

Resolution re: 13372
Inclusion of English
in the Eighth
Schedule of the
Constitution

15.56 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE INCLUSION OF
ENGLISH IN THE EIGHTH SCHEDULE
OF THE CONSTITUTION**

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indian): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

"That in the opinion of this House, English should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and necessary steps taken in that regard"

15.57 hrs.

[SHRI MUHAMMED IMAM in the Chair]

May I, Sir, at the very outset make it abundantly clear that my resolution has absolutely nothing to do with the question of the official or the national language? All I am seeking is to secure the approval of this House for the inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule. And, so that the House may better appreciate what I am asking for, may I attempt to clarify what, in my opinion, is the significance of the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. What in fact did the framers of the Constitution intend, or what in fact is the very clear legal interpretation to be attached to the Eighth Schedule?

In order to understand what the Eighth Schedule in fact means legally and constitutionally, Sir, we have to look at article 351 of the Constitution. Article 351 of the Constitution is a directive provision which says, in effect, that in order that Hindi should represent the composite culture of India it should draw on the forms, styles and expressions used in Hindustani and the languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule, and also draw on Sanskrit. That is the dominant purpose, that Hindi should represent the composite culture of India should draw on the languages enumerated in the Eighth Schedule. A subsidiary purpose is to be found in article 344, that when the President constitutes language commissions a representative

of each of the languages enumerated in the Eighth Schedule should be in such commissions

Thus, Sir, the dominant significance, the legal and constitutional significance of the Eighth Schedule is very clear

An Hon. Member: That is a thing of the past

Shri Frank Anthony. Well, Sir, what I am seeking through this resolution is that specific, legal, constitutional sanction should be given so that Hindi may draw upon, may assimilate words and expressions from the English language which are found to be suitable

Sir, the official Language Commission appointed by the President has already endorsed the fact that English words, technological and scientific terms, should be drawn upon liberally. Today, because of more than a hundred years of usage, of acclimatisation, words from English constitute the commonest of language currency. I will ask what person is there in any part of the country, whatever his language, who does not understand words such as cycle, engine, signal, school? By including English in the eighth schedule, all that I am asking the House to do is to give constitutional, legal sanction for a process which has been endorsed by the Language Commission itself, for a process which has also received the very recent endorsement of the Parliamentary Language Committee. That is all I am seeking through this resolution of mine

16 hrs

Speaking on the 21st February, 1959 the Prime Minister announced that the Sahitya Academy had recognised English and Sindhi in addition to the 14 languages enumerated in the eighth schedule. The Sahitya Academy has, therefore, not only in effect but specifically, for very good reasons, agreed to treat English and Sindhi

along with the languages of the eighth schedule as major Indian languages

Sir, the Senate of the Calcutta University, undoubtedly an august body, adopted a resolution on the 18th July, 1958, requesting that English should be included in the eighth schedule. My resolution is clear. I believe that it is and that it should be unexceptionable. I believe also that it should be, and I hope it will be, non-controversial. Yet, I know and every one of us knows that it can become involved in political considerations. Probably it has already become involved in certain emotional considerations. That is the difficulty. Because it is a language question, and in the matter of language, which one of us can claim complete detachment and objectivity? None of us, because, in the final analysis, each one of us is the product primarily of a linguistic cum cultural matrix, and because each one of us is the product of such a matrix inevitably each one of us in the question of language cannot be completely objective. Because we are such products, each one of us must have his own predilections. But while we may have predilections in the matter of language, is it necessary that we should have prejudices, or worse than that, is it necessary that we should have hatreds?

An Hon Member: Uttar Pradesh

Shri Frank Anthony: I am not going to justify my case here, but I am a greater protagonist of Hindi than some of my friends. I do not have to say that I have earned and I continue to earn my livelihood largely through the Hindi or Hindustani of Madhya Pradesh. As Chairman for nearly 20 years of an Education Board, I have been responsible for making Hindi compulsory in every Anglo-Indian school in this country—what no other non-Hindi body of educationists has done. As Chairman of the Inter-State Board for Anglo-Indian Education, I have been responsible for evolving a set of Hindi textbooks which the Government of India, the Education

Ministry, recognises as among the best Hindi text-book for children whose mother-tongue is not Hindi.

Shri M P Mishra (Begusarai): Replace Hindi in your note of dissent) (Interruptions)

Shri Frank Anthony: That is a different matter.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let the hon Member proceed.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not think I need elaborate my *bona fides* in this matter. I feel that in the learning of a language there should be no hatred, because, in the final analysis, the learning of any language, not only of a world language, must necessarily enlarge our horizons.

Coming from a Hindi State,—Jabalpur in Madhya Pradesh—necessarily many of my friends are people whose mother-tongue is Hindi. And they tell me quite frankly that on this issue they cannot be objective. They say that for them it is not a question only of language a question to be assessed as a question of language should be assessed objectively. And they tell me quite frankly that for them, those whose mother-tongue is Hindi, it is a question or a stark issue of Hindi versus English. And that is my difficulty. It is my problem. I am not claiming, I cannot pretend to claim, objectivity in this matter. I am emotionally involved. Equally, my friends whose mother-tongue is Hindi are emotionally involved. That is why I feel that in this question of the validity or the acceptability of my resolution, perhaps the only persons in this House who can approach it with a reasonable degree of objectivity will be those whose mother-tongue is neither English nor Hindi. And I say this, that I am prepared, unreservedly whatever its fate may be, to place the fate of this resolution in the hands of those whose mother-tongue is neither English nor Hindi.

Dr. Sushila Navar (Jhansi): May I know whose mother-tongue is English in this country?

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall be coming to that madam. I know that apart from this, there is also another consideration which may operate against an objective assessment of the validity or acceptability of the resolution. It is an imponderable but a very definite consideration. It is an emotional and a psychological consideration.

I know that some of my Communist friends particularly may be overborne by that consideration. But I also make my appeal to them. I know that there is a lingering resentment against the Englishmen and what is regarded as the language only of the Englishmen. Because colonial memories are still there and have not been completely forgotten, there is the danger that stemming from this emotion and psychological feeling the resentment which is still felt against the Englishman may be transposed against what is wrongly regarded as the language only of the Englishman.

Yet as I have said, I believe that this question will be objectively weighed and assessed particularly by those whose mother tongue is neither Hindi nor English. I have already sought to clarify the legal and constitutional significance of the eighth schedule. One of my friends there said perhaps rightly in a way, that that significance belongs to the past. I agree with him. In practice we have sought to enlarge the legal significance of the eighth schedule, enlarge it contrary to the original and clear intention of the framers of the Constitution. And that enlarged significance today in practice, has sought to invest the languages enumerated in the eighth schedule as national languages. That is the enlarged concept. And yet, even from the point of view of this enlarged concept in practice what tests would one apply in order to determine whether English should be included in the eighth schedule?

I have already drawn attention to the fact that the Sahitya Academy has thought fit to include English among the major languages of India. Recently the Senate of the Calcutta University have also seen fit to ask that English should be included in the eighth schedule. What tests would this House apply in determining whether English deserves a place in the eighth schedule? In my own humble view, I should imagine that the first test would be, what is the extent of this language. What is the *de facto* position with regard to English? English today is in fact the only neutral language in India. As a result of two hundred years of usage, English is evenly distributed throughout the length and breadth of this country. It is the only language which is so evenly distributed, because of two hundred years of acclimatization English has permeated evenly the educational pattern in every part of the country. It has evenly permeated not only the pattern of the educated people but it has evenly permeated and throughout the country what we may call the uneducated pattern. It is today in fact the most widely known and the most widely used language in India. My own estimate is that the number of persons educated in English is at least ten times the number of persons educated in any other major Indian language. That is because of certain historical facts but that is a fact.

An Hon Member Question

Shri Frank Anthony: I will come to that. If we make an estimate of persons who know English to the extent that they know Hindustani—pidgin Hindustani—I should imagine that at least 60 per cent of the people of India know English of that variety. After all at least my friends from Tamilnad and my friends from Kerala will agree that the humblest peasant, the poorest labourer knows English. *(Interruptions)*

An Hon. Member: What about U.P. and Bihar?

Shri Ferose Gandhi (Rai Bareilly),
This is not Question Hour; you may
continue

Mr Chairman: Let there be less
noise, I think the Mover has the right
to say what he wants to say

Shri Frank Anthony: My friends
from Kerala and Tamilnad, I think,
will make their position clear. May I
point out in this regard, after all,
statistics are not available. But some
of my friends have repeatedly hurled
at me the word "Question", I do not
know where they are going to get
their statistics from. This is a matter
of common knowledge. We do not
have to delve into any alleged
official documents. The 1951 census
does not help us one iota.
I have made some little research
on this subject. You may be a little
surprised to learn—I have the 1951
cen us here—that in order to find out
the number of persons who may be
said to be Hindi-knowing in my home
State of Madhya Pradesh—and that
pattern has been followed in every
other State—the number of persons
listed under Hindi-knowing are those
persons who come under 77 not dia-
lects, but languages, so that the Hindi-
knowing persons, the alleged Hindi-
knowing persons include—not dialects,
but languages. In the 42 per cent
Urdu-speaking people, Punjabi-speak-
ing people, Gorkhali-speaking people,
people who know Rajasthan—77
languages have all been included under
Hindi. I do not know whether the
Muslims are Hindi-knowing, anyway,
they have been included. I do not
know whether the Punjabis are Hindi-
knowing, but they have been included.
So far as English is concerned, the
enumerators were told, "You will only
enumerate those whose mother-tongue
is English. Even the large number of
Indians who have in fact been educat-
ed through the medium of English,
whose mother-tongue is in fact
English, have not been included. So,
we get 171,000

**Shrimati Bhanu Chakravarty (Basir-
hat):** Our mother-tongue is not
English. (Interruptions).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
We are fighting against that spirit

Shri Frank Anthony: It is an inter-
esting academic legal proposition, a
matter which I argued in the Bombay
High Court. May I make an answer
to my hon lady friend who asked
what is a "mother tongue"? When
Major Pinto, who was one of the
petitioners in the Bombay schools
case said, "I am a Goan, but my
mother-tongue is English", the Advo-
cate-General said, "He is a Goan".
His mother-tongue cannot be English.
The Chief Justice said, "So what?
Legally, only the mother-tongue of
Anglo-Indians is recognised as
English." I asked the Chief Justice,
what is a mother-tongue? Is the
mother-tongue the mother's tongue?
The mother-tongue merely means the
tongue in which the child is reared at
home. Here is Mr Masam. I am not
going to say anything dubious about
Mr Masam, I think Mr Masam will
agree that not only in fact, but in
law, the mother-tongue of his son is
English. Why? Mr Masam's own
mother-tongue is Gujarati, Mr
Masam's wife's mother-tongue is
Hindi, but neither speaks the language
of the other adequately for inter-
communication. The only language
which they speak, the only language
of their home is English. De facto
and legally, Mr Masam's son's mother-
tongue is English. The mother-
tongue of the Goans, of hundreds and
thousands of other Indians, is in fact
English. But the point I was making
is different.

श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा (निमाड): सभापति
जी, ध्यान ए प्वायट आफ आर्डर। माननीय
सदस्य न कहा है कि मसानी जी की पत्नी और
बच्चे की कोई मदर-टग नहीं है, लेकिन मैं
अच्छी तरह से जानता हू कि उन की मदर-टग
गुजराती है और वह अच्छी तरह से गुजराती
में बात करते हैं।

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of
order, Mr Masam himself has not
taken objection. The hon Member
may continue.

Shri Frank Anthony: I pointed to Mr. Masani not from any deliberate animus, he is a great friend of mine

Shri Feroze Gandhi: There are other Paras also. (Interruptions)

Shri Frank Anthony: I have not got the same intimate knowledge about Mr Feroze Gandhi as I have about Mr Masani

To come back to my theme, let us look at this question factually No amount of *ipse dixit*, no amount of assertion or counter-assertion can change this fact that the only real all-India language today is English That is a consequence of History No one is to blame My friend, Dr Subbarayan who has not yet learnt Hindi, and Mr Krishna Menon, our Defence Minister, would, be greater foreigners in Delhi than they would be in Europe but for this only all-India language of English And the same applies to most of the people from the north who go to Tamilnad

Shri E. D. Misra (Balandshahr): On a point of order, Sir

Shri Frank Anthony: Must I give way?

Mr. Chairman: I must hear the point of order

श्री १० द० मिश्र सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान रुल १८७ की तरफ दिखाना चाहता हूँ

श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती : कुछ समय में नहीं आयेगा ।

Mr. Chairman: Let not others dictate to him, let him choose his own language.

कुछ भारतीय सदस्य सब आयेगा ।

श्री १० द० मिश्र : अंग्रेजी तो आप पढ़े लिखते हैं, लेकिन मैं भारतीय भाषा में बोल रहा हूँ । इस रूल १८७ में यह लिखा है

"The Speaker shall decide whether a motion or a part there-

of is or is not admissible under these rules and may disallow any motion or a part thereof when in his opinion it is an abuse of the right of moving a motion or is calculated to obstruct or prejudicially affect the procedure of the House or is in contravention of these rules"

मैं यह सबमिट कर रहा हूँ कि वह रेजोल्यूशन जो आपका है, यह डिस्एलाउ होना चाहिए और इस प्राउड पर डिस्एलाउ होना चाहिए कि इस तरीके का रेजोल्यूशन जो है वह रेजोल्यूशन मूव करने के राइट को एब्ज्यूज करता है ।

इस सिलसिले में मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि कास्टीट्यूशन में जो वह एग्मेंटमेंट करवाना चाहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी भाषा भी शैड्यूल में शामिल कर ली जाये, उसके बारे में मैं आर्टिकल ३४४ पढ़ कर आपका सुनाना चाहता हूँ । वह इस तरह से है —

"The President shall, at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a Commission which shall consist of a Chairman and such other members representing the different languages specified in the Eighth Schedule as the President may appoint "

आठवें शैड्यूल में जो वह इंग्लिश को शामिल करवाना चाहते हैं उसके सम्बन्ध में पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त कास्टीट्यूशन बनाया गया था उस वक्त बहुत मोच समझ कर इसको पास किया गया था और इस में मेरे साथी एन्थनी साहब भी शामिल थे चूँकि वह कन्स्टिट्यूट प्रेसिडेंट के मेम्बर थे । मेरी सबमिशन यह है कि

Mr. Chairman: Order, order I think I have heard the hon. Member sufficiently. All these points have been

13382 Resolution re: VAISAKHA 4, 1961 (SAKA) Inclusion of English 13383.
in the Eighth
Schedule of the
Constitution

considered by the hon Speaker and he has allowed it. The Resolution is half way through

Secondly, Rule 187, to which the hon Member referred, refers only to motions and not to Resolutions. So there is no point of order. I have given my ruling.

Shri Frank Anthony: These interruptions, fortunately for me and unfortunately for the interrupters, seem to furnish me with fresh material. While I was sitting down listening to the pointless point of order, my hon friend, Dr Subbarayan, a revered member of the Congress Party, offered me his own example. He speaks Tamil, his wife speaks Konkani and the language of their home is English, which, in fact and legally, is the mother tongue of their children.

To come back to the point that I was making, I think these concrete illustrations are sure to bring home a general example pointedly. As I said, our hon friends from Tamilnad, but for English, would be greater foreigners in Delhi than they would be in Europe. The same would apply to most of us from the North when we go South.

But why should we go outside this House? What does this House represent? Is it not par excellence the microcosm of this country? Is it not par excellence the cross-section of this country—at least of the leaders of thought and action of this country? Should we not accept facts because they may be distasteful, how can you fly in the teeth of facts? What is the only language of communion in this House? How do we function in this House? How can we attempt to function in this House except through the only all-India language in this country, English?

Shri B. D. Mishra: Here is a point of order. Can these feelings be raised like that?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let us hear the Member fully.

Shri Frank Anthony: It is a fact. I am not arguing whether it is a fortune or a misfortune. I am merely stating it as a question of fact. As I have said, it may or may not be a misfortune. That is a question of opinion. After all, we may blame history, we may blame the compulsions of history about certain facts. What has happened since Independence? Whom do we blame for that? Who made English the most major of the major languages of India? Who made it? We did. The framers of the Constitution of Republican India advisedly, deliberately made English the dominant Indian language. It is not an *ipse dixit* from me, although, perhaps, I would be qualified to elaborate something more than an *ipse dixit*. Look at the judgment, rather illuminating judgment of Mr Justice Chagla in the Bombay Schools case which, I, incidentally, brought against the Bombay Government. What does he say? I do not want to take the time of the House. What has Mr Justice Chagla said? It would repay reading. I will just read the relevant parts. He goes through the whole scheme of the Constitution. You may blame the framers of the Constitution. He deals first with article 343. (Interruptions)

जरा समझने की कोशिश कीजिये, शायद समझ जायें। अगर नहीं समझ सकते हैं, तो मैं लाबी में हिन्दी में झपाका समझा दूंगा।

Mr Justice Chagla, in this very lucid judgment of his, goes through the integrated scheme of the Constitution. He deals with article 343. My hon and learned friend may or may not know what article 343 refers to. Article 343 (1) declares the official language of the Union, that is, English. Then he goes to article 345. Article 345 provides what should be the Regional languages. Then Mr Justice Chagla goes through article 348 which deals with the language of the Supreme Court and the High Courts. He goes through the other articles

[Shri Frank Anthony]

which deal with the question of legislation. He sums it up in these very significant words

"There is one other sense in which English has been given more importance in the Constitution than even the languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule—English today and till it is replaced by Hindi is the official and administrative language of the country. It was also the official language of the States till the States replaced it by some other language. It is the language of the courts, the Supreme Court and the High Courts."

It is the language of legislation, because as was rightly pointed out, not only was our Constitution drafted in English, but until different provisions are made, all our laws, orders and notifications are to be in English. That is the legal position. Do not blame me. Do not blame the British. Blame, if you want to, your own framers of the Constitution if, in terms of Mr Justice Chagla's very clear and lucid judgment, the framers made, in fact, English the dominant Indian language.

As I have said, English today continues increasingly to spread and to be learnt with fervour by Indians, whatever community they belong to. I know it. I have not a little to do with education. The demand by persons, whose mother tongue is not English, for English, since Independence (can we stigmatise them all as slaves) has not increased fourfold, but it has increased tenfold. Today, there are between 2 and 3 million children—whose mother-tongue is not English, at any one time, learning through the medium of English. The people of India, the parents of India have deliberately, calculatedly, chosen English. Because they are slaves? Certainly not.

Pandit Govind Malaviya (Sultanpur): Remember 400 millions. *yes.*

Shri Frank Anthony: They have done it, not because it was the language of the rulers of the country or because, in a very small way, it is my language, but because it is a world language. I know how so many of the leading lights of this great party—the Congress Party—come to me, even from the Hindi States, to get admission for their children in over-crowded Anglo-Indian schools, how Ministers from Hindi States harass me in my capacity as Chairman to get admission for their children in already egregiously overcrowded Anglo-Indian schools. (Interruptions) So, do not blame me.

Now, let me go on, and I shall try, in spite of interruptions, to finish quickly. What is the legal position? The obscurantist way, perhaps the easiest way of those who wish to kill English is to stigmatise it and brand it as foreign, because it is natural for anyone to react strongly against anything which has the flavour of the suggestion of foreignness. And yet, I am dealing with the legal position. Is English foreign? It is foreign in origin, yes, but let us look at it objectively. I shall come to Mr. Justice Chagla's own decisions. Which one of them can make either history or language standstill?

If origin is the only test of foreignness, then what is English to the British people?

16 32 hrs

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

We forget, because memory is short and it never thinks in terms of these vast periods of history. In terms of origin, English for the British is a foreign language. Where does English come from? It does not emerge from any indigenous British dialect. It was never the language of the Britons, who were savages till about 600 B.C. The lineal ancestors of English were the dialects, and languages if you like which had tremendous affinity, the dialects of the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes who invaded and conquered

England. They took their foreign dialects with them. And from their foreign dialects emerged old English, middle English and ultimately modern English. We forget that like India, Britain has traversed a rapid succession of language changes. The original dialects of Britain were Celtic. Then, you had Latin, which civilised them a bit; French which civilised them a little more; and of course, you had these dialects of the Angles, Saxons and the Jutes. From the point of view of origin then, English is a foreign language for the British people, if you assess foreignness in terms of origin. But people do not do that because it does not help. I am merely arguing against this obnoxious term foreign. Why should we cite examples outside of India? What has happened in India? Who will say that Sanskrit is a foreign language? Yet, it is a fact, that Sanskrit was brought to India by the Aryans. It was a fact and yet Sanskrit became...

Seth Govind Das (Jabalpur): Nobody accepts it. (Interruptions).

Shri Frank Anthony: Why go into that controversy? All the greatest scholars have held unanimously that it was brought to India. But what is the shame for it? Sanskrit became in fact, the language *par excellence* of India's ancient culture, and of her religion. Where it came from does not matter. What does it matter where Urdu came from? Urdu was drawn essentially from foreign sources. But its richness, its beauty and its refinement have been among the greatest leavening influences on the language, thought and culture of India. Because Urdu happens to be the language of a foreign country with which our relations are estranged, will people get up and say 'Oh, no, Urdu is foreign in origin, it is the language of Pakistan, and, therefore, Urdu should not be one of our languages?'

Seth Govind Das: Nobody says that. (Interruptions).

Shri Frank Anthony: Precisely, if nobody says, *ergo*, then a fortiori, why do you continue to say that English is a foreign language? You say it is foreign only because you stigmatise it as foreign.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The English language is foreign; the English tradition is foreign.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Decisions are not to be taken just now.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am analysing it legally. To whom does English belong?

One of my friends says I am testing it in terms of purely legal issues. If its origin does not make a language foreign, then English satisfies all the conditions of being indigenous. We have got into this sort of solecism and fallacy of saying that English is the language of the Englishman. The Englishman in his insularity may think so, but English today is the language of the world.

Shri Raghunath Singh: No. It is Anglo-Saxon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should be given an opportunity to state his views.

Shri Frank Anthony: English today has even changed its name. The Americans do not refer to it as English. They have put out a dictionary of the American language. The Australians do not refer.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to listen to the hon. Member even though we may not agree with him. He must be heard, and then replies given by other hon. Members when they get the opportunity. In this way we cannot proceed with the debate.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We are taking interest in the debate.

Shri B. D. Misra: May I ask him one question?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It may be interesting to him, but not for the House or for me

Shri Frank Anthony: I have not the slightest objection. I am encouraged by interruptions (interruptions) May I continue?

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member may continue, but how long is he going to take?

Shri Frank Anthony: I will finish in ten minutes. Do not penalise me for the long period taken by the interruptions.

As I was saying, English belongs to the world. We have the American language today. There is the American dictionary. The Australians have put out their own dictionary of the Australian language. Ghana today has set the pace for Africa, and has accepted English for the Africans as their official language. And I believe not I, not any one, with all due respect to some Members on that side, will be able to stem the irresistible language tides of history. And we will have not only the Englishman's English, we will have to take into account American English, Australian English, African English, and Indian English. I said this at the Commonwealth conference and there "my friends, my colleagues from India, clapped me; they applauded me to the ceiling when I said we would have all these streams, and perhaps the richest, the deepest and the widest stream would be the stream of Indian English—not pidgin English, but Indian English," English conditioned, English enriched by the genius, the thought, the language, the unmitable imagery of India.

I do not know why my hon friends are afraid that because I make but an inevitable, an irresistibly good case for English, we will throw Hindi overboard. Here I am arguing for the narrow position of including English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

In the final analysis, if we do not answer this question in a forthright way here, let us in the privacy of our back rooms or anywhere else answer it to ourselves. What is the final, the ultimate, the conclusive integrating bond in this country? The final bond of integration in this country, not only the linguistic bond but emotional bond of integration, is the English language. There is no other bond, there is no other communion. Let us accept it. If you create a vacuum by destroying English and do not fill it, Indian history will repeat itself. We will fall into so many watertight linguistic, cultural enclaves. That is a different matter, but let us at least accept facts and face them.

I want to deal finally with the narrow legal position. It is not very important. I have shown that *de facto* English is the most major of the major Indian languages. I have not made it so, the framers of the Constitution in their wisdom have made it so, facts have made it so. Legally what is the position? Legally English is an Indian language. Since you do not even accept the imprimatur of our thoughts, let me quote what Justice Chagla, one of the greatest of the lights of our judiciary, has given his seal to. No one has sought to or can upset his decision. May I just read it—what Mr. Justice Chagla has said? This is what he says:

"In the eye of the Constitution, no distinction is made between the English language and the languages spoken by the other Indian minorities"

"In the constitutional sense—and that is the only sense we are concerned with—it is as much an Indian language today, as much recognised by the Constitution, as much entitled to protection as any other language spoken by any other section or community in this country."

And however emotionally my Hindi friends may feel, I feel they are not above a human appeal. And I make it. *De facto* it is the major Indian language. Legally, it has been held to be as much an Indian language as Hindi because it happens to be my mother tongue. The recognised mother tongue of a recognised Indian minority cannot legally be anything but an Indian language. That is the seal Mr. Justice Chagla has placed on the position of English in the Bombay Schools case.

But look at it in a human way. That is the last light in which I ask even the Members from the Hindi States to look at it. How would you feel, if anybody either deliberately or unwittingly, came to you and said: "Your language is a foreign language"? Every time anyone comes to me and says it or every time even the Prime Minister says it, (An Hon. Member: That is a fact) a stab of pain—a stab of pain—shoots through me. I am a product of the matrix of history. I am an Indian (Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear). And I am a proud Indian.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"That in the opinion of this House, English should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and necessary steps taken in that regard".

Pandit K. C. Sharma wanted to raise a point on the admissibility of this Resolution.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): I fully agree in many respects with my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, that English is an important language and it has had its share in building what is called the Indian nationality. We owe to this language many great things, but still...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not called the hon. Member to speak. He said he had to raise a point to the effect that this was not admissible. I only want to hear him on the legal

point. I am told that this has been decided by the Chairman. I am sorry I did not know about it.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: The point I wish to raise was not raised then.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He wants to raise it on the point of admissibility of the Resolution. This has been admitted and the right had been given to the Mover for moving the Resolution. If he wants time to speak on this Resolution, that would be a different question. That would be considered later. In that speech of his, he can raise any other point.

Now, I come to the amendments that are tabled.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Mine is a new point; it was not raised then.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will come to him later. First, let me dispose of the amendments.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): May I submit that the Chairman at that time did not give opportunity to any Member to submit a point where the admissibility was questioned? (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. So far as admissibility is concerned, it was raised and the Chair has given its decision. Now, if other questions are to be raised, the hon. Members are entitled to say whatever they want when they get the opportunities and we will decide then.

There is amendment No. 1 of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"That consideration of this Resolution in regard to the position of English in the Constitution be deferred until the Report of the Parliamentary

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Committee on official language is discussed by the House."

This is inadmissible and ruled out. Then, there is the second

"That in the resolution,—

for the word 'English' the following be substituted: 'Sindhi'.

This is also out of order.

The third is by Shri Bhakt Darshan

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"That the consideration of the issue whether English should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution or not, should be postponed, till both Houses of Parliament have discussed the Report of the Committee of the Parliament on the Official Language."

That would also be out of order.

The fourth is also of Shri Bhakt Darshan.

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House is of opinion that though English has not been included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution, yet all legitimate facilities for education etc. should be provided through English medium to those, who claim it as their mother tongue, till they are able to acquire adequate knowledge of the regional language of the State, in which they happen to reside."

This is beside the point and irrelevant to the Resolution that we have got.

The next is that of Shri Thann Pillai, No. 5.—

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

"That in the opinion of this House the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution be divided into Part A and Part B. Part A shall consist of (1) Sanskrit, (2) Urdu, and (3) English and Part (B) shall contain the other 12 languages contained in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and necessary steps be taken in that regard."

This is also out of order and irrelevant. It goes because it is beyond the scope of the resolution that we have got before us.

The next, No. 6, is of Shri Surendranath Dwivedy—

That after the words "That in the opinion of this House", the following be inserted, namely—

"a Committee consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament be appointed to examine and recommend whether."

Is this moved?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes, Sir. I move:

That after the words "That in the opinion of this House", the following be inserted, namely:

"a Committee consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament be appointed to examine and recommend whether."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we come to the seventh by Shri Achaw Singh..

That in the resolution,—

for the word "English" the following be substituted: "Manipuri": That also goes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The next is—

“That in the resolution,—

for the word “English” the following be substituted:

“Gondi tribal language” (Inter-
ruption).

We have no objection for that language; but here we are only discussing whether English should be included.

Then, there is the amendment of Shri Braj Raj Singh—

That in the resolution,—

for the word “English” the following be substituted:

“Manipuri, Sindhi and Santhali”.
That also goes

Then, we come to No 10 of Shri Surendranath Dwivedy It reads

That after the word “English” the following be inserted, namely:

“Smdhi or any other Indian language”

I do not know what is meant by other languages This enlarges the scope.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: English is also there and Sindhi and other languages will be included.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not definite as to what it would contain That is also out of order

The next is that of Sardar A. S. Saigal. It reads:

That after the word “English” the following be inserted, namely:

“Sundhi, Rajasthan and Nepal”.

That also is out of order because it is beyond the scope

Then, we come to the amendment of Shri Bishanchandar Seth and others. It is:

That after the word “English” the following be inserted, namely:

“Smdhi, Rajasthan and Dogri”.

That also goes on the same ground.

Then, we come to Shri Dwivedy again, No. 13. He says:

That in the resolution,—
omit,—“and necessary steps taken in that regard”

Is this moved?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If my second one is out of order

An Hon. Member: This has no meaning |

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. This also goes

Then, we come to the amendment of Shri Raghunath Singh

Now, Shri Raghunath Singh's amendment It reads.

“That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted, namely:

“That in the opinion of this House, Portuguese and French be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and necessary steps taken in that regard”

Now this also .. (Interruptions): I need not take a decision because the House has taken a decision by voice.

Shri Mohammed Imam's amendment reads:

“That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:

‘and that English shall continue as the official language of India till 2001 A.D.’.”

That also is out of order. Now, the resolution as also the amendments that are in order are before the House for discussion.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Sir, I would not discuss the admissibility of the Resolution, whether it is admissible or not. I would simply point out that the Resolution, even if it is passed by the House, would be useless; even if the House is in favour of that, it would be useless for the simple reason that the Resolution seeks to amend the Constitution. An amendment of the Constitution is possible only under article 368. A regular Bill should be put before the House that the Constitution may be amended. Now, I shall point out a parallel case. Suppose a man is a plaintiff and he wants a declaration that he is the owner of a property that is in the possession of the opposite party, what becomes the position of the man? If he gets a decree, then he shall have to bring another suit for the possession of that property. This sort of procedure is considered abuse of the process of the court. If the process of the court cannot be abused, the process of the House cannot be. Therefore, my respectful submission is that even if the Resolution is in order, it constitutes abuse of the process of the House and therefore, it is not a healthy practice to bring a Resolution of this sort. What is the effect of this procedure? This Resolution seeks the introduction of a Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member allows me, I might just point this out to him that in the Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions, several times Bills have been brought and Resolutions have been tabled for Sindhi to be included in the Eighth Schedule. I do not know whether there was a case for English but a Bill regarding Sindhi was brought by Shri Vajpayee. This was directly done. It was a Bill and permission was required for the introduction of that Bill. But that Committee disallowed its introduction and stated that first a Resolution might be moved so that the opinion of the House might be gauged whether there is really a substantial opinion behind it so that the amendment of the Constitution

might be taken up if really the sense of the House was first ascertained and it is found that there is a substantial section which is behind it.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: I still think that it is not a very healthy practice to move in the way my friend has been intending to move because it would simply constitute the introduction to the introduction of a Bill. It is not a very healthy practice

Anyhow, I come to the other point—article 351. It is the objective of the language provisions that it has to evolve a new all-India culture in which the language will play a part in helping the development of that culture. What should that culture be? Culture is a way of life and that way of life is expressed in a certain language. Shri Anthony has said that English has played a great part. But what great part has it played? It played only one part; it made the people feel the pinch of slavery. What is in the bones and flesh is certain fundamental terminologies of the Sanskrit language. What is the fundamental thing in an Indian's blood? It is *prem*, it is *sat*, it is *ahimsa*; it is *tyag*. It is not the love or the 'be-loved of my friend. Shri Anthony's terminology. What makes the Indian flesh, What makes the Indian bones? It is not the love. It is not dancing. It is not the theatre. It is not the cinema. It is *sat*, it is *prem*, it is *ahimsa*. These have roots in Sanskrit language, because Sanskrit at that time expressed the Indian life, what was truth in it, what was finest in it, what was everlasting in it. Therefore, the Constitution envisaged that all those languages which derived their origin, which had their birth in Sanskrit language, not in the sense of the words but in the sense of the ideas, in the sense of the fundamentals, in the sense of the fountain of life, in the sense of the springs of action and motivation, should be considered so that they have their own share in the evolution and development of the new national language.

13397 Resolution re: Inclusion of English in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution

VAISAKHA 4, 1951 (SAKA) Indianisation of Foreign Firms in India

English cannot be said to contribute anything in any sense whatsoever in the evolution and development of the new national language. You may pass that English should be the national language. That is different question. But to include English in the Eighth Schedule means simply that English should be considered as one of the languages which is expected to play its part in the evolution and development of the new national language in the sense in which any cultural language plays its part in that evolution. In what way English can play that part, I fail to understand.

English has been helpful in many ways. It taught us many things. It might be the one language which might be a great vehicle of many great things that would build the future of this country, and perhaps it may build the future of humanity in the world to come. That is a different question. It is not to detract from the importance and significance of the English language and its usefulness that I oppose this. But to say that within the words of the Constitution, within the concept of the coming evolution of a language which would inspire the Indian mind as their own language and which will play its part as a medium, a vehicle in the national development in every sphere of life, English should find a place is something with which I cannot agree. English cannot find its place because the fundamental concept of English life has not become a part of the Indian life and Indian mind and blood. Their very bone and flesh refuse to accept the fundamental concept of the English language.

Therefore, Sir, with these words, I make my humble submission that the resolution is badly framed, it will have a bad effect and it will serve no useful purpose. I oppose the resolution.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, this resolution has given

us an opportunity to discuss among many other important things our attitude towards English language. Although it has a very limited and narrow scope, I feel that we should give full consideration to this proposal, because in a democracy it should be our endeavour to see that no minority suffers any difficulty whatever in the matter of their education or otherwise on account of its adherence to a particular language. Ours is a multi-lingual nation, and we want to give full scope to all and everybody to do their best in promoting cultural unity which only can promote the growth and solidarity of the national unity of this country.

Sir, the Mover has already admitted that this resolution has nothing to do with the question of national or official language. Hindi has been accepted as our national language, our common language, the sooner we adopt it, the sooner we take all steps to see that it is made practical in this country to use this language in all our activities, the better for us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member like to continue next time?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This discussion will be continued the next day. Let us proceed to the Half-an-hour discussion.

17 hrs.

*INDIANISATION OF FOREIGN FIRMS IN INDIA

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on the 11th March, 1950, Starred Question 1102 was answered in this House. The question dealt with the covenanted Indian employees in the foreign-owned companies like the plantations particularly those who were drawing more than Rs. 1,000. In reply to the

*Half-an-hour discussion.