

member of the International Monetary Fund and we did not certainly let them know. But having said this, I would say that I do not think it is right to say that the welcome to any of our Ministers was anything but warm in the USSR. That would be doing injustice to the USSR and putting something on it, which is not justified.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : I would ask the Finance Minister— now he has given a list of the countries of Western Europe that he has visited. But in his itinerary, as given out to this House, we are not finding that he visited or tried to visit or attempted to visit any of the East European countries. Does this show that there has been a shift in the policy of non-alignment of the Congress Government that is to say, is the Congress Government shifting from its policy of non-alignment to the policy of alignment with the Western bloc financially and, consequently, also politically ?

In this very context I would ask the hon'ble Finance Minister to enlighten the House on the point that when he visited Western Germany, did he also have in his mind that by his visit to that country he may be hurting the sentiments and feelings of the East German Republic ? It is true that we have not given diplomatic recognition to East Germany in that fashion; still we have got our trade relations with East Germany, and there have been some talks in this House and in the Lok Sabha also whether we are going to grant recognition or we are going to have diplomatic exchanges with the East German Republic. Now with that in view did his visit to the Federal Republic of West Germany augur good for our policies as far as that country, namely, East Germany, is concerned, augur good for our relations with that country ? That is the second question which I would ask the hon'ble Finance Minister to enlighten us on.

The next thing which I would ask the hon'ble Finance Minister to enlighten this House on is whether the loans and the agreements for loans which he has executed with the different countries of Western Europe, have these loans got any strings, hidden or concealed, implied or expressed ? Now, it may be made clear to us, at least to this House, whether there are any con-

ditions or preconditions attached to those loans. Of course, he has said that those loans, agreements, or talks which he had with the countries of Western Europe, had nothing to do expressly with devaluation. But then one thing he has been silent upon in spite of a question that was put to him by my predecessor in this House. He has said that due to some procedural technicalities of the International Monetary Fund the question of devaluation could not be mooted to the Soviet Union, with whom we have got the best of relations. Now the point is not whether due to some technical procedure of the International Monetary Fund we could or could not dis close the question of devaluation or the decision on devaluation to the U.S.S.R.; the question is exactly this. When we were going to take a decision on devaluation, certainly that decision was taken in the Cabinet here. Now, if that decision was taken in the Cabinet here, when we have the best of trade relations with the U.S.S.R., did we not or should we not have informed, or should we not have made some information available to the U.S.S.R. in some way to the effect that the Government was thinking of devaluation, or immediately after the devaluation was it not possible for the Government also to let the U.S.S.R. know about devaluation along the proper diplomatic channel without being bogged up in the technical, procedural thing which the hon'ble Finance Minister has just now placed before the House ?

SHRI SACHINDRA CHAUDHURI: So far as my visit to Western European countries was concerned, the itinerary that had been made out was not out of any sort of shift in our general policy of non-alignment. It was in pursuance of that policy and no other. I had a particular mission to go there because of the simple reason that I had to discuss this question of aid which was to be routed through the Consortium, and these are the Consortium countries, and I had a reason for going there.

The second thing is that we got the warmest feelings for all the East European countries and with the great nation of the U.S.S.R. There is no reason why some day or the other somebody should not go there. In fact, it would be untrue to say

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri.]

that our Ministers do not go there. Our Ministers, including the Prime Minister, has been to the U.S.S.R. and quite a lot of Ministers, more than one, went to the U.S.S.R. very recently after my visit. I should say this. So far as we are concerned, I do not see any reason why if we visit a particular State there should be any feeling of unhappiness in any other part of the world. After all, if we are going to one country, that does not mean that I personally have got to go to another country. As I said, I went there with a particular idea in my mind, namely to find out what were the economic possibilities of co-operation between our country and the countries that I visited. There is no question of slur, no question of hurting anybody, no question of any shift from the policy we have.

So far as the other question is concerned, namely communicating with the U.S.S.R., I explained that we had not communicated to any of the other countries. Certainly, so far as our trade is concerned with the U.S.S.R. and the East European countries, it is a valuable trade for us as well as. I hope, for them too. But my duty, or rather the duty of the Government, after having taken the decision was to inform our country first before informing anybody else. And when that information had been given, it was broadcast in this country. That information went there. I do not think we have an obligation to consult any of the other countries as to what we do in the matter of arranging parity in our exchange, and in consequence of that, there was no question of distinction between one country and another.

Madam, I do not see the reason why the hon'ble Member opposite thinks that we are bogged up in any technicalities. There is no technicality at all. There are international obligations created by international agreements. The International Monetary Fund is an organ of an international body, or an international body by itself. There are certain terms under which we are members, and that body is entitled to say that as we are going to have a share in the funds of this body, if we want to use them, we shall abide by the rules to which we have agreed. And in compliance with that, as a self-respecting nation, as a nation with honour we have to do that. There is no

question of technicalities or bogging down in technicalities.

I think I have answered all the questions of Mr. Chatterjee. I do not think there is any more question.

SIXTH AND SEVENTH REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR LINGUISTIC MINORITIES

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : On a point of order on this, Madam. I have my best wishes for Mr. Shukla and I consider him to be one of the ablest Deputy Ministers. In spite of that I would object to his moving this motion because I would point out to you, Madam, paragraph 22 of the Chief Minister's Conference Resolution which reads :

" The Zonal Councils should pay particular attention to the implementation of this policy in their zonal areas. A committee consisting of the Vice-Chairman of the Zonal Councils should be set up under the chairmanship of the Union Home Minister. If considered necessary the Union Home Minister may invite either Chief Ministers or other Ministers to meetings of the Committee. This committee would keep in touch with the working of the various safeguards for linguistic minorities and the promotion of national integration."

The point, Madam, here is this. I would have been happy if Mr. Shukla could preside on this Committee. But unfortunately he cannot preside over this Committee. It is the Home Minister in person, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, who would be presiding over this Committee, and unless he moves this motion and sits through the debate I do not think the impressions, even though they will be conveyed to Mr. Nanda through Mr. Shukla, will be as effective as if he would have been here.

Secondly, there is no other business anywhere else that could prevent Mr. Nanda from coming to this House and from moving this motion. This is on the fourth year when we are taking up this report on the linguistic minorities; there was a gap of three years. That shows how lightly this particular thing, even though very important from the point of view of national

integration, has been dealt with by this Government. And on this particular occasion, Madam, I would request you to prevent Mr. Shukla from moving this motion and ask Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda to come and move it.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI V. C. SHUKLA) : May I say something about this objection ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do you want to say anything? He has addressed the Chair and the Chair must say something. The Government organises its own business and anyone of the Minister's representatives can be here. Mr. Shukla is here and whatever you have said, Mr. Shukla will convey to the Home Minister but this discussion must go on. The Deputy Minister.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : At least (here must be a directive that he should reply to this debate.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA : I beg to move :

"That the Sixth Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st January, 1963 to 31st December, 1963 and the Seventh Report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities for the period 1st January, 1964 to 31st December, 1964, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 7th May, 1965 and the 10th December, 1965, respectively, be taken into consideration."

Madam, I would, to begin with, confine myself only to certain introductory remarks and after the hon. Members have participated in this debate, I would take that opportunity to reply to those points raised and clarify the matters.

As the hon. House knows, the question of linguistic minorities in the present form arose when the States were reorganised on a linguistic basis late in 1956. Although before such reorganisation the Constitution of India itself laid down several safeguards for the linguistic minorities the bulk of these rights are grouped under the Fundamental Rights in our Constitution—apart from these, they are also mentioned in article 347 and after the States Reorganisation Commission made certain recommendations, two new articles were introduced in the Constitution to give further safe-

guards to the linguistic minorities. The more important thing is that these rights given to the linguistic minorities are justiciable. In other words, any person aggrieved can take these matters to the court of law and take the appropriate decision in case he finds the action of the concerned Government is not in keeping with the Constitution.

Then another memorandum on the safeguards of the linguistic minorities was made out by the Government of India. It was also laid before both the Houses of Parliament and it gave two or three lines for the protection of the rights of the linguistic minorities. The provision of facilities for primary education in the country is guaranteed in the Constitution but for secondary education, no such provision was made in the Constitution. In this memorandum and in the executive orders, the Home Ministry and also the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities have been insisting that the respective State Governments make arrangements for the students belonging to the various linguistic minorities in the various States so that after the primary education is over, if a certain number of students ask for that kind of education through their mother tongue, that education should be made available. The minority language in the various States could also be given official recognition provided a certain percentage of population spoke that minority language in a particular area. This of course is left to the discretion of the State Governments and if the State Governments find that all the conditions laid down in this memorandum are fulfilled, the minority language could be recognised in these areas for such purposes.

The third point laid down in this memorandum was the provision against discrimination in matters of recruitment to the services under the State because of language. This principle which was laid down in this memorandum has been accepted by all the States and most of the State Governments have taken action to implement this point of the memorandum.

Then the meeting of the Chief Ministers and Central Ministers held in August 1961 also reaffirmed and further improved upon the safeguards which have been provided to the linguistic minorities in this country.

[Shri V. C. Shukla.] As I have said, the Chief Ministers again reaffirmed their faith that no person should be debarred from Government service in any State because of the language he speaks. Another decision taken by the Chief Ministers' Conference was that the Commissioner who was appointed by the Government of India should be given the fullest possible cooperation by all the State administrations. To ensure this it was recommended that the Chief Ministers themselves should take over this matter so that there is proper coordination between the various departments and the linguistic minorities get the best possible attention from the State administration. It was also decided that a Special Officer would be appointed to look after this work and to assist the Chief Minister and the Chief Secretary in fulfilling the obligations provided in the Constitution.

Then again in the National Integration Conference which was held later on, these decisions taken by the Chief Ministers were again affirmed and confirmed and further safeguards, although minor, were suggested. Now the Committee which met suggested certain safeguards in the shape of some agencies for the implementation at the zonal, district and State levels and they also reviewed the implementation of the various decisions taken before the National Integration Conference met.

I must say that in all sections of the country the various linguistic minorities here and there have expressed by and large their satisfaction at the various steps taken by the Government to safeguard these linguistic minorities' rights. If hon. Members would care to go through the two reports under discussion, they would find that although there are some lacunae, some mistakes and certain deficiencies, but by and large, the work done by the Commissioner has been hailed and it has certainly benefited the linguistic minorities spread out in the various parts of our country.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Their complaint is that the State Governments have not complied with the directives.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: In certain respects but in most of the respects the Commissioner has said that the State Governments have complied with the recommendations of the Commissioner.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
The Commissioner himself has complained.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA : I will explain what action we have taken on the sixth and seventh reports that are under discussion today. According to the scheme of our Constitution, most of the safeguards that have to be given to the linguistic minorities have to be given by the State Administration. The Central Government by itself has no *locus standi* in this matter. It has only to take these matters to the State Administration, request them to take action and keep on checking what action has been taken about the decisions which have been arrived at with their concurrence. So all these recommendations by the Commissioner were forwarded by the Commissioner to the various State Governments and all the suggestions, I must say, have been accepted by the State Governments except in one or two cases which are mentioned in the report and I personally feel that the State Administrations are quite serious in affording the Constitutional guarantees and protecting the linguistic minorities.

To conclude, I would say that administrative action cannot be a substitute to the cultivation of goodwill and a spirit of ready accommodation and understanding.

It has to come by cultivating this idea and this atmosphere and I am sure the various linguistic minorities and the various State Governments would do their best to see that this kind of atmosphere is generated in the country so that these recommendations can be properly fulfilled.

The question was propo-

3 P.M. '

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Madam Deputy Chairman, as I indicated to you earlier, the approach of this Government in dealing with this particular Report is very half-hearted. The very absence of the Union Home Minister from the House when a matter of this magnitude that seriously affects the spirit of national integration in this country is being discussed, shows what their attitude is. There is nothing that could have prevented him from taking part in this discussion, or at least sitting through to have the mood of the House assessed. May be, as people say, he might be now interested in having a look at his horoscope with Mr. Haveli Ram.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) in the Chair]

That may be one of the reasons that has prevented him from coming here. He might be looking forward to his own future through his astrologer. Or else there is nothing so important in the country, that could have prevented him from participating in this important discussion in this august House. Therefore, Sir, my contention that the Government's attitude to this Report is half-hearted comes true; it comes true when we find the Union Home Minister absent from the House when we are discussing this Report.

Now coming to the Report, I would start with the Chief Ministers' Conference which has been mentioned by the mover. After having gone through the Resolutions of the Chief Ministers' Conference I had absolutely no doubt in my mind that they were serious about national integration in the country. The precept is all right; the Resolution is all right. But what about the implementation part of it? I would come to that later on. When we look at the Resolution it says that the Conference was convened to find out ways and means for better national integration by removal of obstacles, and there was unanimous agreement about implementation of safeguards to linguistic minorities. But the agency for implementation in this regard is very inadequate. I will not call it defective because I have no grievance, in particular against the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. He has been trying to do whatever he could. The fault lies at the door of the Home Minister of India and the State Ministries. Under the Constitution the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has absolutely no executive functions. His role is purely a recommendatory role. It is not even advisory. The advice has to come from the Union Home Minister if he feels satisfied with the recommendations of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. Therefore, the powers given to him are very inadequate, and I was constrained to find that in his own Report, in the Seventh Report at page 89, he himself has put down in so many words his helplessness. He says in paragraph 405 :

"Some State Governments, however, have not viewed this recommendation of the Commissioner favourably." * * *

In another paragraph 407 he says :

"Instances of delay in furnishing information regarding the implementation of safeguards have been mentioned in the foregoing chapters. Enquiries into complaints in these matters have generally been delayed."

As indicated by the Commissioner's Report, in certain cases the Commissioner has satisfied himself that there had been cases of intentional delay, or else he would not have put it in black and white. Therefore, Sir, I urge that either the powers of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities should be enhanced, or the entire thing turns out to be a farce. There have been certain recommendations which have also been repeated year after year without any heed being paid to these recommendations either by the Union Home Minister or by the State Chief Ministers, who are now dealing with the cases as reported to us by the mover of the motion. That is the first part of it. Then there is the second part. The second obstacle is that in certain cases even people are prevented from meeting the Commissioner when he is on tour. I have a specific instance here where a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Bihar has sent me a copy of a letter written to the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities which says that in spite of his repeated attempts to have an interview with the Commissioner he could not have it; not that the Commissioner did not allow it, but the officers who were in charge of the Commissioner's tour programme in a particular district of Bihar gave the particular M.L.A. wrong information about the tour programme of the Commissioner and ultimately, after he had departed from the district, he was somewhere else in Patna. It says—'the M.L.A. was informed that the Commissioner had gone away to Patna, and that, if it was necessary, he could take all his people to give evidence before the Commissioner in Patna itself. When this Commissioner had gone on tour of a particular district and a people's representative, in spite of his repeated correspondence with the district authorities, could not have an interview with the Commissioner, you can well imagine. Sir, the plight of the cum-

[Shri Lokanath Misra.] mon man who is suffering under the majority community.

The same Chief Ministers' Conference passed a Resolution that said that no facility previously available should be reduced and, wherever possible, further facilities should be given. That was in precept. When it comes to implementation, I shall bring to you kind notice, Sir, a particular paragraph from the Report itself. Whatever I am quoting here is from the Report itself. It is embodied in the Seventh Report, at page 15 in paragraph 74.

"A complaint of Oriya speakers was mentioned in para 57 of the Sixth Report alleging that there had been heavy fall in the number of Oriya primary schools in Singhbhum during 1961-62. The State Government have now reported that the number of Oriya schools indicated against 1960-61 including both "pure Oriya" and "mixed Oriya" schools,"

I am happy they have not said "adulterated Oriya".

"whereas during 1961-62 only "pure Oriya" schools were included in the statistics. Although the State Government mentioned that there were 57 such "mixed schools" in 1960-61, the increase in the number of Oriya sections during 1961-62 was reported to be only 11."

And then it continues to say :

"The State Government have not also explained the circumstances under which the number of Oriya medium pupils was reduced by more than 10,000 during the course of one year. The Commissioner feels that a more detailed investigation in the matter should be made by the State Government at an early date." The point is, from 17,000 students in the previous year, the number of students came down to as low as 7,000 in the course of just one year only. That shows how sincere our Chief Minister, are when it comes to implementation. I do not know when the Commissioner would get a reply from that particular State Government. He must have been waiting for it all this time. But I know he will not get a reply. It is all a manipulation. They

want that even though this minority might be speaking a different language now, ultimately through this kind of a force, they must be brought into the majority language. That is what explains this sharp reduction in the course of one year of 10,000. This particular fact read in the context of the Chief Ministers' Resolution only shows how sincerely they are in implementing their resolutions also.

There are so many other complaint* which one comes across in this Report, Sir. There are complaints about inadequate number of teachers. Here in paragraph 135 on page 24, it is stated :

"Oriya linguistic minorities of Vishakhapatnam had complained that in spite of substantial number of Oriya pupils in the Kenneth Panchayat Samiti Primary School, Gandhigram, facilities for education through Oriya were not being provided. The complaint was referred to the State Government who reported that the Block Development Officer has been instructed to appoint one Oriya teacher there."

And in the next paragraph it is stated :

"During his last tour in Srikakulam district the Assistant Commissioner was told by the Oriya linguistic minorities that the number of Oriya schools/sections at the primary stage was inadequate."

Everywhere if you go through this Report you will come across complaints of this nature, complaints which have been subsequently substantiated by the Assistant Commissioner also. He does not know how to get over it. Who is to get over it ? Can Mr. Shukla give an undertaking here, an assurance here, and say that he will seriously look into this matter and if the State Governments do not abide by his directions then he would get a direction issued by the President ? There is provision in the Constitution that where the State Government does not abide by the general principles or by any article of the Constitution, about safeguards for the linguistic minorities and their interests, then the President can give directives. Why does he not do it ? Is he going on waiting to get the right gesture from the State Government ? How long do we wait. In

the meantime the attempts of the respective State Governments are that they should somehow get the students now 'speaking the minority language, to take to the majority language by forcing them into that language.

There had been so many complaints about publications in the majority language -of voters' list and court documents. These have also been substantiated afterwards by »he Commissioner. If this is the state of things, then you are doing the greatest injustice to democracy itself, because the voter in a particular area cannot find out if his name is there in the voters' list. He cannot register his name and he will not fee in a position to correct his name if it is an incorrect form. You will be preventing him from taking part in the elections. Therefore, from that point of view at least you should give directions to the State authorities asking them to see that these records and documents are published in the minority language also wherever it is necessary. The rules in this respect are very clear. If you have anywhere more than 15 per cent of the population speaking a minority language you can issue the directive. Why don't you do that ? Why do you shirk your responsibility in this respect ? Why are you not doing this ?

There had been certain complaints, Sir, about the languages in which applications should be submitted in the courts and the Commission has found a case about which they say this on page 240 :

"Complaint that Oriya was the official language in courts, offices, and schools in Seraikella and Kharswan prior to merger with Bihar. The stopping of entertaining petitions in Oriya, sudden switching over to Hindi after integration with Bihar as the official language in the courts, offices and schools; changing of all notice boards and mile posts to Hindi; issuing of summons and other official notices, circulars and correspondence, printing of electoral rolls and preparation of settlement records in Hindi have been detrimental to their interest and inconvenience."

And the most important complaint is this one here.

"Complaint that a case registered as c/1 case No. 7 of 1956 remanded for

trial has remained undisposed for tat last 5 years due to failure of the Government to get the genuinness of the Oriya signature tested by an expert even though the examination fees have been paid by the parties."

This one case clearly shows how you give Justice to the people. They say in English: justice delayed is justice denied. And here why is the man denied justice ? He is denied justice because he is guilty of sot knowing the language of the majority and here sits our Home Minister all the time looking after the interests of the minorities.

SHRI A. D. MANT (Madhya Pradesh) :
Why don't they learn the language ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Everybody does not possess my hon. friend Shri A. D. Mani's faculty of mind. Though he hails from Madras he has switched over to Hindi even though he does not talk ia Hindi here but talks in English. I suppose he has taken to Hindi after being in Nag-pur for 37 years. After all, it takes time. Even for a person of Mr. Mani's mealai calibre it took some 37 years and even then he does not talk Hindi the way even I talk. I do not belong to a Hindi area, but all the same I can boast that I speak better Hindi, clearer Hindi, than Mr. Mani can even after staying in Nagpur for the last 37 years. So naturally you must give the people some time. Yon cannot ask them to switch over all of a sudden to the other language. It will take some ten or fifteen years, and ultimately as the State Government manipulates, it may be, that there will be only one language in that particular State of Bihar. But if you insist and force these people to know the language, start talking to them and start dealing with them in a language that they do not know, you would neither do justice to them nor can you give them justice.

I was told and somehow I had gathered the impression that the question of domicile no more exists in this country, because we are all Indians. The question of domicile was only taken up during the British regime because they found that that helped them. After we call ourselves the Republic of India there is no justification for a domicile certificate anywhere. At least I know that Orissa does cot have

[Shri Lofcanath Misra.] it. But here is a case mentioned in this Report which says that certain States in the country require the production of domicile certificate for appointments.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar) : Now they have abolished it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is a proverb in Oriya which I feel tempted to translate into English. The proverb is this. The question is asked who is in God's chamber and the man answers, 'I have not eaten the plantain'. I referred to 'States'; why did you get up, Mr. Yajee ? Does it pertain to Bihar ?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I have got the right to state the position.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Nobody has got a right when I am on my feet.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : We have abolished the system of domicile certificates recently during the Chief Ministers' Conference of the Eastern Zone at Ranchi.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : This question of domicile should immediately go. The Union Home Minister should immediately issue directions to every State Government that they should do away with this certificate of domicile.

Now I come to the last item and that is about the chow dance. There are five classical types of dances in India and the fifth is the chow dance for which Seraikela was internationally known. They have a cultural centre called the Silpa Kala Pitha which was sponsored by Shri Sudhendra Naraytan Singh who is the only recipient of the Academy Award from Bihar. Now the pity is since this belongs to one who is from the minority community, this does not get a pie. The entire money given by the Bihar Government goes to another institution called Chow Dance Centre or something like that which nobody knows. Even in Bihar it is not known. Anybody who comes from outside as a disciple or even as a spectator goes to this Silpa Kala Pitha because that has artistes of calibre. Without artistes art is nothing. If you try to sponsor art through your authority, can you do it ? Through your money, can you do it ? Mr. Shukla cannot turn an

artiste overnight even if he wants to inspite of his authority. He might be a good Deputy Minister for Home; but can you replace Ashok Kumar ? You cannot do it.

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA : You can do it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : That is different. I do not have the authority; therefore I can't but you cannot do it. But that is what you are trying to do in Bihar. In this particular instance you have been trying to do it. So it would be better if you advise the Bihar Government not to take a partisan view even of art. Look at it dispassionately. If you are a connoisseur of art, if you are a lover of art, if you want art to live in the country, you cannot apportion certain money to your own favourites and start calling them articles. People will not accept them; the country will not accept them. They must know that particular art. If you do not know how to dance and if you are sent to the rostrum to dance, can you entertain the people? You cannot do it. You are only pouring your money to waste. Instead of wasting the money, you divert the money to the institution that deserves it.

Finally, through you, I would place one or two points before the Home Minister for his consideration. He must seriously consider them. Of course, whether this is feasible or not, I cannot say. Now they have to depend purely upon the State agency for implementation, even for information regarding implementation. That puts them into some sort of an embarrassing position because they are not kept informed. They do not even come to know whether what they have asked the States to do is being implemented or not. Therefore I would suggest that you should have one officer for every State who would be directly responsible to your Commissioner. Or make him responsible to your Ministry, I would not mind but let them be free from the State prejudices.

SHRI A. D. MANT: And controls.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : And controls naturally. So those would be the persons who could give you dispassionate objective information about the affairs in the States regarding the implementation-

of safeguards to the linguistic minorities. And if they need anybody's help there for implementation, there must be some sort of a link between them and the Governor direct. I suppose every Governor we have now in India comes from a different State from where he is posted. Therefore I would expect from them that objective outlook and if the Governor directly helps the officer whom you post in the different States of India I think that would be the ideal position both for getting information and for getting your directions implemented. Thank you. * -

. SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, there is a reference about the Urdu-speaking public in Uttar Pradesh in this Report and having a first-hand knowledge of that problem, I would like to throw some light on it. And before iioing into details I would like to point out certain facts given in the 6th Report on page 9. They have given the districts of Uttar Pradesh and also the number of schools in 1960-61 and in 1961-62. In Almora there were four schools in 1960-61 but after one year there remained only three where Urdu is taught. In Saharan-pur there were 19 schools and after one year only 18 rema ned. In Fatehpur from 28 schools the number came down to 22. In Ghazipur there were 36 schools in 1960-61 but after one year there remained only 30. Jalaun had 10 schools which came down to six after one year. Mani-puri had 12 schools and after one year there were only six. In Pilibhit there were 35 schools and after one year there remained only 20 schools. And so far as Gorakhpur is concerned it is an astonishing thing. In 1960-61 there were 45 schools arid after one year how many remained ? Nil. So many people disappeared from the district ? There were pupils in 45 schools who were being taught in Urdu and after one year all the schools were closed down. Of course, the Commis-missioner for Linguistic Minorities pointed out this fact to the Government but no reply was received. These Reports are frill of this kind of thing that the attention of the Government was drawn to some facts, to some complaints but no heed was paid to them. So I would ask this. What is the use of having a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, paying so much

money / He goes round the country and a Report is published and presented to the House and hours arc spent on discussion over the Reports and nothing comes out of it, just because we have no power to force the Governments of the States to pay heed to the minorities. I tell you that the lot of the Urdu-speaking public has been very bad in Uttar Pradesh. They fought well and they called the conscience of the country to it and the conscience of the country replied to some extent but still their lot is not better. This is due to many factors and I will not go in detail into them but I will only point out some facts. It is wrong to say that as cars have been imported into the country from foreign countries, so also a language has been imported from some foreign country into India. It sprang up from our motherland. It was never imported. I would also point out that nobody invented it. It was not invented by any king or any emperor or by a section of any religious people or by a group of people. It was not invented by anybody. It sprang up from this very soil where I am standing now, from Delhi. Six hundred years ago it was as much a flourishing capital as it is today. People from all parts of the country thronged here. They lived together and they wanted to speak to each other and they were searching for a link language. Luckily the link language was supplied by the suburbs of Delhi. They used to speak in those days "Khari Boli" and "Khari Boli" was absorbed by them. It was a dialect. It was not a literary language. As you know, a dialect has always a very limited vocabulary, a few words and a few nouns. So, even after absorbing those words into that language, they could not express themselves well, many of their ideas and thoughts. So, they began absorbing words from other languages and the process went on for centuries. This language developed here in Delhi. It did not develop on any sectarian basis nor on any religious basis. I assure you that this language never found a place in the durbars of kings or emperors even up to the last day. Their whole business was carried on in Persian. Even the people who belonged to high' castes used to look down upon Urdu. They never wrote their letters in Urdu. They never spoke in Urdu. It was taken up by the common people, by saints and

[Shri Hayatullah Ansari] *mdhus*. There was no religious bias given to the language. Nearly all people in this country took to Urdu. A few years back, I think about eighty years back, there was a Mela at Shahjahanpur. It was called *Mela-e-Khuda Skinasi*. They wanted to discuss the problem of religions. Nearly all sects of all religions took part in that discussion. In that discussion there were Arya Samajists, Christians, Muslims, Sikhs, etc. A book was published on it and perhaps you will find it in your library. It is in Urdu. Swami Dayanand spoke in Urdu. There was a Maulana from Deoband who spoke in Urdu. There were others who also spoke in Urdu. It was a common language. Urdu never developed as the language of any party. Many words were taken from Persian and Arabic, but they were Indianised. They were never taken as Persian words. It is written in a foreign script, but the script also has been Indianised. I tell you there are four letters in Arabic expressing the sound "Z", but in Urdu out of the three letters only one remained. There are three letters for expressing the sound "A" but in Urdu only one letter remained. There is a very beautiful story about a Maulana who wanted to speak the *Tatsam* words—the words in their original form. He went to a village shopkeeper and said "Do you have *Ark hana*" and pronounced *hana* with Arabic accent. The shopkeeper was astonished and got afraid. He said: "Saheb, we have this thing, but not so thick." It happened, because we are not accustomed to these heavy sounds, they also absorbed Indian ideas in such a way that I think many of our critics, when they go into Urdu poetry, are unable to differentiate where the foreign idea ends and where the Indian idea begins. If you will allow me, I will just read a couplet from Ohalib :—

न था कुछ तो खुदा था, कुछ न होता
तो खुदा होता ।
डुबोया मुझको होने ने न होता तो मैं
तो क्या होता ।

When there was nothing there was God. If there would not have been anything, there would have been God. My coming into being drowned me. If I had not come, what would have happened? I do

not know. This is the idea. This has been absorbed in such a way that I do not think that the Urdu critics have found it out to be a vedantic idea. Here is a very famous couplet of Ghalib which denotes birth and rebirth :

सब कहाँ कुछ लाला व गुल में नुमाया हो गई,
खाक में क्या सुरतें होंगी जो पिन्हा हो गई ।

The poet says there are so many flowers on the ground, but these are not those beautiful faces which have vanished under the ground, many of the beautiful faces have come out on the ground in the shape of flowers and buds. Still a lot of them are under it. It is an old Indian philosophy given in a poetic style. So, Indianisation went on in respect of words and sounds and everything and even in respect of the script. Now, we write Urdu in such a way that I do not think any man from Persia or Arabia will be able to read even a single word. Even those words which have been taken from Arabic or Persian when written in the Urdu styled script, I do not think that Arabs or Persians will be able to read it. The shape has been changed. Everything has been Indianised. I mean to say Urdu is 100% an Indian language. You will see that it played a great part in our history of independence. Ram Prasad Bismil, the great leader of the Revolutionary Party, was a very good poet of Urdu and one of his couplets is very famous and very well known :—

सफ़रोशी की तमन्ना अब हमारे दिल में है,
देखना है जोर कितना बाजुएँ कातिल में है ।

Bhagat Singh was very much impressed by this couplet and on account of this couplet he joined the Revolutionary Party. He was always very much impressed by the poetry of Ram Prasad Bismil and while going to sacrifice his life he asked his Guru Bismil to read one of his poems. So, in this way Urdu played a great part in our national struggle. It has taken part in all our national life. It is not in any way from outside. Its nature is Indian. Its writers are Indians, composed of all communities. There are Hindu, Christian, Sikh and Muslim writers and if you will put them all together I think that non-Muslim writers will exceed in number. But I do not know now why they are so

much against Urdu. They take it as something from outside. That is wrong. It is a great part of our cultural heritage and if you will lose Urdu, I think you will lose a very great language. There are so many beautiful things in Urdu literature. It has art and it has science, (it is a complete library. There are stories written in poem. If you go through them you will find that they are all full of Indian characters. Perhaps you know that there is a great epic written about the grandsons of the Prophet, who were killed in Karbala. If you go through it, you will find that all their characteristics are Indian. They eat like Indians. They clothe themselves like Indians. They talk like Indians. All these things are like Indians. But somehow or other we are under this misconception that those who speak Urdu, or write Urdu, are not cent per cent Indians. I will tell you where we have borrowed this idea. I will point out to you a very bad case of history, those bad days when Mr. Jinnah brought out his two-nation theory into our political life. Those were the bad days. He said that nationality was based on religion.

AN HON. MEMBER : But he did not know Urdu.

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI: He did not know even Islam. He was a champion of Muslims and he was a champion of Urdu. He did not know either. He was on very safe ground because not knowing both of them he could say whatever he liked. That was a very unlucky phase of our life. But he went on preaching his theory in such a way and so vehemently that even a good number of our non-Muslim friends were converted to his ideas. He went with his followers to Pakistan. But there are certain non-Muslim political parties which still believe that Muslims are not Indians, that they belong to some other nation as they speak Urdu. They believe that those who speak Urdu do not belong to India. It is cent per cent Mr. Jinnah's theory. Unluckily for us, a good number of non-Muslim political parties follow the same line. They plead the same thing day in and day out. In this way every mind is divided. I claim my mother tongue to be Urdu. I have used Urdu all my life, I fought the British in that language, I must fight them, I have al-

ways been thinking in Urdu, I have been always writing in Urdu. Am I a traitor on account of this? Before getting independence I was not called a traitor but after getting independence I have become a traitor. That is wrong. Maulana Azad used to speak in Urdu. So many of our great leaders like Raft Ahmed Kidwai spoke in Urdu and wrote in Urdu. So many of our martyrs had as their mother tongue Urdu. Abdul Hamid who died fighting against Pakistan spoke in Urdu. So Urdu belongs to India. It does not belong to any other country. It has been wrongly supposed that it should go to the other side of the border. Still we have got in India greater writers in Urdu than they have. But under this misconception a sort of bad feeling and also— I will not use a very harsh word, I would say— unfriendly attitude is going on against Urdu. I would point out that both of these reports are filled with these facts. The number of schools is decreasing; the number of pupils is going down; and the facilities are diminishing. So what is the use of having the report of the Commissioner when they cannot do anything?

Sir, a few words about the background of the problem . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : You have got only one or two minutes more.

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI : When India was divided, so many of us were under the impression that as a good number of Muslims had gone to the other side, Urdu also should go to that side. On account of this the education of Urdu was stopped in Uttar Pradesh. On that occasion we carried on a democratic movement, that is, a signature movement. We gathered 22 lakhs of signatures from adults from Uttar Pradesh and along with them we presented an application to the President of India, and I am proud to say that the Chairman of this august House was the leader of that group who presented that application to the President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. We demanded in that application only those things which Government used to say that they wanted to give to the Urdu-speaking people, nothing more. In those days the Central Government used to say that they wanted to give such and such facilities to the Urdu-speak-

[Shri Hayatullah Ansari] ihg people, and also the Government of Uttar Pradesh used to say that they wanted to give so much facilities to the Urdu-speaking people. We put down those things in our application and said that they should be given those things in such a way that they got them in reality. We still ask that whatever you say that on grounds of justice the Urdu-speaking people should get then, you give them in such a way that they become something practical, not only theoretical. I will not go into details. The hon. Member, Shri Misra, has gone into them but he has given only the difficulties of the Oriya people. But if we go through the report, we find that the same things are happening with Urdu-speaking people in Uttar Pradesh. So I ask the hon. M. n. isler to throw some light as to what are the remedies.

I will say one thing more. There is no competition or quarrel between Hindi and Urdu. All those who say that they have got Urdu as their mother tongue are very proud of it but they are learning Hindi. Their sons and daughters are learning Hindi, and they are doing very well in Hindi. So there is no competition between Hindi and Urdu. All of us who belong to Uttar Pradesh want that we should excel in Hindi more than any other people who speak Hindi whether they are in Rajasthan, Bihar or any other part of India. We want to excel them. So there is no question of competition between Urdu and Hindi. This is the position. I would ask the Government to throw some light as to what they are going to do to implement these recommendations which have been made by the Commissioner of Linguistic Minorities in order to remove the difficulties of the Urdu-speaking people in Uttar Pradesh.

डा० हरिवंश राय बच्चन (नाम-निर्देशित):
श्रीमान, क्या मैं कुछ कह सकता हूँ ?

दो बातें मैं कहना चाहता हूँ । माननीय सदस्य ने अभी कहा कि स्वामी दयानन्द ने उर्दू में भाषण दिया था और उनकी तकरीर उर्दू में लिखी गई थी । मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि स्वामी दयानन्द उर्दू बिल्कुल नहीं जानते थे, वह संस्कृत के विद्वान थे, उन्होंने जितना भी

लिखा वह सब हिन्दी में या संस्कृत में लिखा ।

दूसरी बात आपने यह कही थी कि अब्दुल हमीद की भाषा जिनको परम बोर चक्र मिला उर्दू थी । उनको उर्दू बिल्कुल नहीं आती थी और अपना पत्र-व्यवहार वह हिन्दी में करते थे । "धर्मयुग" में उनका एक पत्र भी छपा था ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी: आपकी इंफार्मेशन के लिये कह दूँ कि मैं उनके घर में गया था उनके मरने के एक हफ्ते के बाद । मैंने उनके घर वालों से बातचीत की थी । वह सब उर्दू बोलते थे । मैंने यह कहा है कि वह उर्दू बोलते थे । यह नहीं कहा कि उनकी राइटिंग किस में थी ।

डा० हरिवंश राय बच्चन: हिन्दी में ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : घर वाले जो हैं वह उर्दू में भा खत लिखते हैं और हिन्दी में भी । हमीद हिन्दी में खत लिखते थे और उर्दू भी जानते थे । मेरे पास कई खत मौजूद हैं जो हिन्दी में लिखे हुये हैं । मैंने जो बात कही है वह हिन्दी स्क्रिप्ट की बात नहीं कही है । I have spoken only for the language, not for the script.

डा० हरिवंश राय बच्चन: जब स्क्रिप्ट हिन्दी हो तब भाषा के आधार पर कौन कह सकता है कि यह हिन्दी नहीं है उर्दू है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY) : The subject is not the controversy between the two Members but the rights of the linguistic minorities. Mr. Niranjn Singh.

श्री निरंजन सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं ज्यादा समय तो नहीं लेना चाहता । रिपोर्ट जैसी हमारे सामने है उससे केवल यह मालूम पड़ता है कि यहाँ वहाँ से कुछ जोड़ दिया गया है और नवीन कुछ नहीं । रिपोर्ट का मतलब भी ऐसा ही है कि कहीं से ले आये और उसको रख दें । अब उस रिपोर्ट

के द्वारा हमको क्या इंफार्मेशन मिलती है और हम कितनी जानकारी प्राप्त कर सकते हैं, यह इससे मालूम पड़ता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सबसे पहले तो यह बात है कि दो रिपोर्ट एक साथ हैं और 1965 और 1964 में छपी हुई रिपोर्ट आज हमारे सामने यहां डिस्कशन के लिये है। चार साल पुरानी चीज को दुहराया जाय उससे हमको कितना फायदा होगा यह तो हाउस जान सकता है और आप जान सकते हैं। इसलिये सब से पहले मेरा यह कहना है कि रिपोर्ट आये तो उसी साल वह डिस्कस होनी चाहिये जिससे कि मेम्बरस को और जनता को यह पता रहे कि गवर्नमेंट क्या कर रही है, उनका डिपार्टमेंट क्या कर रहा है। चार-चार साल तक उसके ऊपर सोते रहना यह न्याययुक्त नहीं है।

अब मैं आपके सामने दो तीन चीजें कहना चाहता हूं। पहले तो जो सिक्स्थ रिपोर्ट है उसके बारे में यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि पेज 38 पर पैराग्राफ 200 में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"...the mother tongue of the pupils was, or presumed to be, English."

यदि आपने अंग्रेजी में वहां पर पढ़ाना जारी रखा तो उनकी मदरटंग अंग्रेजी ही समझी जायेगी और मैसूर गवर्नमेंट का भी इन्टरप्रेशन यही है जैसा कि रिपोर्ट में दिया है। सरकार ने जो तीन भाषाओं का फार्मूला बनाया है और जिसको वह फिर बदलना चाहती है तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि वहां पर अंग्रेजी ही रीजनल लैंग्वेज हो जायेगी। यह बात कहां तक ठीक है, इस पर गवर्नमेंट ने क्या एक्शन लिया है और उसके लिए इसका क्या एक्सप्लेनेशन है ?

दूसरी चीज आपने देखी कि जैसा कि चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की कान्फ्रेंस में यह डिसाइड हुआ और जिसके बारे में कमिश्नर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा है :

"The progress in this direction has not been communicated to the commissioner."

यह रिपोर्ट मई 1964 में छपी है और आपने उसको 7वीं रिपोर्ट में देना था लेकिन इसके बारे में कोई रेफरेंस नहीं दिया गया है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से मालूम करना चाहता हूं कि यह बात क्यों नहीं दी गई और इस पर गवर्नमेंट ने क्या एक्शन लिया ?

इस तरह की और भी चीजें हैं जिनके संबंध में मैं कहना चाहता हूं। गवर्नमेंट ने एक फार्मूला तय किया है कि जहां पर 15 प्रतिशत आबादी माइनारिटी लोगों की होगी, वहां पर उनके बच्चों को उनकी जबान में शिक्षा दी जायेगी। सब प्रान्तों ने हिन्दी को माइनारिटी लैंग्वेज मान लिया है लेकिन एक प्रान्त ऐसा है जिसमें माइनारिटी लैंग्वेज हिन्दी नहीं है और वह केरल है। केरल के संबंध में मुझे यह जानकारी है कि वहां पर यूनीवर्सिटी में जो हिन्दी डिपार्टमेंट है उसमें जो हैड आफ दी डिपार्टमेंट है वह केरल का ही रहने वाला है और वहां पर जितनी परीक्षाएं होती हैं उससे ज्यादा लड़के जो वर्धा द्वारा हिन्दी में परीक्षा ली जाती है उसमें बैठते हैं। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या कारण है कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से, वहां पर हिन्दी नहीं है और इसके लिए गवर्नमेंट ने क्या किया है ? दूसरे प्रान्तों में जब दूसरी लैंग्वेज के लिए सब तरह का प्रोत्साहन दिया जाता है तो केरल को आपने इतनी लिवरटी क्यों दी है ? हमारे सामने जो दो साल की रिपोर्ट है उसमें सब प्रान्तों में हिन्दी को स्थान दिया गया है सिर्फ केरल में ही हिन्दी को स्थान नहीं दिया गया है। इसका क्या कारण है, क्या वहां पर इतनी माइनारिटी नहीं है ? इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वहां पर जितने लोग हिन्दी पढ़ना चाहते हैं वे वर्धा की हिन्दी में ज्यादा दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। वहां पर अध्यापक नहीं हैं जो कि उन लोगों को हिन्दी पढ़ाएँ, लेकिन मैंने 15

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

सेन्टर ऐसे देखे हैं जहाँ पर लोग इम्तहान देते हैं। इसलिए मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर हिन्दी पढ़ाने के लिए लोगों को फैसिलिटीज क्यों नहीं दी जाती है?

तीसरी चीज, जैसा कि आपको पता है कि इसको कोई भी सीरियसली नहीं लेता है और आप 7वीं रिपोर्ट के पेज 197 में देखेंगे कि इसमें कौन कौन से प्रान्तों ने रिपोर्ट दी है। बिहार एक ऐसा प्रान्त है जिसके बारे में 1962-63, 1963-64 के बारे में रिपोर्ट नहीं दी है। रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा है कि बिहार गवर्नमेन्ट ने रिपोर्ट नहीं दी। उसके बाद क्या हुआ, यह हम नहीं जानते हैं। यह जो रिपोर्ट छपी है वह 1965 में छपी है। 1965 में छपने के बाद 1962-63 और 1963-64 की रिपोर्ट सबमिट नहीं की गई। इसलिए मैं सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट और खासकर के होम मिनिस्टर साहब से मालूम करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्हें इस बारे में क्या कहना है।

इसके बाद मैं अब दूसरी चीज कहना चाहता हूँ जो मध्य प्रदेश के संबंध में है और जिसमें आपको इन्टरेस्ट होगा। इस रिपोर्ट के पेज 18, 19, 20 और 21 में यह लिखा है "Further action in the matter by State Government is awaited."

इस चीज के बारे में जब एक एक्सपर्ट कमेटी बन चुकी है और उसके बाद रिजोल्यूशन भी हो चुका है कि जहाँ तक माइनारिटीज का सवाल है उनकी मदरटंग क्या होनी चाहिये और इसका फार्मुला क्या होना चाहिये। इसके ऊपर मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेन्ट से दो बार कहा गया है मगर अभी तक वहाँ से कोई उत्तर नहीं आया जिस तरह से बंगाल में संघालों की अपनी मदरटंग है और उन्हें अपनी ज़बान में प्राइमरी एजुकेशन मिलती है। तो जहाँ पर 15 प्रतिशत माइनारिटीज की आबादी है वहाँ पर उनको अपनी मातृ-भाषा में शिक्षा मिलनी चाहिये। इसमें

लिखा हुआ है "Except the States of Madhya Pradesh and Punjab all the States have accepted in principle to implement fully the above constitutional provision." इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि मध्य प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट ने इस चीज को इम्पलिमेंट क्यों नहीं किया जब कि उनका बारबार यह समझा गया है कि जो 14 लैंग्वेज हैं वे मदरटंग नहीं है? जो भाषा जवान से बोली जाती है वह मदरटंग है। वस्तर के लोगों की भाषा गोड़ी और हलवी है और धीरे-धीरे ही यह भाषा पतप सकती है। इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर इन लोगों को अपनी भाषा में शिक्षा देने का प्रबन्ध वहाँ की सरकार द्वारा क्यों नहीं किया गया? वहाँ की सरकार सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट द्वारा पास किये गये फार्मुले को लागू क्यों नहीं करती है?

श्रीमति अनीस किदवाई (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उर्दू का नाम भी ले लीजिये।

श्री निरंजन सिंह : उर्दू को सब जगह लिया जा रहा है। मध्य प्रदेश में उर्दू है लेकिन वहाँ पर जो आदिवासी लोगों की भाषा हलवी और गोड़ी है उसके लिए वहाँ की सरकार कुछ नहीं कर रही है।

श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्रू (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
मिश्रा के राज में उर्दू है, यह आप क्या बात कहते हैं?

श्री निरंजन सिंह : मैं यह बात मानता हूँ कि मिश्रा के राज में उर्दू नहीं हो सकती है और आपका कहना ठीक है। पर मेरा यह कहना है कि जिन लोगों की तादाद वहाँ पर ज्यादा है, जिन लोगों के लिए कांस्टीट्यूशन में प्राविजन किया हुआ है, उसको अभी तक मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने इम्पलिमेंट नहीं किया। वह इस सारे इन्टरप्रेशन को कबूल करना नहीं चाहती है और इसलिए मैं सरकार से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उसे और मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार को इस बारे में क्या कहना है। असल में जहाँ तक उर्दू का सवाल

है वह नेशनल लैंग्वेज है और कॉन्स्टीट्यूशन में भी उसके लिए प्राविजन है और उसको कोई इग्नोर नहीं कर सकता है। लेकिन संभाल नेशनल लैंग्वेज नहीं है, वहां पर वह लोकल लैंग्वेज के रूप में पढ़ाई जाती है। इसलिए मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हलवी और गोड़ी भाषाओं को भी लोकल लैंग्वेज के रूप में क्यों नहीं पढ़ाया जाता है? हमारी सरकार इस बात पर क्यों सो रही है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ?

फिर एक रिक्मेन्डेशन यह है कि प्राविन्सेज की सर्विसेज में जो एग्जामिनेशन्स होंगे वे, अंग्रेजी, हिन्दी और माइनारिटीज की जो लैंग्वेज होंगी उसमें होंगे। लेकिन देखने में यह आया है कि तीन प्रान्तों को छोड़ कर बाकी जगह अंग्रेजी का ही उपयोग किया जाता है। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों की भाषा अंग्रेजी नहीं है चाहे वे तामिल के लोग हों, तैलुगू के लोग हों, उन पर कोई भाषा थोपी नहीं जानी चाहिये और माइनारिटी लोगों की ही भाषा में परीक्षा का प्रबन्ध किया जाना चाहिये। 5 साल के बाद भी जब से हमने इस तरह का प्राविजन किया है क्या माइनारिटीज की भाषा में परीक्षा हुई है? अगर नहीं हुई है तो फिर इस तरह की रिपोर्ट को यहां पर डिसकस करने की क्या जरूरत है? इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो रिपोर्ट कमिशनर साहब ने दी है अगर उसको इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया जाता है, उस पर एक्शन नहीं लिया जाता है, तो इस रिपोर्ट को यहां पर लाने की और इतने खर्च करने की क्या आवश्यकता है।

4 P.M.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir I welcome this opportunity of discussing the Sixth and the Seventh Reports of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. The report is objective because it is a very good record of what is obtaining in the country.

SHRI AKBAR ALT KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): And excellently written. L62RS/66-6

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : It is excellently written, I agree. But, Sir, the reports are, I should say, of an observer. I wonder if article 350B contemplated the appointment of a Commissioner only to observe facts and to report to the President. I thought, Sir, that he was intended to play a more vital role, a more important role than that of being a more observer. What more important role he could have played I will support with my remarks during the course of my speech.

Sir, it is a recognised principle—I will confine myself first to education and if time permits, I will turn to other aspects—in education that instruction must be imparted in the mother tongue. As long ago as 1949 the Provincial Ministers' Conference—it should be said to their credit—recognised this principle that not only in primary education but also in secondary education instruction must be imparted in

the mother tongue. This was further strengthened by the States Reorganisation Commission which made several recommendations giving safeguards to linguistic minorities. The Government of India considered these recommendations and had a memorandum in 1956. Later on, the Chief Ministers of States had a conference in 1961. They accepted the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission and also the memorandum drawn up by the Government of India all of which went to support the safeguards that were devised for the linguistic minorities.

Now, Sir, the obligation of implementing these recommendations devolved on the State Governments. But the State Governments, as they were constituted, one could see, were not very keen on implementing these recommendations, firstly, because they were all governments of linguistic provtohes where the majority language received all importance, got greater emphasis and the minorities, therefore, were there as though at sufferance, and therefore, the Governments of the States' were not very keen to implement these recommendations. These two reports give numerous instances

as to how the State Governments have fallen far short of expectation in this re-card.

The hon'ble Deputy Minister in the course of his speech while moving this motion said that there is commendable progress in the work of implementation by

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] the State Governments. I very respectfully differ from him. The State Governments have not moved their little finger in implementing these recommendations. Both these reports go to support this statement.

Now, with regard to the implementation of the scheme of establishing schools and classes in minority languages, first it was agreed by all the Chief Ministers, and Education Ministers also, that during the primary stages there must be ten students of the minority language in each class and forty students totalling in the school to have a provision for these classes to be opened in the minority languages and teachers given. Now some States have said that because there are not forty students and *rn students in each class therefore, they have not done it. Some States said that though there were sixty students there were not ten in each class, and therefore they have not done it. So they have tried to find out an excuse to explain away their not implementing it. One State goes to say that the obligation imposed by article 350A was not mandatory, it was only a direction. That shows that that State is not at all interested in improving minority languages or in providing facilities given in article 350A.

In secondary education the same thing obtains, namely, a minimum of 15 in each class and 60 total in a school. They have not taken care to do it. If these safeguards had to be implemented in the right spirit, first of all, the minority area should have been demarcated by the State. An assessment should have been made of the people speaking minority languages. Then an assessment of the needs of those areas must have been made as to how many teachers are required for this minority or how many schools are required for this minority. The State Governments must have immediately accepted the Government of India's memorandum and the Chief Ministers' Conference Resolution and also the Southern Zonal Ministers' Conference resolutions as far as the Southern States are concerned. They should have set about this work of demarcating these areas, making the assessment and making provision also. Now, even if they want, to implement, they do not have enough teachers, they do not have enough schools and equipment. They do not have

text-books also. There have been numerous complaints received by the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner that they do not have proper text-books also. This shows that the State Governments have not moved in the matter at all. Wherever there were elements asserting themselves, where their voice could not be silenced, there provision has been made in those areas. In some areas already facilities were existing for minorities, and those facilities, it must be said, have not been cut down, though, as our hon'ble friend remarked, at several places those facilities also have been cut down, the number of schools has gone down, the number of classes also has gone down. Therefore, Sir, the State Governments have failed to provide these facilities, the work of demarcating the areas, assessing the minority languages population and assessing the needs of these areas and making provision for them. That has not been made. Therefore, they have totally failed. Now, whose duty is it to see that the States are made alive to these needs? Surely, it is the duty of the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner. First of all, he must educate himself about this. I think, as far as this is concerned, he has gone by only what the State Governments seem to have done. The Assistant Commissioner went to Bellary in the Mysore State where they have made a representation. In several other districts in the Mysore State there are people with minority languages in concentrated areas where they could have not only classes but ten or fifteen schools. But there is no mention of all that. In my district, for instance, there are Telugu-speaking people. I am a Telugu-speaking man. But we have not had a single school since the Adam's day. We thought we should have had a school at least. The people are not enlightened.

It was the duty of the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner first of all to have made this assessment himself independent of the State Government. He should have kept a map of each State before himself, each district before himself, taken the census report along with it and then found out and demarcated the area where there were concentrations of people speaking the minority languages and then he should also have assessed the needs of those minority areas. Then he should have pointed out to the Governments, taken them by the ncs

and said : "There is a concentration of minorities there. What have you done for them ?" If the Government had said : 'We are going to do this for them', he should have told them : 'I am not at all satisfied. Tell me how many teachers you have trained, how many teachers can you provide for these areas and how many schools can you open ?' That has not been done. When I visualised the role of the Commissioner, I thought he would have done at least that, namely, educated himself first in order to be able to be effective with the State Governments in getting them to implement these recommendations. I do not think of him and I do not suggest that he should play the role of an executive officer. Not at all. It is not the intention but this is the thing which he should have done and if his report is to have any effect and if the President has to get a true picture of what is happening in the country of how far the State Governments fall short of implementing the recommendations of the Commissioner, this is the objective picture, true factual picture that he should present to the President. This report only records what is happening and what complaints have been received. No doubt he has taken action, wherever complaints have been received, to impress upon the State Governments to remedy the complaints but the State Governments have turned a deaf ear to him. In fact my State Government has not at all furnished the statistics to him. There are other Governments like that of Madhya Pradesh, Punjab and Assam which have not done. The Assam Government has not provided facilities in the tribal areas for schools and classes to be opened in the tribal languages. Until today it has not submitted its report to the Commissioner. Similarly there are other Governments too. If these recommendations have to be implemented in the right spirit, this is the role that the Commissioner should play. I have no hope of the State Governments doing it because their emphasis is on the majority language and so they are not very keen on implementing this but there must be some agency to make them open their eyes and move in the matter of implementation. Who could that agency be ? The President himself cannot do that. That was why article 350(b) visualised the appointment of a Linguistic Commissioner. It is not only just to observe as on

the screen the picture but to take concrete action or to compel the States to do this. If the State Governments, after his pinpointing to them the actual needs by facts and figures, still remain adamant, then it is for the Parliament to take such action as is deemed necessary.

The Home Ministry also has a responsibility in the matter but the Home Ministry is burdened with hundred thousand things but that is not an excuse for the Home Ministry not to take vigorous action. If their Ministry, as is admitted, is very widely burdened, they should appoint another Minister in the Ministry specially for this. It is not done at all. Why should there be not a Minister for seeing that these minorities get these safeguards ? They are in a good number. After all they cannot be second-rate citizens. They should enjoy the same or equal opportunities as the majority language people. Therefore this is a very important thing.

You know, Sir, and the House knows the dissatisfaction that prevails in the linguistic minority areas and in the tribal areas. We have not done by the tribals as they surely deserved. We have not done by the semi-tribals as they have deserved. We have not even done it by the other linguistic minorities who are absorbed in the general population. We have not done anything. Therefore it is but right that the Home Ministry must give thought again to this question.

About acceptance as the official language, the States Reorganisation Commission had definitely laid down the line that wherever 70 per cent of the people speak a language, then that forms the language of the State but wherever there is a concentration of minority language of at least 30 per cent, there that language should be accepted as the State language. There is a complaint in several States. For instance in Andhra, in Mysore and in Kerala . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : In Assam also.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : Maybe but I am not very well conversant with that. I dare say that there could be such grounds there also. Where there is a concentration of 30 per cent, people and where their language has not been accepted

[Shri M. Govinda Redely.]

as the State language, there are complaints . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : In Andhra we have done it.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : That is good. This also should be attended to.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: That is for Urdu in Andhra.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: For Kannada and Marathi also. In those areas they have their schools. Generally I have met people from Maharashtra and Mysore . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: But now there is a special circumstance and that is, now large industries are coming up in several areas where people speaking a language different from the language of the State are coming in large numbers and are concentrating. They have neither the schools there in their languages nor other facilities for- their languages. They have nothing there, this is a very serious matter and the office of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, I visualise, should at least be a very important one in order to fulfil the obligations and duties imposed upon the Commissioner. If the powers are lacking, it is for the Home Ministry to confer on him powers but if it goes on in this way, he will be only just as a cinema-goer seeing things on the screen.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Home Ministry is extremely indifferent about this.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भाषायी अल्पसंख्यकों का प्रश्न तीन वर्ष पहले भी रिपोर्ट के समय विवाद का विषय बना था। फिर से इस रिपोर्ट पर जब चर्चा हो रही है तो इस सवाल का दुबारा उठना स्वाभाविक है। जो व्यवस्था इस समय कमिश्नर के द्वारा हम कराना चाहते हैं उसके लिये मैं समझता हूँ स्वयं मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि उनके हाथ कितने बंधे हुये हैं। वह सलाह देने के अतिरिक्त इसमें और कितना अधिक कर सकते हैं इसके बारे में उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है। माननीय सदस्यों ने मांग की है कि इस चीज को केवल

सलाह तक हम न रखें और जहाँ जहाँ भी भाषायी अल्पसंख्यकों को शिक्षा की, नौकरियों की और सरकारी कामकाज को अनुविधायें हैं उनको हम प्रत्यक्ष व्यवहार में लायें और कोई सक्रिय पग उठा सके तो अधिक अच्छा होगा।

इस विवरण में अनेकों ऐसे उदाहरण दिये हुये हैं जहाँ पर भाषायी अल्पसंख्यकों को यह अधिकार प्राप्त नहीं है। मैं गृह मंत्रालय से निवेदन करूँगा कि जितने भी उदाहरण दिये हैं, जिन-जिन क्षेत्रों में प्रारम्भिक शिक्षा भी उनकी मातृभाषा में मिलने की व्यवस्था नहीं है ऐसे जितने भी उदाहरण दिये हैं, उनके लिये हम केवल सुझाव तक संतुष्ट न रहें। इन सुझावों को अगर हम कार्यान्वित न कर पाये तो—यह केवल सुझाव देने तक का सवाल नहीं है मातृभाषा में जब प्रारम्भिक पढ़ाना नहीं होता तो—उसकी कुछ प्रतिक्रिया लोगों के मन में जाग्रत होती है। हम यदि कह दें कि इस सम्बन्ध में कोई बांधने वाली व्यवस्था नहीं है मर्जी के अनुसार प्रान्तीय सरकार इसकी व्यवस्था करेंगी तो जैसा कि पंजाब का यहाँ उदाहरण दिया गया, मातृभाषा की पढ़ाई की व्यवस्था न करने का लोगों के आपस के दिलों में कितना फर्क पड़ता है, एक दूसरे के प्रति कितना विद्वेष का निर्माण होता है, यह हमने अनुभव किया है। इस चीज को रोकना आवश्यक है इसके लिये कठोर कदम राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये भी हमें उठाना पड़े तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सारे विवाद का यह एक ठोस परिणाम होगा कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा इस हिन्दुस्तान के किसी भी कोने में रहने वाले विद्यार्थी को अनिवार्य रूप से उसकी मातृ-भाषा में ही मिलेगी और जहाँ कहीं भी इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था नहीं होगी तो राष्ट्रपति केन्द्रीय सरकार की माफ़त इस व्यवस्था को वहाँ लागू करवाने का इंतजाम करेंगे; मैं समझता हूँ कि एक बुनियादी चीज इसमें से पूरी हो जायेगी।

जो माध्यमिक शिक्षा है वह वहाँ की जो क्षेत्रीय भाषायें हैं उनमें साधारणतया होती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह माध्यमिक शिक्षा भी उच्च स्तर तक उनकी भाषा में हो सके यह दृष्टिकोण हमें अपनाना चाहिये।

मुझे इस बात का खेद है कि केन्द्रीय शिक्षा मंत्रालय अथवा शिक्षा आयोग की आजकल जो प्रवृत्तियाँ हैं, केवल क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं में ही माध्यमिक और उच्चतम शिक्षा उन्हें मिले, इस दृष्टि से बाधक हैं। आज के ही समाचार-पत्रों में एक विवरण छपा है कि काश्मीर सरकार ने चौथी प्राइमरी स्टेज से ही, अंग्रेजी को मीडियम आफ इंस्ट्रक्शन बनाने का विचार किया है, यहाँ तक कि डोगरी और काश्मीरी को दूसरे से पाँचवें दर्जे तक एक आप्शनल सबजेक्ट के रूप में पढ़ाने का विचार कर रहे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रवृत्ति बहुत खतरनाक है, इस चीज को हमें दृढ़ता से रोकना चाहिये। अगर यह चीज न रोकी गई तो इससे सारे देश की तसवीर एक दूसरी तरह की होगी, ऐसे भीषण विवाद इसमें से खड़े होंगे कि जिसके कारण हम इस मूल समस्या की शकल को ही बदल डालेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इन मामलों में कठोर पग उठाये और केवल प्रान्तीय सरकारों के स्वयं के निर्णयों पर इन चीजों को न छोड़े।

आखिर हमको इस सारे देश का एक नक्शा बनाना है। यह बात हो सकती है कि भाषा को सर्वाधिक महत्व देने के बाद जब हमने देश के राज्यों का पुनर्गठन किया उस समय शायद किसी के दिमाग में रहा हो कि जब भाषा के आधार को ही प्राथमिकता दे कर हम राज्यों को बना रहे हैं तो अल्पसंख्यक-भाषा-भाषी की कोई समस्या भी रहेगी अथवा नहीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन लोगों को गम्भीरता से इस सवाल पर विचार करना चाहिये। जब माइनारिटीज लैगुएज के सवाल पर विचार करते हैं तो यह चीज उन्हें समझनी चाहिये कि यह देश एक है। किसी भी भाषा को बोलने वाला व्यक्ति इस देश के किसी भी कोने में

जायेगा, कोई भी कारण उसके लिये हों, राजनैतिक कारण भी हो सकते हैं, नौकरी उद्योग व्यवसाय के कारण भी हो सकते हैं, तो वह जायेगा और यह कोई जरूरी नहीं कि एक निश्चित काम के लिये जाने के बाद वह अपने ही प्रान्त में बार-बार लौट कर आयेगा जहाँ से कि वह वहाँ गया है। मैं राजस्थान के प्रदेश का रहने वाला हूँ, आज हिन्दुस्तान का एक भी प्रान्त ऐसा नहीं जहाँ राजस्थान से गये हुये लोग किसी न किसी तरह से दिखाई न दें, वहाँ उनकी पीढ़ियाँ बीत गई, मैं उनसे राजस्थान की बात पूछने की कोशिश करता हूँ लेकिन राजस्थान में उनके पिता भी नहीं गये, बच्चों का तो वहाँ पर जाने का सवाल ही खड़ा नहीं होता। वह वहाँ पर हैं और वहाँ की भाषा उनकी है। उनकी मातृभाषा के रूप में हिन्दी है और वहाँ पर वह चाहेंगे कि उनके बच्चे मातृभाषा में अपनी पढ़ाई करें। लेकिन इतना भी मैं चाहूँगा कि वह जब वहाँ पर हैं, उस प्रान्त में रह रहे हैं, राजस्थान से कई पीढ़ियों पहले का सम्बन्ध रहा होगा, तो आज कोई कारण नहीं कि मद्रास में रहने वाला वह राजस्थान का व्यक्ति जो चार पुस्त या दस पुस्त पहले गया हो वहाँ पर, तामिल भाषा को न अपनाये, बंगाल में गया हुआ व्यक्ति बंगाली को न अपनाये या और किसी भी प्रान्त में गया हुआ व्यक्ति उस भाषा को न अपनाये और अपनी सारी शिक्षा-दीक्षा प्रारम्भिक अवस्थाओं के बाद वहाँ की भाषा में ही करने में किसी प्रकार का संकोच दिखाये। आखिर उसको वहीं रहना है, उसको वहाँ के जीवन के साथ समरस होना है, उसी में उसकी प्रगति है, सारे देश के एकीकरण का नक्शा उसमें से बनेगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि राजस्थान में ऐसे अनेकों बंगाली परिवार हैं जो आज सौ-सौ वर्ष या उससे भी ज्यादा समय से वहाँ रह रहे हैं उनके लड़के बच्चों ने हिन्दी में शिक्षा प्राप्त की है, हिन्दी में प्रथम डिवीजंस में उन्होंने अपनी शिक्षा-दीक्षा प्राप्त की, वह आज वहाँ काम कर रहे हैं, नौकरियाँ कर रहे हैं, उनके जीवन

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

में किसी प्रकार से कोई आघात नहीं आया। उनके घर का कैरेक्टर उससे नहीं बदला, उनके जीवन की पद्धति उससे नहीं बदली। भाषा का एक अपना स्थान है, एक उपयोग है जीवन में। हिन्दुस्तान के किसी भी कोने में रहने वाला व्यक्ति किसी भी भाषा को बोलने वाला व्यक्ति उसकी कुछ भिन्नताएँ हो सकती हैं, उसके खानपान में, उसकी वेशभूषा में थोड़ा अन्तर होगा लेकिन आन्तरिक रूप से वह एक है और इस देश की जितनी भी भाषाएँ हैं जो हमने आठवें शेड्यूल में रखी हैं वह सारी की सारी भाषाएँ मिल कर इस राष्ट्र का निर्माण करती हैं। इस देश की जो संस्कृति है, इस देश की जो सम्पत्ति है, इस देश का जो सारा वायुमंडल है वह इस देश की सभी भाषाओं से प्रकट होता है। प्रान्त की दीवारों को तोड़ कर, जाति और सम्प्रदाय की दीवारों को तोड़ कर सभी भाषाएँ मिल कर देश की राष्ट्रीयता, देश की सारी तहजीब और तमझून को प्रकट करने के लिये जिम्मेदार हैं। इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि यह भाषायी अल्पसंख्यक जहाँ पर भी हैं—हम प्रान्तों को किसी भी प्रकार से तोड़ें जो वहाँ की सरकारी भाषा रहेगी कामकाज की, उसके अतिरिक्त ऐसे अनेकों लोग, असंख्य लोग रहेंगे जिनकी मातृभाषा भिन्न प्रकार की है,—अगर उनका कुछ निश्चित परसेंटेज है तो निश्चित रूप से उनको सब प्रकार की सुविधायें देनी होंगी। लेकिन यह कब हो सकता है, उस समय जब कि एकता और सामंजस्य का भाव जुड़ा हुआ हो। परन्तु ये भाषाएँ जब आगे के चलने वाले विवादों को जन्म देती हैं, इन भाषाओं की आड़ में जब और कुछ बातें कही जाती हैं तो फिर यह जो नैसर्गिक उत्तरदायित्व है व्यक्ति के विकास का भाषा के माध्यम के द्वारा वह नहीं रहता और यह स्वामाविक बात है कि हम अगर अपने प्रान्त को आगे बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से उन्नत करना चाहते हैं तो केवल बहुभाषाभाषी

लोगों की शिक्षा-दीक्षा, उन्हीं की नौकरियों, उन्हीं के आर्थिक विकास का प्रबन्ध कर के हम नहीं चल सकते तो हमारे लिए ऐसा डेड वेट छूट जायगा जो बहुमत वाले लोगों को आगे बढ़ने नहीं देगा और उनकी रफ्तार को रोक देगा। उनके हित में, उन लोगों की भलाई, उनको ठीक प्रकार से विकास के अवसर मिलें, जनतंत्रीय देश में सब प्रकार की गतिविधियाँ ठीक प्रकार से हों, सब अपना हिस्सा और अपनी जिम्मेदारी पूरी कर सकें, यह दृष्टिकोण इसमें लेना होगा। परन्तु सब चीज परस्पर सद्भावना और समन्वय से ही आ सकती है।

अगर इसके कारण किसी प्रकार की पृथक्ता पनपाने की कोशिश की जायेगी, किसी भी प्रकार अलग चीज के निर्माण करने की कोशिश की जायेगी, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम यहाँ इन्हींसेस में भाषाओं के लिए वकालत कर सकते हैं। भाषा कौन-कौन बोलते हैं, भाषा बोलने वाले विद्वान कौन-कौन हैं? महाकवि रवीन्द्रनाथ टैगोर अंग्रेजी में कविता किया करते थे, लेकिन अंग्रेजी में कविता करने के कारण आज हम रवीन्द्रनाथ टैगोर के नाम का प्रयोग करें इस देश में अंग्रेजी बनाये रखने के लिए, तो मैं यह समझूँगा कि हम उस स्वर्गीय आत्मा के प्रति अन्याय कर रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं आपके सामने एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ आन्ध्र का, जहाँ पर उर्दू माध्यम से चलने वाले विद्यालय चलते हैं। आज वहाँ पर यह कोशिश की जा रही है कि इन उर्दू माध्यम से चलनेवाले विद्यालयों में शुक्रवार की छुट्टी की जाय, इतवार की छुट्टी न की जाय।

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) :
On a point of clarification. Sir, May I point out that Rabindranath Tagore never wrote a single line of poetry in the English language? He wrote every line in Bengali and what we now have as the English poetry of Rabindranath Tagore, every line of it is a translation from Bengali. He never wrote a single line of poetry in English.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मेरे मित्र जो यहां पर मौजूद हैं वे साहित्य क्षेत्र में मेरे से ज्यादा अधिकार रखने वाले हैं और मैं इस विवाद को उन पर ही छोड़ दूंगा और मैं समझता हूं कि वे इसका योग्य उत्तर देंगे। लेकिन जो तर्क जिस आधार पर दिये जा रहे हैं . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : श्रीमती सरोजनी नायडू ने अंग्रेजी में लिखा है।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : यह दूसरा उदाहरण है। मुझे व्यक्ति विशेष से कोई मतलब नहीं है, मैं उस मनोवृत्ति को केवल यहां पर आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। अगर एक व्यक्ति किसी भाषा का विद्वान हो और हम उसका दूसरे तर्क से उपयोग में लाने की कोशिश करें, तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह चीज उपयुक्त नहीं होगी। जिस तरह से पिछली बार भाषाई अल्पसंख्यक आयोग की रिपोर्ट के अवसर का फायदा उठाकर उर्दू की वकालत की गई थी, वैसा ही इस बार भी किया जा रहा है। मैं दिल्ली और उसके आसपास की बात कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दी बोलने वाले लोगों के साथ फारसी बोलने वाले लोगों के संबंध में आने के कारण उस समय उर्दू पैदा हुई, यह तर्क मैं समझ सकता हूं। यह भी कहा गया है कि जो दरबारी बादशाह लोग थे, वे उर्दू का प्रयोग नहीं करते थे, उर्दू को बड़ी घटिया और नीची निगाह से देखते थे और उसको वाज़रू भाषा समझते थे। उनका तो सारा कारोबार फारसी भाषा में होता था। पर कलकत्ते में भी मुसलमान बादशाह थे। निज़ाम नीचे थे। बीदर और बरार में सारी हकूमत थी। वहां पर तो फारसी भाषा का संबंध हिन्दी से नहीं आया। वहां तो फारसी का संबंध मराठी से आया, तैलगू से आया, बंगला से आया। पर दोनों ने मिलकर कौन सी भाषा बनाई? यह बात सच है कि बंगला में फारसी भाषा के कुछ शब्द आये। मराठी में आज भी फारसी भाषा के शब्द बहुत बड़ी मात्रा में मिलते हैं।

मेरा यह निवेदन है कि अगर इस तरीके से हम आज उदाहरण दें कि अमुक मुसलमान व्यक्ति ने देश हित के लिए बड़ा काम किया, उनकी मातृभाषा उर्दू है यह प्रिच्यूम करके हम चले, तो वह भाषा कैसे यहां देश में रहेगी। अगर इसके साथ यह अर्थ जोड़ने की कोशिश की गई तो फिर जो शंकाएं प्रकट की गई हैं और जो शंकाएं पैदा हो रही हैं, उससे यह विवाद हल नहीं होगा। इसलिए मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हम भाषाओं को उसी रूप में देखें जिस रूप में हम उनका उपयोग करना चाहते हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल एक बात कहना चाहूंगा। इन दो कमिशन की रिपोर्टों में सिन्धी भाषा के सम्बन्ध में स्पष्ट रूप से एक सुझाव दिया गया है। कमिशनर स्वयं इस बात को समझने में असमर्थ हैं कि जब चारों तरफ से इस बात की मांग की जा रही है कि सिन्धी भाषा को आठवें शिड्यूल में रखा जाय तो उसके लिए सरकार पग क्यों नहीं उठाती है? वह भी अपने देश की भाषा है और आज उसको शिड्यूल में न रखने के कारण राजस्थान के अजमेर शहर में जहां पर आज 40 प्रतिशत सिन्धी लोग रहते हैं, जिनकी सिन्धी मातृभाषा है, आज उनको सिन्धी भाषा के माध्यम से शिक्षा-दीक्षा देने का इंतजाम केवल इसलिए नहीं है कि सिन्धी आठवें शिड्यूल की भाषा नहीं है। कमिशन ने इस चीज की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है और मैं चाहूंगा कि गृह मंत्री जी इस विषय पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करेंगे।

यह बात ठीक है कि भाषा के संबंध में प्रान्तों को अधिक आग्रह करना पड़ेगा, लेकिन इसके लिए मैं यह चाहूंगा एकत्व की भावना से सब भाषाओं का निर्माण करना चाहिये चाहे हम बहु भाषाभाषी हों, चाहे अल्प भाषाभाषी। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि इन भाषाओं में से एक भी भाषा ऐसी नहीं है जो किसी न किसी

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह मंडारी]

क्षेत्र की माइनारिटी को लैंग्वेज नहीं है। यह दुवारी तलवार है। और हर भाषा दो धारी मार करेगी। एक दूसरे का लिहाज रखकर ही हमें सद्भावना का निर्माण करना चाहिये। लेकिन कुछ पाजिटिव स्टैप्स हैं जिनको पूरा नहीं किया गया है जिसके कारण हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन में आपत्ति खड़ी हो सकती है और विवाद खड़े हो सकते हैं तथा स्वामाविक अधिकारों से लोगों को वंचित किया जा सकता है। इसमें गृह मंत्री जी को केवल सलाह ही देना नहीं चाहिये बल्कि आगे बढ़कर राष्ट्रपति के अधिकारों के आधार पर ठोस कदम उठाने के लिए जल्द से जल्द कार्यवाही करनी चाहिये। यही मुझे निवेदन करना है।

श्रीमती अनिस قدوائی : جناب وائس

چیرمین صاحب، کئی سالوں سے مائنرٹی کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہاؤس کے سامنے پیش ہوتی رہتی ہے اور بد قسمتی سے مجھے بھی ہمیشہ کچھ نہ کچھ اس پر کہنا پڑتا ہے اور اپنی آواز اٹھانی پڑتی ہے کیوں کہ میں اس صوبہ سے تعلق رکھتی ہوں جس میں ایک کروڑ سے زیادہ لوگ اردو زبان بولتے ہیں۔ دوسرے صوبوں میں بھی اس طرح کی اقلیتیں موجود ہیں۔

اس وقت جو رپورٹ ہمارے سامنے آئی ہے اس پر نہ تو ہوم منسٹری کوئی فخر کر سکتی ہے اور نہ اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹ کوئی فخر کر سکتی ہے۔ کیوں کہ کمشنر نے اس بارے میں کافی شکایت کی ہے کہ کس طرح سے اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹس اس کی سفارشوں کو نظر انداز کر دیتی ہیں اور بار بار

لکھنے کے بعد بھی لسانی اقلیتوں کو انکا حق نہیں ملتا ہے۔ یہ تو ذمہ داری ہماری ہوم منسٹری کی ہوتی ہے کہ وہ دیکھے کہ آیا مائنرٹیز کے ساتھ، مائنرٹی لینگویج کے ساتھ ساتھ کیا سلوک ہو رہا ہے۔ اگر انہوں نے ایک کمشنر مقرر کر دیا اور وہ ایک رپورٹ لکھ کر یہاں ہاؤس کی میز پر رکھ دیتا ہے تو اس سے کوئی تسکین نہیں ہو سکتی۔ نہ مسئلہ حل ہو سکتا ہے اٹھارہ سال گزر چکے ہیں اور یہ مسئلہ بار بار گورنمنٹ کے سامنے لایا گیا ہے۔ آج پھر میں کہتی ہوں کہ اب وقت آ گیا ہے جب ہوم منسٹری کو اپنا فیصلہ بالکل آخری اور قطعی دینا چاہئے کہ آیا وہ مائنرٹیز کی آواز سننے کے لئے تیار ہیں یا نہیں؟ اس سے تو میں بالکل انکار کرتی ہوں کہ یہ زبان صرف ایک اقلیت کی زبان ہے۔ جیسا کہ ابھی ایک ممبر نے ظاہر کیا ہے حیات اللہ صاحب نے غلطی سے عبدالحمید کی مثال دے دی اور اس پر ہمارے ”بچن“ صاحب نے اعتراض کیا۔ میں کہتی ہوں کہ وہ عبدالحمید کی زبان نہ سہی لیکن میری زبان ہے حیات اللہ انصاری کی زبان ہے، اکبر علی خان صاحب کی زبان ہے، سپرو صاحب کی زبان ہے، پنڈت کنزرو صاحب کی زبان ہے اور گجراں صاحب کی زبان ہے۔ ہزاروں لاکھوں اور کروڑوں کی تعداد

میں اس زبان کو پڑھنے والے، بولنے والے موجود ہیں ان کو اس طرح سے نظر انداز کر دینا کہاں کا انصاف ہے اسکولوں کی تعداد کم ہوتی چلی جا رہی ہے۔ اسکولوں سے ٹیچرس غائب ہوتے چلے جا رہے ہیں۔ ہر جگہ ایک درخواست دینے پر جھگڑا ہوتا ہے۔ ہر جگہ یہ سوال ہے کہ ہم کیسے زبان کو باقی رکھیں اور کیسے اپنے بچوں کو پڑھائیں اور کیا کریں۔ میں لیپا پوتی کی بات نہیں کرتی۔ اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ مسلمانوں کو بہت زیادہ تکلیف پہنچ رہی ہے۔ جیسا کہ پہلے ایک مرتبہ میں نے کہا تھا کہ مسلمانوں کو اس لئے زیادہ تکلیف پہنچ رہی ہے کہ انہوں نے چھ سات سو سال کے اندر اپنا سارا لٹریچر جو عربی اور فارسی میں تھا خواہ وہ ہسٹری ہو یا مذہبی لٹریچر ہو یا ادبی ہو سب اردو میں منتقل کر لیا تھا اور اردو میں اسے منتقل کرنے کے بعد آج وہ یہ محسوس کرتے ہیں کہ ان کے بچے جاہل ہیں وہ نہیں جانتے کہ ہمارے بڑے مورخ کون تھے، وہ نہیں جانتے کہ ہمارے سائنسٹ یا حکیموں نے کیا کچھ کام کئے، وہ نہیں جانتے کہ ہمارے شاعر اور مصنف کیسے تھے۔ اس لئے مسلمانوں کو اس سے زیادہ تکلیف ہوتی ہے یہ نسبت دوسروں کے -

جہاں تک یو۔ پی۔ کا سوال ہے وہاں کی گورنمنٹ اس معاملہ میں کچھ بھی سننے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہے۔ ہم لوگ جو انجمن ترقی اردو سے تعلق رکھتے ہیں ہم نے آہستہ آہستہ اردو کو فروغ دینے کی کوشش کی۔ ہم نے چھوٹے چھوٹے مکتب کھول کر کام چلایا اور گورنمنٹ کو زیادہ پریشان نہ کیا۔ اس طرح چھوٹے چھوٹے اسکول کھول کر کے جلسے کر کے آپس میں مل بیٹھ کر کسی طرح ہم اپنی کوشش سے زبان کو ترقی دیتے رہے۔ اس میں کوئی ہندو مسلمان کی تخصیص نہیں رہی۔ کوئی ذات پات کا فرق نہیں رہا۔ صرف ایک زبان کے بولنے والے اکٹھے ہوتے رہے۔ لیکن اب اتنے سالوں کے بعد ہم کو محسوس ہوتا ہے کہ ہماری سب کوششیں بے کار تھیں۔ تھری لینگویجز فارمولا جس کو سنٹرل گورنمنٹ نے منظور کیا تھا اور جس کو چیف منسٹرس کانفرنس میں بھی منظور کرایا گیا تھا اس پر جب عمل درآمد کا وقت آیا تو ایک خفیہ سرکلر پہنچ جاتا ہے کہ تیسری زبان سنسکرت ہو۔ ہمیں سنسکرت سے کوئی تعصب نہیں ہے۔ سنسکرت ہو یا ہندی، فارسی ہو یا عربی ہو یا بنگالی ہو سب اپنی زبانیں ہیں۔ زبان کسی قوم کے لئے یا کسی دائرہ میں محدود نہیں ہو سکتی ہر زبان سمکھنی چاہئے۔ ہم

[شریعتی انیس قدوائی]

لوگ اس کے قائل ہیں لیکن وجہ کیا ہے کہ آپ ہمارے بچوں کو اس سے محروم رکھیں کہ وہ اپنی مادری زبان میں تعلیم نہ حاصل کر سکیں اور جس زبان میں وہ بولتے ہیں اس میں وہ خط نہ لکھ سکیں اور ایک دوسرے سے اپنے دل کی بات نہ کہہ سکیں۔ یہ کسی گورنمنٹ کو حق نہیں پہنچتا ہے کہ وہ اس طرح ایک بہت بڑی مائنرٹی کو پریشانی میں ڈال دے۔ اٹھارہ سال سے ہم یہ پریشانی اٹھا رہے ہیں اور اب ہمارے نوجوان قابو سے باہر ہو رہے ہیں اور وہ وہی طریقہ اختیار کر رہے ہیں۔ ویسا ہی ایجیٹیشن کرنا چاہتے ہیں جو ان دنوں ملک میں رائج ہو گیا ہے۔ ایسے ایجیٹیشن کو ہم نا پسند کرتے ہیں اور ہم لوگ سمجھتے ہیں کہ آئینی طریقہ برت کر مطالبہ پیش ہو اور کوئی ایجیٹیشن نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ اس سلسلہ میں کہیں ایک دن کی ایک صاحب بھوک ہڑتال کر رہے تھے اور اب سنا ہے کہ ایک اور صاحب نے پندرہ دن کی بھوک ہڑتال کا اعلان کیا ہے۔ ممکن ہے کہ ایک درجن لوگ یہاں پر بھوک ہڑتال کریں۔ ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ یہ نوبت آئے۔ ہم نہیں چاہتے کہ گورنمنٹ کو زبان کے سلسلہ میں کوئی پریشانی اٹھانی پڑے لیکن جہاں تک ذہنیت کا تعلق ہے مجھے بڑا افسوس ہے کہ اپنے وہ

ساتھی جنہوں نے گاندھی جی کے ساتھ کام کیا اور اپنے وہ ساتھی جنہوں نے گاندھی جی کی زبان سے سنا تھا کہ دو رسم الخط میں یعنی دو لکھائی میں ایک زبان ہندوستان کی زبان ہو سکتی ہے وہ آج بالکل اس سے منحرف ہو چکے ہیں۔ ابھی جب ایک سو پانچ ممبرس آف پارلیمنٹ کے دستخط کرا کے ہم نے پرائم منسٹر وغیرہ کے پاس بھیجا تھا تو میرے ایک عزیز دوست بہت پرانے ساتھی جو تھے ان کے پاس دستخط کرانے کے لئے گئی۔ انہوں نے کہا کہ دیکھئے ہم بالکل اس سے ایگری کرتے ہیں اور ہم بالکل آپ سے سہمت ہیں کہ اس زبان کے مسئلہ میں آپ لوگوں کو واقعی تکلیف ہے لیکن میں دستخط کرنے سے مجبور ہوں۔ میں نے کہا کہ اس سے جب آپ اتفاق کرتے ہیں تو آپ سائن کیوں نہیں کرتے۔ تو انہوں نے کہا کہ ہم بڑی مشکل سے تو ہندی یہاں تک لائے ہیں اور اب اگر ہم نے اس پر دستخط کر دیئے تو اندیشہ ہے اردو ہندی پر چھا جائیگی۔ میں نے کہا کہ چاہے ہندی اردو پر چھا جائے چاہے اردو ہندی پر چھا جائے بنگالی ہندی اردو دونوں پر چھا جائے مجھے تو کوئی افسوس نہیں ہوگا۔ کیوں کہ اگر یہ ساری زبانیں مل کر ایک ایسی زبان بن جائے تو اس سے ملک کا بھلا ہی ہوگا

نقصان نہیں ہوگا اور ملک کی تمام
مشکلیں حل ہو جائیں گی - معلوم
نہیں کہ آج کیا ہو گیا ہے کہ
ہم لوگ ایسی عصبیت کے شکار ہیں -
اس کا شکار ہمارے سیاست دان
بھی ہیں - اور شاعر بھی ہیں ہمارے
ادیب سبھی اس کا شکار ہوئے جا
رہے ہیں - ایک ایسی زبان کی
ہم کو ضرورت ہے جس میں ملک
کا کام چلایا جا سکے حکومتوں کو
جو اقلیت کی زبانیں ہیں ان کی
نگہداشت کرنی ہے - یہ بھی آپ
کہتے ہیں کہ کانسی ٹیوشن
میں لسانی اقلیت کے لئے سیف
گارڈ موجود ہے لیکن وہ سیف گارڈ
جو موجود ہیں وہ کیا صرف کاغذ
کے لئے ہیں - اٹھارہ سال میں ہم کو
کوئی امید نظر نہیں آئی اور اب
ہم زیادہ دن اس کا انتظار نہیں کر
سکتے - آپ کو دو ٹوک فیصلہ
کرنا چاہئے کہ آیا آپ ہماری زبان
کو دیش کی زبان مانتے ہیں یا
نہیں - آیا آپ ہماری مشکلوں کو
سمجھتے ہیں یا نہیں - آیا آپ ہماری
دشواریوں کو دور کرنا چاہتے ہیں
یا نہیں - اب ہم بالکل عاجز آ گئے
ہیں ہمارے بچے بالکل جاہل ہیں ان
کو نہ اردو آتی ہے نہ ہندی آتی
ہے اور نہ انگریزی آتی ہے وہ کسی
زبان میں اپنے دل کی بات بیان نہیں
کر سکتے - میں پوچھتی ہوں کہ جب
کشمیر کی رپورٹ بھی آپ کو بتا

رہی ہے کہ اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹس اس
پر عمل نہیں کر رہی ہیں تو کیا
ہوم منسٹری کے پاس کوئی ایسا
ذریعہ نہیں ہے کہ وہ اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹ
سے اپنی بات منوا سکے اور کانسی
ٹیوشن کے مطابق عمل کرنے پر ان
کو مجبور کر سکے - جو کچھ ہمیں
ملا ہے اس سے ہم زیادہ نہیں
مانگتے - کانسی ٹیوشن میں جو رعائتیں
ہمیں دی گئی ہیں - جن فیسلٹیز کا
بندوبست ہے ہم صرف اتنی ہی
مانگتے ہیں اور جب قانون کے اندر
ہی مانگتے ہیں تب میں نہیں سمجھتی
کہ کیا دشواری آ سکتی ہے ہوم
منسٹری کو یا کیا مشکل پیش آ
سکتی ہے ایجوکیشن منسٹری کو
اور کیوں پس و پیش ہے ہماری
اسٹیٹ گورنمنٹس کو - اگر وہ کانسی
ٹیوشن کو مانتی ہیں اور دستور کے
مطابق انہوں نے گورنمنٹ بنائی ہے
تو ان کو ہمارے مطالبات کو منظور
کرنا چاہئے -

اس رپورٹ پر کچھ زیادہ کہنے
کی ضرورت نہیں ہے اس میں جو
کچھ ہے وہ آپ کے سامنے حاضر ہے -
ہم نے لوگوں کے جذبات آپ
تک پہنچا دیئے - بہت سے نوجوان
ہیں جو ہماری بات بھی سننا پسند
نہیں کرتے وہ کہتے ہیں کہ سالہا
سال ہو گئے اور آپ ہماری آواز
بھی گورنمنٹ تک نہیں پہنچا سکے

[شریمتی انیس قدوائی]

اور اب جو ہمارا جی چاہے گا وہی کرینگے لیکن وہ کیا کرینگے؟ وہی غنڈہ گردی اسوقت جو ملک میں عام ہو رہی ہے اس لئے میری درخواست ہے کہ ایسی غنڈہ گردی کا راستہ نہ کھولنے ایسی بد نظمی کا راستہ نہ نکلنے دیا جائے اور لوگوں کو ہنگامہ آرائی پر مجبور نہ کیا جائے۔ جو لوگ ادب کے ساتھ درخواستیں پیش کر کے لاکھوں دستخط بھیج کر اور سب آئینی طریقہ اپنا کر کوشش کر چکے ہیں ان کی سزائے۔ آج نوجوانوں کی ایک نئی نسل ہے اور وہ نئی نسل یہ سوچتی ہے کہ ہمارے حقوق کی ضمانت جو کسٹی ٹیوشن میں ہے اس پر کوئی عمل نہیں کر رہا ہے۔ ان چند الفاظ کے ساتھ میں ختم کرتی ہوں۔

†[شریمتی انیس قدوائی]:

جناب وائس چیمبرمین صاحب، کئی سالوں سے مائینارٹی کمیशन کی رپورٹ ہاؤس کے سامنے پیش ہوتی رہتی ہے اور بد-کسمتی سے مجھے بھی ہمیشہ کچھ نہ کچھ اس پر کہنا پڑتا ہے اور اپنی آواز اٹھانی پڑتی ہے، کیونکہ میں اس سب سے تامل رکھتی ہوں جس میں ایک کروڑ سے زیادہ لوگ اردو زبان بولتے ہیں۔ دوسرے سبوں میں بھی اس طرح کی اقلیتوں کو موجد ہے۔

اس وقت جو رپورٹ ہمارے سامنے آئی ہے اس پر نہ تو ہوم مینسٹری کوئی فکڑ کر سکتی ہے اور نہ سٹेट گورنمنٹ کوئی فکڑ کر سکتی ہے، کیونکہ کمیشنر نے اس بارے میں کافی شिकायत کی ہے کہ کس طرح سے سٹेट گورنمنٹ اس کی سیफارिशوں کو نजर انداز کر دیتی ہے اور بار-بار لکھنے

کے بعد بھی لسانی اقلیتوں کو انکا حق نہیں ملتا ہے۔ یہ تو ذمہ داری ہماری ہوم مینسٹری کی ہوتی ہے کہ وہ دیکھے کہ آیا مائینارٹی کے ساتھ مائینارٹی لँगوج کے ساتھ کیا سلوک ہو رہا ہے۔ اگر انہوں نے ایک کمیشنر مقرر کر دیا اور وہ ایک رپورٹ لکھ کر یہاں ہاؤس کی میز پر رکھ دیتا ہے تو اس سے کوئی تسکین نہیں ہو سکتی۔ نہ مसالا حل ہو سکتا ہے۔ اٹارھ سال گزر چکے ہیں اور یہ مसالا بار-بار گورنمنٹ کے سامنے لایا گیا ہے آج فیر میں کہتی ہوں کہ اب وقت آ گیا ہے جب ہوم مینسٹری کو اپنا فیسلا بیلکول آخیری اور کتई دینا चाहिए کہ آیا وہ مائینارٹی کی آواز سننے کے لیے تیار ہیں یا نہیں۔ اس سے تو میں بیلکول انکار کرتی ہوں کہ یہ زبان صرف ایک اقلیت کی زبان ہے جیسا کہ ابھی ایک ممبر نے اظہار کیا ہے۔ ہیات اٹلا صاحب نے سالتی سے ابدول حمید کی ميسال دے دی اور اس پر ہمارے 'بچن' صاحب نے اتراج کیا۔ میں کہتی ہوں کہ وہ ابدول حمید کی زبان نہ سہی لیکن میری زبان ہے ہیات اٹلا انصاری کی زبان ہے۔ اکر اली خاں صاحب کی زبان ہے سمر صاحب کی زبان ہے، پंडित कुंजरू صاحب کی زبان ہے اور गुजराल صاحب کی زبان ہے۔ ہزاروں لاکھوں اور کروڑوں کی تاداد میں اس زبان کو پڑنے والے بولنے والے موجد ہیں انکو اس طرح سے نजर-انداز کر دینا کہاں کا انصاف ہے۔ سکولوں کی تاداد کم ہوتی چلی جا رہی ہے۔ سکولوں سے ٹیچرس غایب ہوتے چلے جا رہے ہیں۔ ہر جگہ ایک درکواست دینے پر اڑا ہوتا ہے۔ ہر جگہ یہ سوال ہے کہ ہم کسے زبان کو باکی رکھیں اور کسے اپنے بچوں کو پڑاؤں اور کیا کریں۔ میں لپا پوتی کی بات نہیں کرتی۔ اس میں کوئی شک نہیں کہ مسلمانوں کو بہت زیادہ تکلیف پہنچ رہی ہے۔ جیسا کہ پہلے ایک مرتبہ میں نے کہا تھا کہ مسلمانوں کو اسلئے زیادہ تکلیف پہنچ رہی ہے

कि उन्होंने 6-7 सो साल के अन्दर अपना सारा लिटरेचर जो अरबी और फार्सी में था फ्वाह वह हिस्ट्री हो या मजहबी लिटरेचर हो या अदबी हो सब उर्दू में मुस्तकिल कर लिया था और उर्दू में इसे मुस्तकिल करने के बाद आज वह यह महसूस करते हैं कि उनके बच्चे जाहिल हैं वे नहीं जानते कि हमारे बड़े मौरिख कौन थे, वह नहीं जानते कि हमारे साइंटिस्ट या हकीमों ने क्या कुछ काम किये वह नहीं जानते कि हमारे शायर और मुंसिफ कैसे थे। इसलिये मुसलमानों को इससे ज्यादा तकलीफ होती है यह बनिसबत दूसरों के।

जहां तक यू० पी० का सवाल है वहां की गवर्नमेंट इस मामले में कुछ भी सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। हम लोग जो अंजमन तरकी उर्दू से ताल्लुक रखते हैं हमने आहिस्ता आहिस्ता उर्दू को फरोग् देने की कोशिश की। हमने छोटे-छोटे मकतब खोल कर काम चलाया और गवर्नमेंट को ज्यादा परेशान न किया। इस तरह छोटे-छोटे स्कूल खोल करके जलसे करके आपस में मिल बैठ कर किसी तरह हम अपनी कोशिश से ज़बान को तरक्की देते रहे। इसमें कोई हिन्दु-मुसलमान की तब्सीस नहीं रही। कोई जात पात का फर्क नहीं रहा। सिर्फ एक ज़बान के बोलने वाले इकट्ठे होते रहे लेकिन अब इतने सालों के बाद हमको महसूस होता है कि हमारी सब कोशिशें बेकार थीं। श्री लेंगवेजेज़ फार्मुला जिसको सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने मंजूर किया था और जिसको चीफ़ मिनिस्टर्स कांफ्रेंस में भी मंजूर कराया था इस पर जब अमल दरआमिद का वक्त आया तो एक खुफिया सरकुलर पहुंच जाता है कि तीसरी ज़बान संस्कृत हो। हमें संस्कृत से कोई तासब नहीं है। संस्कृत हो या हिन्दी, फारसी हो या अरबी हो या बंगाली हो, सब अपनी ज़बानें हैं। ज़बान किसी कौम के लिए या किसी दायरे में महबूद नहीं हो सकती, हर ज़बान सीखनी चाहिए। हम लोग इसके कायल हैं, लेकिन वजह क्या है कि आप हमारे बच्चों को इससे महरूम

रखें कि वह अपनी मादरी ज़बान में तालीम न हासिल कर सकें और जिस ज़बान में वह बोलते हैं उसमें वह खत न लिख सकें और एक दूसरे से अपने दिल की बात न कह सकें। यह किसी गवर्नमेंट को हक नहीं पहुंचता है कि वह इस तरह एक बहुत बड़ी मायनोरिटी को परेशानी में डाल दे। अठारह साल से हम यह परेशानी उठा रहे हैं और अब हमारे नौजवान काबू से बाहर हो रहे हैं और वह वही तरीका अस्तैयार कर रहे हैं। वैसा ही एजिटेशन करना चाहते हैं जो इन दिनों मुल्क में रायज हो गया है। ऐसे एजिटेशनस को हम नापसन्द करते हैं और हम लोग समझते हैं कि आयनी तरीका बरत कर मुतालबा पेश हो और कोई एजिटेशन नहीं होना चाहिए। इस सिलसिले में कहीं एक दिन की एक साहब भूख हड़ताल कर रहे थे और अब सुना है कि एक और साहब ने पन्द्रह दिन की भूख हड़ताल का एलान किया है। मुमकिन है कि एक दर्जन लोग यहां पर भूख हड़ताल करें। हम नहीं चाहते कि यह नीबत आए। हम नहीं चाहते कि गवर्नमेंट को ज़बान के सिलसिले में कोई परेशानी उठानी पड़े, लेकिन जहां तक जहूनियत का ताल्लुक है मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि अपने वह साथी जिन्होंने गांधी जी के साथ काम किया और अपने वह साथी जिन्होंने गांधी जी की ज़बान से सुना था कि दो रसमउलखत में यानी दो लिखाई में एक ज़बान हिन्दुस्तान की ज़बान हो सकती है वह आज बिल्कुल इससे मुनहरिफ हो चुके हैं। अभी जब एक सो पांच मेम्बर्स आफ पार्लियामेन्ट के दस्तखत कराके हमने प्राइम मिनिस्टर वगैरह के पास भेजा था तो मेरे एक अजीज दोस्त, बहुत पुराने साथी जो थे उनके पास दस्तखत कराने के लिए गई। उन्होंने कहा कि देखिए हम बिल्कुल इससे एग्री करते हैं और हम बिल्कुल आप से सहमत हैं कि इस ज़बान के मसले में आप लोगों की वाकई तकलीफ है लेकिन में दस्तखत करने पे मजबूर हूँ। मैंने कहा कि इससे जब आप इत्तेफाक करते हैं तो आप

[श्रीमती अनोस किदवाई]

साइन क्यों नहीं करते। तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम बड़ी मुश्किल से तो हिन्दी को यहां तक लाए हैं और अब अगर हमने इस पर दस्तखत कर दिए तो अन्देश है उर्दू हिन्दी पर छा जाएगी। मैंने कहा कि चाहे हिन्दी उर्दू पर छा जाए, चाहे उर्दू हिन्दी पर छा जाए, चाहे बंगाली हिन्दी उर्दू दोनों पर छा जाए, मुझे तो कोई अफसोस नहीं होगा। क्योंकि अगर यह सारी जवानें मिल कर एक ऐसी जवान बन जाए तो इससे मुल्क का भला ही होगा नुकसान नहीं होगा और मुल्क की तमाम मुश्किलें हल हो जाएंगी। मालूम नहीं क्या हो गया है कि हम लोग ऐसी असबियत के शिकार हैं। इसका शिकार हमारे सियासतदान भी हैं। और शायर भी, हमारे अदीब सभी इसका शिकार हुए जा रहे हैं। एक ऐसी जवान की हमको जरूरत है जिसमें मुल्क का काम चलाया जा सके। हुकूमतों को जो अकलियत की जवानें हैं, उनकी निगेहदाश्त करनी है। यह भी आप कहते हैं कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में लसानी अकलियत के लिए सेफ गार्ड मौजूद है लेकिन वह सेफ गार्ड जो मौजूद है वह क्या सिर्फ कागज के लिए है। अठारह साल में हमको कोई उम्मीद नजर नहीं आई और अब हम ज्यादा दिन इसका इन्तेजार नहीं कर सकते। आप को दो टूक फैसला करना चाहिए कि आया आप हमारी जवान को देश की जवान मानते हैं या नहीं। आया आप हमारी मुश्किलों को समझते हैं या नहीं आया आप हमारी दुश्वारियों को दूर करना चाहते हैं या नहीं। अब हम बिल्कुल आजिज आ गये हैं। हमारे बच्चे बिल्कुल जाहिल हैं उनको न उर्दू आती है न हिन्दी आती है और न अंग्रेजी आती है। वह किसी जवान में अपने दिल की बात बयान नहीं कर सकते। मैं पूछती हूँ कि जब कमिश्नर की रिपोर्ट भी आपको बता रही है कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स इस पर अमल नहीं कर रही है तो क्या होम मिनिस्ट्री के पास ऐसा जरिया नहीं है कि वह स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से

अपनी बात मनवा सके और कांस्टिट्यूशन के मुताबिक अमल कराने पर उनको मजबूर कर सके। जो कुछ हमें मिला है उससे हम ज्यादा नहीं मांगते। कांस्टिट्यूशन में जो रियायतें हमें दी गई हैं, जिन फिलेसिटीज का बन्दोबस्त है, हम सिर्फ उतनी ही मांगते हैं और जब कानून के अन्दर ही मांगते हैं तब मैं नहीं समझती कि क्या दुश्वारी आ सकती है। होम-मिनिस्ट्री को क्या मुश्किल पेश आ सकती है, एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री को और क्यों पसोपेश है हमारी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को। अगर वह कांस्टिट्यूशन को मानती हैं और दस्तूर के मुताबिक उन्होंने गवर्नमेंट बनाई है तो उनके हमारे मुतालबात को मंजूर करना चाहिए।

इस रिपोर्ट पर कुछ ज्यादा कहने की जरूरत नहीं है, इसमें जो कुछ है वह आप के सामने हाजिर है। हमने लोगों के जज्बात आप तक पहुंचा दिए। बहुत से नौजवान लोग हैं जो हमारी बात भी सुनना पसन्द नहीं करते, वे कहते हैं कि बरसूँहा बरस हो गये और आप हमारी आवाज भी गवर्नमेंट तक नहीं पहुंचा सके और अब जो हमारा जी चाहेगा वही करेंगे, लेकिन वह क्यों करेंगे? वही गुंडा-गर्दी इस वकत जो मुल्क में आम हो रही है इसलिए मेरी दरखवास्त है कि ऐसी गुंडा-गर्दी का रास्ता न खोलें, ऐसी बद-नजमी का रास्ता न निकलने दिया जाए और लोगों को हंगामा आराई पर मजबूर न किया जाए। जो लोग अदब के साथ दरखवास्तें पेश करके, लाखों दस्तखत भेज कर और सब आयनी तरीके अपना कर कोशिश कर चुके हैं, उनकी सुनिए। आज नौजवानों की एक नई नसल है और वह नई नसल यह सोचती है कि हमारे हुकू की जमानत जो कांस्टिट्यूशन में है, उस पर कोई अमल नहीं हो रहा है। इन चन्द अलफ़ाज के साथ मैं खतम करती हूँ।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : Mr. Mani, which minority language are you going to speak on?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I represent the majority language in the country, the largest single group, that is, Hindi.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : Five minutes.

SHRI A. D. MANI : No, ten minutes. I have got some points to make.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :
The debate will continue on Monday.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad that the House has an opportunity of discussing the Sixth and Seventh Reports of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities. The Sixth and Seventh Reports will assume importance in the years to come when the various universities adopt the regional languages as their medium of instruction and when the staff recruited in the secretariats of the various State Governments will largely consist of persons who speak what they call local language. The Commissioner himself has referred to the fact that the acceptance of the regional languages as medium of instruction in the universities would cause a certain change in the present situation. I feel, Sir, that the time has come for the Home Ministry to consider a further amendment of article 350, 350A and 350B. If the House were to scrutinise article 350A it will be seen that under that article the various local authorities are asked to give instruction in primary education in the mother-tongue of the children belonging to linguistic minority groups. This has been largely fulfilled by a number of State Governments.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
Violated.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Largely fulfilled, at least certain portions had been fulfilled in regard to primary education. Article 150B says :

"(1) "There shall be a Special Officer for linguistic minorities

(2) It shall be the duty of the Special Officer to investigate all matters relating to the safeguards provided for linguistic minorities under this Constitution and report to the President upon those matters at such intervals as the President may direct, and the President shall cause all such reports to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to

the Governments of the States concerned."

It is here that the machinery for the protection of linguistic minorities is not so adequate as the circumstances warrant. Frankly the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities is not given the respect that is due to him in the Constitution. The Report bristles with a number of cases where references made by him to various State Governments have not been replied to so far. I do not want to single out any particular State Government because that might arouse some controversy in this House. A number of State Governments do not regard this Officer as fulfilling an essential purpose or a necessary purpose under the Constitution and I feel that the time has come, in view of the fact that the language complexion of the various universities is changing, for Government to give some powers to the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities to see that his recommendations are accepted by the State Governments.

I feel also that the Home Minister should advise the State Governments to provide some time in the legislative forum for the discussion of this Report as far as the State is concerned. This matter has never been discussed in any of the State Legislatures. Though there are various grievances of linguistic minorities in the various States, this matter has not been discussed on the floor of the State Legislatures. I quite agree that a discussion in Parliament serves the purpose, as far as the Constitution is concerned, but if the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities is to be effective, he must have his Report discussed at least for one or two hours in the State Legislatures, so that the grievances of linguistic minorities may be ventilated there.

The second point I would like to make is that the Report mentions a large number of cases of glaring violations of the safeguards which have been contemplated in the Constitution. The Commissioner mentions in his Seventh Report that in spite of the Public Employment Act, which was passed in 1957, which removed domiciliary restrictions, the Assam Government issued public notifications asking for candidates who are natives and domiciled to apply for certain posts. This matter has been taken up by the Commissioner for

[Shri A. D. Mani.] Linguistic Minorities with the concerned State Government, but so far there has been no satisfactory clarification of the attitude of the State Government as far as this matter is concerned.

There have also been cases where domiciliary restrictions have been imposed by other States. In the case of Madhya Pradesh, which has been free from linguistic , bitterness of any kind, there is a stipulation that in respect of employment in certain categories, the person concerned must have passed a qualifying examination from a school in the State. That matter has been taken up at the Regional Council meeting, but I feel that in regard to domiciliary restrictions we have got to take the facts into account. My hon. friend, Mr. Lokanath Misra, said that the domiciliary restrictions should go, but there are categories of Government servants, who by their local talent will be the most suitable for employment. For example, in respect of Class IV, in the case of chaprassis, who are not called upon to do any clerical work, it is not possible to insist that there should be no domiciliary restrictions or there should be no language qualification prescribed for such categories.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar) : I fail to understand what has domicile to do with this matter, because the Linguistic Commissioner's duty is to protect the interests of the linguistic minorities living in a particular State. Therefore, it is assumed that the man is domiciled in that State. He has certain linguistic rights which are different from the linguistic rights of the majority and he should protect them. Domicile has nothing to do with it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: The question of domicile arises this way. The person, who is not domiciled, belongs to another State and speaks a different language.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would just like to ask Mr. Sinha whether he has come through the Report itself because it mentions about the domiciliary certificate. Without going through it, if Mr. Sinha asks a question, how can he reply?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : If the Linguistic Minorities Commissioner has pronounced on the domicile issue, he has exceeded his jurisdiction.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) : Order, order.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like this matter to be considered at the Zonal Council Meeting. It is not fair to insist that in the case of chaprassis, who have to speak the local language, applications should be invited from all over India. There has got to be some stipulation in respect of language in regard to Class IV. In regard to Classes, HI, II and I, I agree with the recommendation made by the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, that no language test should be prescribed as a condition precedent for employment and that the language test should come in after the period of probation is over. That is the position normally understood. In this connection I must say with regret that the State of U.P., which has been in the vanguard of political advance in India has not set up a very good example in regard to the prescription of the language test. There Hindi is compulsory.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY : They say they are a backward State.

SHRI A. D. MANI: So, Hindi is compulsory. The linguistic minorities do not get that necessary protection which the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has been urging in his previous Reports in the State of U.P., though the State, I must say, is also free from linguistic bitterness of the kind which has disfigured the history of other States in other Darts of India. I feel that in regard to the language question we ought to take a reasonable view and that is in respect of certain categories of employees a knowledge of the local language is necessary and that if there is any insistence on that qualification as a pre-condition to employment, there should be no objection on the part of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities.

There is also a genuine feeling and that feeling is shared by many people in Orissa that in the case of public sector undertakings, the local people do not get opportunities for adequate employment. It is again a question of linguistic minorities and so on. We should try, as far as possible, to see in respect of these subordinate categories that a language qualification, which is suitable for the requirements of the State, is insisted upon and if the matter is