

that nothing should be done in this country which would create a feeling of scare and put difficulties in the way of Government and the interests of the millions of our people. I seek the cooperation of all the hon. members in this endeavour of ours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Jatesingrao Gaekwad to reply. He is not here. I will now put to the House the substitute motion No. 1 that was moved yesterday. The question is—

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

"This House, having considered the food situation in the country, notes with regret that the prices of foodstuffs have soared sky-high and the purchasing power of the people has been constantly declining and the Government have utterly failed to check this tendency"

The motion was negatived.

15.23 hrs.

MOTION RE TWELFTH REPORT OF COMMISSIONER FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up further consideration of the Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities.

Shri Rao Birender Singh may continue.

श्री बीरेन्द्र सिंह राव (महेन्द्रगढ़)
 डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं कल अर्ज कर रहा था कि कम संख्या में भाषा बोलने वालों के लिये जो तहफ़क़ुज कर दिया गया है—हमारे कांस्टीचूशन में, वह एक खास स्कीम के तहत है और वह स्कीम कांस्टीट्यूशन के पार्ट 17 के अन्दर रखी गई है। आर्टीकल 350 (ए) और (बी) में सिर्फ़ इतना तहफ़क़ुज दिया गया है कि लिग्विस्टिक माइनॉरिटिज़ के बच्चों को उनकी अपनी

भाषा में प्राइमरी स्कूल की एज़ुकेशन देने का बन्वोबन्धन किया जायगा। यह तहफ़क़ुज आखरी और चौथे चैप्टर में दिया गया है जो पार्ट 17 के अन्दर है।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मुझे इस बात का अक़वाम है कि जो स्कीम कांस्टीट्यूशन में आफिशियल लैंग्वेज के मुतल्लिक अपनाई गई है, उस की तरफ़ देश ने ध्यान नहीं दिया, उस में हम सब बराबर के कुसूरवार है और इस हाउस में भी उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया गया राष्ट्रपति जी ने भी ध्यान नहीं दिया। साथ ही मैं उन का भी कुसूर समझना हूँ जो लिग्विस्टिक माइनॉरिटीज़ है जो प्रोटेक्शन चाहती है, लेकिन राष्ट्रभाषा के बिनाफ़ आवाज़ उठाती है, देश की एक भाषा बनाने के बँ ख़िलाफ़ है। चैप्टर 1, पार्ट 17 में यह प्रोवाइड किया गया है कि इस देश की आफिशियल लैंग्वेज हिन्दी होगी—देवनागरी स्क्रिप्ट में और 15 वर्ष तक अंग्रेज़ी में काम चलाया जा सकता है। कांस्टीचूशन लागू होने के 5 वर्ष बाद एक कमीशन बनाया जायगा, दूसरा कमीशन 10 वर्ष के बाद बनाया जायगा और ये कमीशन देखेंगे कि 15 वर्ष में देश में राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी लागू हो जाय। लेकिन अक़वाम की बात है कि न पहले कमीशन की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आई, न पार्लियामेन्ट की कमेटी के सामने—जो इस मिलसिले में बनी थी, वह रिपोर्ट गई। उस कमेटी ने क्या रिक्मेन्डेणन्ज़ की हैं वह रिपोर्ट भी पार्लियामेन्ट के सामने नहीं आई और जहा तक मेरा ख़याल है कांस्टीचूशन के एक खास आर्टिकल के इण्टरक्टिव को

[श्री वीरेंद्र सिंह रा-]

इसकार कर के सरकार न दूसरा कमीशन हिन्दी के दिने बनाया, जा 10 साल के बाद बनना था आज 25 साल हो गये हैं ।

अंग्रेजी देश का मन्त्र नहीं है विदेशी भाषा है लख आज भी पूरे जार शासक चल रही है । यह उस कमीशन का काम था कि वह निष्कर्ष करता कि किस हद तक अंग्रेज का यज्ञ रिस्ट्रिक्ट किया जाय 15 साल के अन्दर किस तरह से हिन्दी प्राप्तिव्य आधार पर लागू की जाय । पार्लियामेन्ट का यह अख्तियार दिया गया था कि 15 वर्ष के बाद अगर अंग्रेजी का इस्तेमाल होगा तो पार्लियामेन्ट लेजिस्लेशन के जगहें इजाजत दे सकता है वरम अंग्रेजी का इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता था । पार्लियामेन्ट ने कोई लेजिस्लेशन पार नहीं किया कि 15 वर्षों के बाद अंग्रेजी का इस्तेमाल इस देश में किस हद तक कड़ा कड़ा किस तरीके से होगा ।

मैंने अभी कहा कि लिग्विस्टिक माइनीरिटीज न भी इस तरह ध्यान नहीं दिया— कास्टीचुशन के मुताबिक जब तक उस सारी स्कीम को अपनाया नहीं जायगा तब तक वे प्रोटेक्शन क्लेम नहीं कर सकते हैं । देश की जब तक एक भाषा नहीं होगी तब तक देश में एकता नहीं आ सकती, न देश के अन्दर एकीकरण आ सकता है खोशल इन्टीग्रेशन, इकानामिक इन्टीग्रेशन, कल्चरल इन्टीग्रेशन कुछ नहीं हो सकता है और यह देश एक नेशन नहीं

बन सकता जब तक वह सारी स्कीम को न अपनाये ।

आर्टिकल 350(ए) और (बी) के अन्दर जो प्रोटेक्शन दिया गया है, वह स्पेशल डाइरेक्टिव्स वा आधारी चैप्टर है उस में भी आखरी आर्टिकल 351 है जिसे मैं यज्ञ रखा गया है—

‘It shall be the duty of the State to develop Hindi to serve as a medium of expression for all elements of the composite culture of India’

मैं डिप्टी स्पोकर्स साहब फास्टीचुशन का कोट कर रहा हूँ लेकिन अफसोस है कि इस तरह कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है वरन्क छोटी छोटी चीजों की तरह हम दौड़ रहे हैं । आज मुझे दुःख होता है जब हिन्दुस्तान की कोई भाषा दिखाई नहीं देती उस के बजाय हम आपस में बड़े हुए एक दूसरे के गले पर छुरी चार्ते हुए दिखाई देने हैं । आप एशिया 72 में जायें, वहाँ विदेशी स्टाला में जा कर देखिये, उनके अन्दर आप का कोई भी ऐसा विदेशी बर्तकान्दा नहीं मिलगा जा हिन्दी जानना हो, उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तानिया को अपने यहाँ इन्टरप्रेटर रखा हुआ है । इस के मुकाबले आप हमारे उन आदिमियों को देखें जो यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में हम को रिप्रेजेंट करने जाते हैं, वे वहाँ दूसरे देशों की तरह अपनी भाषा में बात नहीं कर सकते, वे वहाँ विदेशी भाषा में ही बात करते हैं, सीक्रेटरी मीटिंग्स में वे कर भी अपनी भाषा में बात नहीं कर सकते ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is this a linguistic majority or minority? The Report is about Linguistic Minorities.

SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO: This is all connected; this is a part of the whole scheme. I am talking about the whole concept of it

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, ये भाषा के झगड़े आगे भी होते रहेंगे जब तक यह सरकार हम बात की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देगी कि निम्न तरीके से अलग अलग लैंग्वेजिज को पूरा बहावा दिया जाय। नमाम देग से ऐसी कोई भी भाषा नहीं है जिम को आप टोटली माइ मीरिटी की भाषा कह सके। हर एक लैंग्वेज अगर किसी स्टेट से माइनोरिटी की लैंग्वेज है तो हमारे स्टेट से मीजोरिटी की लैंग्वेज है। हम को थंड उफारता से देखना होगा, तब ये झगड़े बन्द हो सकेंगे।

इस सरकार ने एक नीति अपनाई कि भाषा के आधार पर इस देश के अन्दर स्टेट्स का रिआर्गेनिजेशन किया जाय। कुछ हद तक रिआर्गेनिजेशन आ भी, लेकिन अभी भी बहुत सी डिमाण्ड आप के पाम हैं, कोई भोजपुरी चाहता है, कोई उलगांग चाहता है, कोई भाषा के आधार पर इरिगाणा का विस्तार चाहता है— बिशाल हरियाणा चाहता है। यह सारी चीजें दोबारा देखनी चाहिए। और मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस भाषा के झगड़े मिटाने हैं तो भाषा के आधार पर दोबारा एक स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमिशन बनाकर सरकार ज्यादा तहफूज रिजनाल लैंग्वेज को देने के लिए फिर से सुबो को तन्वीम करे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before I proceed further, I would like to mention two points. Number one is to remind the members that we are discussing about the problems of linguistic minorities and not of the majorities in this country. Number two is that we had fixed five hours for this debate, but we have already taken more than five hours. Even so, there are many more speakers. The Congress party itself has sent to me a list of another seven speakers; there are also others who are not in the list but who seem to be very eager to speak; and there are names from individual members also. Under these circumstances, I should be guided by the pleasure of the House.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS (Mangaldai): Let the time be extended.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Yes; let the time be extended.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you want the time to be extended, may I know by what amount of time it should be extended?

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: Upto 6.00 p.m.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs have anything to say?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): As you rightly pointed out, Sir, we are in the hand of the House. May I suggest that we may leave some time for other business also? It is only 3.30 p.m. now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): No. Till the rising of the House today.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Are all of you agreeable to discuss it till the rising of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Then how can I defy the House?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So, we will discuss this until the House adjourns today. I would like to know how much time the Minister will require?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): About half an hour.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will call him at 5.30 p.m. We have two hours more for the members.

Mr. B. R. Shukla.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Bahraica): It is an unhappy coincidence that the discussion of the Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities who is entrusted with the power of investigating the safeguards on primary education in mother-tongue has come up in the House at a time when one of the States of our Union, namely, Assam, has been rocked by serious, shameful and painful riots. Therefore, it is but natural, though avoidable and undesirable, that the debate has degenerated itself into mutual recriminations and mud-slinging and also mutual acrimony. The debate would have been certainly more scientific and more fruitful if the heat of the controversy had been put aside and the discussion had been more dispassionate.

The reason why there has been a provision in the Constitution itself for providing safeguards for primary education in the mother-tongue for linguistic minorities is this that, when a child is born, he knows only the language of the mother and, therefore, at that stage of infancy, it is well-nigh impossible for a child to adopt a medium other than its mother-tongue. Therefore, whether it is tribal people or whether it is Bengali people, they may belong to any group or section, but the question here is, if they constitute a linguistic minority in some part of the country, there must be provision for imparting education in the mother-tongue of that particular minority. A Constitutional provision has been laid down that there would be a Commissioner appointed to

investigate whether adequate safeguards have been given for this purpose or not, and the report of the Commissioner is, Constitutionally, required to be laid before the House for discussion. But in the same constitutional provision, it is also provided that such reports shall be sent to the States. Now, the Central Government or the Commissioner for that purpose, is not empowered to implement these constitutional provisions. My submission is that there should be a change in the Constitution itself which should provide that such reports should not only be laid before the Houses of Parliament but such portion as it pertains to that particular State, should be laid before the appropriate legislature of the State concerned so that Members of that legislature should have ample opportunity to discuss whether the safeguards and the constitutional directive that exist have been observed or have been observed only in the breach.

Then, there is another difficulty. Primary Education has been made the exclusive subject of the States. Therefore, when primary education has not made sufficient headway in this country, even for the children of the majority community, it is no wonder that the minority communities who, by their very nature, are not sufficiently entrenched in the legislature, do not find that the safeguards, existing for them have been observed in their proper spirit. Therefore, it should be provided that when the Centre is allocating funds for educational expansion, a certain sum should be earmarked for the education of the linguistic minorities in their mother tongue and if that is not followed, the grant should lapse or, the Centre should directly take upon itself the responsibility of establishing such groups of schools in every State and the State should be completely relieved of the obligation of implementing these provisions.

I am quite conscious of the directive that you have just given that this is not a discussion about the implementation of the national language. But I would beg your indulgence for becoming a little

apparently irrelevant in this context because the question of language is divisible in three parts. The question is of mother tongue. The question is of regional language and the question is of national language. These three questions cannot be discussed in their isolation. But, for a proper appreciation, all these three questions should be viewed in one gamut and I think then only there can be a proper appreciation.

It has been said that injustice is done to one type of linguistic minority or the other in this country and, therefore, there are so many riots, so many feuds and differences. My own submission is that India has been a nation in spite of diversity in culture, language, religion, creed and caste and that unity which is coming down from the time immemorial can certainly, I hope, survive all these ugly riots which are the outcome, not of linguistic differences but they are the outcome of the basic cause of economic disparity in this country. From time immemorial, the language of the ruling class has been the instrument of oppression over millions in the country. In the Vedic times or in the Aryan times, the language was Sanskrit. It was rich in heritage, it was scientific in approach, but it remained the language of a few priests and Pandits and of the rulers and the masses were wholly cut off from that language. Persian language was the language of the Muslim rulers. English was the language of the British rulers. This is what happened. The Government now is not carried on by a few *elite*, nor by monarchs or by aristocrats, but the Government now is carried on by the elected representatives of the people. Therefore, it is but natural that regional languages clamour for recognition and recognition of their due place.

At the primary stage the Government should provide facilities for the education of children in their mother tongue. The regional language should be the language of the colleges at the secondary stage. Over and above the regional language, there should be a national language, which is for the time being.

Hindi and English, both. We have heard various things about implementation of Hindi and progress in Hindi. The question of encouraging regional language and mother tongue should be taken up along with the development of Hindi, all these three should be dealt with together. The Ministry of Education should be made responsible for the implementation of the various provisions of the constitution.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Sir, in regard to the Report under discussion, that is, from July 1969 to June, 1970, in the very first para of the report itself it has been stated that due to the fact that the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities assumed charge after this period, this has been made possible due to the assistance of the establishment alone. Under the circumstances I would go into one of the major recommendations No. 702 made by the previous Linguistic Minorities Commissioner. It states:

The question of providing facilities or instruction through mother-tongue to Konkani-speakers in Mysore has been engaging the attention of the State Government since 1964.

—that is, for the last 6 years.

It has been seen that facility for instruction through Konkani medium exists in Goa, Daman and Diu.

—It should be appreciated that Shri-mati Maragatham Chandrasekhar had been very considerate.

It will be appreciated if the Government of Mysore take final decision in the matter without any further loss of time so as to instil a feeling of confidence in the Konkani-speakers of Mysore.

It is high time—for 6 years the State Government has been sitting, sitting pretty, if I may say so,—without taking any decision on a very simple thing.

Article 350 of the Constitution provides that it shall be the endeavour of the State Government to provide for instruction in

Minorities (M)

[SHRI B. V. NAIK]

Mother-tongue. We witnessed yesterday and day before yesterday substantial amounts of debate as well as heat in regard to the linguistic minorities. I would like the Minister of Home Affairs to tell us what is the language of the minority. The Chair was of course very kind in asking us that we should be able to confine our discussion in regard to the linguistic minorities only.

I strongly feel, Sir, that the definition of the linguistic minorities should be re-defined and reinterpreted.

Sir, in Assam Khasi is a linguistic minority. In Bihar, Santhali is a linguistic minority. In the State of Gujarat, Bhili is a linguistic minority. In the State of Kashmir, Pahari is a linguistic minority. In the State of Madhya Pradesh, it is Gondi which is the linguistic minority; in Maharashtra, it is Bhili; in Mysore, it is Konkani and Bhajari; in U.P., it is Kumaoni, and in Bengal it is Santhali. These are the minorities which we find when we go through the 11th report of the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner.

When we talk about the linguistic minorities in the various States right from Kashmir to Cape Comorin, we are talking only about linguistic rivalries. As far as the so-called linguistic minorities are concerned to whom the so-called injustice is done, it is a case of injustice being done by one rival language to the other language. When the Constitution guarantees instruction in the mother-tongue for the linguistic minorities, the primary concern of the Government and the Ministry of Home Affairs should be to take care first and foremost of those people who have no language to speak of their own. In these circumstances, I would like to suggest a sort of formula.

There was a talk by one of our very learned Members about something called as cultural genocide. It was in respect of two States which have engaged the major portion of the debate. If we want to keep the culture alive, with great deference to

the learned speaker as well as the great culture, let us say, of Bengal, the Bengali culture, if we want to maintain, let us say, the Kannada culture or the Bengali culture, I would say that let the concerned linguistic States foot the bill. I did not want to enter into this, but what we find is that we are asking the Assamese Government to foster the Bengali culture. Similarly, I think our friends from Tamil Nadu are asking the Government of Mysore to foster Tamil culture . .

SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kolkata): For his information, I may say that there is not much difference between Bengali and Assamese cultures.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: But the word 'culture' or the German equivalent 'kultur' was used. I would say that let the respective States which are interested in the furtherance of the culture and the language and the traditions foot the bill for the starting of their language medium schools. In these circumstances, I would suggest that the case of these linguistic minorities has to be reviewed, and I would suggest also that the respective State Governments should be able to foot the bill. I would go to the extent of saying that if the Mysoreans or the Karnatak people want schools to be opened, let us say, in the city of Bombay for Kannada boys and girls, well, we cannot quarrel; the State of Maharashtra may do whatever is practicable and possible. That is good enough. But if some more facilities are required, let the respective State Governments come forward and foot the bill in respect of the schools that are going to be started in the city of Bombay or anywhere else in Maharashtra, or in that way, we can even say wherever are linguistic minorities of the official languages of the country all over the country. On that ground, can we say that those speaking the official language of the Union as defined in article 344 of the Constitution is a linguistic minority anywhere in this country? It will lead to lot of absurdity. I think that if we have to keep in view the biggest aspect, namely the integrity of the country, then everyone of us will have to do a substantial amount of re-thinking on this issue.

Shri R. S. Pandey was very particular about amity etc. between the various language groups in neighbouring States. That was what he had said as a Hindi-speaker. If we see the statistics of even the official language I did not want to enter into that controversy, we find that Bihar has a population of 4.64 crores out of which 44 per cent speak Hindi, Madhya Pradesh has a population of 3.23 crores out of which 78 per cent speak Hindi, and Haryana has a population of 0.75 crores out of which 88 per cent speak Hindi. Punjab 1.11 crores, 35 per cent Hindi; Rajasthan 2.01 crores, 56 per cent Hindi. U.P. 7.37 crores, 85 per cent Hindi. The total population of this so-called homogenous Hindi-belt from Bihar to M.P., to Haryana Punjab, Rajasthan and U.P. is 19.11 crores, and on an average two-thirds, 12 crores, are Hindi speakers.

The constitution-makers, the founding fathers, have been good enough to adopt as the official language—some of the speakers were on the point of referring to it as the national language—the language of a minority. This has been accepted by the majority of the population of the country with languages abounding in adequate and sometimes greater cultural and linguistic values. Under the circumstances, it is for the protagonists of the official language to take a realistic attitude as far as the linguistic minorities are concerned, they themselves being a linguistic minority.

We have a basic question in regard to the discussion that is going on here. This sophisticated discussion we are carrying on is not very meaningful for the large masses in this country, 80 per cent of whom are non-literate, non-signing, non-writing people. Under these circumstances, instead of being very chaste about language, instead of being very sophisticated about the official language of the Union, if we are able to evolve a sort of basic Hindi not only for the literate population—a basic English is produced in about 800 words—but for others also, it will be acceptable to all and it will be meaningful. We have variants of Hindi in regions. In Bombay, we have Bombay Hindi and so on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That will be a minority Hindi?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Only then will it become a majority Hindi from a minority Hindi.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is he speaking for majority or minority?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: It depends upon what point of view we look at it from.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am concerned with the minority.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: That section of the population which has not adopted it will then adopt this Hindi which is of a basic nature.

In regard to the various linguistic States which we have since 1956, we have broadly adopted the pattern of unilingual States, the principle of one language one State.

The other day, Shri Indrajit Gupta said that we are very unrealistic and on the slightest provocation people are at daggers drawn. Now we are coolly discussing this. I would suggest that the principle of one language one State be modified for the sake of administrative convenience and we adopt the reverse principle of one State, one language, in which there is considerable possibility of cutting down the size of the States so that the languages in our country flourish on the basis of integrity and we can steer clear of mutual rivalry. It is this mutual rivalry which has created a hot debate, which is responsible for the situation that prevails with regard to the Assam-Bengal controversy.

Sir, with these words I am again urging that we need an official language and a language for the masses.

I thank you, and conclude my speech.

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta-North-West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am much obliged for the opportunity you have extended to me.

Minorities (M)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Rather an unusual subject for Mr. Sen.

SHRI A. K. SEN: It is a usual subject because I was associated with the policy making and the legal forms which preceded the setting up of the Linguistic Commissioner's Bureau and the various admirable reports which have come from time to time from that office.

It is true that many of us feel today whether it was wise to cut up the country into linguistic States. But it is not the occasion to speak on it nor have we the time to devote to such an important matter, but it is enough to say that in the constitutional frame, a special position was accorded to the minorities, not merely linguistic minorities but all minorities—cultural, religious and others.

In one of the earliest cases which came up to the Supreme Court, touching on the Kerala Education Bill, the Supreme Court struck down many of the provisions, and in doing so, laid down the essence of our Constitution. In memorable words which are quoted in every country and also in the United Nations whenever minority rights are sought to be trampled down. Their Lordships said in delivering the judgment that not only did we insert in our Constitution vital safeguards for all minorities but we also chose a national anthem for ourselves which illustrates the very nature of India and it says in so many words that India is a land of many cultures and of many groups; they exist and they will exist in a bigger home, that is, India, and hail to that India which keeps for centuries all the strains and streams which have followed a cross the borders, which are part of India and which are distinct, and possibly they still continue to be distinct, linguistically or otherwise.

The vital safeguards, as have been quoted in this report itself, are these: and they need reiteration because they seem to be forgotten by many State Governments from time to time in their zeal to foster either one language or the other or support one institution or another by recording special State patronage.

As I said, the earliest cases came from Kerala, and then they were followed by other cases where the Supreme Court laid down that the Government cannot say that a minority institution will choose either a language not of its own or will choose a managing committee not of its own, and that it was the inherent right of every minority community, either linguistic, cultural or religious, to run its own institution according to its own choice, and the choice includes not merely the choice of the management but the choice of the medium of instruction, the choice of curricula and the choice of affiliation to a particular university to which it wants to affiliate. These were the great principles laid down by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions. The last of them was the Arya Samaj case. I had the honour to argue that case myself, and the Supreme Court are dealt with the case where the Punjab University Act sought to compulsorily affiliate all colleges within a particular area, and at the same time, the university wanted to pass a regulation imposing the Punjab language as the medium of instruction. The Supreme Court said in no uncertain terms that a minority institution is completely at liberty to follow its own choice not merely in matters of management but also in matters of medium of instruction.

16.00 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY *in the Chair*]

That is the guiding line for educational policies to be followed. We not only gave this great right and safeguarded it in our Constitution but we also made it a State policy under article 350A which says that it shall be the endeavour of every State and every local authority—it makes it quite clear—to provide adequate facilities for instructions in mother tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority groups and the President may issue such directions to any State as he considers necessary or proper for the provision of such facilities. Consistent with the Constitution is the first memorandum of the Government in 1956 as also the subsequent

decisions of Chief Ministers' Conferences in 1961 and onwards which laid down very clearly that in the secondary stage and also at the college education level minority institutions and minorities, linguistic and others, will have the inherent right to follow their own choice and the State Government cannot say: I shall not give you grant because you are not choosing my management or my medium of instruction. That was exactly what was held in Arya Samaj case, where the Supreme Court held that it was not open for the Government of a State to control the purse strings in such a way. In fact this was the argument put forward by the Advocate General of Kerala in the Kerala Education Bill. He said very curiously; we are not forcing grants on these institutions. They were Catholic institutions and the ruling party at that time thought that the Catholics were rather inimical to their ideals and policies. The argument put forward was in these terms; we are not forcing them to take our grant, but if they take our grants they must follow our policy; they must have managements according to our rules; they must have teachers according to our rules and so on. The Supreme Court in its judgment said that we would be making a mockery of the constitutional rights granted to minorities if by controlling the purse strings you can segregate completely those great rights.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Some minority institutions in Kerala are not really minority institutions; they are run some vested interests of minorities for the majority as a racket!

SHRI A. K. SEN: We are considering real minority institutions and the very question has the answer. We are dealing with the rights of minority institutions as minority institutions which means genuine minority institutions, not bogus ones. If it is the endeavour of any State Government at any time to say that there will be only one language and the minority institutions must follow it irrespective of the choice or that they will not get a grant unless they follow the particular type of management or particular language as

Linguistic Minorities (M)

medium of instruction or if they affiliated institutions on the condition that only one medium of instruction shall be followed, it will be destroying those rights which had been set out in the very first page of this chapter, in articles 29, 30 and 350A. I am not really touching any controversial issues which have arisen emotionally by many untoward and unpleasant happenings, anti-social happenings in certain areas of India including Assam in the name of Language. Language is an expression of human beings, it expresses their sorrows and joys and aspirations and grievances. In fact the whole picture of one's life expresses itself in the language he employs, either by his own tongue or by his own pen or by dramas put on the stage or films put on the screen. This is the medium of expression of the human mind. When that sacred medium is sought to be prostituted in its own name to perpetrate unspeakable crimes on other groups who happen to follow a different language, that is the greatest dishonour and disservice done to that language. Let this be borne in mind by anyone who champions the majority languages, like Hindi or the minority languages or those who champion the majority languages and try to suppress the minority languages. Our Constitution is the greatest bulwark against such an attempt and our courts will strike down any such attempt as unconstitutional. I have no doubt about it, but what I am saying is, as a citizen of India, it pains us grievously if we find that in the name of language, all sorts of crimes are sought to be perpetrated and we are divided into camps of either those who support it or those who do not support it. There cannot be any support for such crimes in the name of language.

For instance, in my State, I will be the very first man to protect those who are sought to be made victims of violence in the name of language. In my State of West Bengal and in the city which I have the honour to represent here, I am very proud to say that though we ourselves are devoted to the language of the majority which is Bengali, yet there are hundred

Minorities (M)

[Shri A. K. Sen]
of schools which follow the language of the groups which have started those schools like Hindi, Tamil and Telugu and so on.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: So also in Assam

SHRI A. K. SEN: I am very glad it is so and let it be always so. Let those who say that there will be no school which is wedded to any language other than Assamese be in a minority. That is my hope. If tomorrow somebody compels all Hindi schools to have Bengali, I will be the first to oppose it just as I will oppose anybody in Delhi saying that all school in Delhi should follow Hindi. In Delhi we have Tamil schools, English schools—my friend Mr. Anthony is sitting there Telugu schools and so on. Therefore, this is the picture of India, Mr. Basumatari remind me of the very happy experience I had in 1959 when we had what is improperly called “language” riots, because there cannot be any language riots, in Assam. Many of the Members of Parliament from Assam accompanied me and I gratefully remember the services many of them rendered to those who fell victims to violence in the name of language. I visited almost every village where there was a riot at that time. Our two languages are so close that we understand each other. Mr. Basumatari speaks to me in my language and the script is the same. In every meeting I addressed, I asked, “Shall I speak in Hindi or Bengali”, not that my Hindi is very good but I claim some knowledge of Hindi and everywhere I was asked to speak in Bengali. When I spoke in Bengali, there was such a tremendous response, particularly in a village called Charali on the banks of the Brahmaputra, where a hundred refugees from Pabna in East Pakistan of the olden days had settled. They were fishermen. That village was destroyed in the name of language. So, in Assam it is fairly cold at night, particularly on the banks of Brahmaputra. They were without any shelter, any clothes and any food. I gave a call for help. First I put Rs. 10 myself. Then you will be surprised to know that nearly Rs. 5000 were raised in one meet-

ing. Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed was next to me. I remember, tears came in his eyes as it did in my eyes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): How much did he give?

SHRI A. K. SEN: It does not matter what he pays. It all depends with what spirit it is given.

This is the position. It is true, when we speak of language, these violences, all incidents, are bound to come in the forefront which may even cloud the issue. But the issue is one that no State can compel a particular language to be pursued by the minority. That is the fundamental right of a minority. If it does so, the Parliament will correct it, the Supreme Court and the High Court will correct it.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): The Parliament will correct it. The Supreme Court may correct it.

SHRI A. K. SEN: The Parliament is bound to correct it.

It is true that most unhappy things have happened in the name of language. Who is responsible for it? May I remind the law makers there? First of all, the University passes a resolution. The Academic Council says, English will be replaced in ten years; in the meantime, English and Assamese will remain as medium of instruction—no other language, not even Bengali which happens to be the language of a vast number of people there. That really was most unfortunate.

What happened then? That agitation started saying that even for ten years English should not be there. By the threat of agitation, they revised the resolution. That really sparked off a much worse agitation. What happened? Every institution run by the minorities, particularly, the Bengali institutions in various places were forced to accept Assamese. The management committees were replaced by the nominees of the Government and they were forced to accept Assamese. In many colleges, it transpired that there was not a single teacher who could teach in Assa-

meze. About 80 to 90 percent of the boys knew Bengali and English. It was suggested: Let us have Bengali and English, at the same time, until we learn Assamese. It was said, "we shall certainly learn Assamese."

Sir, I am for making Assamese compulsory in every school in Assam. But to say that the medium of instruction must be Assamese will be wrong legally, morally and for the purpose of national integration.

What has happened is much worse. It is no use recounting all that. Thousands of persons have been rendered homeless, for what is called a language movement. In many of the leaflets which were sent to me by these affected people, I found it was stated, "*Bhasha Biplav*". It I had to send it in Bengali, I have to say, "*Bhash Biplav*". If my Hindi brothers had to send the same thing, they will say "*Bhasha Biplav*". Both Bengali and Assamese scripts happen to be almost the same. These are the two flowers of the same State. They grew on the soil of the same State. One flower is becoming the vampire for the other or is sought to be made the vampire for the other, sucking the blood out of the other so that it completely drops dead.

This is an effort which is not only pregnant with immense potentiality of evil capable of being reacted in other parts of the country but is also unconstitutional. Don't try to be so intolerent in the matter of language. Particularly the majority has to be tolerant. That is why I have told my Hindi friends also not to be intolerent. I remember, when Dr. Subbarayan was the Minister, all the Hindi enthusiasts used to put questions in Hindi. The poor man could not follow Hindi; he could not follow the question in Hindi. But the questions were put to him in Hindi. It was too late for Dr. Subbarayan to learn Hindi.

What I say is, let us all learn each other's language. When we go to Switzerland, what a picture it is—three cantons; a population of 4 1/2 millions. When we

go to the French-speaking part of Switzerland, we find so many German schools, so many Italian schools. When we go to German-speaking part of Switzerland, we find so many French schools so many Italian Schools. When we go to the other part of Switzerland, we find so many German schools, so many French schools. If we go to Wales, we find so many Welsh schools and English is learnt as a compulsory subject.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond-Harbour): Go to Sweden; that is the best place.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Let us remain in our own country. In this country we have shared the same culture from Kashmir to Kenyakumari, and from Gujarat to the borders of Assam; we have shared the same language, the same history, the same source of civilisation. Every civilisation that has come here has merged into this great civilisation. That is Bharat trip; that is called pilgrimage to India, because this is where every stream of human life, every stream of human civilisation, has come and merged and made it into such a beautiful civilisation which you find in the pages of history. Indian civilisation is like the old civilization of Egypt or Messapatomia or Syria or of old Israel. Do not live on the pages of history or under the sands of archaeologists. We live as living examples of tolerance.

When I went to Cochin years ago and went to one of those old synagogues there, the rabbi showed me with very great pride the old *tamra patra* by which the grant was made by the then Raja of Cochin and in which these memorable words are written. It was in Sanskrit. The Tamilians would kill us; The old *tamra patra* in Cochin is in Sanskrit and I read it through. It says that our friends from across the seas have come to us, driven by religious intolerance and religious persecution; so, it is our duty to give them shelter; and he gave them land, free of rent, next to the temple. (Interruptions) It is there still for the whole view of the world the tolerance of

[Shri A. K. Sen]

India. Tolerance is part of our culture. Everywhere this has happened. When Vasco-dagama came, he was given gifts and everything, and the men who took the gifts on the ships were taken as slaves: This is what we have always done.

I would appeal to all those who are now trying (*Interruptions*) to forget this that these 16 languages are the languages of India. They are not rivals. Somebody said, 'rivals'. They are not rivals. They are complementary to each other. They will enrich as common brothers and sisters the whole fabric of India's civilisation, India's literature, India's contribution to the world. Tamilians have such an old language, such an old civilisation; why should they be afraid of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI A. K. SEN: Thank you very much for this indulgence.

What I want in Assam is, as in olden days we sent Parliamentary Delegations, there must be a parliamentary Delegation sent which will at least calm down the atmosphere and come and report to us, what is wrong there.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: (Diamond-Harbour): I have given a Substitute Motion which reads as follows:—

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

"This House, having considered the Twelfth Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st July, 1969 to 30th June, 1970, laid on the Table of the House on the 12th April, 1972, is of the opinion—

(a) that the Government has failed to safeguard the linguistic and cultural freedom of linguistic minorities in different regions and States under articles 350, 350A and 350B of the Constitution of India;

(b) that according to Commissioner's own admission "in the States of Assam, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, and the Union

Minorities (M)

Territories of Chandigarh, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Laccadives, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, North East Frontier Agency and Tripura, the facilities provided for instructions in the mother tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority groups are not in accordance with the provisions of Article 350A of the Constitution;

- (c) that the Central Government has refused to honour the demand of the Nepali-speaking population of Darjeeling, West Bengal, for inclusion of Nepali language as one of the official languages of the Indian Union through an amendment of the English Schedule to the Constitution;
- (d) that the provisions of the Official Languages Act, as amended in 1968, have not been strictly adhered to by the Government;
- (e) that the Government has failed to solve the language problem in Assam where Assamese language should be the medium of instruction and administration and at the same time the linguistic minorities in that State must get their education through their mother tongue in primary, secondary and university levels and same principle should be followed in respect of other States and Union territories also but the Government has failed to take positive steps in this regard;

and urges upon the Government to adopt a time-bound programme to protect the linguistic, cultural and educational interests of linguistic minorities in different States and regions under articles 30, 350A and 350B of the Constitution."

There is a clear provision in the Constitution, Article 29(1) which says:

"Any section of the citizens residing in the territory of India or any part thereof having a distinct language, script or culture of its own shall have the right to conserve the same."

We have seen that fifteen languages have been recognised in the Constitution. Our Constitution has been amended to suit the conditions and requirements. But this much-wanted Nepali language, although they have been struggling hard for so many years, and their right is very legitimate, has not yet been recognised. That is also the case with Urdu. I remember a couple of years ago—that was early 1969—when Mr. Anand Narain Mulla headed a delegation to the Prime Minister and I happened to be in that Delegation—when we placed our case before the Prime Minister at that time that Urdu may also get its due position in the language map of India, we were told that others might not like it. But, that is not the consideration. We have an Article. We have a clear Article in the Constitution and there are reports.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad): Urdu is not in the language map of India?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): It is not one of the fifteen languages?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am saying that it should be given a due place. They have given all along hallow assurances but seldom they are fulfilled. When you require the Gurkha jawans to go and protect your borders, you call, 'Jai Jawan', but when the Gurkhas want that their language should be recognised and should find a place in the Schedule, you cannot fulfil it. What happened? The hon Prime Minister had gone there. There was a demonstration which has no parallel in the history of Darjeeling. Everything was shut down and it was so genuine and self-generating and we also recognise and support the regional autonomy demand within the Indian Union of the Darjeeling District.

I support all the speakers, those who have spoken in favour of having an MPs Delegation sent to Assam. It was done before because that delegation might help in bringing back normalcy, might bring back hope and confidence in the minds of those who were affected in the last riots which have really tainted our image before the world.

I only say that in Assam it is the

outcome of factional fight between different factions in the ruling Party and the administration the bureaucrats, the Police and the anti-socials joined hands together and they defied the Chief Minister and the Chief Minister had no hand and no voice in the matter. As a result, what did happen? This must be a disgraceful thing for us. How are we going to run the administration of the country? Well, Sir, the House can judge for itself. It is all an outcome of a factional fight.

I quote from the Twelfth Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities a India which says:

"A study of the preceding Chapter would indicate that the facilities available for linguistic minorities in different parts of the country particularly in the fields of education and recruitment to services, are not uniform."

They also say:

"In the States of Assam, Haryana; Jammu and Kashmir; Madhya Pradesh; Orissa; Punjab and the Union Territories of Chandigarh; Himachal Pradesh; Manipur; Jaccadive; Mumcoy and Amindivi Islands; North East Frontier Agency, and Tripura the facilities provided for instruction in the mother tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to Linguistic minority groups are not in accordance with the provisions of Article 350A of the Constitution.

In this connection, mention may be made of the case of the speakers of Bishnupriya-Manipuri in Assam. Since 1963 when the speakers of Bishnupriya-Manipuri put forth their demand for introduction of their languages in lower primary schools in Cachar district, the demand for introduction of Bishnupriya-Manipuri as a medium of instruction at the primary stage has not been conceded by the Government of Assam, though the stipulated strength of pupils appeared to be available."

It is a very regrettable matter

—Then it says:—

"In the States of Jammu and Kashmir Nagaland and Punjab and in the Union Territories of Andaman and

Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Delhi, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, Manipur, North East Frontier Agency, and Tripura, the principle of 10: 40 formula has not been accepted. On the other hand, Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Tamilnadu follow a formula more liberal than 10: 40 formus."

Sir, I congratulate them for doing so. Than the report says—

"Punjab and Chandigarh have not also furnished any statistical data since their inception as separate entities. Other State where difficulty is experienced in collecting statistical data in this regard are:

Bihar—furnished upto 1963-64;

Orissa—furnished upto 1964-65;

Manipu and West Bengal—furnished upto 1966-67 only."

Continuing the Report says:

"During the year under report, information was sought from different States and Union Territories about facilities provided for answering questions through the media of mother tongue/minority languages in which instruction was imparted.."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly conclude. You are reading the whole book!

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I did not go to Bagdad from the banks of Padma or Brahmaputra, nor did I travel from Delhi to France or Sweden; Then the report says:

"No response was received from Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Chandigarh, Himachal Pradesh, and Manipur."

Sir, the position has been given clearly in this report. This is a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Constitution. This is only in letter not in spirit. The Government is only defying this provision.

I would like the House to take note of my substitute Motion and agree to my substitute Motion and pass it. Thank you.

श्री मूल चन्द डागा (पाली)

सभापति महोदय, देश में भाषा के ही झगड़े नहीं हैं बल्कि वास्तव में कुछ नेता लोग भाषा की आड़ में अपनी हुकुमत करना चाहते हैं। मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता कि कहीं पर भाषा के झगड़े होते हैं। लेकिन कुछ लोग जो हैं जिनकी नेतागिरी कायम नहीं होती वे ऐसे झगड़ ले लेते हैं, कहीं पर वह भाषा की आड़ में खड़े होते हैं, कहीं पर धर्म के नाम पर खड़े होते हैं और कहीं पर गाय का बहाना लेते हैं। यह सभी एक प्रकार के बहाने हैं जिनको लेकर वे लोग खड़े हो जाते हैं और देश में अपनी हुकुमत चलाना चाहते हैं। हमने मविधान में कहा था कि 15 साल में हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी हो जायेगी लेकिन आज भी हम बड़ी हिम्मत और हौसले के साथ अंग्रेजी में बात करते हैं और साथ ही कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दी अच्छी जानते हैं। जब हमने हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी को माना है तो हमें संस्कृत का उत्थान करना चाहिए क्योंकि संस्कृत सभी भाषाओं की जननी है। लेकिन हम संस्कृत के उत्थान की बात नहीं करेंगे अगर एक वकील को अपनी वकालत से ही मतलब है तो वह अंग्रेजी में भी काम सकता है। जसा राष्ट्र होगा वैसा ही भाषा बोलने लगेंगे। इस बात से मतलब नहीं है कि हम कौन सी भाषा बोलते हैं। हमारे राजस्थान के लोग हिन्दुस्तान के कौन कौन में जाते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के हर कोने में राजस्थानी मौजूद है लेकिन व कभी नहीं कहते

कि भाषा का झगडा है। हम लोग जानते है कि हमको किसी के साथ भी एग्जस्ट करना है चाहे वह पर कोई भी भाषा हो। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वास्तव में यह भाषा ब जा झगडे है वह गवर्नमेंट न पैदा किए है क्योंकि उनमें अपनी नीति का स्पष्ट नहीं किया। सरकार न हिन्दी का राष्ट्रभाषा घोषित कर दिया और कहा कि किन्तु किन्तु सन के बाद ये किया जायगा किन्तु आज तक वही कहा आ रहा है। तामिलनाडु में हिन्दी का बहिष्कार किया जाता है खुले रूप से चैनेक दिया जाता है उन्हें मान्य है कि तमिलनाडु भी डिस्ट्रिक्ट का हिस्सा है लेकिन वह कहेंगे कि हम नहीं चाहते हिन्दी हो। ता भाषा के नाम पर जो बात करते है दम्भमान में वह भाषा का मवाल नहीं है बकि उनमें एक माल करन का मवाल है। किन्तु वह स बात भिन्न करत है—एक भावना उमके पीछे रहती है। श्री पैरुज फामूला आपने रायमें किया, किन्तु अब भी क्या उ बाने क त है। म न्नारिटी की बात हाती है ना कहते है कि 15 परसेंट लोग अगर उस भाषा के होंगे तो कानून का अनुवाद कर दिया जायगा लेकिन क्या कभी हिन्दी में भी वही उमका अनुवाद करत है ?

बेकार का एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट में दिया कि 15 परसेंट पीपुलेशन अगर किसी एक भाषा को बोलती है तो उस भाषा के अन्दर कानून का अनुवाद कर देगे। जब कि करना कुछ नहीं है, और एक निर्णय ले कर के लोगो मे आग पैदा करनी है।

*At district level and below the municipality or tehsil where a linguistic minority consists of 15 or 20 per 2700 I. S — 10

cent of the population important Government notices rules and other publications are to be published in the Mother language also

यह डिस्ट्रिक्ट टर्मलीयर हा नहीं सकता। हिन्दी में तो कानून का अनुवाद हो नहीं पाना काई आदमी मुझे माल में हिन्दी में वहम कर नहीं सकता वहा ज जजमेंट हिन्दी में हीन नहीं है जब कि हिन्दी बोलने वाला की मन्धा काफी है लेकिन निगय और ने यह ले लिया कि 15 परसेंट लोग अगर किसी एक खाम जबान के बोलने वाल है तो वहा उन की भाषा में कानून का अनुवाद होगा। आप मेरी माउन्टारिटीज का और प्रोटक्शन दीजिये किन्तु अनुवादशयक बात पैदा बना की जाती है जो कि इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं हो सक्ता ? हाता क्या है राजनीतिक लोग जंग जाते है उस जगह मेरी बात कर देत है।

नीचे पैरुज फामूला का मवाल पैदा हुआ और कहा गया कि अजब नहीं बानी जायगे। ता नागा न दया कि हमारी हुकूमत चली जायगी इम्प्लीमेंट उन्हा कहा कि अजबो रहनी चाहिये क्या कि वह अपनी हुकूमत चाहते है।

आप न डिस्ट्रिक्ट लेवल क बाव म कहा

“At district level where 60 per cent population of a district use a language other than the official language that language may be recognized as additional official language by that district”

अब एक नई बात कर दी कि 60 प्रतिशत लोग अगर किसी जिले के कहे या दूसरी स्टेट के अन्दर एक भाषा के लोग जिन की संख्या 60 प्रतिशत हो कहे कि वे अपनी भाषा में

[श्री मूलचन्द्र डार्या]

Minorities (M)

बोलना चाहते हैं तो क्या उन के लिये हमारे भाषा में कानून बनाया जायगा ? अरबों में बगला देश के लोग रहते हैं यों-तु-तु-तु कि हमारा कानून बनाना में होना चाहिये तो वहाँ के हार्ट आर्ट में क्या व्यवस्था होगी ? यह क्या फैसला आप ने लिया है। अरब आप किसी प्रान्त में जाते हैं जहाँ आप की भाषा नहीं बोलनी जाती है तो आप की समस्या क्या भी होगी। यह नहीं है कि अरब आप के भी छोटा समुदाय बनती रहे और कार्रवाई नहीं हो सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप का कोई झगडा नहीं है, और आप जो रिपोर्ट है इस को बन्द करना चाहिये इस में लोगों की आवश्यकता का उल्लेख जाता है। आप की भाषा के मामले में एक नेशनल पीनिसी बनानी चाहिये। तीन नेशनल फोरम बनाये ता उस को इम्प्लीमेंट किया जाय। लेकिन यह इम्प्लीमेंट होता नहीं। जो प्रान्तीय भाषाय है उन को जड हम काट रहे है क्योंकि हम कोई ऐसा निर्णय नहीं लेते हैं जिस को इम्प्लीमेंट भी किया जा सके। यह जो रिपोर्ट है, और कोई प्रान्त उस को इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं करता तो क्या उस के खिलाफ कोई ऐक्शन लिया जा सकता है ? नहीं ले सकते हैं जो यह तो एक आफिय कायम कर दिया है इस से काम नहीं चलेगा। हम लोग जानबूझ कर झगडे पैदा करते हैं। भाषा के मामले में हम को एक राष्ट्रीय नीति कायम करनी चाहिये।

श्री एस्. ए. शर्मा (श्रीनगर) .
जानके सहर, यहाँ माइनारिटी कमिश्नेज की बात हुई है। लेकिन एक ऐसी जवान है जो

माइनारिटी में होने के बावजूद भी इस मुल्क में शर्माथी बनायी गयी है। मेरा रोये सुनना ही जवान की तरफ है जिस पर मुल्क की शांति के बाद यह इन्जाम लयाया गया कि यह मुसलमानों की जवान है पाकिस्तान की जवान है। 25 साल के बाद पाकिस्तान ने खद मायित कर दिया कि पाकिस्तान में उर्दू के लिये कार्रवाई जगह नहीं है। पिछले साल में उर्दू का प्रचार प्रसार का काम शुरू कर दिया गया। उर्दू का प्रचार प्रसार का काम शुरू कर दिया गया। उर्दू के लिये पाकिस्तान में कार्रवाई जगह नहीं है। लेकिन उर्दू का बावजूद यह प्रोग्राम की गयी। यह प्रचार प्रसार का काम शुरू कर दिया गया। उर्दू के लिये पाकिस्तान में कार्रवाई जगह नहीं है।

इसका है कि जानू पाकिस्तान में उसे मुसलमानों को शर्माथी के लिये जम्मु काश्मीर उर्दू का उर्दू का नहीं है। जम्मु में वाजरी है और काश्मीर में काश्मीरी है। यह जवान मुसलमानों की जवान है, माननीय वाजरी जी के प्रश्न की जवान है लेकिन वाजरी जी ने प्रश्न किया है इस जवान के साथ इंगलैंड इसे काश्मीर में रिफ्यूजी बना दिया गया। आज भी इस देश में जब मुसायरे होते हैं, उर्दू की फिल्में दिखायी जाती हैं, जब जब बड़े फेस्टिवल होते हैं तो इस मुल्क के नेता, जिसे माननीय वाजरी जी शामिल हैं, उर्दू के मुसायरे को सुनने के लिये, क्रिज अहमद फेज के कला और कोस महिलाबादी के कला सुनने के लिये 10,

10 ह० को टिकट लेने है। लेकिन जब उसका मुकाम देने की बात आती है तो वहने है कि यहाँ की भाषा नहीं है। जब जब आने में उसको जमान की शक्ति में स्वीकार किया गया है।

श्री मल्ल चन्द्र डाला भाषा का जमी जगह बनाने का सवाल नहीं है। मयाल यह कि प्रत्यय में ना बाने वाले हैं उनका प्राप्ताह दिया जाय। यह गरी नहीं है कि क्या मर्यादा की जमान बनई जाय।

श्री एस० ए० शर्मोस मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि उस आर्जन में भाषा का दर्जा दिया लेकिन उस जवान के लिये क्या किया। जब तक आप उस जवान को इलाका नहीं बने, उस को रिकग्नाइज नहीं करन किसी स्टेट में, उस को आईन में सजा रखने में क्या फायदा है। जब आप मुस्तरका तदजीत की बात करते है तो उस का एक शहकार उर्दू है। आप उस उर्दू की हेसियन को तसलीन नहीं करते। आप उसका नाम लेते ही बिदकते हैं। लेकिन बुनियादी सवाल यह है कि पिछले 25 सालों में इस जवान के लिये कुछ किया गया है या नहीं। अभी मैं इन रिपोर्ट को पढ़ रहा था, यू० पी० में जहाँ इसने जन्म लिया, परवरिश पायी, और मुस्तरका तहजीब को जन्म दिया वहाँ उस्तसबो भी तादाद बढ़ रही है लेकिन उर्दू पढ़ने वालों की, उर्दू अकलबो की तादाद कम हो रही जा रही है। -

उर्दू ने हिन्दुस्तान की जगह आजादी में, उर्दू शायरों ने जो पार्ट भ्रदा किया उसे नजरअदाज नहीं किया जा सकता है। आज भी उर्दू जवान इम मुल्क में एक भयंकर तहजीब बनाने के लिये जो रोल भ्रदा कर रही है उससे आखे बन्द नहीं की जा सकती लिगुयस्टिक माइनाग्रीज के बोटे हामिल करने के लिये पोलिटिकल पार्टीज अपने इन्वेक्शन मैनीफेस्टो में यह यकीन देनानी करनी है कि उर्दू जवान के साथ इसाफ होगा, उसको दलाका दिया जायेगा, उसको सैकेन्ड लैंगुएज के रूप में रिकग्नाइज किया जायेगा बजीर आजम ने कहा कि हमने य० पी० की हुकमत को हिदायत को है कि उर्दू पढ़ने के लिये बुनियादी तालीम के मकतब कायम करने के लिये सहूलियत दी जाये। लेकिन यू० पी० की हुकमत ने उनको वायलेट किया है। प्रेजिडेंट डाइरेक्टिव इशू कर सकता है कि जहाँ एक खाम तादाद एक जवान बोलने वाली हो वहाँ उस जवान को पढ़ाने का इतजाम किया जाना चाहिये। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या य० पी० में पाच जिले भी उर्दू बोलने वाले नहीं है? इन्वेक्शन के बक्त वायदा किया जाता है, लेकिन जहलियत बरी है मुल्क के हुकमरानो की जो माननीय वाजपेयी जी के जहन में है। उर्दू एक ऐसा मयार है जहाँ साबित होता है कि किस के जहन में कौन सी बात है, कौन सा जज्बा है। हिन्दुस्तान की मुस्तरका तहजीब की मुकतलिफ शकसे है, जैसे लाल किल्ला, ताजमहल। उसी तरह उस मुस्तरका तहजीब की मिश्राणी उर्दू है। और अगर आप उर्दू के साथ इसाफ तहरी कर सकते, तो

[کشی ۴۵۰ ۴۰ شامیہ]

ماڈنارٹری لئگوئج کے ساتھ اسکا ف نہیں کر سکتے، پاپ ماڈنارٹری کے ساتھ اسکا ف نہیں کر سکتے۔ اوردے کے لیے جو ناڈسٹریکٹ کر رہے ہیں اس کا جو نوکمان ہوگا وہ ملک کی مشترکہ تہذیب کے لیے ہوگا۔ اس لیے لئگوئسٹک ماڈنارٹری کمیٹی کی رپورٹ کو اس کا اس اسٹڈیڈیشن کو ختم کرنے کی بات نہیں ہے۔ بات ہے اپنے دلوں میں، اپنے دماغوں میں آزاد خیالوں کی روشنی پیدا کرنے کی۔ یہ ڈاگا ساہب اور دیم دے دوستوں سے گوارا کرنا کہ کمیٹی کے ہر کے لیے اپنے جہنم کی خلیج کو خلیج سے الگ کر دیا جائے اور اپنے خلیج کی خلیج میں گالیب کا کلام، میر کی شاعری اور داگ کی شاعری سننے کی ہرگز بات کر لیں۔ تب پتا چلے گا کہ

what you are actually missing.

شری ایس۔ اے۔ شمیم -
(سربراہ) - جاب میں، وہاں
مائٹریٹی لئگوئج کی بات ہوئی
ہے۔ لیکن ایک ایسی زبان ہے جو
مائٹریٹی کی نہ ہونے کے باوجود
بھی اس ملک میں شہریت ہونے
کے لیے ہے۔ سہرا کے ساتھ اردو
زبان کی طرف ہے جس پر ملک
کی تقسیم کے بعد یہ الزام لگایا گیا
ہے کہ یہ مسلمانوں کی زبان ہے
پاکستان کی زبان ہے۔ ۱۵ سال
کے بعد پاکستان نے خود ثابت کر
دیا کہ پاکستان میں اردو کے لیے

کوئی جگہ نہیں ہے۔ سندھ میں
جو جگہ ہوئے، پنجاب میں جو
مسادات ہوئے اور خود اردو شاعروں
نے اردو کے خلاف چالوس نکال کر
یہ ثابت کر دیا کہ اردو اگر زبان
ہے تو ہندوستان کی زبان ہے، اس
کے لیے پاکستان میں کوئی جگہ
نہیں ہے۔ لیکن اس کے باوجود
ہر قسم کی سہاوت کا وعدہ کرنے
کے بعد ابھی تک اس زبان کو اپنا
کوئی علاقہ نہیں دیا گیا۔

یہ صحیح ہے کہ جموں کشمیر
میں اسے مسات کہا گیا ہے، لیکن
جموں کشمیر اردو کا علاقہ نہیں ہے۔
جموں میں ڈوگری ہے اور کشمیر میں
کشمیری ہے۔ یہ زبان یوپی کی
زبان ہے، مانہہ واجپٹی جی نے
یوپی کی زبان ہے۔ لیکن واجپٹی
جی نے انہیہ کہا ہے اس زبان کے
ساتھ اس لیے اسے کشمیر میں ڈوگری
بلا دیا گیا۔ آج بھی اس میں
ہیں۔ جب مشہور ہوتے ہیں، اردو
کی فلموں دکھائی جاتی ہیں، جب
جب بڑے فلمسٹن ہوتے ہیں تو اس
کا نام کے نوتما، جن میں ساتھ
واجپٹی جی شامل ہیں، اردو کے
مشہوروں کو ملنے کے لیے، وہی
احمد نوری کے کلام اور جوہی
ماڈنارٹری کے کلام کے لیے ہے۔
یہ ہے کہ نکتہ لیتے ہیں۔
لیکن جب اس کا مقام دیکھنے کی بات

آتی ہے تو کہتے ہیں یہاں کی
بھاشا نہیں ہے - جب انہیں میں
اسکو زبان کی شکل میں سونپ کر دیا
گیا ہے -

شری مول چند ڈاگ - بھاشا کو
کسی جگہ نامے کا سوال نہیں ہے -
سوال یہ ہے کہ آپ سڈھیا کے جو
بولیے والے ہیں اسکو پرووستاھن دیا
جئے - یہ صحیح نہیں ہے کہ کیا
ملک کی زبان نہ تھی حایے -

شری ایس - اے - شمیم - میں
بہ نہ رہا ہوں کہ ایسے آئیں میں
بھاشا کا رہے نا کہ اس زبان
نے لئے کہا گیا - حسب تک آپ
اس زبان کو علاقہ نہیں دیتے اسکو
رکرنڈنیر نہیں دتے کسی سٹیٹ
میں اسکو انہیں میں سجا رکھلے
بے کا دندہ ہے - حسب آپ مشترکہ
ترویج کے بات کرتے ہیں تو اس
کا ایک شائع کردہ ہے - آپ اس
اردو کی حوثیت کو تسلیم نہیں
کرتے - آپ اس کا نام لینے ہی
بدتے ہیں - لیکن ہدیادی سوال
یہ ہے کہ پچھلے ۲۵ سالوں میں
اس زبان کے لئے کچھ کیا گیا ہے
یا نہیں - ابھی میں اس رپورٹ
کو پڑھ رہا تھا یہ میں میں جہاں
اس نے جنم لیا پروورش پائی اور
مشترکہ تہذیب کو جنم دیا وہاں
استانویہ کی تعداد بڑھ رہی ہے لیکن

اردو زبان والوں کی، اردو مکندوں
کی تعداد کم ہوس جا رہی ہے -

اردو نے ہندوستان کی جنگ
آزادی میں، اردو شاعروں نے جو
پارت ادا کیا ایسے نظرائنداز نہیں کہا
جا سکتا ہے - آج بھی اردو زبان
اس ملک میں ایک مشترکہ تہذیب
نامے نے لئے، جو رول ادا کر رہی
ہے اس سے آنکھیں بند نہیں کی
جاسکتیں - لیکن سٹک مائٹورٹیز کے
ووٹ حاصل کرنے کے لئے پالیٹیکل
پرتیز آپ الیکشن مینیسٹریز یہ یقین
دھانی کرنی میں کہ اردو زبان کے
ساتھ انصاف ہوگا، اس کو علاقہ دیا
جائے گا اسکو - سیکرٹری لینگویج کے
روپ میں رکوکٹائیز کیا جاوےگا -
وزیراعظم نے کہا کہ ہم نے یہ ہی
کی حکومت کو ہدایت کی ہے کہ
اردو کو پوھنے کے لئے بلہادی تعلیم
کے مکتب قائم کرنے کے لئے سہولتیں
دی جائیں - لیکن یہ ہی کی حکومت
نے انکو واپس لوسے کا ہے، پروپوزیشنٹ
ڈائریکٹو آشو کر سکتا ہے کہ جہاں
ایک خاص تعداد ایک زبان بولیے
والوں کی ہو وہاں اس زبان کو
پوھنے کا انتظام کیا جانا چاہئے -
میں پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا یہ
ہی میں پانچ ضلعے بھی اردو بولیے
والے نہیں ہیں؟ الیکشن کے وقت
مددہ کیا جاتا ہے، لیکن مذہب

[شری ایس۔ اے۔ شہم]

وہی ہے ملک کے حکمرانوں کی جو
مانیہ واجہتی جی کے ذہن میں
ہے۔ اردو ایک ایسا معیار ہے شہان
ثابت ہونا ہے کہ کس کے ذہن میں
کونسی بات ہے۔ کون سا جذبہ ہے۔
ہندوستان کی مشترکہ تہذیب کی
مختلف شکلوں میں جیسے لال
قلعہ تاج محل۔ اسی طرح اس
مشترکہ تہذیب کی نشانی اور ہے۔
اگر آپ اردو کے ساتھ انصاف نہیں
کر سکتے تو مائینورٹی لینگویج کے
ساتھ انصاف نہیں کر سکتے۔ آپ
مائینورٹی کے ساتھ انصاف نہیں کر
سکتے۔ اردو کے لئے جو ناصافی کر
رہے ہیں اسکا جو نقصان ہوگا وہ
ملک کی مشترکہ تہذیب کے روتے
کو ہوگا۔ اس لئے لینگویسٹک مائینورٹی
کمیشن کی رپورٹ دو یا اے انسٹی
ٹیوشن کو ختم کرنے کی بات نہیں
ہے۔ بات ہے اپنے دلوں میں اپنے
دماغوں میں آزاد خیالی کی روشنی
پیدا کرنے کی۔ میں ڈاکا صاحب
اور دوسرے دوستوں سے گزارش کروں گا
کہ کبھی لمحے بہر کے لئے اپنے ذہن
کی کونکوں کھلی چھوڑ دیجئے اور
اپنے ذہن کی کھلی کھوکی میں
غالب کا کلام بہر کی شاعری اور
داغ کی شاعری سنے کی حوس
پیدا کر لیجئے۔ تاکہ پتہ چلے کہ

[What you are actually missing]

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS (Mangal-dai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities begins with an emphasis on national integration. So from the point of view of national integration, we have to discuss the problem of linguistic minorities and whether the safeguarding of the interests of the linguistic minorities should come in clash with the interests of the linguistic majority in the concerned States.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta said that the situation in Assam was a danger to the whole nation. Perhaps, as I understand, he means that national integration is in danger. Another hon. Member said that through the conflict between regional languages, English gaining is more importance. So, this is the question, and we would have to think of it from the national point of view, and nothing can be thought from a national point of view unless we think of it from the mass point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you want to suggest, you suggest to the Ministry.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: Here, during the past two days in the discussion of this particular subject, I have seen that the Government of Assam and the Assamese people have been put in the dock. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I crave your indulgence to give me some time to place before the hon. House the true picture of what is happening there; and I want to place it from our national point of view.

Now, we are giving more prominence to English language which is the language understood by not more than 10 per cent of the population.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Not more than one to two per cent.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: This is how we have failed to solve our national problem. We have not yet solved the question of our national language, and to solve this question, we have to solve the

question of the regional languages. Only by developing and giving to proper place to the regional languages, as a feeder to the national language, we can resolve the linguistic conflicts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you are speaking in the same language, and not using your own language.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: We should be compelled. When Hindi or the national language is introduced, we will be compelled to speak in that language. Because we are not in the position of compulsion, we are using this language of two per cent of the population

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): You are speaking in the language of convenience for the benefit of the House.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: Through this language India was dominated, and it is now the language of the bureaucracy and aristocracy and it has estranged the masses from the Government and from the political leadership also.

Now, when we look at the problem from the point of view of the masses, we must remember that we have 70 per cent illiterate masses. We are talking of socialism and democracy and all these big words. To have democracy, we must educate the masses of people. Is it possible in English? It should be through their mother tongue, through the regional language. When we talk of socialism, it is the mass of workers and peasants who should constitute the State and who should be educated to run the administration, to run the economy and even the educational system; they must be taught to do these things and not the parasitic gentry, who constitute only 1.5 or two per cent English-speaking people in the country. So we have to give due importance to regional languages and also the national language, Hindi. Incidentally I should say that Hindi should be modified to some extent so that it would reflect all the regional languages of India.

Coming to the point of conflict between linguistic minorities and linguistic majorities, I point out the Eighth Schedule to our Constitution which has listed 15 languages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: I have just started. Of these, Hindi-speaking group constitutes nearly thirty per cent of the total. Next comes Bengali, 8.7 per cent of the whole people; so also Telugu group. But what is the position of Assamese? At the national level Assamese is a minority language group constituting 1.3 per cent of India's total population. So it should be protected from the large language group in its home State Assam, where it is the regional language, being the language of the majority people. It should be helped to develop on the principle of equality of all languages and cultures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude now.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: Bengali is a well-developed language; there is a separate nation of this language, 75 million people are there and 37 million people in West Bengal and another seven million scattered all over India, but most of them in Assam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given you ten minutes; please conclude now.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: I have not yet come to the main point; I request you to give me at least ten more minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot give any more time; please conclude.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: Some hon. Members were quoting census figures of Assam... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Please tell us if Assamese is a minority language in Assam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt let him finish.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: No, Assamese is majority language in Assam of more than 60 per cent people. So this conflict between Bengali and Assamese, the former trying to make Assam bilingual with Cachar as the base.

MR CHAIRMAN: It is not the controversy between Bengali and Assamese that we are discussing; we are discussing the report of the Commissioner of Linguistic Minorities. I am calling Mr Uni Krishnan.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: I want to suggest a solution. The recommendation of the University Grants Commission was that regional language should be the medium in universities. Accordingly, the Gauhati and Dibrugarh Universities of Assam adopted Assamese as the medium of instruction. It was a correct decision. But this was opposed by Cachar district by resorting to agitation against the Government of Assam and the Assamese people. Counter agitation was organised by Assamese student in Brahmaputra valley on this medium-issue that resulted in some violent incidents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: I have not come to the main point yet.

MR CHAIRMAN: I do not know why members on this side also should behave like this. I have given 5 minutes to others and 12 minutes to you.

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS: I am telling how the present situation has developed. An hon. member was quoting the census figures of 1931, 1951, etc. The influx of Bengali population into Assam was a continuous process due to economic problems in Bengal for long before partition. The Bengali population in Assam increased more after the famine in 1943 to which reference was made here by the Minister of State for Agriculture, and considerably after partition and after each Communal riot in former East Pakistan.

MR CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat. Mr. Unnikrishnan

SHRI DHARNIDHAR DAS. I am suggesting a solution. The solution is possible when the linguistic minorities will accept Assam as unilingual State and the Assamese language as the sole medium of the universities of Assam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever he says will not go on record.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह तो बहुत बड़ा बह्सास्त्र है कि जो कहा जायेगा वह लिखा नहीं जायेगा। यह तो कभी कभी चलाना चाहिए।

सभापति सहोदय : देखिए, श्रीरी को मैंने पांच मिनट दिया है, इनको 14 मिनट हो गए और फिर भी

श्री इयानन्दन मिश्र : समाजवाद की दृष्टि से तो इन्होंने ही कुछ कहा है श्रीरी ने तो कुछ कहा ही नहीं।

सभापति सहोदय : श्रीर आपने ही उस को समाप्त है।

SHRI K. P UNNIKISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, I have listened to the two-day debate on the 12th report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities with considerable sorrow and anger or may I say with considerable sorrow and anguish, rather than in angare, because it has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that despite the remarkable sense of national identity and purpose, and unity we displayed when our freedom was threatened in 1962 when the Chinese invaded our country and again in 1965 and during the historic days of 1971, we are still where we started in 1947. Unfortunately, to my mind, apart from various linguistic and sociological contradictions, the most important factor which strikes my mind is the stark regional imbalances and uneven development. That is a fact which has to be borne in mind while going into the report or problems connected with it. I

do not agree with some people who want to take a very narrow view of this report. The very articles of the Constitution 350A and 350B, under which this office has been created and authorised to place through the President before this House and so this report are very restrictive in their scope; because the problems are far more fundamental than this office of Commissioner can ever hope to solve or even report to this House. There are many subterranean tendencies in our national life, various tendencies of chauvinism deliberately cultivated by a set of chauvinistic politicians in most of part of the country. Our democratic exercises have very often encouraged these tendencies because they can make a political capital out of it. But what they are really making a political capital out of it from the story of uneven development and regional imbalances.

The fate and fortunes of linguistic minorities, as Mr. Frank Anthony pointed out yesterday, are very carefully concealed in this Report. It is not a question of adequate educational opportunities to linguistic minorities alone that have been thrown up during the last two decades and a half in this country. There are far more fundamental problems.

I come from a State where million are forced upon by certain circumstances to go elsewhere from Cape Comorin to Himalayas and to every tehsil in India for their livelihood. Today we find that not only our opportunities are being curtailed but our lives are also in danger. I do not agree with Mr. Frank Anthony who said that this is the sole result of States reorganisation. Because the States' reorganisation came to grips with a fundamental factor of our national existence, that is, there can only be unity in diversity. Sri Aurobindo once said, "What we are seeking is not uniformity in this country. What we are seeking is unity." Jawaharlal Nehru used to remind us also about the same thing, unity in diversity. That is our theme. Unfortunately, this unity is now in peril and is being threatened by chauvinistic forces, encouraged not only by

forces of monopoly but also, I would say, by forces which are beyond our borders, by foreign agencies, like, C.I.A.

The point is that States' reorganisation came to fundamental grips with this factor that ever since "the *Bhakti* movement" five centuries ago in our history, there have been assertive regional cultures with which we had to come to confront with or with which we have to come to terms with. There is nothing wrong with the States' reorganisation. As my hon. friend pointed out, if democracy has to live, it has to live through people's languages, not only through Hindi but also through various other regional languages.

Today, there is an element of cultural oppression as a result of this chauvinism which is raising its ugly head in many parts of the country. Mr. A. K. Sen pointed out about constitutional aspect. I am not a constitutional *pundit*. But I know it is in gross violation of article 16(2), rules are framed and what is going on in many States. My friends from Maharashtra like Mr. Sathe will forgive me if I have to say something unpleasant about his State and the State Government. What is going on in their State. I just cannot understand. Not only our basic rights as Indian citizens are being violated in Maharashtra, and not only by the Shiv sena but by the orders of the State Government which are violative of our fundamental rights, and we will go to the court....

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I joint you in condemning Shiv Sena cult.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: In Maharashtra, there is this pernicious doctrine of the sons of the soil....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, The Shiv Sena affair, the C.I.A. affair and all that is another thing. The State Government should not be dragged into it. If there is anything wanting on the part of the State Government in so far as its language policy is concerned, that can be mentioned. But not other things.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: It is a fundamental question concerning linguistic minorities. Article 16(2) guarantees to linguistic minorities employment opportunities; they shall not be restricted. That is the picture thing which has been violated by the Maharashtra State Government, by a section of the people of Maharashtra. Where else can I go; except to this House to say this.

17 hrs.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Should the local people not get jobs?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: They should.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: I would not go into many details...

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: My name has been given as one of the speakers. I have repeatedly been requesting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wait.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: If I am not called, I will have to protest and go.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: The Government of Maharashtra have recently issued a circular asking all industrial establishments even in the private sector—not only in the public sector to appoint...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is this? How is that relevant here?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: The rights guaranteed for linguistic minorities under article 16(2) are being threatened. Is it relevant or not, Sir? I am requesting you to give the verdict.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Are we discussing protection of minority languages or protection of jobs?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: The rights of linguistic minorities are covered by that article—all problems of linguistic minorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Even to become a taxi driver in that State, it has become difficult. A new order has been promulgated which says that only those who have been resident there for 15 years can become a taxi driver in that State. On the question of housing, there again, only a man who has been there for the last 20 years...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with language.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That has nothing to do with the linguistic minorities; the order of the Maharashtra Government has nothing to do with the linguistic minorities. It applies to every one. It is only residential and not linguistic. Why are you confusing the issue?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: Linguistic minorities are being barred, their rights are citizen threatened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: My point is that the Government at the Centre cannot afford to remain a silent spectator when the basic rights of linguistic minorities are threatened. (Interruptions) There is our great leader, Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan who, during the worst days of the Samyukta Maharashtra agitation, said, 'If I have to choose between this country and Samyukta Maharashtra, I shall choose this country and its leader, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru'. I would appeal to the Central Government to look into the various laws which have been passed by the Government of Maharashtra.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must conclude now.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: There are many factors to be referred to...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are other speakers also; they will not get a chance then. May I request the Parliamentary Affairs Minister to control this side and

stick to the time? Otherwise, I will have to call the Minister to reply.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT: (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): I will request Mr. Unnikrishnan to kindly co-operate with the Chair.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There are numerous instances. I have asked many people belonging to my State. They were forced to declare other languages as their mother tongue during the census and when I asked them as to why those chose other languages as their mother tongue, they say, 'We will not be given jobs, we will not be given housing.' So, they are forced. So, the whole exercise of protection to linguistic minorities is a fraudulent exercise and only the Government, the national Government at the Centre can really protect the linguistic minorities. And it goes against the decision of the National Integration Council and Articles of the Constitution which give protection for the linguistic minorities and if these things are permitted to go in the States, then... (Interruptions) They are even forcing. That is what I referred to earlier as "cultural oppression." I know the Government of Tamil Nadu is pressurising the Malayalees... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: At this rate, you will not finish.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Please listen to me for a moment. The other day, what was going on....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot go on quarrelling with every hon. Member. He knows the Rules of the House.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I will just conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him talk and others will not get time.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: But these are vital factors connected with the whole Report.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: How can you take the whole time? I have to say something.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: About the All India Radio broadcasts, the Malayalam broadcast time in the AIR, Madras station was deliberately cut down. Mr. friend, Mr. Matha Gowder got excited unnecessarily. He should know them. He tried to place before the House the other day that everything was all right in Tamil Nadu. But, his Party is the worst culprit in the whole game, the worst culprit. Even you are trying to use and exploit the split in your party to launch a 'Malayalattan' Ozhiga campaign in Tamil Nadu....

(Interruptions) Don't try to intermidate.

SHRI J. MAHTA GOWDER (Nijgiris): You know MGR is a Malayalee and he has been elected as an MLA.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: You are trying to evict all the Malayalees in the Gudalur Taluk... (Interruption) No, no. Dont get excited. Please listen for a change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am unable to control—the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs also requested him, he is out of control of everybody. I cannot ask him to sit down. Let him go on. Others will not get time.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: I request you to conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it proper for me to ask this side on my left finish within three or four minutes when this side does not co-operate with the Chair and an hon. Member takes 15 or 20 minutes? Am I fair? Is the Chair fair?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I will just conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You take any amount of time you want.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: You may call the next speaker. Sir, we apologise to you.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I apologise if I have offended you. Will you allow me to finish with one sentence only with your permission?

MR CHAIRMAN: Shri H. M. Patel.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhanduka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are discussing the report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. The issue is really very limited namely, whether the facilities required are accorded for those who are regarded as the 'Linguistic Minorities' in the various States of our country.

The previous speaker really went right away from the main subject

Reading this report, it becomes quite clear for 25 years the Commissioner had been labouring to no purpose. He cannot function effectively. The purpose of appointing him is to ensure that he submits or makes available regular reports so as to ensure that the safeguards mentioned under certain Articles of the Constitution have in fact been afforded to them. Pathetically, in the end, he says that the cooperation that he seeks from the State Government is not usually forthcoming. And also, it is evident, the Constitutional safeguards provided are not sufficient for the purposes in view. Sir, had that not been the case, we would not have had occasion to see certain acts of violence and intolerance that we saw taking place in a number of States

All this happens because the spirit underlying the Constitution has not been observed. A Constitution can work only if there is loyalty to it, in spirit and in letter. Mere adherence to letter of the law cannot afford the necessary safeguard to the minorities which they require. What has happened in Assam is a proof.

Various questions which have been made in this House in the course of this Debate clearly show how far we are departing from the spirit of these provisions. The spirit is that there should be an attitude of tolerance exhibited towards the minorities in States, where one language is the

language of an over-whelming section of the population, in order to ensure that those Linguistic Minorities may be afforded all the facilities of studying and learning in their own languages. That is why those provisions were made.

Now, it has become quite clear that some different methods have to be adopted by us if we are going to achieve the objectives which we had in mind. We provided for the Reports of the Commissioners to be placed before this House and debated, in the hope that wherever there was any departure from the spirit, from compliance with these provisions, action would be taken by the State Governments and that public criticism and public opinion would ensure that these linguistic minorities get the safeguards provided for them. But that purpose not having been achieved, I feel, the time has come for us to further examine this issue from a totally different angle.

We must consider now whether a fresh policy needs to be evolved, in order to ensure that the linguistic minorities in the various States get their safeguards

A suggestion was made that a parliamentary delegation might visit Assam. If the suggestion is made in order to initiate the evolution of an all-India policy for the safeguarding of linguistic minorities, I would say that it is a good suggestion, because it may enable this House in the first instance to obtain from its own Members a report on what took place in Assam and why, the reasons for whatever took place, in what way thereafter we can approach this problem and so on so that we can ensure compliance with the provisions in the Constitution in spirit and in letter. I suggest that this is one method which we may evolve.

If that is not acceptable, I would suggest to the Government that they appoint a regular commission which should report within a fixed period of time to consider this entire problem and consider how best to evolve a fresh policy, a policy which does not depend merely upon the

provisions in the Constitution but also provides for the administrative machinery for implementing them. That machinery cannot be merely the commissioner who has no powers, and that machinery cannot be the Government of India which also cannot do anything, because it is the State Government which has the right and the power at present to deal with the question of linguistic minorities. Either the Government of India should amend the Constitution and take powers to themselves for the safeguarding the linguistic minorities in so far as these points are concerned, that is to say, the language question, the merits of it, in what way the rights of the linguistic minorities can be safeguarded from the cultural consideration and so on.

We have heard today a passionate appeal in regard to Urdu. Urdu is regarded neither as a minority language nor as a language of any region. But this is one of the national languages. But what was pleaded was....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Every language is a national language.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Although it is a national language, all that is necessary to ensure that Urdu flourishes is not being done. Urdu language is a very fine language and I think it would add to the cultural development of this country; if it flourishes. But if its spokesmen ask for a special territorial allotment, then what happens? For instance, Sindhi is there and....

SRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Let it be Gujarat.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Whether Gujarat is to be allotted to Urdu or to UP is not the question. UP has certainly far more Urdu-speaking people than any other State. But I am not suggesting any such thing. What I am saying is that the recognition of lan-

guages need not mean any such things. Recognition of languages only means that all necessary facilities should be afforded for the development of those languages in order that they may serve the various purposes for which language development is necessary.

What has happened in Assam lately and what has been happening in other States illustrates the fact that the implementation of the provisions in the Constitution in regard to the safeguarding of the linguistic minorities cannot be achieved through the commissioner reporting every year, but that it is necessary to approach the entire question in a different way. I would support the idea of a parliamentary delegation visiting Assam and reporting on it, but only from the point of view of evolving a fresh national policy in this regard. In the alternative, I would suggest that Government seriously consider the question of amending the Constitution and taking the powers necessary for safeguarding the rights of linguistic minorities from the Centre and directing the State Governments in that regard.

***SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have been discussing the report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the last two days. Unfortunately, the House instead of discussing the main problems of linguistic minorities in various States has drifted from the main issue and is discussing the troubles which flared up in Assam recently.

It is very clear from this as to how much the language can excite the people. The same language can create differences and also can create cooperation among people. We find that even though there are several languages spoken in this country, each of these languages has a place in the cultural history of this country. That is how the great Telugu musicians like Thyagaraja, Shyama Sastri etc. demonstrated their musical powers and are still respected and honoured in Tamilnadu.

*The original speech was delivered in Telugu.

[Shri P. Venkatasubbiah]

Apart from that I would like to submit one or two points in this connection. In this report a mention has been made regarding the facilities and safeguards that are to be given to the people of linguistic minorities in Tamilnadu and Mysore. In Tamilnadu there are 25 per cent people who speak Telugu. In the same way in Mysore State in Kolar District a majority of the people speak Telugu. In this connection I would like to quote the opinion given by the Commissioner regarding the safeguards given to these Telugu speaking people in Tamilnadu.

"From the report received from the Collector of Ramanathapuram, it appears that from 1st July 1969 to 30th April 1970 important notices and rules were not published in Telugu in the areas where Telugu speakers constitute more than 50 per cent of the population."

Not only that.

"In this connection, a reference was made to an order of the Madras High Court by which it was provided that summons and other court processes should be made through Telugu also in Hosur Taluk. The allegation was that the entire stock of printed forms supplied by the State Government for that purpose was destroyed locally. The matter has been brought to the notice of Government."

Not only that. Two members have been elected to the Tamilnadu Assembly from Hosur and Dharmapuri Taluqas. It has been reported by these members of the Tamilnadu Assembly that the Government is trying to convert Telugu speaking majority into a minority by dividing the constituencies. I am not stating this by way of complaint. The right of expression in one's mother tongue is very clearly safeguarded in the Constitution itself. That is why this Commission has been appointed. In the same way it has been mentioned in this report that there are no educational facilities for Telugu speaking people in the districts of Kolar and Guburga where their number is large. All these things have to be carefully considered.

Some of our colleagues have suggested that a Parliamentary Committee should be

appointed to go to Assam and make an on-the-spot study of the recent disturbances there and submit a report to this House. My submission is that appointment of such a Commission would go to worsen the conditions than to improve them.

Instead I submit that we should have a Standing Committee on the lines of the Standing Committee for Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes so that this Committee can constantly keep a watch and suggest ways and means to see that the interests of the various linguistic minorities in various States are safeguarded. Our country has several languages and several cultures, they are like the confluence of Triveni and all these cultures are great in their own way and in order to see that there is cultural and emotional integration in this country we should see that such tendencies as we have seen in Assam are nipped in the bud.

The Kannada language and the Telugu language have more or less the same script. I submit that to stream line such common scripts of languages the Central Government should give its cooperation and help.

Because of the preponderant influence of the Sanskrit language on the three Dravidian languages, namely Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, we feel that they are different from Tamil. Otherwise we find more similarity in all the four Dravidian languages. Finally I conclude by requesting our Tamil speaking brothers to give all help and cooperation in order to see that the Telugu language and the people who speak that language progress in Tamilnadu. I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to express my feelings in connection with this report.

श्री स्वामी ब्रह्मानन्द जी (हजीपुर)
 सभापति महोदय, प्राया के ऊपर जो
 श्रावण होते हैं, पहले हर मासनीय सदस्य को
 यह सौजन्य चाहिये कि प्राय है हम, कोस
 की ब्रह्मा है सभा ? प्राया पत्रों का
 कराने की चीज है प्रायें जब मैं या संसद
 में जिज्ञा सीधिए । इसविषय कोई भी सभा

खराब नहीं है। हर भाषा ने मानव को उचा उठाया है। भाषा एक सनेत्र है, एक इशाग है। जैसे आदमी ऐसे करता है ता मालूम होता है कि वह पानी पारता है। तो सब से पुराना इशाग कौन सा है? सब से पुराना इशाग संस्कृत है। संस्कृत क द्वारा तमिल निकली, बिगडी हुई हिन्दी निकली। श्रीर उर्दू भाषा ता एक मिली हुई हिन्दी है। उस का रखना चाहिये। उस में तिमि का पर्व है श्रीर नाई पर्व नहीं है उर्दू श्रीर हिन्दी में। संस्कृत तमिल और उगला न ग्लनी हुई है।

अब जो ये भाषा के नाम पर झगडे होते है मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उन में क्या लाभ होता है, और किस को हाना है। किसी सूत्र में अगर चार भाषाये हैं तो या ता सूत्रे मिटा दिये जाय और केवल नौ सभा रखी जाय, और जितने भाषा वाले लाग है उनका हारा अलग बना दिया जाय और हकूमत बरायी जाय। लेकिन उस तरह से किसी समस्या का हल होने वाला नहीं है, बल्कि झगडे और बढ़ेगे ही। समझ में नहीं आता कि यह झगडे कैसे निपटेंगे। भाषा में क्या लडाई है? यह लडाई तो नेता-गिरी की है। भाषा में कोई झगडा नहीं है। उर्दू इतनी लचीली और अच्छी भाषा है वह किसी से कम नहीं है। पहले यहा संस्कृत भाषा आई, किसी जमाने में फारसी आई अब अंग्रेजी चली। इस अंग्रेजी को तो विदा करे और जितनी भाषाये हैं उन की उर्बात हो।

इन शब्दों के साथ में अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हू।

SHRI D. BASUMALARI (Kokrajhar)
Mr Chairman, Sir, yesterday I have been listening to the speakers from West Bengal. I was much pained to hear them as they have unnecessarily, without any basis, attacked us. The examples cited by the various speakers are not correct. Most of them have heard from some people who

came here who met them here and gave them false reports without any basis and those hon Members have just placed those views here in Parliament.

Now in regard to languages, Assam State is quite different from the other States. You must understand what is Assam first. In other States may be there are two or three languages but in Assam there is no community which comprises the majority. I know Bengali very well, just as Mr Samar Guha I know Assamese very well I love my mother tongue. My mother tongue is Bodo. It is not a language but it is a dialect, and the Assam Government has given permission to them to use their dialect as a language. Wherever such a question comes the Assam Government consider it. Still, our Bengali people are fighting there for making Assam a bilingual State.

So you are from Bihar and you know while this question came up in Parliament at the time of our great leader Nehru who said in the party meeting in 1960 that the Assamese people have been exploited for ages. These Bengali people had been taken out from Bengal for clerical jobs to different places by the British and they secured all the facilities of the services and all that in the British time. If you see the figures, you will find that the Assamese in the offices or in any department formed only two to three per cent. When Independence came the country had been divided into so many parts on language basis as per the SRC report. Assam had to be recognised as a State. They have every right to have their regional language as medium of instruction. It is a mixed language which is spoken by many local people, tribes like Bodo, Lalung, Rabha, etc. Some Members referred to the Bodo community of the plain tribes which comprise five communities. Bodo, Rabha, Lalung, Miri and Deori, that is, five different communities with different dialects. Now, of these the Bodo community translated it into a language, they have been allowed to have their dialects as the medium of instruction upto the primary stage, i.e. upto class VIII. Recently the present Government raised it to the higher secondary level.

[Shri D. Basumatari.]

Some hon. Member complained here that in 1955 the Muslim population had been compelled to learn Assamese as their medium of instruction. It is not compulsion, it is not duress or pressure. The language Bill was passed in 1960. Before that they came to know that the language Bill would be passed and all the Muslim community, 27 per cent of the population took to the Assamese as the Medium of instruction. They say it was under duress. Mr. Ahmed is not here. He belongs to that community and he knows. (*Interruptions*) He stated during his recent visit to Assam that their should be one language, one State, that is Assamese in Assam. It was repeated by Mr. Mirdha too during his visit to Assam after Mr. Ahmed.

Then what is this? It is the sense of domination of Bengali-speaking people over them. They have dominated for ages together. Prime Minister Nehru himself said that once. He further said that people should rise to the occasion and he said it on the floor of the House in 1960.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Was Mr. Ahmed a better Assamese? Other MLAs were not Assamese, only Mr. Ahmed was Assamese? (*Interruption*).

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: Of course he is an Assamese Muslim but I am a tribal Assamese. Who are the people to whom you are referring? They are practical men; they are wise men; they know how to stand by the time of the time and therefore they have taken to study of the Assamese language of the region. Here in this report, it says that 582 Bengali high schools are there in Assam, thousands of elementary schools in Bengali language. Everything is paid for by the Government. Is there any authority which has raised the question at the time of sanctioning the grants as to whether they have to learn Assamese or not?

Recently what happened? Who brought this quarrel first? It is the sense of domination of the Bengali over Assamese. A resolution was passed by the Academic Council of the Gauhati University that Assamese should be the medium of in-

struction up to the college level and English should remain for ten years. The moment this resolution was passed by the university, tension arose in Cachar, fighting with Non-Bengali speaking people there started. There are so many Hindi-speaking people in the tea gardens; ten lakhs and they are not Bengali-speaking; they live in Cachar. About 20,000 people who are Manipuri speaking people are there; they do not speak Bengali. They have been told: you must learn Bengali here, in Cachar. . . . (*Interruptions*) Fighting took place in Cachar. I am telling you with all my authority. . . . (*Interruptions*). After passing of the resolution by the Assam Assembly for a separate University for Cachar, the Chief Minister of Assam with the consent of all concerned recommended it to the Centre, and then all sorts of trouble started in the Brahmaputra valley being instigated by the anti-social element. I represent Assam, not you.

So, the complaint made by the many hon. members here is not quite correct. Mr. Daschowdhury said that overnight the Muslim population had been converted to Assamese, by being compelled by the Government to learn Assamese. As I said, they are wise people and they have done it voluntarily. Is it the fault of the Government or people of Assam? I appeal to the Bengali people here. You do not stay there. You represent here the city of Calcutta. If you go to Assam. . . .

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I will be killed.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: No, you will be hypnotised by love and affection and be made *bheda*.

The complaint lodged here is quite incorrect. I appeal to my Bengali friends. The Assamese have become fairly educated and they want to stand on their own legs. They want to exist and they have every right to exist. The domination by Bengalis should not be there. Sir, I am neither a Bengali nor Assamese. I am a tribal of the original people of Assam. I know both languages and I can speak both languages, and also my mother tongue. I do not have any prejudices against an language. This is my

appeal that every community should live in harmony

MR CHAIRMAN The Minister

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd) Sir this debate has agitated the whole House It is a very serious problem The Prime Minister is receiving deputations almost every day The Chief Ministers of Bengal and Assam are coming here frequently I have all the respect for the Deputy Minister, but it is not possible for him to deal with such a serious problem of such gravity If it is not possible for either Mr Pant or Mr Mirdha to come the debate should be postponed This is absolutely wrong attitude on the part of the Government What impression will be created outside?

MR CHAIRMAN The Minister

श्री प्रटल बिहारी बाजपेयी सभापति महोदय, शायद पहले श्री मिर्धा उत्तर देने वाले थे, लेकिन आज वह विवाह में व्यस्त है। मेरा सुझाव है कि आज 6 बजे तक चर्चा चले और श्री मिर्धा बहम का जवाब कल दें।

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F H MOHSIN) Sir I am in an embarrassing position

SHRI SAMAR GUHA I do not want to embarrass you It is this attitude of the Government to this serious problem that I referred to

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) Sir, on principle, such an objection should not be taken Each one of our colleagues in the Council of Ministers is competent to reply, because it is the collective responsibility of the Government They cannot humble our colleagues like this

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN Sir, I am glad that keen interest has been taken in the debate. The debate has been very lively,

though at times some fire works did work, all the same I am happy that the Members on all sides have taken so much interest in the debate

The dispute about the linguistic minorities or the problem about the linguistic minorities is not new Nor it has come only after the formation of States on linguistic basis It was there before and they have continued to be there By and large I might say that the problem of linguistic minorities have been solved to a great extent

The framers of the Constitution took into account the difficulties that linguistic minorities might experience and they made provisions in the Constitution itself for the preservation of national integration and also to realise the unity of the people Articles 29, 30, 347 and 350 were provided in the Constitution itself to provide safeguards for linguistic minorities along with other fundamental rights under articles 14, 15 and 16 providing safeguards for linguistic and religious minorities

There are two categories of safeguards provided for linguistic minorities, the safeguards provided by the Constitution itself and the safeguards agreed to by the Chief Ministers in the Chief Ministers' Conference the Education Ministers' Conference etc After the reorganisation of States, it was found necessary that further safeguards should be provided for linguistic minorities Though it was known that one language would remain predominant in a particular State, still there were possibilities of a large sections of a linguistic minorities remaining in that State There are linguistic minorities in almost all the States For example, in Maharashtra, Marathi is the State language but there are so many other linguistic minorities, Kannada, Telugu, Tamil, Gujarati, etc In other States also, that is so So the problems were there before and they continue to be there

SHRI F. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): On a point of order, Sir As far as I can see, the Hon. Member's duty

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar.]

constituted because there is no quorum. On an important subject like this, I want the Government party to remain present in the House at least to constitute the quorum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The bell is being rung... now there is quorum. The Minister may continue his speech.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Finding some more safeguards were necessary for linguistic minorities, article 350A and 350B came to be included in the Constitution. Article 350A reads:

"It shall be the endeavour of every State and of every local authority within the State to provide adequate facilities for instruction in the mother-tongue at the primary stage of education to children belonging to linguistic minority groups;

"...and the President may issue such directions to any State as he considers necessary or proper for securing the provision of such facilities."

According to article 350B, a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities was to be appointed by the President. As such, a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has been appointed and he is required to investigate into the complaints of the linguistic minorities throughout the country and report to the President. Later on, so many things have happened. The Education Ministers of all the States have met, the Chief Ministers have met, and they have provided some safeguards by mutual discussion. Those safeguards can be broadly stated, as far as education is concerned, thus:

"Teaching by appointing at least one teacher, through the mother-tongue at primary stage if there are 40 pupils in a school or 10 pupils in a class desirous of learning in that language.

"The modern Indian languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, as well as English, should be used as media of instruction at the secondary stage. Other languages may also be used in the hill districts of

Assam and the district of Darjeeling in West Bengal. For the purpose of providing instruction at the secondary stage in a mother-tongue of the linguistic minorities, a minimum strength of 60 pupils in the last four classes and 15 pupils in each class will be necessary, provided that for the first four years a strength of 15 in each class will be sufficient."

Hon. members laid more stress on implementation. When there are so many Constitutional provisions and agreed scheme of safeguards, it cannot be said that there are no provisions for safeguarding the interests of linguistic minorities. But something could really be said about implementation,

As regards implementation, many States have already implemented the safeguards which were promised. For the benefit of the members, I may say that for implementing these Constitutional provisions—I have already read out article 350A of the Constitution—, a workable formula has been evolved at national level which provides that arrangements must be made for instruction in the mother-tongue by appointing at least one teacher provided there are not less than 40 pupils in the whole school or 10 such pupils in a class desirous of receiving instructions in their mother-tongue. All State Governments excepting Jammu & Kashmir and Nagaland have implemented this decision. However, the Government of Assam have reserved to themselves the right to recognise or not any mother-tongue as the medium of instruction even if the stipulated number of pupils are forthcoming. This is the actual state of affairs. In Orissa the facilities for instruction in the mother-tongue are limited to minority schools exclusively functioning for them. In Haryana, use of Punjabi has been permitted to some private schools. In Punjab only private schools have been allowed to continue the medium of instruction of their choice. In Himachal Pradesh there are some orders for imparting the instruction through Punjabi only. So far as the Union Territories

are concerned, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry have implemented this arrangement.....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The hon. Minister is only reiterating what has already been circulated in the report....

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: It is more than that.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Various issues have been raised in this House, particularly in respect of Assam. He is only reading what is contained in the report; it is not something unknown to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will not say according to your dictation. You have said whatever you liked, and he will say whatever he likes.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: As regards advance register of linguistic minorities pupils, in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in this respect, orders have been issued by all State Governments excepting Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir for opening of advance registers in the schools. However, in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir, orders exist for opening of advance registers in some selected areas which are supposed to be minorities pockets. All the Union Territories excepting Arunachal Pradesh have also issued similar orders.

So, it cannot be said that the State Governments are not implementing the promises made and decisions arrived at the Chief Ministers' Conference.

Regarding primary education through tribal languages, a provision for imparting instruction through tribal languages has been reported by the Governments of Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Tripura. But, of course, provision could not be made for imparting education in dialects because they have no script.

Some people have made a point that the tribal dialects are neglected. Education cannot be imparted through dialects

unless they adopt one or the other of the scripts.

As regards imparting education through Konkani, Shri B. V. Naik has said that there is no provision in the Mysore State. I think he has not read the report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities in full. It has been stated that a complaint was made by the Konkani Mahasabha of Bombay and not from the Konkani people from Mysore State. The Konkani Mahasabha of Bombay made a grievance about it, but the Mysore Government has come forth to say that they will provide instruction through the Konkani language if the Mysore people express a desire for that. But, unfortunately, Konkani has no script of its own. In Maharashtra, the Konkani people have adopted Devanagari as their script and in Mysore they have taken to Kannada script and it is for them to adopt any script they like. But, if sufficient number of students come forward for a primary or a secondary school, provision would be made in the Mysore State also and that was the assurance of the State Government.

Complaints were also made by Mr. Unnikrishnan about the Shiv Sena activities. But we are not concerned with the Shiv Sena activities at present. We are only considering the report of the Commissioner for the Linguistic Minorities. The Shiv Sena agitation was about recruitment to the services. They wanted employment for the so-called 'sons of the soil' of Maharashtra. But that is a different problem altogether with which we are not concerned at present.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It is also a question of linguistic minorities.

SHRI F. H. MOHIN: It is not a question of linguistic minorities. There are no complaints about opening of primary schools with Kannada medium or Telugu medium or any other medium.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We have said that we condemn the Shiv Sena activities unequivocally.

DR. KAILAS (Bombay South): There are schools conducted with Malayalam and Tamil languages as the medium of instruction run by the Municipal Corporation of Bombay as well as by the State Government.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: None can appreciate the stand taken by the Shiv Sena. But that is not very much relevant for our debate to-day. We are only concerned here with the protection of the linguistic minorities and we have no reports of any such serious complaints...

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I only want the scope of Art. 350B to be further amended so that all these complaints can be brought in.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: But even in Maharashtra, as far as I am aware of, knowledge of the regional language is not a pre-requisite for recruitment to services except in certain categories of services like Tehsildars and so on.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I will get the relevant copies of the orders of Maharashtra Government and come to you.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: If there are any complaints of that nature, we will certainly look into them.

DR. KAILAS: There are Kerala people working in our hospitals and schools, Government and private organisations in thousands.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: With a view to providing mother tongue as the medium of instruction in the minority languages, the agreed safeguard at the national level is that there should be a minimum strength of 60 pupils in the last four classes of the Higher Secondary stage and 15 pupils in each such class. All the State Governments with the exception of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, J. & K., Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh have accepted the formula of 15-60 and have issued instructions for implementing this arrangement. In Haryana

Hindi is the medium of instruction in Government-managed schools. However, they have permitted the use of Punjabi as medium of instruction in some private recognised schools where it existed in the erstwhile United Punjab. In J. & K., English is the medium of instruction. However, Social Studies can be learned through the medium of Urdu, English or Punjabi. In Punjab, Punjabi has been made the sole medium of instruction in all Government-managed schools, Hindi has been permitted to continue as the medium of instruction.

Unfortunately, Punjab and Haryana, both have taken the stand that they are unilingual States and there are no linguistic minorities. This stand is not correct. I hope that they will realise this and give due protection to the linguistic minorities in their respective States.

During the whole debate, the Assam dispute over the language in Cachar and Brahmaputra valley dominated the debate. That is so, because, this is the current problem facing the country. I may briefly state the facts which led to the dispute on the language issue in Assam.

At present there are two Universities in Assam, namely, Gauhati University which covers certain portion of Assam, Manipur, Nagaland, Meghalaya and Mizoram and the Dibrugarh University, which covers the districts of Upper Assam. The question of the media of instruction in Gauhati University has been a subject of controversy for quite some time. In 1968 the Academic Council of Gauhati University proposed to have a number of regional languages as the media of instruction, but no final decision was taken. The question was again raised in 1970, but it was again put off. On June 6, 1972, the Academic Council of the Gauhati University took a decision to permit Bengali students to write their answer papers in Bengali while continuing with Assamese and English as the medium of instruction from the Academic Session 1972-73.

On the 12th June, 1972, the Academic Council decided in partial modification of their earlier decision that (i) Assamese would be the medium of instruction in colleges under the jurisdiction of the Gauhati University; (ii) English would continue as the alternative medium of instruction till such time not exceeding ten years; and (iii) a student would have the option to answer either in Assamese or in English in the University examination.

On the 23rd September, the Assam Legislative Assembly passed a Resolution that the medium of instruction in the Gauhati and Dibrugarh Universities should be Assamese with alternative provision for English and that Cachar should have a separate University.

For appreciating the rationale behind the decision of the Academic Council taken on the 12th June, 1972, one has to bear in mind the national policy on Education. It was also probably thought that it may not be feasible to ask the students to write their answers in a language through which they have not been taught in their classes. That might be the intention.

Assamese is the official language of Assam. The State Government desired to develop this language and to make it the medium of instruction in the Universities so that its administrators should be well-versed in the language and should be capable of running the administration through the medium of the Assamese. A large number of Bengalees living in Assam are bilingual. They have studied Assamese and they understand it very well. With a view to enabling them to take part in the State administration, it was probably considered necessary that they should have proficiency in the official language. As regards the study of their mother-tongue, i.e., Bengali, all the facilities for the purpose are available at the primary and secondary stages of education.

From the Twelfth Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, it appears that during the year 1967-68, at the Primary stage, the number of schools and sections imparting instruction through the medium of Bengali was 2213 and 4 respectively. The number of students and teachers was 1,80,987 and 4,484 respectively.

At the secondary stage, the number of schools imparting instruction through the medium of Bengali was 582 and the number of students receiving instruction through this medium was 1,19,179. The overall strength of teachers was 4,863.

The question of the medium of instruction in the University is an altogether different matter. The University Education Commission of 1948-49 considered this matter. They considered that both from the point of view of education and general welfare of a democratic country it was essential that study should be through the regional languages, for that would enable the students to enrich their literature and to develop their culture.

They however thought that, for the time being, it was desirable that the University should have the option to use the Federal language as the medium of instruction either for some subjects or for all the subjects.

18 hrs.

In case of regions having pockets of linguistic minorities, the commission considered that the right policy to follow was to unreservedly allow the use of the mother-tongue for basic education, and if the numbers are adequate, for secondary education also, introducing the regional language gradually in the upper grades at the school and making it the medium of instruction at the university stage.

A point was raised as regards the national policy on university education. The national policy on education is this. As has already been placed before both Houses of Parliament many times, it is that urgent steps would be taken to adopt

[Shri F. H. MOHSIN.]

regional languages as the media of education at the university stage; and suitable courses in Hindi and English should be also available in the universities and colleges with a view to improving the proficiency of students in these languages up to the prescribed university standards, that is, the establishment in non-Hindi States of colleges and other institutions of higher education which use Hindi as the medium of instruction should also be encouraged and the study of English deserves to be specially strengthened because of its importance as an international language and also because of its knowledge in science and technology, and that every effort should be made not only to protect the rights of minorities but to promote their educational interests.

The Constitution gives rights to the linguistic minorities in the matter of education. Articles, 29 and 30 of the Constitution are often quoted in this connection to urge that no State can deny these rights to the linguistic minorities. However, in the larger national interest, the linguistic minorities, while preserving their language and script should make integrated efforts for achieving all-round progress of the State.

The problem that has arisen in Assam today may arise somewhere else also. So, the point is that the people in the respective States should try to learn the State language and assimilate themselves with the rest of the people so that they will not lag behind in the development of the State and in getting the opportunities in other spheres also. If we think in this perspective, I do not think that there would be any dispute about linguistic minorities. But at the same time, I would appeal to the State Governments also to allow them some time so that they can learn this language not only in the primary and secondary stages but also in the higher stages of education. What is required is a proper understanding, a proper appreciation of the feelings and difficulties of each other, and if that is done, then a solution may not be far.

When the Assam dispute arose, some Ministers visited the area, including the Prime Minister. They have studied the situation, and now the situation is calm. I do not think that it is necessary for a parliamentary committee or for any commission to go into the matter and tour that area, because the problem is not unknown to us, and we are already seized of the problem and we know the feelings of the different sections of the people, and the Central Government are very eager to solve the problem. If such a commission or a parliamentary committee is formed, I do not think that matters would be easier...

AN HON. MEMBER: It may make it worse.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: It may be so, but I would not say that. Anyway, I would appeal to the Members to realise the difficulty and to help the Government in solving the problem by not making any exaggerated statements. Some of my friends from Bengal made a very exaggerated statement about the atrocities, so-called atrocities...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: No, it is absolutely wrong...

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I have not taken the hon. Member's name.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: He is making an under-estimate. He has got the courage to say so; let him have a judicial inquiry. Why does he not have the courage to have a judicial inquiry into the matter...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not amenable. Nothing that he says will go on record.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: **

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He feels that certain statements made here were exaggerated. He is entitled to that opinion. But the House is entitled to know from him what is the factual position, according to the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a procedure. Let him conclude and then I will allow him to put a question. It is not that he could get up at any time and go on speaking at the top of his voice. That is not proper. He is a very learned man, a professor.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: My senior colleague, Shri Pant, has already made a statement on the floor of the House on 14th November, 1972. The districts mainly affected were Kamrup, Darrang, Nowgong, Sib Sagar and Dibrugarh. According to the information available, 31 persons were killed. Of these 3, are reported to have died as a result of police firing and 18 due to riots and arson.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Question. I can give the names on the floor of the House.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: In respect of the remaining 10, the precise circumstances of death are being ascertained. 760 persons received injuries including 126 police and other personnel on duty.

Anyway, the Government of Assam have taken prompt measures to arrest the situation.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: How many houses burnt? How many villages burnt? What is the number of refugees?

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I cannot go into details.

I would make an appeal. Whatever has happened, nobody is happy about it. We are all concerned over it. Whoever commits violence must be condemned. We all condemn those incidents. I think the whole House would join me in that.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You did not utter a single word until the issue was raised by us.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I appeal to all sides to co-operate with Government. The atmosphere is normal now. Conditions are normal. Let them continue to be so,

so that we can take decisions in a calm and cool atmosphere. We do not want that the situation should again become abnormal. We are all responsible members. We are all elected members representing the people. Without your co-operation, it may become difficult for Government to bring about a solution.

I would request all political parties, leaders and members to co-operate....

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jai-Nagar): Except the Congress Party.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: They should go on with their factional fights and divide the people! Only the leaders of the Congress Party in Assam should go on with their factional fights, instigating the people, dividing the people!

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I am making an appeal to all members of all parties.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Please do not deliver sermons here.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Innocent people have been the victims of the political fight between the two groups.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: Whatever has happened, nobody is happy about it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Go and ask Shri Sarat Sinha. I say: do not deliver sermons to us here.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I am not supporting that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Put your own house in order.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The President of the.... **

MR. CHAIRMAN: He should not mention names. It will not be recorded.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): What is the objection to sending an all-party delegation? That will help calm the situation.

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: So, I would again appeal to the hon. Members on all sides to co-operate with the Government and help us to solve this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, there are some substitute motions which have been moved. Does any Member want to press his motion?

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: No 5 may be put separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I shall put the substitute motion No. 5 of Shri Bhogendra Jha, first.

Substitute motion No. 5 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All the other substitute motions, No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 will now be put together.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, on a point of Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order; there is no other business.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You cannot put together all these substitute motions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can put all of them together. Why are you wasting time? You are a sick man, I am also a sick man.

I am putting substitute motions Nos 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 together to the vote of the House.

Substitute motions Nos 1 to 4 and 6 were put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 a.m.
18.16 hrs.

TEE LOK SABHA THEN ADJOURNED TILL ELEVEN OF THE CLOCK ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1972/AGRA-HAYANA 10, 1894 (SAKA).