

Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 20th November, 1963."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 20th November, 1963."

*The motion was adopted.*

14.31 hrs.

**MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL\***

(Amendment of section 456) by  
Shri Indrajit Gupta

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South-West): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** I introduce the Bill.

**DELHI RENT CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL\***

(Amendment of section 14) by  
Shri N. R. Laskar

**Shri N. R. Laskar** (Karimganj): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the

Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri N. R. Laskar:** I introduce the Bill.

**CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL**

(Amendment of articles 136, 226 etc.)  
by Shri Shree Narayan Das

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Shree Narayan Das on the 13th September, 1963:—

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

He has to continue his speech.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das** (Darbhanga): Sir, while moving this motion during the last session of the House, I drew the attention of the House to article 329 of the Constitution. By that article the powers of ordinary courts were barred with regard to electoral matters. But even then, under the provisions of articles 226, 227 and 228 the High Courts, and under the provisions of articles 132 and 136 the Supreme Court, entertained various cases, including writ petitions, against the decisions of the tribunals. And the process went on in the way that several cases were not decided upon till the eve of the next general elections. Hon. Members of the House know that a large number of cases were pending up to the last, going from the Tribunal to the High Court and from the High Court to the Tribunal.

The purpose of my Bill is to restrict the powers of the Supreme Court and the High Courts in this respect. But it is not with the view that they should not come in. In other countries for a very long time the elected assembly or the elected body was independent of

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

all control by the courts with regard to the composition of the House, and with regard to controversies arising out of elections it was the House itself which used to decide the cases. For a long time this went on. But for political reasons it was thought proper—because in a democracy there are so many parties, and the decisions in the House are taken on the basis of majority—therefore it was thought worthwhile by the House itself that controversies with regard to elections should be handed over to a special tribunal consisting of judges, not in the capacity of ordinary court judges but as nominated under the provision of an Act passed by that House itself. Therefore, in U.K., also the provision is that election cases are handed over to a court consisting of two judges, not in the capacity of an ordinary court but in the capacity of a special tribunal. Here, in our country also the Constitution-makers thought that Parliament was the supreme body, and with regard to the composition and other electoral matters the independence of this body should be retained. It was for this reason that they made the provision in article 329 which I will read for the benefit of the House. The marginal heading of that article is "Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters". And the article commences with these words, "Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution". That suggests that whatever has been stated elsewhere in the Constitution by way of powers of the High Courts and the Supreme Court, they will not exercise those powers with regard to those items if it is with regard to "the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies". And clause (b) of the article says:

"no election to either House of Parliament or to the House or either House of the Legislature of a State shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in

such manner as may be provided for by or under any law made by the appropriate Legislature".

Under the provision of this article Parliament passed a law in 1951, namely the Representation of the People Act, wherein provisions were made to deal with the controversies arising out of elections, and tribunals were to be set up. In that Act there are no provisions for any appeal to the High Court. But after the general elections, Parliament found that the interpretation given to this article 329 was different from the intention of the Constitution-makers and that every now and then on any decision of the tribunal appeals were filed either in the High Court or sometimes in the Supreme Court. When that Act was amended Parliament made the provision that such kinds of interference or taking cognizance of any minor matter decided by the tribunal should not be there, they are not to be taken to the court; and the High Court was given the power of hearing an appeal against the decisions of the tribunal. It was with this view that the High Court will get an opportunity, and if any injustice has been done by the decisions of the tribunal that will be looked into, and any point of law that the High Court will consider as deserving of attention will be considered. And the appeals were to be disposed of by the High Court within six months of the filing of the appeal. That is what was said in the Representation of the People Act.

But even then there was no end to it. The High Court and the Supreme Court went on—the High Court under the provisions of articles 226, 227 and 228 and the Supreme Court under the provisions of articles 132 and 136—entertaining cases. The result has been that the election decisions have been much delayed, to the detriment of those who have been elected and sometimes to the detriment of those who had filed the cases and who want-

ed to dislodge the Member who had been elected.

**Shri Maurya (Aligarh):** The time for disposal by the High Courts is three months or six months?.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** In the present Representation of the People Act, it is six months.

**Shri Maurya:** I think it is three months.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Six months.

Electoral matters deeply concern the elected body. The right to vote or to right to stand for election is not an ordinary right. Therefore, in the case of *N. P. Poonuswamy vs. the Returning Officer, Namakkal* and others, the Supreme Court *inter alia*, made the following point:

"The right to vote or stand as a candidate for election is not a civil right, but is a creature of a statute or special law, and must be subject to the limitations imposed by it. Strictly speaking, it is the sole right of the legislature to examine and determine all matters relating to the election of its own members, and if the legislature takes it out of its own hands and vests it in a special tribunal of entirely new and unknown jurisdiction, that special jurisdiction should be exercised in accordance with the law which creates it".

In short, this means that if some powers are given to the courts under an Act of Parliament, those courts should exercise that power to that extent only. But in practice, all major and minor matters as decided by the tribunals, have been taken to High Courts and Supreme Court and this has led to unnecessary delay.

Parliament has also the right to curtail the powers of the High Courts

under section 170 of the Representation of the People Act. There was a provision in the old Act that no appeal shall lie against the decision of the tribunal. That point was considered by the courts, and the decision was that that section was not *ultra vires*. Under article 246 of the Constitution, read with Items No. 72 and 95 of List I of the Seventh Schedule thereof, Parliament has the exclusive power to make laws affecting the jurisdiction of the High Courts in election matters. This, however, does not oust the jurisdiction of the High Courts to intervene in election matters under article 226. Therefore, I have brought forward this Bill. An hon. Member has given notice of an amendment that it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion. Because it is a very important matter and it involves some fundamental points, I agree it is necessary that the opinion of the public should be gathered before the House proceeds to consider this Bill.

Even now, in France it is the elected body which has the sole power to consider any points arising out of election matters. But in India, in order to avoid political pressures, we decided that all matters relating to administration of elections be given to the Election Commission. It is an independent body, and there is no interference by Government in its working. Similarly, in order to avoid political pressures, we made a provision in the Representation of the People Act for constitution of special tribunals consisting of retired Judges or acting judges, and sometimes District and Sessions judges. There is no danger, therefore, to the fairness and impartiality of elections.

My only point in bringing this measure is that there is enormous delay in the disposal of the cases by the High Courts and Supreme Court under various articles of the Constitution, which has practically resulted in justice being denied in very many cases. For instance, I remember a case in which an election petition was

[Shri Shree Narayan Das]

filed, and the decision was not given till the eve of the next election.

Therefore, this is a very important matter. If it is circulated for eliciting public opinion, there is no harm. The House can consider every opinion that is received and then decide the matter in due course.

I once again emphasize that by this measure I am not going to take away all the powers of the courts. Parliament is supreme and under article 329 it has been specially laid down that there should be no interference by ordinary courts in election matters. But the High Courts will continue to enjoy the right of hearing appeals against the decisions of tribunals, but we will try to avoid the long delays arising out of cases under articles 136, 132, 226 and 227 before the High Courts and the Supreme Court, which practically results in denial of justice.

I hope the House will accept Shri Samanta's amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

There are two amendments. Shri Raghunath Singh is not here.

Shri Tiwari, Shri Samanta.

**Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th June, 1964."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The time allotted for this Bill is one hour. We have already taken 33 minutes, and only 27 minutes remain. Five minutes each.

Does the hon. Minister accept the amendment for circulation?

**The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen):** No.

**Shri S. C. Samanta:** I am thankful to my hon. friend Shri Shree Narayan Das for bringing forward this Bill.

This thing has been disturbing our minds, and every now and then we have been putting questions to the Law Minister about the election cases that are pending and he gives us reports. So, my hon. friend has brought this piece of legislation for the consideration of the House. Article 329 has been referred to by my hon. friend Shri Shree Narayan Das. It says that no election to either House of Parliament or to the House or either House of Legislature of a State shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as may be provided for by or under any law made by the appropriate Legislature. We have made a law, the Representation of the Peoples Act under this article by which we have empowered the election tribunal to deal with election cases. The other sections mentioned by my hon. friend to some extent give power to the Supreme Court and to High Courts to handle these tribunal cases also. The Supreme Court and the High Courts deal with election cases adjudged by the tribunal and it takes a long time. A person who was sitting in this House for more than four years was unseated at the end of the 4th year. In order to have speedy decisions, my hon. friend has given some suggestions.

**Shri Maurya:** Will you suggest some special procedure? Don't you think that the Civil Procedure Code will apply in the normal course?

**Shri S. C. Samanta:** These cases are those mentioned under article 329 and the High Courts and the Supreme Courts have been given power. For that reason my friend has made some suggestions. If Government cannot make up its mind just now, it is better to have the legal opinion of the country and for that purpose I have

proposed that it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion. I hope the Government will accept my proposition because of the gravity of the situation. So many election cases are pending before us. We would request the Government at least to accept the circulation motion.

**Shri Maurya:** Section 116(a) is clear about the time it says every appeal shall be decided as expeditiously as possible and endeavour shall be made to determine it finally within three months from the date on which a memorandum of appeal is presented to the High Court. So, the period is not six months; it is three months.

**श्री हेम राज (कांगड़ा) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक श्री श्रीनारायण दास ने पेश किया है जहां तक उसका मकसद है कि एलेक्शन पेटिशनस जल्द से जल्द फंसल हो जानी चाहिए, वह ठीक ही है। इस बिल को लाने में जो उनका मकसद है, जो उनका अभिप्रायः है उससे तो मैं थोड़ा सहमत हूँ क्योंकि हमने देखा यह है कि एक एलेक्शन हो जाता है और एलेक्शन के बाद खास तौर से मुझे पंजाब की याद है कि एक एलेक्शन पेटिशन आई, दूसरा एलेक्शन भी हो गया, यह होशियारपुर का केस है, लेकिन उसका फंसला नहीं हुआ। दूसरे एलेक्शन के बाद तीसरा साल चला गया तब कहीं जा कर उस एलेक्शन पेटिशन का फंसला हुआ। इस किस्म के देरी के केसेज एक दो नहीं हैं, गालिबन बहुत ज्यादा हैं। इस लिहाज से जो इस बिल को लाने का उनका मकसद है मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बहुत हद तक दुस्त है। खास तौर पर उनका जो मकसद है उन के मकसद से सिर्फ एक बात हल होती है और वह यह होती है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के जो १३६, २२६ और २२६ नम्बर के प्राविजंस हैं और उन के मुताबिक हाईकोर्ट को जो रिट और मैडेमस ईश्यू करने की पावर है, उनके अन्दर जो

दखल देने का अधिकार है वह किसी हद तक दूर हो जाने चाहिए। लेकिन मैं एक बात नहीं समझ पाया कि हमारा यह जो रिप्रेजेंटेशन बिल दी पीपुल्स ऐक्ट है उसके संवशन ११६ बी में हमने हाई कोर्ट को पावर दी है कि अपील उनके पास हो सकती है। तीन महीने में उनको फंसला करना होगा और उनका जो फंसला होगा वह फाइनल होगा। ११६ बी इस तरह से है :—

“116(b) The decision of the High Courts on appeal under this chapter and subject only to such decisions the order of the tribunal under section 98 and 99 shall be final and conclusive.”

अब सवाल यह है कि अगर हाई कोर्ट के डिमिशन में कोई ऐमा फंसला हो जो कि प्वाएंट आफ ला हो तो उस को हम किस तरीके से सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जाने से बार कर सकेंगे ? अगर हम जुडिशिएरी को कोई अधिकार देते हैं और जुडिशिएरी कोई फंसला करती है तो उस फंसले में अगर कोई ला प्वाएंट इनवील्व हो जाता है क्योंकि जो भी ट्रिब्युनल हम बनायें, चाहे इनकम-टैक्स का ट्रिब्युनल बनायें या कोई और ट्रिब्युनल बनायें, अगर कोई ला प्वाएंट कहीं पर आ जाय तो उस ला प्वाएंट का आखिरी फंसला करने के लिए हमारे पास एक ही कोर्ट रह जाता है, सुप्रीम कोर्ट, जहां पर जाकर हम उस ला प्वाइंट का आखिरी फंसला ले सकते हैं। उसका जो जजमेंट होगा वह आखिरी होगा और वह फंसला सारे देश के लिये फाइनल हो जाता है। उससे आगे फिर कोई अपील नहीं रहती है। इस लिहाज से अगर देखा जाये तो उनके विधेयक का जो मन्तव्य है, मकसद है, उससे हमें इतिफाक हो सकता है लेकिन जहां तक उसको हल करने के लिए उन्होंने जो तजवीज रखी है, उसमें कुछ कमियां रह सकती हैं जिन कमियों को कि दूर नहीं किया जा सकता। इसलिए मैं

[श्री हेमराज]

समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने जब यह तजवीज रखी है कि इसको सरकुलेशन के लिए भेज दिया जाए तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह मामला ऐसा नहीं है कि जो आर्गुबिल नहीं है। इसलिए उसमें दोनों के लिए मुश्किल हो जाता है, जो उम्मीदवार जीता है और जो उम्मीदवार जीता नहीं है और जिसने पेट्रीशन दायर की है। अब जो उम्मीदवार जीता जाता है उसके बरखिलाफ एपेलेशन पेट्रीशन होती है और वह सिलसिला चलता रहता है, एक अनिश्चितता की तलवार उसके सिर पर लटकती रही है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर जरूर गौर किया जाय। जो संग्रहण श्री सामन्त ने रखा है कि इसको सरकुलेशन में भेज दिया जाय, वह एक मुनासिब संग्रहण है और गवर्नमेंट को उसे मंजूर कर लेना चाहिए। अगर इसको सरकुलेट कर दिया जायगा तो बाद में दूसरों की सब रायें इस पर आने के बाद गवर्नमेंट सब पर गौर करके एक आखिरी अपना फ़ैसला कर सकती है कि आया इमर्जेन्स आइन्दा किसी और तरीक़े की जरूरत है या नहीं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री सामन्त की तरफ़ीम को सपोर्ट करता हूँ और श्री श्री-नारायण दास जी जो विद्येयक लाए हैं, उसका स्वागत करता हूँ।

15 hrs.

**Shri A. K. Sen:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have certainly given the best consideration to the Bill and the amendment, but I feel that it would not be proper to take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and of the high courts. After I have said this, if it is still the feeling of the House that it should be sent for circulation, so far as the Government is concerned, it shall not oppose the motion for circulation. But I think after Shri Shree Narayan Das and Shri S. C. Samanta have heard

me, they would not possibly insist upon its circulation.

We have provided for appeal to the high courts against decisions of election tribunals under section 163(a) and (b). Where appeals have been provided, the position of the high courts is that they would not interfere with article 226. It is only when there is no appeal provided for under any law that the decisions of tribunals may be interfered with either under article 226 or article 227. Therefore, when we provided in the last amendment to the Representation of the People Act for regular appeals, after that, no interference has been made by any high court under article 226 or 227.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Some cases are pending.

**Shri A. K. Sen:** Only on interlocutory matters. But the decision itself has not been challenged by way of application under article 226. In fact, no one would advise a person to challenge a decision of the election tribunal under article 226.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Then there is no necessity.

**Shri A. K. Sen:** But the hon. Member, being a lawyer, will agree that with regard to these interlocutory matters there is no regular appeal provided under the law nor any revision under section 115 of the Civil Procedure Code is provided. So, the litigants who are having their matters adjudicated upon by election tribunals have no other remedy but to approach the high courts, and if there is an erroneous decision in an interlocutory matter, I for one would not be a party to the taking away of the only jurisdiction of the court to correct an error in regard to an interlocutory matter, because I have myself seen several interlocutory orders which were outrageous and they could only

be corrected by the High Courts. The gravity for it would not be to try to curb the powers of the High Courts under article 226; it should not be normally touched unless there is overwhelming reason for it. We have not ever tried to do it, but to provide for limited appeals in regard to interlocutory matters in the Representation of the People Act itself, I am thinking of it myself; having seen some of the interlocutory orders of some of the election tribunals, I am convinced that the High Courts should have the power to interfere with some of these outrageous orders. Otherwise the litigants would have no remedy.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Then make provision for that.

**Shri A. K. Sen:** For that, the remedy would be to provide for specific appeals which were not thought of in 1956 when the amendments to the Representation of the People Act were made, and we should now think, therefore, of providing remedies for litigants whose election petitions are pending or against whom election petitions before the election tribunals to challenge the interlocutory orders are pending final decision by the election tribunals. Therefore, I think we are all agreed that the proper remedy should be by way of a further amendment to section 116 of the Representation of the People Act. It will be proper to do, because, as it is, the High Courts can interfere under article 226. Therefore, I can assure Shri Shree Narayan Das that we have already taken up this matter and possibly we shall soon be introducing an amendment to the Representation of the People Act, but we have not done it only because we are thinking of other matters which might be taken along with this in order to bring about a comprehensive Bill for amendment of the Representation of the People Act. We should not normally touch article 226 if we can avoid it and since we can avoid it we should not really touch it. As I have

said, ever since we have provided for regular appeals against the final decision of election tribunals, there has been no interference under article 226.

The next point is about the Supreme Court's powers under article 136. It will be disastrous if the High Courts remain the ultimate authorities without the Supreme Court having any power to decide finally on matters of law or on substantive matters of law of public interest. Otherwise, we have got the experience of two or three High Courts taking different points of view over the same question, and if we take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, in different States we will have different laws which will be rather unfortunate at least in this country where we have a uniform law in regard to everything. Therefore, if we give the right of appeal to a litigant, to prefer an appeal to the High Courts against the decisions of the election tribunal, it is a logical sequence that we must provide for appeal, and not take away the right of appeal, to the Supreme Court. Here, the Supreme Court would grant special leave to appeal only after careful consideration of the matters involved. The Supreme Court, in a well-known decision on Deena Bandhu Sahu vs. Jadhmani Mangraj (AIR 1954/Supreme Court 411) laid down the criterion as follows, with regard to election tribunals:

"The Supreme Court does not, when hearing appeals under article 136, sit as a court of further appeals on facts and does not interfere with findings given on a consideration of evidence, unless they are perverse or based on no evidence."

So, it is only where the findings on facts are absolutely perverse or based on no evidence that the Supreme Court comes in. They said:

"This is particularly so when the findings under challenge are those of election tribunals."

[Shri A. K. Sen]

It is only on a matter of law that they entertain an appeal. It would be disastrous if different High Courts have different decisions on points of law and yet, on the same election law, we have different election tribunals sitting in different States and deciding differently. Therefore, it is absolutely logical that we must provide an ultimate appeal to the Supreme Court on a point of law.

Here, what we are trying to do is not giving the right of appeal to the Supreme Court but trying to take away what is already there, and if the Supreme Court exercises this jurisdiction, it is very cautiously done, as they say, particularly in relation to election tribunals.

This is all I have to say. After what I have said, namely, that we are thinking of giving or making a provision in the Representation of the People Act itself, providing for limited appeals or revisional jurisdiction in regard to interlocutory matters, I think Shri Shree Narayan Das would not press his motion.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Law has not mentioned anything with regard to article 329. I stated that I am not against giving any powers either to the High Courts or to the Supreme Court, if the House thinks proper. My only point is this. Ordinary courts have no powers with regard to electoral matters. The powers had been debarred. I am not against whatever the hon. Minister has stated. You may make a provision in the Representation of the People Act giving powers to the High Court to hear any appeals against any interlocutory orders. You can as well make a provision in the Representation of the People Act that Supreme Court can take cognizance of such things and decide points of law. I have no objection to that.

My only point is on principle. The principle, as it was understood at that time by the Constitution-makers and in other countries also, is that ordinary courts do not exercise any power with regard to electoral matters save and except those powers which are given by that elected body by an Act or under any law made therein. Therefore, he has not given any reply to my point. The Parliament is the supreme authority with regard to the composition and hearing of election tribunals and it was with that intention that we made a provision in the Representation of the People Act constituting tribunals consisting of retired judges or acting judges. Therefore, we do not want to curtail the power. We want to give more powers so that injustice may not be done in any case and political considerations may not come in. But the general powers given in the Constitution under that article should be exercised for ordinary rights. But the right to stand for election is not an ordinary right. It is a right given by the Constitution. Therefore, that should not be interfered with by the courts in the ordinary course. Therefore, although a Constitution amendment requires the support of two-thirds majority, I would even now request the hon. Minister to agree to the circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion. There is no harm if on this fundamental point, the opinions of Bar Associations and of Judges themselves are invited.

**Shri A. K. Sen:** I said, Government does not make an issue of it and we will not oppose it. I said, after hearing me, if the House feels that it should be sent for circulation for eliciting opinion, Government will not make it an issue and will not oppose it.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Therefore, under these circumstances, I would appeal to hon. Members to allow this measure to be circulated for eliciting public opinion. When the opinions



are received, we will decide whether we should proceed with this or drop this. So, I support the motion moved by my hon. friend, Shri Samanta, that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion thereon.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th June, 1964."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.14 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT)  
BILL

(Amendment of Article 343) by  
Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya** (Rai-  
ganj): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg  
to move:

"That the Bill further to amend  
the Constitution of India be cir-  
culated for the purpose of eliciting  
opinion thereon by the 31st March,  
1964."

While moving this Bill, I feel it is  
perhaps the will of Providence that  
my Bill has come in the very nick of  
time. The incidents that have been  
happening in the House during the  
last two days amply demonstrate the  
need for making provision for a  
neutral language for the official  
purposes of the Union. This is ex-  
actly what my Bill wants to do. Arti-  
cle 343 of the Constitution which my  
Bill seeks to amend provides that the  
Official Language of the Union shall  
be Hindi in Devanagari script. My  
Bill seeks to add Sanskrit to Hindi  
in that article.

The Bill is not new. It was in-  
troduced first in February, 1958 and  
has since then been before the Par-  
liament. It has come up now for  
discussion. Before I proceed with the

Bill, I wish to make some quotations  
from the hon. Prime Minister about  
Sanskrit itself.

**Shri Sonavane** (Pandharpur): Let  
him speak in Sanskrit.

श्री च० का० भट्टाचार्य : यदि भवन  
अनुमतिदीयते तदा संस्कृतभाषया एव  
वदितुम इच्छामि ।

**Shri Sonavane:** Continue it; we will  
understand it.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** This is  
what the hon. Prime Minister said:

"If I was asked what is the  
greatest treasure which India  
possesses and what is her finest  
heritage, I would answer unhesi-  
tatingly, it is the Sanskrit lan-  
guage and literature and all that  
it contains. This is a magnifi-  
cent inheritance and so long as  
this endures and influences the  
life of our people, so long the  
basic genius of India will con-  
tinue."

He proceeds further and says:

"Hardly any language in the  
world has probably played that  
vital part in the history of a race  
which Sanskrit has."

He again says:

"India built up a magnificent  
language, Sanskrit, and through  
this language and its art and ar-  
chitecture, it sent its vibrant  
message to far away countries...  
I have often wondered that if  
our race forgot the Buddha, the  
Upanishads and the great epics,  
what then will it be like? It  
would be uprooted and would lose  
the basic characteristics which  
have clung to it and given it dis-  
tinction throughout these long  
ages. India would cease to be  
India."

These are inspiring words and I beg  
to be excused if I have caught the