

IRON ORE MINES LABOUR WEL-
FARE CESS (AMENDMENT)
BILL

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1963, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

12-12 hrs.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: Further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri on the 23rd April 1963, namely:—

“That the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for 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 a consideration”,

together with amendments moved thereon.

Out of 15 hours, 9 hours and 35 minutes have already been taken.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): When will the Minister reply?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has put me that question. What can I say?

An Hon. Member: The time ought to be extended.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): How much time has been taken?

Mr. Speaker: Out of 10 hours for general discussion, 9 hours and 35 minutes have been taken. There are certain Members who are very anxious to speak. I am also very anxious to accommodate them. I would request hon. Members to help me in that respect; if I cannot accommodate them during the general consideration stage, I will certainly try to accommodate as many as I can during the clause by clause stage as well as the third

reading stage and if I am really compelled to call in some more Members, probably I might have to extend the time a little.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By your leave, may I reiterate today my request that the time for the first reading might be extended by at least two hours. If that is not possible, if the House is not agreeable to it, then the time for the second reading must be increased to 7 hours.

Mr. Speaker: I will see to that.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): I merely wanted to know when I would be called upon to reply to the debate. If many Members still want to speak, it is in your hands.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any objection if I extend it?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Is he speaking on his behalf?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: My hon. colleague, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not here. But if the House would be willing to sit for an hour more, I think it would be possible to accommodate them.

Mr. Speaker: I have a list of 52 Members with me; there might be others who might rise in their places and try to catch my eye. I want hon. Members also to appreciate the pressure under which I have to carry on. I want to accommodate at least 20 Members more. Therefore, 3 hours must be given to me. So the hon. Minister can calculate when he would be called.

Shri Maurya may now continue his speech.

Shri P. C. Borooah (Sibsagar rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि हम अपने संविधान की पवित्र धाराओं का अध्ययन ठीक प्रकार से करें तो वहाँ पर "शैल वी", "देअरआफ्टर" और "प्राप्रेंसिव यूज आफ हिन्दी" यह तीन शब्द ऐसे हैं जिन का अनालिसिस करने के बाद यह मालूम होता है कि राष्ट्रपति को संविधान के लागू होने के पांच वर्ष बाद एक कमिशन बिठलाना चाहिये, और उसके अध्ययन के पश्चात् ही कुछ निर्णय लेना चाहिये। यही नहीं, उसके पश्चात् दस वर्ष के बाद भारत के राष्ट्रपति जी को एक और कमिशन बिठलाना होगा, यह संविधान के शब्द हैं, और वह कमिशन इसका अध्ययन करेगा कि देश में दस वर्षों में हिन्दी की कितनी प्रगति हुई है और अंग्रेजी की क्या परिस्थिति है तथा उसे सदन के सामने रखेगा। आज इस सदन में जो निर्णय हम लेने जा रहे हैं, उसके लिये मैं कहता हूँ कि वह अवैधानिक होगा, इस कारण से कि जो कुछ भी निर्णय होगा वह कमिशन का जो पांच वर्ष का अध्ययन है हिन्दी के बारे में उसके ऊपर अतिरिक्त रत होगा। यह विधेयक आउट आफ डेट है और जो निर्णय होगा वह अवैधानिक होगा।

इससे आगे बढ़ कर जहाँ तक भाषा का संबंध है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह पुत्रों अपनी माँ से प्यार होता है, जिस तरह से देश भक्त को अपने देश से प्यार होता है, जिस तरह से धर्म विश्वासी को अपने धर्म से प्रेम होता है, ठीक उसी प्रकार से एक भाषा के प्रेमी को अपनी भाषा से प्रेम और उसमें विश्वास होता है। जहाँ मैं यह बात कहता हूँ वहाँ मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि हमारे मित्र जो ० डी० एम० के भाई हैं उनका भी अपनी भाषाओं तमिल, तेलुगू और कन्नड़ से ही उतना ही प्रेम और उसमें उतना ही विश्वास है जितना हम हिन्दी भाषियों को हिन्दी में है। लेकिन उनकी सिर्फ एक बात मेरी धयन में नहीं आती है जिस को मैं आगे बढ़

कर लूंगा। आयरलैंड, वेल्स, ईरान और तुर्की इनकी मिसालें हमारे सामने मौजूद हैं आयरलैंड के जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं वे करीब करीब सब अच्छी तरह से अंग्रेजी जानते हैं, उसको लिख पढ़ सकते हैं और बोल सकते हैं, भारतवर्ष के मुवाबने में बहुत ज्यादा प्रतिशत लोग वहाँ पर अंग्रेजी को अच्छी तरह लिख सकते हैं, पढ़ सकते हैं और बोल सकते हैं, लेकिन इस बात के होते हुये भी उन्होंने आयरलैंड की अपनी भाषा को अपनी राज भाषा बनाया। अपनी राज भाषा उन्होंने आयरिश भाषा को बनाया। उन्होंने अंग्रेजी को अपने ऊपर नहीं थोपा।

मैं कुछ देर के लिये इतिहास के पन्नों को दोहराना चाहता हूँ। आज से २७०० वर्ष पूर्व यहाँ पर संस्कृत का बोलबाला हुआ। मध्य देश में संस्कृत थी और धीरे धीरे वह पूरे राष्ट्र में फैल गई। उसके पश्चात् भगवान गौतम बुद्ध तथा महावीर जी ने अपने धर्म का और अपने विचारों का प्रसार किया वह अर्ध मागधी और मागधी भाषा में किया, जो कि आगे बढ़ कर पाली भाषा का रूप ले गई। आज से ठाई हजार वर्ष पूर्व इस राष्ट्र में पाली भाषा लोग बोलते थे। ईसा मसीह से ६०० वर्ष पूर्व और ईसा मसीह से ६०० वर्ष पश्चात्, १२०० वर्ष तक इस राष्ट्र में पाली भाषा रही, और उसके प्रतीक महाराज अशोक के स्तम्भ हैं। उन स्तम्भों पर उन्होंने जो कुछ लिखवाया वह पाली भाषा में लिखवाया। जब आज से २००० वर्ष पूर्व या १८०० वर्ष पूर्व हम अपना कार्य पाली भाषा में चला सकते थे, और अच्छी तरह चला सकते थे, मैं केवल यही नहीं कहता, जब हमारी सभ्यता को दूसरे लोग भी मानते थे, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दी के बारे में क्यों इतनी परेशानियाँ आती हैं? हमारे ० डी० एम० के लीडर ने कहा कि हम इस चैप्टर को खोलें :

"Let this chapter of the language be opened for the moment."

[श्री मौर्य]

ऐसा उन्होंने कहा था। मैं एक मिनट के लिये उसी चैप्टर को यहां पर खोलता हूँ। इस मुल्क में १७६ के करीब भाषायें हैं। जब उन भाषाओं को हम अपने सामने रखते हैं तो क्या देखते हैं? उन भाषाओं को एक एक करके मैं लूंगा जोकि कमिशन की रिपोर्ट के २७ वें पन्ने पर लिखी है। उसी के अनुसार मैं यहां आंकड़े देता हूँ।

असमियां बोलने वाले	५० लाख
बंगला बोलने वाले	२ करोड़ ५१लाख
गुजराती बोलने वाले	१ करोड़ ६३लाख
हिन्दी, उर्दू प्रयात् हिन्दु- स्तानी बोलने वाले और उसमें विश्वास करने वाले	१५ करोड़
कन्नड़ बोलने वाले	१४ लाख
मलयालम बोलने वाले	३३ लाख

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह गलत है।

श्री मौर्य : यह मैं सही कह रहा हूँ, जो कि कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में है और सन् १९५१ के सेंसस रिपोर्ट के अनुसार है।

मराठी बोलने वाले	२ करोड़ ७० लाख
उडिया बोलने वाले	१ करोड़ ३१ लाख
संस्कृत बोलने वाले	केवल ५५५
तमिल बोलने वाले	२ करोड़ ६५ लाख
तेलगू बोलने वाले	३ करोड़ ३० लाख
दूसरी भाषाओं के बोलने वाले	करीब ३ करोड़

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर दो तरह की सभ्यतायें बढ़ती रही हैं, द्रविड़ सभ्यता और आर्यन सभ्यता। द्रविड़ सभ्यता में जो तीन चार भाषायें आती हैं उनके बोलने वाले केवल ६ करोड़ हैं और आर्यन भाषा बोलने वाले करीब ३६ करोड़ के हैं। इस ३६

करोड़ में भी मैं थोड़ी देर के लिये इस सदन का ध्यान वहां पर ले जाना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दी बोलने वाले कितने हैं।

अब मैं हिन्दी की बात पर आता हूँ। करीब १५ करोड़ हिन्दी बोलने वाले और समझने वाले हैं, और इनमें बहुत से उसको लिख और पढ़ सकते हैं। इस राष्ट्र के १५ करोड़ लोग हिन्दी बोलने वाले हैं। भाषा का प्रश्न जिस समय कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली में उठा था और बड़ी भारी परेशानी सामने आयी थी, उस समय हमारे आदरणीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो कहा था उसको उन्होंने इस सदन में आज फिर दुहराया है। उन्होंने १३ सितम्बर, १९४६ में कांस्टिट्यूट असेम्बली में जो कहा था उसमें से पन्ना १४१४ पर से मैं कुछ आपकी पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ। वह इस प्रकार है :

"But, at the same time, it created a great gulf between us who knew English and those who did not know English and that was fatal for the progress of a nation. That is a thing which certainly we cannot possibly tolerate today. Hence this problem.

However good, however important, English may be, we cannot tolerate that there should be an English-know elite and a large mass of our people not knowing English. Therefore we must have our own language."

ऐसा आदरणीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उस समय कहा था। उस समय भाषा का निर्णय बहुत अच्छी तरह से लिया गया था कि देश की राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी होगी क्योंकि उसको देश के ४२ प्रतिशत लोग बोल या समझ सकते हैं। लेकिन आज यहां पर अंग्रेजी को हमारे ऊपर थोपा जा रहा है। हमारे सब से पहले राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी ने भी इसके संबंध में १५ अगस्त

१९६० को मद्रास में जो कहा था उन शब्दों को मैं आज इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारे डी० एम० के० के भाई भी उनको मुन लें। उन्होंने कहा था :

"You expect us to respect your feelings and we do so. We do not want to impose anything on you, not even a language. But do not impose on us a foreign language."

उन्होंने कहा था कि हम कोई भी जवान आपके ऊपर नहीं थोपना चाहते, लेकिन यह कहाँ की वकालत है कि आप गोरों की भाषा को, एक विदेशी भाषा को हमारे ऊपर थोपना चाहते हैं। अंग्रेजी को अच्छी तरह जानने वाले देश में २ फीसदी भी नहीं है।

मैं भावनाओं को लेकर सदन का ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी एक बड़ी साधारण, सूक्ष्म और सरल तथा सुन्दर भाषा है। मैं स्वयं इसकी मिसाल मौजूद हूँ। मैंने उर्दू फारसी दस बारह वर्ष पढ़ा तब थोड़ी सीता समझ सका, अंग्रेजी को मैंने २५ बरस तक पढ़ा मगर (उसको अच्छी तरह समझ नहीं पाया), और हिन्दी को मैंने एक बरस नहीं एक महीना नहीं एक दिन भी नहीं पढ़ा लेकिन मैं हिन्दी थोड़ी बहुत समझता हूँ। मैं कृता चाहता हूँ कि जिस भाषा को १५० वर्ष तक सिखाने के बावजूद अंग्रेज २ फीसदीसे ज्यादा को न सिखा पाये उस भाषा को आप थोप कर क्या राष्ट्र को पीछे ले जाना चाहते हैं।

हां, एक बात में मैं हिन्दी के विरुद्ध हूँ। जिस तरह की हिन्दी बनाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा उसके मैं विरुद्ध हूँ। आज हिन्दी में ऐसे शब्द लाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है जैसे :

अभियन्ता, अभिशापी, लैपथगामिनी इस तरह के जो शब्द लपेटे जाते हैं मैं उनके विरुद्ध हूँ। ऐसे शब्द जैसे :

रेलवे स्टेशन, इंजेक्शन, डायरी

414 (A) L.S.D.—4.

जो कि हमारे रोजानाके जीवन में आ गये हैं उनको हिन्दी में शामिल कर लेना चाहिये। ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो हिन्दी ओ वढ़ नहीं सकेगी। और अगर ऐसा किया गया तो हमारे डी० एम० के० भाइयों को उस हिन्दी पर कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। डा० श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी ने १३ सितम्बर, सन् १९४९ को कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली में जो कहा था वह पेज १३६१ पर इस प्रकार लिखा है :

"If you want that Hindi is to rally occupy an all-India position and not merely replace English for certain official purposes, you make Hindi worthy of that position and allow it to absorb by natural process words and idioms not only from Sanskrit but also from other sister languages of India. Do not obstruct the growth of Hindi. I can speak Hindi in my own Bengali way. Mahatma Gandhi spoke Hindi in his own way. Sardar Patel speaks Hindi in his own Gujarati way. If my friends from the Uttar Pradesh or Bihar come and say that theirs is the standard Hindi which they have laid down and anyone who cannot speak this language will be tabooed, it will mean a bad thing not only for Hindi but it will be a bad thing for the country. I am glad, therefore, that provision has been incorporated in the draft articles suggesting as to how this language should develop in this country."

ममतलब यह कि जो हिन्दी बनायी जाये उसको कठिन न बनाकर ज्यादा से ज्यादा सरल बनाए जाये। हमारे आदरणीय पंडित जवाहलाल नेहरू जी ने सन् १९४९ में कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली में कहा और जो कुछ यह कहा उनकी बातों को मैं देखता हूँ। उनकी भाषा बहुत प्रबल है, उनकी भावना बहुत प्रबल है। लेकिन उनकी कथनी शर करनी में अन्तर है। जो कहते हैं कने नहीं हैं। जो वह कहते

[श्री मोर्य]

हैं वही करते तो आज यह विरोधी दल पैदा न हुआ होता। तमाम लोग उनको अपना एक मात्र नेता मान कर चलते। वे अपनी कथनी और करनी में फर्क को मिटाये। उर्दू के बारे में उन्होंने कहा था कि उर्दू एक डाइनेमिक भाषा है, उसमें रवानी है, जोश है लेकिन उर्दू के लिये क्या किया गया? आज देश में आसामी भाषा के लिये घर है, बंगला के लिये घर है, मराठी के लिये घर है, गुजराती आदि अन्य भाषाओं के लिये घर हैं, लेकिन उर्दू एक खानाबदोश भाषा है, उसके लिये कोई स्थान नहीं है। उसके लिये कोई घर नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि उसको राष्ट्रीय जवानों में शामिल किया गया है, लेकिन उसका स्थान कहाँ है? केवल यह कह देना कि उसको ढबें शिड्यूल में शामिल कर लिया गया है काफी नहीं है। उसको एक इलाके की जवान मानना पड़ेगा और अगर ऐसा किया गया तो जो लोग उर्दू भाषा में यकीन करने वाले हैं उनको भी हम से नाराजगी नहीं होगी। उर्दू किसी खास मजहब की जवान नहीं है। मुसलमान उसको अरब से अरबने साथ नहीं लाए थे। वह हिन्दुस्तान की जवान है, यहाँ पैदा हुई और बड़ी है, उसका एक कल्ब है, उसका एक तनबुन है, उस के पीछे एक भाव है। मैं उसी भाषा को जानता हूँ। इसलिए जो लोग आज यह समझते हैं कि उर्दू किसी एक मजहब की जवान है उनसे मैं कहूँगा कि वह अपनी इस गलत फहमी को दूर कर द।

जहाँ तक हिन्दीकी बात है, उसके लिए एक आन्दोलन चल रहा है। इस सदन के आदरणीय सदस्य स्वामी जी भूख हड़ताल कर रहे हैं। वह कहाँ तक सही है या कहाँ तक गलत है इस बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। लेकिन यह एक भाषा का सवाल है जिसको देश

के ४२ प्रतिशत लोग बोलते हैं। इस संकट के समय इस भाषा के प्रश्न को पैदा करके और सदन को परेशानी में डाल कर राष्ट्र का नुकसान किया जा रहा है। यह धमकी की बात नहीं है। यह देशके ४२% हिन्दी भाषी लोगों की भाषा का सवाल है, यह १५ करोड़ इन्सानों का सवाल है। इसको आपको अपने सामने रखना पड़ेगा। जब आप दो करोड़ और चार करोड़ लोगों के लिए भावना से प्रेरित हो जाते हैं और उनकी धमकी का ख्याल करते हैं, तो हमारे प्यार, हमारी मुहब्बत और हमारे मन में जो श्रद्धा है उसका भी आपको ध्यान रखना चाहिए।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ जो कि इससे अलग है। उत्तर और दक्षिण में विरोध चला है इसका कारण एक यह भी है कि उत्तर प्रदेश एक बहुत बड़ा प्रान्त है। अगर उसके दो टुकड़े कर दिए जाएँ, उसको दो हिस्सों में बाँट दिया जाए तो उत्तर और दक्षिण नजदीक आ जाएंगे। यह बात सत्य है कि ऐसा करने से उत्तर और दक्षिण का अन्तर मिटेगा। उत्तर और दक्षिण को निकट लाने के लिए मैं दूसरा सुझाव है कि भारत की दो राजधानियाँ बना दी जाएँ, एक दिल्ली और दूसरी हैदराबाद ऐसा करने से भी उत्तर और दक्षिण का फर्क मिटेगा। और दक्षिण वाले हिन्दी को आसानी से सीख लगे। जब वे लोग एक विदेशी भाषा को सीख कर उत्तर वालों से आगे बढ़ सकते हैं तो मेरा विश्वास है कि भविष्य में वे हिन्दी को भी सीख कर उत्तर भारत वालों से आगे बढ़ जायेंगे।

यह जो विधेयक आया है इसका विरोध करते हुए मैं कहता हूँ कि जो कुछ हम आज यहाँ पर निर्णय ले रहे हैं वह उस कमीशन के लेखे जोखे के अनुसार ले रहे हैं जो कि संविधान के लागू होने के पाँच साल बाद बनाया गया था, जब कि हमारा निर्णय उस कमीशन के लेखे जोखे पर होना चाहिए था जो कि दस बरस बाद बनाया जाता। इसलिए यह निर्णय

अवैधानिक है। इसी लिए मेरा निवेदन है कि एक कमीशन बनाया जाए और उसके लेखे जोखे के आधार पर यहाँ निर्णय लिया जाए। मेरा निवेदन है कि अंग्रेज़ी को इस बिल द्वारा हमेशा हमेशा के लिए हम पर न थोपा जाए। आदरणीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू और उनके साथी अपने जीवन काल में राष्ट्र भाषा को राष्ट्रमेंचला कर हमेशा हमेशा के लिए अजर अमर हो जाए यही मेरी कामना है।

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it would not be out of place to recall on this occasion the debates of the Constituent Assembly, where for the first time, the problem of national language was discussed. Sir, you were one of the Members of that elder body which debated this issue and tried to come to some compromise—I purposely use that word, because among all the languages, you selected one of the sister languages as an official language for the first time in Indian history. It is a historic decision, no doubt. Nowhere in the past history, so far as we could see, one language for all India ever existed. Therefore, looking to the conditions then prevailing, with the background of the national struggle behind and a certain crusading will shown by Gandhiji during the national struggle since 1922 to have some language of communication to the common people, this issue was decided by way of a compromise. It was because of him that this issue was decided by way of a compromise.

I remember, Sir, when you decided this issue that among the Indian languages Hindi should be elevated to the position of an official language, there was a good deal of mental reservation. There was a recognition that this language problem could not be solved like any other problem. There was a recognition that India on a political plane is a federation but it is something more than other federations. Because it is a federation of languages, it is a federation of cultures, the question of languages, cul-

tures and other social backgrounds of different regions must be debated and discussed from the regional angle and ultimately some consensus should be evolved.

On that occasion—I do not want to bring that issue here—you also had raised the question of the script. You had pleaded for the acceptance of the Roman script. When I go through the debates, I sometimes feel that this matter of the script also will have to be debated one of these days if at all we want to make any progress.

If we accept this position, now, after 1949, when you debate that issue in 1963, the issue is reopened for further debate, whether we have progressed, whether Hindi language is in a position to discharge the functions of a modern State, a very complicated State and preserve that sense of unity. Panditji, while speaking here yesterday, never mentioned “national language”. That epithet was not given by him for Hindi. He said that we want a “link language”. In the Constituent Assembly you have used the term “official language”. That is the proper term. Let my Hindi-speaking friends realise that ours is a composite political structure. This is a plural society in the real sense of the term, and in a plural society with a composite political structure we have tried to build up a certain sense of unity and we are going to strengthen it further in a diversity. It is a peculiar phenomenon. It is the art, it is the skill, it is the statesmanship of the central leadership to see how to further forge that link of unity and strengthen the ties of unity in a diversity, preserving different cultures and different languages giving them full scope for their development. This is the problem that has been reopened and is open for debate here, and it is not simply a question of continuing the *status quo*.

No doubt, the purpose of the Bill is very limited. We want to continue the *status quo*. We have realised that there is no other alternative. What-

[Shri Khadilkar]

ever one might say, let us admit frankly,—I do admit—with all our opposition to English, the debt that we owe to English language. The English language in this country has served as a foster mother for all the Indian languages. When we came in contact with English, particularly in the west and in the east, what do we find? My hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, yesterday referred to Macaulay. No doubt, the Britishers then thought that by the introduction of English they would be able to suppress the Indian languages. The opposite effect had taken place. Ideas filtered down, a certain cross-fertilisation of ideas and cultures and languages took place resulting in the flowering of the Indian languages. When I remember the past, what was the nature of the Indian languages. It was devotional and religious. In tone, it was poetic, no doubt. It had no secular approach, no prose worth the name.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): They were pious.

Shri Khadilkar: If I am wrong you may correct me later on. It had no prose worth the name. The Bengali writers, the Marathi writers and others....

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation (Shri B. S. Murthy): Andhra writers.

Shri Khadilkar: I am saying that in every region new forms were evolved, lyrics came, essays came and beautiful prose was being written in Bengali and every other language. I would say, a new creative period began and the flowering of languages took place. Therefore, Macaulay was defeated, I would humbly submit to Shastriji. Let him try to understand the phenomenon as it took place.

Another thing that happened was, when we came in contact with the British through their language and

with the western thought, a certain renaissance took place in the east and the west. Let my hon. friends belonging to the Hindi-speaking regions excuse me if I say that this renaissance never took place in the north of India as it took place in the east and the west. I am not making a very bold statement. I have got it examined with Hindi scholars like Kavi Dinkar and others. I make this statement because I had a discussion with him and he said that I was perfectly right. Therefore, in this period of renaissance, the flowing of languages in the east and the west developing a new personality and at the same time enriching itself with new ideas and assimilating them, has revolutionised the Indian languages and brought in a new development among great writers in Bengal, Maharashtra and other regions—I am not omitting the other regions, only for the sake of saving time I am mentioning two. Therefore, when we decide now and lay down a policy for the future we have to consider all these things.

What should be the policy? Let me be very frank. Some people, while talking about language here, think of their constituency. This is not a constituency problem, nor is this a party problem. This is a national problem. If we want to preserve and strengthen political unity we will have to recognise this federation of languages, this federation of cultures, where certain local feelings will have to be respected. It is an emotional problem. It is intimately connected with the life of the people. (*Interruptions*).

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): This "federation of languages and cultures" is not denied by anybody.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He is not talking of federation of voices.

Shri Khadilkar: This is intimately connected with the lives of the people, and I must say that if we remove this

force that has been projected by the English, contact with English, I am afraid the poverty of Indian literature is likely to further continue. Therefore, I for one would not like to break away from this world current, a world language in which new culture, new science and new art of Government and everything is being reflected every day. Are we going to cut ourselves off from this world stream and thereby have the satisfaction that we have done a patriotic duty?

Sir, my patriotism does not lead me or guide me in this direction that this language also I should try to shun and keep it out. I would like to assimilate whatever best is there in world thought, and this is the only language which has reached to some extent to some percentage of the population in this country and where this world thought, its absorption and infiltration to the lower level is taking place.

After saying this, I must also say one word regarding my hon. friend, Shri Anthony. Frankly, when he pleaded for English he was pleading for a good cause. But he was so much embittered that his accumulated bitterness he sputtered out and he lost the cause because of his speech.

There is another approach, and I would like just to mention one thing. When this question of whether we should enrich our own languages or try to have that fixation—a mystic Marxist here referred to it day before yesterday in his speech—to English was considered, at that moment Tagore gave a warning. What did he say? Tagore said that a few educated live in the upper part of the house and the vast illiterate millions live below, with no stair in between. So, I would humbly ask Shri Frank Anthony: after seeing all this, in this democracy should we not establish communion, certain communication and certain intercourse with the masses? It is only by that intercourse that we can enrich our language and get a new vitality and new force for our

political and social evolution. The only difference between the pleading of Shri Frank Anthony and my pleading is this. He is cut off from society. He is, in a way, I hope he will excuse me for saying so, a rootless person, without any mooring in the Indian society. He should shake off that complex of rootlessness and try to become one with the mass of the people, as poet Tagore advised the English-knowing people to emulate that example. If he does that, then his pleading for English would be more successful in the present context.

Then, before I come to the present measure, I would say that every region must have its full say in this matter and there should be at least one spokesman for each region. Sir, since you were also, at that time, taking a very prominent part in the discussion of this matter, you would realise the feelings and sentiments of the people when it is a question of language. Therefore, this is a problem in which, perhaps, what I am saying may not be acceptable to the hon. Member, Dr. Aney. He belongs to the past generation, more than two generations past. Those people who were born late in the last century have perhaps a different idea now about patriotism and language and culture.

So far as I am concerned, when I look at the present measure, I find that it needs certain modifications. Let me be very clear about it. Today, while laying down the law for the next ten years or more, the Home Minister or the Government is trying to win over the people to their point of view. I do realise that certain unanimity, unity and certain agreement must be reached. But unity on what basis? Let us realise and understand as I have said earlier, it is a compromise. I would like to ask Government one question. After elevating Hindi to that pedestal, what have they done during the last fifteen years or so to popularise Hindi, to propagate Hindi, in the Southern region? Have they established a university there? I know that in Maharashtra we have got

[Shri Khadilkar]

many people who are proficient in Hindi. We form a sort of link or bridge of understanding between the north and the south. We have nothing to say against Hindi as such. We would like to assimilate it, enrich it and give it a new form and content; we would like to remove its poverty. We want to be proud of Hindi. If there is a mixture of these languages, different languages contributing to Hindi, I think the Hindi language would be enriched. As Professor Mukerjee said, there is no creative writing in English? In the non-Hindi regions also there is no creative writing in Hindi. That must be realised.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must now conclude.

Shri Khadilkar: I will finish my speech in two minutes.

Therefore, to those who plead for Hindi and those who want to continue the *status quo* and those who want a Committee to be appointed right now, instead of appointing a Commission after ten years, I will put this question. What has happened to the progress of Hindi? Why is it that Hindi has not progressed so far? Why is it that the Hindi regions of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have not made any progress in this direction and introduced Hindi at the top—most level? Who have prevented them from doing this? They want progress of Hindi—excuse me for saying this—dependent upon getting full official recognition. I do not think any language can progress by Government backing alone. When Sankara came from Kerala to the North and established his *Math* to defeat Buddhism—of course, I do not agree with everything that he did—he established his caste system and stabilised a sort of agricultural society in this country, by allocating functions to different sections of society; when he did all that, he never had any governmental backing or governmental authority behind him; he did it as a mission and he succeeded. Why not the literate

Hindi people go to the south and east with a crusading spirit and establish centres of Hindi learning with the co-operation of the local people? That is the only way of spreading Hindi, making it more popular, and establishing intercourse between the masses and the Government.

Coming to the Bill, as I said..

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, he has to conclude now. I cannot afford to give more than ten minutes to any hon. Member. He has taken fifteen minutes.

Shri Khadilkar: Please give me two more minutes. I am the only spokesman from my region. I will finish my speech in two minutes.

Mr. Speaker: That is not fair. I will have to call another hon. Member from Maharashtra. So, I cannot give him more time. I think the best course left for me would be to ask Shri Khadilkar to sit in the Chair and regulate the business of the House. I am sorry, I cannot give him any more time now.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): **Mr. Speaker,** one thing is very clear from the debate till now, and that is this, this Bill enjoys general support from all parts of this House.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I only said "general support", and I underline it. All the same, it is very significant that there is general support for the spirit of the Bill, for the essence of the Bill.

Any impartial person in this country will welcome this Bill, which says that English will continue for as necessary a period as is thought by the people of this country. I do not think that anybody has seriously suggested that we should reconsider the decision of the Constituent Assembly. I do not pretend to forget the voice

of my hon. friend from the South, Shri Manoharan. Of course, he said that there should be a re-appraisal of the Constitution itself but I think it is too late in the day to plead for the re-appraisal of the Constitution as such.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): This is the proper time.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: As far as Hindi is concerned, we have accepted it as the official language. I come from the southern-most part of this country. The distance dividing Hindi and Malayalam, which is my mother tongue, is more than 2,000 miles. But, because of that alone, I do not consider Hindi to be a foreign language, as English is. I may inform you that some people talk too much about the anti-Hindi movement in the South, or in the non-Hindi-speaking areas. Of course, there are some fears and apprehensions, and some of them are quite justified. But, to say that the people in the South are all anti-Hindi is far from the truth. The basic and impartial question is this, whether one believes in the unity and oneness of the Indian nation. If one does believe in this, he has to agree to the necessity of choosing one of our national languages as the official language of the Union.

Shri S. Kandappan: Only on sentimental grounds.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: And we have rightly chosen Hindi as the official language. Again I would repeat that the basic question is whether one sincerely believes in the unity of India. If we decide to be a part of this country, we have to communicate with our brethren in the North, and there should be a medium for that.

Shri Kandappan: English is there.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Some people may ask: why not English? I will just request my friends to consider whether it will be a consolation for us in the non-Hindi-speaking areas

to see that a foreign language is imposed upon the Hindi-speaking people also. The people in the non-Hindi-speaking areas will have to learn another language, whether it is Hindi, English or Punjabi. Whatever be the official language, they will have to learn one language extra. That they will have to do anyway if the precondition is accepted, namely, that they remain a part of the Indian Union. If they decide to go away then it is a different question.

An Hon. Member: What about C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Then I do not think the language problem will be easily solved. In Dravidistan the common language problem will not be solved very easily.

An Hon. Member: We should not talk of that now.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: So, I think, it is no solution for the non-Hindi-speaking people to impose for our benefit a foreign language on nearly 40 per cent of the people who speak Hindi. It is all the more better for our country and for the non-Hindi-speaking people to learn a language which is an Indian language and which is spoken by quite a considerable section of people in this country.

But another question can be asked. Why should it not be any other Indian language? Why should it be Hindi itself? I will agree that it is a very genuine question. There is nothing wrong in selecting any of the Indian languages. Why not have Tamil? But, there again, I will submit this. I had an opportunity recently to visit Indonesia. They had a very similar problem. I was really interested to see that the Indonesian language which is a common language was really spoken by a microscopic minority in Indonesia. The language, which is similar to Hindi here, is Javanese but they refused to accept Javanese as the common language and decided to have the Indonesian language, which was

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

the mother tongue of only a very small minority, for the whole country of hundreds of islands. It is very interesting to see that after 1928 when that decision was taken in a national convention during the last 35 years they have succeeded in popularising this minority language throughout the country. Even in the remotest village, even an old woman can understand and speak this language. So, theoretically there is nothing wrong in accepting any of the 14 languages, but in India we cannot just copy. We have a past, we have a history, we have a tradition of the national movement and Hindi has occupied this position as a result of all these things put together. So, it is futile to think about another country which in its wisdom and quite rightly has chosen a minority language.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): Have you mastered Hindi as much as you have mastered English?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I would request my hon. friend, Shri Sreekantan Nair, not to think so much about us but to think about our children. That is the real difficulty. For me or for my hon. friend, Shri Sreekantan Nair, it will be very difficult, almost impossible to speak Hindi as we speak English. It is late in the day to think about that. Maybe, some linguists will do that, people who can learn language very easily can do that. But I am thinking of my son who is in the school today and who is learning Hindi as a compulsory subject. It will be of interest to you to know that in my State for the last 15 or 20 years Hindi is a compulsory subject in the secondary schools.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: They will also be at a disadvantage.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: It is interesting to know that there was no such violent movement against the imposition of Hindi on the school-children there. They were taking to it. They

were learning it. I am sure, if you properly teach them, my hon. will speak Hindi as I speak English or even much better. So, we are thinking about the future and we come to the conclusion again that we have to have an official language. That language cannot be English. That language should be an Indian language and we have chosen Hindi as the official language for various reasons of past history and traditions of our national movement.

Now the whole problem is about the change-over. That is the crux of the problem today. There one has to be very careful. One has to go step by step. One should not hustle the Government into wrong or hasty decisions. On that question of change-over, suppose, we are asked to have the leadership of people like Swamiji, I think, that will be the biggest calamity for this country; that will be the end of India. There is no doubt about that. Fortunately for us that day will not come, I am sure, when that kind of leadership will be imposed upon this country—an intolerant, inflexible, unreasonable leadership, who just want to impose something which they believe to be sacred upon the whole country. I am sure that neither this House nor this country will back up such unreasonable movement which may lead to the disruption of this great country. So when we think of this change-over to the official language, that is, from English to Hindi, in course of time after the non-Hindi-speaking people have picked up Hindi quite sufficiently, there cannot be much of this difficulty.

There I have to make some concrete proposals to the hon. Minister. He is not present here but, I am sure, his deputy will tell him what our feeling is. One of the main problems agitating the people, specially the middle-class, the educated section, in the non-Hindi-speaking areas is that of Government service, that is, the Union service. We have given notice of an amendment to the effect that a candi-

date appearing for a test by the Union Public Service Commission should have the liberty to write in English, Hindi or his mother tongue. A candidate who writes his paper in a language other than his mother tongue should be given some special consideration. Again, those candidates who come from the Hindi-speaking areas will also have to pass through certain tests because when we accept Hindi as the official language there is an inherent advantage for those who come from the Hindi-speaking areas. It should not be allowed to perpetuate into some kind of a vested interest. It should not be allowed to stand in the way of those people coming from the non-Hindi-speaking areas. So, it was very wise on the part of the Government to devise the three-language formula. The Hindi-speaking areas are expected to teach a language other than Hindi that is, one of the modern Indian languages, and English and we would propose that a Hindi-speaking candidate should definitely be asked to write a paper in one of the non-Hindi languages in India so that these two categories of people are put on the same footing and one does not feel that one is at a disadvantage. There I will agree that when he writes a paper in another modern Indian language he should also be given some consideration. There should be moderation. In examinations we have heard of moderation. That moderation can be exercised in the case of non-Hindi-speaking candidates when they write in Hindi and in the case of Hindi-speaking candidates when they write a paper in another Indian language. If a guarantee like this is given and if that is implemented, much of the heartburning of the non-Hindi-speaking people can be removed and much of the apprehensions also can be removed. But I have a feeling that in the implementation of the three-language formula the Hindi-speaking States are indifferent.

The Emotional Integration Committee in its report has indirectly suggested that the progress made in the Hindi States, as far as the taking up

the teaching of South Indian languages is concerned, is not at all satisfactory. They may have several excuses to give—lack of teachers, etc.,—as I heard the U.P. Minister giving such excuses. But an feeling that the Hindi States are reluctant are in different, in enforcing 3-Language Formula will do great harm to this country.

13 hrs.

What about the Universities? We were told yesterday by Dr. Shrimali that the universities are going to accept regional languages as the medium of instruction. But today 90 per cent of our universities are having English as the medium of instruction in the universities. What a calamity it has brought to the education system, you should know, Sir. A student is learning everything in his regional language upto the matriculation and soon as he enters the university, the college, he has to learn everything in English. As the Prime Minister rightly pointed out, the standard of English is going down and a student finds it so difficult. So, it is high time that the medium of instruction in the universities also should be the regional language.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Excuse me; I want only one or two minutes more.

When we think of the changeover from English to the national language, as Prof. Mukerjee, our leader, has pointed out on the first day in his speech, it is very important that the regional languages take their proper place. I was really surprised to hear some of the speeches of the so-called Hindi enthusiasts when they spoke so much about the conversion to Hindi. I am sorry to say they did not speak about the necessity of the changeover to the other languages also. They should have that much consideration for Tamil, Malayalam, Gujarati or Marathi and all that as they have for Hindi. Very often they think only about Hindi, Hindi, Hindi and nothing else. If they cannot think of about

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

the other 14 languages with the same kind of kindness and consideration and patronage, then the real unity of our country cannot be achieved. If proper leadership is given, I am sure, this linguistic problem, a delicate problem and the most difficult problem, can be solved to the interests of our people, to the unity of our country. The thing that we need today is proper leadership, not the leadership that is intolerant and unreasonable.

Shri P. C. Borooah: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in spite of so much of debate, discussions and generation of heat taking place in Parliament and in the party-parleys, platforms and in the press, I must confess that I have not been able to get myself much interested in this controversy on the issue of Official Language Bill. It is because, Sir, with the aggression of Chinese in the north and infiltration of Pakistanis in the south and the west, that area has been sandwiched between the two unfriendly countries and the people of Assam have to keep alert for any eventuality. They have not been able to forget those grim days of October and November last year when they suffered a good deal on account of the Chinese aggression and also on account of our unpreparedness for guarding our frontiers. Adding to this again, comes the news of new concentration of troops, consider of roads and air-fields on our northern frontier. The apprehensions with the people there are rising high. Such being the state of affairs and such being the state of mind of the people of Assam, it is only natural that they have not been able to take much interest in this controversy. The country is still in the state of national emergency and the people of Assam feel that nothing should have been done which may come in the way of our making an all-out effort which we have been called upon to make for defence and development of the country. This controversy that has arisen now has to a great extent diverted their attention from making the country prepared for defence and deve-

lopment. As such, they feel that the Bill should not have been brought at this moment. We could have deferred it till the cessation of the national emergency because we have got still enough time for bringing such a measure before Parliament. This is my first observation.

Coming to the question Hindi's position in the country, I would like to say that India is one national and a nation must have a common national language. The people of this country have unequivocally declared Hindi to be their common language, whether for official purpose or for national usage. It is a happy augury that there is not much objection, rather there is no objection to this decision. Hindi is going ahead all right although the pace, one must admit, is a bit slow. But let there be no hurry or compulsion; let it have a natural growth. After all, the life of a nation is not limited to a single generation only. The thing which is not possible immediately can possibly be done in 5, 10 or 25 years. The thing which cannot be done in one generation can possibly be done in the next. Still, then, it will be well within the life time of the national. So, there is nothing to fear that the Hindi will not be the only official language of the country. This is my second observation.

Coming to the position of English, I need not say much because much has been said in favour of this language, the great part that it had played in the unification of the country and also in the achievement of our independence. I would only appeal to the Hindi-supporting friends that let the position be not disturbed for the present. I am making this appeal to them only for two reasons. Firstly, a large majority of our people have not yet been able to pick up the Hindi language quite well and, in spite of it, if it is forced on them, there will naturally be repercussions and those repercussions will do harm not only to the cause of Hindi as the official

language but also to the cause of the country. Secondly, the Hindi itself has not fully developed and it has been said by many of my friends here that it has not yet attained the position to replace English in the country. Not only that nothing has yet been done to make it fit for its usage in technical, legal and scientific spheres, it has not yet been standardised also. What we find in this House? When our Prime Minister on rare occasions speaks in Hindi, his language is somewhat different from what is spoken by our Home Minister. Again, the language spoken by the Home Minister is somewhat different from the language spoken by our Agriculture Minister, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh. This is the position. There is already a controversy going on in the country in regard to the form of Hindi that will be used by All India Radio. There is a permanent controversy existing in regard to the writing of the cinema scripts for Hindi films. There is difference between the Wardha school and the Hindi school of the Rashtra Bhasha Prachar Samitis. All these things perplex the non-Hindi-speaking people. They must know definitely what the form of Hindi is which will be used for official purposes, and what the Hindi will be which they will have to learn. This is the main thing. Until and unless that is done, I do not think that English as it is being used should be disturbed.

Fourthly, coming to the regional languages, I hope that the development of the regional languages will not be allowed to suffer because of our making Hindi the official language.

Many legal and constitutional points were raised here. I am not a lawyer myself. So, I do not want to discuss about those things very much, but having a little bit of common-sense I could not get myself convinced why the word 'may' will mean 'shall', and why the word 'shall' will mean 'may'. I do not understand this thing. But I could follow what Shri Mahtab was telling us yesterday,

namely that the word 'may' means 'may' and the word 'shall' means 'shall'. That is the only thing that I could follow the interpretation that he gave about 'may', and I support that thing. I think that 'may' in this Bill is quite appropriate, and there is no necessity to disturb it.

I do not want to speak for long, because everything has been said already. I only want to say that the people of Assam have got general support to this Bill, and as for my part, I support this Bill, subject, however, to any additions or alterations which our Home Minister may bring in afterwards. With these words, I support the Bill.

Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet): As I was listening yesterday to the speech of our Prime Minister with respectful attention, I could not help feeling that he was wriggling in the grip of two conflicting emotions, his heart, his inclinations, his culture and his upbringing pulling him from one side, and the compulsions of a party government tugging him from the other. The Bill is a reflection of the double personality of our Government.

Shri Bade (Khargone): It is a tug-war.

Shri Narasimha Reddy: I really congratulate the drafting department and the genius that inspired it for having made it possible with such incredible cleverness for the Government to do in future as they like, according to the Hindi or English colour of the personality that presides over the Home Ministry.

After the framing of our Constitution, the Hindi enthusiasts have been on the war-path. Some of them have resorted to threats and intimidation, instead of sweet reasonableness and understanding of the points of view of

[Shri Narasimha Reddy]

others who are in no way inferior to them either in numbers or in quality. Dr. Subbarayan, a leading Congressman, who was the Chief Minister of Madras, who subsequently occupied many important positions, and who died in harness as Governor, full of years and honours has in his dissenting note attached to the report of the Official Language Commission said that the majority in the Official Language Commission did not take into consideration the deliberate and considered views of important witnesses from Bengal, Madras and the Kannada-speaking areas. If this is the case with cultivated and cultured gentlemen of light and leading, we can easily understand the tenor of mobs who are actuated almost always by emotion.

Some of the Hindi enthusiasts have been behaving of late in a manner which threatens to assume dangerous proportions. The disturbance at the time of the President's Address to both Houses is an attempt to storm the Central citadel by an outright onslaught. In spite of the Speaker of this House admonishing the Members for such a conduct, there have been repeated scenes of intimidation in Parliament, while a crowd of a thousand or more was battering at the gates outside the House, led by some political leaders. This has created the worst kind of apprehensions in the minds of the non-Hindi-speaking people, this simultaneous exhibition of pressure tactics both inside and outside the Parliament, so much revolts that if the Prime Minister does not stand firm in this matter, I am afraid that there will be grave repercussions in the south. We see it reported in the papers today that about 101 persons have been arrested in Madras picketing a Hindi *prachar*-house conducted by the Union Home Ministry.

I wish that Government would some time or the other convene a Congress session in Madras or in Calcutta.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How can Government convene a Congress session?

Shri Narasimha Reddy: I am sorry—I meant Parliament session. Then, Government will see not one thousand persons but ten lakhs of people thronging at the gates to give an unmistakable impression of the feeling of the non-Hindi-speaking people regarding this language question. Members of Parliament who but yesterday nearly swept with angry gestures and gesticulation swept Shri Frank Anthony off his feet would also realise what an amount of feeling there is in the south regarding this language problem.

With these conflicting emotions surging in different parts of the country, emotions which at any time may take a violent turn, it is up to the statesmen of our country, and to the distinguished Members of Parliament who are at the helm of affairs today to rise above local prejudices and stringulations. Especially in a region where the fires of session are smouldering, I hope Government will not fan the flames, not the Members of Parliament do anything which would lead to the undoing of that edifice so enthusiastically built by the great men of our country. Merely saying that such and such a thing is enshrined in the Constitution, and so, it is imperative to act on it, does not improve matters. It is no answer to the question, because the Constitution itself so far has been amended fourteen times, and two more Bills are pending sanction—Bills which do not have even an one-millionth of the importance which the language issue has at the present day. Dr. Subbarayan in his dissenting report had mentioned that while Commission had its sittings, the Madras Government sent a second letter requesting them to even recommend an amendment to the Constitution.

We have been receiving threatening letters and communications calling

those people who are in favour of English as 'Deshdrohis'. In the great days of the national movement, it was the English language that combined the north and south in one common bond of friendship and brotherliness and the 'English-speaking' people were in the vanguard of those patriots who fought for the country's freedom, To address such letters to those who have got a soft corner for English like this and to address them letters like this will merely is to drive the iron into their hearts and make them stand stiff in an uncompromising attitude.

The non-Hindi speaking people have languages of their own, languages highly developed and cultured with a glowing literature extending back over a thousand years. They are proud of their languages. They feel they are not yet acclimatised or reconciled to a comparatively later language an infant language like the Hindi dominating the all-India scene. They feel that a State language like their own should not have that pre-eminent position. They are prepared to have English because they feel at ease with that language in so far as correspondence at home or abroad is concerned.

They feel that so far as languages are concerned, both English and Hindi are foreign languages; at any rate, they feel that Hindi is not the language in which Lord Buddha spoke nor Ashoka administered his empire. They are content with the thought and memory that it is the English languages which brought them into contact and understanding conversation with the great men and women of our times like Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, Dr. Annie Beasant and Mahatma Gandhi; they feel that it is English that opened the gateway to knowledge and scientific and technical advancement, and that any tinkering with English would take our country back to the dark middle ages.

There is only one man in this country in the higher rungs who has taken a national, reasonable and rational view in the matter and that is Pandit

Nehru. His first reactions to this language question on August 7, 1959 have been clear, emphatic and unmistakable. We heard the DMK leader Shri Manoharan mentioning the other day that this statement of his has been widely welcomed and appreciated throughout the non-Hindi speaking areas.

The Bill, as it is drafted, whittles down the assurances given by the Prime Minister. Much has been said about the words 'shall' and 'may' and other things. But so far as these two words are concerned, I may say this: we may spend days and days in casuistry and verbal jugglery regarding the meaning of these words 'may' and 'shall'; but we cannot take away from them the natural meaning that people give them in common and in legal parlance. 'May' means 'certainly' may not'. If I mention in Parliament that I 'may' resign my membership of Parliament tomorrow, it does not mean that some of the hefty Members of Parliament sitting opposite should come to me, compel me, put a pen in my hand and ask me to write my resignation—simply because I said that I 'may' resign my membership. If 'may' is not substituted by 'shall', it means there has been a thorough some result of the assurance given by the Prime Minister to Parliament. Further, the other assurance the more important assurance, that Hindi will not be imposed on us and that English would remain the official language for as long as the non-Hindi people want it, has not been implemented at all.

This is the second time in the lifetime of our Prime Minister when the solidarity and integrity of the country hangs by a thread. The first was at the time of the formation of linguistic States. He should have stood firm then on it. But unfortunately he yielded. He yielded because a few wagons and a few station yards in Andhra were burnt. He thought a revolution was in the offing, and he declared in the Lok Sabha in a voice surging with emotion that he was ac-

[Shri Narasimha Reddy]

ceptable to the formation of an Andhra Province, which brought with it a [trial] of undesirable consequences.

Now, again, the country stands in the same position. The integrity and safety of our country is at the cross-roads. It is time for our Prime Minister to take a firm stand in the matter. I am sure that on him lies the safety of our country. It has been a fashion from the time of the formation of the linguistic States for agitators to feel that if they want to get anything done by the Prime Minister which he does not really want to do they will have to carry on a continuous ceaseless and relentless agitation, and finally would have to yield. These are pressure tactics.

In this context, I would like to quote the words of Edmund Burke, which are instructions for statesmen and politicians for all times and under all circumstances not to be carried away by temporary agitation. He says:

"Simply because half-a-dozen grasshoppers make the field wring with their importunate chink while thousands of cattle repose under the mighty oak, pray do not think that the whole world is filled with no other noise but the noise of these few but troublesome insects of the hour".

Outside the walls of this Parliament House, beyond the confines of Delhi, far away to the farthest south, and the outermost extremities of the east and west, there are millions of hearts throbbing in unison with Pandit Nehru's sentiments which he uttered on August, 1959, that he should no longer sacrifice the integrity of the country in order to appease the ravenous move of any linguistic demon. I invite Pandit Nehru to support our amendments which are couched in his language and sentiments, and justify himself before his conscience, his country and the world at large that un-

daunted he has fulfilled the historic assurance which he made in Parliament on August 7, 1959.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): In a matter of momentous importance like this, one would have expected the measure to be introduced in a friendly and hospitable atmosphere. It is rather unfortunate that some friendly and hospitable atmosphere. It is rather unfortunate that some friends, at any rate, chose to generate a certain amount of heat into the discussions, not knowing possibly what profound and unfortunate reactions that such a conduct would have on the country. Luckily that atmosphere which did not at all bode well for the future of this measure has improved considerably in the course of these few days and I should congratulate the House Minister for having been very helpful in the matter. A large number of Hindi-speaking people have also adopted a very reasonable attitude towards the Bill. I hope they will also appreciate how extremely helpful and co-operative the non-Hindi speaking Members of this House have been. Therefore, I believe that this Bill has a better chance of success and the bodings that were entertained earlier will not come out true.

On this occasion I would like the House to remember with gratitude the great mission that the Father of the Nation understood and the prophetic vision with which he launched this movement in favour of Hindi as the one common language of India. It was as early as 1918 when nobody had any idea of sharing the spoils of war that he did it. He sent his own son to Madras to propagate Hindi. Ever since in all the South Indian States there has been an unassuming movement, but all the same a very powerful movement and a very widespread movement, in favour of Hindi. In those days we could not have found much of support or patronage or financial assistance from the Government of the day. Even so, by the voluntary

work of the numerous Hindi workers aided by local leaders, be in noted, not from those areas from where the clamour for Hindi is the loudest today but our local leaders, they were able to have something like 6000 centres for Hindi learning and possibly about 4000—5000 or even a larger number of Hindi pracharaks. Even after freedom they have been doing magnificent work. In fact my complaint has been throughout all these years that in spite of the fact that the Constitution laid an injunction especially under article 351 that Hindi must be propagated all over India very little has been done by the Government, by the Central Government for the purpose of propagating Hindi. I do not depend upon any other material except their own publications. I have been able to gather figures till about 1957-58. For the propagation of Hindi the Central Government has spent about Rs. 9 lakhs, out of which Rs. 8 lakhs have gone to the Hindi areas and about Rs. 1.20 lakhs to the non-Hindi areas. I have got detailed figures. I am thinking whether anybody was at all serious in this matter. It was no happy commentary for the Ministry of Education yesterday when our Prime Minister said that more than this Ministry, it is the cinema industry that has popularised Hindi. I was inclined to intervene and say: do not forget the voluntary work that has been done by the people of those areas. If here and there you hear the voice like that of the DMK friends, the fire-eaters at other end... (*An Hon. Member:* are they lonely?) you should not understand that the rest of the South India is inhospitable to Hindi. My friend Shri Vasudevan Nair just now said about Kerala, Andhra and Mysore have been running a number of voluntary institutions for the propagation of Hindi and Tamilnad I must say is doing equally well, if not even better, though the voice of our DMK friends is much louder. I may say that there are quite a number of people who speak on the platform against Hindi but they choose to send their ladies and children to these Hindi institutions and see that they learn Hindi

just as we hear many Ministers and others speaking about basic education, or Hindi but sending their children... (*Interruptions.*)

An Hon. Member: They are sending their children to the convent to study English, while talking of basic education. Are the children of DMK

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

Shri Dasappa: They are sending their children to the convents where English is the medium of instruction. This is the kind of life that we see but that should not in the least men that so far as this Bill is convened, it is likely to meet with any large opposition.

The matter has assumed such a controversy as the Prime Minister was pleased to give certain assurances. In fact the Statement of Objects and Reasons states very specifically that the Bill has been brought forward in order to implement the assurances given by the Prime Minister on the 4th September 1959. Does this embody or enshrine all the assurance in itself? That is the main question.

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

Shri Dasappa: How many more seconds or minutes I can have?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have taken ten minutes.

Shri Dasappa: I shall conclude in a few minutes. With the explanations that have been given, it is evident that it does enable English to be continued along with Hindi as the official language with no limitation of time and further the fact that the various States including the non-Hindi speaking States will be consulted is a matter which is gratifying.

[Shri Dasappa]

To that extent it must be reassuring to the Members.

I pleaded elsewhere to introduce the word 'shall' instead of 'may'. In the context of what the Prime Minister has stated 'may' will be as satisfactory as 'shall'. My hon. friend Shri Hanumanthaiya stated the other day that after all this is not a thing which could be decided merely by a provision in the law. If for instance this law is not going to be implemented not only in letter but in the true spirit, the non-Hindi speaking people have enough strength and solidarity in them to assert themselves against such a thing.

There are certain friends who want to spell out everything in detail. It is not fair that logic should be driven to that extent. We should not drive the measure to the logical limitations. I am reminded of a play by Ibsen, *Demand for the ideal*. There was a very happy family, father, mother, children, brothers and sisters. They were getting on exceedingly well, peacefully, contented and happy. But a great reformer came in their midst and he told them what the behaviour and the conduct of the father should be, what the character and conduct of the mother should be, how the son should behave towards his parents and how the brother should behave towards his sister and so on. From that day they began to test their conduct in the light of this fine ideal which was held out by the reformer before them. Now, would you believe that house broke into fragments. So, what I am suggesting is, it is better that we do not try to be too logical like that which endanger our unity. Let us leave it here. After all it is a life-current that we are having. Language is a growing thing and through it various ideas also grow. Therefore, I would suggest that these matters should not be driven to their logical conclusion. The Bill, on the whole, merits the support of the House.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, from one side of the House there has been a fear expressed that this Bill perpetuates English, and from the other, that it is an imposition of Hindi, that is from the southern regions. Naturally both cannot be right. It is quite possible that both are wrong, because, as far as I can see, this Bill has tried to take into account the feelings and emotions and the ideas of the Hindi-speaking regions and also the fears and doubts and the apprehensions that exist in the minds of the South. The Government have tried to accommodate reason and emotion together and this is the best they could do and, I, without any reservation whatsoever, accept this Bill.

There has been a great deal of talk about the merits of English. Some say it is the window to the outside world and some call it a gateway and so on. Some claim that our unity itself depends upon the merits of English language and by its use in this country. They forget that while English has been a communicating medium between States and the people in this country, it also gave birth and is responsible for the creation of Pakistan. So, to claim all sorts of things for the English language is not at all a correct thing. Surely nobody is going to discard English. It does not matter what language you have. The Russians are learning English; the Germans are learning English, and it will be an advantage. We will do so. But, at the same time, the claim that English is our saviour, that English is the only one thing through which we can progress, I think, is simply unacceptable. Those who want English do not do so because they think that English is as good as a national language for them. It is only a weapon which they are using for protecting something else. So, what they fear is, by the introduction of Hindi, not the imposition of Hindi

but the dominance of Hindi-speaking people. This fear is genuine.

My hon. friends from the Hindi area may say all that is not true; it would not be imposed and we do not want to put any hurdles in the way of the south. At the same time, look at the whole picture of our linguistic States. In every State today, the person whose mother-tongue is that of the State language has a definite advantage not only because he knows that particular language but of the very fact of having been born as a person belonging to that community or language; that is the emotion. That is the thing that exists today. Whatever you say, you cannot remove from the mind of the people in the South that lurking fear. So, the problem today is, how to meet or remove that fear.

Look at the suggestion of having examinations by the Union Public Service Commission in Hindi and how it created a furore; they were frightened. The only way is to see that there is equality of load, that all people carry equal burden. Shri Nair suggested that the UPSC examinations should be in 14 languages. The difficulty is about the evaluation. We have a competitive examination; if one person is answering in one language and another is answering in another language, you cannot compare the two, and the comparison of two standards becomes difficult. There is this difficulty. But there are other ways you can devise.

If a person's mother-tongue is Hindi, you must compel that person to take some other language. I insist on some other Dravidian language like Malayalam or Tamil or Teugu or Kannada, because then they will feel the difficulty that the people from the Kannada and Tamil and similar areas have to undergo to learn Hindi. This can be one. Taking all our Hindi enthusiasts, can any of them tell me if they have

made any attempt to learn any South Indian language—enthusiasts like, for instance, Dr. Govind Das and Shri Prakash Vir Shastri? (*Interruptions*) They did not.

Now, it was said that the three-language formula has not been implemented. So, they say there should be a national language. You cannot have an official language by passing a resolution. If Dr. Govind Das and Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, for instance form a Government today, they will not be able to make Hindi as the official language from 1965. I challenge them. Even after 10 years they will not be able to do it. What is the use of arguing and lamenting and crying over a thing when they know it is not possible. So, we have to do the next best thing. So, there is a psychological malady and you have to find a cure.

An Hon. Member: What is your cure?

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: I said that the load must be equal.

Dr. M. S. Aney: How would you do it unless you trust those people? (*Interruption*).

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: For example, in the UPSC, for the purpose of the examination, the Hindi-knowing person must be compelled to take some Dravidian language. (*Interruption*). I have got very little time. I know come to the assurances. Shri Frank Anthony wanted everything to be put down in writing. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, on the other hand, wanted to . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let him proceed.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: In this Bill itself, there is a provision for having a committee, and the committee will be elected on proportional representation. Naturally, the committee will consist of a very large number of people coming from the non-Hindi

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

areas. If this committee makes suggestions, it will have a binding not only on Parliament but also on the non-Hindi speaking areas. They are represented there. Naturally, the Government will not take any step which will create a furore and dissatisfaction in the whole of South India. That is not statemanship. That is not the art of Government. Therefore, there is no reason for fears and doubts. Suppose, even if Shri Frank Anthony to have such these things are put down in writing Parliament can always change it. Where is the guarantee? He cannot have a steel-frame like that.

Then, Shri Prakesh Vir Shastri was saying that the assurance should have been given when the Constitution was framed. How could that be done? After 15 years we are faced with a particular situation and that particular situation demands that the people in the South who have got fears for the South. Therefore, I think we will be making a great mistake if we divide the people and so on by creating this passion about Hindi, English, Tamil and so on.

Further, it was asked that the report of the committee should be sent to the State legislatures. I am dead against it, because the conditions in the States are such that when a thing like that goes there, then the emotions are roused; there is competition; to take the extreme view, look at the river dispute and see what stand they have taken.

I ask the people from the Hindi areas, why has not Hindi grown and why do we still feel hatred for it after 15 years of independence? I come from Hyderabad where the business of Government was conducted in Urdu; the instruction in university was conducted in Urdu; and the proceeding of the High Court were conducted in Urdu, but still it was quite easy for the Government

of India to have a university in Hyderabad in Hindi medium. But our Hindi enthusiasts are so afraid of contamination of Urdu. So, the whole chance of utilising the apparatus that was there was lost because of this attitude of the Hindi speaking people. They are creating a new language; every day a new word is coined. They just think that by bringing a dictionary like Dr. Raghuvira, they are doing a service to the language. That is not the case.

I come not from any particular area with a language, but my mother tongue is Urdu. I do not belong either to the Hindi or non-Hindi area. Urdu was borne in the bazaars of Delhi. But unfortunately today, like Karna of Mahabharata, it is not recognised by the family and it is ousted. If tomorrow we have a kind of country with India and Pakistan as a sort of federation—if you have that picture in mind; if not politically, at least on other grounds, some sort of federation is bound to come—on that day how much advantage there would have been if you had a language that would absorb Urdu and become the common language for the future? It was because of that our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi foresaw that years ago and he insisted upon Hindustani in Devanagari and Arabic script. Having that idea in mind, I think we should be more generous and more liberal, to accept this Bill and work with a feeling of service to the country. With that in mind, we can go a long way.

Dr. M. S.: Sir, let me thank you for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate. This Bill is in my opinion a confession on the part of the Central Government of its failure to discharge the duties and obligations laid upon it by the Constitution under Chapter XVII. The object and nature of all those duties and obligations have been clearly and unambiguously laid down in Article 351 which gives a special

directive for development of the Hindi language. That article is there in the Constitution for the hon. Members to read.

In this connection, I desire to quote the opinion of my friend and one of the most respected Members of the House, the late Thakurdaḡ Bhargava, expressed in his minute of dissent to the report of the Committee of Parliament on official languages at page 103. I will only quote a small portion—a few sentences—from that paragraph. He said:

“I must frankly say that had the Education Ministry been active and done its duty from its start, i.e., 1951, the present situation in regard to the language dispute would not have arisen. But it is no use now bemoaning the past.”

Along with him, I also think that it is no use bemoaning the past. There could not be greater condemnation of the policy of the present in the period from 1951 to the date of the publication of the above report.

I would agree with Mr. Bhargava that it is no use bemoaning the past.

There is another matter which cannot but sadden the minds of all those who worked for Swaraj under the inspiration of leaders like Late Dadabhi Naoroji, Lokmanya Tilak and under the dynamic leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and contributed their humble mite not only to the bringing of Swaraj, but also to the building up of the Constitution. What we find is, there is a great difference in the attitude of the people towards Hindi then and the attitude of the people towards Hindi now. At the time of the Constituent Assembly—most of us were present there in the Assembly, when the matter was ultimately brought, it was unanimously adopted. There was unanimous support to the recognition of Hindi as the official language of India in Devanagari script. There

was no difference about it. But here find today there is not a negligible section of the House which not only does not accept Hindi, but considers it a matter of a serious nature, disregard of which may be followed by serious consequences. This kind of threat is there.

Shri S. Kandappan: It is a derogatory to us.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I am not saying this in disparagement of what my friends have spoken. My point is, this is the situation in the country today, of which Members have to take notice while considering this present Bill.

In 1963 we hear harsh and jarring notes of opposition coming from at any rate not a negligible section of the House. Threats are held out of partition of Bharat into North and South India by certain groups. And, we find some very eminent public men add their powerful voice of support to this cry.

Among other reasons, I have no hesitation to say that the agitation that swept over Bharat for demand of linguistic provinces and ended after the formation of a number of new linguistic States such as Andhra, Kerala, Karnatak, Maharashtra, Gujrat and Madhya Pradesh roused the linguistic fanaticism in the country. And, it has not at all disappeared with the creation of the linguistic States. On the other hand, every dispute between one linguistic province and another, be it of an economic nature or of administrative nature, has been found to be incapable of mutual settlement. Vidarbha area, for its non-linguistic attitude and its strong stand to keep itself aloof from being drawn into these disintegrating forces, demanded a separate existence for itself as an autonomous unit. But the Government of India felt itself powerless and succumbed to the influence of the linguistic fanatics. Linguism destroyed the broader outlook and

[Shri M. S. Aney]

dimmed the nationalism, coming in the way of compromise and mutual settlement of differences between themselves. That is the situation which we find today.

Once the idea of identifying the greatness of the State with its regional language was thus fostered, it was but a step forward for a further and dangerous deterioration that some of the enthusiasts in these separate linguistic States could easily raise the bogey of Hindi imperial rule over the non-Hindi Indian States. It seemed as if free India is going to get a challenge from several bigoted groups in Madras, their sympathisers in Karnatak and Andhra, threatening the unity of Bharat at a time when a foreign power like China has already invaded certain parts of the Himalayas on the northern borders and another neighbouring State, Pakistan, is taking all possible steps to add to the difficulties of India.

It is freely written in certain papers that the right of secession from the Indian Federation is perfectly constitutional. Who are the persons who are taking part in this discussion. Some of the most eminent public men of India are taking part in this discussion.

14 hrs.

Sir, I have dealt with this aspect at some length because I think that the Members must have a correct and concrete picture of the situation in which the Government of India is called upon to tackle this problem. We are living in a state of emergency. Do not forget it. The state of emergency is still there. The situation is a peculiar one. All these factors have to be taken into consideration before you pronounce your opinion on this Bill.

If what I have said above is correct, then I say without any hesita-

tion that the need for the whole of India to stand united was never so imperative and urgent as it is today. When a grave situation arises, the leaders of the nation have to be bold, brave and benign.

I say, Sir, that the present Bill is the result of the combination of these three great qualities which can help the nation to persuade our disgruntled friends to be with us to serve the motherland and present to the enemy nations that the integrity of India both emotional and physical is inviolate and that any attempt at its violation will be stubbornly opposed by India as a whole. This picture, in my opinion, is necessary, and the whole world is looking as to how we are behaving in regard to this matter and what ultimately will be the impression left on the people of India as a whole. That is the main point that we have to consider, and not as to how many people are speaking Hindi and how many are speaking languages other than Hindi.

I believe strongly that the present Bill does that to a great extent. I do not say that it could not have been improved on.

Now I shall deal with a few points in the Bill as it is to show how and why it should be acceptable to all, the whole House, even to my esteemed friend Shri Frank Anthony and the members of the community. The first and foremost thing of importance is that the Bill does not touch or affect in the least the exalted position given to Hindi in Devanagiri script as the official language of the Union. I want hon. Members to remember that. Secondly, English language shall continue to be after 1965 what it has been since 1948 and for transaction of business in Parliament. This is *status quo*. This is a matter which those who are opposed to this Bill looking at the whole picture should see, that at least for some time to come English language will continue as an associate

language. Thirdly, there would be a committee appointed at the end of ten years to review the progress made in the use of Hindi for official purposes of the Union, and submit a report to the President making recommendations thereon. Fourthly, texts of the Acts of the Union will be in English and the authorised translation in Hindi as Hindi texts shall be prepared. I would have liked the position reversed rather than what it is stated in the Bill. Fifthly, the State legislatures are free to adopt regional languages for their Acts and also for use in High Courts etc. Though the Bill prolongs the use of English beyond 1965, its displacement by Hindi as the national language is kept as the goal to be achieved.

As the progress of Hindi is kept dependent on the report of the Committee and its recommendations on which Parliament will have to act, there is no question of imposition of Hindi on them. It shall make its way towards the goal by parliamentary methods which consist of consent in a particular way of the people of India speaking all the various languages. The question of official language of India is a national question and not one of Hindi-speaking or non-Hindi speaking people. The Parliament cannot abdicate its sovereign right to please even the Prime Minister or appease some of the disgruntled people of this country. While making a law for the whole of India, Parliament cannot abdicate its powers and keep it dependent upon the consent of some minority or majority or some disgruntled people.

Sir, there is only one more point which I want to touch. The main difficulty in this matter is that the object of higher education is service of the State and Union, even now as it has been before. This object has to be changed. It is mainly this thing that has created the whole trouble. An equitable distribution of appointments among people of

regional languages should also be possible. If these things are taken into consideration, the present Bill should appear to be a measure which should help us to bring about a kind of understanding to maintain the unity which is the great need of the hour.

There is one more point. Many people resent the idea that we should have to use and accept English as associate language and medium of education even after 15 years of our independence. It is so because we have not become self-sufficient in this direction, as we have not been self-sufficient in the matter of defence. We require their arms, their technicians and so on to prepare our defence and even industrial progress. So also, in administrative matters we shall have to accept English as our associate language. We have to preserve the territorial unity and administrative smoothness and efficiency with the help of English weapons and English language also for some time to come.

Sir, if my friends approach the question from the points of view which I have tried to place before them, they will have good reason to congratulate the Government on having found a solution to the rather ticklish question of the official language problem. If this Bill is properly worked, then at the end of ten years the difficulty will be much less. I would say, Sir, do not allow the present solidarity to be imperilled. That is my main advice to my friends

सर्वं नाश सम्पत्तने श्रधंम् त्यजति पंडित : ।
When in time of danger everything is likely to be lost, the wisemen will part with half and settle the affairs. I, therefore, end my speech with a Sanskrit quotation from Rgveda:

संगच्छ्जम् संवन्ध्वम् सं वो मनांसि जानताम्
Be together, think together, know each other and be united. Sir, I support the motion for consideration of the Bill.

Shrimati Akkamma Devi (Nilgiris): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the behaviour of some of our Hindi-speaking friends on the opposite side, the hon. Swamiji and others, at the time when the President's Address was delivered to both the Houses of Parliament by staging a walk-out, and also at the time of the introduction of the Official Languages Bill by trying to break the rod and also by shouting, and also the other day by performing a havan, a bonfire in the premises of the Parliament House and always interrupting our Prime Minister and other hon. Ministers of the House whenever they speak in English, clearly reminds me of two lines from a poem which I studied during my school days:

"Men may come and men may go
But I will go on for ever."

These friends are not considerate towards their other friends who come from non-Hindi-speaking areas. Whatever their difficulties are, whatever their problems are when immediately it is switched over to Hindi, they do not bother at all. I would lie to quote again two lines

"Water, water everywhere
Not a drop to drink."

These friends always go on shouting "Hindi, Hindi". What about their friends from the non-Hindi-speaking areas who do not have the advantage of having Hindi as their mother tongue. These friends are always inconsiderate. They do not pause for a second to think about the non-Hindi-speaking people who form 60 per cent of our population. They do not think that these areas, these States are also on the map of our country. By their extreme views, they are doing more harm to Hindi than striking deep roots to it in the Indian soil.

We from Tamilnad respect Hindi and love Hindi. This is clearly proved by the voluntary efforts of our people and the State Governments to bring in the three-language formula—Hindi, English and Tamil. Hindi is in-

cluded in our syllabus from the fifth class onwards. Many boys and girls have passed their degree examinations with Hindi as their second language. Voluntary efforts are spreading and, even now I am happy to say, many women's associations and Mahila Mandals in the rural areas have taken up teaching of Hindi as one of their activities. I am also proud to say that there are many women graduates in Hindi in the South. They have taken a step further to spread the teaching of Hindi to their less fortunate sisters in these areas.

Taking my case as an example, I had not had the advantage of learning Hindi during my school days or college days, because I took French as my second language. Even inside the House, though I do not follow the speeches of my Hindi friends, I sit quietly and listen and try to grasp and understand the points. I have also made an earnest attempt to study Hindi. That I am earnest at this shows that we respect Hindi and we love Hindi. Mere shouting will not prove one's affection for Hindi.

Along with my friends from the South, I too have an apprehension about the use of the words "may" and "shall" in clause 3 of the Bill. Ordinarily, the word "may" means may not. Now the hon. Prime Minister and Law Minister have stated that the word "may" also means "shall". So, the position becomes clear and my fears are removed.

At the same time, I feel that our respected leader and also the hon. Home Minister, who alone understand the feelings of the non-Hindi-speaking people, should give us an assurance that the word "may" shall be substituted by the word "shall", so that we will be having English as an associate language along with Hindi, and, secondly, that English will be continued as long as the non-Hindi-speaking people desire it. Here I am stressing the importance of English,

because it is the international language. It is also very necessary for the study of technological subjects, scientific subjects, medical science, in fact, for the learning of everything relating to the scientific world. Then, we arrange for technical experts coming here from friendly foreign countries. Similarly, delegations from this country go to foreign countries and foreign delegations visit our country for discussion on Plan projects and business or on study tour and pleasure trip. Therefore, knowledge of English is essential for interchange and exchange of ideas. So, along with my friends, I give my support to the Bill, only with the request that English should continue as an associate language along with Hindi as long as the non-Hindi-speaking people desire it.

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप का बड़ा अनुगृहीत हूँ कि आप ने ऐसे पवित्र अवसर पर और ऐतिहासिक महत्व के अवसर पर जब कि राष्ट्र भाषा जैसे महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न पर सदन द्वारा विचार किया जा रहा है, मुझे अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अवसर दिया। यह राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा का प्रश्न बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। मैं केवल एक कांग्रेस मन की हैसियत में ही नहीं वरन् एक अध्यापक की हैसियत में कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार भारत की १४ प्रादेशिक भाषाओं की एक डिक्शनरी बनाये। जहाँ "पानी" के लिए "वाटर" लिखा जाता है वहाँ तेलगू, कन्नड़, मराठी आदि सभी १४ प्रादेशिक भाषाओं में "पानी" के लिए प्रयोग किये जाने वाले शब्दों को लिखा जाय। इस तरह से चौदहों भाषाओं की एक डिक्शनरी बना दी जाय और उसको पढ़ाना शुरू किया जाय। मैं इस के लिए तैयार हूँ। दक्षिण भारत के लोगों में मैं अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वे हिन्दी को राजभाषा के पद पर बिठाने के लिए राजी नहीं हैं तो वह किसी भी भाषा को, वरन् कि वह इस देश की भाषा हो, उसको राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा बना लें। उस के

राज भाषा होने का ऐलान कर दें। मैं आप के साथ पूरी तरह से सहयोग करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। मैं हिन्दी वालों से कह दूंगा कि वे अपना मुँह बन्द रखें, शांत रहें और उसको स्वीकार कर लें।

गुप्तकालीन भारत में इस देश में संस्कृत राष्ट्रभाषा रही है। उस समय इस देश में संस्कृत का बहुत प्रचार था और संस्कृत का ऐसा वातावरण बना हुआ था कि मड़लों से लेकर कुटियाओं तक संस्कृत का बोलबाला था और सुगा तक इस देश में उस समय संस्कृत बोलता था। जब भगवान् बूद्ध का जमाना आया तो उन्होंने संस्कृत के स्थान पर पाली को अपनाया। उस समय अवस्था यह थी कि कुछ ब्राह्मणों को छोड़ कर जो कि ऊँचे ऊँचे स्थान पर थे और वे संस्कृत के महान् पंडित होते थे लेकिन आम तौर पर उस समय भी गरीब जनता होती थी वह संस्कृत को नहीं समझ पाती थी। वे बेचारे यह नहीं समझ पाते थे कि धर्म क्या है और उस की प्रांचिम्न क्या क्या हैं? तब भगवान् बूद्ध ने संस्कृत के स्थान पर पाली अपनायी और उसका उन्होंने व्यवहार किया। हम ने देखा कि पाली इस तरह से देश में और जनता में फैली।

आज अगर हिन्दी जितना कि उसको फैलना चाहिए था, नहीं फैला है तो यह किस का दोष है? यह गवर्नमेंट की जिम्मेदारी है। इस के लिए मैं गवर्नमेंट पर लांछन लगाना चाहता हूँ। नेहरू सरकार पर मेरा चार्ज है कि आज पन्द्रह वर्ष के अन्दर देश के अन्दर हिन्दी उतनी नहीं फैली जितनी कि फैलनी चाहिए थी और इस के लिए यह सरकार दोषी है। मैं डा० मेलकोटे से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सन् १९४७ के बाद से जब कि इस देश को स्वराज्य मिला है, इस गवर्नमेंट ने दक्षिण में हिन्दी प्रचार के वास्ते कितना रुपया दिया है? यह ठीक है कि हिन्दी के प्रचार के लिए वहाँ के लोगों ने स्वयं काफ़ी रुपया खर्च किया। करोड़ों रुपये उन्होंने दक्षिण में हिन्दी प्रसार के लिए खर्च किये लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने क्या दिया

[श्री शिव नारायण]

है ? वह तो खर्चा पब्लिक ने किया है लेकिन सरकार ने इस के लिए कितना पैसा दिया है ? मैं तो सरकार से माफ़ कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर वह अंग्रेजों को अभी देश में कायम रखना चाहता है तो वह हिन्दी और अंग्रेजों दोनों को बतौर राजभाषा के ऐलान करे। हिन्दी और अंग्रेजों दोनों इस देश का राज भाषाएं रहेंगी। ऐसा ऐलान सरकार कर दे ताकि हम अपने बच्चों को अंग्रेजी पढ़ायें और वे आई० ए० एस० और पी० सी० एस० कम्पटीशंस में बैठ सकें और उनमें दूसरों के मुकाबले कम्पाट कर सकें। आज सेक्रेटेरियट सर्विस में कौन डीमिनेट करता है ? आज गवर्नमेंट का मन्त्रिणालय किस के हाथ में है ? व उत्तर प्रदेश वालों के हाथ में है या दक्षिण व मद्रास वालों के हाथ में है ? वह सब के हाथ में है यह दुरुस्त है लेकिन मेजरिटी किस की है ?

आज पंजाब और कश्मीर से लेकर दक्षिण में कन्याकुमारी तक सब लोग मिली जुली हिन्दी-उर्दू, वाली हिन्दी को समझते हैं। इसलिए भले ही टूटीं फूटीं क्यों न हों लेकिन हिन्दी बोल जाय, सब लोग उसे समझते हैं। इस हाउस में जैसा इंगलिश बोल जाते हैं वह मैं हूं जानता हूं। मैं भी इंगलिश का एक विद्यार्थी रहा हूं और मैं इंगलिश जानता हूं। मैं इंगलिश का अध्यापक भी रहा हूं। लेकिन मैं कहूंगा कि लंगड़ा इंगलिश बोलने के बजाय यह कहीं अच्छा है कि सब लोग देश में हिन्दी बोलें भले ही वह टूटीं फूटीं क्यों न हों। हम सब अगर चाहें तो हिन्दी को समझ सकते हैं।

इस देश में सब से बड़ा अभिशाप यह अंग्रेजी है। मैं आन्थोनी से जिन्होंने कि कल इम पार्लियामेंट में बैठ कर अपने भाषण में गालियां दीं हैं, कहना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने गालियां देकर उम कहावत को चरितार्थ कर दिया है :—

“बस तेरी गोद में, उखाड़ू तेरी दाढ़ी।”

उन्होंने कल ऐसा इंगलिश बोला कि हम उसका एक सैंटेंस भी नहीं समझे कि उन्होंने क्या कहा ? लेकिन इतना निश्चित है कि इनडाइरेक्ट तौर पर उन्होंने इस देश को कोसा और गालियां दीं। मैं और कुछ न कह कर सिर्फ यही कहना चाहूंगा कि जिस देश में उन्होंने जन्म लिया उस देश को कोसना और गालियां देना अनुचित बात है। जिस तरह से भारतवर्ष से अंग्रेजों का हुकूमत समाप्त हुई और वे सात समुन्दर पार चले गये उसी तरह अंग्रेजों भी इस मुल्क से देर सबेर जाना चाहिए। अंग्रेजों के स्थान पर किसों भी देशों भाषा को आप राष्ट्रभाषा और राजभाषा के पद पर आसीन कर दीजिये, मैं उसके सामने नतमस्तक हो जाऊंगा। अगर इस देश में वाकई आप राष्ट्रीय एकता लाना चाहते हैं तो वह हिन्दी द्वारा ही ला सकते हैं। हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा अभी हम ने तय नहीं किया है बल्कि हिन्दी को तो राष्ट्रभाषा कांग्रेस ने सन् १९१८ में ही तय कर दिया था। इस देश को महान् हस्तियां, पल्लभ भाई पटेल, दादा भाई नौरोजी, गोविन्द वल्लभ पंत, गांधी जी, मुभाष बाबू आदि ने हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा बनाना स्वीकार किया। इन महान् हस्तियों के अलावा सबसे पहले स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती जो कि गुजरात से आते थे उन्होंने इस देश के लिए हिन्दी बतौर राष्ट्रभाषा के रक्खा था। ऐसा करने का कारण स्वाभाविक था क्योंकि सब भाषाओं में हिन्दी सब से आसान भाषा है। हाउस में जो माननीय सदस्य हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं मैं उनको चैलेंज के साथ कहता हूं कि मैं उन को ८ दिन के भीतर हिन्दी पढ़ना सिखा सकता हूं।

जो बच्चे आज हमारे फोर्य क्लास में पढ़ते हैं वे पन्द्रह वर्षों में एम० ए० पास कर सकते हैं और एम० ए० की डिग्री हासिल कर सकते हैं। मैं यह मुझाव देना चाहता हूं कि मद्रास के जो एम० ए० पास लड़के हिन्दी में हों और उत्तर प्रदेश के हिन्दी के जो एम० ए०

पाम लड़के हों, दोनों कम्पटीशन में बैठें और सैलेशन कर के उन में से ले लिया जाय । मैं कब कहता हूँ कि उन को न लिया जाय ? उनको सर्विस में रखिये । हम तो स्वयं ही पदलित लोग हैं, दबाये हुए लोग हैं और जिस तरह से हमारे लिए रिज-रवेशन है दक्षिण वालों के लिए भी सर्विसेज में रिजरवेशन रख दिया जाय । मैं दस करोड़ आदि यों को रिप्रेजेंट करता हूँ और मैं यह बात बड़ी जिम्मेदारी के साथ कह रहा हूँ । मैं हरिजन कम्युनिटी को रिप्रेजेंट करता हूँ । इस देश के अन्दर १० करोड़ हरिजन बसते हैं जो कि आज भी भूखे, नंगे और अशिक्षित हैं . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मौजूदा बिल से इसका क्या तात्लुक है ? यह तो लैंग्वेज बिल है ।

श्री शिव नारायण : अगर हिन्दी पढ़ाने और उसका प्रसार करने का प्रयास किया जायगा तो उससे हम हरिजनों को भी लाभ होगा और हमारे वहाँ से अशिक्षा दूर होगी । सरकार द्वारा हिन्दी की पढ़ाई की व्यवस्था करने से गरीब लोग भी पढ़ सकेंगे और जो मुल्क में लाखों और करोड़ों लोग अशिक्षित और निरक्षर हैं वे शिक्षा प्राप्त कर सकेंगे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो अलग बात है । वर्तमान बिल तो लैंग्वेजेज के बारे में है । डेबर कमिशन की रिपोर्ट आ रही है उस अवसर पर इसके बारे में कहा जा सकता है ।

श्री शिव नारायण : मैं कह रहा हूँ कि भाषा हमारी सरल हो और यही कारण है कि हिन्दी इस देश की राजभाषा स्वीकार की गई है क्योंकि वह बहुत आसान भाषा है । हिन्दी इसलिए रखी गई कि उसको बंगाल में भी समझा जाता है और दूसरे प्रदेशों में भी समझा जाता है—उस को हिन्दुस्तान के कोने कोने में समझा जाता है । और देश के बड़े बड़े लोगों ने उसको रखा ।

मेरे मित्र, श्री मौर्य, ने उर्दू के बारे में कहा । उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश को बांट

दिया जाये । अगर वह बंटवारे पर ही तले हुए हैं, तो मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इतिहास का विद्यार्थी हूँ और आज ऐसा भालूम होता है कि जयचन्द और पृथ्वीराज का खून इन रंगों में अभी बाकी है । उस नीति पर चल कर इस देश का कल्याण नहीं होने वाला है । (Interruptions) उनका यह कहना गलत है कि उत्तर प्रदेश का बंटवारा कर दिया जाये । मैं भी उर्दू जानता हूँ ।

न पैमां शिकन है, न गहार है हम,
वतनपरवरी के खतावार है हब ।

मैं उर्दू, हिन्दी, पंशियन और फ़्रेंचजी जानता हूँ । (Interruptions)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर ।

श्री शिव नारायण : जितने आपोजीशन के लोग बोले हैं, जितने विरोधी लोग बोले हैं, वे महज अपनी पार्टी के प्रापेगेंड के लिए और अपना नाम पैदा करने के लिए बोले हैं । इस मुल्क का हर आदमी शुभचिन्तक है । यह बहुत मुन्दर बिल पेश किया गया है, जिसमें हिन्दी और इंगलिश दोनों को उचित स्थान दिया गया है । संविधान के अनुसार हिन्दी राष्ट्र-भाषा निश्चित है । अगर देश की बड़ी से बड़ी हस्ती हिन्दी नहीं बोलती है, तो मैं उसका दोष समझता हूँ ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : काले पर गोरे का चिपक लगा है ।

श्री शिव नारायण : गोरे और काले का क्या मतलब है ?

जो लोग हिन्दी जानते हैं, उनको इस हाउस में हिन्दी बोलनी चाहिए । यह कोई अनुचित बात नहीं है । मैं बिल्कुल सिम्पल हिन्दी बोल रहा हूँ, जिसको सब समझ सकते हैं । मैं सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि जब यूनि-वर्सिटीज बन्द हों, तो वहाँ के विद्यार्थियों को वालन्टीयर्ज के तौर पर हिन्दी पढ़ाने के लिए दक्षिण भारत में भेजा जाए । सरकार ने

[श्री शिव नारायण]

जो जिम्मे दारी ओढी है, अगर वह इसको नहीं निभा सकती है, तो वह दूसरे को सौंप दे। दूसरे आदमी भी इस काम को चला सकते हैं।

मैं अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं पिछड़े वर्ग और दबे हुए समाज से सम्बन्ध रखता हूँ। हमारे बच्चे दबे हुए हैं। हम को ऐसी शिक्षा मिलनी चाहिए, जिससे हमारा उत्थान हो। अगर बड़े बड़े आदमियों के बच्चे अंग्रेजी स्कूलों में पढ़ें और वही हाकिम बनें, तो देश के ८२ परसेंट आदमी कैसे आगे बढ़ सकते हैं? यह आई० सी० एम० क्लास सब से खतरनाक है। यह आई० सी० एम० क्लास और आफ्रिसर्ज ही इस गाड़ी को नहीं चलाने देते। वे ही राष्ट्र-भाषा की प्रगति के रास्ते में बाधक हैं।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि नवनरमेट इन बातों पर अमल करेगी।

श्री बिशनचन्द्र सेठ (एटा): आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष सहाय्य, सबसे पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे इस बात पर बहुत आश्चर्य है कि अहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्त और अहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्तों से आए हुए माननीय सदस्य एक गलत दोगारोपण करते हैं। हिन्दी-भाषी प्रान्तों की कभी भी यह मान्यता नहीं रही कि केवल हिन्दी ही इस देश की एकमात्र भाषा है। हमारी मान्यता तो सदैव यह रही है कि इस देश में जो भी भाषायें हैं, वे सभी इस देश की भाषायें हैं, परन्तु इन सब भाषाओं के बीच में एक मूत्र स्थापित करने की आवश्यकता थी और हम से पूर्व कई बड़े बड़े बहानू नेताओं ने हिन्दी को उस लिक के रूप मान्यता दी थी। उसका कारण यह था कि हिन्दी एक ऐसी सुगम भाषा है, जो कि देश के सभी भागों में समझी जाती है। मैं करीब करीब सारे देश में घूमा हूँ। मेरा अनुभव है कि हिस कहीं भी जायें, हिन्दी में हम अपना प्रयोजन सिद्ध कर सकते हैं। इसलिए आज इस प्रकार का दोगारोपण करना कि हिन्दी वाले दूसरी

भाषाओं को उन नेत्रों से नहीं देखना चाहते हैं, जिनसे वे हिन्दी को देखते हैं, बड़ी गलत भावना है। मैं चाहूँगा कि अहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्तों से जो सज्जन यहाँ पधारे हैं, वे अपने हृदय से इस भावना को निकाल दें।

कल आदरणीय प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कुछ बातें कही थीं। मैं उनकी ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ बातें कहीं और उर्दू के सम्बन्ध में भी। हमें उर्दू से कोई द्वेष नहीं है, परन्तु उर्दू कोई प्रान्तीय भाषा नहीं है, जिसके सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मन्त्री या दूसरे लोग वकालत करें। अपनी अपनी जगह पर सब भाषायें स्वतः बढ़ती हैं और उनको बढ़ाना भी चाहिए। हमारी तो सबसे बड़ी शिकायत यही है कि सब प्रान्तों की भाषाओं को पूरे जोर के साथ बढ़ाना चाहिए था, परन्तु देश का यह दुर्भाग्य रहा सरकार की प्रवृत्ति रही कि चाहे बंगाल हो चाहे आसाम, हर एक प्रान्त की भाषा को ओर उदासीन रही है। प्रश्न उठता है कि क्यों रही। इसलिए कि सरकार की जो केन्द्रीय शासन की मशीन है, वह इस प्रकार से चलाई जा रही है कि उसमें अंग्रेजी को ही प्रमुखता दी जाती है। निवेदन है कि आज हमें इस प्रकार की स्थिति का निर्माण करना चाहिए कि हमारे देश की जितनी भी भाषायें हैं, उन्हें पूरी शक्ति के साथ बढ़ाया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर सरकार ने हमारी सब प्रान्तीय भाषाओं को ईषान्दारी के साथ बल दिया, तो उसका नतीजा यह निकलेगा कि सब भाषाओं के साथ साथ हिन्दी भी स्वतः बढ़ेगी।

इसी के साथ ही मैं एक बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात कहना चाहता हूँ हिन्दी के विरोधी पक्षों की ओर से जो एक बात कही गई, मैं उस को मान्यता देता हूँ। हिन्दी में इस प्रकार की शब्द रचना करना, जो सामान्य आदमी न समझ सके, हिन्दी की सहायता करना नहीं है, बल्कि

उसके साथ विश्वासघात करना है। आज हमारे देश में "रेलवे", "टेलीफोन" आदि जो अनेकों शब्द प्रचलित हैं, जिनको हम समझ सकते हैं, उनको हिन्दी में एडाप्ट कर लेना चाहिए। इसके दो लाभ होंगे। एक तो हिन्दी की विशालता बढ़ेगी और दूसरे, अन्य प्रान्तों में हमारे सम्बन्ध में जो अनेक प्रकार के भ्रम हैं, वे नष्ट हो जायेंगे।

कल एक माननीय सदस्य ने यहां पर एक ऐसी बात कही, जिसको मैं राष्ट्रीय अपमान मानता हूं। उन्होंने कहा कि अंग्रेजी के आने के बाद हमारे देश में बुद्धिवादी भावनायें बढ़ीं और देश में आज जो अनेक प्रकार की शक्ति दिखाई देती है, उसके बढ़ने का माध्यम अंग्रेजी है। मैं उन माननीय सदस्य का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, परन्तु उनकी बात मुन कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ, क्योंकि वह इस सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य हैं। मैं तो यह मानने के लिए तैयार हूं कि आज यह कहना कि एक दूसरी भाषा के कारण हमारे देश में लिप्याचार बढ़ा, समझदारी बढ़ी, योग्यता बढ़ी, हमारी बुद्धिवादी भावना का इन्हीं बड़ा कोई भी दुष्परिणाम नहीं हो सकता। हम जो कुछ भी बड़े हैं, वह अपनी योग्यता और क्षमता के द्वारा बड़े हैं अगर यह कहा जाये कि कांग्रेस ने स्वराज्य लिया, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या उसने अंग्रेजी के द्वारा स्वराज्य लिया। अगर देश के हर प्रान्त के लोग, जिन को अंग्रेजी का एक अक्षर भी याद नहीं था, स्वतन्त्रता की भावना से प्रेरित न होते, तो कोई कारण नहीं था कि देश में इस तरह का टेम्पो और वातावरण बनता कि अंग्रेज यहां से चला जाता। इसलिए किसी भी माननीय सज्जन का यह कहना कि अंग्रेजी की दतनी बड़ी देन है कि उसने हमारे देश में योग्यता का मापदण्ड बढ़ाया, देश के प्रति अमानमूक्तक शब्दों का इस्तेमाल करना है।

उसी के साथ साथ उन्होंने राजा राममोहन राय की भी उपमा दी। मैंने भी राजा राममोहन राय के सम्बन्ध में लिट्रेचर को पढ़ा

है। मैं बनाना चाहता हूं कि समय की गति होती है। जिस प्रकार आज से पन्द्रह वर्ष पहले कांग्रेस और हमारी इस सभा ने सर्वसम्मति से यह निर्णय किया था कि हम अपने देश में हिन्दी को राष्ट्र-भाषा बनायेंगे, परन्तु भर्कमस्टॉसिज के कारण आज यह स्थिति आ गई है कि वह इस बारे में कुछ अमेंडमेंट लाना चाहती है, ठीक उसी प्रकार जब राजा राममोहन राय ने अंग्रेजी के बारे में कहा था, उस वक्त देश की यह स्थिति थी कि हमका अंग्रेज के साथ लड़ना था दूसरे देशों की सहायता प्राप्त करनी थी इसलिए उस भावना की आवश्यकता थी, लेकिन आज वह स्थिति नहीं है। आज हम स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्र के नागरिकों की हैभियत से बँटे हुए हैं। इसलिए आज ऐसी उपमायें देकर, जो हिन्दी के विरोध और अंग्रेजी के पक्ष में आती हैं, देश के भागने गलत दातें रखने की चेष्टा नहीं करनी चाहिए।

जो बात अब मैं कहने जा रहा हूं वह बड़ा भारी कटाक्ष कांग्रेस वालों पर है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि कोई भी शासन जब किसी राष्ट्र पर हुकूमत करना चाहता है तो अंग्रेजों की तरह डिवाइड एण्ड रूल उसकी पॉलिसी होती है। मैंने बड़ी गहराई के साथ इस लैंग्वेज प्रावलैम को देश में देखा और इसको स्टडी किया है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि कांग्रेस सरकार इस तरह की मनोवृत्ति को बैकडोर से पिछले दरवाजे से अपनाना चाहती है और चाहती है कि प्रान्त आपस में लड़ने रहें, देश में भाषावार अगड़े होते रहें। इसी मनोवृत्ति से आज सारे देश के अन्दर इस प्रकार की भावनायें लाई गयीं, मैं देश के लिए दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण मानता हूं। आज हम स्वतन्त्र हैं। जितनी भी भाषायें हमारे देश की हैं, वे सब हमारी भाषायें हैं। मैं हिन्दू महासभा का प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते भाफ कह देना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दी भाषा कभी भी नहीं चाहते हैं कि कोई भी भाषा उन्नति न करे, अथवा वह पिछड़ जाए। ईश्वर जाने हम यह कभी भी नहीं चाहते। मैं कल ही मद्रास से आया हूं। मुझे दुःख

[श्री बिशनचन्द्र मेठ]

हुआ कि मद्रास में मैं वहाँ की बोली में लोगों के साथ बात नहीं कर सका और मैंने अपनी बात को किसी तरह से टूटी फूटी भाषा, टूटे फूटे तरीके से उनके सामने रखा। इससे स्वतः मुझे लज्जा लग रही थी फिर किस तरह से कहा जा सकता है कि जो हिन्दी भाषी हैं वे यह चाहते हैं कि दूसरी भाषायें देश में न पनपें। मेरा निश्चित मत है कि जितनी भी भाषायें देश की हैं, वे जब पनपेंगी तो साथ साथ हिन्दी भाषा भी पनपेगी और यदि वह अन्य भाषाओं के शब्दों को अपने में मिलायेगी तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि देशकी मञ्ची उन्नति हो सकेगी। अर्थात् सहयोग सारे देश का एक दूसरे को प्राप्त हो सकेगा।

मैं आप को भारतीय विधान की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मैं कुछ पत्र इस समय कोट नहीं करूँगा क्योंकि समय नहीं है। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि मैंने कुछ पत्र आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को लिखे और उन के उत्तर भी आये। उन के उत्तरों से जो एक संकेत मिलता है, वह आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। संविधान सभा, अथवा विधान निर्माताओं ने एक रेजोल्यूशन सर्वसम्मति से पास किया था, उसे आप देखें। उस प्रस्ताव का सम्बन्ध एक बड़े ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय से था। उस की रोशनी में हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री की जो भावना उन के पत्रों में अंकित हुई है, उस को आप देखें। उन का कहना है कि चूँकि हमारे कुछ प्रामिाजिज्ञ हैं, उन को हमें इम्प्लेमेंट करना है, इस वास्ते इस बिल को ला रहे हैं। सरकार कितना बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व अपने ऊपर लिए हुए है, यह बतलाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब कन्स्टिट्यूट असेम्बली ने सर्वमत से एक रेजोल्यूशन पास किया तो आज क्या कारण है कि आप उस को इम्प्लेमेंट करना

नहीं चाहते, आप उस भावना की पूर्ति करना नहीं चाहते? बीच में अगर आपने कोई कमेटी बनाई या कोई चीज जान बूझ कर देश में क्रिक्शन क्रियेट कराने हेतु बनाई ताकि लोगों में एक तरह की भावनायें न उभर पायें, सारा देश एक न हो पाये पर आज देश को ही खतरा पैदा हो गया जो बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है और इस का सारा उत्तरदायित्व आपका है। मैंने कन्स्टिट्यूट असेम्बली की प्रोसीडिंग्स को पढ़ा है। देश के सभी पक्षों ने अपनी भावनाओं को वहाँ रखा था और अन्त में सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने पूरी गम्भीरता से समझने के बाद इसका फैसला किया था और वे इस निश्चय पर पहुँचे थे कि हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा की मान्यता दी जाय। जब इस प्रकार की छानबीन के बाद हिन्दी सर्व सम्मति से स्वीकार कर ली गई तो आज कौन सी ऐसी नई बात पैदा हो गई जिस को ले कर आप भिन्न अर्थ लगाने बैठे हैं। चूँकि आप स्वतः संविधान का आदर नहीं कर रहे हैं इसलिये सरकार के प्रति लोगों में जो सद्भावना होनी चाहिए वह नहीं है और लोगों के दिलों में शक व, शुबहा पैदा होता दिखाई दे रहा है। यह शक व शुबहा इसलिए भी पैदा होता है कि जब आज सरकार अपनी बात पर कायम रहना नहीं चाहती है तो कल उस बात पर जो वह आज कहती है, कैसे कायम रहेगी। यह बड़ा गलत उदाहरण है जो आप प्रस्तुत करने जा रहे हैं। यह बड़ी गलत उपमा है जो आप देश के सामने रख रहे हैं। रूलिंग पार्टी को, कांग्रेसजनों को गम्भीरता से इस विषय पर विचार करना चाहिये। जिस चीज को आप ने एक दफा निश्चय कर लिया और जो चीज सारा देश चाहता है, उसे पूरा करिये, बिना शक आप स्वतंत्र हैं यदि जन-भावना उपरान्त आप उसमें परिवर्तन कर दें, यदि आप ईमानदारी के साथ उस भावना की रक्षा नहीं करेंगे तो

सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा देश में कैसे कायम रह सकेगी, यह विचारणीय है ।

कांग्रेस के जो अनुयायी हैं, उन को अपनों दिलों को आज ईमानदारी के साथ टटोलना चाहिये कि उन्होंने हिन्दी के लिए क्या किया है । समुचित हिन्दी के साथ विमाता का सा सलूक किया गया है । कभी हिन्दी को बढ़ने नहीं दिया गया । आज बार बार कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी वाले प्रदेशों ने यह नहीं किया, वह नहीं किया । मेरा भी उत्तरदायित्व है हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में । मैं जानता हूँ कि सरकार ने कुछ करने नहीं दिया । सरकार को अगर इस प्रकार की विपरीत मनोवृत्ति न होती तो बहुत कुछ हो सकता था । मैं एक प्रश्न आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ । इजराईल की मिसाल को आप लें । उन की हीब्रू लैंग्वेज थी जोकि सारी दुनिया से खत्म हो चुकी थी, उस के बारे में जब उन्होंने निर्णय कर लिया कि इस दो हजार वर्ष पुरानी भाषा को लाना है, तो उस को मान्यता देने के साथ साथ सारे देश में उस भाषा को चालू कर दिया । दूसरी उपमा मैं आप के सामने इंग्लैंड की रखना चाहता हूँ । थोड़े दिन पहले जैसी नौकरशाही और जिस प्रकार की प्रवृत्ति हमारे देश में चल रही है ठीक इसी प्रकार की प्रवृत्ति वहां चल रही थी और ठीक इसी प्रकार से इंग्लैंड की फ्रेंच सरकारी भाषा हुआ करती थी । फ्रेंच वहां की आफिशल भाषा हुआ करती थी जबकि ग्राम लोगों की सारे देश की भाषा अंग्रेजी थी । जिस प्रकार हमारे यहां पर एक दो परसेंट अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे हैं, उसी प्रकार से वहां पर भी एक दो परसेंट फ्रेंच पढ़े लिखे थे और वे ही शासन करते थे, देश को रूल करते थे । परन्तु जिस समय पब्लिक प्रेशर सरकार पर पड़ा, लोगों की भावना बदली और उन्होंने जोर डाला तो सारी की सारी फ्रेंच खत्म कर दी गई और इंग्लिश को मान्यता दी गई । ठीक वही बात इस

समय हमारे देश में हो रही है । यही सवाल मैं आज माननीय सदस्यों के सामने रखता हूँ । इस पर सभी को सोचना विचारना होगा । यह देश का प्रश्न है, देश की उन्नति का प्रश्न है । अगर ईमानदारी के साथ कांग्रेस सरकार हिन्दी को जीवित रखना चाहती है, उस की बहुलता करना चाहता है और चाहती है कि हिन्दुस्तान की ही एक भाषा इस देश में एक दूसरे को समझाने के लिये प्रयोग में लाई जाए, तो क्यों न उस का जो उचित स्थान है, वह उस को दिया जाय । विदेशों भाषा पर आज हम आश्रित हैं । आज अगर हमारा कोई मुकदमा होता है हम कोर्ट के सामने जाते हैं तो अंग्रेजी में ही कोर्ट का जजमेंट होता है जबकि हम अंग्रेजों पढ़े नहीं । हम डाक्टर के पास जाते हैं, तो सारी बात अंग्रेजी में होती है । कितनी सम्मानशून्य यह बात है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय पर गम्भीरता से विचार किया जाय । द्वेष बद्धि से इस पर नहीं सोचा जाना चाहिए । हिन्दी भाषा किसी भी प्रान्त पर हिन्दी लादने की चेष्टा नहीं कर रहे हैं, परन्तु वे स्नेह के वातावरण में यह सब कुछ करना चाहते हैं, और स्नेह के वातावरण को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं ।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am not enamoured of English, but circumstances leave me no alternative. I find it easier to speak through the medium of Sanskrit than through the medium of Hindi. But the irony of fate is such that, standing here in the Parliament of India, the Constitution denies me the use of the only all-India language that India has evolved. It is not that I have not approached the Chair for permission to use Sanskrit. I have approached the present hon. Speaker as well as his predecessor, but I am told the Constitution does not permit it. So that is the irony of fate from which we suffer that in the Indian Parliament I am denied the use of the only all-

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

India language that India has evolved and which has received international recognition as such.

My friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee has put in an amendment that all the regional languages may be used as official languages, excepting Sanskrit. I smiled when I read it. I thought that the joke that Mr. Kamath had at his cost some time back had gone to his heart. Otherwise, while recommending all the regional languages, why should he delete the only all-India language out of the list? That surprised me. But in any case that is his attitude there.

But even while I use English, I do not use it with any apology. Some quotations have been made from the Constituent Assembly proceedings. I would also quote some of the speeches. When Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar—it was he who put in this Chapter XVII of the Constitution containing the articles on official languages—when he put in the article on official language to replace English by Hindi, what did he say? He said:

“I for one did not easily reach the conclusion because it involved our bidding goodbye to a language on which I think we have built and achieved our freedom. It was not without a pang I agreed to that decision.”

That is the language of the mover of the resolution, who put that article before the Constituent Assembly. He goes further:

“There should be English for many years to come. For my own part I think it will have to be for many many years to come.”

Mark the language, mark the expression that he uses, “for many many years to come”. That certainly does not mean that it should be limited to fifteen years. He makes it clearer further:

“My own feeling is that English will last in the form of Bills and Laws and Interpretations of such Laws much longer than 15 years.”

This was contemplated when the Constituent Assembly discussed the official language—part of the Constitution. Maulana Azad supported Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar's proposition and he says:

“I am in full agreement with Shri Ayyangar that a period of at least 15 years should be fixed for it.”

And then he says:

“The union of north and south has been possible through English. If we give up that language that relationship will cease.”

This is the expression not from the DMK, but this is from Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad recorded in the Constituent Assembly proceedings.

Then, President Dr. Rajendra Prasad closing up the proceedings that day said:

“After all English language has brought us nearer and nearer..”

While we have replaced English as the official language and this Bill seeks to replace it further, let us not be ungrateful to the language which has served our purpose in the national struggle. In fact beginning from Raja Ram Mohan Roy upto Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru it is English which goes to contribute a large part of their make-up. Take away English from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, he loses the hold that he has got over the world today. We may not forget it. Then, I was thinking, why did Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar feel the pang....

Shri Maurya: If you take away English, India will not lose anything.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: India will at least lose you. If we consider

the contribution of English, whatever else the British Government did, it brought about three-fold unity in India. Firstly, the unity of language of administration—English was there. Secondly, the unity of civil and criminal law jurisprudence—the same civil procedure code, the same Indian penal code all through India. Thirdly, the unity of administrative service—the same Indian civil service exercising authority all over India. These three unities were contributions to India during the British period. These are facts of history. This can never be ignored, nor forgotten.

Then, I come to the Bill itself. I would like to quote the opinion that the West Bengal Assembly gave regarding the previous Parliamentary Committee report. The opinion was: "This Assembly is of opinion that—

(1) Sanskrit should be used for such ceremonial purposes as the Government of India may from time to time specify;

(2) Parliament should by law provide for the continuance of English as the official language until such time as Hindi and some other Indian languages are accepted as the official language of the Union;

(3) communication between this State and another and between Union and this State should be on a bilingual basis, one of the languages being the State Language Bengali and the other the official language of the Union as it may be at the time;

and the Constitution be amended accordingly."

The West Bengal Assembly not only went beyond the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee but it made further recommendations and required the modification of the Constitution to suit those recommendations.

Now, I put before this House the resolution passed by the Calcutta University. The resolution is:

"That each of the fourteen major languages listed in our Constitution be recognised as a national language of India, and that English be also recognised as such;

That adequate central financial assistance be made available to the States for the proper and rapid development of the national languages of India;

That all-India Services Examinations be conducted in English and English alone for the time being."

That was the demand of the University of Calcutta. So, those who are urging for the continuance of English for some time more are not moving in the air, but they are moving on very solid ground of popular requirements. These matters should be considered.

Coming to the Bill itself, I say the Bill has a very limited purpose. It deals with the official language. There is no need of bringing in the question of national language or the popular language. A language may be an official language without being a national language. Persian was the official language for some time, but it was not the national language. Sanskrit was the official language for a period of history, it was not the popular language. There were some expressions made here. Mr. Khadilkar was saying that India has never had one language all over the country. He began by that, but he contradicted himself by his conclusion when he said Shankaracharya carried his victorious campaign from Kerala to Kashmir and from Kashmir to Assam. How did he carry it? Could he carry it because India had no language through which he could explain his campaign all over the country?

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

How could Shankaracharya do it? He did it because one language was understood in all parts of India. I refer to a Sanskrit book:

‘नेषध महाकार्यं That was composed in 12th century. It deals with दमयन्ती स्वयंवर, marriage of Princess of Berar. Our revered leader Dr. Aney comes from that area. He says:

‘अन्योन्यभाषानवबोधभीते संस्कृत्रिमाभिव्यव-

हारिवत्स

दिग्मः वनेनेतु नरेषु वाग्भिः सौवर्गवग
जनैरचिन्धिहे’

People were coming from all parts of Israel has revised Hebrew which has they would not be understood to each other if they spoke in the regional language they adopted Sanskrit. That is recorded in a poem composed in the 12th century in India. Therefore, let it not be said that India had no language by itself. Whether that is workable or not, that is a different matter.

Then, just now, in the course of one of the speeches I heard that Israel has revised Hebrew which has been out of use for 2000 years. If Israel could have done that, we can do that also. Sanskrit is not a language of the type as Hebrew was. If anyone wants to go through that character of the language, I may refer him to Prof. Maxmuller who went into the question whether Sanskrit is a living language or not. He gave a verdict that Sanskrit is a living language in India.

Now, about the Bill I would say only one thing. The Bill deals with only two things. It retains the position of Hindi as it is. It does not affect the position of Hindi as in the Constitution. What it does is that it only gives a slightly longer lease of life to English. That is the long and short of the whole Bill. If I were a

member coming from the Hindi areas, I would not have uttered a single sentence in favour of the Bill. I would have just been quiet and left it to others to decide the fate of the Bill as it is, because Hindi is enshrined in the Constitution as the official language. So long as the Constitution is not changed, what is the fear and what is the anxiety of the Hindi-speaking people?

There is only one clause, clause 3, where ‘may’ is required to be changed into ‘shall’. I feel, ‘may’ should be replaced by ‘shall’, as there has been a demand from many sides of the House. Of course, it has been stated that the Law Department have suggested that ‘may’ may mean ‘shall’ and ‘shall’ may mean ‘may’. The Law Department, I must say with all apology, is not a very sure guide on this matter. They did not prove a sure guide on the Nanavati case; they did not prove a sure guide on the Beru Bari case; they did not give a very sure guidance in the matter of merging the functions of the Attorney-General with the Law Ministry. Even on all these matters they did not give us very sure guidance. In this matter also, I am afraid they are not giving us their sure guidance. That word ‘may’ in clause 3 should be changed into ‘shall’.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): Having listened to the debate since the day before yesterday, I must say this that in spite of the fact that language arouses one's passions with an intensity which is only second to that which is aroused by the love of one's country, yet, the speeches in the House on the whole have shown a certain amount of sobriety which is something of an improvement on the speeches that we have had in this House on this subject before. It is true that there are extremes, and as our leader Shri Jawaharlal has pointed out, those Hindi-speaking persons who took the step of behaving as they did in this House at the time of the intro-

duction of the Bill and subsequently have been perhaps the greatest enemies of Hindi. In that context, I would like to particularly congratulate many of those Hindi-speaking Members who have spoken during these two days and who have shown a certain amount of restraint.

It is true as Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya has pointed out that Hindi is enshrined in the Constitution. Sir, You will recall that in those days when the Constitution was being drawn up, there was no feeling amongst us from non-Hindi-speaking States at the outset that Hindi should not be accepted as a common language. It was felt in India that we must have a language which would have had its origin in the soil of this country, that we must have such a language as an all-India official language at least, as was deep-rooted not only in the soil but which was capable of being more easily understood by all parts of the country, although everyone did not know it. These were the feelings that inspired us when we first met in the Constituent Assembly and decided that Hindi should become the common language. But, as time went on, the way in which certain Hindi-Speaking Members expressed themselves led to a very great change. I shall just quote what our Speaker had said at that time when he was a Member of the Constituent Assembly. He said:

"I am one of those who have withdrawn their support from Hindi in the Devanagari script simply because of the fanaticism and intolerance of those who support it."

That was how things went on. That was very unfortunate, because while it is true and there is no doubt that when we enshrined Hindi in the Constitution, everyone accepted it, still, it was not for those whose mother-tongue was Hindi to say that Hindi must come here and now. That sort of feeling was there at that time, and it still finds expression among certain people.

414(Ai) LSD—6.

I should like to say that if we are going to really have Hindi as the 'link' language here, the only way to do so will be to leave that decision to the non-Hindi-speaking people in this country. English is undoubtedly a very well developed language, and it is an international language, and we owe a great debt of gratitude to that language. It is true to say that Raja Ram Mohan Roy did advocate that English should be utilised in India. I might also add that it was the same Raja Ram Mohan Roy who first said that Hindi should be the common language of this country; it was Raja Ram Mohan Roy who also realised that for the India of his days and in fact, that is true even up till now, the window of the world could be opened to the country only through English. So, we cannot deny our gratitude to this language which has brought about our unity and which has brought the modern concept of things like socialism to us. It is no use saying that everything was there in the past. Many ideas are new ideas. They are now finding their way in our own languages. There is no doubt that some of the regional languages of this country are very highly developed today. I agree with Shri Khadilkar when he says that Hindi developed only much later because probably it did not come into close contact with the English language at the outset as did Bengali, Tamil and other languages. Nevertheless, we have chosen Hindi to be the official language of the State. In that case, should there not be more tolerance about this on the part of those who want to bring in Hindi here and now? Should they not show some tolerance and at least support the assurances of the Prime Minister which have mostly been embodied in this Bill? If they really want that the whole of India should accept this language as the language for official work at least or even as the common language, then they must allow time and they must allow adjustments to take place.

I would like to quote from Dr S. P. Mookerjee's speech in the Constitu-

(Shrimati Renuka Ray)

ent Assembly. One of my hon. friends from a non-Hindi area had quoted him. But I would like to read out what he had stated just a little earlier in the portion which has been quoted by my hon. friend. He has said:

"A language will be shaped in the natural course of events, in spite of current controversies, in spite of individuals, however big or however eminent for the time being they may be. It is the people's will that creates changes; they come naturally and often imperceptibly. It is not a resolution of the Constituent Assembly which will decide the supremacy of the language."

That still holds good today. We must remember that if we want Hindi to come, then we must allow a feeling to grow to that effect amongst the non-Hindi-speaking people. Sir, I come from Bengal, and I must say that what Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya has said is true, namely that there is a large section in Bengal and a very important section, which does not want to give up English for some time. I hold the view that in India eventually it must be the national languages including also one language as the link language, which we must accept. But in order that this may be acceptable to all, we must give some time for adjustment.

Now, I would like to say one or two words about the actual amendments that have been tabled to the different clauses in the Bill. There is one amendment which has been tabled by some of us. I understand from the speech of the hon. Minister that he is willing to accept the suggestion that we have made, namely that the report of the committee that will be appointed after ten years should be placed before Parliament, and what is more, before the States. I hope that he will be accepting this suggestion.

Another amendment is regarding the controversy over 'may' and 'shall'. We are very much puzzled at this. The lawyers differ on this. There is no doubt about it. Our Law Minister has even said that the word 'may' can mean 'shall' and the word 'shall' can mean 'may'. So, where is the difficulty in accepting 'shall' if 'shall' can be 'may', and 'may' can be 'shall', if some people want it? Nevertheless, if there is so much difficulty over these two words, may I suggest what the hon. Home Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri himself has said while moving the Bill for consideration? He has said that English will continue to be used for an additional period. I would suggest humbly that perhaps it might be acceptable if this phrase is used instead of the words 'may' and 'shall' which create so much of controversy.

15 hrs.

Finally, I would say that there can be no question that the language which we have enshrined in the Constitution as the official language shall come to that position in time. But time must be given for that process. There is also something which is there in the Constitution itself, and which I would like to read out for the information of the House because sometimes we are apt to forget it. In the last chapter of Part XVII of the Constitution dealing with the official language, in article 351 it has been laid down:

"It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing.

wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

This is embodied in the Constitution; as we embodied the provision for Hindi as the official language in the Constitution, but we also have this article in the Constitution. We have to remember and realise that Hindi can only take its place, if it really contains the elements of all the other languages. As Dr Shyama Prasad Mookerjee said, Hindi has to be accepted as spoken in the Bengali way, as spoken in the Tamil way and so on. If those who are Hindi-speaking do not insist on the purity of the language but are agreeable to have it changed as a living language in the context of the times and developed according to the needs of the day, it will become acceptable to all. Gurusdev Rabindranath Tagore has been quoted. So I will conclude by mentioning something that he also said. He said—"I was one of those who were great purists for the Bengali language. In my younger days, I went to the length of using 'jharna kalam' for 'fountain pen'. But today I realise if our language is to develop, and be enriched then we must be willing to accept words from other languages". If Hindi is willing to accept all our national languages, we can realise our objective.

In fact, we will have to accept from other languages including English from the outside world, if we are to live in the world of today and be able to go ahead in the manner that we want.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I am not so credulous or optimistic as to join my hon. friend, Shri Khadilkar, or Dr. Aney, in admonishing or advising my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony; nor do I consider it rational to join in the decrying, discrediting and disowning of the English language which has undeniably made a contribution to the growth of certain modern political and economic institutions

and awareness in our country. That is why I approach my task this afternoon with great diffidence, because while one group is defiantly denying past history, the other is proclaiming that it can deny the very context in which we live. The proposed legislation before us has, therefore, in my humble submission, been embattled by a two-edged sword of fanaticism which no reasonable and balanced person can possibly approve of. If Swami Rameshwaranand is accused of burning the Bill, I think there are many here who are equally anxious to bury it. This has, unfortunately, created a difficult situation for those who want to raise a reasonable argument in respect of the constitutional propriety, if not the validity, of the Bill before us.

The Bill has been surrounded so much by intemperate intolerance from many quarters that I do not feel so emboldened as to suggest anything categorical. But I do think that, in the first place, the Bill is eminently ill-timed. While we are busy fighting on our borders and preparing for meeting the eventuality of external aggression, we have been embroiled and involved in a controversy which, in spite of the judicious approach claimed by the Home Minister on behalf of the Bill, is bound to create ill-will. I also feel that the policy and approach of the Government of India, far from being dictatorial in the matter of enforcing Hindi, has actually been, if we go to the crux of the matter, indifferent, ineffective and inefficient. I therefore feel that the Bill should actually have been postponed or at least, as I have suggested, circulated for eliciting public opinion.

I also feel that our discussion is greatly handicapped because we do not have before us in terms of article 344 the Report of the second Commission which should have been appointed after ten years of the commencement of the Constitution. This is the consequence of an inexcusable lapse. The Government cannot by any stretch of imagination or interpretation hold

[Dr. L. M. Singavi]

brief for not having complied with this mandatory provision of the Constitution. I would like the constitutional pundits or the Home Minister on behalf of Government to tell us as to how it is that Government can possibly and conceivably justify the absence of the appointment of the Commission, to which even the first Official Language Commission had looked forward and had hoped that that that Commission would be able to give proper guidelines for a proper consideration of the problem.

I would like briefly to recapitulate the inspiring atmosphere of the Constituent Assembly when this constitutional settlement, this formula, came to be adopted. I feel sorry and disappointed that after the elapse of these years we have not been able to forge and fortify that solidarity to which we had looked forward and which we had proclaimed with so much emphasis and with so much optimism at the time of making our Constitution.

Time does not permit me to make a prolonged excursion into all that was said at the time of Constitution-making, the seed-time of our Republic. But I should like to quote two or three passages which are of great relevance even today. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who presided over the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly, had this to say before the discussion on this chapter commenced:

"Let us not forget that whatever decision is taken with regard to the question of language, it will have to be carried out by the country as a whole. There is no other item in the whole constitution of the country which will be required to be implemented from day to day, from hour to hour, I might even say, from minute to minute. Therefore, Members will remember that it will not do to carry a point by debate in this House".

We note with great regret and disappointment that these provisions of

the Constitution were not lived, not to say minute to minute or hour to hour, but even from year to year. That is why I feel that if we want to ensure the ultimate actualisation of the hope that is entertained, I think, by and large in this country, namely, the actual of Hindi as the official language of the Union, we must appoint, as has been suggested by some hon. friends, a Commissioner for the Hindi Language who would from year to year, month to month, task to task and transaction to transaction, pursue the matter of effectuating this particular constitutional provision.

I would like this respect to quote my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, who had this to say at the time of Constitution-making:

"May I say also, at the very outset, that I accept this premise entirely, that if India is to achieve real unity, a real sense of Indian nationality, then everyone of us must accept this premise that we must have a national language. English is my mother tongue. Because I am an Indian, because English is my mother tongue, I maintain that English is an India language. The hon. Member who has preceded me has just mentioned that English is not the prerogative or the monopoly of the Englishman. It has become the mother tongue and assimilated to or has become part of the people in different parts of the world. Although English is my mother tongue, and though I claim English as an Indian language, I realise that English cannot, for many reasons be the national language of this country".

With great respect, I beg to submit that Shri Anthony appears to have resiled and retraced from the position he had accepted at the time of Constitution-making.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Here the expression is 'national language'. Shri Frank Anthony now says that he referred only to official language.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I appreciate the difference my hon. friend makes. I think the status of a national language is far greater and far more important than the status of a mere official language. So that while Shri Anthony was prepared at that time to have Hindi as the national language of India, today he has unfortunately re-traced completely from that position.

Shri S. Kandappan: He explained the reasons for it.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I do not see that anything has happened in these past years to justify such a change of position. It may be that there are people who in that inspiring, edifying atmosphere were compelled by the logic of events to accept a national solution to a national problem. It may be that at that time their acceptance was not without inarticulate qualifications. But it is no longer possible for any one to say that any other language but Hindi should possibly claim the status of the official language of the Union. I feel that the constitutional settlement or formula embodied in the Constitution is a salutary one which the posterity must dutifully implement and comply with. This is what the hon. Mover and the author of the formula, if I may say so, Shri N. Gopalaswamy Ayyangar to say in respect of the formula:

"I thought I said that the scheme should be looked upon as a whole. It was the result of a great deal of discussion and compromise. If I may emphasise it, it is an integrated whole. We cannot give up one part of it, unless it be a very minor or verbal correction that you want to make, or even a minor matter of substance. It does not matter very much. But the important things in this draft are an integrated whole and if you touch one part of it the other things fall to pieces."

That is the difficulty which arises with the present Bill. I shall demonstrate very briefly the departure of the Bill from the constitutional formula. Article 343 categorically states that the

official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagiri script. There are only two exceptions as I had submitted earlier on a point of order. These exceptions even today do not justify that English should be the official language of the Union or that legislation should continue to be enacted in English or that English should continue as an official language of the Union for all purposes in a blanket way.

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

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Article 343(3) says that notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, of the English language for such purposes as may be specified in the law. There are many eminent lawyers in this House and law has been freely bandied about in this discussion. I should like to know if the doctrine of pith and substance which has come to be honoured as the central principle of constitutional interpretation would justify that for all purposes in a blanket, unspecified way you should continue English as the official language of the Union. In the relatively short time at my disposal, I would refrain from quoting from a large number of other participants in this debate but the tenor of discussion goes to show that the cause of national unity seems to have suffered a certain decline and set-back. I say this with a sense of agony and distress. It appears to be so when my friends of the DMK demand a re-appraisal of the constitution in this particular context. They demand that the formula which embodies the judicious compromise enshrined in the Constitution should be abrogated. That is the objective which I understand them to pursue through the medium of reappraisal, which would certainly be doing great injustice to the cause of national unity because it is through this medium of reappraisal that the theory of secession and the theory of regional languages as being hostile and antagonistic to the official language of the Union would be brought up. I find a balanced statement

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

of the problem as it affects us in the speech of Shri Hiren Mukerjee. We must try to follow an unbiased national policy.

Sir, I shall conclude in two minutes. A great deal of progress has been made in the development of Hindi as the official language of the Union. Not all the hon. Members, unfortunately, if I may say so with great respect, are even aware of the revolution in a sense which has been effected in terms of development of Hindi. Because we do not have the findings of a second official language commission we are not able to cite the material and take cognisance of the great growth Hindi has undergone and to justify its increasing use for official purposes of the Union.

I would come to the Bill, now. I have already referred to its constitutional impropriety. I shall take two or three minutes. Most speakers before me have appropriated as much as fifteen minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are the second speaker from your party; your leader has taken half an hour.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: We should not allow this to become regional or communal question. It is a national question. We ought not to allow our petty affections to afflict our opinions. I feel that the sudden upsurge of an all absorbing love in the hearts of some friends for the English language is unreal and unconvincing. It does not bespeak the feelings of the large masses of people in this country, whether they belong to the northern or the southern region. Those who claim to be the mouth piece of popular opinion in the Southern States must take stock of the situation. I think if the Bill were actually to go for eliciting public opinion but for the regional propaganda it would certainly receive the support of the people at large, even if it embodied the principle of laying down a certain time-limit. Before I conclude, I have to make two

suggestions: One for the appointment of a Commissioner for Hindi language and another regarding the appointment of a standing committee of Parliament which may review the matter from year to year. Government should earnestly consider the creation of a Hindi Ministry which may actually pursue the task in an earnest and planned manner. I hope that the bringing about of the actual use of Hindi as the official language is not a matter merely of this or that party, but is a matter of national importance and I hope Government will spare nothing in seeing that the original provision in the Constitution is made to materialise before long. I oppose this Bill on the ground that it is not constitutionally proper and permissible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Shastri.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): I may be given a few minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry; there is no time now. We will try to accommodate him on clause-by-clause discussion.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I am the only person from my Group who will speak on this.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: He may be given five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him take five minutes.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दुनिया में जो भी राष्ट्र हैं, उन के लिए एक जमीन होती है, इन्सान होते हैं और उन की भाषायें होती हैं, लेकिन हमें यह देख कर शर्म आती है कि भारत इतना बड़ा देश है और हम उस को दुनिया में प्रजा-प्रभुत्व का एक मन्दिर मानते हैं और इस प्रकार भारतवर्ष को लोक सभा उस प्रजा-प्रभुत्व के मन्दिर का एक शिखर और कलश बन जाती है, उस में अगर हम अंग्रेजी जैसी फारेन लैंग्वेज को बहुत दिनों तक चलाये, तो प्रजा-प्रभुत्व पर लानत है। हिन्दुस्तान की जो चौदह भाषायें हैं, उन में कोई भी भाषा इस अपना सकते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं

महात्मा गांधी के एक संदेश को पढ़ने की इजाजत चाहता हूँ, जोकि शायद इस मौके के लिए बहुत मौजूद है। "हिन्दी स्वराज और इंडियन होम रूल" में यंग इंडिया में प्रकाशित एक रीडर का प्रश्न और उस का उत्तर इस प्रकार दिया गया है :

"Reader: Do I then understand that you do not consider English Education necessary for obtaining Home Rule.

Gandhiji: My answer is yes and no. To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them. The foundation that Macaulay laid of education has enslaved us, I do not suggest that he had any such intention, but that has been the result."

उस के बाद वे कहते हैं :

"We write to each other in faulty English, and from this even our M.A.s. are not free; our best thoughts are expressed in English; the proceedings of our Congress are conducted in English; our best newspapers are printed in English. If this state of things continues for a long time, posterity will—it is my firm opinion—condemn and curse us.

It is worth noting that, by receiving English education, we have enslaved the nation. Hypocrisy, tyranny, etc., have increased; English-knowing Indians have not hesitated to cheat and strike terror into the people."

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: This is written in English.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : गांधी जी ने यह कहा है।

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां पर जो एम.० पंजा० बैठे हुए हैं और जो इंग्लिश में बात करते हैं, उन में शायद बास पच्चीस या ज्यादा से ज्यादा पचास ही ऐसे होंगे जोकि अपने तमाम विचार जो भी उन

के दिल के अन्दर हैं, अच्छी तरह से इस विदेशी भाषा में रख सकते हों।

आगे चल कर गांधी जी कहते हैं :

"It is not a painful thing that, if I want to go to a court of justice, I must employ the English language as a medium, that when I become a barrister, I may not speak my mother-tongue and that someone else should have to translate to me from my own language? Is not this absolutely absurd? Is it not a sign of slavery? Am I to blame the English for it or myself? It is we, the English-knowing Indians, that have enslaved India. The curse of the nation will rest not upon the English but upon us."

वह क्यों ?

"I have told you that my answer to your last question is both yes and no. I have explained to you why it is yes. I shall now explain why it is no.

The object of making money thereby should be eschewed.

जो बात मैं कहने जा रहा हूँ, इस को कहते हुए मुझे बड़ी शर्म आती है। दक्षिण भारत वालों की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि उन को सर्विस में उन का उचित हिस्सा नहीं मिलता है या बाद में नहीं मिलेगा। लेकिन इस का इलाज अगर करना हो तो हिन्दी वालों के लिए और नान-हिन्दी वालों के लिए कोटा मुकर्रर कर के लिया जा सकता है। सर्विस में आने के लिए या पैसे के लिए भारतवर्ष की जो भाषा है, या हमारी प्रान्त की जो भाषा है, उस का हम गला नहीं घोट सकते हैं, अपना अपना भाषाओं के लिए लड़ नहीं सकते हैं। प्रान्तों में हम अपना प्रान्तीय भाषायें चला सकते हैं और यहां केन्द्र से पत्र व्यवहार कर सकते हैं और यहां केन्द्र का भाषा अलग हो सकती है। तमिल वाले या कन्नड़ वाले अपनी अपनी भाषाओं में अपना काम काज चला सकते हैं। हमें चाहिये कि हम अपने देश में दु

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

बैंगुएज फार्मूला रखें। जो हिन्दी वाले हैं, उन के लिए हिन्दी और एक दूसरी कोई भारतीय भाषा पढ़नी अनिवार्य होना चाहिए और नान-हिन्दी वाले जो हैं, उन के लिए अपनी मातृभाषा और हिन्दी पढ़ना बाज़िर्गामी होना चाहिये। कोई धो बैंगुएज फार्मूले की जरूरत नहीं है। अगर यह रहता है तो हम हमेशा अंग्रेज़ों के नाँचे दबे रहेंगे।

The three language formula—it will not be the Lok Sabha of India, but it will be the Lok Sabha branch of England. We do not want to accept any other rule. We want to accept, all the people want to accept, the two-language formula. One should learn Hindi—it is the common language and it is the only national language—along with one other language. Which is our mother-tongue.

यह जो हिन्दी के विरोध में प्रचार होता है दक्षिण भारत में इस को मैं समझ नहीं पाया हूँ। आप से भी मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या यह एक लानत नहीं है कि पंद्रह साल आजाद हुए हमें हो गए हैं और आज भी हमारे जो डिप्लोमेट्स होते हैं, वे जो क्रेडेंशल्स पेश करते हैं, अंग्रेज़ों में हाँ करते हैं, हिन्दी में नहीं करते हैं ? माननीय पुरुषोत्तम दास जी टंडन ने जो मिनट आफ डाइसेंट दिया था, उस से पता चलता है कि क्रेडेंशल्स इंग्लिश में ही पेश किये जाते हैं। यह जो तमिलियंज की तरफ से एरियंज और द्रविडियंज में फूट डालने का कोशिश की जा रही है, हिन्दी और नान-हिन्दी वालों को विभक्त करने का कोशिश की जा रही है, इस को मैं भारतवर्ष के लिए एक लानत समझता हूँ। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जब क्लॉज़िज़ पर बहस हो तो मुझे समय दिया जाय ताकि मैं अपने विचार रख सकूँ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful to the House, and may I also, with your permission, congratulate the hon. Members who have spoken, on the restraint and broad-mindedness

shown by them on this difficult and vital issue? I feel there could not have been a better lead given by the Parliament. Shri Frank Anthony, I must admit, was a solitary exception, and I hope he does not mind it if I remind him of the rule that exception only proves the rule.

Most of the speeches made mainly refer to clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill. I shall try to deal with some of the points raised. Before I refer to them, may I say that I have sent three amendments to clause 4 in order to clear up certain doubts expressed here by some of the hon. Members! Those amendments, I am sure, must have been circulated. But with your permission, I shall read them out. In clause 4, page 2, sub-clause (1), in lines 9 and 10, for

“the President may appoint a Committee consisting of thirty members”,

I have suggested that it should be substituted by the following:

“There shall be constituted a Committee on Official Language, on a resolution to that effect being moved in either House of Parliament with the previous sanction of the President and passed by both Houses.

(1A) The Committee shall consist of thirty members”.

The other amendment is, in page 2, sub-clause (2), after line 18 I have suggested the insertion of the following words:

“and the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to all the State Governments”.

The third amendment is in regard to sub-clause (3), page 2, line 20. After the words “in sub-section (2),”, I have suggested the insertion of the following words:

“and the views, if any, expressed by the State Governments thereon....

It is clear that the first amendment of course is with a view to clearing up the position about the appointment of a committee by the President as was mentioned in the Bill. It had to be cleared up because it did create some confusion. In regard to the other two amendments, one clearly provides that the report of the Parliamentary Committee with the permission of the President, will be laid before both Houses of Parliament. The other amendment says that it would also be sent to the State Governments and their views will be obtained. These amendments, I am quite sure, would be generally supported as they would further clarify the approach of the Government. It is our desire that Parliament and the State Governments should have full say in the matter.

In regard to clause 3, some hon. Members have argued that in providing for the continued use of English for all the official purposes of the Union without any time-limit, Government have gone against the spirit if not the letter of the provisions of the Constitution relating to the official language. On the other hand—just now Dr. Singhvi argued on the same lines—various fears and misgivings have been expressed over the use of the word “may” in this clause. It will be recalled that clause 2 of article 343 of the Constitution provides that for a period of 15 years from the commencement of the Constitution, i.e. until 25th January, 1965, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement. Similarly, under article 120 of the Constitution, provision has been made for the use of English for transaction of business in Parliament for a period of 15 years only from the commencement of the Constitution. However, Clause 3 of article 343 of the Constitution enables Parliament to provide by law for the use of English beyond 25th January, 1965 for such purposes as may be specified in that law.

The whole object of clause 3 of the Bill is to provide for the continued use of English beyond 25th January, 1965 in addition to Hindi for the official purposes of the Union and for parliamentary business. As indicated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this is in pursuance of the policy of the Government, as indicated by the Prime Minister in the speech delivered by him on 4th September 1959. The language of clause 3 is necessarily couched in constitutional and legal terms. A careful and dispassionate examination of clause 3 will show that these provisions are in consonance with the Prime Minister's statement, to which a reference was made earlier. This clause is an enabling provision. It makes it clear that even after 25th January 1965, the English language in addition to Hindi shall continue to be used lawfully for all the official purposes of the Union for which the English language is in use at present, as well as for business in Parliament. As the language authorised for use in the Union is also the official language for inter-State communication and for communication between the States and the Centre under article 346 of the Constitution, it follows that after 25th January 1965 also, English will continue to be used for communication between one State and another and for communication between the Centre and the States. The sum and substance of it is to make English an additional medium of language that may be used for the official work at the all-India level. This is precisely what the Prime Minister had in view when he stated in his speech of September 4 and earlier on August 7, 1959 that English should be an associate, additional or alternate language. If Parliament makes it lawful, as provided in clause 3, to make use of the English language for all the official purposes of the Union for which it is being used at present, there seems no reason to apprehend that the people in non-Hindi-speaking areas or those who do not heed that the people in non-Hindi will be put to any difficulty or inconvenience.

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

In the context of clause 3, which is an enabling provision, the use of the word "may" seems more appropriate than "shall". The question whether "may" should be replaced by "shall" has been given very careful consideration, as hon. Members had laid stress on that. Government are, however, advised that the use of the word "shall" in this context may give rise to misinterpretation that both Hindi and English have to be used simultaneously for all the official work of the Union. This will be not only inconvenient, but impracticable and wasteful. What is intended is not that Hindi should be used every time English is used or that English should be used every time Hindi is used. The intention is that while Hindi may be used progressively for different official purposes of the Union, English will also continue to be used without any limitation as to the purposes for which it may be used.

As I have mentioned in my introductory speech, what is envisaged is prolonged bilingualism. I am sorry I have not been able to agree to the suggestion made that "may" should be substituted by "shall". It was not easy for me not to accept this suggestion made by hon. Members. Especially, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy—it seems she is not here—requested me specially to accept her amendment. She is not here, but in her absence, I might like to say that she was good enough to say a few good words about me.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): All ladies are good to you.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But I hope she will not revise her opinion about me, as I am not able to accept her amendment.

As I just now said, there are legal and other difficulties in the way. No

less a person than Sri Sachin Chaudhuri, who is an eminent and distinguished lawyer of the country, has expressed the view that if "may" is changed to "shall", a certain period has to be prescribed for the retention of English. I am not quite sure if those who support the retention of English will agree to any such proposition.

"May" make it a permissive clause. "Shall" might perhaps mean, as I just now said, the simultaneous use of both English and Hindi. For example, if the Madras Government want to send any communication to the Centre, it may have to be accompanied by a Hindi translation or if the Rajasthan Government want to send any communication in Hindi to the Centre, it will have to be accompanied by a translation in English. I do not think that this would be creating a very wholesome situation. However limited the introduction of Hindi may be, its propriety or legality might also be challenged. However, I can assure the hon. Members from the non-Hindi-speaking areas that Government fully understand the spirit of the non-Hindi speaking people. We know their difficulties. We also know that it will take time to use Hindi freely. The spirit behind the word "may" will, therefore, have to be considered in that context.

Mr. Manoharan has indirectly cast a doubt on my *bona fides*.

Shri Mancharan (Madras South): I only said, you misled the House. I did not doubt your *bona fides*.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am referring to another matter altogether. He said that this is not a compromise Bill which I have placed before the House, but some kind of compromise between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. I can tell the House that this Bill fulfils the assurance given by the Prime Minister.

Shri Manoharan: No.

Shri S. Kandappan: It is not contained in the Bill.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: What did the Prime Minister want? The Prime Minister wanted three things to be done. He wanted English to be continued....

Shri S. Kandappan: Continued indefinitely as long as we wish.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: He is not trying to picket on the streets of Madras city or lead a procession or a movement. He should kindly give me at least the opportunity to express my views fully. I was just now going to say that there were two or three things which the Prime Minister had suggested. One was that English should continue beyond January, 1965. The second thing he said was that there should be no time limit prescribed for the purpose. Thirdly, he had said, that the views of the non-Hindi-speaking people should be taken into consideration before arriving at any final decision.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): A little more than that.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, that is my reading. If there is something more than that I cannot give any more explanation on that point (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I just ask one question of the Home Minister? The Prime Minister said that he meant "shall". Does "may" mean "shall" in this context?

An Hon. Member: He had his say (*Interruptions*).

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I have already stated what is meant in the Bill. I have tried to explain it fully (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order order. Questions, if any, should be put in the end.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Well, Sir, as I said just now, clause (3) clearly provides for the continuation of English. Secondly, there is no time limit prescribed in the Bill. Thirdly, in so far as consultation is concerned, as I said in my introductory speech, there could not have been a better body than a parliamentary committee to consider over the matter, a parliamentary committee on which will be represented members from different States and members speaking different languages. Although I had said that the report will be sent—the report of the parliamentary committee—to the State Governments and it will be placed on the Tables of both the Houses, still I thought it advisable to put it in some form in the Bill and I have, therefore, suggested those two amendments. There will be, in accordance with the desire of the Prime Minister—as he had mentioned then—full and complete consultation and it will be only then that the President would be issuing directions on the recommendations made by the parliamentary committee.

Well, Sir, this is what the Prime Minister actually wanted, so that there should be no imposition, and I can assure the House that this desire of his would be borne in mind throughout. May I also add, that it is wrong to think in terms of personalities in these matters? After all, governments come and go. But I do not think any democratic government in the world worth its name will dare go against the general wishes of the people in so far as the issue of language is concerned. It is a volatile subject which rouses tremendous emotions amongst people. So, any government which comes into power will have to think a hundred times before defying the wishes of the non-Hindi-speaking people. The House is aware that even in the midst of some kind of an authoritarian rule in Pakistan it has not been possible for them to introduce Urdu as the only official language in East Bengal, and Bengali is one of their official languages. Our non-Hindi-speaking friends have to appr-

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

ciate and understand our ultimate objective. I am indeed happy that they generally do so. Those who support English have to understand the fact that English will not continue as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges for long or for ever. Even in universities, there is an attempt to introduce the regional language, which has been supported by some eminent educationists also. English will, therefore, gradually lose its importance. In administration also, the regional language or languages are being adopted. Already, 11 State Governments, including the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, have adopted the regional language as their official language, and I am informed that in the two or three remaining States also the matter is being actively considered. It would, thus, be seen that different regional languages will be more and more in use in all the States, both in the administrative and educational fields. However, I personally think that it would be most unfortunate if English loses its hold, "without any further common links" to use the words of the Prime Minister, for that would not help the integration of strengthening of the country. Therefore, howsoever slow the progressive use of Hindi might be, its progressive use becomes important. If, for example, the regional languages should take, say, 15 to 20 years to replace English fully, in educational and administrative fields, Hindi should, during the same period, be in a position to serve as the common bond. Therefore, I suggest that the progressive use of Hindi should not be objected to.

To talk in terms of laws, rules and regulations is one thing, but what could be done practically is another. Even within one State there is the problem of common language. And I have found that English alone has come to our rescue, because Hindi has yet to grow and be learnt. Although Shri Hem Barua made a fine speech, almost in general support of this Bill, even in his State, he will remember

and we all remember, what kind of difficulties had arisen in Cachar. I am thankful to the Assam Government for having agreed to the suggestion that Bengali should be the official language at the district level.

15.48 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

But, when I raised the question as to what should be the language to be used between the district and the State headquarters, and also the language or languages to be used in the State Secretariat, there were difficulties about it and yet when, after some discussions, they found that what I had suggested was reasonable and practical, they agreed that the communication between the district and the State headquarters would be in English.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): That shows how reasonable the Assamese are.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I entirely agree. I convey my very sincere congratulations to Shri Hem Barua as well as to his State Government.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hem Barua should not take the whole credit for Assam.

An Hon. Member: Shri P. C. Borooah is there.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am sorry. There are two Baruas in this House.

An Hon. Member: Three.

Shri Hem Barua: There are four now.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Then, I must convey my congratulations to all the four. It was agreed that for quite some time English will be used in the Secretariat also. When that is the position in a State, hon. Members can very well imagine as to how it will

be possible to make a quick change in the Union Government at the Centre here.

If we are advising the State Governments to continue English for quite some time, the question of having a quick change-over to something else for all purposes at the Union level would be a very difficult proposition indeed. So, as I said, from a purely practical point of view it is essential that we have to go slow in the matter.

There are other aspects also. My fear is that in case we want to switch-over immediately or very soon, the result will be that intercommunication and mobility from one place to another will become exceedingly difficult. It will not be possible for officers to be sent from one State to another. It may become difficult for the High Court Judges to be transferred from one State to another. It may not be possible for the children of Government servants who are transferred from one place to another to go and join schools and colleges in other States because either it is regional language or it is Hindi. If there is no common language, it would create enormous difficulties. The common language has also to be learnt along with the regional language. Then intercommunication could be easily possible.

Even for business and trade it might become difficult for one set of people to go and establish an industry in another State. So, it is essential that we should impose no such barrier. I have therefore always suggested and advised that we must not precipitate matters even if we have love for Hindi. Is it not essential that we should give complete freedom to our people to move from one place to another and search their own employment or establish their own trade or business? If we come in their way, it would not help, as I said, in integration. It might perhaps lead to disintegration. I would therefore appeal to my hon. friends, specially those

who come from the Hindi-speaking areas, to realise the gravity of the situation and not do anything which might injure the cause of Hindi itself.

This problem will have to be tackled with the utmost patience and as far as possible with the consent of all. I think, that patience and constructive efforts, officials and non-official, towards the teaching and learning of Hindi alone will help the country and our countrymen.

Shri Anthony said that it was not possible for me to take an objective view in the matter as Hindi is my mother tongue. There may be some truth in that as I am weak in many respects and am not big enough.

Shri N. R. Ghosh (Jalpaiguri): He took such a view in the Constituent Assembly.

Shri Frank Anthony: Both of us have the same inhibitions.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But for him to suggest that no one can take an objective view will be rather going too far.

Shri Frank Anthony: As far as mother tongue is concerned.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: May I tell him that this world will not move peacefully if there were not at least some people who could consider...

An Hon. Member: Including himself.

Shri Frank Anthony: I include myself.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Who could consider vital matters without passion and without a subjective approach. In fact, only such people show the way and smaller fry like us try to pursue the same path. What, after all, was Gandhiji? He did not come from a Hindi-speaking area. I remember, in 1920 when I heard his speech for the first time, it was not possible for him to express himself cogently and clearly in Hindi. Still, he took up the cause of Hindi not because he favoured Hindi but because he felt that at least there should be one common Indian language which might be used from one end of the country to another. His desire was to

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

build up a strong, united and integrated nation and it was for this reason that he laid the utmost stress on finding a common language for India. I might also inform Mr. Anthony that the Bill which was drafted quite some time ago has not been substantially changed at all. I might tell him that it was drafted about five or six months back and whatever slight changes have been made have been made with a view to remove any misapprehension in non-Hindi-speaking areas. It is true that I took into consideration the strong feelings held in the Hindi-speaking areas. It did not mean that I was not aware of the same kind of feelings in the non-Hindi-speaking areas. Mr. Anthony should at least sometimes give us the credit for making a correct assessment of the situation and taking action only on that basis.

Democratic Governments have to function sometimes under pressure (*Interruption*). Democratic Governments, as I was saying, have to function sometimes under pressure.

श्री बागड़ी : उन का क्या वह तो नोमिनेटेड हैं . . . (*Interruptions*)

Shri Nath Pai: I think there is a tendency to insult the Constitution. Mr. Frank Anthony is nominated under the provisions of the Constitution and it has become quite a fashion to insult him as a nominated Member . . . (*Interruption*). What is this democracy? (*Interruption*).

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : माननीय सदस्य नामजद हैं और उन के लिए यदि कोई कह दे कि वह नामजद सदस्य हैं तो क्या यह असत्य भाषण है ? क्या यह बात सत्य नहीं है कि वह नोमिनेटेड हैं ? (*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इतना गुस्से में आने का क्या कारण है मेरी समझ में नहीं आया ?

श्री बागड़ी : श्री नाथ पाई को जरूर गुस्सा आया है ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अगर गुस्सा आया है तो कहा जायगा कि सत्य बात के ऊपर आखिर इतना गुस्सा क्यों ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सत्य बात भी कही जाये तो यह देखना होगा कि वह किस गरज से कही जा रही है ? किसी की नुकता-चीनी करने के लिए कही जा रही है या किस लिए कही जा रही है ? जो भी संविधान के पीछे आ गया है वह मੈम्बर है, चाहे वह चुन कर आया हो या नामजद हो कर आया है । सब मੈम्बरस बराबर हैं । इस सदन में किसी तरीके से भी आये, सदन के अंदर मੈम्बर मੈम्बर में कोई फर्क नहीं है चाहे वह किस तरीके से भी आये वह सारे कांस्टिट्यूशन के नीचे आये हैं और इसलिए उन में कोई फर्क नहीं है और किसी को इस ब्यास से कि वह नोमिनेटेड है घगिया या बढ़िया कहना, यह निहायत अनुचित है और ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिए ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जब सदन की कार्यवाही में बाकायदा उन के लिए नामजद लिखा जाता है तो . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है लिखा जाता है और क्यों न लिखा जाये ?

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जब इस में कौन सी बुरी बात कह दी कि वे नामजद मੈम्बर हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस को कहने की क्या जरूरत है सब जानते हैं कि कहां उन का नाम लिखा जाता है ?

Shri Hem Barna: There is always an insinuation. (*Interruption*).

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): There is an insinuation behind it, and an innuendo clinging to it. We are not objecting to the fact. . . (*Interruption*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा मतलब भी यही था कि उस को कहने की गरज क्या है ? चूंकि ? "इसिनूएशन" का तर्जुमा नहीं आता था इसलिए मैं ने उस तौर पर कहा था ।

Yes, the hon. Minister.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was telling Mr. Anthony specially and the House that democratic Governments have to function sometimes under pressure. But the most important pressure is that of public opinion which, I believe, is not generally wrong. But then sometimes there are certain vital issues in which Governments and public leaders have to give the lead and mould the public opinion. We cannot take bigger steps or build up a nation if the Government or their leaders do not function in this way. I might also inform him that I have had consultations with all the South Indian Chief Ministers more than once, and especially in regard to clauses 6 and 7 to which a reference was made by Mr. Anthony. They were agreeable to this. And, after all, what is provided in clauses 6 and 7? There are two things provided there. One is that the Hindi text or a translation of any law in Hindi may be provided or done in any State where the official language of the State is the regional language. The second thing is that Hindi could be used for pronouncement of judgment or decree in the High Courts. These are the two things. I agree that they are important matters. But what is actually provided there in the two clauses? We leave it entirely to the State Governments to appoint a day, and it is only the State Government or the Governor of the State who will have full discretion to take action in this behalf. There is no compulsion at all. It is entirely in the discretion of the State Governments to provide for these things. In regard to the High Courts, we have said that either a regional language which is the official language of the State or Hindi can be used. So,

we have not ruled out the regional language or English. So, it can be English or the regional language or Hindi if they so desire, and their translations for texts of judgments etc. Similarly about the Bills or laws, we have said that in case the Government so desires and agree, it can provide for translation of the same that is, of the regional language laws into Hindi.

16 hrs.

I do not think that I have gone beyond what Shri Frank Anthony himself had suggested. In fact, he wanted much more than that. For, Shri Frank Anthony said the other day:

"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.'"

So, he has definitely said that. Then, he went on to say:

"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?"

I congratulate him and I welcome this statement. But may I tell him that I have not gone to that length? In fact, he has gone much farther than what is actually proposed in this Bill.

It is indeed most welcome, and I hope he will not mind it unlike our DMK friends, that it is satisfying to note that the Anglo-Indians, or a large majority of them, speak very well in Hindi or Hindustani.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am not so mad.

Dr. Govind Das (Jabalpur): You are quite good. Why do you say it in the negative?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I must give credit to Shri Frank Anthony, for, whenever I start speaking with

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

him in English—because I am afraid that he might get annoyed otherwise—he replies to me or starts replying to me in Hindi. I welcome it.

Similarly, Shri Manoharan was angry at my saying that the DMK opposed Hindi. The main difference with him is that he is not prepared to accept Hindi as the common link, and I can only appeal to him to think over the matter. We need not close our minds on any matter. In fact I never meant to criticise Shri Sezhiyan who spoke the other day, and as far as I can judge, Shri Manoharan was referring to his last speech and to what I had said in reply to his speech in the course of the discussions on the Home Ministry's Demands. In fact, I have complimented the DMK, and it was a compliment which was based on the advice of another commoner member from Madras, not a capitalist member but a commoner member from Madras, who had told me that the DMK boys were trying to learn Hindi. This is no reflection on the DMK. To my mind, it is a compliment and a tribute.

Shri Manoharan further said that the provision to review the progressive use of Hindi by the appointment of a committee was merely a camouflage, and this will lead to restrictions on the use of English. I have already said a good deal about that matter while making a reference to clause 3 of the Bill. But I am surprised that a Member of Parliament should belittle the importance of a parliamentary committee itself. I know each and every Member of Parliament is jealous of his status and position, of the important role he plays in the formulation of the policy of the nation. However, if the parliamentary committee in its own wisdom places certain restrictions on the use of English, no one could prevent it. In any case, the committee will certainly take everything into consideration before making its recommendations.

Shri Manoharan's suggestion that all the 14 languages should be declared or made official languages of the country or of the Union is something, if I may put it very mildly, far from practicable. Some countries were quoted and it was said that they have more than one official language. It may be true. But we need not necessarily follow other countries in every matter.

Shri Manoharan: If the situation warrants.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I think in a vast country like India, which has different languages and so many States, it is much more desirable to have a common language.

Shri S. Kandappan: It is a politically manufactured aggregate.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: A common language is a basic thing. In smaller countries, it is much easier to have two or three or four official languages. But in a big country like India, it will definitely lead to disintegration. The point to be realised is that, after all, we have to consider what is the most important thing. Language is definitely important. Regional languages are important. They have to be used and they have to be developed. But as the Prime Minister said the other day, unless we have some kind of common link, the country will be divided into compartments.

Shri S. Kandappan: Equating a link language with a national language is not correct.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: There will be barriers and.....

Shri Manoharan: On a point of clarification.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: May I complete my sentence?....After ten years.....

Shri Manoharan: He says that it is absolutely impracticable, it is impossible. If he had formulated that view

after having consulted language experts, I could have understood it. What I say is, please try it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: This is not a matter in which expert advice is actually needed.

Shri S. Kandappan: The Linguistic Society of India can do it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: After all, we must use our commonsense in this matter.

I have no doubt that it would mean tremendous inconvenience, expenditure, time and delays if we have 14 official languages adopted by the Union Government.

Shri S. Kandappan: It will give us a sense of pride in our hearts.

Mr. Speaker: All those opinions have been expressed already. We should now listen to him patiently.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If hon. Members are not prepared to consider even this matter calmly and coolly—I have expressed my views—I would merely appeal to them to think over it again. If our ultimate objective is to build up a united India, I have no doubt they will think a hundred times before arriving at the decision that there should be 14 official languages in this country, adopted by the Union Government. There are, as I said earlier, extreme views held in the matter and we must have a balanced approach and only then we can carry the country with us. I was indeed very happy to read a statement of Shri Bhakthavathsalam, the Home Minister of Madras Government and I can understand very well the enormous difficulties he may have to face in the Madras State. Already a threat has been given and perhaps action might have also started to picket certain buildings where Hindi is taught to the Central Government employees. I am also told that some other kind of agitation may also be commenced or begun. Anyhow, I would indeed

be sorry if it is done. But as I said the Madras Government are certainly faced with a very difficult situation. I shall read out one or two sentences from the statement of Shri Bhakthavathsalam. He has stated that the Bill represented the greatest common measure of agreement and that he would not feel sorry if it was passed. He further said that he felt that the Bill gave what they wanted for the continuance of English. He further added that the Madras Government had suggested continuance of English as an associate language of the Union Government indefinitely but indefinitely was not equivalent to eternal. He also said that the proposed amendment of the DMK to the Bill in Parliament seeking to provide for a referendum in non-Hindi areas after ten years whether Hindi should be adopted went into the fundamental question and wanted that the official language could never be Hindi.

I do not want to take the time of the House but we have in fact, while framing the Bill, kept in mind the recommendations of the Madras Government made in the third memorandum to the Parliamentary Committee which said that the Government of Madras desired to place before the Parliamentary Committee of the Government of India the view that it would be necessary to use both English and Hindi as two official languages of the Indian Union for a prolonged period. They say that the initial phase of transition will consist in progressive increase in the use of Hindi for different official purposes—Mark these words. The memorandum goes on to say that this must be succeeded by a latter phase of transition when the discontinuance of the use of English for different official purposes may be brought about progressively the Indian Union has necessarily got to be bilingual throughout both the phases of the transition. That was the memorandum submitted to the Indian Parliamentary Committee by the Madras Government. I was somewhat surprised when one of my friends and colleagues said that the

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

views expressed by the Madras Government in the memorandum were not fully accepted by the Government of India. Here, it is said that the Government of Madras desire to place before the Parliamentary Committee the Government of India the view that it would be necessary to use both English and Hindi as two official languages of the Indian Union for a prolonged period. Then, later on, the State Government have said that the recommendations or the suggestions made in the memorandum were almost fully accepted by the Parliamentary Committee, and it would therefore be wrong to think that we have done anything which went against the wishes of the South Indian States. In fact, the Madras Government took the lead in the matter and their views were carefully considered by the Parliamentary Committee and the President has accepted the recommendations made by the Parliamentary Committee on various matters and in pursuance of one of those recommendations we have come up to this House with this Bill.

I might also add, as I said then, about the fear in the minds of our young men and women especially, that they might not get enough opportunity for employment etc., or they might be handicapped in regard to promotions and increments etc., Government was and is very careful and watchful in that regard. In fact, the question of how to ensure equality of people belonging to different regions in the matter of services is undoubtedly important, as I have said just now. Sub-clause (3) of article 344 of the Constitution states in explicit terms that in making their recommendations regarding the progressive use of Hindi, the Official Language Commission shall have due regard among other things, to the just claims and the interests of persons belonging to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to the public services. This question was, therefore, examined in considerable detail by the Official

Language Commission and the Committee of Parliament. The Committee recommended that the process of change-over to Hindi should be so developed and regulated that it does not have the effect of placing any linguistic groups at a disadvantage in the matter of recruitment to the public services. As pointed out by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, the Committee also made various suggestions on matters relating to recruitment to the All-India and Central services. The President has accepted most of the recommendations made by the Committee. The Parliamentary Committee had agreed with the recommendation of the Official Language Commission that the Union Government would be justified in prescribing a reasonable measure of knowledge of the Hindi language as a qualification for entering into their services provided a sufficiently long notice is given, and the measure of linguistic ability prescribed is moderate. Hon. Members might take note that the Parliamentary Committee had recommended and had agreed with the recommendation of the Official Language Commission that the Government of India would be justified in prescribing a reasonable measure of knowledge of the Hindi language for entering into the services. But the Government of India, in spite of that, have adopted the principle that language should not be a bar to recruitment. Facilities have been provided, as I said the other day, for teaching Hindi free of cost to the Central Government employees who are not conversant with Hindi after their recruitment to the services; and it has been specifically laid down in the Presidential Order, that although Hindi training would be obligatory for employees in Class III grade and above who are below a certain age, no penalty should be imposed for failure to attain the prescribed standard by the due date.

It should be mentioned here that the departmental tests in Hindi or Hindustani have been there even ear-

lier. Of course, it is an old practice. It will somewhat surprise the hon. Members to know that this was made obligatory for defence services even during the British regime. The House might still be more interested or amused to note that an order was issued from the Home Ministry in 1951 when our leader, Shri Rajagopalachari, was the Home Minister. He was the Home Minister at that time; that order provided for the introduction of Hindi tests in departmental examinations of almost all the Central services. This was the instruction issued in his time, when he was the Home Minister.

Shri Tyagi: He was not a Swatantra Leader then. The Swatantra Party had not come into existence.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is dated 1949. (Interruptions).

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, this was issued during his time. In fact, he ordered the introduction of Hindi tests in departmental examinations of almost all central services. Anyhow, later on we issued instructions in 1958 that if a Government servant, to whom this order was applicable, failed to pass the Hindi examinations, he would not on that ground suffer in any way in the matter of securing quasi-permanency, earning annual increment, promotion, confirmation, etc. I think the year I gave was correct—1951.

This will prove that there is no intention at all on the part of the Government to place any kind of handicap on those who do not know Hindi and who are already in service and who are recruited later on, in their getting promotion or other benefits.

I do not want to take more time of the House, but before I conclude, I would like to appeal to all Members and specially those Members who come from Hindi-speaking areas, that this question of language is such that we will have to carry the country with

us if we want to have a common link or common language. To Seth Govind Das, specially, I might say, that he was right when he quoted Gandhiji, Subhas Chandra Bose or our Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. It is true that they had said those things. He could as well have quoted Rajaji, because Rajaji went much further than these gentlemen. When he was Chief Minister of Madras Government, he had arrested a large number of people, those who spoke against the propagation of Hindi.

Shri Tyagi: I hope, you, as Home Minister, will not follow it.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, he also had the same views. But in these matters conditions change and the opinions might also alter. However, we have in this matter a special responsibility. I would, therefore, suggest that Sethji should also think over the matter again. Does he not support the idea of progressive use of Hindi. I would like to ask him, or does he want that Hindi should be straightaway introduced in all the States? I think I would not be unreasonable if I put that question to him, whether it would be a practicable proposition to introduce Hindi for all official purposes immediately or at once.

He will have to realise what the consequences would be of this kind of a step. We cannot in this matter succeed by merely force of authority. The wisest and the best solution in the circumstances is to help gradually in the development of Hindi and its use with the ultimate objective that the country will gladly learn it and our countrymen will be in a position to accept it as the official language of the Union. Conditions and circumstances change in a field of activity where men and their mind and thoughts matter. We cannot just stick to an end, and not make any change in the light of the situation as it prevails. I hope this will be considered carefully by every section of the House and they will be good

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

enough to lend their general support to this Bill.

Shri Ranga: May I ask for some clarifications from the Home Minister?

Shri Tyagi: No, no.

Shri Ranga: Why?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He may address it to me.

Shri Ranga: There were certain things which my hon. friends on this side and some of our friends there also wanted to get clarified. I was myself thinking of asking him for some explanations at that stage. But the Deputy-Speaker, as is usual with him then cautioned us that we might as well wait until he finished his speech and thereafter we might ask for certain explanations. I hope that is not wrong.

Mr. Speaker: If he wants to put a question, he may do so.

Shri Ranga: Sir, may I ask the hon. Home Minister whether he is aware of the fact that under the authority of the Government and at the expense of the Government an advertisement was published in all the papers including the *Hindu* of Madras in last November wherein they published the assurance of the Prime Minister to the non-Hindi-speaking people that English would be continued to be used as an official language until the non-Hindi-speaking people would agree to a change? My hon. friend mentioned three points from out of the Prime Minister's assurance.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister himself has explained it.

Shri Ranga: He failed to mention this particular point.

श्री बागड़ी : संविधान ने भी यह विश्वास दिलाया था कि सन् १९६५ के बाद हिन्दी आ जायेगी ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: At the cost of the Government and in the name of the Government with the Prime Minister's own photograph in it this one-fourth page advertisement was published in the *Hindu*. I have seen it myself last November. It was published in various other papers also.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point?

Shri Ranga: Therefore, I would like the hon. Home Minister...

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Is it a reply to the Home Minister's speech?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us be patient.

Shri Ranga: The hon. Home Minister mentioned three points which, according to him, are included in the Prime Minister's assurance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member was not present when the Prime Minister himself intervened. He had referred to this assurance.

Shri Ranga: That is all what he has referred to. The Home Minister has again referred to that speech. He was summarising it and bringing it down to three points. Those three points do not include this particular assurance given by the Prime Minister. It was published under the authority of the Government and at the expense of the Government in all papers.

Mr. Speaker: That is not denied here.

Shri Ranga: May I have the privilege of asking the Home Minister whether he is aware of it or not; if so, may I know whether that also does add up materially to the three points that he has mentioned now?

Shri Kapur Singh: You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister finished his speech I rose to request that an opportunity to seek a clarification may be given to me. You said then that whatever points there

remained to be clarified the Home Minister would do it.

Mr. Speaker: He has done it.

Shri Kapur Singh: This is one of the points that I wanted to raise, and Shri Ranga has raised it.

Mr. Speaker: That is what he has done now, I suppose.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, three Members of the Swatantra Party have spoken and each one has contradicted the other. I think, as leader of the party, Shri Ranga should ask their explanation.

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister might like to reply to it. Shri Ranga says that the fourth aspect has not been mentioned by the hon. Home Minister.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: If I have been able to follow Shri Ranga correctly, he suggests that consultation, or obtaining the views of the non-Hindi-speaking people, should be done, and that I have not referred to that. Is that the point which the hon. Member has raised?

Mr. Speaker: His point is that English should be continued until the non-Hindi-speaking areas want otherwise.

Shri Manoharan: If the Home Minister is prepared to listen, I will read it just now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He need not do it now.

Shri Manoharan: Yesterday, I have shown that very paper.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I have also read the speech of the Prime Minister more than once. I have just now explained that through this measure, through this Bill, we are creating an agency for obtaining the different views of the people coming from different areas. We are giving

it a specific shape and form. Firstly, there will be the Parliamentary Committee and, as I said the other day, two-thirds of the members of the Committee would be, as was done last time, from the non-Hindi-speaking areas. I had also said that Members of Parliament are not odd individuals; they represent millions of people of the country. Therefore, there could not be a better committee to consider this matter dispassionately and from a broad angle. Parliament is the only body which can consider it from a broad point of view, on a national basis.

Shri Ranga: The State Legislatures are there.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: U.P. can very well say that Hindi should be the official language and it should spread over the whole country. Or, the State of my hon. friend, Andhra, might say that Telugu should be the official language. So, it is only this body, this Parliament, which can consider the matter from a national angle.

Shri S. Kandappan: It is dominated by the Hindi-speaking people. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Sezhiyan: The assurance of the Prime Minister has clearly stated:

"English will continue as an associate language and I would not take it away till I was asked to take it away by the non-Hindi-speaking areas."

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It has already been quoted. What does he want now? I would just request hon. Members to conceive of this situation. All arguments have been advanced. One may not feel convinced by the arguments of the opposite party. That is possible. There might still be people, hon. Members, who might not be convinced by the arguments that have been given by others. But there is.

Shri S. Kandappan: This is a categorical statement by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Now they have only the opportunity to exercise their right to vote. What else can be done? We have discussed it, and discussed it at length. It is not possible, now or at any time, that everybody might be converted to the views of the other.

Shri Ranga: The only point is that the Home Minister says that it is only this Parliament which has to decide whether public opinion is ready or not. We only say or wish to add this Parliament as well as the concerned State Legislatures.

Mr. Speaker: That would arise during the clause-by-clause consideration. Hon. Member can move amendments as to whether it should be the Parliament or the Legislatures. I think some amendments of that nature have already been tabled. We will see them then. Now I will have to put the motion to the House.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am sorry, but may I add a word, Sir? The other point is, the Prime Minister himself replied the other day to the point raised by Shri Frank Anthony and said that after obtaining the views from the Parliamentary Committee, from the State Governments, no State Government is prevented from considering the matter in its State Legislature, if it so desires. I further say that having a referendum will be unconstitutional.

Shri Ranga: We are not talking of the referendum.

Mr. Speaker: I will now take the substitute motion of Dr. Govind Das. Is he pressing it?

डा० गोविन्द दास : मैं इस को वापिस लेना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his motion?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Have I to put Shri Yashpal Singh's amendment?

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

Shri Bade: Sir, my submission is that all those amendments which are for circulation may be put together.

Mr. Speaker: But the dates are different. If all the hon. Members agree, I have no objection to that. May I put all those amendments which are for eliciting public opinion together?

Some Hon. Members: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I will put amendments No. 2, 3, 4, 6, 31, 49 and 50 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That all or any of these amendments might be accepted by the House."

Those in favour may kindly say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against may kindly say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I think, the 'Noes' have it.

Some Hon. Members: The 'Ayes' have it.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will have to put them one by one. Hon. Members will realise that the procedure of putting all these amendments on the same subject together can only be applied if there were to be no divisions. If

the House is to divide, then only one can be put at a time and I will choose one which is for the latest date, put it separately and then the House can decide. Amendment No. 6 suggests "the first week of January 1965"; therefore, that is the longest date and I will put that to the vote of the House.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): No, no; Sir. They may be put one by one.

Mr. Speaker: Either the hon. Members can decide among themselves and let me know which one I am to put to the vote of the House or I will have to select one. If I have to select one then it will be the one which asks for the longest period of time.

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir): It should be the one which asks for the shortest period of time.

An Hon. Member: Amendment No. 5 may be put.

Shri Tyagi: On a point of order, Sir. The procedure permits that the common factor of a number of amendments can be put. In these amendments the common factor is whether the Bill be circulated or not. If you put that question, that is, decide one way or the other, then the other part goes out if it is defeated.

Mr. Speaker: That is no form of any motion. If the hon. Members agree on my putting amendment No. 5, I have no objection; otherwise, I have to select one.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
भाप ही तै कर दें, अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने तो नम्बर ६ चुन लिया है, उसी को रखूंगा । राम सेवक यादव जी मुझ पर छोड़ रहे हैं क्योंकि मैं उन्हीं का अमेंडमेंट चुन रहा हूँ इस वक्त ।

Shri Frank Anthony: No. 6 will not do. Why not put amendment No. 3?

Shri Barrow: Amendment No. 3 strikes the medium of all these.

Mr. Speaker: The normal procedure that we have been following so far is that when there are similar motions of this nature and if the Speaker has to select it, he selects the one that asks for the longest period of time.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Longest period is so long, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Now I am going to put amendment No. 6 to the vote of the House.

Shri Rajaram: Amendment No. 5.

Mr. Speaker: When the proposal was made that all might be put together, nobody objected. What difference would it make? Only, of course, the difference would be in whose name it appears, in whose name the motion had been put.

An Hon. Member: There are different dates.

Shri Barrow: The date would make the difference for voting.

Shri Ranga: If all of them were lumped together, it makes no difference.

Shri Frank Anthony: Some of us only want real circulation and others want the Bill to be circulated out of existence.

Shri Tyagi: We may only put that the Bill be circulated. This part only may be put to the vote of the House.

Mr. Speaker: No. That is my difficulty. I have already pointed out that the form of the motion that is provided under our rules is that the date is also to be given. That would be no motion which I would be putting to the House. If they persist that amendment No. 5 should also be put separately, then I shall do it.

Shri Tyagi: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment No. 5 cannot be put. The amendment No. 5 is barred because there was one earlier

[Mr. Speaker.]

for the same day, that is, the end of July. Then, I will have to put the amendment of Dr. Govind Das. Now, as he has withdrawn it, certainly amendment No. 5 can be put to the vote of the House.

Shri Frank Anthony: Amendment No. 3 may be put.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: Dr. Govind Das's amendment is the same as of mine.

Mr. Speaker: They ought to have known, in the first instance, what the effect of it would be. They all asked me to put them together and now when I am putting them together, they are placing me in a very delicate position.

Shri Kapur Singh: Ultimately, it is the form of the motion that matters. Whatever the hidden intention may be behind the motion it does not signify in relation to the act voting.

Mr. Speaker: This can only be said in the House. But it might be required for some other purpose outside.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Sir, I think, if you put the amendment.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I am going to put each amendment separately. If every-one presses for his own amendment, then I cannot help it. Then, amendment No. 2.

Now, let the lobbies be cleared and then the doors will remain closed. I will put the amendments to the vote of House one after the other and the doors might not be opened at all.

Let the lobbies be cleared.

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): I would like to know whether the Home Minister is accepting any of the amendments which seek to circulate the Bill for eliciting opinion thereon.

Mr. Speaker: Was he in doubt yet?

Shri Manoharan: Sir, I would like to make a statement.

Several Hon. Members: No, no. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. No statement at this moment can be made.

Shri Manoharan: Since we find that the Home Minister is bent upon relying only on numbers and not prepared to respect the feelings of the non-Hindi-speaking people, we refuse to be a party to the injustice of the linguistic imperialism perpetrated through this Bill. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. At this stage there can be no statement by the Member....

Shri Manoharan: We walk out as a protest against the majority tyranny being exercised. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

(Shri Manoharan and some other hon. Members left the House)

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Ferozabad): May I submit that if any statement by Shri Manoharan has been recorded, it should be expunged from the proceedings?

Mr. Speaker: What is to be expunged?

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: If anything of what Shri Manoharan has said has been recorded, it should be expunged.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): What is to be expunged? They are only staging a walk-out.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing to be expunged.

Now, I am going to put each amendment separately. As regards the order in which I shall put them to vote, I shall take the one which contains the longest period first and then come to the second longest period and then to the third longest and so on.

First, I shall take up amendment
No. 6 by Shri Ram Sawek Yadav.

Let the Lobby be cleared.

The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 13]

AYES

16.45 hrs.]

Bde, Shri
Badrudduja, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri

Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Maurya, Shri
Shastry, Shri Prakash Vir
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi

Utiya, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Akkamma Dev, Shrimati
Aligesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A. S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Aney Dr. M. S.
Arunachalam, Shri
Azad, Shri Ehwat Jha
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Balakrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Banerjee, Dr. R.
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Besra, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.
Bhargava, Shri M. B.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Borooh, Shri P. C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chanda, Shrimti Jyotsna
Chandrasckhar, Shrimati
Chatterjee, Shri H. P.
Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan
Chuni Lal, Shri
Colaco, Dr.
Da jit Singh, Shri
Dasappa, Shri
Dass, Shri G.
Deo Bhanj, Shri R. C.
Desai, Shri Morarji
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Dey, Shri S. K.
Dhuleshar Meena, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dubey, Shri R. G.

Elayaperumal, Shri
Ering, Shri D.
Gackwad, Shri Fatehsinhra
Gaitonde, Dr.
Gairaj Singh Rao, Shri
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Gandhi Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri N. R.
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Rai, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Jena, Shri
Joshi, Shri A. C.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kanungo, Shri
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Khadilkar, Shri
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Khanna, Shri P. K.
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kishen Veer, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishnapal Singh, Shri
Kunhan, Shri P.
Kureel, Shri B.N.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
Lalit Sen, Shri
Lonikar, Shri
Mahtab, Shri
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini

Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati
Maithia, Shri
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Manan, Shri
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Maniyangadan, Shri
Marandi, Shri
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Binar
Melkote, Dr.
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
Mobanthy, Shri G.
Mobiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Mukane, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Murmur, Shri Sarkar
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naidu, Shri V. G.
Naik, Shri D.J.
Naskar, Shri P. S.
Pande, Shri K. N.
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Paramasivan, Shri
Parasahar, Shri
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri Man Singh P.
Patel, Shri N. N.
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri M. B.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri, S.K.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Pattnayak, Shri Kishen
Pillai, Shri Nataraja

Pottekkatt, Shri
Prabhakar, Shri Naval
Pratap Singh, Shri
Raghavan, Shri A. V.
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raju, Dr. D. S.
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R.
Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
Ramaswamy, Shri V. K.
Rananjai Singh, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Dr. K. I.
Rao, Shri Krishnameorthy
Rao, Shri Mudhyal
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Ray, Shri mati Renuka
Reddiar, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Reddy, Shri mati Yashoda
Saha, Dr. S. K.
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sanji Rupji, Shri

Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Satyabhama Devi, Shri mati
Sen, Shri A. K.
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shah, Shri Manabendra
Sham Nath, Shri
Shankaraiya, Shri
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Sharma, Shri D. C.
Sharma, Shri K. C.
Shashi Ranjan, Shri
Shastri, Shri Lal Bahdur
Shastri, Shri Ramenand
Sheo Naran, Shri
Shrimali, Dr. K. L.
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singh, Shri R. P.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shri mati Ramdulari
Sinha, Shri mati Tarkeshwari
Nonavane, Shri
Soy, Shri H. C.
Subbaraman, Shri
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Sumat Prasad, Shri

Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Surya Prasad, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. N.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Tahir, Shri Mohammad,
Tantia, Shri Rameshwar
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
Tyagi, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Varma, Shri M. L.
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Venkatasubbiah, Shri P.
Varma, Shri Balgovind
Vidyalankar, Shri A. N
Vyasa, Shri Radhelal
Warior, Shri
Yadab, Shri N. P
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes 11; Noes 206.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I shall take up the one which contains the second longest period, namely amendment No. 50 by Shri Bade and others.

The question is:

"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).

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 28th October, 1963." (2)

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 14]

AYES

[16.49 hrs.

Anthony, Shri Frank
Bade, Shri
Badrudduja, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Barrow, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Kapur Singh, Shri

Krishnapal Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Patil, Shri D. S.]
Ranga, Shri
Sanji Rupji, Shri
Seth, Shri Bishanchander
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.

Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Utiya, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Yashpal Singh, Shri
.

*One name could not be recorded.

NOES

- Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
 Akkumma Devi, Shrimati
 Alagesan, Shri
 Alva, Shri A. S.
 Alva, Shri Joachim
 Ancy, Dr. M. S.
 Arunachalam, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Bajaj, Shri Kumalnayan
 Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
 Balakrishnan, Shri
 Balmiki, Shri
 Banerjee, Dr. R.
 Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Basappa, Shri
 Basra, Shri
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhagavati, Shri
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.
 Bhargava, Shri M. B.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Borooh, Shri P. C.
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
 Chatterjee, Shri H. P.
 Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan
 Colaco, Dr.
 Daljit Singh, Shri
 Dasappa, Shri
 Dass, Shri G.
 Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Deshmukh, Shri B.D.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
 Dey, Shri S. K.
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dubey, Shri R. G.
 Elayaperumal, Shri
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gaekwad, Shri Fatehinarao
 Gaitonde, Dr.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Ganapati Ram Shri
 Gandhi Shri V. B.
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Ghosh, Shri N. R.
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.
 Guha, Shri A. C.
 Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
 Hajarnavis, Shri
 Hansda, Shri Subodh
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Heda, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jamunadevi, Shrimati
 Jeche, Shri
 Jena, Shri
 Joshi, Shri A. C.
 Joshi Shrimati Subhadra
 Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
 Kabir, Shri Humayun
 Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
 Kanungo, Shri
 Kar, Shri Prabhat
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Keishing, Shri Rishang
 Khadilkar, Shri
 Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
 Khanna, Shri P. K.
 Kindar Lal, Shri
 Kisan Veer, Shri
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Kunhan, Shri P.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakshminanthamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Lonikar, Shri
 Mahtab, Shri
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati
 Majithia, Shri
 Malaviya, Shri K.D.
 Malliah, Shri U. S.
 Manjun, Shri
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Maniyangadan, Shri
 Marandi, Shri
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Melkote, Dr.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibbuti
 Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
 Mohanty, Shri G.
 Mohiuddin, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Mukane, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Murmu, Shri Sarkar
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthiah, Shri
 Naidu, Shri V. G.
 Naik, Shri D. J.
 Naakar, Shri P. S.
 Pande, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Viahwa Nath
 Panna Lal, Shri
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paramasivan, Shri
 Parashar, Shri
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
 Patel, Shri Man Sing P.
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri P. R.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patil, Shri M. B.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. K.
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
 Pillai, Shri Nataraja
 Pottekkatt, Shri
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Raghavan, Shri A. V.
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raju, Dr. D. S.
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R.
 Ramaswamy, Shri V. K.
 Ramanjai Singh, Shri
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Ray, Shrimati Renuk
 Reddiar, Shri
 Reddy, Shri Narasimha
 Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Samanata, Shri S. C.
 Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
 Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri P.G.
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Sham Nath, Shri
 Shankaraiya, Shri
 Sharma, Shri A. P.
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. C.
 Shaahi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Srinimali, Dr. K. L.
 Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri R. P.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeshwari
 Sonavane, Shri
 Soy, Shri H. C.
 Srinivasan, Dr. P.
 Subbaraman, Shri
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Surya Prasad, Shri
 Swamy, Shri M. N.
 Swamy, Shri M. P.
 Tahir, Shri Mohammad
 Tantia, Shri Rameshwar

Thimmaiah, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tiwari, Shri R. S.
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
 Tyagi, Shri
 Uikey, Shri

Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Varma, Shri M. L.
 Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Vidyalankar Shri A. N.

Vyas, Shri Radhelal
 Warrior, Shri
 Yadav, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
 • • •

*Two names could not be recorded

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is Ayes 19; Noes 204.

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: Now amendment No. 31. The question is:

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

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Shri Kamath's amendment to vote.

The question is:

"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 Krishnapal 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)

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I come to Shri Sezhayan's amendment.

An Hon. Member: He is not here.

Mr. Speaker: Then too, because it has been moved, I shall have to put it to vote.

The question is:

"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 instructions to make

a report by the last day of the first week of the next session." (51)

The motion was negated.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I shall put the motion for consideration to vote.

The question is:

"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."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Now, we shall take up the clauses.

Clause 2.— Definitions

Shri Frank Anthony: I have got an amendment to this clause.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I request that since it is about five minutes to five o'clock, we may take up the second reading tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: But we have to sit after 5 P. M.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill has to be taken up at 5 P.M. Since it is only five minutes to 5 P.M. now, I suggest that we may take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Official Languages Bill tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: Why not start it today? There are a number of amendments.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have got amendment No. 34 to this clause.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I want to move amendment No. 126.

Mr. Speaker: That amendment is to clause 3 and not to clause 2.

Shri Bade: I want to move amendment No. 81.

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg to move:

Page 1, for line 14, substitute—

'(b) "Hindi" means Hindi in the Devanagari or the Roman script.' (34)

Shri Bade: I beg to move:

Page 1, after line 14, insert—

'(c) "the authoritative texts" means the texts in Hindi language.' (81)

Mr. Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Now, Shri Frank Anthony. I would appeal to all hon. Members that since we have had enough discussion already, only the points might be made and not long speeches.

Shri Frank Anthony: But, still, I hope you will allow us.

Shri Hajarnavis: On a point of order. In article 343(1) of the Constitution it has been stated that:

"The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script."

So, there can be no qualification of this so long as the Constitution is not amended. The amendment of the hon. Member reads thus:

"'Hindi' means Hindi in the Devanagari or the Roman script."

Mr. Speaker: What has Shri Frank Anthony to say to this?

Shri Frank Anthony: I feel that there is no constitutional inhibition. I am not seeking to supersede the provision of the Constitution. My

amendment seeks to provide for something in addition to it. The University Grants Commission has recommended Devanagari script or Roman script. The Sampurnanand Emotional Integration Committee also has recommended....

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali): The University Grants Commission has not made any such recommendation at all.

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall show it to the hon. Minister. The University Grants Commission has recommended it.

Dr. K. L. Shrimali: My hon. friend has to accept my statement so far as the University Grants Commission is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Frank Anthony is a very eminent lawyer of our highest court. He may not refer to what other people have said or asked for. A legal objection has been raised, and he may answer that legal objection.

Shri Frank Anthony: These bodies have recommended it. The Sampurnanand Emotional Integration Committee, has recommended it, and the States are adopting it. I am only giving permission to the States.

Mr. Speaker: I am only asking the hon. Member to answer the objection which has been raised.

Shri Frank Anthony: There is no supersession. There is no embargo in the Constitution. It says that that shall be the official language, and I hope that it shall be. We may merely make it permissive to use another script. That is all.

Mr. Speaker: I do not agree with Mr. Anthony. When it is clearly put down that Hindi in Devanagari script shall be the official language and if we want to make it Hindi in Devanagari or in Roman script, changes the whole thing altogether. It is not

[Mr. Speaker.]

the same thing. If you add or subtract or do something like that it becomes different altogether. He will agree there. That is barred.

17 hrs.

Shri Bade: Sir, my amendment No. 81 wants to insert a sub-clause (c) to say that the 'authoritative texts' means the texts in Hindi language. In the Bill there is no mention of what is the authoritative text. In order to clear what is the authoritative text, I have moved this amendment. According to the Bill it seems the English version is the authoritative text. I want to make it clear and say that the authoritative text is the Hindi text by the addition of this sub-clause (c) to clause 6.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister would reply tomorrow. We take up the next business now.

17.02 hrs.

COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME
BILL—contd.

Clause 2— (Persons to whom Act
Applies).

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill. It is already five o'clock. Are any Government amendments to be moved?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): I have moved all the amendments to clause (2).

Mr. Speaker: Does she want to say anything?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I do not want to say anything. It has been explained amply by the Finance Minister already.

Mr. Speaker: Am I required to put any amendment separately to the vote?

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): The Finance Minister has not replied to what we have said. Yesterday we had a debate on the various amendments. He has not explained. He has not answered the many amendments that we have moved. We expected that at least.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I did not want to repeat all the arguments already used by the Finance Minister because I should have thought that I would be unnecessarily taking the time of the House. But the hon. Member suggests that something must be said' because the hon. Members opposite have spoken about that. I would be repeating mostly the same arguments which have been advanced by the Finance Minister and I think the hon. Members will excuse me if virtually I repeat what has already been said.

The House is not unaware of this fact that the proposal of levying on the people paying land revenue a compulsory deposit scheme would affect them. They want that it should not be so. That will mean that virtually 2.50 crores of accounts will be left out from the orbit of the operation of this scheme. That will leave a very large population of this country outside the purview of this Bill. The basic intention of this scheme must be understood. The hon. Member has become rather sensitive about this scheme because it has come with the Finance Bill. If this measure had come after the Finance Bill or even before the Finance Bill, they would have understood the desirability or the propriety of the rural areas saving. Almost all the reports go to show this. There is no time for me to read the report of the Rural Credit Survey Committee and the report of the other sample surveys such as the National Sample Survey. In each of these reports it has been pointed out that the capacity of the rural areas has not yet been tapped. Unless and until the rural areas are tapped, the quantum of saving of this country