the people of this country

The language problem is not a problem of today or yesterday. As early as 1937 the Dravidian Movement of Tamil Nadu was spear-heading the language issue. Without fear of being contradicted, I can say that the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam's persistent endeavours, persuaded Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to give the solemn assurance, in his capacity as the Prime Minister of the nation, that Hindi would not be imposed on non-Hindi speaking people so long as they did not want it. Today it goes to the credit of Thiru M. G. Ramachandran, the ardent advocate of Arignar Anna's

ideals, following the footsteps of this great son of India, convened a Conference of four southern State Chief Ministers and got a Resolution unanimously adopted that Hindi would not be allowed to be imposed on non-Hindi speaking people. This Resolution is the subject-matter of discussion today.

At the very outset, I would like to point out that language issue is not a trivial matter which can be debated for finding a solution within six hours.

I have no hesitation in saying that if India is to survive as a nation then Hindi has to be given a go-by. In 1937 Periyar Ramaswamy, who is popularly known as E V Ramaswamy Naicker, started the anti-Hindi movement. He was not an ordinary man. My hon friend Shri C Subramaniam, mentioned in his speech that he had the privilege of joining Gandhiji's movement in 1920. Periyar Ramaswamy was in the Congress much earlier than that. If anyone went to Mahatma Gandhi to get some clarifications about the policy of Prohibition he would immediately direct him to go to Periyar Ramaswamy. When Rajaji introduced Hindi in 1938, Periyar Ramaswamy led the anti-Hindi agitation. It was a mass movement, taking 1001 people to prison and ending the precious life of two people. We should ponder over as to what prompted Periyar to lead this anti-Hindi agitation in 1938 when Indian was under British rule.

I should say that there is no animosity or hatred towards Hindi among the people of South India. As pointed out by Shri Bala Pajjanor, the people of Southern States know more languages than the people of Northern States. Their opposition to Hindi springs from the fear that, if Hindi becomes the national language, the official language and the link language, they would be second-class citizens of the country for ever—in fact they would become the slaves of

\*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

Hindi-speaking people. They are also goaded by the apprehension that they would be mortgaging the freedom and liberty of their descendants; also if they now accept Hindi as the sole language of the nation. It may not be an exaggeration to say that Periyar Ramaswamy could foresee this as early as 1936 and he started the anti-Hindi movement.

I would like to refer in brief to the position prevalent in India two thousand years ago, when we had no caste cultural and religious barriers. The Dravidian race was in power throughout the country, with the laudable concept of One Community and One God, without being super-imposed by Vedas and other scriptures. What do we see today? Every day the Adiravidians are being attacked by caste-Hindus in some part of the country or the other. This is the inevitable consequence of accepting the alien culture and traditions of Aryans by the Dravidians. The cultural transformation has come to this pass that today the marriage in my own house is not solemnised in my language Tamil but in Sanskrit. The prayers to Gods in my temples are not in Tamil but in Sanskrit. The worship in my temples is conducted not in Tamil but in Sanskrit. It has led to this sorry state that the dravidians are prohibited entry into the temples. Injunctions, inhibitions, restrictions and regulations have overtaken the life of dravidians in our country. The alien domination has brought in its wake the water-tight compartments of four castes—Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras. I have referred to this because of the present fears of the people of Southern States that, if Hindi becomes the national language, the official language and the link language, the people of Hindi-speaking States would be Brahmins, the people like Shri Sathé who support them would be Vaisyas, the people who are adjacent to these people would be Kshatriyas and the people of South India would be for ever the Sudras—

in effect the lifersera of Hindi-speaking people. Periyar Ramaswamy had this faright in 1938 when he started anti-Hindi struggle.

It would be pertinent to point out the political background in 1936 when Rajaji introduced compulsorily Hindi teaching in Tamil Nadu. In 1937 Elections the Congress Party came to power in all the 11 Provinces—then there were not 22 States. In no other Province Hindi was introduced. But Rajaji introduced Hindi in Tamil Nadu. Why did he do this in 1936? I should recall here that in later years he became the staunch antagonist of Hindi. Rajaji no doubt occupies a pre-eminent place among the patriots of India. He unravelled many tangles in our freedom struggle. He wanted the people to learn Hindi and also learn to oppose Hindi. He wanted that when independence came it should not become the handmaid of Hindi-speaking people. Now what do we see? 22 States are there in the country. As referred to by Shri C. S. in his speech, though Hindi is the mother-tongue of people living in 7 States, though English-speaking population is just 1 per cent or 1.5 per cent, English is wide-spread throughout the country, unlike Hindi confined to 7 States. Take for example even the three-language formula. If non-Hindi speaking people accept it, they have to learn, besides their mother-tongue, English and Hindi. Naturally the burden on them is more as compared to Hindi-speaking people for whom no special efforts are required to learn Hindi being their mother-tongue. In three-language formula the burden of languages is not equally shared. Why should one section of the people bear the additional brunt, when all are having equal rights?

Mahatma Gandhi wanted Hindustani—a mixture of Urdu spoken by the Muslims and Hindi spoken by Hindus—to be learnt just for the sake of establishing cordial relations between Muslims and Hindus. Mahatma's dream died with him when he

[Shri A. V. P. Asaithambi]

was murdered. Hindustani was changed to Hindi. Why was it done? Shri Raj Narain wants that in Tamil Nadu the people should learn Tamil, in Kerala the people should learn Malayalam, etc. We have also no objection in the people of Bihar speaking and learning only Hindi. But the problem arises when the people of Bihar want to communicate with the people of Tamil Nadu. In what language they should do this? We have got this House, a representative body of 22 States in the country. What should be the language in which this House, if it desires, should communicate with 22 States having different languages? That is the problem we are facing today. Hindi or any other language—which should be the language of such a communication? Here I have without any doubt to say that English puts equal burden on all the people. English is not an alien language at all. Nagaland, a constituent unit of our country, has adopted English as the State language. Do you want to throw out Nagaland by saying that English is an alien language? If that happens, naturally other States will follow and if this is allowed to happen, then disintegration of the country sets in.

I do not deny that the D.M.K. was committed to secession. What was the reason? We were afraid of becoming the slaves of Hindi imperialism. Later on we realised that we could pursue our struggle within the constitutional framework and we surrendered our demand for secession. But I hasten to add that the reasons which provoked us to demand secession persist. We have forfeited our demand for secession but we are not yet alienated from the causes that culminated in such a demand. Even after 31 years of our Independence, we have not been able to find a solution to the language problem. Why should it be allowed to plague our country further?

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister may be answering the Debate. The hon.

Member is making good points. May I suggest that the Prime Minister puts the earphones so that he hears the translation.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is getting it translated. Leave it to him. Please don't disturb the speaker.

SHRI A. V. P. ASAITHAMBI: As I stated at the beginning, I wish to repeat that I have no hatred towards Hindi. But I hate its imposition. It is claimed that Hindi is spoken by majority of the people in the country. I would like to counter this argument by quoting from the 1972 Census Report of the Government of India. According to this Report out of the population of 54.81 crores, 16 crores of people speak Hindi. But, you will be surprised to know that 47 dialects have been grouped under the heading Hindi and thus the number of Hindi-speaking people has been swelled to 16 crores. The number of real Hindi—that is the Khadi Bholi—speaking people is just 3 crores. Where is your majority? In a democracy the minorities must be given protection from the oppression of majority, even if I concede that Hindi is spoken by majority of people. Here have you chosen peacock as the national bird on the strength of its numbers? Have you chosen tiger as the national animal merely on the strength of its numbers? If you go by the numbers, then the sparrow and rat alone can become the national bird and national animal respectively. You have chosen peacock for its beauty and rarity. Similarly you have chosen tiger for its valour and strength. A national language must merit its choice on its own culture, traditions and literary value, and not merely by the number of people speaking it. We got freedom from the Britishers, not to become slaves of another section.

I am afraid that the era of an all-India party coming to power at the Centre is coming to an end. The Congress Party which ruled the country for three decades has been decimated with the defeat of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Four parties come together

to form the Government at the Centre and now within 19 months of Janata Government these groups are vying with one another in becoming supreme and that has created unseemly squabbles in the Janata Party. If this is the case with a political party ruling at the Centre, you can imagine what will happen in a country, which is a sub-continent by itself because of its diverse cultures and different languages, if one linguistic group tries to establish its supremacy over the others.

Shri C S referred to the fall of Congress Party in 1967 in Tamil Nadu and he analysed the cause for this in a beautiful manner. No accusing finger could be raised against Shri Kamaraj the leader of the Congress Party in Tamil Nadu. Yet he could not save the Party from its rout. The reason was the grievous error committed by the Congress Party at the national level in the matter of language in 1965. The Congress Party has not yet been able to raise its head, in Tamil Nadu. Similarly the Janata Party has also no *janata* in Tamil Nadu. Indira Congress has also drawn blank in Tamil Nadu. Only Bala Pajjanor and myself—in other words, Thiru Karunanidhi and Thiru M G R. have the opportunity. If these two come together in Tamil Nadu, there can never be anybody else in Tamil Nadu on the political arena.

19 15 hrs.

[Mr SPEAKER in the Chair]

The people of four Southern States have woken up. The four Chief Ministers of Southern States have come together in this conference for the first time, since they have realised that the Central Government is getting debilitated. If Indira Congress Government had been there at the Centre, Dr Chenna Reddy and Shri Devraj Urs would not have attended this meeting. Similarly, if Janata Government had been there in these two States, then also the Chief Ministers of these two

States would not have come to attend this conference. If in the coming Elections, no all-India party comes to power, and only regional parties get elected, what will happen in the country? There will be inevitable and unavoidable separation. Passion will be let loose. In spite of anti secession law, there will be demand for secession. As is commonly known in legal circle, law cannot be based on full justice and fairplay. We on our part do not want such a thing to happen. We want to protect our country's unity and integrity. But we must bear in mind that there were 633 princely States before the advent of British here. The Britishers unified the nation and after independence, Sardar Patel strengthened the bonds of unity. In 1956 language was the basis for reorganising the States. I want that during Morarji Desai's regime the country should not sunder apart. English is the world language and it can safely be the link language of the country also. It is no longer an alien language. Even now, as mentioned by Shri C S, non-Hindi speaking people are second-class citizens. If tomorrow Hindi supplants English, what will be the position? The fear of slavery makes us oppose this move.

Mahatma Gandhi got us freedom. But within a short time after that, one of his moves was misinterpreted and he was murdered. Now we should not break the country. We want to protect the nation. Hindi is the enemy of India and we should thwart its efforts to subjugate India. Now four non-Hindi States have come together. I would like to warn the Government that at not a very distant future 15 non-Hindi speaking States in the country may come together to oppose the imposition of Hindi.

With these words I conclude my speech, thanking you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this debate.

MR SPEAKER. The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir...

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he replying or intervening?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I am replying....

MR. SPEAKER: We shall resume the debate after this.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: You may call it intervention if you like.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is speaking.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have listened very carefully and attentively to all that has been said here. Even when I was absent from the House for about 45 minutes in two shifts, I was listening because I attach great importance to the question which has been debated here today. I should have been very happy if no passions had been involved. But it only shows the sensitivity of the question. I do not want, therefore, to tread on any sensitive ground. I would not yield to the temptation of replying to some points which are not really necessary for the consideration of this question but which might create even an unintentional misunderstanding. I do not want, therefore, to take that risk. This is a question which is very vital for the unity and strength of this country. But how politics comes in to this can be illustrated by the fact that, when my hon. friend, the Mover, Mr. Sathu, said that ultimately Hindi alone should be the common language, he was not considered a Hindi fanatic, but I was considered as a Hindi fanatic. I never said that Hindi should be imposed on anybody. I do not believe in imposition of Hindi because such things cannot be done by imposition and governmental imposition does not lead to desired results.

Sentiment, and emotions ought not to be brought in here and they

ought not to be exacerbated. I have no doubt about it in my mind. That does not help the process. I have, therefore, said that it is not the compulsion of the government but it is the compulsion of patriotism which will bring Hindi. That is all that I have always said and, patriotism is not a thing which I have to inculcate.... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH: Why are you trying to equate the two?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: We are also patriots. It is not the monopoly of anybody.

MR. SPEAKER: He never said that we are not.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have not said that I am a better patriot than the hon. Member. I have never said it. But why is sensitivity brought into it? I do not want to hurt anybody. It is not what I am saying, but it is a fact that in this country all of us are suffering from shortcomings in this matter because of the past history of the country. That is why the language problem is there. For thousands of years in its previous history we never had one common language because there never was one common government. There were hundreds of governments. At no time of history was there one government in this country before 1948. In 1948 all the princely States were merged and it was by the end of 1948 that the country had one government. Otherwise, the Britishers had left us with 551 governments in this country, but the country achieved one government because we realised that that was what was required to be done if India was to progress, develop and take its own place in the comity of nations.. (Interruptions) If my hon. friend, Mr. Venkatasubbiah, does not become impatient and allows me to speak, I shall be grateful.

This is a matter which arose when the movement for national freedom was going on and the Indian National Congress, for freedom. I will not say

that it was only the Indian National Congress which was working for freedom, there were others too, but Indian National Congress was the main body which was working, and if I say so, it will be no exaggeration. At that time people from the south, from Bengal, from Maharashtra and from Gujarat proposed that Hindi be the common-national language; that is what they called it at that time. That was accepted and nobody contested it until we won our freedom.

After freedom when the Constitution was drafted, Hindi was recognised as the common language, not as a national language and all the other languages of the country which are recognised in the Constitution are considered national languages so that there may be no quarrels on that account. And yet, Hindi, by common consent, was considered as the official language and as the common language for the Centre and for the country and it was agreed that for fifteen years, English would continue as an associate language for this purpose.

Then controversies arose. (Interruptions). It is not recognised as the common language in the Constitution. That is the fact of history. It is not of my making. My hon. friend, Shri Subramaniam was a Member of the Constituent Assembly. But I was not.

**SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** English shall continue to be used for all official purposes of the Union.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I do not want any controversy. I accept that. Don't call it 'associate' if you do not want it to be so called. I do not understand why that should create any controversy. Both should continue together. That is what has been said.

I have no quarrel about it. Then, again, controversies began to persist. We are a nation where controversies are very common. That has been our history. We have got to see that controversies do not hinder but help in-

tegration. Otherwise, I have no quarrel with controversies.

That Act was passed in 1967 in which the following things have been provided:

"It will be obligatory to use English for communication between the Union and the non-Hindi States and between the State and another where either of the two is a non-Hindi State unless that State itself desires a change.

(2) That both Hindi and the English language shall be used for notifications, resolutions, press communiques etc.

(3) While framing the rules under the Act it will be kept in mind that no employee is harmed in any way for not achieving proficiency in both the languages; and

(4) That the provisions of Section 3 regarding the use of English for official purposes of the Union shall remain in force until Resolutions to the contrary have been passed by the Legislatures of all the non-Hindi States and also by each House of Parliament."

I stand by it. We are all committed to this. Therefore, there is no question of trying to circumvent it in any way.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** But the rules are against it.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I did not frame the rules. That again is important. When they framed rules finally in 1976 I was nowhere in Government but I was in detention at that time

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR:** My allegation is that these rules are very badly implemented.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I cannot tell immediately. My friend has

(Shri Morarji Desai)

made a very impassioned speech. I appreciate it.

**SHRI A. BALAJANOR:** Patriotism brings Hindi; patriotism will also kill Hindi. I seek a clarification from the Prime Minister.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I did not interrupt my friend when he was speaking even when he was referring to me all the time. Why does he not extend that courtesy to me? You ask for clarification at the end. Why interrupt me? That is not right. That does not help in any way.

Therefore, after all, there are some instances of lapses. I would say that they have come to my notice and I immediately rectified them and if fresh instances come to my notice I will go on rectifying them. I know that there were only Hindi forms available in Delhi. That is not right because Delhi is not inhabited only by the Hindi-knowing people. It appeared that other forms were not there. It is not possible to print all forms in two languages because some forms are long and go over two to three pages and, therefore, it is not possible to have them in English on the reverse very conveniently. But, both should be available. On that score, I have no doubt and, if there is any lapse, I shall be grateful to anyone who points it out to me. If they come to my notice from any ministry I have made it clear that if there is any lapse, serious notice will be taken and proper punishment given. I would like to do that. But is it not agreed? It was agreed. I find there is no quarrel about the language policy. Even when my friend who spoke last and spoke in a very impressive manner, I did not follow the language but I could understand what he was saying. He has changed from partition into unity. That is a great thing. Therefore, I do hope he will change in this matter also. But that change was not brought about by me. Force of circumstances has done it. In the same way in this matter also force of cir-

cumstances will achieve the result. He also said at the end that he is not opposed to Hindi. I am satisfied. I have no quarrel with him at all.

I objected when my hon'ble friend, Shri Samar Mukherjee said that this is a multi-national country. It cannot be a multi-national country. There can be different communities if you want to say that. They are not nationalities. They are communities but that in a vast country they are bound to be there. But it is one nation. It is not so now. Even when we had not one government in this country, the world recognised us one nation. This is a peculiar fact of history. If you compare India with Europe minus Eastern Europe, you will find the same number of languages, the same amount of population and many regions but Europe will never be considered one nation or one country. India has always been recognised as one country. That is because of its one culture—a culture also which has been brought together from various sources. It is a composite culture and that is also a peculiarity of this country. It has always absorbed everything and made it into its own. That is what we are trying to do and that is why this nation cannot be called a multi-national country.

When Pakistan was formed, Mr. Jinnah had introduced the two nation theory. It was never accepted by this country. We had to accept Pakistan because of our weakness, because we could not have obtained freedom unless we accepted that and the British Government would have been perpetually here. We felt that discretion is the better part of valour and, therefore, we accepted our freedom in two parts and yet India, as it is, is large enough. We should have no quarrel about it. But then also we did not recognise the two-national theory. The fact of it is we have a large Muslim community in this country—second largest, perhaps, or third largest. But it is there. I would consider it dis-



honourable for this country if any Indian national has to migrate from the country because he is ill-treated. That is what we have got to achieve. I cannot say we have achieved all that. But do we want to make it better or do we want to lapse into something worse? This is all I want my hon'ble friends to consider. It is, therefore, that I would not like anybody trying to create any impression that there is a feeling that Hindi is being imposed. But as Hindi people are called fanatics don't those who propagate only English also qualify 'or the same epithet'? Why should we do that? I say that both things should not be done. Let it develop. Let people see this and realise this and I have no doubt that Hindi will be recognised. But I will not do anything to impose it. That is all the assurance and complete assurance I can give so far as it lies in the power of this Government. Let there be no doubt about it. If there are any faults anywhere, we shall certainly try to remove those faults so that no suspicion arise.

But, if, in the name of suspicions, it is sought to be so delayed that this can never be achieved, I shall not be a party to it. That also must be equally understood.

This is where we have got to strive for more agreement than disagreement. And that is why I agreed readily to this debate. And if at any time this is to be debated coolly, we can certainly do so and find out what we have to do. But, let suspicions disappear. This is what I want to achieve. And if we can remove suspicions I am quite sure, we will be able to achieve it.

A question was raised about Bihar. It was said that Bihar is carrying on correspondence in Hindi. But they have also made the rule that in communication with non-Hindi States, they will send English translations along with them. So, they are carrying out the law. Therefore we cannot quarrel with them.

I want that every State should carry on its affairs in its own language. All languages have been considered national. They are of equal importance in my view.

It is, therefore, that I have said that Government affairs and Education must be carried on in the language of the State.

The Three language Formula also was at one time devised almost un-announcedly, if I may say so. And if that had been followed, and if it is followed, I am quite sure, many difficulties can disappear.

But there too, I am not going to impose it on anybody because that way nothing can be achieved. I have no doubt about it in my mind. But I am quite sure that the Centre has a habit. It is carrying on in English and in Hindi but ultimately, it has got to see that the Constitution is finally honoured not by any force. Can any instance be pointed out that any Central Government servant has been punished on account of inadequate knowledge of Hindi? If so, I would like to see that. If any such case arises, please bring it to my notice. That will not happen.

But that does not mean that I should not encourage them to learn Hindi. They must learn both English and Hindi. I am trying to see also that all the examinations for the IAS, IPS, and IFS are conducted in all the languages of this country so that there is no question of any fear or unequal competition anywhere. But there too, they will have to learn English and Hindi compulsorily. Otherwise they will not be able to work.

But all these things also have got to be brought in such a manner that they consolidate us, integrate us and make us strong and do not create walls amongst us, if there are any, we must demolish them.

[Shri Morarji Desai]

That is the appeal that I would like to make to my hon. friends. And, with that appeal, I hope, my hon. friends will not have any apprehensions about this Government's policy.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN** (Madras South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very difficult to immediately follow the hon. Prime Minister in a Debate because he has the weight and the authority and all the information at his command.

I shall therefore confine myself to a few points which go to show that though the Government professes to observe the Official Languages Act in letter and in spirit, as a matter of fact, this is not actually being done.

The Chief Ministers' meeting held at Madras was prompted only because there has been failure in the implementation of this Official Languages Act.

I will cite an instance. The hon. Prime Minister said: 'I would like to have any instance where officers have been at a disadvantage. Sir, the Kendriya Hindi Samiti has recommended that all officers of the rank of Deputy Secretary and above working in the Ministries... (Interruptions).

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: Will anybody from the Government side speak again? **Shri K. Ramamurthy**: Mr. Mandal will speak.

**MR. SPEAKER**: I am not aware. Mr. Ramamurthy, we do not know at what stage we are. Let us proceed.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: No Sir; at least you should know, if anybody from the Government side is going to speak.

**SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY** (Tirumangaluru): If they are not going to reply, there is no need for a further discussion at all.

**MR. SPEAKER**: They have not told me that nobody from the Government side is going to speak.

**SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY**: That I know. Is there anybody going to interject or reply from the Government benches? If it is not there, there is no need for further discussion.

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE**: I raised a technical objection, when the Prime Minister was speaking, not because I did not want to hear him, but simply because the debate is continuing and we wanted to know who will finally be replying to the points raised here.

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN**: Mr. Mandal will reply.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR**: The Minister gave us an assurance. But what about the points raised?

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE**: Maybe I was not understood correctly when I objected to the Prime Minister speaking. Not that I did not want to listen to him. But since the debate is continuing, we would like to have specific replies to the issues that have been raised. Mr. Venkataraman just now raised a very pertinent issue.

**MR. SPEAKER**: I think Mr. Venkataraman does not require the assistance of anybody.

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR**: I raised certain points, because I wanted certain assurances. The Prime Minister gave the assurances and I kept quiet. But my point has not been answered. I said, "Covertly it is being imposed on us." I cited certain things. I could have listed all the cases.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: I am on a point of order. (Interruptions).

**SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR**: For example, notices are to be made in Hindi. That is why I did not read. Every section is there. Somebody must give a reply. We are answerable

to our people there. About the Prime Minister's assurance, we are very happy. He is doing it very well. Not only here, but outside also. The resolution also gives encomiums to the Prime Ministers, starting from Nehru.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI:** My point of order is: Are you going to set up a precedent that whenever some substantive motion is moved, anybody from the Government side can speak in the middle and it will be left as it is, and more Members speak and the mover may reply?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I will go by the rules, as they are. If anybody points out that the last reply is compulsory under the rules, I will insist on their replying. If you are not able to show it, I cannot help.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** I was saying that though there have been repeated assurances both by the Prime Minister and by the then Home Minister in this House when there was a similar debate in March and April this year, the implementation of the Official Languages Act is far from the assurances given. In fact, there have been several cases and instances brought to the notice of the State Governments as well as to the Members of Parliament in which the persons who are not Hindi-speaking, i.e., whose mother-tongue is not Hindi, and who are in Central Services and in other services, are under a severe handicap. I will cite some instances. I will not tall in a vague fashion.

The Kendriya Hindi Samiti has recommended—and I understand that this recommendation is under implementation—that:

"The officers of the rank of Deputy Secretaries and above, working in Ministries and Departments and other offices in the Central Government have to acquire a working knowledge of Hindi, according to a time-bound programme."

Now, Sir, this is an instance which is being made on the officers who are

working in the departments. If Hindi and English are going to be used simultaneously, there seems to be no reason why there should be an insistence on them that they should learn Hindi within a time bound programme.

I want to point out that there was an All Parties' Parliamentary Committee in 1959 which included such stalwarts as Dr. Raghuvira, Purshotam Das Tandon and they had recommended that officers of over 40 years of age should not be compelled to learn Hindi. I want to ask how in the face of this recommendation of this Parliamentary Committee, they could make a recommendation that all Deputy Secretaries and above must learn Hindi within the time bound programme. How can it be commended on them to learn Hindi? I am talking of all the departments.

The second instance which I am giving is that many departments, Ministries and offices have been identified by the Government of India for transaction of all business in Hindi. This, I submit, is going contrary to the Official Languages Act where in it is specifically provided that the transaction of business of the Government shall be both in Hindi and in English. I submit for the consideration of the Government that such an identification of certain departments saying that they shall transact business only in Hindi is contrary to the Official Languages Act and therefore the implementation is faulty.

There is a letter which the Prime Minister has written to the Finance Minister of the Tamilnadu Government. In it, the Prime Minister has stated that conditions could not remain static and that the use of Hindi for official purposes was bound to increase now.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** What is wrong in it?

**SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur):** But the Prime Minister is saying something else.

**SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:** If the Official Languages Act says that Hindi and English shall continue to be used for the purposes of the administration, if you say that the use of Hindi is bound to increase, then one day Official Languages Act will become a dead letter because slowly, surreptitiously the use of Hindi would increase; and then without the consent of the State Governments which are non-Hindi speaking State Governments, a *sine-qua-non* condition precedent for the adoption of Hindi as the official language of the country would have come into being. Therefore, if you say that the use of Hindi will be increased, then you are going to set at naught completely the spirit of the Act which says that only, after the legislatures of the non-Hindi speaking States have passed resolutions and have recommended discontinuance of English and that it has been approved by both the Houses of Parliament that English will be discontinued, this is a back-door method of really bringing about the use of Hindi without complying with the provisions of the Official Languages Act.

Now I want to go into another instance. It is reported in the Hindu dated 16 July 1978 that officers who are serving in Hindi areas and who are deputed to Central Government, when they come to the Centre, they are compelled to continue to note in Hindi and not use English? It means another way of preventing the continued use of English along with Hindi in the files. Therefore, I want to make it clear that though we all greatly appreciate the assurances given—we have great regard for the assurances, we believe the assurances will be implemented—in point of fact at various levels in the government, this is not being implemented; it is being violated. I will not hold the Ministry or government responsible. It is the incident of self-preservation; the

departmental chief and the Hindi speaking officers want to have their hegemony spread over and therefore it is one of the ways in which they might be trying to prevent other people gaining proper positions here. Therefore, it is upto the government to see that all these things are not done. In fact if they want to increase the use of Hindi, they should consult the Chief Ministers of the states whether in such and such department they can use it and only after getting their consent they should increase the use of Hindi; that will be in accordance with the spirit of the Official Languages Act; otherwise it will be a violation.

I have only one more point before I conclude. The three language formula has become almost a dead letter... (Interruptions) I do not understand what you say. In the statement which the Minister of Education laid on the Table of the House yesterday, we found that no state was really implementing the three language formula. Whatever my other colleagues from my State may say, we are committed to the three language formula. We may be defeated in elections; but that does not mean our convictions will go with the elections. We believe in the three language formula; we want three language formula should be implemented. I would therefore appeal to the Prime Minister to call a meeting of all the Chief Ministers and have a re-thinking on the three language formula and come to some conclusion. A national consensus should be arrived at.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time fixed is upto 8 O'clock. Unless the House wants to extend the time... (Interruptions).

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** Six hours were allotted and we started at 1.30. You were kind enough to tell us the Business Advisory Committee that if necessary you would extend it by another two hours.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I never said that; if necessary the House could extend it; I have no power to extend it.

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** Why are they averse to this? We must have another three hours.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have no power in this regard. Two things are before the House. One is whether the debate should be extended...

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** Yes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You will not allow me to complete? The other is whether it should be extended today. These are the two propositions. The first thing is whether the debate should be extended....(Interruptions).

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:** No.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think the Noes have it; I cannot extend it....(Interruptions). I cannot help it.

So, I call upon Mr. Sathe.  
(Interruptions)

**SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN:** Let it go by majority. Let there be a Division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Do you want division?

**SHRI K. GOPAL:** You promised six hours.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA:** I am extremely sorry...  
(Interruptions)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there any point of order? What is the point of order?

डा० कर्ण सिंह : (ऊधमपुर) - अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे विनम्र प्रार्थना करूंगा और अपने जो सलाहकार दल के सदस्य हैं, उनसे भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह जो वात्सा का सवाब है, यह सब माफ़क है, 6 घंटे में सभ्यता से इन सब बातों को ही बड़े, कैबिनेट बसि कल श्रा परतीं 2 घंटे

धीरे मिल जायें तो बहुत सारे सदस्य धनी हैं, किन्तु इसके ऊपर धन विचार व्यक्त करते हैं। मैं अपने मित्रों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इसमें ऐसी कोई गड़बड़ नहीं होगी, कल दो घण्टे मिल जायें तो इसको समाप्त कर दीजिए। क्यों वह कहने का मौका मिले कि बोलने नहीं दिया, जहा 6 घंटे बोलें हैं वहा 2 घंटे और बोल सकते हैं, यह बेरी प्रार्थना है।

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** May I make a submission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?— Let me know.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** You will please see that six hours were allotted to this discussion. We began at 2 30 P.M. Even if we have to stick to the time limits, we have to close at 8 30 P.M. In the remaining 35 minutes we shall not be able to accommodate a large number of Members of Parliament specially from South who want to speak on this.

(Interruptions)

**MR. SPEAKER:** This is not a point of order.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** Point of order is coming.

**MR. SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** My point of order is that the hon. Prime Minister has gone on record repeatedly and he was good enough even to-day by way of assurance that he does not want...

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it a point of order? Which Rule is broken?

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR:** I will sit down and I will not make a point of order.

**SHRI RAVINDRA VERMA:** The question of extending the time for this debate was raised when the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair. At that time we made our point of view clear. You will kindly recall that in

## re. Language Policy (Motion.)

[Shri Ravindra Verma]

the Business Advisory Committee, when this matter was brought up, it was decided that six hours will be devoted to this debate. The House accepted the Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

This is a very important subject, undoubtedly. This is a very sensitive subject, undoubtedly. Perhaps, every hon. member would like to express his views. But within the time schedule that Parliament has to observe it is impossible for every member to get a chance. Some hon. members wanted the time to be extended. A suggestion has been made that it should be extended by two hours. Even if you want to extend it by five days, everybody cannot get a chance to speak on this subject. No last word can be said on this subject. There are at least 18 Members from our side whose names are also with you. Just as other parties have the names of their members, our party has also its members who want to speak. Therefore, Sir, it appears to us that if this debate is to be extended, it can be extended for two hours, but we will not be in a position to say that time can be found tomorrow or the day after. It is a motion under 184. It is not possible, therefore, to say specifically whether time can be found tomorrow or time can be found day after tomorrow. If, in principle it is agreed that it should be extended by two hours, we will have no objection, but we cannot argue to a specific date to be provided for this debate. (Interruptions).

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I am on a point of order. When the matter was taken up in the Business Advisory Committee.... (Interruptions). This motion is under 184. Under 178 no speech on a resolution shall, except with the permission of the Speaker, exceed fifteen minutes in duration...

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Which is the rule which has been broken?

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: You take 182. The Speaker may, if he

thinks fit, prescribe a time limit for speeches. Rule 182 gives you the power to fix the time limit. Now, you have to take cognisance of the matter as to how many members should be allowed how much time. You in your wisdom selected the leaders of some of the parties and you gave second chance to some parties and also gave time to the ruling party members. So, for the Parliamentary Affairs Minister to say whether the time is correct, I am not on that; I am on a different matter. I am on agreed time of six hours and that you gave assurance to the members of the Business Advisory Committee that you will extend the time.

MR. SPEAKER: I said, House can extend the time. I never said I could.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: The House can extend the time upto what time, when the discussion is incomplete? That is the reason why I refer to 182. Under 178 you can prescribe the time limit of 15 minutes. But in this case, you allowed me 40 minutes because the matter was very vital and so, you allowed extra time. So, you must have a generous and very reasonable approach. If is for the House to extend it upto 8 or 8.30 because we have lost half-an-hour. And you cannot really reduce this to 5½ hours. Now, I request you in view of the Business Advisory Committee's decision and the promise that you gave ...

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. No rule has been broken. You are making a speech. No rule has been broken. Now the Minister has said on behalf of the Government that they are willing to extend it by two hours and half-an-hour that is left i.e., 2½ hours, but the time shall be found only at the convenient time.

The House stands adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.  
22:04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 2, 1972 (Sundays 11, 1972) (Sundays).