

want Tibet to come entirely under the USSR and China, because I was in Tibet, I was travelling in China, I was helped by Soviet Russia and by China to go to Tibet, I know what they are thinking; I know their psychology. So, I beg you to consider this Tibetan question from the standpoint that it is a war move between U.S. and USSR.

Mr. Speaker: How long ago was the hon. Member there?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I was staying in Peking and Nanking and travelling all over China, and I took one year to go from Peking to Tibet and back. I went by the northern route and came back by the southern route to China. I specially studied it because Soviet Russia and China helped me. I may tell you one thing more. In 1925 Soviet Russia and China were rivals in connection with Tibet.

Mr. Speaker: The House is satisfied with what he has already said.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): I want to ask the hon. Prime Minister if these 10,000 refugees that have come from Tibet are all well-to-do feudal lords, or are they the common people of Tibet.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot give any description of all of them. They have not reached, they are on the way, but it is hardly likely that Tibet will produce 10,000 lords.

Shri P. S. Danila rose—  
... ..

15:09 hrs.

# COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS FORTY-FIFTH REPORT

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills

and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May, 1959."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May, 1959."

The motion was adopted.

15:09 hrs.

# RESOLUTION RE: INCLUSION OF ENGLISH IN THE EIGHTH SCHEDULE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): I beg to move:

"That the time allotted by the Houses on the 24th April, 1959 (Vide Forty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions) for the discussion of the Resolution regarding inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution be increased from three hours to four hours."

Shri A. M. Tariq rose—

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): I suggest it may be five hours.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Six hours.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): We have already taken one hour. If the time is extended, the House will have to sit for three more hours for this.

Mr. Speaker: The time that was originally allotted was three hours. Now the hon. Member wants to increase it by one hour.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): One full non-official day will do for this Resolution, that is, 2½ hours.

\*\*\*Expunged by the order of the Chair.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indians): May I seek a clarification from you? I as the Mover of this Resolution have certainly no objection to extension of the debate for one hour. Under the rules, it can be extended to 4 hours. But I would request that the debate be concluded today or tomorrow. Otherwise, it will mean just this, that merely for the sake of another hour we are going to postpone this for three months. Already, you know that between the time I moved the Resolution and now a fortnight has elapsed. I believe people have been persuaded. I knew that at least 95 per cent of the non-Hindi speaking people today are prepared to vote for this Resolution, in favour of it.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

An Hon. Member: Absurd.

Shri Frank Anthony: I ask, with the greatest of respect, without imputing any motive, what is the reason to postpone it for three months merely for the sake of one hour. If my hon. friend wants another 2½ hours, then the rules will have to be suspended. Let us sit for 2½ hours today. It is ordinary, elementary justice I am asking for.

Mr. Speaker: How many hon. Members wish to participate in the debate?

Shri Frank Anthony: Let us conclude the debate today or tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to extend or curtail it. I am going to leave it to the House. Let me know how many hon. Members want to take part in the debate.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: There is no doubt that by this Resolution we are trying to amend the Constitution by adding one more language to the VIIIth Schedule. It is a very important matter. I find a number of hon. Members want to take part in this.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: From all sides.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, to the right, to the left and in front of me I leave it to the House. But I am not able to understand one point. Three hours have already been allotted and we can always extend it by one hour. What does the hon. Member want? Does he want four hours in addition to the three hours already fixed?

Sardar A. S. Saigal: I want four hours.

Shri Keshava (Bangalore City): I should be given a second.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): In view of the very important nature of this subject, there should be full scope for discussion. Since there are only two hours left—it will not be possible to go beyond 5 p.m. because we have got many important meetings, particularly Select Committee meetings, to attend—and today is the only non-official day of this session left, it should be discussed for at least two hours in the next non-official day.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I submit that tomorrow has not been specified as an official day? It is a nondescript day. If my hon. friends are genuine in their request, why not we sit for three hours tomorrow? I am anxious to have it concluded today or tomorrow. But this request is merely motivated by the desire to postpone the voting.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Tomorrow is an official day.

Shri Frank Anthony: What is the difficulty? Why should we postpone voting on this issue?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: He is afraid of voting.

Shri Frank Anthony: I want a vote now. Let us have a vote. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: How many hours have already been spent on this Resolution?

लेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, अगर एन्वनी साहब को इतना विश्वास है तो बिना भाषण के यही वोटिंग हो जानी चाहिये ।

**Shri Keshava:** May I have one second.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I am not going to allow him

Three hours were allotted for this Resolution. The time taken is 1 hour and 4 minutes. I find a number of hon. Members anxious to speak. The hon. Member ought not to attribute motives to other hon. Members. They have a right to speak and vote on it. If even getting up and asking for time to express their views is objected to, it will be more objected to when they vote against it. They have a right to speak against it. I am not going to be muzzled. I will allow the debate to proceed as long as I think it is necessary to do so. Nothing is going to be gained by such hustling. The hon. Member who is anxious about it must carry the rest of the Members with him, instead of saying, 'All right; put it to vote'.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** No, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** If hon. Members, so many of them, who have risen to speak, vote against it, what is it that the hon. Member is going to do? Let hon. Members express their views for and against so that it may be decided one way or the other after full discussion. It is not merely because it belongs to Shri Frank Anthony that I am saying this.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** No, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** The whole House wants to be fully seized of it. The hon. Member himself protested yesterday by way of a privilege motion that Shri Joachim Alva said something. I am afraid he is repeating the same thing here in another form. He ought not to attribute motives at all.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I said we could discuss it for five hours. But let us conclude it today or tomorrow. My hon. friends are not wanting that. Why are they doing that? Let us sit till 12 o'clock to night.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** The Prime Minister, while leaving, told

me that he was very anxious to participate in this debate. Today and tomorrow, he will not be free. He requests the House through you that he must be allowed to participate in the debate, and after his speech, voting should take place. I would, therefore, tell Shri Frank Anthony through you that if this is postponed to the next session, he is not going to lose anything.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I am equally anxious. But I do not know why voting should be postponed. Let us suspend the rules. Let us allow three full days for the discussion of this Resolution. Let my hon. friend accept it now. Let us have the discussion.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** I support Shri Frank Anthony in what he has said.

**Mr. Speaker:** Whoever want to speak, can get up.

Several hon. Members rose and kept standing.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. What is this exhibition of exuberance about? I do not know if any hon. Member was in possession of the House.

**An Hon. Member:** Shri Surendranath Dwivedy was on his legs, last time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

बीमती सहोवरा बाई राय (सागर रजित अनुसूचित जातिया) इस में पहले महिलाओं को ज्यादा मौका देना चाहिये क्योंकि भारतवर्ष में महिलाओं को छोटे बच्चों को शिक्षा देनी होती है।

**Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir):** May I say a word? My Resolution is next on the Order Paper.

Just one request, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not going to allow the hon. Member.

Shri A. M. Tariq: Sir, by allowing this extension of time, I am going to be deprived of the right of moving my resolution. I got my resolution first on the list by ballot. According to the report of 5th May, my resolution stands first. Now, I would be deprived for my right. I want your guidance. I should not be deprived of the privilege of moving my resolution. I want only one minute just to move my resolution. That is my request. I do not want to be deprived of my rights.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members have no prescriptive rights in this House on any particular point. I fully sympathise with the hon. Member. But it is open to this House to extend the time for any item. Merely because another hon. Member would lose the right of speech or moving a resolution, this House cannot curtail its right. An item can go on endlessly. Other hon. Members must take their chance. There is the ballot. He must take his chance and get the resolution into the ballot. I cannot go out of the way and allow him to move his resolution now when the other one is part-heard. The hon. Member has no right.

An Hon. Member: That is exactly what is happening; it is pushed out.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West-Reserved-Sch. Tribes): The House is seized of the motion of Sardar A. S. Saigal. I would like to know what the decision is.

Mr. Speaker: I have not placed it before the House. The House is not seized of it.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Then, has this motion of Sardar Saigal been rejected. He has presented it to the House.

Mr. Speaker: But it has not been placed before the House. In the meanwhile, in accordance with the desire of the House. I have allowed speeches or the debate to be carried on to the end of this day. Let us see what happens then. Under these cir-

cumstances, what is the objection of Shri Jaipal Singh.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Sir, I am not objecting. I am welcoming your idea that you are not going to muzzle anybody and are going to give opportunities to everybody including Shri Jaipal Singh.

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty (Barrister): My submission is this. Up till now there has been a convention for the last 7 years where we have allowed a person coming next on the list to introduce his Bill or resolution. In that sense, if this is an exception, I have no objection. This should not be applicable always because otherwise by the vote of the biggest party over here, Bills and Resolutions can be shut out if they so desire.

Shri Raghunath Singh: When the hon. Member was in the Chair as Chairman she did not allow me to move my resolution, Sir.

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty: This is wrongly put, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: There is no such convention. What we have been doing is this. Ordinarily 2½ hours are allowed for a Resolution. That is the maximum. We request hon. Members who are moving a resolution to close it just 5 minutes in advance of the time of 2½ hours. We do not allow the 2½ hours fully. We allow 2 hours and 25 minutes so that the next hon. Member may have 5 minutes to move his resolution. But in cases where the time is 5 hours, the next hon. Member must wait for 5 hours less 5 minutes. But, if by that time he has to give notice of a fresh resolution, he loses his right. I cannot help it. But there is no such convention as mentioned.

Shri A. M. Tariq: If I have no right can I not appeal to your generosity? I am a newcomer to this House and I had to work on this Resolution for the last 6 months. The Deputy-Speaker gave a ruling last time on this. I want one second to move my resolution.

15947 Resolution re: **VAISAKHA 18, 1861 (SAKA) Inclusion of English 15948**  
in the Eighth  
Schedule of the  
Constitution

Mr. Speaker: No. Shri Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, while moving my amendment for reference of this Resolution to a Parliamentary Committee, on the last occasion, I said that the House should have a full consideration of this proposal because in a democracy no minority should have a feeling that because of their adherence to any particular language they are suffering under disadvantages. It is also clear that in this country Hindi has been accepted as our common national language. The Constitution has put its seal on it and there is no question of going back on that. Although the Mover of the Resolution has stated that he is not raising these issues, I think the issues are such that they cannot be limited to the narrow limits of the Resolution as it stands before us today.

Although we want Hindi introduced in our country, at the same time, we like that its evolution should not be forced but carried out with the general goodwill and agreement of all. I have very carefully listened to the speech of my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony. I have also gone through his speeches in the Constituent Assembly and, lastly, his note of dissent in the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Language.

If I may say so, the note of dissent he has appended to the Report of the Language Committee has very mischievous implications. When he was urging his case, he also referred to Sanskrit and Urdu and said that English is as foreign as Sanskrit and Urdu. These are things which create more prejudice against English. Perhaps, Shri Anthony has damaged the cause of English by imputing these things in this House, while sponsoring his Resolution (Interruptions).

We deplore these controversies over this issue. We feel that the protagonists of Hindi in their own anxiety have done more harm to Hindi than the non-Hindi speaking people. At the 113(A) LSD—7.

same time I want to record my dissatisfaction at the manner in which this Government have also proceeded in the matter.

During the last 9 years, what have they done and what steps have they taken to see that the Constitutional provision in this regard is properly implemented within the time prescribed in the Constitution? They have not popularised Hindi to the extent expected so that it can be introduced by the time specified.

As a positive step, we belonging to the P.S.P. are advocating that we should establish academies of Indian languages in the States with a view to furthering higher studies in the Indian languages and literature and for carrying on research in linguistics and Indian literature and culture. Like a non-Hindi student who has to learn Hindi through a 8 years' course, the Hindi students also should be made to learn other languages than Hindi. It should be compulsory for them. It should be obligatory on the Hindi-speaking people and the Hindi-speaking students to acquire proficiency in some other language than Hindi. When these steps are taken, the proper psychological and cultural atmosphere will be created for introducing Hindi as the national language. Even the Language Commission, while discussing this, has expressed its dissatisfaction that the Government has not done all that was needed. They have advocated the acceleration of the plan for the propagation of Hindi.

Even when this Committee of Parliament demanded of Government to place the plan of action before them—as to how Government is going to act—that was not given to them. In these circumstances, we feel that it is not, perhaps, an opportune moment to introduce it and impose it on the people, but, at the same time, English language has vitally influenced our own country. There is no doubt about it. Therefore, while developing a common language our association with English should not be abruptly ended.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

At the same time, I want to emphasise that if there is opposition to the English language it is not because it has a foreign origin. I do not think we should have any prejudice on that score. The very fact that it is being spoken by a very large percentage of our educated population and the fact that it is still by and large the dominant medium in our Parliament establish its own importance and it cannot be eliminated or minimised by merely passing a legislation and decrying it. It is bound to continue for some years and we are, therefore, in agreement that there should be no rigid date fixed to replace it in view of the difficulties already pointed out by me.

But I have a word also for my friends who advocate English and whom I would call the English fanatics as well. I would particularly refer to Shri Frank Anthony and the Anglo-Indian community. Let me make it clear one thing. I have full sympathy with their cause. We want to afford them all facilities. They are Indians and India is their motherland. But there is a feeling which nobody can deny, and that is, these brethren of ours have not yet been able to shake off their past exclusive attitude. Even after Independence, no visible signs of their desire to identify themselves completely with other communities, to share in their sorrows and troubles, have been observed. English has created a gulf between the English-knowing people and those who do not know English. Perhaps this insistence that English should remain as a dominant language in this country is again to strengthen that gulf between the people and the few English-knowing sections of the community. Therefore, I would plead with them to consider this aspect and in order that English, have its proper place, they should also put it in a manner which will create a favourable atmosphere in this country so that all past prejudices over it could be shaken off.

Having said this much, I would come to this resolution. I have some difficulties in accepting this resolution.

I feel that it perhaps does not fit in with the scheme of things as contemplated by the relevant article in the Constitution. I am not a lawyer. The Mover of the resolution is a renowned advocate. But I have to draw the attention of the House to the article as such. The article in question has, to my mind, two aspects. The article refers to the directive for development of the Hindi language. It is article 351. One aspect is, it must serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and "to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule."

The second aspect is, "by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages". So, there are here two aspects. One is, how can the Hindi language be developed without interfering with other regional languages and what are those regional languages? They have been specified in the Schedule. Then there is no ban on the English language, because, in the second category it has been stated that the Hindi language shall draw from Sanskrit and other languages. There, the English language and other languages come in. Therefore, I do not think it is quite relevant to ask that English should be included in the eighth schedule of the Constitution. But this is perhaps a technical matter and I do not want that the technical grounds should be stressed too much. Very many people of our country are interested and therefore we have to look at it from other points of view.

But I have another difficulty in this matter. When I read the debates of the Constituent Assembly I found there were great exponents of this. I found Shri Frank Anthony and also our old friend who is here,—Dr. Subbarayan,—had taken part in those discussions. Dr. Subbarayan advocated that English should be included in the

eighth schedule. Shri Frank Anthony had an amendment. But he withdrew his amendment, when finally the clause was adopted. I repeatedly went through the debates of the Constituent Assembly to find out the reasons for which Shri Frank Anthony withdrew his amendment then. No reasons had been given and nor has Shri Frank Anthony, while moving his resolution here, stated the reasons for which he wants to include English in the eighth schedule. Perhaps, what I feel is that this was done in response to an appeal made by late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar who had said while moving the clause in the Constituent Assembly:

"It is the result of a compromise in respect of which great sacrifices of opinions and very greatly cherished views and interests have been made or sacrificed for the purpose of achieving 'this draft in a form that will be acceptable to the full House'. Perhaps this was done because it was desired that a decision on this matter should be such as would be acceptable to the whole nation and the whole society. Therefore, this was accepted by all those who were present there. It is not a new thing. Even Shri Frank Anthony has said: 'I concede that English for many reasons cannot be the national language of this country'."

Therefore, my point is, all these questions were raised then. So, what is the reason for raising this question at this moment? Even at that time, it is not only the question of English that was raised. Other language questions were also raised. For instance, I find an amendment that Rajasthani and other languages may be included in the eighth schedule. Sindhi is also there. My friend Shri Jaipal Singh also raised the question of Mundari and other languages. I find that in the Constituent Assembly the question that Rajasthani be included was put to the vote and was defeated. So, there are many dialects, apart from languages. Which of them do we really

want to be included in the eighth schedule? Is it necessary at this moment in order to develop Hindi properly? In order to make them acceptable to our countrymen inhabiting this land, should we not again reconsider the whole question? It can never be said that English is an Indian language. It is fruitless to argue that because one lakh or two lakh odd people have it as their mother-tongue it is an Indian language. But one should not feel shy to say that "it may be a foreign language, but it is also my mother-tongue and I adhere to it". There is nothing wrong in it. But to advocate that it is an Indian language is, I feel, out of the point.

Therefore, my simple proposal is—and I think Shri Frank Anthony will agree with me—that if we want to go again into the question, let us appoint a committee. I have suggested a committee of both Houses of Parliament to go into the entire question. This is the opportune time for it. I would think so because the Language Commission report is before us; the report of the Parliamentary Committee on the question is also before us and it will be taken up by us in the next session, before it is sent to the President for final disposal. If, in the meantime, we have a committee to go into the entire question to allay the fears and dispel the doubts in the minds of our minorities—either Anglo-Indians or tribals or Sindhis or whoever they are—it will be good. Let, therefore, a Parliamentary Committee go thoroughly into the matter and place its report before the House and let us then finally dispose of once for all this important question.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am indeed very grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in a debate which has unfortunately taken the type of turn that you and I used to see even during our Constitution-making days, I feel ashamed that after all that has happened, we have not become normal. The same passions—call it linguistic fanaticism and it

[Shri Jaipal Singh

makes no difference—seem to be ob-  
sessing us today. I would have thought  
therefore that experiences would have  
taught us to review the position.

There is one attitude which says  
that the Constitution is the last word.  
Therefore the Constitution must re-  
main untouched. We have already  
amended it seven times, and we should  
go on amending it if our experience  
shows us that by amending it we make  
ourselves better and our country  
greater. So, this sort of sanctity of  
the Constitution is something that  
ought to be dispensed with. After all,  
it is Parliament that decides every-  
thing. I am not going into this battle  
of north versus south or Hindi versus  
English. If there is anyone who has  
a claim to having a mother tongue  
which is the prescribed Indian lan-  
guage in this country, it is I. My mother-  
tongue is not Hindi; it is not English.  
But I speak both these languages  
better than many people here. I take  
pride in learning languages. I think  
there is no other Member of Parlia-  
ment in this House or the other House  
who speaks more languages, either  
languages spoken in this country or  
elsewhere.

I am proud of knowing languages.  
I am surprised that this sort of animus  
has been developed because of this  
resolution of Mr. Frank Anthony. My  
suggestion is, we cannot go on for  
ever. I know you have no desire to  
hustle me and I can go on talking for  
10 hours at a stretch, if I want. But  
I have no such desire because I am not  
going to talk to people who are, shall  
we say, blinded with a dishonest belief,  
who refuse to believe something, who  
refuse to see the other point of views.  
I am not talking to them. All that  
I am trying to say is, what are we  
after? Here is the Constitution and  
here is the Eighth Schedule. Are we  
taking up the point of view that the  
Eighth Schedule has comprehended  
and included all the languages that are  
in India? Are we going to take shelter  
behind the Eighth Schedule, just be-  
cause it is in the Constitution? I say

my mother-tongue is Mundari. Here  
is the first volume of the 14 volumes  
of the Mundari Dictionary. Does any  
hon. Member here know anything  
about it? I am told mine is no lan-  
guage. They ask, what is your script?  
My script in Bengal is Bengali; my  
script in Orissa is Oriya; my script in  
Bihar is the Bihari script. What is  
Sanskrit? In Bengal, it is in the Ben-  
gali script; in the Tamil Nad side, it  
is in their script and so on.

I would have thought that we would  
have accepted the enrichment of lan-  
guages. Instead of that, what is hap-  
pening today in the name of language  
or languages? Even the languages that  
are in the Eighth Schedule are being  
prevented from being developed. I  
hope I do not offend my friends. I  
have no desire whatever to offend any-  
body, because I learn every language  
that I can possibly do. We have decid-  
ed that Hindi shall be the national lan-  
guage. I am not objecting to it. If  
tomorrow, Parliament in its wisdom,  
decides that Bengali shall be the na-  
tional language, I shall accept that also.  
But it is a matter of fact that at the  
present moment Hindi is the official  
language of the country.

I would like my Hindi friends to  
realise what tension was created when  
we accepted Hindi as the official lan-  
guage. Have they forgotten the quar-  
rel about international numerals? Do  
they want to divide the country again?  
Let us be sober and diligent. Let us  
not say anything that is going to hurt  
the other person.

I feel the only solution is that the  
Eighth Schedule should be in two  
parts. One should contain an inven-  
tory of the indigenous languages, lan-  
guages that have been born here, that  
have developed and continue to deve-  
lop here. The second should contain  
the non-indigenous languages; call  
them 'foreign' if you like, but I do not  
like that word. There are several lan-  
guages in the list of the Eighth Sch-  
edule that are really according to my  
point of view not indigenous languages

But no language is worth its name that does not derive its vitality from the rest of the world. I am more against the purists. They think that they are the Alpha and Omega of this language problem. I would like to remind those who do not like to acknowledge, who do not like to be told of the real history, because history is yet to be written of the pre-Aryans. It is an unscientific expression, but you know what they did? Before the "aryan" people came in, while my people were here, you know how the inspiration from Mundari, the generic language of the people of those days, was drawn by even a grammarian like Panini? Today I am told, mine is no language.

What is the State of Bihar doing? They are trying to kill every tribal language. I am supposed to be protected by the Constitution. My language, rights and customs shall be protected so long as they do not in any way conflict with the rest of the country. After the States' reorganisation, what do we see in Orissa, in the areas that were Hindi-speaking and in the Hindi high schools? Now they say, we shall not give you grants-in-aid unless the medium of instruction is Oriya. What is happening in Bihar? What is this Bengal-Bihar dispute—Seraikalla and Kharsawan? My hon. friends there belong to my tribute; I think I ought to know more about it than my friends. Every Adivasi is a multi-linguist, a polyglot. If he is in Bengal, he is a very good Bengali speaker. If he is in Assam, he speaks Assamese. In fact, there are few Adivasis who do not speak more than three languages.

So, if we want to be honest, what should we do? First mother-tongue; second, what I would call the economic language. Wherever he has to work, he has to learn that language, because he has to work there. The third is the regional language. In the name of regional languages, believe me, even the official language of this country is being put to a disadvantage in places like Sundergarh district. I would like my friends to come along with me and

see. What happened last year when our Prime Minister went to Rourkela? The Chief Minister of Orissa though he would demonstrate before the Prime Minister. "Here you are; it is really a Oriya-speaking area". He speaks in Oriya; nobody understands it. When the Prime Minister has to speak, he says, "I do not know Oriya". Then he asks the crowd,

आप लोग कितने हैं जो हिंदुस्तानी जानते हैं ।  
and everybody says "he knows". I have no objection to being in Orissa or anywhere else, so long as there is give and take. If you say, Orissa for the Oriyas only and Hindi for everybody, I would like to ask my Hindi friends, why don't they learn some other language of the South, so that they might inspire confidence in the other side? I take pride in learning every language I can possibly do. Take, for instance, the classical language Sanskrit. On an occasion like this, I feel like saying

पयः पानम् भुजंगानाम् केवलम् विषं वर्धनम् ।  
उपदेश ही भुजंगानाम् प्रकोपाय न तु शान्तये ॥

That is the position. If people have got an open mind, an honest mind and if they listen to reason, there will be no trouble.

After all, this House is expected to be bereft of parochialism or narrow-mindedness; every Member is supposed to be a statesman. If that is the case, I am afraid the type of demonstration we have been seeing here during this particular debate does not do much credit to all of us. I am sorry I have to say all this. But the thing is, English is not my mother-tongue. I am not talking of English only; what about the people talking French in Pondicherry? If Goa comes back to India, as it should, what about the Goanese? What about Rajasthani? There is full-fledged State of Rajasthan. I have worked in Rajasthan and I can say it is a rich and beautiful language. Why does that one big State not have Rajasthani included in the Eighth Schedule? So, the only

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

thing is for us to behave normally; to learn to give and take, accept facts as they are, and not live, shall we say, in a well and refuse to acknowledge facts. It is not the question what is Mr. Anthony's mother-tongue. Mr. Anthony speaks very good Hindi also.

Shri Frank Anthony: Hindusthani.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Maybe Hindusthani and perhaps he speaks something else also; I do not know. But I think Mr. Frank Anthony has also to learn that he has to carry the country and this House with him, and I am very glad you chastised him. It is the general folly of youth, he is a young man, the House must forgive him. I do not think he meant what he said. I sincerely say this. I would never dream of thinking that English was an Indian language. Yes, babu English is. And if Mr. Frank Anthony expects that babu English should be one of the languages included in the Schedule, I support him whole-heartedly. But I do feel that we should begin to behave normally before anything like this is debated in this House—because, we are not normal. In the name of language, wisdom and a little bit of gentlemanliness, not trying to hurt the other fellow—that is the definition of a gentleman; a gentleman is one who does not hurt the feelings of another person . . .

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member evidently means gentleness.

Shri Jaipal Singh: No, Sir, gentlemanliness. If we behave a little like gentlemen in the correct Oxford sense, then we will be in a better position to debate this.

I do feel and I think the best thing is if a high-powered committee of honest people, without prejudice, people, who know the meaning of language, people who know the country also, people who can go about the country were appointed (An Hon. Member: Let the Speaker nominate one) let this Committee or Commission take its own time, let it take ten

years, I do not mind, let it take its own time and at the end of it let its report be submitted to this House; and then if we were to find ways and means as to what the solution is as between indigenous and non-indigenous languages, that will be the only solution.

But this idea that just because something is in the Constitution, just because something is a regional language, just because somebody has been left out, some language has been left out, therefore we have to bull-doze over it, as it were, all in the name of the Constitution, I am afraid, is not going to lead this country towards a harmonious development.

I feel great injustice has been done to many people, including myself, whether it is Orissa, whether it is Bengal, whether it is Bihar, whether it is Assam, all over the country, all in the name of language. (Interruption). I am very glad that I am respected by my friends. I hope they have accepted what I have told them. If they have only accepted what I have told them, if that is the case, there is only one suggestion I have to make in this connection and that is that the Schedule should be in two parts: indigenous languages, truly native to this country and non-indigenous, yes, excellent languages but languages that have developed and continue to develop in this country.

And, of course, the real solution is to abolish all the States. Let us have a unitary form of government. We have had far too much of parochialism.

Shri C. D. Pandey: Including Jharkhand.

Shri Jaipal Singh: And lastly, one solution seems to be a very simple one, something which I would welcome, namely that Sanskrit should be made a compulsory classical language in all the schools. If that is done, Hindi will become the official language of this country in no time.

Sanskrit, not the Hindi of my friend from Jabalpur, not the Hindi of my friend here. I do know whether they talk Hindi or not. There is only one person who, I think, talks Hindi in this House, and that is my friend Shri Bhakt Darshan. I feel I am a student, I want to learn; but I certainly have not been able to learn any Hindi from my friends who advocate Hindi just hear.

**Shri C. D. Pande:** Why are you pointing at me?

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** Sir, they know it.

I was a member of the Press Commission . . .

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Kesaria):** I can teach you their Hindi.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** Sir, I will ask my hon. friend to address his remarks to you.

I was a member of the Press Commission.

पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश" (शिवपुरी) : मैं माननीय सदस्य के हिन्दी प्रेम की सराहना करता हूँ ।

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** We hear a lot about the Punjabi suba. When I was a member of the Press Commission, I was amazed to find that there was not a single Hindi paper in the whole of the Punjab. (Interruption).

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar):** There are three in my district alone.

**Shri Jaipal Singh:** I would ask my hon. friend Mr. Frank Anthony. We have had a good debate and I think the general feeling of the House is there; I would ask him to be a little patient. The debate is there, it has been fruitful—some of us got excited. I think it is a good thing that he and we got satisfied that the debate by itself did not press this way or that; and we could take it up at a later date when we are a little more sober and diligent and normal.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta—Central):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is after very careful thought and a great deal of prolonged discussion that we of the Communist Party have decided to oppose Mr. Anthony's resolution. In view of the shortness of time I would try to be as concise as possible. But there are certain things to which I would like, in all humility, to draw the gravest attention of the House.

The main reasons for our attitude in regard to this resolution are two-fold. English can, by no stretch of imagination, by no sophistry or jugglery of argumentation, be called or thought of as one of the languages of India. And, secondly, to put it in the Schedule can only be intended either to perpetuate the present position of English or to prolong, without patriotic justification, the transition from English to Hindi as well as to the other national languages of our country. I know that this may not be consciously the intention of many of my friends here who have told me that they are in favour of the resolution. But I know that they have been goaded by the fear of, what I can only describe as, Hindi fanaticism to resort to that sort of attitude. But whatever the intention, the effect of the resolution will be very undesirable from the view-point of our people.

Eminent leaders of our country like Shri Rajagopalachari, for instance, have gone so far as to ask for the indefinite continuance of English as the country's official language, and they have also asked for the cessation of all effort for a changeover to our own languages. Their *bona fides* are, of course, by no means in question, but as far as their advice is concerned it should be, with all respect, completely discarded.

I could appreciate Mr. Anthony's initiative if he had suggested something on the lines of what my friend Shri Dwivedy has proposed here, if he had suggested that the Eighth Schedule might very well be amplified as my friend Shri Jaipal Singh wants,

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

if he had suggested that languages like Sindhi, Mundari and Oraon find a place there, if he had suggested that the question of English might in that context be examined. Then, surely I could have appreciated his position. To my mind unlike Mundari or Sindhi, English cannot possibly claim a place in the Eighth Schedule. But if Mr. Frank Anthony had attempted a solution of our linguistic problem in that way, with a sort of perspective and a sort of realism that takes note first of all of the deepest needs of the overwhelming majority of our people, then I could have given him some credit. But unfortunately he has not done so, and I am afraid I can hardly give him any credit for what he has done.

I hope I shall be believed when I say that I have no animus against the English language or against the English people.

15-59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I know that perhaps it was at the back of Mr. Anthony's mind when he made a speech last time. Referring to the Communists he said that possibly they have come emotional hostility towards English, and that kind of thing. Sir, if personal references are permissible, I would like to say that I have spent some of the happiest years of my life in England, I cherish memories of England and its sights and sounds more than I care to tell. I count Englishmen and women among my best friends. But I know—it is not merely a matter of subjective feeling or of injured Indian vanity—I know and I aver that our roots touch different soil. Whether we like it or not is a different proposition. If we believe in the oneness of humanity in an abstract way, we might regret it. But the fact is that our roots do touch different soil. That does not mean that we keep apart in water-tight compartments, in isolation from each other. But it means surely that their language just cannot

take the place of ours and that its position in India, what it has been so far, must change and it must yield to Indian languages, Hindi and the other national languages of our country.

16 hrs

I learnt Bengali at my mother's knee. Shri Jai Pal Singh has been reminiscent. I should also say that I learnt Bengali at my mother's knee. I imbibed it just like I imbibed my mother's milk. I know. I appreciate. I have every understanding that Shri Anthony and Shri Barrow surely have, no doubt, the same feeling about English, which is their own national language. If there are other hon. Members of this House who have the illusion that they have been brought up on English—I think there are perhaps a microscopic section who might have that illusion—I am very sorry for them, because their lives are bound to be somewhat futile. They are much too marginal a section of society to be really effective. I am really sorry for them. I hope there are not such people but if there are they only hug the illusion that they have really and truly been brought up on English. This illusion may be harmless in individual instances. But if it is projected on to a larger plane, it might very well be disastrous.

We have had in this country a phenomenon of what we used to call Ing-Bung Society, इंग-बंग सोसाइटी a sort of Indo-Anglican conglomeration, neither here nor there, neither fish nor flesh, who had lost both the worlds, who did not know where they stood, who did not have that kind of cultural integration which is absolutely necessary for self-expression. I do not say this to ridicule them. I am very sorry about them. But I do hope that in our country the phenomenon of this kind of artificial association of cultures comes to an end altogether.

Perhaps I can claim that I know some English. But I know it well

1996g Resolution re: VAISAKHA 18, 1881 (SAKA) Inclusion of English 1996g.  
in the Eighth  
Schedule of the  
Constitution

enough to know that we cannot know it well enough. I know it very well. Actually our experience is that few things have been more pathetic and futile in our lives than the utter disproportion between the time and labour which we have spent in trying to learn English and the results. We see the results all over the place and every day of our life. The utter disproportion between the amount of energy which we waste in learning a foreign language, which perhaps cannot be learnt in the way which we had hoped we would be able to learn it, and the utter disproportion between what we have done and what we have achieved, the actual results, it is something which makes my heart absolutely sick. That is why I feel that we should discard certain conceptions which at one time perhaps did have a certain kind of objective validity.

I know, of course, it would be said to me that there have been eminent Indians, who in spite of this load of an alien language, have attained eminence in science and in the arts. But to my mind it only shows that our great people whose long career in history has not been mere longevity; they had enormous reserves of talent and in spite of the inhibiting factor of foreign Imperialist rule over our country, the culture of our country had such vitality, had such creativity that it broke all bonds and we have got our eminent people from Raja Ram Mohan Roy onwards because of that factor. But by and large, during British rule we have been intellectually sterile and spiritually emasculated. This is not something which I am saying just like that or in a fit of perversity. This was said in the Declaration of Independence which we read after the Labour Congress on the 26th January, 1930. This intellectual sterility and spiritual emasculation has come with the imposition by British of the English language. That is something which we shall never be able to forget.

I know, of course, that at certain periods the English language has been something like a catalytic agent. It has roused us from a certain torpor. But like David in Biblical lore, who laid aside the armour of Saul and took the pebbles from his own national brook, we have to lay aside the armour of the West and find out our own weapons from our own sources. This is what was done by the great Bengali poet, Michael Madhusudan Dutt, who till 34 years of age was trying to write poetry in English and then discovered his mistake. He had to pay the price for it. He turned out to be a great poet, but throughout his life it was a tragedy because he was torn between two worlds. This happened. It was again Mahatma Gandhi, who with his extra-ordinary mastery of the English language strove most of all for Hindustani and our other languages, like Gujarati, for India's heart would not respond otherwise to the task of national emancipation and advance. This is my main point that today India's heart has got to be roused to the task of national advance and it cannot be done if we are going to have English in the position that it has enjoyed so far.

There are few things which we should want so much as to see that educated Indians, like ourselves—most of us here can come into that category—are free of the thraldom of it. I want that we all learn English well. I myself have sought to do so to a certain extent, with whatever success it may be. But being overborne by English—which with few exceptions we are bound to be—will be a national calamity. I do beseech Shri Anthony to consider it because he will understand that after all in regard to English I certainly do not and cannot have any particular animus. That is why I repeat: let it not be thought for a moment that we wish to discard English altogether. It is a magnificent language with its stupendous literature and it is now ahead even of French as far as wide understanding of it is concerned. It is

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

perhaps today in the world the most widely known of all foreign languages. There are other great foreign languages like French or German or Russian or Chinese or Spanish, which we might also try to learn. But for historical reasons and for objective reasons we have acquired a certain familiarity with English. Therefore it stands to reason that English shall be the principal foreign language which we shall continue to learn. That is why so far we have got the provision for obligatory teaching of English in our high schools. It will be essential for a long time to come for those who go up for higher education and technological training. But there we have to stop short. It is a foreign language that we shall utilise but we shall utilise it only within necessary limits.

I know Shri Anthony is right when he says that English is the mother tongue of some 150,000 Anglo-Indians. If the number was substantially larger and if they lived by and large in a compact area, there might have been at least, geographically speaking, a colourable case for the inclusion of English in the Schedule. But there is no such case. I am sorry, but there is no such case. The plea has been made that English must be drawn upon by Hindi for enrichment of its vocabulary and that is a reason for such inclusion, but this argument does not really hold water. There is no bar—and there never has been—to our languages borrowing from foreign sources whenever permissible. We have borrowed much from Persian, but Persian is a foreign language and we have not put it in the Schedule. But Urdu is an Indian language which we have evolved on Indian soil and we have put it in the Schedule.

The mention of Urdu reminds me that in regard to this particular language also there is a feeling, specially in a city like Delhi, where Urdu has been traditionally the medium of communication, that Hindi fanatics—I am not going to name them—are

behaving in such a way that Urdu is going to be steam-rollered, bulldozed out of existence, so to speak, as Shri Jaipal Singh picturesquely put it. I remember, you took part in the discussion in the Constituent Assembly on the language issue and you began by saying—it is in the proceedings—that you came with a great deal of sympathy for the idea of accepting Hindi as the official language of India but you found a kind of Hindi being used and being more or less imposed that you were beginning to have your doubts. This is how you addressed your remarks in regard to the language question. I know this position continues. I want my hon. friends, like Seth Govind Dasji, for whom I have very great respect, who works in the literary sphere with a kind of asiduity which evokes respect from everybody—apart from anything else, apart from the literary quality of his contribution, his devotion to literature is something which makes me at least admire him a very great deal, I wish him to give very careful thought to this. Sometimes, he says, there might be exaggeration in the statement that Urdu is being steam-rollered out of existence. Maybe, there are exaggerations, but those who are down and out possibly do make some exaggerations when giving expression to their injured feelings. But their feelings are injured, I know it for a fact.

In Calcutta, I know it for a fact, there are people who speak Urdu. They have no other home than Calcutta. They are Calcuttias, but they speak Urdu, they read Urdu poetry, they go to *mushairas*. I know how in a place like Calcutta or Bombay or Delhi or Hyderabad Urdu is more or less sought to be steam-rollered. It should not be. I only make an incidental reference to it because I tell those who are enthusiasts of Hindi that only if they reassure those who are speaking the other languages of this country, it is only then that they will get the real acceptance of Hindi as the official language.

Sir, some of us perhaps are fairly at home in English and maybe we even flatter ourselves on that account. But I beseech the House please do remember, as I have tried to indicate before, that we have had to pay a terrible price for this preoccupation with English. I repeat it, Sir, we have had to pay a very terrible price for our preoccupation with English. Perhaps, no statistician can compute the loss to India on account of the waste of grey matter in our brains in our efforts to learn an obstinately alien language, an effort which in its effect did not certainly seem worthwhile.

Now, Sir, let us not delude ourselves. Neither Toru Dutt, nor Man Mohan Ghosh, nor Sarojini Naidu lives in English literature as first-rate or even as second-rate poet. A very few Indians have written English prose—Gandhi; outstanding among them but their works will not be embedded in the developing tradition of English writing. Mr Anthony may have illusions about Indian English or Ghana English. I do not know about Ghana, but I know about India and that bubble will surely be picked in no time. Indo-Anglian literature even from Derozio to John Masters suffers because of the environment of people like Mr Anthony. I am not ridiculing him. I will try to be very understanding and sympathetic. But unfortunately for those like Mr Anthony whose mother language is English, the entire environment, where he lives, moves and has his being, diverts him from English, and unless he adapts himself to Indian conditions, unless he really and truly associates himself with Indian ideals and Indian ways of thought, pathos and instability will come to his cultural life. It has happened and I warn him against this danger. It is almost something which is predestined, but he has to fight against it. That is why we wish our Anglo-Indian brethren to associate themselves a great deal more with real, genuine Indian traditions and Indian ways of thought and action.

The Prime Minister is not here, but I do wish to make a reference to him also in this context. I recall the best book which he has written, his *Autobiography*, where he speaks of his often having in this country "an alien's feelings". He says I feel "out of place everywhere, at home nowhere". That is how he describes himself in his autobiography in a mood of aesthetic integrity. It was due to the Anglicism in which he was partly brought up. But he had sensitivity and a very fine fibre and even in English he has brought out very charming works. But turning to Hindustani he has written, or rather spoken (and that has been later published) admirable prose and it is really admirable. It is so much more genuine than the kind of Sanskritized Hindi which sometimes comes from the quarters which Seth Govind Das patronises. But he has done it. But quite apart from what Jawaharlal Nehru has given to his country, and he has given a lot in different ways, his being lost between two worlds, like so many of our talented people have been is the Indian tragedy. Schizophrenia of the soul may well be a captivating personal phenomenon, but it is a national loss. And it is due to the dominance of English in our cultural horizon, a dominance which must go if we are to rise and create a new Indian civilisation.

We want in this country a change-over from English not only to Hindi which is the obvious and already accepted official language, but also to other national languages of our country. If some Hindi chauvinists provoke suspicion, anger and indignation in non-Hindi speaking regions and if we retaliate by suggesting that English should be kept as the neutral language indefinitely, as our State language or something very like it, that would be like cutting off the nose to spoil the face. I must say that a great provocation often comes from Hindi chauvinists, as I have stated before, but that is no reason for our falling at a rebound into the snare laid by the protagonists of English.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Mr. Anthony might soothingly say that he lays no snare at all and he only asks for English a place in the Schedule. I have read his minute of dissent to the report of Parliamentary Committee. I have no doubt that it is the thin end of the wedge and that will help delay the change-over to Indian languages, a change-over as much from English to Hindi as from English to Tamil, to Gujarathi or Marathi and so on.

We do not ask for a post-haste renunciation of English. As a great foreign language I hope we will continue to cherish it. I do not wish to move too fast towards Hindi and other national languages. We have been compelled to slow down the pace in regard to so many things. Free and compulsory education for children between the ages of six and fourteen years of age and so many other urgent directives in the Constitution have had to be postponed. We cannot have a complete switch-over by 1965 as it were, as it was once hoped by many people. But we cannot postpone it for ever and we should not postpone it for too long.

Vested interests are busy delaying this process. For instance Tamil and Bengali are developed languages but neither for official nor for academic purposes have they been helped to go ahead sufficiently yet either in Madras or in West Bengal. Even Hindi-speaking States plead the difficulty which bureaucrats above all feel, in changing over quickly towards Hindi. One must, of course, not be precipitate, but even honest efforts are rare. And when there is such talk as that our courts are "accustomed to English" and that our languages are not precise, expressive and so on and so forth, what is it that is really meant?

What indeed is the Indian revolution? I personally do not think that we have really had much of a revolution, but my hon. friends on the other

side say we have had an Indian revolution. What indeed is this Indian revolution if you expect everything to move smoothly without any jolt to any vested interests? Just as a change-over to a socialist pattern of society means, and should mean, a jolt to property relations, so a change-over from a foreign language to our own languages, will mean the termination of the monopoly position of the English educated? I repeat, we should not be precipitate, and I affirm that we must ensure that in the solution of our linguistic problems, we place no linguistic group in a position of disadvantage, and all linguistic minorities can pull their weight equally in the tasks ahead. But the change-over must come and the sooner the better.

We cannot tolerate the plea that English is a highly developed instrument and we must retain it. Our languages surely are not as advanced as English. But we have to make do with our own languages to raise the cultural level of our people, to stop the emasculation of our languages by the imposition of English as an instrument in the hands of a few and see that there is a real, vital link between the people and the administration. Our own languages must be Indian democracy's media of communication between the people and the administration.

Therefore, Sir, I will say that I have tried to put my case as objectively and dispassionately as I could and I ask the House to give very careful thought to this matter. Though I do not like to see this discussion postponed, it is good that we apply our minds more carefully to this matter. I know if we do give very careful thought to all the implications of the Resolution before the House, a large majority no doubt will oppose Mr. Anthony's Resolution.

श्री गोविन्द दास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,  
आप को तो शायद मालूम होगा . .

भी व० २० वाँ : अगर आप इतिहास में बोलें तो वे लोग भी समझ सकेंगे। वे यही कह रहे हैं।

लेठ गोविन्द दास : श्री एन्वनी साहब और मैं दोनों ही एक नगर से आते हैं और उन का और मेरा पीढ़ियों का सम्बन्ध रहा है। इसलिये मैं व्यक्तिगत रूप से एन्वनी साहब का बहुत अधिक आदर करता हूँ और उन के और मेरे बीच के जो सम्बन्ध है, वह भी इस को स्वीकार करते, कि उन में कभी कटुता नहीं आ पाई और हमारा हमेशा प्रेम का सम्बन्ध रहा है।

मैं यहाँ पर सौभाग्य से या दुर्भाग्य से, हिन्दी का एक हिमायती माना जाता हूँ। परन्तु चाहे मैं हिन्दी का हिमायती हूँ लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं सारी भारतीय भाषाओं को उतनी ही पूजा की दृष्टि से देखता हूँ, जितना कि हिन्दी को देखता हूँ। उर्दू का मैं देखी नहीं हूँ। उर्दू को मैं इसी देश की एक जबान मानता हूँ और इतना ही नहीं हिन्दी को उसे एक शैली मानता हूँ।

इनी के साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी के लिये भी मेरे मन में बहुत आदर है और अंग्रेजी ही नहीं, जितनी भी भाषाएँ हैं, इस दुनिया की, उन सब को मैं आदर की दृष्टि से देखता हूँ। इसका एक कारण है। मनुष्य इस सृष्टि का सर्वश्रेष्ठ प्राणी इसलिये है कि निसर्ग ने उसे जो ज्ञान शक्ति दी है वह किसी दूसरे प्राणी को नहीं। उस ज्ञान शक्ति के कारण जिस प्रकार की बोली वह बोलता है, उसी प्रकार की बोली सृष्टि का कोई दूसरा प्राणी नहीं बोलता। मनुष्य और दूसरे प्राणियों में सब से बड़ा अन्तर है, उनकी भाषा उनकी बोलियों का। और अगर कोई मानवता का आदर करता है, मनुष्य को सृष्टि का सर्वश्रेष्ठ प्राणी मानता है तो उसे मानव की जितनी भी बोलियाँ हैं, जितनी भी भाषाएँ हैं, चाहे वे भारतीय भाषाएँ हों, अंग्रेजी भाषा

हो, या विश्व की कोई भी भाषा हो, उन सब को अत्यन्त आदर की दृष्टि से देखना होगा।

मेरा थोड़ा बहुत सम्बन्ध गुरुदेव रविन्द्र ठाकुर से भी रहा है उनकी एक बात मुझ को याद आ जाती है। वे हमेशा कहा करते थे कि वे सरस्वती के एक पूजक हैं। अभी मुर्कशी जी ने मेरे साहित्य के सम्बन्ध में मुझे बहुत आदरपूर्ण शब्दों में याद किया। गुरुदेव कहते थे कि कोई सरस्वती का प्रेमी, कोई भी साहित्य का प्रेमी किसी भाषा का द्वेष नहीं हो सकता, किसी भाषा से द्वेष करना सरस्वती की प्रतिमा पर प्रहार करना है और जिस का भी साहित्य से कोई सम्बन्ध रहा है, उसको सब भाषाओं को अत्यन्त आदर की दृष्टि से देखना ही होगा।

लेकिन यह सब होने पर भी अंग्रेजी भाषा, चाहे हम उसे कितनी भी बड़ी भाषा, कितनी भी उच्च भाषा, कितनी भी अच्छी भाषा क्यों न मानें, कितनी भी आदर की दृष्टि से क्यों न देखें, भारतीय भाषा नहीं है। हमारे मित्र एचनी साहब ने कुछ अफ्रीकी देशों का उदाहरण दिया जहाँ अंग्रेजी वहाँ की भाषा मानी जाती है परन्तु वे अपने भाषण में या उन्होंने जो नोट हमारी संसदीय भाषा समिति की रिपोर्ट में लिखा है, उस में, यह सिद्ध नहीं कर सके कि ममार का कोई भी सम्य देश किसी भी विदेशी भाषा को अपनी भाषा मानता है। इसलिए अंग्रेजी, चाहे हम इसे उच्च दृष्टि से देखें, कितनी भी आदर की दृष्टि से देखें, हमारे संविधान में छाठवें परिच्छेद में नहीं आ सकती। मैं संविधान सभा का भी एक सदस्य था, एचनी साहब भी थे और उन्हें याद होगा कि उनको या किसी को भी संविधान सभा में यह माहस नहीं हुआ कि वे इस सूची में अंग्रेजी को रखने का प्रयत्न करते। तब संविधान के बन जाने के बाद और छाठ वर्ष बीत जाने के बाद आज यहाँ यह प्रश्न किस प्रकार उठता है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता।

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

मैंने आप से अभी निवेदन किया है कि मैं अंग्रेजी का द्वेषी नहीं हूँ, अंग्रेजी को अत्यन्त आदर की दृष्टि के देखता हूँ। विदेशों में जब मैं जाता हूँ, तो अंग्रेजी में मुझे बोलना पड़ता है। परन्तु एंघनी साहब मुझे क्षमा करे यह कहने के लिये कि मैं तो अंग्रेजी का द्वेषी नहीं हूँ, वह हिन्दी के और भारतीय भाषाओं के बड़े भारी द्वेषी है। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में उस दिन जो कुछ कहा, हमारी ससदीय भाषा समिति की रिपोर्ट में अपने नोट में जो कुछ लिखा उससे स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि उनके हृदय में कितना अधिक द्वेष हिन्दी के लिये है। उसी द्वेष के कारण और अंग्रेजी के अत्यधिक प्रेम के कारण, वह उस नोट में कई बड़ी गलत बातें भी लिख गये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि शान्ति से मेरे मित्र अपने उस नोट पर थोड़ा विचार करे और देखें कि उस में उन्होंने कितनी असत्य बातें लिखी हैं। कुछ उदाहरण मैं देना चाहता हूँ हिन्दी के रूप के सम्बन्ध में आलोचना करते हुए हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में यह कह कर कि हिन्दी तो इस देश के केवल आध प्रचलित लोगों की भाषा है, वे आगे बढ़े। उन्होंने कहा कि हिन्दी से तो अंग्रेजी यहाँ के कहीं अधिक लोग जानते हैं। फिर वह यह कह पड़े कि हिन्दी तमिल और बंगला से १,००० वर्ष कम उम्र की है। समस्त में नहीं आया कि उनका वह ऐतिहासिक ज्ञान कहा से आया कि हिन्दी तमिल और बंगला दोनों भाषाओं से १,००० वर्ष कम उम्र की है। वे और आगे बढ़े। उन्होंने यहाँ तक कह दिया कि हिन्दी का एम० ए० पास व्यक्ति अंग्रेजी के मैट्रिक पास व्यक्ति की भी योग्यता नहीं रखता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : राम राम ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : इन सब कथनों पर जरा शान्ति से वह विचार करे।

16.28 hrs.

[SHRI C. R. PATTABRAMAN in the Chair]

फिर उन्होंने इस देश के लोगों को लड़ाने का प्रयत्न किया है। श्री जयपाल सिंह जी ने

अपने भाषण में कहा कि हमें इस विषय पर देश में फिर से झगड़े लड़ने नहीं करने चाहियें। हिन्दी भाषा भाषी कोई झगड़े उत्पन्न करना नहीं चाहते। मैं अपने मित्र श्री ही० ना० मुकर्जी से सर्वथा सहमत हूँ कि १९६५ का सन् रत्न कर हमें हिन्दी को देश में किसी के ऊपर भी लादना नहीं चाहिए। समय का यह प्रश्न नहीं है। लेकिन देखना यह है कि हिन्दी भाषा भाषी या भारतीय भाषाओं से प्रेम रखने वाले लोग आपस में लोगों का झगड़ा कराने का प्रयत्न करते हैं या एंघनी साहब ने प्रयत्न किया है। उन्होंने हिन्दी और अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी लोगों की लड़ाने की कोशिश की है। उन्होंने आदिवासियों और इस देश के दूसरे लोगों को लड़ाने का प्रयत्न किया है। उन्होंने हरिजनों और सर्वार्थ हिन्दुओं को लड़ाने की कोशिश की है। उन्होंने उर्दू के प्रश्न को उठा कर हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों को लड़ाने का प्रयत्न किया है और अन्त में उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तानी की बात कह कर महात्मा गांधी का नाम लिया। जब उन्होंने महात्मा गांधी का नाम लिया तब मुझे ऐसा मान्य हुआ कि जैसे पैरेडाइज लास्ट में मिल्टन साहब ने लिखा है कि सेंटन भी कभी कभी सकिप्टम कोट करने लगता है। लेकिन वह जरा देखें कि इस द्वेष के कारण वह क्या कह गये हैं। फिर उनकी दलीलें की मैं आप। कितनी पोच दलीलें हैं। पहले वह कहते हैं कि आठवें परिच्छेद में अंग्रेजी को सम्मिलित करने से उसके हिन्दी में हम शब्द ले सकेंगे। यहाँ पर अनेक बार कहा जा चुका है और मैं संविधान की २५१वीं धारा का स्मरण दिलाता हूँ जिस के अनुसार हम अंग्रेजी और किसी भी दूसरी भाषा से बराबर शब्दों को ले सकते हैं। वह दलील कि अंग्रेजी को सूची में स्थान देने के बाद हम अंग्रेजी से शब्द ले सकेंगे बिल्कुल गलत है। अंग्रेजी से हम बराबर आज भी शब्द ले सकते हैं। हम ने लिये हैं, ले रहे हैं और भविष्य में भी हम लेंगे। केवल अंग्रेजी से ही नहीं बल्कि विश्व की समस्त विकसित भाषाओं से। किसी

भी भाषा में शब्द कानून के द्वारा नहीं चुँस दिये जा सकते। शब्द भाषा में आते हैं अपने आप। स्टेशन, प्लेटफार्म, टिकट, एंजिन यह सब शब्द हिन्दी में कानून के द्वारा नहीं आये हैं, अंग्रेजी शब्द होते हुए भी प्रचलित होने के कारण आये हैं।

उन के दूसरी दलील यह है कि अंग्रेजी भारतीय भाषा है, और अगर अंग्रेजी भारतीय भाषा नहीं है तो, वे यहाँ तक बढ़ गये, उन्होंने कहा कि संस्कृत भी बाहर के आई हुई है। आश्चर्य हुआ मुझे उन की यह बात सुन कर। पहले तो इसी बात पर विद्वानों में मतभेद है कि आर्य भारत के ही रहने वाले थे या बाहर से आये, और संस्कृत को विदेशी भाषा मान लेना, केवल इस लिये कि अंग्रेजी एक विदेशी भाषा है, यह तो एक बड़ी भ्रष्टाचार दलील है। यह कितनी पोखी दलील है इस को वे स्वयम् विचार सकते हैं। अंग्रेजी को ग्रियर्सन साहब ने जो स्वयं अंग्रेज थे इस देश की भाषा नहीं माना।

उनकी तीसरी बात यह है कि अंग्रेजी ऐंग्लो इंडियन लोगों की मातृभाषा है। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि ऐंग्लो इंडियनों से भी कहीं अधिक तादाद में जो लोग इस देश में रहते हैं उन की भी सब भाषाओं को हम अपने संविधान में स्वीकार नहीं कर सके। अगर हम उन सब भाषाओं की अपने संविधान में लेंगे, जो कि इस देश के तमाम लोगों की मातृभाषायें हैं, तो फिर उन भाषाओं की संख्या लगभग ६०० हो जायेगी।

इस प्रकार भी जो उन की दलीलें हैं वे कितनी पोखी हैं यह मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और अन्त में जितनी बातें मैं ने कही हैं उन्हें सरसरी तौर पर फिर आप के सामने रखूँगा।

पहली बात मैं यह कहूँगा कि अंग्रेजी इस देश की भाषा न होने के कारण और उसके विजेताओं की भाषा होने के कारण, उस के साथ अंग्रेजी राज्य और अंग्रेजों के प्राधिपत्य

के इतिहास के लगे होने के कारण उसे इस देश के संविधान में स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता। दूसरी बात यह है कि यह प्रश्न केवल हिन्दी के विरोध में ही नहीं जाता, समस्त भारतीय भाषाओं के विरोध में जाता है। अंग्रेजी को सूची में लेने से केवल हिन्दी की हानि होती है। यह बात नहीं है, समस्त भाषायें जो हमारे संविधान में स्वीकार की गई हैं, उन सब की हानि होती है। तीसरी बात यह है कि यहाँ पर जब अंग्रेजी का इतना दौर दौरा है कि अंग्रेजी को हटाने के विरुद्ध राजा जी सदा नेता यहाँ पर याचिका भेजते हैं, चाहे वह याचिका हमारे संविधान के विरुद्ध ही क्यों न हो, तब अगर कहीं हम ने अंग्रेजी को अपने संविधान में स्वीकार कर लिया तो फिर अंग्रेजी में जिसे थिन एंड आफ दि बेज कहते हैं वह होने वाला है और अंग्रेजी का जो दौर दौरा है वह और बढ़ने वाला है, वह समाप्त होने वाला नहीं है। श्री हीरेन्द्र मुकुर्जी यह चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी का स्थान यहाँ की भारतीय भाषायें जल्दी से जल्दी ले लें। तब मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी इस में इतनी देर हो रही है तो अगर अंग्रेजी सूची में स्वीकार हो गई तो भारतीय भाषायें अंग्रेजी का स्थान किन्नी कठिनाई से ले सकेंगी, इस पर आप को विचार करना चाहिये।

जयपाल सिंह जी के कथनानुसार मैं इस बात का पक्षपाती हूँ कि यदि आवश्यकता हो तो संविधान में परिवर्तन किया जाय। हम ऐसा कर भी चुके हैं। लेकिन इस विषय में संविधान में परिवर्तन एक बड़ी खोफनाक चीज होगी। जयपाल सिंह जी के इस कथन से कि अधिक से अधिक भाषायें हमें सीखनी चाहियें, इस में भी मेरा कोई मतभेद नहीं है। हिन्दी भाषाभाषियों को इस देश की एक भाषा और सीखनी चाहिये, यह हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन अपने अपने प्रस्तावों में कह चुका है, संसदीय हिन्दी परिषद् ने तामिल तक सिखाने के लिये कहाए खोली थी। इस का मैं विरोधी नहीं, अधिक से अधिक भाषायें

[शेठ गोविन्द दास]

सीखनी चाहिये और इस के लिये हम सब को प्रयत्न करना आवश्यक है। आज श्री हीरेन्द्र मुकर्जी ने जो कुछ कहा है बहुत दूर तक मैं उस से सहमत हूँ। बहुत कम बार मैं अपने साम्प्रदायी भाइयों के उन के विचारों में सहमत हो सका हूँ, पर आज मेरा सीमावर्ती है कि श्री हीरेन्द्र मुकर्जी हिन्दी के बारे में जो कुछ कहा उन के भाषण के ६६ अंश से मेरा कोई मतभेद नहीं है और मैं उस से सहमत हूँ।

मैं अन्त में आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि एन्ग्ली साहब का जो यह दावा है . . .

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know whether the hon. Member has no difference of opinion with the hon. Mover of the resolution?

Mr. Chairman: He was referring to Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

शेठ गोविन्द दास . एन्ग्ली साहब का जो दावा है कि जो अहिन्दी भाषाभाषी हैं वे सब के सब उन के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने वाले हैं, उन के सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने आरम्भ में कहा भी था कि वे इस बात को देख लें। बिना भाषणों के वोट करा कर देख लें, आज वोट लिये जायें तो वह देख लें, कल वोट हो तो देख लें या फिर जो हमारा अधिवेशन फिर से होने वाला है उस में देख लें कि कितने लोग उन के साथ जाते हैं और कितने लोग उन के विरोध में जाते हैं। मेरा विश्वास है कि इस सदन का प्रचंड बहुमत उन के प्रस्ताव को गिरावेगा। इस में थोड़ा बहुत भी सन्देह नहीं है। मैं अंग्रेजी भाषा के प्रति अत्यन्त आदर रखते हुए भी इस प्रस्ताव का अधिक से अधिक विरोध करना चाहता हूँ।

बीमती सहोबरा बाई राव : चेयरमैन साहब, इस के बाद महिलाओं को पहले सीका देना चाहिये।

Shri N. B. Ghosh (Cooch-Bihar): I would like to approach this resolution moved by Shri Frank Anthony objectively, without introducing into it any emotion or any feelings. The resolution looks quite innocuous, quite innocent and quite simple. But if you read between the lines of his speech, or even if you read his speech as a whole, you will find that, as a matter of fact, his real object is something else. But I wish to approach this resolution as it is.

His speech formulates certain propositions. His first proposition is this, that article 351 of the Constitution demands the inclusion of English, and then he says that for the promotion and propagation of Hindi, for expressing the composite culture of India, English is essential, and he says that English has got a good, or perhaps a better claim than Sanskrit. It is an Indian language. He considers, that in any case both English and Sanskrit are foreign languages; if actually English is to be considered as a foreign language, then Sanskrit also must be considered as a foreign language. Though he says that he is not pleading for the acceptance of English as the national language of India, yet, as a matter of fact, what he actually says amounts to this that there is no other union or no other bond that can keep India together, if we do not accept English as the national language of India.

Secondly, he says that English is spoken or understood by at least 60 per cent of the people of India. That is his claim. I was not present at the time he made his speech, and I spent some money in purchasing his speech, and I analysed the whole speech carefully and minutely. He says that if the sort of claim that is put forward in favour of Hindi is admissible, then English is spoken in that fashion by at least 60 per cent of the people.

Not only that. He says that the census is not correct, was not honestly

made, and that the figures which were supplied by the Census are not acceptable. He pitchforks two instances from the families of two of his friends and says: here you see their mother tongue is not entered as English. And he thinks that one plus one should not make two, but it should make two million. I do not understand by what jugglery, by what magic he wants to say that two million or 20 million people understand English.

Now I shall give you certain figures. According to the last census, the number of people whose mother tongue was returned as English is 1,71,742, and it was distributed in the following manner: East India: about 45,000; Central India 49,000; Western India: 47,000; South India 12,914; Northern India 11,461; North-western India: 4,523; Andaman and Nicobar: 114. You will find these figures at page 18, Table No 5 of the Census.

Then you will find that the instructions for making these returns was that the languages should be recorded as returned by the citizens, and mother tongue was defined as the language spoken from the cradle. I am quite sure Shri Anthony will not be seriously arguing that people, at least of his community and British nationals who return their language as English, failed to return in a single instance, because they are educated people who are conscious of their rights, who know how to exercise their rights. So, it cannot be said that the number was more. Even if we accept the two cases of his two friends, they make only two instances. Let me concede that there are 200 such instances, but certainly they will not make 2 million.

There is another figure which he gave, and we can also look at the census figures. If you look at the census figures, of the people who understand English, the number shown is 37,98,408. Let me take it as 38 lakhs. It includes English literates also, i.e., people who can simply sign their names in English. Even if they

are included, the figure does not exceed 38 lakhs. And if you look at the percentage, you will find that the percentage of the people whose mother tongue is English is 1/20 or 0.05. The percentage of people who understand or speak English even in this liberal sense would be a little more than 1%.

There are several languages of the Colerian group, Munda and other languages, numbering 30 or 40, and the people speaking them far exceed those whose mother tongue was returned as English. If English should be included in the Eighth Schedule on account of the fact that it is the mother tongue of 78,000 people, then the claims of these other languages are much greater.

If you look at the Eighth Schedule, you will find what was at the back of the minds of the framers of the Constitution. You will find that 14 languages have been mentioned there, out of which four are South Indian languages and the rest North Indian. The ten North Indian languages are of the Indo-Aryan region, they are predominantly Sanskritic. The four South Indian languages have been the mother tongues of South Indians for thousands and thousands of years, and whatever might have been their origin, they have been completely transmuted by Sanskritic culture. In Malayalam, the percentage of Sanskrit words is above 70, and it is only slightly less in Telugu and Kannada. In Tamil it is over 40 per cent. Whatever might be the other differences, all these languages are of Sanskritic origin or of Sanskritic culture, and we get a pattern of a sort in the Eighth Schedule.

What was the object of Article 351 of the Constitution and the Eighth Schedule? Do you think that we can fit in English there? There is no question of emotion. I am trying to approach it from the intellectual point of view. Article 351 says:

"It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of

[Shri N. R. Ghosh]

the Hind. language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating... wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

One of my friends here thought that "other languages" in article 351 might as well include English. I beg to differ from him. If you actually interpret the Article from the point of view of law you will find that here the words "other languages" definitely mean other languages included in the Eighth Schedule. There is a scheme, there is a pattern, namely that we are to transmute Hindi, to enrich it in a particular way, and that is, that we have to do it keeping in tact Indian culture and drawing upon mainly Sanskrit and other languages which are either very closely connected with Sanskrit or even largely influenced by Sanskrit. In this pattern, has English got any place? English would be a misfit there. Under this scheme of Article 351, you cannot fit in English from any point of view.

I have heard it said that we sometimes borrow English words. That is permissible. We have borrowed Portuguese, sometimes Spanish words, and we borrow English words too. That is permissible. All living languages can borrow words, vocabulary, from other languages. That is a different matter altogether. But the framers of the Constitution by article 351 wanted to create a new sort of Hindi, a Hindi which will be acceptable to the whole of India. That was the object, not the Hindi either of the Western UP type or the Delhi type, but a Hindi which will be acceptable to the east, south, north and west. In that view article 351 is significant. You find that this Hindi which is to be evolved will draw for the vocabulary primarily on Sanskrit. That is, it will be a sort of Sanskritised Hindi.

Now, you know that in Bengali, Oriya, Assamese and the languages of the Biharis—Maithili, and Bhojpuri etc.—the percentage of Sanskrit is as high as 80 and more. We do not understand the Urdu-type Hindi. But the framers of the Constitution wanted the creation of a Sanskritised Hindi which they thought would be acceptable to all parts of India. For that purpose and in that context English has got no place, it has got no role to play, in this Schedule. Its structure is different; even its soul is different. If you examine it intellectually, you will find that this was at the back of the mind of the framers of the Constitution. It is not a question of liberalism or favour. You are evolving language of a particular type—English cannot have any place in it. You cannot fit it. If you look at the scheme of the article, it is impossible to include English there. It does not fit in.

As I was submitting, this is not a new attempt. What is actually Sanskrit? Sanskrit means 'Sanskrita' reformed. Actually, Sanskrit in its present form was not the vedic language. Old Sanskrit was something else. It was disciplined by the grammar of Panini and it was simplified its alphabets were arranged phonetically. It was made a sort of a language which would be understood in all parts of India. That is the modern Sanskrit. We are actually yearning for the day when there will be no clamour, no dispute about language, when we will hail that reformed Hindi as the common language of the whole of India. That is the day we are looking for. That was the purpose of article 351. The very scheme rules out English.

Now English is a great language. It has got international importance. So was French; so was German. Here in India during the reign of the Pathans and the Moghuls, Persian was the court language. Persian continued to be the court language for some time.

But where is Persian now? It has gone. So will English. Though on account of our education, on account of our habits or on account of our behaviour which we have developed we have been using English and we want to stick to it, there must come a day when English shall have to be rejected by us, not as a language as such; we will continue to learn English but it cannot be thrust upon 350 millions of India. If anybody says that English is to be added to the VIIIth Schedule or that English is to be accepted as an interstate or national language of India, we will resent it; we will reject this idea.

Mr. Chairman: The hon Member has taken more than the usual time. He must conclude now.

Shri N. R. Ghosh: There is another thing Shri Frank Anthony has uttered a threat that unless we accept English as the national language of India, India will disintegrate, fall to pieces. That is the threat he has uttered. I tell him that that threat does not frighten us. I tell him that if there is no unifying force in our common culture, in our unity, in the fundamental unity of our nation, then English will not help us. If we are united, if we banish English we will not in any way suffer for its rejection.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I request the hon. Member to resume his seat.

Shri N. R. Ghosh: May I have one or two minutes more?

Mr. Chairman: I am not asking him to conclude now. He will kindly resume his seat. I have to make an announcement.

It is now nearing 5 P.M. May I know how many hon Members want to speak?

Several Hon. Members rose—

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): There are many more hon.

Members to speak. The time-limit must be strictly adhered to.

Mr. Chairman: All of them cannot speak today. This Resolution will be carried over to the next session as a part-discussed Resolution and it will be taken up next session automatically on the first available day. Would it make any difference if we close the discussion earlier and go on to the next item of business? I sounded Shri Panigrahi about the half-hour discussion. He is keen on going on with it. It is true that this Resolution was taken up for discussion today at 3.5 P.M. It must go on till 5.35. There is no doubt about it. Therefore, would the House prefer to stop now?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: Then discussion on this Resolution will go on till 5.35 P.M. and then we will take up the half-hour discussion.

Shri C. D. Pande: The idea was that we would have two hours for discussing it today and two hours later.

Shri Frank Anthony: Two days.

Shri C. D. Pande: Therefore, let us stop at 5 P.M., so that we may have two hours later.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: No, no.

Shri Frank Anthony: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: The whole trouble is that I am bound by the ruling of the Speaker and the Committee on this. They have given 2½ hours. It goes on till 5.35 P.M.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I submit that we must adopt a formal resolution about carrying this over to the next session? The House must accept a formal resolution to carry it over.

Mr. Chairman: I think a decision has already been taken about that. It will be a part-discussed Resolution. There will not be a ballot on it. I

[Mr. Chairman]

think that is worrying the hon. Member. It will automatically go over to the next session.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): I want to know what exactly is the position regarding the ruling of the Chair that 2½ hours are allotted for the discussion of this Resolution. Can the time be extended by the Chair or with the consent of the House? Otherwise, automatically the Resolution lapses.

Mr. Chairman: Actually, what I was suggesting was just the opposite, that in view of the fact that this is being carried over, would Members like to stop it now and go on with the half-hour discussion?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Thirumala Rao: We can stop the discussion at 5 P.M.

Shri C. D. Pande: That was my suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: The time allotted is 2½ hours. Therefore, it will go on till 5.35. I cannot take any time from it.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: May I point out that originally 2½ hours were allotted?

An Hon. Member: Three hours.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It was then extended to three hours, out of which we had taken 1 hour and 4 minutes on the last occasion. That means, that 1 hour and 56 minutes remained when we begun today. Normally, this would have commenced at 2.30. But, since there was the Tibet debate going on we commenced late.

17 hrs.

Before that, there was the motion moved by my hon. friend Sardar Saigal which said that instead of 3 hours it should be 4 hours. The Chair did not take any decision on that and it was not put to the House. The Chair said: 'Let us go on provisionally

and when we can decide'. The position is this.

As matters stand, the three hour time limit stands. We have not yet decided to extend it. (Interruption). I am placing the facts as they are. We have not yet decided to extend the time beyond three hours. It is open to the House to extend that. There is no question about it. Therefore, the issue was whether we should sit longer and complete three hours or whether we should switch over to the next item.

It appears that somehow or other some Members want that this discussion should be switched over to the next session. But, assuming that there is a decision that it shall be switched on to the next session, we are not bound by the time limit of three hours, which is regarded more or less as provisional.

Therefore, my submission is that at 5 o'clock we stop and if Shri Anthony wanted, the balance of the time may be taken on the next day. But that does not seem to be the sense of the House. (Interruption). It is open to the House either to have the balance of time tomorrow or in the next session. It is for the House to decide. My suggestion is that at 5 o'clock we stop and, later on, if you want to extend the time, you may and the House may decide how much time we should have for this resolution.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): My submission is that Shri Ghosh be permitted to finish his speech and we close after it for the day. Whether the time has to be extended or not can be decided in the next session because the resolutions will automatically go over to the next session.

Shrimati Benu Chakravarty: We have always been very jealous of not allowing the 2½ hours for non-official business, which we have every Friday, to be impinged upon. Therefore, whatever the House may decide to do, whether they want to extend it to tomorrow or the session after, the

resolution should be raised not till the end of the 2½ hours. Therefore, the question of finishing at 8 o'clock should not be pressed by Shri Bharucha.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** The Char has just announced that this resolution will go to the next session, and it will not go to the ballot etc. So far as the rights of the hon. Mover are concerned, they are quite secure. Whether you adjourn the debate at five or later is immaterial. Therefore, it is not necessary to go on till 5.30.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** Is it not necessary to have 2½ hours?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** According to the wish of the House the hon. Speaker was pleased to say that we may take it to the next session. In view of that I would suggest this.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think we have had enough discussion on this.

**Shri A. M. Tariq:** I have got a submission. If the House decides to carry on this resolution to the next day, then, I may be allowed to move my resolution.

**Mr. Chairman:** I am afraid we are bound by the Order Paper. Unless the Mover and all the Members are agreeable, we should go on for 2½ hours as has been pointed by Shrimati Renu Chakravarty. Therefore, I do not think it proper to stop at five.

**Shri Ghosh—has he finished?**

**Shri N. R. Ghosh:** I have not finished.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has taken 23 minutes. I gave him two warnings. I wanted the hon. Member to cooperate with me. I was going to suggest when he was going into the Constitution that it was not necessary for the purpose and that he can go on to the main resolution. But I thought I should not interfere and I kept quiet. He has already taken 23 minutes.

**Shri N. R. Ghosh:** Will you give me half a minute, Sir?

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes.

**Shri N. R. Ghosh:** I am just telling my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony that the figures are wrong and they are acknowledged to be wrong. I am quoting Ghana as an instance which we should copy.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shrimati Manjula Devi. After her I will call Shri Anwar Harvani.

जी बाह्य (बाबाबाकी) : जीन, मैं एक  
व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ । मैं  
यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बिरोधी पक्ष  
के लोगों को भी मौका दिया जाये ।

**Mr. Chairman:** I have got here a list of hon. Members of the Opposition as well as of the Congress who are for English and against English. A deliberate list has been drawn up by the learned Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker and I am following it. They have taken everything into consideration and I dare say he will get his chance.

**Shrimati Manjula Devi (Goalpara):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, the inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution should be treated in a most impartial and in an impassionate way, avoiding all emotional outbursts. Before I proceed I would like to draw your attention to Part III of the Constitution—Fundamental Rights, Article 15. It reads:

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. There must be less noise in the House.

**Shrimati Manjula Devi:** Article 15 reads:

"The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them."

Now, we consider the community of Anglo-Indians as citizens of India and the mother tongue of this community is English. We should not discriminate on the ground of race or religion.

[Shrimati Manjula Devi]

It is quite in keeping with the Constitution to include English as one of the languages. The inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution would not impair the prestige of any of the regional languages. As the mother tongue of the minority community it should be included.

The question may arise that the Anglo-Indians are scattered over India and do not belong to one particular region and, as such, English cannot be treated as one of the regional languages. But there is Sanskrit which does not belong to any particular region. It belongs to the whole of India. I suggest that there should be two Schedules or that the Eighth Schedule should be divided into two parts, keeping English, Urdu and Sanskrit in one and the rest of the regional languages in the other.

It is English that has raised the standards of India to the supreme heights in international politics. It is through English that we can extend the principle of Panchsheel. It is due to English that India has gained that great name in the world for its non-alignment with other nations or military pacts or other agreements. It is through English that India has advanced in the modern world. As such I think that it should be included in the eighth schedule.

I would like to say one more point. But for the invasion of the Moghuls on India, but for the Moghul rule in India, Urdu would not be here as a language of the Indian nation. Now, the invasion of English or the introduction of English into India can be treated in the same way. If Urdu can be included and when we accept the minority community of Anglo-Indians as one of our citizens, I think it is just right that we should include English in the eighth schedule. It only shows the broadness and the lack of conservatism of Indian outlook in all aspects of life.

So, I do hope that we will speak and decide the issue on the merits of the question and not on an emotional basis. With these few words I support the resolution.

श्री सम्भार हस्वानी (फतेहपुर) :  
सनापति महोदय, मैं आप को सम्बोधित करता हूँ कि आपने मुझ को इस महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का अवसर दिया है ताकि मैं अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकूँ।

एक समय था जब हमारा देश स्वतंत्र नहीं था और ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यशाही का यहाँ शासन था। उस समय हमारी हालत उस गुँथे की सी थी जो एक ऐसे यंत्र का प्रयोग करता था अपने विचार प्रकट करने के लिये जोकि हजारों मील दूर से लाया गया था। मगर आज हमारा देश स्वतंत्र है और स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद हमारे देश ने अपने विधान में हिन्दी को राज भाषा और राष्ट्र भाषा माना है। हिन्दी को राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा मानने से पहले इस देश में कई विचारधाराएँ भाषा के विषय में थी। कुछ भाइयों का विचार था कि ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यशाही इस देश में हमेशा बनी रहेगी और अंग्रेजों का राज्य यहाँ हमेशा कायम रहेगा और अंग्रेजी भाषा यहाँ हमेशा चलेगी। कुछ भाइयों का विचार यह था कि इस देश में हिन्दुस्तानी भाषा ही एक ऐसी भाषा है जो हर जगह काफी समझी और बोली जाती है, इस बावजूद, हिन्दुस्तानी भाषा को अपनाया जाय। कुछ भाइयों का यह विचार था कि इस देश की भाषा वह हिन्दी भाषा हो जिस में संस्कृत के शब्द ज्यादा से ज्यादा लिये जायें और इसे एक ऐसी भाषा बनाया जाय जोकि न किसी शहर में बोली जाती है और न ही समझी जाती है। आज हम देखते हैं कि हिन्दी का समर्थन करने वाले भाइयों में इस भाँति की विचारधारा वाले लोग ज्यादा हैं और यही वजह है कि आज देश के कुछ हिस्सों में हम पाते हैं कि हिन्दी का विरोध हो रहा है।

[श्री अन्तर हरबानी]

लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे श्री एन्ग्ली साहब ने जो प्रस्ताव इस सभा के सामने रखा किया है, उस को हमें इस दृष्टिकोण से नहीं देखना चाहिये कि एक मुकदमा हिन्दी बनाम अंग्रेजी का चल पड़ा है, बल्कि सवाल दूसरा ही है। जिस वक्त हमारा जिवान बना और उस पर हम ने अपनी गृह लगाई, अपनी छाप लगाई, तो हिन्दी उसी दिन देश की राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा बन गई। उसके अलावा इस देश में जो और भाषायें बोली जाती हैं, चाहे रिजनल भाषायें हों, किन्हीं इलाकों की भाषायें हों, प्रदेशों की भाषायें हों, या जो किसी प्रदेश की भाषा नहीं है जैसे उर्दू है, उनको भी मान्यता दी गई। अंग्रेजी भाषा को बोलने वाले हमारे एन्ग्लो-इंडियन भाई हैं और उनके अलावा बहुत से हिन्दुस्तानी घरों में भी अंग्रेजी का प्रयोग किया जाता है, लेकिन उस को नहीं माना गया है। तो आज इन भाषाओं का मुकदमा बनाम हिन्दी नहीं है बल्कि इन भाषाओं के लिए एक अलग जगह है। यह तो एक अलग सवाल है। इस वास्ते हम हिन्दी भाषा बोलने वालों को इस दृष्टिकोण से नहीं देखना चाहिये और मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ तक अंग्रेजी का ताल्लुक है, एक समय था जब हर चीज जो अंग्रेजी थी उसे हम हीन समझते थे, उससे हमें नफरत थी। बराबर अंग्रेजी माल का हम ने बाइकाट किया। अंग्रेजी स्कूल छोड़े। अंग्रेजी बोलना भी छोड़ना चाहते थे। यह वह समय था जब हम ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य-शाही से जग कर रहे थे, हमारा उसके साथ युद्ध चल रहा था और अपने में देश भक्ति की भावना पैदा करने के लिये हम ने हर अंग्रेजी चीज को हीन समझना शुरू किया। अगर आज हम स्वतंत्र हैं। हम को बुले दिमाग से इन सब चीजों पर बिचार करना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कहना कि अंग्रेजी भाषा ने इस देश की कीर्ति सेवा नहीं की है, बिल्कुल गलत बात है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन में अंग्रेजी ने एक बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा भरा किया, एक बहुत

बड़ा काम किया। मुझे याद है कि इंडियन नैशनल काँग्रेस के सब के पहले सभापति से ले कर बाद के सभापति तक के जितने भी एग्रेस बनते थे, अपने जो वे भाषण बनाते थे, वे सब अंग्रेजी में बनते थे और बनाते थे। हम जानते हैं कि जब हम स्कूल में पढ़ते थे और हम ने जब राजनीतिक कार्यों के प्रति अपनी भावों को तो तो जिस किताब ने सब से अधिक हम लोगों पर असर किया वह गांधी जी की लिखी हुई थी "माई एक्सपेरिमेंट्स विथ ट्रुथ" और वह अंग्रेजी में लिखी गई थी। उस किताब को पढ़ कर हिन्दुस्तान के संकटों और हज़ारों नज़्दिक जेलों में गये और कई फाँसी के तक्तों पर झूले।

श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह (छपरा) : गांधी जी की जो भात्मकता है, वह गुजराती में लिखी गई थी और बाद में उस का अनुवाद हिन्दी में हुआ था और यह अनुवाद महादेव देसाई ने किया था।

श्री अन्तर हरबानी : मेरे भाई यह बता रहे हैं कि वह गुजराती में लिखी गई थी। यह सही बात है। लेकिन उन्होंने उस को अंग्रेजी में पढ़ा था, यह तो वह मार्गेंगे ही।

दूसरी किताब जिस ने सब से अधिक प्रभाव हम पर डाला वह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू द्वारा लिखी गई थी "माई माटोबायोग्राफी" और वह भी अंग्रेजी में लिखी गई थी। इस किताब ने भी हम में जोश पैदा किया और देश के स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन को आगे बढ़ाने में बड़ी मदद की, देश की स्वतंत्रता के लिये लड़ने के लिये हम में जोश पैदा किया। अंग्रेजों के घरों का हिन्दुस्तानियों में राष्ट्रीयता की भावना पैदा करने में, फैलाने में बड़ा हाथ रहा है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि अंग्रेजों से इसलिये नफरत करना कि वह अंग्रेजों की लाई हुई चीज है, गलत बात है। हिन्दुस्तान के स्वतंत्रता सपना में अंग्रेजों का बहुत बड़ा हाथ रहा है और आज भी हिन्दुस्तान को एक बनाने का

## [श्री अन्तार हजारी]

को आन्दोलन चल रहा है, उस में भी अंग्रेजी ने बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा भटा किया है।

इसलिये मैं हिन्दी के समर्थकों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस मामले को अंग्रेजी वर्सस हिन्दी या अंग्रेजी बनाम हिन्दी न बनायें बल्कि वह यह समझें कि हिन्दी तो हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा उस दिन ही हो गई जिस दिन कि सेंट्रल हॉल में बैठ कर के हम ने संविधान पर अपनी मुहर लगाई थी। अब मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दी को मजबूत बनाने के लिये, हिन्दी को बल प्रदान करने के लिये, हिन्दी को ताकत-वर बनाने के लिये हम को और भी भाषाओं की मदद लेनी होगी। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो हिन्दी को बल मिल सकता है और वह एक अवर्द्धत भाषा बन सकती है और वह एक विशाल देश की एक विशाल भाषा बन सकती है। इस काम में मैं जानता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी हमारी काफी सहायता कर सकती है और हमें काफी मदद दे सकती है। मैं इस में पड़ना नहीं चाहता कि इस प्रस्ताव ने क्या आचानाये पैदा की है। मैं तो यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव पर जब हम सोचें या अपने विचार प्रकट करें तो इस चीज को मूल जायें कि यह मामला इंग्लिश बनाम हिन्दी का है बल्कि यह सोच कर के कि हिन्दी हमारी राज भाषा, हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा हो चुकी है, इस को ध्यान में रखते हुए इस पर विचार करें।

इंग्लिश के अलावा दो तीन भाषायें और भी हैं। एक वह भाषा है जोकि किसी खास राज्य में नहीं बोली जाती है बल्कि पूरे देश की वह भाषा एक तरीके से बन चुकी है। मेरा मतलब उर्दू से है। यह पूरे देश की भाषा एक तरीके से है। दूसरी संस्कृत की बात है जोकि बाहे कहीं बोली नहीं जाती है। तिसरी और पड़ी अवश्य जाती है और जिस भाषा के आधार पर हमारी सब भाषायें

बनी हैं। तीसरी भाषा अंग्रेजी है जो इस कंटेनरी में जाती है। तो इन भाषाओं को हिन्दी बनाम ये भाषायें मान कर हम न चले और हिन्दी बनाम ये भाषायें हम न बनायें बल्कि सोचें कि इन भाषाओं को हम क्या जगह दे सकते हैं। इतना ही मुझे निवेदन करना था।

बीजती उषा नेहरू (सीतापुर) : सभा-पति जी, जब किसी देश को गुलाम बनाना होता है तो इस के लिये जरूरी है कि उस की जवान को सत्प कर दिया जाय। जब तक आप किसी देश की जवान को सत्प नहीं करेंगे तब तक वह देश गुलाम नहीं होगा। जब अंग्रेज यहां आये उन्होंने ने सब से पहली बात यह की कि हमारे देश की जवान पर हमला किया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो हमारे हिन्दू भाई थे वह तो कुछ उन के फेर में आ गये और जो अंग्रेजों के बार हुए वह उन पर कामयाबी से हुए। लेकिन कुछ असे तक मुसलमानों ने प्रोटेस्ट किया। कुछ असे तक वह नहीं गिरे लेकिन आखिर कब तक न गिरते। वह भी गिरे। जिस दिन हिन्दू और मुसलमान दोनों गिर गये, दोनों की जवान सत्प हो गई उस दिन से अंग्रेजों का राज्य यहां पर पूरी तौर से हो गया। यह चीजें कोई मैं ही नहीं कह रही हूँ। अंग्रेजों की जो किताबें हैं उन में खुद उन्होंने इसे बयान किया है कि किस तरह से उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान में आ कर इस बात को सोचा कि हिन्दुस्तान को इसी तरह से गुलाम बनाया जा सकता है। उन का ही कहना है कि हम हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम उसी वक़्त बना सकेगे जबकि हम उन की जवान को सत्प कर देंगे।

आज भारत स्वतंत्र हुआ है, जो फिरंगी यहां आये थे, जिन्होंने हमारे हिन्दुस्तान को अपना गुलाम देश कर के रक्खा और हम को गुलाम बनाया, आज हम ने उन को दूर कर दिया है। लेकिन अब से मैं यहां बैठी हूँ मैं

अधिकांश के साथ चुन रही हूँ कि जिन अंग्रेजों को हम ने निकाला, जिन्होंने हमारी नदियों को, हमारी बगीचों को, हमारे आस्मान को अपना कह कर रखा, हम को दबा कर रखा, आज हम उन की ओ जवान हैं उस के लिये कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि उसे कॉन्स्टिट्यूशन के बेटन में शामिल कर लिया जाय। मैं अंग्रेजी के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। मैं उन में से हूँ, मैं एन्ग्ली साहब को बता दूँ, जिस को छूटपन से ही बिल्कुल अंग्रेजी की तालीम दी गई। वह जमाना दूसरा था। मुझे हर चीज अंग्रेजों की मिली। उन की किताबें, उन का खाना, उन का पीना, उन का ही रहन सहन, सब कुछ अंग्रेजी। और मेरी किस्मत ऐसी कि जहाँ मैं आती गई वह भी पूरे अंग्रेज थे। हालाँकि वह भी कि पहले मैं हिन्दुस्तानियों से पिछड़ी थी। और आज भी हालाँकि यह है कि मैं ज्यादा किताबें अंग्रेजी की पढ़ती हूँ। लेकिन वह जमाना खत्म गया। यहाँ जागृति आई। वह जागृति किस तरह से आई जब हम इसका इतिहास पढ़ चुके हैं तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किस तरह से यह चीज हमारे सामने आ सकती है कि अपने कॉन्स्टिट्यूशन के बेटन में अंग्रेजी को खाना है।

एन्ग्ली साहब बड़े काबिल आदमी हैं, अक्लमन्द आदमी हैं। बड़े भारी वकील भी हैं। इन्होंने जो स्पीच दी वह बहुत उम्दा थी, जैसे अच्छे वकील अपने मुकदमे को पेश किया करते हैं वैसे इन्होंने किया। आज उन्होंने देश में एक हलचल सी मचा दी है। यह मुकदमा ऐसा लगे है जिस ने सारे देश में हलचल मचा दी है। आप को सुन कर ताज्जुब होगा कि कल शाम को जब मैं पार्लियामेंट से जा रही थी मेरी कॉन्स्टिट्यून्सी के जो जनसंघ के मोलानाथ हैं खुद उन का खत मेरे पास आया। मुझे लेकर दिया गया है कि जो हमारी मावरी जमान है वह कैसे कायम रहे। मुझे हंसी आई कि हमारे एन्ग्ली साहब के मुकदमे ने सारे देश में कितनी हलचल मचा दी है, सारे देश को

हिला दिया है, और उसी का नतीजा यह है कि जो हमारे श्री राजगोपालाचार्य जी इतने बड़े बुद्धिमान हैं वह भी कुछ इस के बारे में लिख रहे हैं। और भी कुछ लोग लिख रहे हैं। हालाँकि वह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती लेकिन मैं एम्मी साहब को जरूर मुबारकबाद देती हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने मुकदमे को बहुत उम्दा, बहुत सुन्दर तरीके से और बहुत कामयाबी के साथ पेश किया है।

श्री ए० ड० बाबे : अभी कामयाबी नहीं हुई।

श्रीमती उमा रेड्डी : मैं एन्ग्ली साहब के कहना चाहती हूँ कि माना, उन की जवान अंग्रेजी है, लेकिन उन का बतन हिन्दुस्तान है। पहले उन को अपने बतन का खयाल करना है कि उन के बतन में कौन सी राष्ट्रीय भाषा होनी चाहिये। आज मैं सच्चे और साफ दिल से बात करना चाहती हूँ। मेरे दिल में बहुत दिनों से जवान का झगड़ा उठता रहा है। मैं हिन्दी की प्रेमी हूँ लेकिन जो हिन्दी का नक्शा हिन्दुस्तान में मैंने देखा वह मेरे ऐसे आदमी के लिये बहुत तकलीफदेह है। वह हिन्दी ऐसी है जो मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। वह हिन्दी लिटरेरी किस्म की है। यहाँ तक कि सड़कों के हिन्दी नाम सकील हिन्दी में लिखे गये हैं। पार्लियामेंट और असेम्बलीज में इतने बड़े बड़े नाम लिख कर रखे हैं, एक-एक गुज के हिन्दी न ब लिखे गये हैं, कि अगर उन को कोई आदमी पढ़े तो उस की समझ में न आवे जब तक वह इंग्लिश के कर न लें। हालाँकि यह हो गई है। मैं समझती हूँ कि जिस तरह से जब कोई आदमी प्याज शुरू-शुरू में खाना शुरू करे या शराब पीना शुरू करे तो वह बहुत ज्यादा आगे बढ़ जाता है इस में भी यही बात हुई। इसी के साथ दूसरा नक्शा भी हमारे सामने आया कि एक तरफ तो हिन्दी के इतने मन्ने-मन्ने नाम कि हमारे समझ में नहीं आते हैं, और इसी लिये भ्रमस वाले हम के बिल्कुल खिलाफ हो गये और दूसरी तरफ यह चीज भी कि जो हमारे हिन्दी वाले

## [श्रीमती उमा नेहक]

साहबान में वह उर्दू के पीछे इस तरह से डंका ले कर चले कि हमें परेशानी हो गई।

मैं आप को बतसाऊ कि जब हम लोग इलाहाबाद में थे तो प्रेम्पन्ड लेखक जो थे हमारे हिन्दी के गुप्त थे। वह हम को समझाया करते थे कि किस तरह से लेख लिखा जाता है। अगर आप उस की किताबें पढ़ें तो आप को पता चलेगा कि कितनी मीठी उन की जवान है। यह चीज क्यों है? इस लिये कि हिन्दी और उर्दू दोनों जवानों एक दूसरे से मिली हुई है।

श्री डॉक एम्बनी : वह हिन्दुस्तानी है।

श्रीमती उमा नेहक : इसी तरह से मैं जानती हूँ कि जितनी भी हमारी जवानें हैं, तामिल, तेलगू, कन्नड़, मराठी, सिन्धी, वह जितनी ही आपस में मिलेंगी उतनी ही सुन्दर जवान पैदा होगी और हमको यह करना भी बाजब है। हर जवान को हमें जिन्दा रखना है। अगर हिंदी को जिन्दा रखना है तो हम को यह चीज करनी ही होगी।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो साहित्यिक लोग होते हैं, लिटरेरी लोग होते हैं, लिखना पढ़ना जानते हैं उन्होंने भी इस जवान के झगड़े को देखा। उनकी समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह अक्षय का कैसा झगड़ा हो रहा है। मैं कहती हूँ कि जिसनी हमारी भारतीय भाषायें हैं, वह सब हमारे देश के खजाने हैं। हम अंग्रेजी से लड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं, हम अंग्रेजों से लड़ें और उनको हमने निकास दिया, जितनी भी जवानें हैं हम उनको सीखना चाहते हैं लेकिन हम एम्बनी साहब से यह झगड़ा आज इसलिये कर रहे हैं कि हम यह तो जरूर चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी जिन्दा रहे और हम उससे प्रभावित उठायें, लेकिन हम उसको अपने सिर का ताज नहीं बना सकते। अगर आप मुझ से कहें कि हम उसको अपने सिर का ताज बना दें तो यह नहीं हो

सकता। किसी तरह से भी नहीं बना सकते। मैं एम्बनी साहब को बकीब बिलाती हूँ कि अगर यह हमारी अंग्रेजी जवान जिन्दा न रहने की लड़ाई हुई तो मैं खुद उनके साथ शामिल हो जाऊंगी, अगर अंग्रेजी को बचका लगाने की बात हुई तो मैं उनके साथ हूँगी, लेकिन अंग्रेजी यहाँ जिन्दा रहेगी, अंग्रेजी यहाँ से जाने वाली नहीं है। स्कूलों में मुसीबतें आई हुई हैं, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि जमाना भी बदल रहा है और इस बदलते हुए जमाने के बीच में यह मुसीबतें आती ही हैं। स्कूलों की हालत यह हो गई है कि देल कर रोना आता है। आज अगर आप स्कूलों में जाकर देखें तो वहाँ हालत यह है कि स्कूल में बच्चों ने हिन्दी पढ़ी, मैं अपने प्रवेश की बात कह रही हूँ, लेकिन अब वह बी० ए० में पहुँचते हैं तो उनको एक किताब दी जाती है ५० सफ़ो की जो कि संस्कृत में होती है और उसमें उसको एक परीक्षा पास करनी होती है। मैंने अपने बच्चे से पूछा कि आखिर वह क्या करते हैं? उन्होंने कहा कि हम रट लेते हैं और रट कर लिख देते हैं। लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती कि आखिर प्रामर जाने बगैर काम कैसे चलता है। यह चीजें हमारे लिये मुश्किल की हो गई हैं। आज कहा जाता है कि हम को स्कूलों की शिक्षा को बदलना है। लेकिन अफसोस तो यह है कि जितना हमें बदलना चाहिये था हम अभी तक उसे बदल भी नहीं पाये हैं। अकेले हिन्दी ही नहीं, और सॉर्जेंट्स को भी नहीं बदल पाये हैं। आज हम ने अपनी जगह हिन्दी मान ली है लेकिन जो लोग यहाँ से फारेन कंट्रीज को जाया करते हैं वह हिन्दी नहीं बोलते हैं यहाँ पर जो भी विदेशी आते हैं, हालाँकि वह अंग्रेजी भी जानते हैं लेकिन वह उसे यहाँ बोलते नहीं हैं। वह अपनी बोली यहाँ पर बोलते हैं और इंटरवेंटर्स उनका मतलब बतलाते हैं। मैं एक साहब को जानती हूँ कि जो कई बोलिया जानते हैं लेकिन यहाँ बोलते नहीं क्योंकि उनको अपनी पश्चिमी जवान

का सम्बन्ध है। इसीलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि जो ऐसी इच्छा है, हमारे देश के रहने वाले हैं, भारतीय हैं और दूसरे लोग जो कि रीजनल लैंग्वेज को बोलते हैं वह इस सम्बन्ध पर ठंडे दिल से गौर करें। मैं श्री जयपाल सिंह जी से कहती हूँ कि मैं उनके खिलाफ बिल्कुल नहीं हूँ, लेकिन उनके ठंडे दिल से सोचना चाहिये। मैं इस वक्त ठंडे दिल से अपनी बात कह रही हूँ। इस वक्त मेरी स्थिति बिल्कुल नार्मल है, मैं एक्साइटेड नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहती हूँ कि हर जवान जिन्दा रहे, मैं यह भी चाहती हूँ कि सब जवानें मिल कर रहें, किसी जवान से दूसरी जवान का झगड़ा नहीं होना चाहिये, लड़ाई नहीं होनी चाहिये लेकिन साथ ही यह भी चाहती हूँ कि जो हमारी हिन्दुस्तान की बोलियाँ हैं वह भी जिन्दा रहें, इसी से हम भागे बढ़ सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर आपने यह कहा कि हम हिन्दी की कास्ट पर अंग्रेजी को अपने कास्टीयूशन में जगह दें, तो मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाती हूँ कि आपकी सारी दलील बेकार है क्योंकि याद रखिये कि प्राजादी उसी मुल्क की बरकरार रहती है जिस मुल्क की जवान जिन्दा रहती है। मैं श्री फेंक एन्थनी से प्रार्थना करती हूँ कि वह इस पर जरूर विचार करें और अपने प्रस्ताव को वापिस लें।

श्रीमती सहोदरा बाई राय (सागर—  
रजित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) सभापति महो-  
दय, मुझे भी बोलने का मौका दिया जाये।

सभापति महोदय : अभी तो मैंने श्री  
न० रा० मुनिस्वामी को बुलाया है।

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): After  
him kindly give a chance to the hon.  
lady Member. She has been a great  
fighter for Goa.

Shri N. R. Manisamy (Vellore): Mr.  
Chairman, Sir, at the outset I must  
confess that I am somewhat pessimistic,  
but at the same time I do say that  
I am a realist. When the hon. Mover  
moved this Resolution, he preambled

his speech by saying that it is intended  
only for a limited purpose of enrich-  
ing Hindi by adding English to the  
Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.  
It is not intended to make English  
official language because our Constitu-  
tion provides that Hindi is the official  
language, but this Resolution is intend-  
ed only for a limited purpose of  
making English available for Hindi to  
enrich itself. One can certainly sub-  
mit why we should go to a foreign  
language for the enrichment of the  
Hindi language. I dare say that not  
only English but any other language  
also can be included in the Schedule.  
I know, in India not only English but  
several other languages also claim to  
have the same equal status for getting  
themselves included in the Eighth  
Schedule. For example, Kashmiri. I  
know it is there also in the Constitu-  
tion but in Kashmir not only Kashmiri  
is spoken but there is Ladakhi and  
Dogri which are also spoken there,  
and at the same time the official  
language there has been Urdu. There  
are various other languages also that  
are spoken in other parts of India as  
Sindhi, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's  
language i.e. Bhojpuri, the language  
of other hon. friends, Tulu Thai and  
a host of other languages which should  
have found a place in the Eighth  
Schedule. But when this Resolution was  
moved, I found that hon. Members on  
the other side have not only taken  
objection on the Constitutional basis  
but on other bases also. The main  
thing which persuaded them to this  
objection is that this language is not  
the language of this soil. I quite  
agree that English is not the language  
of the soil but the association that we  
have had with that language is such  
—we had association with it not for a  
few years but it is about 200 or 300  
years association—that it is not easy  
for us to get rid of it by one stroke  
of pen. There is a method by which  
we can eliminate it. Why make a  
precipitant haste? In that respect I  
say that this language must certainly  
find a place in the Constitution.

Objections were raised from the  
other side which have been persuaded

*Inclusion of English in  
the Eighth Schedule of  
the Constitution*

[Shri N. R. Munisamy]

by several reasons, firstly, on the basis of sentiment and secondly on the basis of passion. They have been very much excited thinking evidently that the English language might in the long run find itself entrenched in India and that it will never go out of India. English language happens to be the language which drove the Englishmen out of this country. It is not any other language. We had several conferences with the English people and spoke to them only in English at the Round Table Conference and at other conferences.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue in August.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The two and a half hours are over. So, I move that this debate may be carried over to the first Non-official Resolutions day of the next Session.

Shri Frank Anthony: May I bring forward an amendment that it should be carried over to the next Session and that the discussion be for a period of two days? My hon. friend may accept it.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: We shall decide it then, not now. We simply decide today that this Resolution is carried over to the next Session on the first Non-official Resolutions day.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is a matter for adjustment.

Shri Jaipal Singh: There is a point of order on this. We can carry it over, but it will be for the Business Advisory Committee to allot the time, not for us.

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, I say it is a matter for adjustment later on.

श्री बाबू : मैं चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों का नाम बाबू के पास होने के लिए पहुँचा हुआ है उनका उस समय क्याल रखा जाय।

अन्यथा बाबू : मैंने नामनीय सदस्य का नाम बोलने वालों की लिस्ट में जोड़ दिया है। Shri Panigrahi.

17.35 hrs.

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the Chair]

Shri Frank Anthony: May I suggest that this may be carried over to the next session, not to the next non-official day, because the Business Advisory Committee....

Mr. Chairman: The next non-official day will be in the next session. Therefore it will be discussed on the first non-official day reserved for Resolutions.

Shri Frank Anthony: That is only two and a half hours.

Mr. Chairman: That can be discussed by the Private Members' Bills and Resolutions Committee.

17.36 hrs.

**VILLIERS COLLIERY\***

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): I thank the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that after waiting for two long months, rather three long months, at last this half-an-hour discussion has been allowed today.

This half-an-hour discussion relates to the arrears and the wages which were due to the workers engaged in the Villiers Colliery, Talcher in Orissa. Here is a tragic story of 700 coal miners working in this colliery. They were deprived of their dues, their current wages and arrears which amount to several lakhs of rupees. These seven hundred coal miners have been forced today to lead a life of misery and shame; and it is because of the non-payment of their dues by the management. They worked hard and patiently in running the mine, and the only reward they got was this non-payment of their dues.

\*Half-an-Hour Discussion