

MR. SPEAKER : There is hardly one minute and I think we can adjourn for lunch now. We shall take up item No. 15 after lunch.

12.59 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at seven minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair)

MOTION RE : ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : I beg to move :

“That the Eleventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st July, 1968 to 30th June, 1969, laid on the Table of the House on the 31st July, 1970, be taken into consideration.”

Having regard to the multi-lingual character of our society, the framers of our Constitution felt that there was an imperative need of assuring to the linguistic minorities a sense of security. A comprehensive scheme of safeguards for the linguistic minorities was therefore written into the Constitution. Subsequently, on the basis of the decisions taken at the national level from time to time, particularly in the meeting of the Chief Ministers and Central Ministers held in August 1961, specific schemes of safeguards for linguistic minorities in the matter of education, provision of text-books and teachers, use of minority languages for official purposes, recruitment to State services etc. have been evolved.

To meet the requirements of article 350B of the Constitution, the office of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities was set up in July 1957. The Commissioner and the officers under him investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for linguistic minorities. The results of investigations mentioned in the annual reports of the Commissioner of Linguistic Minorities are required to be submitted to the President and laid before each house of Parliament. However, the responsibility for implementation of various safeguards for the linguistic minorities rests on the State Governments and the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities is not required to discharge any executive functions for the purpose. Unless full co-operation is extended to him by the State Governments, he cannot show results.

So far 11 reports have been laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament. The first seven reports have been discussed in Parliament, either in both the Houses or in Lok Sabha or in Rajya Sabha and 8th to 10th reports could not be discussed in Parliament. In the mean time, the 11th report covers the same topic as dealt with in the 8th, 9th and 10th reports, it was considered that only the 11th report may be discussed in Parliament. The Eleventh Report was laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha on the 31st July, 1970, and it is with a view to discuss this report that I move this motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are two substitute motions by Shri Mohanty.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara) : Sir, I move :—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

“This House, having considered the Eleventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st July, 1968 to 30th June, 1969, laid on the Table of the House on the 31st July, 1970, is of the opinion that the office of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities be abolished as it has failed to properly investigate the problems of the linguistic minorities with a

view to safeguard their constitutional rights as contemplated in article 350B (2) of the Constitution." (1)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely :—

"This House, having considered the Eleventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st July, 1968 to 30th June, 1969, laid on the Table of the House on the 31st July, 1970, is of opinion that—

- (a) special efforts should be undertaken to safeguard the constitutional rights of the Oriya Speaking minorities residing in Andhra Pradesh and Bihar;
- (b) the State Governments should insist upon knowledge of regional language as a prerequisite for entry into State services, in keeping with the Central Government's insistence for knowledge of the official language for entry into the Union Services." (2)

SHRI DASARATHA DEB (Tripura East): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are now discussing the Eleventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in India. The submission of this kind of a report with some recommendations to the Government has become a sort of a routine affair and just to perform that sort of routine work Parliament has sometimes discussed them and Members have expressed their feelings and made certain suggestions to the Government for execution. But after that nothing much has happened regarding safeguarding the interests of the Linguistic Minorities just as in regard to the safeguards for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The same thing is taking place here.

I may quote some words from this report. Talking about the Provincial Educational Ministers' Conference, 1949, it says :—

"It was agreed in this Conference that at the primary stage of education, if the

mother-tongue is different from the regional language and there are not less than ten pupils in a class or 40 pupils in a whole school desirous of having instruction through their mother-tongue, arrangements shall be made for providing instruction accordingly by appointing at least one teacher. It was also decided that at the secondary stage of educational facilities would be provided for instruction in the mother-tongue, if one-third pupils of a school were desirous of having instruction in the mother-tongue. These decisions were binding on all Government, municipal and district board schools.

The report says that these decisions were binding on every State Government, but actually what is taking place is that the Central Government as well as the governments of States go ahead without paying any heed to the legitimate demands of the minority communities just as big animals go ahead without being affected by the chattering of small beasts or birds. This is the kind of treatment that the people of the linguistic minorities have been receiving from the Central Government as well as from the State Governments for so long.

This weaker section of the people cannot be defended by this Government run by the capitalist or the vested interests class whose main interest is to serve the people of the vested interest.

After reading all these reports I have found that this Commissioner to some extent is fairly satisfied with the task performed by the State Governments. At this stage I am not in a position to verify the position in other States but I can very well say about my State, the Union territory of Tripura. In this report it says :—

"TRIPURI—The number of schools in which the subject matter was explained in Tripuri went up to 150 from 127 of the previous year. Similarly, the number of students and teachers went up to 7,128 and 234 from 6,164 and 196."

A reading of this report may create an impression that in the primary stage Triba students, particularly Tripuri-speaking

[Shri Dasarath Deb]

people, are being taught by a teacher in their own mother-tongue. But it is absolutely incorrect. It has nothing to do with the reality that exists in our parts. Our people have been demanding for a very long time that for the Tripuri-speaking people or other people who have got their own distinct mother-tongue, at least one teacher should be appointed in the school so as to explain the things in their own mother-tongue.

This has never been carried out in our State. In Tripura, we have got vast areas where only Tripuri-speaking people stay and their number, in some cases, is 90 per cent to 100 per cent. There are so many schools where all the students speak Tripuri language. No other students are there. But even in such schools, in our parts, the Tripura Government is very much reluctant to post a teacher whose mother-tongue is at least Tripuri. Evertime, the Government has come forward with a plea that in basic training colleges, the people whose mother-tongue is different, Bengali or any other language, are being taught Tripuri language so that they will be able to teach lessons in Tripuri language to Tripuri-speaking students. To learn a language in three month's training, even for a man of the highest calibre, is not possible, particularly, when they are to teach school children. It may be the case in other States also.

This is not the only question. We have set up certain Commissions or deputed certain District Magistrates to look after the interests of linguistic minorities. It will not help the situation. The whole understanding must be different. The linguistic minorities, according to me, have got to be dealt with in two different categories. One category is of those people belonging to linguistic minorities who have got their own States where their mother-tongue is an established regional language recognised by the Government. Unfortunately, these people will have to stay in other States where their mother-tongue is not a regional language. Their case is to be dealt in a different way and the Report has suggested how that should be dealt with.

There is another category of linguistic minorities. Most of them are dialects; only spoken language, not written language. It is unfortunate that these people have got no

States where their mother-tongue is a regional language. Take for instance Nepalis in West Bengal, Tripuris in Tripura and Santhalis and Oraonis in Bihar. These people have got no States where their language is recognised as a regional language. If you want to give full opportunity to develop their own languages, then this matter is required to be dealt with in a different way.

This Report suggests only one way. It has overlooked the problems of those unfortunate people who have got no regional language accepted by the Government. In the case of those people, the first guarantee to develop their language is to give them regional autonomy. Under their own self-Government or self-administration, they can develop their mother-tongue into a regional language. By saying about autonomy, I do not say that we should allow them to secede from the Indian Union. They should remain in the Indian Union. But for the safeguard of their interests, for the safeguard of their language, for the safeguard of their economic interest, land employment, etc., these people must be treated on a different footing. They must have a regional autonomy. If they have a regional autonomy, their Government will have to spend money to develop their own language. In that way, the Nepalis, the Santhalis and Oraonis in Bihar, the the Tripuris in our parts, the tribal people in Manipur and in some other parts, may be Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, etc., should be provided with regional autonomy by which they can develop their own regional languages.

So, my point is this report will not serve the real purpose to safeguard the interests of the linguistic minorities. Take Urdu. They have got no State. But it is a developed language and there is a suggestion that wherever they have ten students or more in a school, lessons should be given in that language and there should be one teacher. But, how can you develop where more than five lakh people speak in the same language and reside in a very contiguous area and almost all the students in the schools belong to that community? You say the District Magistrate will be in charge of this. How can the District Magistrate look after this? It is not the job of any official, however high he may be. It is not

the job of certain officers. It is for that particular community and that community should be given a regional autonomous body and the entire policy and the money should be entrusted to them to look after the development of that language. If you do not adopt this measure, then simply talking of giving certain safeguards to the linguistic minorities will not help them. That is why I ask the Government to change their whole attitude and give their proper thought very deeply over this issue and see that minority people are developed.

*SHRI J.M. GOWDER (Nilgiris) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Eleventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in India for the period July, 1968 to June 1969 has been taken up for discussion today and I would like to say a few words.

At the outset, I would like to point out that the Commissioner's Report for the year 1968-69 is being discussed now in 1971-72. The very fact that the discussion on 1968-69 Report has come up so belatedly shows the scant interest of the Government in the welfare of the linguistic minorities in the country. The Office of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities is as a result of Article 350B of the Constitution. This constitutional appointment has been expressly made to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for linguistic minorities under the Constitution of India and the Commissioner's Report is to be laid before each House of Parliament. The inordinate delay in the matter of discussing the Commissioner's Report for 1968-69 makes me feel that the Office of Commissioner for Linguistic minorities has been constituted just as an eye-wash, and no serious consideration is given to the recommendations of the Commissioner.

Now, let us see what happens to such Reports after they are discussed here? If our past experience is any guide, superficial discussion takes place in this House and then they are either thrown in the dust-bin of the Secretariat or sent to the National Archive. The recommendations made in such Reports are never implemented in earnestness. I would like to say that this Report should not share the same fate. The

constitutional safeguards given to the linguistic minorities have got to be implemented and if that is to be done, then the Report of the Commissioner should be taken more seriously and effective steps must be taken to translate the constitutional mandate into action.

It has been specifically mentioned in the Report of the Commissioner that it cannot be said that all the schemes of safeguards for linguistic minorities agreed to at the all-India level have now been fully accepted by all the State/Union Territories for implementation. It is not my fancy but it is the unpalatable statement of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in his Report. I agree that the Commissioner is not the administrative machinery for implementation of the safeguards, but all the same it is a duty enjoined upon him to undertake extensive tours for investigation of grievances reported and persuade the State Governments and Union Territories to implement fully the scheme of safeguards. What is the staff at his disposal - two Class I Officers, one Class II Officer and eight ministerial staff. The Commissioner is expected to function effectively with this small complement of staff and he has to ensure proper implementation of constitutional safeguards for linguistic minorities throughout the country.

If the Government want to stand by the safeguards enshrined in the Constitution, then the time has come for augmenting the strength of staff of the Commissioner. I would also suggest the appointment of Deputy Commissioner in all the regions of the country. I know that the hon. Minister might put forth the plea that the State Governments are primarily concerned with the welfare of the linguistic minorities. If the State Governments take real interest in this matter, then there is no problem. But, what happens if certain State Governments are unmindful of the safeguards of the linguistic minorities? So far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, the State Government is genuinely interested in the welfare of linguistic minorities and is taking all possible steps to implement the safeguards for them. We have no problem at all. Let us see what obtains in other States.

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri J. M. Gowder]

An all-India agreed decision was arrived at that the knowledge of regional language should not be a pre-requisite for recruitment to State Services. But to our dismay we find that Maharashtra, Bihar, Haryana, Orissa, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh have not accepted this decision. They seem to insist that for recruitment to State Services knowledge of the regional language is essential. This shows that they are fanatically devoted to their regional languages and they do not want anyone from other States to enter their State Services.

We talk of national integration day in and day out. So long as this sort of attitude prevails, national integration will only be a distant goal. This is not an issue from which the ruling party should try to derive political advantages. In the interest of national unity, if a thing is to be done then it should be done boldly without entertaining any political considerations. If a State does not take adequate steps to implement the safeguards of linguistic minorities, then bold directions should be given by the ruling party here.

I would bring to your attention, Sir, that Bihar, Nagaland and Orissa have not yet drawn up lists of the areas where a linguistic minority group constitutes 15 per cent or more of the population. Barring Manipur and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, no other Union Territory has prepared such a list so far. What does this show? The State Governments and the Union Territories are not showing interest in the welfare of linguistic minorities living in their areas. Even after 14 years of inception of the Commissioner, he also has not been able to persuade the State Governments to do this important work. The Central Government also does not seem to be genuinely interested in the problems of linguistic minorities. India is a multi-lingual country and national integration is a must. If the problems of linguistic minorities are neglected in the manner, then surely are civil never be able to achieve nation integration. If the Commissioner is not able to discharge his functions effectively, it is only due to inadequate staff under him.

As I pointed out earlier, the staff under the Commissioner should be augmented considerably. Regional Office must be created

and Deputy Commissioners must be appointed to assist him in his onerous duties. The State Governments may be really interested in the welfare of the linguistic minorities and they may be doing everything in their power to implement the constitutional safeguards for them. But, still if the Deputy Commissioners are located in the States, they may be able to assist the State Governments which lag behind. I conclude with these few words.

श्री आर. बी. बड़े (खरगोल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय यह लिग्विस्टिक माइनारिटीज आफ इन्डिया के कमिश्नर की जो रिपोर्ट है यह बहुत महत्व की रिपोर्ट है। अब यह रिपोर्ट देने का हर साल प्रयत्न किया जाता है पर दरअसल में माइनारिटीज के बारे में जितने सेफगार्ड्स अपने संविधान में दिए गए हैं उन का पालन होता है या नहीं यह देखने की बात है। कमिश्नर ने 1956 में यह कहा है—

“We wish to emphasise that no guarantee can secure a minority against every kind of discriminatory policy of a State Government. Government activity at State level affects virtually every sphere of a person's life and a democratic government must reflect the moral and political standards of the people.”

इसके साथ में एक और बात उन्होंने यह कही है :

‘Enough safeguards and enough provision should be made so as not to perpetuate separatism or to impede the processes of natural assimilation.’

इस प्रकार से दोनों बातें यह चाहते हैं कि कान्टिन्युइटी रहे ऐसिमिलेशन भी रहे और यह राष्ट्र एक है तो एक भावना होनी चाहिये।

मैं विशेषकर मध्य प्रदेश से आया हूँ तो मध्य प्रदेश के बारे में ही ज्यादा मैं बोलूंगा। मध्य प्रदेश में दो प्रकार की मिन्न-मिन्न परिस्थितियाँ हैं। एक तो 'बाहरी' है। बाहरी लोग हिन्दी, इंग्लिश, उर्दू, संस्कृत और मराठी

बोलते हैं। लेकिन जो बोर्डर एरिया है, हिली क्षेत्र है जिसमें 67 लाख आदिवासी रहते हैं उनकी भाषा अलग-अलग है। उनमें माडिया भाषा गवर्नमेंट ने मान ली है। लेकिन वस्तर में हलबी भाषा है। उसके बारे में कोई भी प्राविजन नहीं है और गवर्नमेंट ने उसके लिए कोई भी कदम अभी तक नहीं उठाया है। फिर एक गोडी भाषा है जिसे बोलने वाले 22 लाख गोड है। गोडी भाषा के बारे में मैंने भी बहुत दफा कहा कि गोडी भाषा की स्टडी और उसका प्रतिनिधित्व होना चाहिये लेकिन वह भी नहीं हुआ। मेरे क्षेत्र में कम से कम 20-22 लाख लोग ऐसे हैं, भील और भिलाले जिनकी भाषा भीली है लेकिन उसमें भी अलग अलग ट्राइब्ज है और उनकी भाषा भी अलग अलग अलग है। तो उनकी भाषा की स्टडी कैसे हो, इस के बारे में कमिश्नर ने मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट के बारे में कुछ लिखा है। सकेड्री एजुकेशन के विषय में उन्होंने लिखा है—

'The State Government have accepted the principle that provision of facilities for instruction through any language mentioned in the Eight Schedule will be considered, if *bona fide* requests by a fair number of pupils are received for the same. However, the Madhya Pradesh Government are yet to issue orders to provide facilities for instruction through the mother-tongue of linguistic minorities at the secondary stage according to the agreed formula. It has been brought to the notice of the Commissioner that fixation of the minimum strength of pupils for providing such facilities would involve a heavy expenditure. There is provision for advance registration of Linguistic minority pupils desirous to have instruction at the secondary stage of education as well. The progress made in opening such registers has also been intimated by the State Government. Government have

issued orders for non-diminution of the facilities for instruction through minority languages as existed on 1st November, 1936 "

कमीशन की पहले जो रिपोर्ट आई है उसमें भी यह बातें थी और अभी भी उन्होंने पेज 40 पैराग्राफ 282 में यही कहा है कि सकेड्री एजुकेशन में माइन्सिटीज और आदिवासियों की जो भाषा है उसके शिक्षण की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है। मैं कहता हूँ कि केन्द्र से इस प्रकार का कमीशन जाता है और उसको कोई भी सख्ती करने का अधिकार नहीं दिया जाता है तो इस प्रकार का कमीशन नियुक्त करना फिजूल बात है और फिजूल का पार्लियामेंट का टाइम भी लेना है। इसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा है कि मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट ने उनको यह लिखा—

"The official language of the State is Hindi. A list of the districts, tehsils and municipal areas has been prepared by the State Government "

उन्होंने यह कहा है कि हमने जो प्रस्तावली भेजी उसके उत्तर में मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट ने यह कहा है—

'The Madhya Pradesh Government have stated that replies to representations in minority languages are not sent in the languages in which these are received."

लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि जो प्रस्तावली गई थी वह हिन्दी में गई थी। हिन्दी में पूछने की वजह से उसका जवाब भी हिन्दी में गया था। इसलिए उनको अपनी भाषा नहीं थी वह सवाल नहीं आता है। उन्होंने खुद ही प्रस्तावली जो निकाली थी वह हिन्दी में निकाली, थी और हिन्दी में ही जवाब दिया गया है। तो आदिवासियों ने जवाब अपनी भाषा में नहीं दिया यह पूछना निरर्थक है। फिर कहा है—

[श्री आर० वी० बर्ड]

"The Madhya Pradesh Government have said that there has been no demand for publication of substances of laws, rules etc. in minority languages."

इस के बाद कहा है कि रेडियो में माइना-रिटी लैंग्वेज जो है उनका प्रचार होना चाहिये जैसे राजस्थानी है मैथिली है :

"Radio broadcasts have become part and parcel of the life of our citizens. This is well illustrated from the demands received from Sindhi speakers in Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and U.P."

मध्यप्रदेश में उन्होंने सिंधी का थोड़ा सा प्रोग्राम दिया है हफ्ते में एक दिन। लेकिन वह बिल्कुल अपर्याप्त है। एक अंग्रेज लेखक ने कहा है कि इन्डिया इज ए म्युजियम आफ लैंग्वेज। मैं कहता हूँ कि म्युजियम होगा लेकिन जो लिग्विस्टिक माइनारिटीज है उनको अपने साथ लेना है, उनको अपना कल्चर सिखाना है तो उन आदिवासियों के लिए उनकी अपनी भाषा में ही किताबें तैयार होनी चाहिये, टेकस्ट बुक्स होनी चाहिये।

इस के साथ साथ मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन की भाषा और हमारी भाषा में बहुत फर्क है। हिंदी भाषा जो वह बोलते हैं वह बहुत टूटी फुटी हिंदी बोलते हैं। उसको एक डायलेक्ट आप समझिए लेकिन वह हिंदी भाषा से बिल्कुल विपरीत है। सिर्फ लिग्वेड एक बराबर है मैं समझता हूँ कि इसकी स्टडी होनी चाहिये। लेकिन मध्यप्रदेश गवर्नमेंट अपने आपस के भगड़े जो हैं मिनिस्ट्रीज का भगड़ा है पार्टीज का भगड़ा है उसकी वजह से वह आदिवासियों की तरफ देखते नहीं हैं। एक कमीशन नियुक्त कर दिया है जो जाता है। सत्रह जिले हैं आदिवासियों के जिनमें 67 लाख आदिवासी यहां रहते हैं। लेकिन उनकी भाषा के शिक्षण की कोई

व्यवस्था नहीं है। बस्तर में मैं गया था उनकी जो भाषा है हलबी भाषा वह दूसरी भाषाओं से बिल्कुल विपरीत भाषा है। उसकी तरफ शासन ने या केन्द्र ने कभी ध्यान नहीं दिया।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि उर्दू भाषा के बारे में कहा गया है कि इतने स्टूडेंट्स हों तो उसके लिए टीचर की व्यवस्था की जायगी। उर्दू भाषा अपने देश की भाषा है। लेकिन देवनागरी में लिखी जाय तो हमें कोई भ्रावजेकशन नहीं है। उर्दू भाषा में कहा गया है कि 15 स्टूडेंट्स हों तो एक टीचर दिया जायगा। कितने दिये गए इसकी संख्या दी गयी है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां मध्य प्रदेश में क्या चल रहा है, द्राइवल भाषाओं की व्यावस्था क्यों नहीं की जा रही है। इस ग्यारहवीं रिपोर्ट में कमिश्नर ने इसके बारे में लिखा है। मैं कहता हूँ कि हिंदी भाषा से सबको परिचित होना चाहिए लेकिन उसका मतलब वह नहीं है कि जो उनकी मातृभाषा है वह खत्म हो जाय। वह खत्म नहीं होनी चाहिए। जो बच्चे आते हैं वह मात्रभाषा ही पढ़ते हैं। सेकेन्ड्री एजुकेशन में मैं ने देखा है जो मास्टर आते हैं उनको भी वह भाषा नहीं आती है। मैं ने देखा है कि कोर्ट में आदिवासी आते हैं तो कोर्ट को समझाना मुश्किल होता है। वकील उनको समझाता है। एक वकील कहता है कि यह फलां बात कह रहा है दूसरा कहता है कि नहीं यह दूसरी बात कह रहा है। फिर वकीलों के आपस में झगड़े होते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ जैसे हम अपनी भाषा में कहते हैं—ठहरो, ठहरो, उसको वह कहते हैं हागा हागा। अब वह यह समझते हैं कि यह मद्रा नहीं क्या कह रहे हैं गाली दे रहे हैं या क्या कह रहे हैं? जैसे हम राम राम कहते हैं, जो वह अपनी भाषा में बाक बाक कहते हैं, जो उनकी जो इस तरह की भाषाओं हैं उनके

सिक्ख की उचित व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए।

महाराष्ट्र में लिग्विस्टिक माइनरिटीज के केसेज में उन्होंने कहा है कि हम उनकी जो भाषाएँ हैं उनको नहीं लेंगे। वहाँ की जो जिला परिवर्द्ध हैं वह उनको मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं। तो मैं ऐसा समझना हूँ कि लिग्विस्टिक माइनरिटीज कमिश्नर को यह ताकत दी जाय कि वह जाकर उनको बाध्य करें और उनसे पूछे कि हमने जो सिफारिश दी है वह पूरी हुई या नहीं। तब तो इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट देने और पार्लियामेंट का टाइम लेने का कोई अर्थ होगा नहीं तो हर जगह लिग्विस्टिक माइनरिटीज कमिश्नर की रिपोर्ट भेजना और हमारा यहाँ बोलना सब बेकार है। पहली रिपोर्ट आप ने देखी होगी और यह रिपोर्ट भी आपने देखी होगी। दोनों में एक ही बात लिखी हुई है। इसमें वही बात लिखी हुई है जो पहली रिपोर्ट में लिखी थी तो मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट या दूसरी गवर्नमेंट्स इसकी सिफारिश को क्यों नहीं मानती हैं इसकी तरफ ध्यान जाना चाहिए। बस इतना ही मुझे निवेदन करना है।

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY : Mr. Deputy-speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on my substitute motions more in a sense of sorrow and in frustration rather than in anger even though any sensible person has more than enough reason to feel angry about these reports which are being submitted here to Parliament.

Sir, if I may be permitted to strike a personal note, I can say that I was one of the most ardent supporters of the proposal for the creation of a special officer for linguistic minorities in the wake of the acrimonious debates that had been raised in both the Houses of Parliament on the SRC report. It may be recalled that the States Reorganisation Commission had been appointed in the year 1954 to redraw the boundaries of the States of the Indian Union on the basis of language, culture and administrative

convenience. After the Harcourt labours of the SRC were over and its findings saw the light of the day, the SRC Bill had been drawn up to redraw the boundaries of the States of the Indian Union. After the exercise was over, it was found that a new problem had crept up in the shape of the linguistic minorities.

After the States had been redrawn on linguistic, cultural and administrative basis, it was seen that there was accretion of a certain population in the linguistic States which was known as linguistic minorities, people speaking a language different from the majority of the people speaking a particular language and residing in a particular State. Now, it was at the instance of the late Prime Minister Nehru, in the interests of emotional integration, the post of a special officer to safeguard the cultural, political and economic rights of the linguistic minorities was created and it came to be enshrined in article 350B of the Constitution.

Sir, I do not wish to take the time of the House by repeating the various safeguards which had been provided for the linguistic minorities in the Constitution of India. For instance, among others article 29 says that every citizen belonging to the linguistic minority has the inherent right to conserve his own culture, his own language and his own cultural characteristics. Article 16 says that every person belonging to the linguistic minorities must be given equality of opportunity in matters of public employment. Article 15 says that there should be prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, caste, place of birth, etc. There are also various other safeguards which the House knows only too well, and I do not wish to take the time of the House by traversing that familiar ground.

This special officer had been appointed to safeguard these inalienable rights of the linguistic minorities. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities was specifically charged to see that the linguistic minorities are not degraded to the status of second-class or third-class citizens living in a State. In that context, if we view this particular report, let alone all the other tame reports which had been laid on the Table of the House so far, one comes to the painful conclusion that it is an exercise in futility. Therefore, it is an irony of history

[Shri Surendra Mohanty]

that I, who was ardently supporting the proposal for the creation of the post of a special officer, namely, the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, stand today to urge upon this House to recommend to the Government for its abolition. It is true that the Government tried a retired High Court Judge; various other incumbents came and left. Of late I do not know why the Home Ministry has a special fascination for the feminine sex and of late the linguistic minorities commissioners are ladies. I have great admiration for them. For instance, the Commissioner who had submitted this report was a personal friend of mine and we have worked for a long time as colleagues in Parliament and I bear personal testimony of her sincerity of purpose. But may I urge on the Government that they should not make this post a cushy berth for frustrated politicians and defeated party men in the elections and belonged to the ruling party and the present also was a Member of the Rajya Sabha. I do not envy their fortune but I would only plead that they must express deeper concern for the misfortune of the linguistic minorities.

I had expected from the hon. Minister Mr. Mirdha an eloquent speech on the linguistic minorities commissioner's report, while moving this motion. But he was laconic and merely said that this was the responsibility of the State Governments.

The next question is: if the responsibility devolves on the State Governments what was the purpose in creating a special officer for linguistic minorities and providing him one class I officer, half a dozen class II officers and a number of ministerial officers—a full complement in Allahabad. It is for making *snan* in the Sangam and thereby earn piety and *dharma*? Or to discharge certain functions as directed under article 350(b) of the Constitution?

In this light I want to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to certain enormities in this report? This report is in respect of the linguistic minorities in India. It should have been common knowledge to the Commissioner for linguistic minorities that there are about two or three lakhs of unfortunate Oriya speakers living in Bihar in Sakalla sub-division of Singhbhum district. I do not wish to go into the history as to how they came

to be there. I am only concerned to find that this report clearly sweeps them away and does not make even a mention about the Oriya speaking linguistic minorities in Bihar. It says on page 22 of the report:

“The speakers of Hindi, Bihari, Urdu, Santhali, Bengali, Mundari and Oraon/Kurukh constitute 44.30, 35.39, 8.93, 3.57, 2.84, 1.21 and 1.19 per cent respectively of the population.”

Have the Oriya-minorities been eliminated in the meantime.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I may be given some time because it is a matter which affects fundamentally the lives of millions of people.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have given you six minutes more than your time.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY: Please give me five more minutes. I have given notice of two motions and I have applied my mind and studied this report.

Even though this report at page 22 under the heading ‘Bihar’ had refused to recognise the existence of Oriya linguistic minorities, in para 134 at the same page it says:

“According to a report received from the State Government, there are facilities for instruction through the media of Bengali, Ho, Maithili, Munda, Oraon, Oriya, Santhali and Urdu.”

If the Commissioner had applied some to-who he or she was signing, he or she could have certainly detected this inconsistency in the report. On the one hand, you do not recognise the existence of Oriya-speaking minorities in Bihar. On the other, you claim to have provided educational facilities for them. It is all moonshine, a tissue of blackest lies, meant only to hoodwink Parliament that a particular Government is taking all possible steps for providing safeguards for linguistic minorities. Only the other day, the Oriya-speaking population had to resort to hunger-strike and protests, because to spread them over the State like homeless Jews, Sakalla sub-division was going to be dismembered and partitioned to disperse the concentration of Oriya speakers. Against this move, there was hunger-strike and *dharma*. It is a very

painful thing for me to say that there was a *lahi charge* by Bihar police on the peaceful pickets who went there to protest against this enormity. You will also find in the report how the Oriya-speaking minorities in Bihar have been denied the opportunity of employment. There are various other things, to which I do not wish to make a reference now. I propose to bring all these matters to the notice of the minister. I submit the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner should not merely investigate into these things, but should bring them to the notice of the President. It should be the incumbent duty of the President, or the President should be advised by the Home Ministry, to issue directives to the defaulting State Governments that the provisions of the Constitution were properly implemented. If that is not done, the commission will be merely a redundant appendage only meant only to provide jobs for retired or frustrated politicians of the ruling party.

In Andhra also, there are Oriya-speaking minorities, but they are not being given the protection they deserve. In this report, you will find the fantastic statement that Oriya-knowing teachers are not available in Andhra. With the rising spiral of unemployment, do you believe that Oriya-knowing teachers are not available to teach in Andhra Schools? I will wind up by saying that either you have to strengthen the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner with adequate funds and other resources so that he performs his duties effectively or you abolish that sinecure. Pending that please for heaven's sake, see that special efforts are undertaken to safeguard the constitutional rights of the Oriya-speaking minorities in Andhra and Bihar.

My hon. friend from Madras said that there are no problems of linguistic minorities there. They have been fully integrated emotionally. But when I went to Madras, I found that nobody understood any other language except Tamil. Mr. was changed to Thiru and I was addressed as Thiru everywhere. That only shows how Madras, how Tamilnadu, is proud of its own heritage, its own language, culture etc.

I would plead only one thing. What is sauce for the gander must be sauce for the

goose. If the Government of India insists that knowledge of Hindi, which is the official language, will be essential for holding Central Government posts, I do not see any reason why the State Governments should not insist on knowledge of regional languages in the interest of good administration.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA (Balasore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is a very controversial subject and anyone who claims himself to be a socialist will be very much afraid to deal with a subject like this lest he would be misunderstood.

AN HON MEMBER: Then why are you dealing with it?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: I am dealing with it for the specific reason that persons who are in the social and cultural field are confronted with this vital question.

The position of the Minorities Commissioner has become almost a decoration. I tell you from my own personal experience that there are about 6 lakhs of Oriya-speaking people in West Bengal working in greater Calcutta. I do not say that they should not learn Bengali. They should. When I was in Bengal for 16 years I made it a point to learn Bengali. Similarly, when I go to Bihar I claim to be a Biharí and speak Hindi. But my sons and daughters will certainly demand that they should also have the right to learn their mother-tongue, which is Oriya. But to my utter surprise, confusion, dismay, disillusionment and frustration I found that in West Bengal there are no facilities for learning Oriya for six lakhs of Oriya-speaking people. This matter was taken up with D. B.C. Roy when he was the Chief Minister and also with Shri P.C. Sen when he became the Chief Minister. Ultimately what happened was that study of Oriya language was abolished for the post-graduate departments of the Calcutta University.

Now, what harm is there if the Minorities Commissioner tells the West Bengal Government that these six lakhs Oriya-speaking people want their sons and daughters to learn Oriya language in addition to Bengali and what is the difficulty in the

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

State Government agreeing to such a proposal? In certain outlying Oriya tracts in West Bengal—I am not raising the question of outlying Oriya tracts as such—there are three lakhs of Oriya speaking people who want that there should be safeguards for their mother tongue. Now there is no provision for their sons and daughters to learn through the medium of their mother tongue. If only the government insists and persists on the stand that there should be provision for learning through their mother tongue for all the people, all this problem could be solved. In India there is no harm if we learn even ten languages. But facility for learning through the mother tongue should be there.

I am approaching this subject from the psychological standpoint. We cannot become nationalists and socialists unless we solve this problem. In Russia they solved the national and chauvinistic problems in the Balkan Province. Why could we not do that in India when we claim ourselves to be socialists?

When I am in Delhi I speak in Hindi. Similarly, Oriyas living in Bengal must learn Bengali. At the same time, there must be provision for their children to learn Oriya in the schools and colleges. There is the same problem in Andhra Pradesh also.

When the linguistic redistribution commission was there I took it for granted that there will definitely be many areas, outlying areas where this problem will arise, where the people have not got the facility to learn through their own mother tongue. The best course will be to allow the mother tongue to be used in the schools and colleges. Then there will be no difficulty.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He may continue his speech the next day. Now we will take up the discussion on Bengal.

15.00 hrs.

MOTION RE LAW AND ORDER SITUATION IN WEST BENGAL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we shall take up the motion standing in the

name of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and Shri Samar Mukherjee.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond-Harbour): Sir, it is marked for three hours. Since you were very gracious yesterday for a motion which stood on the same footing, I shall be grateful if you will apply the same principle today that you did yesterday.

I move:—

“That this House expresses its serious concern at the deteriorating law and order situation in West Bengal and role therein of a section of the police, C.R.P., official machinery and anti-social elements.”

It is a very bad day for us that we have to bring these things before this august House. The day before yesterday a headmaster in Durgapur was burnt alive within his own school. Sir, you come from the teaching profession, so, you will realise the seriousness of the whole thing. Who could do it but the protected gangsters of the ruling party? I shall quote it later during my speech.

In Garia in South 24-Parganas, on the head of a senior political worker named Narayan Roy Chowdhury, the police have inscribed the words “CPM” with a sharp weapon. The inscription on his head with the sharp weapon was done within the police station where the key persons of law and order are supposed to exist. I quote from what the magistrate says in his order—

“Seen prayer of Investigating Officer to show arrest of accused Narayan Roy Chowdhury who has been forwarded to court today in connection with Sonarpur Police Station Case No. . .”

Then, it goes on to say:—

“Sonarpur Police Station went to the brutal length of inscribing the letters “CPM” on the back of his head by means of a sharp weapon. I personally found this wound on the back of the head of this accused when he was produced before me. I also saw a good number of other bleeding injuries all over the person of this accused.”