

[Mr. Speaker]

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Fund of India to meet the amounts spent in respect of the former Part C States of Delhi and Himachal Pradesh on certain services during the financial year ended on the 31st day of March, 1957, in excess of the amounts granted for those services and for that year by the legislature of each of those States."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, I introduce* the Bill.

12.31 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): Sir, I move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Committee of Parliament on Official Language laid on the Table of the House on the 22nd April, 1959."

Sir, I am glad to have this opportunity of moving this motion. I have been associated with this work, which is, I think, sufficiently delicate and complex, for many months, and I naturally feel somewhat gratified that the report which was framed after great amount of deliberation is now before the hon. Members of this House. Besides, while moving the motion for reference of the report of the Official Language Commission to this Committee I had given an assurance that this report would be placed on the Table of the House and the hon. Members would have the opportunity of expressing their views on it.

As hon. Members are aware, and as I also mentioned at that time, this

report had to be submitted direct to the President, and under article 344 of the Constitution, sub-clause (6), the President was to give his final decision on the proposals made by the Committee. The framers of the Constitution did not envisage this stage of discussion in Parliament but I felt that it would be desirable to have the opinions of the Members of the House before any final decisions are taken on the report.

I may submit that I am not aware of the exact position that I occupy at this particular moment. The Committee is no longer functioning. But I had the privilege of acting as the Chairman of the Committee. Now, in initiating this discussion, whether I am doing so as a member of Government or as the Chairman of the Committee I do not exactly know. In either case, I would seek the indulgence of the hon. Members of the House and hope that the proposals made by the Committee will be treated in the same manner and the method of approach will be similar to what was adopted in the Committee itself by the hon. Members of both Houses who were asked, to serve on that Committee.

Sir, this report was published and placed on the Table of this House more than four months ago. During this period, I have little doubt that hon. Members have had ample time to study and to examine the proposals made by the Committee. The report is not a voluminous one. It has the merit of being written in a concise and simple form. The most vigorous part of it, I think, consists of the note that Shri Anthony has attached to it. Well, it indicates the vigour of his mind. But I won't go further; perhaps, he was in an angry mood when he expressed the views, which he has, and in the form in which he has expressed them.

Well, so far as the report is concerned, as I said, it was published

*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

about four months ago. If I had enough time I would have perhaps reiterated most of what is stated in Chapter II of the Report. I would invite the special attention of the hon. Members of the House to that chapter which gives, again, in a simple and straightforward manner the basic and fundamental principles which have guided the Committee and which should, if I may say so with humility, also guide others in dealing with a question of such intricacy.

I am glad that the report was very well received. The educational world as well as public men hailed the report mostly with satisfaction. Of course, there are, unfortunately, a few individuals, some of them highly respected, who have not yet been able to reconcile themselves to the scheme that is embodied in Chapter XVII of the Constitution Barring such persons, on the whole, the report had a very good reception. In fact, it had a very good Press too. The papers, not only in the various languages but also in English in various States barring a few, though they are not unimportant ones, showed a similar attitude of appreciation and understanding.

I do not propose to go more fully into the details. I hope I will not have to speak for long. I will only refer to a comment which appeared at the time in a paper published in the United Kingdom. It is one of the most important papers whose opinions are respected in all countries and also in our own, the *Manchester Guardian*. The *Manchester Guardian* said:

"It was difficult to see how the Committee's proposals could be bettered".

It goes on to remark that:

"the very pressure from the people which compelled India to match the States with linguistic boundaries makes it more urgent that Hindi should become estab-

lished as a common language to all".

Further,

"While English will remain a great help to Indians, parity for English and Hindi would have gone against the Indian feeling of nationhood".

I gave this quotation as the paper has obviously no prejudice against any section of the people here or any particular bias for Hindi. But the conditions in which we are functioning drove me to the conclusion that the report that we submitted is the best that could be framed in the circumstances.

I do not say that it is a perfect report. In a matter of this type, where passions and emotions are bound up, it is not easy to have an ideal scheme. Even the original scheme that is embodied in our Constitution and which is now familiarly known as the constitutional settlement was the result of a lot of give and take. The constitutional scheme was the result of very assiduous labours, and the people gave their best to the hammering out of a solution which would be satisfactory to all concerned and which could conduce to the best interests of the country.

While moving the resolution which contained clauses 343 to 348 which formed the constitutional or the linguistic scheme, Shri N Gopala-swami Ayyangar observed that it was an integrated scheme which can stand or fall, but it would not be fair to cut off one part from the other. So, it is an integrated and flexible scheme and we had occasion to examine it again. The Committee gave ample thought to the consideration of the original scheme itself, and after examining it from every possible aspect, it reached the conclusion that this scheme should be fully approved and adopted and that it would be

[Shri G. B. Pant]

improper and hazardous to depart from the scheme as it is embodied in the Constitution. It is also the opinion of the Committee that all legitimate needs and demands can be met within the scope that is available within the Constitution

I have the pleasure of saying that though Dr. Krishnaswami may not agree with me, his father Shri Ramaswami Mudaliar did. Of course, it is certainly open to young men to form independent opinions and in this age, independence often involves the departure from the opinions entertained by the elders. Otherwise, the young men ought to be dubbed as reactionary, and the best way to go forward is to differ from those who are nearest to you. I do not think Dr. Krishnaswami will actually differ.

Sir, the report, as I said, deals with various matters. It is hardly possible for me to deal with all of them or even with the major problems that are set out in the report. As I stated a moment ago, this Committee was formed to examine the recommendations made by the Official Language Commission. I have had occasion to speak on the general question of language in this House more than once, and I need not reiterate what I then said. I am glad to say that the statements that appear in Chapter II and the analysis of the situation that has been made in the report fully confirm what I had myself stated from time to time. The report has been framed with due regard for all interests and especially with due regard for the needs and interests of those who do not speak Hindi today. The Committee has made a special effort to take their difficulties into account and it has tried to frame its proposals in such a way that no inconvenience may be caused and no disadvantage may in anyway be caused to the non-Hindi-speaking people. That was one of the main guiding principles which the Committee placed before itself.

I would not ordinarily take the time of the House by mentioning the names of the members of the Committee. But, you, Sir, at the time when this motion for selection of Members for the Joint Committee was made, observed that it would be a miniature Parliament. So, its decisions could naturally be full of significance and also of weight. I will just give the names of the Members who were elected and who laboured hard to produce this report. The names are Shri Purushottam Das Tandon, Shri K. P. Madhavan Nair, Shri Alluri Satyanarayana Raju, Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira, Sardar Budh Singh, Shri Bhagirathi Mahapatra, Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Shri Perath Narayanan Nair, Shri Prafulla Chandra Bhanj Deo. These are from Rajya Sabha. From the Lok Sabha the Members are: Seth Govind Das, Shri P. T. Thanu Pillai, Swami Ramnanda Tirath, Shri B. S. Murthy, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, Shri Hifzur Rehman, Shri B. Bhagavati, Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri Mathura Prasad Mishra, Shri Manikya Lal Verma, Shri Bhakt Darshan, Shri Shripad Amrit Dange, Shri Harish Chandra Sharma, Kumari Maniben Vallabh-bhai Patel, Shri G. S. Musafir, Shri Atulya Ghosh, Shri Deorao Yeshwantrao Gohokar, Shri Hirendranath Mukerjee and Shri Pramathanath Banerjee.

Well, I have just read out these names in order to remind the hon. Members of the character of the committee and of the position that the members of the committee occupy in public life. Except for the note of Shri Frank Anthony, about which I have just made a passing remark,—I do not propose to say much more, because I had long talks with him and I could not convert him to my point of view—besides that there are a few other notes by Tandonji, Seth Govind Dasji, Harish Chandrajji, Shri Bhanj Deo and one other. All of them complained of the report being

of a halting and unsatisfactory character.

श्री गोविन्द वास (जबलपुर) ने तो
नोट ऑफ डिसेंट नहीं था, वह तो एक
सुझाव वाला नोट था ।

Shri G. B. Pant: I said "note". I did not say "note of dissent". Only, you did not agree with some of the recommendations

So, if they were all dissatisfied in any way with the report, it was because of its halting character, as they say I am happy, and I hope hon Members of this House will be gratified to find, that not a single member from any non-Hindi areas has appended any note of dissent, or expressed any view, which would be discordant with the proposals contained in the report. They had a hand and share in evolving these proposals and they have unreservedly adopted this report which was the result of our joint labours. This unanimity is the greatest asset and I feel that, in the circumstances in which we are, we must look at these things from a correct perspective.

Language is a vital force, it is a force for good, it is a bond of unity, but it can also be a force for division, for disintegration. So, while bearing in mind the national requirements and the need of having a common link for binding together all parts of India emotionally, culturally and administratively, we should remember that it is only through the goodwill and through the co-operation, active co-operation, of all sections of the Indian community that we can make rapid advance. If we show any resentment or if in our efforts we try to run fast, we may sometimes fall down and not be able to retrieve the ground that we may have lost. So, we have throughout adhered to this basic principle. In fact, on the first day we met, I had the privilege of telling my fellow members of the committee that our success will be measured not so much by the character of our proposals

as by complete unanimity among ourselves. We want to promote emotional integration in the country. We want to consolidate our independence. We have also to remember that we are passing through difficult times. And we have to see that even if we feel that our aspirations are not being fulfilled we do not adopt such measures as will create disunity or as will deprive us of the co-operation of non-Hindi-speaking people in advancing the Union language for Union purposes. That has been the main principle that we have placed before ourselves, everyone of us has placed before himself, in that committee. But there were a few occasions when the cordial atmosphere that prevailed there was disturbed.

I remember what an amount of excitement there was when the constitutional scheme or settlement, as I said was framed over this question of language. But in this committee luckily we were able to conduct our business in a calm atmosphere, because everyone was anxious to make his utmost contribution for promoting the unity of the country and for achieving the purpose which has been laid down in the Constitution itself. I may submit that, as I said, this scheme that is given in the Constitution was unreservedly accepted by the hon Members. Their acceptance was not subject to any reservation. Several changes were, however, made in the recommendations of the Language Commission itself, so that the scheme might be thoroughly acceptable to all sections of our great nation. We have as many as fourteen languages in our Schedule, but there are many more that are spoken in the country.

14 hrs.

All of these languages are entitled to our respect. It is the duty of everyone of us to promote those languages to the extent we can. Any idea that the advancement of anyone language can in any way be injurious to another is altogether fallacious. After all, language is the main bond

[Shri G. B. Pant]

of man with man. Take away the medium of language and what is there to make two minds meet or to make two persons understand each other? So, it is a noble medium through which civilisation, through which culture and through which the very existence of society is determined. So, we have to see that whatever we do is fair to all languages and now I have little doubt that the proposals made in this Report have commended themselves to the bulk of our people, if not to all. In any case we have served one very useful purpose. There was sharp controversy before the publication of this Report and a lot of misgiving, suspicion, distrust was prevalent. This Report put an end to all that bitterness. Even those who differed and even those who criticised the Report did so in a spirit of friendliness. All through, there was an appreciation of the difficulties which surround this very great problem. But our task was relatively easier because we had the basis and the framework in our Constitution and we had only to carry out the directions that had been given to us.

There was, I think, some excitement over some of the recommendations of the Language Commission. The Language Commission had said that it was not in a position to state definitely whether English should or should not continue in any form after 1965. That gave cause for much perturbation and people felt that an effort was being made to push out English by 1965. We have definitely held that it is not practicable to push out English by 1965. Of course, so far as the original scheme goes, it lays down that Hindi is the official language of the Union but it provides a period of fifteen years for the use of English. After that the Parliament has the authority to decide whether English should be used, and, if so, for which purpose and for how long. We have said that the Parliament should pass a law to promote the use of English

for such purposes as it may consider appropriate or for as long as may be necessary.

I may state here that there is no prejudice against English as such. We have reason to be grateful to the great English writers and others who have helped us in many ways. The English language has been a source not only of our getting into contact with the modern world, but it has also brought science and technology and many other things here. And it brought them at a time when we were not thoroughly conscious of what the western world had been able to achieve and what great progress science, technology and other things had made. In fact, even in the matter of Indology, the English writers discovered many things about our past about which we were not fully aware at the time. So there is no prejudice, no bias against English. I may also add that it is essential that even in future people should learn English in this country. As the hon. Prime Minister said the other day, English opens to us the window to the modern world. There are other modern languages, no doubt, but English is an international language and it holds perhaps the first place among languages today in the world. So, we would not gain anything by developing any sort of animus against English. We should have arrangements for continuing English in our ordinary educational institutions and also wherever necessary in our administrative, judicial, cultural and other establishments. That is necessary.

Then we have to promote a new glossary. We have to prepare a code for legal terms, for administrative terms and for so many other things. Much work has been done in this direction so far, but there is a great deal more to be done. So far as scientific and technological terms are concerned, we can draw upon English and so far as all these new terms are concerned, which will have to be coined if Hindi is to serve as the

official language of the Union and if the regional languages are to serve their own respective States, if all that has to be done then effort should also be made that so far as is possible the words that are introduced in the regional languages and in Hindi are common. Not only that, we should try to explore all avenues for enriching our culture and for raising the standards in our universities and other places. But, we cannot forget that so far as the common language for the country which has accepted a democratic status is concerned, only an indigenous language can serve that purpose, because English is a very difficult language. I have spent many years in learning English. But, I do not know how many mistakes I make. Because, one's mother tongue is something different and a foreign language which is learnt in this manner is so difficult to be assimilated fully that one cannot be too sure. Besides, it costs a disproportionate effort so far as the average citizens are concerned who have not to follow up any scientific or other like subjects.

In the past, the elite of the English knowing people in the country has been completely separated from the general mass in the country. There was a wide gulf. Whatever life and vitality came in our national movement, it was only when Gandhiji took up the reins and with his knowledge of English he adopted the indigenous language for carrying on his own work and the work of the national organisation also. We have to remember that in a democratic country in which every individual has a vote, the language that is used for administrative purposes, for official purposes, for judicial purposes is, to the maximum extent possible, easily learnable and assimilable by the people at large, by the masses, by the average citizens.

So, the question is not confined to Hindi. The regional languages deserve as much of attention as Hindi. It is only really through the develop-

ment of both that we can have that synthesis for which our country has been well known from times immemorial. We have a real diversity that gives vitality to our unity. That diversity has to continue. These languages should be cultivated and the various regions should conduct their affairs to the maximum extent through their regional languages.

The Language Commission had recommended that the medium of education in the Universities should be Hindi and similarly that the language of the High Court should be Hindi and the language of Bills, etc., should also be Hindi. We decided in this Committee that the regional languages should have the maximum scope in their own respective regions and the medium of education in the Universities should be the regional language—it is going to be so whether we wish it or not—and that the language even in the High Courts should be the regional language, though in certain matters such as reportable judgments, decrees and orders, a Hindi translation should also be attached. We also decided that Bills, etc., in the legislatures of the States should be in their own regional language, so that the regional languages will have full sway in the administrative, judicial, cultural and educational fields. This is, I think, to some extent, a corollary to our re-organisation of States on a linguistic basis. When the States have been so formed, it becomes all the more necessary that all the administrative and other activities in the regions should be conducted in their own languages. We thus gave to the regional languages that opportunity which they thought they would not have according to the recommendations of the Language Commission.

There are one or two other factors which have to be borne in mind in this connection. Latterly, there have been some developments which have a very direct bearing on the question that we are considering. I have already referred to the re-organisation

[Shri G. B. Pant]

of States on a linguistic basis. Hon. Members are, I believe, also aware of the fact that the States have adopted their own respective languages as the medium of instruction everywhere up to the secondary stage and in some, even in their Universities, and it is going to be the pattern for the future. All the official work is now being done in the regional languages. At least a number of States have already decided that it should be so done and it is, I think, almost a certainty that other States will follow suit. There is a keen desire in all the States that their regional languages should be adopted for their official and administrative purposes.

Hon Members will see that however much we might try to encourage the use of English and to take measures for educating our youth in English, standards of English and the quality of English, both of which are said to have already somewhat deteriorated, will go down further. There would not be the same interest or desire among the Members of any particular State to learn English to the extent that it exists today, when the administrative work can be done or has to be done in his own mother tongue or in his own regional language, and the medium of education also is generally his own language. So, we have to concede now that English, in these circumstances, will nearly cease to be even the medium of communication between the different sections of intelligentsia, whether one wills it or not. But, these unassailable factors which are tending that way cannot be resisted. Now, we have regional States based on languages. The work there officially is being done in the regional language, and the medium of administration too is the regional language, and the work of the legislatures as well as of the High Courts is to be done in the regional language. When all these developments will take place cannot be predicted with accuracy, but there

is no doubt that all regions want to advance in this direction as rapidly as they can.

In the circumstances, when this bond of English collapses, whether you will it or not, what is to bind together the different States? So, the problem has become much more urgent than it was at the time when the constitutional scheme was finalised. So, it is necessary that there should be a common medium of communication between the different States for official work, for academic work, for cultural work and even for business and trade. English, whatever be our desire, cannot serve that purpose hereafter.

So, in the circumstances, I do not see how anyone can press for the continuance of English as the sole medium or for not having a common medium for all States. It is not a question of having a medium for one set of States and another medium for another set of States. If India is to be a union, if the integrity and unity of the country is to be maintained, then we should have a common medium. That is the least that is necessary. If such a medium of communication is lacking, then I think everything goes to pieces.

We have many languages like flowers in our garden of India, which form our composite culture, and it is desirable that there should be very close relationship between all these languages, and every effort should be made to promote these languages. So, implementation of the decision taken in the Constituent Assembly has become almost inevitable in the existing circumstances. And every step that is feasible, but which has the co-operation and the goodwill of all parts of India has to be utilised for this purpose.

I may also submit that we have suggested that the language which we call Hindi now has to be remodelled. It should reflect the composite

character of our culture. We should introduce in Hindi as many words as may be possible from all other regional languages. And as is already provided in the Constitution, we should see that consistently with its genius, the Hindi language is enriched and also brought as near to the other languages as possible.

On the day the Constituent Assembly took this decision of adopting Hindi as the official language, I had the opportunity of speaking to the leading members of all States, and I then submitted, and I would repeat that with all humility, that Hindi which is being accepted as the official language of the Union is now the common language of all of us, it ceases to be the exclusive language of any particular region. There are some differences between one language and another, no doubt, but so far as is possible, we have to remove them; we have to see that Hindi, if it is going, appropriately and adequately, to occupy the place which has been assigned to it by the grace and favour of so many non-Hindi-speaking States, is capable of discharging the various functions which it is expected now to perform.

So, the Hindi language should be simple, and we should not have any artificiality about it. The Official Language Commission said that we should not bother about purism in Hindi. Well, I would go further and say that whatever brings Hindi closer to other languages makes it pure, and so, we attain purism that way and not by isolating Hindi from other languages.

In other countries too, at times, efforts have been made sometimes to exclude words which have been already included in their languages, such as the movement that was started in England at one time that all words that were not Anglo-Saxon should be left out. But such efforts have never succeeded, and all those who had taken to such methods had

to revise their opinions, for, if a language is to grow and if it has to gain vitality, and if it has to grow richer and richer, then the more it takes from others, the better it is for it. Of course, its genius remains, and that has to be preserved.

So, we would like the language of Hindi to be so recast, so rebuilt that it can be easily intelligible to all others.

There is one thing more that I would like to say in this connection, namely that a language develops only through usage. There should be some fields in which Hindi can be used in various regions simultaneously, so that it may through actual experience become a natural language of the character that I have just indicated. If that is done, if we are able to give it some trial in this manner, or if, not trial, if we start like that, if we start using it, and if we see that we go on adding regional words, regional idioms, and thus we assimilate what is good in other languages, then we shall see where the defects lie and how we are to remedy them. Artificial ways of building the language can never succeed, and perhaps our methods so far have been a little artificial though we have got many volumes of words that have been prepared for administrative, legal and other purposes. So far as these words also are concerned, I would say that we should take from all languages in our country such legal terms, such technical terms as are in use in other States, so that this may be really a composite language of India representing its composite culture.

I have referred to some of the basic matters. There are many other things which are there. We have made certain proposals about the language of the High Courts and also about the language of Bills and the language that should be used in State legislatures. Of course, about

[Shri G. B. Pant]

Parliament, there is no difficulty. About the States, as I have just said, we have given priority to the regional language for such purposes. We have also dealt with the question of recruitment to services which is an important one and which properly tackled is likely to cause greater heart-burning, if not than anything else. We have suggested that for the all-India services the examination should be conducted for the present through the medium of English but notice should be given so that Hindi may be used for the examination later. Then we have also said 14-33 hrs.

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair] that there should be a compulsory paper in English. There should be two papers in Indian languages, one Hindi and one other Indian language of equal standard so that those who go in for such services may be fully familiar with at least one other Indian language. Whatever be the difficulty they may find in learning the language, they have to share it with the non-Hindi speaking people.

A suggestion was made that the regional language might be adopted as the media for such examination on a quota system. We are against a quota system. We do not think that we should put any artificial bar on the number of candidates who can be recruited from any area. We must have the best of talent for the service of the nation, and a quota system will come in the way of the achievement of this objective. But we have suggested that an expert committee should be appointed to see if regional languages can be adopted as the media of examination, because the task of moderation of the papers and of the assessment of the answer papers is very difficult and if there are papers in various languages, then I as a layman cannot say whether the competitive test that is held and the results tabulated at the end will fully reflect the intelligence and the equipment of the examinees.

Similarly, we have made suggestions for other educational institutions. We have also suggested that there should be a Commission for dealing with matters pertaining to law, legal terminology, preparation of statutes, their translation etc. and also another Commission for the purpose of developing scientific and technical terminology in a right and proper manner.

I have already taken a great deal of time. I did not intend to do so, as I said, at the outset; nor does it quite suit me today to speak for such a long time. But I thought that it was my duty to place before the House a sort of a brief summary of what appears in the Report and the objective that we had before us or the approach we had to this problem and the difficulties we had to resolve. I hope the House will attach due importance to the recommendations of the Committee and will accept them. In fact, there is no question of acceptance or rejection in a way because, under the Constitution, these proposals have to go to the President and the President is to take decisions on them. But he will have the benefit of hearing the hon. Members and of having a clear idea about their views.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Committee of Parliament on Official Language laid on the Table of the House on the 22nd April 1959".
Seth Govind Das.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): What about the amendments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought hon. Members had been satisfied with the observations of the Home Minister.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput): No, Sir.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): We have given notice of amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was thinking whether the moving of amendments would be relevant here because if we have not to take any decisions, what should we do with the amendments? If we allow the amendments, then a vote shall have to be taken on them and there will perhaps be Divisions also. Article 344(5) of the Constitution says:

"It shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) and to report to the President their opinion thereon".

Dr. Krishnaswami: May I make some observations?

Seth Govind Das: On a point of order I am raising this point of order as far as the amendments are concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us hear those who say that they can move amendments. Then I will hear Seth Govind Das

Seth Govind Das: I am raising a point of order whether the amendments can be moved or not.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why are so many hon Members rising simultaneously?

I was doubtful myself about the admissibility of the amendments. Therefore, I wanted to hear first those who say that they be allowed to move amendments. Then I shall hear Seth Govind Das also.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): As you observed, Sir, it is the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission and make a report to the President. Consequently, a report to the President has been made. It is really within the jurisdiction of the

President to issue any direction that he chooses. Now, it is necessary that before the President acts, he must have some inkling as to the way in which this House thinks. Whatever the resolution is—assuming for a moment that the amendment is accepted by the House—that is not binding on the President. It only indicates the opinion of the House, which way the House thinks.

There should be a general approach towards the solution of the numerous problems contained in the Report. Therefore, there is absolutely nothing wrong in an amendment of the type which I have given, that the House takes note etc (*Interruptions*). I am saying amendments of the type which I have given (*Interruptions*) because I am not saying mine only.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There cannot be any other amendment of the type of Shri Bharucha's amendment

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am pointing out that it serves only to give an inkling to the President of the mind of the House. It would only show how the mind of the House works. We show him the particular approach to be followed. It does not contravene the exclusive powers of the President, to issue such directions as he chooses on the finding of the Committee. But it is only fair to the President that this House should give an inkling of its mind to the President. Therefore, amendments cannot be of a mandatory nature, but, certainly they can be in the form of an expression of the opinion of the House. And, I think, it is not only fair but it is necessary that the President should know the mind of the House.

Therefore, I suggest that amendments which are of a mandatory nature or which contravene any of the provisions of 344 to 349 of the Rules will be out of order and others will be in order.

Shri Frank Anthony: Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I submit with respect that since this Report is before us

[Shri Frank Anthony]

to be noted, then, from that flows the right of this House to express an opinion. As my hon. friend, Shri Bharucha has pointed out, we cannot make a motion in the nature of a recommendation. But, there is no specific provision which places an embargo on this House expressing an opinion. I say that since we are discussing this particular motion by the Home Minister

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If you say the opinion of the House is that English shall continue—if this is decided by the House—after 1965 .

Shri Frank Anthony: But it is not a direction or a recommendation. We are only expressing our opinion.

May I say this? There is no embargo. I am now seeking to interpret it according to the interpretation of the Constitution. Unless there is a specific embargo here, in the words of Justice Holmes, you can always in constitutional interpretations interstitially put what is not specifically prohibited. Now, since we have been permitted to discuss this Report, *affortum* we can express our opinion on it. Otherwise, the logical conclusion will be this that because we cannot make our recommendation we cannot even discuss the Report. We will have to carry it to that conclusion that because there is no power in the Constitution for us to discuss it, impliedly it is prohibited, if you accept that. But having allowed that, because there is no prohibition, we can discuss it, *a fortiori* flowing from that we can certainly express an opinion. But the opinion will be of a different form. It does not bind the President. We express an opinion as the grammatical expression would show. It does not mean that it is binding.

It is absolutely the right of the House to express an opinion on any motion before it. If the motion had not been placed before it, then we

cannot. We might even put it in the recommendatory form since the motion is before us. Because it is before us we can express it in the form of an opinion.

Dr. Krishnaswami: Sir, the Constitution itself gives authority to this House to express its views. I refer to article 344 (6)

"Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

Since it gives to the President the discretion to reject a part of the recommendations of the report, it is necessary for this House to express its views. In order to enable the President to come to a right decision it would be competent for Parliament to express its opinion and make concrete suggestions on the report of the Committee, which is today, the subject-matter of discussion in this House.

Furthermore, according to the Rules of Procedure of this House and the practice followed in the House of Commons, an amendment or a substitute motion can be tabled in respect of any motion that is moved in this House. Since the motion has been moved by the Home Minister, I suggest that all our amendments or substitute motions are completely in order.

Shri Mahanty: Sir, under article 344(1) a committee of the Members of Parliament was appointed. Under clause (5) the report has been submitted to the President. Now, the limited question that I would like to bring before you in the shape of a point of order is this. Inasmuch as Members of both Houses of Parliament have not been elected on any specific directive but were elected merely and in view of the fact that

a Parliamentary Committee's report has been submitted to the President, the House will be within its rights to express an opinion on that report. It may be just possible that the hon. Members who represented Parliament did not reflect the views of the Parliament as a whole. Why I am saying so is this. There was no specific platform there was no specific mandate and there was no specific issue on which these Members were elected. Therefore there is likely to be a difference between the conclusions of the report and the body of opinion that is prevailing in Parliament.

The President cannot issue directives as an autocrat, because he functions within the limitations of the Constitution. Naturally he has to be guided by the opinion which will be tendered by the Council of Ministers and the Council of Ministers has to be given a direction by this House and also by the Parliament as a whole. The only proper way is by moving this amendment. I do not know why Government is allergic to these amendments; their fate is well-known. Therefore, it will be detracting

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The allergy was exhibited on my part. I have expressed doubts.

Shri Mahanty: As the custodian of our rights and privileges, I would appeal to you to see that our privileges are not restricted. We are perfectly within our rights to move amendments if they are within the four corners of the Constitution and the Rules of Procedure. Therefore, I believe, at any rate, my amendment is in order. It does not contravene the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure. I should be permitted to move it.

श्री मोहन दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
मेरा इस संकल्प में यह निवेदन है कि हमारे
अधिकार के.....

206 (A) L.S.D.—7.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): In English

Some Hon. Members: In English.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is a request by those who have taken up the cause that these amendments might be allowed, that the hon. Member may speak in English at this stage

Seth Govind Das: Sir, what I want to submit is this. So far as this question is concerned, we should see what the Constituent Assembly had in view (*Interruption*). It has been specifically stated in our Constitution that after the lapse of 5 years a Commission would be appointed and for considering the report of the Commission a Committee of Parliament would be appointed. Nowhere in the Constitution has it been mentioned that first the report of the Commission as well as of the Committee will come to Parliament and will be discussed here and then the President will take action on it. (*Interruption*) If it was desired by the makers of the Constitution that resolutions and amendments in this respect should be moved in both Houses of Parliament, then, they would have specifically said so

Shri Frank Anthony: It has got nothing about the motion. Therefore, when this question was first raised, whether the report of the Committee would come up for discussion here, we pointed out that according to the Constitution, this should not come here. But then, it was thought desirable to have a discussion on the report. Now, Sir, if you allow amendments and resolutions to be moved, then politics would be introduced in the matter which the Constitution-makers wanted to avoid. When this question was raised here on the 3rd of September, 1957, it was clearly stated by the Speaker:

"Even when the report is submitted to the House, we are not

[Shri Frank Anthony]

going to have resolutions passed as to what portions of the recommendations of the Committee ought to be accepted and what, not. We are only generally going to express our opinion. It is for the Committee to make its recommendations."

I was a member of the Constituent Assembly and there also a discussion took place on this matter and we wanted that the question of language should be kept entirely out of politics and therefore, we recommended that the whole thing should be entrusted to the President. It has been clearly stated in the Constitution in article 344:

"Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

Therefore, Parliament has not been mentioned here and so, I do not think that amendments and resolutions could be moved in this House. We can only discuss it according to the decision given by the Chair on the 3rd September, 1957. It was specifically said that no resolution or amendment would be moved here. Therefore, I want your ruling whether these amendments can be moved or not.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Sir, it was open for the Government not to bring this report for discussion. But, now that the report has been brought before the House and a specific motion has been made, it should be open for the Members to move amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He does not say that his own is in order.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Shall I make a submission because my amendment has perhaps been

hibited by certain hon. Members to be out of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Home Minister.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, the point is very simple. I am somewhat perplexed that a Member of Shri Anthony's legal calibre and knowledge should have argued that amendments can be in order in this case. This is a special occasion. The Constitution says in clear terms that it shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) of article 344 to report to the President its opinion thereon. Article 344 (6) says:

"Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

The Committee was appointed by this House. The procedure is prescribed in the Constitution itself that the Members were to be elected according to the principle of single transferable vote. But they were not only elected in that way by different groups but there was complete unanimity in the House so that it was a body which fully represented all groups and all parties and all languages in this House. That was the way the Committee was formed. In fact there has never been any dispute as to the implications and the import of these provisions. Even at that time when I agreed to have a discussion, it was made perfectly clear that there should be no amendment.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Who is the Home Minister to make it clear?

If the Constitution allows it, we will exercise our right.

Shri G. B. Pant: You have every right to claim that your position should be accepted but you can discuss with me for a minute.

Shri Narsinh Bharucha: He is not the law for us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Every hon. Member had his chance.

Shri G. B. Pant: So, the Constitution lays down that the President will take this into consideration. It is said here..

Shri Narsinh Bharucha: Page 186 of the Constitution.

Shri G. B. Pant: . . . that the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report. So, that is clearly laid down in the Constitution itself. Now, if you amend the report here to say that you are only expressing an opinion, if an amendment is carried through, that means, to that extent, the report is amended. . . .

Some Hon. Members: No

Shri G. B. Pant: It does not retain its form, whatever it be. If you do not make any change in the report, if the report remains as it is, there is no point in asking for any amendment. If it does make some change, then, there is, to some extent, a departure from the report. I say that Shri Anthony was a little ungracious when he said having regard to the discussion, that it should follow as a corollary that amendments also were admissible and should be allowed. I think the position is perfectly clear and as Seth Govind Das has said, on the day the motion was made, the Speaker has definitely said that even when the report is submitted to the House we are not going to have resolutions passed as to what portions of the recommendations ought to be accepted and what not, and we are only generally going to express our opinion.....

Shri Narsinh Bharucha: On what?

Shri G. B. Pant: On what is relevant.

It is for the Committee to make its recommendations. I submit that no amendments can be moved and the matter has already been decided by the Speaker.

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, may I make a submission before you give a decision? If this is the attitude of the Government, with great respect, they may withdraw this motion because this whole debate will be infructuous. I say with the greatest respect that it will prevent this House from giving an opinion in terms of the categorical declaration of the policy which the hon. Prime Minister gave here. I say that we have an inalienable right in this matter. If we make a motion under article 344, we have an inescapable right to move an amendment. Otherwise, this motion is meaningless and let us not have a discussion if we cannot express ourselves. The statement of the Home Minister, carried to its logical conclusion, means that we cannot express an opinion contrary to the official report. What are we seeking to do? We are seeking, merely in terms of certain language, to express the views of this House. Now we can do it orally and it does not offend the Home Minister's interpretation of the law. Now, we can do it writing. How does it offend the legal provision?

15 hrs.

There is a motion before this House. Once the House is seized of a motion it has an inalienable right to move amendments. That is the right of every hon. Member of this House. If the hon. Home Minister says that it is contrary to article 344(6) and we are not making a recommendation, why not withdraw the motion itself? The motion itself will be meaningless. Why should we be allowed to express an opinion contrary to the recommendation when we are not allowed to express that contrary opinion in writing. That is what we are seeking to do.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put one question to the hon. Member. If we are to accept some amendment here, to that extent the report of the Committee would be amended

Shri Frank Anthony: How?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would it not be amended?

Shri Goray (Poona): We are discussing the motion

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not merely a discussion. The plea that is now taken is that if amendments are discussed then voting shall have to be taken

Shri Naushir Bharucha: That is not the point

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am only submitting that if amendments are moved and discussed, how shall we dispose them of unless we take a vote?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Sir, I will make the point clear. The point of view that I am pressing is this. There is a distinction between amending the report and passing an amendment. If the amendment merely expresses an opinion it is not tantamount to amending the report and the President is not bound to accept that opinion. It only helps the President to have an inkling of the mind of the House. Therefore, the amendments must be distinguished like this. Those amendments which are of nature where they are tantamount to amending the report, they can be declared out of order. Those which are not of that nature and which merely expressive of an opinion must be deemed to be in order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am taking one amendment tabled by Shri Frank Anthony. The amendment reads like this:

"and is of opinion that English shall continue after 1965.....".

Supposing this is accepted by the House, the question is whether to that extent the report of the Committee would be amended or not.

Shri Frank Anthony: No

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why not? It was a Committee of this House. How the House as a whole takes another decision

Shri Naushir Bharucha: No, Sir. The words here are: "is of opinion". It is not that "this House recommends" something. If the amendment was "This House recommends that English shall continue after 1965", it would have been an amendment of the Report and not merely an expression of opinion

Seth Govind Das: Sir, the Committee or the Commission is silent over the question whether English will continue after 1965 or not. As far as that question is concerned, another Commission is going to be appointed after ten years and that Commission is to decide that matter. As you have rightly said, if Shri Anthony's amendment is accepted it is nothing but amending not only the Committee's report but also the report of the Official Language Commission. On the 3rd September, Sir, it was clearly mentioned by the Chair that no resolutions or amendments would be moved in this House as far as the reports are concerned

Pandit Govind Malaviya (Sultanpur): Sir, two points have been raised. The first point was that once any motion is moved before this House it is the inherent right of the House to move amendments to it and deal with it in any manner it likes. The other point raised was that if a motion is brought forward here and the House is not allowed to move amendments to it that motion should be withdrawn.

I submit, Sir, that though that is the normal procedure with regard to all motions made in this House and, as in other spheres also, where no

procedure is laid down the general procedure applies, yet where any special procedure or special provision is laid down, that special provision rules out the application of the general provision. So, Sir, here the Constitution has clearly laid down a special, specific, clear procedure for this matter and that is contained in all these articles in Part XVII of the Constitution. In article 344(6), to which a reference has been made, it is stated: "Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report..." In article 343(3) there is a provision for this Parliament itself to do certain things if it likes or not to do certain things if it so likes. In article 343(3) it is clearly laid down "Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of 15 years, of " Therefore, something is laid down as within the rights of the Parliament to do or not to do. Article 344(6) reads: "Notwithstanding anything in article 343, the President may, after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report." In other words, it clearly envisages that even the ordinary right of Parliament to say what it wishes about any matter which comes up before it, is not open to it in this matter. Anybody who will care to remember what happened in the Constituent Assembly will recollect why this was so. As the hon Home Minister stated, and after whose speech we thought, as you yourself said, Sir, that the House would see its way to let the report go through as it is and not have these amendments and substitute motions etc., the Constituent Assembly treated the whole thing as one integrated, complete, whole scheme which was not to be dealt with in parts separately. Therefore, Sir, here the Constitution clearly says that this special procedure shall apply.

The second point that it should be withdrawn is easily met in this way.

The motion is there. If hon. Members wish they can ask for closure and reject the motion. If they do not wish to reject the motion, and they want that some particular view point should be placed before the President they can in their speeches, while opposing or supporting the motion, express themselves and all those speeches may go to the President with the Report. But I submit, Sir, that the provisions laid down in the Constitution clearly envisages that no amendments etc., and no further resolutions on the report of the Committee are to be made by Parliament, so that there would be no room for any fresh heat or controversy about the subject and the largest common measure of agreement, which was achieved at that time after a great deal of effort should remain undisturbed and nobody should have any cause for fresh heart-burning or complaint and this agreed scheme should go through smoothly. I, therefore, submit that amendments should not be allowed.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Sir, I want to make only one submission. Article 344(5) says: "It shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) and to report to the President their opinion thereon." The Government would have been perfectly within their rights if they had not brought the Committee's recommendations here through a motion. You will remember, Sir, when this report was submitted there was a consensus of opinion that we must express our opinion about these recommendations and in deference to the wishes of this House the hon Home Minister stated that irrespective of the provisions in the Constitution he would like to know the opinion of this House so that the Council of Ministers would be guided by the opinion of the House and on the basis of that opinion probably the President also will make his recommendations under article 344(6). Clause (6) of article 344 of course gives absolute power to the President

[Shri Tangamani]

theoretically, whatever may be the recommendations. Even if this motion is passed, it is not going to bind the President. If we are going to express an opinion, it is not also going to bind the President. But, if we are to go, more or less, by the assurance which was given by the Home Minister and the directions given by the Speaker, then, we are at perfect liberty to move suitable amendments in conformity with the rules of procedure. That is my humble submission.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Under clause (6) of article 344, I submit that it looks as if the President cannot consider anything other than what is contained in the report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has been said already.

Shri Achar: So, if he cannot consider anything else, I would submit that any discussion on the subject here is practically of no avail.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is a very simple one if we had confined ourselves to the provisions contained in the Constitution. There is no provision there under which we can discuss this report of the Committee and the report would have gone straight to the President for such action as he thinks advisable. There would have been no objection absolutely and no discussion also would arise. It has been conceded by some of the hon. Members who have argued that the amendments might be allowed, that the Government would have been quite justified if this occasion for discussion had not been afforded and the report of the Committee had gone straight to the President. The difficulties have arisen because the report has come before Parliament and particularly in the form of a motion.

Now, it may be recalled that it was the desire of the Members themselves

that they should have some opportunity of expressing their opinion on the report. It was not intended in the first instance to provide this opportunity to discuss it, but the Members themselves expressed a desire that they should have an opportunity so that they could express their opinion independently, and then the President could take all the opinions into account when he wants to take action. Then the Home Minister had suggested that when an opportunity is provided, the Members may discuss it.

My only difficulty is that this has come in the form of a motion and the Members have urged that because it is a motion, they have a right to move amendments. But the background should not be forgotten. It is a new form that we have adopted. Perhaps, the older one which we used to have was that such and such a thing be discussed. It was not a formal motion. It was a simple procedure; we discussed and then we said afterwards that such and such a thing had been discussed, just as we do in the case of the half-an-hour discussion. That was the usual practice that we followed up till recently. But now, following the House of Commons, we have adopted this form namely, "takes note of" etc. When it is deemed to be a substantive motion, a right accrues to the Members that they could move amendments to the motion. That is the case of the hon. Members. Otherwise, it is generally agreed that so far as the provisions the Constitution are concerned, there is no right for this House to have or contemplate a discussion.

When we consider whether it is not advisable that this motion should be brought before the House in this form, the Home Minister says that it was on the express understanding and because the Members desired to discuss it, this was brought up. He had thought that it would be only an expression of opinion. I do not think any difference is made in this case. If we

are not to take decisions and send our opinions, after, say, division, etc., then, only the views of the Members ought to be conveyed along with the report of the Committee, so that the President might take the views also into consideration, because, under clause (8), the President has got the authority to "accept the whole or part of it". Therefore, in a particular case, the opinion that is expressed here may perhaps be thought suitable by the President,—taking it hypothetically—than even some particular recommendation made by the Committee. But that purpose of ours would be served if copies of all the speeches that are made here are sent, along with the report, to the President who can take into consideration all the views that have been expressed.

Even if the motion has been brought by the Government and even if I do feel that perhaps it would have been better if it had been in the old form or in any other form, then too, I cannot ignore the specific provisions in the Constitution. So, I declare that all these amendments are out of order.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I rise to a point of order. My submission is that the motion of the hon. Home Minister is out of order. The scheme of Part XVII of the Constitution dealing with official language is contained in articles 343 to 351. As was pointed out by some Members, the scheme is that there will be a Committee of Parliament, and it has also been said that "it shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under clause (1) and to report to the President their opinion thereon". Afterwards, the power is exclusively left to the President to issue directions. My submission is that according to the Constitution, Parliament does not come into the picture at all. It is immaterial whether or not Members desire that they should have an opportunity to voice their opinion. If the Constitution does not provide it, the hon. Home Minister has no right

to go behind the Constitution and afford any opportunity for anybody to discuss this matter.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What is the point of order?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: The point of order is that this matter should not at all come in here if we are sticking to the Constitution. Therefore, the motion of the hon. Home Minister is out of order. My real reason in raising this is not to deprive this House of the opportunity of expressing its opinion. But, if the amendments are to be ruled out of order and if the House does not get an opportunity to move them, then there is not much charm in having the discussion.

Shri G. B. Pant: I have considered it advisable always to comply with the wishes of the House. When a desire was expressed that this report should come up for discussion here, I agreed. But, if hon. Members think that no discussion should be held, I cannot possibly force it upon them!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What Shri Naushir Bharucha argued was that this motion is contrary to the spirit of clauses (5) and (6) of article 344 of the Constitution.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: He has no right to bring it up for discussion here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House can discuss any subject which it wants to discuss. But the question is whether the form in which it is put before us is in order or not. (Interruption). Order, order. Let the hon. Home Minister give his reply.

Shri G. B. Pant: So far as the form goes, I was told that this was the prescribed form; and I gave it in this form. So, I would have pleaded guilty if I had adopted a novel form myself!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have adopted the present form. It is a recent one. In the House of Commons it used to be a substantive form.

Shri G. B. Pant: I personally think that this motion had been admitted by the Speaker. It has been put on the order paper for today. I have been asked to speak. I have done so and I am entirely in the hands of the House. If the House does not want to discuss it, I would certainly not compel the House to discuss it. But I personally think that since it is in response to the wishes of the House that I brought this motion, it is perhaps desirable that members should have an opportunity of speaking on it. I do not see any question of impropriety in it. The House is, subject to the other provisions, master of its procedure and the House can always discuss any subject it likes.

Shri Nazshir Bharucha: Not against the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think now we need not spend any more time on this. What I propose is that we might start the discussion. If ultimately the Government thinks that this is not the proper form, then it can be amended or withdrawn and substituted. But it is clear that we want to discuss it. Let the discussion start. In the meanwhile, Government would make up its mind.

Shri Nazshir Bharucha: On what?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On whether it is the proper form or it should be amended in a manner which might be more suitable, according to the provisions of the Constitution. Now Seth Govind Das.

सेठ गोविन्द दास उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मेरा यह कर्तव्य है कि मैं स्वर्गीय श्री जे. आर. दाहदू किन्होंने प्राधिकृत

लैंग्वेज कमिशन के काम को इतनी धच्छी तरह से किया। बड़ी योग्यता और बड़े परिश्रम से उन्होंने प्रायोग के जहाज को चलाया है। उस के बाद मेरा यह कर्तव्य है कि मैं श्रद्धय पन्त जी को धन्यवाद दूँ कि उन्होंने इस कमेटी के काम को इतनी धच्छी तरह से निपटाया, बड़ी निपुणता से पन्त जी ने समिति के कार्य को चलाया और मेरा विश्वास है कि यदि पन्त जी के सदृश योग्य व्यक्ति इस समिति का अध्यक्ष न होता तो हमारी समिति का काम इस तरह से सम्पूर्ण नहीं हो सकता था जिस तरह से यह पूरा हुआ। और पन्त में मैं उन सब प्रायोग के सदस्यों और कमेटी के सदस्यों को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ जिन्होंने इस काम को इतनी धच्छी तरह से किया है।

जहाँ तक प्रायोग की नियुक्ति, उसके काम और समिति के कार्य का सम्बन्ध है, मुझे इस बात का शेद है कि इस सारे काम में बहुत देर लगी। हमारे संविधान में स्पष्ट कहा गया था कि संविधान के लागू होने के पांच वर्ष के बाद इस प्रायोग की नियुक्ति हो जायगी और प्रायोग की रिपोर्ट आने के बाद समिति बनेगी। हमारा विश्वास था कि मात्रे कार्य में ६ वर्ष का समय लगेगा क्योंकि १० वर्ष में दूसरे प्रायोग के नियुक्त होने की बात हमारे संविधान में कही गई है। अब हम देखें कि ६ वर्ष, ८ महीने पहले प्रायोग और पहली समिति की रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के सम्बन्ध में बीत गये। अब यदि दस वर्ष के बाद फिर दूसरे प्रायोग की नियुक्ति होती है तो वह प्रायोग क्या काम कर सकेगा, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

अब यदि हम प्रायोग और समिति के निर्णयों पर विचार करें तो हमें यह स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा कि दोनों ने काफी मेहनत की। इनने पर भी हम इन सिफारिशों को जिनका अन्तगामी देखना चाहते थे उसकी हमें वे देखने को नहीं मिलती। इस का स्पष्ट कारण है, जो कि प्रायोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में स्वीकार

किया है। आयोग अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहना है—

"On a review of the work done so far in the Ministry of Education of the Government of India, there would seem to be room for greater acceleration in the work."

इसके बाद फिर आयोग की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है

"The Government has not been so alert as it could be. There was lack of faith and enthusiasm among the officers who presided over the administration"

तो यदि आयोग और कमेटी अपनी सिफारिशों में ध्यान बढ़ने का माफूल काम नहीं कर सका तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी बहुत दूर तक केन्द्रीय सरकार की है और प्रान्तीय सरकारों की भी है।

यह प्रश्न केवल हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के बीच का नहीं है। प्रधानतः यह सवाल भारतीय भाषाओं और विदेशी भाषाओं के बीच में है। पन्त जी ने अभी अपने भाषण में कहा कि हमें अब से पहले देश की एकता की ओर दृष्टि रखनी चाहिये। देश की एकता अंग्रेजी चलने में रह सकती है या भारतीय भाषाओं में और उन भाषाओं में कम से कम एक भाषा से जो कि सारे देश को एक ही सूत्र में बांध कर रख सके, रख सकती है। इस पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। फिर प्रश्न यह है कि हमने प्रजातन्त्र स्थापित किया है। प्रजातन्त्र में एक विदेशी भाषा के चलते हुए प्रजा के अर्द्ध जन नेता राज्य कर सकते हैं या मुट्ठी भर अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग राज्य कर सकते हैं इस पर भी विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। तीसरी बात हमें यह लोचनी है कि आज जो निर्माण के काम में हमारी योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत होने में इतनी विफल हो रही है, जोष पैदा नहीं होता है, उसका क्या कारण है। पन्त जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि जब तक

कांग्रेस में अंग्रेजी भाषा चलती रही, तब तक कांग्रेस में वह जीवन नहीं आया जिस जीवन की हम को राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में आवश्यकता थी। वह जीवन कब आया? पन्त जी ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया कि वह तब आया जब गांधी जी के हाथ में नेतृत्व आया और गांधी जी ने हमारी हिन्दी को और दूसरी भारतीय भाषाओं को स्थान दिया। आज निर्माण के जो काम हो रहे हैं, उन निर्माण के कामों में जनता का सहयोग, जनता का उत्साह, जनता की समझ इसलिये नहीं है कि हमारा सारा काम एक विदेशी भाषा में होता है, जिस भाषा को इस देश के रहने वाले प्रतिष्ठित लोग भी नहीं समझते। इन तीनों दृष्टियों से अर्थात् हम अपने देश को एक सूत्र में बांधने के लिये विदेशी भाषा के काम कर सकते हैं या भारतीय भाषा से—प्रश्न जैसा मैंने अभी निवेदन किया अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी के बीच में नहीं है, वह एक विदेशी भाषा और भारतीय भाषाओं के बीच का है, दूसरे इस देश में यदि प्रजातन्त्र हम चलाना चाहते हैं तो प्रजातन्त्र में हमारा काम क्या विदेशी भाषा में चल सकता है और तीसरी बात यह कि हमारे यहां जो निर्माण का काम हो रहा है उस में हमें उत्साह नजर नहीं आता, इसका प्रधान कारण क्या है इस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

अंग्रेजी में मुझे कोई घृणा नहीं है। पन्त जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा था कि अंग्रेजी से हमें घृणा नहीं रखनी है। एक छोटा सा साहित्यिक होने के नाते अंग्रेजी तो क्या किसी भी भाषा में मुझे घृणा नहीं है। गांधी जी स्वयम् कहते थे कि अंग्रेजी में उन्हें कोई घृणा नहीं है, अंग्रेजी का वह आदर करते थे, अंग्रेजी में प्रेम करने थे पर अंग्रेजी में प्रेम और अंग्रेजी का आदर करने हुए भी वे कहते थे कि अंग्रेजी राज्य हमारे लिये अन्धभाविक चीज है, अंग्रेजी राज्य जाना चाहिये। जो गांधी जी अंग्रेजी राज्य के सम्बन्ध में कहते थे वही हमारा कवन अंग्रेजी भाषा के सम्बन्ध में है।

[सिड गोबिन्द दास]

अंग्रेजी भाषा से हमारा प्रेम है, अंग्रेजी भाषा का हम आदर करते हैं, मैं मानता हूँ कि यह एक अत्यन्त विकसित भाषा है, पर उसका आदर करते हुए, उससे प्रेम करते हुए भी, जिस तरह से अंग्रेजी राज्य यहाँ नहीं रह सकता था, उसी तरह से अंग्रेजी भाषा भी नहीं रह सकती।

आचार्य कृपालानी (सीतामढ़ी) : प्राइम मिनिस्टर से पूछा है ?

लेड गोबिन्द दास : फिर मैंने दुनिया के करीब करीब सब देशों को देखा है। मुझे अंग्रेजी भाषा से प्रेम है, अंग्रेजी भाषा को आदर है, इस प्रकार का प्रेम, इस प्रकार की श्रद्धा, इस प्रकार की भक्ति नहीं देखी जिस तरह का प्रेम, श्रद्धा और भक्ति मुझे इस देश के लोगों में एक विदेशी भाषा के लिये देखी। लेकिन उनकी संख्या बहुत कम है। १०० में १ भी नहीं है।

कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि हिन्दी लादी जा रही है। मैं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दी नहीं लादी जा रही है, अंग्रेजी लादी गई थी। इस सम्बन्ध में सुनीति बानू के शब्द, जिनको उन्होंने इस आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर अपने नोट में लिखा है धाम के सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ।

"One could write quite a volume on the importance of English in the modern world and in India The English language was never imposed or forced upon the people of India. It was the Indians themselves who "realised the value of English in the present age for themselves and almost everywhere the desire to learn English came from the intellectual leaders of the people."

मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ सुनीति बानू सपूत एक इतिहास के विद्वान् व्यक्ति के इस प्रकार के नोट को पढ़ कर। मैं भी वैकाले साहब का नोट पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो उन्होंने

सन् १८३३ में लिखा था और जो इतिहास को एक बस्तु हो गई है। उससे यह मान्य होया कि अंग्रेजी इस देश में लादी गई थी और अंग्रेजी सादर का क्या अर्थ है। मैं इसके साहब सन् १८३३ के नोट में कहते हैं :

"We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern—a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect."

और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमने सदा अंग्रेजी के इस प्रकार लाये जाने का समर्थन नहीं किया विरोध ही किया है।

इस नोट के केवल तीन दिन के बाद मि० प्रिंसिप जो कि बंगाल गवर्नमेंट के सेक्रेटरी थे उन्होने सन् १८३३ में यह लिखा —

"This minute, T.B. Macaulay, gave to Lord William Bentinck. Bentinck sent it down to me (Education being one of my Secretariat Departments) These discussions of course were confidential and were by me communicated to nobody. But somehow the report got wind that the Government was about to abolish the Madrassa and Sanskrit colleges. The mind of the public of Calcutta was immediately in a ferment. In three days a petition was got up signed by no less than 30,000 on behalf of the Madrassa and another by the Hindus for the Sanskrit College."

फिर हिन्दी का तो यहाँ सबान ही नहीं है। प्रथम हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के बीच का नहीं है बल्कि प्रथम है अंग्रेजी और भारतीय भाषाओं के बीच का। प्रथम मैं अपनी तरफ से हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं के सम्बन्ध में कुछ न कह कर कुछ महापुरुषों की राय जान

के सामने पहुँचा। जिस से आप को मालूम होना कि जो केवल मुझे प्रोटेस्टेंट आपस हिंदी कहा जाता है, वह गलत है। हमारे बड़े बड़े महात्त नेता इस सम्बन्ध में क्या सोचते थे वह मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ। महत्त्वा नापी जी ने कहा था :—

"To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them. The foundation that Macaulay laid of education has enslaved us."

आने से कहते हैं :—

"Today English has become the means of inter-course among the educated classes with the result that the distance between the masses has considerably widened."

आने चल कर फिर नापी जी कहते हैं :—

"Today English has usurped the dearest place in our hearts and dethroned our mother-tongues. It is an unnatural place due to our unequal relation with Englishmen. The highest development of the Indian mind must be possible without a knowledge of English. It is doing violence to the manhood and specially the womanhood of India to encourage our boys and girls to think that an entry into the best society is impossible without a knowledge of English. It is too humiliating a thought to be bearable. To get rid of the infatuation for English is one of the essentials of Swaraj".

नापी जी ही आगे कहते हैं :—

"Our language is the reflection of ourselves and if you tell me that our languages are too poor to express the best thought, then I say that the sooner we are wiped out of existence, the better for us. Is there a man who dreams that English can even become the national language of India? Why this handicap on the nation? Just

consider for a moment. They (professors) assured me that every Indian youth, because he reached his knowledge through the English language, lost at least six precious years of life. Multiply that by the number of students turned out by our schools and colleges and find out for yourselves how many thousand years have been lost to us."

स्वर्गीय मौलाना अबुल कलाम खाजाद जोकि हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री थे उन्होंने ये कहा है :—

"Another great harm that accrued from it was that the development of our languages was impeded. If the Indian languages had been made the media of instruction a hundred and fifty years ago, they would have come in line with the progressive languages of the world."

अंग्रेजी भाषा लागू करने पर भी और विदेशी सरकार होने पर भी उस सरकार को अपनी बातें जनता तक पहुँचाने की फिक्र थी। सन १७७२ या ७३ में ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट ने रीगुलेशन ऐक्ट बना कर वहाँ के गवर्नर जनरल-इन-कौंसिल को नियम धारि बनाने का अधिकार दिया तो उन नियमों का अनुवाद भारतीय भाषाओं में होता था लेकिन आज उस की भी आवश्यकता नहीं रह गई। सन १८५५ में जब गवर्नर जनरल-इन-कौंसिल को ऐक्ट कानून बनाने का अधिकार दिया गया तो उन कानूनों का अनुवाद भी होता था लेकिन अब उस की भी आवश्यकता नहीं रही। आजकल के वैज्ञानिक युग में यह अंग्रेजी हमारे विज्ञान के देवबाणी माने जाने लगी है। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा पठित जवाहरलाल नेहरू से घोर मतभेद रहा है। मैं ने उस मतभेद को अनेक बार उन के सामने प्रकट भी किया है। अंग्रेजी की वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली को उसी रूप में हम ले नहीं सकते। यह प्रश्न २, ५, १०, २०, ५०, १०० या २०० शब्दों का नहीं है। यह प्रश्न है हज़ार

[सेंट थोमिन्स दास]

धीर लाखों शब्दों का धीर यदि हम अंग्रेजी की वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली को उसी प्रकार ले लें तो फिर हमारी भाषा वास्तव में भाषा नहीं रह जायगी ।

आप यह देखें कि दूसरे देशों ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या किया है । चीन, इंडोनेशिया, जापान और रूस ने अपनी भाषाओं में वैज्ञानिक शब्दावली बनाई है । जापान और रूस को तो हम पिछड़े देश नहीं कह सकते । राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कहा था वह मैं पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ और सात कर पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को इस कथन की याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ । गांधी जी ने कहा था —

"Russia has achieved all the scientific progress without English. It is our mental slavery that makes us feel that we cannot do without English. I can never subscribe to that defeatist creed."

आज अगर हमारे विज्ञान की भी जैसी होनी चाहिये वैसी उन्नति नहीं हो रही है, हमारे कलाकार नहीं बन रहे हैं और हमारे कारीगर तैयार नहीं हो रहे हैं तो इस का भी प्रधान कारण यह है कि उन को अपना ज्ञान एक वैदेशिक भाषा के द्वारा प्राप्त करना पड़ता है । यदि इस में परिवर्तन हो जाय तो मेरा विश्वास है कि इस विषय में भी हम बहुत आगे बढ़ेंगे और इन सम्बन्ध में भी हम गुलाम नहीं रहेंगे ।

एक और भ्रम की ओर मैं आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ । कहा जाता है कि पहले हमारी भाषाएँ तैयार हो जायें तब अंग्रेजी का वह स्थान ले लेंगी । यह कोई नई दलील नहीं है । माई मैकाले ने भी इस सम्बन्ध में कहा था —

"...the dialects commonly spoken among the natives of this

part of India contain neither literary nor scientific information and are moreover so poor and rude that, until they are enriched from some other quarter, it will not be easy to translate any valuable work into them."

जब १५० वर्ष के बीत जाने पर भी अभी तक हम उसी जगह हैं और अगर हम ने यह चीज रखी कि पहले हमारी तमाम भाषाएँ ठीक हो तब वे अंग्रेजी का स्थान लें तो यह काम तो होने वाला नहीं है । फिर अब तो प्रश्न अनुवाद का भी नहीं है । यदि भारतीय भाषाओं को अंग्रेजी का स्थान लेना है तो अनुवाद से काम नहीं चलेगा । कानूनों का ही दृष्टान्त ले लीजिये । जब तक कानून अधिनियम के रूप में हम निम्न निम्न भाषाओं में तैयार नहीं करते हैं तब तक अनुदित कानूनी अर्थात् ट्रान्सलेटेड नाउ से हमारी कचहरियों का काम नहीं चल सकता । यह सारे कानून हमारी १४ भाषाओं में होने चाहियें । १४ भाषाओं का नाम सुन कर कदाचित्त आप चबरा उठें लेकिन आप को मालूम होना चाहिये कि रूस में कानून अधिनियम के रूप में २२ भाषाओं में तैयार किये जाते हैं । वहाँ ३१ २२ भाषाओं में तैयार किये जाते हैं तो हम अपने देश में १४ भाषाओं में कानून बनायें, यह सर्वथा सम्भव है ।

इस अनुवाद के सम्बन्ध में मुझे लेक्सपियर के मिडलमर नाइट्स ड्रीम का एक पात्र याद आ जाता है मिस्टर बीटम । जब बीटम एक बार प्रतिबोध के लिये जमल में गया तब वहाँ का जो यूनानी देवता निम्क था उस ने उस के ऊपर सचें का सिर रख दिया । उसे देख कर उन के एक मित्र पिल्लामे "बीटम वाक घार्ट ट्रान्सलेटेड" । माई मैकाले ने इस कथन को याद कर होमर का जो एक अहा अनुवाद हुआ था उस का मजाक उड़ाते हुए कहा, "होमर, वाक घार्ट ट्रान्सलेटेड" ।

हम यही संक्षेप में कर रहे हैं। हर क्षेत्र में विशेष कर कानून के क्षेत्र में अनुवादों से काम कभी नहीं चल सकता।

यह कहा जाता है कि दक्षिण वाले अंग्रेजी ही रखना चाहते हैं बिल्कुल गलत है। शिक्षा के माध्यम के विषय में वहाँ क्या हो रहा है मैं अपने दक्षिण के भाइयों से पूछना चाहता हूँ। जो कुछ समय पूर्व मद्रास में इस सम्बन्ध में एक परिषद् राजा जी ने की थी उस के विरोध में दक्षिण में ही दो परिषदें हुईं एक कर्नाटक में जिस का कि उद्घाटन उस समय के मैसूर के मुख्य मंत्री श्री निजामिगप्पा ने किया और समापितत्व किया श्री दिवाकर ने। दूसरी घ्राघ्र में हुई जिस का कि उद्घाटन श्री कालेश्वर राव ने किया और समापितत्व किया श्री पट्टाभि सीतारमैया ने।

अंग्रेजी के इस देश में तीन बड़े समर्थक हैं एक राजा जी दूसरे मुनीति बाबू और तीसरे हमारे एन्यानी माहब। जहाँ तक राजाजी का सम्बन्ध है, राजाजी ने एक इन्डिपेंडेंट पार्टी, स्वतंत्र दल, बनाया है। राजाजी को यह माहम नहीं हुआ कि अखिल भारतीय स्तर पर उस स्वतंत्र दल के कार्यक्रम में अंग्रेजी को रखते। उन्हो ने अंग्रेजी को नहीं रखा।

एन्यनी साहब को प्राप लीजिये। उस दिन उन की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी कि वह लोक सभा में अपने प्रस्ताव पर मत ले लें। मैं ने तो उस समय धिक्का कर कहा था कि प्राप इस प्रस्ताव पर मत ले लीजिये।

Shri Sampath (Namakkal): May I request the hon. Member that, at least when he says something about the south, if he says it in English, we will be able to explain it later in our speeches.

Seth Govind Das: I am not giving way.

तो उस दिन एन्यनी माहब की अपने प्रस्ताव पर मत लेने की हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी। यदि उक्त प्रस्ताव पर मत लिये जाते तो उन को मान्य हो जाता कि उन को कितना समर्थन प्राप्त है।

जहाँ तक सुनीति बाबू का सम्बन्ध है मैं क्या कहूँ उन के विषय में। मुझे तो बड़ा दुःख होता है। कुछ दिन पहले उन्हो ने अपने एक भाषण में कहा था

“भाज समग्र भारत हिन्दी की ओर दृष्टि लगाये हुए है”

यह उन्हीं की भाषा है, उन की अंग्रेजी का अनुवाद भी नहीं है। यह उन्हीं की हिन्दी है जोकि मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ :

“देश की समग्र सन्तान की आकांक्षा है कि हमारी संस्कृति की अमरवाणी जिस देवभाषा में सुरक्षित है, उनी संस्कृत की छाया में बनी और देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी हिन्दी ही हिन्द की राष्ट्रभाषा हो।”

मुझे सुनीति बाबू को देख कर मेक्स-पियर के एक नाटक में हैमलेट का कथन याद आता है। हैमलेट ने अपनी माता को दो तम्बीरे दिखाई एक अपने पिता की और एक अपने बचा की ओर कहा

‘Look at this picture and that.’

मैं सुनीति बाबू को किमी हमरे की तस्वीर नहीं दिखाना चाहता। मैं उन को उन की पुरानी और भाज की तम्बीर ही दिखाना चाहता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ

यहाँ पर अग्र्यल जी नहीं है। उन्हो ने एक भाषण १२ फरवरी सन् १९५८ को दिया था जोकि हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में छपा है, उस में कहा था :

“Condemning Mr. Rajagopala-chari's agitation for retention of English as the official language of

[Seth Govind Das]

the Union, he warned the people that any support given to the elder statesman in this matter would only be aiding the distributionist forces in the country.

Asking for the retention of English was worse than calling back the British to rule the country. He suspected the hand of some foreign agencies in creating such troubles including the demand for a separate Tamil Nad. He said there were many politicians elsewhere in the world who were jealous of India's rapid progress."

तो मैं ने दक्षिण के श्री पट्टाभि सीतारमैया श्री दिवाकर, श्री निर्जलिगप्पा और श्री कालेश्वर राव के सम्बन्ध में बतलाया और अनन्तशयनम अय्यंगार जी का भाषण भी आप के सामने उपस्थित किया जोकि हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में छपा था ।

(इस अत्रसर पर उपाध्यक्ष महोदय ने घंटो बजायो)

मैं तीन चार मिनट और चाहता हूँ ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं समझता था कि स्पीकर साहब का हुवाला देने के बाद आप और कुछ नहीं कहेंगे ।

सठ गोविन्द दास : जहाँ तक पुरुषोत्तम दास जी टंडन और मेरे समिति की रिपोर्ट पर नोट का सम्बन्ध है, वह कोई नोट आफ डिस्टेंस नहीं था । हम ने कुछ सुझाव दिये हैं और यह सर्वथा अंग्रेज़ों को हटाने के सुझाव भी नहीं हैं । हम ने यही कहा है कि अंग्रेज़ी के साथ-साथ हिन्दी को भी चलाने का प्रयत्न किया जाय । हाँ, हम ने कुछ जगहों के लिये अवश्य कहा है कि वहाँ अंग्रेज़ी की आवश्यकता नहीं है वहाँ हिन्दी होनी चाहिये । उस नोट में हम ने सरकारी नौकरियों के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा है :

"If English is retained for the present as a medium for the

higher competitive examinations, it would be only an act of bare justice that the alternative of the Hindi medium should be permitted to those students who desire it."

आप देखें कि इस वक्त कितने विश्वविद्यालयों ने हिन्दी का माध्यम स्वीकार कर लिया है । ऐसी अवस्था में अगर सरकारी नौकरियों के लिये उम्मीदवार अंग्रेज़ी में ही बैठ सकेंगे तो उन विश्वविद्यालयों के छात्रों के साथ कितना बड़ा अन्याय होगा । यदि आप अंग्रेज़ी को रखना ही चाहते हैं तो उन को हिन्दी में भी परीक्षा देने की सुविधा देनी चाहिये । हम ने समिति के सामने भी यही कहा था और आप से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी नौकरी के लिये परीक्षाओं में यदि केवल अंग्रेज़ी को ही रखा गया तो इन विद्यार्थियों के साथ बड़े से बड़ा अन्याय होगा ।

हम ने एक बात और कही है कि सरकार को इन सारे कामों की कम से कम कोई योजना तो बनानी चाहिये । कमीशन को भी इस बात की शिकायत थी, समिति को भी इस बात की शिकायत थी कि हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं को किस प्रकार आगे बढ़ाया जायेगा उस की कोई योजना सरकार ने उन के सामने नहीं रखी है । और जहाँ तक बिना योजना बनाये काम करने का सम्बन्ध है, आप सन् १९५८ के सरकारी कामों को देखें । सरकार ने भारतीय भाषाओं के लिये जो किया है उस की तुलना अंग्रेज़ी के काम से कीजिये । सरकार ने सन् १९५८ में २१२ पुस्तकें और पुस्तिकायें प्रकाशित की जिन में से ७८ अंग्रेज़ी में, बीस हिन्दी में और शेष ११ भारतीय भाषाओं में ग्यारह ग्यारह । जो अंग्रेज़ी के प्रकाशन पर व्यय होता है उस का ५ प्रतिशत भी भारतीय भाषाओं के लिये नहीं होता । यह हाल है सरकार के पब्लिसिटी विभाग का जिस का काम प्रचार करना है । आप जानते हैं कि

एक देश की किसनी जनता संश्लेषी जानती है। देशी संकेत किर्तन विधीकरण का सम्बन्ध है समाचार और सूचना विधियों को छोड़ कर बहुत छोड़े परलक्षित भारतीय भाषाओं में बनाये जाते हैं। अतः जहाँ तक हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं का सम्बन्ध है सरकार को एक निश्चित योजना बनानी चाहिये और उस के अनुसार काम करना चाहिये।

अब मैं यूनिवर्सिटी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट से भी कुछ उद्धरण आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस कर्मागन के अध्यक्ष भी एक शक्तिशाल्य श्री राजा कृष्णन् थे और यह सर्वसम्मत रिपोर्ट है जिस में अध्यक्ष की समीति भी शामिल है। इस में कहा गया है

"English cannot continue to occupy the place of State language as in the past. The use of English as such divides the people into two nations, the few who govern and the many who are governed, the one unable to talk the language of the other, and mutually uncomprehending. This is a negation of democracy."

आगे इसी रिपोर्ट में कहा है

"We have paid a heavy price for learning through English in the past. Instead of laying stress upon thinking and reasoning, we emphasised memorising; in place of acquiring knowledge of things and realities, we acquired a sort of mastery over words. It affected originality of thought and development of literature in the mother tongue. We have impoverished ourselves without being able to enrich the language which we so assiduously studied. The paucity of great literature which is the inevitable consequence of devotion by the educated to a language other than

their own in a double loss—intellectual and social,—for great literature is a powerful factor in fostering culture, refinement and true fellowship. Whatever the advantages of English and the immediate risks in a change-over to the new, the balance of advantage on a long view of the matter lies in the change".

श्रीर, उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। इसी आपने सुना होगा कि कानपुर में एक आन्दोलन आरम्भ हुआ जिसे अंग्रेजी हटाओ आन्दोलन कहा जाता है। मैंने स्वयं डा० लोहिया के निमन्त्रण पर अनेक आन्दोलन का उद्घाटन किया। कुछ लोगों ने मुझ से कहा कि डा० लोहिया का और आपका एक मंच पर साथ कैसे हुआ। आपको याद होगा कि मैं यह अनेक बार कह चुका हूँ कि कुछ ऐसे विषय हैं जिनमें हमें मिल कर काम करना चाहिये चाहे उसमें हमें साम्यवादियों का साथ करना पड़े, समाजवादियों का साथ करना पड़े, प्रजा समाजवादियों का साथ करना पड़े, राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक सच का या जनसच का साथ करना पड़े। मैंने कई बार कहा है कि जहाँ तक हमारे विकास के कामों का सम्बन्ध है सब दलों को सरकार में मिल कर काम करना चाहिये। इसी प्रकार जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी को हटाने का सम्बन्ध है उनमें साम्यवादी, समाजवादी, हिन्दू समाजवाले कोई भी दल हो मैं सब के साथ हूँ। यह इन विषयों में कि अंग्रेजी रखने के आन्दोलन को मैं एक राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन मानता हूँ। और अंग्रेजी हटाने के आन्दोलन को मैं एक राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन मानता हूँ और मैं मानता हूँ कि इस काम में सब को एक हो कर काम करना चाहिये।

अन्त में.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: अन्त तो हो चुका।

लेट बोल्डिंग बाक . अन्त में मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के हाल ही के भाषण के कुछ शब्दों को

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

पढ़ कर इस लिये सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी के हाथ में यह काम है और मुझे धारा है कि वह अपने भाषण के अनुसार ही काम करेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को कुछ स्थान रखना चाहिये कि मैं चार बार घंटी बजा चुका हूँ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष जी, आप चार बार घंटी बजा चुके हैं, मुझे इस का बहुत अफसोस है, लेकिन मैंने आपसे कहा है कि यह अन्तिम बात कह कर मैं अभी बैठ जाता हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा कि "स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के फलस्वरूप देश में आए महान् परिवर्तन के बाद अब अंग्रेजी को अधिक समय तक उसके वर्तमान स्थान पर बनाए रखना असम्भव है।" उन्होंने कहा कि वे धारा करते हैं कि देश का तमाम प्रशासनिक कार्य जल्दी ही भारतीय भाषाओं में होने लग जायगा। "प्रशासनिक कार्य के लिये कोई भी स्वतन्त्र देश एक विदेशी भाषा पर निर्भर नहीं रह सकता।" उन्होंने आगे कहा कि "जनता के कल्याण तथा शिक्षा के प्रसार के लिये यह जरूरी है कि हम अपनी भारतीय भाषाओं का विकास करें। यदि हम जनता तक पहुंचना चाहते हैं, तो हमें क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं का ही सहारा लेना होगा। अंग्रेजी द्वारा जनसाधारण तक नहीं पहुंचा जा सकता। भारतीय भाषाओं को हम इनका विकसित बनाएं कि उन के द्वारा ज्ञान-विज्ञान की सभी शाखाओं का अध्ययन किया जा सके।"

उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपको बन्ध्याबाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे इतना अधिक समय दिया है, लेकिन, जैसा कि मैंने आपसे निवेदन किया है, यह एक ऐसा विषय है, जिसका मेरे जीवन से बहुत बड़ा सम्बन्ध रहा है और इसलिये आज के स्वर्णवसर पर, मैंने आपके सामने इतना ज्यादा भाषण दिया।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before I call upon the next speaker, I think I might make it clear that there must be a time-limit, of 15—20 minutes.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Yes, Sir, 15 minutes only and that should be strictly enforced.

Dr. Krishnaswami: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In the normal course, 15 minutes would suffice. I would request hon. Members to see that when the bell is rung, they take note of it.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): How can they when you allow them to go on?

Dr. Krishnaswami: Mr Deputy-Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. the Home Minister is not here. He made an appeal today that we should not import passion into this debate. I, Sir, am not going to import any passion into this debate, though the temptation to do so is very great.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur): What about following your father?

Dr. Krishnaswami: I should like to point out to my hon. friend the Home Minister that while the Official Language Committee Report might have been an improvement on the report of the Official Language Commission, there are many things which have been left unsaid which ought to have been said.

Acharya Kripalani: Purposely.

Dr. Krishnaswami: I do not wish to go into the motives but I wish the Acharya to bear with me when I say that the very fact that in their report they have made so many recommendations shows the disadvantages of a leap in the dark. However, certain events have occurred; events of very great importance, since the Official Language Committee Report was placed on the Table of the House.

The Prime Minister in a great speech delivered by a great Indian—and I wish his example could be emulated by other members on the Treasury Benches—made a statement of

policy, according to some of us. But, from what has transpired this morning, it appears that it is not so much an expression of policy as a pious expression of hope. I want to know definitely and authoritatively what the Government is going to do in this matter. (*Interruption*). But, before I deal with those points I should like to examine some of the recommendations of the Official Language Committee and go into the official language question at some length.

Acharya Kripalani: Do not take them seriously.

Dr. Krishnaswami: What is it that we want to achieve? Unfortunately, I cannot take a lackadaisical view of life as my hon. friend, the Acharya does occasionally. But I want to point out that the main thing that we have to concentrate on is the recommendations of the Official Language Committee. Having given up 1965 as the target date, it is wrong and unwise to call Hindi the true official language, for it is in essence to beg the whole question.

We have moved a great deal from the position that we took up at the time of framing the Constitution. There is a greater recognition now of the importance of English in our national life and our attitude to the question has become more objective. (*Interruptions*).

What is it that we want the official language to perform? As far as Government, probably at State and certainly at local levels are concerned, clearly the official language will be the regional languages in the near future. This would mean that in a few States Hindi and in others Bengali, Tamil or Telugu or any one of the 14 languages will be the official language. The only problem—and it is a major problem—would be one of ensuring a fair deal to the linguistic minorities. About the general principle that there is advantage in using the regional language as the language

of administration at the local level there can, probably, be no dispute.

But, as regards the language of the Union, the question basically is this: Which language is most likely to serve the country's best interests? Surely, in order to settle this, we have first to be clear as to what functions we want the official language to perform. Firstly, the language of the Union must be one which is understood widely by the people throughout all the linguistic areas. Secondly, it must have the requisite range and maturity to operate as a vehicle of expression with precision and clarity. Thirdly, there should be the possibility of the language either absorbing trends of thought from abroad or of opening the window on the outside world.

By these tests, according to my hon. friends from the Hindi side, Hindi qualifies to be the official language. It is widely understood. It can be enriched by drawing from different languages, and it has a sentimental value in the context of the past. But, on the other hand, let us clearly realise that it will take considerable time and effort before Hindi can absorb on a continuing basis the flow of knowledge from the rest of the world. Moreover, there is no use disguising the fact that it is as much a foreign language as any other to vast sections of the people in different areas of our country. The case for continuing English rests basically on the ground that it is an important world language, that, whether one likes it or not, it is in effect the *lingua franca* of the educated classes today and that it is eminently suited to open up wide vistas.

An Hon. Member: What is their number?

Dr. Krishnaswami: If my hon. friend interrupts me and if the Chair will give me time I am willing to give it.

16 hrs.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): What is the number of those who speak English?

Dr. Krishnaswami: I am coming to that. It is eminently suited to open up wide vistas of thought all the world over. It can be argued that the persons knowing English today are relatively fewer compared to the population. It is true . . .

Shri Shree Narayan Das: What is their number?

Dr. Krishnaswami: Their number? What is the number of people who know Hindi?

But this is by no means conclusive as an argument against the continuance of English. Surely, by the same token, few people know to read and write their mother tongue and even fewer know Hindi as an additional language. Today, the debate over the official language seems to be conducted in a vacuum because the choice is not now between English and any other language. For a substantial proportion of our population, we have not succeeded even in teaching their mother tongue. To be sure, reference is made to the constitutional provisions on the official language. My hon. friend, the Home Minister referred to articles 343 and 344 and the other provisions relating to the official language. This, he lugubriously terms as a constitutional settlement. May I remind him—he is undoubtedly one of those who has a keen insight into the knowledge of the provisions of the Constitution—that there are other provisions which are equally, if not more, important provisions relating to the official language. According to article 45 which is one of the Directive Principles, it is pointed out:

"The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years"

Now, this is undoubtedly a provision to be found in the Directive Principles and it may not, therefore, be on the same footing as article 343 which lays

down the official language of the Union. But article 45 is the most specifically-worded of all the articles in the Directive Principles. This is as it should be since no democracy can afford to thrive on ignorance. And yet on a vital issue like the language of the Indian Union, some are impressed with the sanctity of article 343 without caring for the essence of article 45. In a sense, article 343 and especially the qualifications, can have significance only after we have given effect to article 45. The Prime Minister, aware of these difficulties, suggested the continuation of English for an indefinite period. He also suggested that the people of non-Hindi speaking areas should have the ultimate voice in determining whether and on what pace should Hindi replace English.

Acharya Kripalani: When he has decided the question, why are you wasting your breath?

Dr. Krishnaswami: If I could be sure that it was a decision of the Government then, I need not waste my breath. But I do not know whether it is a statement of policy or an expression of hope. That is why I have to waste my breath. Those who are most affected by the decision must have a dominant voice, if not the sole voice, in the making of the decision.

Let us realise that this idea of the non-Hindi speaking peoples having a dominant or a sole voice in the choice of the method to be achieved for replacing one language by the other is not something which is so fanciful. Even after centuries of integration with the United Kingdom, the Scottish Members continue to have the final word on Scottish affairs. There is such a thing as the Scottish night in the House of Commons where the Scottish members meet in a conclave to discuss affairs pertaining to education, to local self-government and to certain other matters. It is said that this has promoted greater emotional integration between Scotland and the United Kingdom. It is a valuable convention which we might do well to adopt and

therefore, I think that this is a convention which we ought to adopt. Indeed, had I been fortunate to have my amendment moved, probably this point of view would have been presented more prominently to the attention of the House. But I would like to say that even for us, people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas, the choice as to whether we should decide between Hindi and English or any other language has necessarily to be dependent on the satisfaction of certain essential conditions. Firstly, we have to realise that education up to the age of 14 must be universal. It is only then that the citizens would know what choice they are making. It is an undemocratic decision to merely suggest that we shall make a choice taking advantage of the illiteracy of the vast majority of millions of our countrymen. It is only after this process of education up to the age of 14 has been achieved after some years that the large masses of our people will be in a position to express themselves rationally and meaningfully on the change-over to a new language. Any attempt to hustle a decision earlier can only mean that the decision will be based not on an assessment of merits but on passion, pride and mere majority. I would only ask my friends who have given thought to this question to consider carefully what the implications of this haste would be.

I have very few objections to advance against some of the recommendations in detail made by the Official Language Committee. But the basic approach is something which is far removed from reality. They were over-weighted by the fact that there was a Constitution. Some of our old zamindars in the past were over-weighted by the fact that they had ~~sanads~~ from the previous rulers. But the Constitution is intended for India and not India for the Constitution. If the Constitution does not serve our purpose, let it be amended. Let us have the courage to say that we will amend it. And if we do not want

to have amendments of that type, let us have fresh conventions, conventions where representatives of the non-Hindi-speaking areas will have the dominant if not the sole voice of determining how, when and by what methods there should be a change-over to another language.

It is clear, according to all who have given thought to this language question, that in the coming years we are bound to have greater improvements effected in the realm of industry and science and that for the purpose of effecting such improvements we necessarily must have a modern language. It is also clear that the regional languages will play a very great part. I, therefore, feel that when we think of a switch over from one language to the other, to an Indian language, we ought to educate our people, we ought to give them a chance to make their choice and not rush through these things.

It is true that a committee has recommended that even those who come from non-Hindi-speaking States should have knowledge of a language from the non-Hindi-speaking State. But then, like all workable compromises, this may not work effectively. In fact, the Home Minister has in a very quiet manner, the quiet manner with which he familiarises this house whenever he wishes to make an important change, suggested that they were going to constitute a committee to enquire into this particular recommendation. No compromise which is based merely on politics will ever survive. What we did in the Constitution was to say that we should have an official language. That is all that we can accept. The various qualifications that have been put in the constitution, the various steps that have been taken there, have to be reviewed from time to time. And, certainly, in this matter as to whether we should switch over from one language to the other, it should

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

be taken only after consideration by the non-Hindi-speaking members and only after some of the pre-requisites that we have suggested are fulfilled. Indeed, it is odd that we should work ourselves into a passion over the official language when we have done nothing in the least to really or appreciably remove the load of illiteracy in our country. Even according to the present statistics supplied by the Education Minister by 1965 we would have only about 32 per cent of the people who will have education up to the age of 14. Can we not afford to wait a little before we think of deciding upon a new language? Can we not be democratic, because ultimately it is the people that must decide? And the people cannot decide unless they are in a position to make a choice? Can we not be a bit more democratic and have a proper decision?

While I agree that the members of the Committee were eminent men with saturnine wisdom, I venture to think that some of these points have been overlooked. I would request the Home Minister to re-think over this matter. The Home Minister has been saying that he is very friendly to us—the people of the non-Hindi-speaking States. But may I remind him, in the words of Goldsmith “Handsome is that handsome does”? That has not been done to us until now.

श्री सरजू पांडे (रसड़ा) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री जीने बहुत गौरव से हिन्दी के सबसे बड़े समर्थक गोविन्द दास जी की बातें सुनीं। वह हमारे देश का सबसे बड़ा दुर्भाग्य है कि बारह वर्ष की स्वतन्त्रता के बाद भी हम इस काबिल नहीं बन सके कि हम अपनी भाषा में अपनी बातों को इस सदन में कह सकें। हमारे लिए यह सबसे बड़ी शर्मनाक बात है। मैं नहीं जानता कि कोई ऐसा देश भी आज दुनिया में है, जहाँ के निवासी अपनी भाषा में बात न कर के किसी विदेशी भाषा में बात करते हैं। यह एक माना हुआ सिद्धान्त है कि अगर किसी कोय को गुलाम बनाना होता है, तो

पक्ष से पहले उस की भाषा और सस्कृति पर हमला किया जाता है। अंग्रेज जाति ने हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम बनाने में इस भाषा से बहुत काम लिया। इस भाषा ने देश का बहुत उपकार किया है, यह भी मैं मानता हूँ, लेकिन उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तानियों को सिर्फ इसलिये धेदला कि वे उन को अपनी सस्कृति और श्रेष्ठता में ज्यादा से ज्यादा ढाल सकें और उनका काम बना रहे।

हमारे देश में बहुत मारे लोग कहते हैं कि हिन्दी लादी जा रही है। मैं इस बात को तैयार नहीं मानता हूँ। अगर मैं दक्षिण, मद्रास या तमिल प्रदेश के लोग हूँ, जहाँ हिन्दी नहीं बोली जाती है, तो बहा भी तो मैंने पचास हिन्दी के समर्थक हूँ। मैं यह निबंदन करना चाहता हूँ कि थोड़े से आदमी पालिसी नहीं बना सकते हैं—पूरा मुक्त ही पालिसी बनाता है। जिन जगहों से हिन्दी का विरोध हो रहा है, बहा भी अधिकतर जनता का बहुमत हिन्दी के पक्ष में है लेकिन थोड़े से आदमी यहाँ आकर डर दिखाते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान की अस्थिरता की बात करते हैं। इस लिये हमारे नेता भी डरते हैं और समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई अगड़ा न हो जाये। यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि तमाम समाजवादी लोगों ने भाषा के सवाल को हल किया है। जब कोई देश स्वतन्त्र होता है, तो जातिभेद और पर उममें भाषा का प्रश्न उठता है। यहाँ भी भाषा का प्रश्न उठना कोई नई बात नहीं है। मैं उन लोगों से कहना हूँ कि वे अंग्रेजी छोड़ कर चाहे अपनी रीजनल लैंग्वेज में बात करें, अपनी उबान में बात कर, लेकिन पूरे देश पर एक ऐसी उबान न थोपे रखें, जिस को बहुत थोड़े लोग समझते हैं। मुझे तो कभी किसी यह देख कर लज्जा होती है कि बाहर के लोग यहाँ आकर बैठते हैं और देखते हैं कि किस तरह की अंग्रेजी इस सदन में बोली जाती है—बगला मिली हुई, मद्रासी मिली हुई, बिहारी मिली हुई अंग्रेजी बोली जाती है, एक ऐसी अंग्रेजी बोली जाती

है, जो अंग्रेजी ही नहीं, लेकिन वे लोग बड़ा और भारते हैं कि अंग्रेजी जरूर होनी चाहिये। मैं उन भाइयों के कहना चाहता हू कि इसमें खिद की बात नहीं है। हम सब को इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि अंग्रेजी सत्य हो और उम के स्थान पर हिन्दुस्तान में एक जवान रली जाये और वह जवान हिन्दी ही हो सकती है। मैं तो कहता हू कि कोई जवान अपना लीजिये। अगर बगला में मुहब्बत है, तो बगला ही बोलिये। लेकिन मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कुछ लोग बड़े जोर से हल्ला मचाते हैं कि अंग्रेजी में बोलेंगे अंग्रेजी बली जायगी, तो साइन्स बली जायगी। जैसे याद आता है कि जब मैं कायेम में काम करता था, तो हमारे यहाँ एक बड़े धादमी थे, जो कि कहते थे कि स्वराज्य तो अचक्रो बात है, लेकिन अगर अंग्रेज चला जायगा, तो रेलगाड़ी चली जायेगी। उन को इस बात का डर था। इसी तरह धाज हमारे भाई इस बात का डर दिखाते हैं कि अगर अंग्रेजी चली जायगी, तो साइन्स चली जायगी, हमारी सम्पत्ता चली जायगी। मैं यह कहना चाहता हू कि अगर चली जायगी तो मुल्क की नहीं चली जायगी, वह नीकरशाही की चली जायगी, उन थोड़े स लोगों की चली जायगी, जो कि अंग्रेजी को लेकर मुल्क पर शासन करने की इच्छा रखते हैं। मैं चाहता हू कि हिम्मत और साहस के साथ सरकार को हिन्दी को लेकर धागे धाना चाहिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : सरकार में हिम्मत नहीं है।

श्री सरजू धाण्डे : अगर उम में ऐसी हिम्मत नहीं है, तो मैं कहना हू कि उम को नाजिमी तौर पर कोई और तरीका अपनाना चाहिये।

मैं लैम्बेच कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के बहुत से हिस्सों से सहमत हूँ, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि वह रिपोर्ट कोल्ड-स्टोरेज की चीज होगी। जैसे विश्वास नहीं है कि उसकी रिपोर्टमेंडेन्स

पर धमल किया जायगा। जिनकी श्री रिपोर्टमेंडेन्स इस कमीशन में की हैं, वे बहुत अच्छी हैं, लेकिन अगर उन पर धमल किया जायगा, तो बहुत अच्छा होगा। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि बहुत सारी रिपोर्टें इस सदन में आती हैं और फिर रख दी जाती हैं और उन पर कभी धमल नहीं होता है। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है कि जिस देश में मुज्जिल ने दो फीसदी लोग अंग्रेजी बोलते हो, बहा लोगों को अंग्रेजी बनाए रखने की परेशानी हो। अगर सरकार चाहती है कि देश का बहुमत राज-काज के कामों में हिस्सा ले, हमारे तमाम कायदे-कानूनों को जाने और हमारा बड़े में बड़ा भाग लोक मया के कामों में भाग ले सके, तो हम को नाजिमी तौर पर हिन्दी अपनानी पड़ेगी और अंग्रेजी को जाने देना पड़ेगा। मैं अंग्रेजी में लिपिके रहने का कोई कारण नहीं देखता हूँ। अंग्रेजी के पक्ष में लिफें यही कारण दिया जाता है कि कहीं थोड़ा सा विरोध हो रहा है और यह कहा जाता है कि हमारे यहाँ माइंस नहीं हैं और अंग्रेजी के द्वारा उमका ज्ञान प्राप्त किया जा सकता है। हम कहते हैं कि इस बारे में कोई भी तरीका अपनाया जाये लेकिन अंग्रेजी को छोड़ देना चाहिये। पिछले दिनों मैंने हिन्दी के कठिन शब्दों के बारे में कहा था। मैं इसके पक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि कठिन शब्द हिन्दी में लाए जाये और उम को इस विस्म की हिन्दी बना दी जाये, जिस को बहुत से लोगों को समझने में कठिनाई है। ऐसी हिन्दी का मैं मुखालिफ हूँ। हिन्दी-भाषी कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं, जो जान-बूझ कर ऐसी हिन्दी का प्रयोग करते हैं, जिसमें काफी लोगों को बिड हाती है और लोगों को उमकी मुखालिफन करने का मौका मिलता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी हिन्दी का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिये। अभी सेठ जी ने कहा कि अगर अंग्रेजी तथा दूसरी भाषाओं के शब्द हिन्दी में लिये जायें तो हिन्दी खराब हो जायगी। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि अंग्रेजी और दूसरी भाषाओं के सारे के सारे शब्द, जो कि हिन्दी में नहीं हैं,

[श्री सरजू पाण्डे]

ज्यों के त्यों हिन्दी में रख दिये जायें। लेकिन मैं इस स्थान का उद्धार हूँ कि जो शब्द हिन्दी में अपनाए जा सकते हैं, उन को अग्रर ले लिया जाये, तो कोई ऐतराज की बात नहीं खेनी चाहिये। लेकिन कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं, जो कि ऐसी हिन्दी बनाने के फेर में हैं, जिसको वह खुद ही समझते हैं, दूसरे नहीं समझते हैं। कई स्टेशनों पर हम ऐसे शब्दों को देखते हैं, जो कि समझ में नहीं आते हैं। कानून की जो किताबें लिखी जाती हैं हिन्दी में, या जो हिन्दी में हमारी पार्लियामेंट की प्रोसीडिङ्ग छपती है, मैं नहीं समझ पाता कि उनमें क्या लिखा है, हालांकि मैं हिन्दी जानता हूँ। बड़ी मुश्किल पड़ती है। मैं ऐसी हिन्दी का पक्षपाती नहीं हूँ और न ही मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि मारी की सारी हिन्दी का बाघफाट किया जाये। इसलिये उद्धार इस बात की है कि जो सभी भाषाओं के शब्द हिन्दुस्तानी में अज चुके हैं, जिन को आसानी से अपनाया जा सकता है, उन को ले लेना चाहिये। ऐसे शब्द नहीं गढ़े जाने चाहियें, जो कि स्वाम्ब्याह सस्कृत के हो, या जिन को लोग समझ न सकें। इस तरह शब्दों की परेशानी में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये।

पिछले दिनों मैं मायावरम् गया हुआ था। वहाँ पर मैंने देखा कि जनता में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं थी कि वह हिन्दी की मुखात्मिक हो, लेकिन यह बात उद्धार थी कि हिन्दी समर्थकों के कार्यों की वजह से लोगों में बोझा भा विरोध है। इसलिये मैं चाहता कि हिन्दी बाली को भी अपना व्यवहार बदलना चाहिये और साथ ही साथ उन लोगों को भी अपना व्यवहार बदलना चाहिये, जो वह कहते हैं कि हिन्दी लादी जा रही है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अग्रर हिन्दी लादी जानी होती, तो इन बारह बरसों में बाढ़ ही गई होती। जब अंग्रेजों ने वहाँ अंग्रेजी लादी थी, तो क्या उन्होंने लोगों से पूछा था कि हम अंग्रेजी लाद रहे हैं, आप क्या कहते हैं ?

उन्होंने देखा पर अंग्रेजी को लावा और लोग फटाफट अंग्रेजी पढ़ते, बोलते और पसलूम पढ़नते रहे। जब अंग्रेजी लादी गई, तो क्या हमारी संस्कृति और सभ्यता बली गई ? कहाँ गई ? आज हिन्दी लादी नहीं जा रही है—कहा जा रहा है कि हिन्दी पढ़िए। इसलिये यह कहना कि सारा मूलक हिन्दी की मुखात्मिकता करता है, कतई तौर पर गलत है। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, थोड़े में लोग हिन्दी का विरोध कर रहे हैं।

इस कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्टें भेजनी दी हैं, उन पर प्रमल किया जाये। पिछले दिनों प्रहित जवाहरनान नेहरू ने कहा कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी कान्टीन्यू करती रहें। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर यह सरकार भी मी बरस तक रहेगी, तो मी बरस तक अंग्रेजी भी रहेगी। प्रह कोई छिपाने की बात नहीं है। यह तो सरकार के व्यवहार से ही मान्य होगा है। कुछ लोगों को अंग्रेजी बोलने में शान मालूम होनी है। मैं कहना हूँ कि हिन्दी के विषय में लोगों को जाग्रत करना चाहिये और साथ ही साथ उन इलाकों में जहाँ हिन्दी के प्रति विरोध है, हिन्दी जानने वालों और हिन्दी में काम करने वालों के लिये अधिक में अधिक प्रोत्साहन देने की बात करनी चाहिये। कमीशन ने जो रिपोर्टें भेजनी की हैं, उनमें यह तो कहा गया है कि जो हिन्दी पढ़ना चाहें उनको मौका दिया जाए मगर हिन्दी पढ़ने वालों के लिये कोई खास प्रोत्साहन देने की रिपोर्टें भेजना इस कमीशन ने नहीं की है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग हिन्दी पढ़ना चाहते हैं उनको इसके लिये खास तौर पर मुविषाओं प्रदान की जायें ताकि वे हिन्दी पढ़ सकें।

मैं आपका बहुत अधिक समय लेना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा जो रवैया यह बदला जाना चाहिये, यह जाना चाहिये। अभी सेठ मोविन्द दास की मैंने कहा कि कल के अन्दर २४-२५ अक्षरों में

द्रोसनेशन होता है। इसी तरह से दूसरे मुल्को में २०० जवानों के अन्दर काम किये जाते हैं राजकाज के। मगर हमारे यहां सैकड़ों रुपया, कितना ही रुपया फिजूल के कामों पर खर्च किया जाता है, बड़ी बड़ी ऐश व आराम की चीजों पर खर्च किया जाता है, मगर इस काम पर खर्च नहीं किया जाता है। इसी मदन के अन्दर कितने ही माननीय सदस्य हैं जो कि नेल्सू, तामिल, बंगला इत्यादि भाषायें ही जानते हैं। केवल मराठी जानने वाले भी हैं जो कि पूरे पाच साल गुजर जायेंगे लेकिन जानेंगे नहीं कि इस मदन में क्या हो रहा है और वह इसलिये कि वे न तो हिन्दी जानते हैं और न ही अंग्रेजी। उनके लिये मुश्किल है। अगर सरकार सब चीजों का मभी भाषाभाषा में अनुवाद करने की व्यवस्था कर दे तो मैं समझना हूँ यह अच्छा होगा। जहा गवर्नमट और कामा पर इतना रुपया खर्च कर रही है वहा हम चीज पर भी खर्च कर सकनी हैं और हममें कोई विज्ञाप कठिनाई नहीं जानी चाहिये। हममें माननीय सदस्य जान सकेंगे कि मदन में क्या हो रहा है।

हमनिचे में चाहता हूँ कि जा रिकामेंडे- गन्म इसके अन्दर है उन में मैं बहुत सी प्रच्छ्नी है और मैं उनको उदधून नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार उनका धमन में साथे और साथ ही साथ स्पेशल तौर पर या तो एक मिनिस्ट्री इसके लिये बनाये या स्वयं सरकार इसके लिये कोई कमेटी नियुक्त करे जा हिन्दी का प्रचार इत्यादि कार्य करे। इस काम के लिये अभी तक बहुत ही कम पैसे खर्च किये जाते रहे हैं और इतने बड़ी मुश्किल का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। इस मदन के अन्दर भी हिन्दी का काम बहुत कम किया जाता है। लोगों के अन्दर प्रचार करने की आज आवश्यकता है और अधिक पैसा खर्च करने की आवश्यकता है। किसी के दिल में यह भावना भी नहीं आनी चाहिये कि हिन्दी वाले हमारे ऊपर ज्यादाती करेंगे या हिन्दी

वालों को तरक्की मिल जायेंगी। उनको इसके लिये एम्प्लॉयमेंट देने की भी आवश्यकता है ताकि वे सैटिसफाई हो सकें। वे चाहे सैटिसफाई हो या न हो मगर हमारा काम उनको पूरी तरह से सैटिसफाई करने का होना चाहिये, उनको पूरे तौर पर विश्वास दिलाना चाहिये। उनको विश्वास दिलाया जाना चाहिये कि न उन के साथ नौकरियों के मामले में कोई ज्यादाती होगी और न ही किसी दूसरे तरीके से ज्यादाती होगी। इसके बारे में पूरे तौर से राज्य की ओर से उनको गारंटी दी जानी चाहिये। देश की तरक्की हो सके, और अधिक जनता राजकाज के कामों में भाग ले सके, विकास के कामों में में भाग ले सके, इसके लिये यह जरूरी है कि हिन्दी को अधिक से अधिक प्रोत्साहन दिया जाए। बस इतना ही मैं निवेदन करना चाहता था।

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad) Sir the Parliamentary Com- mitter on official language has spent some anxious moments and the sug- gestions made by the Committee are now before this Sabha for discussion. The delay that has occurred is under- standable in view of the great emo- tions that this matter had roused in the country and also in the minds of people who were going to be affected by any decision or suggestion made. Therefore it was felt necessary by the hon. Members that the matter should be considered dispassionately in all its bearings and with the best of intentions to serve the interests its bearings of this great democracy. Therefore when the Report of the Official Language Commission and its recommendations were being consider- ed the members of the Committee were quite conscious of their own res- ponsibility. We knew that there was great opposition in the country and the opposition came from very big personalities, whose views could not be summarily brushed aside. They carried their own way. The sincerity of those persons could not be question- ed and therefore we had to give due weight to what they said and felt.

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

Therefore, the Committee tried to bring about the greatest maximum unanimity in its suggestions or decisions and to see that a swing forward was given to this most vital question of official language in this country

At times, there were deadlocks. Sometimes we felt that no progress was possible. We adjourned, and adjourned and adjourned the meetings till we came to certain conclusions which carried the maximum weight with the members of the Committee. The part played by the Chairman, his indefatigable energy, patience, sweet reasonableness and the persuasive manner in which he conducted the deliberations, was great and the Committee would not have arrived at these conclusions but for these qualities of the Chairman.

The main recommendation of the Committee is that till 1965, English shall continue to be the principal official language of the Union and after 1965, Hindi shall be the principal official language and English shall be the subsidiary official language for such purposes to be specified by Parliament by Law in due course and for as long as may be necessary. The Official Language Commission had not given any fixity to the matter. There was great discussion in the Committee itself whether any deadline so far as the period was concerned, should be set. The Committee was against any deadline, because, basically, our approach was that there should be no feeling of imposition on the part of the non-Hindi speaking sections of the country. We felt that the matter should be considered in regard to the difficulties which the non-Hindi speaking sections experienced and so there should be no imposition. At the same time, we felt that there should be fixity that ambiguity should end and uncertainty should go, and that there should be a firm decision in regard to one issue that, henceforth, so far as this country was concerned, English shall not have that place which it has enjoyed so far and in the deliberations of this great republic, it

would be any of the indigenous languages that shall be the official language of India.

That being so, and Hindi being the most suited language, it was considered necessary that Hindi should have the place of the main official language in the year 1965, with option and freedom to such people and areas who considered Hindi not feasible in the near future for their practice, to use English so long as they felt it necessary. That freedom is given to non-Hindi speaking areas. We were anxious and I know every Member of the Committee was too anxious to carry the Tamil-speaking brothers with us. I do not say south Indians because from Andhra and Kerala, there was no substantial opposition to Hindi being the official language. But even the difficulty experienced by our Tamilian friends had to be taken into consideration. They were not opposed to Hindi as the official language. Let there be no mistake about that. They supported Hindi as the official language, but they wanted their own time-table, they wanted their own period and their own phasing of the programme, and, therefore, we felt that that freedom should be given to our friends.

Therefore, it is now necessary for us to consider this main recommendation of the committee in its true and proper perspective. Why is it that this suggestion of the committee has been well received not only in this country but outside also? It is because it is realistic approach, an approach which will find maximum support in this country.

Well, human sentiments carry very great weight. They can either make or mar the nation. They can unite, and also they have the power to disintegrate. Language is vital; language is a great force. Human sentiments, culture, are in fact, everything that goes to make human existence, are woven round language. I remember one great statement of that

eminent statesman of Ireland, Mr. de Valera. He has stated in one place that given a choice between freedom and language, perhaps, he would be tempted to choose the language.

That being so, the suggestion which the committee made was that there should be no feeling of imposition on the part of the non-Hindi-speaking people. Dr. Krishnaswami wanted a categorical statement of policy as to whether the Prime Minister's statement was a matter of policy or was only a pious hope. I do not speak for anybody, but the main recommendation of the committee is quite in line with what the Prime Minister has stated. Those whose mother-tongue is not Hindi have the freedom to continue English so long as they desire, and it would be left to them to choose Hindi whenever they think it possible to have it as the official language.

Another thing has to be remembered. There is no conflict between the regional languages and Hindi. The Report of the Official Language Commission has left this impression that Hindi was going to take the place of the regional languages. That fear has been removed. Viewed in the true perspective, English would be substituted by the regional languages at the State level, in all the three spheres of life, that is, education, judiciary and administration. And whatever remains in regard to Union purposes would be dealt with in Hindi. So, there is no real conflict between regional languages and Hindi.

In this connection, I would like to make one thing clear. The medium of instruction is changing; it is bound to be changed. Regional languages have to be the media of instruction, if I might venture to suggest, even at the university stage. It would be very difficult to make Hindi as the medium of instruction at the university level, when a student has received his instruction all through in the regional language; it would be very hard for the student to learn through Hindi, while he has been accustomed to

receive instruction through the regional language or the mother-tongue at the earlier stages. That may be a matter for difference of opinion. The unity of the country will not suffer so long as we see to it that Hindi is a compulsory language from the lower secondary stage up to the University stage, that is, for about twelve years of his student life. Given that grounding in the national language, if the medium of instruction at the University level is the regional language, all talk of disintegration of the nation will be found to be slippery. That is my view. It can be questioned, but I think that is the only practical way of solving the problem.

The Committee has deliberately, intentionally, left one aspect of this question undecided, and that is with regard to the time-table, how the programme is to be phased and how all these various suggestions have to be implemented. My senior colleague, Seth Govind Das, has a grouse about this matter. In the Committee also, he complained and very vehemently opposed our suggestions. But we felt that after all, it was the Government which had to implement these suggestions. Whatever time-table we drew would not be realistic because we were not in a position to appreciate the difficulties and the short-comings that might be there in the situation or that might arise from time to time. So we wished to leave the entire matter of the phasing of the process of implementation to the Government. We have left it at that.

I would like to suggest one more thing. Let us remember that the present Hindi is not and cannot be the official language of this country. The Hindi which is the regional language of particular areas cannot, as it is, be adopted as the official language. The Hindi that is to be the official language of this country has to assimilate absorb and make its own various terms and words from the regional languages. Unless the present Hindi is remodelled so as to assimilate all that is good in the regional languages,

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]
it will not be possible to carry the non-Hindi-speaking sections with you. Let us remember that. Even when I, who have tried to learn Hindi—I must make it clear that I come from a non-Hindi-speaking area and I have tried to learn Hindi—read the translations, it is difficult for me also to follow what those statements are.

Pandit Govind Malaviya: He says he cannot follow the present Hindi, but he wants to adopt it when it is more developed and becomes enlarged more and more.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha I want it to be simplified.

श्री श्रीनारायण दास मैं माननीय सदस्य स जानना चाहूंगा कि हिन्दी सीखने में उन को कितना समय लगा और अंग्रेजी सीखने में कितना समय लगा ।

स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ यह बात तो ठीक है । मगर मैं यह नहीं कहता कि कोई बहुत समय लगने वाला है । लेकिन भाषा की जो हिन्दी है उस को आसानी से बहुत आसान करना चाहिये । इतना मैं अवश्य कहना चाहता हूँ ।

Shri Palaniandy (Perambalur) It may take some time

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (बाराबंसी) यह जो हिन्दी आप बोलते हैं, यह बहुत ही सुन्दर हिन्दी है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय यही तो वह किशायत कर रहे हैं कि जो हिन्दी वह बोलते हैं उस को तो आप समझ सकते हैं, उसे वह नहीं समझ पाते हैं ।

स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ डा० रघुवीरा जी जो हिन्दी है वह हमारी समझ में नहीं आती है ।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . आप पहले अंग्रेजी में बोल रहे हैं ।

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the question of recruitment to the services has also been very thoroughly dealt with and we have recommended that so far as the medium of examination is concerned it can be in the language of the candidate himself. So, there should be no difficulty on that score.

The report of the committee is exhaustive and since it has been considered in a very calm atmosphere it is necessary that the suggestions should be adopted in toto and that, at least for the time being, all the controversies about the official language should be laid to rest and the recommendations, if accepted by the President, would form the true basis for making Hindi as the official language of this country.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadī (Ludhiana) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it must be admitted that we are debating a most important problem pertaining not only to the language as such but also to the stability of the country. It certainly relates to a subject which is dearest to an individual because he takes it from his or her mother. Therefore, on our dispassionate observations, and deliberations and decisions thereafter depends the future unity, oneness, strength and stability of the country.

It has been recognised that there are 14 major languages in the country besides many others that are spoken in the different parts of the country. It is also admitted that English holds a very important position. Not only has it contributed a great deal to the unity and integrity of the country but also, as the Prime Minister said and the Home Minister has reiterated it, it is the window to the modern world, to modern science and technology. Therefore, I submit we have got to be very careful in our observations and in our deliberations.

It is also correct that Hindi is the spoken language of 42 per cent of the population. There may be doubts in some quarters about the figures and it may be said that in this 42 per cent the Punjabis are also included, the minorities of U.P. are also included. But that is besides the point. The fact is it is the spoken language of 42 per cent of the people and we have come to a decision and accepted it as the official language of the Union. We have got to abide by that decision; not only abide by that decision but we have also to implement that decision in all possible ways. Therefore, I submit that these are the premises from which we have to start. It cannot also be denied that after the decision that Hindi should be the official language of the Union was accepted, there had been certain movements. Certain steps were taken by certain sections which brought a certain reaction against Hindi. I particularly refer to the debate which was held on this issue in the West Bengal Assembly and to the movements in other parts of the country including, of course, Punjab. Despite our decision at that time, we cannot escape what has happened thereafter in different parts of the country and the movements that started there against it.

I might submit here at the outset that Punjab had supported the decision when Hindi was adopted as the language of the Union. I also support it and as I said, I would be very glad to implement that decision. At the same time I would also like, as the Home Minister was pleased to say, that the regional languages must prosper and grow in their own sphere to the greatest extent.

With this basis, let us see the report and the recommendations, but there is another factor that has got to be kept in view. Maintenance of the unity of the country rather than strengthening it is the fundamental thing. Other things are secondary. The objective is the maintenance of the unity of the country. All the other things are only means and in

the case of those means, even if we have got to take any other language even English, we should not exclude that contingency. Therefore, it is the second premise. It is the second premise also on the basis of which we should examine the recommendations of this Committee.

I have said at the outset that there have been certain reactions and revulsions by certain movements and they have affected the nearness of Hindi to the people and particularly those people who are living in non-Hindi areas and every effort should be made to avoid such things. In this connection, I would draw your attention to what has happened in Punjab. You will recollect, Sir, that there had been a serious controversy going on in Punjab on the Hindi-Punjabi issue. This controversy started at the time of the Census in 1951 when many high-ups there started a virulent propaganda in the rural areas that they should write Hindi as their mother tongue in the census records. It was a most dangerous step detrimental to the interest of Hindi taken by those who professed to be the protagonists and propagandists of Hindi. They went to the extent of using all means. I am glad that the Prime Minister was kind to come to our aid and declared then that this was a very false step and a wrong step they were taking and condemned it and directed that those figures should not be taken as correct and they should be scrapped from the census records. But, Sir, the mischief had been done. Many high-ups in public life took up that position. They made a propaganda. But, as I have just now submitted, the mischief had been done. There was a consequent revulsion of feelings on the other side—those who wanted Punjabi, those who loved Punjabi. As I said, Punjab was one of the States which had unanimously supported the adoption of Hindi as the Union language, because Punjab feels that Hindi is the one language that can be adopted as an official language. But, as I submitted, this

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarbadi]

created a reaction and the result was the cry for the Punjabi Suba

This cry of the Punjabi Suba was a purely linguistic cry. It had not the least communal colour in it. The mere fact that many people from all sections went to jail, if the figures and the names of people who went to jail are seen will itself establish my contention that it was a purely linguistic move simply because of the revulsion of feelings as a counter to the one that the protagonists of Hindi, the misguided protagonists of Hindi, did in 1951.

I am glad that the Prime Minister in his wisdom and Indian leadership came to our aid. We had discussions and a political settlement was arrived at. As you know, Sir,—you were one of the participants in that—it was the fortune of the country and the fortune of my State that the point was settled in the form of the Regional Formula.

In the Regional Formula, you will recollect, which was agreed to, there are two clauses to which I would particularly like to draw the attention of the House. It was postulated in paragraph 8 that demarcation of the Hindi and Punjabi regions in the proposed Punjab State will be done in consultation with the State Government and other States concerned. Paragraph 9 of the statement said that Sachar formula will continue to operate in the areas comprising the existing Punjab State and in the area which now comprises of the PEPSU State the existing arrangements will continue until they are replaced or altered by an agreement later on. This political settlement postulated two things: demarcation of the two areas between Punjabi-speaking and Hindi-speaking regions, and, secondly, the application of the accepted formula in the Punjabi and Hindi regions and the then existing formula in the PEPSU region. This was a political settlement which had

an absolute and unanimous support of the Sikhs and many other sections of Punjab and also the Government of India. You will also recollect, Sir, because you were one of the leaders in that, that this august House was kind enough to adopt this formula in its entirety.

Now, despite the settlement of the question, again a movement started, the Hindi Raksha Movement, under the guidance of the Hindi Raksha Samiti. That was again an unfortunate thing which put Punjab again in trouble and turmoil. Sir, I am just trying to draw the attention of the House to one thing. What are the factors, what are the things, what are the reactions subsequent to the adoption of Hindi as the Union language which have crept in to eliminate if not a large section at least a some section from adopting Hindi as the Union language? What are the factors that have crept in to induce some of our Members to make the speeches that we hear today? It is the apprehension that there is to be which we have got to avoid.

As I was submitting, the Hindi Raksha Samiti started this movement. At that time, I would respectfully submit, it was never a linguistic demand. Who does not know that Punjabi is the mother-tongue of the people living in Punjabi region of Punjab they speak in Punjabi in their homes, converse in Punjabi outside and are brought up in Punjabi and all that? Who does not know that? Yet the demand was made that Hindi was their mother tongue. The fact that it was a communal move is amply established from their own manifesto to which I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Was it a political organisation?

Shri Ajit Singh Sarbadi: It was formed particularly for the purpose of this propaganda. I have submitted that I consider Hindi to be the spoken

language of 42 per cent of the people. It is not the language of the scripture of any community. But what the Hindi Raksha Samiti said is that Hindi is a "language which has a vital link with Sanskrit, the fountainhead of Indian culture, the language of our scripture", and that "it is in the fitness of things that no restrictions or limitations are imposed on the teaching and use of Hindi in free India." This is what I find in their manifesto.

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

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: I have taken ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 15 minutes.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: I will finish very soon. As I was submitting, this was a propaganda and they said it was their 'religious' language. This again created a reaction, and I am glad that the Prime Minister came to our aid and made an unequivocal declaration, condemning such a move. Yet, the mischief was done. This is the unfortunate aspect of the whole thing. What happened later? The thing was dead and gone, but yet, the Punjab Government appointed a goodwill mission. What was the object of the two-man goodwill mission. Its terms of reference were only two. A notification was issued when the goodwill mission was formed, and the terms of reference were, they were "to tour the States, meet important persons, sound public opinion for promoting good relations between the communities and secondly to devise ways and means to bring normalcy to the State." What was their object? The object was that they should move about throughout the State and bring goodwill to the people. Nowhere has it been laid down that they should go and tackle the language question. I have read the terms of reference verbatim. Yet, they constituted themselves into a language committee and

started meeting the people and made the Punjab Government spend nearly Rs. 16,000 by way of TA and DA. They evolved a different formula over and above the political settlement that had been arrived at and had been decided upon once and for all and finished.

They have submitted their report. They have interviewed about 700 people. I am a very small fry; I have been a social worker all my life; but I represent about seven lakh of people in my constituency. But nobody came to see me because they felt that I have got my set views. I do not know what they thought about the matter. They posed themselves as the language committee and are reported to have said that Punjabi, as one language, should have two scripts. I cannot understand the basis on which they said so. I believe that previous to the report, the Chief Minister of Punjab had already made an unequivocal declaration and said in so many words that there cannot be any change without agreement because, it has already been postulated in the regional formula. Unless those parties to the agreement agree, there cannot be any change, and there is no question of having two scripts. Punjabi has its natural script. Yet, it is reported that they have said so. I am sure that the Punjab Government will not touch it even with a pair of tongs. It is not worth the paper on which it is written. We want the unity of the country. We want its strength and stability. It is after much discussion that we have come to a decision. So, it must be maintained. That is why I am trying to place these facts before the House. Not only this. It was settled that the PEPSU formula would apply to the population of the erstwhile State. Yet, the High Court issued a circular applying its own orders and Rules about language of Courts without caring to know what the orders of the PEPSU High Court, the then High Court of Patiala, were. So, then again the settlement was infringed. I am drawing your

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi.]

attention to this to show that these are things which in a way will create reaction, against which we have to safeguard ourselves.

17 hrs.

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

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: The ultimate result should be that the regional language should have a full right to grow and prosper. I was very much pleased to hear—and I congratulate the Home Minister for that—that in all the High Courts also the regional language will be used. The language of the administration at all levels, and also medium of instruction in the University should be the regional language. May I say in the end that we should function in such a way that the regional language suffers nowhere?

बंधित ब्रह्म नारायण "बबोल" (बिचपुर)
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने जो मुझे इस विषय पर अपने विचार व्यक्त करने का अवसर दिया उस के लिये आप को धन्यवाद है।

इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं कि सभी एक मत से इस बात को स्वीकार कर रहे हैं कि इस राष्ट्र की भाषा एक होनी चाहिये। जिस समय इस राष्ट्र को स्वतन्त्र करने के लिये संघर्ष चल रहा था और जब हमारे मस्तिष्क में किसी प्रकार का विकार नहीं था, ठीक एक बीबी की अवस्था में हम थे, उस समय हम ने यह निर्णय लिया था, और प्रायः अगर कहीं विरोध दिखाई पड़ता है तो उस का कारण यह है कि एक तो हम सब भोगी हो गये हैं और साथ में ही रोगी भी हो गये हैं। साथ ही यह लोग जिनका इस देश से बियोग हो गया है और जो बियोगी हैं, उन के मत में इस का पुनः प्राप्त करने की माशांका है। वे पुनः हमारे ऊपर अपना अधिकार जमाने का चरम कर रहे हैं, वे हमारे भीतर ही भीतर विच मोल कर, हमारे ही लोगों में फूट पैदा

करने का चरम कर रहे हैं। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि यह देश विविध भाषाभाषी है और इस कारण इस देश में हिन्दी के प्रति विरोध उत्पन्न हो गया है, वे स्वयं इस विरोध के जन्मदाता हैं। कभी भी इस देश में इस प्रकार का विचार उत्पन्न नहीं हुआ, न हो सकता है और न पागे होने वाला है। कुछ लोग बोड़े दिन यह झगड़ा चला सकते हैं, चला लें, भागे तो यह चलने वाला नहीं है। इस का कारण यह है कि इस देश की धात्मा एक है। और एकात्मिकता के साथ इस देश को स्वतन्त्र करने के लिये हम लड़े हैं और एकात्मिकता के साथ इस देश की स्वतन्त्रता की रक्षा करने के लिये हम अपना प्रात्मसर्पण करने के लिये तैयार रहेंगे। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं ने अनेक बार यह निवेदन किया है कि हमारे देश में बाहर से दुर्भाव प्रथा है और बाहर की ताकतें हमारे देश में बिलबाद कर रही हैं। और इस देश के विपक्ष-गामी बनाने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जिम बक्त यहाँ के लोग बृद्धिमान बन जायेंगे वे इस दुश्चक्र को समझने लगेंगे और उन का मार्ग ठीक हो जायेगा।

इस में सन्देह नहीं कि यह देश विविध भाषाभाषी है किन्तु इस में देश में कोई विरोध उत्पन्न नहीं हो सकता। जिस प्रकार एक उद्यान में अनेक प्रकार के पुष्प खिलते हैं और अपनी सीरम से उस उद्यान को सुवासित कर देते हैं। ठीक इसी प्रकार इस देश में विविध भाषाओं देश के गौरव को बढ़ाने वाली हैं उस के पतन की ओर लं जाने वाली नहीं हैं। यह भी नि.सन्देह है कि भारतोद्भूत भाषाओं और हिन्दी में किसी प्रकार का विरोध नहीं होना चाहिये। हिन्दी बोलने वालों को ऐसी पद्धति नहीं अपनानी चाहिये जिस से कि दूसरे प्राणों की भाषा बोलने वालों को यह भावुक दें कि वे हमारे छिर पर चले जा रहे हैं। और दूसरी भाषाओं के बोलने वालों को भी यह

नहीं समझना चाहिये कि सम्पूर्ण देश का राज्य इन्हीं के हाथ में चला जायेगा और हमारा कोई स्थान ही नहीं रहेगा। ऐसा तो निकाल में भी हो नहीं सकता।

वैसा मैं ने निवेदन किया, हिन्दी तो इतनी सरल भाषा है कि साधारण परिश्रम से इस को पढ़ा जा सकता है। जिन लोगों ने दस दस बीस बीस वर्ष अंग्रेजी का ज्ञान प्राप्त करने में लगाये हैं यदि वे दस बीस दिन भी सच्ची लगन के साथ हिन्दी के लिये लगा दें तो उस का भाषा ज्ञान तो उन को संकलन प्राप्त हो जायेगा। लेकिन कोई जान बूझ कर कहे कि हम हिन्दी का ज्ञान प्राप्त करने नहीं क्योंकि हम किसी दूसरे के मानस पुत्र हैं, इस प्रकार का जिनका निश्चय है उन को कौन समझा सकता है। जो सो गया है उस को तो जगाया जा सकता है लेकिन जो जागते हुए सोने का बहाना किये पड़ा है अथवा यदि वे अंग्रेजी का शब्द इन्टेंशनली कहू तो शायद अंग्रेजी प्रेमियों को प्रसन्नता होगी—जो लोग इन्टेंशनली पदार्थन कर रहे हैं उन को कौन समझा सकता है। उन को समझाने में तो बहूना भी समर्थ नहीं हो सकते। क्योंकि वे तो निश्चयात्मक रूप से विरोध कर रहे हैं।

एक आनमोय सबस्य . बहूना चाह उन को समझाने में समर्थ न हो पर बमेरा जी तो समझा सकते है ।

पंडित बबू नारायण "बबोज" . प्राय मुझे इस योग्य समझने हैं तो ठीक है । वैसे मैं तो एक छोटा सा सेवक हू ।

तो मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि देश में एक प्रकार के भ्रम का निर्माण किया जा रहा है। यह कहना कि यदि हम अंग्रेजी का परित्याग कर देंगे तो हम ज्ञान विरहित हो जायेंगे, महा मूर्ख हो जायेंगे, यह भ्रम है। हम कोई अंग्रेजी को इस दृष्टि से नहीं छोड़ रहे हैं कि हम को उस से जो कुछ प्राप्त हो सकता है उस को भी हम प्राप्त नहीं करेंगे। हम तो इस दृष्टि से

छोड़ रहे हैं कि अब हम धामनिर्भर हो गये हैं, भाषा के क्षेत्र में हमारा अपना अधिकार हो गया है, संस्कृति के क्षेत्र में हमारा अपना अधिकार हो गया है, सम्पत्ता के क्षेत्र में हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो गये हैं, सामाजिक क्षेत्र में हमारा स्वल्प प्रकट हो गया है। सत्सारा के सामने जैसे अन्याय्य देश खड़े हुए हैं ठीक उसी प्रकार अपनी भाषा, अपने इतिहास, अपनी संस्कृति, अपनी परम्परा के साथ हम भी खड़े हुए हैं और जैसा वह हम से प्रेम करते हैं वैसा ही प्रेम हम भी उन को देने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन यदि वे हम को मिटाना चाहते हैं तो शान्ति की प्रार्थना करते हुए भी संघर्ष में हम उन से पीछे नहीं रहेंगे। इस भावना के साथ हम खड़े हैं। हम ने केवल पिटने पिटने का ही ठेका नहीं लिया है। हम ने केवल खोड़ने का ही काम अपने हाथ में नहीं लिया है, बचाने का काम भी अपने हाथ में लिया है। और जैसा कि मैं ने निवेदन किया जो संघर्ष हम ने किया वह भी दूसरो के प्रति, प्रेम प्रकट करते हुए अपने अधिकारो की याचना के लिये किया था। ठीक इसी प्रकार मे जिनके मन में हिन्दी का विरोध है उन से भी हमारी यही नम्र प्रार्थना है कि उन को भी हम शत्रु भाव से नहीं देखते। हम तो हिन्दी को देश की एकता के लिये धारो लाना चाहते हैं। और कोई दूसरा कारण नहीं है।

कुछ लोगों को यह भय पंडा हो गया है कि हिन्दी की उन्नति हो जायेगी तो हम राजकीय कार्यों में पिछड़ जायेंगे, हमारे बालबच्चे धारो नहीं धारो पायेंगे। मेरी उन से प्रार्थना है कि यदि वे नहीं पढ़ सकने तो जाने दे। जब तक उन की जिन्दगी है तब तक तो साथ प्रयत्न करने पर भी अंग्रेजी चनेगी उस को कोई हटा नहीं सकता। जब तक वह जीवित है वह अपना काम अंग्रेजी में चला सकते हैं। लेकिन जिस दसचिसता के साथ उन्होने अंग्रेजी का अध्ययन किया उसी प्रकार यदि वे अपने बच्चा को हिन्दी के अध्ययन में लगा दें तो जैसे वे अंग्रेजी के पंडित

[पंडित राज नारायण "बडेल"]

बन गये उन के बच्चे हिन्दी के पंडित बन जायेंगे। और प्रांतीय भाषा तो वे बिना कष्ट के सीखते ही चले जायेंगे। और यह निर्विवाद स्वीकार कर लिया गया है कि प्रांतों में प्रांतीय भाषायें चलेगी और उन को पनपने का पूरा अवसर मिलना चाहिये। और जो लोग इस प्रकार हिन्दी सीखें उन से हिन्दी जानने वालों को गौरव अनुभव करना चाहिये, उन के प्रति सम्मान भी प्रदर्शित करना चाहिये। मैं ने तो धनेक बार कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हुई भाषायें सब मेरी भाषायें हैं। मैं तो देश की अन्य भाषाओं को अपनी मौखी समझता हूँ। मैं हिन्दी बोलता हूँ। और कोई दूसरा बंगला बोलता है तो वह मुझे अपनी मौखी मालूम होती है, मौखी के मानी है "जस्ट लाइक मदर"। मा तो वह नहीं है लेकिन उस की प्राकृति, उस की बनावट, उस का चलन आदि सब मा जैसा है, इसलिये वह हमारी भाषी है। अगर कोई बंगला बोलता है, पंजाबी बोलता है, बिहारी बोलता है, तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि मेरी मा तो नहीं बोल रही है पर मेरी मौखी बोल रही है।

जहां तक अन्य भाषाओं से शब्द लेने का सम्बन्ध है, मेरा निवेदन है कि हिन्दी ने इस विषय में तो कभी सकोच किया ही नहीं। अगर वह लैनटर्न को नहीं ले सकी तो उस ने उस को लालटेन कर के ले लिया। अगर वह वेस्टकोट को नहीं ले सकी तो उस ने उस को बासकट के रूप में स्वीकार कर लिया और अगर आप किसी गांव में चले जायें तो आप देखेंगे कि यदि वे कडेम को इसी रूप में नहीं समझ सकते तो उन्होंने उस को कडम के रूप में पकड़ लिया जिस के मानी वह खराब समझते हैं। बिम तरह सूट से लूटेक कर लिया गया उसी तरह हम ने कडेम को कडम कर लिया। लेकिन इन्ही तरह आप हिन्दी को भी कडम कर दे ता यह बात ठीक नहीं होगी।

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन यह है कि कुछ लोग जानबूझ कर हिन्दी में संस्कृत के शब्द डाल कर

उस को बोझिल बना देते हैं। जैसे किसी सुन्दर स्त्री को धामूषणों से इस तरह लाद दिया जाय कि उस के धंगों का दर्शन ही न हो सके, उस के धंगों का दर्शन दुर्लभ हो जायें, ठीक इसी प्रकार से कुछ ऐसे भी लोग हैं जो जान बूझ कर हिन्दी को नगा करने की चेष्टा करते हैं। कुछ तो आचरण चाहिये। अब कोई बोलेंगे कि "जित्ना काम करोगे, उतना ही।" यह "जित्ना" "उतना" क्या होता है? "जितना" और "उतना" क्यों नहीं कहते? फिर कहा जाता है कि "किम ने कहां" "उसने कहा" कहना चाहिए। यह "जित्ना", "उतना" "जित्ना" इत्यादि जानबूझ कर प्रयोग करना भाषा को बिल्कुल नगा करना है। इस के साथ ही, जान-बूझ कर हिन्दी में परिभाषित, शुद्ध संस्कृत के शब्दों का डाला जाना, जब कि प्रचलित हिन्दी के शब्द हम को मालूम हैं और प्रचलित शब्दों का प्रयोग हम कर सकते हैं और जिन को सामान्य-जन समझता है, और साधारण शब्द को हटा कर बोझिल और साहित्यिक की भाषा को जन-साधारण की भाषा में घुसेड़ने का प्रयत्न करना कोई उदारता, बुद्धिमत्ता और दूरदर्शिता का लक्षण नहीं है। इसलिये इस प्रकार का संसृजितता निकाल देनी चाहिये। यदि इस प्रकार के शब्द, जो भाषा की प्रौढ़ता को प्रकट करते हैं, धा जायें, तो हमारे सामने के माननीय सदस्य घबरा जाते हैं। इस में कोई बात नहीं है। धीरे-धीरे अभ्यास करने से किसी भी भाषा का ज्ञान हां जाता है। मैं साधारण इंग्लिश समझ पाता था। मैं जब इस सदन में धा गया, तो और ज्यादा जानन लगा, क्योंकि रोज फकाफक कानों में अंग्रेजी भाषा पड़ती रहती है। सम्पर्क में धाने से, अंग्रेजी में जिस को "टच" कहते हैं—उस टच में रहने से काम बन जाता है। यदि इस कार्य को जोड़ा साथ जायें, तो अधिक सरलता पूर्वक और सुगमतापूर्वक यह कार्य हो सकता है।

आज देश में प्रांतीयता और भाषा का जो अंगड़ा बाड़ा है, उस में राजनीतिकों

का भी दोष है। वे अधिकार प्राप्त करने के लिये छाने जाने के लिये कोई बहाना ढूँढते हैं कि जन साधारण को कैसे मूख बनाया जाय। वे नब्ब पर हाथ रख कर सोचते हैं कि इस से हमारा काम चल सकता है और उसी को बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। मुझे अभी व्याजूम हुआ कि गवर्नमेंट और सब की पार्टी के लोग सोचते हैं कि गुजरात और बम्बई की अलग-अलग कर दिया जाये तो महाराष्ट्र समिति वाले बैठ कर रोते हैं कि हाथ दे, हमने चुनाव में क्या होगा? यह जो मनोवृत्ति है, वह मनोवृत्ति सदैव मनोवृत्ति है। हम को तो देश का कल्याण करना है। लेकिन सोचा यह जाता है कि देश चाहे मर जाये, हम जिन्दा रहें। मैं समझता हूँ कि देश मर जाये, तो मैं पार्लियामेंट का मੈम्बर कैसे रहूँगा। बेश रहूँगा, तो भय की नहीं, तो फिर कभी चुन कर आ जाऊँगा। लेकिन मनोवृत्ति यह है कि मैं बराबर लोक सभा में बना रहूँ देश को कुछ भी हो जाये। यह तो बड़ी निम्न कोटि की भावना है और यदि इस देश के चुने हुए लोगों के मन में, जो कि एक प्रकार से बहुत बुद्धिमान माने जाते हैं, यह भावना रही, तो देश का सोचने का बहुत निम्न कोटि का स्तर हो जायेगा। इस भावना को हम को दूर करना होगा।

साधारण गाँवों में कैसे हुए जितने कुछ बर्न हैं, वे सब हिन्दी जानते हैं। ऐसा कहा जाता है कि महाराष्ट्र के लोग हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक भी महाराष्ट्रीयन नहीं निकलेगा, जो हिन्दी नहीं समझता होगा। एक भी पंजाबी नहीं निकलेगा, जो हिन्दी न समझता और जानता हो। मैं क्या हूँ। वे बड़े प्रेम से सुनते हैं। यहाँ पर सिखों का भी बिक्र किया जाता है। प्रायः हिन्दू और सिख आपस में लड़ें, वह हमारी मूर्खता का शोतक है। चाहे किचर से लड़ाई आरम्भ हो, चाहे कोई करे, यह मूर्खता का शोतक है। जिस समाज में राष्ट्र की रक्षा के लिये बुकनुसी चली—और वह बुकनुसी पुर के मुख से निकली—उस से

यदि मैं लड़ूँ, तो मुझ से बढ़ कर मुझ और पापी और कौन हो सकता है? यह जो बोबणा की गई कि "अखिल हिन्द में खालसा पन्थ गाजे", यह फारसी है, अरबी है, रमान है या चीनी है? यह किस के मुख से निकली? यह गुरु के मुख से निकली। "अखिल हिन्द में खालसा पन्थ गाजे"। सारे देश में खालसा पन्थ गर्जना क्यों करेगा? "जगें बर्न हिन्दू सकल भड भाजे"। कहीं भयभे की बात नहीं है। झगड़ा तो नेतागण पैदा करते हैं। दोष छाता है जनता पर। भारतवर्ष की जनता आज भी भली है और भलाई चाहती है और भले लोगों के साथ लगना चाहती है। लेकिन हमारा स्तर बिर रखा है और हम जनता को पथभ्रष्ट करते हैं। हम उस को मित्र-मित्र चलत मार्गों पर ले जाने की कोशिश करते हैं। हमको एकात्मियता की दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये और ये जो तिरछी निगाह से कानाफूसी करते हुए चूमते हैं, इन से सावधान रहना चाहिये। यह अपनी विशिष्ट भाषा को छुहर भी चलाते हैं खर उर भी चलाते हैं इन की कास्पेरेसी—इन का बडबयन चलता रहता है। इस से कानाफूसी, उस से कानाफूसी, इसको बनाओ, उस को बनाओ, यह सब चलता रहता है। यह क्यों चलता है? यह आ पड़ा है, उसका अस्वीकार करना चाहिये। यदि कोई प्रादमी मेरा सगा ही क्यों न हो, लेकिन अगर मैं देखता हूँ कि राष्ट्र के हित को दृष्टि से वह भिन्न मार्ग पर जाता है, उससे मुझे कोई तात्कालिक लाभ होगा ही, लेकिन अगर प्रागे चल के देश को उस से बड़ा क्षति होने वाली है, तो मुझे उसका भी परित्याग कर देना चाहिये—चाहे वह मेरा पिता ही क्यों न हो, चाहे वह मुझे जन्म देने वाला ही क्यों न हो। जब हम इस दृष्टि से विचार करेंगे, तो हिन्दी का विरोध नहीं रहेगा और हिन्दी बोलने वालों और हिन्दी का एक प्रकार से बल देने वालों और उसका पक्ष लेने वालों के प्रति जो भावना पैदा हुई है, वह भी मिट

[संक्षिप्त रूप नारायण "बजेस"]

जायगी। क्योंकि कुछ मन्तव्य-करण से जब विचार निकलते हैं, तो वे किसी को बुरे नहीं लगते हैं। और जब बनाबटी रूप में किसी भावों को सामने रख कर, उस भावों का बिल्लावा कर के कपटपूर्ण भाषा का प्रयोग किया जाता है, तो ऐसी भाषा को सशोक माना जाता है, उस पर विस्वास नहीं किया जाता है, चाहे वह कोई भी भाषा हो। भाषा बड़ी उत्तम है, जो उत्तम भाषों को प्रकट करती है, उत्तम प्रकार से लोगों को भावों से जाने को चेष्टा करती है। हिन्दी के मन में इस प्रकार की द्वेष बुद्धि अभी तक नहीं आई है। आज तक तो नहीं आई है, इस लिये मैं हिन्दी बोलता हूँ। यदि हिन्दी भाषा में यह दोष आ जायगा, तो मैं हिन्दी को अनकारक मानूँगा। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि हिन्दी में इस प्रकार का दोष नहीं आया है। आज जो उस में आश्चर्यता की बात है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हिन्दी कोई बड़ा सम्पन्न भाषा नहीं है, लेकिन यह बड़ी बहन है। बहुत दिनों से पिट रही थी, उस पर मार पड़ रही थी, यह रो रही थी। सब छोटी बहनों ने उस का सम्मानित कर दिया, कुछ को राजभाषा बना दिया। आज अगर बेकारी की टांग पकड़ कर चौपट की कोशिश की जायेगी उन बहनों के द्वारा, तो उन को भी दुर्बल होनी और इस को भी दुर्बल होनी और कोई तोहरा बाहर से मैथिल आ कर हमारे चिर पर उबार हो जायगी। इस लिये वेद में यह अवसर न आने पाये।

मैं समझता हूँ कि मैं ने चौड़ा सचिक समय से लिया है। इस के लिये मैं क्षमा चाहता हूँ।

Shri Sampath: I am at a loss for words to express my feelings in this House at the outset, that I have not been privileged, just like our Hindi friends, to express my opinions and

feelings in my own mother-tongue in which I have been accustomed to speak. Of course, I shall be allowed to do so with certain restrictions, namely that I should have given you a translation of my speech previously. But, in a way, we are underprivileged. Especially, when I requested Seth Govind Das to speak in English at least when he had to say something about the south, and he refused stubbornly, which was applauded by the Hindi friends very enthusiastically, I felt I was a bit out of place in this House.

Anyhow, to the best of my abilities, I shall try to voice forth my feelings. Today, when we heard our Home Minister, Shri G. B. Pant, we were disappointed at the tenor of his speech. We expected a different speech from him. But he in his usual manner, in his usual suave manner, was telling us that nothing serious is going to happen to the non-Hindi-speaking areas, they are being accommodated, they are being consulted, their grievances are his utmost concern, and so on. In this way, he was indulging in all sorts of sweet words. But he and his people have been advancing this plea all these years.

What we had expected today, especially after the Prime Minister's speech on the discussion on Shri Frank Anthony's resolution to include English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, was quite different. We had expected that his speech would be one of endorsing the Prime Minister's fresh and realistic approach. But he disappointed us; especially, when he was very stubborn that no amendments must be allowed to be moved, we were quite clear about his designs, and his intentions, namely that he is not prepared to accept the Prime Minister's new assurance. In his reply at least, we would like to hear from him what his views are

because it is a serious matter. If the Prime Minister's assurance is to be carried out by any sincere policy, then some of the proposals made in the Report of the Committee of Parliament on Official Language will have to be completely revised, especially the opinion of the Committee on recommendation, serial No. 22, on page 38, which is as follows:

"The Committee desires the Union Government to prepare and implement a plan of action, for the progressive use of Hindi as the official language of the Union, in pursuance of the opinions of the Committee on the recommendations of the Official Language Commission".

The relevant recommendation of the Official Language Commission runs as follows:

"It has not been possible for us to furnish a regular time-table by dates and stages as to how Hindi should be introduced into the business of the Union so as to accomplish the general change-over within the period fixed by the Constitution. Since the Ministries of the Government of India are components of a single organic unity, the phasing of the progressive use of Hindi must, in general, be lateral and coherent in the different Ministries and Departments . . ."

and as on. Similarly recommendations, serial Nos. 35, 36 and 37 will have to be revised. They pertain to the language of the law courts. Recommendation, serial No. 35 says:

"So far as the language of the Supreme Court is concerned, eventually there can be only one language, i.e. Hindi, in respect of the entire court proceedings and records, including of course, the judgements and orders. When the time comes for the change-over, the Supreme Court will have to function only in Hindi language. The authoritative texts of the reported judgements of the

Supreme Court will also be published in the same language".

Then we have recommendation, serial No. 36: 1

"Processes issued in Hindi by the Supreme Court, when addressed to a non-Hindi region or against a person whose mother-tongue is not Hindi, should be accompanied by a translation for the convenience of the concerned party".

Then follows recommendation, serial No. 37, which says:

"Provision should also be made for reliable translations of Supreme Court decisions being available in the State languages in separate regional language series":

Of course, this does not come under that. Anyhow, I do not want to go into the details of the findings of the Committee. But what is the kind of approach—even our Home Minister referred to "approaches" in the beginning of his speech—that has been sought to be made by the Official Language Commission, what is the kind of approach made by the Official Language Committee? Of course, it is a very difficult job to express one's opinion on this vexacious question of language. But all the same, we have arrived at a time when plain-speaking and unequivocal opinions are badly needed.

Shri Bharucha: Yes, quite right.

Shri Sampath: On one side of the picture, what do we see? Arrogance and utter disregard for other languages and cultures of this land. (Interruptions).

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should be allowed to express his views.

Shri Sampath: Megalomanias are parading in their ghastly nakedness

[Shri Sampath]

with the banner 'Hindi at any cost' (Interruptions). It has been witnessed more than once. An hon. Member, for whose age I have every respect, only the other day—that is, very recently—took the Defence Minister and his Deputies to task for not answering questions in Hindi, knowing full well that they do not know Hindi. He is a very responsible Member. He is not an ordinary Member; he is a very responsible, aged, elderly Member. He was very keen on that. He expressed such a gusto. Not only on that occasion, but on many occasions we have been witnessing that it is always funny to find him getting into the fighting mood, especially when . . .

Shri Kalika Singh: (Azamgarh): I think the word 'funny' is not very parliamentary.

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur): It is parliamentary.

Shri Kalika Singh: To say 'It is very funny on his part' is not parliamentary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It is all right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing objectionable in using the word 'funny'.

Shri Sampath: I am not blaming him. That is the kind of approach.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not object to that. 'Funny' is all right.

In this House we have been witnessing such scenes more often. That only indicates that things have not changed since 1949 when the Constituent Assembly was considering these articles concerning language. Even then many warnings had been sounded in that House by the Prime Minister, by you and the late lamented Shri T. A. Ramalingam Chettiar whose

words, I think, will be appropriate to be quoted here. He said on the 13th September, 1949:

"I may say that the South is feeling frustrated. If there is the feeling of having obtained liberty, freedom and all that, there is very little of it felt in the South. Sir, coming here to the capital in the northern-most part of the country; and feeling ourselves as strangers in this land, we do not feel that we are a nation to whom the whole thing belongs, and that the whole country is ours. Unless steps are taken to make the people in the South feel that they have something to do with the country, and that there is some sort of unity in the country, I do not think the South is going to be satisfied at all. There will be a bitter feeling left behind. To what it may lead, it is not easy to say at present."

Shri Ramalingam Chettiar was a Congress member. He was a very responsible and very respected member from Tamil Nad. He said that and nobody heeded these words.

I can understand the feeling with which you would have spoken, Sir when you uttered these words. You said—I assure you I will not put you in an embarrassing position. In the beginning of your speech on the 14th September, 1949 in the Constituent Assembly you said:

"Even after I was elected a Member of this House and when this question arose here for the first time I was consulted by several Members and I gave my unreserved support for Hindi in the Devnagari script. I might emphasise here that I took it for granted that there could be no other language which could be accepted as the lingua franca or Rashtra Bhasha of our country.

As the days have passed I have changed my mind. The most enthusiastic protagonists of this

Hindi have alienated my sympathy and I must say that I agree with Mr. Anthony. I am one of those who have withdrawn their support from Hindi in Devnagari script simply because of the fanaticism and intolerance of those who support it."

Sir, even our Prime Minister was . (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Sampath: On the 13th, the Prime Minister sounded a note of warning. He said:

"So, to come back to the basic approach to the problem: Is your approach going to be a democratic approach or what might be termed an authoritarian approach? I venture to put this question to the enthusiasts for Hindi, because in some of the speeches I have listened here and elsewhere there is very much a tone of the Hindi-speaking area being the centre of things in India, the centre of gravity, and others being just the fringes of India. That is not only an incorrect approach, but it is a dangerous approach. If you consider the question with wisdom, this approach will do more injury to the development of the Hindi language than the other approach. You just cannot force any language down the people or group who resist that. You cannot do it successfully. You know that it is conceivably possible that a foreign conqueror with the strength of the sword might try to do so, but history shows that even he has failed. Certainly, in the democratic context of India it is an impossibility. You have to win through the goodwill of those people, those groups in India in the various provinces whose mother tongue is not Hindi. You have to win the goodwill of those groups who speak, let us say, some variation of Hindi, Urdu or Hindustani."

Sir, I am reading all these excerpts because things have not changed in-

spite of these warnings. What do we see today? What do we hear in Bihar? In some of the places where there had been schools which taught Bengali to the Bengali population of that area, those schools have been closed by the Bihar Government. I heard it more than once in this House.... (Interruptions.) That position, my friend says, applies to Oriya also. What is happening in U.P.? It is more or less the birthplace of the Urdu language. Have they given the status of a State language to Urdu? I want to ask the Members from U.P.... (Interruptions.) In Andhra Pradesh they have given that status . . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh: People who do not know say something. I heard an hon. Member saying that they are destroying. There, they have got every right to communicate in Urdu; they have got the right to apply in Urdu (Interruptions.)

Shri Sampath: It has not been given that status of Official language in Uttar Pradesh. Last year when our Prime Minister attended some meeting in connection with the Urdu language, he gave his opinion that this was wrong and he was very much concerned about the State of affairs in U.P. Nobody can hide it. Now, nobody can come and preach to us we must all be united. I can say one thing. The arguments that they are using against English are in favour of the regional languages and not in favour of Hindi. When they speak that there should be an official language which is the language of the masses, then it is the regional language and not Hindi alone . . .

Seth Govind Das: We all agree

Shri Sampath: You agree here. But what does the Commission say? It says that after the primary stage every school throughout the country should make Hindi a compulsory subject and that in the universities the medium should be Hindi. What is the use of saying 'We agree'? It is there.

[Shri Sampath]

What do we find in Tamil Nad? In the mile stones they are writing the Hindi numerals. Where have they got the right to do that? In the House there was a question and unfortunately it did not reach that day for answer in the House and I went and referred to the answer in the official proceedings. They have not given the answer: why they have used the Hindi numerals. They simply say that the international Indian numerals are to be used. But the question was this: Are there in Tamil Nad mile stones with Hindi numerals? There was opposition but nobody cares for that. Now that Dr. Subbarayan has become the Minister of Transport and Communications, I believe he will be able to understand it and do something in that direction.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him end with this hope.

Shri Vajpayee: that mile stones are to be changed with Ministers!

Shri Tangasani: Even Madras Ministers have expressed their views.

Shri Sampath: Without giving any regard to the feelings of the non-Hindi speaking areas, if by their consciousness that they are in a majority, that they are 42 per cent or 45 per cent of the population, if they try to do something, they will not be successful in it. That is the mildest way in which I can express that warning.

Shri Kalika Singh: Sir, the Constitution of India nowhere provides that Hindi shall be the national language of India. The question that has been in dispute or controversy here is: what should be the language of the Union. If the dispute is about the national language I think it is quite off the track as the Constitution only says that Hindi in Devanagiri script shall be the official language of the Union. It does not say about the official language of the States. That very article, article 343, says that international form of Indian numerals shall

be used for official purposes. Therefore, the word "official" also has been defined in that very article. That article of the Constitution confines itself, limits itself only to the official purposes of the Union. By that I mean that the language will be used in the offices of the Central Government either in the Central Government's communications with the States or in its communications with the Supreme Court or in its communications with other offices. That is the only thing that has been provided in the Constitution of India. It nowhere states anything about the national language.

Now, what is the position regarding the national language? We were in the Gauhati Congress Session. There it was decided by resolution that all the 14 languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India shall be the national languages of India. Therefore, the position today is that all the 14 languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India are the national languages. Tamil, Telugu, Gurmukhi, Urdu, all these are national languages of India. There is no doubt about that. Therefore, all the States in India are quite free to adopt any of these 14 languages for the purpose of education in the primary stage or in the university stage, for the purpose of administration and for all other purposes, because these 14 languages are the national languages.

The same problem arose in Soviet Russia also. In Soviet Russia they have got 119 national languages. The problem there also was the same. Nine crores of Russian people of the European part of Russia had occupied the Asian part of U.S.S.R. and that Asian part had so many languages. Therefore, it was very difficult for the Russian people of the European part of Russia to bring them under their clutches. They, therefore, came to an agreed solution and they said that all the 119 languages will be national languages in Russia. That was a very

good solution. Here also, in India, we have already said that all the 14 languages will be national languages of India. There is no controversy about that.

Now, coming to the question of Hindi, my learned friends here have not read that portion of the report of the Official Language Commission which says in one chapter 'which Hindi?' is to be the official language. The Official Language Commission has opened a very important question there. It says that the Hindi which is the regional language shall not be the official language of the Union. That is very clear. According to article 351 of the Constitution of India Hindi shall be developed as representing a composite culture akin to Hindustani and it will assimilate and enrich itself by having the form, style and expression of all the 14 languages of India and in that process it will have assimilated from the Sanskrit language most of the form, style and expression. Therefore, it is the Hindi which will be developed that will come in use as official language after 1965, that will not be the Hindi which is a regional language. I say and I assert that a regional language cannot become the official language of the Union. It is only for this reason that English also cannot be included as a regional language, although there is another argument that English is a foreign language and therefore it cannot be put in in the Eighth Schedule. But, at the same time, English cannot be put in as one of the regional languages, just as Hindi, which is the official language of the Union, cannot be put in as a regional language, because the Hindi that has been described as the official language has got nothing to do with the Hindi of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh or Rajasthan. That Hindi is named after Hind, because the word 'Hindustani' has been used in the Constitution. Hindi should be akin to Hindustani. Hindustani is nowhere mentioned in the census. Hindustani is a word which Mahatma Gandhi gave to the nation in 1930. That Hindustani meant nothing but an

Indian language. That word, Hindustani, has been used in article 351. So, what is that Hindi which should be akin to Hindustani? The word 'Hindi' is from Hind just as the word 'Bharati' which is the name of a journal from Bombay. From Bharat we get the word 'Bharati'. From Hindustan we have Hindustani. From Hind we have the language Hindi. So, when we read article 351 carefully, we will come to the conclusion that Hindi which is the official language of the Union is quite different. The Official Language Commission has posed the question, "Which Hindi" with a question mark. The Commission has been appointed by the President of India under the Constitution to make recommendation in regard to the progress of Hindi which is coming up after 1965. So, we are waiting for that day when all the fourteen languages will combine and contribute to Hindi to make it really an element expressive of the composite culture of the whole of India. There is no question of imposing on anyone the Hindi of Uttar Pradesh or Madhya Pradesh or Rajasthan in any part of India. That is not what is meant in the Constitution of India. That point should be very clear to all of us.

If we have got Hindi in Uttar Pradesh, there is the Uttar Pradesh Official Language Act. We passed it in 1951. It is only because of that Act that the State preferred to have Hindi as the official language for the purpose of the proceedings in the legislature. We speak in Hindi there, in Lucknow, only because we have an Act there. Under the Act and under separate orders, it has been provided that Hindi should be progressively used in the courts also. It is very wrong to say that Uttar Pradesh is not allowing Urdu or any other language in the courts. Everywhere, in Uttar Pradesh, in all districts, plaints are filed in Urdu and written statements are filed in Urdu. The documents can be filed in Urdu. There is no question of discouraging it at all there. Bihar also has a similar provision to follow Hindi as the official language in that State. The same thing has been done

[Shri Kalika Singh]

in Madhya Pradesh also for certain purposes. Now, it is very clear that if the State of Madras wants to have Tamil as the official language, it can pass a Bill that Tamil shall be the official language in the Madras State.

An Hon. Member: They have already passed it.

Shri Kalika Singh: So, the question really is, what kind of Hindi shall be developed. The Official Language Commission is conscious of that question. It recommends the establishment of a national academy of Indian languages. Of course I have got my own views about it. I want that the name should be the national academy of official language of India, or something like that. The name they have suggested is, national academy of Indian languages. Then, when that Hindi has to be developed, later on certain developments may arise. For instance, in Bengal, they may write Bengali in the Devanagari script and ask the nation to accept it because Hindi has to assimilate the forms, style and expressions used in the other languages of India also. The Tamil people may say that they will write Tamil in Devanagari script and may say that according to article 351 that is the form, style and expression which they are giving to Hindi. My learned friend was saying that UP has got an Urdu-mixed Hindi. So, that objection they can still have in future when the Hindi that is spoken in UP is assimilated with the culture of the Urdu-speaking people. Therefore, the Marathis or the Tamilians may say we are not going to adopt that Hindi. They may bring out a journal saying that is the official language, and they may write Marathi or Tamil, or any other language of that State, in Devanagari, saying that is the form and style of impression that they are going to give to Hindi. Then a controversy might arise after the year 1953 when so many journals will begin to be issued from all the States and then it will be up to the Government of India just to bring out a journal to show which should be the correct

form. But the question will still be confined to the offices of the Central Government. That stage will not be reached and, as our Prime Minister has already said, unless the States accept Hindi, that language cannot be imposed. It is not going to be imposed on the nation. It is not the national language; it is only the official language. Therefore, my learned friends of all the States can remain assured that there is no question of imposing this language. It will come only through their acceptance, because of the provision in the Constitution itself, because it is akin to Hindustani, and Hindustani means the composite language of all the 14 languages that are mentioned in the Constitution of India.

काशी बरीब (गिरिडीह) जगज्जिटी स्वीकर, दुनिया की तारीख दुनिया का इतिहास दुनिया की हिस्ट्री जहा जन व बदल और प्रसन्न पर काम पर रोकनी वाली है बहा तारीख हमें फवाद की एक और बजह भी बताती है जिसका कि नाम जवान है। बुतावे भाज ही नहीं बल्कि इस्लाम से भी पहले दुनिया में जवान का लज्जा जवान का फवाद जवान का तास्वुब इतना शदीद इतना सक्त और इतना जबर्दस्त था कि घर व भी जवान के भागे मारी दुनिया को मज्म यानी बूगा कहने से। इस्लाम ने भा कर जहा नस्ली और कौमी बरतरी और बडाई के तस्मुबर का Superiority of race and nationality के सवाल को घाइडिया का घालमवार इमानी बिरादरी और बराबरी के तस्मुबर से Universal brother-hood और इन्वेजिटी की घाइडियालीजी से बदला वहां उसने जवान के तास्वुब को भी हुमेबा के लिये सतम कर देने का ऐमान कर दिया और फिर इस्लामी लड़की व अब दुनिया के एक सिरे से दूसरे सिरे तक दुनिया के एक मोर्चे से दूसरे मोर्चे तक, दुनिया के एक कोर्नर से दूसरे कोर्नर तक फैली तो मुसलमानों के

न सिर्फ अपनी धरती जवान ही को बल्कि दुनिया की सभ्यता की सभ्यता जवान और राष्ट्रियों की विकास करना अपना फर्ज मानसही करार दिया। लेकिन जब उन्होंने सभ्यता जवानों की नादिर व नायाब, प्रखरी कीमती और इम्पीटेंट किताबों को एक जवान से दूसरी जवान में तबदील करने ट्रांसफर करने या ट्रांसफ्रेट करने का काम शुरू किया तो जवान विप्टी स्वीकर, यह दुनिया की सारीक में पहली कोशिश की जो जवान को धगड़े की बजह बनने से रोक सकसी थी। लेकिन यह कोशिश नाकाम हो गई। यहां तक कि योरप की सारीक की जवान के कपड़ों की एक सरीक और सन्वी याददास्त पेश करती है जो छोटे छोटे सिगविस्टक यूनिट्स में तकसीम है। इसी तरह से जब हिन्दुस्तान में धार्य धार्य तो अपने साथ जवान भी लेकर धार्य वे। अपनी बोली भी लेकर धार्य वे लेकिन सारीक के धमस ने जब इन्हें इजने बड़े सन्वे चौड़े मुल्क से मुक्तालिक इजाकों में तकसीम करके इलाकसी जवानों को जन्म दिया और मुसलमान, धरवी, फारसी और तुर्की लेकर दासिम हुए तो हिन्दुस्तान के धमनपसन्व मिजाज ने जवान के साथ, ससाधुम, टकराव के बजाव, प्रेम, मुहब्बत, मसलहत और रबादारी से काम लेना पसन्व किया और एक नई जवान की दास बेल पड़ने तक जिसकी कि बुनिबाद फाउंडेशन धरवी, फारसी और तुर्की जवानों की मसाधर बानी बर्द की बजाव मुकामी, जवानों की मसाधर पर रखी गई। जिन में संस्कृत धास तीर पर काबिले चिक है। और इसी मिसी मुनी जवान का नाम धाने चल कर उर्दू रखा गया, जिस ने बहुत ही जन्म धवाम की मवान, अनता की जवान, मालेज की जवान को हैसियत धस्तियार कर की और उसका धामन मकामी और मर मकामी उमूम व कलूम, धवम और तहवीव व नमदूम (धादूर्ड इंड क्लफ्ट्स लिटरेचर विविसाधवेधम इंड क्लचर) के वेमुजार

श्रोतियों से इतना माला माल हो गया कि धाव कोई भी मकामी जवान धपने बधीरे के एतबार से इतना सरकराव व बुजन्द होने का धावा नहीं कर सकसी। बुनावे धाव भी जब कि उर्दू को एक धवाधो और मालेज की जवान को हैसियत में तससीम करने से इन्कार किया जा रखा है, दिन को रात और रात को दिन कहा जा रखा है, इस पर भी दुनिया देखसी है कि तहजाव व तमद्दून और धवव व धादूर्ड के वेमुक्कधामी (इंटरनेशनल) जसलों में ध्यादातर उर्दू ही हिन्दुस्तान की नुमायन्दगी करसी है।

इस कूर्ड जमीन पर, इस म्मोब पर, जब इन्सान ने कदम रखा था, तो धावव उस वक्त भी कोई जवान बोली जाती होगी, चाहे वह जवान इसारो में हो, चाहे धावाव में हो, चाहे धल्फाज में हो। लेकिन बीजूदा जमाने का कोई इन्सान, कोई मनुष्य, धगर इन पुरानी जवानों को फिर के रावव करना चाहे, बलाना चाहे और मीजूदा जमाने की पसन्वीदा, धालू जवानों को तर्क करना चाहे, छोड़ना चाहे तो यह सरापा भूल और बेबकूकी होगी। क्योंकि पुरानी जवान धाव की इन्सानी जरूरियात को पूरा करने के लिये नाकाफी होगी। इस-लिये उसमें इजाफा कराना पड़ेगा, तर-सीम करनी पड़ेगी, धमेडमेंट करने पड़ेगे। और जब तरसीम व इजाफा होगा तो वह अपनी शकल बदल कर नई सूरत धस्तियार कर लेगी। फिर एक नई जवान को बलाना कोई धासान काम नहीं है क्योंकि उसके लिये बेपनाह बलाना और सूरज की लालों गरदिने दरकार है।

धगर इन बीजो को धाप नधरधन्दाव भी कर दीजिये, तो वह सभ्यता बड़ी धाहमिकत रखता है, इम्पारटेंस रखता है कि जवानों को मीध्वेज को फिस्वाव की बजह बना कर क्या कोई कीम धपने इतहाव को, यूनिटी को, और एक मुल्क अपनी सामनियत को, इंटे-

[काशी मरीन]

बिटी को, बाकी धीर बरकरार रखने में कामयाब हो सकता है। यूरोप की सारीक जो धाब हमसे बहुत ज्यादा तरकी याफता है, इस सवाल का जबाब नकी में देती हैं। इसलिये जवान को लगड़े की बजह बनाना, धीर जोश में आकर रायज, चालू धीर पसन्दीया जवानों को पामाल करना, बरबाद करना बतनी मफावात के, नेशनल इंटेरेस्ट के कलघन खिलाफ है। मैं ज्यादातर बिहार का हाल बता सकता हू। हकूमत बिहार को अच्छी तरह मासूम है कि वहां काफो तादाद में रोजाना, हफ्तेवार धीर माहवार उर्दू के अक्षवारत धीर रिसाले, मैगजीन निकलते हैं। लेकिन ताज्जुब है कि बिहार सरकार को, बसूसन हमारे सूबे के हरदिलअजीब धीर भोले भाले धी बाबू को यह भी मासूम नहीं कि बिहार में किस जगह धीर कौन लोग उर्दू बोलते हैं हालांकि अगर वह अपने एजू-केसन मिनिस्ट्री से दरियाफत करमाने की तकलीफ नबारा करवाते तो मासूम हो जाता कि उर्दू बोलने वाले लड़कों के लिये बिहार की यूनिवर्सिटी सामाना हजारा हजार की तादाद में इम्तिहान के परचे उर्दू में छापती हैं, तो यह समझ में आ जाता कि कौन धीर कहाँ यह जवान बोली जाती हैं।

फिर इसी बजह से "कैम्पस एंड फिलर्स अबाउट बिहार" के नाम से जो किताब छपी है, धीर उसमें बिहार की आबादी लैंग्वेज के हिसाब से जो दी गई है तो वहा जानबूझ कर उर्दू बोलने वाले भाषी इन्सानों की कोई तादाद ही नहीं दी गई, जो बहुत अफसोस-नाक है।

दूसरे बिहार का वह इलाका जिसमें भाषी की तादाद में लोग बंगला, जवान बोलते हैं धीर उन लोगों के लैड रिफार्डस कमीन के कागजात, बंगला में हैं, अगर उन कागजात की जवान को बंगला की बजाए हिन्दी में बरन दिया जायेवा तो

भाषी इन्सानों के लिये परेसानी धीर बरबादी का सामना होगा, जिसे आपको ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

बहरसूरत इस बतल सवाल सिर्फ उर्दू धीर बंगला ही का नहीं, बल्कि मुल्क की दूसरी जवानों भी जो मुस्लिम कम्प्यूनिटीज में, मुस्लिम इन्सानों में, मुस्लिम सूबों में, मुस्लिम प्राविसेज में बोली जाती है, एक शरीब धीर सक्त दबाव, प्रघर महसूस कर रही हैं, जिसकी बजह से उत्तर से ले कर दक्षिण तक, धीर पूरब से लेकर पश्चिम तक, जनता में, मासेज में, एक तरह की सखी एक तरह की तलखी, एक तरह की कड़वाहट दिखाई दे रही है। जो कमी कमी जवान के लगड़ों की सूरत अस्तियार कर लेती है धीर मुल्क के अमन व अमान को, सा एंड धार्डर को, जलजले की तरह, भूकम्प की तरह, अर्धबबेक की तरह हिला देती है। धीर जिससे हमारी बजारत, राखिला, मिनिस्ट्री धाफ होम एफेयर्स की मशीनरी डोल जाती है।

इसलिये मेरे ध्याल मे इन तमाम चीजो को देखते हुये एक ही सूरत है कि हिन्दी को मुल्क की एक सरकारी जवान करार दे कर, सब ही मुकामी जवानों को उनके इन्सानों में, दूसरी सरकारी जवान करार देने का प्रैक्टिकल इमानदारी, धीर खुलस के साथ एमान कर दिया जाव क्योंकि एक जवान की तरकी की दूसरी जवान की तरकी में टकाबट नही बनना चाहिये।

दूसरे लैंग्वेज कमेटी रिपोर्ट में होम मिनिस्ट्री का सरकुलर दो बार नेक विल इन्सानो को मुतमइन कर संकता है, जवान के तमाम बोलने वाले मुतमइन नहीं हो सकते क्योंकि उरकी कोई भी कानूनी अह-मियत नहीं है।

बहुतेरी बात यह कि रत्नमल्लत में जो सर-
कारी बयान रायच की जाय यह बयान की
बयान हो, बगता की बयान हो, भासेज की
बयान हो, बापी जी के बयान की बयान हो,
हमारे दोस्त डा० केसकर के आकाशवाणी की
बयान न हो, सम्पूर्णानन्द जी की बयान न
हो, टंडन बाप बयान न हो ।

लक्ष्मी मेहता (कर्मिणी) : जलब तेली

सोहकर - दुनिया की तारीख - दुनिया का
अहसास - दुनिया की हस्तरी जलक व
जदाल के आसपास पर - लोर काउं पर
दुशली काल्पनी है वहाँ तारीख में
फसद की एक ओर वजह भी बताती है -
जिस का नाम दुनिया है - जलतजे अज ही
नेहें बल्के असल से भी पहले दुनिया
में दुनिया का जेकरा - दुनिया का फसद -
दुनिया का तेसब अला शदीद अला सवत
ओर अला बरुसत ता के सब भी लेली
दुनिया के अके सारी दुनिया को वजह येली कौनला
कहेते ते - असल ने अकर जहाँ नसली
ओर नुमी बरुसी ओर बरुली के तसुव को
Superiority of race and nation-
ality के खेाल को - अनी ता को वालकेर
अनसानी बरुदरी ओर बरुली के तसुव से
universal brotherhood ओर
Equality की Idiology से बदल
वहाँ लस ने दुनिया के तेसब
को भी हमेशे कहेते खतम को दल्ले का
अएलन को दल्ले - लोर येर असली तेहनेब
जब दुनिया के एक सरे से दुसरे
सरे तक दुनिया के एक कुशे से दुसरे
कुशे तक दुनिया के एक काउं से दुसरे
काउं तक पहली तो मुसलमानों ने नद
सुव लेली सुव दुनिया ही को बल्के

दुनिया की तम दुनिया ओर तेहनेब की
जललत कौना अला फरुष मलसुमी कुरार
दल्ले - लकिन जब अनेहों ने तम दुनिया
की नदर व नलब अजे लहेते लोर
असलतलक कताओं को एक दुनिया से
दुसरी दुनिया में तेदल कर्ने - कुरासलर
कर्ने या कुरासलत कर्ने का तम शुरुव कल
तो जलब तेली सोहकर - ये दुनिया की
तारीख में पहली कुशे तेली जो दुनिया
को जेकरे की वजह बल्के से रुक सकली
तेली - लकिन ये कुशे नाकम हो गली -
पहली तक के बरुप की तारीख भी
दुनिया के जेकरों की एक लवल लोर लसी
पलदलसत पेहली कती है जो जेकरे जेकरे
Linguistic Units में लसुम है -

असी लरु से जब हलदुसलन में
अरे अरे तो अजे सलत दुनिया भी लकर
अरे ते - लेली लेली भी लकर अरे ते
लकिन तारीख के लल ने जब अनेहों अले
बरे लसे लोर जेकरे लक के मुसलक
लक में लसुम कर्ने ललली दुनिया
को जलम दल्ले ओर मुसलन -
सुवली - फारसी लोर नुकी लकर
दल्लल हौने तो हलदुसलन के लसन
पसद मलज ने दुनिया के सलत तसलम -
कुरार के बजल्ले परुम लसलत -
लसलत लोर रुरादलरी से लम ललल लेल
पसद कल ओर एक नली दुनिया की दल्ले
पुने लकी जस की ललल foundation
सुवली - फारसी लोर तुकी दुनिया की
लसलर लेली लरुप की बजल्ले लसली
दुनिया की लसलर पर रुकी गली

[کالی متنیں]

جن میں سلسکرت خاص طور پر قابل ذکر ہے۔ اور اس ملی جلی زبان کا نام آگے چلکر اردو رکھا گیا ہے۔ جس نے بہت جلد عوام کی زبان - چلتا کی زبان - ماسز کی زبان کی حیثیت اختیار کر لی۔ اور اس کا دامن مقامی اور نھو مقامی علوم و فنون - ادب و تہذیب و تمدن اترتس ایلتہ کرائٹس - لٹریچر - سولایزیشن ایلتہ کلچر نے بے شمار موتوں سے اتنا سالمال ہو گیا کہ آج کوئی بھی مقامی زبان اچھے ذخیرہ کے اعتبار سے اتنا سرگراز و بلند ہونے کا دعویٰ نہیں کر سکتی۔ چنانچہ آج بھی جبکہ اردو کے وجود کو ایک عوامی اور ماسز کی زبان کی حیثیت میں تسلیم کرنے سے انکار کیا جا رہا ہے - دن کو رات اور رات کو دن کہا جا رہا ہے - اس پر بھی دنیا دیکھتی ہے کہ تہذیب و تمدن ادب و آرٹ کے ہون الاواسی - انٹرنیشنل - جلسوں میں زیادہ تر اردو ہی ہلدوستان کی ناپہلگی کرتی ہے -

اس کردہ زمین پر اس گلوب پر جب انسان نے قدم رکھا تھا تو شاید اس وقت بھی کوئی زبان بولی جاتی ہوگی - چاہے وہ زمینی اشیاوں میں ہو - چاہے آواز میں ہو - چاہے الفاظ میں ہو - لیکن موجودہ زمانے کا کوئی انسان - کوئی منصفہ - اگر ن ہوائی زبانوں کو ہر سے والیج

کرنا چاہے - چلانا چاہے - اور موجودہ زبان کی پسندیدہ اور چالو زبانوں کو ترک کرنا چاہے - چھوڑنا چاہے تو یہ سولیا بھول اور بے وٹولی ہوگی - کہونکہ وہ ہوائی زبانیں آج کی انسانی ضروریات کو پورا کرنے کے لئے نکالنی ہوگی - اس لئے اس میں اضافہ کرنا پڑتا - ترمیم کرنی پڑیگی - اسملتہ سٹائٹس کرنے پڑینگے - اور جب ترمیم و اضافہ ہوا - تو وہ اپنی شکل بدل کر نئی صورت اختیار کرلے گی - پھر ایک نئی زبان کو چلانا کوئی آسان کام نہیں ہے - کہونکہ اس کے لئے بے پناہ خزانہ اور سوچ کی لاکھوں گودشوں درکار ہیں -

اگر ان چیزوں کو آپ نظر انداز بھی کر دیکھتے تو یہ سوال بڑی اہمیت رکھتا ہے - اسمارٹمنس رکھتا ہے کہ زبان کو - لینگویج کو فساد کی وجہ بناکر کہا ایک قوم ایلتہ انصاف کو - یونگی کو - اور ایک ملک اپنی سالمیت کو - انٹگوریٹی کو - باقی اور برقرار رکھنے میں کامیاب ہو سکتا ہے -

یورپ کی تاریخ جو آج ہم سے بہت ترقی یافتہ ہے - اس سوال کا جواب نئی میں دیتی ہے - اس لئے زبان کو چھڑنے کی وجہ بنانا اور جوہی میں آکر والیج - چالو اور پسندیدہ زبانوں کو ہاسل کرنا - بہتاد کرنا وطن کے مفادات کے - نیشنل

انٹریسٹ کے لحاظ سے - میں زیادہ تر بہار کا حال بتا سکتا ہوں - حکومت بہار کو اچھی طرح معلوم ہے کہ وہاں کافی تعداد میں روزانہ - ہفتہ وار - ماہوار اردو کے اخبارات اور رسالے میگزینس نکلتے ہیں - لیکن تعجب ہے کہ بہار سرکار کو خصوصاً ہمارے صوبے کے ہر دلچسپ اور بولنے والے بھائی سری بابو کو یہ بھی معلوم نہیں کہ بہار میں کس - چکنے اور کون لوگ اردو بولتے ہیں - حالانکہ اگر وہ انہیں ایجوکیشن منسٹری سے دریافت فرماتے کی تکلیف گزارا فرماتے تو معلوم ہو جاتا کہ اردو بولنے والے لوگوں کے لئے بہار کی یونیورسٹیوں سالانہ ہزاروں ہزار کی تعداد میں استحصان کے پرچے اردو میں بھی چھاپتی ہیں تو یہ سمجھ میں آجاتا کہ کون اور کہاں یہ زبان بولی جاتی ہے -

پھر اسی وجہ سے ٹیکنس ایڈت ٹیکرز ایڈت بہار کے نام سے جو کتاب چھپی ہے اور اس میں بہار کی آبائی لہجوں کے حساب سے جو دی گئی ہے تو وہاں جان بوجہ کر اردو بولنے والے لاکھوں انسانوں کی کوئی تعداد ہی نہیں دی گئی - جو بہت افسوسناک ہے - دوسرے بہار کا وہ علاقہ جس میں لاکھوں کی تعداد میں لوگ ہنگلے زبان بولتے ہیں اور ان لوگوں کے لہجے رگڑتے - رسپی کے لفظات ہنگلے زبان میں ہیں - اگر

ان لفظات کی زبان کو ہنگلے کی بجائے ہندی میں بدل دیا جائے گا تو ان لاکھوں انسانوں کے لئے پریشانی اور بربادی کا سامان ہوگا - جس پر آپ کو دھیان دینے کی ضرورت ہے -

بہر صورت اس وقت سوال صرف دو اور ہنگلے ہی کا نہیں ہے بلکہ ملک کی دوسری زبانوں ہی جو مختلف کمیونٹیوں میں - مختلف علاقوں میں - مختلف صوبوں میں - مختلف پراونسز میں بولی جاتی ہیں - ایک شدید اور سخت دباؤ - پریشر محسوس کر رہی ہیں - جس کی وجہ سے اتر سے لیکر دکھن تک اور یورپ سے لیکر پچھم تک چلنا میں - سب میں ایک طرح کی سختی - ایک طرح کی تلخی - ایک طرح کی عداوت دکھائی دے رہی ہے - جو کبھی کبھی زبان کے جھگڑوں کی صورت اختیار کر لیتی ہے - اور ملک کے امن و امان کو - لائیڈ آؤٹ کو - زلزلہ کی طرح - ہوکمپ کی طرح - ارتھکوئیک کی طرح ہلا دیتی ہے اور جس سے ہماری وزارت داخلہ - منسٹری آف ہوم ائیرز کی مشینری قبول جاتی ہے -

اس لئے میرے خیال میں ان تمام چیزوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے ایک ہی صورت ہے کہ ہندی کو ملک کی ایک سرکاری زبان قرار دے کر سب ہی مقامی زبانوں کو ان کے

जिस संविधान सभा ने हिन्दी को राष्ट्र-भाषा स्वीकार किया उसने भी हिन्दी बालों को बतते ऐसा नहीं किया बल्कि उन लोगों के बतते किया जो कि हिन्दी बाले नहीं थे । और जब देश आजाद हुआ था उस वक्त भी एक भाषाज ऐसी नहीं उठी कि हिन्दी भी जगह कोई दूसरी भाषा या एंगनी साहब की भाषा धरेंजो को राष्ट्रभाषा बनाया जाय ।

18 hrs.

लेकिन सोचना चाहिये कि क्या कारण है कि स्वाधीनता के बाद हिन्दी का विरोध किया जाने लगा है । जब कांस्टीच्युएन्ट प्रसेम्बली—संविधान सभा—बनी, तो उस समय भी कोई झगड़े नहीं हुये कि हिन्दुस्तान की भाषा कौन हो । यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि आज यह घान्दोलन चलाया जा रहा है और झूठा प्रचार किया जा रहा है कि हिन्दी जो राज भाषा मानी गई, वह एक बोट से मानी गई । एक धरेंज पत्रकार, श्री किशोरे मार्टिन हिन्दुस्तान घाये और उन्होंने लोगों से बातचीत करके यह बात अपने अखबार न्यू स्ट्रेट्स टाइम्स में लिख दी । हम समझ सकते थे कि यह बूल उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर नहीं की, उनकी शस्ती से हुई क्योंकि उन्होंने जिन लोगों से बातचीत की, उन्होंने उनको शसत सबर दी । लेकिन अभी भारत सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त संस्कृत

कमीशन की रिपोर्ट निकली है, जिसको मौलाना आजाद साहब ने बनाया था । उस कमीशन के सभापति थे सुनीतिंद्र साहब चटर्जी, जो कि ग्राफिस्वियल लैंग्वेज कमीशन में भी थे । उस रिपोर्ट में यह बात कही गई है कि संविधान सभा में हिन्दी जो हिन्दुस्तान की राजभाषा मानी गई, वह बहुत थोड़े बहुमत से—सिर्फ एक बोट से—मानी गई । मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे ज्यादा गलत और झूठा प्रचार गाबरू भी नहीं कर सकता था । संविधान सभा में हिन्दी को राजभाषा बनाया गया, सर्वमम्मति से वह सबकी राय से, मुकम्मल राय से बनाया गया । सब ने उस को स्वीकार किया । एक भी बोट उसके विरुद्ध नहीं पडा ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : वह निर्णय धुनैनिमस था ।

श्री ज० प्र० मिश्र : वही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ । एक भी बोट संविधान सभा में उसके खिलाफ नहीं पडा था ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: माननीय सदस्य भव भयना जांचन कल जारी रखें ।

18:02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 3rd September, 1980|Bhadra 12, 1981 (Saka).