

अभी निर्णय दे दें, या कल परसों भः दे सकते हैं, मुझे उसके बारे में कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। लेकिन मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जब तक आपका इस विषय में फैसला न हो जाय तब तक उस प्रश्न सूची को छपाने का काम स्थागित रखा जाए। यही मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है और यही मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न तो कोई था ही नहीं और इसकी जरूरत नहीं थी कि मैं इसके लिए कोई खास वक्त निश्चित करता और इसके लिए हाउस का वक्त खर्च करता। पर मेरे मित्र अभी थोड़े अरसे से हाउस में आए हैं और वह इसको बहुत जरूरी समझते हैं, इसलिए मैंने कहा कि यह मसला हाउस के सामने आ जाए।

उन्होंने यह कहा है कि जब गोष्ठा अने-म्बनी में यह रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ तो उन्होंने वहाँ अविलम्बनीय किस्म का काल प्रोटेशन नोटिस भेज दिया। मैंने उसको नामंजूर कर दिया। पहला उज्य तो उन्होंने यह किया कि इनको जो पत्र यहाँ से भेजा गया उसमें इसका कोई कारण नहीं दिया गया कि उसे क्यों नामंजूर किया गया, अगर कारण दिया होता तो वह मेरे पास आकर मेरे साथ बात करते। कारण नहीं था, इसलिए तो यह और भी जरूरी था कि वह मेरे पास आकर मुझ से बात करते तो मैं उनको फाइल मंगवा कर दिखा देता और जो वह कहते उस पर और कर लेता और अगर कोई दूसरी चीज हो सकती थी तो कर देता। तो कारण न होने से उनका मेरे पास न आना मेरी समझ में नहीं आया।

अब वह नामंजूर हुआ, तो आपने एक शार्ट नोटिस कवैश्चन दिया। मैं ने उसको रिस्क्रिप्ट नहीं किया और जैसा कि आपने कहा मैंने उसको महत्व का समझा और मैंने उसे मिनिस्टर साहब को भेज दिया। अगर उन्होंने उसको एक्सेप्ट नहीं किया तो नियम 54 में उनको ऐसा करने का अधिकार था। वह कह

सकते थे कि वह इस शार्ट नोटिस सवाल का जवाब नहीं दे सकते। इस बारे में उन पर कोई उज्य नहीं किया जा सकता।

अब रहा सवाल यह कि अगर मैं उसको महत्व का समझता हूँ तो मैं उसको किसी दिन स्टैंड सवाल की शकल में ऐसी जगह रख दूँ ताकि उसका जवाब मिल जाए। जब मैं उस सवाल को रखना चाहता था तो पता चला कि 3 मार्च के लिए उसी मजमन का सवाल, जिसकी सूचना 11 जनवरी को दी गयी थी, नोटिस जारी होने के एक दिन बाद, मुकर्रर किया गया है और वह स्टैंड किवेश्चन है। मैं ने उस पर आपका नाम भी रखवा दिया है इससे ज्यादा मैं और कुछ नहीं सकता था। जब उसी मजमून का एक सवाल आ चुका था तो आपके नाम से दूसरा सवाल अलाहिदा नहीं रखा जा सकता था। यह मेरी मजबूरी थी। अगर वह सवाल न होता तो मैं आप के नाम पर अलाहिदा एक सवाल रख लेता।

तो ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं हुई है जिसमें किसी नियम का उल्लंघन किया गया हो, और इसलिए मुझे फैसला देने की जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री मधु लियये : आपने कहा कि 11 जनवरी को वह सवाल भेजा गया। लेकिन गोष्ठा विधान सभा में यह प्रस्ताव 22 जनवरी को पास हुआ है। इसलिए उस प्रश्न की शकल मेरे प्रश्न से भिन्न हो सकती है। इसी लिए मैंने यह निवेदन किया था।

मैं आपका फैसला माने लेता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसके लिए शुक्रिया।

12-17 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: LANGUAGE
ISSUE

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, the meeting of Chief Ministers of States, convened to consider the language issue, met on 23rd

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

and 24th February, 1965. The meeting strongly deplored the incitement to violence in order to give expression to grievances of any kind and urged that strong action should be taken to put down lawlessness. It considered that recourse to violence and destruction of public property cut at the very root of the democratic process, which required that all differences should be settled by methods of discussion and persuasion.

The meeting felt that all those who were in a position to influence public opinion should speak out frankly against use of violence and mobilise public support for settling disputes and differences in an orderly way. At the same time, the conference recalled that genuine difficulties as well as unwarranted apprehensions aroused by misleading propaganda must be speedily removed. The conference recalled that through the provisions on the subject in the Constitution, through the enactment of the Official Languages Act, through the decision to have a trilingual basis for education and through the assurance given on the floor of the Lok Sabha by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and reiterated and amplified by me in a broadcast to the nation on 11th February 1965, both the long-term objectives and the need to move towards them with necessary caution had already been spelt out.

Hindi is the official language of the Union and English is to continue as an associate language. There was no question of making any modification in these basic decisions on which alone a sound policy could be evolved. What needed consideration was a number of practical issues arising therefrom, including the amendment of the Official Languages Act, 1963, to give effect to the assurances referred to above. The Chief Ministers agreed that the examination of these issues should be taken in hand. The importance of ensuring equality of opportunity, as enjoined by the Con-

stitution, between people belonging to different parts of the country, was emphasized by many Chief Ministers.

Reference was also made to the question of the various States having an equitable share in the All India Services. The need for evolving a sound system of moderation for examinations for All India and higher Central Services before the introduction of Hindi as an optional medium, was emphasized. It was further urged that consideration should be given to the introduction of regional languages as media for these examinations. It was suggested that before any decisions are taken on these questions, a study of all the aspects involved should be undertaken in cooperation with the Union Public Service Commission.

The working of the three language formula evolved by the Chief Ministers' Conference on national integration and accepted by the State Governments were reviewed. It was decided that this formula should be fully and effectively implemented in all the States. It was urged that in accordance with this formula, the study of an Indian language in current use, preferably one of the southern languages, apart from Hindi and English, in the Hindi-speaking areas and of Hindi, along with the regional languages and English in the non-Hindi-speaking areas would further promote the sense of national unity and encourage better and freer communication between the people in the different parts of the country. Necessary action will now be taken by the Union Government in pursuance of the above decisions.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इस स्टेटमेंट के बारे में सर्वसम्मति करने के वास्ते हर एक ग्रुप के लीडर को बुलाऊंगा ।

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री : (बिजनौर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने एक प्रस्तावकपण प्रस्ताव भी इस सम्बन्ध में दिया था . . .

अप्यस्य महोदय : अत्र उक्तं वक्तुं तो था
नहीं फैसला, इसलिए कहाँ से सुनता ?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has given us what purports to be a resume of the deliberations of the Conference of the Chief Ministers. May I know whether he is contemplating to see that whatever the decision—and I am not sure this is the final decision—is reached by creating a national consensus, and the Prime Minister makes a serious effort to treat this above the Party basis, not the sole concern of the ruling Party which has bungled in this, particularly in view of the fact . . . (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Only a question is to be put, not a speech.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It is a statement of fact.

Mr. Speaker: I have to allow only some questions.

Shri Nath Pai: I was not allowed even one full sentence. Even one sentence was not allowed to be completed by Mr. Hanumanthaiya. (Interruptions).

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): He says 'national consensus' and at the same time he talks of bungling. How can these two things go together?

Mr. Speaker: He might have his own reactions and impressions and suggestions. All those are not to be given just at present. Only a clarification is to be sought.

Shri Nath Pai: I am coming to it. For a veteran politician, he should have a little thicker skin than he shows.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He was the Chief Minister of Mysore also.

Shri Nath Pai: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, if any offence was caused in any quarter. The Chief Ministers do

not represent even the Congress Party in the State. They only represent the ministerial wings of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking him to put the question.

Shri Nath Pai: May I ask whether the Prime Minister because of the unrepresentative character of the Chief Ministers—it is a serious thing that they do not represent anything more than the ministerial wings of the Congress in the different States—will make a serious effort to reach a solution of this very delicate and explosive problem by creating a national consensus and, secondly, whether he will take steps to bring into life once again the body which was doing some useful work called the National Integration Council?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not quite agree with what Shri Nath Pai has said about the Chief Ministers that they represent only the Congress Party . . .

Shri Nath Pai: The ministerial wings of the Congress Party.

Mr. Speaker: You may not agree. You have to listen.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: They may be the representative of the Congress Party but they are in-charge of the administration of the whole State and, therefore, they hold a very important position. In regard to having a discussion with others, I have already said that we will hold a meeting of the leaders of various political parties in the Parliament and I hope I shall be able to arrange it soon. We may also, as he has said, revive the National Integration Conference. The meeting of that Conference might also be held.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, I do not know how you want us to present our points before him. We cannot very well do it in the form of merely a question or a query. I hope you will be a little indulgent with us.

[Shri Ranga]

There are two or three points raised. I am all in favour of achieving a national consensus. But at the same time I cannot very well approve of the manner in which the earlier National Integration Conference was formed and, therefore, I do not think it would be enough and it should not be confined to the Parties alone. It is natural for every Party to be divided in regard to this particular matter....

An hon. Member: No, no.

Another hon. Member: Your Party.

Mr. Speaker: His own Party might be divided. But you have to listen.

Shri Ranga: If my hon. friends are anxious to say that the Congress Party is not divided at all, then they must be like ostriches being blind to the facts, as they are, which they themselves are facing with very great difficulty. Therefore, whenever an effort is made to reach a national consensus, I would advise the Prime Minister to see that not only the political Parties and groups therein—there are groups there; there are groups with us—in regard to this particular matter but also other elements, important elements and personalities who are specially . . . (*Inter-raptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Ranga: If they do not want any solution for this particular problem, they need not have asked the Prime Minister to come to this Parliament. I can as well sit down. What is this?

Mr. Speaker: I would request hon. Members to listen patiently.

Shri Ranga: It is because of this unhelpful attitude of the rank and file of my own friends that this crisis has arisen this way. Therefore, all the great personalities who are interested

in this particular matter and social forces, institutions, will have to be given every possible opportunity to express themselves and also to agree among themselves so that a real national consensus could be achieved. I would like my hon. friend Prime Minister to keep this in mind.

Then, there is another point raised in that resolution or whatever it is, the consensus, I suppose, that these Chief Ministers are supposed to have reached over the three language formula. We would have no objection if each State is free in Hindi speaking areas to choose from within the five south Indian languages—maybe, there is also the sixth one, that is, Bengali; I do not know whether they are going to consider that also as one of the other languages to choose from these—any one of them according to their liking. On the other hand, they would be sowing seeds of discord in the whole of this country and also in the south if they were simply to say that out of these five languages, this particular language is going to be chosen as a third language. So, let them not invite further trouble by creating that kind of a thing.

Mr. Speaker: I would just request hon. Prof. Ranga that here, after the statement has been made, only a clarification can be sought. Now he is giving his suggestions . . .

Shri Ranga: Excuse me, Sir. I had already prefaced my remarks by saying, if you simply ask us to confine ourselves merely to a clarification, then you make our task entirely impossible. Then, we need not as well be asked to say anything at all but leave it as it is. Let the country decide for itself.

In conclusion, I would like to say that it is not enough for Parliament to be confronted with the consensus that the Chief Ministers are supposed to have reached. It is most essential that the Prime Minister should take into his confidence not only the Mini-

sters and the ministerial wings within the Congress, not only the whole of the Congress, not only the whole lot of these political parties but all those other forces also which are interested . . . [An hon. Member: Which are those other forces?] Finally, may I know, since the Chief Ministers were advising him and the Government to take strong action against all those people who had indulged in unlawful and violent activities, whether they have also considered and would consider the advisability of releasing all those people who had been put in jail during the recent disturbances?

Mr. Speaker: This is the only query that has been made. Otherwise, his earlier observations contained advice or suggestions which he wanted that Government should keep in view.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I would merely say that in so far as the question of release is concerned, it is a matter for the consideration of the State Governments concerned and they will do the needful.

Shri Ranga: What about the consensus? I made a suggestion in regard to that. What is the Prime Minister's reaction to that?

Mr. Speaker: That is a suggestion, and they will consider that. I have asked the Prime Minister to keep that in view.

Shri Ranga: And the question of language also.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I was a little surprised—perhaps I should not have been—at the tenor of the Prime Minister's statement. I expected something more or a little more than what I read in the papers and other speculators had suggested about the Chief Ministers' decision. We here in Parliament have already had some kind of a discussion in regard to the matter at issue, and I had expected the Government to come forward with some more speci-

fic ideas, short-term as well as long-term. Government does not seem to do that at all. On the contrary, an almost semi-frivolous suggestion is thrown out that at some time in the future there would be consultation with the leaders of other groups and parties.

We have tried to stress in this House that unless certain passions and prejudices which have been fanned to a dangerous heat are sought to be soothed by necessary action, even a long-term programme would not be successful. What the Prime Minister suggests on the basis of the advice he has got from members of his own party holding high position in different parts of the country completely ignores the desirability of taking some immediate steps in order to soothe the passions particularly roused in Tamil Nad and certain other parts of the country.

Therefore, the question of release, and the question of judicial investigation of firings which have taken place in more than one area is a question which agitates the whole country and which should agitate the Prime Minister and his colleagues. But they do not seem to have any other answer than the old familiar bureaucratic answer that nothing would be done.

Therefore, I want satisfaction here, Parliament should want satisfaction, in regard to the short-term measures which Government is going to adopt or has in contemplation.

Regarding the long-term measures, my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai has referred to the idea of the resuscitation of the national integration movement, and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has responded favourably towards that.

But there is a great deal of point in what Shri Ranga has pointed out, namely that sometimes these conferences are held in a way where it becomes a sort of a repetition of the kind of thing which takes place sometimes in Parliament or in meetings of

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

political groups and parties. It may be necessary to bring into the picture other people also, such as scientists, writers, artistes, and musicians, because it is necessary today to have in the country a movement for national solidarity which has today got absolutely distorted. Therefore, we want from Government not this kind of a pedestrian statement about what some Chief Ministers have decided already which everybody is talking about and which everybody knows about, but something more of a statesmanlike and an understanding appreciation of the position in the country today in regard to the language problem, and some inkling about what short-term as well as long-term measures are going to be adopted. I am sorry I do not get anything of that sort from the Prime Minister.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): What is the question of the hon. Member?

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Barrow.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I ask the Prime Minister what specific amendments, if any, were considered at this conference with regard to the Official Languages Act of 1963, and whether the words—I am speaking from memory—'equitable representation of the different States in the services' would imply a quota system for the States and whether that has been approved?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: In so far as the amendments are concerned, it is said in the statement which I have just now read out that the question will have to be examined as to what the amendments should be or what kind of amendments should be made. In regard to the representation to different States in the Services, this is also a matter which needs further examination, and it has, therefore, been said that it would be for the Government to consider over this matter further.

Shri Barrow: May I ask for one clarification? Surely, there must have been some basis for this...

Mr. Speaker: Several suggestions might have been made, and Government say that the matter has still to be examined further. So, how can we pin the hon. Prime Minister down at this moment?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): It was widely reported in the papers that the Chief Ministers had two specific formulations before them. I do not know whether that is correct but it was widely reported in the papers. One was a working paper on amendments suggested by Shri A. K. Sen, the Law Minister, and the other was a working paper prepared by the Home Ministry. Could we get some inkling as to whether the terms of these working papers were considered by the Chief Ministers' Conference, as has appeared in the papers?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: No, what has appeared in the papers is not correct. The first paper to which a reference has been made by the hon. Member was not considered at all. I do not know whether that paper is a real...

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Yudhvir Singh.

श्री युद्धवीर सिंह (महेन्द्रगढ़) : क्या प्रधान मन्त्री यह बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि मुख्य मन्त्रियों की इस बैठक में क्या किसी मुख्य मन्त्री की तरफ से इस बात पर भी जोर दिया गया कि अंग्रेजी को अनिश्चित समय तक देश की राजभाषा रखा जाये ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इस सवाल की इजाजत नहीं दे सकता कि किसी मुख्य मन्त्री ने क्या कहा और क्या नहीं कहा ।

श्री युद्धवीर सिंह : प्रधान मन्त्री किसी का नाम न बता कर यह बता दें कि क्या वहां पर ऐसा कहा गया था । क्या किसी मुख्य मन्त्री

की तरफ से या ग्राम तौर पर यह चर्चा हुई कि अंग्रेजी हर कीमत पर रखी जानी चाहिए और हम हिन्दी को किसी रूप में बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं या क्या यह चर्चा हुई कि इन सब घटनाओं के बावजूद हिन्दी अवश्य रखी जानी चाहिए ? क्या इन सब बातों के संदर्भ में किसी मुख्य मन्त्री की तरफ से संविधान में संशोधन का जिक्र आया ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : किस मुख्य मन्त्री की तरफ से क्या जिक्र आया, यह नहीं पूछा जा सकता है। यहां पर यह नहीं आ सकता है कि किस सरकार ने क्या सवाल किया और किस ने क्या जवाब दिया।

श्री श्रींकार लाल बरवा (कोटा) : तो फिर आयेगा क्या ? इसका जवाब मिलना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें। जब उन की पार्टी के एक मेम्बर खड़े हैं, तो उनको बैठ जाना चाहिए।

किसी मुख्य मन्त्री ने क्या कहा, मैं इस सवाल की इजाजत नहीं दे सकता।

श्री सुदबीर सिंह : इस बात की चर्चा हुई या नहीं, यह बता दिया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं मेम्बरों से यह दर-रूवास्त करूंगा कि इन बातों को यहां लाने का क्या फायदा है कि किसी मुख्य मन्त्री ने यह दलील दी या नहीं, उसको किस ने रद्द किया और दूसरे ने क्या तजवीज दी ? इन बातों को लाकर कोई झगड़ा नहीं खड़ा किया जाना चाहिए।

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): Mr. Speaker, regarding the decisions arrived at at the Chief Ministers' Conference, at present I have practically nothing to say.

An hon. Member: Then sit down.

Shri Manoharan: I am going through the decisions of the Chief Ministers in between the lines.

I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to one thing. In the whole of South India, now calm is being restored. But on the other side, something is being raked up by the State Government by arresting DMK leaders all over the State. Today I have received reports that under DIR, members of the Legislative Assembly as well as Corporation Councillors have been arrested.

I want to know whether there is any sincere attempt on the part of the Prime Minister as well as the Chief Ministers to restore order and calm throughout the country.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am sorry I am not aware of these details, nor can I go into them. Naturally the matter has to be handled by the State Government. However, I shall try to contact the Chief Minister and know what the facts are.

Shri Manoharan: The Chief Minister of Madras is in the capital.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend, the Home Minister, made strong speeches which infuriated those friends. He posed as if he is a peacemaker here in this country. He should give advice in this matter.

Shri Manoharan: The military sent by the Central Government is still in Madras.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): Harassment by the military is going on. It is a fact. It is going on in my constituency of Tiruchengode. I have received telegrams to that effect. This matter has to be tackled.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): What is the object of communicating the decisions of the Chief Ministers' Conference to this House? Is that going to be the basis for further consideration by the Government of India of this

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

matter with the help of Members of this House?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I did not quite follow.

Mr. Speaker: What is the object of mentioning or putting the decisions of the Chief Ministers before this House? Would these be the basis for further discussion of those decisions with the Members of this House?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: There is a discussion going on on the President's Address; there is going to be a discussion on the General Budget. These proposals could as well be discussed during those occasions. We will certainly always like to have the help and co-operation of hon. Members.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : भाषा का प्रश्न जो पन्द्रह वर्ष पहले सर्वसम्मति से संविधान में और दो वर्ष पूर्व राजभाषा अधिनियम में निश्चित हो चुका है, दक्षिण भारत के नाम पर, केवल एक राज्य के कुछ सामान्य व्यक्तियों द्वारा उपद्रव होने के कारण केन्द्रीय सरकार ने जो मुख्य मन्त्रियों का यह सम्मेलन बुलाया, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि मुख्य मन्त्रियों के इस सम्मेलन की वैधानिक स्थिति क्या है, आया इस सम्मेलन के निर्णयों से भारत सरकार अथवा संसद् बांध जाती है अथवा ये निर्णय केवल परामर्श के रूप में हैं? मुख्य मन्त्रियों के इस सम्मेलन के निर्णयों की पृष्ठ भूमि में क्या भारत सरकार संसद् में राज भाषा अधिनियम में जो श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के आशवासनों की पृष्ठ-भूमि में ही पारित हुआ है, कोई परिवर्तन करने का विचार तो नहीं कर रही है?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : यह जो उनसे विचार विनिमय था यह तो सलाह लेने के लिए, उनकी राय लेने के लिए था। फँसला तो आखिरी पहाँ पार्लिमेंट करती है। इस

सिलसिले में भी फँसला करना उसके ही हाथ में है। जहाँ तक कानून वगैरह में तब बीली की बात है, उसमें यह हुआ है कि उस पर विचार किया जाए कि किस रूप में, किस तरह से वह हो।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : शायद मैं अपने सवाल को अच्छी तरह से समझा नहीं पाया हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बड़ी अच्छी तरह से आपने समझा दिया है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मेरा कहना यह था कि राजभाषा अधिनियम प्रधान मन्त्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के आशवासनों का ही परिणाम था और उन्हीं आशवासनों को यथावत् कायम रखने के लिये मुख्य मन्त्रियों ने निर्णय दिया है। अब उसमें तो कोई किसी प्रकार का परिवर्तन नहीं होगा, मैं यह स्पष्ट जानना चाहता हूँ, गोलमोल भाषा में नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने कहा है कि फँसला आपके हाथ में है। फिर और ज्यादा आप क्या चाहते हैं?

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): The late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, after consultation with all the Chief Ministers, settled once for all this question. It was in pursuance of that that the Official Languages Act was passed by this Parliament. Now to seek to amend that Act will be a no-confidence motion against the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru—it will be like that. So Government ought not to seek changes in the Official Languages Act. Instead of using English, the regional languages will be allowed till Hindi is developed in the non-Hindi areas.

श्री मधु लिमये (मोंघर) : सब से पहले मैं खड़ा हुआ था लेकिन जो लोग बैठे थे, जो बोलना नहीं चाहते थे, उनको आपने पहले बुला लिया

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर मेरी स्वाहिश यही हो कि आप सब से पीछे आये तो फिर क्या एतराज है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : ठीक है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका एक खास वाइंट आफ व्यू है । इसलिए मैं चाहता था कि वह अलहदा आये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक असें से हम लोग सरकार के सामने यह सुझाव दे रहे हैं कि भाषा समस्या को अगर स्थायी तौर पर हल करना है, उसका हल निकालना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिए आधार यह माना जाए कि गैर-हिन्दी राज्यों पर हिन्दी न लादी जाए और हिन्दी राज्यों पर 26 जनवरी के बाद बिल्कुल अंग्रेजी न लादी जाए । लेकिन सरकार ने कभी इस सुझाव को नहीं माना है । इस बीच में श्री विनोदा भावे के द्वारा यह सुझाव अगशन के समय दिया गया था और समाचार पत्रों में भी हमने पढ़ा और कल गृह मंत्री जी ने भी कहा कि यह बात सही है कि मुख्य मंत्रियों ने विनोदा भावे जी के सुझाव को माना है, लेकिन अभी जो मुख्य मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन की सिफारिशें हैं, इनको जो कुछ भी आप कहिये, जिनको अब सदन के सामने रखा गया है, उस में तो मुझे इस आधार का जिक्र तक नहीं मिला है । तीन भाषा वाला फार्मूला या सारी जो बात चलती है, उससे स्थिति सुधरने के बजाय और बिगड़ेगी और जनता को उकसाने का मौका मिलेगा । इसलिए प्रश्न यह है कि क्या सरकार विनोदा जी का जो सुझाव था कि हिन्दी इलाकों में अंग्रेजी न रहे और गैर हिन्दी इलाकों पर हिन्दी न लादी जाए, उसके

आधार पर सभे केन्द्रीय विभागों का गठन करेगी ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : जहां तक हिन्दी या अंग्रेजी को लादने की बात है फोर्स किसी पर करने की बात है वह तो इसमें भी माना गया है कि जहां हिन्दी लोग नहीं जानते हैं वहां अंग्रेजी का वे प्रयोग करेंगे चाहे वह शासन हो या दूसरे काम हों । जहां पर हिन्दी है वहां वे हिन्दी का प्रयोग कर सकते हैं, जो हिन्दी बोलने वाले, जानने वाले प्रदेश हैं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अंग्रेजी उन पर लादी जाएगी या नहीं ?

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : उस में कोई इसका सवाल नहीं है कि उनको अंग्रेजी का जबरदस्ती प्रयोग करना होगा । ऐसा कहीं कोई फसला नहीं है । आपका शायद यही सवाल था ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा सवाल यह है कि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में अंग्रेजी अनिवार्य विषय रहेगा क्या हिन्दी इलाकों में ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं और उजाजत नहीं दे सकता हूं । अब आप बट जायें ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The Prime Minister himself has expressed his agreement—I hope he is serious about it that he does consider that a discussion in Parliament is called for. You have noticed from the kind of question asked and further sought to be asked that this is a matter on which Parliament should have an opportunity of further expressing its opinion. Otherwise, we could have had a pressnote and saved nearly one hour of our time. There must be some issue, an item in the parliamentary agenda to ensure that when the Prime Minister makes a statement, it must end up in something. We cannot treat this as if we are reading a newspaper report. We are not a newspaper office.

Mr. Speaker: If I get a notice, I will consider that.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Yesterday, when I asked a similar question, you were pleased to brush it aside by saying that it was too general in character. It is befitting in the context of the Prime Minister's statement today.

Mr. Speaker: What does he want me to do? Let him put his question if he gets an opportunity in the President's Address. He may sit down now.

Shri Shinkre: It is in the context of the Prime Minister's statement.

Mr. Speaker: I am not discussing that. I will allow one Member from each group.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): In this connection, I would like to make a submission about the agenda. We are finding it difficult.

Mr. Speaker: Tomorrow we will have that opportunity.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We get these agenda papers; they do not generally include very important statements that are going to be made.

Again, there is to be a reply by the Home Minister or the Law Minister on the points raised that day.

An hon. Member: It is to come only tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Probably, she was not present.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I was here. I was under the impression that you were going to give your ruling the next day. Anyway, I would like to say that these things should be put down on the agenda paper so that we may know what is happening.

Shri Ranga: You take all this time to consider this matter and then you want us to believe and accept that you are going to consult the Home Minister's statement on its merits and thereafter you would give your ruling then and there? How does it sound?

Mr. Speaker: It sounds very well. There is nothing odd in it if only he considers it a little more dispassionately. When I put it, I would have studied all that I can and then I hear him also and then I can tell . . .

Shri Ranga: Immediately?

Mr. Speaker: If I ask hon. Member to give me fifteen minutes more after the Minister has said what he has to say?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: With regard to what you said yesterday about what is to come tomorrow, may I read the reporters' copy that I have got with me? Yesterday what you said with regard to the momentous ruling that is to come tomorrow, was—at one stage you said that the Minister "will make a statement tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker: Have I not corrected myself immediately?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Later on you said that the Minister may make a statement on the same day as you give your ruling. At another stage, you said that there would not be any discussion, when Shri Bade who is not here at present, raised that point. I hope you will agree that during the interregnum between the Minister's statement and your momentous ruling, the Members here may be permitted to raise points of clarification, as the Minister's statement may be controversial.

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday, or the day before, I made it clear that there would be no further discussion and only for the reply it has been fixed; I cleared that. If I require another

fifteen minutes, I will beg of the House to give me this and I will announce the decision.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Suppose he raises controversial points, we should be permitted to clarify the points. (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I want to draw your attention . . .

Shri Rama Chandra Mallick (Jajpur): Mr. Speaker, I want to say . . .

Mr. Speaker: He should sit down; I will give him an opportunity.

Shri Rama Chandra Mallick: I will read only one rule.

Mr. Speaker: Would he sit down? What does Mr. Nath Pai want to say now?

Shri Nath Pai: May I read for your consideration something arising out of the assurance given to this House on the 18th? May I read that assurance?

Mr. Speaker: How can I allow him, if I do not know what he is going to raise?

Shri Nath Pai: I am quoting from the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: It may be from the proceedings but he ought to have given me notice . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Nath Pai: I did give you notice.

Mr. Speaker: Did I permit him to raise the point?

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I will not be trying to sneak in something without being properly fortified in my position. You were pleased to say . . .

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nath Pai would kindly excuse me. It would be a bad precedent, if I allow him now? If I find there is some force in his contention, I will allow him.

Shri Nath Pai: I will state the position. I do not know why I cannot quote your own sentence. It is a five-word sentence "I will study the position and convey to the House my reaction." This was the assurance that I wanted to read. There was your assurance to the House, not to me personally and, therefore, I wanted to raise it.

Shri Rama Chandra Mallick: Sir, most respectfully I want to read one rule of our Rules of Procedure.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him and then he may make his submission. He may sit down now. Mr. Kripalani.

MOTION ON PRESIDENT'S
ADDRESS—Contd.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Mr. Speaker, sometimes the truth might come from the mouth of the communists even. . . .

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): We are unable to hear him.

Mr. Speaker: If all the other Members were silent, they will be able to listen to Acharya.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I said that my friend on the right, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, said that the President's Address to the Parliament was a ritual. Of course it is a ritual. Otherwise, why would the President come with a posse of soldiers to the House, where the only battle that is waged is the battle of words. Then, he comes in a carriage that was used in the 16th century by the kings of England and the Queens of England. It is drawn. I do not know by how many horses,—probably—by eight horses. This was also done by the Kings of England and it was done here by the representative of the king of England. If it were not a formal occasion, all these things would not be there. This pomp and show and the dramatic effect were all right a little earlier but now we have a Prime Minister who is a