

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

My only point is whether it is open to a Member of the House to write to a Minister so far as to request him to withdraw a case that is pending investigation and inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what I wanted to bring to the notice of the hon. Member—that it should not be open to the Member and he should not just resort to this procedure of standing up any time, any moment and making observations on any subject that he likes. I must have advance notice of that. Now he has put me an abstract question. Can I reply to it?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not want your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The reply is not there. But the question has been put.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not want the reply today.

Mr. Speaker: That is not fair. That is exactly what I am objecting to. If he has to put a question, I should have notice so that I might be prepared to answer. Now the question is there, but not the answer.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not want the answer today. You can give it tomorrow or the day after. I am not in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker: This is the procedure to bring up a matter in the House—I am quoting rule 377.

“A member who wishes to bring to the notice of the House any matter which is not a point of order shall give notice to the Secretary in writing stating briefly the point which he wishes to raise in the House together with reasons for wishing to raise it, and he shall be permitted to raise it only after the Speaker has given his consent and at such time and date as the Speaker may fix”.

This was not a question that cropped up suddenly because of the discussions we were having. Therefore, I will request him just now to observe this rule in future.

12.19 hrs.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL

Mr. Speaker: Bills for consideration and passing.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice from the hon. Member that he wants to raise a point of order on this question, that the motion cannot be moved. Therefore, I shall hear him first.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): Before we go to that, I just want to point out one thing. We had originally decided that we were not going to sit after 5 P.M. since yesterday. But late in the evening yesterday, when most of us were engaged in various sub-committees and Committees of the House, this matter was raised and passed by the House at 6 O'clock with hardly a few Members in the House to deal with it. I would request you not to permit such a question to be put so late in the evening, because we can now take it up in the normal course between 12 and 5,—and if we tried to sit extra hours we can even sit an extra day on the 8th. Otherwise, a decision is taken when the House is very empty; now most of us will have to sit upto 6 or 6.30 for two days.

Mr. Speaker: I will be more careful in future.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Briefly, my point of order is as follows, that the requirements of the special procedure laid down for

moving a Bill of this nature in either House of Parliament which have been clearly laid down in article 349 have not been fulfilled, and that the sanction which the President is purported to have given to the introduction and consideration of the Bill, about which we have been informed by the Secretary in the copy of the Bill circulated to us, is defective under the Constitution because the conditions precedent as laid down in the Constitution have not been fulfilled. As the provisions of the Constitution stand, the President has no power to give sanction to the moving or consideration of a Bill of this nature in the form in which it is being moved.

We have been informed that the President has recommended the introduction and consideration of this Bill under two articles of the Constitution—under articles 117(3) and 349. So far as recommendation under article 117 (3) is concerned, that does not concern me here, but I am concerned with the sanction that the President is purported to have given under article 349.

Article 349 reads like this:

“During the period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, no Bill or amendment making provision for the language to be used for any of the purposes mentioned in clause (1) of article 348 shall be introduced or moved in either House of Parliament without the previous sanction of the President”

This sanction we are informed the President has accorded, but the article proceeds further, because the President is not a free agent in the matter, and it states:

“... the President shall not give his sanction to the introduction of any such Bill or the moving of any such amendment except after he has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Commission constituted under

clause (1) of article 344 and the report of the Committee constituted under clause (4) of that article.”

This brings us to article 344 which reads like this:

“The President shall, at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a Commission which shall consist of ...”

After this Commission has done its work and reported and made recommendations, a Committee of Parliament would be constituted. That is under clause (4) of article 344.

Now, so far as article 344 is concerned, two Commissions are contemplated, one after the expiry of five years and one after the expiry of ten years. After five years a Commission was appointed. My contention is that if any Bill makes any provision or seeks to make provision for the subjects mentioned in clause (1) of article 348 within those five years, the recommendations of the first Commission which has to be appointed meantime and those of the Parliamentary Committee to be constituted thereafter to scrutinise the recommendations of the Commission, have to be taken into consideration by the President. If after a lapse of ten years any Bill seeks to make provision touching upon the subjects mentioned in article 348(1), the President cannot give his sanction unless he has in the meantime appointed a second Commission and that Commission has been followed by the appointment of a second Parliamentary Committee, and the recommendations of the Commission and Committee have been taken into consideration by the President. It is binding on the President, and I do maintain that in view of these provisions of the Constitution which I have read out and which are obligatory upon the President, the President is not a free agent, and so

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

he cannot give any sanction, unless that Commission and Committee have been constituted, to a Bill of this nature.

Mr. Speaker: He concedes that one Commission was appointed after five years and a Committee was thereafter appointed by the Parliament and it has made its report. Therefore, the President had only the report of the first Commission and the first Committee when he considered that and gave the sanction. The only objection is that he must have considered the reports of both the commissions and both committees before giving his sanction.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: It is there in the Constitution, Sir, that he must appoint, after the lapse of ten years, a second commission and a second committee must be appointed by Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, the question arises whether he could give sanction for the motion, for the introduction of a Bill, before another Commission had been appointed and its report has been received and considered by the Parliamentary Committee. Is that his point?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: After the expiry of ten years from the commencement of the Constitution, before a Bill is introduced....

Mr. Speaker: That is right. A Bill can be introduced when ten years have elapsed. But it is not said that it is necessary to appoint a Commission immediately after five years or ten years. After ten years may mean 12 or 13 years.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Unless that is considered by the President, the Bill cannot be introduced or considered.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, I have also a point of order, almost of the same type that the House is now seized of. It can be

disposed of with the same. In raising a point of order, Shri Chaudhuri seems to agree that the sanction from the President has been obtained. I think that there is no sanction from the President. There are differences in the language used in the two articles 117 and 349, Article 117 merely uses the word 'recommendation'.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the point of order that the sanction under article 349 is not regular?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is not there at all. I shall point out why I say so.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow him time to raise the point of order that he is going to raise. But I may read for the information of the House what it says here:

"The President, having been informed of the subject matter of the Bill providing for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union, for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High Courts, has given his previous sanction to the introduction of the Bill under article 349 of the Constitution and also recommends the consideration of the Bill under article 117(3)."

So, this previous sanction was given though on the Bill it is put down only as recommendation.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The Bill does not say so.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I wanted to read this.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Can it be an extraneous document, apart from the Bill? I quite see that the Government might try to wriggle out of the position. There is no question of abridged version appearing on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: We have to see actually the sanction that I have received

from the President and not the endorsement that is made.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Am I not in my right to bring it to your notice that this information is not supplied to us, that the information here misleads us. This is the document circulated to us from time to time over which we have wasted our time, studying the position. We should know whether proper sanction has been accorded or not. This is like what happened in the Supreme Court one day. One day, a gentleman rose and said, "Here, I have got the remand order in my pocket." The remand order may be in his pocket, but what is required in law is that it must be put up legally, as is provided in the law, according to the provisions of the law. So, it must be before the House. You being the custodian of the privileges of the House . . .

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): What does the Law Minister do?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Apart from the legality—I may not find fault with the law Minister—my submission is that when this Bill is being placed before the house, when it is being published, and published over the signature of Mr. M. N. Kaul, Secretary, Lok Sabha, it is most essential that the President's sanction must be reproduced in it in the same language.

Mr. Speaker: So far as that is concerned, I agree readily with the objection of the hon. Member that this sanction should have been reproduced there in the same form in which it is required by law. I will direct the Government that it should be done in future. But the hon. Member might argue whether it does affect for the present the validity of the Bill or the introduction of it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Could I intervene? Some of us who gave notice

of certain amendments which require the President's recommendation have received a communication early this morning that we should get the President's consent by this evening. Well, conceivably on the telephone I could get the President's recommendation. But would that sort of thing be permitted? It could not be permitted, because it has to be done in a proper way. It has to be done in a manner which is not only legal on the face of it, but it must be expressed in a manner which shows the complete legality of the entire proceeding. This Government has a large apparatus, a very expensive apparatus and a number of Ministries which do not do their job properly. Only yesterday all sorts of questions arose, which show how faulty is the practice of several Ministries—(Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This sanction has not been received on the telephone or today. It is dated 6th April, 1963.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: That does not explain. You have been a judge and as Shri U. M. Trivedi has pointed out, the sanction must be put in black and white (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The sanction is there. I have agreed with the objection that it ought to have been reproduced on the back of it, on the Bill itself. Therefore, I do not know what further Shri Mukerjee wants.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Three years ago, on a Constitution amendment matter, a wrong date was given, and a hell of a lot of hullabaloo took place in this House, and the thing was corrected. If this sort of thing goes on for ever and ever, where are we and where is Parliamentary practice going to?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let Shri U. M. Trivedi, who was on his legs first, continue his point.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it has been mentioned as follows:

"The Committee constituted under clause (4) of article 344 of the Constitution to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) thereof expressed the opinion that complete change-over to Hindi by the 26th January, 1965 was not practicable and that provision should be made in pursuance of clause (3) of article 343 of the Constitution for the continued use of English even after 1965...."

Mr. Speaker: Does he also mean to say that if his point is upheld, then this Bill cannot be taken up for consideration, and the motion cannot be made?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes; that is the point. The motion cannot be made, because there is an inherent lacuna in bringing this motion before the House for consideration, in as much as the provisions of article 344 are there; it is a condition precedent.

Mr. Speaker: He is supporting Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But in a different language.

Shri Bade: From a different angle.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I understand the meaning of the word that I use. Article 344(1) has got a mandatory provision, both for five years and for 10 years. It says:

"... at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, ..."

The words that have been used are, "ten years" after the commencement of the Constitution.

Then, when we read 344(2), there the duties that have been cast upon

the Commission are given. Here, "the Commission" means the two Commissions that are to be appointed and not one single Commission. It says:

"It shall be the duty of the Commission to make recommendations to the President as to—

(a) the progressive use of the Hindi language . . ."

When both these are read together, then what is required is that there shall be constituted a Committee consisting of 30 members of whom 20 shall be members of the House of the People and 10 shall be members of the Council of States. After that appointment has been made, only then the provision in 349—the penultimate provision—comes into play where it is said:

"...without the previous sanction of the President, and the President shall not give his sanction to the introduction of any such Bill...."

The restriction is upon the President on his using his powers to give the sanction. It is not a provision for the Government. It is a provision which relates to the personal powers of the President which is not exercisable in any manner by the Government of the Union. It is a power vested entirely in the President, and a personal power which is vested in him has got a restrictive provision in it that he shall not exercise that power of sanction unless and until this condition has been fulfilled.

I will, therefore, say, Sir, that the ten year period having passed in 1960 since the commencement of our Constitution in 1950—on 26th January 1950 our Constitution came in, on 26th January 1955 there could be one Commission and the other Commission could be appointed in 1960—and three years have passed after that and up-to-date no Commission has been appointed and the recommendation that could be made by the constituted committee

and these two commissions not having been there, it is not possible for this House to discuss it.

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hanumanthaiya wants to say something?

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): No, Sir; it related to the point previously made.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Speaker, may I invite your attention to rule 65 and rule 68? Before I proceed, Sir, to read those rules, I submit, that even in cases where we may agree with the principle of a Bill, it is essential that in order to promote the highest parliamentary traditions in our country, where parliamentary democracy is in its infancy, we must conform our procedure to the constitutional requirements and the requirements of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

Here is rule 65. I am aware that sub-rule (1) refers to a Private Member's Bill. But I submit, in all humility and with all earnestness at my command, that what applies to a Private Member's Bill, in so far as the President's sanction is concerned—because that is a very important constitutional requirement—must apply *a fortiori* to a Government Bill also. What does sub-rule (2) say? It reads as follows:

“(2) If the Bill is a Bill which under the Constitution cannot be introduced without the previous sanction or recommendation of the President, the member shall annex to the notice such sanction or recommendation conveyed through a Minister, and . . .” (please note the last bit of it) . . . “the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with.”

Now, Sir, as you have observed, and rightly so, the President's sanction has not been conveyed in the manner required by this rule. And, as my hon.

colleague has already said, the constitutional requirement also has not been complied with.

I would submit, Sir, therefore, that the requirements of the Constitution as well as the rules have been flagrantly violated in this respect, and that the motion for consideration will not be in order.

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will recollect that when your predecessor was presiding over this House, a similar point was raised, not directly concerned with the introduction of a Bill under article 349, but on the question of appointing a Second Commission. And the point then raised was that since ten years have expired, we should have appointed a Second Commission under article 344, because the word used in article 344 is “shall”. The Government did not appoint the Second Commission for reasons then explained by the late Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, who was the then Home Minister, because the First Commission's recommendations and the report of the Parliamentary Committee were still under consideration and we were taking steps for implementation of that Commission's recommendations and the report of the Parliamentary Committee. When the matter came up here, I personally took part in the discussions and said that our view was that the word “shall” must be construed as “may”.

Shri Nath Paj (Rajapur): How can you arrogate that authority to you (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Order order.

Shri A. K. Sen: That is the view which the Government took, and I said then that unless we were corrected by the court that our interpretation was wrong, we propose to adhere to our own interpretation, for the simple reason that there were various other provisions in the Constitution itself where the language used is

[Shri A. K. Sen]

"shall" and yet the Supreme Court and other courts have ruled that the word "shall" should be construed as "may". It is not such a matter on which we can dispose of the question merely by laughing, in my humble submission.

In the Government of India Act, there was a section, section 205, which used the word "shall" and the Privy Council, in a well-known decision . . .

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: May I know the context in which it was used?

Shri Nath Pai: Let us have the whole text.

Shri A. K. Sen: If the hon. Member is prepared to listen, I will give all the facts, because I am here to give all the facts.

In that section of the Government of India act, the word used was that the High Court "shall" give leave or special certificate for appeal to the Privy Council on certain matters, if certain things happen. The Privy Council, deciding on that question, held in a decision reported in 67 Indian Appeals that where duties were cast upon high dignitaries indicating something to be done by the person concerned, the use of the word "shall" should not ordinarily be interpreted as mandatory. Similar interpretation was put in interpreting article 320, concerning consultation with the Public Service Commission. The language of article 320 is as follows:

"(1) It shall be the duty of the Union and the State Public Service Commission to conduct examinations for appointments....."

Then, sub-clause (3) says:

"The Union Public Service Commission or the State Public

Service Commission, as the case may be, shall be consulted—

- (a) on all matters relating to methods of recruitment to civil services and for civil posts;
- (b) on the principles to be followed in making appointments to civil services....
- (c) on all disciplinary matters affecting a person serving under the Government of India or the Government of a State...."

The point arose whether the Government, either in the States or in the Centre, could take disciplinary proceedings without consulting the State Public Service Commission or the Union Public Service Commission, as the case may be, because article 320 uses the word "shall". In one of the earliest decisions of the Calcutta High Court, in which I argued the matter for the Government of West Bengal, I argued that the word "shall" must be construed as "may", and that argument was accepted by the Calcutta High Court, after an elaborate examination of all the authorities. Later on, when the matter came up in a different case to the Supreme Court, the same interpretation was accepted and the word "shall" was construed as "may". And the reasons are not far to seek. Those who will read the decision will see that the reasons are quite plausible and should not possibly cause laughter outside the House.

Therefore, the word "shall" is not conclusive, as I argued on that occasion when the late Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant was speaking on the question of implementing the recommendations of the Commission and the Committee and the objection was raised why a Second Commission was not appointed, though so required under article 344 of the Constitution,

and I then said that if the previous Commission's recommendations and if the previous Committee's report were still to be implemented, the appointment of a Second Commission will be futile, and since we are still considering how best to implement the steps proposed by the Commission and the Parliamentary Committee, to appoint a second one when the first one has not yet been discussed or given effect to would be futile and, therefore, on a parity of reasoning and without going into the details of the argument I said that the Government's view was that the word "shall" must be construed as "may", having regard to the very nature of the case, because the previous Commission's recommendations and the previous Committee's report may still be in the process of being fulfilled, or may still be in the process of acted upon or decided upon and to say that the President, notwithstanding all this, must appoint a Second Committee simply because the word "shall" has been used would not be giving a proper and reasonable construction to the Constitutional provision. And that is matter which is now nearly three years old, and we are taking the view that the Parliament, the Government at the Centre and the States have still been concerned with the implementation of the steps and the measures recommended by the First Commission and the Parliamentary Committee and also what happened in Parliament on those reports and we are, therefore, now at the stage of passing a measure proposed by the Government, based on those recommendations of the Commission, on that report of the Committee and on the discussions which have followed in the State Legislatures, in the Lok Sabha, in the Rajya Sabha and in other places. Therefore, the question of our not appointing the Second Commission, as required under article 344, is, in my opinion, well disposed of.

Now the next question is whether there is any bar, as argued by Shri

Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri and Shri Trivedi, whether the bar is implied or not under article 349, because there was no Second Commission. According to the argument which has been put forward, the reasoning appears to be as follows. Article 344 requires that there must be a Second Commission and since article 349 mentions that the President will give his sanction after considering the report of the Parliamentary Committee and the recommendations of the Commission, as mentioned in clause (4) of article 344, it must necessarily attract both the Commission's recommendations and the Parliamentary Committee's report, and since there was no second Commission or second Committee, the President was incompetent to give sanction for the introduction of this Bill. This, in my opinion, again follows from a fallacy of thinking that it is obligatory for the President to appoint a Second Commission irrespective of whether the First Commission's recommendation has yet been implemented or not, and secondly from the fallacy of reading a bar or reading a limitation which is not there, and trying to weave out a limitation by inference or by argument. In my submission, a proper reading of article 349, apart from the question whether it is obligatory to appoint a Second Commission or not, is this that the President shall not give sanction to the introduction of any such Bill except after he has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) of article 344 and the report of the Committee. That means, whatever report there is, whatever recommendations there are, he must after considering that give the sanction. If there is nothing else, there is no question of his considering that. Suppose, there was a committee but it made no report; or there was a commission but it made no report. . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; we should now discuss calmly.

Shri A. K. Sen: These difficult questions cannot be answered by mere vigour in my submission. They have to be answered logically if they can and they have to be determined logically. The method of deciding other points, I am afraid, is wholly inappropriate for deciding such questions. Therefore, in my submission, reading this section as others, the President will not only have to take into consideration whatever report there is—if there is no report there is no question of considering it. It is a well known principle of law and you will bear me out that when something has to be considered an interpretation is always annexed to it or written into it that this thing is to be considered if it exists or if it is possible. If it does not exist, the question of consideration does not arise at all. Therefore in my submission the question of considering a non-existent recommendation is out of the question and the objection raised has to fail.

Shri Nath Pai: The hon. Law Minister has tried to not exactly quibble but make much play with the words 'shall' and 'may'. He is certainly aware that it is possible within the next 15 minutes to get an umpteen number of decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Supreme Court as also of the Privy Council showing that wherever the word 'shall' has been used, it has been used in a mandatory sense, whereas there are cases—he is quite right—when the word 'shall' may become 'may'. That cannot be a conclusive argument by itself. That should be taken into consideration.

Secondly, his saying that I had pointed out to the House that we may construe it to mean 'may' is also not very acceptable to us because we do not remember the House having given this power to the Law Minister of India to interpret..... (*Interruption*).

Shri A. K. Sen: I said, it is the Government's point of view. I never claimed the power for the House.

Shri Nath Pai: I am very happy. But that was the impression I got because, maybe, a wrong language has been used. But a very substantial point that I want to submit is this. It says that if you are seeking to move any Bill or to enact any legislation during the period of 15 years, all these requirements must be fulfilled. If that was the interpretation the Government proposed to have, then rather than arrogate the claim to Government it was proper and it would have been the right thing for the hon. Law Minister to advise the President to make a reference to the Supreme Court. There is a provision that in all such matters where such dubity exists it is open to the Government to make a reference to the Supreme Court. Such a reference was not made. It is a little too late in the day to say that this was the meaning.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I want to point out only one thing in regard to the interpretation of the word 'shall'. Of course, it has been stated in standard legal lexicons as also in any number of judicial decisions in this country and elsewhere, whether 'shall' is mandatory or directory depends upon the context. Here the context is the entire context of Part XVII dealing with the official language. If you kindly look to the duties of the Commission and the scheme of Part IV, it is a fact that Hindi was declared to be the official language by the Constitution. But practical circumstances forced us to use English for a certain number of years for the official purposes of the Union and the intention, as I interpret the Constitution of the whole Constitution was that there should be a progressive extension of the use of Hindi. If you look to clause (2) of article 344, that is, the duties....

Mr. Speaker: That is all right; I have followed him.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: There is just one question which I would like to put to the hon. Minister through you. He has taken an entirely legalistic view.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I will finish in one sentence. The point is that in this case the appointment of successive commissions by the President in the scheme that is envisaged by the Constitution is mandatory. If the Government has a different view, either the whole thing should be referred to the Supreme Court, or Government might agree to drop certain provisions which affect article 344(1).

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The hon. Law Minister, Shri Sen, stated before this House that very recently on question of interpretation in which he himself figured as an advocate, the interpretation of 'shall' was equated with 'may'. I will request him to cite a single instance in the history of legal interpretation in the world where in a restrictive clause 'shall' has ever been construed as 'may' if the restriction is put in the clause itself. There is not a single instance in the history of the world where 'shall' has been interpreted as 'may'.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I say a word?

Mr. Speaker: I have heard enough.

Shri Frank Anthony: I feel that it is not necessary at all to go along with the hon. Law Minister that 'shall' is not mandatory. It is not necessary. If you look at article 349, it is very clear. It is a maxim of interpretation that a provision is never interpreted so as to stultify that provision. I say, assuming that 'shall' is mandatory and the President had appointed another commission in 1960, the Hindi friends would have made a grievance of it as to

why should you wait till 1965. The words are not 'appointment of the commission' but 'the recommendations of the Commission'. So, if it took five years for the recommendations of that Commission and the Parliamentary Committee, the first grievance that will be made by the Hindi people is that you are doing nothing to accelerate the progress. Assuming that a second commission had been appointed after 1960, it would take two years for them to make their recommendations and a year for the Parliamentary Committee to function. In that interregnum certainly you can say that it was never intended that this should be stultified and the President may certainly act in terms of the recommendations of the first commission and the first committee, assuming that 'shall' is mandatory.

Shri Maurya (Aligarh) rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am clear about it.

Shri Maurya: Just one sentence.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think there is anything more that I require for elucidation. One point raised was by Shri Kamath about rule 65. As he himself admitted, that applied to non-official Members. There is a distinction made. When an hon. Minister is bringing forward a Bill, he is not required to append that sanction along with the Bill that he brings forward. It does not apply and there is a distinction made.

13 hrs.

The second question is that article 344 is mandatory. It says:—

"The President shall, at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a Commission which shall consist of Chairman...."

[Mr. Speaker]

I need not go into the controversy whether 'shall' means 'may' in this context or not because it is not essential for giving my decision at this moment, though I might make a casual reference to it. To me it appears that both commissions are necessary in the context of things. But so far as the present question is concerned, that can be disposed of without going into the exact meaning of 'shall' or 'may'. It is mandatory, of course, as I have said, so far as I can see reasonably, that the President shall appoint two commissions and then there shall be two committees—one after five years and another after another five years. Now, one commission was appointed and the committee was also appointed after that. The President has considered the report of the commission as well as of that committee. That Mr. Trivedi admitted, conceded, when I put him that question. So, one process has been undergone. It was intended to watch the growth of Hindi by stages—one commission is first to be appointed, then the commission has to make a report and then a committee is to be appointed by Parliament and that report also has to go to the President and the President has then to see both the report of the commission and the committee and see whether any progress has been made. And at that time, if after considering that, the Government wants that there ought to be some Bill brought forward in order to introduce in certain sphere Hindi or to retain English in others, then certainly it would be justified in view of the reports of one commission and one committee to introduce one Bill. When the second commission is appointed and sufficient advancement has been made—and the report of another committee also has been received and the President can consider the second one also—then a second Bill also can be brought forward by the Government.

So far as the words here in article 349 that are mentioned are concerned, though it might be said that under

the General Clauses Act singular means plural, in this particular context it is only the commission and the committee that are mentioned, not both the commissions. If it was intended, after considering the report of both the commissions and both the committees, then that would have been put very clearly. So, in my opinion it is enough when one stage has been passed—one commission has been appointed and the report of the committee also has been received and the President has considered both of them—he can give consent to the introduction of one Bill.

So far as the appointment of the second commission is concerned and that the Government has failed in that, that would be quite a different thing. If the Government has failed, that might be a matter of censure against the Government. I am not concerned with that just at this moment, to say anything about it whether the Government has performed its duties or not. That is not before us now. But so far as this Bill is concerned, there is no bar under article 349 to its introduction.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। संविधान के जरिये यह गारण्टी दी गई है कि पन्द्रह साल के बाद अंग्रेजी नहीं रहेगी और देश की राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी और उसकी लिपि देवनागरी होगी। इस लिए जो विधेयक आ रहा है, वह संविधान के विरुद्ध जाता है। किसी ऐसे बिल को, जो संविधान के विरुद्ध जाता हो, बगैर संशोधन किये पेश नहीं किया जा सकता है और उस पर चर्चा नहीं की जा सकती है। इस लिए मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि चूंकि यह बिल संविधान के विरुद्ध है, इस लिए इस पर बहस की इजाजत न दी जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हम इस बात का फैसला कर चुके हैं। जब इस बिल का

इन्ट्रोडक्शन हुआ था, तो उस वक्त भी यह सवाल उठाया गया था। उसके बारे में हम यह फैसला कर चुके हैं कि यह बिल आ सकता है और इन्ट्रोड्यूस हो सकता है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification, Sir. While we have to bow to your ruling the House is entitled to have an explanation from the Minister concerned as to why the President's certificate of sanction was not conveyed in the proper form and manner and as to who was remiss who failed in his duty. The Minister should explain which Minister was responsible for this—Law Minister, Home Minister. . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have agreed with that objection. But that is a separate matter. That should not preclude us from considering this here. That should not debar us from going on with the motion here. That would be a separate matter as to how that escaped their attention or who was responsible for it. It have given a direction that in future any sanction given should be reproduced in those words in the Bill as well.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, would you not be pleased to ask the Minister as to who was responsible?

Mr. Speaker: Just now it cannot be done.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is that point that I wanted to clarify. The publication, along with this Bill, of the notification of that President is not necessary. As far as the legal interpretation goes, every act done by a constituted authority is presumed to be legal unless proved otherwise. If the Secretary of Parliament publishes something for the consideration of the House, it is presumed that he has followed every legal formality required, unless it is proved that he has suppressed that or there is anything. . . (Interruption)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member would realise that the words of the 378 (A) LSD—5.

article were 'previous sanction' and not recommendation.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Even if the previous sanction is obtained, it is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Recommendation is not previous sanction. The Minister for Home Affairs.

Shri Nath Pai: Why was the House not told? Why was no reference made? You yourself are inclined to give an interpretation. He has another. He knows that the matter was running into a kind of double interpretation. Was it not proper, therefore, to have sought the advice of the Supreme Court?

Mr. Speaker: On what point?

Shri Nath Pai: On the point whether the word shall' means 'may' and whether there was the necessity. . . (Interruption.)

Mr. Speaker: I said, that is not needed here.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह एक बड़ा कानूनी और ग्रहण नुक्ता है। इस लिए इसके बारे में सुप्रीम कोर्ट से राय ले लेनी चाहिए। इनके भरोसे तो कल यह बिल अदालत में फेल हो जायगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य जानते हैं कि जहाँ पर यह सवाल हो कि कोई बिल अल्ट्रा-वायर्ज हो सकता है, तो उसक बारे में हम फैसला नहीं दे सकते। यह बात आम तौर पर कोर्ट्स के ऊपर ही छोड़ दी जाती है कि वे किसी बिल के बारे में अपना फैसला दें।

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Sir, I rise to support the point which has been made by Mr. Nath Pai. It is a very important question and we would have liked to hear the Law Minister, who was just left the House, as to why in an important case like this

[Shri Kapur Singh]

he did not think it proper to refer the question to the Supreme Court as to whether 'shall' here can mean 'may'.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether. I have not given my decision on that point at all. (Interruption.)

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajar-navis): Sir, if I might say....

Mr. Speaker: Where is the necessity now?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I beg to move : . . .

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक निवेदन है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आपको इतनी दफ्ता वक्त दिया है और जो कुछ आपने कहा, वह मैंने सुन लिया है । अब आप बैठ जायें ।

श्री बागड़ी : आप मेरा एक निवेदन सुन लें, तो मैं बैठ जाता हूँ ।

मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि यह भाषा और भविष्य का प्रश्न है और बहुत जरूरी प्रश्न है । इस लिए इसको पास करने से पहले सरकार देश में रिफ्लेडम या राय-शुमारी करा लें । (Interruption.)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, I beg to move:*

"That the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union,

for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High Courts, be taken into consideration."

Since I introduced this Bill, I have had occasion to meet a large number of people both outside as well as here in Parliament—quite a few Members of this House as well as of the other House. I think that I am in a position to gauge the situation in so far as this Bill is concerned correctly. I know very well that strong views are held on this question and I do not want to minimise the matter. Yet, with the talks I had and the impression I have gathered, I can say with confidence that there is a general spirit of accommodation amongst the different views held. Those who come from the Hindi-speaking areas and others who come from the non-Hindi-speaking areas have agreed to one thing that ultimately Hindi would be the official language of the Union.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri S. Kandappan: (Tiruchengode): No. We strongly object to it.

Mr. Speaker: We are inside Parliament where we have pledged ourselves to proceed in a manner.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri): It is against the Prime Minister's assurance.

Mr. Speaker: Assurance would come afterwards.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I have never said that there is no one in this country or no one in this Parliament who does not hold a different view. But, I have merely said that by and large there is a feeling in this House as well as, I can say, in the country, that a spirit of accommodation should be shown in the matter, in the sense

*Moved with the recommendation and previous sanction of the President.

that Hindi, as provided in the Constitution in article 343(1) should be accepted as the official language of the Union.

Shri Rajaram: Please amend the Constitution.

Shri Muthu Gounder (Tiruppattur): Delete the clause.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: According to the same article....

Shri S. Kandappan: Accommodation not at the cost of our culture and language

Mr. Speaker: Are we going to take decisions by this demonstration now? It would be very regrettable if we resort to such methods. Here, we have to persuade each other and go by arguments. Only wordy duels would be fought and not physical ones, I suppose.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was also going to add that in the same article 343, clause 3 provides that during this period of 15 years, as was just now said, a Commission will be set up and a Parliamentary committee will also be set up which will go into the various aspects of this problem. It is provided in the same article that Parliament has the power to legislate so that if Hindi could not be used for all purposes, English will continue or can continue. It is in accordance with that provision that we have come before this House and want the authority of House to pass the Bill so that English might continue along with Hindi.

I would like to tell the House that the main purpose of this Bill is to fulfil, as I said, the general wishes of the Members of this House, because, the Members of this House had considered the report of the Parliamentary committee which was appointed. As far as I know, the House had given its general approval to the recommendations made by the Parliamentary Committee.

Shri Frank Anthony: No. We gave no approval. That was not put to the vote. We were not allowed to move amendments.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Voting might not have taken place.

Shri Frank Anthony: We were not allowed to move amendments. He must not make wrong statements.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, it shows that there was a very big, considerable majority in this House which agreed with the recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee. I have no doubt about that.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri): By a majority, do you mean that you can kill any language as you like?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We should have patience to hear.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Bara Banki): These people do not want this Bill. That is why it should be dropped.

Mr. Speaker: Both the extremes do not want. It is only the House....

श्री बागड़ी : प्रधान मंत्री जी वचन देकर इनको उकसा रहे हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: I would just now request hon. Members that they should be careful today. We are proceeding with a very delicate matter so that they must exercise great discretion. We should not offend each other in this manner. There may not be scenes. I will restrict in this matter that every Member shall address the Chair alone and not talk to each other. Even interruptions would be directed at the Chair.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: In so far as the problem is concerned, as is obvious, extreme views are held. It is suggested that Hindi is almost being given up and there is the other point

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

of view that by some kind of manoeuvring we are trying to see that English is not used in future. These extreme views....

Shri S. Kandappan: On a point of clarification, he says, extreme views. One is offensive and another is defensive. He ought to differentiate between these two.

Mr. Speaker: He might be allowed to have his say. Clarification may come afterwards.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: In so far as the use of Hindi is concerned, I am prepared to admit that there could have been faster progress made. But, it cannot be denied that the progress during the last few years in Hindi has been something remarkable. It is true that there have been non-official efforts made. Also they have received considerable assistance from the Government. There is the literary side of Hindi. In so far as the literary side is concerned, as I said just now, non-official organisations have helped a good deal and made considerable progress. Government also have produced glossaries, huge volumes of many important documents. In this way, action has been taken. Official and non-official efforts have been made.

In regard to speaking Hindi or writing Hindi, I can say that not only in the Hindi speaking States, but in the other non-Hindi speaking areas, considerable progress has been made in learning Hindi. Large number of people who have never spoken in Hindi may not be doing so very well, but yet, they can now speak in Hindi. I do not want to take the time of the House. But, I was greatly impressed when only a few months back, I went to Madras and I had to address a convocation of the Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha. Whenever I went to Madras, I had always spoken in English. Therefore, I enquired in that function whether I had to say a few

words in English or in Hindi. There were about 3000 boys and girls sitting there who were to take their degree. They all said that in this pandal, no word of English has to be used and you have to address us in Hindi. This is an example of how Hindi is being learnt in areas which are not Hindi-speaking.

I also feel that we could have been much more liberal, as has often been said by my colleague and friend Shri Dasappa, in giving assistance and help to voluntary organisations in the south. I have no doubt that if greater assistance is given to them, financial and other help, they can carry on the work with much greater speed and with greater effectiveness.

In these circumstances, I want to appeal to the House, I know it will raise controversies, but I would like to appeal to the House that this matter should be considered with a broader angle, and with a broader approach. It is not in any way a party question. I think that it is a national issue, a national problem, and I hope that this House will be good enough to consider this matter in that context. It would be unfortunate if, on account of our discussions, we create bitterness between languages and languages. It has also to be realised that if this House will give a proper lead, I have no doubt, the whole country will accept it.

It has often been said that this Bill does not fulfil what the Prime Minister had said before. I do not want to go into that matter, because the Prime Minister will himself be addressing this House and speaking on this Bill and he will certainly clear up the position. But there is no doubt, and as far as I can judge, I can say, that in so far as the continuance of English is concerned, that was the basic idea that after the expiration of this fifteen-year period, English will continue, and this Bill clearly provides it in clause 3 that English will continue,

of course, as has been provided therein, in addition to Hindi.

It has also been said that the committee which will go into this matter, as has been provided in clause 4 of the Bill is a committee of Members of Parliament. A doubt has been expressed that this committee might not be fully representative, that it might not represent all the States, or the Members of different States who hold different views on this matter. I have no doubt that there can be no better committee than a committee of Members of Parliament, because the Members of Parliament are not in a sense merely an individual or a few odd individuals being placed on a committee. The Members of Parliament represent millions of people of their States, and in the circumstances, I personally think that there can be no better committee to consider over this matter than a parliamentary committee. Of course, the Members from various States speaking different languages will definitely be represented on that committee.

It might interest hon. Members to know that the last parliamentary committee which was appointed had about 21 members representing the non-Hindi-speaking areas in a total composition of 30 Members. Out of 30, at least 20 definitely—I think that it was about 21—were members from the non-Hindi-speaking areas. So, the House will thus see that the next committee naturally, when it is appointed, will have more or less the same proportion. I have no doubt that the report of that committee also, as a similar report was discussed last time in Parliament, will be discussed in Parliament again, and the views expressed in Parliament will be communicated to the President. Also, I have no hesitation in telling the House that the report of the committee will be circulated to all State Governments and will be sent to all State Governments.

Generally, it is our rule that important recommendations which con-

cern the States, which have wider implications and which affect the States in any way—such important documents are sent to the State Governments for their consideration and for obtaining their views. In this matter also, the report of the committee will be sent to the State Governments, and before the President makes any final recommendation. So, the President will have full material before him to consider before he passes any final orders, namely the report of the parliamentary committee, the discussions and views expressed by the Members of Parliament as well as the views expressed by all the State Governments.

In these circumstances, I think that it will be agreed to that enough precautions have been taken to dispel the mis-apprehensions which have often been mentioned and talked about during the last few days.

As regards clause 3, I might further add that it will enable the use of the English language for all official purposes of the Union. It makes it clear that there will be no disability attaching to English, nor will there be any restrictions on its use for purposes of either the official work of the Union, inter-State communication and communication between the State and the Centre, or for transaction of business in Parliament.

What is envisaged here is, to borrow a phrase from the memorandum of the Madras Government, which was submitted to the commission which was appointed by the President, namely the Official Language Commission, 'a prolonged bilingualism'. This means that while Hindi may be used progressively, there should be no restriction on the use of English as such.

I might add that in so far as the use of Hindi in the States is concerned, we do not want to impose any restrictions; we cannot. In almost all the Hindi-speaking States, Hindi, and in other States also the regional language, have been made the official

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

languages, and they have passed their laws. In the circumstances, to suggest that there is any restriction imposed on them would be quite wrong. I have heard or rather not only heard but several Members have spoken to me as if the Centre wants to impose some new restrictions or does not encourage them in the use of the regional language or Hindi as the official language of the State. That is far from the truth. If the Hindi-speaking States do want to use Hindi for all purposes, they might do so; in fact, they will then help in the development and in the growth of Hindi, especially in the official work, and it might help the whole country because there will then be a basis on which we can proceed; and in case Hindi is adopted by any other State, they will get the necessary help in the language, the words and every other thing which is necessary.

It has also been suggested that this period of ten years for the setting up of another committee is rather short. I have seen in the papers various suggestions made in this regard, and I found that it was difficult really to fix a period which would be acceptable to all. It is true that there is some arbitrariness in so far as periods are fixed in these matters. The suggestions made by various people in the papers are, 15 years, 20 years, 25 years, 30 years, 40 years; and there is another suggestion that it should be fixed at 50 years. Hon. Members can easily visualise how far we can accommodate these suggestions. It is really difficult to do so. This ten year period is, to my mind, a reasonable period. What do we do after ten years? After ten years, it is a parliamentary committee or Members of Parliament who consider the progress made. They review the position and then consider other aspects of the problem and make their recommendations. It is nothing more than that. Therefore, on the one hand, it will help us, I mean Government, to remain

vigilant, to be careful, to see that they are able to produce some results during this period so far as Hindi is concerned and on the other, Parliament will have the opportunity to see whether considerable or satisfactory progress has been made or not, if any change was possible or not, if the period has to be extended or not—these are matters which the committee will be fully entitled to consider. In the circumstances, I think that the period of ten years should generally be accepted.

As regards clauses 5, 6 and 7, I do not want to say much. But some objections have been raised to the effect that the regional language or Hindi should not be used in law courts for purposes of decree, judgment etc. I might say that the provisions of clauses 5, 6 and 7 are strictly in accordance with the President's directions. English will continue to be used in the Supreme Court and the High Courts and for Acts, Bills etc. It has been provided only that there will be an authoritative text in Hindi of central statutes. Scope has thus been provided for the progressive use of Hindi and the official languages of States in the field of law without disturbing the position held at present by English in this sphere.

Some objections have been raised in regard to the use of the word 'translation'. It has been suggested that words like 'version' or 'text' might be better alternatives. Personally speaking, I could have no special objection in accepting these words. But in the article of the Constitution itself, the word 'translation' has been used. In this Bill also, we have used this word in more than one place. In these circumstances, after having given thought to it, I felt it might perhaps be advisable not to make any change.

I do not want to take any more time, but before I conclude, may I say that although not connected with the Bill in any way—I mean the services, the facilities to be given to them; the

services may not be put in any disadvantageous position in any way in regard to the use of Hindi or English—still I know there is a lurking fear in the minds of people of those areas and States where Hindi is not spoken. It is felt that Hindi-knowing boys and girls might be in a better position to compete for services to get more employment and they might receive certain other benefits or facilities also. I would like to make it quite clear that in so far as the services are concerned, whether in the matter of recruitment or promotion, we do not envisage that a boy or girl will suffer only because he or she does not know Hindi. Clause 3 of the Bill clearly provides for the continuation of English side by side with Hindi. Even now, there are clear directions. Of course, we try to train or teach government servants; not 'try', but in fact do so. But for the last 8, 9 or 10 months, there has been some difficulty experienced because of the talk about this Bill which has created some doubt in the minds of some of the government employees. Otherwise, before that, the government employees were taking great interest in learning Hindi. We had arranged for classes after the office was over, sometimes during intervals also, lunch intervals etc. They were attending in large numbers. Not only here in Delhi, but in all other places where we have our Central Government offices, they have been learning Hindi and they had picked up a good deal of Hindi. It is a separate matter. There is no compulsion about it. It is done willingly, with their consent, and as I said, some good result has already been produced.

Shri Tyagi informs me that the words used in the Bill, 'the President may appoint a Committee' will create some confusion. In clause 4, it is said that after the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, the 'President may appoint a Committee consisting of thirty members...'. Later it is said that the Committee will be elected respectively by the members of the

House of the People and the members of the Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation etc. I have consulted the Law Ministry and the law experts. Technically, they do not find any mistake in it. Yet I did suggest that if it is clarified, it would be better. In that sense, I am prepared to agree with Tyagiji and at the appropriate time, I would like to move an amendment which will put the position right.

As I said, I do not want to take more time of the House at this stage. But once again I would like to say that we are in a position in which serious criticisms could be made in regard to this Bill, but to my Hindi friends or those who speak in Hindi, I would like to say in all frankness that if I had found that this measure was damaging to Hindi, I would not come up with this legislation at all. To those who do not speak Hindi, may I say that if there was any ulterior motive behind this Bill, I would not have presented it much before January, 1965. The growth of a language and its acceptance as official language has to be achieved through an evolutionary process. In this vast country we have to move in this regard carefully and cautiously. It is a great thing that in this vast country with so many languages, the non-Hindi speaking people as a whole have, as I said in the beginning, accepted Hindi as the ultimate objective of being the only official language of the nation.

An Hon. Member: No.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I said as whole. In the circumstances may I say that the Hindi speaking friends should take advantage of this admirable attitude of the non-Hindi speaking people? Any hurry or precipitate action would, I strongly believe, never be right.

I think that in this background generally what is provided in the Constitution is acceptable that Hindi should be learnt and it should find a place of honour or whatever we might like to call it, that it should find an

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

important place in the country, but it can find that rightful place only if we try to achieve it through goodwill, and especially the goodwill of those who do not know Hindi or who do not speak Hindi.

Sir, I move.,

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union, for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High Courts, be taken consideration."

Dr. Govind Das (Jabalpur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st July, 1963." (1)

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 26th October, 1963." (2)

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 26th January, 1964." (3)

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the Budget Session, 1964." (4).

Mr. Speaker: Amendment No. 5 by Shri Manoharan is barred because an amendment has already been moved for eliciting opinion by 31st July, and this says end of July, which is the same.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the last day of the first week of January, 1965." (6)

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session." (31)

Mr. Speaker: Amendment No. 32 by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri is just the same as No. 1. Therefore, it is barred.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of 10 members, namely Dr. M. S. Aney, Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shri Hem Barua, Sardar Kapur Singh, Shri Krishna-pal Singh, Dr. L. M. Singhvi, Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yajnik, and the Mover with instructions to make a report by the last day of the first week of the next Session." (33)

I would only like to say that I would be happy if the Home Minister joins this Committee, because it would then be a sporting team of eleven. It is only ten now.

Syed Badrudduja (Murshidabad): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st December, 1963." (49).

Shri Bade (Khargone): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the last day of the last

week of the Budget Session of 1964." (50)

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of nine members, namely, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Sardar Kapur Singh, Shri C. H. Mohammad Koya, Shri Krishnan Manoharan, Shri A. V. Raghavan, Shri C. L. Narasimha Reddy, Shri G. G. Swell; and the Mover with instruction to make a report by the last day of the first week of the next session." (51)

Mr. Speaker: The original motion and the amendments are before the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What about the time allocation?

Mr. Speaker: Normally, the time should be 15 minutes, but in certain cases where a particular point of view has to be represented, certainly I will extend the time to half an hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am grateful to you, but I wanted to know the allocation of 15 hours as between the two readings.

Mr. Speaker: It is for the House to decide. May we have 10 and 5?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: How much time would be taken by the Minister? Does this include the reply of the Minister?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I would only make a request. The Home Minister said the Prime Minister will also intervene. The Prime Minister's name has been dragged into it because of the assurance he has given, and he should not be cribbed and confined within the time limit, and that time should not be debited to this account.

Mr. Speaker: Then it is agreed that we have 10 and 5 hours.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

An Hon. Member: Eleven and four.

Shri Radhe Lal Vyas (Ujjain): Five hours are not enough for the clauses. You may extend it by one hour.

Mr. Speaker: The allocation of time between the two stages is 10 and 5 hours.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): May I request the Home Minister to clarify the suggestion of Shri Tyagi which he has accepted, so that it may become clear?

Mr. Speaker: He has said whatever he wanted to say on that, and now there would be speeches.

Shri Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My hon. friend the Home Minister has very rightly put it that we are discussing a matter of national significance, and it is very important that we reach as nearly as possible a national agreement on the matter of this Bill, and I am hoping that perhaps with a few slight alterations this Bill could be made so that it would be acceptable to almost everybody concerned.

13.47 hrs.

(**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair)

If there was in this Bill a clearer assurance—and my hon. friend the Home Minister has already tried to give something of that assurance—if a clearer assurance was incorporated in this Bill and not merely the assurance verbally given by the Minister, it would have been better. If the apprehensions of the non-Hindi speaking areas regarding discrimination against them can be laid at rest, then surely there ought to be no difficulty in securing almost unanimous agreement on this Bill. As far as I am concerned, on behalf of our group I support this Bill, and we are only making certain suggestions so that it

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

might be made really acceptable for the people of this country.

It goes without saying that for the advance of our people, for the efflorescence of our people's culture, for the social, political and economic development of our country, our own languages in the different regions of our country should have their rightful status. Hindi has already been the country's choice as the official language, but I wish to say here that Hindi as well as our other national languages have to be assisted by Government agencies as well as by non-official effort to come into their own as quickly as possible, and it is only in so far as that objective is assisted that this Bill is going to be helpful to India.

I hope there will be no disagreement with regard to the basic principle, namely that we cannot and must not perpetuate the present position of English. We cannot also, unless there is clear patriotic justification, prolong indefinitely the transition from English to Hindi and the other national languages of our country. I know there are some people who wish English to continue for as long as we can foresee in the future. We cannot agree with that point of view. English cannot perpetually have its present position, but we must not then be goaded by fear and dislike of what is described sometimes as Hindi fanaticism into supporting the point of view of some of our friends here who want English to continue permanently in this country.

Indefinite continuance of English as official language is now a move which is being made by certain people in our country. But the categorical answer of Parliament to that move should be "No". We cannot have the indefinite continuance of English in this country. Of course as the Home

Minister has said, we do not try or we do not wish to hustle things overmuch and that is where the Prime Minister's assurance comes into the picture. We are all happy that the Prime Minister will later intervene in the debate. But in 1959 the Prime Minister in several pronouncement had made clear that he would like English to continue as an associate additional language and he would like it to continue as long as people required it. He had also added that he would leave the decision not to the Hindi knowing people but to the non Hindi knowing people. I do believe that the Prime Minister made a very statesmanlike statement on that occasion and I am sure he is going to stand by it. But I do hope also that he is going to make it clear that we are not going to have anything in our statute which would make it impossible for Parliament to have a law in regard to our national languages, Hindi as well as the other national languages. Only a minority, 'a' vocal and vociferous minority should not have a veto in regard to whatever democratic decision we arrive at. Our basic principle is clear. We have to have as quickly as we can our own languages, Hindi and the other national languages into the picture. English cannot continue permanently. But English has to continue for a certain length of time which we cannot specify at the present moment. In the meantime every effort must be made to see that Hindi and the other national languages really and truly come into their own. All together, therefore, we have to decide what to do. Hindi and non Hindi areas together. I do not want a bifurcation between Hindi and be said that only non Hindi areas would decide or Hindi areas would decide. All together we should decide this question of national importance.

This question of English is being brought up sometimes very effectively, because of a certain kind of fixation we have developed about this

language. It has played such an overpowering part in the shaping of our lives in this country. But I do wish to say a few words about this language as far as our official employment of it is concerned. There is no denying that English is a magnificent language. But there is no denying at the same time that it is foreign to us. There could be no question that our roots touch different soil. We shall certainly utilise English, but within necessary limits. We shall certainly never banish English from our academies or from our libraries. We shall certainly, as quickly as we can, remove it from its position of predominance, a predominance which it enjoys at the cost of our own languages and our own effort to rise to the full stature of our being. There has been in this country a sort of a thralldom to English. Not a mere political or emotional matter is involved in this. It is not a matter of sentiment being posited against sense. But this predominance of English has been a brake on our creative work and creative development through which alone we can justify ourselves as a people. We learn our own languages at our mother's knee; we imbibe our own languages just as we imbibe our mother's milk. There may be a microscopic minority of Indians who speak English at home. They may imagine that English is their mother language. I am not referring to the Anglo-Indian community to whom English is, as a matter of fact, the mother language. But there are many Indians, a very few people who perhaps speak English at home for God knows what reason. But they are a marginal set of people who are inconsequential to India. They may have been the top dogs in the *angrezi* era but they cannot continue to be so any longer. It is only through our own languages that we can think and write and act creatively and naturally and effectively and that is why there should be no difficulty about accepting the principle that we have to have a change over to our own national languages. Hindi and the other national languages as quickly as it is possible.

There has been in this country such an utter disproportion between the energy we spend in learning an ineluctably foreign language which we cannot perhaps learn properly and what we have achieved in creative spheres and this disproportion if we come to think of it makes our hearts sick. Gandhiji once regretted that Ram Mohan Roy had not written in Hindi. Some people thought at that time that it was perversity on the part of Gandhiji to suggest that Ram Mohan Roy should have written in Hindi. But when we think of our own history, who are really the creative springs in our people's life even today? Not the English-knowing among our own greatmen; they were indubitably great men; there is no doubt about it. But our own poets and saints and mystics have had the real influence over our lives: Tulsidas in the north, Thiruvalluvar in the South, the Saiva and Vaishnava saints of the south, the grand line of Maratha mystics from Gyaneswar to Tukaram, that grand sequence of great men like Kabir, Dadu, Nanak, Chaitanya, Ravidas, Hazrat Nizamuddin and Moinudin Chisti—such a wonderful galaxy of people of whom we can never be sufficiently proud. It is to them that we have to look. I do not wish to say that the recent period of Indian recovery has to be forgotten. No, not at all. The English knowing element among our greatmen have made a very large contribution but as far as the deepest springs of our people's activity are concerned, they are linked with what contribution has been made by our great men who operated through our own languages, through our own media of communication and that is why in this country we have found these poets, saints and mystics who are the heroes of Indian history. So, it is these which I wish this House to remember because we are discussing something of very profound importance to the present as well as to the future.

In biblical lore we read about David who laid aside the armour of soul and

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

who collected pebbles from his own native brook. We can only be invincible when we have our own resources, our own spiritual and material resources to depend upon.

Let us not compliment ourselves too easily of our proficiency in English. Perhaps we are somewhat proficient—an achievement at a very heavy cost to ourselves. This achievement is secondary and derivative and almost always uncreative. Neither Toru Dutt nor Sarojini Naidu is remembered today even as a second rate poet in the English language. With novelists like R. K. Narayan writing English fiction, we have no place except in the margins of English writing. We are just nowhere as far as English sensibility is concerned. Let us not imagine that we can produce a kind of Indian English which would be part of the legacy of English literature. That kind of illusion should be nurtured not in Parliament but in a kind of place which I need not specify.

I know that it is the great provocation which comes from Hindi chauvinists which make us forget these things. Provocation comes all the time. The provocation appears to give a certain kind of justification to this kind of thought which makes us cling to English as long as we ever can. But that great provocation notwithstanding, we should not rebound into the snare of the protagonists of English, who want English to have a permanent settlement of this country.

“स्वधर्मो निघनं त्रेयः परधर्मो भयावहः”

We should remember that. We should not from one extreme be pushed into another, a snare which we should avoid.

Must we truckle down, because English is more developed than our own languages? Where does this argument lead to? How can our languages ever go ahead if English superiority pins them down, as it has pinned us down, for so very long? Rabindranath Tagore once said, how can you expect a mint to go on producing coin if the

coin is not legal tender? We have not got a literature of knowledge sufficiently to carry on so much of our work in the country, it is only because we have not plunged into the water and tried to swim because we have left our languages in the shape, because we have thought we have nurtured to ourselves, hugged to our bosoms, the illusion that English is a language through which we shall express ourselves, our personality, our creativity or the best that is in us. That is why this fixation about English has got to go, and that is why one day I said in reference to those Members of this House who occasionally create a great deal of rather undesirable disturbance,—I said about them—that they have a passion for our own Indian languages which has developed in them as a kind of fixation; God bless them for that passion, because that is a passion which is the exact contrary of that rather unworthy passion for an ineluctably alien language like English which has taken so much of our creativity. Now that we are trying to stand on our own, let us try to depend on our own resources and then and then alone shall we be able to make a contribution to the world which is worth-while.

14 hrs.

Vested interests are busy delaying the process. But we know we have to defeat this; for this purpose, I repeat—over and over again, every time I say Hindi, I say, at the same time, Hindi and our other national languages—they all have to be given encouragement to go ahead. The Home Minister said that in the different States they are making a move. I know they are making a move, but how tardily, how ineffectively, how unenthusiastically? Even in West Bengal, which is supposed to be so very proud about the Bengali language, they have only recently announced that on the anniversary of the birthday of Rabindranath Tagore on the 8th of May, they are going to make Bengali the official language of

the State. It has taken them such a very long time. Take Tamil Nad for instance. I know that they are using Tamil language for their official purposes to a large extent in Tamil Nad. But I do expect that these particular regions of our country which are specially proud about their own cultural heritage go ahead much faster than they have done.

Take the Hindi-speaking areas. Even in those areas, when I was a Member of the Parliamentary Committee whose report is before us at the present moment, we got so many reports that even in Hindi-speaking areas real progress in regard to making Hindi the official language for State purposes is not being made. Even now, I would like my hon. friend the Home Minister to read the report of the Parliamentary Committee dated sometime in 1958. It had made certain tangible suggestions about what what could be done not only for Hindi but also for the other national languages, for instance, in regard to recruitment to the services through the Union Public Service Commission and similar agencies of for recruitment to institutes like the military training institute near Poona and other places. This Committee had made a definite recommendation that some expert body should be set up to examine how far it is possible to have a moderating system so that not only Hindi but all the other national languages can be used as the medium of examination for the recruitment through these agencies. As far as I know—I shall stand corrected very gladly if I am wrong—no expert examination has been made in regard to how, for purposes of recruitment through the Union Public Service Commission or for purposes of recruitment to national institutes for training of various sorts, we are going to employ our own languages. Hindi as well as other languages. No expert examination has been made, and the Committee had said at that time that the quota system was possibly one alternative so that different regions might be represented in the services, but the quota

system was not very desirable because it went against the whole principle of recruitment on an all-India basis, and that therefore there should be an effort to have a system of moderation so that all the regional languages could come into the picture. This recommendation was made in 1958 and nothing was done. Sometimes, from the non-Hindi areas the complaint is made that this Government is doing it too much and too fast for Hindi. But even for Hindi it is not doing it, let alone other languages. There is some kind of lack of care, a lack of real emotional desire to do something worth-while in as quick a time as possible. There is a lack of seriousness and earnestness in the official hierarchy, particularly because our administration is cluttered with people who because they have been brought up on English have naturally a vested interest in the continuation of English for as long as we care to foresee in the future. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. If we can carry on as long as we are alive with English which we have learnt, it is all for the better; our children also are growing up on English; I am told so many children now go to the English medium schools. Sometimes I feel a sense of shame when some of these English-speaking stalwarts come and tell us that so many of our enthusiasts even for Hindi and other Indian languages send their children to English-medium schools. If that process continues, the idea of having an elite, a selected class of people with special qualifications which are supposed to be superior, would get into the picture and even cut across the whole idea of a socialistic, secular and democratic State, and would cut across the whole idea of the possibility of changing over from English to our own Indian languages without which we can never be able to go ahead. I do not mind if there are English medium schools here and there. I do not mind; but as far as our primary school system is concerned, there has to be a particularly important provision that everybody in the primary stage, if he or she has to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

go to a publicly-sponsored school he or she has to have the education through our own Indian languages and not through a language which is not ours. If there have to be English medium schools, they must be for a very marginal section of our life, which must be there more or less as show-pieces, and for those like the Anglo-Indians to whom the English language is their own mother-tongue. But the change-over to our languages is not being done, and even in the non-Hindi areas, the shift from English to our own languages is not being done in the way in which it ought to be done.

I feel also that we have to look ahead, and the Prime Minister is here; he has called upon us to look further into the future. We have here the Home Minister also. He should examine the idea, how far it is now necessary to incorporate such languages as Mundari and Sindhi in the schedule of languages in the Constitution, because it is very necessary that we try to get into the picture those people who speak in these languages so that they might have a sense that they are sharing in the task of building a new India of the future.

That is why I believe that once we accept the principle that we have to shift to our own languages as quickly as we can, once we agree that for the time being, of course for some special difficulties, we are going to allow English to continue for a certain period of time which we cannot quite define at the present moment, then perhaps there could be almost unanimous agreement over this Bill.

Coming to the actual provisions of the Bill, I would suggest that in clause 3, "may" is changed into "shall". I say so particularly because only earlier this morning we had a very intriguing discussion how "shall" might mean "may" and how "may" might mean "shall" and so on and so forth. I am not being unparliamentary, but Shakespeare himself has told us that the

law is an ass. But the law is an ass particularly when the English variety of jurisprudence is concerned so much that Shakespeare's Jack Cade once said "let us go and kill all the lawyers". I do not understand. I did study some law once upon a time, but I have forgotten most of it. But I am quite prepared to concede, as I recollect some little law which I had once tried to imbibe, and I would say that in clause 3, the word "may", as used, might conceivably be interpreted as "shall". But I am not going to take any risks; when I find jurists like our law Minister getting up and saying things—obiter, which they throw about—and referring to unspecified judgments of Supreme Court or the Privy Council, we all get rather befuddled. It is rather better that instead of "may", we put "shall". Also, we are going to have translations of all these things into our own languages. This is a provision which is overdue; a long time ago it should have been done. Now I would ask my hon. friend, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to try to translate it from "shall" to "may". If you keep "may", very probably a difficulty would arise. Then you cannot say that according to Maxwell, in his famous interpretation of statute, and what he has said therein, "may" means "shall" or "shall" means "may". In our Hindi version of this law, we cannot have that kind of playing about with words which might be a wonderful terminological exercise which gives great satisfaction to jurisprudence. But we have been tied too long a time to that kind of things and it is better we say things straight. Let us say what we mean, and let us in clause 3 put "shall" instead of "may".

In clause 4 my friend the Minister has given certain explanations, certain assurances also, in regard to how the report of this committee would be discussed in Parliament and how it would be circulated to the State Governments. But here, in regard to this clause, I would suggest that not only should the report of the committee to

be appointed ten years later be discussed in Parliament but this report should also be circulated to the State legislatures so that apart from the governments concerned the State legislatures also may have an opportunity of discussing that report, and if the President is in possession of the discussion of the report in the different State legislatures and also in Parliament he would be in a better position to make up his mind in regard to what special steps ought to be taken about this matter.

Clauses 5 to 7 are more or less acceptable, but I would just add a caveat that perhaps the expenses in the translation into these Indian languages—we are having the translation into Hindi, of course; there is an English version and in Bengal or Tamīnad there would be Bills or Acts which are accepted in Bengali or in Tamil and they would be translated into Hindi; and there would be an English version also—are going to be heavy. This process of translation which would take place all over the country is a process which is going to be rather expensive, and it would need a certain kind of organisation. I would suggest that this task is taken over by the Centre. All these different States also have a kind of feeling that they have only the obligation to produce their stuff in Bengali or Tamil or Gujarati or Punjabi, whatever language it is, and they can do the English translation—they do not have to do the translation; they even now think in English as far as statutes are concerned,—that these two jobs can be done very quickly. If there is going to be Hindi translation—it is very important and I support that idea—perhaps it is better, for the time being, to make a provision that these translation undertakings are organised and financed by the Centre so that the different States will have an idea that in regard to the interpretation of these statutes in our own Indian languages the Centre itself is taking its share.

I would suggest, also, that in regard to the recruitment to the services the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee are examined—I do not say that all the recommendations can be accepted *in toto*; many other problems are cropping up and many other grievances may be brought up especially of the non-Hindi speaking areas—and there should be a definite assurance that recruitment to the services even at the all-India level would be by an examination where the medium of examination would be Hindi as well as the other Indian national languages. There is no difficulty, of course, about having Hindi as a compulsory paper. There would be no difficulty about having some kind of a test after one gets into the services, and in the case of people who come from non-Hindi-speaking areas the test might be made not a particularly hard one so that one need not be a Hindi scholar in order to continue in the service and to receive all chances of promotion. Therefore, as far as recruitment to services is concerned, I would suggest ways and means are found for incorporation in the present piece of legislation, if that is possible, a certain provision which would give a kind of definite assurance to the non-Hindi-speaking areas that they have nothing to fear, nothing to worry about, that all the apprehension of discrimination is unnecessary.

I would suggest also that, as a tentative measure, in Parliament we might try to have a system of simultaneous translation. From time to time this question has come up, and the former Speaker, Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar had even suggested that he might begin that system of translation into two or three languages. We cannot at one go have simultaneous translation in all the 14 languages scheduled in the Constitution, but we can at least start by making an effort so that there may be simultaneous translation of speeches which are made in Parliament. I say this because on so many occasions our colleagues come and they are not able to speak in

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

any but their own languages. Only the other day one of the Members of our Group, a Santhal Member from West Bengal, spoke and whatever he spoke was not intelligible to whoever did not understand Bengali—it was the language in which he could express himself. Therefore, I would suggest, at least tentatively, something is done to see that in Parliament there is provision of simultaneous translation of our speeches into at least some of the leading Indian languages.

I say, therefore, what I said in the beginning, that consistently with our needs and our situation we have to advance the pace of Hindi. But we have also, at the same time, to advance the pace of development of our own national languages. This has to be done simultaneously and hand in hand. Let the States effectively begin to employ the regional languages as official languages and the medium as instruction at every stage without delay. Till the balance is happily struck, English will have to remain, but not for ever, not indefinitely, not virtually as a permanent settlement.

"In my father's house there are many mansions" that is what the Bible says. In our emerald country there are many demarcated regions. But we are a country where on the way to Kedarnath you see lotuses with a thousand petals, a country where arathi is performed before the deity not with one lamp but with five lamps held together in a lovely bracket, where the age-long quest has been for the one in the many, for fundamental unity in diversity. But today we live in a restless and changing world and our response has been a plan, a plan for socialism where unity in diversity will be respected and raised to higher levels of living. Let all of us, whether we live in Tamilnad or Punjab or in Assam or in Kerala, join together in the task of serving our country and our people.

And, we can do that best in our own way by the use of our own language as the key to the people's heart. Let the Hindi-speaking areas behave so that all suspicion and fear is eliminated, and then we can all embark on our common endeavour and achieve the success which is overdue.

With these words, Sir, I support this Bill, but I suggest that it be altered so that the non-Hindi-speaking areas can be definitely and concretely reassured that no discrimination is going to be practised against them.

डा० गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री अध्यक्ष महोदय ने जाते हुए एक बात कही थी कि यह मामला बड़ा नाजुक मामला है। मैं उन से

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): Sir, I want to make one request.

डा० गोविन्द दास : जी नहीं, मैं अपनी भाषा में बोलूंगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He is not yielding.

डा० गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वर्षों तक यहाँ पर

Shri S. Kandappan: Sir, we are discussing a very important Bill on which point I think even Dr. Govind Das will agree. We have to make one request to him. We will not be able to follow his speech here. Even if he prefers to deliver his speech in Hindi, at least he can give us a translation of it in English so that we are able to follow what he says.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is left to Dr. Govind Das, Both Hindi and English can be used here for speeches.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Sir, may I make one appeal to you. Dr. Govind Das is going to advance arguments on behalf of Hindi, and they are mainly addressed to the non-Hindi-speaking areas. He is one of the leaders of the movement. I think

all Members in this House including the Members from the South are to fully understand the weight of his arguments. I would, therefore request him to speak in English (*Interruption*)

ड० गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बड़ा दुःख है कि मैं बीसों वर्षों तक यहां पर अंग्रेजी में बोलता रहा हूँ, और उसके बाद मैंने प्रतिज्ञा की कि मैं अपने देश में अपनी भाषा में बोलूंगा और विदेशों में अंग्रेजी में बोलूंगा। इसलिये अपनी प्रतिज्ञा का पालन करना मेरा धर्म है। जो बातें मैं यहां कह रहा हूँ यदि सदस्यों की इच्छा हुई तो अन्त में उनको अंग्रेजी में भी कह दूंगा।

मैं कह रहा था, आप से, कि अध्यक्ष जी एक बात कह कर गये हैं कि यह मामला बड़ा नाजुक है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। मेरे लिये यह इसलिये और भी नाजुक हो जाता है कि जिन पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में मैंने पिछले ४३ वर्ष तक काम किया, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में, जिन श्री लाल बहादुर जी के साथ-साथ मैं न जाने कितने वर्षों तक काम करता रहा हूँ, उनके मत के विरोध में शायद यहां मुझे कुछ कहना पड़े।

शास्त्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि इस मामले में सदस्यों की स्ट्रॉंग व्यूज हैं। बिल्कुल ठीक है। इस सम्बन्ध में बड़ा बुनियादी मतभेद है, और मैं उन में से हूँ जिन्होंने ५० वर्ष तक, अपनी सारी जिन्दगी में, एक काम किया है। उसके विरुद्ध जाना मेरे लिये जीवन के इस सन्ध्या काल में संभव नहीं है। लेकिन मैं इतना पंडित जी और शास्त्री जी को आश्वासन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उनके इस विधेयक का विरोध करते हुए भी, उनके मतों का विरोध करते हुए भी, उनके प्रति मेरी वैसी ही श्रद्धा है, वैसा ही विश्वास है जैसा कि अब तक रहा है, और भविष्य में वैसा ही रहने वाला है। मैं जीवन भर कांग्रेस वादी रहा हूँ, और चाहे इस विधेयक के आज मैं विरुद्ध हों, लेकिन इसके बाद भी

मैं कांग्रेस में ही रहने वाला हूँ, किसी दूसरी संस्था में जाने वाला नहीं हूँ।

अभी यहां कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि हिन्दी कभी केन्द्र में आने वाली नहीं है। जो लोग ऐसा कहते हैं वे तो हिन्दी के ही विरोधी नहीं हैं, मैं तो कहूंगा कि वे भारत का विभाजन चाहते हैं और स्वयं अपनी भाषा के विरुद्ध हैं। कुछ उनमें से ऐसे भी हैं जो इस देश में निवास करते हैं और उनकी दृष्टि अभी भी इंग्लैंड की तरफ है।

शास्त्री जी ने उदारता की बात कही। मैं उनसे बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ। एक लम्बा भाषण मैं देने वाला हूँ क्योंकि यह मेरा विषय रहा है, लेकिन मैं उनको इस बात का आश्वासन दिलाता हूँ कि आरम्भ से अन्त तक वे उसमें कटुता का एक शब्द कहीं नहीं पायेंगे।

मानव समाज में जब कभी भी कोई बड़ी बात हुई है तो उसके लिए वातावरण तैयार किया गया है। हमारे देश की आधुनिक स्वतन्त्रता का भी यही इतिहास है। हमारे देश का वर्तमान वायुमंडल तैयार किया था राष्ट्र पिता ने, जिन्होंने इस नये भारत का निर्माण किया है, और उन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा था यदि मैं यहां उसे पढ़ दूँ तो कोई अनुचित बात नहीं होगी। इसी के साथ मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। आज जो कुछ मैं कहूंगा वह अपनी ओर से बहुत कम होगा जो कुछ मैं यहां पर कहूंगा वह यहां के महापुरुषों की ओर से ही कहूंगा। गांधी जी ने सन् १९१८ में कहा था जब कि देश का नेतृत्व उनके हाथ में आ रहा था :

“यह भाषा का विषय बड़ा भारी और बड़ा ही महत्वपूर्ण है। यदि सब नेता सब काम छोड़ कर केवल इसी विषय पर लगे रह तो बस है। यदि हम लोग भाषा के प्रश्न को गौण समझ या उधर से मन हटा लगे,

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

तो इस समय लोगों में जो प्रवृत्ति चल रही है, लोगों के हृदयों में जो भाव उत्पन्न हो रहा है वह निष्फल हो जाएगा । भाषा माता के समान है । माता पर जो प्रेम होना चाहिए वह हम लोगों में नहीं है । हम अंग्रेजी के मोह में फंसे हैं । हमारी प्रजा अज्ञान में डूबी है, हमें ऐसा उद्योग करना चाहिए कि एक वर्ष में राजकीय सभाओं में, कांग्रेस में, प्रान्तीय सभाओं में और अन्य सभा समाज और सम्मेलनों में अंग्रेजी का एक भी शब्द मुनाई न पड़े । हम अंग्रेजी का व्यवहार बिल्कुल त्याग दें ।”

यह हमारे राष्ट्र पिता ने सन् १९१८ में कहा था । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि भारत को सच्चा भारत रहना है तो वह भारतीय भाषाओं के बिना नहीं रह सकता । यह प्रश्न हिन्दी का नहीं है । यह बहुत गलत कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी वाले यह चाहते हैं और हिन्दी वाले वह चाहते हैं । यह प्रश्न भारतीय भाषाओं का है । एक और हिन्दी और अन्य भारतीय भाषायें हैं और दूसरी और अंग्रेजी है । अंग्रेजी केवल भाषा के रूप में यहाँ नहीं है । अंग्रेजी के साथ सारी अंग्रेजियत बंधी हुई है । उसके साथ अंग्रेजी संस्कार बंधे हुए हैं, अंग्रेजी संस्कृति बंधी हुई है । और अंग्रेजी सभ्यता बंधी हुई है । भारतीय भाषाओं के साथ भारतीयता है । इसलिए यदि हमें इस देश को सच्चा भारत बनाना है तो वह हम अंग्रेजी द्वारा नहीं कर सकते । हिन्दी और अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं में कोई संघर्ष नहीं है । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता जब हिन्दी और अन्य प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के संघर्ष की बात कही जाती है । हिन्दी और अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं की एक ही संस्कृति है । वे सब एक ही संस्कृति से

निकली हैं । शब्द भंडार भी उन सब का एक है । उत्तर की भाषायें तो संस्कृत से निकली हैं, दक्षिण की भाषाओं में प्रचुर परिमाण में संस्कृत की शब्दावली है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वर्णमाला भी एक है ।

डा० गोविन्द दास : फिर एक भाषा बढ़ती है तो सारी अन्य भाषायें भी बढ़ती हैं । मैं आपको एक दृष्टांत दूंगा । केन्द्रीय सरकार इस समय शब्दावली बना रही है । उस शब्दावली को थोड़े से हेर फेर के साथ सब राज्यों ने स्वीकार कर लिया है । तो इस प्रकार एक भाषा बढ़ती है तो अन्य भाषायें भी बढ़ती हैं ।

फिर भाषा प्रयोगशाला में नहीं बढ़ती । भाषा बढ़ती है जब वह व्यवहार के क्षेत्र में आती है । प्रयोगशालाओं में कभी दुनिया में भाषा नहीं बढ़ी । मैं इतिहास का एक छोटा सा विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ । मैंने भाषाओं का इतिहास पढ़ा है, और क्योंकि यह मेरा विषय रहा है, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई भी भाषा प्रयोगशाला में नहीं बढ़ी, भाषा बढ़ी है व्यवहार में ।

फिर प्रान्तीय भाषाओं की बढ़ती भी केन्द्र में हिन्दी की बढ़ती से होगी । अगर केन्द्र में अंग्रेजी में सब कुछ चला तो अन्य भारतीय भाषायें नहीं बढ़ सकतीं । प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का भी विकास नहीं हो सकता । फिर तो सारे प्रान्त अंग्रेजी की ओर देखेंगे । इस सम्बन्ध में भी राष्ट्र पिता का ही एक कथन सुनिए ।

“अंग्रेजी को प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का या हिन्दी का स्थान नहीं देना चाहिए । अगर अंग्रेजी ने यहाँ के लोगों की भाषाओं को निकाल न दिया होता तो प्रान्तीय भाषायें आज आश्चर्यजनक रूप में समृद्ध होतीं । अगर इंग्लैंड फ्रेंच भाषा

को अपने राष्ट्रीय काम काज की भाषा मान लेता, तो आज हमें अंग्रेजी का साहित्य इतना समृद्ध न मिलता। नार्मन विजय के बाद वहाँ फ्रेंच भाषा का ही जोर था, लेकिन उसके बाद लोक प्रवाह विशुद्ध अंग्रेजी के पक्ष में हो गया। अंग्रेजी साहित्य को आज हम जिस महान रूप में देखते हैं, वह उसी का फल है।”

संविधान सभा में जब भाषा विषयक विवाद चल रहा था उस समय एक प्रश्न उठा कि आठवें शिड्यूल में हम अंग्रेजी को भी स्थान दें। उस समय जो कुछ हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था उमको भी आप सुन लीजिये। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा था :

“There is an insidious move on the part of some to include English as one of the languages of the Eighth Schedule. This is obviously a wrong thing to do, as English is not an Indian language, though it is acquired and owned as mother tongue by some Indians like the Anglo-Indian community. It should be enough if we recognise the need of learning English, or a modern European language. It would be absurd, therefore, and unwarranted too, to include English as an Indian language in the Schedule. In this move to include English is to by-pass the basic principles of the replacement of English by India's national language. It will be wholly in contravention of the spirit and contents of the Constitution and the modern history of our people during the last half a century”.

यह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का कथन है और किसी का कथन नहीं है।

सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात हमारे लिये स्वतन्त्रता है, लेकिन स्वतन्त्रता की हम रक्षा कब कर सकते हैं ? स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा अंग्रेजी के दौर दौरे से होने वाली नहीं है। स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा तब होगी जब उस स्वतन्त्रता को, उस स्वराज्य को यहाँ के लोग अपनी स्वतन्त्रता और स्वराज्य समझेंगे, मानेंगे। इस सम्बन्ध में भी आप राष्ट्र पिता का कथन सुनिए। उन्होंने कहा था :

“अगर स्वराज्य अंग्रेजी बोलने वाले भारतीयों का और उन्हीं के लिए होने वाला हो तो निस्संदेह अंग्रेजी ही राष्ट्र भाषा होगी। लेकिन अगर स्वराज्य करोड़ों भूखे मरने वालों, करोड़ों निरक्षरों, निरक्षर बहनों और दलितों और अन्त्यजों का हो और इन सब के लिए होने वाला हो तो हिन्दी ही एक मात्र राष्ट्र भाषा हो सकती है।”

स्वतन्त्रता के साथ चार प्रमुख बातें हैं जो हमें देखनी हैं। पहली बात है भारतीय एकता, दूसरी बात है भारत में समाजवादी समाज की रचना, तीसरी बात है भारत में प्रजातन्त्र की सफलता और चौथी बात है भारत की आर्थिक उन्नति। हम एक एक बात को ले लें। क्या भारतीय एकता अंग्रेजी से रह सकती है ? बार-बार यह कहा जाता है कि यह विधेयक इसलिए लाया जा रहा है कि भारत की एकता बनी रहे। यह कैसी एकता है ? आप देखें कि अंग्रेजी के द्वारा कैसे एकता रहेगी। अंग्रेजी भाषा ने यहाँ के पढ़े लिखे लोगों में और यहाँ की जनता के बीच में एक बहुत बड़ी खाई खीद दी है, एक बड़ी दीवार खड़ी कर दी है। जब तक हम उस खाई को पाट नहीं देंगे और जब तक हम उस दीवार को ढहा नहीं देंगे तब तक भारतीय एकता कायम नहीं रह सकती। आज क्या हाल है, आप देखें कि जितना काम हो रहा है, जितना

[श्री गोविंद दास]

भारत की एकता का प्रयत्न हो रहा है वह सब का सब प्रयत्न एक छोटे से तबके की ओर से, एक छोटे से तबके द्वारा हो रहा है जो कि अंग्रेजी जानता है। इसमें बहुत कम हिस्सा यहां की आम जनता का है। देश को एकता के सूत्र में बांधने के लिये कोई भी विदेशी भाषा काम नहीं दे सकती। इसीलिये हमने संविधान में हिन्दी को राज भाषा स्वीकार किया था क्योंकि वह यहां के ४२ प्रतिशत लोगों की मातृ भाषा है, और देश के कुछ छोटे छोटे क्षेत्रों को छोड़ कर बाकी समूचे देश में समझी जाती है।

इस सम्बन्ध में भी महात्मा गांधी का ही एक कथन सुनिये :—

“यह बात नहीं कि मैं भाषा के पीछे दीवाना हो गया हूँ।
फिर भी मैं भाषा पर इतना जोर इसलिए देता हूँ कि राष्ट्रीय एकता हासिल करने का यह एक बहुत जबरदस्त साधन है। और जितना दृढ़ इसका आधार होगा, उतनी ही प्रशस्त हमारी एकता होगी।”

आज यह खेद का विषय है कि गांधी जी की इन बातों को हम भूल गये जब एकता नहीं लाई जा सकती तो फिर समाजवाद इससे कैसे लाया जा सकता है? जिस अंग्रेजी भाषा को लोग समझते नहीं हैं समाजवाद की स्थापना अंग्रेजी के द्वारा कैसे होगी यह समझ में नहीं आता। फिर जो प्रजातन्त्र के चलने की बात है वह भी अंग्रेजी द्वारा चलना संभव नहीं है क्योंकि इस देश के ६८ फी मदी लोग अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं। अगर हमको प्रजातन्त्र को चलाना है, अगर हमारे यहां बालिग मताधिकार है तो उस भाषा में प्रजातन्त्र चल सकता है जो कि इस देश की भाषा हो या इस देश की मातृभाषायें हों। अंग्रेजी के द्वारा इस देश में प्रजातन्त्र नहीं चल सकता। इसीलिए आप देखते हैं

कि हमारे केन्द्रीय सरकार के कामों में, हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में और हमारी अन्य दूसरी बातों में यहां की जनता को कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है।

अब चौथी बात रही आर्थिक उन्नति की। आर्थिक उन्नति बिना विज्ञान की उन्नति के नहीं हो सकती। और विज्ञान की उन्नति के लिए हमें वैज्ञानिक चाहिए। अभी शिक्षा मंत्रालय के अनुदानों पर बोलते समय हुए मैंने एक निवेदन किया था कि हमारे एक प्रसिद्ध वैज्ञानिक डा० कोठारी इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कहते हैं। इस अवसर पर मैं डा० कोठारी ने जो कहा था उसको उद्धृत नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि मैं थोड़े ही दिन पहले यह कर चुका हूँ। हमारे वैज्ञानिक तीव्र गति से तभी तैयार हो सकते हैं जब हमारी वैज्ञानिक शिक्षा हिन्दी और हमारी अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं के द्वारा मिले।

इस सम्बन्ध में भी महात्मा गांधी का मत सुनिये :—

“यह कभी नहीं हो सकता कि हजारों लोग अंग्रेजी भाषा को अपना माध्यम बनाएं, और यह अगर मुमकिन हो तो भी चाहने लायक तो कतई नहीं। इस की सीधी-सादी वजह यह है कि अंग्रेजी के जरिए मिलने वाला उच्च और पारिभाषिक ज्ञान आम लोगों तक नहीं पहुंच सकता। यह तो तभी हो सकता है जब इस ज्ञान का प्रसार ऊपर के दर्जे वालों में भी किसी देशी भाषा के द्वारा हो।”

जब संविधान में हिन्दी को राजभाषा स्वीकार किया गया और शेष चौदहों भाषाओं को राष्ट्र भाषा स्वीकार किया गया तब हिन्दी के प्रति और हमारी अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं के प्रति लोगों के मन में कितने उत्साह और

जागृति की लहर उठी थी। लोग हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं की ओर झुके थे लेकिन जब से यह चर्चा चलने लगी कि फिर से अंग्रेजी यहां हमेशा के लिए चलने वाली है तब से यह जोश जो हमारी जनता में हिन्दी के राज भाषा और शेष १३ भारतीय भाषाओं के राष्ट्रभाषा होने पर हुआ था वह जोश ठंडा हो कर खत्म हो रहा है। फिर से लोग अंग्रेजी की ओर मुड़ रहे हैं। यह स्वाभाविक भी है। लोग अपने बच्चों को अंग्रेजी इसलिए पढ़ाते हैं कि इस गरीब देश में सरकारी नौकरियां अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोगों को ही मिलती हैं। जब छोटी से छोटी नौकरी भी बिना अंग्रेजी के ज्ञान के नहीं मिल सकती तब अगर लोग अंग्रेजी के द्वारा शिक्षा प्राप्त करने की कोशिश करते हैं तो उसमें लोगों का दोष नहीं है बल्कि यह हमारा दोष है।

यह कहना गलत है कि अकेले अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोग हिन्दी का विरोध कर रहे हैं। हिन्दी का प्रचलन, हिन्दी को केन्द्र में चलाया जाय इसका विरोध केवल अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोग ही नहीं बरन हिन्दी भाषा भाषी भी कर रहे हैं और यह विरोध कौन लोग कर रहे हैं? यह विरोधी वही दो प्रतिशत लोग जिनके कि हाथ में सारी राज सत्ता है जिनके कि हाथ में सारे का सारा देश का कामकाज है, जो आज भी अपना आधिपत्य इस अंग्रेजी के द्वारा इस देश में बनाये रखना चाहते हैं, वे हिन्दी और अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं का प्रचलन नहीं होने देना चाहते और उनका स्वार्थ अंग्रेजी से सघता है। इसलिए यह कहना कि केवल अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी विरोध करते हैं यह बात सही नहीं है। अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी भी कर रहे हैं और हिन्दी भाषा भाषी भी कर रहे हैं, जैसा मैंने अभी कहा वे लोग इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं जिनका स्वार्थ अंग्रेजी से सघता है। फिर यह बात भी गलत है कि सारे अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी राज्य हिन्दी के विरोधी हैं। दक्षिण में मद्रास को छोड़ कर केरल, मैसूर और आन्ध्र हिन्दी के विरुद्ध नहीं हैं। पूर्व में बंगाल

को छोड़ कर असम और उड़ीसा हिन्दी के विरुद्ध नहीं हैं। पश्चिम में गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र हिन्दी के विरुद्ध नहीं हैं। केवल बंगाल और तमिलनाडु तक ही यह विरोध केन्द्रित है। पहले मैं बंगाल को लेता हूँ। यह आवाज पहले बंगाल से उठी थी कि भारत-वर्ष में एक भाषा की जरूरत है और वह भाषा हिन्दी ही हो सकती है। इस बारे में केवल बंगला भाषा के ही नहीं बरन हमारे भारत के एक बड़े भारी साहित्यकार श्री बंकिमचन्द्र चट्टोपाध्याय ने अपने एक भाषण में यह कहा था :—

“अंग्रेजी के विषय में लोगों की जो कुछ भावना हो, पर मैं यह दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि हिन्दी के बिना हमारा कार्य नहीं चल सकता। हिन्दी की पुस्तकें लिख कर और हिन्दी बोल कर भारत के अधिकांश भाग को निश्चय ही लाभ हो सकता है। यदि हम देश में बंगला और अंग्रेजी जानने वालों की संख्या का पता चलायें तो हमें साफ प्रकट हो जायेगा कि वह कितनी न्यून है। जो सज्जन हिन्दी भाषा द्वारा भारत में एकता पैदा करना चाहते हैं, वे निश्चय ही भारत बन्धु हैं। हम सब को संगठित होकर इस ध्येय की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रयास करना चाहिये।”

न्यायमूर्ति श्री शारदा चरण मित्र तो देवनागरी लिपि के इतने प्रेमी थे कि उन्होंने “देवनागर” नामक पत्र निकाला, जिस में समस्त भारतीय भाषाओं का साहित्य देवनागरी लिपि में छपता था। सारे भारत की भाषाओं का साहित्य देवनागरी लिपि में निकालने का प्रयत्न किया था। अब फिर से वह त्रैमासिक पत्र संसदीय हिन्दी परिषद द्वारा निकला है। उन्होंने उस समय हिन्दी भाषा के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा था :—

डा० गोविन्द दास]

“हिन्दी समस्त आर्यवर्त की भाषा है। कलकत्ते की “एक लिपि विस्तार-परिषद” समस्त भारतवर्ष में एक नागरी लिपि का प्रचार करने में तन मन से लगी हुई है। यद्यपि मैं बंगाली हूँ तथापि मेरे दक्षतर की भाषा हिन्दी है। इस वृद्धावस्था में मेरे लिये वह गौरव का दिन होगा जिस दिन मैं हिन्दी में स्वच्छन्दता के साथ बोलने लगूंगा और प्लेटफार्म के ऊपर खड़ा होकर हिन्दी में वक्तृता दूंगा। उसी दिन मेरा जीवन सफल होगा जिस दिन मैं सारे भारतवासियों के साथ साथ हिन्दी में वार्तालाप करूंगा।”

नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस ने इस बारे में कहा था उसे भी सुन लीजिये :—

“सबसे पहले मैं एक गलतफहमी दूर कर देना चाहता हूँ, कितने ही सज्जनों का खयाल है कि बंगाली लोग या तो हिन्दी के विरोधी होते हैं या उसके प्रति उपेक्षा करते हैं। यह बात भ्रमपूर्ण है और इसका खंडन करना मेरे अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ। मैं व्यर्थ अभिमान नहीं करना चाहता, पर इतना तो अवश्य कहूंगा कि हिन्दी साहित्य के लिये जितना कार्य बंगालियों ने किया है, उतना हिन्दी भाषा प्रान्त छोड़ कर और किसी प्रान्त के निवासियों ने शायद ही किया हो। . . . मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि बंगाली लोग अपनी मातृभाषा से अत्यन्त प्रेम करते हैं और यह कोई अपराध नहीं है। शायद हम में से कुछ ऐसे आदमी भी हैं जिन्हें इस बात का डर है कि हिन्दी वाले हमारी मातृभाषा बंगला को छुड़ा

कर उसके स्थान पर हिन्दी रखवाना चाहते हैं, यह भ्रम भी निराधार है। हिन्दी प्रचार का उद्देश्य केवल यही है कि जो काम आज अंग्रेजी से लिया जाता है, वह आगे चल कर हिन्दी से लिया जाय।” . . .

“प्रान्तीय ईर्ष्या-द्वेष को दूर करने में जितनी सहायता इस हिन्दी प्रचार से मिलेगी, उतनी किसी दूसरी चीज़ से नहीं मिल सकती। अपनी अपनी प्रान्तीय भाषाओं की भरपूर उन्नति कीजिये, उसमें कोई बाधा नहीं डालना चाहता और न हम किसी की बाधा को सहन ही कर सकते हैं, पर सारे प्रान्तों की सार्वजनिक भाषा का पद हिन्दी को ही मिला है। . . . यदि हम लोगों ने तन मन धन से प्रयत्न न किया, तो वह दिन दूर नहीं है, जब भारत स्वाधीन होगा और उसकी राष्ट्रभाषा होगी हिन्दी।”

यह हमारे नेता जी का कहना था। यह भी कहा जाता है कि तामिलनाडु इसके खिलाफ है। इसके लिए मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि सन १९५८ में तामिलनाडु में “दि लैंग्वेज कन्वेंशन” नाम से एक परिषद हुई थी। उस परिषद के स्वागताध्यक्ष श्री के० भाष्यम और उस परिषद के अध्यक्ष भूतपूर्व विन्ध्य प्रदेश के राज्यपाल श्री के० सन्तानम थे जो कि आजकल हमारी राज्य सभा के सदस्य हैं। श्री भाष्यम ने अपने भाषण में क्या कहा था वह सुनिये :—

“The danger is pointed out that imposition of Hindi will lead to disruption of the country. Is this correct? On the other hand, if Hindi is progressively introduced in the Union administration and

communication between the States is also in Hindi it is possible to express in Hindi mass feeling of the inhabitants of one region to the inhabitants in another region in a much more effective way than English."

श्री श्री सन्तानम ने अपने भाषण में कहा था वह भी मुन लीजिये :—

"Hindi has functioned for the past many decades as the *lingua franca* of India at the mass level. Even the British Government recognised this fact by making it the *lingua franca* of the Indian military forces. Under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership, intense propaganda for Hindi has been carried on for the past 40 years and thousands of boys and girls in non-Hindi States have been educated in Hindi to a level similar to the S.S.L.C."

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur): Gandhiji wanted Hindustani, not Hindi.

Dr. Govind Das: "The Hindi taught in the school will be continually nourished by the Hindi spoken in the bazar and the Hindi heard in the Cinema, the radio and other places. On the other hand, no English will be heard anywhere except in select gatherings of professors and scholars."

इसके बाद आप शेष अहिन्दी भाषा-भाषी राज्यों के सम्बन्ध में कुछ बातें लीजिए । कर्नाटक में अभी थोड़े दिन पहले ही—कर्नाटक दक्षिण में है—एक भ्राल कर्नाटक हिन्दी कन्वेंशन हुई, जिसके अध्यक्ष थे बंगलौर के एक्स-मेयर, श्री आर० अनन्त रामन, बी० एस० सी, एल० एल० बी० और जिसका उद्घाटन किया मैसूर लैजिस्लेटिव कौंसिल के चेयरमन, श्री जी० बी० हल्लीकेरी ने । वहां पर जो प्रस्ताव पास हुआ, उसको मुनिये :—

"Although Hindi has been the declared official language of the

Indian Union, provision has been made for the continued use of English in the form of an official language until 1965. But now there is a move to amend the Constitution so as to retain Official language, it is said, as a result of extraordinary pressure from a section of the Non-Hindi speaking public. The Karnatak Hindi Convention views this with concern. The Convention is of the opinion that to give place in the Constitution an official status to a foreign language is below the self-respect of any nation and a hindrance to the healthy growth of the official language as well as the regional languages.

* * *

Therefore, this Convention earnestly urges upon the Government to give up their efforts to make English an associate official language for an unspecified period."

इसी प्रकार कटक में एक सम्मेलन हुआ, जिसके अध्यक्ष थे पद्मश्री श्री आर्तवल्लभ महान्ति, एम० ए० । उस सम्मेलन में यह प्रस्ताव पास किया गया :

"यह सम्मेलन अंग्रेजी भाषा शिक्षा का विरोध न करते हुए भी अंग्रेजी भाषा को अनिर्दिष्ट काल के लिए हिन्दी के साथ सहयोगी या अतिरिक्त भाषा के रूप में ग्रहण करने का एकान्त विरोधी है । यदि अंग्रेजी को अतिरिक्त भाषा के रूप में ग्रहण करने का प्रयोजन हो तो इसे केवल १९६५ से और पाँच वर्ष अर्थात् १९७० ई० तक ही रखा जा सकता है ।"

इस विषय में स्वामी विचित्रानन्द दास, एडवोकेट ने अपना यह संशोधन पेश किया था कि पाँच वर्ष के स्थान पर दस वर्ष रखा जाये, किन्तु उपस्थित साहित्यिकों में से किसी ने भी उनका समर्थन नहीं किया ।

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

हाल ही में बिहार राष्ट्रभाषा परिषद् का एक अधिवेशन हुआ जिसके सभापति श्री अनन्तशयनम् अय्यंगार थे जो आँध्र के रहने वाले हैं तेलुगु-भाषा भाषी हैं। वह बहुत दिनों तक हमारे स्पीकर थे। उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में कहा :

“हिन्दी भाषा की समृद्धि से अप्रत्यक्ष रूप में उत्तर भारत की सभी अन्य भगिनी-भाषाओं की समृद्धि होगी और दक्षिणी भाषाओं की भी इस से समृद्धि होगी क्योंकि उनके काम-काज की भाषा हिन्दी ही होगी।”

आगे चल कर उन्होंने कहा :

“हिन्दी के प्रति भारत के किसी कोने में वास्तविक घृणा नहीं है और सामान्य रूप से सभी मानते हैं कि इसका प्रसार अवश्य होना चाहिए एवं यह पूर्ण रूप से राष्ट्र के काम-काज की भाषा बने। ऊपर से जो विरोध कुछ और से देखने में आता है उसका कारण यह है कि हिन्दी-साहित्य को अधिकाधिक समृद्ध करने के पूर्व ही अंग्रेजी से हिन्दी पर उतर आने का हठ अथवा खीचा-तानी हो रही है।”

अभी दक्षिण के एक विद्वान् और मैसूर विश्वविद्यालय के अवकाश-प्राप्त प्रोफेसर श्री चन्द्रहासन दिल्ली पधारे थे। उन्होंने एक वक्तव्य में कहा :

“अगर अंग्रेजी को जबरदस्ती लादा जा सकता है तो क्या कारण है कि हिन्दी को नहीं लादा जा सकता जबकि बात ऐसी नहीं है। हिन्दी तो भारत की भाषा है भारत की अधिका जनसंख्या द्वारा समझी

और बोली जाने वाली भाषा है। संविधान में जब १९६५ के बाद हिन्दी को राजभाषा के रूप में प्रयोग करने की व्यवस्था कर दी गई तो अब ऐसा क्यों किया जा रहा है कि हिन्दी को राजभाषा नहीं बनने दिया जायगा।... द्रविड़ मुन्नेत्र कडगम हिन्दी का विरोध करता है पर यह तो भारत की अखण्डता का भी विरोधी है। वह तो अलग द्रविड़स्तान चाहता है। उसे देश की एकता में विश्वास नहीं है।”

गाडगिल साहब महाराष्ट्रियन हैं हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी नहीं हैं। वह बहुत समय तक इस सदन के सदस्य थे और पंजाब के राज्यपाल भी रहे हैं। उन्होंने अपने एक भाषण में कहा है :

“हिन्दी एक संगठित करने वाली शक्ति है। जन-साधारण को एक विशाल जीवन की तरफ ले जाने का मार्ग है।... वह अब किसी एक प्रदेश की न होने की वजह से सारे देश की होगी और सारे देश का बौद्धिक और व्यवहारी जीवन समृद्ध करेगी। हिन्दी का प्रचार-कार्य एक वाड्यज्ञ है।”

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य अपना भाषण समाप्त करने का प्रयत्न कर।

डा० गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा जो दृष्टिकोण है उसको कोई आपके सामने नहीं रखेगा और कम से कम कांग्रेस वाले तो नहीं रखेंगे। इसलिए मुझे अपनी बात कहने के लिए कुछ समय और दिया जाये।

गुजरात विद्यापीठ के उपकुलपति श्री देसाई ने अपने एक लेख में कहा है :

“दुख तो यह है कि यह भी कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी तैयार नहीं है या पूरी

तरह विकसित नहीं है। स्वभाषा का ऐसा अपमान करते हुए हम अभी चाहिए और कभी कोई भाषा बिना उसको उपयोग किये कहीं विकसित हुई देखी है? इस लिए सरकार को प्रामाणिकता से हिन्दी के उपयोग के लिए पूरा मौका देना चाहिए। अभी तक कानून से ऐसा नहीं किया गया है। इस बाधा को दूर करने की जरूरत है। इसके बजाये हिन्दी कभी आ ही न सके ऐसा कानूनी कदम उठाया जा रहा है।”

वह आगे कहते हैं :

“ऊपर की विचारणा से उल्टा यह दिखाई देता है कि अंग्रेजी को सहभाषा के रूप में ग्रहण करना, यह किसी तरह का उपाय ही नहीं है। इससे तो भाषाकीय अंधेरे और कारबार में अराजकता ही पैदा होगी, क्योंकि अंग्रेजी भाषा वैसे भी देश की जनसंख्या के एक प्रतिशत तक पहुंची है और वह भी उसे ठीक तरह से नहीं आती। और प्रजागति देखते हुये इसके बारे में हर साल शिथिलता ही बढ़ेगी। उसके चिह्न सर्वत्र नजर आते हैं। इस वजह से शिक्षा और राज-व्यवस्था दोनों में सुधार नहीं हो रहा है। प्रजा चीखती रहती है, मगर कोई सुनता ही नहीं। स्वराज्य की नौकरशाही अंग्रेजीशाही बन चुकी है। यह भी निभ नहीं सकेगी, क्योंकि माध्यम के रूप में उपयोग करने के लिये अंग्रेजी ही उसे (नौकरशाही को) कम आती जायगी।”

मरे पास और भी बहुत से उद्धरण हैं, लेकिन चूंकि आप कहते हैं कि बक्त नहीं है, इसलिये मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि बम्बई और पुना तथा अन्य अहिन्दी भाषा क्षेत्रों के अनेक लोगों ने हिन्दी को शीघ्र ही केन्द्र की राजभाषा के स्थान पर प्रस्थापित करने का अनुरोध किया है। उन में से कुछ नाम ये हैं : श्री विमलशंकर ना० शास्त्री, श्री कांतिलाल एम० जानी, श्री रतिलाल र० जोशी, श्री मधुमदन एम. देसाई, कांकिलार० पटेल, श्री नन्द किशोर ओझा, इन्दिरार० पारेख, श्री विपिनचन्द्र वादवे, श्री किशोरीलाल वशिष्ट आदि। ऐसे कितने ही लोग हैं, जिन्होंने यह कहा है कि अंग्रेजी सहभाषा के रूप में हमेशा के लिये, अनिश्चित काल के लिये मुकर्रर न की जाये।

मैं अब इन उद्धरणों को पढ़ना समाप्त करता हूं और अन्त में अंग्रेजी के केवल दो उद्धरण पढ़ कर मुनाना चाहता हूं।

आयरलैंड के विख्यात कवि, थामस डेविस, कहते हैं :

“A nation without a mother tongue cannot be called a nation. The defence of one's mother tongue is more essential than the defence of the boundaries of one's motherland, because the mother tongue is a more powerful barrier against the intrusion of foreigners than even the natural barriers of rivers and mountains.”

यह कहा जाता है कि हमारी भाषायें सघम नहीं हैं। लेकिन अंग्रेजी के एक प्रमुख विद्वान श्री क्रस्ट कहते हैं :

“Indian vernaculars are magnificent vehicles of speech and capable of expressing any human conception and being the vehicle of the highest scientific education.”

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

ग्रन्थ में मैं आप से यह कहूँगा कि मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस संकट-कालीन परिस्थिति में इस विधेयक को क्यों लाया जा रहा है। अभी १९६५ तक बराबर अंग्रेजी चल सकती थी। इसलिये मैं इसका इम वक्त लाया जाना किसी प्रकार से भी उचित नहीं समझता। मैं यह नहीं कहना कि सरकार ने इस संबंध में कोई काम नहीं किया है। उसने कुछ काम किया है, लेकिन यदि गत बारह वर्षों के एक युग में उसने संविधान की भावना के अनुसार उचित काम किया होता, तो आज इम विधेयक की आवश्यकता न होती। देश के प्रचंड बहुमत के विरोध में सरकार यह विधेयक ला रही है। इस देश के ९८ फीसदी लोग अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं और दो फीसदी अंग्रेजी जानने वालों के लिये ९८ फीसदी लोगों के ऊपर अंग्रेजी लादी जा रहा है।

जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, इससे स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा नहीं हो सकेगी, इस से एकता की स्थापना नहीं हो सकेगी, इस से समाजवाद की रचना नहीं होगी, इससे हमारी आर्थिक उन्नति नहीं होगी, इससे इस प्रकार के कोई भी महत्वपूर्ण काम हो जायें, यह संभव नहीं है। और प्रजातंत्र तो इसके द्वारा चल ही नहीं सकता। इस विधेयक के द्वारा अनिश्चित काल के लिये अंग्रेजी लादी जा रही है। मुझे भय है कि गत बारह वर्षों में हिन्दी को चलाने के लिये जिस प्रकार कोई योग्य कार्य नहीं हुआ, यदि यह विधेयक इसी तरह से स्वीकृत हुआ, इसमें कोई समय न रखा गया—दस वर्ष, पांच वर्ष या कोई भी अवधि निर्धारित न की गई—तो उसी प्रकार इस विधेयक के स्वीकृत होने के बाद भी कोई व्यावहारिक कार्य नहीं हो सकेगा। जो कुछ पिछले बारह वर्षों में हुआ है, वही भविष्य में होने वाला है और पन्द्रह बीस वर्षों के बाद हमारे सामने वही परिस्थिति आयेगी, जो कि आज हमारे सामने

हिन्दी को चलाने के विषय में सरकार ने कभी कोई आयोजना नहीं बनाई है। जो आयोग मुकर्रर हुआ, वह भी कोई आयोजना नहीं बना सका और इसी प्रकार संसद् की कमेटी भी कोई आयोजना नहीं बना सकी। हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में भी हिन्दी चलाने की कोई आयोजना नहीं बनी। बिना किसी निर्धारित अवधि के और बिना कोई आयोजना बनाये इस प्रकार के विधेयक को मैं स्वीकार नहीं कर सकता। मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि आज भी सारा काम काज हिन्दी में चल सकता है। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि हमने गलती की कि जिस दिन से संविधान लागू किया, उसी दिन से सब काम हिन्दी में क्यों नहीं चलाया। आयरलैंड में उसके स्वतंत्र होने के बाद दूसरे दिन से ही गैलिक में जब काम चल सकता है, इजराईल में उसके स्वतंत्र होने के बाद सब काम हीब्रू में चल सकता है, जोकि दोनों मृत भाषायें थीं, तो हिन्दी और अन्य भारतीय भाषायें जोकि मृत भाषायें नहीं हैं, इनके द्वारा उस दिन से सारा काम चल सकता था और आज भी मैं समझता हूँ कि चल सकता है।

जैसा मैंने आरम्भ में निवेदन किया है, मुझे दुख है कि जिनके चरणों में बैठ कर, जिनके नेतृत्व में, पंडित जॉं के, मैंने आज तक अपना सारा जीवन व्यतीत किया है, शास्त्र। जॉं मेरे साथ रहे हैं, उनके द्वारा लाये गये विधेयक का मुझे विरोध करना पड़ रहा है। तीन बार उनके मतों के विरुद्ध मुझे अपना मत देना पड़ा है। एक बार उस वक्त जबकि संविधान सभा में अंकों का प्रश्न आया था, दूसरी बार उस वक्त जबकि गोबध संबंधी मेरे विधेयक का सरकार ने विरोध किया था और तीसरी बार यह है। लेकिन यह मेरी अन्तरात्मा का प्रश्न है, यह वह प्रश्न है जिस को मुलझाने मुलझाते और जिम के लिये काम करते करते पचास वर्ष का अपना सारा

जॉवन मैंने व्यतंत किया है और जिस प्रश्न को स्वराज्य के बाद मैं सब से महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न समझता हूँ। इसलिये अपनी अन्तरात्मा के अनुसार काम करने के लिये, इस जॉवन के संध्याकाल में, मैं बाध्य हूँ। मेरी निगाहों में पड़ित जो इतने उदार हैं, शास्त्री जी इतने उदार हैं कि वे मुझे गलत नहीं समझेंगे और मेरा जो इस संबंध में मत है, उसका आदर करेंगे।

मुझे बड़े दुःख के साथ इस विधेयक का विरोध करना पड़ रहा है।

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी आज यह सोच कर आया था कि आज हिन्दा में ही बोलूंगा। लेकिन मुझे मेरे कतिपय दक्षिण के मित्रों ने कहा कि आप हमें समझाने की जब कोशिश कर रहे हैं तो इस बजह से आप अंग्रेजी में जरूर बोलें। उनके इस अनुरोध का आदर करते हुये मैं अंग्रेजी में ही अपना भाषण दूंगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is unfortunate that this Bill has been brought before the House in a manner unbecoming of the great party which is now ruling our country. The Constitution provides that we must proceed . . .

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I thought Hindi will be more polite.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We would like to proceed and abide by the Constitution. When we entered office as Members of this House, each one of us took an oath that we will abide by the Constitution and uphold the Constitution. The Constitution provides that under article 87, the President is enjoined to summon Parliament by issuing proper summons to Members of Parliament. It provides that at the commencement of the first Session, the President shall address both Houses of Parliament assembled together and inform the Parliament

of the causes of its summons. The address was presented to both Houses of Parliament and this address had made absolutely no reference whatsoever to the present Bill which has been put before the House. As to why this particular method was followed in contravention of the specific provision of law, specific provision of our Constitution, passes my comprehension. In England there is merely a convention that the address of the Monarch must state the reasons why Parliament has been called. Here, we have got a positive provision of law that the causes of the summons must be stated in the address. And in the address although specifically all the various Bills which are to be passed in the House were mentioned, this particular Bill was not mentioned.

The other legal difficulty about which a point of order was raised this morning and which was very obvious was that the Government has thought it fit to circumvent the provisions and to twist the language of the clear provisions of article 349 read with article 344 of the Constitution. I have not yet understood and I will fail to understand the arguments of the hon. Law Minister that it was sufficient to appoint one commission after five years and then not to care for the other commission which was to be appointed after another five years. The purpose for which the second commission was to be appointed is very clearly indicated in the article itself. Both the commissions had to study the growth of the Hindi language in India because the commission was asked to make recommendations about the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union in five years. If it had not progressed, it was for the second commission to indicate what would have been the progress after the end of ten years.

The second question was about the restriction on the use of English language for all or any of the official

[Shri U. M. Trivedi].

purposes of the Union. As to how the other State Governments were acting was also a matter to be studied by this commission and also the language to be used for all or any of the purposes mentioned in article 348 of the Constitution. Article 348 clearly provided:

“(1) Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Part, until Parliament by law otherwise provides—

- (a) all proceedings in the Supreme Court and in every High Court,
- (b) the authoritative texts—
 - (i) of all Bills to be introduced or amendments thereto to be moved in either House of Parliament or in the House or either House of the Legislature of a State,
 - (ii) of all Acts passed by Parliament or the legislature of a State and of all Ordinances promulgated by the President or the Governor of a State, and
 - (iii) of all orders, rules, regulations and bye-laws issued under this Constitution or under any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of a State,

shall be in the English language.

Further, it provided:

“(2) Notwithstanding anything in sub-clause (a) of clause (1), the Governor of a State may with the previous consent of the President, authorise the use of the Hindi language, or any other language used for any official purposes of the State, in proceedings in the High Court having its principal seat in that State....”

Now, this ought to have been studied by the commission. In Madhya

Bharat, as long as Madhya Bharat was in existence, immediately an order was made by the Rajpramukh that the State language shall be Hindi for all practical purposes. Even in the High Courts, you could argue the case in Hindi.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: A Bill was passed.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: A Bill was passed. The same was the state of affairs in Rajasthan. This was not studied at all. I do not know what happened in Bihar and what was the position in Uttar Pradesh.

Shri K. C. Sharma: (Sardhanria): About Uttar Pradesh, Hindi.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: If all these conditions were to be studied they could have been studied only after the lapse of ten years. When you have not studied all those things and not taken that particular step, and yet have come to the conclusion that the recommendations of the committee that was formed at the end of five years was a sufficient justification for you to bring forward this Bill, I most emphatically and humbly submit that it was not a correct thing that the Government has done. It is quite true that under the provision of article 255, it will not be possible for anybody to challenge this Act before the Supreme Court because what is lacking in this is merely a sanction or a recommendation. But we cannot fight for these words. The spirit behind the whole provision was there. It is the meticulous care with which now the Government comes forward and suggests that the plural may not include the singular and at the same time it comes round and says that where the word ‘shall’ has been used, we may interpret it as ‘may’—these are not very good things in the spirit of the language, in the spirit in which the framers had framed the Constitution. The debates of the Constituent Assembly leave absolutely no doubt in the mind of one who

wants to read them, at that time, the whole Constituent Assembly was one on this point, although there were some murmurs. There were some objections. All those objections were rightly waived by one and all from the south and from the north that the language of our country shall be Hindi. It was a unanimous decision. That decision was made very patent when the discussion on the question of numerals to be used were discussed. On that point, the Hindi lovers had to give way, to allow the numerals as written in the Roman language to be used. It is not that there are not sufficient fanatics all over. There are. I am not pleading here as a fanatic. What is to be pleaded, fanaticism apart, and the question that has to be considered is that if each one of us agrees on this principle that if there is any language in this country which can at any time become the *lingua franca* of India, the one and only language is Hindi. I am a Gujarati. My mother tongue is not Hindi. I can speak Hindi no doubt. But, after having travelled over most parts of India and foreign countries, where there are many Indians settled, I come to one single conclusion and it is this that the only language which can be the means of communication between the various people of the States of our country is Hindi. It was not difficult in Rangoon for a man coming from the south, Tamilian, Telugu, Malayali to start talking in Hindustani within a week of arrival. If that could be achieved there, I can see no reason whatever why we have not been able to achieve the same thing within 15 years. Whose fault is it?

15 hrs.

The directive Principles were given that every effort shall be made for 10 years for the compulsory education of children. If this compulsory education of children had been there, if provision had been made to give some sort of knowledge of

Hindi to the youngsters in the various parts of our country, today, the opposition which appears to us coming from various sources would have been absent. We have failed in our duty, to carry out the directive principles which were laid before us by the Constitution makers.

There is a sort of opposition coming from the south and I come across some very strong protagonists of Hindi also veering round to the view, having gone out from the political parties to which they belonged, and they think that Hindi must not be imposed upon the people. Nobody wants to impose Hindi. I will certainly oppose any imposition by mere force of law. That will not be democratic. At the same time, those who want to obstruct the imposition of Hindi or the use of Hindi for the whole of India, must also consider, are they not trying to impose English upon those who do not want it.

Shri S. Kandappan: English is not their language.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Are they not doing a harmful thing?....

Shri S. Kandappan: It is equally foreign to us.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I am coming to that very point. If it is equally foreign to somebody, then, is it meet and proper for you, is it the principle of democracy that English must be imposed upon the rest of the 20 crores of people simply because one crore or 2 crores or 3 crores do not like it?

Shri K. Rajaram: Don't you feel that Hindi is a foreign language to us in the south?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: With very great respect, I must tell my friends, Hindi is not a foreign language.

Shri K. Rajaram: It is a foreign language for us.

Shri Mutthu Gounder (Tiruppattur): It is as much foreign as English.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is a language which you do not understand. It is not a foreign language. The moment you accept the unity of India, that India is one, the moment you accept Schedule VIII of the Constitution, you will find that neither Tamil, nor Telugu, nor Hindi, nor Urdu, nor Sanskrit, nor Gujarati, none of these languages are foreign to our country. The only language which is foreign is English. It finds no place whatever in the Schedule. It is an irony of fate that in our own country today, after the lapse of 13 years or 14 years of the making of the Constitution, I should say,—the Constitution was made and came into existence, if I remember aright, on 26th November, 1949—it was already made by us—14 years after the making of the Constitution, and after having agreed to the principle that Hindi shall be the language of India, we are bringing a Bill which creates a doubt in the mind of the people.

Some are not satisfied with what is being put there, that English will still be there. Hindi-lovers are feeling that for all time to come, we are losing the one single thing that we have achieved of having unity in our country with all the diversities that exist in our country. This Bill, therefore, is not welcomed by the lovers of Hindi. It is also not welcome as I find from those who do not want it. They think that the Government has not gone the whole hog with them. We feel that some injustice is being done to the country at large. I do not want to recapitulate the various resolutions passed all over the country on this question of Hindi. Those of us who have travelled in the South have come across people who have exerted themselves in learning Hindi, very chaste Hindi. I was an honorary teacher of the Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha and much older men than I were my pupils. With the assiduity and industry with which they learnt the lan-

guage and the rapid progress that they made, within 15 days, they were able to write letters. It has given hope that if Hindi is being taught, if efforts were made without showing fanaticism whatsoever of any kind, and given proper direction with love and regard, Hindi could have been made easily the language of the whole country.

It is true, because we cannot forget, that due to English we have advanced our knowledge. But, then, this was naturally due to the fact that the language of the British who ruled us was English. If the language of those who ruled us was French as it was in Pondicherry, we would have got the knowledge through French. If the language of those who ruled us was Hindi, we would have got our knowledge through Hindi. Nothing would have prevented us from getting the knowledge that we have got today. Every language enumerated in the Schedule is sufficiently strong in vocabulary to impart the knowledge to each one of us for all the studies that we want. Take the language of the Danes—it is a small country. They have got scientists. English is not the language of the British isles with a total population of 4 crores or 5 crores. The language of 20 crores of people could not have science is an unbelievable thing. The most unfortunate thing is that the development that ought to have been made has not been made. But, it is progressing. We were handicapped. We were slaves all these days. We have broken slaves all these days. We have broken those shackles. Today, we want to progress in that direction. Should we now put some shackles over us by having this language which is foreign to us? It is true, we are indebted, most of us are indebted certainly to English for the knowledge that we have gathered through English. But that is merely an incident or an accident in life. Accidentally, we were in that position and, therefore, we had to do it. But that cannot be a justification for keeping English for our

children to learn. How shameful it becomes when we go to a foreign land, and we are asked 'What is the language in which all your work in your country is carried out?' We have to say 'In English'.

We are not what I might call *varnasankaras* born of the British. We have a distinct culture of our own, and having a culture of our own, we are people who are a distinct race from the British, with a distinct history and a distinct stamp and a particular pride that we possess. It is militating against that very pride of ours if we accept the proposition that English shall continue to be the language of our country.

It is quite true that those of us, people like me, who have been practising at the Bar, have developed this habit of talking in English. Having always been mustering our thoughts in English, we find it easy to express ourselves in English. But that cannot be the excuse for continuing English as the language of our country. We are a passing generation. We cannot leave a legacy upon those who are coming behind us by putting upon them the same shackles and continue the slavery which this language has brought upon us. If we have to go with our heads high, and if we have to make ourselves felt as a nation in this world, we must have a language. And what can be that language? Let us think dispassionately. Let us think in terms only of the unity of our country. Let us think in terms of the great nation which we have built up after the Constitution has been given to us. If we think in those terms we shall come to one conclusion and one conclusion alone, namely that there cannot be any other language but Hindi for this country. And what is the difficulty in studying Hindi? I have not yet come across any. Perhaps with the exception of Malayalam and Tamil, all the alphabets in each one of the languages are the same; Bengali, Gujarati, Oriya, Marathi, Kanarese, Telugu and all other langu-

ages have the same alphabets, namely *ka, kha, ga, gha*, etc. There is no change at all. Even in Burmese, even in Ceylonese, and even in Siamese, the alphabets are those derived from Sanskrit.

Shri S. Kandappan: That is not so in Tamil.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I have already said so. I know a little smattering of Tamil, and I have already said that that is not so in Tamil. Tamil is a superior language in this sense that it has the least number of alphabets in this world. The difficulty about Tamil is only this much, namely:

मचयो : अभेदा : तथयो : अभेदा :

That means, what you talk as *sa* we would talk as *cha*, and what you talk as *ta* we would talk as *tha*. That is all. At the same time, I do not want to decry the language. Tamil is a rich language. Tamil is a language of rich poets. Tamil has got its own literature. Tamil has enriched the culture of India. But that does not mean that Tamil should be the language for the whole country. Nobody says that Tamil should not be declared as the language of the State in which it is spoken; it should be used. And it must be enriched. But at the same time, I pray, and each one of us us prays, that the Tamilian friends should realise that if this great country has to rise and the old dissensions must be forgotten it can only be done by having one single language in our country for the sake of this country, for the growth of this country and for the greatness of this country.

With these words, I oppose this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, Shri M. L. Dwivedi, Shri M. L. Dwivedi. The hon. Member is not here. Now, Shri S. N. Chaturvedi.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. I called the hon. Member twice but he did not get up. I have called Shri S. N. Chaturvedi now.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad): I have heard with attention the debate that has gone on on the Official Languages Bill. This is a subject which has aroused controversy, but just as the previous speakers have appealed, I also join them in urging for a calm consideration of this subject.

There are so many important considerations involved in this matter, such as the unity of the country, the growth of our culture, the development of our intellectual heritage etc. I, therefore, appeal that we should not be carried away by slogans. We should not doubt or suspect each other's motives. We should not be suspicious, and should not base our judgments on what the fanatics on either side may say. There is a very large element both in the Hindi-speaking and in the non-Hindi-speaking areas, which thinks sanely and calmly on this subject, and if they sit together and discuss, they can arrive at a proper and reasonable solution.

The first point is that the use of a foreign language as our medium of communication is certainly very derogatory to our self-respect. It hurts our pride and lowers us in the estimation of others. Even our culture is belittled by this. Others from a very poor opinion of a culture which has not been able to give even an adequate vehicle of thought. Probably, we are the only people in the world who have been disparaging their own language. Nobody else, I think, in any country has talked about the inadequacy of its own language as a vehicle of expression. What is the reason for this? As my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee has pointed out by quoting Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, how can a mint go on turning out coins when they are not legal tender? If we put the seed in cold storage, how can it

sprout? That is what has happened. When a language goes out of use, how can it develop? So, English to which we have given our adherence, and sometimes fanatical adherence, has come to be used as the language in this country. It was used because a nation came here, conquered this country and ruled over us, and, therefore, their language was learnt by a certain number of people and that language then became the official language. But in spite of two hundred years of usage it has not become the language of more than two per cent. of the people. Even this 2 per cent. does not use it with any amount of proficiency. I am on the management of a post-graduate college, and I have seen that even the lecturers in those colleges cannot probably write a whole letter correctly in English....

An Hon. Member: Which university is that?

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: There are mistakes in those letters....

An Hon. Member: U.P. University.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: I think that this applies to most of the universities.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Certainly not.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: Our performance in English has been of a pretty low order. How many original and creative contributions have been made by our people in English? I think that whatever contributions have been made by our people are mostly imitations. We cram up some phrases and we just throw them about. That is all that we have done. Our actual contribution to creative literature and science has been almost nil. There may be one or two Rabindranath Tagores or J. C. Boses. But I do not know how many Miltons, how many Rabindranath Tagores, how many J. C. Boses have remained mute

or inglorious because of a foreign medium.

Shri S. Kandappan: Do not make such sweeping remarks. There are Miltons in all languages.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: I am saying about our contribution through the English language here. The great reservoir of intelligence and initiative that we have in this country, 98 per cent. non-English knowing people, has not been tapped. (*Interruptions*). I am talking about facts as they exist. We are confining ourselves to the 2 per cent. of the people who are considered educated in this country. They consider themselves separate from the common man. They are a little anglicised in their approach. They are losing their roots in the soil of this country. That is what has happened. They cannot communicate even with their own countrymen. What they learn is not passed on to the other 98 per cent. of the people. There is thus a tremendous loss of talent in this country and the country is suffering due to that. That is what to which I am drawing the attention of the House. From the very early stage, all our attention is diverted to cramming these English words. We do not know the spellings. The spelling is peculiar. Everything is peculiar. Because competitive examinations are held in the English medium, they have to learn the language. That is why their initiative, their intelligence and their creative effort are all crippled. That is my point. We have almost consigned the 98 per cent. of our people to oblivion. They cannot progress without acquiring knowledge of the English language, howsoever eminent they may be in their own language.

These are the two things I am saying. There is the question of our national pride. There is the question of dwarfing and blighting all the talent in the country. These have to be considered.

15.24 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR *in the Chair*]

I have learnt the English language. I know that it has a very rich literature. I have no animus against the English language. Nor is it intended that English will go away from this country at any time. We have no such idea. The point is that it should not be the medium of instruction, it should not be the medium of communication, it should not be the medium of administration. That is all we say. Let us give English all the respect it deserves. We shall take knowledge from any country, from anywhere, from any language. Other countries have also done it. They have not banned English; they have not banned German. Even now, when these 2 per cent. of our English knowing people go out to other countries, for scientific education, they have also to learn German; some people have to learn Russian and others other languages. That is what we want to do.

We want to give that knowledge through the medium of our own language, not only Hindi but other languages too, every regional language. The regional language should be the medium of instruction in the State in which it is spoken. I am sure if this happens, all languages will develop. They will develop side by side. But until English ceases to be the medium of instruction, none of these 14 languages will develop to its utmost, as it should. It is only when they become the media of instruction in their own different States that they will progress.

But the question remains of a common language for the whole country. There are misapprehensions on this score. But I can say about myself and I think about a very large section of the Hindi-speaking people, that they do not want to take any unfair advantage through making Hindi the common language of this country. It was because it was decided by the Constituent Assembly that

[Shri S. N. Chaturvedi.]

Hindi should be the common language that it has been so accepted. If this question is reopened, probably another controversy will arise. Also, Hindi happens to be the language not only of the largest number of people in the country but it is understood throughout the country. And it is in order that it should become the common language of this country and should be most widely and easily understood, this language should be put into use at the earliest stage. The sooner it is put into use, the earlier will it develop and grow. Then the apprehensions on the score of its inadequacy will disappear.

I can understand the apprehensions of my non-Hindi speaking friends. So far as we are concerned, we certainly want that the Hindi language should become the official language of this country but only with their goodwill. It should become the bond of unity and not an agency of disintegration. We do want their co-operation and we certainly appeal to their goodwill and to their good sense. After all, there has to be a common language for this country and that common language has to be one of the 14 languages recognised by the Constitution.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: It is because of our co-operation that today we are discussing it.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: I am grateful for that. Only the other day my hon. friend remarked, 'You must be feeling happy that this Bill has come'. I replied I can only feel happy if you are happy, not otherwise'. I have no desire to be happy at others' expense; there is no sense of exultation about it. This is a question for all of us to solve and we should put our heads together and come to some decision by agreement. If that happens, this Parliament will be remembered in history for having given this country a common language, not if it divides the country because of this language

controversy. That is why I make this appeal.

Again I say that we do not want to take any unfair advantage. At least that is not the feeling of sensible persons. In the beginning, you will certainly feel a sense of disadvantage. That is because they have not made up their minds to learn this language. If they could go to England and compete in the ICS competitive examination with English-speaking people and beat even Englishmen in their own language there, I am sure they can compete very well with their own countrymen even if the examinations are held through the medium of Hindi. If there is a desire—although the Language Commission and the Committee have not countenanced this proposal—that their interest should be safeguarded during the transitional period by a quota system in the examinations given to the 14 languages, to set at rest all misapprehensions, we can agree to that. But, if as the Committee suggested, there should be a moderation committee and some uniform standard should be evolved, that might be a better course. I say this only as an earnest of our goodwill, although the proposal of the quota system has been discountenanced by the committee.

I think we should not consider this Bill in terms of putting the Hindi-speaking people at an advantage and the non-Hindi speaking people at a disadvantage. Let us not judge each other by what the extremists on either side say. Let us remember that there is a very large section of our people who can think calmly and coolly over this matter and come to a decision with honour and respect and with glory to all of us, to this country and to this Parliament.

Shri A. S. Alva (Mangalore): I beg to support the motion. We are unnecessarily troubling ourselves with the question whether Hindi is opposed to any of the other languages

in the country. We have accepted Hindi as the official language and that stands. There is no dispute that Hindi must be the official language.

Article 343 contemplates that within fifteen years, it may not be possible to switch over to English, and therefore clause (3) of that article says:

"Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, of—

(a) the English language, or.."

Further, article 344 envisages commissions to be appointed to find out how far Hindi can be used. It even envisages that Hindi could be used before 15 years, because clause (6) of the article says:

"Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

Therefore, it is clear that the Constitution itself contemplates that English must continue for 15 years, and if Hindi has sufficiently progressed, it can be used even before 15 years. But for that a committee was appointed. They went into the whole matter, considered all the aspects and came to the conclusion that it may not be possible immediately after 15 years to change over.

With your permission, Sir, I would refer to page 13, paragraph 22 of the Report which says:

"The process of changeover from English to Hindi as the Union official language has to be so developed and regulated that it may be effected without causing any dislocation and with the minimum of inconvenience, and in determining the pace at which changes should be brought about, consideration has to be given,

among other things, to the progress of Hindi in non-Hindi areas, and the linguistic capacity of existing government servants. The process of changeover should also not have the effect of placing any linguistic groups at a disadvantage in the matter of recruitment to the public services."

Then it proceeds:

"In the first phase, Hindi has to be used in addition to English, and preparatory measures taken which will set the position for the next phase when the discontinuance of English for different official purposes may be brought about progressively. The date for the final changeover from English to Hindi will mark the point of culmination in this process rather than a new stage. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as a deadline, and the approach to this question has to be flexible and practical. The Committee considers that until 1965, English should be the principal official language of the Union and Hindi the subsidiary official language; and from 1965 when Hindi becomes the principal official language, English should be used as a subsidiary official language for purposes to be specified by Parliament by law in due course for as long as may be necessary."

This makes it clear that, as I submitted in the beginning, it is not necessary to wait for the deadline till 1965. The President, after appointing a commission, could switch over to Hindi even before that period. But in this report they came to the conclusion that it would not be possible to switch over from English before 1965 or even immediately after that. It is on account of the precautions which the Committee has mentioned that this Bill has been brought forward.

There need not be any hostility as far as English is concerned. My hon.

[Shri A. S. Alva.]

friends have submitted that English will be necessary for scientific and technological studies, especially when people have to go to outside places. The Committee has gone into this also carefully, and at page 11 they say:

"The gradual replacement of English in official work by Hindi and the regional languages does not mean severance of our ties with English.

"The special place which it must continue to have in the intellectual and scientific fields, and as a means of international contacts is not conditional upon the perpetuation of the existing arrangement. We live in an age of rapid scientific advancement and technological change. The development of science and technology may take place at an even faster pace in future, and these subjects will play an increasingly dominant part in our national life."

So, they say that English should not be wiped out. My submission is that if in 1965 Hindi is introduced as the official language and English is replaced, practically it will mean that all the Members of Parliament who do not know Hindi will be absolutely useless and will not be able to discharge their functions after that period. We are only pleading for some more time. During these years Hindi has made very good progress in the South, and we should be able to switch over to Hindi within a period of ten years from the deadline.

The Law Minister said that the word "may" was enough, but in all humility I submit that we should not wrangle over it. As commonly understood, "shall" means a different thing, and it is necessary to change "may" into "shall". I am sure Government will see its way to accepting that amendment.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): This Languages Bill has unfortunately kicked up clouds of heat and froth, conflict and controversy, not only in the Lobbies of Parliament, but also in the country as a whole.

There are two sets of views, each an extreme view clashing with the other in an atmosphere of anger and banter. But to me this is all meaningless froth and bubble, in the frenzied atmosphere of which the real perspective, the national perspective, is either lost or distorted. You cannot bring the actual perspective into focus if you put the telescope under your blind eye. This is what is happening unfortunately in the country today.

There are two schools of thought, contending schools, and they are either blind of one eye, or they suffer from a myopic vision in both their eyes. And a man with jaundiced eyes sees nothing but jaundices everywhere.

The views, for instance, which Dr. Govind Das is reputed to represent on the one hand, and the views of Shri Frank Anthony which are very well known, are diametrically opposed to each other. In their mental approaches and in their psychological attitudes, Dr. Govind Das and Shri Frank Anthony are as apart from each other as the astronauts are from the moon today, and both of them come from Jabalpur!

To me this Bill is an honest attempt by an honest man at effecting a compromise between these two contending schools of thought, these two opposing views, and these two opposing principles.

Shri D. C. Sharma: And an honest man is speaking on the Bill.

Shri Hem Barua: Thank you.

An Hon. Member: At least now you realise it.

Shri Hem Barua: May I say this is a synthesis, a compromise, between Shri Nehru, whose weakness for the English language is proverbial,— it is said that he even dreams in English—who is a “queer mixture of the East and the West,” and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri whose infatuation for the Hindi language is now an open secret. I would say that this is an amalgam of Harrow and Cambridge with Kashi Vidyapith.

True it is that India needs an official language, which breathes of the aroma of her soil, a language through which the people can pulsate and hear the throb of our national life. Why is it that we want an official language of this sort? Is it merely because it gives us national prestige? No. That would mean a sentimental appraisal of national compulsions. True it is that we do not want to be a crow in peacock's feather. But that is not the reason why we want an official language, want an indigenous language as our official language. Has not Israel, whose emergence into Statehood was made possible by the political and financial help that the English-speaking Jews of United Kingdom and United States offered, discarded the English language and made Hebrew the language of Israel?

We have adopted democracy as a keystone of our national life. We must not forget that no country in the world can call itself democratic and free and at the same time conduct its affairs in a language that is foreign to its genius. How can democracy work? How can the massive resurgence of our democratic life fulfil itself if the people are denied an opportunity to communicate their urges and impulses in a language that they can comprehend, in a language that is nearer to their own heart? Our Constitution has given adult franchise and certain Fundamental Rights. How can the mechanism of

it work if our people are isolated from the broad stream of our national life because of the barrier imposed by a language which they do not understand. This is not how democracy works. It is perhaps because of this idea in his mind that Gandhiji said thus in 1947: “Without a national language, Indian independence has no meaning.”

Hindi is accorded the status of an official language in our Constitution. I do not want to reopen that question. Hindi is accorded the status of an official language in the Constitution not because Hindi is better developed than any other regional language, nor because it is rich and copious in its literary wealth, nor because Hindi is an effective weapon of diplomacy, science and technology but because of the fact that this is an Indian language spoken by a solid block of majority and is fairly understood all over the country except in a few parts. Modern Hindi which, I would say, is in the initial stages of development from fourteen dialectical variations is not even 100 years old and from the literary point of view, compared to Tamil or Bengali for instance, Hindi may not be as developed. But we do not accord official status to a language as an award for its literary wealth or merit. What has the man in the street to do with this aspect of things?

Now, this Bill which I described as an honest attempt by our Home Minister, seeks to give some sort of status to the English language. But then, unfortunately, instead of diminishing the apprehensions in the minds of our people, it has intensified them.

15.43 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I will cite them, one by one. The first apprehension is this. Hindi might swamp and swallow the regional languages and retard their dynamic growth. Just as the composite fragrance of a lotus lies in the

[Shri Hem Barua.]

fragrance of the individual petals, the composite strength of India depends on the strength and beauty that the regional languages come to acquire. Therefore, I would say that on no account there should be an attempt made either to devitalise or dissipate the regional languages. I would like very much when the Prime Minister intervenes if he gives an assurance that this will never be done.

The second apprehension is this, English imposes an even and equitable disadvantage on all while Hindi reposes cent per cent advantage on 40 per cent of our population and imposes hundred per cent disadvantage on the rest. It is likely to get reflected in our employment pattern. In spite of our Plans, the unemployment figures in the country are growing. The apprehension is that with Hindi as the official language, the unemployment figures in the Hindi-speaking areas would register a sharp decline—it is a most welcome thing and on the other hand the unemployment figures in non Hindi speaking areas would shoot up into incredible proportions. This problem of language cannot be isolated from the economic problems that are bound to flow out of this piece of legislation. Therefore, I say that the Government must give us an assurance here and now that on no account an imbalance in the employment pattern of our country will be allowed to occur. On no account should an individual be allowed to reap the advantage because of the fact that he is born into a particular language group.

On the top of that, there is a third apprehension the lurking suspicion that there is a concealed plan in the Bill to banish English ultimately from the position that it is allowed to enjoy at present. Personally speaking, I am not worried about that because I do not think that ten years would be sufficient to oust English from our country. English was our official language for full 100 years and the British

powers spared no pains to spread and propagate that language throughout the length and breadth of the country. What was the result? It did not go beyond two per cent. What the English language, itself a language of great charm and power, in spite of the British rulers, could not achieve, Hindi, I am afraid, would not be able to do in the course of another 25 years or so and that too when the responsibility for propagating Hindi is shifted by the Government to the hands of a few zealots who create more problems than solve any.

On the question of English as one of our official languages, I would say that nobody can be happy over the fact that India has to choose or adopt a foreign language as the official language. We who have spearheaded our nationalist struggles cannot dream of it. But then what are the facts behind these things? Nobody can be happy if English remains as the official language. It would be very much happier if Hindi could have been the only official language of our country. May I point out what Sir David Eccles, who was at one time the British Secretary for Education, said recently in Rome? He said that the Indian Prime Minister, in accepting English as an associate official language has accepted defeat at the hands of Britain. But whatever it be defeat or no defeat, what is the way out? This precious unity of our country, this inheritance of rich possessions, cannot be allowed to be destroyed on the altar of division and desertion, because that would mean death and disaster for the nation. (*Interruption*). Though it is utterly unfortunate to think so, may I say that this might lead to further vivisection of our country in defiance of the Anti-secession Law which we do not want. We want to preserve the unity of this country.

Can we afford to do it? Would it not be utter folly and stupidity on our part if we create conditions that might

lead to such a tragic situation in this country? Should we forget that throughout the long corridors of history, India was never a nation? When the Sikhs fought for an empire, they fought for the defence of a Sikh empire. When the Mahrattas fought for an empire, they fought for the defence of a Mahratta empire. Historically, this is a fact. (*Interruption*). You read Panikkar's book. Historically speaking, India is a nation of sub-nationalities. This is the authentic image of India from the view-point of history. Our Prime Minister is a student of history and he also understands that this is the authentic image from the view-point of history.

What have we inherited from the past? If we have inherited anything from the past we have inherited only cultural unity and nothing beyond that. What is the basic essence of this cultural unity? The basic essence of this cultural unity is an inherent respect for multiplicity and diversity. We forget this fact only at our peril. I would say that diversity is India's beauty. Diversity is India's destiny also, and we cannot forget these facts. What have we inherited from the British? If we have inherited anything from the British, we have inherited the administrative unity of our country. They have achieved administrative unity of this country by a uniform pattern of doministration, by a uniform system of education, by common currency, by common means of transport and communication.

What have we inherited from Gandhiji in our national struggle? We have inherited political unity. This is the perspective of the inheritance that is before us. Even at the risk of unpopularity, I would say that this political unity of our country cannot be taken for granted. We have to canalise all our effort and energies to strengthen the political unity of this country so that this political unity can become the beaconlight for all of us.

An Hon. Member: For fighting the Congress also!

Shri Hem Barua: Any negligence on the part of our people or on the part of our Government in this aspect would mean disaster for this country. I would make an appeal to the proponents of Hindi, and I would also say, at the same time, that we very much want Hindi as the sole official language of this country, but, I would appeal to the proponents of Hindi and say, let us, because of this compulsion of history thrown on us by destiny, examine the problem in a very sober manner and come to decision. The decision that is propounded in this piece of legislation, I think, is the right approach to this language problem.

I say that it would have been better if it could have been one language, but, can you ever think of writing off South India, or could you ever think of writing off the non-Hindi speaking area from the Indian map? If we ever think of that, that would be the way to death and not the way to life.

Let us not forget certain things. Let us not forget that there are instances of countries that have more than one national language. We can take the example of some Commonwealth countries. Canada, for instance, has two official languages: one English and the other French. Though the French people are in a minority in Canada the French language enjoys equal status with English there. But let me not be misunderstood. This is a compulsion of history forced on us. What about Ireland? Ireland has two official languages. When the Irish people were engaged in the fight for freedom as we were engaged in the fight for freedom, they announced that only Gaelic should be the official language of Ireland. But after Ireland achieved freedom they gave equal status to the English language with the Gaelic language. I may quote article 4 of the Irish Constitution which says:

"The national language of the Irish Free State is the Irish lan-

[Shri Hem Barua.]

guage, but the English language shall be equally recognized as an Official language."

Here, may I point out that it is "shall" and not "may", and there is no time-limit fixed for the revision and to examine the position of English in that Constitution. I think all genuinely patriotic and right-thinking people would welcome a move on the line adopted by the Irish people in their Constitution over this language issue. I think this Bill seeks to serve this purpose.

I would say that Hindi, if it has to strike deep roots in the country, a thing which we very much desire, must live in a more liberal atmosphere and in a more liberal air. It has to open the doors and windows of its mind. At the same time, it must chisel off some of the psychological edges of aloofness and pedanticism. It is by shedding off these psychological edges that the English language has now become what it is today. I would say that all that seeks to retard the process of dynamic growth so far as Hindi language is concerned must be discarded because I have always thought that a living dynamic language cannot grow and develop in *purdah*. I do not think that Hindi wants to be a static and sterile language.

Hindi must have a common pool of words. Primarily, it might be Sanskrit, as it was Latin and Greek for the English language. But ultimately, it must go beyond that as the English language has gone beyond that. I can cite examples from the English language of words which have been borrowed from different parts of the world. I would say that Hindi must borrow not only from Sanskrit but must borrow words and expressions from different regional languages of our country including Urdu. About Urdu, I think it is only a regional language. It is not the language of a community. It is no use trying to

load a language with archaic words and expressions or with abstruse words and expressions, because that smacks of artificiality, and artificiality is bad.

I remember a story that I read when I was a young man about an English girl. What happened was this. This girl had been to school in a mofussil town. During the holidays she came back home. The next morning she picked up an egg from the breakfast table, held it before her grandmother and said: "Grandmother, take an egg. Make an aperture on the apex and then a corresponding one at the base. Then, if you inhale forcibly or breathe forcibly into it, putting your kissing apparatus on the aperture at the apex, the shell is shattered of its contents." This is what the girl told her grandmother. The grandmother in amazement exclaimed:

"What's the world coming to. Well, when I was gal, I broke the head and sucked." Here is an example of two different styles: one is pedantic and artificial and the other one is simple and exact. I will say the result is the same. Now, I will say, Sir, that any language that modulates its style, as the English girl in her adolescence has done—and you will agree with me when I say that all girls in their adolescence.....

16 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: I won't agree with him in a hurry.

Shri Hem Barua: I am just finishing, Sir. I will say, Sir, that any language that modulates its style, as the English girl in her adolescence has done—and you will agree with me when I say that all girls in their adolescence are vibrant emblems of mental immaturity—then it is bound to be static, staccato and wooden.

I would say that Hindi must outlive this process that throws a bridge between the English girl in adolescence and her grandmother and acquire some of the dynamism and vitality, the

qualities that make any language readily acceptable by the people at large.

I would say, Sir, this is a historic occasion for our country, and let us hope and trust that we shall be able to establish the new resurgence of a new life for the nation driving away or dispelling all shadows of discord and disharmony that haunt the land today.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : (गोपालगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस लेंग्वेज बिल का स्वागत तो करता हूँ लेकिन साथ ही लोगों के मन में कुछ आशंकाएँ हैं जिनके कारण कुछ डर लगता है। मैं उन बातों को यहां कह देना मुनासिब समझता हूँ।

अक्सर कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी फ़ैनेटिक्स इस देश में हिन्दी का नाश कर रहे हैं। मैं नहीं जानता कि हिन्दी फ़ैनेटिक किसको कहते हैं, कौन हिन्दी फ़ैनेटिक हैं। हां मैं एक लेंग्वेज फ़ैनेटिक को जानता हूँ जो अंग्रेजी लेंग्वेज का फ़ैनेटिक है और वह मिस्टर एंथनी हैं। मैं उनको लेंग्वेज फ़ैनेटिक समझता हूँ। वह मुझे ऐसा कहने के लिये माफ़ करेंगे, लेकिन ऐसा कहने के लिये मेरे पास प्रमाण हैं कि उनको फ़ैनेटिक कहा जा सकता है।

जो हिन्दी को राजभाषा के रूप में देखना चाहते हैं वे तो वही बात कहते हैं जिसको संविधान में रखा गया है। उनको फ़ैनेटिक क्यों कहा जाता है। वह तो वही बात कहते हैं जिसको हम संविधान के द्वारा देश को देना चाहते हैं। यदि मैं कहूँ कि देश में सोशल जस्टिस होनी चाहिये तो क्या यह उसको लादना समझा जायेगा। यह तो हमारे संविधान में है। हम तो संविधान की चीजों को मान्यता देना चाहते हैं। चूँकि हिन्दी १५ वर्ष के बाद राजभाषा होने वाली थी इस वास्ते हमने अक्सर इस ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित किया। यह दूसरी बात है

कि गवर्नमेंट ने अपने काम में फेल किया, गवर्नमेंट ने अपना काम ठीक से नहीं किया। और इसी कारण आज यह भाषा का विवाद फिर आ गया है। अगर गवर्नमेंट चाहती कि १५ वर्षों में हिन्दी अधिक से अधिक फैले तो वह ऐसा कर सकती थीं लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने किया नहीं।

जिस समय संविधान में हिन्दी राज्य भाषा रखी गयी उस वक्त किसी पर कोई दबाव नहीं था, इसको न भी माना जा सकता था, या अंग्रेजी या किसी दूसरी भाषा को राज्य भाषा रखा जा सकता था। लेकिन लोगों ने संविधान बनाते समय समझा कि अगर हम को हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट और हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार बनाना है, विदेशों पार्लियामेंट और विदेशों सरकार नहीं बनानी है, तो हमको हिन्दुस्तान की किसी भाषा को राजभाषा रखना जरूरी है और सब बातों को सोच कर ही हिन्दी को राजभाषा का स्थान दिया गया। अब चूँकि सरकार चूक गयी और उसने हिन्दी का काम ठीक से नहीं किया, इसलिये यह विवाद फिर शुरू हो गया।

यह विवाद किस तरफ से आता है। तीन तरह के लोगों की तरफ से यह विवाद आता है। पहले तो वे लोग हैं जो यह चाहते हैं कि इस देश में अंग्रेजी लदी रहे जैसे मिस्टर फ्रेंक एंथनी और उनके दो चार साथी वे लोग समझते हैं कि अंग्रेजी ही यहां की मातृभाषा हो सकती है या मातृ भाषा होनी चाहिये। ये लोग नहीं चाहते कि अंग्रेजी के सिवा देश में किसी और भाषा को चलाया जाये।

लोग साउथ को दोष देते हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि साउथ में कहीं इस बात का विरोध है कि हिन्दी राजभाषा न हो, लेकिन उनकी बात गलत तरह से कही जाती है। हां बंगाल की लैजिसलेटिव असेम्बली के लिए मुझे अफसोस है। बंगला और हिन्दी तो

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

मिली जुली भाषाएँ हैं, उनकी वर्णमाला में बड़ी समानता है। बंगाल का विरोध मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। आप देखेंगे कि दक्षिण के चार राज्यों को जोड़ कर शेष राज्यों जैसे महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, पंजाब, या बंगाल की भाषाओं का स्क्रिप्ट करीब करीब हिन्दी से मिलता जुलता है, थोड़ा सा इधर उधर फर्क है। और अगर आप इन प्रान्तों में से किसी में दस दिन भी रहें तो आप वहाँ की बोलचाल को समझ सकते हैं। केवल दक्षिण के चार राज्यों के लिए यह नहीं कहा जा सकता। दक्षिण की भी चार भाषाओं में से दो भाषाएँ संस्कृत से निकली हैं। उन भाषा वालों को भी हिन्दी की वजह से कोई अधिक कठिनाई नहीं हो सकती।

जो लोग हिन्दी को नहीं चाहते वे तरह तरह की बातें करने लगते हैं। पार्लियामेंट की आफिशियल लेंग्वेज कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है उसमें मैं ने प्रॉफ एंथनी साहब का नोट आफ डिस्सेंट पढ़ा है। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि श्री एंथनी जैसे विद्वान आदमी का दिमाग इस प्रकार की गलत बातों की ओर कैसे चला गया। उन्होंने गलत बातें रहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दी जानने वाले आधा परसेंट हैं और अंग्रेजी जानने वालों से हिन्दी जानने वाले कम हैं। मुझे यह देख कर ताज्जुब हुआ कि अपने आरग्यूमेंट को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए किस तरह आदमी का दिमाग कलड़ हो जाता है। उन्होंने कहा कि दिल्ली म्युनिसिपैलिटी ने यह प्रस्ताव पास किया कि उर्दू को न रखा जाए और हिन्दी को रखा जाए और इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने लिखा है :

"Hindi imperialism is making it increasingly impossible for linguistic minorities to live with self-respect in the Hindi speaking States. The latest expression of this hatred against Urdu is a recent decision of the Delhi Corporation Language Committee

that the Hindi official vocabulary must ensure that ultimately no Urdu word is used."

यह एकदम गलत बात है। ऐसा कोई निर्णय नहीं किया गया लेकिन अपने आरग्यूमेंट को पृष्ठ करने के लिए उन्होंने यह बात लिख दी यदि आप उनका समूचा नोट आफ डिस्सेंट पढ़ें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि किस प्रकार उन्होंने हिन्दी और नान-हिन्दी वालों को लड़ाने के लिए तर्क दिए हैं। मेरे पास समय नहीं है कि मैं वह सारा नोट पढ़ कर सुना सकूँ लेकिन आप पढ़ें तो देखेंगे कि यह देश के लोगों को लड़ाने के लिए लिखा गया है। एक तो इस प्रकार के लोग भी हैं जो कि हिन्दी को नहीं चाहते।

दूसरे लोग जो हिन्दी नहीं चाहते वे वे लोग हैं जो कि समझते हैं कि आज हिन्दो को लाना प्रैक्टिकल नहीं है। मैं उनकी इज्जत करता हूँ। मैं उनकी बात मानता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब हिन्दी को हम लोग राज भाषा हिन्दी प्रांतों में नहीं बना सके, वहाँ उन लोगों को डिफिकल्टीज हुई और सब काम वहाँ हिन्दी में नहीं कर सकते हैं तो उन प्रांतों में जहाँ कि हिन्दी मातृभाषा नहीं है उन में तो और दिक्कत होंगी। इसलिए जो प्रांत हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं और जो अंग्रेजी में बराबर काम करते आये हैं उन लोगों के लिए छूट होनी चाहिए। इसलिए संविधान ने १५ साल का समय दिया था। १५ साल का समय इसलिए दिया गया था कि यदि ५ वर्ष का भी लड़का हो और वह हिन्दी पढ़ना शुरू करे तो वह भी १५ वर्ष के भीतर हिन्दी अच्छी तरह से पढ़ सकता है और वह सरकारी काम काज हिन्दी में भली प्रकार कर सकता है। १५ वर्ष का समय जो संविधान में रक्खा गया था वह फिजूल में ही नहीं रक्खा गया था। जो लड़के अभी पाठ्यक्रम शुरू करते हैं, जो अभी हिन्दी की क, ख, ग, घ शुरू करेंगे, उनको हिन्दी पढ़ाई जाय तो वह १५ वर्ष में हिन्दी का समुचित ज्ञान हासिल कर सकते हैं

जिससे कि हिन्दी में वे अपना काम काज कर सकें। हिन्दी के शिक्षण और प्रसार के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अवहेलना बर्ती और राज्य सरकारों ने भी उस की अवहेलना की और इस तरह अधिक ध्यान नहीं दिया। इसलिए मैं उन की दिक्कत को समझता हूँ और आज वस्तुस्थिति यह है कि अभी कुछ दिन और अंग्रेजी को हमें चलाना चाहिए।

हिन्दी का विरोध वे लोग भी करते हैं जो कि नौकरियों में बैठे हुए हैं या जिनको कि नौकरियों की फिक्र है। राजा जी ने तो साफ़ कहा था कि हिन्दी के आजाने से दक्षिण के लोगों की नौकरियों में कम जगह मिलेगी। मैं मानता हूँ कि उन की आशंका किसी हद तक सही हो सकती है। गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की सर्विसेज को उठा कर देखें तो मालूम होगा कि दक्षिण के लोग उस में बहुत अधिक हैं। वे इसलिए अधिक हैं कि वे हम लोगों से अंग्रेजी ज्यादा जानते हैं। चूंकि कलकत्ते, मद्रास वगैरह में अंग्रेज पहले आये, उन का पहले अंग्रेजों से टच हुआ, कुछ अंग्रेजी ज्यादा सीख गये। इसलिए जब अंग्रेजी में परीक्षा होती है तो नेचुरली उनको ज्यादा जगह मिलती है। हम को कोई ग़ज़ नहीं कि उनको ज्यादा जगहें क्यों मिलती हैं। लेकिन जो महज़ नौकरियों की बिना पर हिन्दी को अपोज़ करते हैं वे देश के साथ घात करते हैं। यदि यह मनोवृत्ति है तो आप कोटा सिस्टम कर दीजिये कि इतनी जगहें अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोगों के लिए सुरक्षित रहेंगी। हिन्दी का पेपर कम्पलसरी हो, अंग्रेजी भी हो लेकिन जो अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोग हैं उन की नौकरियां इस क़दर सुरक्षित रहेंगी। आप भले ही वर्तमान आंकड़ों पर यह व्यवस्था कर दीजिये, मुझे कोई उज़्र नहीं होगा लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि इस तरह जो कि नौकरियों के कारण हिन्दी का विरोध करना चाहते हैं, उनका विरोध इस तरह से ही ख़त्म हो जाय।

हिन्दी का विरोध वह लोग भी करते हैं जो कि समझते हैं कि अंग्रेजी हट जाने से हमारी मिलिकियत छिन जायेगी। जो डोमिनेशन उन्होंने लोगों पर किया हुआ है वह हट जायेगा और उनकी मिलिकियत छिन जायेगी इस तरह के ही लोग उसका विरोध करते हैं। अब किया क्या जाय? विल ठीक है लेकिन विल में एग गलत बात यह है कि उस में टाइम लिमिट फ़िक्स नहीं किया जा रहा है। मेरा तो कहना है कि आज जो लड़के जन्म लेते हैं उनको यदि आप हिन्दी पढ़ाने की कोशिश कीजिये तो २० वर्ष के बाद सब लोग अच्छे तरीके से हिन्दी पढ़ सकेंगे। इसलिए हिन्दी के लिए २० वर्ष की लिमिट कर दी जाय तो भी ठीक रहेगा। आप इस को अनिश्चित काल के लिए छोड़ देते हैं यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं नहीं कहता कि जो लोग हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं उन पर यह लादी जाय लेकिन यदि मन हो तो वे इसे आसानी से सीख सकते हैं। यदि उन के मन में हो कि हिन्दी राज भाषा हो तो आप इसके लिए कोई टाइम लिमिट २० वर्ष आदि की रख सकते हैं। इस तरह की व्यवस्था रटने से आज जो जन्म लेने वाला बालक है वह भी २० वर्ष बाद हिन्दी पढ़ जायेगा और तब हिन्दी लागू कर दी जाय। इसलिए मेरा विचार है कि हिन्दी लागू करने के लिए एक टाइम लिमिट फ़िक्स करना ज़रूरी होता है।

मैं एक दूसरा सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। हमारी १४ राष्ट्रभाषाओं में १२, १३ राष्ट्रभाषाएं ऐसी हैं जो कि संस्कृत से निकली हुई हैं और जिनकी कि स्क्रिप्ट को छोड़ कर फोनोटिकस और ऐलफबेट एक है। उन की एक स्क्रिप्ट बना दीजिये। एक स्क्रिप्ट सारे देश के लिए बना दीजिये तो सब लोग सब लैंग्वेज पढ़ लेंगे

एक माननीय सदस्य : रोमन स्क्रिप्ट कर दीजिये।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : आप देश के बाहर की चीज को ही कौंकें राष्ट्रीय भावना

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

आप में पनपी नहीं है इसलिए आपको रोमन स्क्रिप्ट करने को बात सूझती है। जो चीज हिन्दुस्तान की नहीं है उसको लेने की बात आप करते हैं।

मैं तो कहूंगा कि यह जितनी भी संस्कृत से निकली हुई भाषाएं हैं उन की एक स्क्रिप्ट तयार कर दीजिये। मैं इस के लिए यह भी मान लूंगा कि हिन्दी में जरा इसके लिए इधर उधर चेंज करना होता वह भी करना मान लिया जाय। सब की एक स्क्रिप्ट कर देने से ही सब भाषाओं की समस्या किसी हद तक हल हो जायेगी और इस तरह लोग सभी भाषाएं पढ़ सकते हैं।

जैसा मैं ने कहा नौकरियों में एक परसेंटेज रख दिया जाय नहीं तो यह काम चलने वाला नहीं है। आज जितने माननीय सदस्यों ने इस डिबेट में हिस्सा लिया है सबों की इस बारे में एक राय है। कि हमारी एक राज भाषा होनी चाहिए। इस बारे में एक राय है। अभी श्री एन्थोनी नहीं बोले हैं संभव है उनकी दूसरी राय हो...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं अभी श्री एन्थोनी को बुलाने वाला हूँ।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : अभी तक जिन लोगों ने हिस्सा लिया उन सभी लोगों ने यह कहा है कि एक राज भाषा होनी चाहिए और वह भाषा हिन्दी ही हो सकती है। मैं तो यहाँ तक आगे जाने वाला हूँ कि अगर्चे हिन्दी से आप लोगों को कोई नफ़रत हो तो उसके स्थान पर कोई दूसरी राजभाषा बना दीजिये लेकिन कोई भारतवर्ष की ही मातृभाषा राजभाषा बनाइये। किसी भी मूरत में इस देश की राज भाषा अंग्रेजी नहीं होनी चाहिए।

दूनरे डी० एम० के० पार्टी के लोगों को हिन्दी से चिढ़ है। अब उनको भारतवर्ष से ही चिढ़ है और वे हिन्दुस्तान से अलग होना चाहते हैं इसलिए उनकी बात मैं नहीं कहना चाहता।

इसलिए उनके विरोध को मैं कोई विरोध नहीं समझता लेकिन जो लोग हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्रीयता में विश्वास करते हैं हिन्दुस्तान की एकता में विश्वास करते हैं उन के लिए मैं कहूंगा कि आप सब मिल कर बैठिये और भाषा की समस्या पर शांतिपूर्वक विचार विमर्श कीजिये। अगर यहाँ की राज भाषा हिन्दी नहीं होनी है तो उसके स्थान पर कोई दूसरी देशी मातृभाषा राज भाषा बना दीजिये लेकिन अंग्रेजी को इस देश में राज भाषा नहीं रहना चाहिए।

Shri Frank Anthony: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a good deal has been said which, I feel, has little relevance to the Bill as such and I would not have digressed at all but for one or two specific references to me. The hon. Speaker who preceded me referred to me as some kind of a fanatic and to some kind of wrong figures that I had given in my minute of dissent to the Parliamentary Language Committee's Report. May I pause just for a minute to answer that?

I do not know what my hon. friend's background is, but I can officially point to certain hostages to my *bona fides* in this matter. My hon. friend, Shri Bhattacharyya, reminded me yesterday saying, "You were the only person who proposed that Hindi should be the national language of India in the Constituent Assembly". I went further. I said, "It should be taught to everybody as the medium of instruction from the 5th class". Why did I do it? Was it because I was an English fanatic? No. It was because I believed then that a language must, by an evolutionary process, commend itself to the country. But during the years what has been my bitter personal experience? I had asked for Hindustani. I went to the hon. Prime Minister. I said, "You invoke Gandhiji's name when it suits you, but when it does not suit you, you repudiate him. Why do you not

put Hindustan?" He did not think much about it.... (*Interruption*).

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Can he let me know the difference between Hindi and Hindustani?

Shri Frank Anthony: He asked, "What is the difference between Hindi and Hindustani?" I said, "You will see the difference." Gandhiji with his unerring instinct knew that it would be a neutral language. Hindi will become the vehicle of communalism which will be seized upon by Hindu communalists and it will become a symbol of oppression of the minorities.

An Hon. Member: Totally wrong.

Shri Frank Anthony: It would become a symbol of linguistic genocide for the minority communities.... (*Interruption*). And what has happened? I am only answering why I am bitter. Of course, I am bitter. I have had to go to the courts and spend thousands and thousands in order to prevent.... (*Interruption*).

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): Hindi has been accepted.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am answering this charge of fanaticism and why I have become a fanatic..... (*Interruption*).

An Hon. Member: On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): May I understand the meaning of the word 'genocide'? It has got a very bad odour all over the world. In what sense is he using that word?

Shri Kapur Singh: Is there a point of order if he does not know the meaning?

Shri R. S. Pandey: On a point of order, Sir. I do not mind if the hon. Member wants to criticize Hindi. He has got every right to do so; he has the privilege to criticize Hindi. But

giving this impression that those people who are talking in favour of Hindi are pro-Hindu or that they are suffering from any complex of Hindi or communalism is absolutely wrong because it has been accepted in the Constitution which he says.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Now, probably he thought, he apprehended, and probably rightly, that he might not get the opportunity. Therefore, he wanted to speak. Otherwise, where is the point of order?

Shri Frank Anthony: I would not have started on this note. But one of my misguided Hindi friends accused me of being a fanatic. I was only answering that.... (*Interruption*).

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I object to this. He says, misguided Hindi friend.... (*Interruption*). I have never used that (*Interruption*). You are a misguided. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Frank Anthony: You were not in the Chair, Sir. I had to put up with this pre-concerted heckling from the Hindi fanatics.... (*Interruptions*).

Some Hon. Members: No, Sir. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Even if certain things are not liked by us, we have to hear them and with patience. Let us show that toleration.

Shri A. P. Sharma: That Hindi represents communalism is wrong. He said that in the official language report also.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He says, he had represented it to the Prime Minister. He is trying to explain it. He says, he is being called fanatic. But I will ask him to exercise greater restraint.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am only answering this.

Shri J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar): The framers of the Constitution were not fanatics.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not want to canvass further our *bona fides*. I will go straightway to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: That will be better.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have asked for the circulation of the Bill for several reasons. In the first place, whatever Government's claims may be—claim by the Home Minister or even by the Prime Minister—I feel that in this matter, in the framing of this Bill they have definitely functioned in an atmosphere of unreality. Psychologically, and even physically, they have been under pressure from the Hindi chauvinists. Delhi is a stronghold of Hindi chauvinists. I say this. One of my friends talked about the resolution from the Delhi Corporation. I say, I saw that not in one but in several papers—let that go. But on this issue which for the non-Hindi speaking people who represent 80 per cent of the population.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Question not 80 per cent.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I just say this in one line. The greatest political canard that has been perpetrated in the Republican India is that 40 per cent of the people are Hindi-knowing—the greatest political canard. The last 1951 census was deliberately inflated. Not only whole dialects which have nothing to do with Hindi. (*Interruption*). Let me argue that. Whole dialects which have nothing to do with Hindi have been included in Hindi census and even languages, Urdu, Punjabi and, as my friend Dr. Singhvi said, Rajasthani have all been included, filched to make Hindi into 42 per cent. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee who is a great indologist and who has written many better books in Hindi than many Hindi protagonist friends has said, "What is the Hindi today?" He said, "As far as I

can see it, what they are trying to erect into. The language of India is merely a dialect which came into existence only recently since about 1850". —but let that go. As I was saying, Government had no rapport in a matter which has been emotional significance for the majority of the people of India, with the non-Hindi speaking people. As I said, there have been unremitting psychological and even physical pressures from the Hindi chauvinists because they have been functioning from Delhi. You, Sir, were the victim of what happened the other day here. What was it?

An Hon. Member: You were treated well.

Shri Frank Anthony: What was it? Even at the introduction of the Bill there was an orchestrated.... (*Interruption*). May I say it was orchestrated with the typical expressions of Hindi chauvinism today. The exhibition to my mind was not only unspeakably disgraceful, it was an exhibition of crudity and vulgarity which anybody who attempts to stand up to the dictat of Hindi chauvinism has to put up with—sheer vulgarity and crudity that was unspeakably disgraceful to the House. (*Interruption*).

Who has had the opportunity among the Governments—I want an answer from the Home Minister—of the non-Hindi States to study it? I have a lot of friends among even Hindi-speaking Congress people, many close friends. One of them told me this. He said, he asked Kamaraj Nadar, what is your opinion about the Bill and he said, how can I give an opinion about the Bill, I have some vague idea about it. Another Bengali friend came to me. I asked, what is P. C. Sen doing? He said he had not the foggiest notion about it. I get all kinds of telegrams and letters from numerous legislators from Bengal and Madras asking me to send them copies. They said, we are in complete ignorance of this Bill, what is it all about.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It was published in the *Hindu* paper.

Shri Raghunath Singh: In the Gazette also it was published. He should not say that.

Shri Frank Anthony: How many hours had they to study it? That is my point. Why am I asking for circulation? I would have thought that at least ordinary courtesy, democratic decency would have required that a Bill of far-reaching implications, a Bill which affects the whole country, which affects intimately the non-Hindi States, would have been referred to the legislatures. Allow them to study it. Why this desperate hurry to dush it through? That is why I have asked for circulation. I say, this is a measure of the contempt of the Hindi chauvinists for the non-Hindi-speaking people. Time is not given to their Governments, much less to their legislatures to study a measure which affects them vitally and intimately.

What is the plea? I say, the plea will be taken, the plea has been taken that postponement will mean a concession to Hindi agitation. May I say with great respect that this is a palpably disingenious plea. I know what the Hindi chauvinists want. They want to put it off completely indefinitely until there is the demission not only of Nehru, but also of my good friend Lal Bahadur Shastri. Because, they feel that with the demission of Jawaharlal Nehru, they will be able, by a Cabinet dominated by Hindi protagonists, to wreak their Hindi chauvinistic will on the non-Hindi-speaking people. They want to postpone it indefinitely.

Some Hon. Members No, no.
(*Interruption*).

Shri Farnk Anthony: All these protestations only prove what I am saying. But, I have not asked for postponement indefinitely. I have only

said, postpone it till the next session, the Monsoon session or at the most till the winter session. Am I asking too much? The Government appears to be absolutely adamant. In spite of all the professions about consulting non-Hindi people, they do not want to give them any time to study this Bill. They have not given them time.

I say that it is necessary for some of the Members who were not here to know something of the background from which this Bill has emerged. Some Members may recall the debate in August 1959 on my Resolution that English should be included in the VIII Schedule. What happened? Today, there is not so much heckling. But at that time, there was concerted, pre-concerted heckling. The atmosphere was foul, befouled; it was hate-filled. Fortunately, the Prime Minister was there. He realised that it was potential for complete disaster to the country—this hate-filled atmosphere. He said, I am going to intervene. On the 7th of August, he intervened. I say this, I said it then as a tribute to the Prime Minister, fortunately he had the vision to see through that cloud of bitterness, of hatred, of recrimination. He saw through it. He made what I hailed as a statesmanlike, memorable assurance. I say it was an assurance, it was acclaimed as an assurance, as a solemn assurance to the non-Hindi-speaking people. It was an assurance which brought a balm, a healing touch to a problem which could very well have destroyed this country. It was hailed by us as a categorical assurance. This was what he said. I am only reading the concluding sentence of the Prime Minister's assurance.

"So, I would have it as an alternate language as long as people require it and the decision for that, I would leave not to the Hindi-knowing people but to the non-Hindi knowing people."

[Shri Frank Anthony]

In September 1959, about a month after, the then Home Minister Pantji, whom I regarded with great respect and even affection, placed the report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Table of the House. What did I do? I do not know whether you were there in the House at that time or you were in the Chair. I sought merely to move an amendment to the consideration. Did you see what happened? The whole Hindi phalanx shouted me down. Why? Because, I was merely seeking an amendment to concretise the Prime Minister's assurance. I know they do not like some of my expressions. They need not accept them if they do not fit them. I knew the Hindi megalomaniacs never had the remotest intention of honouring the Prime Minister's assurance, that the megalomaniacs inside the party never had the remotest intention of honouring the Prime Minister's assurance. I know that they not only hated Jawaharlal Nehru...

Several Hon Members That is wrong. He should withdraw it.

Shri Frank Anthony: All right; they did not hate Jawaharlal Nehru, but what they hated was Jawaharlal Nehru's formula. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I request you to kindly ask him to withdraw these words. These are remarks made against the Members here. These are false and malicious statements made by him.

Shri Frank Anthony: They hated Jawaharlal Nehru's formula; they loved him; they loved Jawaharlal Nehru. I concede that. But they hated the Jawaharlal Nehru formula. Not one of them had the courage to say 'Boo' to Jawaharlal Nehru to his face. All their efforts have been concentrated behind the scenes, not only to dilute this assurance but deliberately to sabotage it.

I shall give you something of the inside story, because I know what the inside story is. My hon. friend Dr. Govind Das is not here. He was among the principal hecklers, and I got a little angry at that time. Today, I am not angry, but I am only a little heated. What did I say? Dr. Govind Das was heckling me. I said 'I withdraw my minute of dissent repudiating Hindi, in the specific terms of the assurance given by Jawaharlal Nehru.' And I told him, 'Get up, and say that you endorse Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance, and I shall sit down.' He said 'We do'. So much for his profession at that time. I do not know whether he endorsed the assurance today. But those were his exact words. Dr. Govind Das said 'We said so'.

When the Home Minister introduced this report and made a speech, I charged him, I charged him with the deliberate omission to make any reference to the Jawaharlal Nehru assurance. And then, what happened? The Prime Minister, appreciating the genuine revival of fears among the non-Hindi-speaking people—once again intervened. That was on the 4th September. And this was what he said:

"Whatever I said then...."
—that was on my resolution—

"...of course, I hold by it completely."

In spite of Jawaharlal Nehru's repeated assurances, the Hindi protagonists have never accepted that assurance. What happened then? You may remember that the introduction of this Bill was promised some time ago. There was repeated postponement of that promised introduction. What happened during the incubation period? A senior member of the Congress Party, a very well-meaning member of the Congress Party came to me and said 'the Hindi people are agitated; will you accept some kind of a compromise on the Prime Minister's formula?'. I said;

'Who am I? It is the Prime Minister's formula given as a sacred assurance to the non-Hindi-speaking people. Who am I to accept a compromise?'. From that time onwards, for three or four months, there was this unremitting canvassing and feverish pressure brought to bear on the Home Minister the whole time. And what was proposed to me?

They said that they were against the words 'alternate' and 'associate', because they were a little too-far-reaching. And they said 'Accept 'secondary' or 'additional'. that was one suggestion. What was the other suggestion? They did not like the indefinite period in the Jawaharlal Nehru formula. And they said 'Would you not accept five years or ten years?'. Then, worst of all, they said 'We do not like the assurance that the matter should be left to the non-Hindi-speaking people.'. I do not know what happened.

Shastriji was under no obligation to consult me. I thought that he might, though I am not a member of his party. But he did not see fit even to discuss the matter with me. But then, the Bill was suddenly produced before the House. And I say this that when I read it, I was utterly horrified. Everything in it gave me an idea of the measure of the irresistible political dominance of the Hindi phalaini in the Congress Party. Every thing that they wanted they got in the Bill. Everything that was proposed to me by way of a compromise they got. And Shastriji, the good man that he is, necessarily has his predilections, because Hindi is his mother-tongue.

Shri Raghunath Singh: As English is my hon. friend's mother-tongue.

Shri Frank Anthony: Therefore, this pretence of objectivity is of no use I cannot be objective with regard to English. Shastriji cannot be objective with regard to his mother-tongue Hindi. None of us can be objective with regard to our mother-tongues.

378(Ai) LSD—8.

We are all products of a matrix, and the most powerful ingredient of that matrix is the month-tongue with which we have been nurtured. So, he cannot be so, I am saying, the good man that he is.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: On a point of order.

Shri Frank Anthony: I hope, Sir, that you would not take away all this time from the time allotted to me.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): My point of order is this. The hon. Member just now sought to give the impression to the House that a Member on behalf of the Congress Party approached him for some sort of formula or some agreement. Will the hon. Member make it clear whether the Member came to him from the Congress Party with full authority of his party or it was an approach to him by an individual member? I say this because this is a wrong impression that he has conveyed to the House.

Shri Frank Anthony: He was a well-meaning Member with no pretence of coming on behalf of the Party. He merely said, 'I am trying to get a compromise. This is what the Hindi people want. They say if you meet them halfway, we will have a compromise'.

I have said that everything they were seeking was ultimately embodied in the Bill. The tragedy has been this. They have got everything they wanted. But I say this: Hindi imperialism's—like all neo-imperialisms—appetite grows with feeding. The appetite of Hindi imperialism grows with feeding.... (Interruptions). One man cannot impose a language. If English is to be accepted, people will accept it because they realise when they compare it with Hindi, that the study of Hindi is a sheer waste of time.... (Interruptions). That is the only reason for it. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I continue with my arguments? Look at the disingenuous, tortuous, arguments that are being sought to hoodwink the submissive, gullible, non-Hindi people.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma (Khammam): On a point of information.

Shri Frank Anthony: I submit my time should not be curtailed owing to these interruptions.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: I would like to know from the hon. Member whether he is hailing from any non-Hindi area so much so that he is championing the cause of the non-Hindi speaking people.

Shri Frank Anthony: It is hardly a point of order.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I have a point of order. As you know, I rarely get up on points of order.

Let us have some kind of parliamentary language. The hon. Member has said in regard to the Home Minister the words 'pretence of objectivity.' Now, this is a very dishonest way of making a statement. Can one hon. Member cast a reflection on another by saying 'pretence of objectivity'. I want your ruling on the matter.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I make it clear? I have said that about myself also.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is how I understood it—he said that we cannot have any objective assessment. He mentioned himself also in that.

Shri Frank Anthony: Yes. He did not understand it.

Shri Joachim Alva: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar (Hoshiarpur): Can a Member abuse himself and then abuse another?

Shri Joachim Alva: It is very dishonest to say 'pretence of objectivity' about another hon. Member. It is a reflection on that hon. Member. Every Member has equal right in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If he uttered that for himself also, I cannot take exception to it.

Shri A. N. Vidyalankar: Could a Member abuse himself and then abuse others?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think I can interfere at this stage with anything that he has said. He may continue.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय अगर कोई विरोधी सदस्य अपने को गाली दे तो क्या उसको यह अधिकार मिल जाता है कि वह दूसरों को भी गाली दे ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Frank Anthony: Ten minutes have gone in interruptions.

Shri Tyagi: The satires and pungency of the speech of my hon. friend should not be misunderstood. He is after all at heart a good gentleman.

Shri Frank Anthony: Ah. Thank you.

I was indicating some of the pleas by the Hindi protagonists against this formula. One plea is that this was not an assurance, that those of us who understood it specifically either did not understand English or did not understand the Prime Minister, that even the newspapers which highlighted it as a categorical assurance apparently were benighted newspapers. This is how even the *Times of India*, which is rather anti-English, reported in its issue of 5-9-1959: "Associate Status for English—P. M. Reiterates Stand".

And then one other ground is that the Prime Minister himself was rather confused, he probably did not know what he meant then; they even suggested that he might not know even

now what he meant then. I feel that is very unfair to the Prime Minister, because in a letter written to Shri Sampath and released in the papers on 4-8-1960—we may be a little ambivalent speaking in this House; by nature politicians are inclined to be a little tortuous and ambiguous, but when they write they are not so ambivalent—this is what the Prime Minister said, and it is in inverted commas:

“There has been no occasion at any time for our Government to go back in any way on the assurance I gave in the Lok Sabha with regard to the language question.”

It means that he gave an assurance, and that it was an assurance. This rather disingenuous plea that it was not an assurance has been met by the Prime Minister.

Another argument is this. Apparently it may apply to Hindi phraseology that an assurance is not mandatory; in Hindi “may” may mean “may not”. I do not know. But they say that by this assurance to the non-Hindi speaking people the Prime Minister meant “may”, he even meant “may not”. I say it is a travesty of the English language.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: The hon. Member has been attributing motives, making scurrilous attacks, trying to sow the seeds of discord, disunion and all this. He has been holding this Member said this, that Member said that, against those who cannot refute it. What is this type of speech that is going on?

Mr. Speaker: That is all right.

Shri Frank Anthony: As I say, it will probably be argued that “may” in the context means “shall”. I would say this, whether it is scurrility or anything else, for anyone to contend that “may” in the context of article 343 from which the Bill emerges, in the specific context of the language of this Bill, means “shall” is the ultimate

in political chicanery. When I deal with clause 3 I shall show. . . .

Shri Tyagi: Chicanery?

Shri Frank Anthony: Political chicanery, sheer political chicanery for anyone to suggest that.

Shri Tyagi: It is a rather hard word.

Shri Frank Anthony: Yes, sheer political chicanery.

I say in fact the Bill should have been a simple one line measure if it was intended straightforwardly, honestly, to implement the Prime Minister's assurance. It could have been in this form: “English shall be the associate alternative language”. We need not have put a time limit to it. Parliament can always revoke it. I am giving notices of amendments. If they wanted to implement the Prime Minister's assurance that it should have been left to the non-Hindi speaking States, what was the difficulty in saying that it shall be the alternate language until otherwise decided by the non-Hindi speaking legislatures? That was the assurance. Or, if they are not prepared to trust the non-Hindi speaking legislatures, it could be until otherwise decided by three-fourths of the Members of each House respectively, ensuring that the Hindi protagonists would not be able to overrun the non-Hindi speaking people by a simple majority. If there was a will—but there never was any will—to implement the Prime Minister's assurance, it could have been a simple two line Bill. Instead, opportunity has been taken by forms of insidious methods to make this Bill in fact an instrument for blanket imposition of Hindi.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: On a point of order, Sir. Again, a charge is made against the Home Minister.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am not charging anyone. I am making a statement of fact. That is the difference. English is susceptible of such nuances of meaning.

Mr. Speaker: That is my difficulty also, because I cannot understand the whole significance of those adjectives that he has been using.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I say this? They may be a little fierce but they are the choicest of parliamentary invective.

Mr. Speaker: Even if they be parliamentary and permissible, even then it should be dignified. . . . *(Interruptions.)*

Shri Kapur Singh: If a word is parliamentary, there should be no further restriction, whether it is dignified or not.

Mr. Speaker: It is contained in our rules. Besides being parliamentary they should not be indecent or undignified. It is in our own rules. . . . *(Interruptions.)*

Shri Badrujuja: Sir, on a point of order. Can a parliamentary expression be undignified?

Mr. Speaker: When we take parliamentary words, we often borrow them from the English House of Commons. But here there are circumstances where the same words might not look dignified. Therefore, we have to develop our own conventions.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am a little sorry.

Mr. Speaker: He has been using too strong adjectives.

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg to submit that though it may partake of the character of invective, if it is refined, it can never be undignified. Perhaps it is lack of understanding on the part of some people *(Interruptions.)*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I do not see any harm if Mr. Anthony claims that he has better knowledge of English. I at least admit that I have lack of understanding so far as the adjectives that he has used. . . . *(Interruptions.)* Order, order. I cannot

very well appreciate the many adjectives of his. Therefore, if I confess there was lack of understanding on my part, there would be no harm. Even the others should not take so much objection to that.

Shri Tyagi: He has only displayed how comparatively bitter the English language is. That is all. . . . *(Interruptions.)*

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, I will need ten minutes more. All through I have been interrupted. I have spoken for about twenty minutes.

Mr. Speaker: My difficulty is that when a Member chooses to use such a language which is interrupted so much, then interruptions also should form part of the speech.

Shri Frank Anthony: It is a little unfortunate. I do not want to impute motives but I anticipated these interruptions.

Mr. Speaker: He may take five more minutes.

Shri Frank Anthony: Look at the blanket imposition.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There can be no point of order now.

Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma: If the hon. Member presumes that our understanding is much less, then he should all the more be careful to speak in a language which is more understandable and clear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have every regard for the hon. lady Member. But she frequently resorts to these points of order.

Shri Frank Anthony: Look at the blanket imposition, Sir. English may

or may not be an additional language. The expression used is 'in addition to Hindi'. I wonder if my non-Hindi speaking friends have understood this. Here is an instrument in this expression for the blanket imposition of Hindi from 1965. The expression 'in addition to Hindi' postulates essentially that English may be used only in addition for official purposes. So that from 1965 for all official purposes, Hindi shall be used. That is what the expression 'in addition to' means. That is the simple meaning. I shall show you how the Parliamentary Language Committee functioned behind closed doors: how it was regimented. I shall have something rather bitter to say about how it functioned. Even that Parliamentary Committee, regimented though it was, did not go so far. They said categorically that after 1965 even Hindi may not be sufficiently developed and it would not be sufficiently developed for all the official purposes. But this expression, "in addition to" will be used—(Interruption). I know my hon. friend is a good friend; I trust him. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru is a better person, but they will be demitting the scene in ten years. What is the good of their assurances? Some body will go to the courts, and the then Cabinet, weighted by my hon. friends like Shri Satya Narayan Sinha with his natural predilection for Hindi, will say that "in addition to" means Hindi shall be used for all the official purposes of the Union. Why does clause 4 come in? Clause 4 is a deliberate snare.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Satya Narayan Sinha has all along been silent. Why should be drawn into this? (Interruption).

Shri Frank Anthony: Clause 4 is a deliberate snare. My hon. friend the Home Minister may say that clause 4 provides for the progressive use of Hindi. I say that it is otiose. Clause 3 provides for the blanket use of Hindi. Clause 4 is otiose. But clause 4 is a disguised instrument for the replacement of English after 10 years. It is not meant for the progressive use

of Hindi. Clause 3 provides for the blanket imposition of Hindi from 1965. Clause 4 is just a snare.

Clauses 6 and 7 refer to the State legislatures—the imposition of Hindi translations. As I said, ordinary elementary courtesy required a reference at least to the State legislatures before it was imposed on them. I would still ask the Home Minister: what will happen if the matter is deferred even till the winter session?

श्री यशपाल सिंह अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बिल्कुल शिकायत नहीं है कि हमारे एथनी साहब हिन्दी के खिलाफ हैं। वह नामिनेटड मेम्बर हैं और इसलिए उन के आइडियाज़ भी नामिनेटड हैं। मैं इतनी दरखास्त जरूर करूंगा कि भाषा एक अहम विषय है और इस पर कम से कम मुझे आधा घंटा दिया जाये। यह हिन्दुस्तान के ४४ करोड़ इन्सानों की जिन्दगी और मौत का सवाल है।

मैं अपने माननीय गृह मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिए बिल्कुल मुबारकबाद नहीं दे सकता कि वह इस वक्त इस बिल को लाए। अगर माननीय गृह मंत्री जी चाहते तो १५ साल की अवधि में देश का एक एक बच्चा हिन्दी सीख सकता था। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि मुझ जैसे मंद बुद्धि आदमी को अगर माननीय गृह मंत्री जी गुरु बन कर लैटिन, फ्रेंच, अरबी, फारसी आदि किसी भी भाषा की शिक्षा दें तो मैं ६ महीने में उस जवान को सीख सकता हूँ। और अगर ऐसा न कर सकते तो मुझे यहाँ से निकाल बाहर कर दिया जाये। तो जब मेरे जैसा मंद बुद्धि सीख सकता है तो क्या गृह मंत्री जी के आई० सी० एम०, आई० ए० एस० और पी० सी० एस० अफसर हिन्दी नहीं सीख सकते थे। यह गवर्नमेंट का कुसूर है कि उस ने ऐसा नहीं किया, और जब वजाय अपने कुसूर के लिए पश्चात्ताप करने के वह यह बिल लाये हैं जिस को कि इस समय

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

पर लाना बिल्कुल नामुनासिब है। इस को आज सिर्फ इसलिए लाया गया है कि जनता सरकार से यह न पूछे कि डिफेंस में क्या हो रहा है और उधर से अग्नी दृष्टि हटा कर भाषा के प्रश्न की ओर लगा ले। और इस प्रकार भाषा के मसले में उलझ जाय। यह देश की आजादी का सवाल है। मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में आयरलैंड के नेता श्री डिवेलरा का एक कथन याद आता है। उन्होंने न कहा था कि अगर तराजू के एक पलड़े में मेरे देश आयरलैंड की आजादी हो और दूसरे पलड़े में मेरी मातृभाषा हो तो मैं उस पलड़े की ओर झुकूंगा जिस में मेरी मातृभाषा है न कि उस पलड़े की तरफ जिस में कि मेरे देश की आजादी है, क्योंकि मेरी मातृ-भाषा कायम रहेगी तो देश की आजादी भी वापस आ जायगी, अगर मेरी मातृभाषा कायम नहीं रही तो देश की आजादी भी कायम नहीं रह सकेगी।

इन १५ सालों का इतिहास कांग्रेस सरकार की पराजय का इतिहास रहा है। वह देश के सामने कोई आर्डाइयल नहीं रख सकी। और यह केवल भाषा का ही मसला नहीं है जिस में सरकार की यह स्थिति रही हो, हर मसले में यही स्थिति रही है, चाहे वह काश्मीर का मसला हो, चाहे इन्वेक्युयी प्रापर्टी का मसला हो या कोई और मसला हो कांग्रेस सरकार का इतिहास पराजय का इतिहास रहा है। यह केवल भाषा का ही-सवाल नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे मिर्जा गालिब का एक शेर याद आता है जोकि इस प्रकार है :

बूए गुल नालाए दिल दूदे चिरागे महफिज
जो तेरी बज्म से निकला वो परीशां निकला।

मेरा दावा है कि अगर हमारे माननीय गृह-मंत्री और सरकार चाहती तो इन १५ सालों में देश का एक एक नागरिक हिन्दी सीख सकता था लेकिन सरकार ने चाहा नहीं।

आज सरकार अपनी नाकामयाबी पर परदा डालना चाहती है और यह नहीं कहती कि हमारी इनएफीशेंसी रही है, और हम से एक बड़ी भारी भूल हो गयी है, बल्कि उस चीज को एक नए रूप में ला कर देश पर अंग्रेजी लादना चाहती है। लेकिन जनता आज इतनी भोली नहीं रह गयी है कि इन बातों में आ जाय। मैं आज यहां आप से हिन्दी की रक्षा की भीख नहीं मांगता। हिन्दी की रक्षा करने के लिए हमारे बाहुओं में बल है, अपने संविधान की रक्षा करने का हमारे जज्बात में बल है। लेकिन सरकार को नेक रास्ता दिखलाना हमारा कर्तव्य है। अगर आज यह बिल न लाया जाता तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता में जो एकता की गंगा बह रही थी, जनता में प्रेम का जा दरिया उमड़ रहा था, उम को धक्का न लगता। आज उस एकता और प्रेम को खंडित करने के लिए यह बिल लाया गया है। यह ४४ करोड़ इन्सानों की जवान का सवाल है। जिस संविधान को पूरा करने के लिये हम ने तीन तीन बार शपथ उठाई है, उसी को आज हम पूरा नहीं कर रहे हैं। क्या संसार में कोई ऐसा अभाग देश है कि जिस को स्वतन्त्र हुए १५-१६ साल हो गए हों और वहां का काम दूसरे मुल्क की जवान में चल रहा हो। ऐसा कोई भी-वदकिस्मत मुल्क दुनिया में न होगा।

हम से कहा जाना है कि अंग्रेजी नहीं रहेगी तो टैकनालाजी कहां में आयगी, अगर अंग्रेजी नहीं रहेगी तो भव विज्ञान कहां से आयेगा। मैं पूछता हूँ कि रूस के एक बेटे ने भी अंग्रेजी को नहीं पढ़ा, लेकिन उन्होंने ने स्पूतनिक को ला कर जमीन पर चैते खड़ा कर दिया। रूस के एक बेटे ने भी गुलामी की भाषा को नहीं पढ़ा। लेकिन उन्होंने ने जमीन पर राकेट को ला कर रख दिया। वे लोग चांद तक पहुंच गए। अगर हमारी सरकार चाहती तो १५ सालों में हिन्दी का समुद्र उडेल सकती थी, सरकार चाहती तो इस

अवधि में हिन्दी के लाखों ग्रन्थ लिखे जा सकते थे। और उस को आज यह बिल लाने की जरूरत न होती।

मेरी दरखास्त है कि इस मामले में सरकार ने अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं किया है। मैं आज सरकार से हिन्दी की रक्षा की भीख नहीं मांगता। हम उस की रक्षा करने में समर्थ हैं। हम वेल की जोड़ी के प्रताप से यहां नहीं आए हैं। लाखों इन्सानों के दिल और दिमाग ने हम को वोट दिया है। वे लाखों इन्सान जानना चाहते हैं कि राष्ट्रभाषा के मामले में सरकार ने क्या किया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आज श्री पुरुषोत्तम दास टंडन यहां होते तो क्या सरकार इस बिल को ला कर सकती थी, अगर आज महात्मा गांधी जीवित होते तो क्या सरकार इस बिल को ला सकती थी? अगर सरदार पटेल आज होते तो क्या सरकार इस बिल को ला सकती थी? अगर राजेन्द्र बाबू आज होते तो क्या सरकार इस बिल को ला सकती थी। आज सूना देख कर सरकार जनता के हुकूम पर आक्रमण कर रही है। मैं सरकार से हिन्दी की भीख नहीं मांगता। कोटि कोटि देश की जनता इस की रक्षा करेगी, मेरे जैसे सिपाही हिन्दी की रक्षा करेंगे, लेकिन सरकार को नेक रास्ता दिखाना हमारा काम है। माननीय गृह मंत्री जी एक टीचर हैं जिन के चरणों में बैठ कर हजारों नौजवानों ने शिक्षा पायी है। इसलिए मेरा कर्तव्य है कि मैं उन से कहूँ :

स किं सखा सधुन शास्ति यो धिपम्,
 हितान्न यः मंश्रुणुते स किं प्रभुः ।

मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि उन को नेक रास्ता दिखलाऊँ। उन को देश की भाषा हिन्दी का विरोध करना शोभा नहीं देता। मैं तो कहना हूँ कि मुझे देश की किसी भी भाषा से विरोध नहीं है, चाहे वह बंगला

हो, चाहे वह गुजराती हो, चाहे उर्दू हो चाहे गुरुमुखी हो। इस देश की जो भाषायें हैं उन से मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। मैं उन सब भाषाओं की इज्जत करता हूँ और उन के लिये अपने प्राण दे सकता हूँ। साथ ही साथ मैं बंगाल के मुख्य मंत्री जी की इस बात के लिए मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने बंगाल से अंग्रेजी भाषा को बाहर कर दिया और ६ मई से बंगाल का सारा काम काज बंगला भाषा में होगा।

देश की कोई भी भाषा हो मुझे उसके प्रति आदर है। लेकिन आज के जमाने में जबकि दुनिया प्रकाश की ओर बढ़ रही है, आज जबकि आदमी चन्द्रमा पर जाने का प्रयत्न कर रहा है, उस जमाने में एक बोसीदा जवान को हमारे ऊपर लादा जा रहा है, जिस जवान को जर्मनी ने निकाल बाहर किया, जिस को आयरलैंड ने निकाल बाहर कर दिया, जिस को चीन ने निकाल बाहर कर दिया, जिस को रूस ने निकाल बाहर कर दिया। वही हमारे ऊपर लादी जा रही है हमें हिन्दी के लिए अभिमान है। हम ने हिन्दी को संविधान में यह बात सोच कर ही रखा था। अगर आज देश में हमारी भाषा होती और अंग्रेजी न होती तो चीन की इतनी हिम्मत न होती कि वह हम पर हमलाआवर होता।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप आगे कल जारी रखें।

17 hrs.

**COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME
 BILL—Contd.**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Morarji Desai on the 22nd April, 1963, namely:—

“That the Bill to provide in the interest of national economic development for compulsory deposit