

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes 64; Noes. 109.

The motion was negatived.

15.59½ hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT

Sári Rane (Buldana): I beg to present the Thirty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I shall take up the adjournment motion now.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: The discussion on the Bill should continue, because the motion for adjourning the discussion on the Bill has been lost.

Mr. Speaker: The discussion on the Bill will continue tomorrow.

16 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT IN HANDLING LANGUAGE ISSUE

Mr. Speaker: I shall fix the time-limit, because there would be a large number of Members desiring to speak. I propose that the mover may take 15 minutes and the others 10 minutes each.

Shri M. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the House do now adjourn". I do so, because, I wish to draw pointed attention to the recent tragic events in the south, which have cast their shadow on the country and on the deliberations of this House. A short while ago, the elements conspired to create stark horror in Rameshwaram, but it was Government's folly and arrogance and its lack of

capacity for intelligently anticipating and sympathetically responding to public feeling which provoked fury in Tamil Nad, usually so sedate and sober, over the issue of language on Republic Day and subsequently. My intention is to censure Government for its utter failure to tackle the tragedy in Tamil Nad and its repercussions elsewhere, as in West Bengal.

We are not unready to welcome and cooperate with whatever honest efforts Government might make to solve the crisis. Meanwhile, however, the mind of the country must be made known and the heart of our people must speak, as it can only do in Parliament.

The death roll in Tamil Nad, as I learn, is 78 including 4 policemen and 5 who burnt themselves to death as a protest against the imposition of Hindi, like the Buddhist monks of South Viet-Nam. It is true that certain kinds of incendiary leadership, whom I shall not name, were flourishing in Tamil Nad and the frustration and irritation over Government's failures on food and every other front have accumulated. But when men come forward and publicly burn themselves to death for their own mother-tongue, when thousands stand by in admiration and sorrow and then some of them in sudden anger think nothing of such ugly things as burning policemen also to death; such events cannot be treated lightly and brushed aside. Emotion of that sort can burn solid thrones, let alone the rickety structures of vainglory that prop up the Government. The city of Delhi is the historic grave of vainglory and Government must beware.

This warning is needed, because among other things the ruling party in this country has always failed to understand the complications of the language question in India. They list some 14 languages in the schedule to the Constitution and call the Republic a Union of States. But they do not

seem to know the democratic implications of the situation. Some years ago, they fired on Telugus and Marathas before being compelled to give them their rightful linguistic States. Now they do not seem to know the heart's desire of our people who are trying to emerge into a truly free life, our people who live in different religious age-old languages and culture of their own.

I am a believer in the unity of our country, unity in the midst of diversity. But separatist groups could exploit the situation mainly because neither the Congress Government nor its handmaiden the Congress Party could even make an effort in time to expain its language policy, if it could, to our people in different region. Meanwhile, Hindi chauvinists—I hate to use that word, but I am afraid the cap fits certain sections of our people—have put pressure on government spokesmen to make the most provocative statements in the eve of Republic Day. The Prime Minister—he is not here, he has too many headaches, but that is his occupational hazard—who become wise after the event, has talked about nothing new happening on the 26th January, and he has assured the country that there would be no imposition of Hindi and that Jawaharlal Nehru's assurances on this question would be implemented. He should have spoken much earlier more clearly and more strongly. He should have anticipated things. He should have known the way the wind was blowing at least in the south. Of course, he did nothing of that sort, and he could not do so because the policies of his Government are uncertain and always precarious and very generally amenable to all kinds of diverse interpretations.

The Hindi-speaking States also have had their share in this game of provocation. They provoked trouble by a stubborn refusal to accept the Official Languages Act provision regarding continued use of English as

an associate language. They have deliberately refrained from passing a legislation to give effect to that Act in contemptuous disregard not only of Parliament's enactment but of Jawaharlal Nehru's commitment to non-Hindi-speaking people.

The legal position today means complete breakdown of communication between the Hindi and non-Hindi-speaking States, for Article 210(2) lays down that English will automatically cease to be the language of the legislature of any State 15 years after the 26th January 1950 unless the legislature provides otherwise. None of the Hindi States have made such a provision and typical of chauvinism was the threat reported from Rajasthan that they would stop increments to those who fail to pass the tests in Hindi.

If the Central Government had taken half as much trouble to help other languages as it does to help and develop Hindi, if the Central Government had tried to have Hindi as a central language only for the minimum purpose of inter-communication, voluntary agreement about Hindi would have been perhaps easy and possible by this time. What has happened is that Hindi alone has received all manner of help and boosting from Central Government sources and influential circles powerful in Government and near about have noised the idea even of Hindi being adopted in the near future as a medium of instruction in all States in the university stage. Such folly—and I can go on multiplying instances of such folly—has created fear in non-Hindi areas regarding the imposition of Hindi and has led many to the very distorted view of preserving English for all time. That is a false and fantastic idea which must be finally and firmly renounced.

Let our own languages come forward and have their place in the sun, whether it is Tamil or Hindi or Bengali or Malayalam, and in good

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

time—I am afraid I have to say it, in good time but not in haste—we shall have Hindi spoken by the largest group, by far, of our people as an all-India link language. If the passion for Tamil or for Bengali were properly directed, as it should have been, in a better context, we could have had by this time Tamil and Bengali replacing English for official and educational purposes in Tamil Nad and West Bengal. That has not happened.

Precipitate and thoughtless action on the part of the Government and the follies committed by Hindi fanatics have provoked a situation that some of us have so much spite for Hindi, have suddenly developed this peculiar spite for Hindi, that they yoke themselves to the chariot of English and even on asking for the permanent continuation of English as the official language of this country. That must never be and against that every possible step has got to be taken.

I have heard reported statements by some members of Government who have talked about the necessity of "re-thinking" on the language issue. Let us do this re-thinking after we have soothed the injured emotions of the non-Hindi-speaking States. Let us go ahead with this effort. Let us put our heads together and evolve correct policies.

I would suggest, therefore, to Government that serious efforts be immediately adopted in order to reach a solution of this crisis, and for that purpose I would recommend that the State languages must be assisted to become really and truly the official language and the medium of instruction in their respective States, that safeguards for whatever linguistic minorities reside in those particular areas must be provided, that there must be provision, as quick as ever that is possible, for all Bills and proclamations . . .

Shri J. B. Kripalani(Amroha): May I know, Sir, whether the censure motion is on the language policy of the Government or the excesses committed?

Some hon. Members: Both.

Mr. Speaker: It contains those things; also.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: As you read the motion it appeared to me to be on the excesses that have been committed.

Mr. Speaker: No. It says: "Utter failure of the Government in handling the language issue". First is the language issue. Both the things are contained there.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I should imagine also that when I refer to some very undesirable incidents having happened in the country on account of the Government's ineptitude I am also entitled in a parliamentary discussion to refer to certain measures which ought to be adopted by Government either today or tomorrow in order to see that such things do not recur.

My idea, therefore, is that every effort should be made to see that the regional languages become the official language as well as the medium of instruction in the respective States, that all Bills, proclamations, documents of the Union Government, reports etc., are made available in the different languages scheduled in the Constitution, that there is unrestricted right for Members of Parliament as well as other houses of legislature in the country to speak in their mother tongue and in view of the technological advancement in recent times facilities are provided for simultaneous translation, as quick as ever that is possible; that Hindi should come to replace English as a language of communication between the Union and the States and also between the States themselves. But this should happen gradually, allowing sufficient

time for the training of staff and the tackling of other problems which arise on account of our having this policy.

Earlier I have personally pleaded for the change-over as quick as we can towards our own language as the official language. Even now my sympathies are with the idea of our having Hindi as the official language of this country. But, after all, we cannot make haste when haste means taking risks, when haste means imposing on our country suffering which should not be borne by any sensible community. Therefore, I suggest that in view of what has happened, in view of the mis-application of certain ideas which were perhaps formed in a different atmosphere and we have reached a situation where we have to make haste . . . (*Interruptions*). Sir, I am not yielding to any kind of interruption because I have only 15 minutes. My idea is that while Hindi should continue to be regarded as the target language which we are going to have as our official language because it is spoken by, by far, the largest segment of our people, we should not today make haste in the manner we thought at one time we could make haste. Therefore, I suggest that the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, should be respected, should be implemented and till that time we go slow, we soothe whatever emotions have been injured in the mean time and we try to adopt such steps as would really make for a solution of the problem facing our country.

I would also suggest to the Government that they should look into the matter of the question of the examinations held by the Union Public Service Commission and similar other organisations. Examinations for all services have got to be conducted in the different languages of India and so long as that is not decided, English will have, unfortunately, to continue as the only language for examinations. I was a member of the Committee presided over by Shri Govind

Ballabh Pant in 1958 and I know that we had asked for a process of moderation by the application of which we could have all the fourteen languages as media of examinations. But, of course, the process of moderation is difficult and maybe, it will take some time before we can make up our minds about it. Therefore, till all the fourteen languages of our country are made the media of examination in Union Public Service Commission and other examinations, we should have to have English continuing as the only language for examinations.

Therefore, I would say that the Central Government must provide funds for developing the other Indian languages equally with Hindi, if it is not quantitatively equal—it cannot be quantitatively equal because the Hindi region is much larger—at least in proportion. There should be a fair distribution of the resources which Government is allocating for the development of the different languages. There is, for instance, today in such government organisations as the All India Radio, discriminatory provisions for Hindi which soar to high heaven—the discrimination is open for anybody to see—and that kind of discrimination must cease. The emphasis today, therefore, has to be placed on agreement among all sections of our people and on gradualness. As I have said before, today we have reached such a context of things when we must not fight shy of gradualness. We have to make haste on the economic and technological fronts. We cannot afford to have national disintegration on the issue of languages.

Therefore, my submission to the House is that our primary job is, first of all, to soothe the injured feelings of the South. There have been shootings and firings and all kinds of undesirable happenings. Also, on the part of the crowd certain things have taken place which we all deplore, burning policemen for instance. Everybody must deplore that sort of thing. But let there be a judicial enquiry wherever these firings have taken place and let there be also an

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

amnesty towards the students and other demonstrators who had come forward. Also, let there not be a repetition of the performance of certain Government spokesmen who tried to arrogate the responsibility for the tragedy in the South to Left Communists, to some other people, or whomsoever they wish to give a bad name and hang them at the nearest lamp post. Let there be no repetition of that performance.

I would tell the Prime Minister that there should be serious consultation, political and intellectual, regarding national solidarity and the evolution of an effective language policy. The stock of goodwill in our country in favour of the country's leadership is running out. Events in Madras are only a pointer from which we have to draw our lessons. If Government does not draw that lesson and act accordingly, I am afraid, I have to say something which I have said earlier, that this government in that case, sooner or later, would have to quit. Let us not ignore the handwriting on the wall; that is the warning which the events in the South have given, and that is the warning which I wish through my adjournment motion to convey to the House and to the country.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। अंग्रेजी 1965 के पश्चात् देश की राष्ट्र-भाषा नहीं रहेगी यह हमारे संविधान में लिखा हुआ है। मैं वैधानिक बात कह रहा हूँ उस से अधिक नहीं कह रहा हूँ। जब संविधान बनाया था उस समय ये सब के सब मीजुद थे। बहुसंख्या के आधार पर प्रजातंत्र चलता है तो इस समय 99 प्रतिशत को 1 प्रतिशत के लिए जो बलि चढ़ाया जा रहा है यह देश के लिए किसी प्रकार से भी लाभदायक नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री त्रिबेदी ।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिबेदी (भदसौर) : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी जो बात दक्षिण भारत में हुई है हम उस के साथ संवेदना जाहिर किये बगैर नहीं रह सकते। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से जो हुआ, वह भी कुछ अच्छा नहीं हुआ और लोगों की तरफ से जो हुआ वह भी कुछ अच्छा नहीं हुआ। लेकिन इस का दोष हम किस को दे सकते हैं, यह हमें देखना चाहिए।

जब हम ने अपना संविधान बनाया तो हम ने आर्टिकल 120 में यह लिख दिया कि हम पन्द्रह साल में अंग्रेजी के बजाये हिन्दी की स्थापना राज-भाषा के रूप में कर देंगे। इसी प्रकार आर्टिकल 343 से आर्टिकल 348 में भी यही बात कही गई है। लेकिन किन्हीं कारणों से स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने आफ्रिशल लैंग्वेज एक्ट के नाम से एक कानून बनवा लिया जिस में व्यवस्था की गई कि हिन्दी के साथ अंग्रेजी सहभाषा रहेगी। संविधान के मुताबिक इस से ज्यादा करने की गुंजायश नहीं थी। जब वह कानून बन चुका था तो ऐसी कौन सी बात हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कर दी थी, जिस से दक्षिण वालों के दिलों में आशंकायें पैदा हुईं और क्या यह आशंका वास्तविक थी या किसी ख्यास पक्ष वालों ने एक वाद को ले कर चलने वालों ने यह स्थिति पैदा कर दी थी, यह बात हमें सोचनी होगी।

हिन्दी वालों ने कभी यह कोशिश नहीं की कि हम यह भाषा ठूस कर दूसरों के गले में उतार दें। आखिर अंग्रेजी हमारी मातृ-भाषा नहीं है। जो भाषा परदेश से, दूसरे मुल्क से पांच हजार मील की दूरी से हमारे यहाँ आई हुई है, जब हम उस भाषा को अपना सकते हैं, तो क्या हम अपने बतन की, हमारे मुल्क की, हमारी ही मातृ-भाषा, राष्ट्र-भाषा संस्कृत से निकली हुई और उसी लिपि में लिखी जाने वाली भाषा को नहीं अपना सकते हैं, क्या हम उस को नहीं सीख सकते हैं, क्या हम उस का प्रसार नहीं कर

सकते हैं? अगर हम चाहते तो जरूर कर सकते थे। लेकिन हम ने कभी यह कोशिश नहीं की कि हम अपने बालकों को 1950 के बाद पांचवीं से आठवीं या दसवीं क्लास तक हिन्दी सिखायें। अगर सब बालकों को हिन्दी सिखाई जाती तो आज यह समस्या पैदा न होती।

आज मुझे तो एक ही सवाल दिखाई देता है। चाहे बंगाल हो, चाहे तमिलनाडु हो और चाहे केरल हो, वहाँ के जिन लोगों को नौकरी की पड़ी हुई है, जो बड़ी बड़ी नौकरियों के पीछे रात टपकाते घमते हैं, उन के दिलों में एक ही बात है कि नौकरी नहीं मिलेगी। यह सवाल नौकरी का है। ये लोग रोजी और रोटी के पीछे, हिन्दी के पीछे पड़ गए और उन्होंने यह सवाल पैदा कर दिया। हिन्दी सब जगह प्रचलित है। ऐसा कौन सा देश है, ऐसा कौन सा स्थान है जहाँ हिन्दी नहीं समझी जाती है, जहाँ हिन्दी वाले नहीं मिलते हैं? बर्मा में मैं ने देखा है कि वहाँ पर बर्मी भाषा के होते हुए भी
(Interruption).

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): There are so many places.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri): I request the hon. Member to make a visit to Tamilnad and see things for himself. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When I stand up all the hon. Members should sit down. No Member ought to be on his legs when I stand up. That is the first point. Secondly, I will again appeal to the good sense of the hon. Members. We are having discussion on a vital matter. It has excited the emotions of many sections of the people and there has been so much of trouble. We should talk about it seriously. It cannot be decided in this manner, by shouts from one side of the House replied by shouts from the other side. Let us listen to every view very patiently and then see what can be done about it.

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : श्री० एम० के० के मेरे मित्र ने यह अपत्ति की है कि तमिलनाडु में जा कर देखिये कि वहाँ पर कोई हिन्दी समझ सकता है या नहीं। मेरे मित्र श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् तमिलनाडु के हैं और मैं ने उन की लिखी हुई पुस्तक हिन्दी में पढ़ी है। मैं तमिलनाडु के बहुत से आदमियों को जानता हूँ, जो अच्छी हिन्दी जानते हैं।

Shri Rajaram: May I inform my hon. friend that it has been translated by others?

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : मैं तमिलनाडु के उन ब्राह्मण विद्वानों को जानता हूँ, जिन को सारी रमायण, महाभारत और वेद कंठस्थ हैं। (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं मननीय सदस्यों को याद दिलाऊँ कि टाइम सिर्फ़ ढाई बंटे है। अगर इस तरह टाइम जाया चला जायेगा, तो बहुत थोड़े मेम्बर बोल सकेंगे। (Interruptions).

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : हुकम होगा तो मैं बैठ जाऊँगा मुझे इजाजत दीजिये कि बोल लूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इनका समय जाता है। हमें देखना चाहिये कि अपने समय का जितनी अच्छी तरह से वह इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं, कर।

श्री बागड़ी साहब बोलें। वह क्या कहना चाहते हैं ?

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) बाहर निकाले जाने वाला या मर्यादा किये जाने वाला कानून मेरे लिए है, मसूदा पर ही वह लागू होता है या और भी जो कोई हल्ला मल्ला करते हैं, उन पर भी लागू होता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या इसका आपका जवाब चाहिये।

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्र बाकी इस बात का बड़ा सख्त अफसोस है कि इस तरह से हमारे कुछ मित्र यह समझ कर बैठे हुए हैं और इस की निश्चित नींव डाल कर उन्होंने अपनी पार्टी की स्थापना कर ली है या पार्टी की स्थापना के समय ही इसका निश्चय कर लिया था कि हम को उत्तर के साथ सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना है। ऐसे आदमियों के वास्ते मैं कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। इन के बारे में मैं पहले ही कह चुका हूँ। इस देश का कोई वतनी इस देश के टुकड़े कराने पर अगर जोर देता है तो वह अपने आप को देशप्रेमी तो नहीं कह सकता है और कुछ कहना चाहे तो भले ही अपने आप को कह सकता है। ऐसे लोगों से मेरा कोई वास्ता नहीं है और उन से मैं बिनती भी नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन जो अपने आप को इस देश का वासी समझते हैं, भारतवासी अपने आप को समझते हैं, उन को तो एक दफा नहीं सौ बार अपने गले में यह बात उतारनी होगी कि अगर इस देश में कोई भी भाषा बोली जा सकती है, कोई भी भाषा राज भाषा होने की शक्ति रखती है, दवा कर सकती है तो वह केवल हिन्दी ही है।

मैं गजराती हूँ, हिन्दी भाषी नहीं हूँ। मैं हिन्दी भाषी प्रदेश का रहने वाला हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह अच्छी तरह से समझता हूँ कि अगर किसी भाषा को राष्ट्र भाषा बनना है तो सिवाय हिन्दी के वह और कोई दूसरी भाषा नहीं हो सकती है। इस के ऊपर इतना विरोध करना, विरोध कर के सरकार...

Shri Muthu Gounder (Tiruppattur): That will never happen. We will fight.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We will also fight; do not worry.

Mr. Speaker: I will not be able to conduct the proceedings of this House if hon. Members behave in that manner. Inside the House these scenes

cannot be tolerated. Hon. Members, everyone of them, will have to listen to whatever is said whether they like it or not. That would show the spirit of democracy that they have got in themselves.

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly): They do not believe in democracy.

श्री उ० म० त्रिवेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इतने विघ्न डालने की कोशिश की गई है इस बीच में कि काफी समय उन में ही व्यतीत हो गया है, फिर भी मैं आप का आभारी हूँ कि आप ने मझे इतना समय बोलने के लिए दिया है। मेरा यह कहना है कि अगर प्रजातंत्र में हमारा विश्वास है, अगर संविधान में हमारी मान्यता है और उस को हम मानते हैं तो हर एक आदमी अपनी छाती पर हाथ रख कर यह बताये कि संविधान बनाने समय उसके दिल में क्या दूसरी कोई भाषा थी या कि यह था कि सिवाय हिन्दी के दूसरी कोई भाषा राज भाषा हमारे यहां नहीं बन सकती है। जब हम ने इस को मंजूर कर लिया था और दिल से मंजूर कर लिया था तो आज इस का पालन क्यों नहीं किया जाता है? जब हम 1952 में यहां आये थे और हम ने संविधान की कसम खाई थी और कहा था कि हम संविधान के अनुसार चलेंगे, इस का पालन करेंगे तो आज हम किस तरह से यह कहने के लिए तैयार हो गए हैं कि हम इस को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं उन आदमियों से बिनती करूंगा जो कि इसके विरुद्ध जाना चाहते हैं और वे अपने दिल पर हाथ रख कर बतायें कि क्या अंग्रेजी उन की मातृभाषा है? तमिल और तेलुगू से क्या अंग्रेजी का कोई सम्बन्ध है? क्या यह भी सच नहीं है कि संस्कृत, कृष्ण, हिन्दी की बर्णमाला, उस के एक्सफेक्टस से, ए, आ, इ, ई, क, ख, ग इत्यादि से भारतवर्ष की सभी भाषायें नहीं निकली हैं। उसको अपनाने के वारते आपके दिल में कितना बंद पैदा हो रहा है? क्यों आप सरकारी मकान तोड़ रहे हैं, क्यों आप रेलगाड़ियाँ

तोड़ रहे हैं, क्यों आप सब-इन्स्पेक्टर को जला रहे हैं और यह सब कुछ कहां तक उचित है? यह मानना होगा कि इस तरह से देश का ही नुकसान होता है। सरकार ने ज्यादाती की या नहीं की इस में जाना नहीं चाहता हूं। उस ने की होगी। लेकिन फिर भी इतना मैं जरूर कहता हूं कि सरकार ने गलती की कि शुरू में ही ऐसे कदम नहीं उठाये और उसका ही यह नतीजा है कि यह दशा हुई। अगर शुरू में ही सरकार ने इस तरह के कदम उठा लिये होते तो आज जो हमें भुगतना पड़ा है वह भुगतना न पड़ता।

This policy of appeasement all along has been the ruin of this country and must be stopped for all time to come.

श्री पालीवाल (हिण्डौन) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भाषा के प्रश्न को ले कर जो स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, वह निस्सन्देह बहुत चिन्ता का विषय है। इस प्रश्न को ले कर कुछ तत्वों ने एक ऐसी स्थिति खड़ी कर दी है जिस के लिए वास्तव में देखा जाय तो कोई गम्भीर कारण नहीं था। हमें यह मानना चाहिये कि यह एक दुःखद सत्य है लेकिन है जरूर कि हमारे देश में कुछ तत्व ऐसे हैं जो देश के टुकड़े करना चाहते हैं दक्षिण भारत में और उतर भारत में। उनकी संख्या चाहे अधिक नहीं है, थोड़ी है लेकिन वे हैं जरूर। इस को हमको मान लेना चाहिये।

इसके अनिश्चित कुछ तत्व ऐसे भी हैं देश में जिन की नीति ही यह है कि कोई ऐसी स्थिति हो जिससे इस देश की एकना कमजोर पड़े और वे अपने वाद को इस देश पर, समुच्चय पर या इसके कुछ भाग पर लाद सकें। ये तत्व किसी भी स्थिति का अपने श्रेय की सिद्धि के लिए इस्तेमाल करना

चाहते हैं। ऐसे ही तत्व हैं जो इस स्थिति पर मन ही मन सन्तोष मान रहे हैं और इस का जितना रूप है, उस से अधिक अनिश्चित करके दिखाना चाहते हैं।

सीधे सादे शब्दों में कहा जाय तो यह कहा जा सकता है कि देश का बहुत बड़ा भाग देश की बहुत बड़ी जनता, कन्याकुमारी से ले कर के हिमालय तक और असम से ले करके राजस्थान तक इस देश को एक सुदृढ़ राष्ट्र के रूप में देखना चाहती हैं। देश को सुदृढ़ बनाने के लिए और उसको कायम रखने के लिए कुछ मूलभूत चीजें होती हैं जिन को हमारे संविधान में स्थान दिया गया है। उन मूलभूत चीजों में एक चीज यह भी है कि हम ने यह स्वीकार किया है कि इस देश की एक भाषा ऐसी जरूर होनी चाहिये जिस के द्वारा देश के भिन्न भिन्न भागों में आपस में हम विचार विमर्श कर सकें। यह कहीं भी नहीं है कि देश की प्रादेशिक भाषाओं की प्रवहेलना की जाय। देश की प्रादेशिक भाषाओं की उन्नति का भी संविधान में स्थान है। लेकिन यह तो मानना ही होगा कि प्रादेशिक भाषाएँ उस भाषा का स्थान नहीं ले सकती हैं जिस के द्वारा सारे देश को एक सूत्र में हमें बांधना है और एक सूत्र में बांध करके चलना है।

मैं यह नहीं कहता हूं कि इस विषय में कोई जल्दी की जाय। आपने देखा होगा, अध्यक्ष महोदय, कि मैं बहुत कम बोलता हूं, कभी कभी बोलता हूं। मैं स्वयं हिन्दी भाषी हूं और आपने देखा होगा कि स्वयं हिन्दी भाषी होते हुए भी जब कभी हिन्दी के विषय में अधिक उतावलेपन का यहाँ प्रसंग प्राया है, तो मैं उस से प्रमहमत रहा हूं। फिर भी

[श्री प.ल. बाल]

यह तो मानना ही होगा कि अन्ततोगत्वा, आज न सही, पांच साल बाद सही, दस साल बाद सही, बीस साल बाद सही, पच्चीस साल बाद सही, कोई भी समय नियत कर लीजिये, कोई समय हम ऐसा जरूर देखना चाहते हैं जब इस देश में विदेशी भाषा के स्थान पर जो आज हमारे सारे देश के विचार-विनिमय का आधार बनी हुई है, हिन्दी आ सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बात को मूलभूत रूप से सब मानते हैं। यहाँ तक कि मोशन को मूव करने वाले महोदय ने भी एक बात को तो माना है, यद्यपि उन्होंने इस स्थिति को अतिरंजित कर के पेश किया है और सरकार के ऊपर जितनी गालियाँ वह लाद सकते हैं, उन्होंने लाद दी हैं। यह मानना चाहिये कि देश के अनेक भाग देश को एक सुदृढ़ राष्ट्र के रूप में देखना चाहते हैं और उन्होंने इस बात को मूलभूत रूप में मान लिया है कि एक भाषा देश में होनी चाहिये। हमको यह मानना चाहिये। अधिक से अधिक कोई स्थिति है तो यह है कि उस समय हमारे संविधान के बनाने वाले हमारे नेताओं ने या राष्ट्र के प्रतिनिधियों ने जो समय नियत किया था पन्द्रह साल का, वह कम रहा। उस समय वे ठीक ठीक यह अन्दाज नहीं लगा सके कि पन्द्रह साल में इतना काम नहीं हो सकेगा। या यों कहें कि पन्द्रह साल का समय तो ठीक रखा था किन्तु उसके इम्प्लिमेंटेशन में जो गति हम समझते थे कि इस गति से इस काम को किया जा सगा, उस गति से वह काम नहीं किया जा सकेगा। यह सरकार की एक फॅल्योर मानी जा सकती है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस समय हमारे सामने केवल एक विकल्प है, एक ही रास्ता है, और वह यह है कि आहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्तों के

सामने जो कठिनाई है उस को झेली भाँति समझा जाये और उसके विषय में सहानुभूति से विचार किया जाये। लेकिन वह सहानुभूति किस रूप में हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अधिक से अधिक यह हो सकती है कि हम यहाँ पर बैठ कर ठंडे दिल से विचार करेंगे और तब इस बात को मानेंगे। सहानुभूति का अर्थ यही है कि हम जल्दी में कोई ऐसा काम न करें जिससे वहाँ के रहने वालों को कुछ नुकसान हो, उन के इंटेरेस्ट को कुछ धक्का लग, उनके हितों को धक्का लग। जहाँ तक हितों का सम्बन्ध है, इसमें कोई इमोशनल बात नहीं है। जो सबसे बड़ी हितों की बात है वह मेरे खयाल में सर्विज की है। सर्विसेज के माभले में लोग कुछ घाटे में रह जाते हैं जब कम्पटीशन होता है और सारा काम उस भाषा में होता है जिसको वे अभी तक पूरी तरह जान नहीं पाये संख नहीं सके हैं। वे लोग कुछ घाटे में रहते हैं। यह ठीक बात है और मानने योग्य बात है। तो इसके लिये कुछ समय नियत कर दिया जाये। लेकिन जो गन्ती हमने इस बार की, वह आगे के लिये नहीं होनी चाहिये। पिछली बार हमने पन्द्रह साल की अवधि तो नियत की, लेकिन उस अवधि में, इस भाषा को सीखने का काम या यह भय, जिस प्रकार से अंग्रेजी का स्थान लेंगे, इसका क्रमबद्ध कार्यक्रम हम नहीं बना सके और हमारा उद्देश्य पूरा नहीं हो सका। यदि हम लोग यह मान लें कि आगे के लिये एक अवधि निश्चित की जाये और इस अवधि में प्रति वर्ष हम एक कार्यक्रम के रूप में काम करना शुरू करें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत सी कठिनाइयाँ दूर हो जायेंगी।

एक मांग सामने आ रही है और वह यह कि अनिश्चित काल तक के लिये अंग्रेजी सहभाषा बनी रहे। मैं बहुत नम्र निवेदन करता हूँ। मैं कभी भी हिन्दी फेनेटिक नहीं रहा, लेकिन फिर भी मेरा नम्र निवेदन है

कि इस स्थिति को मानने के लिये मेरा दिमाग तैयार नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो अहिन्दी भाषाभाषी प्रान्त हैं वहाँ की जनता को अधिक से अधिक सुविधा दी जाये, जितना रीजनेबल समय हो सकता है उस से भी अधिक समय उनको उदार हो कर हिन्दी सीखने के लिये दिया जाये।

Shri S. Kandappan (Truchengode):
We are not craving for your sympathy.
We demand our rights. (Interruptions).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
This is the feeling you have raised.

Mr. Speaker: If everyone is only conscious of his rights, then nobody will look after his obligations.

Shri S. Kandappan: We have already sacrificed enough for the Hindi demon. Let there be no more insinuation. We are magnanimous enough. That is why we are keeping quiet in the larger interest when the Hindi speeches are made in this House.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):
There is the English translation provided.

Mr. Speaker: When I am speaking, I am being interrupted again and again. Let us be conscious of our obligations and look to the unity of the country. Otherwise, this discussion cannot take place. We know that there are differences. But why should there be such an excitement here?

श्री पालीवाल : मेरा निवेदन यह था कि हम इस सदन में या दूसरी किसी कांफ्रेंस टेबल पर शान्ति के साथ बैठ कर विचार करें। जो नीति हम स्वीकार कर चुके हैं मूलभूत रूप से, उस उद्देश्य से इधर उधर तो नहीं जाया जा सकता, लेकिन उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिये समय का कार्यक्रम बनाने के बारे में, मैं समझता हूँ, हम विचार कर

सकते हैं। इसके लिये एक राउंड टेबल पर बैठ कर विचार किया जा सकता है और एक सर्वसम्मत हल निकाला जा सकता है। लेकिन मेरा यह निवेदन होगा कि उसके इम्प्लिमेंटेशन में जो इधर उधर के तत्त्व भोली जनता को भड़का कर लालसेनेस की कार्रवाई कराते हैं, उन के प्रति अत्यन्त कठोर रुख रखना चाहिये और ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को उसे दबाना चाहिये, क्योंकि मैं मानता हूँ कि यहाँ जो घटनायें एक क्षेत्रमें होती हैं उनका असर दूसरे क्षेत्रों पर अच्छा नहीं पड़ता है। लोग समझते हैं कि शायद ऐसी घटनायें करवा कर ही अपनी बात को मनाया जा सकता है। यह एक अच्छा प्रिसिडेंट नहीं होता। इससे सारे देश की शान्ति और व्यवस्था खतरे में पड़ सकती है और हिन्दुस्तान की एकता खतरे में पड़ सकती है। जो लोग इस तरह से भड़काने वाले हैं उनको समूचीन रूप से बड़ाई के साथ और मजबूती के साथ रोका जाना चाहिये। न इसमें कोई उदारता की बात है न अनायास की बात है।

Shri Manoharan (Madras South):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I must say that I do not like to confine myself with the language policy of the Government of India at present because that I can do during the debate on the President's Address.

We are now discussing the adjournment motion tabled by Mr. Mukherjee on the police excesses and the calling in of military and as to how innocent people in Madras State were caught like a mouse in a trap and shot like a dog. I can understand the feelings expressed by certain Members here. (Interruption).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं माननीय मेम्बरों से बार बार अपील कर रहा हूँ कि इस तरह की बातें यहाँ नहीं उठाई जानी चाहियें।

श्री रामेश्वरामय्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा उनसे निवेदन है कि जिन्होंने साइन

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

उखाड़ दी और भाग लगा दी उनको गिर्दोष कहा जा रहा है ।

सभ्यता महोदय : मगर हर वक्त सोगों को खड़े हो जाना तो ठीक नहीं है ।

Shri Manoharan: The leader of the Jan Sangh Party, Mr. Trivedi was saying that Hindi is going to be the only official language, one and the only official language. With your permission, Sir, on behalf of the South, I tell you that Hindi can never be and shall never be the only official language. (Interruptions). Therefore, it is quite unnecessary. . . .

Shri Thirumala Rao: Every time the word 'South' is appropriated by Tamilnad. But that is not the case. (Interruptions).

Shri Manoharan: I am very happy that Mr. Thirumala Rao is wanting me to include Bengal, Orissa and Assam—not only the South.

Shri Atulya Ghosh (Asansol): Bengal has accepted Hindi as the only official language.

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah (Adoni): Don't make capital out of this situation. We resent it very much. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Everyone has a right to claim that he is speaking on behalf of a province or some section of population. But the others can also counteract that claim. Therefore, we ought to listen to what the Member says. Let him make that claim. When other speak, they may say that it is not correct. (Interruption).

Shri Manoharan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I am disturbed like this, I may require more time.

Mr. Speaker: I must assure him that these interruptions are also part of the game. But one thing must be made

clear. If some particular Member is interrupted again and again, deliberately, then I will have to give him time.

Shri Manoharan: Mine is a narration of what has happened in Madras State as well as the rest of the south for the past 20 days.

An hon. Member: Not south.

Shri Manoharan: Please do not disturb.

On January 25, the students of Madras colleges, 50,000 students, had their procession in order to protest against the imposition of Hindi. They wanted to meet the Chief Minister of my State. They went to Fort. St. George with a view to meet him. Very arrogantly, the Chief Minister of Madras refused to meet them.

An hon. Member: That is wrong.

Shri Manoharan: I can prove it. I accept the challenge. He refused to meet the students. That irritated the student population on the 25th. On the 25th midnight, leaders of the DMK in Madras State were all rounded up, arrested and put behind bars without assigning any reason at all. We the DMK, had passed a resolution in our executive to observe January 26 as a day of mourning . . .

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Some other hon. Members: Shame on you.

Shri Manoharan: I cannot understand this, why they should do this instead of listening to me.

Mr. Speaker: I am all attention. He might continue.

Shri Manoharan: We had decided to observe January, 26 as a day of mourning, only January 26, 1965. The previous Republic Days were celebra-

ted by the DMK leaders of the country. But we had specially chosen this particular Republic Day for observing as a day of mourning, because on that particular Republic Day for observing only official language of the country. That was why we had chosen that particular Republic Day for observing our intention to hold hundred meetings in each division. The police interfered immediately. They said: 'You should reduce the number of your meetings to one, because the law and order situation comes in. We will have to give you protection. Therefore, you have to reduce it to one and have a meeting'. We agreed. The next day in the Assembly, the Chief Minister of Madras State said: 'You are cowards. Have you got enough audacity to hold hundred meetings?' That explains his mind.

On the 26 morning, The Venkateswara Hostel and the Law College Hostel were raided by the police. On the 25th midnight, for your information, goondas engineered by the Congress Party Secretary there, or Congress goondas entered the Venkateswara Hostel....

An hon. Member: That is not proper.

Mr. Speaker. Order, order. I must remind the hon. Member that that would be a dangerous game to play because if it is once started, there would be no end to it. I would appeal to him to desist from it....

An Hon. Member: This is not Madras.

Mr. Speaker: He should not indulge in it. He knows the atmosphere also. Therefore, we ought not to go into such things.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): If it is a statement of fact, what is to be done?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Can one refer to the conduct of a person who is not present here?

2148(Ai) LSD—3.

Shri Manoharan: He was a party to that raid—I am sorry.

Shri Atulya Ghosh rose—

Shri Manoharan: On the 25th morning, there was a procession in Madurai almost all students of high schools. They had a peaceful, orderly procession. That procession was disturbed by—now I can say freely—goondas who are in the District Congress Committee office. They pounced upon the students with lethal weapons, deadly weapons. One student was grievously injured; another was beaten down. What action the Government of Madras has taken against these goondas, I do not know. But these students were assaulted. They were put behind bars.

On the 27th—I think this narration will give a clear picture—Annamalai University students took out a procession. That was in sympathy with the students who were brutally assaulted by Congress goondas with the help of the police in Madras State.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): On a point of order. The hon. Member is criticising and making imputations against a State Government. The subject under discussion here is the conduct of the Central Government. I would like your ruling on the point as to whether he can discuss the conduct of the State Government here.

Mr. Speaker: My difficulty is that the motion also, as worded, is confined to the failure of the Central Government, but we have got the results of it. That also comes in there. Therefore, I could not stop him.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): On a point of order. The hon. Member is referring to something which has nothing to do with Hindi as such. He is talking about the law and order problem in a State.

An hon. Member: No, no.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is not Hindi as such.

Shri Manoharan: On the 27th, the Annamalai University students' procession was disturbed by the police. One student, Rajendran, was shot dead. So many students were killed.

The Thyagaraja Engineering College was raided and students teargassed and lathi-charged. The Madura Arts College Principal—an old man of 60 years—in spite of his declaration that he is the principal of the college, was brutally assaulted by the police and was admitted to hospital.

On another day, eminent professors like Elakkuvanar, a Tamil professor, and Arunachala Goundar, the Vice-Principal of Hindu College, were arrested and put behind bars. All over Tamil Nad, 30,000 DMK office-bearers including leaders were rounded up.

Immediately, the Chief Minister of Madras announced the closure of colleges. The worst part of this announcement was when he said that thereby through the closure of colleges—he could earn or he could save Rs. 5 crores. Nowhere in the world you could find such political behaviour.

There was shooting at many places. The military was alerted. Kumarpalayam, Thiruchengode, Thirupur, Pollachi—our hon. Food Minister's constituency—Coimbatore, Karur, Manapparai, Kamban, Gudalur, Thiruvottiyur, Peranampet, Jelarpet, Madras, Arani—these are the places where shooting took place.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee said that 60 or 80 people were killed. For your information, upto the time of our leaving Madras, the number was more than 150 dead and they are on the increase. There were indiscriminate firings. Hundreds of people were killed. The rule of law was conspicuous by its absence. The law of the jungle prevailed in Madras State. The very fact that the military was alerted is itself an indication that

the civil authority failed and military authority superseded.

Immediately, I sent four telegrams, one to the Prime Minister, one to the President another to the Home Minister and the fourth to the Governor of Madras asking them to see that the callous, indifferent, obstinate, blood-thirsty Chief Minister Bhaktavatsalam and his Ministry was dismissed.

An hon. Member That is objectionable, unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: He should not transgress the limits.

Shri Manoharan: I want to know whether the Governor of Madras had appraised the situation and sent a document to the Prime Minister, if so, what action, the Government of India has taken on it.

Finally, there was self-immolation by five people. Self-immolation is not an ordinary joke—burning and reducing themselves to ashes. You should understand the people of this part of the country. My request to you is that you should understand the intensity of feeling, the depth of feeling, there. In one breath, people are talking about the integration of the country; in another, they say that 'our language, the Hindi language, is the only official language'. This is a contradiction in terms.

We, people of the south—I can include Bengal, Assam, Orissa and Gujarat, in spite of Shri Morarji Desai—I can tell him that we will never allow Hindi as the only official language of the country. Therefore, I request the Central Ministry, especially the Prime Minister to probe into the matter, to institute a judicial inquiry into the matter. In the final analysis, if the judicial pronouncement justifies the brutal action, the brutal repressive action unleashed by the Chief Minister of Madras, I am prepared to offer my membership in Parliament.

Shri Atulya Ghosh: On a point of order. The Chief Minister of Madras

is not here. He has been branded as blood-thirsty.

Mr. Speaker: Why should he stand up again?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why should he bother? He should bother about Bengal.

Mr. Speaker If something happens that is irregular, he should bother, but in the present circumstances I will not allow it.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, दुर्भाग्य से मैंने एक ऐसे राज्य में जन्म लिया है कि जिसकी मातृभाषा हिन्दी है। इसलिए पिछले 17 वर्षों में राज भाषा के सम्बन्ध में जो स्थिति सरकार की व्यवहार से चलती आई है उस में हिन्दी भाषी राज्यों की स्थिति लगभग एक मा की जैसी है जिसमें अपने बच्चे को टकड़ होने से बचाने के लिए पराई मां के मुपुर्द करना पसन्द किया। 17 साल तक यह अभागी माँ इस बच्चे को पराये हाथों में देख कर हँस खुश होती रही क्योंकि वह जीवित था लेकिन अब वह बच्चा जब उस डाइन के हाथों से हत्या होने का स्थिति में है तब फिर धैर्य सहनशीलता की सीमा को लांघ गया, और कुछ शब्द कहने के लिए मझे आज आपके सामने खड़ा होना पड़ा है क्योंकि आज जब वह माँ डायन बन कर उस बच्चे को मारता चाह रही है तो वह महन नहीं हो सकता है।

मैं पले यह बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इन उपद्रवों के बीच में ही मझे मद्रास जाने का अवसर मिला और मैंने यह जानने का यत्न किया कि इन दंगों के पीछे क्या स्थिति थी और किस प्रकार से ये दंगे भड़के। मझे अच्छी तरह से याद है कि 26 जनवरी को मद्रास नगर में जब एक हिन्दी विरोधी जलूस निकला जिसमें कुछ लड़के थे और वह भी छोटी आयु के थे। आप यदि चाहे तो उनके चित्र भी मेरे नाम माँजूद हैं और मैं आपके सामने उन्हें

प्रस्तुत कर सकता हूँ। उसके कुछ ही घंटों के बाद एक हिन्दी समर्थकों का जलूस निकला जो कि उससे बड़ा था। उसके बाद राष्ट्र के नाम गृह मन्त्री श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने हिन्दी सम्बन्धी अपनी नीति के सम्बन्ध में जो स्पष्टीकरण किया उससे स्थिति लगभग शान्त हो गयी थी और उसके बाद दो-तीन दिन तक वहाँ कोई विशेष घटना नहीं घटी। लेकिन मुझे आज इस कटु सत्य को कहने की आज्ञा दी जाय कि बंगाली में भी निर्जलिनका जन्म दिन के अवसर पर इस देश के चार प्रमुख नेता एकत्रित हुए और उन्होंने इस हिन्दी विरोध को फिर नये रूप में एक दूसरा जन्म दिया। परिणामस्वरूप वह हवा फिर भड़क उठी। दूसरी सबसे बड़ी चीज यह हुई कि कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष श्री काम राज ने कंगल में अपने एक वाषण में यह कहा कि अगर उनके पास हिन्दी में पत्र आयें तो फेंक दें। एक और देश के प्रधान मन्त्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री यह कहते हैं कि हिन्दी का विरोध संविधान का विरोध है और हिन्दी का विरोध करने वालों के साथ संविधान का विरोध करने वाली जैसी स्थिति उत्पन्न जायगी लेकिन कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष श्री कामराज जो कि सारे देश में सत्तापुत्र पार्टी के अध्यक्ष हैं वे दूसरी ओर इस तरह की बात कहते हैं। जब वे कहते हैं कि मैंने यह नहीं कहा था कि हिन्दी में अपने पत्रों को फाड़ कर फेंक दो बल्कि मैंने तो यह कहा था कि यदि उनके पास हिन्दी में पत्र आयें तो उनकी उपेक्षा कर दी जाय। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ इस सरकार से कि क्या कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष को इस प्रकार का अधिकार आपने संविधान में यह व्यवस्था रखते हुए दिया है कि वह इसी तरह की घोषणा कर सकें? वही कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष अभी कल रायपुर में यह कहते हैं कि बिना हिन्दी सीखे हुए काम नहीं चल सकता है। एक ही प्रादमी दो भाषाओं में इम तरह से बोलता है। हिन्दी भाषी राज्य में जब वह जाता है तो दूसरी भाषा बोलता है और जब वह केरल और मद्रास प्रादि में जाता है तो बिल्कुल उसके विपरीत भाषा में वह बोलता है। इससे माँ ज्यादा यह

[श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री]

बंगे भड़के तब जबकि इसी केन्द्रीय सरकार के एक जिम्मेदार मिनिस्टर ने हैदराबाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार के अपने एक दूसरे सहयोगी मन्त्री श्री भक्त दर्शन का नाम लेकर संघ लोक सेवा प्रायोग सम्बन्ध वचनव्य की आलोचना की और कहा कि इस प्रकार की नीति केन्द्रीय सरकार ने स्वीकार नहीं की है जबकि श्री भक्त दर्शन ने कहा कि मैंने सरकार के निर्णय की केवल चर्चा की है, अपनी ओर से किसी प्रकार की कोई बात नहीं कही है। बात ठंडी हो जाती लेकिन केन्द्रीय सरकार के दो जिम्मेदार मिनिस्टर्स के इस्तीफे ने उस प्राग के अन्दर घी डालने का काम किया जिसके कि परिणामस्वरूप सारे देश में स्थिति के खराब होने और वातावरण बिगड़ने को बल मिला। देश का वातावरण और भंग बिगड़ सकता था और वह अशान्ति को और भड़का सकता था। यदि मंभाला न होता। (Interruption).

कई आन्वयिक सवत्थ : भेम, भेम।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : मैं आप से बड़ी नम्रता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मन्त्री जी इस तरह से हिंसात्मक कार्यवाही होने के बाद अग्न महत्वपूर्ण राष्ट्रीय निर्णय को बदलने लग जायेंगे तो पहली बात तो मैं प्रधान मन्त्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उससे हम अपने भविष्य को सुरक्षित नहीं रख सकेंगे। मुझे यह देख कर दुःख हुआ कि मद्रास में हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों के बाद प्रधान मन्त्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने आकाशवाणी से जो अपना भाषण दिया उस अपने सारे भाषण के अन्दर जिन लोगों ने इस सरकार के हितों की रक्षा के लिए अपनी जान तक की भी परवाह नहीं की, कुछ गुंडे जिन्होंने कि पुलिस पर आक्रमण किया, सरे बाजार दरोगाघों पर पेट्रोल डाल कर भाग लगाई, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने उनके सम्बन्ध में एक शब्द भी अपने भाषण में नहीं कहा। अब कैसे पुलिस आपके

अधिकारों की रक्षा करे और क्यों आपके अधिकारों की रक्षा करने के लिए आकर अपने बाल बच्चों से सदा के लिए विदा ले ? शास्त्री जी को इस बात की चर्चा करनी चाहिए थी।

दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि इस प्रकार की हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों के बाद अग्न केन्द्रीय सरकार इतनी तेजी से अपना निर्णय बदल सकती है और प्रधान मन्त्री इस तरीके से हड़बड़ा कर भाषण दे देते हैं मानों कोई चीन का आक्रमण हो गया हो और रेडियो से ब्राडकास्ट भी किया इस तरीके से प्रधान मन्त्री इन हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों से चिन्तित हो गये कि मुख्य मन्त्रियों की मीटिंग बुलायें तो मैं आज आप से यह स्पष्ट रूप से कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह केन्द्रीय सरकार इस प्रकार का निर्णय लेकर देश में हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों को स्वयं जन्म देने का वातावरण बना रही है क्योंकि इस प्रकार हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों को रोका नहीं जा सकेगा। हम से यह कहा जाता है कि मद्रास के अन्दर रेलगाड़ी जलाई गई, मद्रास के अन्दर डाकखाने जलाये गये और उसके बाद फिर सरकार के नेता विवश हुए भाषण देने के लिए और प्रधान मन्त्री विवश हुए इस तरह का निर्णय लेने के लिए तो प्रधान मन्त्री जी मैं आप से स्पष्ट भाषा में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस क्षेत्र के निवासी जो कि पिछले 20 सालों से अपनी वाणी पर ताला डाले हुए हैं इस प्रकार की हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों से यदि सरकार के निर्णय बदलने लग गये तो आप याद रखिये कि हमने रेलगाड़ियों की पटरियां उस समय उखाड़ी थीं जिस समय कि यह लोग अंग्रेजों के तलबे झाड़ा करते थे। सन 1942 का वातावरण उनको याद होगा। अग्न हमने कहीं इस तरह की ज्वालाएं भड़का दीं जैसा वहाँ उठ रहा है और यह कान्ति की चिनगारो देश के अन्दर उठ पड़ी और दिल्ली में

यह हवा चल पड़ी जैसे कि आसार बनने लगे हैं तो यह ज्वालाये आकर संसद भवन को छुएगी उस स्थिति को आप बचा नहीं सकेंगे साथ ही उसकी सारी जिम्मेदारी इस कमजोर सरकार पर होगी जो कि इस प्रकार के निर्णय करती है।

राष्ट्र की एकता के नाम पर यह कहा जाता है कि हम अपनी जबान बन्द रखें और मौन साधे रहें पिछले 20 वर्षों से हम राष्ट्र की एकता के नाम पर चुप बैठे भी रहे लेकिन अब हमारी सहनशीलता की भी सीमा समाप्त हो चली है। राष्ट्र की एकता के नाम पर अंग्रेजी को बनाये रखने के बाद दूसरा प्रस्ताव यह आयेगा कि राष्ट्र की एकता सुरक्षित रखने के लिए अंग्रेजों को वापिस यहाँ पर बुलाया जाय। अगर इन तरीके से राष्ट्र की एकता सुरक्षित रह सकती है तो हम इस प्रकार की राष्ट्रीय एकता में विश्वास नहीं करते। सरकार की इस प्रकार से हिंसा के घ्रागे घुटने टेकने की बात को हम कदापि पसन्द नहीं कर सकते हैं। क्या हम हिंसा से डरकर राष्ट्रीय निर्णय बदलेंगे? राष्ट्रीय एकता के नाम पर पोर्टिट्ट श्री रामूल के मरने के बाद इस दुर्बल सरकार ने घुटने टेक कर देश का सन्तानाश किया है। बम्बई की गलियों में जो घटनाएं घटीं, गुजरात अहमदाबाद में जो घटनाएं घटीं हम उन्हें भूलना नहीं चाहते। क्या अब सरकार फिर चाहती है कि इस प्रकार के दुर्बल निर्णयों से मद्रास में फिर वह घटनाएं बहें या केरल में उन घटनाओं की पुनरावृत्ति हो? सरकार इन हिंसात्मक कार्यवाहियों के आगे झुक कर इस तरह की घटनाओं को प्रोत्साहन दे रही है और परिणाम यह होने वाला है कि अब मद्रास में केरल में यह हुई है तो कल को नागालैण्ड कश्मीर और गोवा में उमा प्रकार की घटनाएं घट सकती हैं। सरकार की हिंसा के आगे घुटने टेकने के कारण स्थिति गिरती ही चली जा रही है। अगर सरकार को कोई बात करनी थी तो उसे दृढ़ता के साथ अपना निर्णय

10
इस प्रकार का रखना चाहिये था कि जिससे वास्तव में देश की एकता बनी रहती। फिर एक शान्तिपूर्ण वातावरण में निर्णय लेती। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि मद्रास में अभी वह घटनाएं समाप्त भी नहीं हुई थीं वातावरण शान्त भी नहीं हुआ था लेकिन यहाँ तत्काल एक वक्तव्य में शास्त्रज ने मुख्य मन्त्रियों के सम्मेलन बुलाने की घोषणा कर दी। अगर उन्हें विचार के लिए बुलाना भी था तो मेरी समझ में उन्हें तब बुलाना ठीक होता जब देश का वातावरण शान्त होता। प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने अहिन्दी भाषी राज्यों के मुख्य मन्त्रियों के सम्मेलन की घोषणा हिंसा से डर कर की है जो कि सर्वथा अवांछनीय है और इन परिस्थितियों में सही निर्णय सम्भव नहीं होगा।

17 hrs.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के मरने के तीब्र दिन के बाद जब उनके मकान के सम्बन्ध में निर्णय लिया गया म्यूजियम बनाने का अगर 6 महीने के बाद यह कैबिनेट बैठ कर विचार करत तो शायद उनके सोचने का ढंग बिल्कुल दूसरा होता। उसी प्रकार से क्योंकि यह आन्दोलन भड़क उठा है अभी सारे देश का वातावरण गरम है इसलिए यह मुख्य मन्त्री लोग शान्ति के साथ कोई निर्णय न ले सकेंगे। ऐसे अशान्त वातावरण में मुख्य मन्त्री सम्मेलन बुलाने का अर्थ क्या था? दूसरे यह मुख्य मन्त्रियों का सम्मेलन बुलाने की वैधानिक स्थिति क्या है यह मैं प्रधान मन्त्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ? दूसरे फिर अहिन्दी भाषी राज्यों के मुख्य मन्त्रियों का एक सम्मेलन एक गलत परम्परा है। भाषा के सम्बन्ध में कोई निर्णय या परिवर्तन अगर कर सकता है तो देश की संसद ही कर सकती है या राज्यों की विधान सभा कर सकती है। मुख्य मन्त्रियों को नहीं केवल संसद को भाषा नीति पर निर्णय करने का अधिकार है। मुख्य मन्त्रियों का कोई निर्णय इस तरह से सारे देश पर

[श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री]

लादा न जाये। दूसरी सत्र से बड़ी बात यह है कि जिन मुख्य मंत्रियों को आप बुलाने जा रहे हैं वह लगभग एक ही दल के मुख्य मंत्री हैं और उस में भी एक घड़े के। यह बिलकुल एक असंवैधानिक और गलत परम्परा आप डाल रहे हैं इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह सम्मेलन आप स्थगित करें वरना देश के अन्दर आप एक बड़ी गलत परम्परा का श्रीगणेश करेंगे। अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अपने वक्तव्य के उपसंहार की ओर ले जाते हुए दो, तीन बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ। एक बात तो यह है कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के आशवासनों की चर्चा की जाती है और कहा जाता है कि उन के आशवासनों को हम पूरा करना चाहते हैं। यह राज-भाषा विधेयक मेरे हाथ में है। उसके जो उद्देश्य अन्त में लिखे हुए हैं उन उद्देश्यों में स्पष्ट लिखा है कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने समय समय पर जो भाषण दिये हैं और उन में जो आशवासन दिये हैं उन की पूर्ति के लिए राज भाषा विधेयक लाया जा रहा है। राज भाषा विधेयक लाया ही श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के आशवासनों की पूर्ति के लिए था और उस राज भाषा विधेयक में स्पष्ट स्थिति है कि जो लोग हिन्दी नहीं जानेंगे वे अनिश्चित काल तक अंग्रेजी के माध्यम से कार्य करते रहेंगे। मैं नहीं समझता कि फिर उस के बाद अंग्रेजी कैसे रहेगी? जब उस के प्रयोग पर कोई रुकावट नहीं थी तो इस तरह की दुखद स्थिति आकर क्यों बने? मुझे खुशी होगी अगर उन भाइयों ने तामिल भाषा का समर्थन किया होता और मांग की होती कि तामिल को आगे लाया जाये लेकिन वैसे न होकर अंग्रेजी के लिए आन्दोलन होना और उस में इस प्रकार की हिंसात्मक प्रवृत्तियों का सामने आना, ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि उन के पीछ कोई और सूत्र काम कर रहे हैं जोकि इस तरह से अंग्रेजी भाड़ लेकर देश की एकता को नुकसान चाना चाहते हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि अगर तामिल भाषा भाषियों को डर है कि हिन्दी के मुख्य राज भाषा हो जाने से और अंग्रेजी के सह भाषा रहने से नौकरियों में उनकी कमी हो जायगी तो हर एक राज का उन की आबादी के अनुसार कोटा निर्धारित कर दिया जाये। प्रधान मंत्री ने यह विलकुल असंवैधानिक घोषणा की है और उनको यह घोषणा करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं था कि संघ लोक सेवा आयोग के लिए केवल अंग्रेजी रहेगी जबतक कि अहिन्दी भाषी राज्य उस को न हटायें। इस तरह की घोषणाएं उन्होंने अपने रंगीले भाषण के अन्दर की हैं। अगर उनको नौकरियों में कमी होने का डर है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की नौकरियों में हर एक प्रान्त का उसकी आबादी के अनुसार कोटा नियत कर दिया जाये। कोटे के आधार पर नौकरियां दी जाय, ताकि उन की स्थिति भी सुरक्षित रहे और दूसरों की स्थिति भी सुरक्षित रहे।

अन्त में एक बात कह कर मैं बैठ जाता हूँ। आज इस विषय में दक्षिण भारत की बात बार बार कही जाती है। लेकिन दक्षिण भारत में केवल मद्रास ही नहीं, बल्कि तीन और राज्य भी दक्षिण भारत में हैं। इन के प्रतिरिक्त और भी अहिन्दी-भाषी राज्य हैं। मद्रास में तामिल अरस्तु कड़गम जैसी संस्था भी है, जो द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़गम के इस आन्दोलन का विरोध करती है। इस लिए इन को भी इस में सम्मिलित नहीं किया जाना चाहिए।

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the country has witnessed in Madras, Tamilnad, not only a mass protest as my friend Mr. Manoharan pointed out, not only self-immolation of five young men but a blood bath unprecedented since Independence. I feel that it is not only a national tragedy

but a national tragedy with a disastrous potential. May I very respectfully say to those who may not know much about the feeling at least in Tamil Nad, not to dismiss it lightly. I addressed mass meetings in Tamil Nad, not under the auspices of the DMK. My friend, Mr. Manoharan, I think, was a little resentful because I declined to address meetings under their auspices. They were a little resentful because when I addressed these meetings, I made no reference to the DMK movement. But very large numbers of students, intellectuals, doctors and lawyers came to see me and my friends will have to understand this sooner or later; I hope, sooner. What I felt was that it was not a question of loaves and fishes. It is an insult to the people of Tamil Nad and the people of Bengal; if I can describe it, it was a sort of mystique of a certain group of people, an evocation of their deep memories, historical and of language. I found that particularly among the people of Tamil Nad who had vibrant, fiercely jealous memories of a proud and rich language heritage. That is what you have got to contend with; what you will have to contend with in a place like West Bengal. You see the tragedy: the tragedy is this. The flames are spreading; they are spreading to the other non-Hindi areas. And the tragedy is heightened by this fact that there was no resistance to Hindi. I was one of the most ardent supporters of Hindi being put as the official language. No resistance at all. Whatever resistance has been has come, has been created—I say this with respect—by the increasing intolerance, increasing obscurantism, increasing chauvinism of those who purport to speak on behalf of Hindi. That is the tragedy that we see being perpetrated. . . . (Interruptions). I know Hindi. I can understand the feeling of those whose mother tongue is Hindi. I feel strongly about English—you may not respect it as my language—as you do about Hindi, as Hindi people do about Hindi. I warned them. Do not trade in hate because hate begets hate. Today you are trying to mobilise

non-Hindi people on the *Angrezi hatao* movement. It will recoil; somewhere you will catch a tartar; it will recoil into your own lap. The Hindi chauvinists have sown the wind of hate and the country is reaping whirlwind of inter language hate. That is what they have got in there. The *Angrezi hatao* movement has recoiled into their laps; it has become a *Hindi hatao* movement (Interruptions.) I know Hindi; it is my second language and I probably talk Hindi better than my friend talks English. It has been an unfortunate story and it has been a long story and I say this with due respect to the Prime Minister whose political place is full and whom I wish so well; it has been a long story of bitter hate and a long story of broken promises. I know more about this; perhaps than most people in this House because I have been at the centre of it. It started from the Language Commission. What happened? I will not point a finger at the members. But I knew in advance what was going to happen; we knew their powerful Hindi bias. There were two distinguished Indians, Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, the famous Bengali Indologist who had written outstanding books in Hindi and Dr. Subbarayan an outstanding son of Tamil Nad. What did they enter? They entered a plea for patience; they said: hasten slowly; do not impose Hindi. There is no sacrosanct deadline in the Constitution, whatever some constitutional pundits may say. I know at least as much as they do about the Constitution. The Constitution is not only misinterpreted; it has been garbled. I am not one of those who say: excise chapter 17. But I do say: where was there any religious sanctity for 1965? My friend, Shri A. K. Sen is sitting there. Where was the religious sanctity? Look at article 343(3); it gives a blanket power after 1965 to Parliament to prescribe the use of English, an unfettered power. They could have said that English could continue—I have not said it—that English could continue as the sole official language. I do

[Shri Frank Anthony.]

not understand this sudden sanctity for a non-fundamental right. The language of the provision itself gives absolute power. That is why I say, there is no need to amend the Constitution because Parliament has ample power to say what it likes with regard to Hindi. Parliament has power certainly to prescribe bilingualism. That was the Language Commission.

Then we come to the Parliamentary Language Committee. I was a member. The same intolerance, the same hate. I asked for the meetings to be held publicly so that at least the country would know what thirty people were doing with regard to the most vital matter affecting the country vitally. No, *In camera* proceedings. I asked for the Chief Minister of West Bengal to be called to give evidence I said that in 1958 both houses of the legislature of West Bengal—my friend Mr. Atulya Ghosh has not forgotten it—unanimously resolved that they would not accept Hindi as the sole official language. I asked for that; let us call him and get his evidence. I asked that the Chief Minister of Tamilnad be called because I knew that Tamilnad Government had changed its position from the time it had given evidence before the Language Commission in 1955. They had said: permanent bilingualism. All my requests were brushed aside. Even then I had an open mind. What I was horror struck at was by the absolute avalanche of hate against English. Dr. Ramaswami Mudalliar wanted to get out of that committee because he said: never in my long public life have I sat in a committee with such a befouled atmosphere. It was only then that I decided to stand out, alone if necessary against this avalanche of hate against English and mine was the only minute of dissent. Then there was this Language Bill in 1963. . . . (Interruptions.)

श्री फ्रैंक एंथनी : अंग्रेजी से घृणा अंग्रेजी राज में शुरू हुई थी । माननीय सदस्य उस

वक़्त अंग्रेज़ के साथ थे ।

Shri Frank Anthony: It was on my private Members' resolution that the Nehru Formula emerged on the 7th August, 1959. What was it? I shall finish in two minutes, Sir. It was that English shall continue—it was imperative that English shall be the associate, oblique, alternate language as long as the non-Hindi people so desire. How do they put it in the Official Language Bill? I knew that Government was under unremitting pressure from the Hindi protagonists to dilute that assurance because when the Parliamentary Language Committee report came here on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th September, I tested the *bona fides* of the Hindi elements. I moved an amendment to the substantive motion of the late Pandit Pant. I wanted to formalise Pandit Nehru's assurance. I moved an amendment: In the opinion of this House English shall be the alternate language as long as the non-Hindi speaking people so desire. You will remember the whole Hindi phalanx rose as one man to yell me down. I tested their *bona fides* and that was the measure of their *bona fides*. They had no intention . . .

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

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall finish in a minute. So far as the language was concerned, they had no intention to honour the Nehru formula. What was my objection to the Act? Sections 3 and 4 were a travesty. I wrote to the Prime Minister; I saw him. I said, "You said English shall be the alternate or associate." You put "may" and English may be used only in addition to Hindi. The Prime Minister wrote back. I have got his letter. He said "I have been advised that 'may' means 'shall'. But in the House it was clear that 'may' means 'may'; that is, English may not even

even be used. What that an assurance?

And then, the clause was a far worse backdoor method for the imposition of Hindi: 30 people sitting in camera, hand-picked. And what happened to Shri Kamath's amendment? Shri Kamath wanted to bring Parliament in. Government would not allow Parliament to come into the picture.

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

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall finish now. I had another amendment. Government would not allow non-Hindi States to come in. I said: "All right. Here is this 'may.' Let the change be by a majority comparable to article 368 so that at least it would reflect the opinion of non-Hindi States." The Government brushed me aside. I say this to the Prime Minister: if he is to save the country from balkanisation, the least he must do is to give statutory implementation to the Nehru formula. Amend section 3: delete section 4.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I thought that the hon. Mover of the censure motion would desist in coming forward with a motion which has an element of censure, as well as the question of a lack of policy and preparation for introduction of the language (*interruption*). On this occasion, when the atmosphere is surcharged with emotion, it is not proper to debate the language question and simultaneously to censure the Government for what has happened: the most tragic things have happened in Tamilnad, I know, and I do not want to minimise the forces, whatever might have been the forces, which might have given the lead resulting in a certain accumulated distress and bitterness getting behind all this movement. I do not want to belittle it, but today, what has happened in Tamilnad on the question of language has shaken the foundations, of our unity and the integration of this

country which, when the Chinese came, was proclaimed to have been strengthened. It was there on all hands, and there was no necessity of any further effort. Therefore, it is time that this House and every Member of this House, instead of accusing one party, instead of accusing the Government, pondered over the situation and see how after freedom, we are going to evolve one national, link language, with the co-operation of all sections and groups in this country.

Ours is a plural society and in a plural society every Member has got to be very tolerant and show an understanding attitude. Otherwise, this society will be broken to pieces. Ours is a political federation, but, at the same time, it is a federation of languages and cultures. In such an atmosphere, when we are considering the question of evolving one national, official language, we must exercise a good deal of restraint and patience. I never thought that, when *Pravda*, the official organ of the Soviet Union has said that all these happenings are the result of reactionary forces, an hon. Member like Shri Mukerjee could align himself on the floor of this House with forces of reaction and play into their hands.

An hon. Member: It is not correct.

Shri Khadilkar: On this occasion, we have got to understand one fundamental thing. This is a process of national struggle, a left-over thing and an unfinished task. Once Gandhiji had observed with a vision peculiar to that genius, that a time will come when in this country the people will find it difficult and there will be a tussle or conflict between two languages—not Hindi and the regional language, but Hindi and English—and it will require high statesmanship to resolve that conflict. Therefore, if we want to finish the task which has remained to be completed, we will have to recapture what we stood for. Those of us who have spent the best part of our life in

[Shri Khadilkar]

the national struggle, do we not aspire to have one national language? It would be a symbol of our unity. Prestige and self-respect demand it. When it is evolved and how it is evolved is a different question.

On this occasion, I also feel that Government should not be hustled into taking any hasty steps. You will have to evolve a policy very slowly and cautiously. In Tamilnad, patriotic people are there, but there is a lunatic fringe led by DMK and some others, supported by men like Rajaji, who have grown with age more perverse and who like "Grey Eminence", to satisfy their ego, are ready to sacrifice unity. (*Interruptions*).

Mr Speaker: I must remind the hon. leader of the DMK that when he started this game, I cautioned him that that was dangerous.

Shri Rajaram: He said, we are lunatics. He acted as a lunatic during the Samyukta Maharashtra agitation.

Mr. Speaker: That did not refer to anybody. That was only a fringe that was lunatic, not the substance.

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): We are Members of this House. If we are lunatics, this House becomes a lunatic asylum!

Mr. Speaker: He may be conscious of wherever he is. I will advise Mr. Khadilkar to be more careful in choosing his words, because there are other personalities that are being referred to. Ordinarily we do not allow such references in the debates inside the House, because they are not here to reply to that. Moreover, however much we may differ from Rajaji, we can criticise his policy, but he should not be referred to in such terms.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It was said this House is a lunatic asylum. It may be, but at least I am not a lunatic and you are not another.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, I had asked every Member to feel as he thought.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, on this occasion, I would like Government to take time. Don't act in a hurry. That would be interpreted that Government can be bullied into taking a decision. In a plural society, the essential thing is tolerance between citizens and respect for the State. I appeal to the Government. Yesterday the hon. Prime Minister has observed that he would invite all parties to discuss this matter. While inviting all the parties, consulting every section of opinion it must be remembered that this decision must be taken on a national plane. We should not surrender our right. This Parliament is supreme and the Cabinet is there. So, we must take the decision here. If we allow ourselves to be deviated from the straight path, I am afraid we are not taking lessons from history. I would appeal to Government. They should read what happened in the times of the Moghul period and the Maratha period. On this occasion, the central leadership, without surrendering to pressure, violence or bullying tactics, must assert its right, this Parliament must assert its right, and formulate a national policy.

Sir, I know 17 years have gone and today many fantastic suggestions are being made. I for one would appeal to the Home Ministry and to the Prime Minister that perhaps in their own way they thought that sufficient progress or preparation was made. There is legitimate criticism that enough preparation was not made. You cannot switch on and switch off a language and introduce a language in that way. I would appeal that more time should be given. There is no doubt about it. Language is a vital force. It is a force of integration, but it is a force of disintegration as well. Therefore, I want to suggest that after the present emotional atmosphere has been cleared, this House and all sections of the House should have an opportunity to debate the question of evolving one national language.

An Hon. Member: Not national language.

Shri Khadilkar: I am coming to that.

Mr. Speaker: This cannot be solved by running at each other's throat.

Shri Khadilkar: We must debate on the question of having one link language to begin with. Ultimately, I am convinced that every patriotic Indian, whether he belongs to the south or to the north, will come to the conclusion—it may take even 50 years—that this nation must have its own language for dealing with its business.

There are suggestions regarding quota system. I do not like it. I will explain my reasons later. There are suggestions regarding permanent bilingualism. But I would appeal to the Home Ministry and to the Prime Minister that the time has come when we must establish a national institute of languages where all languages, from the languages in the tribal areas to the regional languages which are well developed, must be studied. We must then evolve a policy. I take this opportunity again to stress that this House alone is the sovereign body to determine the language policy.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as has happened before, I speak on this occasion for myself and my two Akali colleagues and not on behalf of the Swatantra Party.

Mr. Speaker: But the Secretary of the Swatantra Party has sent in his name (*Interruptions*).

Shri Kapur Singh: Sir, no two opinions are possible on the gravity of the situation out of which this adjournment motion arises, though there may be some difference of opinion with regard to the nature and extent of the accountability of the Government for it.

I accuse this Government of three grave failings in this connection.

These three grave failings are: ideological non-appreciation of the matter involved, political mis-anticipation, and communalism and regionalism.

The entire superstructure of Chapter XVII of our Constitution rests on three or four postulates. These postulates are: that one language and a culturally uniform society is necessary for the health of a political nation; that English or any non-Indian foreign language as official language is derogatory to our self-respect as a free people; and, Hindi is spoken and understood by the largest group of Indians and as such it is entitled to be raised to the status of the official language.

Sir, had I the time or the inclination to argue on these three postulates I could have shown that they are by no means self-evident and that, at best, they are arguable. But this Government has treated these postulates as dogmas with the result that it has led to the crisis which we are discussing today.

With regard to political mis-anticipation of this Government I would say that it consists of a smug belief that choice and implementation of Hindi as an official language is a dry pragmatic matter which does not involve any emotional repercussions.

That Hindi to non-Hindi people spells out, firstly, permanent political weightage to Hindi speakers, secondly, assertion of cultural superiority of Hindi speakers over all others and, thirdly, denigration of older, superior and richer non-Hindi languages of India was never properly understood by our rulers, and thus they failed to anticipate the emotional outburst that now near-threatens the integrity of the country and the solidarity of the nation.

The third failing was communalism and regionalism. I can best illustrate it by referring to the case and the fate of the Punjabi language after it

[Shri Kapur Singh]

was decided to make Hindi the official language of Independent India. The Punjab University Commission of 1930, which was presided over by such an eminent Sanskrit scholar as Dr. Wooluer, with a galaxy of learned Punjabi Hindus as members, reported in a carefully considered Report, that (1) Punjabi was the oldest and one of the most well-developed, morphologically, of the Indo-Sanskrit languages, (2) its written literature was one of the richest of all Indo-Sanskrit languages, and (3) its true and natural alphabet, Gurmukhi, was chronologically nearest to Brahmi, and phonologically most suited for its language.

Up to 1947, for over a quarter of a century, the All India Congress Committee officially recognised it as the mother-tongue of the inhabitants of the area between Attock and Jamuna, of three crores of Indians. But, in 1948, since independence came and power passed into the hands of a certain class of people.....

Mr. Speaker: How are these things relevant?

Shri Kapur Singh: I am trying to explain how our emotional reactions have been affected by the imposition of Hindi. I am now concluding.

Mr. Speaker: How does Punjabi come into the picture?

Shri Kapur Singh: Punjabi comes in because it is this type of imposition of Hindi which has given rise to the emotional outburst in the South. I am trying to explain my point.

Yet, in 1948, suddenly, the All India Congress Committee repudiated its previous stand and the hon. Member, Shri K. M. Munshi, one of the revered leaders of my party, declared . . .

Mr. Speaker: Discussion on the President's Address might be the most suitable occasion for referring to this.

Shri Kapur Singh: Shri K. M. Munshi declared that Hindi was the mother-tongue of the Punjabis. The Punjabi Hindus declared that their mother-tongue, because they were Hindus, was Hindi. The Hindu pandit, solemnly argued that Punjabi was a dialect of Hindi; that it was the language of the vulgar Sikhs, that Gurmukhi was a barbarians' script. So, the Hindu masses, led by some of those who now lend lustre to this House as members, shouted:

"Ooda aida nahi padhenge,
gandi bhasha nahi padhenge."

One of those hon. Members, at least, publicly declared that abusive insult to Sikh gurus, particularly Guru Gobind Singh, was a necessary corollary to spread of Hindi. Can you blame people if they refuse to be misled by the spoken word and understand the true intentions of those who would have Hindi as our official language?

The question of language is a political and a cultural question. It is not an administrative and lingual question. Hindi is not a language but a banner of communal and regional domination. It is a symptom of an attitude that enslaved us for a thousand years. Its cementing power is questionable but its destroying power of our functional unity is now clear and has become all too evident by the incidents that have taken place in the South.

May I now conclude by a tell-tale quotation from the eleventh century Indologist, al-Biruni, who accompanied Mahmood of Ghazni into India and who wrote the authoritative book, *kitab-ul-Hind*? In that he says about the type who now espouse the cause of Hindi in the manner they are doing:

"All their fanaticism is directed against those who do not belong to them. They call them *mlechhas* and forbid having any connection with them . . . their

haughtiness is such that if you tell them of any science or scholar in Khuranan or Persia they will think you to be both an ignoramus and a liar.'

India must not be allowed to escalate into these dark ages again and Hindi, therefore, must be given up in the interests of a united nation, an integrated country and a modern forward-looking Hindu people.

X

श्री भगवत झा आजाब (भागलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस स्थगन प्रस्ताव को पेश करते हुए श्रीमान् हीरेन मुखर्जी ने कहा कि "मैं यह प्रस्ताव इस लिए पेश कर रहा हूँ कि सरकार की भाषा नीति अनिश्चित है, इसका कार्यान्वयन गलत हुआ, मद्रास में जो हिंसात्मक कार्रवाई हुई वह सरकार की गलती के कारण हुई" और चौथी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि इस देश में सिर्फ हिन्दी को सहायता मिली। उन्होंने स्थगन प्रस्ताव को पेश करते हुए ये चार बातें कहीं।

मैं आप के सामने और इस सदन के सामने यह बात रखना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सच है कि सरकार की भाषा नीति अनिश्चित है? अगर यह अनिश्चित है तो पिछले 17 वर्षों से सरकार ने इस भाषा नीति पर विचार किया और इसमें सिर्फ हिन्दी प्रान्तों के लोगों ने ही नहीं बल्कि दक्षिण के, उत्तर के, पूर्व के, पश्चिम के और मध्य के, सम्पूर्ण देश के, हिमालय पहाड़ से लेकर कन्याकुमारी तक और बंगाल की खाड़ी से लेकर अरब समुद्र तक के सम्पूर्ण देश की जनता और सरकारों ने, सम्पूर्ण देश के विभिन्न दलों के सदस्यों ने, जितने देश में शिक्षा विशारद थे उन्होंने सब ने भाग लिया और उम के बाद यह भाषा नीति बनायी गयी। आज की भाषा नीति कांग्रेस सरकार की बनायी हुई भाषा नीति नहीं है, बल्कि इसको निर्धारित करने में देश के सभी लोगों ने भाग लिया है। हिन्दी के विषय में देश में जहाँ भी कोई कांग्रेस हुई, उस में केवल हिन्दी प्रान्त

वालों ने ही भाग नहीं लिया, बल्कि उन में म. स. ने, केरल ने, मैसूर ने, महाराष्ट्र ने, गुजरात आदि तमाम प्रदेशों के प्रतिनिधियों ने भाग लिया। अगर यह बात सच है तो इस भाषा नीति को एन्थनी साहब, जो इस सदन के एक नामजद सदस्य बहुत समय से चले आ रहे हैं, हिन्दी प्रान्त वालों की भाषा नीति कैसे कह सकते हैं। वह भी उस कमेटी के सदस्य थे जिस में इस विषय पर विचार किया गया था, और उन्होंने कहा कि मैंने प्रधान मंत्री को लिखा, मैंने सदन में पेश किया। लेकिन यह सब कहने के बावजूद यह बात सच है कि हिन्दुस्तान की भाषा नीति अब तक एक मत से बनायी गयी है।

यह बात सच है कि 26 जनवरी को हिन्दी हिन्दुस्तान की राजभाषा बन गयी। पर यह किसी एक सूबे के कहने से नहीं हुआ, बल्कि इसके पूर्व हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री के नेतृत्व में हिन्दुस्तान के गृह मंत्री के अंदर में, तमाम राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्रियों ने इस बात पर बहस की, और जहाँ तक मुझे याद है इस भाषा को 26 जनवरी को राजभाषा घोषित करने के पूर्व 23 दिसम्बर को जो अन्तिम बैठक हुई, उस बैठक में इन तमाम प्रश्नों की विस्तार से व्याख्या की गयी। मैं जाना चाहता हूँ गृह मंत्री से कि क्या यह बात सच है कि जब उन्होंने कान्फरेंस बुलायी तो उसमें मद्रास के मुख्य मंत्री श्री भक्त बत्सलम ने, मैसूर के श्री त्रिविक्रमियप्पा ने, केरल के मुख्य मंत्री ने भाग लिया। क्या यह बात सच है कि इन तमाम अहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्तों के मुख्य मंत्रियों ने एक मत से इस भाषा नीति को स्वीकार किया?

आखिर 26 जनवरी को हुआ क्या? हमारे संविधान के अनुसार जहाँ 26 जनवरी, 1965 से इस देश में एक मात्र एक भाषा हिन्दी होती वहाँ हम ने अपने अहिन्दी भाषी मित्रों की भावनाओं का खयाल रख कर, उनके विचारों के साथ हम ने अपने विचार

[श्री भगवत झा आजाद]

को मिला कर, यह मंजूर किया कि इस देश में अंग्रेजी एक सहभाषा के रूप में रहेगी। हमारे भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उनकी भावनाओं के अनुसार इस मदन में कहा, और न सिर्फ कहा बल्कि कहने के बाद एक विधेयक इस पार्लियमेंट में पास किया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी के मित्रों से कि वे एक ऐसी बात बताएं जो भारत सरकार के बिना पार्लियामेंट के पास किये हुए की हो। मैं एक ऐसी बात जानना चाहता हूँ जिस को हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने भाषा के सम्बन्ध में किया हो, जिसको कि इस पार्लियमेंट ने पास नहीं किया हो। क्या वे एक ऐसी बात बतला सकते हैं? वे एक भी ऐसी बात नहीं बता सकते। और अगर वह नहीं बतला सकते तो मैं बतला सकता हूँ कि मद्रास में भाषा नीति के सम्बन्ध में दंगे किस ने कराये। ये दंगे इस देश की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लैफ्ट विंग ने कराये। ये दंगे डी० एम० के० पार्टी ने कराये, ये दंगे उन हुल्लड़वाज लोगों ने कराये जो भाषा के नाम पर इस देश का बटवारा कराना चाहते हैं। (इंटर शंस) अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह है इन की सहनशीलता, यह है डी० एम० के० वालों की सहनशीलता। ये लोग हिन्दी वालों को साम्राज्यवादी कहते हैं। मैं हिन्दी प्रान्त का रहने वाला हूँ और मुझे इस बात का गौरव है कि मैंने उस प्रान्त में जन्म लिया कि जिसकी भाषा इतनी समृद्धिशाली है, जो न केवल हिन्दी प्रान्तों में ही बोली जाती है वरन् देश के कोने कोने में बोली जाती है। यह गलत बात नहीं है, यह सही बात है। लेकिन हम ने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि हिन्दी न सीखने वालों पर हिन्दी लादी जाये। क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू जी के बाद, इस भाषा को लाने के पूर्व तमाम मुख्य मंत्रियों ने एक मत से स्पष्ट सलाह दी? क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि

26 जनवरी को हिन्दुस्तान में गृह मंत्री ने अपने ब्राडकास्ट में कहा कि हम हिन्दी को एकमात्र राजभाषा तब तक नहीं बनाना चाहते जब तक कि अहिन्दी भाषी लोग उसके लिए स्वयं तैयार न हों। क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि 26 जनवरी के तीनों दिनों पूर्व हिन्दुस्तान के गृह मंत्री मद्रास में थे, और जब उन से यह बात कही गयी तो उन्होंने मद्रास में एक प्रेस कानफरेंस में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि हम दक्षिण पर हिन्दी नहीं लादना चाहते। और जब तक वे चाहें अपने राज्य में भी अंग्रेजी में काम काज चला सकते हैं, अगर वे तमिल में न चलाना चाहें तो। आप जब तक चाहें हिन्दी न सीखें। लेकिन एक बात में स्पष्ट रूप से कह दूँ कि जिस तरह से दक्षिण वाले अपनी इच्छानुसार हिन्दी सीखने या न सीखने के लिए स्वतंत्र हैं उसी तरह हम भी अपनी इच्छानुसार अंग्रेजी सीखने या न सीखने के लिए स्वतंत्र हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि दक्षिण के मित्रों पर हिन्दी न लादी जाये, लेकिन हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि उत्तर के मित्रों पर अंग्रेजी न लादी जाये।

एक माननीय सदस्य काई एम्पी

श्री भगवत झा आजाद: एक माननीया अध्यक्ष कहती हैं कि काई एम्पी। से मैं कहता हूँ कि बी. एम्. से एम्पी। सहमति का सवाल ही क्या है। दक्षिण में दंगे इस कारण नहीं हुए कि सरकार हिन्दी लादना चाहती थी, बल्कि वहाँ दंगे इसलिए हुए कि वहाँ यह कहा गया कि अब तमिल भाषा नहीं रहेगी। उन से कहा गया कि अब से आप को अपनी भाषा में बोलने का अधिकार नहीं रहेगा। यह किसने किया? दुर्भाग्यवश हिन्दुस्तान के अखबार, अधिकतर जनता के पैसे को चूस कर, एजीपतियों द्वारा चलाये जाते हैं, अंग्रेजी के अखबार। इन अखबारों ने अपने पत्रों में बराबर इस बात का हवाला दिया कि इस देश में लोगों पर हिन्दी लादी जा

रही है। अगर हमारे उप शिक्षा मंत्री
 श्री भक्त दर्शन ने दक्षिण भारत में यह कहा
 कि हिन्दी भी पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन की
 परीक्षाओं में एक माध्यम रहेगा, तो उन्होंने
 यह तो नहीं कहा कि सिर्फ हिन्दी ही रहेगी।
 लेकिन पत्रों में दक्षिण के लोगों से कहा गया
 कि माध्यम केवल हिन्दी ही रहेगी। और
 इसके परिणामस्वरूप ये दंगे हुए। ये दंगे
 सरकार की गलत नीति के कारण नहीं हुए।
 हमारी सरकार ने आज से नहीं पिछले 17
 सालों से अगस्त इस बात का हवाला दिया
 कि हिन्दी इस देश में 26 जनवरी सन् 1965
 के बाद से प्रमुख राजभाषा रहेगी लेकिन
 उसके बाद भी दक्षिण वाले जब तक चाहें
 प्रोत्साहन को रखें। कहा हिन्दी को अपना
 सवाल पैदा हुआ ? आज हमारी मित्र
 कहती हैं कि आई एम। लेकिन इस देश में
 हिन्दी का लादने की बात सरकार की ओर
 से कब कही गयी। मैं एक उदाहरण देना
 चाहता हूँ। क्या कभी हिन्दी बोलने वालों
 ने इस प्रकार के स्टेटमेंट कहीं दिये जैसे कि
 प्राज डी० एम० के० वाले दे रहे हैं ? इन
 लोगों ने तो ऐसे बयान दिये हैं कि इन्होंने
 हिन्दी फौनेटिक्स को मात कर दिया। इन
 लोगों ने यह नहीं कहा कि हम हिन्दी सीखने
 के लिए टाइम चाहते हैं। वे तो कहते हैं कि
 हम हिन्दी सीखना ही नहीं चाहते। न सीखें,
 हम उन पर हिन्दी लादना नहीं चाहते। लेकिन
 मैं समझता हूँ कि ये डी० एम० के० के चार
 सदस्य ही दक्षिण की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व
 नहीं करते। और सदस्य भी हैं जो
 वहाँ की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं। हम
 उनकी राय मानेंगे। लेकिन जो ये लोग
 कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दी नहीं सीखेंगे तो न
 सीखें उनको इसकी जरूरत नहीं है कि
 हिन्दी सीखें। उन लोगों के लिए हिन्दी
 सीखना आवश्यक है जो लोग इस देश के
 शासन में आएंगे और जिनको लिख भाषा
 का प्रयोग करना होगा। अन्य लोगों के
 लिए हिन्दी सीखना जरूरी नहीं है। अगर
 वे नहीं सीखना चाहते हैं तो न सीखें।

लेकिन जो श्री हीरेन मुखर्जी ने कहा कि
 सरकार की भाषा नीति अनिश्चित है तो
 उसके उत्तर में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सर-
 कार की भाषा नीति अनिश्चित नहीं
 है। दूसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि सरकार
 ने दंगे करवाए। यह भी सही नहीं है, दंगे
 अन्य लोगों ने करवाए। तीसरी बात उन्होंने
 यह कही कि हिमात्मक कारंबाई सरकार
 की गलत नीति के कारण हुई, तो यह भी
 गलत है। और चौथी बात उन्होंने यह कही
 कि सिर्फ हिन्दी को बढ़ावा मिला। यह
 बात भी गलत है। बल्कि मेरा तो सरकार
 पर आरोप है कि उसने हिन्दी के बारे में
 उतना उत्साह नहीं दिखाया और हिन्दी
 को उतना अवसर नहीं दिया जितना कि
 उसको देना चाहिए था, और अगर श्री हीरेन
 मुखर्जी के मित्र यह कहते हैं कि केवल हिन्दी
 को बढ़ावा मिला, तो वे देखें कि किस प्रकार
 बंगला, मध्यप्रदेश, केरल, तमिल, गजराती
 आदि भाषाओं को बढ़ावा मिल रहा है और
 वे प्रसारित हो रही हैं।

मैं देखता हूँ कि इस देश की अपोजीशन
 पार्टियों के लोगों को कांग्रेस सरकार को
 पीटने के लिए जब भी जो भी लकड़ी मिली
 उन्होंने उससे उसको पीटने की कोशिश की
 है। इसलिए मैं अन्त में एक बात और कह
 देना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है। हम अपने
 भूतपूर्व स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल
 नेहरू द्वारा दिये गये आश्वासनों का सम्मान
 करते हैं। हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री
 श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों
 में उन आश्वासनों को दुहराया है और उनको
 समय समय पर गृह मंत्री जी ने भी कहा है
 कि हम उनको निबाहेंगे और उनका पालन
 करेंगे। सम्पूर्ण देश उन आश्वासनों में
 विश्वास करता है लेकिन अगर आज हिंसा
 और धमका कर इस देश के कुछ बन्धु चाहते
 हैं कि हम यहाँ के संविधान में और कानून
 में परिवर्तन करें तो हम इसका विरोध
 करेंगे। आखिर आज प्रश्न क्या है ? अध्यक्ष

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

महोदय, प्रश्न तो विश्वास का है। अगर कुछ लोगों को इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री के आश्वासनों पर और इस पार्लियामेंट के प्रस्ताव पर विश्वास नहीं है तो वे यह समझ सकते हैं कि हमें उन पर कैसे विश्वास हो सकता है? इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि इन आश्वासनों को कबूल किया जाये लेकिन अगर हमारे वे चन्द एक बन्ध हिंसा या धमकी के जरिए यह चाहते हैं कि सरकार से किसी कानून में परिवर्तन करा लिया जाय तो हम उसका जोरदार विरोध करेंगे। हम चाहते हैं कि देश में समता हो, देश में अलग अलग भाषायें हों और देश में हर एक आदमी में परस्पर विश्वास की भावना हो लेकिन यह विश्वास एक तरफ से नहीं बन पाता। इस विश्वास की जड़ दो हृदयों में हुआ करती है। अगर आपका हृदय साफ है तो हमारा हृदय भी साफ है और हमारे हृदय साफ बने रहेंगे लेकिन पहले आप अपना साफ करिये। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस स्थगन प्रस्ताव में कोई बल नहीं है। यह सारी बातें गलत और झूठी हैं कि सरकार की कोई इस बारे में नीति नहीं है। सरकार की नीति स्पष्ट और निश्चित है और अपनी उस नीति पर सरकार को जोरशोर से अमल करना चाहिए।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): This language controversy is the greatest challenge to the integrity of the Indian nation after partition. I do not think there has ever in Indian history been any linguistic strife or any attempt to impose one Indian language over the other. But here we have the present disturbances in Madras.

It is not my purpose to apportion blame; I do not want to accuse the people who have led this movement, nor do I want to blame this party or that party. But it must be admitted that it is an emotional upheaval. I think the people who have indulged

in violence or vandalism would themselves, in cooler moments, regret what has been done. But we in this Parliament who are considering the question of Hindi must also realise one thing and ask ourselves: if during the national struggle when Gandhiji said Hindustani Hindi should be the national language of India, if it was the symbol of the Indian struggle for freedom, how is it and why is it that today a substantial section of our population are resisting the introduction of Hindi as the official language of this country, although it has, by common agreement, been adopted in the Constitution that so far as Hindi is concerned, it should and must continue as the official language of this country?

I feel there are two reasons behind it. The situation has not changed much after the introduction of Hindi as the official language on January 26, 1965. But there is a crisis of confidence in the leadership.

Two elements are responsible for this situation. However much my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad may sponsor the cause of Hindi, it has to be admitted that resistance has developed to an Indian language. I do not think any patriot in this country would dispute the fact that in this country we must have one Indian language as the official and link language for this country. But if resistance has come, it has grown because of the linguistic fanatics, by slogans like *Angrezi hatao* which create reaction as a result of which there is violence and there are all sorts of problem created in this country.

The other is Government's failure. I was reading the newspapers. Our Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, made a fervent appeal to the people of Madras on the 28th and he said:

"We are not doing anything new. We are only following the

directive principles of the Constitution. I do not understand then what the difficulty is today."

That is the whole difficulty of the present leadership. They do not know what the difficulty is, whereas a member of the Cabinet resigns because he feels that by the introduction of Hindi in January, 1965, you are imposing a language on the people and there can be no national unity if this goes on.

Not only that. I will remind you that even the President of the Congress, Shri Kamaraj, who seems to be the real policymaker and power, says that misgivings have been created since 1937. The Constitution in this country was adopted after much debate. Shri Kamaraj was a member, and he has been a Chief Minister. If Shri Lal Bahadur says that this is a constitutional obligation that they are going to discharge, it is also a constitutional obligation under article 351 that the Government of India should promote Hindi language by taking steps, drawing words from other languages, should develop this language so that this can be acceptable to the people of India. What have they done, I want to know.

It is no use accusing the people of Madras. It is not a question of the South, or the North. It has to be remembered that after all the language of only 14 crores of people of this country is Hindi; the rest of the 44 crores are non-Hindi-speaking. When this language is going to be finally adopted in this country, naturally there is apprehension of so many things, which friends have pointed out. I would like to know what you have done to remove these misapprehensions from the people's minds.

I would remind this Government that the great Acharya Narendra Deva, who was a great learned man of this country, and we in the PSP, not today, but in the year 1958, suggested that if you actually want to make Hindi the acceptable language

of this country, it is not a question of more administrative change. It is a purely cultural and educational matter. You have to create a psychological atmosphere behind it. Therefore, it was suggested that three things were necessary, very necessary, very essential, if you want to maintain the cultural unity of this country.

The first was, let there be one academy of language in each State, where there will be provision for teaching of all languages of the country. There should be also institutions where the languages can be translated, so that there is integrated thinking and common purpose.

Secondly, if non-Hindi students are to learn Hindi, it must be obligatory for Hindi-knowing students to learn another Indian language. These are very essential things if you want really to maintain the integrity of the country.

Even in regard to the All India Services it was suggested that if Hindi is going to be the main language, at the same time the Hindi people must also be proficient in some other Indian language. If that is done, then only people will feel that you are not going to impose this language. But since it is going to both the language of the majority of people, we want the development of the language. - There is no question whether this language is the best among the Indian languages. That was never questioned. The point was that it should be *chalti* Hindi, basic Hindi. Have you created any basic Hindi today? Can the common man really feel that he can express himself fully in this language? There is no such language. Rather you are creating more complications and the language is so complicated that people who want to learn it are afraid of the kind of language that you are now introducing. Therefore, it is not a question of *Angrezi hatao*. English cannot be the main language of this country. It is as wrong to say that English should

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

be permanently here as to say Hindi is the only language here and now. I do not subscribe to that theory. At the same time, I say this. Let us take lessons from Israel. In a small country like Israel where the English influence is much more than any other country, they had made Hebrew their own language and they could remove English. In this country is it such a great problem that we could not have our own language as the official language of the country? It is because we wasted 17 years; we have paid no attention. In Madras a student has to learn Hindi for passing the SSLC examination but no minimum marks are necessary. It was not compulsory. In all the other States, Kerala, Andhra and Mysore, Hindi was compulsory and every student must have a minimum number of marks in order to pass the examination. In Madras it is not so. People of Madras, the students are very much exercised on this problem. Nobody is to be accused for that. If anybody is to be accused, it is Mr. Kamaraj, the Congress Party and the Congress administration. They have brought this country to ruin. I would say that they are responsible for this. We agree to what Vinobha Bhave has said so far as this question is concerned. It is an emotional and cultural question. There should be no violence. Let us sit together. Let us first remove this feeling. There will be no imposition whatsoever either on the Hindi speaking people or the non-Hindi speaking people. We should take steps to consider this most earnestly if we are serious about maintaining the integrity of the country. How soon, how far and what steps should we take to make Hindi acceptable to the entire nation!

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Sir, let me at the outset assure my Hindi friends that none of us are against Hindi. We have accepted it as the official language. We will have it as our official language and we will not prefer English to Hindi:

we will want Hindi as our official language. But . . . (*Interruptions.*) Please listen. I have got up today with a very sad heart. I was in Madras. I saw the amount of violence. So many sacred lives of our Indian people had been lost; unheard of things such as self-immolation of five young people was there and the same confusion is starting in Andhra, Kerala and West Bengal and other places and Mysore.

Shri S. S. More (Poona): Why do you rope in Bengal?
18 hrs.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: You unrope it, but it is for me to say what I feel. One thing I would like to say is that it is very easy to say things and try to judge from Delhi but if you come to the South, you will realise, rightly or wrongly, more rightly than wrongly, there has been a crisis of confidence. You say "we have accepted the Constitution", "Was it not a unanimous decision?" "How could it be unanimous unless we all agreed to it?" I ask we accepted it. Yes! we were tolerant, we people, who did not have Hindi as our mother tongue: we were tolerant to take it as our official language because we were patriotic. Again at the time of the Official Languages Act, we abided by the assurance given by our late Prime Minister and the then Home Minister . . . (*Interruptions*). Certainly it is not my mother-tongue. If *Angrezi* is not my mother-tongue, certainly Hindi is not also my mother-tongue. Just as English was imposed by somebody, I can say that Hindi is being imposed from the north of the Vindhya. Please do not mistake me. Certainly it is not my mother-tongue. (*Interruption*). But I must tell you there are two things: please do not disturb me. I am the only lady Member speaking here on this subject now. I expect some chivalry from the House. (*Interruption*). Unfortunately, even my learned friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad said that a crisis came in Tamilnad

because there was a feeling that Tamil was being eliminated. How can anybody think that a mother-tongue of any State could be eliminated, whether by this Government or any other Government? It was not a question of Tamil being eliminated or Telugu being eliminated. It was the feeling of our boys, who have studied English and for whom English is a thing which would enable them to get jobs, that by the imposition of Hindi, (*Interruption*), all their efforts at learning English and all their 20 years' labour in the universities would be of no use unless they have a knowledge of Hindi. They were not frightened that our mother-tongue would be driven away. We are not such credulous people to think like that, or believe that. Please do not insult our intelligence by saying that the agitation was started in Madras because the people were frightened that Tamil would be driven away. It may be their mother-tongue, but that is a different matter. And please do not brush it aside by saying that the agitation was entirely due to the D.M.K. or Swatantra. D.M.K. might have started, Swatantra might have formed it, but it was a popular upsurge and it was the genuine feeling of the people not only in Madras, Kerala, Mysore and Andhra but elsewhere also. One thing that I wish to point out is, and what the Government should do now is that no one should be allowed to exploit this situation to disintegrate this country. You must take this opportunity to integrate the country. If you fail this time, the result may be disastrous.

Hindi was learnt in the South 20 years back, and it was learnt not because Hindi people asked us to do so. We found that it was going to be our national language. When we had multilingual provinces, we felt that Hindi was going to be the language which would unite us. But you brought in the linguistic provinces: you gave us Andhra; you gave us Maharashtra; you gave us Mysore and you gave us Madras. What happened then? Your Hindi receded into the background and gave place to the

regional languages. Let us face the facts. Hindi, instead of becoming the national language, became the regional language. You let lose at great psychological moment. If Hindi is important to you, equally Tamil and Telugu are important for us. Hindi did not have any special significant growth, it does not serve to be the official language on its own merits, but because it is spoken by the largest single majority, a greater percentage in the country, we accepted it. Honestly, if you ask me today, what is the biggest or the only link language in India rightly or wrongly, it has been English. It was English which united the men from Kashmir to Cape Comorin.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Raghunath Singh: No, no. Never.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: Please listen to me. (*Interruption*). But it is true. It was only one or two per cent of the intelligentsia who brought it to the fore, but it enabled all the people to come into contact and understand each other. It enabled one to understand one's neighbours (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: But for the last 15 years, did you develop this language, namely, Hindi? Did you bring it up at least to the level of the other languages like Tamil and Telugu? You have not done it. Even the late Jawaharlal Nehru said "I want Hindi, but I just cannot ignore English." Because English is our window to the west. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: The question has been put: who gave her the name 'Yashoda'?

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: Fortunately my parents; and certainly not on their advice. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have had to shout too much this day. Members should take some pity on me! Now, let us proceed calmly.

Shrimati Yashoda Raddy: Hindi is being resisted today not because it is not wanted, but because of one thing. The people in the North want Hindi to be imposed immediately. But for over 200 years odd, when English was here, it did not percolate beyond one or two per cent of the people, you say. So, within 15 years, how do you expect that the whole of the non-Hindi people can speak Hindi? Even the Hindi-speaking people do not speak it properly. They themselves do not express it properly. How do they expect us to do so? All that we ask is, have no time-limit. I am surprised at the colossal ignorance of the people in the north about conditions in the south. To them, everybody in the south is a Madrasi. Yet they do not even know that four languages are spoken in the south. They say that we are unpatriotic, intolerant and do not learn Hindi. If we plead for English, it is not because we are unpatriotic, but because we still believe in unity and tolerance because we know that language.

They are giving the guarantee that the assurances given by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru will be implemented. People had great faith in Nehruji. We have greater faith in our present Prime Minister also. He is our only hope now. Just as children go to parents for refuge, we are going to the Prime Minister for refuge. If you do not want to back out from the assurances given by Nehruji, why hesitate to put them on the statute? We are not asking for anything more. After all, we are at a disadvantage and we are a minority. You have got a duty to satisfy us, whatever be the difficulties.

I say that English should be there for the Public Service Commission examinations for the present, because I feel we should not barter away intelligent talent for the sake of regional representation on population basis. We want the best of people. Please give us time and you will find that our South Indian boys and girls who come to Parliament will speak better Hindi with greater proficiency. Please give us time. This is a historical watershed

period. Don't put a time-limit. Leave it to us. Incorporate the late Prime Minister's assurance in a statute. That is all we ask.

Mr. Speaker: After this speech, our Prime Minister has justifiable cause to feel happy.

श्री मधु लिमये (मोंघर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि हमारी सरकार जो अहिंसा और शान्ति का घोष करती है, पिछले 18 साल में हमेशा हिंसा और अत्याचार के सामने झुंती रही है। अत्याचार के दबाव में, हिंसा के दबाव में धाकर जैसे कोई अनुचित और गलत काम नहीं करना चाहिये, उसी तरह जब तक कि हिंसाचार नहीं होता है, जो उचित और जायज काम होता है उसको भी नहीं करना है। यह कोई अशुद्धी बात नहीं है।

पिछले 18 साल में आपने देखा होगा कि आंध्र की जनता ने जो मांग की थी कि भाषिक राज्य का निर्माण किया जाए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने बराबर उसका विरोध किया था और जब पोट्टी श्री रामलू का देहांत हुआ, उनको अपना बलिदान करना पड़ा और उसके बाद आंध्र के अन्दर व्यापक पैमाने पर हिंसक आन्दोलन हुआ तब जाकर केन्द्रीय सरकार जनता के सामने झुकी और उसने आंध्र प्रदेश का गठन किया।

उसी तरह से पश्चिम भारत में लोगों ने मांग की थी कि भाषिक राज्य का निर्माण हो लेकिन सरकार ने उसको नहीं माना। लेकिन जब बम्बई में खून की नदियां बहीं और अहमदाबाद में मासूम बच्चों की हत्याएं हुई तब जाकर भाषिक राज्य का गठन/सरकार ने किया।

आज भी गोआ की विधान सभा ने प्रस्ताव किया है जिसके बारे में कुछ निर्णय नहीं लिया गया है। मैं जानता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार उसको नहीं मानेगी जब तक कि लोगों के द्वारा कोई हिंसक आन्दोलन नहीं होता है। इस तरह से हिंसा के प्रभाव में आ कर गलत काम करना या या जब तक हिंसा

नहीं होती है उचित काम नहीं करना यह मैं समझता हूँ भ्रष्टा नहीं है।

यह जो आज मसला हमारे सामने आया है इसके बारे में सरकार के द्वारा यह कहा गया है कि द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़गम के लोगों ने वहाँ पर यह हिंसक आन्दोलन किया है। द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़गम के साथ मेरे जैसे लोगों का मतभेद है। लेकिन अगर उनके मन में, उनके हृदय में केवल हिन्दी के प्रति द्वेष नहीं है, साथ साथ तमिल से प्रेम भी है तो आज नहीं तो कल कभी न कभी हम लोगों के बीच में कोई समझौता हो सकता है। लेकिन सत्तारूढ़ दल के अन्दर जो देशतोड़क तत्व हैं, जो अपने आन्तरिक झगड़ों को ले कर या अपने छोटे स्वार्थों को साधने के लिए जनता को भड़काने का काम करते हैं, उनके बारे में हम क्या कह सकते हैं? मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि यह जो हिंसक आन्दोलन हुआ है उसकी जिम्मेदारी केवल द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़गम या विरोधी दलों पर ही नहीं है बल्कि जो कांग्रेस के सत्तारूढ़ दल के बड़े नेता हैं उन लोगों ने पिछले एक दो महीनों में भाषा के मसले को लेकर जो भाषण किये हैं और लोगों को उकसाने का प्रयास किया है, उससे वातावरण और ज्यादा गर्म हुआ है।

अभी अभी फिलहाल केन्द्रीय सरकार के दो मंत्रियों ने यह जो इस्तीफे देने का नाटक किया है—मैं जानबूझकर उसको नाटक कहता हूँ क्योंकि इस्तीफे क्यों दिये गये और क्यों वापस लिये गये, उसके बारे में आज तक संसद को कोई जानकारी नहीं है—उसकी, तथा केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों से लेकर सत्तारूढ़ दल के जो बड़े बड़े लोग हैं वे जनता को उभाड़ने का, भड़काने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं और उसकी मैं सख्त आलोचना करना चाहता हूँ।

एक ऐसा वातावरण बनाया गया है जिससे पता चले कि जो झगड़ा है वह हिन्दी समर्थकों और हिन्दी विरोधियों के बीच

में है। इस ढंग से इस सवाल पर सोचना मैं समझता हूँ बहुत गलत होगा। स्वयं मैं एक गैर हिन्दी इलाके का भादमी हूँ और मेरी मातृभाषा हिन्दी नहीं है। मेरी मातृ भाषा मराठी है और अपनी मातृभाषा पर मुझे उतना ही अभिमान है, उससे मुझे उतना ही प्रेम है जितना अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं से है। इसलिए मुझे पर कोई आरोप नहीं लगा सकता है कि मैं किसी एक भाषा के साथ पक्षपात कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन साथ साथ मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि इस सवाल को केवल हिन्दी समर्थकों और हिन्दी विरोधियों का क्यों बना दिया गया है। यह हिन्दी समर्थकों और हिन्दी विरोधियों का सवाल नहीं है।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में चार पांच मुद्दों पर प्रकाश डाला था। एक ही मुद्दे को आप लीजिये। उन्होंने कहा था कि राज्य स्तर पर राज्य के लोग जिस भाषा में व्यवहार करना चाहते हैं, उसकी उनको छूट दी जाएगी। उसका क्या मतलब होता है? उसका मतलब यह होता है कि प्रादेशिक भाषाओं के साथ साथ अंग्रेजी का इस्तेमाल करने की भी छूट आप दे रहे हैं। इसको मैं बहुत गलत समझता हूँ। क्या बजह है कि 18 साल में जहाँ जहाँ प्रादेशिक भाषायें चलती हैं, वहाँ वहाँ सरकारों ने अपने काम काज में शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में और अन्य क्षेत्रों में प्रादेशिक भाषाओं का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है।

हमेशा बात की जाती है कि भारत की भाषायें विकसित नहीं हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक उनको इस्तेमाल करने का मौका आप नहीं देंगे, उनको भ्रवसर नहीं मिलेगा, तब तक दफ्तरों में शब्द गड़ने वाले जो लोग हैं क्या वे भारतीय भाषाओं को विकसित करेंगे? जब भाषा का इस्तेमाल होगा, व्यवहार में वह आयेगी, शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में उसका इस्तेमाल होगा, कानून के लिए उसका इस्तेमाल होगा, प्रशासनों में इस्तेमाल होगा तभी जाकर भाषायें विकसित हो सकती

[श्री मधु लिमये]

है। इसलिए यह वलोल कि भारतीय भाषायें विकसित नहीं हैं, इसलिए अंग्रेजी का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये, मैं समझता हूँ बहुत ही गलत दलील है और उसके साफ साफ माने यह है कि एक दो परसेंट जो लोग अंग्रेजी पढ़े-लिखे हैं और उन में से भी अधिकतर लोग रूढ़ी अंग्रेजी बोलते और लिखते हैं उनका ही प्राधिपत्य देश पर ज़िमा रहे। मैं स्वयं अंग्रेजी नहीं जानता हूँ। लेकिन यह कहना कि भारतीय भाषायें विकसित नहीं हैं, इसलिए उनका इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता है, बहुत ही गलत है।

मैं एक दो मिसालें देना चाहता हूँ। हैदराबाद राज्य में विभाजन होने के पहले अदालतों में और दूसरे कामों में उर्दू का इस्तेमाल होता था, ग्वालियर में हिन्दी का इस्तेमाल होता था, बड़ौदा में गुजराती का इस्तेमाल होता था। लेकिन क्या बात है कि इन राज्यों का विलीनीकरण होने के बाद अंग्रेजी वहाँ की जनता पर थोपी गई, लादी गई। इस से बिल्कुल साफ जाहिर होता है कि यह मामला अहिन्दी भाइयों के हिन्दी विरोध का नहीं है। कुछ ऐसे तत्व हमारे देश में हैं, और सत्तारूढ़ दल में भी हैं, खासकर केन्द्रीय सरकार में, जो किसी न किसी बहाने को लेकर अंग्रेजी को हिन्दुस्तान का माध्यम बनाये रखना चाहते हैं। इसलिये श्री शास्त्री का जो यह मुद्दा है कि राज्य स्तर पर प्रादेशिक भाषा के अलावा अंग्रेजी का भी इस्तेमाल किया जा सकता है, मैं समझता हूँ वह उचित चीज नहीं है और हमारे देश के लोग डट कर उसका मुकाबला करेंगे।

आप जानते हैं कि केरल में राष्ट्रपति जी की हकूमत है। वहाँ पर केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा यह कहा गया कि केरल राज्य में मलयालम के साथ साथ अंग्रेजी का भी इस्तेमाल हो। वहाँ तो कोई हिन्दी समर्थक और हिन्दी का विरोध करने वालों की बात नहीं थी। फिर केरल राज्य में अंग्रेजी के इस्तेमाल की छूट क्यों दी जाती है। आंध्र

के मंत्रियों ने अभी अभी कहा था कि आंध्र में तेलगू भाषा के लाने लिये दस सालों की जरूरत है, महाराष्ट्र में तेजी से मराठी नहीं आ रही है। बंगला के बारे में भी मैं यही बात जानना चाहता हूँ। बंगलाभाषी लोग कहते हैं कि हमारी भाषा विकसित है। तो फिर वे इस बात पर बल क्यों नहीं देते हैं कि बंगाल के अन्दर हर क्षेत्र में, अदालत से लेकर शिक्षा तक के क्षेत्र में बंगला का ही इस्तेमाल हो। इस लिये सवाल हिन्दी के समर्थन या विरोध का नहीं है। अगर गैर हिन्दी इलाकों के लोग नहीं चाहते कि हिन्दी आये तो मैं कहूँगा कि हिन्दी को वह न लायें, हिन्दी का इस्तेमाल न करें, लेकिन कम से कम अपने अपने राज्यों में हर क्षेत्र में अनिवार्य ढंग से अपनी प्रादेशिक भाषा का इस्तेमाल करें और अंग्रेजी को राज्य स्तर से बिल्कुल निकाल दें, बिल्कुल हटा दें।

दूसरे मेरा यह कहना है कि इन राज्यों में जो स्कूल हैं, जिन का माध्यम अंग्रेजी है, उन के ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध होना चाहिये और उन राज्यों में केवल प्रादेशिक भाषाओं के जरिये, जनभाषाओं के जरिये शिक्षा दी जाये। साथ साथ किसी भी स्तर पर जहाँ पर कि अंग्रेजी अनिवार्य भाषा, मैं चाहूँगा कि वहाँ पर उसे एक ऐच्छिक भाषा बनाया जाये। अंग्रेजी को अनिवार्य न रहने दिया जाये। हिन्दी के बारे में अगर आप लोगों को विरोध है तो हिन्दी को भी एक ऐच्छिक विषय के रूप में रखा जाये। किसी के ऊपर हिन्दी जबरदस्ती न लादी जाये।

अब केन्द्र का सवाल रह जाता है। केन्द्र के बारे में मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि सरकार की क्या नीति है। एक ओर तो हम कहते हैं कि भारत की जितनी जनभाषाएँ हैं सभी राष्ट्र भाषायें हैं। दूसरी ओर उनका यहाँ प्रयोग करने पर रोक है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस संसद में भारतीय भाषाओं के इस्तेमाल पर क्यों रोक है। जब हमारे

जैसे लोग राष्ट्रपति जी से अनुरोध करते हैं कि वे अपना भाषण हिन्दी में नहीं तेलगू में दें, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी के द्वारा कहा जाता है कि संविधान में इस की छूट नहीं है। संविधान में रोक भी नहीं है। अगर राष्ट्रपति जी अपना अभिभाषण तेलगू में देते हैं तो दक्षिण के लोगों को लगता कि ठीक है, हमारी भाषा की भी इज्जत हो रही है और हिन्दी के साथ साथ दूसरी जन भाषाओं को भी उनका योग्य स्थान दिया जा रहा है।

मविष्य के सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। मैंने आज भ्रखबारों में पढ़ा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी संसद् के अन्य दलों के नेताओं के साथ विचार विमर्श करने वाले हैं। मेरा सुझाव है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी एक व्यापक सम्मेलन बुलायें। वे उस में न केवल संसद् में जो विभिन्न दलों के नेता हैं उन को बुलायें बल्कि जो बाहर के दलीय नेता हैं उन को भी बुलायें। भाषा शास्त्रियों को भी उस में बुलाया जाये और साथ साथ जो दूसरे ऐसे निर्दलीय जन प्रतिनिधि हैं उन को भी बुलाया जाये, और हम लोग शांति से इस विषय पर सोचें। मुख्य मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन को मुलतबी रक्खा जाये। इस बात का फसला पहले उस सम्मेलन में अनौपचारिक रूप से किया जाये और फिर संसद् में बहस होनी चाहिये। उस के पश्चात ही मुख्य मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन बुलाया जाना चाहिये। मेरा यही सुझाव है।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to impress upon the House that this is not merely a South Indian or Madras problem. We all know that the country is in danger, that India's integrity is in imminent peril and all sections of the House should do their best to put forward constructive suggestions so that this language problem may be solved.

Sir, I was instrumental in summoning a conference where extremists of both sides were there. We heard them

and I came to the conclusion—everybody who attended the Conference came to the conclusion—that there was a chance of a national compromise on a satisfactory basis on an all-India level.

I want to point out to the House that it would be thoroughly unfair, it would be oversimplifying the matter to say that this tragedy which has happened in Madras and which we deeply deplore has been the creation of one political party. That will be not putting the case fairly. To say that it has been the doing of some deranged students or demented youth of the country whose adolescent mind was perturbed, will not be true. That will not be putting the issue properly. We should not in any way slur over the intensity of feeling.

I want to tell this House, not for the purpose of putting forward a threat, that there are other areas in India, apart from Madras, Andhra Pradesh or the southern States; in Bengal also people are very deeply perturbed. They are not at all happy. I had been associated with an All-India organisation for many years along with the great Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee and other eminent Maharashtra leaders who had been trying to do their best to develop Hindi and to support the development of Hindi. Today; I must point out if you try to impose Hindi and to replace English by means of a fiat, it will be a disaster for India.

I am a man of law and I may tell you that the greatest integrating force today is the juridical and the legal unity of India. From the Supreme Court down to the High Courts we have retained English and that has kept our integrity in the juridical world intact. If tomorrow you order that the Supreme Court shall carry on its deliberations only in Hindi and that all the High Courts will switch over to Hindi, it will be a disaster not merely because the Attorney-General will have to go or the majority of the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

judges will have to go or some of us will have to retire from the profession but that will lead to disaster.... (Interruption).

All that I want to tell my friends is that I do not understand why there is this inferiority complex today. We are a thoroughly independent nation. We are a sovereign democratic republic. Why do we fight shy because somebody suggests that English should be kept. We are not under any foreign domination. We are doing so in our national interest to keep our national integrity intact. We have got to face the reality.

We, the people of Bengal, had suffered a lot from linguistic frenzy. 52,000 Bengali-speaking people were driven out, subjected to assault, arson and all sorts of fury in a neighbouring State with whom we were on the closest cultural collaboration and friendship. We know what has happened and what is going to happen. You know, Sir, a great Congress leader, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, wanted to have a merger of West Bengal with another neighbouring State. That was turned down and a political leader of some position in the Cabinet today lost the election because of the spontaneous upsurge of the feeling that that might lead to the domination of the non-Bengali-speaking people over the Bengali-speaking people.

Sir, the situation is very tense. Fortunately, the youth of Bengal has not indulged in violence or lawlessness or acts of self-immolation. But we ought to realise the intensity of feeling; we ought to realise the gravity of the situation. I am appealing to the Prime Minister and all the Members of this House to realise that this is not beyond the resources of the statesmanship. What is the harm if to satisfy the millions of our fellow citizens in the South or in West Bengal or in Assam or in Orissa or in other non-Hindi speaking areas one article

of the Constitution is amended? (Interruptions) Sir, I ought to tell you that I yield to none in this House in my respect for the Constitution. I have taken an oath to the Constitution. But taking the oath to the Constitution does not mean that every single line, every single article, is sacrosanct. Having taken the oath to the Constitution, we have amended it 17 times—sometimes on a major issue and sometimes on a minor issue. Even on Berubari, in order to give out the portion of Indian territory, have't you amended the Constitution to placate Pakistan to placate those people who have been carrying on intrusions?

The problem is so serious that you should remember that it is just as serious as a threat to India's integrity, India's territorial sovereignty from China or from Pakistan. Therefore, we should tackle it on that basis. If amending the Constitution 17 times by this Parliament does not mean violation of our oath to the Constitution, what is the objection in having one more amendment of some article? (Interruption). We the people of Bengal . . .

Shri Raghunath Singh: When he was the President of Hindu Mahasabha, he passed the resolution that Hindi should be the *Rashtra Bhasha*. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Consistency has not been the virtue of wise people always.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I had started by saying that I was at the head of an organisation which preached that. But we must be realist. We must face the reality of the situation and we must not be wedded to old formula and dogma. All that we are saying is that the people in the South are perturbed and distressed. The feeling in the South honestly is that they are going to be subjected to the domination of one language which they do not want. It is not merely the question

of relegating English to the background for a little time. They think that it will be wiped out in no time and that there will be complete imposition of Hindi. That is the feeling also in Bengal. Therefore, I am seriously suggesting that the Prime Minister should immediately call a National Convention to find out what can assuage their feelings, whether bilingualism as advocated by Mr. Bhaktavatsalam or what statutory guarantee should be given or whether there should be a constitutional guarantee.

The only thing I am pleading is that we should not stick to mere legalism or so-called lip-service to the Constitution. You must have the courage, in order to save India's integrity, in order to save India's unity, to do the right thing for the purpose of satisfying the people in non-Hindi speaking areas and to assure them that there shall be no imposition and that until they accept it, English should continue as the official language.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid we have been talking in the air. I really do not see how English can be eliminated from Indian life. The whole administration wants the retention of English. The Government may pass an order but I am sure, as in many more important things, this order will also be obeyed in disobedience. All the administrations of every province want English to be retained.

I know that before this, 80 per cent of the work of Bihar and of Uttar Pradesh was being conducted in English. The same is the case with the other States. I also know that where administration was being conducted in provincial languages, that also was turned into English. We have a sneaking love not only for English but also for Englishmen.

Take again education. Those of us who are rich enough send our children outside for education. We send them either to America or to England.

We rarely send them to any other country. If we are not so rich and if we are educated, we send our children—even Ministers send their children—to public schools. They are not public schools, but are class schools. Even if we come lower than that, we send our children to convents, missionary schools.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West): Frank Anthony's schools.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): He is very happy (*Interruptions*).

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Then there is a desire in every Indian who is educated, who is half educated, who is quarter educated, to be modern. We want our country to be modern. Modernism, unfortunately, is equated with knowing English. If you do not know English, you cannot be modern. This anxiety to be modern is there extensively. Even in villages, the children want teachers to teach them English because that is the sign of modernism. Everything modern is progressive—that is also taken for granted. If young men are fighting with each other or are committing crimes, if there is youthful delinquency elsewhere, that must come in India also because it is modern.

Our dress is modern, our eating is modern, our laughing is modern. Even our ladies giggle like British women. They themselves have no love for the Indian smile.

Mr. Speaker: Though Acharyaji is not so modern, he is well aware of everything modern.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): This Parliament should confer on him a doctorate of modernism, as he understands it so well.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am depicting conditions in the country. I submit I am not exaggerating, not at all.

Mr. Speaker: I did not say that.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am minimising them.

Mr. Speaker: On the last occasion, he told us about drain pipe pants or something like that.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I really do not see why many people of the south are disturbed. I can assure them that their IQ is much superior to that of people of the north.

Shri Frank Anthony: They understand it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You can find that in the secretariat. Almost every Secretary is an Ayyangar or a Menon or a Nair. I am sure that even if Hindi is imposed upon them, they will speak better Hindi than the Hindi-knowing people, and they will pass their examinations, because in passing an examination it is not a language, there are so many other subjects in which they will be superior. They are needlessly suffering from an inferiority complex.

And these riots that have taken place, against whom have they taken place? In this matter that Hindi should not be imposed upon the South, Government was one with the people. The Ministers from the South in the Centre were one with the people. Our revered President of the Congress was one with the people. Against whom were they fighting?

Then, I am sorry that they should have chosen such a sacred day as the Republic Day, because it was natural for the Government to be upset by the National Day being called a mourning day. All right, they did that. But the Congress people and the Government thought that the National Day was their day, as if it was not the people's day. If they had considered that it was the people's day, they should have appealed to the people, they should have called the leaders of all parties, outstanding people, and reasoned with them to have their demonstration afterwards not on such a sacred day which we all held as holy, and which is held as holy in every country. I think that was a

very great mistake that my friends of the DMK did, and it was not right, but, though it was not right, the Government being sure that they are one with the people, should have called a conference of all the people.

When the Home Minister went to Madras, did he see Rajaji? Rajaji is one of the oldest statesmen living. We may not like his views, but he should have seen him, he should have seen the leading people of Madras, and reasoned with them, told them that it is not the day only for the Government to rejoice but for all the people to rejoice, and if they have to make a demonstration, they should do it on some other day. Even if they had persisted, the Government should have allowed them to have their demonstration, because the people would not have joined. Of that I am certain, because I was there in Madras four days before these things happened, and I spoke upon the language question. I was not disturbed at all, and people accepted my views that English will remain for an indefinite time in India, unless, as evaluation takes place, it takes away every foreign thing from India, including foreign loans.

My predecessor, Shri Chatterjee, spoke of changing the Constitution. I think that those who think in terms of changing the Constitution are doing the greatest harm to the country. It is the most dangerous thing. It may be that you bring an amendment and you do not get the requisite majority, and if you do not get the requisite majority, the conflict between the South and the North will be increased. I think such a dangerous proposition should not have come from such a wise lawyer as Shri Chatterjee. I do not think there is any need for assurances that English will remain. English will remain. There is no question of it. English comes to us, even with the milk of the babies at their mother's breast. Now-a-days, they do not say: Amma or Appa, but mummy and papa. We talk to our dogs also in English. I think Mr. Anthony is very unnecessarily exercised about the fate of his

mother tongue. In England it may disappear; in India it will not disappear. I can tell you that some of us, especially my friend Prof. Mukerjee speaks better English than 99 per cent of the Englishmen. How can such a language disappear? All our well-read papers, all our papers that command any respect are in English and will continue to be in English. All our steno-typists and typists will be from the South. The Prime Minister can find out in his own office how many steno-graphers are from the South and how many are from the North. I have tried to get a steno-grapher from the North and I could not. So also, all the secretaries and under-secretaries. So, I think it is useless. All the assurances that have been given by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister should suffice for us, and to our misfortune, this language will remain for ever, that means, till our imagination can work. I would advise the Hindi speaking people, for God's sake, confine yourself to the Hindi-Speaking areas; send your children to Hindi schools and have your administration in Hindi, not 80 per cent of it in English. Therefore, I think this is quite a useless discussion. The *status quo* will be maintained for many many years to come, unfortunately.

There is only one thing which we must all remember. Remember as long as you have English, you are dividing society into two classes, superior class, those who know English and inferior class, those who do not know English. It is this that worked with Gandhiji. He did not want this great river, great ocean flowing between the educated and the uneducated. Because, the educated were those who knew English and the uneducated were those who did not know English. A great Maulana, who knew Persian very well, knew Arabic very well, was not educated; a great pandit who knew Sanskrit very well was not educated but if he had a smattering of English knowledge, he was educated. In my days, if you failed in every subject and if you passed

in English, you passed. I do not say these things in order to excite laughter. I am painting you a very painful picture of our country. We want to perpetuate the differences that were introduced by the British; we want to make them permanent. For God's sake at least think of the poor people. If all our knowledge is through English, it is not going to percolate to the masses. Find out a way. Therefore, I say to the Hindi people: see that English has no currency at least in those provinces where Hindi is spoken. You are talking of the fanaticism of the Hindi people. I say there is a fanaticism from which we all suffer, that is, love of English, including myself.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, it is very good that this subject has been discussed in the House without any loss of time. Diverst views had been expressed on the subject.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : 26 जनवरी के बाद सरकार की तरफ से हिन्दी में भाषण होना चाहिए। 26 जनवरी के बाद मंत्री महोदय अपने वचन का पालन करें।

श्री बृजराज सिंह : कम-से-कम हमारे होम मिनिस्टर को कांस्टीट्यूशन की कद्र करनी चाहिए। वह हिन्दी में बोलें। ट्रांस्लेशन की व्यवस्था है।

श्री नन्दा : कभी कभी बोलते रहेंगे।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : प्राज शुरू कीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जिस भाषा में मंत्री महोदय बोलना चाहते हैं, उन को बोलने दीजिए।

Shri Nanda: One good has been done. One benefit has accrued that the air has been cleared to a very great extent of various kinds of suspensions, misunderstandings and wrong assumptions.

[Shri Nanda]

Before I say anything about the contentions and the accounts on which this adjournment motion was based, I may, with your permission, give expression to my deep anguish at the tragic and harrowing occurrences in some parts of our country. These horrible developments have been made known to all of us from day to day, and I am sure I am only voicing the feelings and sentiments of the House, of all the Members here and of the countrymen outside, when I refer to the fact that we have all experienced a deep sense of shock and distress at the gruesome acts which were reported to us in the papers from day to day. There was loss of life and there was loss of property, specially public property; there were cases of self-immolation; some persons burnt themselves. It is really horrible to think of such things. The policemen on duty were burnt to death under conditions and under cruel circumstances which we dread to imagine. We dread to see the conditions in which these people were dragged and crushed and burnt. This is not a simple question of destruction of property or loss of life. It is the destruction of the most cherished human values. I think our hearts must be weighed down with sorrow. It is a stigma which this country has to wipe out, and I hope, apart from the other things, we shall proceed to do that.

I may refer to another feature, the fast of Acharya Vinoba Bhave. He does not concern himself with our controversies here; he just reacted to that aspect. We were anxious about his health. Fortunately, the fast has been broken because the conditions became quiet and peaceful and normal. But his aim was just that. I hope there will be many more in this country who will devote themselves just for this purpose.

If we have to live and survive as a nation as a democracy, as a progressive society, then we must get rid of this cult of violence, and whatever

the merits of the disputes, the demands or our differences, there should be ways of resolving them peacefully as normal, civilised human beings. This is the basic condition of the progress of any country and for our survival as a civilised society. It was heart-rending to see from day to day students coming into it. I would say being dragged into these things. This spirit of violence will not be confined to just one aspect, one question, one section and one place. It is apt to spread; it can be very infectious. Nothing will be left safe and intact in this country if we do not think of that more than anything else. Language, economy and everything else are really secondary to this thing. Here we have to see what is at stake in this country.

I am thinking of it especially because one or two things have come to my notice. In today's papers, I believe, there is a threat from the Jan Sangh that they will go about doing similar things—wiping out, tarring anything, any signboard, which appears in the English language. Other kinds of threat have also been given. They may say, "We do not indulge in violence. We are only going to do these simple things". But these simple things have a knack of escalating and nobody can control them. Those who initiated the mischief may be possibly behind and other innocent people will suffer, as they suffer in every case and as they did suffer in this case. Therefore, I would beseech, implore them: Please do not retaliate in this way. This is not the way of protecting Hindi or of lodging a protest against anything excessive, which may have occurred anywhere else.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee said that it is not only in Madras, but there is another area also. But what are the assumptions? All these things have occurred on wrong assumptions. If a person of his standing projects into this discussion the Supreme Court,

and English not being there, what happens? Whoever said that? It has been protected fully. It is these fears, apprehensions about the future and these kinds of assumptions which, in the hands of simpler people, lead to these horrible consequences. The hon. Member is pledged to the rule of law and orderly society. But always, even when the nation's security is involved, he will say "the courts" and nothing else.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Is he the only Bengali leader? Would you please tell us what your distinguished colleague, the President of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, Shri Atulya Ghosh, sitting behind you, said on the occasion of the birthday of Shri Nijalingappa?

Shri Nanda: He gave a very clear and categorical answer on behalf of that State to the extent, of course, he represents it. I say so because this charge may not be levelled, namely, as to how any one individual can speak for the State.

I come to the speech of the hon. mover of the motion. As usual, he has made a very eloquent speech. I must congratulate him on his constructive approach. I may not agree with all of what he said, but it had an appeal. I searched for an answer to the question, what was this adjournment about? How did the Government come in for censure? Let him scan his speech, every word of it, and he will find practically nothing in that. He used two words: "haste" and "ineptitude". About "ineptitude", of course, he has to illustrate where the ineptitude was. I will deal with "haste". There is another thing. He said one thing with which I wholly agree. He said it was incendiary leadership which was really the cause. That was where the mischief began and developed. We had an example of incendiary leadership here. The hon. Member Shri Manoharan, made a speech. What did he say? He said....

Shri Manoharan: The Chief Minister of Madras was there.....

Shri Nanda: The blood-thirsty mentality is oozing out of every word he spoke.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राग भड़काने वाले सुब्रमण्यम साहब भी तो थे।

श्री हुषम चन्व कच्छवाय : कामराज साहब भी तो हैं।

Shri Nanda: Sir, this House has a sample of what may be going on there. If something of this kind can be uttered on the floor of this House, there, in the irresponsible manner in which people can speak outside, we know what is that is being said.

Shri Manoharan: It is a thorough misinterpretation of facts.

Shri Nanda: Everything that he said about events and incidents is just without regard to truth, without regard to what the facts were. (*Interruption*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What was the statement of Shri Bhakt Darshan which created so much misunderstanding in the minds of the entire people, when he was trying to interpret Government's policy?

Shri Nanda: I was myself going to deal with that point. Since it has been mentioned I will dispose of it immediately. I have got here a full statement of Shri Bhakt Darshan.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : घाँटें, घाँटें।

श्री बागड़ी : जब मेरी बात होती है तब तो प्राप मुझे चुप करा देते हैं....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्रीरों से भी तो मैं कह रहा हूँ। हर एक को मैं कह रहा हूँ। प्रापको भी उनके साथ कह रहा हूँ। अब प्राप सुनें मिनिस्टर साहब क्या कहना चाहते हैं।

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

हर बार आप यही कह देते हैं कि आपको ही में कहता हूँ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Sir, may I suggest to the hon. Home Minister that because some people have indulged in harsh words it is not for the Government to retaliate. I believe they have a right to retaliate, but if they do not do that their cause will prosper.

Shri Nanda: I am very much indebted to the hon. Member. I respect him greatly.

श्री श्रीरं (अलीगढ़): मझे बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला। एक क्षण के लिए मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझ पर तो डी० आई० आर० लग सकता है लेकिन जब श्री मनोहरन श्रीर डी० एम० के० के दूसरे लीडर आग भड़काते रहे तो क्यों नहीं गृह मंत्रालय ने कोई कदम उठाया? क्यों वह तमाशा देखता रहा? क्यों उसने इतने लोगों को बेमौत मरने दिया? इसका जवाब मैं चाहता हूँ।

Shri Nanda: It was not at all retaliation, it was only elucidation. It was only to disclose to the view of the House as to what may have been the porcesses which might have created the kind of situation and the consequences which became so alarming and disheartening. I just wanted to put before the gaze of the House the kind of mentality which has been at work. (Interruption).

Shri Manoharan: What I have given is nothing but the events that took place. I did not indulge in any personal attack on any one. I think all the papers there . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Nanda: There was nothing like what is imputed to Shri Bhakt Darshan in the statements I saw or read. Of course, when truncated

reports appear anywhere somebody can possibly misinterpret it. I do not want to enter into the question as to who was responsible for it.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय: कामराज के वक्तव्य से भी तो गड़बड़ हुई। उनको क्यों जेल में नहीं डाला गया?

Shri Nanda: I shall come to that also.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: क्या आप सुनना चाहते हैं या नहीं? अगर सुनना चाहते हैं तो बार बार दखल क्यों देते हैं, बराबर रुकावटें क्यों डाली जा रही हैं। तीन घंटे तक बहस होती रही है, अब जवाब भी तो सुन लीजिये।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय: कामराज द्वारा सारी गड़बड़ हुई है।

Shri Nanda: Now, if there had been a failure on the part of government, to that there cannot be a reply in this way; there can be no justification for perpetrating violent acts. There could have been an attempt to get further elucidation of those things to clear their minds of the doubts. No such attempt was made.

Now, let us first see whether there was anything wrong with our policy. There were provisions in the Constitution. A various stages, a Commission was appointed, then a Committee of Parliament, their recommendations were adopted by both Houses, and then the Official Languages Act embodying all the basic provisions in regard to our policy. Have we departed a little bit, an iota, from the accepted policy of Government? No, we have not. Therefore, it is not a question of policy; there is nothing wrong with the policy. If we had departed from that policy, then we could have been held to blame for that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Shri Subramaniam will reply to you on that.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : त्यागपत्र जो दिये गये थे, उनको क्यों वापिस लिया गया ? इसके कारण भी तो गड़बड़ हुई है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उनके अन्दर कुछ होता रहे, इससे मुझे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है।

Shri Nanda: Then there is the question of implementation. In the matter of implementation did we do anything excessive? There the question of haste may arise. I think those hon. Members who are being dubbed as chauvinists and protagonists of Hindi can very well say that we have done very little in pursuance of those decision and that we have not done much. Because, what did we do? Then, again, on the question of haste, it is not as if on the 26th some announcement had to be made or some decision had to be taken. It just came by efflux of time because it was provided in the Constitution. Therefore there is no question of any haste so far as the application of the provisions of the Constitution is concerned.

Then the question will be: what did we do in order to see that people understand what we are doing? Some hon. Members have stated that the Prime Minister's broadcast should have taken place earlier. Well, the Prime Minister's broadcast came at a time in a particular situation. But were we silent till then? Were we doing nothing before that? I will take the hon. Members back to the previous year. During that year there were meetings with the Chief Ministers where every little thing that was decided in respect of the language policy was a matter of unanimous consent and approval of all those who were present. On every little thing communiques were issued and they were publicised. I will mention at least one. Some decisions were taken in December at the last meeting of the Chief Ministers. They received very good publicity. A full account of the decisions taken at this meeting was given to the

press. What is the reaction? The Hindu wrote in its main editorial of December, 15:

"... the decisions taken at the Chief Ministers' Conference indicated by and large the readiness to submit to pragmatic considerations as well as willingness to respect the spirit of the 1963 Official Languages Act."

More or less similar comments were made in the other papers also. That was at that stage. After that nothing has been done. At that stage this was the response and the reception to the policy of the Government as in the course of implementation.

19 hrs.

Then, I happened to be in Madras on the 23rd January as was mentioned by an hon. Member. There it was brought to my notice that the Home Ministry had issued some kind of a circular and that it was causing some perturbation. I categorically contradicted that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What was the circular?

Shri Nanda: There was no circular.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Then why did you contradict it?

Shri Nanda: I explained that and it appeared in bold headlines in the papers, in the Hindu and others. All that I said twice on the 23rd and on the 25th, that is, before the 26th, appeared under the headlines "Hindi without handicap"; "Nanda's call to DMK to desist from observing mourning day" etc.

There was a mention of Shri Bhaktavatsalam as to why he did not do something. He requested them to have their day earlier or later but not to do this sacrilegious thing on the day of the Republic. That was his request to them. So, all that had appeared and I believe there are

[Shri Nanda]

many people at least among the students, the teachers and others who read the Hindu and other papers. It had appeared in the other papers also. So, there was not a shred of justification on the ground of any misunderstanding about the policy because there I categorically stated that.

Also, apart from the circular, I took that opportunity twice to say that nothing was going to be done about Hindi which would not be acceptable to them and which would cause them any inconvenience.

Shri Manoharan: The Home Minister now says that there was no circular; that there was nothing. But in the Hindustan Times of the 17th there was a circular from the All India Radio about the recruitment of transmission executives for which the qualification laid down was knowledge of at least one Indian language literature and the desirable qualification was fair knowledge of Hindi.

Shri Nanda: He is rather too hasty. I was talking about the circulars. I would certainly explain all that had happened. In the ordinary working of one or two ministries they had issued certain instructions; but before the 26th, on the 23rd, I told them that even if a slight mistake in a slight matter had occurred anywhere it was going to be immediately rectified and those were withdrawn before the 26th, or the 25th. There was no occasion and I had stated that also.

Shri Manoharan: What is your explanation?

Mr. Speaker: He has given that answer.

Shri Nath Pal: Did you send copies of your circulars to Shri Subramaniam and Shri Alagesan also? Did they receive the copies of your circulars?

Shri Nanda: The Ministry got it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: When they could not understand, how could the people understand?

श्री बागड़ी : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। माननीय गृह-मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि गलतफहमी हुई नहीं, बल्कि फैलाई गई। अगर जनता में गलतफहमी नहीं फैली थी तो वजारत के जो एक माननीय सदस्य हैं वह कौन सी गलतफहमी के शिकार हो गये। या कि वह भी इस तहरीक में शामिल थे। इस की सफाई होनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कैसे है।

श्री बागड़ी : इस लिये कि दूसरों पर यह लांछन लगाया जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप बैठ जायें, मैं कांस्टिट्यूशन के किस आर्टिकल का हवाला दूँ जिस का उल्लंघन किया गया है।

Shri Nanda: May I add another fact? This policy as it developed and as it was evolved was discussed at various stages in the Madras Assembly and it is not only the Government of Madras, not only Shri Bhaktavatsalam or whosoever might have been the Chief Minister but all parties agreed to that. It was on the basis of the consent of all the parties, whatever has been done, and not of Shri Bhaktavatsalam.

Shri Manoharan: No, Sir.

Shri Nanda: I have got a report of that; it will take me too much time to go into that.

श्री मधु लिंगयै : भक्तवत्सलम जी हर रोज नये नये बयान क्यों देत हैं।

Shri Nanda: At this stage I am explaining that the policy that has been in force was the policy accepted

willingly and readily by all concerned.

Then, there was another feature. I would like to deal with that. That is: Why is it that we did not anticipate it? That is the question. But I ask: Anticipate what? Is it whether mob violence will result out of mob agitation which is going to bring into the vortex large numbers of people of all shades of intelligence and standing? Who can predict it any time? It is a question of incendiarism. What was happening in that area for a long time? Take the D.M.K. itself. It is not a recent agitation. They have been talking of burning the Constitution and putting it into the sea and also of various other acts of vandalism. They have been preaching that. They had been doing this. It was only when the question of secession came that they stopped that and then they said—and it is important—“Now we shall concentrate on the question of Hindi” knowing that they had not the courage to face the consequences of the law and the Constitution. They took another course. They want to disrupt this country on the issue of language, not being able to face the Constitution. (*Interruption.*) Even Rajaji says, this is a mourning day. He said, “It is twice a mourning day for me than for the D.M.K.” I was asked, Why did not I meet Rajaji?

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): The name of Rajaji should not be dragged in.

Shri Nanda: I was asked: Why did not I meet Rajaji? A colleague of mine met Rajaji just about this time and I need not disclose all that he got out of him. (*Interruption.*) I have not said anything else.

Now, in regard to whatever was said here in respect of any acts of omission or commission of the Government in this matter, I believe I have been able to put forward cogent reasoning and facts to show that the Government did not do anything which it was not called upon to do,

which it was not its duty to do and that in respect of the implementation, the steps taken were minimal. There was not haste at all. Therefore, I do not think the question as to whether some provocation was given, can be sustained. There was no provocation; there was no haste. But this arose out of a continuous sustained agitation which should have been met in some other ways. I must confess why is it that we allowed students to fall into the hands of such people. That is on a larger ground.

Shri Hem Barua: Here is the Home Minister who tells us there was a continuous series of agitation, mischiefs and acts of vandalism. What was he doing then?

Mr. Speaker: He is explaining . . . (*Interruption.*)

Shri Nanda: The virtue of democracy

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The Home Minister says that the people misunderstood him. He had not expressed things even to his Cabinet colleagues. How can he blame the people? I think it is time he should explain that.

Shri Nanda: I shall explain that also.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: You should explain that. There is the statement by Mr. Bhakt Darshan.

Shri Nanda: The virtues of democracy and its handicaps lie in this. We cannot act immediately when there is a protest, immediately as there is a procession or a demonstration. Therefore, one charge is: Why did we not act much earlier? And the other is: Why did we act at all?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: What is the reply of the Home Minister to the question I have asked. We have asked it repeatedly.

Shri Nath Pal: That is the point we have been asking since this morning?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Why should he not face that question? Either his colleagues were wrong or right. If they were wrong, their resignations ought to have been accepted. If they were right, then the people have the right to feel grievance that the Government did not explain properly their point of view. If he wants logic, he has to be logical.

An hon. Member: There is no answer.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Shri Bhakt Darshan makes one statement. Then Shri Sanjiva Reddy makes another statement.

Shri Nanda: As long as it is a question of peaceful processions, there is no problem.

Shri Nath Pal: Why are you chasing only Manoharan and those others?

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर आप प्रश्नों को टालते जाएंगे तो संतोष नहीं होगा।

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाय : उनके भाषण से जो स्थिति बनी उसके बारे में मंत्री महोदय क्या कहना चाहते हैं।

श्री बुजराज सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सभा सात बज गया है और वातावरण गरम हो रहा है। अब इसको क्लोज कर दिया जाए, कल फिर से ले लिया जाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एडजर्नमेंट मोशन ही क्या रहा जो कल तक के लिए जा सके।

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Let us first hear him. Questions may be asked afterwards.

श्री मधु लिमये : न्यायिक जांच की घोषणा की जाए।

Shri Nanda: Why did we not act? That is the question. Shri Bhaktavatsalam acted. He removed all the

DMK leaders that day, thinking that that would suffice. He has had to bear the brunt of this violent agitation, and he has discharged those functions in an admirable way under the greatest stress and strain. On the one side, the Madras Government has been doing everything possible to protect the interests of the people of the State so far as language is concerned; on the other, it has taken a very strong stand on law and order, which it should have done.

Shri Rajaram: We will give the correct answer in the next elections.

Shri Muthu Gounder: The Madras Chief Minister proved a good stooge for you to kill 90 lives and inflict all this suffering on the people. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: I am surprised at the attitude of Members.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Chief Minister has had people shot dead, and he is defending him.

Mr. Speaker: Why should he not? If he is of that opinion, why should he not?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आपके द्वारा विनती करता हूँ कि श्री नन्दा न्यायिक जांच की घोषणा करें।

Shri Nanda: At one stage it cropped up that the assurances of the late Prime Minister had not been carried out. Now, that was not so. I have said that that was not so, that the Act itself was an implementation of those assurances, and later on what the Prime Minister said in his broadcast. I said earlier, on the 23rd and 26th in my broadcast that without the consent of the non-Hindi areas, no step would be taken for taking English out of currency. Hon. Members could ask, what right had I to do so? Still we have done that. At any

rate, we might have gone too far.

Therefore, no such question was raised, could be raised. Hence that is the answer to the hon. Member.

Are we quite sure that in respect of what we have done, when the people now in charge of the Government are not there, some others are there later on are we quite sure that the same assurances will be implemented? Therefore the question was raised of a statutory safeguard. It was not that Shri C. Subramaniam was in disagreement with the policy. This is the explanation (*Interruptions.*)

श्री मधु लिम्बये : क्या इस मामले की न्यायिक जांच करने के लिए नन्दा जी तैयार हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर इस तरह से हर एक मेम्बर जब चाहे बोले और जितनी देर चाहे बोले चला जाए तो कोई डिसिप्लिन नहीं रह सकता ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : संतोषजनक उत्तर नहीं आ रहा है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं आ रहा तो सुनना तो चाहिए। संतोषजनक वह होगा जो आपको पसन्द आवे ।

श्री बागड़ी : गलत बयानी हो रही है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप कह दें तो मैं उनको बन्द कर दूँ। अगर इस तरह से कार्रवाई चलवाना चाहते हैं तो कहिए ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : श्री कामराज द्वारा हिन्दी के अपमान के कारण सब गड़बड़ हुई है, उसका उत्तर दिलाया जाए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सब से बड़ा रहा और चाहता रहा कि आप सुनें, सुनें। मैंने चाहा कि इस पर ज्यादा बात न कही जाए क्योंकि इक्साइटमेंट ज्यादा है। लेकिन आप लोग बार बार देखल देकर कार्रवाई को आगे चलने ही नहीं देते ।

Shri Nanda: I will come to a close, because really I need not have spoken for this length of time. As the hon. Member, Shri Kripalani said, this was a useless discussion, meaning that there was actually no case at all, nothing to be answered. Still I thought I might have this opportunity of clearing up some of the points. There was really no count on which any motion for adjournment could be built up. I want to close on this note that I hope that in future all of us will dedicate ourselves to the maintenance of peace. Government must in all conditions do its duty to maintain law and order.

Mr. Speaker: Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

श्री मधु लिम्बये : जूरीशियल इनक्वायरी के बारे में उनकी क्या राय है ?

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri H. N. Mukerjee. Others must get down. No one else can speak.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I confess I am tired, as the House must be tired . . .

Mr. Speaker: And what about me?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know that you have to bear the brunt of whatever exhaustion has descended upon us, but after having heard the Home Minister I really feel very despondent that he chose not to rise to the occasion as I did try, and so many of my colleagues also in their own different ways did try to put before Parliament the gravity of the situation. I had a very distant hope that Government would at last show some capacity for responding to the needs of the situation. Shri Nanda said good things about some of us, but then he said there was nothing to be answered in the debate.

He began by saying that a stigma had come and got labelled, so to speak, to the history of our country in contemporary times and that stigma had to be removed. When he said that I

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

thought perhaps he was going to follow it up with some kind of statement on behalf of Government which would be some contribution to the removal of that stigma.

He talked about something which I had said. I had used that expression deliberately—incendiary leadership—because I know that when Madras was in flames, there must have been some kind of incendiarism. But are you going to tackle incendiarism by talking in the language which Shri Nanda has spoken? What are you going to do at this present moment, I am asking the Government. What are you going to do in order to soothe the passions which, rightly or wrongly, have been evoked?

What is the good of Shri Nanda giving us a catalogue of his activities in Madras, or giving a certificate to Shri Bhakt Darshan, which he applauds himself? What is the good of our hearing these things, when, after all, if a parliamentary discussion is any criterion, there has been very serious damage inflicted to the integrity of this country?

Shri Nanda gave us a lot of things. He said: have we departed an iota from the adopted policies? All right, you have not departed an iota from the adopted policies. He said: have we not consulted all the Chief Ministers? We concede that you have consulted all the Chief Ministers you have got in your brotherhood. But what has been the result? Why is the whole country agitated? It is not only a question of the non-Hindi-speaking areas or the Hindi-speaking areas. The entire country is agitated. My Hindi-speaking friends are agitated because on their computation they find the whole idea of national integration being in danger. If that is so, what are you going to do in order to quieten the atmosphere? What are you going to do to soothe the feelings not only in the South but in other parts

of the country? What are you going to do to tackle the immediate Madras situation and the long-term problems which are involved in this matter?

We have tried during the discussion, so many of us in our own ways, to offer certain suggestions. Shri Nanda chooses not to give a proper reply. I have asked for a judicial enquiry. Why have I done so? I do so not because I under-rate the heinousness and gravity of certain excesses committed perhaps in Tamil Nad. To burn a man to death, who is not willing to die nobody in his senses would like to die like that—to burn a man to death is most monstrous. Nobody is supporting that kind of thing. When this kind of an incident has taken place in an incendiary atmosphere which was generated by certainly long periods of mismanagement of the linguistic question, what are you going to do about it? Aren't you going to at least assuage the feelings of the people concerned, of Tamil Nad? Is it a matter merely of Mr. Manoharan or anybody in Madras? The Bar Association of the Madras High Court, which includes the people just as respectable as Shri Nanda and Shri Chatterjee have put forward their demands? Are we going to just throw all that into the dust heap because this Government happens to be in power in Delhi? What is going to take place in regard to this? I want, therefore, the Government to come forward with soothing explanations, not only of what it had done or not done but also an offer that there should be a judicial enquiry. Because, on principle, wherever there is firing on the people, there should be judicial enquiry and there should be certain long range measures adopted by the Government of the country. He has given not an iota of a hint that some long-range measures are going to be adopted in this country.

So many of us have cried ourselves hoarse about the idea of national integration, about the idea that Government should consult all parties in

the country, that Government should hold consultations not only with political people but also with cultural representatives, with literary figures and artistic figures and others and that sort of thing, that Government should come forward for resuscitation of the whole national integration programme that Jawaharlal Nehru had initiated. But, no. Shri Nanda does not choose to say anything at all about it. He chose to defend himself. He is entitled to do so. In regard to Jawaharlal Nehru's assurances, he said that even before the Prime Minister made a comparatively categorical statement in regard thereto, he had said something about it. I am only counting upon my memory. But I do not think my memory is failing when I say that I saw in the papers a report of Shri Nanda's speech where he had made this remark about Jawaharlal Nehru's assurance: that it was deserving not only of consideration but of respect. This is a language of legalism which occasionally might come from some other people. This is not the language of statesmanship. If the Government of this country has said good-bye to statesmanship, well, they are very welcome to do so. I am sure that this country will not be irrepar-

ably damaged if the Government of today retires from its seat. Parliament has tried to focus attention a serious matter but there is no response from this Government; there is nothing. This Government is incapable of statesmanship. This Government seems to be incapable of generosity, of imagination, of sympathetic understanding of people's problems when they suffer, when they are in turmoil and in tribulation. They have no understanding of the wound in the human heart and they have the gumption to rule this country. If they can do so, God help this country. That is all I have to say.

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Speaker, Sir..

Mr. Speaker: No, he will excuse me. If I allow him, then others will rise.

Shri Nath Pal: What has the Prime Minister to say on this issue?

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 2]

AYES

[19.32 hrs.

Alvares, Shri
Badrudduja, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S.M.
Barua, Shri Hem
Bhattacharaya, Shri, Dinen
Chakaravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri H.P.
Chatterjee Shri N.C.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Dandekar, Shri N.
Deo, Shri P.K.

Dharmalingam, Shri
Dwivedy Shri Surendranath
Elias, Shri Mohammad
Gounder, Shri Muthu
Himmatsinhji, Shri
Kandappan, Shri S.
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kumaran, Shri M.K.
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Manoharan, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mishra, Dr. U.
Mukerjee, Shri H.N.

Murmu, Shri Sarkar
Muzaffar Hussain, Shri
Nath Pal, Shri
Rajerm, Shri
Ramabadarn, Shri
Reddy, Shri Naresimha
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Sezhiyan, Shri
Singh, Shri J.B.
Sivasankaran, Shri
Solanki, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Achuthan, Shri
Alagesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A.S.
Aney, Dr. M.S.
Anjanappa, Shri

Ankineedu, Shri
Arunachalam, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balmaki, Shri
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka

Besappa, Shri
Bhawant, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B.R.
Bhagwati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri.

- Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri
 Borooah, Shri P.G.
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Chandak, Shri
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
 Chaturvedi, Shri S.N.
 Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal
 Chadhuri, D.S.
 Chavan, Shri D.R.
 Chavan, Shri Y.B.
 Chavada, Shrimati Joraben
 Das, Dr. M.M.
 Das, Shri B.K.
 Das, Shri N.T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deshmukh, Shri B.D.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
 Dey, Shri S.K.
 Dighe, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G.N.
 Dorai, Shri Kasinatha
 Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gaekwad, Shri Hachsinhrao
 Gajraj Singh, Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shri V.B.
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Ghosh, Shri Atulya
 Gupta, Shri Badshah
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri M.L.
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jagjivan Ram, Shri
 Jain, Shri A.P.
 Jamir, Shri S.G.
 Jedhe, Shri
 Jha, Shri Jogendra
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Joytishi, Shri J.P.
 Kabir, Shri Humayun
 Kavirolkar, Shri
 Kamble, Shri
 Kedaria, Shri C.M.
 Keshing Shri Rishang
 Khadilkar, Shri
 Khan, Shri Osman Ali
 Khanna, Shri Mehar Chand
 Kisan Veer, Shri
 Kotaki, Shri L.Ladhar
 Koujalgi, Shri H.V.
 Krishnamachari, Shri T.T.
 Kureel, Shri B.N.
 Lakshminanthamma, Shrimati
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N.R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Malaviya, Shri K.D.
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Managan, Shri
 Mandal, Shri J.
 Mantri, Shri D.D.
 Maauriya Din, Shri
 Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra
 Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan
 Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
 Mehta, Shri Jaswant
 Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri M.P.
 Mohanti, Shri Gokulananda
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K.L.
 More, Shri S.S.
 Munzni, Shri David
 Murthy, Shri B.S.
 Muthiah, Shri
 Nandu, Shri V.G.
 Nanda, Shri
 Naskar, Shri P.S.
 Nayak, Shri Mohan
 Niranjan Lal, Shri
 Oza, Shri
 Paliwal, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Paramasivan, Shri
 Parasher, Shri
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
 Patel, Shri Man Singh P.
 Patel, Shri N.N.
 Patil, Shri D.S.
 Patil, Shri M.B.
 Patil, Shri S.B.
 Patil, Shri S.K.
 Patil, Shri T.A.
 Patnaik, Shri B.C.
 Patabhi Raman, Shri C.R.
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramiah, Shri
 Raj, Shrimati Sahodra Bai
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri
 Raju, Shri D.B.
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramakrishnan, Shri, P.R.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S.V.
 Ramaswamy, Shri V.K.
 Ramdhani Das, Shri
 Rampure, Shri M.
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganatha
 Rao, Dr. K.L.
 Rao, Shri Krishamoorthy
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Ramapathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Ray, Shrimati Renuka
 Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala
 Reddiar, Shri
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Shri A.S.
 Samanta, Shri S.C.
 Samnani, Shri
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Sarel, Shri Sham Lal
 Sarma, Shri A.T.
 Sen, Shri A.K.
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Sharm Nath, Shri
 Shankaraiya, Shri
 Sharma, Shri, A.P.
 Sharma, Shri D.C.
 Sharma, Shri K.C.
 Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shinde, Shri
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddananappa, Shri
 Siddiah, Shri
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sonavane, Shri
 Soy, Shri H.C.
 Subbaraman, Shri
 Subramaniam, Shri C.
 Subramaniam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tahir, Shri Mohammad
 Thengal, Shri Nallakoya
 Thengoudar, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A.M.
 Tiwary, Shri D.N.
 Tiwary, Shri K.N.
 Tiwary, Shri R.S.
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
 Tula, Ram, Shri
 Uikay, Shri
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
 Vaishya, Shri M.B.
 Valvi, Shri
 Verma, Shri Ravindra
 Veerappa, Shri
 Venkatasubbiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri K.K.
 Vijaya Ananda, Maharekumar
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhela

Mr. Speaker: The result of the
Division is Ayes 39; Noes 196.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: We do not adjourn.
Therefore, Shri Bhagat might continue
with the Bill.

19.33 hrs.
BANKING LAWS (APPLICATION
TO CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES)
BILL—*contd.*

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I had moved the
motion and clause 3 was under discus-
sion.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 3 is under dis-
cussion. We resume the discussion
the next day.

19.34 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday,
February 19, 1965/Magha 30, 1886
(Saka).*