

[Shri Hem Raj]

and Resolutions presented to the House on the 4th December, 1963."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 4th December, 1963."

The motion was adopted.

**CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT)
BILL***

(Amendment of articles 74, 75, etc.)
by Shri Sivamurthi Swamy

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis): Sir, while I am not objecting to the introduction of the Bill....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Normally, the introduction is not objected to. Are you opposing it?

Shri Hajarnavis: I am not opposing it, but I want to point out certain things.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No speech can be made at this stage. The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I introduce the Bill.

**CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT)
BILL—Contd.**

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the motion moved by Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya on the 22nd November 1963 to amend the Constitution of India.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) :
 ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मवर्चसी जायताम्
 आराष्ट्रे राजप्यो शूर ईषव्यो
 अतिव्याधी महारथो जायताम्
 दोग्धी धेनुर्वोढा अनड्वान्
 आशुः सप्तिः पुरंधी योषाः
 जिष्णु रथष्ठा सभेयो युवा अस्य
 यजमानस्य वीरो जायताम्
 निकामे निकामे नः परजन्यो वर्षतु
 फलवत्यो नः औषधय पच्यन्ताम्
 योगक्षेमः नः कल्पताम् ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री भट्टाचार्य, ने यह बिल यहां पर रख कर एक बहुत ही सुन्दर सुझाव दिया है । मैं इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं कि सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति को लगभग पौने दो अरब वर्ष हो चुके हैं और महाभारत तक संस्कृत न केवल भारतवर्ष की राजभाषा रही, अपितु अन्य देशों में भी इस का प्रचार और प्रसार रहा ।

14.33 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

भारतवर्ष में महाभारत के पश्चात् भी आर्य लोग देश के विभिन्न स्थानों की यात्रा पर जाते थे और कन्याकुमारी से ले कर इधर रामेश्वरम् तक और उधर सेतुबंध से लेकर अमरनाथ तक यदि एक भाषा नहीं थी, तो वे इस यात्रा पर किस प्रकार से व्यवहार करते थे ? इसलिए जिन माननीय सदस्यों को यह विचार है कि संस्कृत भाषा कभी जन-भाषा नहीं रही, मैं उन पर आश्चर्य करता हूं । उन्होंने संस्कृत साहित्य पढ़ा नहीं—और इस में उन का अपराध भी नहीं है ।

अभी बहुत थोड़े दिनों की बात है कि महाराजा भोज यात्रा पर निकले हुए थे, तो कोई ब्राह्मण लकड़ियों का भार ले कर आता हुआ दिखाई दिया । राजा भोज ने सोचा कि हमारे राज्य का यह कितना पढ़ा-लिखा व्यक्ति है, जो लकड़ी उठा रहा है ।

“हे ब्राह्मण, क्या तुम को भार का कष्ट हो रहा है ?” ब्राह्मण ने उत्तर दिया, “भारं न बाधते राजन् यथा बाधति बाधते”—“मुझे इस बोझ से उतना कष्ट नहीं है राजन्, जितना कि आप के “बाधते” के स्थान पर “बाधति” का प्रयोग करने पर हो रहा है।” यह मैं आज के समय की बात कह रहा हूँ, जो कि बहुत ही थोड़े दिन पहले का समय है। आप संस्कृत साहित्य को पढ़ें। कौन ऐसी राजनीतिक उलझन है, जिसको संस्कृत साहित्य में सुलझाया नहीं गया है, क्योंकि सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति से ले कर महाभारत तक आर्यों का सार्वभौम चक्रवर्ती राज्य रहा और उनकी भाषा संस्कृत थी। मुझे उन लोगों पर दया आती है, जो कहते हैं कि साहब, संस्कृत कभी जन-भाषा नहीं रही। उन्होंने केवल मुगल-काल तक का इतिहास पढ़ा है। उससे आगे के संसार का उनको पता ही नहीं है। जो लोग ऐसी बातें कहते हैं, मैं उनके सम्बन्ध में कोई कठोर शब्द नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं तो कहूँगा कि वे पुनः विचार करें।

अभी मैंने आपके सामने जो वेद-मंत्र उपस्थित किया है, उ- एक ही वेद-मंत्र में सारी आवश्यकताओं का वर्णन किया गया है। उसमें पहले परमेश्वर को स्वीकार किया गया है और फिर प्रार्थना की गई है कि हमारे राज्य में ये ये वस्तुयें हों। उसमें कहा गया : हमारे राज्य में ब्राह्मण ब्रह्मवर्चसी हों, क्षत्रिय शूरवीर हों, एक एक योद्धा महारथी हो, दस दस हज़ार के साथ युद्ध करने वाला हो, हमारे देश की गाँयें दूध देने वाली हों, बैल भारवाहक हों, घोड़े बड़े शीघ्रगामी हों, स्त्रियाँ बड़े बड़े नगरों का और सब प्रकार के व्यवहार का संचालन करने वाली हों, यजमान के घर में सभा में बैठने योग्य, सभ्य, शूरवीर सुपुत्र हों, कभी ऐसा न हो कि हमारा राज्य वर्षा से नष्ट हो जाये, या वर्षा ही न हो, हमारे

राज्य में दुर्भिक्ष न हो, खाने के पदार्थ हमारे योग्य हों, स्वर्ण आदि पदार्थ भी निर्वाह के योग्य हों, उनकी न्यूनता न रहे, समय पर औषधियाँ और वनस्पतियाँ फल लायें।

मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि यदि प्रारम्भ में संस्कृत को सहभाषा नहीं, राजभाषा मान लिया गया होता, तो यह जो दक्षिण और उत्तर भारत के लोगों का विवाद खड़ा किया जाता है कि साहब, हिन्दी को दक्षिण के लोगों या बंगाल के लोगों पर लादा जा रहा है, यह विवाद उपस्थित ही न होता, क्योंकि हम सब एक भाषा और एक सभ्यता के मानने वाले हैं और हम सब एक दूसरे के निकट आ सकते थे। अब भी यदि इस को राजभाषा स्वीकार किया जाये, तो यह विवाद दूर हो सकता है।

हमारी प्रान्तीय भाषाओं में सहस्रों शब्द संस्कृत के हैं। मराठी में “बंधूनी” शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाता है। यह बहुवचन है और नपुंसक लिंग बनाया हुआ है, किन्तु संस्कृत का शब्द है। गुजराती में भी आप संस्कृत के सहस्रों शब्द पायेंगे। बंगला में तो संस्कृत के शब्दों के संख्या ही नहीं है। यदि किसी संस्कृत के विद्वान के सामने कोई बंगला भाषा बोलता है, तो बहुधा वह उसके भाव को समझ लेता है। यही स्थिति पंजाबी की है। पंजाबी में भी सहस्रों शब्द ऐसे हैं, जो संस्कृत के हैं। उदाहरण के लिए ‘प्यो’ शब्द, जिस का अर्थ पिता है, संस्कृत से निकला हुआ शब्द है। केवल भारत की प्रान्तीय भाषाओं में ही नहीं, बल्कि मैं यहां तक कहता हूँ कि अंग्रेज़ी भाषा से भी संस्कृत के बहुत से शब्द हैं। आप जो “मदर” बोलते हैं, वह संस्कृत के “मातृ” शब्द से निकला हुआ है। आप जो “फादर” बोलते हैं, वह संस्कृत के “पितृ” शब्द से निकला हुआ है। आप “ब्रदर” बोलते हैं, जो कि संस्कृत के “भातृ” शब्द से निकला हुआ है। आप “सिस्टर” बोलते हैं, जो कि संस्कृत के “स्वसृ” शब्द से निकला हुआ है।

[श्री रामेश्वरानन्द]

इसी तरह आप "डाक्टर" बोलते हैं जो कि संस्कृत के "दुहितृ" शब्द से निकला हुआ है। से जितने शब्द हैं, ये सब संस्कृत के शब्दों से बिगड़ कर बने हैं और अब संसार को आदत पड़ गई हैं अशुद्ध शब्दों का प्रयोग करने की। यदि संस्कृत राजभाषा बने, तब कोई किसी प्रकार का विवाद खड़ा नहीं होता। "अवि-वाहित" के लिए अंग्रेजी में आप "बैचलर" कहते हैं, जो कि संस्कृत के शब्द "ब्रह्मचारी" से निकला हुआ शब्द है। मेरे पास इतना समय नहीं है कि मैं सब शब्दों को यहां पर प्रस्तुत कर सकूँ।

हमारी प्रान्तीय भाषाओं की जो लिपि है वह तो निकली ही संस्कृत से है। हिन्दी का एक-एक अक्षर मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ कि कहां से निकला है? संस्कृत के जो ६० या ६३ अक्षर हैं, वही अक्षर तो हिन्दी में हैं। आप कहां से इनको लाये हैं। अ, आ, इ, ई, आदि जो अक्षर हैं जिनका प्रयोग हिन्दी में होता है, ये सब संस्कृत के अक्षर नहीं हैं तो किसके अक्षर हैं। हिन्दी की लिपि संस्कृत की लिपि का विशुद्ध रूप है। आप यह देखें कि पंजाबी की लिपि जिस को गुरुमुखी लिपि कहते हैं, उसके जो शब्द हैं, वे भी यहां से ही लिये गये हैं। जैसे हम आकार कहते हैं, व आड़ा कहते हैं, हम उकार कहते हैं, व ऊड़ा कहते हैं, हम इकार कहते हैं, व ईड़ी कहते हैं। एक एक अक्षर, संस्कृत के अक्षरों से निकला है। लोग इन शब्दों का रोजमर्रा प्रयोग करते हैं।

मैं उन लोगों से सहमत नहीं हूँ जो यह मानते हैं कि भाषायें यहीं से बनी हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि सबसे पहले सृष्टि के आरम्भ में भगवान ने वेद दिया और वेद में २६वें अध्याय का जो पहला मंत्र है और जिसमें कुछ उपदेश दिया गया है, उसको मैं आपको सुनाता हूँ :

यथोमाम् वाचम् कल्याणिम् आवदानि जनेभ्यः
ब्रह्माराज्याभ्याम् शूद्राय चार्याय च स्वाय च ॥

भगवान कहते हैं, मनुष्य मैं तुम को सबसे पहले यह वेद की भाषा दे रहा हूँ इस भाषा को जैसे मैं तुम को दे रहा हूँ इसी तरह प्रत्येक स्त्री पुरुष तक तुम इसको पहुंचाओ।

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि भाषायें बनती नहीं हैं, बिगड़ती हैं। असमर्थता के कारण प्रान्तीय और विदेशी भाषायें बनी हैं। जैसे भगवान ने सृष्टि से आरम्भ में एक सूरज का निर्माण किया, चन्द्रमा का निर्माण किया, हवा पानी का निर्माण किया, हमारे और आप के शरीर का निर्माण किया, इसी प्रकार से भगवान ने एक भाषा आरम्भ में सृष्टि की दी और वह संस्कृत भाषा थी

सभापति महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि दो चार मिनट और मुझे दे दिये जायें।

सभापति महोदय : समय बहुत कम है और बोलने वालों की संख्या बहुत अधिक है। आप दो मिनट और ले लें और खत्म कर दें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : धन्यवाद।

मैं कह रहा था कि संस्कृत भाषा ऐसी भाषा है कि यदि वह आगे आये, तो सब जितनी समस्यायें हैं, उनका समाधान हो सकता है राष्ट्रभाषा के रूप में संस्कृत भाषा भगवान ने सृष्टि के आरम्भ में दी और वह बहुत देर तक चलती रही। किस तरह से यह भाषा बिगड़ी? जिस तरह से एक बालक तुतला कर बोलता है, जिस तरह से बालक रोटी नहीं कहता, लोती कहता है और आप भी लोती बोलने लगते हैं, तो भाषायें बिगड़ने लग जाती हैं। इस तरह से कालान्तर में जा कर भाषाओं का हास हुआ और भाषा का भाषान्तर हो गया। यह कोई आरम्भिक चीज नहीं है। मैं उन लोगों के साथ सहमत नहीं हो सकता जो कहते हैं कि भाषायें यों ही विकसित हो जाती हैं। इस तरह से किसी भाषा का विकास नहीं होता है। इससे तो भाषाओं

का ह्रास ही होता है। जिस तरह से सृष्टिचक्र, यह संसार ह्रास की तरफ जा रहा है, सूर्य, चन्द्रमा, पृथ्वी, आदि ह्रास की तरफ जा रहे हैं, इसी प्रकार से भाषायें ह्रास की तरफ जा रही हैं। यदि भगवान ने आरम्भ में कोई भाषा नहीं दी तो मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों को बोलना कैसे आया? आज भी आप एक बात को अनुभव कर सकते हैं। एक बालक को या दस बीस बालकों को एकान्त में आप रख दें और एकान्त में रख कर उनको भोजन आदि देते रहें, युक्ति से उनके साथ आप बात न करें, तो क्या उनको बोलना आयेगा। सृष्टि के आरम्भ में यदि कोई भी भाषा नहीं थी आपके विचार से तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनको भाषा आई कैसे? इसलिए आरम्भ-सृष्टि में भाषा थी और संस्कृत भाषा थी और लिपि भी थी। अगर उन को यह न पढ़ाई जाती तो जो लोग कहते हैं कि हजार दो हजार वर्ष पहले इस को बना लिया गया है व्यापार के लिए तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कैसे अनपढ़ लोग लिपि बना सकते हैं। जब आरम्भ में लोग लिखे पढ़ें नहीं थे, लिपि कोई नहीं थी, भाषा कोई नहीं थी तो उन्होंने लिपि और भाषा का निर्माण कैसे किया?

इसलिए मैं मांग करूँगा कि यदि यह स्वीकार कर लिया जाये और संस्कृत को भी राष्ट्र भाषा माना जाये हिन्दी के साथ तो यह जो लोगों को बेकार का बहम है कि कैसे आयेगी, यह भी निराधार साबित हो सकता है। जब सात समुद्र पार की हम ए, बी, सी पढ़ सकते हैं, गले के नीचे न उतरने वाली अरबी और फारसी पढ़ी जा सकती है तो अपने ही देश की भाषा और अपने ही देश की लिपि को सीखने में कोई समय नहीं लगेगा।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Madam Chairman, I want to submit very respectfully that, since so many hon. Members want to take part in

this discussion, you will kindly extend the time limit for this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: The House can do so.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): I only wish to make one submission and it is this. Today the third Bill on the list of business is a Bill to provide for the periodical disclosure of assets of Ministers and it stands in my name. Last time also it was on the list. The Committee for Private Members' Business has gone into this matter very thoroughly and carefully and has made time allocations which were approved by the House at the last sitting. According to that the time allocation for this Bill which is at present under consideration was 2 hours, 1 hour for the next Bill which is my hon. Friend Shri Naval Prabhakar's. Out of two hours, I understand, nearly an hour or so has been spent already and only a few more minutes remain.

Now, I have no objection to extension of time by a few minutes, say, 10 to 15 minutes, but I would only make a request that the worse coming to the worst I must be given enough time, even five minutes, to make my opening speech on the Bill and then it can be carried over to the next day because under the Rules, I am told, if it is not done, some damage may accrue to my Bill as well as, to the other Bill which stands after that. If we extend time for this Bill by 15 or 20 minutes, or even half an hour, I will not suffer. I would only request very earnestly that the Bill which stands in my name be given sufficient time to be moved today, and the discussion may then be adjourned to the next day.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think, the consensus of opinion of the House is that the time for this Bill should be extended.

An Hon. Member: By two hours.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I do not think we stand in the way of Shri Kamath's Bill in any way. I do not think that will come up today.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (धाराबंकी) :
मेरा निवेदन यह है कि दोनों बिल इसमें आ सकते हैं यदि हम एक घंटा अधिक बैठ जायें। इससे कामत जी का भी काम चल जाएगा और—

Mr. Chairman: As regards Private Members' Bills the Chair has no power to extend the time. But if the House is of opinion that the time should be extended, the House is a sovereign body. However, let us see if the number of speakers comes up to that level.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is only one objection to that procedure. Once again I want to make it clear that I am not against extension of time but it should not block the Bill that stands in my name. It was on the list last time, that is, 15 days ago; it is on the list of business again today. If the Rules are so construed that even on the third successive day my Bill can be moved, I have no objection and it can go for the next day. But as I understand the Rules, once the Bills are not reached on the second day on which they are shown on the list of business then all the Bills which stand on the second day on the list of business and yet are not moved fall and they will have to go for a fresh ballot. Last session also it happened, and so it lapsed. Fortunately in this session it came in the ballot and it is the second day that it is on the list. Therefore I earnestly request that it should not be blocked.

Mr. Chairman: You have made it quite clear. It will come in due course. If it does not come today, it will come in another ballot.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It may not; that is the whole trouble. I am sorry to say that, but it seems my hon. friends want to block it.

Mr. Chairman: It will come in a fresh ballot.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It may not win in a fresh ballot.

Mr. Chairman: It will get a chance in the fresh ballot.

Dr. B. N. Singh (Hazariabagh): It may not be balloted at all.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It may not find a place in the ballot at all.

Mr. Chairman: We shall consider it afterwards. Professor Mukerjee.

An Hon. Member: It can be moved one minute before we adjourn.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I agree.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Madam Chairman, though I do not envisage Sanskrit in practical terms as the national language of our country to be used for all official purposes, I think that the motion which has been brought by my hon. friend, Shri Bhattacharyya deserves the support of this House, particularly because of a certain crisis which seems to have arisen in our country in regard to this language problem. Mr. Bhattacharyya very modestly has put up the case for Sanskrit not to be the sole official language of our country but, if he has his way, it would be one of the alternative languages to be used for official purposes. And that modifies the proposition to an extent which, I think, ought to mobilise the support of this House for his motion.

Madam, it goes without saying how very much this country owes to the glory of Sanskrit not only in order to fortify our national self-respect, but also to sustain the day-to-day inspiration which ought to be there if we are going to conduct ourselves properly in a free India. Our country, our State has for its motto, the Sanskrit saying:

“सत्यमेव जयते नानृतम्”

Truth alone triumphs, out un truth.
And here we find:

“धर्मचक्र प्रवर्तनाय”

why in the later period, one of our
greatest saints Kabir had said:

संस्कृत है कूपजल, भाषा बहता नीर

Even though it was part of the Buddhist canon, the words are patently Sanskrit and the reason for the functioning of our Parliament and allied institutions is to see that the law of righteousness prevails. There are mottoes inscribed on the walls of Parliament House which are couched in Sanskrit mainly because it has the classical quality of conciseness and the profoundest significance at the same time. There are so many other ways in which we can remind ourselves of the glory of Sanskrit and how much we owe to it. Therefore, it is by no means inappropriate for Parliament to try and get the feeling of the country specially in the southern parts of our country in regard to this matter. Though I do not agree with many of the formulations made by those who are enthusiastic protagonists of Sanskrit, there is no question of the primacy of Sanskrit in the cultural life of our country. I do not agree, for instance, with my friend Swamiji when he said that Sanskrit was the language of the people. He said before the Mughal period or so it used to be the language of the people. I do not agree with that proposition, Sanskrit classical literature itself has evidence that even in the dramas of Kalidasa the women and the servants talk in a dialect It is not Sanskrit.

Shri Yashpal Singh: He said that it was before the Mahabharata period.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If it is before Mahabharata, then it is such a misty period that we cannot make any positive assertion in regard to that period. And after all, in the inscriptions of Ashoka, what we discover is not that Sanskrit was being used but *prakrit* which probably at that time used to be understood by the commonalty, but Sanskrit was a classical language which was learnt by the elite. That is

Sanskrit is water in a well while our own languages which we speak are the flowing river. Sanskrit, therefore, has a prominence no doubt. But it does not quite belong to the people in the sense that the languages we speak from day to day are our very own like the mother's milk which we imbibe. From that point of view, it is not necessary to press the claims of Sanskrit on an exaggerated basis. I do not for a moment deny, for instance, that Sanskrit even today, even in degenerate days, has a very great position of importance as a unifying factor. If you go to a place like Varanasi, Sanskrit there after all is a cementing factor of Indian life. But there again we are taking a rather limited view because our country is not only a Hindu country and it was for secular democratic reasons that our country adopted the official language to be Hindi and Sanskrit was not accepted. It was mainly because of that, not because of any animus against Sanskrit. But it was only because of its being rather remote from the day-to-day avocations that we did not choose Sanskrit to be our official language.

What Mr. Bhattacharyya is suggesting is to find out the opinion of our country in regard to having Sanskrit as an alternative official language and why should we not have it? Mr. Bhattacharyya has pointed out, for instance, that for ceremonial purposes, Sanskrit might very well be used, for purpose of the accreditation of Ambassadors, for purposes of University convocations and admission of students into a Degree and that kind of thing, just as in Oxford or in Cambridge the address is given in Latin—even now, when the convocation is held, the address is given in Latin which nobody understands—we could for certain symbolic reasons, the reasons of dig-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

nity, the reasons of association of ourselves with our past, adopt this kind of thing. But that cannot be done, he says, unless....

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis): In my own University, at the time of convocation, Sanskrit is used. All the proceedings are conducted in Sanskrit.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If it is necessary for legal technical reasons to have some kind of a modification of the constitutional provision as it is in order to employ Sanskrit for certain ornamental purposes, that little modification certainly ought to be done. If it is not necessary, if ceremonial employment is possible without any kind of modification, naturally the position can be clarified by Government and by the elicitation of opinion we can get the position even clearer still. Therefore, my feeling is that here is a proposition which ought to be supported. After all, Sanskrit has been a cementing factor. Muslim scholars have studied Sanskrit very carefully, not only the Arab scholars like Alberuni but Muslim scholars who have functioned in our country even in the Mughal period. What Darashukoh tried to do by getting a synthesis of Indian learning and Muslim learning is a kind of thing which we shall never forget. And after all, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the roots of our inspiration as far as our work today is concerned. I sometimes hear accusations against our country that humanism is a phenomenon which is alien to India; because we have had a caste-ridden society, the idea of humanism is not there at all. I do not know. I cannot go into this matter in any detail. But after all in the Mahabharatha we find that wonderful sentence:

“म मानुषात् श्रेष्ठतरो हि कश्चित्”

There is nobody greater than man. Man is a measure of all things. This kind of statement we get in our own scriptures, and even when *pauranic* rites and ceremonies are performed, rites and ceremonies which are inter-

polated so to speak with the implications of the caste system, we find wonderfully sublime statements: for example, such a *sloka* as that which goes like this:

“अपवित्रः पवित्रो वा सर्वावस्थां गतोऽपि वा ।
यः स्मरेत् पुण्डरीकाक्षं स बाह्याभ्यन्तरः
शुचिः॥”

—the idea of everybody getting purified only because of a certain kind of spiritual cleansing that can take place. This is mentioned even in the performance of those rites and ceremonies which are utterly associated with the most caste-ridden aspect of life. These are the things which we ought to recall to ourselves and, therefore, since we owe to Sanskrit so much of that inspiration which alone can help us to go ahead, let us try to find out what our people feel about it. If we can co-exist with English, if Hindi and English can co-exist, why not Hindi and English and Sanskrit also? In the south, people are putting up this question: let us support English because Hindi predominance is going to be a very dangerous thing. Now, how are you going to answer this? Let us find out what they feel in regard to Sanskrit. If the south, for example, feels that their apprehensions can be mollified by the adoption of Sanskrit as an additional alternative language, let us find out. As I said earlier, I cannot quite envisage in practical terms the adoption of Sanskrit. But let us find out. And Mr. Bhattacharyya wants nothing more than to have the elicitation of opinion and, therefore, I feel that this is a matter which ought to be supported. Government should not stand on ceremony, should not take a very technical position. Government should take an imaginative view of the situation and accept this, secure the opinion of different people and then come to whatever decision is thought right and proper.

Mr. Chairman: Now, Shri Ram Sewak Yadav, I would request the hon. Member to take only five minutes. The discussion ought to be concluded by 3.30 P.M.

15 hrs.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : सभापति जी, श्री भट्टाचार्य जी ने—

Shri A. T. Sarma (Chatrapur): The time allotted for this Bill must be extended. How can we express our views in five minutes?

Mr. Chairman: Then, any hon. Member may move a motion for extension of time, and then we shall see.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): I move that the time allotted for this Bill be extended by one hour.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I had moved a motion even earlier.

Shri A. T. Sarma: The time must be extended. After all, it is a vast subject. We should have at least fifteen minutes each to express our views.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I oppose this move for extension of time, because it will block the other Bills which have secured the ballot, and for which I think time has been allotted by the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions. I do not think that it is proper at this stage to ask for extension of time.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I beg to move:

"That the time fixed for this Bill be further extended by one hour."

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): I support Shri D. C. Sharma's motion.

Some Hon. Members: We all support it

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the question to vote.

The question is:

"That the time fixed for this Bill be further extended by one hour."

Those in favour may say 'Aye'.

Several Hon. Members: 'Aye'.

Mr. Chairman: Those who are against may say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Chairman: The 'Ayes' have it....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The 'Noes' have it. I press for a division.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Let the Lobby be cleared.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): May I make a submission? Why not ask the Members to rise and then make a count?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have asked for a division. So, what the hon. Member is suggesting cannot be done now.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: That can be done in a few minutes. You can ask the Members to rise and then count the number.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let there be a division. Let hon. Members know for which purpose the hon. Member wants extension of time for his Bill, and how unreasonable he is. Let the entire House know how unreasonable he is.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is pressing for a division. So, let the Lobby be cleared.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: If my hon. friends are fond of pressing for a division for everything, we cannot help it.

Dr. B. N. Singh (Hazaribagh): The ruling has been given already, and the Chair has asked that the Lobby be cleared.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : सभापति जी, एक निवेदन सुन लें ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : डिवीजन की घंटी हो जाने के बाद निवेदन नहीं होता ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Time cannot be extended unless the House sits longer.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Of course, the division is going to be held now. But if the House is going to sit longer after extending the time for this Bill, beyond five o'clock, then, of course, there will be no need for this.

Mr. Chairman: That question cannot be taken up now. The hon. Member has pressed for a division and there will be a division now.

The question is:

"That the time fixed for this Bill be further extended by one hour."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 10]

[15.06 hrs

AYES

Aney, Dr. M. S.	Jedhe, Shri	Rajdeo Singh
Bakliwal, Shri	Jyotishi, Shri J. P.	Raju, Dr. D. S.
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri	Kadadi, Shri	Ram Sewak, Shri
Balakrishnan, Shri	Kanungo, Shri	Ramaswamy, Shri V. K.
Barupal, Shri P. L.	Kindar Lal, Shri	Rane, Shri
Basappa, Shri	Kougalli Shri H. V.	Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.	Kurcel, Shri B. N.	Ray, Shrimati Renuka
Brahm Prakash, Shri	Mandal, Dr. P.	Saha, Dr. S. K.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri	Marandi, Shri	Saigal, Shri A. S.
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati	Mehdi, Shri S. A.	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Chavda, Shrimati	Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari	Samnani, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.	Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt	Sarma, Shri A. T.
Dasa, Shri G.	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Sharma, Shri D. C.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.	Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta	Shyam Kumari Devi
Dighe, Shri	Mohsin, Shri	Siddananjappa, Shri
Elayaperumal, Shri	Mudiah, Shri	Singha, Shri G. K.
Gandbi, Shri V. B.	Naik, Shri Maheshwar	Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Ganga Devi, Shrimati	Niranjan Lal, Shri	Subbaraman, Shri C.
Ghosh, Shri N. R.	Panna Lal, Shri	Swamy, Shri M. P.
Ghosh, Shri P. K.	Patel, Shri Chhotubhai	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Goni, Sri Abdul Ghani	Patel, Shri Man Sinh P.	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Gounder, Shri Muthu	Patel, Shri P. R.	Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Hajarnavis, Shri	Patil, Shri T. A.	Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Hem Raj, Shri	Patil, Shri V. T.	Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Himatsingka, Shri	Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Yainik, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Pratap Singh, Shri	Yashpal Singh, Shri
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas	Ragunath Singh, Shri	Yusuf, Shri Mohammad

NOES

Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath	Nair, Shri Vasudevan	Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Kachhavaiya, Shri	Omkar Singh, Shri	Umanath, Shri
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu	Pottakkatt, Shri	Utiya, Shri
Mishra, Shri M. P.	Shashank Manjani, Shrimati	Vishram Prasad, Shri
Misra, Dr. U.	Swamy, Shri M. N.	Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.	Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi	**

Mr. Chairman: Are there any corrections to be made?

Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra (Khandwa): I want to vote for 'Ayes'.

Shri Braj Bihari Mehrotra (Bil-haur): I want to vote for 'Ayes'.

Dr. U. Misra (Jamshedpur): I want to vote for 'Noes'.

**Two names could not be recorded.

Shri Braj Bihari Mehrotra: I want to vote for 'Ayes'.

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. Member not voted or voted wrongly?

Shri Braj Bihari Mehrotra: I have voted wrongly.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Once he has voted, he cannot correct it now.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member has made any mistake in voting, he can always correct it.

Shri Rameshwaranand rose—

Mr. Chairman: The result of the division is as follows:

Ayes: 81; *Noes* 19.

So, the 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it. The time is extended by one hour.

The motion was adopted.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : सभापति जी, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि आज सदन एक घंटे के लिए ज्यादा बढ़ा दिया जाय ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) । मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I think you were in the Chair when Shri Kamath pointed out certain reasons why if today his Bill regarding Ministers declaring their assets is not taken up, then it is going out of the picture altogether, for God knows how long.

I want to submit to you and through you to the House that perhaps it would be fair, and I might add; generous on the part of the Congress Party, if they agree to this Bill of Shri Kamath being at least initiated today, because otherwise those of us who are in a minority in this House, in a perpetual minority, as far as the life of this House is concerned, shall get a feel-

ing that by brute majority, they are keeping out discussion of a matter which affects the integrity of the Ministers. (*Interruptions*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I support the motion by my hon. friend. (*Interruptions*).

Shri D. C. Sharma rose—

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would request that my hon. friends like Shri D. C. Sharma and the Deputy Chief Whip who are here should see to it that this Bill which has now come on the Order Paper after a long time after securing the ballot—we have already difficulty in getting our Bills balloted and securing the ballot, and with great difficulty this Bill has now come on the Order Paper—is allowed to be taken up today. I hope they will see reason; if they are also interested in the ultimate discussion of this Bill and they do not want to shut it out, they must agree to the extension of time of sitting which is asked for.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has made his point quite clear. But according to the rules framed by the House, the time fixed for the discussion of private Members' Bill is 2½ hours. I think it cannot be extended beyond that period. But anyway, I shall convey your feelings to the Speaker.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Is it not possible even to permit Shri Kamath to move his Motion? The discussion may not take place today for lack of time, but at least you should allow him to move his motion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It requires only one minute. Then it can be discussed next day. Otherwise, the impression created in the country outside regarding Govt. will be that they are acting *mala fide* and with a guilty conscience. This will be unfortunate; I want to prevent that. But to stall a Bill of this nature, espe-

[Sri Hari Vishnu Kamath] cially when corruption is in the air, and on terrafirma at Jaipur and other places there was a torrent, a Niagara, of words about prevention of corruption....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should not make a speech now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am not doing it. I am only pointing out the difficulty. The time fixed for discussion of private Members business is 2½ hours and now the House has agreed to extension of time for the current Bill.

Mr. Chairman: If you can kindly persuade Shri Naval Prabhakar....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not want to do that. I am confident that you have understood me. But I am afraid that the other Members opposite have not been able to understand you or me.

An Hon. Member: They do not want to understand.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: As my hon. colleague said, perhaps they do not want to understand.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We are trying to understand both you and the Chair.

15.13 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am making a plea, Sir, in all humility and earnestness with regard to the Bill, which is item No. 3 on the agenda which stands in my name, which seeks to provide for the disclosure of assets by Ministers. You will realise in the ballot that was held I have been fortunate enough to get this Bill fairly high up in the list. But due to a mistake in the business a fortnight ago, it was not reached. That did not matter. But today there was hope, every possibility, almost certainty, of its being reached. But now the House has adopted a motion extending the time for the first Bill in the agenda by one hour. My hon.

colleague, Shri Yadav has tried to move a motion asking that the House sit for one hour beyond 5 p.m. Discussion is on that motion.

Unfortunately, if my Bill by this fortuitous development by this extension of time for the first Bill, is not reached today, under the rules, unless you in your supreme wisdom and authority permit—I would request you and entreat you to permit it,—because you are the supreme custodian of the rights of Members, specially of the minority in this House—it would be pushed out of the picture. At this rate, they can block anything they like—and we cannot do anything in the matter—by their sheer majority.

Therefore, I would request that you may be pleased to permit me to just move it, taking only a minute, so that my Bill is not pushed out of the picture. Under the rules, unless this is done, that will be the result and a fresh ballot will have to be taken. I leave it in your strong and competent hands.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: I want to oppose this move.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of any opposition. The time limit has been fixed by the Committee and then approved by the House. We were proceeding according to that. But the House is master of its own business and can extend the time for discussion of any business beyond the allotted time. Now the House has extended the time for the first Bill. How can I override that and give Shri Kamath time for his Bill? We will have to stick to the fresh allotment of time just now made. I hope the hon. Member would also agree with that.

Now he desires me that I should either allow him to move his Bill in between or extend the time beyond 5 o'clock so that he may have an opportunity to move his Bill. But that cannot be a sufficient reason, that just because a Member wants to move his Bill, therefore, the time should be extended.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If you will bear with me for a moment, I have been trying to submit that this is a matter which Shri Kamath had mentioned at 2.30 P.M. only in order to have as assurance from the Government Party that they would not use their perpetual majority in this House to push his Bill out of the picture. I know you are bound by the rules also and you cannot go beyond them unless there are very special circumstances supervening. but I am trying through you to appeal to the Government Party to see that an impression does not go about that because they have a majority, they can push completely out of the picture discussion of a Bill which seeks to discuss the question of the assets of Ministers.

This Bill being of a particular nature, I do feel that Parliament owes it to itself to see that it is not, for purely technical reasons, pushed out of the picture. I opposed the extension of time for Shri Bhattacharyya's Bill, even though I am personally keen that it should be long discussed; I opposed it because I saw in it a desire on the part of the ruling party to push out this Ministerial Assets Bill. Therefore, my feeling is... (*Interruptions*). I am speaking as modestly as possible, with as much quietude as possible. Parliament owes it to itself to see that no impression goes about that the majority in this House blocks, through purely technical argumentation, discussion of a matter which refers to the question of corruption in the highest echelons of our country's services. Therefore I am asking if only this little concession could be made that at 5 O'clock you allow Shri Kamath just a couple of minutes to move his motion, so that it could be discussed. I do not know if the rules help you to do that.

Mr. Speaker: By how much has the time been extended?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Extension is by one hour for Shri Bhattacharyya's Bill.

Mr. Speaker: How long will it take that Bill to be disposed of?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 44 minutes were left at 2.30 P.M. for this Bill. Now one hour has been added. It comes to 1 hour 44 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Then there is one hour for the other Bill. So it comes to 2 hour 44 minutes. It is not a question of one or two minutes.

I entirely agree with Shri Mukerjee that this House should not give the impression that simply because one party has got a majority, therefore, it can push out any Bill, in this case a Bill which seeks disclosure of assets of Ministers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is the unfortunate thing that has happened.

Mr. Speaker: Can I go into motives?

Probably, if Shri Kamath had not been overcautious, these 15 minutes would not have been lost, because I am told by Shri Mukerjee that he took precaution in warning the other party that they should not act in a manner that his Bill might be pushed out. Where was the need for that. If he had gone on without it, probably it would have been reached.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I did not raise it *suo motu*.

Mr. Speaker: First it was done by the other side?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether then. But I took that from Shri Mukerjee.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: I agree that the House should not give that impression that because there is a Bill which tries to make it incumbent upon Ministers

[Mr. Speaker]

to give details of their assets, therefore the House should extend the time for the current Bill. But on the other hand, as Shri Mukerjee said—and I also felt—though he opposed the extension, more time must be given to the Bill under discussion, because it is very important. I can say that the Members on the other side may also have felt likewise as Shri Mukerjee felt. They might have honestly felt that the present Bill must be given longer time. How can I go into the motive or the intention behind their move?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You rightly said that you cannot go into the question of motives. But as a Judge, you have always tried to go into the course of human conduct and the inferences to be drawn therefrom. Unfortunately, as it has transpired today, the Members opposite, the Benches opposite, will be branded, much to my regret, outside in the country with *mala fides* and a guilty conscience, with so many skeletons in their cupboard. That impression should not go abroad. They should not block my Bill. That is all my request.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं भट्टाचार्य जी ने जो विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया है कि हिन्दी के साथ साथ संस्कृत को भी राष्ट्रभाषा बनाया जाए, इसका विरोध करता हूँ।

जब भाषा का प्रश्न उठे तो सदन को यह देखना है कि जनतंत्र के लिए कौन सी ऐसी भाषा हो सकती है जो ज्यादा लाभदायक हो। जनतंत्र बिना जन भाषा के निष्प्राण है और समाजवाद निर्जीव। यह जो समाजवाद और जनतंत्र का संदेशा हमें गांव-गांव फैलाना है, उसको हम जनता के द्वारा और जनता की भाषा में ही फैला सकते हैं न कि ऐसी एक भाषा के माध्यम से कि जिस को लोग न समझते हों। मैं और मेरा दल जब अंग्रेजी का विरोध करते हैं तो इस लिए नहीं कि हम अंग्रेजी भाषा को खिलाफत करते हैं, उसके विरोधी हैं या हम को विरोध करने को आदत पड़ गई है। उसके पीछे एक तर्क है और वह यह है कि

अंग्रेजी इस देश की जनता की भाषा नहीं है, केवल दो प्रतिशत लोगों की भाषा है। ज्ञान और जानकारी जनभाषा के जरिये ही फैलाई जा सकती है, अंग्रेजी के माध्यम से या किसी ऐसी भाषा के माध्यम से नहीं जो कि थोड़े से लोगों की भाषा हो। इसी चीज को दृष्टि में रखते हुए मैं, इस अंग्रेजी का भी विरोधी हूँ और संस्कृत भाषा का भी।

भाषा विचार अभिव्यक्ति का माध्यम हुआ करती है। अगर हम अपने विचारों को उसके द्वारा जनता तक नहीं पहुंचा सके, तो फिर उसका उद्देश्य ही मर जाता है। संस्कृत को जब हम इस कसौटी पर उतारते हैं तो देखते हैं कि इसका भी वही दर्जा है जो कि अंग्रेजी का है। शायद हम यह तो कह सकते हैं अंग्रेजी जानने वाले अधिक हैं और संस्कृत जानने वाले उससे भी कम। संस्कृत को हिन्दी के साथ साथ राज भाषा और राष्ट्र भाषा बनाने का जो प्रयास किया जा रहा है, यह उसी तरह का प्रयास है जैसे लोग अंग्रेजी को राष्ट्र भाषा बनाये रखना चाहते हैं। जो लोग यह चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी राष्ट्र भाषा बनी रहे, उनका मंशा उसके पीछे यह है कि जनता अपने अधिकारों को प्राप्त न कर सके और अधिकारों और कर्तव्यों से वंचित रहे, उन से दूर रहे। यही उद्देश्य इस विधेयक के जरिये भी झलकता दिखाई देता है।

यह हमारे देश का दुर्भाग्य रहा है कि शुरू से ही भाषा को ले कर कुछ इस तरह के प्रयास बराबर चलते रहे हैं कि जनता को अधिकारों से अलग रखे। एक समय था जब इस देश की जन भाषा पाली और प्राकृत थी। अगर स्वामी जी यहां होते तो मैं उनको बताता कि संस्कृत कभी जन भाषा नहीं रही है। जब स्वामी जी जन भाषा की बात करते हैं तो वे भूल जाते हैं कि जब इस देश में पाली और प्राकृत जन भाषायें थीं, तब राजकाज संस्कृत भाषा में चला करता था ताकि मुट्ठी भर लोग जो संस्कृत के विद्वान हैं, वे ही राजनीति पर, समाज पर, व्यापार पर छाये रहें और साधारण जनता को अधिकारों से वंचित रखा जाए।

फिर दुर्भाग्य का दूसरा क्रम आता है जब मुसलमानों की हकूमत देश पर आती है जब हिन्दी, हिन्दुस्तानी, उर्दू जो कुछ भी कह लें, लोग बोलते थे लेकिन राजकाज अरबी और फारसी में चलता था ताकि कुछ खानदानी लोग, कुछ चुने हुए लोग सरकारी नौकरियों पर छाये रहें और राजनीतिक सत्ता अपने हाथ में बनाये रहें और बाकी जनता यह समझती रहे कि वह अरबी फारसी भाषायें जानती नहीं है, इसलिए वह राजकाज चलाने की अहल नहीं है, लायक नहीं है। तब भी इन लोगों का मंशा यह रहा कि जनता के मन मर जायें और वह कभी उस ओर देखने का प्रयास न करे।

इसके बाद जब अंग्रेज आये तो उन्होंने अंग्रेजी जनता पर लाद दी और वाध्य करके चालीस पच्चास लाख लोगों को अंग्रेजी पढ़ा दी। ये तो बड़े लोग बन गये, प्रमुख लोग बन गये और बाकी जनता को अधिकारों से उन्होंने वंचित रखा, ज्ञान से रहित रखा। गांधीजी के पुण्य प्रताप से जब हम आजाद हुए तो आशा बंधी थी कि अब राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी में राजकाज चलेगा और जनतंत्र का संदेशा, ज्ञान की झलक गांव-गांव और घर-घर पहुंच जायेगी। उस जनता तक पहुंच जायेगी जो पढ़ी भी नहीं है और जिस को पढ़ाने का बराबर प्रयास चल रहा है। अंग्रेजी कायम रखने के बराबर प्रयास चल रहे हैं। हमारे भट्टाचार्य जी ने इस को लाकर अपना दूसरा कौशल दिखाया है, अंग्रेजी का भेष बदल कर कि राष्ट्र भाषा संस्कृत बना दी जाए हिन्दी के साथ-साथ यानी जो उद्देश्य वह अंग्रेजी द्वारा पूरा करने के इच्छुक थे, उसी को वह संस्कृत के द्वारा पूरा करने के इच्छुक हैं। अंग्रेजी के पक्ष में वह उतनी तकड़ी दलीलें नहीं दे सकते थे जितनी तकड़ी संस्कृत के पक्ष में दलीलें या तर्क दिये जा सकते हैं और यह कहा जा सकता है कि यह इसी देश की भाषा है। लेकिन उद्देश्य दोनों का समान रूप से एक ही है और एक ही उद्देश्य को ये

दोनों पूरी करेंगी यानी अंग्रेजी रहती है तो हमारे भट्टाचार्य जी जैसे लोगों का वर्चस्व कायम रहेगा और अगर संस्कृत आ जाती है तो भी उन जैसे लोगों का वर्चस्व बना रहेगा। साधारण जनता के हाथ में कोई अधिकार आने वाले नहीं हैं।

इस तरह का जो प्रयास किया जा रहा है इसको मैं जनतंत्र के विपरीत मानता हूँ, यह जनतंत्र को मारन वाला प्रयास है, इससे जनतंत्र सफल नहीं होगा, जनतंत्र बढ़ेगा नहीं। दक्षिण और उत्तर की बात भी की जाती है। दक्षिण में जानबूझ कर हिन्दी या हिन्दुस्तानी के खिलाफ शोर मचवाया गया है। अगर यह सरकार, जो कि कांग्रेस के हाथ में है, कांग्रेस दल के हाथ में है, चाहती तो इस तरह का विवाद न उठता जैसे संविधान को जलाने की बात है। द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कड़घम को कितनी मुहुब्बत संविधान से हो गई है कि वह इसकी प्रतियां दूकानों से खरीद तो रहा है जलाने के लिए और देखना है कि कितनी खरीद कर वह जलाता है। अगर कांग्रेस सरकार केन्द्र में सही दिशा में कदम उठाती और राष्ट्र भाषा बोली जाने वाली भाषा को बनाती, जन भाषाओं को पांतीय भाषायें बना देती, तमिल को मद्रास में राजकाज की भाषा बना देती तो अंग्रेजी के समर्थन में बोलने वालों का तथा संस्कृत भाषा के समर्थन में बोलने वालों का मुंह बन्द होता। जैसी वकालत माननीय सदस्य अंग्रेजी या संस्कृत के लिए करत हैं, वैसी वकालत यदि वे तमिल, तेलुगू, मराठी, गुजराती, बंगला इत्यादि के लिए करत तो बहुत खुशी होती। इन में से कोई राष्ट्र भाषा बने, यह भी अगर वे कहत तो भी यह खुशी की बात होती। भट्टाचार्य जी बंगला को भी सहभाषा बनाने की बात कहते तो भी प्रसन्नता की यह बात होती—

श्री च० का० भट्टाचार्य : मैंने पहल तो बंगला वाला मामला शुरू नहीं किया—

श्री राम सेवक यादव : आप समझ नहीं रहे हैं जो मैं कह रहा हूँ। मुझे खुशी होती बंगला में कहते अगर आप। अगर आप बंगला के बारे में कहते तो भी बंगाल में रहने वाले गरीब लोगों के हाथ में, गांव में रहने वालों लोगों के हाथ में सत्ता जाती। इसलिए वह तो बड़ी होशियारी से और बड़ी कोशिश से चल रहे हैं जिससे जनता के अधिकार मजबूत न हों, उसके हाथ मजबूत न हों।

समाजवाद की बहुत बात की जाती है, जनतंत्र की बहुत बात की जाती है। समता में विश्वास रखन की बहुत बात की जाती है। यदि यह सच्चे दिल से की जाती है तो ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिये, ऐसा प्रयास नहीं किया जाना चाहिये जिससे इस देश की जनता पर जो हावी रहे हैं, जो मुट्ठी भर लोग समाज में आगे रहे हैं, वही हावी रहें, वह आगे रहें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री द्र० ना० तिवारी : इस में कोई शक नहीं जैसे श्री हिरेन मुकर्जी ने कहा कि संस्कृत में अच्छा भण्डार है और संस्कृत से हमारी सारी भारतीय भाषाओं की उत्पत्ति हुई है और कभी कभी सेरीमोनियल अंकेशज पर उसका व्यवहार किया जाए तो कोई बुरा नहीं है। उन्होंने यह भी बताया कि आप के सिर के ऊपर भी संस्कृत में एक वाक्य लिखा हुआ है। यह सब सही है। मैं इसको मानता हूँ। हम भी संस्कृत जानते हैं थोड़ी बहुत बोल भी सकते हैं। लेकिन प्रेक्टिस न होने की वजह से अधिक नहीं बोल सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में संस्कृत कभी भी राष्ट्र भाषा या राज भाषा नहीं रही है और न होने की सम्भावना है . . .

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (विजनौर) :
रही जरूर थी।

श्री द्र० ना० तिवारी : रही नहीं, पाली और प्राकृत भाषायें रही हैं। मैं यह भी नहीं मानता हूँ जैसे स्वामी जी ने कहा कि कोई भी भाषा मनुष्य की सृष्टि के पहले ही से उत्पन्न हुई है। मनुष्य जब पैदा होता है। उसके बाद ही कोई भाषा बनता है, कितनी पवित्र भाषा ही क्यों न हो। आज बड़ महत्व की बात यह है कि हमारे भट्टाचार्य जी जिस रूप में इस बिल को लाये हैं, उस रूप में इसको स्वीकार कराने के लिए लोगों की भावनाओं को कुछ कुरेदना होगा। असली बात जो है वह लोगों की नजर से छिपी रहेगी। असली मन्तव्य तो यह है कि हिन्दी की प्रगति में, जो कि राज भाषा होने जा रही है, कुछ बाधा पैदा हो और वह जल्दी से राज भाषा न हो सके।

इसी सदन में आपने देखा होगा कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी की बहस जब भी हुई है तो किन सदस्यों ने क्या कहा। अगर हिन्दी को राजभाषा नहीं बनने देना है तो उस वक्त क्यों कोई उच्च नहीं किया गया जब इस पर बहस हो रही थी और कानून यहां पेश हुआ था। आज बहुत सोच विचार के बाद एक ऐसा रास्ता निकाला जा रहा है जिसमें कि हिन्दी राज भाषा के पद पर प्रतिष्ठित न हो सके, और लोगों की भावना को कुरेद कर पुराने जमाने की बातों को सामने रख कर देश में एक ऐसा वातावरण तैयार किया जा रहा है जिसमें कि असली बात से लोगों की दृष्टि हट जाय। यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट बात है कि यह विधेयक बहुत ही खतरनाक है और मैं समझता हूँ। क इत्स बहस के बाद भी यह पास होने वाला नहीं है। इसलिये इस वाद-विवाद पर जो भी व्यय होगा वह व्यर्थ होगा जायेगा और मैं चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्र के घन को इस तरह ज़ाया न किया जाये।

मैं समझता हूँ कि जो लोग हिन्दी को राजभाषा नहीं बनने देना चाहते हैं वे कई तर्क रखेंगे। उन तर्कों में से एक यह भी है कि जिसकी जिसकी चर्चा श्री यादव कर रहे थे। जो कुछ

वे कह रहे थे उसको श्री भट्टाचार्य समझे नहीं। वे तो यह कह रहे थे कि यदि श्री भट्टाचार्य यह विधेयक लाते कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के साथ किसी तीसरी भाषा को भी जोड़ दिया जाय, जो कि देशी भाषाओं में से हो तो वह यह बात कुछ हद तक विचार करने की होती। लेकिन वे एक ऐसी भाषा को राज भाषा बनाने की बात कह रहे हैं जिसको देश की रहने वाले लोगों में से २५ प्रतिशत से भी कम जानते हैं, जिसका ज्ञान अधिकतर लोगों को नहीं है। अगर वे राज्य की सारी कार्रवाई उस भाषा में करवाने की सोच रहे हैं तो उस स्थिति में सारी बातें जनता तक कैसे पहुंचेंगी। यहां ठीक ही कहा गया कि जो आर्थिक क्रान्ति आप देश में लाना चाहते हैं उस की तमाम बातों को आप जनता के इस भाषा के द्वारा नहीं पहुंचा सकते। मैं मानता हूं कि संस्कृत एक बहुत उत्कृष्ट भाषा है, अच्छी भाषा है। उसको पढ़ना चाहिये और उसके ज्ञान में वृद्धि करनी चाहिये। यह सब है और हमारा कर्तव्य भी है कि ऐसा करें। इसमें हमें गौरव भी होगा। लेकिन गौरव को लेकर जो असली काम हमारे सामने है उसको हमें नहीं भूलना है। हम को यह दृष्टिकोण सामने रखना है कि हिन्दुस्तान की लिंक भाषा, बातचीत की भाषा, सारे देश में क्या हो सकती है। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि जो सरकारी अफसर काम करते हैं या जो सदस्य पार्लियामेंट और असेम्बलियों के हों उनकी भाषा सरकारी भाषा हो। भाषा ऐसी होनी चाहिये जिसके हर प्रान्त की जनता अपने रोजमर्रा का काम चला सके। आज के वातावरण में संस्कृत को यह पद कभी प्राप्त नहीं हो सकता है। फिर हम अंग्रेजी पढ़ेंगे, अपनी भाषा तो है ही, कोई साउथ की भाषा पढ़ेंगे, इतना सारा बोझ हम नहीं उठा सकेंगे।

इसलिये मैं श्री भट्टाचार्य से अपील करूंगा
र इस सदन से प्रयोग कइया कि जिनका

में यह विधेयक है उस में इसे पास नहीं
होना चाहिये।

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Sir, the Bill before the House has attracted great attention throughout India mostly in the intellectual circles. There is not much interest for this proposition, so far as I could sense, among the people in general. The other day I read in a paper that a great leader like Dr. Katju saying that Sanskrit would be a very effective all India link for the purpose of Indian unity. I agree with that view. But as everything has its own laws and principles, so has language, which changes in two dimensions: in time and in space. This law seems to be as effective and lasting almost as the law of gravity. You see any language in any country. It varies from place to place and from time to time. Take even one of the regional languages—Kannada or Telugu or Tamil. Modern Kannada or Tamil or Telugu is somewhat different from ancient Kannada, ancient Tamil or ancient Telugu. In 400—500 years' time the language puts on a new appearance and a new garb. Most of our excellent literary output by the old great poets are found in Sanskrit and the old regional languages. But on that account it is impossible to make it current coin for modern intercourse. At the same time these masterly achievements in the field of writing have very greatly influenced the modern language and the modern mind. It is almost like a human being growing from one age to the other. He may be very wise and effective, say between 40 and 50 years. Afterwards the body becomes a little weak; maybe, the mind grows or sometimes it does not grow. But once we pass the threshold of 60, we cannot act as a man between 40 and 50 does. Time make changes like that. In the case of Hindi, I am told that there are at least 25 varieties, differing from place to place in Northern India. Bernard Shaw has made

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

a great point of this law in his drama called *Pygmillion*. This law is applicable to Sanskrit also. It has changed in course of time and in course of space. Our best works in the field of religion and literature are embedded in this language. We should not neglect these ancient heritages merely because it did not happen to be current language or current coin of intercourse.

There is another lacuna in the matter of the use of Sanskrit language. Thousands of years ago, those who became masters of this language wanted to keep it as a close preserve. They did not allow some class of people to go into the depth of this language. They did not want women, *shudras* and *mlechas* to go into that depth. They made it a close preserve, with the result that it ultimately came to be identified, in the modern mind, with those principles which are against equality by which we stand and by which we take our oaths of office or membership as the case may be. That is another disadvantage attached to this language. It is not what is called a mere imaginary, disadvantage. In Mysore, I happened to start a department, when I was in office, in order to encourage literary and cultural developments. I got published several books on great epics and other literary works in Kannada language. In the legislature I had to face great criticism, because of the step I took. They attributed to me, that I am reviving all the old fossilised ideas of priest-craft, caste privilege and things of that kind. That was far from my mind. I merely wanted the literary excellences of our language to be the common property of the people. That was my idea. But the criticism came this way. Therefore, if we make Sanskrit one of our official languages, maybe there will be that criticism. That the criticism has already been voiced by my hon. friends from the Communist party.

At any rate, having studied both the views, I want to take an impartial view, a view that will ultimately do

good to this nation. We decry the 19th century as being a very reactionary century. I do not want to enter into that controversy. But it is in the 19th century that the United Kingdom of Great Britain achieved its highest point of glory, and this glory was not achieved by stones or water or forest, but by human beings. Every person worth the name in public life, or in the field of literature or science, had his background, his schooling, on the basis of the classical languages: Greek and Latin. Every great man whom we come across in English history or politics studied greece and Latin in the grammar schools or in other schools. That gave them such a good foundation that they started on the inheritance of their forefathers or what is called the European heritage or renaissance. Then the modern languages gave them the necessary knowledge of the existing affairs of things, and they became almost perfect men for any work that was entrusted to them. I envisage that in order to produce such finished personalities in this country, Sanskrit and Persian should be the classical languages that the people must be allowed to study. It may be that some people select Sanskrit and it maybe that some people select Persian. It may be that some people select both. It does not matter. But if you want our youth to rise in stature and standards and achieve great things for this country, their education must be sound. Their education must be solid and that can only be done by studying Sanskrit in the first instance and Persian also in the second instance; for even on merits, Persian cannot come up to the standard of Sanskrit.

I am a student of literature and I have discussed this question of literature with people all over the world. There is hardly any language in the modern world which has attained the peak point or the high standard of Sanskrit in the field of epics and other great literary works in the form of drama, etc. I wanted to compare our epics with the European epics; that is, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odysee*. I went

through from the first letter to the last letter of these two great epics. It is no exaggeration to say that if that mighty epic, the brightest epic of European civilisation is compared to the Ramayana or the Mahabharata, it is like comparing some big mountain in South India to Mount Kailas or the Himalayas. Sanskrit has attained that height, and no regional language in India, no modern language in the world has been able to attain yet that height of excellence in the field of literature and religion. The other fields have not been covered by Sanskrit because it did not grow. It had to come under the operation of the law of two dimensions, as I had said. Therefore, I would request the House to include it as one of the languages in the Schedule but not necessarily for the purpose of official intercourse. If we include English as one of the languages in the Schedule; self-respect and gratitude to our forefathers demand the inclusion of Sanskrit as one of the official languages.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. M. S. Aney. I would like to know how long the Minister would require for reply? I have got seven to nine names with me.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: The extra time allowed for this debate was one hour. Out of that one hour, 20 minutes have been taken away by Shri Kamath and his supporters. Should that be included in my time?

Mr. Speaker: They are also Members. Those minutes have to be debited to this account. If some controversy arises in the Bill or Resolution under discussion, that has to be debited to that subject or the time allotted to that subject. How long will the Minister take? I have about eight to ten names with me. According to the present allotment the debate has to be concluded by 4.14. Shri Bhattacharyya has the right of reply. He might take about ten minutes. There-

fore, there are only 15 minutes that can be given to the Minister.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Please give me at least 20 minutes.

Shri Hajaravis: I shall try to finish within 10 minutes. I shall give five minutes of my time to Shri Bhattacharyya.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I cannot call anybody else.

Shri Muthu Gounder (Tirupattur): We want to speak. The Tamilians are the only people who object to Sanskrit.

Shri A. T. Sarma (Chatrapur): I may be given an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot do that within the present allotment.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : थोड़ा समय और बढ़ा दीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर कोई मोशन मूव करे और हाउस एडाप्ट कर ले तो हो सकता है ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि इसके लिए कम से कम एक घंटा और समय बढ़ा दिया जाए ।

Shri Hanumnanthaiya: We also support it.

Mr. Speaker: Is that the desire of the House?

Several Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Then the time may be extended by another hour.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the motion before the House which my hon. friend Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya has brought forward is a very simple one. At the same time it is a very important one. The Bill consists of only two clauses. In the second clause he sug-

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

gests that after the word "Hindi" the words "and Sanskrit" shall be inserted. Except for this change, the rest of the provisions of Part XVII of the Constitution dealing with official language is kept unamended. I want to mention this fact first. Because, all that my hon. friend, Shri Bhattacharyya seeks is to put in Sanskrit as a co-official language along with Hindi. That is what he wants to do. The other provisions relating to Hindi being the official language are provided for in the remaining sections of that chapter. He does not want Sanskrit to be inserted there. The important point which I want my hon. friend, Shri Hanumanthaiya, who made a splendid speech, to bear in mind is this. All that he wants is that Sanskrit should be recognised and honoured as an official language along with Hindi. In the olden days there was a way of honouring men. If the greatest honour was to be given to a man, he was called upon to occupy a seat along with Indra.

सिंहासनम् गोत्राभिडोद्यानिष्ठत्

Indra used to call a king who has done great service to come and sit with him and share along with him the ornamental seat of throne. He did not want him to exercise the functions of Indra but he wanted people to respect that king. The position which my hon. friend, Shri Bhattacharyya has taken is that of Indra. He wants Sanskrit to be respected as much as Hindi is respected. That is the position that he wants to secure. Therefore, if this Bill is passed as it is, there is no danger of Hindi being superseded by Sanskrit. Neither is it his idea to create further trouble, as envisaged by my friend of the DMK party. The position of other languages will remain the same even after the passing of this Bill, just as they were unaffected when we passed a Bill prolonging the life of English for official use for a certain period of time. So, the only question is whether it should be done or not and my answer is that it should be done.

I will now give my reason for it. If we are to really carry out or implement the position which is given to Hindi in the Constitution, then Hindi has to be developed and enriched. That can be done only if Hindi and other national languages which are mentioned in the Schedule draw heavily from the treasures of Sanskrit. That is the only way in which they can get themselves enriched. That is the only way by which our regional languages as well as Hindi itself can come up to a position at which we can confidently say that now Hindi is so competent, so enriched and so developed that it can safely be entrusted with the work which the Constitution intends it to perform as the real official language.

Secondly, if there is any language which has really close touch with the majority of languages of India, it is only the Sanskrit language. Therefore, if all the regional languages of India cannot be made the official languages but some languages should be recognised as official languages, Sanskrit is the only language which can perform that function. Because, out of Sanskrit has grown several languages. Shouraseni, Magadhi, Paisakhi and Maharashtri are the four languages out of which most of other vernacular languages have grown. Besides the vocabulary and words in all these languages, which have ultimately now grown into our modern languages, is mostly Sanskrit. Almost 80 per cent of the words of these languages are from Sanskrit. So in a way, Sanskrit is the only language which has close association with almost every language, with all the people who speak different languages of India. Therefore, the people of India have got common respect for this language second only to their mother language.

I think the idea of my friend is only to include it as a language in the Constitution. Now the modern educationists find it difficult to make adequate provision for encouraging the study of Sanskrit. Notwithstanding the fact that the entire Indian culture is illumined with the impress of Sans-

krit, proper provision for the study of it is not made and the attention which it ought to deserve is not given to it. If we include Sanskrit as official language in the Constitution, as Shri Bhattacharyya has suggested, naturally a situation will arise where the position of Sanskrit will improve.

Other advantages will also flow out of it. For example, the literature of other languages can take advantage of Sanskrit, and that is another factor. I can give many more reasons but I feel rather tired. These are some of the reasons why I want the motion of my hon. friend to be carried by this House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Speaker, by your leave, I move that the debate on this Bill be adjourned. As the House has been pleased to extend the time for this Bill by another hour, it would not be concluded today, which means that it will come up the next day allotted for Private Members Bill, that is 20th the last day of the session. I am all in favour of this Bill being discussed for the whole of that day, for full two and a half hours, if need be. I am not bothered about it. Rather, I am anxious that it should be taken up and fully discussed. But I would humbly and earnestly plead, since my hon. friends have expressed their wish not to block my Bill, lest they should be taken amiss, I would request that the House may be pleased to adjourn the debate on this Bill under rule 109 of the Rules of Procedure. It will otherwise be a very dirty trick played on me if they do not accept this very innocuous motion of mine. People outside the country will tend to regard it as a dirty trick played by the brute majority just to block my Bill. So, I move:

"That the further discussion on the Bill be adjourned."

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I support my hon. friend.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: Shri Kamath is in the habit of making

such statements. In fact, the suggestion for extension came from....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I know my language. He need not teach it. I know the English language.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Kamath should not try to reply.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: It is Shri Prakash Vir Shastri who has asked for extension of time.

Mr. Speaker: I will give every one an opportunity.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Shri Kamath talks of the brute majority of the Congress party. At the same time, he wants their votes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I said "otherwise". He did not hear me properly.

Shri Kapur Singh: I do not want to take the time of the House. I want to associate myself whole-heartedly with the observations of Shri Kamath.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: Shri Kamath is always in the habit of making insinuations and charges against the party in power. Now he has charged us by saying that we have been obstructing and trying to shut out his Bill. Actually, the suggestion for extension of time for this Bill came from Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, and not from the ruling party. If the ruling party has a big majority, that is not the fault of the ruling party. It is an index of the confidence that people have reposed in us. That is why we are here. He has always been in the habit of making insinuations and using such objectionable language. I strongly protest against the language he has used against the party in power.

16 hrs.

Shri Rane (Buldana): Sir, it appears that Shri Kamath and hon. Members of the Opposition are under the impression that the Government

[Shri Rane]

has a hand in the motion for extension of time. I can assure you and the hon. Members of the Opposition that the Government has no hand in this. As a matter of fact—I will be frank with you—I told the Secretary of the Parliamentary Affairs Ministry two days back that Shri Kamath's Bill might come up and he should instruct the Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs that they should be ready. So, there are no *mala fides* on the part of Government. I can assure you that. Of course, you know, that many times you also are helpless.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis): I am here in attendance on behalf of Government. I have neither objected.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We do not accuse you.

Shri Hajarnavis: But may I submit that the subject that we are at present discussing is of importance.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I agree.

Shri Hajarnavis: Hon. Members have expressed concern and I could not say that the discussion should be shortened. I am entirely in the hands of the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The whole of the next day may be taken over this Bill.

Shri Hajarnavis: If Shri Kamath's Bill reaches or it touches, we shall discuss Shri Kamath's Bill. I do not mind. I am entirely in the hands of the House. The House controls its own procedure.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): May I take it that the Government also is willing to agree that it should be kept alive?

Mr. Speaker: Professor Ranga would realise that even if the motion is accepted, there is another Bill and that will take one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You were pleased to suggest some time ago that the House can sit for two or three minutes more so that I can move the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: But who knows, time for it might be extended?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The motion can be made with your consent, and you can see through the game.

Mr. Speaker: I will have to put it to the House.

Shri Ranga: I would like to say one word to the Government Benches. It is not that they should take the attitude of being merely indifferent; I would like them to associate themselves actively with us in seeing that this Bill comes up for discussion. They themselves are seized of the idea of an Ombudsman. They have said so in this House as also in the other House. The hon. Home Minister also has said that he is now preparing his own scheme in order to put down corruption in all ranks, in the Government administration as well as in the ministerial ranks. Therefore it is in conformity with what they themselves have expressed to be their special anxiety that we are requesting them also to associate themselves with us in seeing that this Bill is given an opportunity of being discussed in this House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Otherwise it would be hypocrisy.

Shri D. C. Sharma: There is nothing abnormal and exceptional in the Bill which Shri Kamath has brought forward. The assets not only of Ministers but also of members of the Congress Party are revealed to the Congress Party. Therefore there is nothing exceptional in it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then why fight shy of it?

Shri D. C. Sharma: At the same time I submit that any charge like that can be submitted to the Congress Party. Therefore we are not afraid of this Bill being brought forward. But I cannot understand why the lady protests too much. Why does he insist so much on bringing forward this Bill today?

Shri Kapur Singh: There is no lady.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was quoting from Shakespeare. And he says he is a master of the language! Why is he insisting so much on it? I think, Shri Kamath will live for another five or ten years and there is chance for us to discuss this Bill.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: And allow corruption also till then?

Shri D. C. Sharma: But why should he insist on the Bill being taken up today? Has he taken some tip from some pundit that the Bill should be brought forward today? I believe, Shri Kamath should take things as they are constitutionally, realistically, politically and diplomatically and accept what is going to happen in the House and not press too much for his Bill. I know, it will come. I also know what its fate will be.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let it be discussed.

Shri D. C. Sharma: They talk of the brute majority and say that we do not want the Bill to come forward. But suppose this Bill comes forward and again we vote against this Bill,

then they will say it is the brute majority. Therefore what is the good of talking about this brute majority? I think, this Bill is not going to be passed. Shri Kamath should look upon this question very coolly and should come forward with this Bill when it is due. I can assure him that this Bill must come. Shri Kamath is a gentleman who is the most persistent and he will not let it go. It will come one day. But why should he insist on it today?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Postpone eradication of corruption also.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर (दिल्ली-करोल बाग):
श्री भट्टाचार्य जी के बाद मेरा विधेयक आने वाला है। मैं अनुभव करता हूँ कि जो मेरा विधेयक है वह मानवता और समाज के लिए एक कल्याणकारी विधेयक है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस पर अच्छी तरह से विचार हो। समझ में नहीं आता है कि श्री कामत इतने क्यों उतावले हो रहे हैं। उनके पहले मेरा बिल है, उसके ऊपर भी तो बहस होगी।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : होने दीजिये ।

Mr. Speaker: I am putting it to the House now. The question is:

"That further discussion on the Bill be adjourned."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 11]

[16.10 hrs.

AYES

Aney, Dr. M. S.
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Kapur Singh, Shri
Mishra, Shri M. P.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Pottakkatt, Shri
Ranga, Shri

Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chavda, Shrimati
Das, Shri B. K.
Ghosh, Shri N. R.
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kandar Lal, Shri
Koujalgi, Shri H. V.

Kureel, Shri B. N.
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta
Mobain, Shri
Niranjan Lal, Shri
Patil, Shri D. S.
Prabhakar, Shri Naval
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raju, Dr. D. S.
Raju, Shri D. B.
Ram Sewak, Shri

Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Ray, Shrimati Renuka
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Sarua, Shri A. T.
Sharma, Shri D. C.
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati
Siddananjappa, Shri
Subbaraman, Shri
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri K. K.
Virbhadra Singh, Shri

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Mine is not recorded.

Mr. Speaker: He is for 'No'?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Yes Sir; I am for 'No'.

Shri Raj Bahadur: I have not voted. My presence may be recorded.

Shri Hajarnavis: I have also not voted.

Shri Mahesh Dutta Misra: There is no quorum in the House, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The Ministers say that they have not voted. I will have a count. There is quorum. The result of the Division is:

Ayes—10.

Noes—39.

The motion was negatived.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the supporters of this idea that Sanskrit should also be included in the list of languages which are to be recognised by the nation as a part of our national heritage and if we should have some link languages in this country, Sanskrit should also be one of the link languages.

One of my greatest regrets in my life as a student and as a scholar has been that I have not had the opportunity of learning either Sanskrit or

Hindi. I wish I had learnt these two languages. If in this country the same system of education had prevailed when I was a student, as obtains at Oxford and Cambridge, I am sure I would have had the opportunity of learning these two languages in addition to my own. But unfortunately in those days Sanskrit was not so much favoured by the British, nor was there Hindi in such a prominent position. So, I had to be content with studying only my own language, Telugu and English and when I went over to Oxford, I was forced to study, also unexpectedly, both French and German. It was a difficult task and yet I learnt them. That was the position, in fact, with almost all over Indian students. We had to learn two other European languages in addition to English. If that is the case even now with the British Universities, why should we not also make a similar effort in our country? I am all in favour of developing all our Indian languages and more specially Tamil because Tamil, according to me, is as ancient as Sanskrit if not more ancient, is a very highly developed language and has a literature too. It is there in the south with us. In fact, it is the basic language for all our four south Indian languages; Malayalam, Telugu, Karnataka and then Tamil. It used to be called by some other name, not Tamil in those days. But nevertheless, that is the marrow of our bones. Then, on the top of it, the bone has come and the body also. All that has been pro-

vided by Sanskrit for all other languages except Tamil. Tamil has had its own independent development. On the other hand, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam adopted Sanskrit grammar. There it has become the warp and the weft of our language as well as our literature. Naturally, anyone who wants to be really a good Telugu scholar or Kannada scholar or Malayalam scholar has to be well-versed in that language and anyone who wants to become an excellent speaker in that language, must necessarily come to possess knowledge and proficiency also of thousands of Sanskrit words. It may surprise quite a number of our friends from North India to be told that our pronunciation, our use of Sanskrit words, is purer than what the Hindi friends are able to use. Fortunately or unfortunately for them, Persian and Urdu came to super-impose themselves over Hindi so much so that their pronunciation, their use of Sanskrit words, has become vulgarised or *prakritisid*—not vulgarised, but popularised—or rusticated, but with us we kept our Sanskrit words pure. We have termed them into our own language. We made it very clear also in our own grammar that we are terming them into our own language by adding what are known as *vibhakti* and *prityaya*, *dumubhulu* and so on. So great is the influence of Sanskrit over all but one Dravidian language. Naturally, we are pleased that someone has made a suggestion like this. We would like to have Sanskrit recognised in this manner as my friend Mr. Hanumanthaiya has put it. I have also read the epics which are popular in the Western literatures and I have read our own Sanskrit epics as translated into Telugu and Kalidasa's Plays also, not only Plays but also *Prabhanda*s and even stories and all these things. Our literatures will be very poor indeed if they are shorn of these translations from Sanskrit literature. So, if we want to develop our own languages, we must see to it that the mother language, the Sanskrit

language, is developed, preserved and protected.

One suggestion I would like to make for whatever it is worth. The learning of Sanskrit has got to be made more easy than it is now. Unfortunately, although we have a number of Sanskrit Universities in various parts of the south in India, not many people are coming forward to study there. Even scholarships are being given; stipends are being given. It is because they do not see any future for themselves. If on the other hand Government were to recognise Sanskrit in the manner in which we are suggesting to them, then opportunities will be created for a large number of our people to learn Sanskrit, to become *pandit*s or scholars and then have a good enough future for themselves to look forward to. In that way, we can preserve this great treasure not only of our past culture and past thoughts and past poesy, but also we will be able to develop our own genius through Sanskrit and through our genius we can develop Sanskrit literature also. So, I am in favour of this motion.

Shri A. T. Sarma (Chatrapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to speak in Sanskrit, but I regret I was not permitted to speak in Sanskrit as per the existing rules of procedure.

An Hon. Member: You can.

Shri A. T. Sarma: As per the existing rules, I was not permitted. How can I speak in Sanskrit?

Mr. Speaker: I have not permitted him to speak in Sanskrit because he has always been speaking in English here.

Shri A. T. Sarma: That is why I am obliged to speak in English.

Mr. Speaker: English he has chosen for himself. I can allow him to speak in Hindi if he wants to.

Shri A. T. Sarma: I will speak in English.

Sir, I whole-heartedly support this motion. In this connection I want to express my views how Sanskrit literature and the language has worked from about 5000 years B.C. We know what is meant by the term 'Sanskrit'. It means 'purified'. Whether there was another language and it was a purified product of that language after purification or modification has to be examined.

From the Vedic ages till now we have been using Sanskrit. That is my opinion. And I shall presently prove that Sanskrit was a spoken language, and it has been so from ancient times till now. Even now, in India, there are certain families who speak Sanskrit in their houses and do not use other languages. We are now using Sanskrit in an indirect form. From birth to death, we are using Sanskrit only. The other languages are for our own purposes. But, for these *samskaras*, starting from *jaatakarma* up till the death ceremony, we use only Sanskrit, and we perform all these *samskaras* in Sanskrit.

If we wake up in the morning, we recite Sanskrit *slokas*. When we take our bath, we recite *stotras*. If we perform any *puja* and worship our Gods, we worship them in the Sanskrit language. There is no other language for that purpose. If our children begin their lessons, they begin with '*Shree Ganeshaya namah*'. For any auspicious work we begin or we do, we say first *Shree Shubhamsatu* or *Vande Mataram* or *Om Tat Sat*. Similarly, if we conclude anything, we say '*Itishree*'. In the Hindi language, these terms, namely '*Shree Ganesh*' and '*Itishree*' have become idioms. So, even now Sanskrit is in use in various forms. And, therefore, we could not afford to neglect the Sanskrit language, even though we may speak so many languages in India.

If we look at the actual position, we can see that even our Government are using the Sanskrit language in several forms. Our motto '*Satyameva jayate*' is a Sanskrit term. Even the technical terms which have been coined in Hindi are almost 99 per cent Sanskrit words. So, Sanskrit is not out of use. It is not a dead language. Still, it is alive in our country. I shall explain in a few minutes for how long it will be so and how long it will play its role in the field of literature.

First of all, what is meant by the term 'Sanskrit'? It is said:

"*Samsritam naama daivi vak anyakhyataa maharshibhih*" Dandi of the 6th century has defined that it is a divine language, and Sanskrit is called as *amaravaani*, *surabharati* and *devabhasha*. That shows that it is not a degenerate language. It is existing from the very beginning up till now.

Sanskrit has got two forms actually. One is Vedic and the other is classical. One is called *vaidika* and the other is called *laukika*. The Vedic literature is a vast literature. The Vedas are four in number. After all, what are the Vedas? They are defined as:

"*Apaurusheyam vaakyam vedah*"

That means, the Vedas were not written by any person. We are not in a position to trace out who wrote the Vedas. Even the Western scholars have tried their best and they could not find the date of the Vedas or the origin of the Vedas. But they come to the conclusion that at least five thousand years ago those books might have been written. That was their conclusion. So, let us be satisfied with their conclusion. We can easily see that from 4000 B.C. the Sanskrit language has existed. But that was Vedic Sanskrit. We see that in the seventh century B.C. Panini flourished, and he wrote his grammar called the *Ashtadhyayi*. There, he mentions about 50 grammarians and about 15 *niruktakaaras*. That means

that by that time, Sanskrit was in its extremity, and about 60 grammarians wanted to modify the language. That is the nature of a language. A language goes on changing, if it is a living one. That shows that Sanskrit was a living language, and all the grammarians wanted to check the irregularities in the language, and they tried their best, and lastly, Panini, the grammarian could modify and check all the irregularities and put it in a proper form. From that date, it has been called Sanskrit, that is, *samskritam*; *samyakritam* means 'modified'. From 7th century B.C. we are having the word 'Sanskrit' in our literature. Even at that time many *granthas* and even the books on Jainism.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 'Sanskrit' means 'refined', and not modified.

Shri A. T. Sarma: *Samskritam samskritam chaiva samskritam* (संस्कृतं चैव संस्कृतेः)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: *Vanyeka samalan karoti purusham vas samskrita dharyate.*

Shri A. T. Sarma: *Samskritam* means सम्यक् कृतम् purified or modified. (Interruption by Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath) *Samskritam cha Prakritam cha prakritam chaiva samskritam samskritam samskriyate.*

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: *Alami-daaneem.*

Shri A. T. Sarma: So, it means that Sanskrit is a modified language. The living language was checked by grammarians and all the irregularities were removed and the language was put in a particular form. Then, it was called *Samskritam*. That was about the 7th century B.C. Even at that time, all the books on Jainism were written in Sanskrit. But from the 5th century B.C. i.e. from the birth of Buddha we find another Prakrit

language, that is Pali, which was in vogue at that time. Pali also played a great part.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It was not Prakrit, but it was *laukik*.

Shri A. T. Sarma: Pali was Prakrit, and we call it *Ardhamagadhi*. It is a kind of Prakrit. It is not a *laukikbhasha*. Pali is included in the term 'Prakrit'. It is called *Ardhamagadhi*. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I am finding myself in a difficulty. There are scholars and *vidvans* on all sides. So, what shall I do?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But none greater than you.

Mr. Speaker: No, I admit my inferiority.

Shri A. T. Sarma: My point is this that from the 5th century till the time of Vikramaditya we are having two languages, namely Sanskrit and Pali or *Ardhamagadhi*, which was a kind of Prakrit. We find books in both the languages. Even the inscriptions of Ashoka were depicted in the Pali language. But books on astrology and Dharmashastras and all the original books on *darshan* were written in Sanskrit at that time. So, both the languages were in vogue, from the 5th century B.C. up to the time of Vikramaditya, or the first century B.C. From the time of Vikramaditya again, we find Prakrit.

Shri Ranga: Why does the hon. Member not come down to the point? We do not want a dissertation on Sanskrit literature.

Shri A. T. Sarma: I am pointing out that it was a spoken language and it has been a spoken language from the Vedic times till now.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ranga complains that the hon. Member is still too far away, and he is still only in 1st century B.C. Now, he should come to the 20th century.

Shri A. T. Sarma: I shall explain everything in a minute. There are four stages in the languages of India. One is the Vedic language of the Vedic period, the second is Sanskrit, the third is Prakrit and the fourth is the modern languages. These are the four stages in which Sanskrit has undergone modification in so many shapes.

But these modern languages originated only in the 8th century A.D. Till then, we had Sanskrit and Prakrit side by side. At the time of *Saatvahanas* there was Prakrit prevalent throughout the country. At the time of Chandra Gupta II, of the Gupta dynasty, at the time of Harsha and at the time of Bhoja, Sanskrit was in its extremity. So, both the languages could play their part in literature and were in vogue. From then, that is, from the 8th century A.D., we are having these modern languages. These modern languages are the products of Prakrit.

Prakritih samskritam proktam prakritam tataagotam. All the modern languages are called Prakrit languages. According to the Prakrit grammarians, they defined 64 Prakrit languages, and in those 64 all the modern languages come in. Oriya is a Prakrit language, Bengali is a Prakrit language, and so is every language practically. According to the Indo-European philology these Prakrit languages and Sanskrit come under one group. All the morphological languages have been assigned to one group.

Mr. Speaker: Now the hon. Member should come to the point and he should also try to conclude now.

Shri Ranga: There are six others wanting to speak.

Mr. Speaker: There are opponents also.

Shri Kapur Singh: The whole House accepts his thesis.

Shri A. T. Sarma: My point is that Sanskrit was a spoken language. Even now it is in vogue. It is not a foreign language to us. Some say that Sanskrit is a difficult language and it cannot be adopted as the official language. But Sanskrit was official language also from the 5th century BC till now. I will prove it. There is an inscription in Girnar written by Rudradaman which belongs to the 1st century AD, written in Sanskrit. There is an inscription in Allahabad, a *prasasti* by Harisena which is written in Sanskrit. All these inscriptions are written in Sanskrit. Our Dharmasastras are written in Sanskrit. They are nothing but the penal code. The kings wanted to put them in Sanskrit. That is why we are having various dharmasastras.

Mr. Speaker: What shall we do now?

Shri A. T. Sarma: If Sanskrit is adopted as the official language, it is not difficult. It can be learnt very easily, within one year. There are two aspects in Sanskrit, one the language side the other the *saabdic* side. Learning the *saabdic* side will take a long time, even 40 years. But the language side can be learnt in one year.

I will tell you a story. Satavahana was with his wife. She said:

मौदकं परितोडयमाम्

The king could not understand the language. He thought she was hungry and wanted him to satisfy her with some *modakas*. But she laughed at him. So he was offended thunderstruck. He wanted to learn the language, some *vyakarana*. So Sarvavarma composed the *Katantra vyakarana*. By learning this within 6 months, he became a master of Sanskrit. That shows that the language can be learnt very easily, within 6 months. We have a grammar in Sanskrit which is very refined, which can be learnt within one year or six months and

through that we can learn Sanskrit. There is no such grammar anywhere in the world which can make a man master in any language. Its phonology, its alphabets and vocabulary are very refined and enriched. In English we have to learn so many things....

Mr. Speaker: That is not disputed.

Shri A. T. Sarma: Sanskrit can be easily learnt and it can, without any difficulty, be adopted as the *lingua franca* or official language.

There is another point. I have already said there are Aryan languages and Dravidian languages in India. In Aryan languages, 60-80 per cent words are Sanskrit. Even in the case of the southern languages, excepting Tamil, the other languages, Telugu, for instance—Prof. Ranga has told us—are influenced by Sanskrit. So far as Telugu is concerned, the books in grammar and rhetoric—*Kavijanasraya* and *Balavyakarana*—were written in Sanskrit. So if Sanskrit is made the official language, there will be no difficulty.

I think it is the best language. According to the linguistic classification, Sanskrit is not confined to India, but it is an international language. All the morphological languages have been defined as Indo-European languages and Sanskrit has been given a prominent place in that grouping. So Greek, Latin, Armenian, German and Celtic languages are all interconnected with Sanskrit. If Sanskrit is adopted as our official language, I think all the world will welcome it and Sanskrit will flourish among our languages. So in my opinion Sanskrit is the language best suitable to be chosen as the official language. I wholeheartedly support the motion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House. The House extended the time twice for this Bill. But we must have quorum in the House when it is discussed. We are hardly 30.

Shri Raghunath Singh: 37.

Mr. Speaker: Even that will not make up the quorum. The bell is being rung—Now there is, quorum.

Shri Muthu Gounder.

Shri Muthu Gounder: I rise to oppose the motion moved by Shri Bhattacharyya. I think I am the only Member to do so; ours is the only Party which is opposed to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ram Sewak Yadav is with him.

Shri Muthu Gounder: As far as the DMK is concerned, we are not against any language of the world. There is always a mistaken impression somewhere in the House and also outside that we are against Hindi. We are not against any language of the world. So we are not against Sanskrit also. We do accept that Sanskrit is a very rich language. It has got a literature thousands of years old. We know it because our language has a literature thousands of years old and all along, there has been a fight between Tamil and Sanskrit. Also when such a situation comes, we will continue this same fight which was fought by our predecessors.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: On a point of information. The DMK objective is the formation of a Dravidian Union consisting of the Kannada people, the Telugu people and Tamil people. The Telugu people and Kanada people are almost Sanskritised in language and psychology. How does he propose to combine these two States with his Dravid Nad if he opposes Sanskrit so vehemently?

Shri Muthu Gounder: That is a different question.

When we form the Dravidian Union, we will also know how to adjust things.

Mr. Speaker: Let him adjust things for the present.

Shri Muthu Gounder: We are not opposed to the language. The Sanskrit language has a history and tradition and religion. It brought in this country Varnasrama dharma. This is the language which is the root cause of all this caste system, this is the language that has made crores of people untouchables. We fought this Sanskrit language and the religion behind it, the traditions behind it, the morals behind it, under the banner of the self-respect movement for the past 40, 50 years.

Before this Sanskrit language invaded our Tamil country we were having our own Tamil language. Under the Tamil tradition we were having only one God, and that is Siva, that is kindness to all.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is a Sanskrit word.

Shri Muthu Gounder: We did not have any caste. After Sanskrit came, the Vedas, the Upanishads came. Caste, religion, brahmana, vaisya, sudra, every community came with the Sanskrit language. So, whenever we think of Sanskrit, this unspoken language, we see before us only this *varnasrama dharma*. It is so not only in this generation. From the time of Tiruvalluvar and Kapilar we were fighting against Sanskrit because it was a religious language.

As our *pandits* and *vidwans* explain, it is a religious language, the language of Aryan religion. Now a days we are all one, we are all made one. After our hard work and labour for 40 years through the self-respect movement and other literature, we are now able to see that Brahmins, Harijans and other caste Hindus are all made of one community. We are gradually coming to that. But if we again introduce this Sanskrit, every evil will follow, because it did a lot of havoc among Tamilians and their literature.

Shri Yashpal Singh: On a point of order, Sir. *Sudratva* is not compulsory.

Shri Muthu Gounder: I have a right to say what I feel, but I do not want to hurt anybody's religious feelings. But on account of the Sanskrit language, its traditions and the caste system, we do not take any pride in calling ourselves Hindus, because when we call ourselves Hindus, it seems that we belong to some particular caste or community. We want to call ourselves Tamils. We are not accepting even this Hindu religion because it is backed by Sanskrit and the culture behind Sanskrit.

There is need for us to introduce English as a national language. I am not speaking on behalf of a foreign language. Actually, there are so many Anglo-Indians who still have their mother tongue as English. But we hesitate to make English our national language. In such circumstances, where is the necessity of bringing another language which is not spoken at all, as a national language. We are already having 14 languages. That will do for the time being. Let us wait. Let modern times enter India, let all these religious feuds, caste barriers etc., disappear. Then let us bring Sanskrit with its fine literature, so that we can translate it into our languages.

Sanskrit really did a lot of havoc to our society, especially Tamils. We are now safe because Sanskrit is far off, but if it comes, it will bring with it all this Brahminism, Aryanism and casteism. In our temples at Palani and other places, Sanskrit words and *mantras* are being still recited. We hate it. On account of this Sanskrit, we have to hate even those gods there. Nowadays we are introducing Tamil *padals* and *stotrams*.

Mr. Speaker: For the simple question before us, we should not go beyond certain limits. That might hurt others' feelings.

Shri Muthu Gounder: Before finishing, I only want to say that I do not hate Sanskrit language. I know the merits of the language somewhat.

with all respect for that language, I still oppose this move.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र ने जो शायद तामिल जाति के हैं, बहुत सुन्दर शब्दों में इस बिल का विरोध किया है। लेकिन शायद उनको अपने इतिहास का पता नहीं है, ज्ञान नहीं है। एक समय कि श्री विजय साम्राज्य का मजापीठ साम्राज्य तमिल लोगों ने कम्पबोडिया, थाईलैंड, वीयतनाम, मलाया में कायम किया था। बारहवीं शताब्दी में इन्हीं तमिल लोगों ने इन देशों की राज भाषा संस्कृत रखी थी।

Shri Vasudevan Nair: He is not understanding you.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I have got a right to speak.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Speak in English.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : इन्हीं तमिल लोगों ने बारहवीं शताब्दी तक साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में संस्कृत को राज भाषा बनाया। दूर की बात आप छोड़ दीजिये। आंध्र देश में जाइये। आंध्र देश वालों ने मोन साम्राज्य बर्मा में कायम किया था जो कि पेगू से लेकर मांडले तक था। उसकी भी राजभाषा संस्कृत थी।

16.46 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जिन विद्वानों का यह मत है कि संस्कृत कभी पठित भाषा नहीं थी वे किस तरह से इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे हैं? वह बोलचाल की भाषा नहीं थी। वे किस तरह से इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे हैं? हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर संस्कृत राज भाषा थी। और बारहवीं शताब्दी तक राजभाषा रही

मलेशिया को आप लीजिये जहां आंध्र और तमिल दोनों जातियों के लोग रहते थे। मलाया का अन्तिम राजा परमेश्वर था। उसको हुए आज से दो शताब्दियों से अधिक नहीं हुए। परमेश्वर ने जब इस्लाम धर्म को ग्रहण किया तो उन्होंने अरबी स्क्रिप्ट को ग्रहण किया लेकिन १३० बरस पहले मलाया की राज भाषा क्या थी? क्या वह संस्कृत नहीं थी? वह संस्कृत थी।

आप काश्मीर को लीजिए। वहां पर ६० सैकड़ा लोग मुसलमान हैं। हमारे यहां जो डीड्ज आफ राइट्स होते हैं, वे अंग्रेजी भाषा में छोटी छोटी पुस्तकों में छपे हैं। लेकिन काश्मीर की भाषा मुग़ल समय तक लोक प्रकाश की भाषा थी। लोक प्रकाश क्या था? यह वह ग्रन्थ था जो कि करीब करीब पांचवीं बी० सी० से लेकर सोलहवीं शताब्दी तक चला। इसकी भाषा संस्कृत थी। यही भाषा वहां चलती थी। जेनुल आबदीन के समय में कुछ थोड़े से शब्द लोक प्रकाश में अरबी और फारसी के जरूर आ गए जब कि वहां इस्लामी राज्य कायम हुआ। लेकिन लोक प्रकाश की भाषा संस्कृत रही। सोलहवीं शताब्दी तक लोक प्रकाश की भाषा में ६० प्रतिशत संस्कृत के शब्द थे।

पूर्व की बात आप छोड़ दें। पश्चिम की तरफ आप जायें। पश्चिम में केवल दो भाषायें थीं। वैदिक भाषा और सेमेटिक जिस को शामी भाषा कहते हैं। शामी भाषा की दो ब्रांचिज हुईं, अरबी और ईरानी। वैदिक भाषा की भी दो ब्रांचिज हुईं, गाथा की भाषा जोकि पारसियों की भाषा थी और दूसरी वैदिक भाषा। जो आर्य लोग हिन्दुस्तान में रहते थे उन की भाषा वैदिक भाषा हुई और जो आर्य ईरान में और मध्य एशिया के पास रहते थे उन की भाषा गाथा हुई। जब तक गाथा के व्याकरण का अध्ययन ठीक से नहीं कर सकेंगे, वेद को नहीं समझ सकते हैं। उस समय भी हिन्दुस्तान

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

के बाहर देखें। आज भी जब वैदिक भाषा थी और वैदिक भाषा के बाद जब बौद्ध धर्म का हिन्दुस्तान में विकास हुआ, पाली भाषा का प्रचार हुआ। कालान्तर में पेशाची भाषा और असुर भाषाएं हुईं, संस्कृत की अपभ्रंश भाषाएं हुईं। पेशाची भाषा कहां बोली जाती थी। शिवी राष्ट्र में बोली जाती थी, गांधार राष्ट्र में जोकि अफगानिस्तान का पूर्वी हिस्सा था, वहां बोली जाती थी। गुडाढ्य की कथा सरित सागर क्या है और किस भाषा में लिखी हुई है। पेशाची भाषा में ही तो लिखी हुई हैं।

हमारे दोस्त ने पाली का जिक्र किया। बौद्ध धर्म ने पाली भाषा में ग्रन्थ लिखे। लेकिन आप देखें कि बौद्ध धर्म तब तक हिन्दुस्तान में व्याप्त नहीं हो सका जब तक कि बौद्ध ग्रन्थों का अनुवाद संस्कृत में नहीं हुआ। अश्वघोष ने जब बौद्ध चरित्र का अनुवाद संस्कृत में किया, पाली ग्रन्थों का अनुवाद संस्कृत में किया तो बौद्ध धर्म सारे हिन्दुस्तान में फैला और हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में फैला। उस से पहले यह बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश तक ही सीमित था। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ संस्कृत वह भाषा थी जो सारे हिन्दुस्तान में ही नहीं कैस्पियन सागर से लेकर बॉर्नियो तक अर्थात् वरुण द्वीप जिसे आप कहते हैं, वहां तक की राज भाषा संस्कृत थी, पुरानी वैदिक भाषा थी। जो लोग आज कहते हैं कि तमिल संस्कृत से अलग हैं वे अपने इतिहास को भूलते हैं। अपने गौरव को भूलते हैं। वे भूलते हैं कि जिन तमिल लोगों ने बॉर्नियो में, सुमात्रा में, जावा में संस्कृति फैलाई थी वे वहां संस्कृत को ले गये थे। उत्तरी हिन्दुस्तान के लोग बॉर्नियो में संस्कृत ले कर नहीं गये थे। आज आप किस मुंह से कहते हैं कि तमिल से संस्कृत का सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

इस लिए मैं इस विधेयक का सम करता हूँ। कहना चाहता हूँ अगर हो सके

तो संस्कृत को राज भाषा अवश्य बनाना चाहिये।

Shri Kapur Singh: On a point of correction. My hon. friend just now said Asvaghosh made translations from Pali originals. It is not correct. He wrote originally in Sanskrit. He did not make any translations from Pali.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मिलिन्द प्रश्न का ट्रांस्लेशन पाली से संस्कृत में हुआ था।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री भट्टाचार्य जी ने संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में जो विधेयक उपस्थित किया है मैं उस की भावना का हृदय से अभिनन्दन करता हूँ।

इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में दो तीन शंकाएं इस सदन में उठ खड़ी हुई हैं। कुछ मित्रों ने यह कहा कि संस्कृत जब राजभाषा रही तब उस ने देश में जातियों को एक दूसरे से घृणा करना सिखाया। कुछ लोगों ने यह भी आरोप लगाया कि संस्कृत के कारण ही हमारे देश में वर्णाश्रम धर्म और उसी से आपस में एक दूसरे को छोटा बड़ा समझने की प्रवृत्ति का उदय हुआ। हमारे एक दो मित्रों का कहना यह भी था कि संस्कृत कभी जन भाषा नहीं रही, संस्कृत सीमित क्षेत्र के लोगों की भाषा रही है। मैं पहली बात से अपना कथन आरंभ करता हूँ। जिन लोगों का यह कहना है कि संस्कृत के कारण छोटे बड़े का और जाति भेद का उदय हुआ उन्हें इस का सब से अच्छा परिचय वेद से मिल सकता है। वेद भारतवर्ष का ही सब से प्राचीन ग्रन्थ नहीं है बल्कि दुनिया के सब पुस्तकालयों में सब से प्राचीन ग्रन्थ यदि कोई माना जाता है, जिसे पश्चिमी और पूर्वी विद्वानों ने एक मत से स्वीकार किया है वह ऋग्वेद है। ऋग्वेद में एक प्रकार का मंत्र आया है जिस के शब्द मैं आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ :

“यथेमां वाचं कल्याणी मा वदानि जनेभ्यः

ब्रह्मराज्याभ्यां शूद्राय चाययि स्वाय चारयणाय ।”

इस का अर्थ यह है कि यह पवित्र वेद की वाणी या यह ज्ञान का भंडार किसी एक जाति विशेष की सम्पत्ति नहीं है, यह जिस प्रकार से ब्राह्मणों की सम्पत्ति है उसी प्रकार से शूद्रों की भी सम्पत्ति है। यह आर्यों के लिए भी उसी प्रकार से ग्राह्य है जिस प्रकार से अनार्यों के लिये है। आर्य तथा अनार्य का यदि हमारे देश में कोई भेद कभी हुआ तो सामाजिक व्यवहार के कारण ही। जिन्होंने समाज की प्रथाओं का, शासन के नियमों का यथावत् पालन किया, समाज में उन को सम्य समझा गया, उन्हें आर्य कहा गया। जिन्होंने सामाजिक प्रथाओं का उल्लंघन किया और उन प्रथाओं का यथावत् पालन नहीं किया, उन्हें अनार्य कहा गया। यह कोई जाति विशेष नहीं थी बल्कि समाज की व्यवस्थायें थीं जिन के आधार पर इस प्रकार की संज्ञायें दी गईं। संस्कृत ने कभी इस देश में जाति भेद उत्पन्न नहीं किया। संस्कृत का ज्ञान सब के लिए समान रूप से रहा।

दूसरी बात यह कि संस्कृत कभी जन भाषा नहीं रही। इस के लिए भी मैं दो उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। संस्कृत जन भाषा रही इसका एक सब से बड़ा प्रमाण तो भोज प्रबन्ध में आया है। एक स्थान पर जब एक व्यक्ति अपने सर पर लकड़ी का बोझ ले कर नदी पार कर रहा था तो सामने से राजा भोज आये। राजा भोज ने ब्राह्मण को पसीने से नहाया हुआ देख कर पूछा :

“भारं कि वाधति विप्रं”

हे ब्राह्मण तू जो अपने सिर पर समिधाओं की गठरी ले कर जा रहा है तो क्या तुझे बोझ अधिक लग रहा है कि पसीने से नहाया हुआ है। उस ब्राह्मण ने उत्तर दिया :

“भारं न वाधते राजन, यथा वाधति बाधते।”

मेरे सिर पर लकड़ी के काष्ठ का बोझ उतना दुःख नहीं दे रहा है, बोझ तो बाधति शब्द

का ज्यादा है जिक का व्याकरण से तुम ने अशुद्ध प्रयोग किया है। उस वाधति का जितना बोझ मुझे लग रहा है उतना दुःख मुझे लकड़ी के बोझ से नहीं है। यानी हमारे देश में लकड़ी इकट्ठा करने वाला भी संस्कृत का कितना बड़ा विद्वान होता था उस का ज्ञान उस समय के प्राचीन ग्रन्थों के देखने से प्रतीत होता है।

इस का एक और छोटा सा दृष्टांत यहां देना चाहता हूँ। शंकराचार्य के समय में एक बहुत बड़े विद्वान हुए जिन का नाम मंडन मिश्र था। कोई व्यक्ति उन से मिलना चाहता था। जब उस ने मंडन मिश्र के गांव में जा कर पूछा उनका निवास स्थान कहां है तो एक व्यक्ति ने उत्तर दिया कि अगर मंडन मिश्र के निवास स्थान को जानना हो तो उस का एक ही चिह्न है कि जिस व्यक्ति के दरवाजे पर पिंजरो में रक्खे हुए तोता और मैना वेदमंत्रों का उच्चारण कर रहे हों, समझ लेना कि वही मंडन मिश्र का घर है। उस ने अपनी भाषा में कहा :

“स्वतः प्रमाणं परतः प्रमाणं कीरांगना यत् गिरो गिरन्ति।

द्वारस्थ नीडान्तः सन्निरुद्धा अवोहि तन्मंडनमिश्र वासः ॥

जिस व्यक्ति के दरवाजे पर पिंजरे में रक्खे हुए तोता और मैना वेद स्वतः प्रमाण हैं या परतः प्रमाण हैं, इस विषय पर चर्चा कर रहे हों, समझ लेना कि वह मंडन मिश्र का निवास स्थान है। इन प्रमाणों के होते हुए यदि कोई व्यक्ति यह कहे कि संस्कृत कभी जन भाषा नहीं रही तो वह भारतीय इतिहास से अपने परिचित न होने का प्रमाण देता है। संस्कृत इस देश की जन भाषा रही है। संस्कृत ने इस देश में कभी कोई भेद रेखा उत्पन्न नहीं की। संस्कृत का ज्ञान सब के लिए समान रूप से रहा है, न केवल संस्कृत का साधारण ज्ञान बल्कि वेदों का ज्ञान जो है वह भी समान रूप से सब के लिये ग्राह्य रहा है।

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

संस्कृत साहित्य का भंडार भी इतना पूर्ण है जिस का ठिकाना नहीं। संस्कृत में लीलावती का गणितशास्त्र, संस्कृत में अपने पाणिनी का व्याकरणशास्त्र, संस्कृत के अन्दर कौटिल्य का अर्थशास्त्र है, जो कि राजनीति का एक अद्भुत ग्रन्थ माना जाता है, जिस का कि हिटलर ने अपने देश की भाषा में सब से पहले संस्कृत से अनुवाद कराया था। संस्कृत में पंचतन्त्र ग्रन्थ है जिस में कहानियों के रूप में राजनीति के सिद्धान्तों को सरल किया गया है। संस्कृत में भारद्वाज का विमानशास्त्र है। संसार का कोई ज्ञान, कोई विद्या इस प्रकार की नहीं है जो संस्कृत के अन्दर न हो। इस दृष्टि से संस्कृत पूर्ण भाषा है।

जो लोग कहते हैं कि हमारे देश में पाली चली, प्रकृत चली यह तो उसी तरह से है जैसे अज हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में है। जिस प्रान्त का मैं निवासी हूँ उसी प्रान्त में दूरी से, स्थान भेद से, हिन्दी भाषा में भी अन्तर हो जाता है, जिन्हें हम बोलियां कह कर पुकारते हैं। इसी तरह कभी संस्कृत में जिसे हम आर्यपुत्र कहते हैं प्राकृत में उस को अज्यपुत्र कह दिया गया। यानी शब्द तो मूल वही है परन्तु शब्द भेद से, स्थान भेद से या फिर मति भेद से भी, जिस का परिचय अभी थोड़ी देर पहले मिला, बहुत से लोगों ने शब्दों को बिगाड़ना आरम्भ कर दिया कि हम तो संस्कृत शब्दों का उच्चारण नहीं करेंगे हम जान बूझ कर अपभ्रंश भाषा का उपयोग करेंगे लेकिन उन के कारण संस्कृत भाषा को किस प्रकार से अपराधी या दोषी ठहराया जा सकता है।

अन्त में मैं अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए केवल मात्र यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश का यह सौभाग्य रहा कि अब तक इस देश में जो भी गवर्नर जनरल या राष्ट्रपति हुए, चाहे व चक्रवर्ती राजगोपालाचार्य हों चाहे डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद हों, चाहे हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति

डा० राधाकृष्णन हों, सभी संस्कृत के विद्वान, संस्कृत के प्रेमी और संस्कृत के अच्छे ज्ञाता रहे हैं। हमारा यह भी सौभाग्य है कि धर्मचक्र प्रवतनाय जिस कुर्सी पर लिखा हुआ है, अब तक उस पर जो लोग भी आ कर बैठे वे सब संस्कृत के अच्छे विद्वान थे, चाहे वे गणेश वासुदेव भावलंकर हों चाहे अनन्तशयनम् आय्यंगार हों, चाहे हमारे वर्तमान अध्यक्ष श्री हुक्म सिंह हों। संस्कृत के विद्वान सभी रहे। सौभाग्य से ही इस देश में अब तक जितने हमारे गृह मंत्रा रहे, नन्दा जी के बारे में मेरी पूरी जानकारी नहीं है, लेकिन सरदार वल्लभाई पटेल, गोविन्द वल्लभ पन्त, डा० कैलासनाथ काटजू, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, यह सब संस्कृत के प्रेमी रहे और संस्कृत के ज्ञाता रहे। लेकिन इतना सब कुछ होने के बाद भी संस्कृत को जितना लोकप्रिय बनना चाहिये था या संस्कृत का जिस प्रकार से सब प्रान्तों में एक आवश्यक भाषा के रूप में अध्ययन होना चाहिए था, उतना नहीं हुआ और संस्कृत के सम्बन्ध में हम उचित निर्णय नहीं ले सके। मुझे विश्वास है कि श्री भट्टाचार्य के इस विधेयक से संस्कृत को कुछ बल जेरूर मिलेगा। देश को एक बार फिर से सोचने के लिए इस विधेयक ने अवसर दिया है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक की भावना का हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to pay my tribute to all the persons who have spoken in favour of this Bill. I also offer my felicitations to those persons who have spoken against this Bill. I think Shri Raghunath Singh has given the most devastating reply to those persons who thought that Sanskrit was the language of separatism.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue his speech the next day.

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 9, 1963/Agrahayana 18, 1885 (Saka).