

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

309 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, one Member from among themselves to serve as a Member of the Committee on Public Accounts for the unexpired portion of the term ending on 30th April, 1960, *vice* Dr. P. Subarayan ceased to be a Member of the Committee on his appointment as a Minister."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Members of this House do proceed to elect in the manner required by sub-rule (3) of Rule 254, read with sub-rule (1) of Rule 309 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, one Member from among themselves to serve as a Member of the Committee on Public Accounts for the unexpired portion of the term ending on 30th April, 1960, *vice* Dr. P. Subarayan ceased to be a Member of the Committee on his appointment as a Minister."

The motion was adopted.

13-06 hrs.

MINES (AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Mines Act, 1952.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Mines Act, 1952".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Nanda: Sir, I beg to introduce the Bill.

13.07 hrs.

MOTION RE. REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGE—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Govind Ballabh Pant on the 2nd September, 1959, namely:

"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."

The hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): May we take it that the debate will be continued till Monday?

Mr. Speaker: I think we shall finish it today. All that was asked for was some extension of time. We shall sit till 6 O'clock as we have been doing for the past few days. The non-official business will start at 3-30 P.M. That will leave us 2½ hours. Thus, from now, we will have 2 hours... (*Interruptions.*) We can go on talking endlessly about this. There must be conclusion of this debate. I have called upon the hon. Prime Minister.

श्री जगदीश अवस्थी (बिल्होर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सदन के बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने पुरानी परम्परा को तोड़ करके कल हिन्दी भाषा में भाषण किये हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री से भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम आज तो वह भी हिन्दुस्तानी में भाषण दें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हिन्दुस्तानी वह जानते हैं।

श्री जगदीश अवस्थी : अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आज कोई परीक्षा तो नहीं है।

प्रधान मंत्री तथा वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुश्किल यह है कि जिन को समझाना चाहते हैं हमारे निम्न, उनके कान तक आवाज न पहुंचे और दिमाग में न आये, तो समझा नहीं सकते हैं।

Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Rajampet): Sir, if the hon. Prime Minister speaks in Hindi, we shall not be able to understand.

श्री प्रकाश चौर शास्त्री (गुड़गांव) :
दोनों भाषाओं में बोलिये।

12.09 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after the minor excitements that we experienced a little while ago, it is a little difficult to come back to the calm atmosphere of a debate on language. Although perhaps this debate on language has not been quite as calm as it might have been and there has been some excitement and some passion introduced into it, yet, even while this debate has been going on and important questions were considered—because the question of language is very important—I have had a vague feeling that the debate was slightly out of date or will soon be out of date. Why do I say so? Because this whole debate, this whole approach is governed by a static conception of India, as if India was not changing and India is not what it is. We carry on in the old way. What is happening in India? Apart from the rest of the world, a new world is growing up. It is coming in upon us with giant strides, even though many of us may not quite realise it. In two ways it is coming in upon us, and both ways are such that they will affect the question of language more than, if I may say so with respect, any decision of this House; or, rather, the decisions of this House will be governed by these forces.

What are those forces? One is the obvious fact of the growth of, call it democracy, education, vast numbers of people coming into the field of political decision. Whether it is by means of elections or otherwise, all these people come in and a vast number of them, a great majority of them have no background of a foreign language in them. That is a fact of life. It is not a question of choice. It is so. And the more they come in, the more they will change the scene—for good or bad is a different matter, opinions may differ. We who sit here, many of us, belong to a generation which was brought up differently, that is, brought up through the medium of English, through English as a medium of education. Obviously, that is not being repeated even now in India, and will still less be repeated in the future, so that the whole context of this argument is changing.

The second point, which I think is important to bear in mind, is that the new world that is growing up in India is going to be a scientific, technological and industrial world. We talk about Five Year Plans and all that. We talk in terms of some project here, some there. But if you look at the whole picture, it is a picture of an entirely and absolutely new world growing up in India. It is the industrialisation of India, it is the industrial revolution coming to India in the middle of the twentieth century, rather belated no doubt, and trying to catch up with the developments of the twentieth century.

Now, may I ask, what has all that got to do with language? I say it has everything to do with language. We seem to think of language as something either writing in government files, may be for the primary or secondary schools, or may be for a *mushaira* or *kavi sammelan*. It is all that, of course, I do not deny it; but it is something vast and something basic which moulds the people, and it has moulded all the activities and

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

occupation of the people. If this industrial revolution comes here, as it is coming and it is bound to come, it changes the texture of our thinking and it introduces words without number which you have to use in these new occupations, and all the efforts of Dr. Raghu Vira and Seth Govind Das cannot meet that situation, whatever it may be. They may produce volumes after volumes of artificial words, so-called translations. Nobody will accept them, you can take it from me, because that language of science and technology will not come out of your class-room or translator's room. It will arise from the people who are working there.

These are two major developments that, I say, will affect language, because they affect our entire life, and the decisions that you may make will really be governed far more by these vast developments than by some technical resolution that you may or may not pass. I just wish to say that this is the background with which I should like to approach this question, with which I should like the House to approach this question, because, if I may say so with the utmost respects to this House, we Members of this House are able men, experienced men, but by and large we do not represent the scientific, technological, industrial world; "industrial" not in the sense of ownership of industry, but of the engineering side of it.

This is the world we are entering into, and this revolution is coming on. That revolution, as it has affected other countries, powerfully affects language, thousands and thousands of new words coming every year from technology, science etc., and those people who suggest to set up some translation bureau for it. I respectfully say, have no conception of the meaning of those words. Translations of some scientific words and symbols which have grown out of certain contexts and conditions can-

not be done so easily as if it is an artificial thing coming out from some slot machine; it is important to remember that.

Now, having said that and unburdened myself to that extent, I should like to say that this Committee of which my friend and colleague the Home Minister was the Chairman has done I think quite a remarkable piece of work. I do not pretend to agree with every line that they have written and I do not want anybody here to agree with every line that they have written. It was, after all, a very difficult problem, people thinking quite differently being brought together in a large committee and miraculously agreeing, except for one or two or three or two and a half, whatever it may be. It really is remarkable that this measure of agreement was brought about. Of course, when you seek such a measure of agreement you give up something here, something there, which I may like, which many of the hon. Members may like. I agree. But, broadly speaking, it was rather a remarkable feat and a feat which I doubt if anyone else except my colleague the Home Minister could have brought about. As I say, I do not like some emphasis here or some lack of emphasis there, but broadly speaking, in the way it has come out, I think it is a worthy report.

Now, some days ago or some weeks ago I had occasion to speak in this House on Shri Anthony's resolution on the English language, and it was my good fortune to say something which pleased Shri Anthony as well as some others. I am grateful to him for that. Whatever I said then—of course, I hold by it completely—I was not laying down any statute or law, I was emphasising an approach, a mental approach. I was not considering what words to use in a Bill or something like that, but a mental approach to this problem.

Let us consider the facts. Apart from our wishes, one of the basic facts today is that the medium of instruction has become the language of the region, the great language of India, whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Marathi, Gujerati, Hindi, whatever you may like. That is the basic fact, and the basic change that has come over India is coming over India which will produce a generation utterly unlike the generation to which I belong to is this, that education will be through an Indian medium and not English. Apart from some people who may consider English as their mother tongue, which is a different matter, that is the basic change.

I do not understand the importance, the relevance or the significance of this argument about Hindi—English etc. I am coming to that. But once you grasp this basic fact that the great regional language of India are now progressively the media of instruction, then you will appreciate the revolutionary change that is coming over India—for good or bad is another matter. It is an inevitable change which has to come, and I think it is a right change, although I realise that there are certain risks and dangers in it—I mean to say risks and danger of a certain measure of separatism. I realise that. But you could not put an end to those risks by ignoring a problem, you have to face it.

So the first thing is this major fact and it is that major fact that produces a certain result on the position of English in India. I want you to realise that it is not a question of Hindi—English, it is a question of the 14 languages—or more than 14, if you like, even though they are not in the Constitution—principally, for education being carried on through that media. That creates a situation which is broadly different from the time when many of us who went through schools or colleges got our education through the medium of English. That is the basic truth.

Therefore, English inevitably becomes in India a secondary language. It is no longer the primary language. It does not matter what you may say about it, it becomes that. The House knows very well the importance I attach to English, and I shall come to that presently. The basic fact is that English becomes a secondary language in India. It is not the medium of instruction. It is a language to learn as a secondary language, maybe some learn it as a compulsory secondary language, but it is a language which is a secondary language and it can never quite occupy that place in our mind because it has lost that place in our educational system except for a few. That is the first, basic fact to be remembered.

The second is, obviously we require some kind of common language link and the Constitution has said that Hindi should be that common official language link. Remember it is for official correspondence or whatever it is—official work—between the States. Having found, apart from any decision in the Constitution, that the position of English is bound to go down in that way, it will come up in another way as I would point out. The argument that may be advanced for English to be this kind of official language for India really becomes very weak if you realise the first fact. Today, as somebody has said, there are plenty of arguments in favour of English. In fact, the fact is we do much of our work in English as everyone knows, and by a decree you cannot change it, because we have grown up into that. Tomorrow it may not be the case and the day after tomorrow it will still less be the case. These are the facts. You cannot ignore them, whatever your likes or my likes may be.

Therefore, you have a variety of reasons into which I need not go, but you have to have that common binding link for the language of India. You may again criticise Hindi; it is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

not good enough, it has not developed enough. It is there I will for a moment accept all your criticisms. Still, the fact remains, and it can reasonably be argued that no other Indian language, other than Hindi, would be more suitable. Mind you, I do not say that Hindi is in the slightest degree better than any other Indian language. In fact, I firmly believe that some of the Indian languages are richer in content and have a better literature than Hindi. But that does not take away from the fact that all the languages have to develop and to influence each other.

Now, the real basic opposition, I take it, comes from a fear that Hindi, if it comes in, will mean a disparity for the non-Hindi knowing areas. I say undoubtedly it will be a disparity. Let us face that. Let us not try to get over it and say anybody can learn it in a fortnight or in a month or a year. It will be a disparity for a considerable time. I say a rule must be laid down by which we do absolutely nothing which creates a disparity for non-Hindi-speaking areas, in regard to matters like services and other things. Let that be quite clear. I am quite clear about that.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal) Will you accept the quota system as was recommended by the Commission?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry I do not know what the quota system is, and I cannot accept anything I do not know or understand. Take services. I am perfectly clear in my mind that for any foreseeable time there should be no compulsory bar—compulsory knowledge of Hindi—to the recruitment of people in the services. None at all. If a man does not know one word of Hindi, still, he ought to be able to come in at that stage. But I would certainly have him learn Hindi. Of course, I want him to learn it at an earlier stage

too. Very probably he will. I am merely saying that this feeling of disparity should vanish. Shri Frank Anthony said, "Oh, the Prime Minister said that there will be no imposition of language. Therefore there should be no compulsory test in Hindi after coming in." I do not see how that follows. It is not a question of a compulsory test in Hindi. We may very well have compulsory test in English. Do you object to that? I think every person who comes into the All-India Services ought to pass a compulsory test in English. Will Shri Frank Anthony object to that? Probably not. I want that wider knowledge.

Suppose, an all-India officer is going to Madras. I would insist on his having a compulsory test in Tamil. These are the normal things that are done for convenience of administration and everything. The man for the all-India service ought to know the language of the place he works in. He normally tries to learn it. Whether he knows it well or not I do not know. We send people abroad. To whatever country we send them, people in the Foreign Service are required, as a compulsory thing, to learn certain foreign languages. Each person has to choose one or two or sometimes three foreign languages. So, you must not look upon it as an imposition. When I said that there should be no imposition of Hindi, what I meant was this. Whether it is Madras, Andhra, Kerala or whatever part it may be, I do not wish to impose a language on that State in the sense in which the State will take it. I know if they have a sense of pressure or imposition they react against it. I do not want that. If the State of Madras says, "We do not want compulsory Hindi", let them not have compulsory Hindi in their schools. As a matter of fact, there are more people learning the language voluntarily than perhaps in any other place in any other way. So, I want to remove this sense of ~~compulsion~~.

I want to remove this idea that they will suffer in service or in the work or whatever it is. I want to remove that sense. I want all these things to develop voluntarily and in a spirit of co-operation and, it is for us to adjust ourselves from time to time to these developments.

In this matter, as I said on the last occasion, we have to be flexible in our approach; no rigidity. I do not like dates and all that. We start movements and processes working which lead in certain directions and which we gradually adjust ourselves to.

I come to English. I had said that English should be an associate or additional language. What exactly did I mean by it? Well, I meant exactly what that means. That is to say, English cannot be, in India, anything but a secondary language in future. In the nature of things mass education will be in our own languages. English may be taught as a compulsory language—I hope it will be—to a large number of people; it cannot be to everybody but to a large number. It remains as a secondary language. But I say that Hindi, whenever it is feasible, comes into use progressively more and more for the inter-State official work. But English should have a place there; not a limited place. That is to say, English can be used by any State in writing to the Government or writing to each other. Remember that this internal State work will be done presumably in the State language. English comes in only on the question of dealings on the all-India scale between States. To that, it should be open to anybody and to any State to do that in English. There is no limitation on that. We encourage them to do it in Hindi; if they can they can do. But there is no limitation. I say there is no limitation of time even to that, except when people generally agree,—and I had said that those very people in the non-Hindi-speaking areas who might be expected should agree. I am perfectly agreeable.

I would submit to this House and more especially to our colleagues from the Hindi-speaking areas that if there is one thing—there are many forces at work in favour of the spread of Hindi and they are spreading Hindi and it is becoming richer—that is going to come in their way, it is sometimes their over-enthusiasm and the way they approach this subject which irritates and rightly irritates others. It irritates me. I do not know about the non-Hindi-speaking areas.

Then there is another thing. The type of Hindi they produce is really a most extraordinary one. I am not worried about it; it is only irritating. Because I said that Hindi or any other language that will come up in India will come up from the masses; not from literary coteries.

Yesterday Acharya Kripalani was talking about Madrasi English, Bengali English, Bombay English and all that, which is completely right. But we have, today very much so, a Bengali Hindi, Madrasi Hindi and Bombay Hindi developing. To my ears, it is rather painful to hear. But I put up with it; there it is. But just like there is Bengali Hindi, there is Seth Govind Das Hindi and Dr. Raghu Vira Hindi. What Hindi are we going to have really? This business of some kind of slot machine turning out Hindi words and Hindi phrases, that kind of approach is an artificial, unreal, absurd, fantastic and laughable approach. You cannot do it. If you try to do it, you will put your mind in some kind of steel-frame which cannot understand anything or progress at all. It can only recite perhaps some slogans by rote. That is all. It can understand nothing else.

Coming to another aspect of English, the aspect that English has to be an associate additional secondary language which can be used by anyone who wants to use it in that central sphere, I mean, even though

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Hindi is the official language, English is used too, and I expect that progressively the use of it will become less and less. It does not make any great differences whether it takes a certain period or double that period, a little more or a little less; I do not mind.

Take another aspect of English to which I attach great importance and that is the technical and scientific terminology. There is no very great difference, although there is some difference, between the terms in English, French, German, etc. Broadly speaking, the scientific terms approximate, though their endings may be different. That is, there is something which might be called international scientific and technological terms. I am strongly in favour of not Hindi only, but every language of India trying to have identical scientific and technical terms. I do not say that every word should be absolutely the same and I do not want well-known words to be rejected. Well-known words, whether in Hindi or Tamil, of course, will be used. But it is not a question of well-known words; it is a question of this vast ocean of language that is streaming in, the technical language, which cannot be reproduced. If you could translate it adequately, even if you did it, even then you do the wrong, because you would be separated from the rest of the world in regard to those words.

It is necessary for us in the modern world to find as many common points of knowledge as possible. We cannot change and we need not change the literary part of our language. That has developed and will develop. But so far as this unknown region, which is getting more and more known is concerned—the scientific, industrial and technological region—we should develop to the best of our ability a common language in India, which is also common for international purposes.

Shri Hem Basma (Gauhati): For the European language Greek is the common pool. What is the common pool here?

An Hon. Member: Sanskrit.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, no. I do not say Sanskrit or any other. It is true that words like Oxygen originally came from Greek or Latin as a rule. I say you have to adopt them bodily, not every word, but common words you use. Any ordinary man does not ask your opinion as to what he should call a bicycle. He calls it a bicycle and be done with it. But there are those gentlemen living in Lucknow who insist on calling it *बिस्कि*। *बिस्कि* is a very good translation.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Longer than that.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: You could translate many things like that, but every villager knows what a bicycle is. You go about translating it and say, "No; bicycle comes from some foreign language". That approach is not good enough.

This is a very important matter—your absorbing this vast number of technical words in the form, as far as possible, that they are used internationally. It does not matter if they come from Greek or Latin. It does not matter if they come from English. But the point is, it is a body of language which you are not using for show. You want that knowledge; you want to advance industrially, technically, technologically and scientifically. You want to advance fast and every obstruction in the way will delay your advance or progress in that direction, which is essential for us to make good.

I need not say again about numerals. It is absolutely essential that we should use the international numerals. We might use any flowery way of writing we like, but in business, in

science and technology, generally the international form of numerals should be universal in India in all the languages and should be the common factor for foreign languages too. Not that I object to any other form being used, but one should encourage in every serious work—I do not mind novels having anything—in every statistical work, the use of international numerals which immediately puts us on a line with others. You can take a book in almost any language—Russian, German or Japanese. You do not know the language, but it is a statistical book and you can easily understand it, because all the figures are in that form which you know. You understand the numerals. The headings you can change and you can marginally note it, so that you can use the world's statistical tables. In Japan, they have adopted this; almost everywhere in the world they have adopted this. Immediately the door opens out to the world's numerals, to the world's statistics and everything; if you keep your statistics in that way, the world looks at your statistics. If you insist on keeping it in a particular way confined to you, you are cut off from the rest of the world. So, these things are obvious.

Language, of course, is a very vital thing. But behind it is something much deeper. It is the reaction—action and reaction and counter-action—of two powerful pulls. One is the pull of the past, which is important and which we have to maintain. The other is the pull of the future. The pull of the future means the pull of what might be called the modern world, of science, etc. I do not think that it would be right at all for us to ignore the pull of the past. It is vital to us; we have grown up in it. For all that India is after 3,000 years, we cannot cut it off. Among other things, that is where language comes in.

I have on a previous day expressed my great admiration of Sanskrit. There are many things, of course, but

I do think that there is one thing which can embody the greatness of Indian thought and culture in the past; it is Sanskrit, which has been built up. We do not talk Sanskrit now no doubt, but the Indian languages of today have either directly descended from Sanskrit, or the Southern languages have been closely allied with it. The background of thought, of culture, whether it is Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and what not, is closely allied to the background of thought and culture of the northern languages because of Sanskrit and its effect on the whole of India. I do not say all of it is good; we have to change it; we have to discard something, but there are the roots on which India has grown up. I think if we cut away those roots, it will be very very bad for us; we become superficial human beings. Therefore, with all my admiration of foreign languages or English,—I want English to continue for a variety of reasons, as I have said—I can never ask our people to transplant their roots to English roots. It cannot be done and it would not be done under our democratic adult suffrage. It does not matter what you argue about it, but this would not be done. Therefore, it is important. Language comes in as an important and as a continuing link for ages past, and that link has transferred from Sanskrit to our modern Indian languages. That is one thing, the great events of the past and the heritages that we have. The other is the future to which we look forward, a future which may be called, to a large extent, influenced by modernism and the like, the modernism of the future, the spirit of the age, call it the *Yuga Dharma*, which is science, which is technology and the like. And I say so with all respect that all the languages of India put together cannot produce it in the foreseeable future, unless you have recourse to something else, to some other languages—of course, our language will be growing rapidly and our languages, I hope, will be developed with heavy books and thinking in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

science—because we have to spend millions and millions. Because, the moment you go to higher regions, it cannot be re-produced by artificial translations and text-books. It is something entirely different.

Therefore, the real conflict in the mind of India today is—language is only a part of it—how to bring out a synthesis from this past, from this heritage of the past to what we want in the present. That is the conflict and it is a basic conflict. I do not know what the ultimate result of this will be.

I referred on the last occasion I spoke here to a lecture delivered by a very well known author and scientist about the two cultures. He was talking about England and the two cultures were literary culture and the culture of modern science. He said there was conflict even in England. I imagine, if that is so in England, what about this country where we are just barely entering the age of science. We glibly talk in terms of science. We are out of that age. Our minds are out of it. If I use industrial words, a rich man may buy up a textile mill and may make money out of it—rich people go on becoming richer and richer—but he understands nothing about industry. He can buy an expert and make money out of it, but he is not an industrialist; he knows nothing about science.

So, that is the basic conflict in the soul of India and many other countries too—this past that we value and that must be valued and the future that we ought to have if we want to survive. Because, we cannot survive with all the past that we have got, unless we add to it the future, the future of science, of technology and all that. How far we can bring about that synthesis, the future will show. I hope it will, because there is no other way.

12.43 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now, in our approach to language, broadly speaking, we should be flexible, because the moment rigidity comes in, difficulties come in, opposition comes in. And if we adopt this approach which is given, I think we shall succeed both on the issue of language and on that basic issue, the synthesis between old and the new.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): Mr. Speaker, I, am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views on language. Originally I had no intention, and I have been a silent member of this House since I was elected to this office. But yesterday there were certain observations made by my friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, which provoked me that I should certainly reply to certain aspects that he touched upon. Because, I had been associated with certain things to which he made reference, therefore, I think it is my duty to make certain things clear.

So far as the report of this Committee is concerned, by and large, I agree with it. Whatever may have been my views in the Constituent Assembly and whatever I might have said there, which was quoted also, since it was adopted by the Constituent Assembly certainly I have been an ardent supporter of Hindi and never have I opposed it. That question is settled and we agree that is the *Rashtra Bhasha*. The only question that has been argued here is how soon it should come and with what pace it should come. The different tones that were expressed here shows that there were differences about this. So far as English and Hindi are concerned, the hon. Prime Minister has referred to them and I would not go into those facts just at present. Because, within the time that I have at my disposal I want to take up the case of my own State, as that is a subject that is really in the forefront now.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri said that he felt pained that even the conditions that prevailed during the time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and the British rule were not being permitted in Punjab. So far as Hindi was concerned, referring to perhaps what Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadı said, he said

“शात वातावरण में हल की धोर जा रही थी और इस प्रकार उन्होंने शात सरोवर में डेला कंकने की बात की। उससे जो लहरे उत्पन्न हुईं उनसे न बचल इस सदन में बल्कि बाहर भी प्रतिक्रिया हुई।”

भाग्य चल कर उन्हो ने कहा

“जो स्थिति भाषा के संबंध में राजा रणजीत सिंह व समय थी, जो स्थिति अंग्रेजी शासनकाल में थी वह स्थिति पुन प्राप्ति चाहिये।”

I could not appreciate what he meant. If he meant that in the period, Maharaja Ranjit Singh's rule, Punjabı was not there I have only to say that even Hindi was not there. As the Prime Minister observed only a little while ago, it is not an easy job to change a language, when it has been the language of administration for a long time. There was Persian at that time. Maharaja Ranjit Singh had no time enough, his rule was not long enough, to change it. If he had ruled long, he might have changed it. We also have been trying. We decided it in 1950 and said that we would change it by 1965. Let us see. It is not easy job.

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बड़ी नम्रता से माननीय सदस्य से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा अभिप्राय स्पष्ट भाषा में यह था कि राजा रणजीत सिंह जी और अंग्रेजों के शासन काल में जो भाषा की स्थिति थी अर्थात् किसी भाषा की किसी दूसरे के ऊपर जब या अनिवार्यता नहीं थी, वही स्थिति आज पचास में होनी चाहिय, जैसा

कि अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, कोई भाषा किसी के ऊपर जबदस्ती दूरी न जाय। यह मेरा स्पष्ट अभिप्राय था।

Sardar Hukam Singh: He has done well to invite my attention to that because I anticipated that. He thought that now Hindi has not that opportunity which it had previously; every language could flourish, every citizen had the option to take any language that he liked, but that is being denied in Punjab to Hindi. I think I am interpreting him rightly. Then I will move on.

I wanted to say that so far as the official language was concerned, during Maharaja Ranjit Singh's time it was Persian. During the British period it was Urdu or English.

He has, of course, a little later said—

“मुझे आश्चर्य तब हुआ जब मेरे मित्र ने यह कहा कि पहले मैं हिन्दी का समर्थक था लेकिन जब से हिन्दी का आंदोलन चला तब से मुझे हिन्दी से घृणा होती चली गई। इसका उत्तर मैं इन शब्दों से तो नहीं दे सकता कि जब से मास्टर तारासिंह ने अकाली आंदोलन चलाया तब से मुझे गुरुओं से घृणा होती चली गई या उनके पन्थ से घृणा होती चली गई।”

It is a strange contrast. That shows the attitude and the approach. Shri Sampath also had referred to my speech in the Constituent Assembly and this could be associated with me also. I had said in the Constituent Assembly that really I was a great supporter of Hindi but this fanaticism of Hindi zealots has driven me back. This was read out by Shri Sampath. So this could be associated with me as well. But now the strange contrast that my hon friend makes is really very curious. He says that hon Members have said that because they showed overzealousness we lost that liking or we began to hate

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

Hindi Even if that much is true then he takes the other side that he is not prepared to say that because

‘ “मास्टर तारासिंह ने यह घोषणा चलाया इस लिये गुरुओं से घृणा हो गई।”

Now, is that a proper contrast to be made here? He can say that if

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun) May I take the liberty of saying a word? I just want to inform my hon friend that the Gurus were not Sikhs at all They were our Gurus. You have usurped them

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am sorry if I have usurped them This is not my intention.

Mr Speaker: He wants to say something again by way of a personal explanation

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बड़ी नज़र से अपने माननीय सदस्य से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा जो अभिप्राय था वह अगर मेरे सारे भाषण को पढ़ेंगे तो बिलकुल स्पष्ट हो जायगा। मैंने सीधी सी भाषा में यह कहा था कि जिस प्रकार से माननीय सदस्य श्री अजित सिंह सरहदी ने यह कहा कि हिन्दी आंदोलन से पहले मुझे हिन्दी के साथ आत्मीयता थी और उसके पश्चात् मुझे उससे घृणा हो गई, उस प्रकार से मैं इस भाषा का प्रयोग नहीं कर सकता कि चूँकि अफ़ाली आंदोलन चला उसके कारण मुझे गुरुओं से घृणा हो गई। मेरी यह स्थिति है। मैंने अपने भाषण में स्वीकार किया है कि उनका ज्ञान हमारा है, व हमारे है, इस लिये हम उनसे घृणा नहीं कर सकते। इसी तरह मैंने कहा था कि हिन्दी केवल हिन्दी रक्षा समिति की नहीं है। हिन्दी सारे भारत की है, केवल किसी बर्ग विशेष की भाषा नहीं है।

Mr. Speaker: No more explanations now.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have read out those portions that he himself uttered and again he has repeated them I am not misquoting him This is on record. I do not say that he said that in those words or that he had developed that *ghana* He said that he would not say that because Master Tara Singh had started this movement he will develop the *ghrana* against the Gurus. There ought to be a proper comparison between the two He could develop a *ghrana* against Punjabi, against the Sikhs or against anybody but there was no cause to bring in the Gurus here This is my point and not the one that he is referring to

Now, I come to

Shri Braj Raj Singh What about Shri Tyagi's remarks?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have conceded his point

Shri Tyagi. Do you mean to say that they were Sikhs? The Gurus were all Hindus Does he mean to say

Mr Speaker The discussion is on language and not on religion

Sardar Hukam Singh. The complaint that he has just now made is that there ought to be no imposition of Punjabi Now I come to this point Everybody knows that Punjab, as at present constituted, is a bilingual State It is because it contains two distinct regions One is the Hindi region comprising of Haryana and the other is the Punjabi region They have been granted and recognised. The Government has demarcated them It is agreed that the Hindi region has Hindi as the mother tongue. Nobody denies that The Sikhs also concede that We are agreed that the Hindi region people have got Hindi as their mother tongue But then we say that the Punjabi region has got Punjabi as its mother tongue. That is denied by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri

An Hon. Member: This should not be done.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am coming to that just now. It is denied that the Punjabi region has got Punjabi as the mother tongue. The case of the Arya Samaj was, I should say, beautifully stated by Shri Ghanshyam Singh Gupta. He sent me a copy of his book

An Hon. Member: He has sent that to us also.

Sardar Hukam Singh: "He termed Hindi as the Arya Bhasha. To an Arya Samajist, Hindi is not only a National language, but also a language of his culture and religion, next only to Sanskrit."

That is quite right. He does not speak of mother tongue. He says, Hindi is not only a National language, but also a language of his culture and religion." Then he gives the figures of those who speak Hindi and Punjabi. He takes the figures from the census. He takes down the figures of the Hindus and the Sikhs, and considers the Sikhs as Punjabi-speaking and the Hindus as Hindi-speaking. He argues that the Hindi region is by and large Hindi-speaking with only 4 per cent Punjabi-speaking people but the Punjabi region has 55 per cent Punjabi-speaking and 44 per cent Hindi speaking people. What is the basis? That he has explained in his own note on page 8. He says

"For reasons given in the previous paragraphs"

that is, the one I have referred to, namely, that it is the language of his religion and culture

"For reasons given in the previous paragraphs I have presumed the Sikh population as going in for the Punjabi language and the non-Sikh Hindu population as going in for the Hindi language"

He has divided the population into two portions and on the basis of religion and community he has put

them down into two compartments saying that these are the Punjabi-speaking and these are the Hindi-speaking people

Now, this is the only trouble that is there in the Punjab. If hon. Members were to appreciate it the whole trouble lies behind this issue, namely, whether really it is the religion that should regulate and determine as to what the language of a person is or whether it is the area or the region that should really determine the language that is prevalent there. If this were to be appreciated the whole trouble would go and also if my hon. friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri were to admit that really it does not depend on religion. It is the language of the people wherever they might be. For the Bengalis, the Tamilians and the Telugus it is not based on the difference in religion. If some Sikh here—and so many are doing that—embraced another religion and gave up his Sikh religion, with that change would his mother tongue also change? It would not, it would continue.

Therefore this division that he makes and on which he bases his argument that the Punjabi region is bilingual and therefore the mother tongue also is Hindi and Punjabi is not right. I am not talking of the *Rashtrabhasa*. So far as that position of Hindi is concerned, that is not denied. That must be understood first of all. Both in the Hindi region and in the Punjabi region Hindi has got that status. Everything should be accorded to it what is its. Nobody denies that and nobody disputes that. Now we come to the regional *bhasa*. Our claim is and we maintain that in the Punjabi region it is Punjabi that is the mother tongue. What is that Punjabi region? It is the Jullundur Division of old with a few small areas, Amritsar District and portions of Lahore District that were added to it. The partition has not made any difference at all. Wherever Shri Gupta has taken down in this book the figures of religion he

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

has not taken down the figures in the returns of language in those censuses. In 1941 these figures could not be tabulated as there was trouble. The Arya Samaj maintained that every Hindu should retain Hindi as his mother tongue.

Every Hindu in Punjab: that was the circular that was issued.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: By whom?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Arya Samaj, vachovali.

14 Hrs.

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री अध्यक्ष महोदय,
मैं फिर बड़ी नज़रता से यह कहना चाहता हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: It is no good; the hon Member has spoken.

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री मैं बड़ी नज़रता से यह स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार से श्री गुप्त ने आंकड़े दिये हैं कि वहाँ पर ५५ प्रतिशत सिक्ख हैं और ४५ प्रतिशत हिन्दू हैं . . .

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this. Sardar Hukam Singh may go on.

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री . मैं यह नहीं कह रहा था मेरा तो निवेदन यह है .

अध्यक्ष महोदय आपने नहीं कहा लेकिन दूसरे सदस्य ने कहा ।

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री : मैं इसका स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow. How many times?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have not given this. It is on page 9 of Mr. Gupta's book. It says:

"While in the Punjabi region the percentage of the Punjabi

language group is 55 against 44, I rather said 45; it is less; of the Hindi language group."

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री अध्यक्ष महोदय,
मुझे इसका स्पष्टीकरण करने की अनुमति दी जाये ।

Mr. Speaker: There is no meaning in his going on in defence of Mr. Gupta. He said something. It is open to any hon. Member to criticise. He has already had his turn.

Sardar Hukam Singh: This is denied by my brothers Hindus that Punjabi is the mother tongue of the Hindus living in the Punjabi region

I was just telling the House that in 1941, the attempt to collect census figures of population on the basis of language and script was given up because there was some trouble. The same thing was repeated in 1951. An attempt was made by our Government. But, then too, it had to be given up in the middle because there were certain fights, quarrels and other things. That could not be done. The only last census figures that we have got are of 1931 and 1921. I might just inform the House that in 1931, out of every 1000 persons living in this Punjabi region as it is now called, that is the Jullundur division which was so called, 955 were returned as Punjabi-speaking.

An Hon. Member: 995

Sardar Hukam Singh: Sorry; I was wrong. Out of every 10,000, 9955 were returned as Punjabi-speaking. In the Census of 1921, it was 9986. This was the position. That remained. No other census has been taken.

The Partition could not make any difference. Whoever came from that side, they were not Hindi-speaking people. They spoke Punjabi. There is the Amritsar district; Lahore people have come. They are all Punjabi-speaking. Those that have come from

Committee of
Parliament on Official
Language

a distance, they were not Hindi-speaking. Therefore, when it is now maintained that Hindi is not the mother tongue of those Hindus who are living there, that creates trouble

In 1948, immediately after the Partition, the question arose in Jullundur. The Municipal Committee passed a resolution that the medium of instruction shall be Hindi. The District Board passed another resolution that it shall be Punjabi in the Gurumukhi script. Both the resolutions were sent to the Commissioner. He set aside both of them and said, they should be thought over again and modified. It is to be seen that if in 1948, just after Partition, they are to be told that Punjabi would not be the medium of instruction even in Jullundur division, where would it be? Out of 10,000 people, 9955 people speak Punjabi. Then too, the medium of instruction is to be something different. I am not doubting the position of Hindi so far as Rashtra Bhasha is concerned. This was the origin when this rub was created.

My friend has said that it is not a new thing that a Punjabi Suba is being asked. This is a legacy of old times. From the pre-partition period, they had asked for a Sikh State. He did not perhaps mention Azad Punjab. They had asked a Sikh State. That still continues though the garb is different. This was the thing he said.

In 1952, when Shri Prasad's resolution was being discussed, the Prime Minister had referred to this fact and stated, if somebody asked for a Sikh State, I would not concede it. Then I stood in my seat and put a question to the Prime Minister whether anybody had asked it. He said, I realise that no responsible person has asked for it. This is in the debate.

I should say this was the earliest book that was published by the Government of India: *India's Minorities*. It was just after the Partition. There also it has been observed:

"The Sikhs also have expressed their confidence in the Union and its leaders. In a Press Conference on November 29, 1947, Master Tara Singh, the leader of the Akali party

I have my differences with the Akali party. Just the other day, I went to Bikaner and his men organised a great demonstration against me with black flags, *murda* and everything. It should not be understood that I am just spousing his cause. That is only four days back.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: That might be welcome which was in accord with the

Sardar Hukam Singh: This *murda* it would not have been welcome. This was what he said.

"We shall continue to support the Congress and the Union Government in its task of reconstruction. The Nationalist Sikh Society representing nationalist Sikhs passed a resolution in December, 1947 stating that the right place for the Sikhs now was in the Indian National Congress and they should offer their whole-hearted support so that with their combined efforts a glorious India might emerge."

So far as the pre-partition period is concerned, I might just make a passing reference. Then too, we have not demanded any separate Sikh State. Really an attempt was made. This can be seen from the representation that was made to the Cabinet Mission. We had stated that we wanted a United India, but if the Muslim League's demand was to be met and India had to be divided, some place should be given to us as well. This was, I can say now, my leaders are there, with the concurrence of the Congress leaders. When the Cabinet Mission had given its plan, it was the Congress that came out saying that it was unfair to the Sikhs and their right should be protected. Nobody can say that even

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

before the Partition, we had asked for anything that was not palatable to our Indian Nationalist leaders. We had always been supporting the unity of India. We never wanted that India should be divided

After that also, I might just remind hon. Members, they may have read an article of Maharaja of Patiala. The other day it appeared in the paper In the Tribune, this article was there He had said that he had been called by Lord Mountbatten to Delhi, in his Secretariat Mr Jinnah was there They were invited to a dinner, Mr Liaquat Ali Khan and Begum Liaquat Ali Khan were there He was offered, because he was then the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes also Bhopal had been removed because he wanted a separate, I should say Rajasthan or whatever it was, with all the Princely States

An Hon. Member: Princely area

Sardar Hukam Singh: It was the Maharaja of Patiala who had come out to fight it He was elected as the Chancellor. He has said in so many words that this had been offered to him so far as Rajas were concerned, Rajasthan and so far as the Sikhs were concerned, a Sikh State

"I had had prolonged talks with Master Tara Singh

This also he has said

"There were two aspects One was based on the idea of a Rajasthan and the other one for a separate Sikh State—Punjab minus one or two districts in the South In some ways I had quite a good deal to do with that I told Mr. Jinnah that I would not accept either of the two proposals "

Now, to say that we had either accepted or asked for such a thing is not fair to us

Then, I come to language again. why it has created so much trouble

Mr. Speaker: What was the attitude of Lord Mountbatten?

An Hon. Member: He wanted it.

Sardar Hukam Singh: He wanted to encourage it. That is clear in many other records, though I should not deal with them

About the imposition, I want to just put it to Shri Prakash Vir Shastri when he says that Bhasha is just like a mother He has said it in the beginning of his speech that *bhasha* is just like a mother; very good, I agree with him, but does he confine it only to Hindi or to the other *bhashas* also?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): It was true of the old, but not now

Shri Tyagi: The others are step-mothers.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Exactly, that was what I wanted to say, that we cannot maintain that only Hindi is the real mother and the others are step-mothers We must respect Hindi, and I do respect Hindi, I would challenge anybody on that, I yield to none in my respect for Hindi, I am eager to read Hindi, rather I know it I have studied Sanskrit also But now the thing is whether really they have that regard for the *matribasha* also, whether that should be thrown away or that has to be recognised in some respect That is the only dispute

I might, just in a lighter mood, refer to the observations made by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri yesterday They were very interesting He said that when a child is borne, he begins to recite the alphabets of Hindi, namely

अ, आ, इ, ई, उ, ऊ,

Shri M. R. Krishna (Karimnagar—Reserved—Sch Castes) That is so in all languages

Sardar Hukam Singh: In all languages? But what did he mean? He meant the Devanagari script in the

north, not the other languages. He maintained that when a child is born, he begins to recite the alphabets of the Devanagari script. He was talking of the script. I can just quote him

Shri Tyagi: The child does not know the script at all

Sardar Hukam Singh: If I have not understood it correctly, then hon Members may correct me. This is what he says:

“कितने प्राकृतिक धीरे कितने वैज्ञानिक स्तर पर इस लिपि का निर्माण किया गया था। हमारे सदन की ज महिला सदस्याये हैं, व शायद मेरी इस बात की साक्षी करेंगी कि देवनागरी की जो लिपि है, वह मनुष्य को प्राकृतिक रूप से माता के गर्भ से भीखने में आती है। जिस समय बच्चा माता के गर्भ से आता है तो पहला शब्द जो उसने मुह से निकलता है, जिस भाषा में वह रोता है, वह देवनागरी लिपि का पहला अक्षर होता है, अ अ अ अ इस तरह कर के वह रोता है ”

Shri Keshava: It is so in all languages, even in Kannada

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am talking of the Devanagari script. He further says:

‘जब उसकी जिहवा के तन्तु मजबूत हो जाते हैं तो दो महीने के बाद जब बच्चा रोता है, तो उसने रोने के क्रम में परिवर्तन हो जाता है और वह अ अ अ कर के रोता है।’

श्री त्यागी गुरुमुखी बोलता है।

सखार दुबल सिंह गुरुमुखी बोलता होता तो शायद उसकी इतनी खिलाफत नहीं होती।

“जब वह थोड़ा बड़ा होता है, तो ई ई कर के रोने लगता है।

जब धीरे बड़ा होता है, तो

ऊ ऊ कर के रोने लगता है
दुनिया में कोई उसको ट्रेनिंग
नहीं देता है।”

अक्षर महोदय भगवान ने यह सारी
सृष्टि क्या रोने के लिये ही रची है।

Sardar Hukam Singh: People have said that when a child is born, he begins to weep that there is a fall in his life, because he was just in lofty heights and now he has fallen to the ground. That is how it is interpreted, because usually he weeps. If that were the belief, then I have no quarrel with Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. If this is the attitude, then I was just thinking of those mothers who do not know these alphabets अ अ इ ई, उ, ऊ. What would they be doing? They do not inspire their children at that time. They do not know it themselves. Many of the mothers even in Punjab might not be knowing it, and yet it is said that the child begins to repeat that script.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: 99 per cent of the Hindi-speaking mothers do not know the script, because they are illiterate.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Quite right. But the child, as soon as he is born, knows it and begins to weep like that! If this were the position.

Mr Speaker: There seems to be a small confusion between the script and the language.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Then one wonders what they would be thinking about other languages. If it is thought and believed that this is inspired, that this is a language or a script or these are sounds that were made by God, or inspired, because they have not been taught by any human being, then what would they be thinking about the other scripts or other sounds or other languages?

An Hon. Member: That is the difficulty.

Sardar Hukam Singh: But he says.

मा के जब बच्चा पदा होता है तो
वह मलिक ब नही कहना और वह ए० बी०
सी० डी० नही कहेगा

What would such a person be thinking about the others? What would my hon friend be thinking about the others? That rather causes concern in my mind, that he would not have the same regard for other languages or other scripts as he has for this. And that brings me back to the observation of Mr Gupta that this is 'the language of our religion and culture'. Now, this was exactly what weighed even with the States Reorganisation Commission, because they said that Sikhs have sentiments towards Punjabi, and Hindus have sentiments towards Hindi. That is quite right. They said that sentiment is arrayed against sentiment.

I only put it before the House that let the sentiments on both sides be taken away. Let religion be divorced from this language problem, let this culture and other things be taken away from it; I am saying this though I have a complaint when Mr Gupta says like that. I say that Sikhism is a distinct religion. My hon friend here has just said that Sikhs are Hindus; but if they had believed like that, then there would not have been the order of the President that only those Scheduled Castes would get these concessions who profess the Hindu religion.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): I do not agree with that order.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That is a different thing. But did he ever raise his voice when that order continued?

Shri Vajpayee: May I put a counter-question to my hon friend? I entirely agree with him that language has nothing to do with religion, or that religion should not have anything to do with politics. But why is it that the Hindu non-Sikhs of the Punjab have been driven to this position that they are prepared to disown their own

mother-tongue? Has the communal politics of the Akalis got nothing to do with it?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes, according to him, that may have been the cause. But then, let us take the facts; let us remove all these extraneous things from that. What is the mother-tongue?

Shri Vajpayee: Causes cannot be removed to this House. There are reactions on the other side also. My hon friend should not present only one side of the picture to the House, simply because he is in possession of the House.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Should I present Shri Vajpayee's picture then?

Shri Vajpayee: He is expected to present the facts on both sides.

Sardar Hukam Singh: No, I am certainly representing what is right according to me, and when my hon. friend has a chance, he can certainly present his side, I have no objection.

What I was driving at was that this had caused great trouble, because the language has been disowned. It may be a reaction, I need not doubt it or quarrel with it, it may be the reaction. Maybe the fault might have been on our side. But then too, we have to see whether there is any mother-tongue in the Punjab region or not. Granting that we made mistakes, and we ought to be punished for that, should the language be driven out of Punjab?

Shri Tyagi, No, no

Sardar Hukam Singh: This was what was said when the Hindi agitation was going on.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): May I seek a clarification? Is there any difference between Punjabi and Hindi? There might be difference between Hindi and Gurmukhi. But

is there any difference between Punjabi and Hindi?

Sardar Hukam Singh: This is what people like Grierson and other experts who examined the question have said, that this is a distinct language, and now that it is there as a distinct language in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution as well, we need not go behind that

Mr. Speaker: It is said that all these North Indian languages like Hindi, Punjabi, Bengali, Marathi are all epibhrasmas or dialects of Sanskrit

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): They belong to the Indo-European group

Sardar Hukam Singh: Swami Rameshwaranand, who was the president of the Hindi agitation, I suppose, said—and I am reading from the daily *Pratap*, which is no friend of mine—

“गुरुमुखी भाषा एक लगदी घोर घघुरी भाषा है जिसे गवर्नमेंट हम पर जबर्दस्ती लाद रही है”

Shri Tyagi: Is it Hindi or Urdu?

Sardar Hukam Singh: It is Urdu

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Hindi agitation has been conducted in Urdu?

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri: On a point of order

में बड़ी तन्त्रना में फिर यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कल्प जिन वक्त पंजाब के मजबूत में क्वैश्चन भावर में पहला प्रश्न धाया था तो हमारे मंत्री महोदय दातार साहब ने यह कहा था कि पंजाब को समस्या प्रांतीय स्तर पर सुलझाई जायगी किन्तु आज उस सारी समस्या को इस हाउस में लौना जा रहा है ता फिर यह आवश्यक हो जाता है कि उमका उत्तर भी धाना चाहिये और इसके लिये गृह-कार्य मंत्री महोदय को हमको हम मदद में विचार करने की अनुमति देनी चाहिये।

Mr. Speaker: A point of order has been raised. I only wanted to know

about this question. Of course, any hon. Member sometimes digresses from the subject-matter on hand. Therefore, any other hon. Member need not go on answering it unless it comes from a responsible Minister in which case it will be the attitude of Government

Now, the hon. Deputy-Speaker has referred to all this. I thought it arose only from Shri Prakash Vir Shastri's speech. Is it all contained in the Report under discussion?

Some Hon. Members: No, Sir

Mr. Speaker: They also agree with Shri Shastri

Sardar Hukam Singh: No, not that I am coming to that

The status that has been given to regional languages is denied to Punjabi even under the regional settlement. It is to be adopted up to the district level. I have not complained against it, because I was a party to that settlement, and I stick to it. But the other side does not allow it to be worked

Mr. Speaker: Even up to the district level?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Even up to the district level

I am even now an adherent of that settlement. I do not go beyond it. I do not ask for anything further. I am still there where that settlement was made. That is quite all right. That should be worked. But he referred to it. He referred to it twice, once when he spoke on the debate on the President's Address. At that time, he had reminded us that those events of 1947 might be repeated. Again, yesterday also he referred to the spirit prior to 1947 being revived or something like that

I have taken enough time. I will be brief. My only complaint is this. I was reading Swami Rameshwaranand's statement that these people

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

have got some hatred. The Punjabi language might not be as developed at present as other languages. But that is the fault of its sons and not of Punjabi itself, because we have been under the suppression of English and Urdu both. Even in Maharaj Ranjit Singh's time, that part of India was being attacked every year. There was a mixture every time. Therefore, it could not allow Punjabi to develop.

Shri Tyagi: But your poetry is very good.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Swami Rameshwaranand had said.

‘गुरुमुखी भाषा एक लगडी और अक्षरी
भाषा है’

—the language is Punjabi, only the script is Gurmukhi—

‘गुरुमुखी भाषा एक लगडी और अक्षरी
भाषा है जिस पर रंगेड हंस पर जबदेगी लाद
रही है’

I do not want to say anything about it. It may even be defective. It is less developed. It may be, though I do not agree with it. But let that argument be conceded. Then too I would ask: was there a child born in the whole world who would disown his mother and claim a mother better dressed and better equipped? If it is really our mother, is there any instance in the whole world where this mother-tongue had been denied? It is said that there is imposition. The only thing that is said is that the mother-tongue should be taught in the school. Would it be an imposition? If English was the compulsory language, was it imposition? If even now in schools, there are compulsory subjects, should not the mother-tongue be taught in the schools? It is said that they should have the option, whether they want to read it or not. They do not want to read their mother-tongue? It is a disease that has to be diagnos-

ed and unless some remedy is applied to it, how can the cure come?

It is for the country to see that this trouble that has been there, and where so many attempts have been made, the last one being the Regional Formula, is solved. That settlement, which is called the Regional Formula is a settlement to which we stick even now. There is no trouble at all. But the complaint is that it is imposition of Punjabi. On whom? On the speakers of Punjabi—that they should read it. On those who have this as their mother-tongue only. I agree there. When it is said that the Hariana people should read it, really there can be an objection. We never asked for that, that it should be compulsorily read in Hariana; because Punjabi was not being given the regional status in the Punjab region itself, and the State had to be kept together in the larger interest, it was desired that both languages might be learnt. Therefore, in Hariana also this principle was applied. Otherwise, there is no imposition or no compulsion on that account.

Now I come to this conclusion.

My hon friend referred to this trouble. He will excuse me if I have taken up his speech and criticised some of his observations. I did so because it gave me a clue to find out what the trouble was. Therefore, I referred to it. Otherwise, I have very great respect for him. He speaks very sweet language. He is a learned man. I do not have anything to say against him. But I had picked it up because he had made certain observations on matters with which I had been connected. Therefore, I had to say such things.

I was glad to hear the Home Minister say yesterday when he answered that question that the Government stuck to the decision that had been taken. But I put it to him: if the trouble is being created and people are not agreeing to the situation as it is

now, it is no fault of ours. Even when Punjabi was not given that full status of a regional language, then too we agreed. We still adhere to that. We only make an appeal, that this formula which was arrived at after mature consideration, should be enforced.

Mr. Speaker: Dr M S Aney I find from the list of speakers who have already spoken that Mysore has not participated in the discussion.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur) I will not take more than five minutes.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli) Tamil Nad has not spoken.

Mr. Speaker: Three Members from Tamil Nad have spoken.

Shri Thanu Pillai: That is from the other side.

Mr. Speaker: From any side.

Shri Thanu Pillai: It is a subject with which we are concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Three hon Members from Tamil Nad have spoken. Mysore has not been called at all.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): From Madhya Pradesh, no one has spoken.

An Hon. Member: Seth Govind Das has spoken.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Seth Govind Das was a member of the Committee. He has spoken. Others have not got time to speak. We want to express our views on the Report.

Shri Frank Anthony: From Madhya Pradesh, I have spoken.

Mr. Speaker: Seth Govind Das has spoken. Then Pandit Brij Narayan "Brijesh" has spoken. Shri Frank Anthony has also spoken.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Shri Frank Anthony is not from our Party.

Mr. Speaker: I am not dividing time according to that.

श्री साहीवाल (इन्दौर) मध्य प्रदेश से एक को भी बोलने की इजाजत नहीं मिली।

श्रीमती सहोदराबाई राय (सागर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मध्य प्रदेश वाले को अवश्य मौका मिलना चाहिये।

Dr. M. S. Aney. During the debate on this motion for the last two days, I have been trying to understand what are the common points among Members who have participated. In spite of the excited nature of the debate and the fact that considerable heat was at times imported into it, I was surprised to find that most of the speakers—in spite of the heat that was generated—have considerable common ground among themselves. So I would first enumerate those four or five important points which I consider as common ground among them all.

First is that Hindi must be the official language of the Union. I find, even among those who advocate the cause of English with great eloquence, there was no dispute about this proposition which is recorded in the Constitution as well as accepted in the Report itself that Hindi shall remain as the official language of the country.

The second proposition is that English should not be allowed to occupy the first place. That fact has been clearly put by the Prime Minister in his speech on the motion brought by Shri Anthony the other day, and today in his usual expressive way he has repeated that fact that English shall get a secondary place and shall not get the first or primary or prominent place it occupies today. These two facts are admitted.

The third fact is that all the Indian languages mentioned in the Schedule

[Dr M S Aney]

to the Constitution are recognised as national languages. National language does not mean only Hindi. Many people are under this impression because we want it to be used as the official language. All the languages entered in the Schedule to the Constitution are recognised as national languages. I use the word 'recognised' for this reason that there are several languages also which are national but they are not recognised in the Constitution. They have also a claim to be recognised as national languages provided there are enough people who speak them and they are developed. Then recognition will come in.

An Hon. Member: These 14 languages are also not recognised by the Constitution but only by the Congress and by convention. (*Interruptions*)

Dr. M. S. Aney. Then, the fourth is that dislodging of English should take place gradually in proportion to the development of the national languages of India. In making themselves progressive, great care should be taken to secure the consent and co-operation of non-Hindi-speaking population. The progress should, in fact, be by persuasion and cooperation and not by imposition. These principles are borne in mind in the debate by all persons.

The fifth is that it is not expedient at present to fix the time limit in the opinion of certain sections and that too very responsible and very respected sections of the House for the matter of that.

While all these propositions stated above show a very great degree of unanimity on what may be called the fundamental position, it was somewhat surprising that the debate at times assumed a form of an excited discussion. The reason for this excitement, in my opinion, is that there is an element of uncertainty in all this about the future of the official language of the Union. All these points are there. Members are agreed that Hindi should be the official language. Yet they feel

a sense of uncertainty as to the period when it is really likely to get the place of the official language. As that uncertainty is there, it makes a person feel that the debate is in some way an unreal one. If I mistake not, my friend Acharya Kripalani's speech was more or less of this nature. He said that the report by itself has made things very flexible and in a satirical way he referred to the speech of the Prime Minister and said that it practically threw water over the whole thing and made the whole thing look something entirely unintelligent. That is the purport of what he said. I do not quote exactly his words.

There is this kind of uncertainty about the future, about the time that Hindi is likely to be put in its proper place as an official language. We must do something to remove this uncertainty. I believe many of the difficulties put forth in the course of the debate are likely to be resolved.

What is our present position? We have got independence. After our independence we have got a national flag, we have got a national song also. In spite of dissensions we have got all these things. In the Constitution we have succeeded, almost by unanimous opinion, in having a national language or official language. But the country does not know when it can have its own national official language.

I think certain things can be tried immediately, to remove this uncertainty. It is not exhaustive. It is capable of being improved and modified also.

The medium of higher education should be the national language of the State in which the educational institution is situated. A programme of this displacement can be drawn with the help of educationists to be carried out within 10 to 15 years. English should be studied as a language but should not be the medium of instruction. That is exactly the point which the Prime Minister has emphasised today.

Immediately it is tried to introduce Hindi or the national language of the State as the medium of higher education in the University, confidence will grow among the people that they are getting a gradual replacement of English from its present position, and to that extent it will raise Hindi to its proper position. That confidence can be created by taking steps. The Prime Minister today has very rightly emphasised that you cannot educate your people in a foreign language. You have to educate them in laws and sciences and if you keep the medium of instruction a foreign language, it can never infiltrate through the people and there cannot be a full realisation of education and culture. The difficulty is there. You have to change the medium of instruction and that should be the national language of the people of the region in which the institution is situated.

The second thing is this. On all occasions and ceremonies of national importance or of universal nature the official pronouncement should be in the Hindi language. Our venerable and revered President many times does it; he delivers his addresses and even addresses the House in Hindi. That is a very good example set by him. Our Prime Minister also delivers his addresses on many occasions in Hindi, which should be copied and imitated by other people on important occasions. An attempt should be made to make all responsible pronouncements in the Hindi language. If we do that, a new sense of reverence, a new sense of urgency and a new sense of confidence about this—that we intend to introduce Hindi as the official language of this country—will grow among the people and this kind of uncertainty will certainly disappear.

It is an intricate problem. But I put it for the consideration of those who have to take the necessary steps. Our Diplomats abroad should use Hindi for speeches and correspondence. If the present incumbents of these offices are not able to do that, they may take

the help of qualified Hindi scholars in this respect.

I may give you a short story. Many years ago I was coming from Simla to Delhi. In my compartment there was one member of the then Japanese Embassy sitting with me. I happened to take out my diary and began writing something in it. He was sitting by my side. He asked me what I was writing and I told him that I was writing in my diary. He asked me why I was writing in English and he further asked me whether I put down my own thoughts and personal ideas also and other impressions also in the English language. When I said that I did so, he felt it was rather strange. I felt considerably embarrassed and even humiliated at the remarks he made. Since that day, I changed my habit. I do not claim to be a great student of Hindi as Seth Govind Das is. But from that day, I had made up my mind not to write anything in my diary in English. That was about the year 1935 or 1936. Whatever I wrote in diary, I did in my mother tongue and not in English. People cannot understand if a man speaks English. If two Indian boys studying in Russia speak in English, the Russians wonder if they have got no Indian language. . . (Interruptions.)

An Hon. Member: English is as good as an Indian language.

Dr. M. S. Aney: In order to keep up our self-respect and to rise in the esteem of our people, not only the political domination should go but even the intellectual domination should go. We would then come to our own. This thing can be done if our diplomats take care to study the Hindi language and make use of it while reading out their speeches. People coming from any other nation, sitting in the U.N., speak in their own language except the Indians who want to speak in English and pride themselves as having spoken much more idiomatic English than the Englishmen himself. What kind of English we speak? My friend Acharya Kripalani yesterday

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

has said that after all our studies, it is the Babu English except in the case of exceptionally brilliant men like our Prime Minister or Mahatma Gandhi or Ramaswamy Mudaliar or Shrinivasa Shastri or Rabindranath Tagore. If even the papers of those who have passed their M.A. examinations or the honours in English were submitted to linguistic scholars in England for valuation, not many will get the good marks that they had got. So, if some steps as I have indicated are taken the element of uncertainty will disappear.

I have heard several speakers and particularly Shri Frank Anthony. I was going to call him Mark Antony. He is my old friend. He wanted to impress upon all of us that because of English we had got Independence and we are what we are today and that if we tried to dislodge that language from its high pedestal and bring it down, we would be ungrateful in spite of these obligations towards that language. That is what he implied. I want to make it clear to all those who are protagonists of the English language that their belief that we won independence because we studied and spoke in English is entirely wrong. I want these remarks to be carefully listened to by all our friends here. I have no hesitation in saying that the problem of India's Independence would have remained eternally unsolved had it been left to be solved by the English-knowing people of India. It was the strength and the sacrifice of the millions of non-English knowing sons and daughters of India under the leadership of far-seeing and courageous leaders like Lokmanya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghose and Mahatma Gandhi that won India's Independence. Had it been really left to the English-knowing people, it would be the cult of moderation that would have remained in power to this day and the demand for independence might not have even come at all. In spite of the opinion that was held by the English-knowing people it was the masses under the leadership of these great

men and farseeing prophets that won Independence. We have won physical Independence for India in 1947. There is also what you call the technical and industrial independence. We are preparing ourselves for that. But India's mental and moral enslavement will continue till English language continues to occupy the prominent place that it has today. The sooner we put an end to it the better. We cannot rise to our full moral and spiritual stature without drinking deep at the fountain-head of our culture, the Sanskrit language and without speaking to the common man through Hindi and other Indian languages which are either born of her or adopted and fostered by her. Sir, I support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Subramanyam. He will take 5-7 minutes and then Shri Khadiikar also will take not more than seven minutes. I will call the hon. Minister at 3.

श्रीमती सहोदरा बाई राय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं रह गई, कल से मौका मांग रही हूँ।

14.48 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Shri T. Subramanyam (Bellary): Sir, the issue before the House is of momentous and historic importance. Even before we achieved self-rule we made the cause of Hindi as a part of our national movement and Mahatma Gandhi had made it an item of our constructive programme.

Then at long last our country which was subjected to foreign rule for centuries became free and now we are entering into an era of great responsibility. This is a formative period through which we are passing and the issue before the House today will give the direction whether the progress has been healthy or otherwise. We adopted democracy and it is a welfare State with socialist pattern and if we have to associate people actively in

the various programmes of our State and if we have to make all these real and significant, then it is necessary that we should adopt the regional languages as the official language in the various States. Already seven States have adopted their regional languages as the official language of their respective States. Now, there is a shift from English to the regional languages as the media of instruction in the various institutions, in the secondary schools and in the colleges. Therefore, we are passing through times with very great rapidity. We have only to see that it should be as smooth as possible. Our country is a multi-lingual country and we have developed a unity. Having achieved freedom, it is the first responsibility to see that we protect this freedom.

Hindi is bound to be not only the *de jure* but *de facto* official language of our country and the language of our people and of our nation. We have only to see that there is no conflict between Hindi and the regional languages. This change-over should be as smooth as possible. In this context, Hindi must absorb as many terms as possible from the various regional languages. There has been a definite proposal that in the matter of evolving the terminology for scientific and technological purposes, there should be uniformity among all these regional languages. Otherwise we will be creating an era of utter confusion. If all the 14 regional languages were to evolve different terminology for science and technology or for administration or for law in their various regions, then not only our whole unity will be jeopardised but we will be rendering the task of students and the youths of this country absolutely difficult and impossible.

Therefore, I welcome the idea of having a Standing Commission of scientists and technologists to frame a sort of glossary for technological and scientific terminology. Naturally, this terminology has to approximate mostly to English or to the international terms. This is a matter to be welcomed.

Then, I hope that this task will be taken up as early as possible, because already time is passing and in the various States different terms are being evolved. This will make for confusion. If this has to be avoided, then this task should be taken up as early as possible.

One difficulty which has been expressed from the non-Hindi areas is with regard to services. That is not a very important factor, but still that is an important factor. It is gratifying, it is heartening, that there has been a large measure of agreement with regard to this. Yesterday, we all felt gratified when we saw Shri Anthony almost agreeing with Seth Govind Das with regard to the Prime Minister's assurance that English will continue as the associate or secondary language even after 1965. Up to 1965 English will be the principal language and Hindi will be the secondary language, after 1965 Hindi will be the principal language and English will continue as the associate or secondary language. No date is to be fixed with regard to such continuance.

One or two hon. friends tried to make out that there was a difference between what the Prime Minister said and what the Home Minister stated. It is not true, because the Home Minister stated that Parliament has the right to continue the use of English after 1965 for such purposes and till such time as the Parliament may so decide. Moreover, in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee he has stated that officers above the age of 45 need not learn Hindi. It is also stated that for the present there should be no restrictions in the use of English. Even with regard to services it has been suggested that there should be lower standards when people enter the services and once they find entry into the services while in training they should try to learn some more Hindi. This morning the Prime Minister was saying that actually there should be no disability at all at the time of entry into the services for those officials coming from non-Hindi

[Shri T. Subramanyam]

regions. Therefore, we have the largest measure of agreement with regard to this issue, viz. that Hindi should be the principal language after 1965 and that English should continue as the secondary language. It will satisfy, I feel, all sections of the House.

In the end, Sir, I only want to tell my Hindi friends that time is on their side. Hindi is bound to come, Hindi is coming in all parts of the country. Coming from the south, Sir, I would like to assure them that we are anxious to make the cause of Hindi successful. It is our cause as well as theirs. It is the national language, and it is bound to become the official language of the Union and all our people. While we develop our regional languages, I would like to say, we shall not ignore the cause of Hindi.

With these words, Sir, I support the motion.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as the time at my disposal is short, I will try to be very brief. We are a multi-lingual nation, and to evolve a common language policy for a multi-lingual nation is a very difficult task. I do appreciate the labours put in by the Committee that was appointed by this House, and what they have done, according to me, is that unfortunately they have considered the dead-line as something sacred, or sacrosanct.

But when they considered the dead-line of 1965 as something secret and wanted to adhere to it, they have not looked to other problems of prior preparation. Are we in a position to change over, I would like very humbly to ask the Home Minister because he has said that progressively we are going to do it. It is a very well worded document, I would say a very diplomatically worded document. There is no fanaticism reflected anywhere, fanaticism of the Hindi side or the other side as well. But with all that balanced document before us, I am afraid there is one difficulty. The other day and also

today our Prime Minister stated in broad terms what should be the national language policy. If it could be translated in practice as a policy document, I would fully endorse it.

Why do I say this? It is because, as I pointed out, there are two pulls. There is a certain amount of fanaticism on the side of the Hindi people. They do not realise it is their responsibility, because they are in an advantageous position. How many Hindi writers there are who have devoted themselves to the study of other regional languages in order to assimilate what is good in them? It is their duty. Are there people with missionary zeal who are conducting this work? They have done nothing. They think that by the sheer weight of majority they will carry on. That is a wrong policy.

I would like to sound a note of warning to the other side also. Language is born and developed out of social intercourse. It is a force of social integration, and in our country we must realise, whether we like it or not, our unity was realised because of the foreign language, foreign domination and during the course of foreign administration. Are we in our zeal to implement certain recommendations here and now going to destroy this unity? Because, what I feel is that as a result of this policy, as a result of Hindi being imposed, people are taking to the regional languages and a certain regional patriotism is growing. I am seeing a fissiparous tendency all around. I have seen the recommendations of the Madras Legislature. Because Hindi is coming in, whether they have developed their regional language or not—at the university stage or at the administrative stage they are hurrying up with the task—they have decided to turn to Tamil. What I would like to suggest is, this tendency also should be stopped.

As the Prime Minister rightly said, there are two pulls. There is a revivalist pull by people like Seth Govind Das, Shri Purshottam Das Tandon, and perhaps Dr. Aney though not

with that enthusiasm. They are looking to the past. There is another pull, the pull of our time which is looking to the future, the new scientific age. While deciding this policy, unless we keep the balance and hasten a little slowly, we are likely to ruin whatever we have achieved so far.

I do not consider,—let me make it very plain,—English as a foreign language. Indo-Aryan languages are foreign in that sense. When you assimilate a language, it develops in course of time local languages. Because of the English language—the Minister of State knows very well—we were together. Because of this cross-fertilisation of ideas our Indian languages like Marathi, Bengali or for that matter Kannada, have developed. We cannot just brush it aside. If we lose this contact, this process of cross fertilisation of ideas our languages would not grow. We have developed the Marathi prose poetry and the different forms of literature because of this cross-fertilisation. That is the case with all Indian languages. Let any pundit come here and contradict me. In fact, our drama was very much influenced by Shakespeare and others. Therefore, do not just say out of a false sense of patriotism that English is something foreign. Why do I say this? It is not that I am less patriotic. But I say this for this reason. If we are cut off from the broad current of scientific development, then, what is likely to happen? The next generation that is coming up, which is very eager to catch up with the progress of the West and the States like the Soviet Union and others will suffer. I would like to point out one thing about the Soviet Union. I have looked into the figures. One of the foreign languages which is taught there is English and it occupies first place in the teaching of foreign language. Even China has got to look to it. So, are we going to change over to Hindi, in our zeal to change over to Hindi, even for the official purposes give up the

study of English? Then we will be cut off from the western wind, a wind which we welcome in the matter of a new scientific age which we want and where we are eager to catch up with the spirit of the development in China, Soviet Union and of the western world. Are we going to be cut off because there is a certain amount of narrow patriotic concept about language? This is the problem.

15 hrs

It is not a question of a simple change. Tomorrow morning, by law, you can change, but you will do incalculable harm, especially to administrative unity. Particularly after the States Re-organisation Act, which is being completed now, we see certain fissiparous tendencies all round. The 'statehoods' within the nation are trying to assert themselves to the detriment of national interests. In certain policies there are pulls. You cannot evolve any national policy regarding planning and so many other matters. Therefore, I would appeal to our venerable and honourable Home Minister who has a fund of wisdom to realise this. The resolution before us says, "we are taking note of", etc. Let it remain there. Let us "take note". But when it comes to the translation of a certain policy in a multi-lingual nation like ours, a policy of guiding the day-to-day affairs of our country, guiding the academic life and laying down the foundation of a new intellectual and scientific development in this country you have to be cautious. I would appeal to him that he should hasten slowly as, by temperament, he is always known to be.

With these words I conclude.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I regret that I have not been able to be present in the House during most of the speeches that have been delivered since the day before yesterday. I have, however, gone through

[Shri G. B. Pant]

the text of the speeches. It is not necessary now for me to make a long speech because really we are not having an ordinary debate. This report was laid before this House so that hon. Members may express their views and those who have to consider this report may have before them the views expressed by hon. Members of this House and that the decisions may be taken after getting as much of light as may be possible.

On the whole, I think the discussion has been conducted in a manner befitting the dignity of this House. Language is a thorny and almost an explosive problem, but the speeches, though sometimes there has been a little heat, have been, on the whole, marked by restraint. Anyway, there has been no trace of acrimony and bitterness. Differences of opinion have been expressed in a manner which is in keeping with the status and the position of this House, this august Lok Sabha and the hon. Members thereof.

I do not know if there is really any difference between the proposals that are embodied in the report and the consensus of opinion as expressed in this House. If there is any difference in any quarter, it is because of misunderstanding or because the Members concerned have not or may not have had sufficient time to go through the report. The report has made definite recommendations which are in accord not only with the views of the Members of the House in general but also in accord with the spirit of harmony, unity and emotional integrity which deserves the first and foremost place in the consideration of all our problems.

Shri Frank Anthony is just coming, and I am reminded of the questions he has put to me. One of them related to the assurance, which had been given by the Prime Minister. He wanted me to assure him that that assurance will be respected. I beg to question the propriety of such a question. The Prime Minister is the

head of the Government. The Prime Minister is the leader of our party. The Prime Minister is the leader of the country. So anything that he says must be respected by everyone of us. To put any question of this kind rather shows that the questioner does not appreciate the position of the Prime Minister or the relationship that exists between him and the members of the Government. Well, I on my part cannot think of raising such questions even if an issue were to be raised between Shri Frank Anthony and Shri Barrow; I think they always go together; if they want they can always rally!

Then, too much of emphasis altogether undesirable, was laid on the point that the amendments that were notified and which had been placed for consideration on paper had been objected to. Shri Frank Anthony sometimes told us that he bewailed, as on occasions, that the lawyer gets the better of him.

Shri Frank Anthony: All of us.

Shri G. B. Pant: On this occasion he seems to have lost all sense of law. So it was by way of compensation that he adopted an attitude which even a man acquainted with the elementary tenets of constitutional law would not have.

I have had the privilege of being associated with the Prime Minister for a long period and I believe and understand his mind better than Shri Frank Anthony; also I have benefited greatly by such association. So, to put a question like that is hardly fair. I would ask, if actions cannot satisfy, can words do?

What was the case on this particular report itself? Shri Frank Anthony was a Member of the Committee. He knows what efforts were made by me to see that no recom-

mentation was incorporated in this Committee's report which did not carry the support of the non-Hindi-Members or the Members who had been elected from non-Hindi-speaking areas in that Committee. Can anything be better proof of my desire and anxiety to handle this problem in such a way as would give satisfaction to the citizens living in non-Hindi areas? I am glad Shri Anthony has withdrawn his note of dissent—better late than never—but about the others, not a single note has been put in by any Member who belongs to the non-Hindi-speaking areas. They have all unreservedly accepted the report in its contents and the proposals and the recommendations. Then, have I not, in fact carried out in effect what the Prime Minister said today, long before that statement to which Shri Anthony referred, was made here? The statement was made about a fortnight or three weeks ago, but this report was signed about four months ago and the proceedings of the committee, which lasted for about two years, were held from month to month and throughout I had acted primarily for achieving unity. I had stated at the very outset that the test and merit of our report would be assessed not by the character of our recommendations, but by the unanimity of the people who have to produce this report. So, from the beginning I have worked for them and I am glad that we all succeeded.

I had not been able to convert Shri Anthony but good sense prevailed and he withdrew his minute of dissent. Then, he asked me, "Will you not take away these paragraphs from the report and also these proposals that appear in the report?" I do not know if he expected me to say 'yes'. Have I the power to do so? Would it be fair to the other Members? Can any Member of the Committee make any changes he likes in it any time, even if they emanated from a very respectable quarter, simply because he has been asked to do so? Was that a fair question?

Shri Frank Anthony: On a point of explanation. I did not ask for any amendment to the report itself. It is not possible under the Constitution. I asked, whether in terms of what I considered to be the Prime Minister's assurance, in fact consequential amendments would not follow and whether in the Home Minister's advice to the President certain consequential amendments would not be necessary, not in the report itself. Nobody can touch the report.

Shri G. B. Pant: I am glad he accepts that. So far as the rest goes, it is not possible for anyone to say what he will do with respect to any matter. Firstly, to deal with these matters in a very technical way, to take two or three words from a long speech and to interpret them as though they were part of a statute, so that other hands may be tied down, is not, I think, by itself a generous way of dealing with this big problem. That has to be dealt with in a manner which will be conducive to the best interests of the country.

Then he asked, "Will the Home Minister deal with it or will the Cabinet deal with it?" If the Home Minister has become something like a red rag—when I use the words "red rag", I do not in any way indicate that the other person should be a bull, but if the Home Minister is a red rag, it must be understood that matters of this type must be considered by the Cabinet and not by any single Ministry.

Shri Frank Anthony: I only wanted to know whether the President will act in his individual capacity or on the advice of the Cabinet.

Shri G. B. Pant: That is a question which has to be determined in the light of the Constitution. Does the Constitution empower or impose the duty on the President to deal with these matters in his individual capacity? I am not aware of any such provision myself.

Shri Frank Anthony: I only wanted a clarification

Shri G. B. Pant: You knew better; still you said it. I had made certain remarks when I had the privilege of making this motion. After hearing those remarks and after observing my conduct in this committee continuously for two years, was it fair for Shri Anthony to create an atmosphere of suspicion unnecessarily?

Shri Frank Anthony: On a point of explanation I do not think the Home Minister is being fair either to himself or to me. I never pointed a finger of suspicion at the Home Minister. I certainly pointed a finger at my Hindi-speaking friends. I never mentioned the Home Minister there. In fact, in the very commencement of my minute of dissent, I paid a tribute to the outstanding tact and courtesy of the Home Minister and I said, but for the Home Minister, the committee would have broken up in disorder; we would have broken one another's heads. Nobody but the Home Minister could have produced that report. I have said that.

Shri G. B. Pant: But you have withdrawn that minute!

Shri Frank Anthony: I never pointed a finger at the Home Minister.

Shri G. B. Pant: Thank you for that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Along with that minute, that compliment also is withdrawn!

Shri G. B. Pant: What I said is this

"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 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 cover 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 that committee that the test of our success will be measured, not by the character of our proposals so much, 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 languages for Union purposes. That has been the main principle that we have placed before ourselves."

So, there could be no room for doubt about my general attitude to this problem, not only now but—I think Shri Anthony knows—from the time

of the Constituent Assembly as to how I handled this question then. I do not consider it necessary to refer again to the decisions of the Committee, but there are one or two points which have to be remembered

As I said, the Language Commission has not stated its views about the continuance of English after 1965. It said that the time is not yet ripe for taking any definite decision, but we have definitely stated in our report that we cannot think of replacing English completely—as was contemplated when the Constitution was framed—by 1965. English must continue after 1965, in accordance with the wishes of Parliament, for such purposes and for so long as may be necessary. There should not be any deadline and there should not be any time-limit for it. We have made it clear that so far as these questions are concerned, they have to be treated in a flexible way, as rigidity will only recoil on us

Similarly, about other matters which have been touched upon here, we have said that all regional languages are entitled to full scope in the fields of administration, education, culture and so on in their respective States, and that Hindi and regional languages should be developed simultaneously so that each may help the other. We have also said that the pace of growth of Hindi, its progress and advancement, will be determined by the degree of active co-operation that we can get from the people living in non-Hindi areas. The more we have this understanding, the greater will be the speed and the smoother will be the progress. So, in every way, we have tried to place before ourselves the demand of a country which has a number of languages and which has been fed by a foreign language, if I may be permitted to use the expression, for about 150 years. We have placed before ourselves the demands of that country. But we know the handicaps under which we labour and we know the difficulties that we have to face and we also know that any

false step that we take, instead of being of any help to us, will retard our progress further. We have also said that Hindi should be simple, and should become the composite language. It must assimilate not only styles that are consistent with its genius, but also words from all Indian languages, so that it may well be regarded as the language of the Union of India. We have also suggested that, so far as the future is concerned, our efforts should be to train people in Hindi in non-Hindi areas with greater zeal, greater energy and greater vigour than we have done so far. We have definitely stated, not only about services but generally, that whatever we may do, we must bear in mind that the least inconvenience, the least dislocation and no disadvantage should be caused to any section of the community

In so far as services are concerned, Dr. Krishnaswami made a remark which was altogether, I think, misconceived. He said that we had suggested in the report that a committee should be appointed to examine the proposal for having two compulsory papers, one in Hindi and the other in the indigenous language. That is not so. We have said that there will be three compulsory papers in a way—one in English, one in Hindi and one in another indigenous language, the latter two being of an equal standard so that all who enter the examination should be able to answer the questions in a manner which may not cause any disadvantage to one or confer any undue advantage to another.

Then, we have also suggested that in the subordinate services an element of bilingualism should be introduced, even in the Central services, so that the Central employees in the regions, who have to do most of the work in the regions, may perform their tasks in the regional language and may learn the Union language to the extent that is necessary to enable them to maintain their contacts with the Centre. That is again a new proposal that has been made there. So

[Shri G B Pant]

that, about services we have taken good care to see that no one, whether belonging to non-Hindi region or to a Hindi region, is placed at a disadvantage and that all have to compete on equal terms

Then they pointed out that after due notice has been given Hindi may be adopted as a medium of examination along with English. But we have suggested that an expert committee should also be set up to see that if regional languages can be adopted as media of examination. So, there also Dr Krishnaswami was confused

Then, Shri Nagi Reddy, I think, made certain remarks. I do not want to deal with them at length. But he forgot that the recommendations of this committee had been supported by Shri Dange by Professor H N Mukerjee and also by Shri Nayar. So, the leaders of the Communist Party were all in agreement with the sentiments and the views expressed in this Report. In the circumstances I would like him to re-examine his own position and also to see whether what has been said here does not represent the views of his Party also.

Acharya Kripalani made a very enlightening speech. I think a great deal of what he said was quite true and correct. But so far as the efforts of the Government of India to advance the cause of Hindi are concerned, they have not perhaps been sufficiently publicised. If the difficulties under which this work has to be done are borne in mind, I think there will be no ground for any dissatisfaction. We have not been able to prepare any time-schedule because we wanted the principles to be settled and final decisions to be taken on the Report before any time-scheduled for the future could be prepared.

This debate really, as I said, is not a debate. I had placed the Report there and the scope, strictly speaking, was very limited. But the debate has covered all aspects of the language problem. I am glad that it has done

so because the problem does deserve the attention of people of the country and as circumstances change, it is necessary to review the position and the situation so that views formed under one set of circumstances may be revised in the light of the changes that are taking place.

I think, as the time fixed for me is over, I should conclude.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the motion formally to the vote of the House. The question is:

"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."

The motion was adopted.

15 33 hrs

RE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up Private Members' Bills and Resolutions. Motion to be made by Sardar A S Saigal.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy (Vellore): I have got a submission to make. This non-official business will go on for 2½ hours and we will sit till six o'clock. The half-an-hour discussion to be raised by me was to come at five o'clock. I want to know whether it will be by-passed or we will sit beyond six o'clock and take it up at six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We might take it up some other day if the House is not prepared to take it up after six o'clock today.

Shri N. E. Muniswamy: May I know when?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot say that definitely. I shall have to consult the programme that is already there.