

**Mr. Speaker:** A point of order can arise on any item that is before the House. Just at this moment, the hon. Minister has sought leave of the House to introduce a Bill. Does he want to raise a point of order on that?—He cannot raise a point of order now on an item which has been disposed of.

**Shri Hem Barua:** I seek a clarification from you.

**Mr. Speaker:** No clarification about things that are passed.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Then we are left in the lurch.

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

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Humayun Kabir:** I introduce the Bill.

12.10 hrs.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL—  
*contd.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up 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 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.”

Shri Yash Pal Singh may continue his speech.

**श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) :** हमारी भाषा जो पन्द्रह सालों में नहीं पनप सकी है . . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आठ मिनट आप ले चुके हैं। यह मैं आपके ज्ञान के लिए कह रहा हूँ। आप दस मिनट और ले लें।

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** पन्द्रह मिनट दे दीजिये। मैंने कल भी अर्ज किया था कि आप चाहें तो मेरा एक महीने का समय काट लें, लेकिन इस वक़्त आप मुझे पन्द्रह मिनट अवश्य दे दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आपका जो गुप है, आपको जो पार्टी है वह कह रही है कि उनका स्पोकमैन कोई दूसरा होगा। आप दस मिनट और ले लें

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** हमारी भाषा जो इन पन्द्रह सालों में नहीं पनप सकी है, उसका कारण यह है कि सरकार ने मुसलमन कोशिश को है कि हमारा लिटरेचर खत्म हो। आज भी उत्तर प्रदेश में सत्रह हजार से ज्यादा अध्यापक ऐसे हैं जिनको बासठ रुपये माहवार तनख्वाह मिलती है। समाजवाद का विषय आज मेरा नहीं है। लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी बार बार यह कहते हैं कि चीन से हमारी बढ़ती हुई आर्थिकता नहीं देखी गई, चीन से हमारी माली हालत की बढ़ोतरी का आलम नहीं देखा गया, हमारी आर्थिकता का समुद्र, हमारी खुशहाली के समुद्र में जो ज्वार-भाटा आ रहा था, वह नहीं देखा गया। यह ज्वारभाटा आया हुआ है, यह सही है। लेकिन कौम का जो मेमार है, जो नेशन बिल्डर है, जो अध्यापक है, जो राष्ट्र का निर्माता है, जो टीचर है, उसकी तनख्वाह आज भी बासठ रुपये माहवार है। जो हिन्दी पढ़ाने वाला अध्यापक है . . . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप जरा ठहर जायें प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर को गुन लें।

**Shri P. R. Patel (Patan):** On a point of order, Sir. Can an hon. Member speak anything which is not relevant to the subject? The subject before us is the Languages Bill, and he is talking of socialism and so many other things.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** हिन्दी पढ़ाने वाले अध्यापक के लिये मैं कह रहा हूँ। आप जरा समझने की कोशिश कीजिये।

अगर इस लिटरेचर को आपको जिन्दा करना होता तो जरूरी था कि आप अध्यापकों की तनख्वाहें बढ़ाते। आज भी देखा जाता है कि अंग्रेजी अध्यापकों के जो एडीटर होते हैं, वे तो दो दो हजार रुपये तनख्वाह पाते हैं लेकिन जो हिन्दी अध्यापकों के एडीटर होते हैं, उनको छः सौ या सात सौ रुपया माहवार ही तनख्वाह मिलती है। ऐसा स्टेपमदरली ट्रीटमेंट उनके साथ क्यों होता है, यह समझ में नहीं आता है। यही वजह है कि इन पिछले पन्द्रह सालों में यह हिन्दी भाषा पनप नहीं सकी है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अध्यापकों के एडीटरों को तनख्वाह देना भी क्या सरकार का काम है ?

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** उनके लिये रूल्स एंड रेग्युलेशंस तो सरकार बनाती है। उनके स्टैंडर्ड को ऊंचा करना तो सरकार का काम है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** इसीलिये तो यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठा था

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** उनका स्टैंडर्ड ऊंचा करना सरकार का काम है। अगर सरकार चाहती तो हिन्दी में लाखों ग्रन्थ लिखे जा सकते थे। ऐसा सरकार ने न तो किया और न ही वह ऐसा करना चाहती थी। आज सरकार अपनी कमजोरी पर परद झालने के लिए इस बिल को यहाँ पेश कर रही है।

आज सब से ज्यादा जरूरी यह है, अगर आप हिन्दी का उत्थान चाहते हैं, कि इस बिल को वापस लिया जाये। सरकार कहती है

कि ट्रांसलेशन हुआ करेगा और ट्रांसलेशन की भाषा में वह काम करती है। हम कहते हैं कि जब भी शब्द ट्रांसलेशन आता है, तब ही हिन्दी की अहमियत कम हो जाती है। ट्रांसलेशन होता है, ओरिजनल का। हम कहते हैं कि पहले हिन्दी में आये, फिर अंग्रेजी में उगता ट्रांसलेशन हो। अगर ऐसी प्रवृत्ति हमारी पार्लियामेंट में होती जाय कि हमने कांस्टीट्यूशन में वादा किया था तो आज हिन्दी इतनी बढ़ोतरी के उपर होती, इतनी तरक्की कर गई होती कि उसको खत्म करने के लिये इस नये बिल को लाने की जरूरत ही न पड़ती।

मैं जिस हिन्दी के लिये बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ वह हिन्दी आज की हिन्दी नहीं है जैसा कि हिन्दू रिजीजन के लिये कहा जाता है या कुछ हिन्दी फौनेटिक्स के लिए कहा जाता है। कुछ हिन्दी फौनेटिक्स हो सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ। अगर मनोराम बागड़ी जी कोई गलती करते हैं या हमारे हुकम चन्द कछवाय जी कोई घृष्टता करते हैं तो इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि हिन्दी माता स नफरत की जाए। अगर कोई गलती करता हूँ तो मुझको उसकी सजा दी जाए। लेकिन इसका अर्थ यह कदापि नहीं हो सकता है कि हिन्दी के प्रति घृणा का प्रचार किया जाए। मैं जिस हिन्दी के लिए बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ, वह किसी एक सम्प्रदाय की भाषा नहीं है, वह हिन्दुस्तान के ४४ करोड़ इंसानों की भाषा है। जो लोग हिन्दू मुस्लिम का सवाल उठाते हैं, वे गलती करते हैं। आज की मैं बात नहीं करता हूँ। आज से कई सदियों पहले की बात मैं करता हूँ। अकबर ने आजम ने जो कुछ लिखा है वह मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ। उनके लिए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी अपनी आलोचनानामा में बड़े अच्छे शब्द लिखे हैं और कहा है कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के एक महान् राजा थे। अकबर ने लिखा है :



जा था जस है जगत में, जगत सर है जाहि ।  
ताको जीवन सफल है, कहन प्रकवर माहि ॥

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह कौनसी भाषा है । यह फारसी नहीं, अरबी नहीं है, यह हिन्दी है ।

इससे भी आगे बढ़ कर गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी सच्चे पादशाह, दशमेश गुरु की वाणी को मैं आपके सामने कोट पक़रता हूँ जिनकी वाणी को समझने में सैकड़ों साल लगे हैं और जिन्होंने संसार के अन्दर सूर्य का प्रकाश किया है :—

कबहूँ रणगूझी नहीं, जस कारज नहीं कीन ।  
गांव बमन जान्यो नहीं, जस स्यों किन  
कह दीन ॥

यह कौन सी भाषा है । यह वही हिन्दी भाषा है जिसके लिए हम लोग संघर्ष कर रहे हैं ।

आज हमारे गृह मंत्री जी ने अहमदाबाद में खड़े हो कर ज़रूर कह दिया कि चालीस परसेंट हिन्दी भाषी लोग हैं । लेकिन अगर उन्होंने आज से एक साल पहले अलाहाबाद में इलेक्शन कम्पेन के दौरान यह बात कही होती तब पता लगता कि वोटों का भाव क्या है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अलाहाबाद से ले कर सहारनपुर तक की जो भाषा है वह हिन्दी भाषा है जिसके लिए हम लोग खड़े हुए हैं । वजाय इसके कि सरकार कांस्टिट्यूशन की वफादारी से, श्रद्धा से और निष्ठा से पालन करती, उसने उनके ऊपर परदा डालने के लिये यह नया विल हमारे सामने लाकर पेश कर दिया है ।

मैं सेठ गोविन्द दास जी का बड़ा मशकूर हूँ, बड़ा आभारी हूँ उस सब के लिए जो कुछ उन्होंने कल कहा । हमें उनके साथे की ज़रूरत है । उन्होंने कल अपने जीवन की संध्या का जिक्र किया है । इसको मुन कर मुझे बड़ा दुख होता है, मेरी आत्मा को बड़ा क्लेश होता है । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उनके जीवन की संध्या नहीं है, यह उनके जीवन

का यौवन काल है । इसलिए कि जिस साइंस के लिए खड़े हुए हैं वह साइंस कम्पलीट साइंस है । वह सन्देह यह कहता है कि हिन्दी जिस कल्चर को रिप्रेजेंट करती है वह कल्चर है :

अशीति वर्षों युवा

अस्सी साल का जवान होता मनुष्य । मैं योगियों की बात नहीं कहता हूँ, बालब्रह्म-चारियोंकी बात नहीं कहता हूँ, मैं भजनीक हस्तियों की बात नहीं कहता हूँ। जो इबादत के बन्दे हैं, उनकी बात मैं नहीं कहता हूँ । जो योगी और बाल ब्रह्मचारी हैं, उन से मोत और बुढ़ापा दोनों धर धर कांपते हैं । हिन्दी जिस कल्चर को रिप्रेजेंट करती है, उन गृहस्थियों की बात मैं कहता हूँ । मुझ जैसे पापी आदायियों की बात मैं कहता हूँ । अशीति वर्षों युवा । डा० गोविन्द दास जी के लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि वह शतायु हों और यही मैं प्रार्थना भी करता हूँ । बुढ़ापा शब्द को वह हटा दें, इंगरो ह्य नवयुवकों के दिल को टेस लगती है ।

हिन्दी फ़ैनाटिक्म जो हैं, उनके लिए मैं साफ़ कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे हपारी जिम्मेवारी नहीं हैं, उनके लिये सही एटमसफीयर का निर्माण करना सरकार का काम है । लेकिन सरकार ने पक्षपात से काम लिया है, इसलिए सही एटमसफीयर पैदा नहीं हो सका । आज भी सरकार सोचे और यह खयाल करे कि इस देश को आगे ले जाना है । १९५८ में जो रिपोर्ट सरकार की प्रकाशित हुई थी उसको मैंने पढ़ा है । वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना नहीं चाहता हूँ । उनके सफ़े ४० का ही थोड़ा सा हिस्सा पढ़ देत हूँ । उससे पता लग जायेगा कि १९५८ में सरकार की पालिसी क्या थी और आज पालिसी क्या है । उसमें लिखा हुआ है :—

“Arrangements may be made for outgoing communications from the Union Government to a Hindi-speaking State being accompanied

[ श्री यशपाल सिंह ]

by a Hindi translation of the English text, whenever such a State makes a request to this effect. The employment of Hindi in actual work of administration before 1965 in this manner will help in establishing forms of address, expressions etc. in that language."

इसके अनुसार कोई ट्रांसलेशन डिपार्टमेंट कायम नहीं किया गया। राष्ट्रपति के भवन में एक ट्रांसलेशन डिपार्टमेंट हिन्दी का चलता था, वह भी आज मत प्रायः हो चुका है। सरकार की ड्यूटी है और उस ड्यूटी को सरकार निभाये। वह हिन्दी को उठाने के लिये काम करे। अगर वह हिन्दी को उठाने के लिए अकाम नहीं करती है और बिल को पास करवाने की कोशिश करती है तो यह रंग में भंग करना होगा। ४४ करोड़ रु. प्रेम की गंगा में स्नान कर रहे हैं, उस कल्चर की तरफ वे बढ़ना चाहते हैं जिस कल्चर में संसार को प्रधान मंत्री ने अपनी आटोबायोग्रफ़ी में भंग लिखा है तमसो या ज्योतिर्गम्य मृत्यामा अमृतं गम्य का आदर्श दिया है। इसमें मृत्यामा अमृत गमय का आदर्श दिया है। उस कल्चर के लिये सरकार का काम था कि कोशिश करे। सरकार बजाय इसके कि उस तमहून को जिन्दा रखती, उसकी कोई परवा नहीं की। माननीय भट्टाचार्य जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं। मैं आपसे भी प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वह जिस वक्त बोलें तो जैसा हमारी कांस्टीट्यूशन में लिखा हुआ है कि संस्कृत के वड़ज अधक होने चाहिये, उनको संस्कृत में बोलने की इजाजत दी जाए।

संस्कृत में, मेरी मातृ भाषा में स्टैप मदरली ट्रीटमेंट के लिए कोई शब्द नहीं है चूंकि हमारे यहां स्टैपमदरली ट्रीटमेंट नहीं होता है, सीतेली मां का सलूक नहीं होता है। इसलिये हमारी मातृभाषा में उसके लिये कोई शब्द नहीं है। हम वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्

को मानते हैं, सारे संसार को हम एक परिवार के रूप में मानते हैं। इसलिये उसमें कोई शब्द ऐसा नहीं जो कि एक दूसरे के प्रति नफरत की भावना पैदा करता हो। हमारी मातृभाषा में ताले के लिये कोई शब्द नहीं है। चूंकि चोरी का एग्जिस्टेंस, चोर का किसी के ऊपर ख्याल करना हमारे कल्चर में नहीं है इसलिये ताले के लिये कोई शब्द हमारे यहां नहीं है। इसी कल्चर के लिये हम लोग खड़े हुए हैं, प्रधान मंत्री जी का फर्ज है, सरकार का काम है कि हिन्दी भाषा को मजबूत करने के लिये ठोस कदम उठाये। आज अगर सरकार इस बिल को लाती है तो रंग में भंग डालती है। जो ४४ करोड़ इंसान इम प्रेम की गंगा में स्नान कर रहे हैं उन्हें अलग अलग करना चाहती है। इस डिवाइड एंड रूल की पालिसी को, जिस से देश के टुकड़े हुए, जिस से देश सदियों तक गुलाम रहा, छोड़ कर सब से पहली जरूरत इस बात की है कि अगर द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़म के भाई जोर डालते हैं अंग्रेजी के लिए तो उन्हें यह शिक्षा दीक्षा दी जाय कि वे तमिल के लिये जोर लगायें। अगर वह तमिल के लिये जोर लगाते हैं तो मैं पहला आदमी हूंगा जोकि तमिल के लिये संघर्ष करेगा। तमिल की बहबूदी के लिये और तमिल को कायम करने के लिये उन के साथ कन्धे से कन्धा भिला कर काम करूंगा। आज हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हिन्दुस्तान की लैंग्वेज होनी चाहिये। क्यों न हम गुजमुखी को फिर से कायम करें, क्यों न हम उन भाषाओं को यहाँ पर कायम करें जिन से हमारी वीरता बढ़ी है? लेकिन आज पाँच हजार मील की दूरी पर की जबान, सात समुद्र पार की बनी हुई जबान, जिस ने डेढ़ सौ साल तक हमारा खून चूसा है, जिस ने डेढ़ सौ साल तक हमें गुलाम बनाया है, जिस ने डेढ़ सौ साल तक हमारी आजादी का अपहरण किया है, आज बही जबान हमें गुलामों का सबक पढ़ाने के लिए आई है। आज जो जबान एक अरब से अरब मुसालिक

की स्वतंत्रता को नहीं देखना चाहती जिस जवान के लिये कहा जा सकता है कि :

“उजाड़े खानमाँ तुने, विगाड़े खान्दाँ तुने, वह जन्नत बन गई दोजख कदम रक्खा जहाँ तुने।”

उस जवान के जनाजे को जक दम खत्म किया जाय और हिन्दुस्तान में प्रादेशिक भाषाओं को कायम किया जाय। सरकार की यह ड्यूटी है। और अगर सरकार ऐसा नहीं करती है तो डिफेन्स आफ इंडिया रूल्स के मातहत सरकार के खिलाफ कार्रवाई की जाय।

**The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I confess to a feeling of a little confusion after the speech of the hon. Member who has just spoken. I hoped and I intend, as far as I could, to deal with the question before this House—

**श्री यशपाल सिंह :** आज के पवित्र वायु मंडल में प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दी में बोलें तो अच्छा रहे।

**श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) :** आज तो हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दी में बोलें तो अच्छा है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप बैठ जायें हर एक मेम्बर को हक है हासिल है कि चाहे वह हिन्दी में बोले या अंग्रेजी में। यह उस की मर्जी है। मैं किसी को इस के लिए कुछ नहीं कह सकता। आप बैठ जायें।

**श्री बागड़ी :** मैं प्रधान मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब आप बैठ जायें।

**श्री बागड़ी :** गाँधी जी की जवान तो बोलें।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :** उत्तराधिकारी तो गाँधी जी के हैं।

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** But the last speech—I am not criticising it, and I am merely saying that I do not quite know what it was about, and I must say with respect that many of the speeches delivered either for the motion or a criticism of it, were—

**श्री बागड़ी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं वाक आउट करता हूँ क्योंकि ऐसे हम भाषा के सवाल पर भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर हिन्दी में नहीं बोलते। मैं इस के विरोध में बाहर जाता हूँ।

12.25 hrs.

(Shri Bagri then left the House)

**श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू :** मैं बहुत मश्कूर हूँ माननीय सदस्य का अगर वह यहाँ से चले गये।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** उन के जाने का कम से कम एक अक्षर तो हुआ कि आप हिन्दी में दो शब्द बोले।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आर्डर, आर्डर, अगर आप भी चाहते हैं।

**श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू :** मैं और भी मश्कूर हूँगा। (Interruption).

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या आप बोलने की इजाजत ही नहीं देंगे किसी को ?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** When we started the course of the Bill, when it was introduced, we saw a most extraordinary and disgusting and disgraceful spectacle in this House. It was a bad beginning. (Interruption). You were pleased to take some action

in regard to that matter. I do not know—I hope at least—that it has some effect on those who misbehaved on that occasion, because if they really thought about the matter at all, they have done more injury to the cause of Hindi than any man in the whole of India. Now, if this is the logic how some hon. Members act, it is a little difficult to meet their arguments which are equally wide of the mark.

Yesterday, one hon. Member who had not come here but in the precincts of this House behaved in a rather extraordinary manner, I do not know if that gentleman, that hon. Member, has the least conception of what Parliament is, what democracy is, how one is supposed to behave or ought to behave. It is extraordinary where we are going to.

**Shri Bade (Khargone):** On a point of order, Sir. When the hon. Member is not here and when action has already been taken against him, can he say...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Yes.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** That, I submit, raises even more deeper questions than even the question of language. Therefore, I am referring to it, because language, after all, does represent some of the deepest urges of the human beings and is the vehicle of all our business. I am perfectly free to say that I will prefer any language, whether Finnish, Swedish or anything, but I am not prepared to have this behaviour in the name of language and spoil democracy and everything.

As I said, many of the speeches—delivered yesterday—some I had the privilege to listen to and some I read subsequently—it seemed to me, having regard to the importance of the occasion and consideration of problems which raise considerable heat and passion, were on the whole, if I

may say so with respect, in spite of the delicacy of the subject and in spite of the strong sentiments expressed, in line with parliamentary practice and procedure and were good for all to listen to, even though we may not have agreed with them. I refer to the speeches like those delivered by Prof. Mukerjee or Dr. Govind Das. Much that Dr. Govind Das said, and indeed part of his speech consisted of quotations from various persons, including quotations from me, one can agree with that and yet, as it happens, thoroughly agree with the conclusion that he has arrived at. Whatever he said, he said because he felt it and I welcome his saying it.

I am sorry I cannot say exactly the same thing about the hon. Member, Mr. Anthony's speech, which I read in full afterwards. It was unhappy. I am not referring to his views. But it was an unhappy speech and as he himself said in the course of his speech, he represented a rather extreme, and I think he used the word 'bigoted' point of view. That is not the way to consider this question. I shall venture to deal with one or two points that have been raised. There are not many points raised; in spite of the heat engendered in the debate, there are not really many points raised, because it is not a contest between English and Hindi. It will be wrong to look at it in that way.

This is a Bill in continuation of what has happened in the past, to remove a restriction which had been placed by the Constitution on the use of English after a certain date, i.e. 1965. It is just to remove that restriction that this was placed. It was to carry out an assurance given in this House; it does not do really much more than that. There are a few other little things, but the main thing is to remove that restriction. It was our purpose to bring this Bill during the last session, but the last session

was tied up with many things, you will remember, with regard to the emergency. It was a short session and we could not do it for lack of time. We were accused then of deliberately not bringing it forward and postponing it. We were accused of doing that by the very persons who want us to postpone it today. I do not understand it. In spite of the heavy work before this House, we insisted in bringing it forward to please the people who thought that we were playing about with this matter and postponing it for various reasons, because we dare not bring it before the House, etc. Now we are asked to postpone it. I am sorry I do not understand the logic behind this demand. This bill is essentially a Bill to extend this period, more or less indefinitely, beyond the period put down in the Constitution—1965. That is the main purpose—there may be differences of language etc.—and I think it should be looked at in that way.

Now, the hon. Member, Shri Anthony has said very hard things about various persons and about the assurance I gave. I am sorry,—I am not, I hope, lacking completely in some kind of mental capacity—I am entirely unable to understand what he has said about going back on any assurance I gave at any time. He talked about all kinds of pressures being exercised on me. I do not know who is exercising it. I am not aware of it, and I have not succumbed to any pressure either exercised or implied. I had given on the last occasion an assurance about no major change being made in regard to the use of English without the consent, without the approval of the non-Hindi-speaking people. That was made by me and that represents not only my view point but the view point of our Government. And, when it was made, it was clear to me that it was made, largely with the approval of this House. We stand by that completely. There is not an iota of difference from what we had said then. And, apart

from that, what I may have said or not said, there are circumstances in the country which inevitably point to that direction. May be, some of these gentlemen who perform *havans*, and what not, on this question may think otherwise. That is a different matter. May be, Shri Anthony in his excitement may also think otherwise. I would strongly recommend Shri Anthony to develop close contacts with the gentleman who is performing the *havan* outside and, perhaps...

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I rise on a point of explanation. May I know—I am not questioning the motives of the Prime Minister—how the Bill reflects his assurance? How are the non-Hindi-speaking people going to be consulted? How is "may" going to be prevented from being interpreted as "may not"?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I shall deal with those points. I do not see how this Bill was going to say anything about the consultation of non-Hindi-speaking people.

**Shri Frank Anthony**: Why not?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: I say, according to my thinking, it is quite absurd and un-constitutional.

**Shri Frank Anthony**: Why is it un-constitutional? Give us some reasons. I am a lawyer and the Prime Ministered also is. Why is it un-constitutional?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: The assurance has nothing to do with the Bill or the Act being passed in this Parliament by the vote only of one part of the Parliament. The whole thing seems to be absurd on the face of it, limiting the power of Parliament, limiting the power of Assemblies and other bodies in that way. It is an assurance which has to be given effect to in other ways. For the Government to see to it that nothing is done against it, for the Government when the time comes to consult the State

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

legislatures also, I can understand. But to say in this House we give an assurance that a future legislation will have to be passed by only one half, or whatever the figure is,—it may be two-third—and others should not vote, seeme to be quite extraordinary (*Interruption*).

As for the words "may" and "shall" — would again say that when people get excited they do not see quite straight—the word "may" is the most ordinary word always used in this connection in the English language. I do not pretend to know more English than Shri Anthony. But the question is of removing a restriction, a restriction which would have prevented the English language to be used after a certain date. We say, for removing it, that this may be used afterwards. It is quite absurd to say that the word "may" means also "may not".

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Why absurd? That is the natural meaning.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** May be, but I disagree with the hon. Member.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** If you disagree with the natural meaning, what can I do?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I disagree with the hon. Member in this context. I say it is not the natural meaning in this context. The dictionary meaning may or may not be so but, in this context, it simply means that the barrier is removed, and I defy, I challenge anybody to prove that this Bill does not remove that limitation and barrier. That is the main purpose of this Bill.

Now, let us consider this matter with some objectivity and calmness. I realise, it is very difficult to do so when people get excited about it. It may be because of my upbringing but I am rather partial to English. I think English is a fine language, just as other

languages are very fine too. Nevertheless, I have been convinced for a long long time, and I am convinced today, that any real upsurge in India from the people, any awakening of the people, cannot take place through the English language; it is patent to me; not today, but for the last 40 to 50 years, ever since I have been engaged in public work in this country. The House will remember, at least many of the hon. Members who have participated in it will remember, the tremendous difference that came in our public work and agitational work when we gave up frock coat, top hat and English language in our approach to the people. There was an amazing difference. Previously, we talked in the English language, even in our Congress sessions and other meetings, but we could not reach the people. It is obvious, and it does not seem to be an arguable point that a country can preserve not only its individuality but develop the sense of the masses only through languages which have some deep roots in their minds and hearts. Therefore, from that time onwards, I have believed that it is through the languages of India alone that we could do it. That has nothing to do with our discarding English, because I think it is a very important language and, I think, in some form or other—it is not a question of ten years or not—English is likely to remain in India for a long long time. I repeat it. I do not know the exact form it will take, whether for international use or otherwise, but the mere fact of its being there will serve as a vitaliser to our language, though it is a curious argument that I am using.

Our languages are fine languages and old languages. I do not know who, I forget the name, somebody, probably Shri Anthony, said they are 50 years old. I was amazed to hear that.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I did not say that, I quoted Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, who said that what is now being passed off as Hindi came here

as a dialect only in 1860. I never presumed to say that. That is what Shri Suniti Kumar Chatterjee says.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Our languages, most of them, certainly the big languages, Bengali, Gujerati, Marathi etc. and the Southern languages of Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam are great languages from any point of view. They have produced great books, which are rooted down in the minds of the people. There is no doubt about that.

**Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal):** Even before Christ.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** So far as Tamil is concerned, if I may say so, it is as old as Sanskrit, and all our languages, Northern languages, apart from the four Southern languages, are all daughters of Sanskrit and have grown out of Sanskrit. The other languages also, to some extent, have grown from that root and have been closely associated and affected by Sanskrit. In fact, one may say with confidence that Sanskrit has represented broadly all the thought, culture and traditions of India; I do not say exclusively, but broadly it may be said so. I am an admirer of Sanskrit; not that I know very much, but I admire it very greatly.

I thought that it would be a great pity if Sanskrit became a completely dead language in India at any time. That would be a great damage done to all that we stand for in India. Unfortunately, we cannot make Sanskrit the working language in India today. That is obvious. I should like to encourage the learning of Sanskrit as widely as possible, but it cannot become the language of the common people. It ceased to be a language of the common people 2,000 years ago when Prakrits came in. It remained a language of the learned and gradually Prakrits developed. But it gives a certain basis and foundation for our present day languages, strengthens them, gives them depth and so on which we should cherish.

If we had only two or three languages, I would have suggested—suppose, there were three languages—that all the three languages should be national languages in the sense that all three should be used as they use three languages in Switzerland or as they use some languages in Finland or in Canada. In Finland about 10 per cent of the population is Swedish but Swedish is also a national language in addition to Finnish because the 10 per cent are there.

In these matters of language one has to be very careful. One has to be as liberal as possible. One should not try to suppress a language. One should not try to coerce anybody into a language as far as possible. Wherever an attempt has been made to suppress a language, a popular language, or coerce the people into some other language there has been trouble. There have been innumerable examples of this. Therefore since it is impossible for us to have 13 or 14 languages mentioned in our Constitution as languages which everyone should know and use daily, nevertheless the makers of our Constitution were wise in laying down that all the 13 or 14 languages were our languages as much as any other. There is no question of any one language being more a national language than any other. I want to make that perfectly clear. Bengali or Tamil is as much an Indian national language as Hindi. Therefore it becomes our duty to encourage the 13 or 14 languages.

But having admitted that may I differ completely from the remark that many hon. Members have made here—and the hon. Member who spoke last repeated it many times—about Hindi being not allowed to grow and not encouraged etc.? I entirely disagree with that. I think, Hindi has grown more in the last 15 years. Not only Hindi but all our Indian languages have grown more in the last 15 years than any language anywhere in the world in this course of time. It is a big thing, I say. But I say that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

with some knowledge and confidence because I happen to be the President of the Sahitya Akademi which deals with all these languages. I see what is being done in all these languages. Reports come to me. Hundreds and thousands of books have been produced in all these languages, including Hindi of course, by the Sahitya Akademi. Hundreds of translations from one into the other have been done. All our languages are alive and are dynamic today. People seem to imagine that the growth of a language is whether it is used by some wretched clerk in some wretched office or not as if that represents the life of a language. It is a part of the use of the language; certainly, it should be used, but no clerks and no departments and Government offices have ever made a language grow.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** (Hoshangabad): Why wretched clerks?

**An Hon. Member:** Wretched Ministers.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Languages grow because of other reasons. What has happened to our languages? In spite of our fine old literature, in spite of some magnificent books, the fact remains that our languages have ceased to grow. They have become static because they did not wholly represent life as it is lived today and the modern trends of thought. They represent our traditions. In the 19th Century our languages had to face English, not directly. English came in—not with our goodwill, but it came in—and because English came in, English became a vehicle of new ideas about the new world, not only of science and technology—that of course, but many other things too. It is the impact of English on our languages that has made them grow from the 19th century onwards. Even the literary forms of our languages changed greatly. They are very very few—prose works, very fine poetical words, epics in our languages, prose works of 19th cen-

tury creation in our languages, fine prose works as they came. So, because of the impact of English on our languages, our languages grow and I do submit that even now, although they have grown and they will grow, the further impact of English on our languages will be good for our languages. From the limited point of view, for the growth of our languages alone, it is good for them to be in contact with foreign languages. I say, foreign languages. They can be in contact with Russian, with French, with German, with Italian, with Spanish, etc. But the fact is that the easiest contact for us is through the English language. Therefore I would submit that for the growth of our languages and making them more and more dynamic in responding to the world's needs today, it is necessary for these contacts to be established and encouraged. I venture to say that because hardly anybody realises the effect of these contacts. I think one of the most harmful things that has happened in India, not in regard to language only but including language and affecting our whole lives is that we have lived for hundreds of years in the past, regardless of who was a ruler here—so-called Hindu times, so-called Muslim times—in closed circle, had very little contacts with outside world, earlier, long ago.

**Shri Hem Barua:** That is true only of the medieval times.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** In the early days of this era, India was not so cut off from the rest of the world. Of course, in the Buddhist times, India had wide contacts, people went all over, people came here—literary and everything. But gradually about a thousand years ago, India became more and more self-centred, may be because we are introspect people—that helped us—but anyhow we became self-centred and we lost these contacts. We could not keep pace and we did not even know what happened in the world outside and that affected our languages too because the language is a very good medium of



what the people are and our languages became static, not progressive, not developing, because our lives were static. And it was the changes that came with the British invasion of India which administered the shock and all that which had this effect on our languages also. It made them more dynamic—brought new forms, brought the novel, brought short stories, brought so many things, brought new kind of drama quite apart from science and technology which is a good thing.

Now, at the present moment, anyhow, we have to face a situation in India and realise that India is a multi-lingual country. We must realise that. What is the good of hon. Members opposite talking about 44 crores of people knowing Hindi? It is not a fact. Everybody knows it. India is a multi-lingual country although the languages in use in India, especially in north India are closely alike through Sanskrit and the languages of the south are not so closely alike but nevertheless they have many contacts through Sanskrit. That is the first fact to be realised. And the second is that we have to develop this country through the languages of the people. There is no other way. You may have English—you may like, I hope, to have English too—but the language, the real language to develop people is through their own language which they understand, to which they have emotional response. I would go so far as to say. I am all for English being used for higher scientific and technological studies—English or the foreign language. But, I think, even to spread the knowledge of science in our schools, we must teach it widely through the national languages. Because, otherwise, you will inevitably limit the people's appreciation of it, people understanding of it. It will not spread. In the higher stages foreign languages will come in; in research work, etc.: not one, but several foreign languages will come in.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Barackpur): The Vice-Chancellors do not agree. That is the trouble.

**The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimali)**: They have agreed.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru**: Let us not look at it from the point of view of Hindi versus English or English versus Hindi. That is a wrong point of view. We have to use each in its proper sphere. In the sphere of national language, only national languages have any place. All the fourteen national languages have a place. There is no doubt about that. You cannot speak of English in that connect. You can speak of English in many connections. You can say as I do say that English should be a compulsory language in the schools, second language, foreign language; that is a different matter; that English should be used for foreign contacts, that English should be used for scientific and technological work of a higher grade and all that. That is all right. But, English cannot be, we must admit it, a language which rouses the understanding or emotion of the common people in India. They must be the languages of India, whether it is Tamil, Hindi, Bengali or Marathi.

I would add that all these languages of India have made remarkable progress in the last 15 years. Some, of course, have made it before too. But, they have now made remarkable progress. I entirely deny, repudiate the suggestion that these languages have not progressed. You may criticise some Government activities. They might have helped more. I do submit you are thinking entirely in terms of offices and clerks. Language is something bigger than offices and clerks. I will tell you an instance. Take Urdu. I think it may broadly be said that no great encouragement has been given to Urdu and yet, such is the vitality of Urdu that today, Urdu is growing faster than many of the other national languages of India. If you judge of it from the number of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

books that are published,—that is a good test—books, dramas, stories and other literary books, it is extraordinary how fast Urdu has grown. Because, it is a dynamic language. I think that if Hindi is really to grow very fast, it should ally itself with Urdu, ally itself in the sense of vocabulary, etc. It will get vitality from Urdu retaining its own genius and nature. Urdu is vital. I shall tell you why. For many reasons, because, Urdu has a strange capacity of adaptability and of drawing from other languages. Urdu has drawn more from English than Hindi, strictly speaking. Urdu has drawn from Persian, Urdu has drawn from Arabic, Urdu has drawn from the Turki language in Central Asia. It can do that. I do not mean to say that you should adapt from Arabic or Turki in Hindi. That is not my point. It is this adaptability that makes a language strong. The other thing weakens it. The tendency which, unfortunately, has been evidenced in India for some time of living in a narrow linguistic circle and coining words from ancient Sanskrit or Pali, I do not know, does not help. Because those words which you coined have no reality behind them, have no emotion, have no history. Every word, if you look up in the dictionary, has got a history behind it. It is an impossibility for you to really translate from one language to another. Because, you cannot translate all the historic connections of that word, where it has been used, how it has been used. That is so in regard to the best of all languages. You may translate, of course, a chair or table. Something like that you can translate. But, as soon as you get a slightly more complicated idea, you cannot translate it. You may represent that idea. Of course, once you get into the question of translating into or from Chinese, it is almost an utter impossibility to do it. Because, the whole background of the Chinese language is quite different. It is not even an alphabetical

language. It is a picture language, or whatever it is. That apart, we do not have to face that difficulty in translating from Hindi to English or any other European languages because the basic stock is the same, historical development, etc. Yet, it is extremely difficult to translate from one language to another. As one who has tried it, I am amazed at the rapidity with which our journalists translate, seldom correctly. But, they do. They pass off some journalistic starting off which I rather doubt if it would benefit the growth of our national languages. This is a new development.

We have to develop our regional languages. There is no doubt about that. I am putting for the moment Hindi as a regional language only. We have to do everything. I have no doubt that they will do more and more of the work, education, administration, etc., in the regional languages.

The real difficulty arises in the next stage. What is the link connecting these regional languages? That is the point we are dealing with. Thus far, the link has been English. In fact, not only the link, but work has been done not in the regional languages, but in English even in the regions. What are we to do? That is not a question of your choice or mine. It is partly, of course.

We all know that English standards are going down; not because of conflict between Hindi and English, but because of conflict between the rising regional languages and English. English standards are going down. They will go down. I think English would be more widely known in India in the future than even now. But, it will not be better known in quality. Individuals apart, you won't have people as we have had in the past, who took pride in their English quite so much. As Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, we have had a fixation about English and we still have it to a large extent. There is no doubt there is a certain vested interest created in the knowledge of English. It is a bad thing to have a

fixation. It is a bad thing to have a vested interest. Because, that automatically separates us from those who do not know English. It is a very bad thing. We know before independence what the position was. In this country of castes, the most hardened caste was the caste of English knowing people, English clothed, English living, English knowing people. A terrible caste. All our administrators and others, many of us too belonged to that caste. It is a bad thing because it put tremendous barriers between us and the masses of India. We gave it up; many of us gave it up. I do not attach much importance to clothing. But, it is important that it removes the barriers. We gave it up and we took to wearing clothes which were more in keeping with the Indian people. That brought us nearer to them. It is quite clear, if I go in European clothes to a village, I am further removed from them than otherwise. As it is, I am far enough from them in many ways. But, I am further removed from them if I go like that. If I go and speak to them in English, I can satisfy myself; I won't satisfy anybody else. That is patent. We have to remove these barriers that have come between us and our people. The great success of Gandhiji's movement was that we removed many of these barriers. That process has not stopped.

All that is admitted. It follows logically that we can only progress in our national languages. National languages mean all the languages mentioned in the Schedule to the Constitution. We cannot, I would add, suppress any of them; we cannot impose any of them on others—both these things. Because, imposition in the sense of imposition is resisted and it is harmful to the thing being imposed. Other languages come up and they fight with each other. The growth of India in the language sense can only take place by the co-operation of languages and not by conflict of languages. They are near enough. I was talking about translation. It is rela-

tively easy to translate from one Indian language to another, because, the ideas behind them are much the same and the language is not so terribly difficult. We can do that. So, we have to take all the languages together. The only question that remains is—there are many questions, and one of them is—the link language between them. And Hindi has been suggested by our Constitution as the link language for Central and official purposes. Remember the words "Central and official purposes."

13 hrs.

It is clear that if we do not think of English as such a link language for any length of time, then inevitably we have to deal with Hindi, not because Hindi is superior to Bengali or Marathi or Tamil—of course, not; nobody says that; in some matters it may be better; in some matters, it may not be—but for the simple reason that Hindi is the most feasible for this purpose, apart from its being widespread; and it is spreading. If may say so, all the steps that my hon. friend the Education Minister may take in regard to the spread of Hindi do not go as far as the effect of the cinema on the spread of Hindi. These are patent things. This is what is happening. This is life as it is. These are recognised things. And any order that in this office Hindi must be used tomorrow—I have no objection to that, but that—does not spread Hindi to the root of it. The cinema does more than all these orders, so that we can envisage or have a link language which is Hindi and no other, that is, if it is not English. I submit that we cannot have English in any sense for a long time.

I said some time ago that I want English to continue here for many purposes, and I hope it will continue and to some extent, it may even be a link language between thinkers and authors, individual thinkers, literary people and even governmental people—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I have no objection—but the normal link language cannot be English.

Therefore, the normal link language has to be an Indian language, and of all the Indian languages, only Hindi is feasible. That is the only claim that I make for it. Because of this, it was decided in our Constituent Assembly, and wisely decided, that Hindi should be the official language for Central purposes.

- Now, it is said that it might have become, but I think that most people agree that at the present moment, it will not serve the purpose fully to take up all this work of the administration. But they say that this is because the Government has not helped it or not encouraged it enough. There may be some justification. I do not think that there is much in regard to Government not helping it, but the reasons are far deeper than Government help or lack of help. People seem to think that a language is a thing which grows or spreads by some magic like the mango tree covered up and which grows up. It is a much deeper thing than that. Especially when there is a question of one language people rubbing up the people of another language, it becomes still more difficult. You have to proceed very cautiously. It is not a question of producing only dictionaries, although dictionaries have to be produced and have been produced and will be produced, all glossaries of terms and other things. It is something much bigger than that.

A language must develop the thinking habits of the subject with which it is concerned. You can write books, and translations are being made of technical books, and that is right, simple books, but the moment you go a little beyond that your translations are stilted; they have no history behind them; the words used have no history behind them. Here, you have a tremendous history which is contemporaneous for the growth of

science and technology, out of which each word has come. Now, if you translate it quickly into some word which has had no previous history, and no previous life in it, it becomes a stilted word. So, all these things come in the way.

That is why it has been suggested, and, I think, accepted, that all scientific and technical terms should as far as possible be in line with international usage, not only in Hindi but in all the languages of India. And if you do that, if all the languages of India adopt scientific and technical words in conformity with international usage, you succeed in two things; first of all, you bring the languages of India closer to each other. Secondly, you keep contacts with the thought of the world in regard to technical and scientific matters. They are both important. And it becomes easy for you to learn another language for scientific work etc. All this is happening daily. And to say that Hindi has not progressed is merely to show an utter and absolute ignorance of the subject. Hindi has progressed; Bengali has progressed, and Tamil has progressed and so on. I am surprised at the abundance—I am not concerned very much with text-books, although they are important, but really—of the matter coming out in all our languages, which represents new thought and a new approach to our problems. That is the growth of a language, and that is happening.

So, I submit that there is no escape for us; you may argue; you may have your preferences as you like; but there is no escape for us from these three or four languages.

India is a multilingual country. Although it is multilingual, the languages are closely allied, and, therefore, they are not foreign to each other. That is, you can skip from one to another with relative ease, and we should try to do so. We have suggested the three-language formula. A larger number of people should know, some other languages apart from English, some other Indian languages,

that is, other than their own. And as this grows, you will find them coming closer together, a large number of people knowing the other languages and the gaps which exist today between Indian languages will lessen. But, inevitably, those languages must grow in their own regions. That should be encouraged.

The question of the link language remains, and there can be no other link language than Hindi basically. But merely saying it or putting it down in the Constitution does not make it the link language. It has to grow into it. It is not sufficiently adapted today for various reasons. It is getting rapidly adapted. Let it be adapted, and let us encourage that process. And while that process is being encouraged, it becomes necessary and almost inevitable for English to continue to be a link language. The process is not a sudden thing that you fix a date and from that date you say that English ceases and Hindi comes in. It is a gradual process of both being link languages, and Hindi gradually getting better and better known and better and better used, and in regard to English, as is happening today, and as I said, the standards are going down, and the use will go down to some extent, although it will be more widespread. That is the process I see.

And in this gradual transformation, dates have very little significance except to see what happens, except to examine the position from time to time to see what is happening, to see whether we are going along the right lines or not. It is important that we should see and give a certain direction to our movements.

Now, from that point of view, it becomes, and it is quite inevitable, according to me, apart from the assurances I gave or I may have given, that English has to continue as an associate language or an additional language or call it what you like.

These words have no particular meaning. The door remains open, and it will be used. As a matter of fact, it is the circumstances prevailing in the country that will compel you to use it. They do compel you to use it, and not what you call it. And if you try to suppress its use, undoubtedly, you create not only a hiatus and a gap but you do stop or progress in many directions, because that progress cannot be achieved at the present moment entirely through Hindi.

Therefore, the whole object of this Bill is to remove that barrier which was put by the Constitution, that barrier of date, and to allow things as they are to continue. For how long they will continue, I think, is a matter which I cannot precisely and definitely say. But our progress should be in these various directions, in developing our regional languages, in developing Hindi also, not only as a regional language, but as a link language, as far as possible, and maintaining English to serve that purpose so that there may be no hiatus or gap. And gradually this process will automatically take shape. Regardless of governmental decisions, these are the forces at work. This is bound to happen. It is happening. You may expedite it or you may slow it down a little. That is a possibility. But I do think we should get rid of English, which, I think, is very good, very useful, but of the fixation of the English language in our minds. I think that is bad, because that separates us from the rest of our people.

There is one thing else. I think the Home Minister said or may say later that whenever that Committee, which is envisaged in this, after ten years is constituted and reports, that report should—we entirely agree—be sent to all the State Governments for their views, so that there is no question of rushing a thing like this. There is no

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

question of trying to impose anything on others in this way, because the attempt will fail. The more you impose, the more obstructions you have, the more difficulties you have. A question like this can only be dealt with by a large measure, of consent and consultation.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** May I very respectfully ask one thing? On this clause 5 I raised this very question. When the report of the Parliamentary Committee was discussed here, I sought to move an amendment. The Speaker said that Parliament had no authority to change that Report by one syllable. What is the good of bringing it here and sending it on to the States? You short-circuit Parliament. We cannot change it by one syllable. That is what we are asking for.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not know what happened then. But I do not see how you can change a Report. A Report is a Report.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Why should not the recommendations be of Parliament? It is a Parliamentary Committee. Why should not Parliament make the recommendations?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Parliament may make independent recommendations. It can always do that. But it cannot change the Report of other people.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** We always consider reports. It can consider the Report and make recommendations.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur):** May I ask another question? The Prime Minister has just said that the Report of the Committee which would be appointed after ten years would be sent to all the States for their opinions and general concurrence.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** We can have a provision to that effect in the Bill.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** What prevents Government from bringing in an amendment or accepting an amendment tabled by some Members here to that effect and incorporating it in the Bill?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Parliament can do what it likes. But it cannot change the thing of somebody else. That is obvious.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** Shri Frank Anthony wants that report to be changed. But my question was different. I want some provision to be made here in the Bill about sending it to the States.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** That question will be discussed in detail.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** I do not think there will be any difficulty about that. My colleague, the Home Minister, will deal with that matter that he has raised in his reply. I have no doubt he will. But the whole approach to this question must be one of the fullest consultation and agreement.

What was the purpose of the assurance that I gave, which I hold today? That is that no change of this kind will be effected in English or Hindi without the full approval of the non-Hindi people; because I wanted to remove any apprehension that possibly by a majority in Parliament or elsewhere we shall make changes which are not approved by them. As a matter of fact, this cannot be done, apart from my assurance, because it will raise such problems and such difficulties that no government can conceivably want to do it that way. That was the purpose.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** With great respect, what exactly did you do last time? You short-circuited Parliament. You short-circuited the unanimous Resolutions of the West Bengal and Madras Legislatures. (*Interruptions*).

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** That was exactly what happened.

**Shri Tyagi:** Even then, English is there. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): Unfortunately, Frank Anthony is not frank. (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not fair.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** One cannot refer everything.

This major question of one language conflicting with another can only be settled by consultation and general consent.

In Pondicherry, we are encouraging the French language. Definitely, we are trying to have a University there with French. Why? As a matter of fact, I do not know if the majority of the people in Pondicherry know much French. Nevertheless, because French is a valuable language and we want it to have a place in India—we want to take advantage of the knowledge of French there—we want to encourage it, to be a window. We want these to be windows of India to the outside world.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee** (Nabadwip): May I ask one question?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** I have tabled an amendment also and I want to be clear about it.

**An Hon. Member:** This is not Question Hour.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** The Prime Minister wants all the State languages to flourish in India. I ask: being a Bengali, why am I not allowed to speak here in Bengali? (*Interruptions*). In the USSR...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** Let me finish my question. I want a clarification.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am giving that clarification. Let him resume his seat. Whenever he expresses a desire to speak in Bengali, he should get the answer from me, not from the Prime Minister.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** You cannot be of any help because I have to submit a translation in English if I have to speak in Bengali. Why should I have to do that?

In the USSR, every language has that privilege. They can speak in any language they like. In the Supreme Soviet, 100 peoples are gathered there. They are allowed to speak in their own languages. I have been there. Why should I not be allowed that here?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The hon. Member probably has much greater information about the USSR than I possess. But what I should like to know is, at any meeting—all-Russia meeting—how many languages are used?

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** In the Supreme Soviet, there are 100 peoples gathered. Of them, 40 did not have any letters at all. So they created their letters, and languages and they are allowed to speak in those languages.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There can be no objection to anybody speaking in the various national languages—of course not. The only practical difficulty that comes in is that a large number of people will not understand them. Maybe we can evolve some system of translation, automatic, simultaneous translations and all that.

**Shri H. P. Chatterjee:** Yes that should be done.

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** There is no objection to that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

A little while ago I mentioned about Urdu. I feel rather particularly about Urdu. It is a good example. Here is a language. For long, the House may remember, there was a conflict between so-called Urdu and so-called Hindi in Uttar Pradesh etc. A more foolish controversy in the linguistic sense I have been unable to think of, because neither side—the protagonist on neither side—did much to progress their language but they wanted to pull down the other. The result was injury all round and little progress.

Now Urdu itself is an amalgam, a synthesis, of various languages; it is about 75—80 per cent Hindi, and about 25 per cent of the words come from other languages, Persian, maybe Arabic and Turki. It is quite clear that when two languages come together, they strengthen each other. The idea of pulling down a language and thinking that your language will profit by it is utterly wrong. Our thinking has been so much in terms of clerks and officers. It disgusts me to think that language should be associated with clerks and officers all the time. Do you develop a literary language or any language by having 100 or 1,000 or 10,000 mere clerks using it? I do not understand it. What was the conflict between Urdu and Hindi? What language should be used by the clerks in office—the same thing.

I have talked about Hindi a great deal. When I talk about Hindi, I should enter a caveat about the content of the language. It is very necessary, and the Hindi people have got to realise that more than the Bengali or Marathi or Gujarati people. There the content is not very different from popular understanding, here it is different and it is growing more and more different. That is why Gandhiji laid stress on relatively simple language, and a language which is understood by most people, and which is, to some extent, an amalgam of Hindi and Urdu as far as possible, retaining the basis of Hindi, the genius as

Hindi. The moment you stop words coming in, you stop the progress of the language.

I should like the House to consider this matter not only in the limited sense in which we have been arguing it, but in the broader sense, in the wider context. We are passing through difficult and delicate periods of transition in many ways, and it requires wisdom from us and a capacity and flexibility in order to meet the demands of the times. Rigidity stops growth. The main question is of India's growth in every way, materially, scientifically, industrially, intellectually and spiritually. We must view every step that we take from the point of that major question. What will it profit us if we honour Hindi and put it in a closed space, which prevents not only its growth, but the nation's growth? The growth of our languages is essentially tied up with the growth of the nation. Both help each other. We must, therefore, look upon this question in this wide context and see to it that we advance all along the line to reach the great goal that we have in view.

Some Hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** The reply would be given by the Home Minister. No questions now. Shri Mahatab.

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** May I seek a clarification?

**Mr. Speaker:** The reply will come from the Home Minister if he has any questions to ask.

**Shri Mahatab (Angul):** I have been waiting since yesterday to be called to speak, and I am very thankful to you for giving me time at last.

Before I proceed to discuss the provisions of the Bill which, according to me, is a straightforward one and should not have created this controversy, I would like to say a few words about the general question of language.



age which was introduced by Shri Mukerjee yesterday.

We have been having all this fighting for the last many years forgetting one simple thing, that at first attempts were made to introduce a common language in India, and that it failed. In many parts of India at one time, Persian was the official language, but that did not succeed anywhere. Although many Persian words were taken over by the local languages, English has been the official language of India for the last so many years, and except for some words of English getting into the regional languages, it has failed to be the common language. Therefore, the Prime Minister is right when he says that it must be admitted that India is a multi-lingual country, but that should not stand in the way of development of an official language.

We must distinguish the official language from the national language. I think the trouble arises when Dr. Govind Das, for instance, talks of Hindi as the national language. Here we are considering the problem of the official language. National language is something different from the official language. The question is whether an Indian language should be the official language or some other language. If on this point opinion is taken all over the country, I have no doubt in my mind that the general opinion will be that one of the Indian languages should be the official language.

Having accepted that, the question arises which language should be the official language.

डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : मैं ने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि केवल हिन्दी ही हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा है। मैं तो १४ भाषाओं में से प्रत्येक भाषा को राष्ट्रभाषा मानता हूँ।

Shri Mahatab: When Gandhiji started his movement, he discussed it threadbare in many provinces and in many of his speeches as to which lan-

guage should be the official language. Of course, it was his idea to introduce a common language also. At that time the contest was mainly among three languages. I may tell you from my own experience that Bengali was a rival of Hindi. In those days it was contended that it was more developed than Hindi, and therefore it should be the official language instead of Hindi, but that was not accepted for the simple reason that the Hindi-speaking people were the largest unit compared to the other language units. So, Hindi was accepted as suitable for the purpose of the official language, and that was provided for in the Constitution.

The Constitution-makers were wise people. Had they accepted that without any qualification, there would have been only one provision in the Constitution. Why did they make these provisions? Much has been said about the unanimity in the Constituent Assembly in this respect. It became unanimous because of the provisos. These provisos created satisfaction to those who disagreed from that view. The difficulties were anticipated, and therefore these provisions regarding the period of 15 years, the appointment of the Commission and the Parliamentary Committee, about holding examinations etc., were made. As far as I remember, when Shri Gopaldaswamy Ayyangar moved these provisions in the Constituent Assembly for acceptance, he made it clear that these provisions had been introduced because his fear was that English would continue for many years. He said so. Why was it left to Shri Gopaldaswamy Ayyangar to move that motion with so many safeguards? Because the times were such that the Constitution had to be framed as un-animously as possible.

13.27 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

He was called upon to move the motion, and he moved it. All these provisions were there. This Bill is

[Shri Mehta]

really a projection of those provisions. According to the Constitution, Hindi shall be compulsorily the official language after 15 years. This Bill extends that period under the provisions of the Constitution.

About the growth of languages, has it been noticed by the learned scholars who are here that even when the official language has been different, the regional languages have developed? The Ramayana of Tulsidas was the product of a time when Persian was the official language. Similarly, the modern languages of India have developed during the time the English has been the official language. So, the official language has nothing to do with the development of the regional languages. That is my study of the whole thing.

It is said that if a particular language becomes the official language, it will help the development of that language, but I find that there are many other languages which are competing successfully with Hindi in the matter of development. In the last Sahitya Akadami awards, to my great sorrow I found that Hindi was not awarded a prize, I do not know how that happened but other languages got prizes. That should be taken into account.

How to make Hindi, the official language, commonly understood all over India? The difficulty arises because of the attitude of certain Hindi scholars who insist that all the words used must be found from the existing vocabulary. This is an impossible thing.

In 1952 I had a discussion with the president of the Tokyo University as to the change in the Japanese language after the industrial revolution and the development of science in Japan. He told me that 60 per cent of the vocabulary of the Japanese language had changed as a result of these changes, because new words had been brought in freely, without any inhibition. But here unfortunately some-

how or other an attempt is made to find out expressions from the existing vocabulary. That is the trouble.

A great man of India has said that Indian culture centres round English. I am surprised at that statement. On the contrary, Indian culture centres round two groups of languages, the Sanskrit group and the Tamil group. Therefore, the utmost cooperation between these two groups is necessary. At one time, I had some discussion with some Tamil scholars in Madras. I am not an expert in the matter but according to them Tamil is more ancient than Sanskrit and more Tamil words have been absorbed in Sanskrit than Sanskrit words absorbed by Tamil. Therefore, they say, Tamil is superior to Sanskrit. I concede that because I cannot sit in judgment over that; there is no point in fighting that out. It is true that many Tamil words have been absorbed by Sanskrit and many Sanskrit words have been absorbed in Tamil. Let us accept that position. Let the process be accelerated so that they could come together, instead of creating difficulties. Let Hindi not have any inhibition in absorbing the words from outside. Many Tamil words have been absorbed in English language and many other languages. Therefore, that attitude should change. If anybody ask me as to when Hindi will be generally accepted all over India, I would say that it will happen when a larger number of Hindi-educated people come up from the non-Hindi areas to complete with the Hindi scholars here. It is not that Hindi literacy alone will do that. Therefore, my suggestion to those who are in charge of this question of propagation of Hindi should take steps to open Hindi faculties in the universities in non Hindi areas so that there could be highly educated people in Hindi in those non Hindi-speaking areas. As far as I know, this kind of post-graduate classes have not been opened in universities in non Hindi areas. That should be done by some means. It is no use saying that large numbers of people understand Hindi. Of course every language is under-

stood everywhere. When the Portuguese first came to India, they did not know any of our languages and yet they managed. The English people did not know any language of India but somehow they too managed. That does not mean that any language can be the official language. For the purpose of official language one should have that kind of high standard at least among a large number of persons. Attempts should be made in regard to that.

So far as the other point of view is concerned, the voice raised in Bengal, I am sorry to say, is not correct in my opinion. If we decide to accept the position that one of the Indian languages should be the official language, there is no doubt that Hindi is that language. Having accepted that position all of us should consider as to how Hindi can easily and quickly take up that position. Therefore, the development of Hindi should be left to the non-Hindi people so that the inhibition to take new words should not be there. That is my conviction and the conviction of many scholars also.

With regard to the provisions of the Bill much has been said. I once challenged Shri Anthony: if you listen to me, probably you would be convinced. For fear of being convinced it seems he has left the House. I had the opportunity of discussing these provisions with many groups in the House as well as outside the House. I have consulted many eminent lawyers whom I have not to pay any fees; they are as good lawyers as any others. Therefore, I am in a position to say something definitely on these matters. At one time I myself thought and communicated to the Home Minister that probably in some matters, some adjustments should be made but subsequently I came to realise that the impression was wrong and the fear which was expressed by both sides was really not justified. Therefore, the Bill as it stands is, I am now convinced, the finest piece of legislation. I will explain to you about the word 'may'. It says that notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen

years from the commencement of the Constitution, English language may from the appointed day.... Now, this has been confused by the way in which the word has been explained. They say that 'shall' means 'may' and 'may' means 'shall'. I think that explanation should not really have been given. In fact, 'shall' means 'shall' and 'may' means 'may'. They cannot be interchanged. Here 'may' refers to the purpose. What is the purpose? Its use is extended and the restriction is removed for the official purpose of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day. In the course of the last 16 years, some of the States at least have decided by law to have Hindi as the official language in their own States. Should we compel them to use English also along with Hindi, double language? I will clinch the issue when I come to (b). It says 'for the transaction of business in Parliament'. Here the practice has been that one can say what he wants in English or in Hindi. If we say 'shall', he has to say things both in Hindi and in English. This will be an impossible proposition. Therefore, the only expression that can be used is 'may'; it cannot be 'shall'. It is not the way as has been pointed out by the hon. Law Minister. That is a wrong interpretation. Therefore, 'may' is the only word that can be used there.

But there is a fear as I was told in my discussions with Mr. Frank Anthony and others: supposing some day the Union Government chose to change their mind and they decide not to use English, what would happen? I put it to you. Here the word is 'may'. Let us take the transaction of business in Parliament. Somebody gets up and talks in English. Can you prevent him from talking in English? Can anybody say: I will not allow you to say things in English? Can we stop the Madras Government from carrying on the correspondence in English with the Central Government? The word 'may' serves the purposes. Any other word will be wrong according to me. It will create

so many difficulties. Otherwise, the Madhya Pradesh Government which has accepted Hindi by law as the State language will have to send duplicate letters, one in Hindi and another in English. These difficulties will arise in those States which have accepted Hindi as their State language. In the course of these sixteen years some States have done so. Gujarat has accepted Hindi as the State language. It is the only non-Hindi speaking State which has done so.

**Shri Nath Pai:** You are misleading the House. They have accepted the Devanagari script for their language.

**Shri Mehtab:** I am sorry. That was the report which I received about the medium of instruction in their University. I am sorry. This difficulty will arise wherever Hindi has been adopted as the State language and I think we have no powers to compel them to go over to English again and communicate in Hindi and in English both. Therefore, 'may' is the only word which could be used. It does not mean 'shall'. 'Shall' will create these difficulties whereas 'may' gives permission to those who do not take to Hindi to use English as long as they like.

The other thing is that articles 3 and 4 must be read together. Article 4 provides that after ten years a committee will be appointed. It is open to the Home Minister and others to find out as to whether this expression is correct—the expression that the President will appoint a Committee to be elected by Members. I do not want to go into those things. A parliamentary Committee will be there. The question of Prime Minister's assurance comes in. I am happy to repeat here what I have said to many friends outside. The Prime Minister's assurance is on two points. One is that English should be continued indefinitely without any time fixed. That has been done in clause 3. He has

said that English will continue so long as non-Hindi speaking people have not come forward to accept Hindi in a general way. The Prime Minister's assurance has to be given a shape. This provision has given that shape. We can think of other shapes. But this shape should be more acceptable to the Parliament. We must have some faith in ourselves also. When I say Parliament, we should have some faith in ourselves. Parliament will appoint a committee and that committee will make enquiries as to how far Hindi has made progress. This means that the committee will find out the progress of Hindi in various States. Naturally, they will make enquiries from the State legislatures, from the State Governments and from various other agencies. We cannot expect a committee of that type to sit in the Central Hall here and to pass resolutions without making enquiries anywhere. Of course, as a Member of Parliament I cannot distrust a committee if it is to be appointed by me in that manner. That is the machinery which has been provided here. As has been pointed out, in the last Parliamentary Committee which consisted of 30 Members, 21 of them were non-Hindi speaking people. Here,—I took statistics—40 per cent of the Members are Hindi speaking and 60 per cent are non-Hindi speaking. Naturally, it is expected that non-Hindi speaking people will be more on the Committee. The trouble arises: some of these non-Hindi speaking people are not so serious as some others are. For instance, when the last committee was making investigations, only two State Governments came forward to submit their memoranda, whereas others did not take interest in it. Only Madras and West Bengal came forward to submit memoranda, and they did it. The other State Governments did not take any interest in this matter. It is not the fault of the law which stood in the way.

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni):** Including the Orissa Government.

**Shri Mehtab:** Yes, that is true. In fact, we are not so particular in these matters as many other States are.

**Shri Tyagi:** You were the Chief Minister there.

**Shri Mehtab:** No, no. I was then in Bombay, and I found out that both the Maharashtrians and Gujaratis were not interested in it.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** He was Bombay Governor at that time.

**Shri Mehtab:** Anyway, it is not the fault of the law which did that. But it is the interest which is generated by various factors. Therefore, this machinery has been devised to give shape to the Prime Minister's assurance. If we think of any other machinery, all the implications have to be thought out. But that machinery and this machinery should not be mixed up, for instance, if this Parliament lays down that this report be again examined by the State legislatures, I think the Parliamentary Committee's report should not be subjected to the examination of State legislatures. Straightway, the State legislatures can be asked. The Parliamentary Committee is an important committee and its opinion should also carry that much of weight. Those who are interested that Hindi should be hereafter accepted as the only official language or those who are interested that the report of the committee should be that Hindi has made considerable progress, should see that that kind of people are elected. Similarly, those who feel that Hindi has not made progress and things should go on as it is, should see that that type of people are elected. Therefore, the selection should rest here, and Parliament should select proper persons who can come to correct conclusion. That is my submission. As far as I see, those who say that this word "shall" and the Prime Minister's assurance has not been incorporated in this Bill, require to be convinced, and if Shri Frank Anthony was here probably he would have been convinced.

With regard to the complaint of Dr. Govind Das, I am very sorry really; whenever two opinions are expressed, why should one be intolerant towards the other? Dr. Govind Das read out many quotations to prove that at one time Gandhiji was advocating Hindi. I also advocate Hindi. While we advocating Hindi, I also advocate Hindi. While we advocate Hindi, we cannot compel others to accept it. Advocating Hindi and to go on propagating Hindi is one thing; to make a law is a different thing. We must make a distinction between the two.

Here, I am reminded of a story from Ramakrishna Paramahansa's parables. The preceptor taught the disciple that God lives in every living being and therefore he should feel one with everybody. The devotee believe it and once, when an elephant was coming with the mahout on, he said, "Now, God lives in me and also in the elephant. Why should the elephant trample upon me when we are the same?" Of course, this man was trampled upon by the elephant. Then he went to the preceptor and asked him, "You have said that God lives in me and God lives also in the elephant why then I was trampled upon by the elephant? The preceptor said there was another God living in the Mahout asking you to go away. Why did you not listen to him?" That is the parable.

Similarly, here, while Mahatma Gandhi was advocating Hindi all along, he was saying that the consent of the people should be taken. Why do we forget that part of the thing? What have we done in the meantime to secure the willing consent of the people who are objecting to it? Have we done any canvassing work? Except by putting pressure on the Government, what else have we done?

I tell you again the feeling in the States. Many are expecting the Government to spend as much money as possible on the development of Hindi. That is being resented by other State languages also. It was asked why should so much money be spent. I am

[Shri Mehtab]

a Member of the Sahitya Akademi, I know it; they are equally spending money on the development of all the languages. I think that is the correct thing to do. If it is expected that Hindi should develop, I think that all the people, and particularly the non-Hindi speaking people, should combine together to see how that is done. We are putting pressure on the Government to get the thing done through the administrative machinery; probably that is not enough.

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur): Is it not the duty of the Akademi itself?

**Shri Mehtab**: Please excuse me. It is not the duty of the Akademi to develop only one of the national languages. (Interruption). Therefore, I say Hindi is not the national language. Hindi is the official language. I make a distinction there. Hindi is the official language. Therefore, I think that those of us who believe that one of the Indian languages should be the official language and those of us who believe that that Indian language is the Hindi language,—let all of us try to develop that language to occupy that position and let us take it out of the Hindi-speaking people. I think then alone it can develop properly. That is my humble submission.

With these words, I support the Bill wholeheartedly. I request the Home Minister to take into consideration all the amendments very carefully, and as far as I see, this Bill as has been drafted is one of the finest pieces of legislation.

**Shri Manoharan** (Madras South). Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that an opportunity is given to me to speak, to express sentiments and views of the non-Hindi speaking areas. First of all, let me confess, and let us not introduce any passion or emotion, or heat in our language discussion because, as our Prime Minister once said, language itself is a slender plant intimately bound up by the sentiments of the people.

Therefore, there is every possibility of engendering heat while we are discussing an issue of this kind. So far as I am concerned, I can assure you that I will never go out of the way unless I am provoked. I hope nobody will provoke me.

First of all, my duty it is to dispel a sort of erroneous impression that is existing in the minds of my Hindi friends and our Home Minister is not free from that infection. He said that the DMK is opposing Hindi as a regional language. In fact, we have no animosity or hatred towards any language at all. Hindi is one of the national languages; of course we do agree. Like that, there are so many languages. The other day, while the Home Minister was speaking here, he said that the DMK leaders are opposing Hindi and they are sending their children to schools to learn Hindi. It is a fantastic and funny interpretation. We are not opposing Hindi at all; and where did he get this information, I do not know. But anything compulsorily imposed on the unwilling people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas, we will have to resist. We will. From that aspect, we oppose the compulsory introduction of Hindi. He claims that the DMK leaders are sending their children to schools to learn Hindi. After having compulsorily introduced Hindi in schools and asked our children to learn, I cannot understand the logic of the Home Minister, how could the situation be otherwise. We will have to send our children to schools and unfortunately they have to learn the language which is compulsorily introduced there. Therefore, he cannot be happy or enthusiastic about that.

Our approach is entirely different. Dr. Mahtab was talking about the approaches taken by so many State Legislatures. Let him understand our approach also. I want to explain our stand. We want a reappraisal of the Constitution. Secondly, the whole language question should be reopened

and re-examined in the light of the experience we have gained, because in the Constitution, it is specifically laid down that Hindi shall be the official language of the country. I am sorry I cannot accept that proposition. For that, the Constitution should be amended. I expect a sense of cooperation as well as a sense of toleration from the Hindi-speaking area. I cannot understand why they are rushing forward to impose a language on the people of the south, or shall I say non-Hindi-speaking areas, who are not willing to accept it.

Clause 3 of the Bill is very clear. It says:

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi—"

I am not worrying about 'may' or may not or whether 'may' means 'shall' or something of that sort. Unfortunately, a controversy has been raised already. We have got our own apprehension about the usage of 'may'. We have sent a memorandum signed by 15 Members—myself, Mr. Frank Anthony, the DMK Members and all the Members representing the non-Hindi-speaking areas to the Prime Minister. In that memorandum we have expressed our apprehension. The Prime Minister was pleased enough to send a reply in which he said that 'may' means 'shall'. Dr. Mahtab was arguing that in this particular context, 'may' alone can be used and 'shall' cannot be used. Our Prime Minister is telling us that 'may' means 'shall'. We have sent a letter to the Prime Minister on behalf of the DMK wherein we have quoted a famous judgment from Australia where it was specifically made clear that 'may' means at times 'maynot' and there can be an interpretation like that. Of course, the Prime Minister did not reply to our letter.

Clause 4 of the Bill says:

"After the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, the President may appoint a Committee . . .

(2) It shall be the duty of the Committee to review the progress made in the use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union and submit a report to the President making recommendations thereon."

It is a camouflage, a calculated treachery, excuse me for using harsh terms. After ten years the committee will decide something and according to the dictates of the committee, things will be done.

The review by the committee itself is to a certain extent creating certain apprehensions, because the committee's function is to eliminate progressively the use of English—that is what pricks me—not the progress of Hindi or something of that sort. We have got our own fear. The intention of the committee is to eliminate progressively the use of English. We have written to the Prime Minister about this that this apprehension should be removed. Unfortunately, that has not been removed.

The Prime Minister was pleased enough to confess that India is a multi-lingual country. It is a historic fact that India is a polyglot country, having a variety of culture and tradition based on Aryan, Dravidian and Monogolian culture. I think nobody will dispute this historic fact. This was very clearly accepted by our late Dr. B. C. Roy when the language issue was discussed in the West Bengal Assembly. He said:

"It is a fact that constitutionalists who were discussing this problem were obsessed with the idea of a country having one language, but they forgot that India is a polyglot country, that there is a large volume of people who have developed their culture

[Shri Manoharan]

and tradition based upon the Aryan language. There is a very large number of people who base their development on the Dravidian language. The Monogolian language also has got a fairly great and large influence over the language of some people of this country. Therefore, in a country which is a polyglot country so far as language is concerned, the question of having one language only need not be such a difficult problem and it is possible to have in a country like this more than one language which may be called the official language."

The resolution that has been passed by the West Bengal Assembly is this:

"Whereas this Assembly cannot agree with the recommendation made in this regard by the Official Language Commission; and

Whereas this Assembly feels that for the unity and progress of India, the whole question of official language demands fresh examination."

So, they want fresh examination. This is the view of the West Bengal Government. The very same view has been expressed by the Government of Madras also. Our Prime Minister was telling that he did not receive any such memorandum. Bilingual proposition has been accepted by the Madras Government. Here more than one language formula has been suggested by the West Bengal Government. Therefore, in the light of all this, we the Members of the DMK, who represent the spirit and aspiration of the people of the south as well as of the non-Hindi-speaking area want that the entire clause should be re-examined and there should be a reappraisal of the Constitution.

The next problem which I want to explain to the House is this. I am not worrying or annoying the Hindi

brothers. They are imposing a language and they should try to understand the spirit of the people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas. Here there is nothing but imposition. That is what we feel. This can be very clearly expressed by myself, because yesterday, while my friend, Mr. Anthony, was telling something about Hindi imperialism, Hindi chauvinism, etc., my Hindi brothers said something as if they were wounded. But the fear has been expressed by our Prime Minister also. While speaking in the Constituent Assembly on 13th September, 1949, on the language issue, the Prime Minister said:

"Is your approach going to be democratic approach or authoritarian approach? I venture to put this question to the enthusiasts for Hindi because in some of the speeches I have listened here and elsewhere, there is very much a tone of authoritarianism, very much a tone of the Hindi-speaking area being the centre of things in India—the centre of gravity—and others being the fringes of India. That is not only an incorrect approach, but it is a dangerous approach."

We feel the danger has come. Therefore, it is the duty of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister to allay the fears which exist in the minds of the non-speaking areas. How that can be done is the question.

The Prime Minister himself has accepted that in so many countries bilingualism has been adopted. He was pleased enough to quote some countries also. Equality of treatment and non-discrimination must find implicit acceptance as a sacred principle in democracy. In Switzerland, under article 116 of that country's Constitution, three languages are accepted as official languages of the country; one is German the second is French and the third is Latin. There is another language, a fourth language, called Romus. That was spoken by



one per cent of the people of the entire Switzerland. That language was also accepted as one of the national languages of Switzerland. By article 127 of the South African Constitution, English and Afrikans both are accepted as official languages of the Country. In Finland—the Prime Minister also quoted Finland—Swedish is spoken by only 9 per cent of the population, but Finnish and Swedish are both the official languages of Finland. In Canada English and French both stand on an equal footing. In Belgium, Flemish and French are both given an equal status.

14 hrs.

Therefore, our approach is that Hindi should not be the only official language of the country but all the 14 languages that are incorporated in the Constitution should be declared as the official languages of the country. That is the only possibility to tackle the issue. If that is not done, I think, any amount of persuasion or any amount of talk about the integrity of the country may be there, but I doubt whether it will solve the problem eternally.

Another point I want to stress here is, if you consider the position of the people speaking different languages within the geographical confines of India, we find that Hindi-speaking areas are being surrounded by non-Hindi speaking areas. For example, on the west, the areas starting from Punjab to Gujarat, the entire south, the areas of Orissa, Assam and Bengal are all non-Hindi-speaking areas. The common people there do not understand and speak Hindi at all (Interruption). Of course, I am speaking subject to correction. If there is any correction at all, I hope hon. Members will excuse me. 40 per cent of the people are speaking Hindi. And, if my information is correct, I am told that there are more than 14 dialects or variations in Hindi.

Now we are imposing a language which has been selected or elected by a particular Assembly which has

nothing to do with the representative colouring of the country at all. That language is being imposed on the people. The reason given is that because it is in the Constitution we cannot amend it. Very many times the Constitution has been amended in this House. Therefore, if anybody argues that it is in the Constitution and therefore it is very difficult to amend it, I should like to tell that more than 16 times the Constitution has been made the casualty for the fleeting fortunes of the ruling party.

Therefore, if they are very sincere enough, if they are honest enough, they should come forward and amend the Constitution in this respect, because the time has come to amend the Constitution in such a way as to suit the needs and meet the wishes and aspirations of the people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas. That is the only way.

I want to say something about the assurance given by the Prime Minister. Today also he agreed partly and said that, of course, he had given an assurance and all that. But what happened to his assurance he did not explain. I thought—of course, I do agree with the *bona fides* of the Prime Minister—that some possibility might occur which might demand a refusal of the assurance, and that frightened me. That is why I have brought a paper with me. Immediately after the declaration of emergency, through the Government of India an advertisement was given and that appeared in all papers, weeklies and dailies, not only in Madras but other South-Indian States. Here is the smiling face of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, radiating a reassuring and a winning smile—like a Greek statue—and underneath that it is said:

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

[Shri Manoharan]

That is the clear assurance given by the Prime Minister. We have submitted a memorandum, and as I have already pointed out, the Prime Minister, in that the reply. "My opinion continues to be the same". The status of the Prime Minister's assurance has come down to the position of an opinion. And, now he says: to be implemented through this Bill. Where is his assurance? Through this Bill we feel the South Indian people as well as the people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas would be hoodwinked because we have got our own apprehensions. Therefore, we say that the assurance given by the Prime Minister should be incorporated in the Bill itself or the Constitution itself. We took it as a Magna Carta wherein the rights of the non-Hindi-speaking people are incorporated. Unfortunately, that Magna Carta is nowhere. But the Prime Minister is here and he says that the assurance is there, his opinion is there and his opinion continues to be the same. We want a categorical assurance from the Prime Minister as well as the Home Minister. The Prime Minister's assurance is there. We want that it is incorporated in the Constitution in such a way that the Bill should be redrafted. Then only you can create a sort of confidence in the minds of the people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas.

Our Home Minister was telling that this Bill was a compromising formula for both the non-Hindi-speaking people and the Hindi-speaking people. My impression is otherwise. It is a compromising formula both for the Home Minister and the Prime Minister himself, and nothing else. If they are very sincere in that they should come forward with a fresh proposal and the Bill in a redrafted form with the assurance of the Prime Minister incorporated therein. Thereby they should see that the unity of the country is maintained.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member may try to conclude now.

**Shri Manoharan:** I am sorry, Madm, I was assured 30 minutes by the Speaker.

**Mr. Chairman:** He has already taken 24 minutes.

**Shri Manoharan:** Another thing is—what the Prime Minister feels about it, I do not know—after so many days and after the generation of heat regarding the language issue, the Prime Minister may be thinking that if he sticks to his assurance his position may be in a way threatened. I am reminded of what the Florentine merchant Machiavelli said once: "Give assurances as much as possible; do not stick to assurances". If the Prime Minister has adopted that craft, with pleasure, offer him the title "The Twentieth Century Machiavelli".

But I hope the Prime Minister will be kind enough to come forward and see that the particular apprehension in the minds of the people is removed, and thereby what he thinks about the unity and integrity of the country is maintained. I hope the majority of the Hindi-speaking people will accept our formula. There are so many Hindi friends with whom we have got much contact. Whenever I meet them they ask me: "It seems you are opposing Hindi". We are not opposing Hindi. We are opposing the compulsory introduction of Hindi. Let us first be clear about it. Secondly, English shall continue indefinitely. That also should be there because that is the assurance of the Prime Minister. I hope the assurance of the Prime Minister will be honoured, kept up and implemented. Unfortunately, through this Bill they are not going to implement the Prime Minister's assurance at all. Therefore, we want that the assurance of the Prime Minister should be implemented. Thirdly, if at all an official language is to be fixed for India, it should not be one official language as such and

official languages should be fixed. If you say that you cannot fix four or five languages or 15 languages because that would be very difficult and the like, you should evolve a programme for it and thereby see that all the 14 languages are declared as official languages of the country. That is the only possible way at. Thereby you can maintain the unity of the country. Therefore, that aspect of the issue, I hope, will be considered by the Home Minister.

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** You write in Tamil and I write in Kannada, is it?

**An Hon. Member:** Do not interrupt.

**Shri Manoharan:** That is his job always. Another thing is, I know Tamil. My mother tongue is Malayalam, and I think I want to learn some other Dravidian language like Telugu or Canarese.

**An Hon. Member:** Not Hindi?

**Shri Manoharan:** Wait, I am coming to that. After that, if time permits, definitely I will learn as many languages in India as possible. Of course, Hindi has a good place there. Therefore, my request to the House and to the Government is that the entire Bill should be re-drafted, and re-drafted in such a way as to implement the assurance given by the Prime Minister. That is the only solution; nothing else. I hope the hon. Home Minister will take note of our request and see that it is done, failing which—of course, it is not a sort of admonition or anything that I am giving—I do not think the people of South India will be very calm or they will relish it eternally. I hope the Home Minister knows something about the South Indian people, their attitude and their mentality. They are people of accommodation and people of toleration. So, the Home Minister as well as the Prime Minister can very well rely upon them. But democratic decency

requires that those people should not be hurt too much; and they are being hurt too much; that is our feeling. That also, our Home Minister should take note of.

I think the Hindi speaking-people are very allergic to English, I do not know the reason why. They are telling us that only one per cent of the people speak English here and, therefore, why or how can we have it? As I have already stated, only one per cent of the people of Switzerland speak Romus and yet it has been acclaimed and considered as one of the official languages of Switzerland. So, why not we also accept English here as a national language?

The mother tongue of Shri Frank Anthony is English, and his Prime Minister is not Mr. Mac Milland but Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. And the Anglo-Indian community is there, which constitutes more than one or two per cent of the total population. Therefore, if only you are somewhat accommodative and men of toleration, we can very well accommodate English as one of the languages of the country. Therefore, my request is that English should also be included in the Eighth Schedule, in which case it will solve the problem to a certain extent. I want to conclude my speech with that note.

Then, we have given some amendments to the Official Languages Bill. One amendment is to the effect that there should be a referendum of the sovereign people on this subject. If the non-Hindi-speaking people are not ready to accept it, and they are not ready for it, there should be a subsequent referendum and, finally, unless and until the non-Hindi-speaking people come to an agreement on it, please do not rush in. You want to have your palatial mansion—I am talking of the desire of the Hindi-speaking people—well, but have the foundation first. You have to build that first. So, please approach this issue cautiously, because it is an emotional problem. I hope the Home

[Shri Manoharan]

Minister, as well as the Prime Minister, will take note of it and act accordingly, act wisely.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya** (Bangalore City): Madam Chairman, while speaking, the leader of the DMK spoke in a manner which carried conviction to most of us on a point of two. It is commonly supposed that there is a great deal of divergence between the views of Congressmen and the views of DMK, and naturally so. Therefore, I must congratulate them that, in spite of the divergences of views, they have been, especially after the emergency, adopting a co-operative attitude towards the rest of us. My only wish is they may continue to do it in a way that they may form an alternative Government in the State in which they are in a considerable number, because democracy presupposes each party to have the reins of administration in hand one day or the other. If that feeling gets into the minds of the people, they will speak with responsibility and with understanding, because they want the co-operation and goodwill of the people.

They have come to Delhi as representatives of the people, and it is a welcome change that is taking place. We are all with them in safeguarding the interests of the underdog, the down-trodden, as they say, of the masses. I hope they will also concede to me that I also represent the people of South India in a way, to some extent, though not to the extent they claim to represent.

14.1 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

In the minds of almost 90 per cent of the people there is no distinction whatsoever between the people of North India and South India. The people of India are one. This has been the feeling generated, not by the English-speaking people; this is not a feeling that has been generated by English-educated people; if I

correctly comprehended, probably, the first known proponents of this idea were Valmiki and Vyasa, thousands of years ago. The names that are found in the two epics are the household names, in Assam or Kerala, Tamilnad or Kannada land, or many other part of the country. They have laid certain foundation for the unity of India. Political exigencies, many a time, alter the pattern of Government and societies. These patterns are ever-changing. But the unity of India is a persisting fact.

I do not to make a long speech on the history of this movement. So, I will straightway come to the period when English dominated the scene. When English came to be learnt in India, it was not imposed on us, though many people are under the impression that English was imposed on us. Those people have not examined the circumstances and happenings a country ago, say that English was imposed upon us. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the then leader of public opinion in this country, who was as much respected then as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru now, fought with the then Government that English should be the language of education and learning in this country. There was a great division of opinion between those people who wanted the Indian language to be the medium of instruction and official language and those who wanted English to replace the Indian languages. What Raja Ram Mohan Roy said then in order to make English stay in India has, more or less, been repeated by the Prime Minister today. The very same reasons advanced by Raja Ram Mohan Roy then are advanced by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru today. So, whoever has got the historical and impartial sense or perspective of these things should cease to complain that English has been imposed upon India.

In politics gratitude is a very rare commodity. That is a well-known proverb. Whoever speaks and condemns English will be partaking all

the odium attached to that proverb. English has done many good things to India. I am not talking of the literature here. I wonder if we could have established our democratic institutions as we understand them, as we practise them, if there was no English language. Where would be our industrial and economic progress if we had not imbibed ideas from the English language? I would ask all Congressmen: Where would be your socialism if you had not studied English and imbibed all these political ideologies therefrom? Show me one book in our ancient literature, whether it is in Kannda or in Hindi or Malayalam or any other language, which preaches socialism of the type that we have come to have as our ideal.

**An Hon. Member:** Ram Rajya.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha):** In our shastras they have always said "Vishwa Kutumba" and all the principles of socialism are embodied in that.

**Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar):** We have not come to the stage of Ram Rajya which Shri Hanumanthaiya also wants to establish.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** I am afraid, some people construe shastras in a strange way. Because of a word is found here or there in our shastras we construe that even atomic energy had been found out and described therein. Apart from that, I want my hon. friend, Shri Bajaj, to show to me the specific book on socialism and not some words here and there in shastras.

**Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj:** Books are necessary to convince others. But if you are convinced yourself, you do not need a book. What matters most is how one lives one's life than what one preaches or writes.

**Shri Manumanthaiya:** Therefore I am firmly convinced that English language has done immense good to

us by not only giving us our freedom but also, what we call, modern outlook of life.

Take the Constitution. In the Constitution certainly we have enthroned Hindi as the official language in article 343, but that language is English. The Constitution is written in English. The entity that sits on the throne may be Hindi but the throne itself is the English throne.

**Dr. M. S. Aney:** And he is, even now, speaking in English.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** Therefore let us not run away with the idea that English has done something bad to us, that it has degraded us.

**An Hon. Member:** Nobody has said so.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** I quote Mahatma Gandhi and Vinoba bhave to show that English should continue to occupy its place. Mahatma Gandhi has placed before us the ultimate ideal that we should have. That was the resolution the Congress adopted on the eve of launching the Quit India movement in Bombay in 1942. Mahatma Gandhi drafted that resolution. He envisaged independence for India and a federal type of government for India and, ultimately, for the peace and progress of the world, a federation of all the nations of the world. He envisaged a world federation. Our Education Ministry also is more or less encouraging that idea in the shape of three-language formula.

Vinoba Bhave has progressed in the matter of coining ideas from Jai Hind to Jai Jagat. These are serious matters adumbrated by mahatmas and saints. We should not in our anxiety that a particular constituency is a Hindi constituency or a non-Hindu constituency run away with our subjective feeling of success in the election. When we speak of determining the national language or the official language we

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

are doing a mighty thing. This is a mightier achievement than the construction of pyramids, the biggest buildings that have been built by human beings. We must have the humility to be objective when we evolve a language for forty five crores of people.

At the stage of the State there must be the regional language, at the stage of the federation there must be Hindi and also English for those people who will not be able to use Hindi and for world intercourse there must be English. These three tiers are logical and cogent and will ultimately do immense good to the country. It may be that in the time of our grandchildren we may be able to occupy the place that the United States of America is occupying today if we formulate this policy of three tiers in all sincerity.

Whatever the hon. Prime Minister has said today is acceptable to me in toto so far as this language question is concerned. The Constitution precluded the use of English after 1965. In deference to the wishes of the non-Hindi-speaking people he has allowed the use of English. That is the principle again and we should not forget that. If the present Bill had not been introduced, none of us could have spoken in English in this House or could have used that language in transacting the business of the Government. That is the real gain and that we must have in mind.

Regarding the words "may" and "shall" there has been a great deal of controversy. The DMK is also aggrieved that the hon. Prime Minister's assurance has not been incorporated in the Bill. Assurances cannot be incorporated in Bills as they are made. They are made in the form of speeches and Bills have to be in the form of laws. If the assurance given is contained in substance in the Bill, we ought to be satisfied. Otherwise, you yourself will say tomorrow, "Who is this Prime Minister to give an assurance?"

**Shri Manoharan:** I will not say like that.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** You will. If the hon. Prime Minister says to the Hindi-speaking people, "I have given an assurance that India shall not be divided", would you agree to that?

**Shri Manoharan:** That is another thing.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** The assurance of the hon. Prime Minister will be in force as long as his party continues to govern. It is not a law for all time to come and for all parties to obey.

**Shri Badrudduja** (Murshidabad):  
Leader of the majority party.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** Therefore whatever assurance he has given, according to my understanding, has been fulfilled by the provisions of this Bill. If some people make it out that "may" may be construed as "may not" by a future government, I would tell them that if it is construed as "may not", Indian unity will be set at naught that day. It is not that the rest of the people are helpless. It is not that in a democracy anybody begs at the doors of anyone else for political power and advantage. As against the hon. Prime Minister's assurance people take that extreme course of construing "may" as "may not" then that day will be the fulfilment of the ideal of the DMK. We need not worry about that.

So far as the hon. Home Minister is concerned, I want to make an appeal to him. Many hon. Members of the Congress Party as well as of other parties has repeatedly appealed to him in their speeches that the word "shall" should be used in place of the word "may". May be that the apprehension is misplaced; may be that they are unreasonable. In any case, I want him to exercise his undoubted sweet influence over the minds of all of us and see that this Bill not only gets the unanimous vote but the unanimous heart behind it. If by what is called political authority we are made to vote for a proposition which

does not command our wholehearted support, to that extent unity gets weakened.

I have submitted to him and to the Prime Minister a formula which, if accepted, will command the unanimous support of the House. I merely want the recasting of clause 3. The word "may" may be retained; I concede the proposition. The clause will then read:

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English and Hindi languages may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used—

(a) for all official purposes of the Union for which they have were being used immediately before that day; and

(b)....."

Sub-clause (b) may remain as it is. Therefore, retain all the words you have already incorporated in the Bill; only, their context may be changed somewhat to command universal acceptance of this Bill.

I am not insisting—if I insist, the Home Minister also has the right to insist, the democratic right is equally there—I won't take the unreasonable attitude that I am right and that my proposition should be accepted. But I again appeal to his sweet reasonableness, and if he bestows thought over the matter and if he accepts this, I am sure that even the DMK people may unanimously accept the Bill. That will be a very great gain.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should now conclude.

**Shri Hanumanthaiya:** Only one sentence more. I was a Member of the Constituent Assembly when this Constitution was framed. A great debate went on there regarding the formula to be evolved. The late Pandit Pant played a very great part in it. He was one of the most persuasive

parliamentarians I have seen. I have seen many parliamentarians and prime ministers of other countries also. His sweet reasonableness and persuasiveness carried the day. And in the present Home Minister we have a sweet gentleman, in some respects more persuasive than Pandit Pant. I call him Congress *kulfi*. If you go to the restaurant, *kulfi* is the sweetest item. He is our Congress *kulfi*.

This recasting of the clause that I have proposed I commend in all sincerity not only to the Home Minister and the Prime Minister but to all the Members of this House.

श्री रामसेवक यादव: : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विषयक इस समय सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत है, वह संविधान, अंगतंत्र, समाजवाद और राष्ट्र-सम्मान सभी के विपरीत है।

मैं सदन का ध्यान संविधान के अनुच्छेद ३४३ (३) की ओर आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ, जिस में लिखा है :

"(३) इस अनुच्छेद में किसी बात के होते हुए भी संसद् उक्त पंद्रह साल की कालावधि के पश्चात् विधि द्वारा —

(क) अंग्रेजी भाषा का ; अथवा

(ख) अक्षरों के देवनागरी रूप का,

ऐसे प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग उप-बन्धित कर सकेगी जैसेकि ऐसी विधि में उल्लिखित हों।"

इस अनुच्छेद में यह साफ़ दिया हुआ है कि कुछ स्पेशल प्राधिकार के लिए, कुछ खास उद्देश्यों के लिए, अंग्रेजी के इस्तेमाल की व्यवस्था करने के लिए कोई विधेयक यहाँ पर पारित किया जा सकता है। परन्तु मौजूदा विधेयक के अनुसार संविधान के लागू होने के समय अंग्रेजी जिन उद्देश्यों के

[श्री राममेवक यादव]

लिए इस्तेमाल हो रही थी, पंद्रह वर्ष की अवधि पूरी होने के बाद भी, अर्थात् १९६५ के बाद भी, वह उन सभी कार्यों के लिये इस्तेमाल होती रहेगी। इस प्रकार यह विधेयक संविधान की व्यवस्था के बिल्कुल विपरीत जाता है। इस लिए गृह मंत्री जी से मेरा निवेदन है— शायद वह किसी बातचीत में व्यस्त हैं— कि यह विधेयक लाने से पहले उन को संविधान में संशोधन करना चाहिए था। जब तक संविधान में संशोधन न हो जाय, इस अनुच्छेद के रहते हुए यह विधेयक संविधान के विपरीत है।

भाषा का प्रश्न बहुत ही जटिल प्रश्न है। जब हम भाषा के प्रश्न पर विचार करें, तो हमारे दिमाग में उत्तर और दक्षिण का प्रश्न नहीं होना चाहिए, क्योंकि चाहे उत्तर की जनता हो और चाहे दक्षिण की जनता हो, हम को हमेशा यह सोचना चाहिए कि उत्तर और दक्षिण दोनों की जनता की भाषायें क्या हैं। क्या वहाँ की जनता, वहाँ का बहुमत, अंग्रेजी बोलता है या वहाँ की अपनी अपनी मातृ-भाषायें बोलता है। मैं खास तौर से माननीय सदस्य, श्री मनोहरन, और दक्षिण के उन साथियों से, जो चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी रहे, यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि दक्षिण भारत में अंग्रेजी के जानने वाले लोग कितने प्रतिशत हैं। मैं ने अभी अपने पास बैठे हुए दक्षिण भारत के एक माननीय सदस्य से इस बारे में जान-कारो ली। उन्होंने ने बताया कि उन के प्रदेश में चालीम प्रतिशत लोग पढ़े-लिखे हैं और बीस प्रतिशत पढ़े-लिखे लोग अंग्रेजी जानते हैं। अगर हम उन की ही बात को लें और उस प्रदेश के बारे में ही सोचें, तो हम देखते हैं कि दक्षिण भारत की, और खास तौर से हमारे मित्र के राज्य की, अस्सी प्रतिशत जनता अंग्रेजी नहीं जानती है। अगर उन देश की अस्सी प्रतिशत जनता को राज-काज में हिस्सा देना है, उस को आगे बढ़ाना है, तो जब तक देश का राज-काज जन-भाषा में नहीं चलेगा, तब तक वह कैसे मुमकिन होगा ?

अगर दक्षिण भारत के मित्र हिन्दी का विरोध करें, तो वह बान मेरी समझ में आ सकता है। ठीक है, व मज्जे से हिन्दी का विरोध करें। लेकिन अगर उन के मुंह से यह बात भी निकलती कि दक्षिण भारत के सब राज्यों में राज-काज की बोली उन प्रदेशों की जनता की अपनी बोली होगी, अंग्रेजी नहीं होगी, तब तो मैं उन से सहमत होता, लेकिन उन का यह अंग्रेजी-प्रेम मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है।

हम अंग्रेजी के विरोधी हैं—इसलिए विरोधी हैं कि अंग्रेजी एक विदेशी बोली और उस को इस देश के केवल दो प्रतिशत लोग जानते हैं और अंग्रेजी का विरोध केवल हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी से नहीं है, बल्कि इस देश की सभी जन-भाषाओं और राष्ट्रीय भाषाओं में है। अंग्रेजी के रहते हुए इस देश में न हिन्दी और न अन्य राष्ट्रीय भाषायें चल सकती हैं। इसलिये हम इस के विरोधी हैं और चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी तत्काल इस देश से जाय।

अभी हमारे मित्र, मैसूर के भूतपूर्व मुख्य मंत्री, गांधीजी के बारे में कुछ कह रहे थे। अमर-गद्दीद राष्ट्र-पिता महात्मा गांधी इस देश के ही नहीं, सारे संसार के महानतम पुरुषों में से एक थे। मैं अंग्रेजी के बारे में उन के विचार इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने ने कहा था :

“अंग्रेजी भाषा के साम्राज्य से अगर हम नहीं निकले, तो करोड़ों सारीबों का क्या होगा ? क्या हमारा सब प्रयत्न, हिन्दुस्तान के समुद्र में अंग्रेजी भाषा के जो जानने वाले हैं, उन के लिए ही है ?

यह प्रश्न था उन का और इस में उस का उत्तर भी छिपा हुआ है।

श्री हनुमन्तैया : गांधी जी ने बताया था कि हिन्दी कैसी रहेगी। उन्होंने ने “हिन्दी” नहीं



कहा था। उन्होंने "हिन्दुस्तानी" कहा था, जो कि एरोबिक केरेक्टर्ज़ और देवनागरी में लिखी जायेगी। क्या माननीय सदस्य यह समझते हैं?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : हमें खुशी है कि हनुमन्तैया जी ने कम से कम अपने देश को भाषा का प्रयोग तो किया। मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो प्रश्न उन्होंने उठाया है, वह डिबेट का प्रश्न है जबकि हम केवल इस समय यहाँ भिद्वांत के प्रश्न को ले कर चल रहे हैं। डिबेट के प्रश्न पर भी जहाँ तक वह जाना चाहें, हम जाने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन जैसाकि गांधी जी ने कहा है कि क्या इस देश की भाषाओं में राज काज न चल कर अंग्रेजी में चलेगा? अगर ऐसा होगा तो इस देश की गरीब जनता को आग बढ़ने के कभी अक्सर नहीं मिलेंगे। उसका उत्तर, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज क सत्तारूढ़ दल और खास तौर से उसी के अधिकारी नहरू "हां" में दे रहे हैं यह बन्ध कर कि "हां, अंग्रेजी में ही चलेगा। उन के शायों में जो शक्ति है, वह न चली जाय, इसी का यह धिल परिचायक है।

सरकार सरमायेदारों और मुट्टी भर अंग्रेजी जानने वालों के हितों की पोषक है। जिस तरह से इस देश के लोगों का बालिक मताधिकार मिला है, अगर उमी तरह से इस देश की जन भाषाय प्रतिष्ठित हो गई, तमिल, तेलुगु, मराठी, मलयालम, कन्नड़, इत्यादि जितनी भाषाय हैं, वे प्रतिष्ठित हो गईं और उन के साथ साथ हिन्दी प्रतिष्ठित हो गई तो बालिक मताधिकार और जन भाषायें दोनों, दो फीसदी का आज जो अधिपत्य है, इस देश में, उसको तोड़ दगी, वह टूटने से बच नहीं सकता है और इस देश की ६८ फीसदी जनता आगे बढ़ जायेगी और सरकार पर कब्जा कर लेगी। इसलिये सरकार को चिन्ता है और उसके मनमें इस तरह की खबराहट पैदा हुई है कि अगर यह बात इस देश में हो गई और १९६५ के बाध अंग्रेजी चली गई और जन भाषायें आ गई, तो जो उन्होंने अपने स्वार्थों का किला बना रखा है, वह टूट जायेगा। जिस तरह से हम

खबरा उठता था कि कहीं उस के हाथ से शक्ति न चली जाय, वैसी ही खबराहट सरकार को पैदा हुई है और यह विधेयक उसी किलेबंदी को कायम रखने के लिए लाया गया है और इस को मैं बेहयाई वाला और कटोरतम कदम कहता हूँ।

विश्व बंधु गांधी जी ने २-९-१९२१ को क्या कहा था, यह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ। यह बात उन्होंने तानाशाही अधिकारों के बारे में कही थी।

"यदि मेरे हाथ में तानाशाही सत्ता हो तो आज से ही विदेशी माध्यम के जरिये अपने लड़कों और लड़कियों की शिक्षा बन्द कर दूँ।"

उन्होंने आगे कहा :

मारे शिक्षकों और प्रोफेसरों से यह माध्यम बदलवा दूँ या उन्हें बरखास्त कर दूँ।

पाठ्यपुस्तकों की बात भी की जाती है। उसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा: मैं पाठ्यपुस्तकों की तैयारी का इंतजार नहीं करूँगा और ये माध्यम के जरिये पीछे पीछे चली आयेंगी। यह एक ऐसी बुराई है जिसका आज तुरन्त इलाज होना चाहिये।"

ये शब्द उनके हैं जिनका नाम लेकर सरकार यह सारा कामकाज चला रही है। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज उनके उत्तराधिकारी उन तानाशाही अधिकारों का प्रयोग इस संकटकालीन स्थिति की छत्रछाया में अंग्रेजी को कायम रखने के लिये कर रहे हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी भी भाषायें हैं, उनको पददलित करने की और उनको निकाल बाहर करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

अंग्रेजी को कायम रखने के लिये यह वजीर की जाती है कि टेक्नीकल टालीम जैसे

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

चलेगी। अभी हमारे मित्र ने कहा कि वह असंभव हो जायेगी अगर देशी भाषाओं में राज काज चला और उसके अन्दर शिक्षा प्रदान की जाने लगी। इसके बारे में भी गांधी जी के विचार बिल्कुल साफ हैं। यह दलील कि पहले तैयारी कर लो तब जाकर उसको काम काज में इस्तेमाल करो, वैसी ही है जैसे अंग्रेज कहा करता था कि पहले लायक बन जाओ तब स्वराज्य लो, पहले तैरना सीख लो तब पानी के अन्दर पैर रखो। मतलब इ दलील का कुछ नहीं है। यह दलील बिल्कुल निरर्थक है। ऐसी दलील देकर इस देश के लोगों में बुद्धि विभ्रम और एक तरह से भ्रम पैदा करने की कोशिश की जाती है। गांधी जी ने इस दलील के बारे में कहा था :

“यह कहना बिल्कुल गलत है कि मातृ भाषा के जरिये टैक्नीकल तालीम देने के लिये बड़ी तैयारी और बड़ी खोज की जरूरत होगी। जो यह दलील पेश करते हैं वे नहीं जानते कि हमारे गांवों की बोलियां हर तरह की बात को समझाने वाले शब्दों और मुहावरों से भरी हुई हैं”।

ये विचार उन्होंने हरिजन सेवक में १९४६ में व्यक्त किये थे। तर्क तो यह दिया जाना चाहिये कि जब तक देशी भाषाओं में शिक्षा नहीं दी जायेगी, टैक्नीकल तालीम नहीं दी जायेगी सांइस में हम तरक्की नहीं करेंगे, पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के अन्दर देश को प्रगति की ओर जो ले जाना चाहते हैं, देश को समृद्धिशाली बनाना चाहते हैं, वह नहीं कर सकेंगे। हम को करोड़ों इजीनियर्स की, मिस्त्रियों की, डाक्टरों की जरूरत है, उसको हम आज तक भी पूरा नहीं कर सके हैं। अगर हमारी ये भाषायें चल जायें, इनकी उन्नति हो जाये तो ये जो दिक्कतें हैं, वे बड़ी आसानी से दूर हो सकती हैं।

भाषा विचार अभिव्यक्ति का माध्यम होती है और बोलचाल के लिये इसका प्रयोग होता है। हम यह समझे बैठे हैं कि भाषा स्वयं अपने में ही ज्ञान है। वह तो केवल ज्ञान हासिल करने का माध्यम है। अगर आप जन भाषाओं के जरिये ज्ञान पहुंचायेंगे, तो और ज्यादा लोगों में वह जा सकता है और ज्यादा लोगों द्वारा सीखा जा सकता है। मैं एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। आज दो रामायण हैं, एक बाल्मीकी रामायण और दूसरी तुलसीकृत रामायण। अब देखें कि कौन सी रामायण प्रचलित है.....

श्री हनुमन्तैया : कम्बा रामायण भी है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : तुलसीकृत रामायण ही प्रचलित हो सकी है, बाल्मीकी रामायण प्रचलित नहीं हो सकी है। इसका कारण क्या है, कारण यह है कि तुलसीकृत रामायण जन भाषा में लिखी गई है जबकि बाल्मीकी रामायण संस्कृत में लिखी गई है जिसको बहुत थोड़े लोग समझते हैं। इसलिये उसका प्रचलन नहीं हो सका है। इस वास्ते यह जो तर्क दिया जाता है यह गलत है।

गांधी जी अंग्रेजी हटाना चाहते थे, यह साफ है। हमने भी बार बार कहा है और इस मामले में कोई गलतफहमी नहीं होनी चाहिये कि हम तमिल तेलुगू, कन्नड़ आदि जो भारतीय भाषायें हैं, उनके विरोधी नहीं हैं, हम चाहते हैं कि उनका इस्तेमाल हो, लेकिन हम एक दम, तत्काल यह भी चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी जाये, भले ही इस में पहले पहल हमें कुछ दिक्कत हो। शुरू शुरू में दिक्कत हुआ ही करती है। लेकिन अगर इसकी शुरुआत नहीं होगी तो कभी इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकती है। गांधी जी को इस मामले में मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था :

“अंग्रेजी भाषा हटाना उसी तरह से है जैसे अंग्रेजों को हटाना। मेरा कहना है कि जिस तरह अपनी आजादी को जबरदस्ती छीनने वाले अंग्रेजों की सियासी हुकूमत को हम ने सफलतापूर्वक निकाल दिया, उसी तरह अपनी संस्कृति को दवाने वाली अंग्रेजी भाषा को निकाल देना चाहिये।”

यह बात उन्होंने हरिजन सेवक में २६-९-१९४६ को लिखी थी और अंग्रेजी हटाने के बारे में लिखी थी। लेकिन दुःख है कि उनके नाम पर हुकूमत का धंघा चलाने वाली सरकार आज-उलटे अंग्रेजी को प्रतिष्ठित कर रही है और जो देशी भाषायें हैं, जो जन-भाषायें हैं, उनको कुंठित कर रही हैं, उनको दबा रही है। गांधी जी ने तो यहां तक कहा था कि इस भाषा के सार्वजनिक प्रयोग के भी वह विरोधी हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि दो हिन्दुस्तानी या दो एक प्रदेश में रहने वाले, एक भाषा जानने वाले अंग्रेजी में न बोलें और अंग्रेजी के इस प्रकार के प्रयोग का भी बहिष्कार होना चाहिये। उन्होंने कहा था :-

“जहां तक हो सके, आपसी बातचीत में भी अंग्रेजी का व्यवहार नहीं करना चाहिये। सार्वजनिक रूप में तो हिन्दुस्तानी ही बोलनी चाहिये और अपनी प्रांतीय भाषाओं का खुल कर उपयोग करना चाहिये। आफिसों में भी जहां तक हो सके, हिन्दुस्तानी में पत्रव्यवहार होना चाहिये। हुकूम या सर्क्युलर हिन्दुस्तानी में निकालने चाहिये। ऐसा होने से लोगों में व्यापक रूप में हिन्दुस्तानी सीखने का उत्साह बढ़ेगा और धीरे-धीरे हिन्दुस्तानी अपने आप देश की सामान्य भाषा बन जायेगी।”

ये गांधी जी के विचार थे, राष्ट्रपिता के विचार थे। लेकिन राष्ट्र के जो चाचा हैं, उनको राष्ट्र से तो मुहब्बत है नहीं, अंग्रेजी से है और उसको वह लाना चाहते हैं।

सरकार अंग्रेजी को झूठ ही अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भाषा कहती है। झूठ ही कहती है, कि यह सारे संसार की भाषा है। जितनी आवादी दुनिया की है, उम में से दस में एक ही अंग्रेजी जानता होगा अगर हिन्दुस्तान में भी जो अंग्रेजी जानते हैं, उन को भी शामिल कर लें।

अगर इस देश में समाजवाद स्थापित करना है, जैसे हनुमन्तैया साहब ने कहा है, अगर गरीबों का राज स्थापित करना है तो ज्ञान को दो फीसदी अंग्रेजी जानने वाले लोगों के अन्दर कैद करके सारी हुकूमत की शक्ति कैद करके, आप कभी नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिये जरूरी है कि जन भाषायें प्रतिष्ठित हों। यह बिल उसके बिलकुल विपरीत जाता है।

गांधी जी अहिन्दी भाषी हलाके से घाते थे। बैसे तो वह सारे विश्व के थे और हिन्दुस्तान तक ही उनको बांधना, उनके प्रति अन्याय करना होगा, अनादर करना होगा, फिर भी अगर उस दृष्टि से देखा जाये, अहिन्दी भाषी होने की दृष्टि से देखा जाये तो जो उनके विचार थे, वे मैंने आपके सामने रख दिये। लेकिन रविन्द्र नाथ टैगोर, जोकि अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी थे, उनके जो विचार थे, उनको भी मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने भाषा के बारे में कहा था कि “हम मछली पकड़ना चाहते हैं परन्तु पानी के साथ कोई सम्पर्क नहीं रखना चाहते हम देश का कल्याण तो करेंगे लेकिन देश का स्पर्श नहीं करेंगे। देश का स्पर्श कैसे किया जाता है? देश की आशा को लेकर, देश का वस्त्र पहन कर” समाजवाद चाहते हैं, लेकिन जनता की भाषा से दुश्मनी करेंगे, जनतंत्र चाहते हैं लेकिन जन भाषाओं का विरोध करेंगे,

### [श्री राम सेवक यादव]

राष्ट्र सम्मान चाहते हैं लेकिन राष्ट्रीय भाषाओं को पददलित करके, पदाक्रांत करके। देश की भाषाओं का सम्मान करके ही देश की उन्नति हो सकती है। देश की उन्नति हो सकती है, देश की भाषाओं को लेकर और देशी वस्त्र पहन कर। अगर हम इस महान पुरुष की बात को देखें तो भी यह जो विधेयक है, यह उसके बिलकुल विपरीत जाता है।

हम अंग्रेजी के क्या विरोधा हैं, यह मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि अंग्रेजी भाषा भारतीय प्रसंग में सामन्ती है, कुल आबादी का दो प्रतिशत, यानी छोटा सा अल्पमत ही अंग्रेजी में ऐसी योग्यता हासिल कर पाता है उसे सदा वह अपने स्वार्थ के लिये ही इस्तेमाल करता है। इस छोटे से अल्पमत के हाथ में विशाल जन समुदाय पर अधिकार और शासन करने का यह हाथियार है। अंग्रेजी का दरअमल में दक्षिण में भी बहुत विरोध है। अश्र्वती राजगोपालाचारी जैसे लोग या उनके प्रभाव में, जो वहाँ की गरीब जनता उठ रही है, वह अपने अधिकारों को चाहती है, वे अधिकार वहाँ की जनता को न मिल सकें, इसलिये अंग्रेजी के जाल में उन लोगों को फँसाने का षडयंत्र रच रहे हैं और चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी बनी रहे। दरअमल वहाँ की जनता उसको नहीं चाहती है। जो दक्षिण के लोग यहाँ आये हैं वे क्या अंग्रेजी में बोल कर अपना चुनाव जीत कर आये हैं? अपने मतदाताओं से वे अंग्रेजी में बात करते हैं या उनकी जन भाषा में। उनका यह तर्क मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि वे अंग्रेजी क्यों चाहते हैं। यदि अंग्रेजी रही तो जिस तरह हजारों साल से यह देश भ्रमोगति को पहूँचा, अब भी वैसा ही होगा। क्यों? क्योंकि इस देश में जाति प्रथा है, इस देश में भाषा नीति है, इस देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था अब तक ऐसी थी कि केवल १ या २ फी सैकड़ा लोगों का आधिपत्य रहा। उन्हीं के हाथ में राज्य

सत्ता रहे, बाकी इस देश की ९८ फी सवी आबादी का हिस्सा पददलित रहे। भाषा के जरिये लोगों के मन को इतना हीन बना दिया जाय कि उनके मन में यह भाव पैदा हो कि हम अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते, हम संस्कृत नहीं जानते, और अगर इन भाषाओं को नहीं जानते तो हम में न तो कोई गुण रहा और न ज्ञान ही रहा, हम हीन हैं, जानवरों से भी बदतर हैं और हम उस हीनता से निकल नहीं सकते हैं, इस भावना में ग्रस्त करने के लिये यहाँ पर सारा प्रयास चला। हम ने उसका नतीजा भी देख लिया। जब जब देश पर विदेशी हमला हुआ तो १ या २ प्रतिशत हुकूमत की गद्दी पर बैठने वाले, पलटनों और व्यापार पर कब्जा रखने वाले, यहाँ के उद्योगों पर कब्जा रखने वाले, मुल्क को बचा नहीं सके। हमारा मुल्क चला गया, हम गुलामी में चले गये। अगर वही गलती फिर दोहराई गई और इस विधेयक के जरिये अंग्रेजी को हमेशा के लिये कायम रखा गया तो वही नतीजा फिर निकलेगा। चीन ने हम को छतरे से आगाह कर दिया है। अगर उससे हम को सबक लेना है तो इस विधेयक को वापिस लेना चाहिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो गया।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** मैं अपने दल से अकेला बोल रहा हूँ। हम लोगों की भी इस बारे में एक स्थिति है। इसलिये हम को २५ या ३० मिनट मिलने चाहिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** बहुत से लोगों को बोलना है।

**श्री राम सेवक यादव :** अपने दल से मैं अकेला बोलने वाला हूँ। स्पीकर महोदय ने कहा था कि प्रायः घंटा दिया जायेगा।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** दूसरी पार्टियाँ भी हैं।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** दूसरी पार्टियां हैं, लेकिन स्पीकर महोदय ने कहा था कि भाषे घटे का समय दिया जायेगा। इसलिये समय है कि अंग्रेजी न रहे। यह दलील दी जाती है कि अंग्रेजी भाषा जो है वह दुनिया की भाषा है : ३ अरब, ३० या ३५ करोड़ आदिमयों में से दस आदिमयों में से एक आदिमी अंग्रेजी जानता है। जैसा शुरू में मैंने कहा, उसमें हमारे देश के लोग भी शामिल हैं। राजतान की भाषा जनता की भाषा होनी चाहिये, अंग्रेजी नहीं होना चाहिये। अंग्रेजी की दुश्मनी केवल हिन्दी से नहीं। देश की जितनी भी भाषायें हैं, जब तक अंग्रेजी रहेगी तब तक उन में से कोई भी भाषा पनप नहीं सकती। यहां पर दक्षिण के लोगों का विरोध एक माने में मैं समझ सकता हूं। शायद उनको यह भय हो कि अगर हिन्दी में राज काज चलेगा, राज भाषा या सरकारी जवान केन्द्र की बन गई हिन्दी— मैं कुछ एहतियात बरतूंगा और उसे राष्ट्र भाषा नहीं कहूंगा, अपने मित्रों के लिये— तो शायद दक्षिण भारत के लोग जो प्राज नौकरियों में ज्यादा हैं, वे न प्रा पायें। सरकार कहती है कि दक्षिण भारत के डर से हम या कानून बना रहे हैं, लेकिन अगर सरकार में ईमानदारी हो, अगर सरकार उत्तर और दक्षिण के प्रश्न को हल करना चाहती है, वह नहीं चाहती कि उनका सबाब उठे, तो सरकार इसे प्रासानी से कर सकती है। अब तक जितनी भी केन्द्राय नौकरियों में खास तौर से दक्षिण भारत के लोग को मिला, उनका प्रासत सरकार निकाल ले और हमेशा के लिये उतने स्थान उन के लिये सुरक्षित कर दे। या जिस तरह से लोक सभा और राज्य सभा के लिये राज्यों के स्थान सुरक्षित हैं उसी तरह से नौकरियों के लिये कर दे, या यह कर दे कि उन्हें राज भाषा पढ़नी तो पड़ेगी लेकिन दस पन्द्रह साल तक उस के नगर नहीं जोड़े जायेंगे। इस तरह से व्यवस्था की जा सकती है, लेकिन यह तभी हो सकता है जब कि सरकार के मन में यह हो कि देश की बोली

यहां चले। अगर सरकार के मन में यह जमा हुआ है कि १ या २ फी सदी लोगों द्वारा बोली जाने वाली भाषा, लच्छेदार टामी इंग्लिश यहां की भाषा बनी रहे तो यहां के हिन्दी, तमिल, तेलूगू बंगला बोलने वालों पर अफसरो का रोब पड़ेगा और वे गमशेंगे कि मुझ से वे लोग बड़े आदिमी हैं और मैं उन से हीन आदिमी हूं, और इस मतलब से यह विषयक लाया गया है तो कोई रास्ता हमारे लिये नहीं है।

जो हमारे मित्रों नेत्र कायम के मित्र हैं मैं उन से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि हम को उनकी लड़ाई पसन्द है। भाषा के मामले में अगर वे कहते हैं कि इस देश की राज भाषा तमिल बने, इस देश की राज भाषा तेलूगू बने क्योंकि हिन्दी को वे नहीं चाहते हैं, तो यह तो मेरी समझ में प्रा सकता है। कम से कम मैं तब यह समझता कि वे मही मानों में गरीबों का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं और वहां पर जो ८० या ८५ फी सदी जनता की इच्छा के मुताबिक वह कहते हैं.....

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** वे ऐसा नहीं चाहते हैं।

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** नहीं चाहते। यह मेरी समझ में प्राता है लेकिन वे इसको नहीं चाहते हैं। वे तो प्राथम्य कर हिन्दी का अन्ध रूप से विरोध कर रहे हैं। इस लिये उन की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं प्राती है। ऐसा लगता है कि यह कुछ ऐसे लोगों की बात है जो कि कुछ स्वाधियों का इस देश में एकाधिपत्य चाहते हैं और हमारे मित्र उन लोगों के हाथों में खेल रहे हैं। असली बात यह है मैं तो कहता हूं कि यहां पर अंग्रेजी की बात क्यों उठती है? अगर अन्नादुराई और प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू मान जायें तो मैं तो कहूंगा हिन्दी वाले इलाकों से कि तुम भी मान जाओ इस देश की राज काज की भाषा, केन्द्रीय भाषा तमिल को मान नो, लेकिन क्या इस के लिये हमारे मित्र तैयार हैं? कि अंग्रेजी का प्रेम उन के मन में जमा हुआ है इसलिए वे कहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी रहे।

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

इसी तरह से एक और विकल्प निकल सकता है कि केन्द्र बहुभाषी बने। देश के दो इलाके कर दें, एक हिन्दी इलाका और एक और हिन्दी इलाका। हिन्दी वाले इलाकों का पत्र व्यवहार केन्द्र से हिन्दी में हो, सारी लिखत पढ़त हिन्दी में हो, दक्षिण भारत में उन की भाषा में सारी लिखत पढ़त हो, यह उनका अधिकार है कि वे अपने यहां से केन्द्र से पत्रव्यवहार में अंग्रेजी को रखें, लेकिन घात यह होनी चाहिये कि वे अपने राज्य में अंग्रेजी नहीं चला सकते। उनको अपनी ही बोली वहां पर चलानी पड़ेगी, अपनी मातृ भाषा चलानी पड़ेगी। अगर वे इस प्रकार की बात कहें तो हम समझ सकते हैं, लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। वे लोग अंग्रेजी को अंग्रेजी से प्रेम के कारण नहीं बल्कि २ प्रतिशत लोगों के स्वार्थ के कारण कायम रखना चाहते हैं। दरअसल यहां पर अंग्रेजी हिन्दी के सवाल के पीछे यह बात है।

इस विधेयक पर तीन तरह के लोग बोले। एक तो वे जो चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी को कायम रखा जाये, दूसरे वे जो नहीं चाहते कि अंग्रेजी कायम रहे मगर चाहते हैं कि वह धीरे धीरे जाय और जब हिन्दी भाषा लायक बन जाय वह राज भाषा के रूप में आ जाय, तीसरे वे लोग चाहते हैं कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी दोनों कायम रहें। मैं तीनों में से एक भी नहीं। हम लोग जो अंग्रेजी को धीरे धीरे हटाना चाहते हैं और जो लोग हमेशा के लिये उस को कायम रखने के हक में हैं उन दोनों में कोई फर्क नहीं पाते। दोनों एक हैं। क्योंकि धीरे धीरे कोई चीज नहीं जाती है, न आज तक गई है पन्द्रह सालों में। क्यों? अंग्रेजी हटी है किसी भी तरह से यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। अंग्रेजी हटने का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि जहां पर दर्जा तीन से अंग्रेजी नहीं पढ़ाई जाती थी वह अब दर्जा तीन से पढ़ाई जायगी। अंग्रेजी हटाने का मतलब यह होता कि शिक्षा का माध्यम बदला होता। यहां

पर एक तरह के स्कूल चलते, हमारे मंत्रियों के सड़के, जो बड़े कलेक्टर या आई० सी० एस० आफिसर हैं, उन के सड़के, बड़े बड़े विजिनेसमैन के सड़के, पसतनों के आफिसरों के सड़के पब्लिक स्कूलों और वेहराबून में न पढ़ते। एक तरह के और समान स्कूल बनते।

श्री हनुमन्तैया : उधर सत्याग्रह करो जी।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अगर श्री श्री हनुमन्तैया साथ दें तो हम को बहुत बल मिलेगा इस में। यह सब चीजें चल रही हैं साथ साथ। वे देश में दो तरह के नागरिक, दो तरह के शहरी बनाना चाहते हैं, एक अंग्रेजी जानने वाले और दूसरे अंग्रेजी न जानने वाले। दूसरे लोगों में हीन भाव पैदा हो और पहले वाले मजे में ठाठ से हुकूमत करे। जब कहा जाता है कि वे पब्लिक स्कूलों को तोड़ दें तब यह जवाब दिया जाता है कि अगर हम उन्हें तोड़ दें तो कलेक्टर कहां से मिलेगा इमलिये मजबूर हो कर चला रहे हैं। ऐसा मालूम होता है मानो वे हम पर मेहरबानी कर रहे हैं, जनता के साथ मेहरबानी कर रहे कलेक्टर कमिश्नर बन कर या आफिसर बन कर। असल में वह लोग जम कर वहां रहना चाहते हैं और १ प्रतिशत लोग जनता का शोषण कर रहे हैं। यह जो तर्क दिया जाता है कि धीरे धीरे हटाया जायगा तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी इस तरह से कभी नहीं हट सकती। न तो वह पन्द्रह सालों में हटी है और न आगे ही हटेगी क्योंकि यहां पर उसको अनिश्चित काल तक के लिये लाया जा रहा है।

विधेयक में कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं जो परस्पर विरोधी हैं। एक तरफ तो विधेयक में कहा गया :

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from

the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi,—”

यानी हिन्दी के अलावा इस्तेमाल होगी। अर्थात् इस देश का राज काज का प्रमुख भाषा हिन्दी ही होगी, लेकिन फिर प्रायः क्या कहते हैं।

(a) for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and”

फिर कहते हैं :

“(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament.”

इस के बाद साफ हो जाता है जब सेक्शन ५ में कहते हैं :

“A translation in Hindi published under the authority of the President in the Official Gazette on and after the appointed day,—

(a) of any Central Act of any Ordinance promulgated by the President”

उस में फिर ट्रांसलेशन की क्या बात है जब अंग्रेजी “इन ऐडिशन” इस्तेमाल हो रही है? मूल भाषा तो हिन्दी होगी जो कि आप के केन्द्र की राज काज की बोली होगी। इस का क्या मतलब है कि वह ट्रांसलेशन होगा। यह जो दो विरोधी बातें हैं वे बिल्कुल हमारी भावना के विपरीत जाती हैं। इस का मतलब है कि सरकार का दिमाग खुद साफ नहीं है। वह खुद उत्तर और दक्षिण का सवाल उठाती है। सरकार इस देश में पूर्णतः गरीबी को दूर करने में असफल रही है, सरकार इस देश की समस्याओं को हल करने में असफल रही और चीन के हमले ने तो सरकार को बिल्कुल ही नंगा कर दिया। सरकार ने उत्तर दक्षिण की भाषा के सवाल को उठा और जो असली समस्याएँ हैं, कोशिश की है वे जनता के सामने न आयें। इस देश की जनता उत्तर दक्षिण में, हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान में और ऐसे दूसरे

मसलों में उलझ जाय और सरकार को नंग न करे और सरकार की नीतियों को जांच पड़ताल कर के उन को समाप्त न करे। बरअसल यह ऐसा विधेयक है जिस से देश में उत्तर और दक्षिण का सवाल पैदा हुआ। संविधान जब सन् १९५० में बन गया और संविधान निर्मात्री सभा ने जब एक समस्या को हमेशा के लिये हल करने के तय कर दिया तो आज १५ साल बाद इस प्रश्न को क्यों खोला जाता है। यहाँ दक्षिण और उत्तर का तो कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं है।

श्री त्यागी : क्या मैं सरकारी नुमायन्दा हूँ जो आप मेरी तरफ देख कर बोलते हैं ?

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं मानता हूँ कि आप सरकारी नुमायन्दे नहीं हैं। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह उत्तर दक्षिण का सवाल तो सरकार ने उठाया है। यह सवाल तो सरकार के शिक्षा विभाग ने उठाया है, उसकी यह नीति है कि यह भेद चलता रहे ताकि अंग्रेजी आपने आप चले। अगर सरकार दक्षिण और उत्तर के प्रश्न को हल करना चाहती हो तो वह नौकरियों के लिए उचित व्यवस्था करके ऐसा कर सकती थी, और अगर ऐसा किया गया होता तो आज सन् १९६५ के दो साल पहले इस बिल को लाने की नीबत न आती और राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण के समय जो घटना घटी वह न घटती।

तो मैं विनम्र निवेदन करूंगा कि भाषा का सम्बन्ध जनतंत्र से, समाजवाद से और राष्ट्र सम्मान से है। अगर आप ये चीजें चाहते हैं तो आपको अपनी भाषा लानी होगी। क्या कोई जन भाषा के बिना जनतंत्र की कल्पना कर सकता है। जहाँ जनता अंग्रेजी न जानती हो वहाँ क्या आप अंग्रेजी में शासन का काम काज चलाकर जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। यह सम्भव नहीं है। बिना लोग भाषा के लोकतंत्र सम्भव नहीं है।

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

जहाँ तक हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी का सवाल है, मैं उनमें कोई फर्क नहीं मानता। जो यह सवाल उठाया जाता है, इसको साफ किया जाना चाहिए। मेरा निवेदन है कि कुछ भी करो लेकिन दो फीसदी अंग्रेजी जानने वालों की भाषा में राज काज नहीं होना चाहिए। हम किसी हद तक भी जाने को तैयार हैं, लेकिन अंग्रेजी नहीं रहनी चाहिए क्योंकि वह सामन्तों की बोली है, वह शोषण की बोली है।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur):** I have a submission to make. The Members hailing from the non-Hindi areas also should be given an opportunity to participate, and especially those hailing from the Madras State where this is a vital problem. I would like to bring this to your kind notice.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall keep that in view. Congress Members will take ten minutes each. I have got a long list before me.

**Shri Khadilkar (Khed):** May I make a submission? At least one representative from every State or every region must be given a full opportunity to have his say. It is not a Congress or a non-Congress issue; it is a national issue.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But the time is limited. We have only about two hours left.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** May I submit that at least one Member from each State should be called upon to speak and give his views?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall try to do that.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** But that is not being done.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But the time is also limited. We have only two hours left for the general discussion.

**Shri Radhe Lal Vyas (Ujjain):** It may be extended by one hour, because the Hon. Speaker had mentioned that the time could be extended by one hour if necessary.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall convey the request to the Hon. Speaker. But, today we have only two hours left.

**Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat):** May I submit that the time allotted for the second reading may be reduced by one hour or so?

**श्री योगेन्द्र झा (मधुबानी):** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ कि समय दल के आधार पर दिया जाता है या उत्तर दक्षिण और भाषा के आधार पर?

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय:** पार्टी की संख्या के आधार पर।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Today, we have only two hours left. I would request the Congress Members not to take more than ten minutes each. Now, Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri.

**Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri (Ghatal):** I am glad that you have given me ten minutes, and even if those ten minutes start from three o'clock, I shall try and see that I say what I have got to say within that time, but I hope you will kindly give me a minute or two more if I cannot do so.

Since my time is limited, I shall only deal with this question from three basic facts. The first basic fact is that I am an Indian, and there is only one country for me—there is no north or south, no east or west—and that is India. For me, there is one culture only, neither the Dravidian nor the Mongolian nor the Aryan but the Indian culture. And it stems from one and the same thing, namely, that we are all sons of the same Mother. I heard my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee saying 'In my Father's house, there are many mansions'. But I would say that my Mother's house has only one hall, and I have got



brethren there. When they progress, I progress, and when they are defeated, I am defeated. That is the way that I look at the matter. I feel that the culture is one. I am not denying that in regions that same culture has taken different shapes and forms. I agree that those shapes and forms must be kept up. The luminosity is one, the light is one, but the way that the light is lit may be different from one place to another.

तमेव भान्त्म् अनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा  
सर्वमिदं विभाति ।

This light is one. The light glows, as I said, from what is native in India, from what is native in the Indian. Therefore, when I consider the question whether the English tongue should continue to be a supplementary tongue for official purposes, I look at the question from this point of view. I say and say at once that I have no special love for the English language in excess of my love for my own language and the other languages which are native languages of India. So far as the English language is concerned, it is a great language, and it is a grand language. Both as a nation and as an individual, I feel that we have reason to be grateful to that language and to those who taught that language.

But, having said that, I cannot imagine that any independent country can survive by transacting its official business, and its expressions of its opinions and its thoughts and its sentiments and its emotions in any language other than something which has its origin in its own country. And this being a multilingual place, or a multilingual country, I agree also that I as a Bengali Member find greater facility in expressing myself in Bengali, my hon. friends from Tamil Nad in Tamil, and my other friends from other parts of India in the other languages, but we are now discussing or debating a matter free from sentiment and in the field of practicality.

And in that field of practicality, my submission to you is this.

We have got to think of continuing our progress and our endeavours at governance and our endeavours at carrying on the business of this House. Rightly or wrongly we have framed the law, and whether other friends may like it or not, we have to remember that a situation does exist today and that is borne out by the report made by the Official Language Commission and the Parliamentary Committee on the Official Language, that we are not roady still with the Hindi language to transact all that we have to do in that language throughout the length and breadth of the country.

This Bill gets my wholehearted support, and for this reason, namely, that it follows what has been visualised and what has been laid down in the Constitution.

Now, I come to my second point. The Constitution is there. There is no motion before this House for amending the Constitution. That being so, we have got to see what flows from the Constitution. Does this piece of legislation which is being proposed carry out the intention of the Constituent Assembly as expressed in the Constitution or does it not? My humble submission is that it does. If you look at the articles, what do you find? I have no time to read out the articles, but I think I am repeating them correctly when I say that in article 343 (1) the first thing which is enshrined is this that Hindi shall be the official language. There is no going away from that mandate given in the Constitution. Whether I like it or not, it is there. Then, the Constitution provides in the exigencies of time for English to continue for a period, and once it has continued for that period, for reviewing the situation. Also, provisions are there for making periodic reviews of the situation by setting up commissions, at the end of five years for the first time, and at the end of ten years for the second time, and by the end of the

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

third period of five years, it was expected and it was hoped that there would not be any necessity for its continuance.

This Bill does not aim at suppressing any regional language, be it Bengali, be it Hindi, be it Tamil or be it Malayalam or any other. What it aims at is merely to try and provide for another period of time in which we shall be in a position to discard English for our official purposes, and that time is left indefinite and for a very important and very good reason. We have foreseen while making the Constitution that at the end of fifteen years we may not be in a position to change the language. But to have to come back to this House over and over again either for abridging the period or for prolonging the period is something which should be avoided, if possible. This is a very serious issue. It always raises sentiments and emotions in different parts of the country, which if allowed to grow would tend to create fissiparous tendencies, and it is proper and right and meet that we do not raise those controversies over and over again.

Therefore, I believe that what has been done in this particular measure is correct, namely, that there should not be any definite period laid down; but the Constitution has said that there should be an examination of the situation. Clause 4 of the Bill provides for a review of the situation at the end of ten years and that review must be done by representatives of Parliament elected by the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote. Therefore, it would be an elective body having representatives of all sections of Indians who would be in a position to go into the matter as to whether the time is ripe to discard English or it is necessary to continue English or it is necessary to do something else. That brings me to the end of the second point.

The third point is a technical one and I will just take three minutes to deal with it. I am sorry I cannot elaborate on it having regard to your ruling that I should not take more than ten minutes.

**An Hon. Member:** Ten minutes?

**Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri:** Yes, that was the ruling given.

The first point I make is this. There has been a debate as to whether 'may' should be there or 'shall' should be there. Speaking for myself—I do not draw on my knowledge of law—reading the clause as an ordinary person with a certain amount of knowledge of English—I do not claim any great knowledge of English—it appears to me that what is proposed to be done, namely the introduction of the word 'shall' is going to offend in this way: we have enshrined Hindi in the Constitution. We have said that Hindi shall be the official language. Are we now, after ten years or twelve years, going to say that although that is so, English shall be a parallel language? Or is it our intention that we may be permitted to use English as an auxiliary or secondary means of expression? If that is so, 'may' is necessary and 'shall' should not be put in here. The Constitution being there, it would, in my humble submission, be—if nothing else—at least a moral disobedience of the Constitution to put the word 'shall' in place of 'may'. The proper word is 'may'; it does not offend anybody. Whether 'may' means 'may not' is another matter. Suppose 'may' does mean 'may not'. Who may not? If 'may' is there, I am not prevented from speaking in English here. I am not prevented from corresponding with the Government of India in English. I am not prevented from having any official transaction in the English language. Some gentlemen in the Government of India may not use English. They may not use it even today. They may use Hindi instead of English. They are not obliged to use

English. Therefore, in my submission, the word 'may' should be there.

The next point is, again, relating to clause 4. I have already expressed my views on that clause. What is being done, if clause 4 is left as it is, is this. At the end of the period of ten years, there might be a preponderance of Hindi-speaking people on that particular Committee. I am not afraid of Hindi. Not at all. It is true that it is not my mother tongue. But I believe that the intellect of the non-Hindi-speaking people of India, the intellect of the entire people of India, is such that we can learn a language and transact every possible business in that language without fear of any competition from anybody whose mother tongue happens to be that language. If that had not been so, in the profession in which I am, I would not have found the English people going away giving place to us. Until 1947, we had to conduct ourselves in the English language. There was no difficulty about it. They had to pack up and go away. Why? Not because India was not good for their health, but for the simple reason that they found the competition too much.

I take this pride, that as a Bengali, as an Indian and certainly as a person who is non-Hindi speaking, if I were called upon to do so. I can understand and learn that language and compete with anybody whose mother tongue is Hindi. What I say is this:

“वलैव्यं मा स्म गमः पार्थ नैतत्त्वय्युपपद्यते ।  
क्षुद्रं हृदयदीर्घं त्यक्त्वोत्तिष्ठ परन्तप ॥”

Forget those fears. I am not afraid of my nationals. I am not afraid of any Indian. I do not think that it is the desire of any section of the people of India to preach or to carry out or exhibit imperialist tendencies. I do not think there would be any overbearing or overburdening of any culture or any language by reason of the fact that that language is the official language and no other.

So far as the development of languages is concerned, there is ample provision, and all the States can develop their languages, as they have been doing in the different regions. The Prime Minister has informed the House that he is satisfied that those regional languages are developing.

Coming to my last point, I do not see the Home Minister. If he had been here, I would have requested him to do one thing.

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis):** I will convey it to him.

**Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri:** I am glad my hon. friend is here. Having regard to the fact that there is a feeling that ten years hence the assurance given by the Prime Minister may not be remembered and other people—people other than those like me—may be here who may not remember or honour the assurance or forget it, would it be possible to have inscribed in clause 4 something to the effect that the report that might eventually be made be put before Parliament and circulated to the different State Governments? It is a small request. I do not insist on it. But if it could be done, it would be good; it would satisfy a great number of

I thank you very much for the time given to me. I am sorry I had taken two more minutes than I had intended people.

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah:** We have been discussing a most important question facing our country. It has been rightly pointed out by the Speaker while giving permission to initiate discussion in this House that this is a very delicate problem and we should restrain ourselves without exhibiting emotion and sentiment on this very vital problem that concerns the integrity of our country.

When the House met here on February 18, and subsequently, most unfortunate scenes were created and

[Shri P. Venkatasubbiah]

displayed here so far as this problem is concerned. In this connection, I would like to say that some of the Hindi fanatics in this country feel that attack is the best form of defence and the best way to promote Hindi is to eliminate English. In this connection, I would, at the same time, pay a tribute to many of our Hindi-speaking friends for the restraint and sympathy they have shown and for the co-operation they have given in this hon. House to maintain decorum and dignity. In the same breath, I would also like to pay my tribute to the D.M.K. friends here, who had been alleged to be very fanatic and very jealous about this problem. So when we discuss this problem, we should not give way to emotion or sentiment.

In our experience, we can see that this language problem often takes its source from a very different angle. When the Justice Party was founded in Madras, though it had a political bearing, it was born mostly out of the frustration of the non-Brahmin elements and officers who could not find their way and rightful places in the political or administrative set-up of the country. There is a maxim, 'community is above country and myself above community. Unfortunately, that has been so in this country; we attribute motives giving political colour to every important problem that concerns the welfare of the country. We are being watched not only by people in this country but by people in every other part of the world, how we behave, how we conduct ourselves when such a national problem confronts us. With these aspects in mind, I would like to say a few words on this problem.

I come from a State which is the happy meeting ground not only of two great religions, Hinduism and Islam, but is a happy fusion of different cultures, different languages. Hyderabad is the replica of modern India. So, when we speak on such a burning problem, we must exercise sobriety and restraint.

I have heard with rapt attention the speeches made on the floor of the House. The point has been well made out by Shri Mahatab and other friends that there is no rivalry between Hindi and English as such. How best can Hindi be made to progress so that it takes its rightful place, so that it can be understood and appreciated by the people living in the non-Hindi areas, is the problem.

The other day, the Home Minister, speaking in Varanasi, gave a word of caution to those of the Hindi-speaking area. He pointed out that non-Hindi people constituted 60 per cent. of the population, and that only 40 per cent. spoke Hindi. He added it was the bounden duty and responsibility of the Hindi-speaking people to respect the sentiments and wishes of the others. It is no exaggeration to say that it has become the great, burning topic of the day so far as the non-Hindi areas are concerned.

This morning I saw a report of the speech made by the West Bengal Chief Minister, Shri Sen, regarding this problem. He has said that Hindi should not be thrust on the non-Hindi people, while every effort is made for the progress of Hindi. In a multi-lingual country like India, to choose an official language is really a big problem. In its wisdom the Constituent Assembly came to the conclusion that Hindi should be the official language of our country, and it was incorporated in the Constitution. There is no dispute about that. After its incorporation in the Constitution, there was ample time for the protagonists of Hindi to develop it so that it might attract the affection of the non-Hindi people. They could have introduced Hindi in the universities in the Hindi-speaking States like Madhya Pradesh, U.P., Rajasthan and Bihar. They could have propagated it. The slogan of one language for this country was given by the Father of the Nation even in the pre-independence days. So they had ample time, but I regret to say that

no attempt has so far been made in that direction except to bring pressure on the Government. So, I would point out that people coming from the Hindi areas should certainly respect the wishes of the people of non-Hindi areas.

As I do not have much time, I would say briefly that the Bill that has been brought forward by the hon. Home Minister, who though gentle and meek is yet firm in his conviction, is a happy compromise, as Shri Hem Barua pointed out, between the Hindi fanatics and the non-Hindi people.

I am not a lawyer, and I do not wish to say much about this word "may", whether it should be substituted by "shall" or not. It is for legal pundits and the State lawyers to say which is suitable.

Apart from that, the assurance given by the Minister while introducing this Bill and the speech made by the Prime Minister, will come as a sort of solace to the non-Hindi people that their interests are safe with the Prime Minister, and that they can accept this Bill.

With these remarks, I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** In rising to participate in this debate, I want to clarify an impression that has been created by the point of order that I sought to raise yesterday. Some people have taken it that my purpose in moving that point of order was to obstruct that passage of the Bill. So, I want to make it very clear that my sole purpose in raising that point of order was to see that the declared objective of the Bill might not be frustrated by some legal difficulties at subsequent stages.

Broadly speaking, I am in agreement with the declared objects of the Bill. What are the declared objects of the Bill? In the Statement of Objects

and Reasons it has been stated that in order to give effect to the policy of the Government as indicated by the Prime Minister, this Bill has been brought forward. Many speakers have referred to the Prime Minister's assurance. My DMK friends also referred to that assurance which was displayed in all the South Indian States in bold types when this country was threatened by foreign aggression, namely that English would 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." The question is to what extent the provisions of the present Bill give effect to that assurance.

One part of it, the permissive continuance of English after 1965, is more or less ensured. Of course, we do not know what the fate of this provision will be after ten years, but after 1965 for at least ten years English will continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that date.

But apprehension is continuing as to the second part of the assurance given by the Prime Minister, namely "I would not take it (English) away till I was asked to take it away by the non-Hindi speaking areas." The Prime Minister has stated that that assurance stands, and that he and his Government would stand by that assurance, but I fail entirely to understand what prevents Government from coming forward with some kind of statutory provision to give effect to that assurance. I am reminded of another occasion. You know the controversy about the ceding of territory of Berubari to Pakistan. There also our Prime Minister gave an assurance to another country. For that reason, ultimately the Constitution had to be amended. A reference was made to the Supreme Court and the Supreme

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

Court said that the action was illegal and unconstitutional. In order to keep up that assurance and honour of the Prime Minister to a foreign country, the Constitution could be amended. What prevents the Government from coming forward making similar statutory provision to give effect to the assurance given in the second part of this assurance which was considered very wise and which was displayed in all the South Indian States in big posters that English would not be taken away, when the country was threatened by foreign aggression. Now, when the time has come to give some tangible shape to that assurance we find the Government fighting shy of giving it any statutory shape.

I would like to say a word or two about the apprehensions in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking States. Reference was made here by the previous speaker to a statement by the present Chief Minister of West Bengal. Day before yesterday, he made a statement to the Press and he stated categorically that West Bengal is not in favour of making Hindi the national language at least till all the non-Hindi States are ready and willing to accept it as such. He also suggested certain amendments to the Bill that is moved here.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** I am glad that you endorse him in this respect at least.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** Yes. It is not very often that I agree with him.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** You agree with him here.

**Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:** I agree when people are right. At least I find once Mr. P. C. Sen to be right. In regard to the reviewing committee proposed to be appointed after ten years under clause 4 of the Bill, he has suggested that it should be so

amended that only the unanimous decision of the reviewing committee would be acceptable. He has also proposed, as has been proposed by certain West Bengal friends from the other side, that this report and its recommendations should be sent to the States for obtaining their views and the President should issue orders or directions after considering that. I fail to understand what Dr. Mahtab wanted to convey when he said that the States should not sit in judgment over the reports of parliamentary committees. There are many provisions in our Constitution where the enactments of Parliament have to go to the States for obtaining their views thereon. There is no reason, legal or moral or political, which should prevent us from inserting a clause whereby the report of the reviewing committee which would be appointed after ten years should be referred to the States. I hope the Home Minister would take that suggestion into account.

I want to assure my Hindi-speaking friends that there is nothing in this Bill which alters the status of Hindi as the official language. So long as this Constitution stands, we all stand by the provision in the Constitution that Hindi in Devanagiri script should be the official language. But at the same time as I have understood the constitutional scheme as elaborated in Part XVII of the Constitution, it was more a practical question as to how to raise Hindi to that status and that is why reviewing commissions and committees were to be appointed. Even in this Bill we have made a provision for a review committee. So, that status remains. The only question is when and how. That shall have to be taken into consideration by our friends from Hindi speaking areas. I hope they would show, as the overwhelming majority of the Members from the non-Hindi speaking areas have shown, a sense of understanding and a grave sense of responsibility over this matter.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you for asking me to participate in this discussion. I come from Madras where... (An Hon. Member: Tamil Nad) the feelings and passions of the people have been roused over this language issue which is a vital problem. It is not only a problem for the DMK; it is a problem for the party to which I have the honour to belong. After all, we have got to face the issue. It is not a question of the DMK alone. It is a question of the feelings of the people of Tamil Nad, and the feelings of the people of South India and also of the non-Hindi speaking areas in our mother-land. On the 18th of February, what did we witness? When the President of India was addressing the Joint Session of Parliament, the Hindi enthusiasts have done the greatest disservice, as rightly pointed out by our revered Prime Minister this morning, by staging that demonstration.

**An Hon. Member:** They do not represent the whole of the Hindi world.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** You must listen to the viewpoint of non-Hindi areas also. You must have tolerance. I know friends from the Hindi areas... (Interruptions.) Some of them realise the passion of the people who hail from non Hindi areas and they have been tolerant. We are very grateful to you.

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** Thank you.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** That is the spirit that they should adopt in future also. That is my humble suggestion. Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I respectfully request you, as I am the only speaker from Tamil Nad, not to insist on ten minutes?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will give the hon. Member two more minutes.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** Then I have finished my speech. Unless you give me twenty minutes, I am not going to speak; there is no point in speaking.

**Some Hon. Members:** Go on.

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** What did we witness on that day? If they cannot show a spirit of tolerance and amity to the other fellow beings of this motherland, what can we expect from them, we who form 60 per cent of the population?

As mentioned by the hon. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri the other day in Banaras—(Interruption).

**Shri P. E. Patel:** Who told you so?

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** It was given out by no less a person than the hon. Mover of this Bill. (Interruption). Even if I were to mention one or two facts, you cannot tolerate. I am really surprised.

**Shri P. E. Patel:** I am from a non-Hindi speaking area.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He does not mean Tamilian; he means non-Hindi speaking people.

**Shri P. E. Patel:** I am one of them

**Shri Ramanathan Chettiar:** I do not include you probably. There may be others. (Interruption). The President of India represents the Constitution and if the hon. Members of Parliament representing lakhs of people behave in this manner in the precincts of Parliament, what can the people of India expect from such representatives? That is the poser which I would like to pose before this hon. House.

There is one other point. At the stage of the introduction of the Bill on the 13th April, what did we witness? Parliamentary democracy has come to such a state when one hon. Member even tried to break one of the mike

[Shri Ramanathan Chettiar]

rods not knowing that the rod has electricity and that it was a danger not only to his life but also to the lives of the other people. This is the way things are done.

One Swamiji is doing hawan or whatever it is.

An Hon. Member: Homam.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: I cannot say what it is. He is doing it within the precincts of Parliament. That shows they are abusing the very democratic principles of our Constitution. Even at the stage of introduction, if hon. Members who hail from the Hindi areas behaved like this, God help this country and its people. After all, everyone among the 43 crores of citizens of this country is imbued with a spirit of nationalism, and they are not a wit behind anybody else and more so, those who hail from the non-Hindi speaking areas; they are not secondary in importance. They are as important as those people who hail from the Hindi areas. Let this be understood by my hon. friends who hail from the Hindi areas.

I would like to dilate upon a matter which was mainly responsible for the birth and growth of Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam in my own State. In 1938, when Shri C. Rajagopalachariar was the Chief Minister of Madras, they tried to introduce Hindi and that too compulsorily. That gave birth to the Dravida Kazhagam movement started by my revered friend, Shri E. V. Ramaswami Naicker.

An Hon. Member: Periyar.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: From that time, their main plan was anti-Hindi. If only then that compulsory Hindi was not introduced all this passion and all these feelings will not have been there. But, for this, I do not apportion blame to anybody. But, unfortunately, at that time, they did not realise how the people's passions and feelings would be roused. Then, when the Constitution was implemented in 1950, Hindi was put in as

the official language, or rather, as they called it, the national language, and that English would go on for 15 years upto 1965, 15 years after the Republic of India had come into existence on the 26th January, 1950. Then naturally, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam which grew out of Dravida Kazhagam had something—to go to the people and say, "Here you are; they are going to thrust Hindi upon us". These are the potential factors which have contributed to this anti-Hindi movement in the south, particularly in Tamil Nad wherefrom I hail. We must face the facts.

Then there is another thing. In 1955, five years after the Constitution came into being, they appointed a Language Commission, and the Commission went round the various States and took evidence. My late, revered friend and leader Dr. P. Subbarayan, was a member of the Commission and under the chairmanship of Mr. B. G. Kher, this Commission was taking evidence. I only want the hon. Home Minister and the Prime Minister to give weight to the memorandum submitted on behalf of the Government of Madras to this Commission. It is a very reasoned out document and in that the Government of Madras have put very reasonable demands. If only this Bill is in keeping with that demand, then, all this heat would not be there.

Then, it was reiterated yesterday by no less a person than the Chief Minister of West Bengal that English should have an associate status and should not have an inferior status because this assurance was given by no less a person than our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who is not only the leading light in the Asian firmament but is a Messiah of peace in the world. When Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance given on the 4th September is not incorporated here, or when this Bill is not in conformity



with that assurance, naturally the people have doubts and apprehensions about this very legislative measure that is before us. That is one point I would like to make.

Another point is this. There is a lot of quibbling about the word "may" and "shall, and all that. If, according to the Law Minister, "shall" can be taken as "may", what is the great difficulty in substituting "shall" for "may"? I do not understand at all this logic. I would only appeal to the hon. Home Minister that he should take into consideration some of the amendments of the hon. Members and see which is the reasonable amendment that could be incorporated so that the apprehensions and doubts and fears in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people can be removed and there will be a smooth working of this Bill from 1965.

Then, some of us on our side have also tabled an amendment saying that at the time of the review—clause 4 refers to the review to be made after ten years from 1965 regarding the progress made by Hindi—it should be circulated to all the State legislatures. This is a very very reasonable demand on the part of the representatives of the people here. If the Home Minister could incorporate this in any form which is suitable, taking into consideration his legal advisers' views, that will also help to allay the fears and suspicions. After all, the legislatures are the sovereign bodies of the people.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention one thing. Let not this House think that this is a matter that concerns only the DMK. I know the feelings are very high in areas like West Bengal, Orissa and Assam and I know some hon. friends from Maharashtra also have expressed to me some doubts, apart, of course, from the South Indian States—Andhra Pradesh, Mysore, Kerala and Madras. I would like the hon. Home Minister to see that when they are bringing in a legislative measure, they should put a legislative measure on the statute

to see that no section of the people, whether from the north, south, east or west, is affected.

With these words, I whole-heartedly support this Bill and I hope the safeguards I have suggested will be incorporated in it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Mr. Maniyangadan.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** May I know if Gujarat is excluded, because it is neither in the north nor in the south?

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** It is in the middle.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Mr. Patel will get his turn.

**Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this issue regarding the language, as stated by the Prime Minister this morning, is not one between two languages English and Hindi or between Hindi and other languages of India. When the Constitution was framed in 1950, the framers of the Constitution decided that Hindi should be the official language of India. The people of India accepted it. I, coming from Kerala State, had accepted that and I do not want that Hindi should be changed from the status of official language of India. I want that it should be continued.

At that time, in 1950, when the Constitution was given to us, Hindi was not in a position to be used for all official purposes. There are certain conditions to be fulfilled before a language can be used for official purposes of a nation. Those conditions were not fulfilled by Hindi and Hindi was not in such a position. Therefore, for some time they wanted that English should continue to be the official language of India. Then it was expected that within 15 years, Hindi might reach a stage when it could be used for all official purposes in India. Now we find that Hindi has not grown up to that stage. That is an unfortunate position. I am not happy over

[Shri Maniyangadan]

that. I submit it is really unfortunate. I do not want to cast the blame on the Government or on anybody else. Whatever be the reason, the actual fact is that Hindi remains almost in the same position as it stood in 1950.

Before independence, during the freedom struggle, Mahatma Gandhi was trying his best to spread Hindi throughout India. I, who belonged to a native State at that time, remember that we were trying our best to study Hindi. Several voluntary organisations were trying their best to spread Hindi throughout India at that time. But after 1950, when Hindi was accepted as official language of India, I submit with regret, that enthusiasm for studying and spreading Hindi was lost. I do not know the reason for that. That is a matter which must be looked into. The reason must be found out and eradicated. Hindi must be allowed to grow to a position where it would take over the position of English. So long as that is not done, there is no meaning in saying that people from the non-Hindi-speaking areas are fanatic or the Hindi-speaking areas are fanatic. We must face facts. Hindi is not now in a position to take over the place of English. That is a fact.

For people who come from non-Hindi speaking areas, there is this difficulty that we do not know Hindi. We have got so many difficulties. If Hindi is to be used for all official purposes, we will be under so many handicaps and we will have to suffer so many drawbacks. In order to avoid that, these people desire that English should continue for some time more.

Regarding the use of the word 'may' in clause 3, there is an argument that this legislation is intended to remove the restriction regarding the use of English after 1965. That means, after 26th January 1965, if this legislation is not passed, English could not be used. This legislation permits such of those who desire to use English for official

purposes. Hindi could be used for all official purposes, but English also may be used. That definitely means, without any legal knowledge, one can say, it may or it may not also be used. If a particular officer decides that English should not be used, he can very well give a direction that Hindi alone should be used, because the legislation permits it. So, I submit that a very definite and clear provision must be made that English will continue to be used for all official purposes up to a period, which I am not certain. I am not certain when that period will come. I have no objection in fixing a period, if anybody wants that, provided anybody can assure that when that period is reached, Hindi would be in a position to take over the place of English. If this was not possible during the last 15 years, I do not think it will be possible for Hindi during the next 10 years to take the place of English, if the present attitude towards Hindi is continued. So long as it is not possible to lay down a period within which Hindi will be in a position to take over the place of English, we need not fix any period. But this thing must be definite. In deference to the assurance given by the Prime Minister, if that assurance has any value, it must not be left to a petty officer here and there to say, "I am not going to use English." My submission is there must be a definite and clear provision that English alone would be used. When I say that, I do not mean that Hindi should not be used. The Law Minister has stated that in certain circumstances 'shall' will be interpreted as 'may'. In this particular case, 'may' definitely means 'may not.' So, my submission is the word 'shall' must be used. Otherwise, there is no meaning in that assurance.

I do not want to go into the question of other difficulties that we are facing regarding the Public Service Commission examinations and other things. Of course, this is not the time for that.

The committee that is going to be constituted under clause 4 will submit a report. Some of us have tabled amendments requesting that the report must be sent to the State Legislatures. I have no objection to its being sent to the Governments, as stated by the Prime Minister this morning. Let it be sent to the Governments. What we want is that the opinions expressed by the State Legislatures and the State Governments must be taken into consideration by the President when he passes the order regarding the language. That is what we are keen about. If that is not provided for in the legislation, I am sure that is not going to happen.

Some people say that those who are speaking for English now are not nationalists. I may submit that nationalism consists not in submitting ourselves to one particular language being imposed. We know what nationalism is. As I said in the beginning, we are not against Hindi. We are for one Indian language to be official language for all official purposes in India and we have accepted that to be Hindi. But let us wait for some time. Let the people who speak Hindi and who desire that Hindi should be the official language create an atmosphere where the people from the non-Hindi speaking areas also will accept Hindi and study Hindi. Let Hindi develop sufficiently.

16 hrs.

Now, Sir, what is the Hindi that is obtaining at present? As somebody said, within the Hindi-speaking regions themselves there are several sections speaking several dialects. The Hindi spoken by one section is not understood by another section in the very same area (*Interruption*). In the State of Kerala, Hindi was a compulsory subject in the secondary schools from 1950 onwards. The students who have passed from there, when they come to Delhi, do not know what the people here speak. It is such a Hindi that is spoken here.

**An Hon. Member:** You have Malayalee Hindi.

**Shri Maniyangadan:** It is not Malayalee-Hindi. It is the standard Hindi that we teach. We use textbooks prepared by well known Hindi writers. But when it comes to a matter of speaking it is a well-known fact that the Hindi language is different in different regions. Therefore, we must have a standard for Hindi, in the first place. When that standard Hindi has grown to such a status as to take the place of official language of this nation, we can have it. There is no time limit for that. My submission is, until that time English should continue to be in its present status.

**श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, स्वातन्त्र्य-आन्दोलन के समय दो प्रकार की विचार-धारायें थीं—कुछ लोग नरम दल के अनुयायी थे और दूसरे गर्म दल के अनुयायी। जो नरम दल के अनुयायी थे, उन के नेता थे सर क्रिरोजशाह मेहता। उन लोगों का विचार था कि अंग्रेजी सरकार को नहीं हटाना चाहिए, क्योंकि इस की वजह से देश में एकता बनी हुई है और अगर कोई परिवर्तन किया जा सकता है, तो केवल एक कि सम्राट को यह कहा जाये कि वह भारतीय प्रजा को भी ब्रिटिश प्रजा की तरह प्यार करे। और आई० सी० एस० की परीक्षाएँ यहाँ होने लगे। लेकिन जो गर्म दल के अनुयायी थे, बाल और पाल जिन के प्रमुख नेता माने जाते थे, उन का कहना था कि स्वराज्य हमारा जन्मसिद्ध अधिकार है हम वह लेकर रहेंगे। आज जब इस विधेयक पर विचार हो रहा है, तो बिल्कुल उसी प्रकार की स्थिति इस सदन में भी है और सदन के बाहर भी है।

पर आज तो हम को यह निर्णय लेना है कि स्वतंत्रता के लिए आन्दोलन करते समय हम जिस प्रकार की भाषा और विचार व्यक्त करते थे, क्या अभी भी हम वही हैं या हट

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

चुके हैं? हमारे मनों में अभी भी उसी प्रकार की पवित्रता है या नहीं।

सरकार का यह बिल, जिस को गृह मंत्री ने उपस्थित किया है, सरकार की पिछले पंद्रह सालों की अकर्मण्यता का प्रमाणपत्र है। पर सोचना यह है संविधान में प्रतिज्ञा करने के पश्चात् भी सरकार पिछले पंद्रह सालों में कुछ नहीं कर सकी इस का दायित्व किस पर है? मेरी राय में जहां इस का दायित्व सरकार पर है, वहां इस का बहुत बड़ा दायित्व हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पर भी है।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : पालियामेंट पर भी है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : पालियामेंट उसी में आ जाती है, जिस में व्यास जी भी हैं।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जो समय समय पर कुछ वक्तव्य दिये हैं उन ही का यह दुष्परिणाम है कि पंद्रह साल के बाद भी हम अभी तक इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ आगे नहीं बढ़ पाए। लेकिन फिर भी मैं सरकार के उन विभागों और उन विभागों के प्रमुखों को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ, जिन्होंने दबी जवान और डीले हाथों से, प्रधान मंत्रों का सहयोग न होते हुए भी कुछ तो किया। विशेष रूप से मैं अपना श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करना चाहता हूँ स्वर्गीय गृह मंत्रों, श्री गोविन्द वल्लभ पन्त, के प्रति, जिन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ न कहते हुए बहुत कुछ किया। काश, कहीं प्रधान मंत्रों का भी सहयोग उन को प्राप्त हो गया होता, तो मेरा विश्वास है कि पन्त जी बहुत कुछ कर सकते थे।

परन्तु अब तो सब से बड़ा प्रश्न यह है कि जो सरकार पिछले पंद्रह सालों में कुछ कर सकी, क्या वह १९७० या १९७५ तक कुछ कर सकेगी। जो सरकार पिछले पंद्रह सालों में "नौ दिन चले ढाई कोड़" का नाति का अनुसरण करता रहा है, वह भगले दस वर्षों

में कुछ कर सकेगी, इस का भी तो कुछ विश्वास मिलना चाहिए। मैं चाहता हूँ कि गृह मंत्री अपना उत्तर देते समय इस का उत्तर अवश्य दें। लेकिन अगर वह मुझ से पूछें तो मैं इसके लिए दो मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ।

पहला मुझाव यह है कि सरकार इस विधेयक में इतना सुधार कर दे, तो बहुत अच्छ हो, कि १९६५ के बाद कम से कम सात हिन्दा भाषा राज्यों को इस से पृथक कर दिया जाय शेष नौ राज्यों के साथ केन्द्र का अंग्रेजों में पत्र-व्यवहार आदि होगा। जिन्होंने हिन्दो को राजभाषा मान लिया है और इस बात की घोषणा भा कर दा है कि १९६५ के बाद वे हिन्दा में अपना कारोबार करेंगे, उन प्रान्तों को इस विधेयक में सम्मिलित नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। उन्हें छोड़ कर यह विधेयक लागू विधेयक लागू रहे।

दूसरा मुझाव यह है कि १९७५ में जिस कमेटी के निर्माण का संकेत इस में दिया गया है, अगर सरकार १९५७ तक हिन्दा को संविधान को प्रतिज्ञा के अनुरूप अपने निश्चित लक्ष्य तक पहुंचाना चाहता है, तो वह उसके अतिरिक्त एक और कमेटी बनाए। वह दूसरी कमेटी भी प्रति-वर्ष हिन्दा की प्रगति का निरीक्षण किया करे और प्रति-वर्ष उस की रिपोर्ट कैबिनेट को जाना चाहिए। वह जो कमेटी होगी उस में हिन्दा-भाषा और अहिन्द भाषा दोनों राज्यों के भा सदस्य होंगे गृह मंत्री स्वयं उस के सभापति बनें। लेकिन अगर प्रतिवर्ष हिन्दा का स्थिति का निरीक्षण किया जायगा, तथा १९५७ तक हम अपने निश्चित लक्ष्य तक पहुंच सकेंगे।

जिस एक बात अहिन्द-भाषा राज्यों के सदस्यों ने, और हिन्दा-भाषा राज्यों के सदस्यों ने भी कई बार आज किस न किय रूप में दोहराया है, वह है प्रधान मंत्री हैं आश्वाहन। कुछ न कहा है कि इस विधेयक में प्रधान मंत्रों का आश्वासन पूरा नहीं होता है

इस विधेयक के उद्देश्यों और कारणों के । विवरण में भी प्रधान मंत्री के आश्वासन की चर्चा की गई है । गृह मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, ने भी इस सदन में और सदन के बाहर भी यह कहा है कि यह विधेयक प्रधान मंत्री के आश्वासन के अनुरूप ही तैयार किया गया है । लेकिन क्या मैं पूछ सकता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने यह आश्वासन संविधान सभा में क्यों नहीं दिया जब इस सम्बन्ध में पंद्रह वर्ष की अवधि निर्धारित की जा रही थी । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री का इस प्रकार का आश्वासन देना असंवैधानिक है, या यूँ कहे संविधान की मान्यताओं के विपरीत है, जो कि उन्होंने बाँच बाँच में, स्थान-स्थान पर उन्होंने दिये । जब संविधान में स्पष्ट व्यवस्था यह थी कि १९६५ में सरकार की मुख्य राजभाषा हिन्दी होगी, तो प्रधान मंत्री ने क्यों इस प्रकार के आश्वासन दे कर देश में एक नये आन्दोलन को जन्म देने की स्थिति पैदा की ? जिससे विघटनकारो तत्वों को प्रोत्साहन मिला ?

आप मुझे इस कटु सत्य को कहने की आज्ञा दीजिए कि प्रधान मंत्री का यह आश्वासन उसी प्रकार की भूल है, जिस प्रकार की भूल उन्होंने काश्मीर में जनमत-संग्रह का आश्वासन दे कर कर्मों का था । इस से राष्ट्र-विरोधी शक्तियों को एक नया हथियार मिल गया । आज जो हिन्दी फ़्रैनेटिसिज्म, हिन्दी इम्पॉरियलिज्म, हिन्दी धोपने और हिन्दी लादने आदि का नारा कई जगह लगाया जा रहा है, यह सब प्रधान मंत्री के उसी आश्वासन का दुष्परिणाम है । मैं तो यहाँ तक भा कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कहीं आगे चल कर देश में इसी आधार पर विभाजन का कोई नींव पड़ी, तो हमारे देश के वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री एत दोष से मुक्त नहीं किये जा सकेंगे, जिन के आश्वासनों के परिणामस्वरूप ही इस प्रकार की बातें चली ।

हां, एक बात स्वीकार की जा सकता है । अगर प्रधान मंत्री ऐसा कोई कोई आश्वासन देते कि अगर १९६५ तक हिन्दी के स्वरूप को

सर्वमान्य राजभाषा के रूप में विकसित करना है, तो देश को अन्य क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं में जो शब्द समान रूप से प्रचलित हैं, हिन्दी को उन्हें भी आत्मसात करना चाहिए, क्योंकि इससे हिन्दी की गौरव-वृद्धि होगी ।

प्रधान मंत्री एक और बात भी कह सकते थे । अगर अहिन्दी-भाषा राज्यों को कुछ आशंका है कि १९६५ में हिन्दी आने के बाद सरकारी नौकरियों में हमारा अनुपात कम हो जायेगा, तो प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दी-भाषा राज्यों को कह सकते कि अगर आप १९६५ में हिन्दी को राजभाषा बनाना चाहते हैं, तो इस के लिए कुछ त्याग करें और उस त्याग का सब से बड़ा प्रमाण यह हो सकता है कि अभी तक अहिन्दी-भाषा राज्यों के व्यक्तियों का जो अनुपात सरकारी नौकरियों में रहा है, उस अनुपात को तब तक बनाए रखा जायगा, जब तक कि उन राज्यों में हिन्दी विधिवत् और उसी अर्च्छे रूप में न चल पड़ेगी, जिस प्रकार वह हिन्दी-भाषी राज्यों में चल रही है ।

16.08 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

मुझे अर्च्छा तरह से याद है कि मेरठ के हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन में दक्षिण भारत के प्रमुख नेता, श्री टी० प्रकाशम्, ने कहा था, "हम तो राजभक्त हैं । अंग्रेज आया उस की भाषा सीखी, लेकिन उस में भी तुम से आगे रहे । अब अगर हिन्दा लाओगे, तो हिन्दा की भी तुम से अर्च्छा सीख कर दिवायेंगे, लेकिन तुम लाओ तो सदा ।" परन्तु सरकार का इस दुलमूल नति का तो परिणाम यह है कि जो लोग दक्षिण में हिन्दी सख भाँ गए हैं, वे भी अपने आप को एक विचित्र स्थिति में पाते हैं । परसों प्रधान मंत्री जाँ से एक शिष्ट-मंडल मिलने के लिए गया । उस शिष्ट-मंडल में दक्षिण भारत की एक मान्य विदुषी श्रीमती लक्ष्मी राघवन् भी थीं । उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री से पूछा, "दक्षिण भारत हिन्दी प्रचार सभा,

## [श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

राष्ट्र-भाषा प्रचार समिति और हम लोगों ने स्वयं प्रयास कर के जो हिन्दी का कार्य किया है और हिन्दी पढ़ा है, वह केवल मात्र इस दृष्टि से कि आगे चल कर हिन्दी भारतवर्ष की राजभाषा बनने वाला है: अब आप हमें बताइये कि जब आप का ऐसा दुलमुल नीति है, तो हम उस का क्या प्रायश्चित्त करें? हमारा क्या भविष्य बनेगा, जिन्होंने हिन्दी पढ़ ली, लेकिन आप को दुलमुल नीति से हिन्दी फिर पीछे जा रहा है।'

इसी नीति का दुष्परिणाम यह है कि आज हमारे देश में एंग्लो-इंडियन्ज का एक वर्ग इस प्रकार की बिषला भाषा के शब्दों का प्रयोग करता है। मुझे उन शब्दों के प्रयोग पर कोई आपत्ति विशेष तो यों नहीं है, क्योंकि वह एंग्लो-इंडियन है—वे एंग्लो पहले हैं और इंडियन बाद में है। लेकिन कल उन का और से एक बड़े कड़ेवे शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया। कल यह कहा गया कि जो लोग हिन्दी का बात करते हैं वे हिन्दू का बात करते हैं। शायद इस में श्री फ्रैंक एन्वनी का अपना कोई दोष नहीं है, क्योंकि हम लोग जानते हैं कि लाडं मैकाले किस नीति के आधार पर भारतवर्ष में अंग्रेजों को साये। १८३६ में मैकाले ने अपने पिता को पत्र लिख कर बताया कि हम क्यों भारतवर्ष में अंग्रेजों को लाना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने लिखा :

"No Hindu who has received an English education ever remains sincerely attached to his religion. Some continue to profess it as a matter of policy, but many profess themselves pure Deists and some embrace Christianity. It is my firm belief that if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolator among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence."

यह एक नीति थी जिस आधार पर अंग्रेजी लाई गई, और आज जब उस अंग्रेजी को हटाया जा रहा है तो उस से फ्रैंक एन्वनी साहब को इस

लिये कष्ट होता है कि लाडं मैकाले के स्वप्न अब हिन्दुस्तान से दूतने का तैयार कर रहे हैं। लेकिन भारतवर्ष ने जब अपना स्वतन्त्रता को लड़ाई का था तो उस समय कहा था कि हम अपने देश में जहाँ स्वतन्त्रता चाहते हैं, अपना भाषा चाहते हैं, अपना देश चाहते हैं और इस देश में अपनापन सुरक्षित चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मुझे कहने को आज्ञा दीजिये कि प्रधान मंत्री के स्वरूप को हमने उसी प्रश्न पर तीन बार बदलते देखा है। एक रूप वह जब नेहरू जा स्वतन्त्रता को लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे नैनू सेंट्रल जेल से अपना पुत्र इन्दिरा के नाम उन्होंने एक पत्र लिखा था। वह पत्र इंग्लिश में था एक पुस्तिका प्रकाशित हुई है जिस में पंडित जी के वह सारे पत्र हैं। उन पत्रों के हिन्दी अनुवाद भी छपे हैं। एक स्थान पर उसमें आया है :

"इसलिये यह मुनासिब है कि इनके (राष्ट्रभाषा) इस्तेमाल के लिये जोर दें और विदेशी भाषा के इस्तेमाल को किसा तरह से गरूर का बात न समझें। तुम कहोगा कि मैं भा कितना धोबबाज आदम हूँ। मैं यह खत हा अंग्रेजों में क्यों लिखता हूँ? इस लिये कि मेरा अपना शिक्षा दूषित रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं हिन्दी आसानी से लिख सकूँ। लेकिन अब भविष्य में ज्यादा कर्तव्यपरायण होने का कोशिश करूंगा।"

यह जिस समय हम आज्ञादी का लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे उस समय जवाहरलाल जा के यह विचार थे। लेकिन जब संविधान में हिन्दी आने लगी तो उस समय प्रधान मंत्री जा के विचार क्या थे, यह भी देखिये। उस समय प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने भाषण में कहा था :

"किसी विदेशी भाषा से कोई राष्ट्र महान् नहीं हो सकता। आखिर क्यों? क्योंकि कोई भी विदेशी भाषा लोगों की भाषा नहीं हो सकती। उससे ब

श्रेणियां स्थापित हो जातं हैं। एक श्रेणा उन लोगों का जो विदेशाभाषा का शैला के अनुसार विचार करते हैं और कार्य करते हैं और एक श्रेणा उन लोगों का जो दूसरा हा दुनिया में बसते हैं। इसलिये राष्ट्रपिता ने हमें यह शिक्षा दी कि हम अपनी अधिक काम अपनी ही भाषा में करने का प्रयास करें।”

यह पंडित जी के अपने भाषण का वह भाग है जिस समय संविधान में हिन्दी लाई जा रही थी। हमारे मित्र श्री हनुमन्तैया ने कहा कि अंग्रेज़ा जो भरतवर्ष में आई वह इस लिये नहीं आई कि उस के अन्दर गुण थे, उस में कोई विशेषतायें थीं, लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री का राय उस से भिन्न है। उसी संविधान सभा में भाषण देते समय प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि :

“हमने अंग्रेज़ों इस कारण स्वीकार को कि वह विजेता का भाषा थी। जब हमने उसे स्वीकार किया तो इस कारण नहीं स्वीकार किया कि वह एक महत्वपूर्ण भाषा है। यद्यपि वह उस समय भी एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण भाषा थी। हमने उसे केवल इस कारण स्वीकार किया कि हम पर अंग्रेज़ों का प्रभुत्व था। . . . अंग्रेज़ी भाषा द्वारा हम ने जो कुछ सांख्य है उसके लिये हमें उस का कृतज्ञ होना चाहिये। किन्तु साथ ही उतने हम अंग्रेज़ी जानने वालों और अंग्रेज़ी न जानने वालों के बीच बहुत बड़ी खाई पैदा कर दें जो किसी भी राष्ट्र के लिये घातक सिद्ध होता। सम्भवतः हम आज इसे सहन नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसी कारण यह समस्या भी है।

अंग्रेज़ी चाहे कितनी ही अच्छी और महत्वपूर्ण भाषा क्यों न हो किन्तु हम इसे सहन नहीं कर सकते कि एक वर्ग अंग्रेज़ी जानने वाले विद्वानों का ही और एक बहुत बड़ा वर्ग अंग्रेज़ी न

जानने वालों का हो। इस लिये हमें अपनी ही भाषा को अपनाना चाहिये।”

संविधान बनाते समय पंडित जी का कहना यह था लेकिन आजका आपने अभी सुना है। एक बात मैं इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में और भी कहना चाहता हूँ। संविधान में ३४३ की उपधारा (३) में केवल यह व्यवस्था है कि १५ वर्ष के बाद अंग्रेज़ी का प्रयोग विधि द्वारा उन्हीं विषयों के लिये हो सकेगा जिनका उसमें निर्देश हो। लेकिन प्रस्तुत विधेयक में इस प्रकार का कोई निर्देश नहीं है। इसका अभिप्राय यह है कि अंग्रेज़ी सब ही कार्यों के लिये प्रयुक्त होती रहेगी यह संविधान की धाराओं के विपरीत है।

धारा ३४४ की उपधारा (६) के अनुसार राष्ट्रपति ने २७ अप्रैल, १९६० को कुछ निर्देश दिये थे जिनमें एक यह भी था कि १९६५ के बाद जब हिन्दी मुख्य सरकारी भाषा हो जायेगी तो अंग्रेज़ी का प्रचलन सहायक (सब्सिडियरी) भाषा के रूप में होगा। इस विधेयक में राष्ट्रपति के निर्देश की अवहेलना की गई है और उसको अतिरिक्त भाषा का स्थान दिया गया है। इस तरह से यह विधेयक संविधान के भी विपरीत है और राष्ट्रपति के निर्देशों के भी विपरीत है।

लेकिन तीसरी सबसे बड़ी बात विलों के सम्बन्ध में कही गई है कि सरकारी गजट में इसके हिन्दी अनुवाद प्रकाशित हुआ करेंगे। आपको तो यही कहना चाहिये था कि १९६५ के बाद हिन्दी विधेयकों का अनुवाद अंग्रेज़ी में सरकारी गजट में प्रकाशित हुआ करेंगे। क्योंकि धारा (३) के अनुसार हिन्दी को प्रमुख भाषा हम बनाने जा रहे हैं। फिर इसके विरुद्ध व्यवस्था क्यों? ऐसा न करने का अभिप्राय यह होगा कि जो कार्य १०० मँकाले मिल कर नहीं कर सके वह इस विधेयक द्वारा भारतवर्ष में होने जा रहा है।

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

अन्त में कुछ और शब्द कह कर मैं अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्त करूंगा, और वह भी। अपनी भाषा में नहीं बल्कि अपने गांधी जी के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ। जिस समय वे दरबान में वकालत किया करते थे किसी बात से कुपित होकर गांधी जी ने अपनी धर्मपत्नी कस्तूरबा का हाथ पकड़ कर धक्का दे कर कहा कि जा, निकल जा मेरे घर से बाहर। जिस समय गांधी जी ने क्रोध में आकर कस्तूरबा को धक्का दिया तो वे दरवाजे पर गईं और दरवाजा पकड़ कर रोने लगीं। गांधी जी ने कहा कि जब कस्तूरबा रो रही थीं तो मेरे हृदय नहीं पिघला, लेकिन थोड़ी देर रोने के पश्चात् कस्तूरबा ने मेरी ओर मुझ कर कहा : गांधी, तू आज मुझे धक्का देकर निकाल रहा है, लेकिन मैं तुझे से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि अगर तुझे मुझ को धक्का देना ही था तो भारतवर्ष में क्यों नहीं दिया ? आज सात समुद्र पार लाकर धक्का दे रहा है, बता मैं अब यहां किस के घर जा कर बैठूँ, किस से अपना दुखड़ा कहूँ ? ठीक वही बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस पार्लियामेंट से और गृह मन्त्री, लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, से हिन्दी पूछ रही है कि अंग्रेजी को अगर यहां से धक्का दिया गया तो इंग्लैण्ड आदि देशों में जाकर बैठ जायेगी, अमरीका में जाकर बैठ जायेगी, लेकिन हिन्दी को यदि धक्का दिया तो वह कहाँ जाकर शरण मांगेगी ? किस देश की भाषा बनेगी ?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Mr. Speaker, I find that three kinds of attitudes have been expressed about this Bill. First of all, there is the attitude of utter, unqualified opposition which, I think, is not very rational or appropriate. The second kind of attitude that has been expressed about this Bill is the attitude of qualified acceptance. There are some persons who are agreed with the main principle of this Bill but who have tried to have certain amendments introduced in this Bill. The third kind of attitude that has

been expressed about this Bill is that this Bill goes far enough but does not go very far, so that it does not serve either the cause of Hindi or the cause of English.

I feel that all those persons who have been opposed to this Bill, and I say this in a spirit of humility and a spirit of respectfulness, have not understood the context of this Bill, and that context can be comprehended only if we take into account our language policy all over India for the last fifteen years or sixteen years, ever since we attained independence.

As I look back upon the language policy of my country, I find that the greatest good that this policy has done has been towards the development of our regional languages. I do not want to use the word "regional", because that may narrow down the scope. I think the utmost that any Government in any part of the world could do has been done by the Indian Government for the development of the 14 national languages.

**An Hon. Member:** Question.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I come from a region which is called the Punjabi-speaking region, and I am proud of belonging to that region. I can assure you that the development which the Punjabi language has undergone during the last fifteen years should be an eye-opener, not only to the people of this country but to the students of languages in any part of the world. I think, of all the achievements of the Congress Government during the last fifteen years, one of the best has been this, that they have tried to give an honoured place, a due place, a well-fixed place, to all the national languages of this country. Of course, there are some languages which have taken greater advantage of this concession, while others have not taken as much advantage of this concession but, all the same, in free India, the map of national languages is an encouraging, heartening and satisfying



map. I think nobody will deny that. Take Tamil, take Marathi or Punjabi, in fact any language in the whole of India, you will find that there has been a renaissance, so far as the development of these languages is concerned. A Government, whose determined policy, well-defined policy, is to give every national language its proper place, not only in the region where it is spoken and written but all over the sub-continent of India, cannot do injustice to any language. And if anybody thinks that Tamil is being ignored, or Hindi is being ignored, or some other language is being ignored, I think he is simply misreading the situation. He is trying to say something which is not warranted by the facts, which is not justified by what has been done and which is not in conformity with the achievements that we have had. Therefore, I think, this Bill, if I could put it that way, is to begin with a Magna Carta for the development of the national languages from Kashmir to Cape Comorin and from Assam to Bombay and other States of India. I think, every student who is interested in the development of language as such as I am will feel heartened when he reads this Bill because this Bill gives every regional language, every national language, an honoured place in this country.

But in a big country like ours we cannot think only in terms of the regional languages or the national languages. It was a fine idea put forward by one of the hon. speakers who preceded me when he said, "Here is this language which is the language of 1 per cent. of the people, why do you not include it in the list of national languages?" I think, if we were to follow that principle, if 1 per cent. were going to be made the criterion for declaring any language a national language, India will become a catchwork of languages. There will be about one hundred languages in India and India will become a veritable babel of languages, a veritable confusion in all kinds of languages.

I think, that is not the problem because, as you know, a spoken language

may change from place to place but the literary language, the accepted form of the language, remains as it is. When we talk of languages we do not talk in terms of the spoken language but we talk of that language whose standard has been accepted by people all over the ages and which has come down from the grandfather to the father and from the father to the son and goes on like a torch handed over from one person to another.

India is a great country. Can you think of any country which does not have an official language—call it by any name that you like? Take, for example, the Soviet Union. They talk about the Soviet Union as the paradise for the development of languages. It is true, of course, to some extent. But do you know that if I go to the high school in the Soviet Union and want to pass my examination, I will have to put in an extra year if my mother tongue is not Russian? If I happen to be an inhabitant of Tadzhikistan or Uzbekistan, I will have to spend an extra one year in order to pass the high school or matriculation examination. That is to say, a premium is put upon, what is called, the national language in the Soviet Union. This is the case in every country. It is true that they allow liberty and freedom to so many languages but so far as the national language is concerned, it is always given the pride of place. It is always given certain advantages. It is always given some kind of kudos in this matter. This has not been done here. If we were thinking of languages in that context, we would have said that a person who passes an examination through the medium of Bengali or Malayalam will have to put in an extra year. We have not done that. We have kept all the languages of India at the same level so far as they are concerned as media of instruction, as media of examination, as media of State intercourse and as media of other things which are implied in the day-to-day government business. Therefore, the feeling is that in the matter of treatment of the national languages the policy has been

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

one of fairplay, equal treatment and unqualified acceptance of the situation.

As I said in the beginning, every country must have—called it a national language or the official language—that. Do you mean to say that the Scottish people do not want Scotch or that the Welsh people do not want Welsh in their own States? They all want it. But for the purpose of having that they have a national language and that is called the King's English or the Queen's English. Therefore, if India is to be made one and united, in spite of what the DMK may say or what my hon. friend, Shri Ramanathan Chettiar, may say or what anybody else may say, I might say that if India is to establish its name in the comity of nations, India must have one national language. You cannot escape from that. If India wants to have one national language, I ask you—to use the words of the hon. Prime Minister—which is the most feasible language, which is the language that deserves this honour—I do not want to use the word "honour"—which is the language that deserves this kind of a place.... (*Interruption*). I know, you know many other languages. I know, you speak with many voices and do not care for that. But here is my hon. friend, Professor Hiren Mukerjee, who, I think, is as good a student of Bengali as anybody else and who also comes from Bengal, who agrees with the hon. Prime Minister and says that so far as the national language is concerned we should have Hindi because it is the most feasible language. I therefore think that so far as this is concerned there cannot be two opinions about it and we should have it.

Some fears have been expressed by people as to what will happen to them, what will happen to Bengali..... (*Interruption*). Here is my hon. friend sitting to my right and she has such a feeling as to what will happen to Bengali.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda):** I never said that.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** You did not say but I can see what is there in your heart.

**Shrimati Renuka Ray:** Sir, he is saying things which I have not said.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** But she has been interrupting me.

**Mr. Speaker:** I did not expect a quarrel between a gentleman and a lady sitting together.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I never quarrel with anybody. How can I quarrel with her?

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

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** She has taken two minutes of mine.

I was saying that it is in the interest of national integrity and honour that we should have Hindi as the language.

Sir, democracy is a game of compromise. Democracy is the art of the possible—politics is the art of the possible—and I congratulate the hon. Home Minister for having brought this Bill which, without giving away the essential points which are required for our national integrity, has also come to terms with those people who have fears, misapprehensions and all kinds of doubts. I think, these doubts will not be cleared by those persons who want to secede from the Indian Union.

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

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** These doubts will not be dispelled by those people who think that by performing *havana* they will be able to advance the cause of the language. They will not be dispelled by those persons who do any thing of that kind. English is going to be there only as a temporary measure, as a sort of an expedient and as

a transitional thing and I think it will go. Nobody will be more happy than I when it goes. I can assure hon. Members who are feeling worried about it that it will go and it will go only when the non-Hindi-speaking people come forward and say that they are prepared to bid good-bye to English.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has resorted to *dharna* now. He is not listening to me.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I want to say one thing to you.

**Mr. Speaker:** *Dharna* is not only that which is resorted to outside.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** South Indians are very good at learning languages. For instance, in one of the colleges of the Punjab which teaches Hindi upto M.A., the head of the Department of Hindi comes from Tamilnad whose people are feeling very worried about it.

Therefore I think that this Bill will put an end to all those apprehensions and will promote the unity of India and all of us will walk together as we have been walking together in the days of emergency.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.

I want to put my difficulty before the House. There are many hon. Members, such a large number of them, who have a great desire to participate in this debate. I do not know what to do.

**Some Hon. Members rose—(Interruptions).**

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Khadilkar:** Sir, I want to make a plea that at least every region must be given an opportunity to have its say.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is what I am trying.

**Shri Khadilkar:** So far it has not been done.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** This Bill has been under discussion for the last two days—today and yesterday—and Maharashtra and Gujarat States have been omitted absolutely.

**Mr. Speaker:** Maharashtra has spoken. Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Not Gujarat.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** May I make a request, Sir, which I made yesterday also? The time which the Prime Minister took—naturally he spoke at greater length, than he even normally does—may not be debited to this account

**Mr. Speaker:** Can we sit longer?

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House prepared to sit longer?

**Some Hon. Members:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thought the hour that we have to devote to that other Bill, can we take it for this and take up the other Bill tomorrow.

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** About the Compulsory Deposits Scheme Bill. . (Interruption).

**Shri Kapur Singh:** May I make another suggestion if you would permit me to do so? Let five minutes be deducted out of the time you originally wanted to allot to every speaker from the Hindi region and every speaker from the Congress side.

**Shri Prabhat Kar — rose**

**Shri Braj Raj Singh — rose**

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** I think the axe should not be applied on those who are called upon to speak at some later stage of the debate. I think it is in the interest of the proper discussion to give opportunities to others.

**Mr. Speaker:** After 10 or 12 hours, most of the arguments would already have been advanced and then it becomes a repetition.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** It is true, but..

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. Members only make their points, then that as well serves the purpose. Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Sir, the House is going to sit in the week after the next week also. Why not extend the time by one day?

**Mr. Speaker:** One day—that is now difficult for me.

**श्री मोर्य (अलीगढ़) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पहले तो यहां कुछ विशेष व्यक्तियों को सबसे पहले बोलने का अवसर मिलता है और उनको काफी समय बोलने के लिए दिया जाता है। लेकिन बहुत से सदस्यों को बाद में बोलने का मौका मिलता है उनको एक तो नुकसान यह होता है कि बाद में कहीं जाकर उनकी सुनवाई होती है और दूसरे यह कि उनके लिए समय की पाबन्दी लगाई जाती है कि वे ५ मिनट या १० मिनट में ही अपनी बात समाप्त कर दें। मैं इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था के बिल्कुल खिलाफ हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** बहुत अच्छा।

**श्रीमती यशोदा रेड्डी (करनूल) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल के बारे में कुछ बातें कहने के लिए उपस्थित हुई हूँ। मैं हिन्दी में इसलिए बोलना चाहती हूँ कि पहले मैं आपके द्वारा, इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों को यह बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि हम लोगों को हिन्दी के प्रति कोई नफरत या द्वेष नहीं है। यह बात अच्छी तरह से समझ ली जानी चाहिए। हम लोगों से जहाँ तक सम्भव हो सकता है हम हिन्दी सीखने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं लेकिन अभी हमारा हिन्दी का ज्ञान बहुत कम और अपर्याप्त है और इसलिए मैं

आपकी इजाजत लूँगी और जो कुछ मैं बोलना चाहती हूँ वह मैं अंग्रेजी में ही बोलूँगी।

**Mr. Speaker, Sir,** at the very outset, I would like to congratulate our Government for having brought this Bill because I do feel the intentions of the Government have been absolutely above suspicion. As far as the assurances that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister have given, that of continuing English, or giving a sort of longer lease to English, are concerned, it is certainly with that intention that this Bill has been brought forward.

Before I say anything about the Bill, I would like to point out that somehow or other an impression has gone round among the Members of the Hindi-speaking areas that we people from the south, mostly non-Hindi-speaking people, do not want to accept Hindi. Let me categorically make a statement that Hindi has been, Hindi will be and Hindi must be the national language of India. On that there is absolutely no doubt, nor can there be any doubt about it. Certainly, Hindi people may object to the Government's policy of not having sponsored Hindi. But they cannot say, we are not making any efforts to learn Hindi. Sir, I can tell you, even my little children have not learnt a word of Telugu, but they are learning Hindi today. So, also my husband. I have just shown to the House that I am with the best of intentions and efforts within my capacity trying to learn it. But all cannot be intelligent as Mr. Krishna can be and speak Hindi fluently. But let me tell you one thing. The only thing that we are saying is this. You people of the Hindi-speaking areas have got an absolute advantage, hundred per cent advantage, which we do not have. Very rightly, people have said that the people of the south have been very intelligent, that they could compete with people when English was brought in. They have competed equally well with other people and in their capacities have bet the English

people hollow. But there the competition of English to every Indian was equal. Here, when Hindi is brought in, you people of the Hindi-speaking areas have got hundred per cent advantage over our people. And what has happened to us? English may be foreign to the country—please do not mistake my word 'foreign' and I would request the hon. Members not to mistake the word 'foreign' when in this particular context I am using it. If English is foreign to this land, I tell you, Hindi is foreign to many people whose mother tongue is not Hindi. I am using it in a very small sense, in a very constricted way. Especially when the people of south and the people of the other areas get agitated, you people should have some toleration; you people should have some respect. After all, we are not taking anything from you. You call us non-tolerant. Is it not without toleration that you are imposing Hindi language today? Is it not because of our patriotic zeal that we have conceded that Hindi should be the language? Even though it has not been our mother tongue, was it not with the spirit of Hindi, with the spirit of India having one language and the pride of having one language that we yielded? What did you say the other day? As long as non-Hindi people do not want it, as long as non-Hindi people do not ask for it, you would not do anything about English. You are imposing Hindi on those people. But what is it that you are talking today? What is it that my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri said today? I have great respect for him and I adore his Hindi. I wish I could speak like him. What did he say? The Bill which has been brought forward by Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri is trying to make Hindi quit India. We have never said that. This Bill has not been brought to make Hindi go outside India. This Bill has been brought only to allay the fears of the people who want English to be there for some more time. We are asking only for some more time. That is all. We are not saying that we do not want Hindi at all. That is very wrong. The hon. Prime Minister was

speaking about the Hindi language. He said that the language is a subject which has to be treated with a sort of loving kindness, that the language is a very forcible thing whether it is for unity or disunity. It has to be treated with a sort of loving kindness. You cannot force it. It is with that loving kindness we want you to do.

Constitutionally, you people are in a powerful position. Nobody can deny from you the right of Hindi. All that we are saying is, Hindi will be there.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** We assure you all the love.

**Shrimati Yashoda Reddy:** You talk like a mother, but, as I said somewhere, you act like a step-mother. It is not like that. It is not what you say, but what you do that we all want. Just as you people have got a hundred dozen constituencies to face, we have also got millions to face there. They are not as intelligent as the Members of Parliament. For them the language is a question of emotion, a question of life-and-death just as the mother-land is important. Next to the mother-land, language is an important thing. So, those are the people whom you have got to go and convince and you have to go and tell them that after all we have accepted Hindi, but it will take some time. The fear that is all along there is that Hindi people will dominate. Today, the fear, rightly or wrongly, is that Hindi people will dominate over us. I may give you an example. Even where English is still the language, some of our officers—I say with authority because my husband suffered it—did not get even increments, not to talk promotions, just because they have not passed some small test in Hindi. I do not say it is wrong. But how much it affects the psychology of the people? I cannot call him an unintelligent man. He has stood first in the university all through, but just because he could not pass some Hindi test, this thing happened.

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

We talk of toleration. India is great today because we have been tolerant. I may say, Hinduism is great today, in spite of these things, because we have been tolerant and toleration is the thing which we want. If you want Hindi to go through, if you want Hindi to be taken up as voluntarily and with as much.....

**Mr. Speaker:** Whom is she addressing?

**Shrimati Yashoda Reddy:** I am sorry; for once, by my emotion—I beg of you to excuse me. After all, it is also a question of personal thing for me. I only appeal to the Members through you that it is only with tolerance that they can make headway.

One more thing I would like to say. Apart from other practical difficulties, this period of 10 years or 15 years is no time. Fifteen years have been granted. That is no time. In every historical change over, everywhere, whenever there is a change over, there is a water-shed period, between one period and another period. A period of nearly 50 or 100 years has to go. It is not a question of 10 years. I am saying this because, even if you make it compulsory for every boy and girl to study Hindi, it will take at least 20 years by the time they could finish their education. If you want to make Hindi compulsory, what happens to people like us in 1965? Do you think we have no work in Delhi, we cannot come and work here in Parliament? What happens to officers? The hon. Minister has said that as far as the officers are concerned, absolute assurances are given.

One thing I would like to tell you about this Bill as to why we do not want oral assurances. When a written Constitution by law can be amended many times, what are oral assurances? I have the greatest faith in the Prime Minister and also Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. I can tell you, these are the only two people, if at all, who can

infuse confidence. It is only these two people. (*Interruption*).

I have very little time. Two things I want. The words 'may' and 'shall' have been referred to by many Members. The other day, the law Minister was pleased to say that 'shall' can be interpreted as 'may'. If 'shall' can be interpreted as 'may', 'may' can be interpreted as what? May not or will not. God knows; I do not know. Please bear with me, two minutes. I would request that this word 'shall' should be here. Firstly, because, there should not be any sort of ambiguity. If at all, right or wrongly, we have any doubt about it, as between two people, one constitutionally strong and another constitutionally weak, as the Head of the people, as a mother looks after the weaker child, the Government should look to the weaker section. They should be pleased to give us assurance. Even if 'shall' is desired, they should have no objection, they should put 'shall'. Because, they will be pleasing the lesser and weaker. They will have not only unanimous support here. The whole country will bless them and will happily follow the path of Hindi: not only as a duty but with moral conviction and very happily. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri is a great man. His great quality is his humility. With a humble appeal, I would request him with folded hands that he should consider our request and replace 'may' by 'shall'. I thank you very much.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Mr. Speaker, I was wondering: when this discussion was going on. Some of my friends talked of the north. They came to Rajasthan and ended there. Some of our friends talked of the south. They came to Maharashtra and ended there. I was wondering where Gujarat is: whether it is in the north or in the south.

**Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur):** That is also the case with Maharashtra.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** I am happy it is in India. Gujarat does not want to be either in the north or in the south. It is happy that it is in India.

I wholeheartedly support the Bill. But, my feelings are, whatever we should have done up till now to encourage Hindi in the non-Hindi-speaking areas, has not been done. At the end of 13 years, it is painful that there are areas in the country which insist that English, a foreign language, should be the official language. So far as the Bill is concerned, it is most reasonable. I fail to understand why my Hindi-speaking friends are opposing this Bill. If they want to serve the Hindi language, they can serve it well by tolerance and not by adopting or using extreme words. That is my submission. For, after all, as the lady Member has said, the advantage is with the Hindi-speaking people. I know that the disadvantage is also there for us the Gujaratis, because we cannot express ourselves well in Hindi, and at the same time, though we have learnt English we cannot, express ourselves well in English also without mistakes. So, it seems that the Hindi-speaking people are at an advantage. My hon. friends like Shri S. M. Baneree, therefore, who are talking so much about Hindi are really doing great disservice to the Hindi language in this way.

Coming to clause 3 of the Bill, the insistence is that the word 'shall' may be substituted for the word 'may'. I do not know what advantage will be gained by putting the word 'shall' instead of 'may'. If we read the Bill, it says clearly that the English language may continue to be used in addition to Hindi for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day. So, if anybody wants to use English for all the purposes enumerated in clause 3, there is no restriction, and anybody who wants to use the Hindi language

also can use it. There is no restriction. So, here is a clause which does justice to the Hindi-speaking people and also at the same time to the non-Hindi-speaking people.

**Shri S. Kandappan** (Tiruchengode): What do you lose if you consider our request and concede to it?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Here, in Parliament, any Member may address in Hindi or in English for years to come. There is no obstruction or restriction absolutely. A letter may be addressed or correspondence may be carried on in any language. There is no obstruction to that under this clause. So, I do not understand why any objection should be taken.

At the same time, I cannot understand the attitude of my hon. friends coming from a certain part of the country. They are insisting on the English language. I can understand if they insist on Kanarese, or Tamil and so on. But I cannot understand their insistence on a language which is foreign to us. We have done away with political slavery, but their insistence in such manner shows that mental slavery is still there, and we must be determined at the earliest possible moment to do away with the English language from our official work.

**Shri Muthu Gounder** (Tiruppattur): Formerly, we were slaves of the English-speaking people, now we shall be slaves of the Hindi-speaking people.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** I would like to know from my Tamil friends one thing. When they go to their voters, in what language do they address the voters? Do they address the meetings in the English language?

**Shri Rajaram** (Krishnagiri): In which language does my hon. friend address the meetings of his voters?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Do those people understand them if they address them in English? They do not. So, they

[Shri P. R. Patel]

have to address them in the regional languages. So, naturally, the regional languages have to be encouraged by the State Governments and by the Union Government. As stated by our Prime Minister, the regional languages have advanced much in these 14 years after independence. The question is only what should be the link between all these languages. Should it be English for ever or should some day Hindi take the place of English? Why Hindi? The reason is this. If we just move about the country from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari—our sadhus also move from place to place—what is the common language we find in common use (*Interruptions*). Do they speak in the English language? They speak in the Hindi language and they are able to move throughout the country and talk with people in Hindi. I have moved from place to place like that.

**Shri Maniyangadan:** What is the language used by our Congress leaders from the north when they go to the south during election time?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** I may tell my hon. friends that even if they are able to speak some broken Hindi, they would be understood. If you go to the villages the rural parts, and try to speak in English, most of them—80 per cent or more—would not understand it. So Hindi is the language which is understood from the north to the end of the south.

**Shri Narasimha Reddy (Rajampet):** Question?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** It is the language which is understood by the masses. The quarrel over English is confined to the few educated people of the country. English is not the language of the masses; it is the language of the intelligentsia, of the classes. That is the inheritance we have got from the British. Otherwise, where was English 200 years ago? The English language came with the English people

and because of their rule over us, we inherited that language. Yet our love for it comes in the way of our having our own language.

I understand and appreciate the feelings of my friends from the south. I think our democracy will always respect the feelings of the minority. It is with this view that clause 3 has been put in. Otherwise, if this Bill had not been introduced and if it does not become law, Hindi would be the only official language and English cannot be used for official purposes. It is only by this Bill that English is continued, and continued for how many years? No definite period is put in here. A Committee will be constituted. It will deliberate and submit its report. A decision will be taken later. This is the way the Prime Minister's assurance is implemented. My hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, may not agree with it. But after all, he must know one thing, that he is an Indian and India's language cannot be a foreign language. If he goes throughout the country, he will find that most of the Anglo-Indian speak the regional language and not English.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Nonsense.

श्री श्रीयं: अग्र्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य श्री चौधरी ने एक प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठाया था। उस समय भी मैं समय चाहता था लेकिन नहीं मिला। इस समय आप की कृपा से मुझे समय मिला है इसलिए मैं सर्वप्रथम उसी के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

माननीय ला मिनिस्टर ने कल एक इंटर-प्रेटेशन दिया था। यदि वह इंटरप्रेटेशन सही मान लिया जाय तो मेरे अपने विचार से संविधान की ११० धारायें बिल्कुल गलत हो जाती हैं, उनका रूप ही दूसरा हो जाता है। ला मिनिस्टर ने ऐसा कहा था कि "शैल बी" को "मे बी" माना जा सकता है। अगर हम संविधान के आर्टिकल ३३६ को देखें तो वहाँ



एक ही लाइन में "मे" और "शेल" दोनों आये हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे संविधान के विधाता, संविधान के जन्मदाता 'मे' और 'शेल' के अर्थ को अच्छी तरह जानते थे। अगर उन को "मे बी" और "शेल बी" का अन्तर नहीं मालूम था तो एक ही लाइन में इन दोनों के इस्तेमाल होने का कोई सवाल नहीं उठता था। आर्टिकल ३६६ (१) में इस तरह से आया है :

339 (1) "The President may at any time and shall, at the expiration of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution by order appoint a Commission to report on the administration of the Scheduled Areas.....".

इस तरह से एक ही लाइन में दोनों शब्दों का प्रयोग किया गया है। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब इंटरप्रेशन माननीय ला मिनिसटर ने यहाँ पर दिया वह संविधान की धाराओं के विल्कुल विपरीत है। यहाँ नहीं, जब हम आर्टिकल ३५२ (२) देखते हैं तो उस में आया है :

352 (2) "Proclamation issued under clause (1)—

(a) may be revoked by a subsequent Proclamation;

(b) shall be laid before each House of Parliament;

(c) shall cease to operate at the expiration of two months unless before the expiration of that period it has been approved by resolutions of both Houses of Parliament."

इसमें जहाँ पर सब-क्लाज (ए) में 'मे' शब्द आया है वहाँ पर अगर 'शेल' कर दिया जाय तो पूरे के पूरे प्रॉक्लमेशन अफ इमर्जेंसी के आर्टिकल के माने गलत हो जाते हैं और वह विल्कुल समझदारी से दूर की बात हो जाती है। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कुछ भी

यहाँ पर ला मिनिसटर साहब ने कहा उसके बारे में क्लेरिफिकेशन हो जाना चाहिये कि 'शेल बी' 'मे बी' इस्तेमाल हो सकता है या नहीं, 'मे बी' का इंटरप्रेशन 'शेल बी' हो सकता है या नहीं ?

जहाँ तक इस विधेयक का सवाल है, जो आफिशल लैंग्वेज बिल यहाँ पर आया है मैं उसे अवैधानिक मानता हूँ। मैं ही नहीं समझता बल्कि यह सत्यता पर आधारित है कि यह विधेयक अवैधानिक है। अगर हम आर्टिकल ३४४ को लें तो उस में एक शब्द इस्तेमाल होता है 'दिअर प्रापटर'। उससे सब कुछ साफ हो जाता है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल आपने एक बुद्धिमत्ता का रास्ता दिखाया था इस सदन में, परन्तु मैं उसके बारे में कुछ न कहते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 'दिअर प्रापटर' से कुछ और ही मतलब निकला है। इस आर्टिकल में दिया है :

344(1) "The President shall, at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a Commission which shall consist of a Chairman and such other members representing the different languages specified in the Eighth Schedule as the President may appoint, and the order shall define the procedure to be followed by the Commission."

344(2) "It shall be the duty of the Commission to make recommendations to the President as to—

(a) the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union."

'दिअर प्रापटर' शब्द को मैं यहाँ पर इरादिये जोर से बताना चाहता हूँ कि दस वर्ष के बाद जो कमीशन बनाया उसकी रिपोर्ट में होगा कि दस वर्ष में हिन्दी में कितनी प्रगति की है, हिन्दी यहाँ पर लाई जा सकती है या नहीं,

[श्री मोदी]

भंगेची की क्या परिस्थिति होगी। इसलिये हमारे सामने जो कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है वह केवल पाँच वर्ष के लेखे को हमारे सामने रखती है, दस वर्ष के लेखे को नहीं रखती है। इसलिये प्रॉटिकल ३४४ में 'बिधर प्रॉफ्टर' शब्द का प्रयोग हुआ है।

इसके बाद मैं कहना चाहता हूँ...

**अध्यक्षमहोदय :** भव प्राप भ्रमदा भाषणकल  
समा त कीर्जयेगा।

Division No. 12]

AYES

Tade, Shri  
Banerjee, Shri S.M.  
Bhawani, Shri Lakhmu  
Brij Rai Singh Kotah, Shri  
Dharamalingam, Shri  
Gounder, Shri Muthu  
Gupta, Shri Kashi Ram  
Ismail, Shri M.  
Jha, Shri Yogendra  
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker

Kamath, Shri Haranji Vishno  
Kandappa, Shri S.  
Kapur Singh, Shri  
Kar, Shri Prabhat  
Krishnapal Singh, Shri  
Marandi, Shri  
Maurya, Shri  
Mukerjee, Shri H.N.  
Nair, Shri Vasudevar  
Pottakkatt, Shri

17.03 hrs.

Rajaram, Shri  
Reddy, Shri Narasimha  
Sezhian, Shri  
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir  
Soy, Shri H.C.  
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi  
Utija, Shri  
Vishram Prasad, Shri  
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.  
Alegesan, Shri  
Alva, Shri A.S.  
Alva, Shri Joachim  
Aney, Dr. M.S.  
Arunachalam, Shri  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan  
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri  
Balakrishnan, Shri  
Balmiki, Shri  
Barupal, Shri P.L.  
Basappa, Shri  
Batra, Shri  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
Bharja Deo, Shri L.N.  
Bharava, Shri M.B.  
Bhaskar, Shri  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.  
Brijeshwar Prasad, Shri  
Chakraverti, Shri P.R.  
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati  
Chaturvedi, Shri S.N.  
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala  
Chuni Lal, Shri  
Colaco, Dr.  
Das, Dr. M.M.  
Dasappa, Shri  
Deo Bhanj, Shri P.G.

Desai, Shri Morarji  
Deshmukh, Shri B.D.  
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Dixit, Shri G.N.  
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.  
Gaekwad, Shri Patehsinhrao  
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
Ganapati Ram, Shri  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Govind Das, Dr.  
Guha, Shri A.G.  
Gupta, Shri Badshah  
Hajarnav's, Shri  
Hem Raj, Shri  
Jagjivan Ram, Shri  
Jain, Shri A.P.  
Jedie, Shri  
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra  
Jyotishi, Shri J.P.  
Kabir, Shri Humayun  
Kedaria, Shri C.M.  
Khan, Shri Osman Ali  
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chan  
Krishna, Shri M.R.  
Kureel, Shri B.N.  
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
Lalit Sen, Shri  
Lonikar, Shri  
Mahtab, Shri  
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini

Malaviya, Shri K.D.  
Manaan, Shri  
Mandal, Shri Yarnuna Prasad  
Maniyangadan, Shri  
Masuriya Din, Shri  
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari  
Mehta, Shri J.R.  
Melkote, Dr.  
Menon, Shri Krishna  
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
Mishra, Shri M.P.  
Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutt  
Mohiuddin, Shri  
Morarku, Shri  
Mukane, Shri  
Muthiah, Shri  
Naidu, Shri V.G.  
Naik, Shri  
Nanda, Shri  
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal  
Pande, Shri K.N.  
Pandey, Shri Vishwa  
Panna Lal, Shri  
Patel, Shri P.R.  
Patel, Shri Rajeshwa  
Patil, Shri D.S.  
Patil, Shri S.B.  
Patil, Shri S.K.  
Pillai, Shri Nataraja

17 hrs.  
**COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME  
BILL—contd.**

**Mr. Speaker:** We may now take up for submission to the vote of the House the following motion about the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill. It is the amendment of Shri S. M. Banerjee. The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided: