

[Mr. Chairman.]

of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted 30 minutes for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1963, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

I have to inform Members that under Rule 162 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted 30 minutes for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Appropriation (Railways) No. 4 Bill, 1963, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

I have to inform Members that under Rule 162 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted 30 minutes for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1963, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE EXPORT (QUALITY CONTROL AND INSPECTION) BILL, 1963

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Bill, 1963, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd May, 1963."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL, 1963—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry that some Members on Saturday still wanted to speak but since we had taken . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): I have not completed my speech. I was speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): On Saturday a very unfortunate thing happened. Let him continue his speech and other speakers . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you had completed your speech. I find from the record . . .

SHRI G. MURAHARI: No, no. I have not completed it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The time should be extended and all Members should be allowed to take part in the discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You see that thing, whether he has completed it or not. But I may submit, Sir. This debate was continued in the other House for, I think, five days. And it was originally fixed for two days. Then it continued for five days. Many things happened there. They had all kinds of discussions and so on. In our House, suddenly it was decided that we must keep to this thing, not because perhaps you were not opposed to it. But you may think. So as the House is to adjourn on the 10th we can sit a little longer. I do not think, Sir, that any large number of speakers had been called, and I do not think it will be right, over a matter like this, that we should apply strictly this kind of thing when we do extend in some cases. Yesterday what happened? At 6.39 or so the House was adjourned. We were told that the debate might continue on Monday also, and then suddenly, at 6.39, when he was speaking—whether

he had finished by then or not, he will say—the House was adjourned. It was 6.39 and you will see it in the proceedings, not 6.40.

Now, Sir, perhaps the Home Minister has got some business. Then we can adjust our time according to his convenience also. I know that he has got plenty of work. But then, why must we be dragged at the tail all the time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It had been announced before by the Deputy Chairman that the Minister would reply at 11 o'clock today.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That was not settled. Just at the point when he was getting up . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was also announced earlier.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: 11 o'clock? Then we could have sat yesterday a little longer. Why these things are cut out? Sometimes Government does not give business, and you adjourn the House at 4 o'clock. Whenever it is to the convenience of the Government we will have to trail behind. It does not look good that Opposition is always dragged at the tail in this manner. I say this is a matter—it is not a party question—over which people wanted to speak, and let them have a chance to speak. For another ten years we may not discuss a subject like this at all. Therefore, Sir, I think it is a legitimate issue. Among hon Members opposite many are there who wanted to speak but have been denied. On this side also there were some, and this matter, as I said, may not be discussed for another ten years. Let it not look as if discussion had been curtailed in an important matter like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the suggestion, but there are always marginal cases. In the case of questions, for instance, I allow three, four,

even five supplementaries to the person who puts the question. Now, usually, people whose question it is not, put two, three, and sometimes even four supplementaries, which I allow. Then, when I pass on to the next question, some people still stand up and I am very sorry I am not giving them a chance. In the case of speeches also there is always a very long list; the time is restricted. People themselves seem constitutionally not in a position to restrict their speeches. Very few Members make brief speeches. It is all long speeches and a long list of speakers.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Why should we be made to suffer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Therefore, there would always be marginal cases. Some people would not at all be able to speak, or some people would not be able to speak at the length they wish to, but if it is the wish of the House, I can continue the House indefinitely. I am sure the House will not supply the quorum. I know people insist on a meeting up to a certain time, but then, at a later stage, the quorum is not maintained. Yesterday the meeting was to last till 6. Then, instead of 6, it lasted till 6.30. Then it lasted till 6.39 and even then there were some Members who had to be left out. If the House had continued till 6.45, there would still have been one or two Members who wanted to speak. So what shall we do with these marginal cases? We would like to have some consideration from the House also. I therefore hope that the Members would cooperate with me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody asked for our opinion. We were just told "adjourned." We were sitting here. We would have been open for consultation. But nothing was done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are thirty Members in the list that I have. If you plead for the two, I might plead for the thirty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not pleading for anybody. I am asking you to consider whether it is possible for you to accommodate some. That is all I am asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is the difficulty. Since I had thirty names and it was impossible to accommodate them all, there had to be some marginal cases, and at some margin the debate will have to stop. I hope you would co-operate with me and I will see to it that most of the people get the chance to speak. There are also the amendments that are coming up. I have spoken to Mr. Abdul Ghani. He will be able to speak on the amendment. Mr. Solomon also will be able to speak on the amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We always speak on the amendments. The amendments are there. The House must have a fair chance to discuss the amendments. We shall speak on the amendments and the clauses.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR (West Bengal): May I make a submission? The Business Advisory Committee had originally allotted 7 hours for this discussion and we have already exceeded that time limit by at least 4 hours. I wanted to submit it for the attention of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Congress Party has it within its power and they may move you to apply the guillotine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not reply to everything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Otherwise we will have to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Murahari, do you think you had not finished your speech?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But my record shows that you finished your speech yesterday.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: They rang the bell. I sat down and they immediately announced that the House was adjourned saying this much that the Home Minister would reply on Monday, that is, today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably you finished your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I wish you were here at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you insist on speaking now?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please speak then.

श्री गोड़े मुराहरी: महापति जी, जैसा कि मैं उस दिन आपके सामने कह रहा था कि यह जो विधेयक हमारे सामने लाया गया है उसका यह नतीजा होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान का एक वर्ग जिसका आबादी करीब २५ लाख है, यानि जो अंग्रेजों पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान का ४० करोड़ जनता को छात्रों पर बैठ कर हमेशा के लिए राजकाज और हुकूमत चलायेंगे इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान को जनता का भाषा में अगर राजकाज चलाना है, जनता का राज होना है तो हमारा जो जनता का भाषा है उसमें कामकाज होना चाहिये। मैंने उस दिन कहा था और आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर श्री अण्णादुरै और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू एक साथ बैठ जायें और इस मामले का कोई हल निकाल ले तो मैं उसको मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ, बनिस्बत इसके कि अंग्रेजों फौरन हटे। मैं इस चीज को पूर्ण जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी और डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया तथा सबका और से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस तरह से कोई मामले का हल निकाले तो मैं उसको मानने के

लिए तैयार हूँ बनिस्बत इसके कि अंग्रेजी फौरन खत्म हो जाये। हिन्दी इलाके के लोगों को हम इस बात में राजा कर लेंगे और मुझे आशा है कि वे लोग इस बात को मंजूर कर लेंगे। अगर इस तरह की बात नहीं होती है तो हम लोगों को सोचना पड़ेगा कि इस मसले को किस तरह से हल किया जा सकता है। एक तो हमारे देश में जो कामकाज है वह राजभाषा हिन्दी द्वारा होना चाहिये और हर एक प्रान्त में अपना अपना भाषा में कामकाज होना चाहिये। अगर तामिलनाडु या बंगाल वाले इस चीज का विरोध करते हैं कि हिन्दी में केन्द्राय सरकार का कामकाज नहीं होना चाहिये तो हम उन्हें नौकरों में संरक्षण दे सकते हैं। हम इस बारे में उनसे यह कह सकते हैं कि हम दस साल तक हिन्दी इलाके वालों को नौकरा नहीं देंगे और अहिन्दी इलाके वालों को दस साल तक हा नौकरा दा जायेंगे।

श्री बी० डी० खोबर गढ़े (महाराष्ट्र) :
क्या आप यह बात मनवा लेंगे ?

श्री गोड़े मुराहरि : हां, इसमें कोई शंका नहीं है। अगर इस चीज को भी वे मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं तो अहिन्दी भाषी प्रान्तों वालों को जनसंख्या के आधार पर संरक्षण दे दिया जाना चाहिये। जिस प्रान्त की जितनी संख्या है उसके आधार पर उम प्रान्त के लोगों को नौकरी में लिया जाना चाहिये। अगर इस चीज को भी मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं तो हम बहुभाषी केन्द्र पसन्द करेंगे। हमारे देश में जितना देशा भाषाएं हैं उनमें केन्द्र का कामकाज चलाया जाना चाहिये। अगर बहुभाषी केन्द्र भी पसन्द नहीं है तो फिर इस चीज के लिए तैयार होना चाहिये कि केन्द्र में हिन्दी प्रान्त वालों के लिए एक अलग महकमा खोल दिया जाये और अहिन्दी प्रान्तों वालों के लिए अलग महकमा खोल दिया जाये। सेण्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के अन्दर हिन्दी प्रान्त वालों के लिए हिन्दी में काम चलाया जाये और अहिन्दी प्रान्त वालों के

लिए, अगर वे चाहें तो अंग्रेजी में काम चला सकते हैं, जब तक कि वे हिन्दी या कोई दूसरी भाषा को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं होते। अगर वे इस चीज के लिए तैयार हैं तो अहिन्दी प्रान्त वाले जब तक चाहें अंग्रेजी में कामकाज केन्द्राय सरकार में चला सकते हैं, लेकिन जो हिन्दी प्रान्त हैं उनको तुरन्त सब कामकाज हिन्दी में शुरू कर देना चाहिये। इन तमाम चीजों को दृष्टि में रख कर काम करेंगे तो फिर इस मसले का हल हो सकता है। जिस तरह से यह बिल लाया जा रहा है उससे तो आगे आने वाला जनता दुविधा में पड़ जायेगा और न उसे हिन्दी का ही ज्ञान अच्छा तरह से होगा और न अंग्रेजी का ही। हिन्दी तो राजभाषा है और साथ साथ अंग्रेजी को उम पर लाद रहे हैं तो इसका नतीजा क्या होगा ? आजकल का जो शासकवर्ग है वह अपनी खुदगर्जी के लिए ऐसा करना चाहता है और हमेशा हम देखते आ रहे हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में यही परम्परा थी। पहले जो शासकवर्ग था वह संस्कृत में काम चलाता था जब कि जनता को उससे कोई मतलब नहीं था और जनभाषा वह नहीं थी। उसके बाद में उन्होंने फारसी में अपना काम चलाया जबकि जनता से उसका कोई मतलब नहीं था और जब अंग्रेज आये तो उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में काम चलाया। तो एक विदेशी भाषा के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान की जनता पर शासन करना यह शासकवर्ग का एक तरीका रहा है और आज भी हम देखते हैं कि चन्द लोग, ३५ लाख लोग जो कि अंग्रेजी समझने वाले हैं वह अपनी हुकूमत कायम करने के लिये अंग्रेजी को हिन्दुस्तान के ४६ करोड़ लोगों के ऊपर लादना चाहते हैं। तो इसको बन्द करना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो भाषा विधेयक है इसको खत्म किया जाये और इसका घोर विरोध करके इसको गिरा दिया जाये।

श्री सभापति : श्री अब्दुल रानी, अगर आप बोलना चाहें तो बोल सकते हैं।

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) :

میں تو کبھی اصرار نہیں کرتا۔ آپ نہیں تو ایمپلیمینٹس کے وقت بول سکتا ہوں۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) : मैं तो कभी इसरार नहीं करता। अगर आप कहें तो इम्प्लेमेंट्स के वक्त बोल सकता हूँ।]

श्री सभापति : मेरे पास तो ३३ नाम हैं और मैं तैतीसों को बुला सकता हूँ। अपोजीशन के नाम कम हैं लेकिन यह फेयर नहीं है कि ये किसी पार्टी के हों तो इन लोगों को न बुलाया जाये और दूसरों को बुलाया जाये। अगर आप चाहते हों तो मैं आपको जरूर बोका दूंगा।

شری عبدالغنی : میں بھجے

بولوں گا۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : मैं पीछे बोलूंगा।]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Solomon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He is not there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In deference to your wishes, Mr. Solomon has decided not to speak. And after what you have said we do not propose to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope any other Members in the list of 33 are not anxious to speak at this stage. Now I would request the Home Minister to speak.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I somehow feel that I have not much to say as there has been general support lent to this Bill. There has been a thought-provoking discussion

and great restraint shown in the speeches, and I am thankful to all the Members of the House for supporting this measure.

Sir, It is clear that the basic proposition that Hindi should be the official language of the Union, as provided in article 343(1), is generally acceptable. In the circumstances, the only question that remains to be considered is how to implement the change-over to Hindi without causing any disturbance to those who come from the non-Hindi-speaking areas. I personally think that we will have to adopt a constructive approach to this matter. On the one hand, there will have to be teaching and learning of Hindi done on a good scale. In Government services also, without introduction of compulsion, we have to create conditions in which those in service will willingly and voluntarily learn Hindi and be prepared to fall in line at some later date when we are in a position to switch over from English to Hindi in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. I do not think that there should be any real difference over his matter. In all wisdom we should take steps which will fulfil this objective without creating bitterness or vitiating the atmosphere.

Sir, if I deal with the main points raised by Shri Annadurai, I would have perhaps covered almost all the essential points raised against this Bill, and I shall try to do so as briefly as possible.

As far as I could see, Shri Annadurai raised three or four points. He said that the provisions of this Bill are doubtful. He said that I indicated, or I suggested, that the provisions of the Bill could as well be discussed in a law court and the decision of the law court would be or should be considered final. I am sorry, Sir, that Shri Annadurai perhaps misunderstood me. I was not suggesting that the language of this Bill, or any of the provisions, is not clear, or it need-

†[] Hindi transliteration.

ed the views or the comment of any court. What I was mentioning was in regard to the use of the words authoritative text in Hindi, and in that respect I had said that it would be for the courts to accept any text they thought proper. There will be three texts, the regional—if the official language is a regional language, then it would be in the regional language—and along with the regional language, a Hindi translation of it, if the State Government so provided, and side by side, an English version also. So, I had merely said in reply to a question put by one of the hon. Members there, that it would be for the courts to accept the version or the text they thought best. But I had never said that in any way the language of this Bill creates misgivings. It is absolutely clear.

Then he said that the Congress Party was coaxed into accepting this Bill, or the provisions of this Bill. And, thirdly, he referred to the assurance given by the Prime Minister.

Well, in so far as the Congress Party is concerned, it is true that we have had many discussions with the Members of the Congress Party and it is also true that the Members of the Congress Party held strong views on certain matters, especially Members coming from the South as well as from West Bengal and other States. Similarly, there were equally strong views held by others who come from the Hindi-speaking areas. I met all of them and met them a number of times, and have to pay my compliments to them for accepting the Bill as it is today.

It is true that certain suggestions were made and I had to incorporate them. They had also some doubts over the words "may" and "shall" as I had mentioned in my earlier speech. But they conceded my point, and they were good enough at least to withdraw their objection. The point is that what the Congress Party has done is the only right course which should be adopted by the country as a whole or by the other political parties in so

far as this question of language is concerned, I do not consider that the issue of the language could be considered as a political issue or a party issue. It is important that it should be considered as a national issue and a national problem. And I would, therefore, beseech Shri Annadurai and his friends to consider this matter in that text. I do not want to compliment the party to which I belong, but I must say that it is the one political party which has tried to help to maintain the stability of the country. This party has taken a balanced view of things on all national matters. It has not considered them from purely party point of view or from purely election point of view. This was a problem or this was a matter which could have been shelved for some time. If I had taken a narrow view of things or the Government had taken a narrow view of things, we might as well have postponed it. There are by-elections going on in the country. The hon. Member is aware—I do not want to name the persons—that there are some people standing who will naturally try to exploit . . .

12 Noon

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You mean by-election where a Minister is campaigning against the Congress candidate?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: A Minister has every right to stand . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A Congress Minister is campaigning against the Congress candidate.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: How can that be?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Statements against the husband become very good election campaign . . .

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Unfortunately Mr. Gupta's intelligence is very poor. What am I to do? He should develop another agency. I

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

know his Party has got some agency to collect intelligence of a special type.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have no intelligence. I read the U.P. Minister's statement about her husband and, therefore, I thought it was a good election campaign.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I merely wanted to say that this was the time when purely for political reasons or party reasons we could have shelved this Bill for some time. We could have taken it up in the next Session. We did not do it. There is no harm even if we are defeated in some constituency but we cannot give in on fundamental issues which concern the whole country and the whole population and I am sorry that Mr. Annadurai should have said that this Bill has been brought deliberately during the emergency period. He should have commented otherwise. In fact, he should have complimented us. There has been a talk about this matter for the last 2 or 3 years because now 1965 was coming closer and nearer and there was a feeling in the non-Hindi speaking areas as to what will happen after 1965, and they felt that it was essential for the Government to bring some Bill which would make it possible for the continuance of English after January 1955. We have been giving thought to this matter for some time past. We would have brought this measure a little earlier but in November a special situation in the country had developed because of the Chinese aggressions and we had therefore to postpone it, but we were very keen that we should bring up this Measure during this Session and we have done so. But as I said, instead of appreciating our position in this regard, Mr. Annadurai felt that we have done it deliberately so that the Government could take strong measures during the emergency period if any one opposed it. So far there have been no coaxing or no compulsion at all. Even in the Congress Party, as I said, there has been no compulsion on Members. We have

not even used some kind of a whip or issued any kind of whip. Formerly something may have been done but now every Member has been left free and in fact, one of the Members has actually opposed it. So, we have given complete freedom to Members, and in regard to any action being taken during the emergency period against people who do not comply with the provisions of the Bill, we have not thought of that at all. Of course, the point has to be considered, if an occasion arises, when there is complete defiance of law or defiance of authority, and if it disturbs the law and order position of a State or a particular area. They are general matters, whether they are in connection with this Bill or in connection with any other matter. The safety and protection of life and property is the first duty of the Government and I have every hope that nothing will be done which the Government may action in which the Government may have to take any action. However, I have every hope that Shri Annadurai and his friends will seriously give further thought to this matter before they launch any kind of action. He referred to the assurance of the Prime Minister. I need not say anything in that respect because the Prime Minister himself intervened in the debate and he has made the position quite clear.

About one thing I wanted to say Shri Annadurai was good enough to say some kind words about me. He perhaps does not know my shortcomings; otherwise he would have been a bit reticent in his compliments. However, I must express my sincere thankfulness to him for the kind words he said, but I wanted to tell him and the House that it is not a question of the Prime Minister or myself being here or there or in the office. It is not a question of personality. The question of language is so important that any Government which comes into power or any Prime Minister or Home Minister who takes up this office after us will have to think a hundred times before impos-

ing any common language on the country. The language issue has to be viewed in a much wider context. You cannot consider it from a narrow angle. The matter will have to be considered in a much wider context and it would be impossible for a democratic Government not to carry all the people, as a whole, with it. If it does not, its results are obvious. So, I would appeal that this matter need not be considered purely from an individual's point of view. We know that there are countries in which there is an authoritarian Government, at least in one neighbour country of ours and even there it has not been possible for them to have one common language throughout the country. I am referring to East Pakistan. The Bengali-speaking people in East Pakistan have been refusing to accept Urdu as the only official language of the State. Bengali continues there. So even an authoritarian Government does not find it possible to make a quick change and they are putting up with the present situation.

Somewhere Ceylon was quoted. I agree that in Ceylon one language has been accepted as the official language of the State but India could not be compared with Ceylon. It is a vast country with about 45 crores of population and with 14 languages being used in the different States. Is it possible for us to copy Ceylon in that matter or will it be a practical proposition to say that we will just brush aside all the 14 languages, we will not recognise what the mother-tongue of the others in the non-Hindi-speaking area is and impose some kind of a law on the whole country and make one language as the official language of India? I say that there can be no comparison between India and other smaller countries. It is, therefore, pertinent on my part to say that this is a proposition which will have to be considered carefully and cautiously by any Government which comes into power in this country.

On one matter Mr. Annadurai expressed his intense feeling and he used very nice words to express them. He said that we should not go by arithmetical majority and we should think in terms of ethical majority. As I said, it was very well put but what is it that we are doing at present? Are we trying to impose anything on the nation as a whole? What have we done? Under article 343(1), as was said just now, after January 1965, Hindi becomes the official language of the Union. Now, we decide, under this Bill, that English will continue as an additional language by the side of Hindi. In that way, we are trying to satisfy the minority element to which a reference was made by Shri Annadurai. Therefore, we are making provision in this Bill, by which there will be constant consultation after ten years when the matter is taken up. There will be full consultation with both the Houses of Parliament and later on or side by side or simultaneously, there will be consultation with the State Governments as soon as the Report of the Committee is received. It will be referred to the State Governments also in addition to being discussed in Parliament. No better consultation could be possible than this and if the majority of this House or of the other House is prepared to lend its support to this measure, will the hon. Member consider it an ethical or an arithmetical majority. It is wrong to suggest, as I said just now, that any Member is working under compulsion. It is in their wisdom that they have come to the conclusion that in this matter, a balanced view, a balanced approach is absolutely essential. Does not Mr. Annadurai see myself being attacked by those who come from the Hindi-speaking areas? Prof. Dinkar spoke very well indeed but one could see the kind of criticism and bitterness which existed in it. The words he used were careful words but it was very easy for me to understand the depth of his feeling.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is a poet.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: He is a poet and it was indeed a fine speech that he made, although he was highly critical of me and my stand. He thought that we were deliberately doing it. He said, why should we be doing this or bringing this measure before the House during the emergency? The same argument was used by Mr. Annadurai and there may be much in common between Mr. Annadurai and Dinkarji than between him and me and between Dinkarji and myself. So, this is an obvious proof of the fact that Government is pursuing the middle course, the right path, with a view to carrying the substantial majority of the country with it. I do not want to deny Mr. Annadurai's following. It may not be very big but in Madras, as he said—he himself admitted that there may be opposition to his move from Mysore, from Andhra and from Kerala—he has his hold on a portion of Madras or a section of the people living in Madras but that apart, the point is clear that we have taken this step and this middle course and, as the hon. Prime Minister said, this compromise with a view to giving satisfaction and as Shri Annadurai wanted, to doing it by persuasion. Our approach has been a peaceful approach in all matters and our method has been of persuasion and conversion and I beg to say that we have done nothing else so far and we do not propose to do anything else in the future except to adopt a peaceful approach and the approach of persuasion and to make people agree to our views and carry them along with us. I think, Sir, Mr. Annadurai would agree that there could be no other approach which could be called ethical than what we have adopted. The only basic difference between Shri Annadurai and ourselves is—he agrees in most of the matters with us but the basic difference is—that he thinks that there should be no common language in the country. This I am not able to appreciate or understand and I do not know how it would be possible for us to work together, to

communicate with each other if there is no common language but because he is opposed to Hindi, he feels that English alone may be allowed to continue. Perhaps, in a way, he will agree and I am glad he did say that the Hindi-speaking States should be allowed to develop Hindi. Let them adopt it and implement it fully in their own States so that the other States might also follow them. This is the right approach. I hope I am not misquoting him. If what I have understood is right, he said:

"Therefore, I would request, I would plead with Hindi States to make their own language their State official language, work it out and make it acceptable to everyone else if they want it."

I think this is just the right approach. I entirely agree with him that the State Governments in the Hindi-speaking areas should adopt Hindi, should develop it fully and try to spread it. If they succeed in introducing it as the official language of the State and implementing it fully, it would be much easier for other States to follow the Hindi-speaking States. They will get the vocabulary, they will get the words and they may be able to introduce them in the administration. I am speaking of the non-Hindi speaking areas. I think this is exactly what Mr. Annadurai had meant and I give him my whole-hearted support but in that case, it means . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In the non-Hindi speaking States it will be the regional language.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It is a different matter. Let it be developed as the regional language but the same thing becomes the common language if Hindi is adopted for the Centre or Hindi is adopted in the States or as a language of inter-State communication. It comes to the same thing. In the Hindi-speaking States it might be adopted or accepted as the regional

language. I do not say that but if it is to be adopted as the official language of the Union, naturally, the same thing, more or less, will have to be adopted in other States. Mr. Annadurai said that India is a multi-lingual State. Well, the Prime Minister said that he was perfectly right but I may remind him—I have not actually read it but I was told—that the Memorandum which was presented to the Committee of Members of Parliament, to the Parliamentary Committee, at that time had used the phrase "India is a multi-lingual nation" but not as some people had put it as "multi-lingual national States"? I mean, you may have India as a multi-lingual nation. Languages are different but the words used there are "multi-lingual nation". They are not different, independent States. The States are all integrated into one and the Union is supreme or Parliament is the supreme authority. So, even the Memorandum, given by the Government of Madras, had taken that view, and, I do not know, I may be not wholly correct but as far as I remember, the Memorandum of the Government of Madras was sent to the Parliamentary Committee then in consultation and perhaps with the approval of the opposition parties in the State legislature of Madras. It may not be correct but that is my impression.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): I may mention that the Memorandum was not supported unanimously. There were dissents.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Well, then, I do not want to press but the point is that consultation was made with all the opposition parties by the Chief Minister and others. Now, I do not say anything about our distinguished leader, Shri Rajagopalachariji. He is not here in the House but he has been making statements. More or less, in a way he has suggested—not in a way but directly—that the Constitution should be amended, and the same thing was repeated by Shri Annadu-

rai also. Again, if I remember right, Rajaji was strongly opposed to the setting up of the States Reorganisation Commission. He had expressed his views and had written to the Prime Minister and I had also occasion to talk with him and I remember he said that it was not a wise step and that it might as well be postponed for some time. Why did he say so? Naturally, as a national leader he felt that this might lead to disintegration and the country should not be weakened. Now, to suggest at this moment that the Constitution should be amended, is to my mind not a very helpful move. The House fully knows as to what amount of difficulties cropped up in the constituent Assembly when the question of official language was considered and as the House is aware all the views were there represented in the Constituent Assembly. Our best brains were available in the Constituent Assembly. They gave considerable thought to this matter for days and days and it is in their wisdom that they came to the decision that the official language of the Union should be Hindi. Do we now want to repeat the same thing again and create a controversy in the country and in a way weaken the country? About this constitutional amendment, I personally feel that it is not necessary as clause 3 of article 343 of the Constitution enables Parliament to provide for the continued use of English beyond 1965. It should be remembered that the constitutional provisions relating to official language present an integrated and comprehensive scheme. It provides for the introduction of Hindi as well as of other national languages for official purposes of the Union at the Union and also at the State levels. It also gives scope for the continued use of English. The procedure laid down in the Constitution for the change-over from English to Hindi as the Union official language provides for a good deal of flexibility and has been framed with due regard to all interests. Various steps have already been taken in the States and

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

at the Centre in pursuance of the constitutional provisions. Adherence to the scheme of the Constitution or the constitutional settlement on language, as it is sometimes called, would appear in the circumstances to be the only sane and practical course to adopt. It can be fairly claimed that the interests of the non-Hindi speaking areas are fully safeguarded by the Official Languages Bill, 1963, and necessity demands on the one hand an amendment of the constitutional provisions so as to give English the status of the official language of the Union; and on the other hand a more or less immediate introduction of Hindi and change-over from English with effect from 1965 can only result, as I said, in prolonging the controversy and creating a certain amount of unnecessary bitterness. In the circumstances, I feel that no political party or group should do anything which might lead to conflict or disruption in the country in any way. If an amendment of the Constitution is suggested, I have no doubt that it will create a Hornet's nest and lead to some kind of a convulsion in the country. I say that this Bill, which I have moved, definitely wants to avoid that circumstance.

Sir, I am sorry that Shri Annadurai should have mentioned about any kind of direct action or referred to launching some kind of a movement. I have already said something about it. We are still—I mean our country has still to—digest or imbibe the true spirit and purpose of a democratic form of Government or imbibe the true spirit of democracy and I include myself also in it; I do not keep myself out or exclude anyone. The whole population in the country has to imbibe the true spirit of democracy. Now, we may be responsible; as Congressmen we may have created a spirit of defiance amongst our people but when did we do it? The context was entirely different; the situation was entirely different. The democratic man, one of the biggest democrats of the world, Gandhi, who

preached non-violence, was not prepared to use weapons under any circumstances. Even in 1945, when there was danger to the country of Japanese attack, Gandhiji said he would like to fight the Japanese in a non-violent way. What he would have done we do not know but I do not want to go to that extent. I merely want to say that even that man decided to fight the then British Government but fight it peacefully, something unique which had never happened in the history of the world before. To use the weapon of non-violence and fight in the political field was something novel and absolutely new, as I said, in the history of the world. Non-violence had been preached by big prophets, great prophets but it was confined to religion, social life, to individuals in connection with religious matters. But the use of non-violence or peaceful approach and peaceful method in the battle field or in the political field was something which Gandhiji has contributed to the world and it was never adopted before. However, I do not want to go into that much but I only wanted to say that even a man of that stature, of those views, had to adopt a defiant attitude against the then British Government. He fought them non-violently and achieved *swaraj* but now, if Gandhiji had been alive I am sure he would have shown altogether a different way to the country. Now, suppose there is deficiency in the Government; certainly it has to be tackled, it has to be handled but I need not refer to Gandhiji. We have so many ways and means of pointing out the deficiencies of Government, of resisting the views of the Government, of resisting the will of the Government. It is not only direct action which can change the attitude or approach of the Government; it works otherwise in contrary directions, if Mr. Annadurai will accept my word. If there is defiance of law if there is defiance of authority, naturally the Government is determined more and more not to accept that challenge. How is

this country to work and function if all the time there is a section in the country which will oppose the laws, which will defy the authority? Well, there will be complete chaos in the country. Do we contemplate that kind of chaos and if that happens, it would be bad for us and for the country as a whole. Therefore, I suggest that the question of indulging in direct action should be thought of a hundred times before anyone lends his support to that kind of action. And I would beg of Annaduraiji this. Really we are passing through a very difficult situation. I say that I have come up with this controversial measure only with a view to give satisfaction to a large number of people who do not know Hindi. It is only because of that that this controversial measure is being moved and considered by this House during this emergency. We want to carry the whole country with us. We want to strengthen our country. We do not want that on any issue there should be suspicions and misapprehensions in the minds of certain sections of the people. But will it be advisable during this period to launch any kind of direct movement? Who will benefit by it? Only our opponents. We are passing through a most difficult period of our history. The Chinese danger is still there. Who will suffer? Is it not advisable that we pool our energies? We should work shoulder to shoulder in order to fight the aggression, in order to build up the country, so that no aggressor in future can cast an evil eye on us. This is the time when we should think of that only and nothing else. Therefore, I do hope that Annaduraiji will reconsider the matter and come to the right decision, the correct decision. The only correct decision would be to resist it in a constitutional manner and if he is not able to carry the majority with him, he must accept the decision of the Government and the decision of this Parliament.

If you will permit me, Sir—I have taken much time—I may say a few

words in Hindi in reply to what Dinkarji and Vajpayeeji said, because my friend, Deokinandan Narayanji, thought that I would never speak in Hindi, much less on this Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your *bona fides* with regard to Hindi are not in doubt.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I shall say a few words in Hindi for just five or six minutes.

दिनकर जी ने यह कहा कि उनकी मूक पीड़ा या उनका जो दर्द है, वह हमें समझना चाहिये। उनका ख्याल यह था कि हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में हमने समझदारी से काम नहीं लिया है और उनका यह खयाल कि हिन्दी को हमने पीछे फेंक दिया है और अंग्रेजी ही सदा रहेगी, मैं चाहता हूं कि दिनकर जी या और जो भाई ऐसा विचार करते हैं, उनको इस पर शान्ति से विचार करना चाहिये और यह निर्णय या फैसला करना चाहिये कि हमने क्या ऐसा इस बिल के जरिये या इस बिल के द्वारा किया है। मैं जानता हूं, वे बहुत बुद्धिमान् आदमी हैं और वे ऐसी कोई बात नहीं कहेंगे, जिससे कि कोई गलत भाव या गलत धारणा या गलत खयाल देश में पैदा हो।

एक बात मुझे उनकी बहुत अच्छी लगी। उन्होंने यह कहा कि हिन्दी एक तरह से मातृ-भाषा-मदर टंग-के रूप में नहीं देखी जाती। एक नया खयाल, एक नया विचार उन्होंने दिया। मैंने अभी ऐसा सोचा नहीं था। उनकी बात में और वाजपेयी जी की बात में बड़ी टक्कर है, बड़ी लड़ाई है। दिनकर जी ने कहा हिन्दी को मातृभाषा के रूप में हम नहीं देखते, वाजपेयी जी ने कहा इसको अगर कुछ लोग न मानें तो हम कुछ प्रदेशों को छोड़ कर भी आगे बढ़ें। मैं इस पर एक दो शब्द आगे कहूंगा। दिनकर जी के कहने की मंशा यह थी कि जैसे संस्कृत पहले एक कामन लैंग्वेज थी और संस्कृत मदर टंग या मातृभाषा नहीं थी लेकिन संस्कृत एक आफिशियल लैंग्वेज थी, कामन लैंग्वेज थी सारे देश में, जहाँ तक उस वक्त इकमत

[श्री लाल बहादुर]

या गवर्नमेंट के काम करने का सवाल था । तो मुझे उनके यह कहने में सच्चाई लगी, जैसा उन्होंने कहा कि कोई मगधी बोलता है, जो मगध की भाषा है, यानी शुद्ध हिन्दी नहीं बोलता है, कुछ फर्क है । कोई अवधि बोलता है तो यह नहीं कहता हिन्दी बोलता हूँ । इसी तरह से मथुरा वाला कहता है ब्रजभाषा मेरी भाषा है, कहीं और चले जाइए तो कोई कहता है हम खड़ी हिन्दी बोलते हैं । यानी, हिन्दी के इतने रूप हैं, अनेक रूप हैं कि मानभाषा के रूप में ही वह जोश नहीं पैदा करती, जो जोश कि हमारे तामलभाषी भाइयों में पैदा करे या कन्नड़ के भाइयों में पैदा करे या मलयालम के भाइयों में पैदा करे । उन्हें यह खयाल आता है कि हमारी यह भाषा पीछे न रह जाये, ठीक है । लेकिन हिन्दी में वह भाव नहीं पैदा होते, हिन्दी को हम सोचते हैं, तो राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से सोचते हैं । मेरे मन में जो बात आती है, वह यह आती है कि अगर कांस्टीट्यूट ऑफ़ इन्डियन ने यह तय कर लिया होता कि बंगला होगी राष्ट्रभाषा—ऑफिशियल लैंग्वेज—तो हम सब उसको मानते और उसको पढ़ते या तमिल होती तो उसको हम पढ़ते । लेकिन तमाम बातों को सोच कर उसने तय किया कि हिन्दी हो । तो सच बात यह है, मैं सच्चाई से कहता हूँ कि हिन्दी के बारे में मुझे यह फीलिंग नहीं होती कि हिन्दी चूँकि यू० पी० की भाषा है, इसलिये यह सारे देश पर लादी जाये । अण्णादुरै साहब ने कहा भारत मतलब इण्डिया, इण्डिया मतलब भारत, भारत मतलब, उत्तर प्रदेश—यह कहा हो किसी ने, शायद श्री श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी ने कहा या श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी ने । इससे अधिक अन्याय और बेइन्साफी हम लोगों के साथ और नहीं हो सकती है । यह ठीक है, प्रधान मन्त्री हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश से आते हैं मगर उसकी वजह से उत्तर प्रदेश ने कुछ नुकसान उठाया है, शायदा कम उठाया है—यह मैं आपसे कहता हूँ । इकानामिक डेवलपमेंट या आर्थिक उन्नति में मैंने तो कुछ पक्षपात किया हो यू० पी० का ।

पहले पांच साल का प्लान बीत गया और दूसरे पांच साला प्लान के दो, तीन वर्ष बीत गए लेकिन एक भी पब्लिक सेक्टर प्रोजेक्ट उत्तर प्रदेश को नहीं मिला ।

(Interruptions.)

شہری فریدالحق اصراری (انٹریڈیج):

یہ سب آپ لوگوں کا تصور ہے...

† [श्री फरीदुल क अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह सब आप लोगों का कसूर है ।]

श्री लाल बहादुर : मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता था कि यह रत्ती भर हमारे मन में बात आती नहीं है कि हिन्दी उत्तर प्रदेश की भाषा है, यह रीजनल लैंग्वेज है और हम एक रीजनल लैंग्वेज को सारे देश पर लादना चाहते हैं । हम सोचते हैं कि कांस्टीट्यूशन में कुछ सोच समझ कर ही फैसला किया कि हिन्दी ज्यादा लोग बोल सकते हैं, समझ सकते हैं, इसको सीखना आसान है, इसको धीरे धीरे देश में फैला सकते हैं । हम समझते हैं कि आज देश को मिलाने के लिये, देश की एकता के लिये, देश को जोड़ने के लिये हिन्दी की जरूरत है । कोई यू० पी० की बात या और कोई बात मन में बिल्कुल आती ही नहीं है ।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि दिनकर जी ने इस विचार को बड़ी सुन्दरता से रखा और इसलिये दिनकर जी के मन में गुस्सा नहीं आना चाहिये, क्रोध नहीं आना चाहिये और इतिफाक से उन्हें ब्लड प्रेशर भी है । उनसे मैं विशेष रूप से निवेदन करूँगा कि जब इतनी अच्छी बात उन्होंने कही है, तो उनको कभी इस धिल से क्रोध या गुस्सा या नाराजी आनी ही नहीं चाहिये और उन्हें यह देखना चाहिये कि नेशनल लैंग्वेज या ऑफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनाने में समय और परिश्रम लगेगा और लोगों को साथ लेकर चलना पड़ेगा ।

वाजपेयी जी ने कहा, उसके बारे में मुझे सिर्फ यह निवेदन करना है कि इसको

† [] Hindi transliteration.

अगर आप राष्ट्रीय ढंग से सोचना चाहते हैं और आप चाहते हैं हिन्दी को नेशनल लैंग्वेज या आफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनाना है, तो फिर आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि हम मद्रास को छोड़ दें और बंगाल को छोड़ दें। यह बात नहीं चल सकती। अगर आपको डेमोक्रेसी और लोकतंत्र के ढंग पर काम करना है, तो फिर इस राष्ट्रीय सवाल को आपका राष्ट्रीय ढंग से ही हल करना पड़ेगा और आपको सारे देश को मनवाना होगा, अगर मद्रास नहीं मान रहा है, तो उसका मनाएंगे, आज नहीं तो चार वर्ष के बाद, पांच वर्ष के बाद मनवाएंगे।

एक माननीय सदस्य : पचास वर्ष बाद ।

श्री लाल बहादुर : जी हाँ, पच्चीस वर्ष, तीस वर्ष बाद भी। लेकिन उनको अपने साथ लेकर, नहीं तो फायदा क्या कि आज आप आफिशियल लैंग्वेज ऐलान कर दें और आपकी कुछ स्टेट्स में वह आफिशियल लैंग्वेज न बन? क्या यह आफिशियल लैंग्वेज हो गई? आप डंडे का इस्तेमाल करें, पुलिस का इस्तेमाल करें, कानून का इस्तेमाल करने के लिये, तो यह कहां तक उचित था मुनासिब बात होगी? इनलिये मैं बहुत ही सम्प्रता से वाजपेयी जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमको एक दूसरे ही ढंग से सोचना पड़ेगा। कुरील साहब यहां हैं नहीं, उनको एक बात मुझे बड़ी अजीब लगी कि साहब इलेक्शन लड़िए। खैर, इलेक्शन का नतीजा बहुत साफ होगा, बहुमत हमारे साथ होगा। कुरील साहब के साथी कितने आएंगे, इसका जवाब मैं देता, मैं लेकिन वे यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं।

एक बात और दिनकर जी ने कही और वाजपेयी जी ने भी उस तरफ इशारा किया कि हिन्दी का काम बढ़ना चाहिये। यह कहा गया कि पार्लियामेंट को हम नहीं बताते कि क्या काम उनमें हम कर रहे हैं। यह भी कहा गया कि कोई कमेटी या कोई ऐसी चीज रहे जो इसको देखे, इसको वाच करे, इसको समझे कि क्या उन्नति होती है, क्या तरक्की होती है।

कल एक तमिलनाडु के मेम्बर ने मुझसे कहा कि आप एक कमेटी जरूर बनाइये, जो कि इस दस वर्षों में देखे कि क्या प्रोग्रेस होती है, क्या उन्नति होती है, जो उस पर विचार करे, रिप्लाय करे। उन्होंने कहा कि इस कमेटी में और प्रदेश के लोगों को रखा जाना चाहिये, यह एक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव बाडी हो। ठीक बात थी। उन्होंने कहा कि वह कमेटी देखेगी और बतलायेगी कि कहां कठिनाइयां हैं, कहां दिक्कतें हैं, कितना बढ़िये, कितना न बढ़िये। ये बातें मुनासिब हैं और मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई कि तमिलनाडु के एक खास मेम्बर ने मुझे इस प्रकार की सलाह दी कि आपको एक कमेटी बनानी चाहिये। यह बात ठीक है। मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि १० वर्ष बाद फिर यह चीज, फिर यह दृश्य दुहराया जाये और बारबार यह चीज देखनी पड़े। मेरा मतलब यह है कि इसके लिए जनता में आम तौर पर सन्तोष होना चाहिये और "प्रोग्रेसिव यूज आफ हिन्दी" की बात को सामने रख कर इसके साथ चलना चाहिये। समय कितना लगेगा इसके बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता हूँ और मैंने अपनी राय तो साफ तरह से कह दी है कि मुझे और कोई चीज नहीं चाहिये, बल्कि प्रेम और मुहब्बत पहले चाहिये। जो चीज खुशी से सारे मुल्क को जोड़े रखे, बाँधे रखे, वह चीज हमें करनी चाहिये।

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Sir, I would like to get some clarification from the Home Minister as a corollary to the explanation he has given. I would like to ask the Home Minister to explain a few things. Even today there are certain disabilities that are placed on non-Hindi-knowing people working in Central Government offices in as much as bills only printed in Hindi, are forced on them without corresponding English bills. I heard some complaints to that effect.

Another point is, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister have assured that in spite of the proposal to

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.]

bring in Hindi as the official language, no impediment would be placed on non-Hindi-knowing people who are in the offices. But in the other House, as the Home Minister remembers, one hon. lady Member made a complaint that her own husband was not given his increment because of his not having passed some Hindi test. Is there any truth in that, and if there is, will that be rectified?

The third point is whether the Home Minister will make it expedient on his part to come forward to have arrangements for simultaneous translations in the House so that we may not have to sit for half the time in the House without understanding what is being said.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am not aware if we have come up with any Hindi text of a Bill in this House or in the other House.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Not Bills here, but bills and forms in offices.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: As regards forms, etc., certainly we will provide English forms also. We will not have only Hindi forms. It would be optional, but somewhere some things were pointed out to us and we have rectified them. For example, money orders. They are in Hindi and English.

AN HON. MEMBER: T.A. bills are important.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: T.A. bills also.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): It is the money that is important, not the bill.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: If it is pointed out to us, we will certainly look into it.

As regards handicaps, I have made it clear that no handicaps will be placed on any officer or official com-

ing from the non-Hindi-speaking areas in matters concerning his service, whether it is promotion, increment or anything else, if he does not know Hindi. Of course, I have said that they should learn Hindi when they have joined the service, and that is a different matter. In the matter of recruitment, etc., there will be no bar imposed

As regards Hindi test, I am not aware of any such case. But if there is any case in which a clerk was debarred from promotion or increment because he did not pass his test—I am not aware of any such case, but if there is any case—he may kindly point it out. I do not think that we have taken any such step. But if it has been taken, of course we will not like that it should be enforced in that manner. One does not know what might happen 25 years later, but at present to create any such situation would not be desirable at all.

As regards simultaneous translations, the hon. Member will have to appeal to the Finance Minister. He is not prepared to spend a single pie on this matter because it will mean foreign exchange. All equipment etc. will have to be imported from abroad. In the circumstances, he might perhaps write to the Finance Minister or appeal to him in this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I seek a clarification. The Prime Minister in the other House and, I think, in this House also said that as far as the change-over is concerned, the question of final decision with regard to the English language, no decision would be taken without consulting and without having the concurrence or opinion of the non-Hindi regions or States in the country. At the same time he said that he did not how to include it in the statute. May I know whether the Home Ministry, while drafting this Bill or later on, consulted the authorities who are responsible for drafting if such an assurance could be incorporated in the form of a provision in the Bill, for example,

by making a provision that no final instructions will be given or directions will be given by the President unless and until they have the concurrence of, shall we say, three-fourths of the States at least, in our country? It seems that it was possible for the Government to incorporate that particular assurance in a legislative form in this Bill. I would like to know whether any effort was made after the Prime Minister's assurance to explore the possibility of finding suitable legislative expression for the purposes of this Bill to embody the Prime Minister's assurance in it.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): May I ask in connection with the question put by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta whether the provision in the Bill to refer it to the State Governments is not tantamount to a reference to the State Legislature because no State Government is expected to come to a decision on this matter without consulting the State Legislature? In the circumstances, does it not by and large fulfil the promise of the Prime Minister that the States will be consulted? This provision in the Bill which was introduced in the Lok Sabha, does it not fulfil to a very large extent the promise which the Prime Minister has given? At the same time is it possible to make such a blanket provision in the Bill that concurrence of the non-Hindi-speaking people will be required before coming to a final decision? That is not possible in any legislation whatsoever, to put it in the form of a legal provision.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Sir, my feeling is that we have fully complied with the assurance given by the Prime Minister. What we have done through this Bill is to provide the necessary machinery for consultation with the State Governments as well as for discussion here in Parliament and for obtaining the views of both the Houses. We have in clause 4 of this Bill provided that machinery, and it had to be given some specific form or shape. If the hon. Member thinks

that there should be a referendum in different States, of course, it was not possible, it could not have been provided. We have to provide the necessary machinery and we have done so. What Mr. Basu has said is perfectly right but may I also add that it is not always advisable? The State Governments may not consider it advisable to consult their State Legislatures in all cases. As I had observed last time, many of the State Governments did not consult their State Legislatures because they did not want to raise a controversy in their States. And it was only the West Bengal Legislature and the Madras Legislature who discussed the last Report of the Parliamentary Committee. Other States did not do it; Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and other States did not do it. So, it should be left to the State Governments. The State Governments are fully free and independent to consult their State Legislatures. If they want to do so, they can . . .

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: That was what I meant.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But, as I said, it should be left entirely to the State Governments to decide as they think best. I think I have met the point.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): I want to say a small thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I am again coming to that marginal case.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): May I ask this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am afraid I will not allow you. I am very sorry. The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union, for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High

Courts, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be referred to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha consisting of the following Members:—

1. Shri Bhupesh Gupta
2. Shri Rohit M. Dave
3. Shri B. K. Gaikwad
4. Shri Abdul Ghani
5. Shri A. D. Mani
6. Shri Sitaram Jaipuria
7. Shri P. L. Kureel Urf Talib
8. Shri V. M. Chordia
9. Shri G. Murahari, and
10. Shri A. B. Vajpayee.

with instructions to report by the first day of the next session."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union, for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High Courts, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid we will have to sit through the lunch hour.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam, half an hour for lunch would do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has said that there shall be no lunch hour.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But if the House so desires that half an hour would be enough, then I shall leave it to hon. Members to decide. Anyway, there are five minutes more.

We shall take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2—Definitions

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are three amendments, No. 1, No. 26 and No. 27. Number 1 is in Mr. Ghani's name and Nos. 26 and 27 are in Mr. Krishna Chandra's name. Mr. Ghani, are you moving your amendment?

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: I am.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam, this amendment cannot be moved.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which amendment cannot be moved?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Amendment No. 1 by Shri Abdul Ghani which runs as follows:—

"(b) Hindi means Hindustani in the scripts of all the fourteen languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India."

This goes against the Constitution, which has clearly laid down that Hindi in the Devanagari script shall be the official language. Without amending the Constitution, we cannot say that Hindi should be written in all the fourteen languages.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As far as the constitutional point is concerned, here...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants to define it. Let us dispense with Mr. Vajpayee's point of order. "Hindi means Hindustani in the scripts of all..." I think he wants to define it. It is a definition that he is seeking. In that sense, the amendment could be moved.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Hindi cannot be written except as defined in the Constitution. That is the point of law. It is a point to be decided...

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: By a simple legislation . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One at a time.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Unless there is a change in the Constitution . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not the question; that is not the point. The point here is this. He is not saying that the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in the Devanagari script. What he is saying is that Hindi means Hindustani in all the fourteen languages as far as possible. He is elaborating it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: How can that be? Too much elaboration will spoil the whole thing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani, you may move your amendment.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: We may have the ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He may move the amendment.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Can we know on what grounds?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has defined Hindi and, therefore, let him move the amendment.

شری عبدالغنی : میرا سلسلہ دہن

ہوا سیدھا سادہ اور دہش کے مت
میں ہے - میں یہ کہیں کہہ رہا
ہوں؟ یہ تو بالکل صاف بات ہے
کہ بھارت کی ایک زبان ہونی چاہیئے
اور یہ بھی صاف ہے کہ وہ ہندی
ہی ہوگی لیکن ہندی کے معنی کہا
لئے جائیں گے؟ وہ میں دیکھ رہا
مہاتما گاندھی کی کہی ہوئی بات

ایسی سرکار کو اور اپنے آنرہبل ممبران
سے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں - باپو نے
سدا ہندی اتہوا ہندوستانی کہا - وہ
کیوں کہا؟ اس لئے کہ ان کے سامنے
یہ بات کھل کر تھی - اس طرح سے
نہیں جیسا کہ ابھی ابھی ہمارے
ہوم منسٹر صاحب نے کہا کہ ہماری
پارٹی دوا وشال ہو دیے رکھتی ہے -
ہم عریک کو ایکو-وڈیت کرنے کی
کوشش کرتے ہیں - تو مجھے ہلسی
آئی - ان کے سامنے دو باتیں تھیں
ایک یہ کہ جب سے سویٹلنڈ ورلڈ
ہوا ہے . . .

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : मेरा संशोधन बड़ा सीधा सादा और देश के हित में है। मैं यह क्यों कह रहा हूँ। यह तो बिल्कुल साफ बात है कि भारत को एक जवान होनी चाहिए और यह भी साफ है कि वह हिन्दी ही होगी। लेकिन हिन्दी के माने क्या लिए जायेंगे? वह मैं देश पिता महात्मा गांधी की कही हुई बात अपनी सरकार को और अपने आनरेबल मेम्बरान से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। बापू ने सदा हिन्दी अथवा हिन्दुस्तानी कहा। वह क्यों कहा? इसलिए कि उनके सामने यह बात खुल कर थी। इस तरह से नहीं जैसा कि अभी अभी हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि हमारी पार्टी बड़ा विशाल हृदय रखती है, हम हर एक को अकामोडेट करने की कोशिश करते हैं। तो मुझे हंसी आई। उनके सामने दो बातें थीं। एक यह कि जब से मिचिलाडड बल्ह हुआ है . . .]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani, please explain—"Hindi means Hindustani in the scripts of all the fourteen languages". You want Hindustani in the scripts of all the fourteen languages?

†[] Hindi transliteration

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: I am explaining my point of view.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because otherwise, under the Constitution, this cannot stand. Are you describing that "Hindi means Hindustani in the scripts of all the fourteen languages"—means or that Hindi should be Hindustani?

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: I am saying so. "Hindi means Hindustani..."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am saying that under the Constitution, it is very clear. But you have said that Hindi means Hindustani. Now, Hindi itself cannot be in all the scripts of the different national languages for the simple reason that article 343 lays down that the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script. If this be so, then your amendment is out of order.

شہی عبدالغنی : "ہندی اتہوا
ہندوستانی . . . باپو نے کہا تھا -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : "हिन्दी अथवा
हिन्दुस्तानी . . ." —बापू ने कहा था।]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, I raise a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it a point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes. I rise on a point of order. You did not rule that this amendment is out of order. Therefore, now we are a little interested in that. Here, the point was raised. I suggested that it is only . . .

1 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If this be so, then Mr. Ghani's amendment is out of order.

شہی عبدالغنی : تو کہا میں یہ
سمجھوں کہ میرے امینڈمنٹ کو
آپ مردہ نہیں کرنے دے رہے ہیں -

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : तो क्या मैं यह
समझू कि मेरे अमेन्डमेन्ट को आप मूव नहीं
करने दे रहे हैं।]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whatever it is, now I raise the point.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it a point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, I rise on a point of order. Originally you accepted this; you did not rule this amendment out of order in the beginning. Now you are a little refreshed. Here the point was raised, and I suggested that it was a little expansionist in this matter. Now you were naturally guided, not by the arguments of Mr. Ghani, which were not forthcoming; you were guided by the text of the amendment which was before you. According to the text, if you had ruled that the amendment was in order, then you need not be influenced at all by any speeches. We might interpret it in different ways—different Members differently. I suggest to you, Madam Deputy Chairman, that you stand by your ruling and allow Mr. Ghani to speak as he likes. It will be a very interesting precedent that you permit an amendment, that is to say, you reject a suggestion of ruling it out, and when you read the amendment you think it is in order. Then, by hearing a speech you say it is out of order. Such a thing is not known in parliamentary practice.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I was willing to allow him to move the amendment and speak on it. But when he spoke on it, I read the amendment more carefully with the Constitution, and I have ruled it out. That is my ruling and there is nothing more.

We now go to the next amendment.

شری عبدالغنی : اگر میرا امینڈمنٹ
آؤت آف آرڈر بھی کر دیا ہے تو یہی
میدم...

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : अगर मेरा अमेन्ड-
मेन्ट आउट ऑफ ऑर्डर भी कर दिया है तो भी
मैडम . . .]

I want to speak on this Clause 2.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am
on my legs. I have gone to the next
amendment; amendment No. 26 in the
name of Shri Krishna Chandra.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: There is one
submission, Madam.

آپ میرے امینڈمنٹ کو اجازت
نہیں دیتے لیکن میں کلاز ۲ پر تو
بول سکتا ہوں . . .

†[आप मेरे अमेन्डमेन्ट को इजाजत नहीं
देते लेकिन मैं क्लाज २ पर तो बोल सकता
हूँ।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am
on my legs. You can speak later.
After the other amendment is clear-
ed, you speak on the clause. Amend-
ment No 26 in the name of Mr.
Krishna Chandra.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA (Uttar
Pradesh): I move:

26. "That at page 1, line 10, for
the word and figure 'section 3' the
words and figures 'sections 3, 5 and
be substituted."

27. "That at page 1, line 10. for
the word and figure 'section 3' the
words and figures 'sections 3, 5 and
7' be substituted."

The questions were proposed.

†[] Hindi translation.

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र : माननीय उपसभापति
महोदया, मेरा अमेन्डमेन्ट बहुत ही संक्षिप्त
है। इस क्लाज में यह दिया हुआ है।

"'appointed day', in relation to
section 3, means the 26th day of
January, 1965 and in relation to
any other provision of this Act,
means the day on which that pro-
vision comes into force."

मेरा अमेन्डमेन्ट यह है कि :

"'appointed day' in relation to
section 3, section 5 and section 7
means the 26th January . . ."

मैं समझता हूँ कि इसको मानने में
गवर्नमेन्ट को कोई भी दिक्कत या आपत्ति
नहीं होनी चाहिये क्योंकि खंड ५ में यह है :

"A translation in Hindi publish-
ed under the authority of the Pre-
sident in the Official Gazette on
and after the appointed day,—"

अगर गवर्नमेन्ट यह चाहती है कि ट्रान्सलेशन
हिन्दी में हो तो उसके लिये कुछ समय मुकर्रर
करना चाहिये। मान लीजिए, गवर्नमेन्ट को
कन्वीनिएन्ट न हो कि २६ जनवरी से हिन्दी का
अनुवाद कराने की उनकी व्यवस्था हो
जाय, तो फिर उसमें दिया हुआ है :
on the appointed day or any day there-
after—तो इसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं है। लेकिन
एक चीज गवर्नमेन्ट के सामने यह रहनी चाहिये
कि उनको यह काम करना है। २६ जनवरी के
बाद जितनी भी जल्दी मुमकिन हो सके, हिन्दी
का ट्रान्सलेशन करने की व्यवस्था करनी है।
क्लाज ५ के सेक्शन्ड पार्ट में यह दिया हुआ है
कि जब कोई बिल पार्लियामेन्ट के सामने
अंग्रेजी में पेश किया जायगा तो अप्पॉइन्टेड
डेट से गवर्नमेन्ट के लिये यह जरूरी होगा कि
उसके साथ साथ हिन्दी का भी ट्रान्सलेशन
रखे। अगर गवर्नमेन्ट वाकई यह चाहती है कि
२६ जनवरी के बाद जिस बिल को वे पेश करेंगे
उसके साथ साथ हिन्दी के अनुवाद को भी पेश
करेंगे तो उनको इसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं आनी

[श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र]

चाहिये और अगर वह उसकी व्यवस्था न भी कर सकी तो भी इसमें साफ है : on the appointed day or any day thereafter— तो अगर यह मान लें कि सेक्शन ३ में दिया अप्पॉइन्टेड डे २६ जनवरी, १९६५ होगा और सेक्शन ५ में भी अप्पॉइन्टेड डे वही होगा और सेक्शन ७ में भी अप्पॉइन्टेड डे वही होगा तो कोई दिक्कत न होगी। क्लॉज ५ में भी और ७ में भी यह लिखा हुआ है : on the appointed day or any day thereafter—

तो कम से कम इसको अगर बिल में रख दिया जायेगा कि 'appointed day is 26th January, 1965 with reference to section 3, section 5 and section 7,'

तो गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर इस बात की एक जिम्मेवारी होगी, एक प्रकार का जोर होगा . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Mr. Krishna Chandra, since the House desires half an hour break for lunch, you may continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned and we shall reassemble at 1.40 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at seven minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at forty minutes past one of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र . माननीया उपसभापति महोदया, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि गवर्नमेंट ने इस बिल के अन्दर सेक्शन ३ के लिए २६ जनवरी सन् १९६५ की एक तारीख निर्धारित कर दी है। लेकिन सेक्शन ५ और ७ के लिए यह रख दिया गया है कि इसमें जो "अप्पॉइन्टेड डेट" है वह वह होगी जब गवर्नमेंट चाहेगी Notification in the Gazette करके गवर्नमेंट उसको लागू कर सकती है। गवर्नमेंट वही "अप्पॉइन्टेड डेट" जब चाहे लागू कर सकती है। लेकिन मैं यह अर्ज कर

रहा था कि इन सेक्शनो में भी, यानी ५ और ७ में अगर गवर्नमेंट इस तरह का कर दे जिस तरह का उसने सेक्शन ३ में किया है यानी यह तारीख २६ जनवरी सन् १९६५ रहेगी तो अच्छा हो। अगर गवर्नमेंट की व्यवस्था में दिक्कत हो, उसकी व्यवस्था पूरी न हो सके, कोई इन्तजाम न हो सके तो भी उसमें कोई रुकावट नहीं आती है क्योंकि सेक्शन ५ और सेक्शन ७ में भी "on the appointed day or any day thereafter" ये शब्द हैं। अगर उस तारीख तक गवर्नमेंट का इन्तजाम न हो सके तो उसको कार्य-रूप में परिणत करने के लिए कोई रुकावट नहीं रहेगी और उनको बाद में ला सकती है। लेकिन अगर कोई तारीख निर्धारित नहीं करती है—जैसा कि माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि हमारे पास इन्डियन पीनल कोड और क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड का हिन्दी अनुवाद तैयार है। . . .

श्री बी० डी० खोबरागड़े (महाराष्ट्र): कौन सी हिन्दी में है, रघुवीरी हिन्दी में है, सेठ गोविन्द दास की हिन्दी में है या प्योर हिन्दी में है ?

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र : गवर्नमेंट की भाषा में किया है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट के पास इसका अनुवाद मौजूद है और वह अनुवाद बेकार रहेगा क्योंकि सेक्शन ५ में यह लिखा है, यह व्यवस्था है कि कोई सेन्ट्रल ऐक्ट, जो आज मौजूद है, उसका हिन्दी अनुवाद अगर appointed day या उसके बाद गवर्नमेंट गजट में पब्लिश कर दिया जायेगा "Under the authority of the President", appointed day

को तब तो वह "आथॉरिटेटिव टेक्स्ट" हिन्दी माना जायेगा। अगर कोई डेट आज फिक्स नहीं करते तो जो आपके अनुवाद मौजूद रखे हैं वे भी और उसके बाद जो आप अनुवाद करायेंगे वे भी "आथॉरिटेटिव टेक्स्ट" हिन्दी नहीं माने जायेंगे। मेरे इस संशोधन को प्रस्तुत करने का उद्देश्य खाली यह है कि मैं गवर्नमेंट में यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि उसका इस संबंध में क्या निर्णय है ? गवर्नमेंट की इस संबंध में बड़ी लचर और दुलमुल नीति है। क्या उसने

वाकई में यह फैसला कर लिया है कि वह हिंदी अनुवाद को "आथारिटेटिव टेक्स्ट" करना चाहती है? अगर उसने यह फैसला कर लिया है तो उस व्यवस्था को कड़ा करना चाहिये। जैसा कि आज बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि हिन्दी की तरफ . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krishna Chandra, I would like you to clarify your points very briefly.

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र : तो क्या गवर्नमेंट की यह मन्शा है जैसा कहा गया है कि हिन्दी को लाने में गवर्नमेंट ने कोई तैयारी नहीं की और फिर आज यह इल्जाम लगेगा। अगर हम आज कोई नीति निश्चित नहीं करते हैं कि सन् १९६५ के बाद यह काम करना है तो हम भविष्य में भी कुछ नहीं कर सकेंगे। सेक्शन ५ में यह भी है कि पार्लियामेंट में जितने भी बिल आयेंगे उसका हिन्दी ट्रांसलेशन साथ रहेगा तो उस के लिए भी कोई तारीख निर्धारित नहीं की है "As from the appointed day or any day thereafter" की जगह "appointed day", उसमें २६ जनवरी, सन् १९६५ हो जाय। अगर इस तरह की बात हो जायेगी तो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों को यह मौका रहेगा कि वे हिन्दी से परिचित हो जायें और साथ ही साथ हर विधेयक का हिन्दी ट्रांसलेशन उन के सामने आ जाये। इस तरह हिन्दी ट्रांसलेशन को पढ़ कर पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर यह मालूम कर सकेंगे कि हिन्दी की भाषा क्या है, कैसी भाषा है, किस किस की भाषा हो, सैठ गोविन्द दास की भाषा हो या कोई दूसरी भाषा हो, इस से उन का परिचय हो जायेगा और वे अपनी तजवीज दे सकेंगे।

फिर क्लॉक ७ में यह परमिसिव है, सिर्फ हिन्दी के लिए नहीं है, बल्कि स्टेट्स में जो आफिशियल है उन सब के लिए है। उस में यह है कि "As from the appointed day or any other day thereafter" लैंग्वेज गवर्नर को इस

बात का अधिकार मिला है कि वे चाहें तो प्रेजीडेन्ट की इजाजत लेकर कोई तारीख मुकर्रर कर दें। और उस तारीख से वहां के हाई कोर्ट के जजमेन्ट, डिक्री तथा आर्डर्स जो उस स्टेट की आफिशियल लैंग्वेज होगी उस में या हिन्दी में होंगे तो उन को भी आथारिटेटिव माना जायेगा लेकिन उन का अग्रेजी ट्रांसलेशन रहेगा। मेरी मन्शा यह है और गवर्नमेंट से यह स्पष्टीकरण कराना चाहता हूं कि उस की इस बारे में क्या मन्शा है, वह वाकई २६ जनवरी, सन् १९६५ पर स्टिक करना चाहती है या नहीं? उस के बाद हिन्दी में जितने काम लिखे हैं, हर बिल का अनुवाद हिन्दी में होगा, जितने ऐक्ट हिन्दी में ट्रांसलेशन हुए हैं, वे आथारिटेटिव हिन्दी माने जायेंगे। सरकार का इरादा २६ जनवरी सन् १९६५ से इस सब को लागू करने का है या नहीं? मेरे संशोधन की यही मन्शा है और मैं गवर्नमेंट से इस बारे में स्पष्टीकरण और क्लैरिफिकेशन चाहता हूं। क्या इस में भी सरकार की कुलमुल नीति आ सकती है? इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने अमेन्डमेन्ट्स को हाउस के सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूं।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani You can speak on the clause.

شری عبدالغنی : مہدم ذہنی

چونکہ چودہ زبانوں والی بات بدقسمتی سے میں نے کہی تھی اس لئے اجازت نہیں ملی -

چونکہ چودہ زبانوں والی بات بدقسمتی سے میں نے کہی تھی اس لئے اجازت نہیں ملی -

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have committed suicide.

شری عبدالغنی : ہاں - غلطی

خود مہری تھی کہ مہرا جو امہند مہندت
تھا وہ آوت آف آرڈر ہو گیا -

بہر حال ذیقتی چیبرمین صاحبہ -

میں سرکاری پہنچوں کو یاد دلانا چاہتا
ہوں کہ زبان کا مسئلہ آج کا نہیں
ہے - اس پر آل انڈیا کانگریس کمیٹی
میں سال ہا سال بات چیت ہوئی
اور دیس پتا مہاتما گاندھی نے ہندی
اتھوا ہندوستانی کہا تھا - مہندم ذیقتی
چیبرمین صاحبہ - آپ جانتی ہیں
کہ سات سو برس تک یہاں مسلمان
حکمران رہے اور انہوں نے فارسی زبان
چلائی لیکن وہ دیس کی زبان نہیں
بن سکی تو ہندی کو خالی سرکاری
زبان بنانے سے وہ دیس کی زبان
ہو جائے ایسا نہیں ہے - جو بھائی
ہندی کو پہار کرتے ہیں اور میں
بھی ان میں سے ایک ہوں ان کو سمجھ
لیتا چاہیئے کہ وہی ہندی قبول
ہوگی جو کہ دیس پتا مہاتما گاندھی
کے ذہن میں تھی ؟ جو کہ یو - پی
میں بولتے ہیں یعنی جو کہ سرل
ہندی ہے - لیکن یہ وہ ہندی نہیں
ہے جو کہ اخباروں میں لکھی جاتی
ہے یا آل انڈیا ریڈیو سے براڈکاسٹ
کی جاتی ہے - یہ بات میں اس لئے
کہتا ہوں کہ شاستری جی نے بڑے
زور سے کہا کہ میں ایکو مہندیتلنگ
اسپرٹ کا ہوں لیکن شاید انہوں نے
اپنے ساتھ بھی انصاف نہیں کیا اور

ہاؤس کے ساتھ بھی انصاف نہیں کیا -
وہ جانتے ہیں کہ حب ہندی کا
مسئلہ چلا تب شاید دنیا میں
جب سے سہولتوں و رلت قائم ہوئی ہے
تب سے اتنے زیادہ دستخطوں سے
کوئی مہمورندم نہیں دیا گیا ہے -
لاکھوں بھائیوں نے ہندو مسلمان
سکھ اور عیسائی تمام نے ملک کے
راشٹریتی سرگھاسی ڈاکٹر راجندر پراد
کو ایک مہمورندم دیا جس میں
اردو کے بارے میں بعد ہندوستانی
کے بارے میں کہا گیا تھا - اس پر
اسی لاکھ بھائیوں نے دستخط کئے تھے
اور اس کو دیا تھا لیکن سرکار نے
اس کو کوئی وزن نہیں دیا - تو ان
کا وشال ہر دیے ہے جیسا کہ وہ کہتے
ہیں -

اگر ہندی کا مطلب وہی ہندی
لیا جائے جو کہ آج مہرے بھائی
واج پٹی جی لہتے ہوں تو میں ان
کو یقین دلاتا ہوں کہ دس ورش
کیا پانچ سو سال میں بھی ایسی
ہندی لگو ہونے والی نہیں ہے -
صرف پڑھانے سے یا پڑھنے سے ہی وہ
دیس کی زبان بن جائے ایسا نہیں
ہے - اس کے لئے آپ کو لوگوں کے
دلوں کو جیتنا ہے - ساؤتھ کے چار
پانچ پرائٹ ہیں اور ان میں کروڑھا
لوگ ہیں تو کیا ان کو نوکرہوں کے
مسئلہ پر پھر شور مچانے جا رہے
ہیں ؟ جن کو ہندی آتی نہیں ہے

ان پر آپ ہندی لاگو کرتے ہیں تو اس کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ وہ ملک کی تمام ترقی سے محروم ہو جائیں گے۔ اگر آپ کا ویشال ہردیہ ہے تو آپ ایسا کہوں کرنے جا رہے ہیں؟ ایسا نہیں کریں گے۔

کانسٹی ٹوشن کو جنم دینے والا ہندوستان کا ایک بڑا پیٹریوٹ فاکٹر امید کر تھا۔ اس آئین کو بنانے میں اس نے بڑی خدمت کی تھی لیکن سنٹرل ہال میں وہ کوئی جگہ نہیں لے سکا حالانکہ نو کروڑ بھائی اس کو اپنا لیڈر مانتے ہیں۔ ساؤتھ کے کسی آدمی کو وہاں جگہ نہیں ملی ہے۔ تو میرا مطلب یہ ہے کہ آپ بہومت کے بل پر، زور پر، جو من میں آئے کیجئے لیکن اس طرح کی باتیں نہ کیجئے کہ ہندی کے معنی وہ زبان ہے جو کہ تمام دیہی کی زبان نہیں ہے۔ آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ مسلمان حکمران مجبور ہو گئے کہ وہ کوئی ایسی زبان قبول کریں جو کہ لشکری زبان ہو جس کو کہ ساؤتھ اور نارٹھ کے تمام فوجی سمجھ سکیں اور انہیں ایسا کرنا پڑا۔ آپ ایسا کرنے جا رہے ہیں یہ میں نہیں جانتا لیکن یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ کل کو پھر سرکار کو اس کے لئے ۷۷ آنا پڑے گا۔ ان کے ویشال ہردیہ کو شاید اور بڑھنا پڑے گا۔ بھارت کی سمیت آپ نے جیت لی تو وہ اس

لئے نہیں جیت لی کہ ساؤتھ والوں کو بھروسہ ہو گیا کہ انگریزی کو آپ دہانے والے ہیں۔ یو۔ پی کے لئے ان کا ویشال ہردیہ ہے کیونکہ یو۔ پی میں الیکشن ہو رہا ہے۔ کیوں نہیں وہ اس کو بعد میں لاتے اور ابھی نہ لاتے۔

تو میں عرض کر رہا تھا کہ آج نہیں، دس برس بعد، پچیس برس بعد، آپ کو ایک ایسی زبان کو ماننا پڑے گا جو کہ سب کی زبان ہے۔ آپ اس بات کو محسوس نہیں کرتے ہیں کہ حقیقت میں ہندوستانی بولنے والے تو کافی ہوں گے لیکن تہمت ہندی بولنے والے بہت کم ہیں۔ تو جب تک سارے دیہی کو اس بات پر راضی نہ کریں کہ ہندی وہ بھاشا ہے جس کو کہ ساؤتھ اور نارٹھ والے دونوں خوب سمجھ سکتے ہیں تب تک ہمیں کامیابی نہیں ہوگی۔ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر صاحب کیوں جرات سے نہیں کہتے کہ جب تک ہم وہیں گے انگریزی رہے گی۔ سب جانتے ہیں کہ پنجاب کا تمام ریکارڈ اردو میں تھا لیکن جب چاہا تو ایک ملت میں آردو کو دیا کہ اب یہ اردو میں نہیں ہوگا۔ اسی طرح سے اگر انگریزی کو ختم کرنے والے ہوتے تو یہ بے چارے ساؤتھ والے چلاتے دھتے اور یہ اس کو ختم کر دیتے لیکن ان کے اپنے میں ہی انگریزی بسی

[شری عبدالغنی]

ہوئی ہے۔ یہاں جو بھائی ہندی چاہتے والے ہیں ان کی بھی نوے فی صدی تقریریں انگریزی میں ہوتی ہیں۔ میرا خیال ہے کہ بھوپیش میں گپتا جی جتنی آسانی سے انگریزی میں بول سکتے ہیں اور جتنی زور بھائی، جادو بیانی ان کی انگریزی میں ہے اس سے زیادہ شاید ہندی میں نہیں اتنی بھی نہیں ہوئی۔

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No doubt about it.

شری عبدالغنی : اور یہی حال

ہمارے پرائم مینسٹر کا بھی ہوگا۔ وہ گالی دیتے ہیں اور پارلیمنٹ کے ممبروں کے لئے غلطہ ازم کی بات کہتے ہیں لیکن اس میں ایک لفظ فارسی کا ہے اور ایک انگریزی کا ہے تو دونوں کو وہ ملا کر کہتے ہیں۔ یہ تھپک ہے کہ ہمارا پریولہج موشن نہیں آیا۔ (Time bell rings)

مہتمم ڈپٹی چیرمین - میں کہہ رہا تھا کہ ہندی ایسی بلاؤ جس کو سارا دیہی قبول کرے، جس کو چلتے پھرتے لوگ اور بازار میں جو بھٹتے ہیں اور جو ترین میں سفر کرتے ہیں وہ بولیں اور سمجھیں۔ میں نے اپنے اسلمنٹ کے دوران آپ کی توجہ اسی طرف دلائی تھی۔ آپ ایسی بھاشا کو مان لیں جس کو

کہ میں ہندوستانی کہتا ہوں۔ تو ایسی بھاشا کو نہیں لاؤ کرنا ہے اور ایسی بھاشا کو لاؤ کرنا ہے جس کو کہ ساؤتھ کے بہن بھائی اچھی طرح سے بول اور سمجھ سکیں۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : ठेठ हिन्दी किमको कहते हैं ? ठेठ हिन्दी क्या है ?

شری عبدالغنی : تہہت ہندی

وہی ہے جو کہ آل انڈیا ریڈیو ہے آپ براڈکاسٹ کرتے ہیں اور جو اخبار میں لکھتے ہیں۔ وہ ہندی نہیں ہے۔ ہندی وہ ہے جس کو کہ گاندھی جی نے کہا تھا۔

مہتمم ڈپٹی چیرمین صاحبہ - یہ کلاز ۲ ایسا ہے جس میں سارا بل کور ہو جاتا ہے۔ حیرت میں صاحب نے یہ فرمایا تھا کہ مجھے موقع دیا جائے گا اور مجھے یقین ہے کہ آپ بھی مجھے موقع ضرور دیں گی۔

उपसभापति : आप ने पांच मिनट से ज्यादा ले लिया है और अभी कितने सारे अमेंडमेंट्स हैं ।

شری عبدالغنی : اگر میں اس

وقت بولتا تو مجھے اتنا ہی وقت ملتا جتنا کہ باقی ممبروں کو ملا تھا۔ یہ کلاز ایسا ہے جس میں سارا بل کور ہوتا ہے۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ghani, you are speaking on the amendments. Please be brief.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी: आप क्या बोल रहे हैं।

श्री عبد الغنی : آپ کہہ رہے ہیں کہ آپ گاندھی جی سے بیوفائی کر رہے ہیں - دیس سے بیوفائی کر رہے ہیں - ذرا دیس سے پہار کرو اور پہار کرنے کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ آپ کڑی بات سننے کے لئے تیار نہ ہوں - کڑی بات بھی آپ کو سننی چاہئے - اس میں دیس کا پہا ہے -

2 P.M.

میں یہ عرض کر رہا تھا کہ اگر اس وقت ساؤتھ کا پہار ساتھ رکھنا ہے ، ساؤتھ کا پہار لہنا ہے - کہوں کہ وہی زبان زبان ہوگی، وہی حکومت حکومت ہوگی جسے دل و دماغ سے ساؤتھ والے پہار کریں ، نارتھ والے پہار کریں تو اگر ان کا پہار لہنا ہے تو پھر آپ کو ان کو مطمئن کرنا ہے - آپ چاہتے ہیں کہ جلدی ہندی ہو جائے تو ان کی زبان میں ان کو اجازت دی جائے کہ تامل میں لکھیں تھلگو میں لکھیں، ملہالم میں لکھیں، بنگلہ میں لکھیں، مراٹھی میں لکھیں - کوئی آپ کا چھکڑا نہیں ہونا چاہئے - اگر جلدی کرنی ہے اور اگر جلدی نہیں کرنی ہے اور آپ کو

انہیں آپے ساتھ لہنا ہے تو پھر آپ کو دونوں باتوں ماننی چاہئے کہوں کہ زبان کا مذہب سے تعلق نہیں ہے - جب سے آدم و حوا ہوئے جب جب، جیسے ضرورت ہوئی، ویسا نام رکھ دیا، ویسی زبان ہوگئی - آج ہندی زیادہ بولنے والے ہیں، ہندوستانی جس کو میں کہتا ہوں تو آپ اس کو مضبوط بنائیے - ساؤتھ کے بھائیوں کو مطمئن کھجئے اور اس سے ہی ہندی کی زیادہ سے زیادہ مہم ہونگی - دیتی حور میں مہودیہ - چونکہ آپ ہمیشہ ہی مجھے ایکموتیت کرتی ہیں اس لئے میں آپ کا حکم ماننا ہوں (Time bell rings) اور درخواست کرتا ہوں کہ ہندی کو ہندوستان کی زبان مانئے اور اگر آپ ہندی کو آج دیو ناگری میں کرتے ہیں تو آپ مہربانی کر کے اس کو سب ہی زبانوں میں کرنے کی اجازت دے دیجئے -

آخری بات میں کہتا ہوں کہ ہندی اس طرح سے نہیں بلمگی جسے پنجاب میں بولتے جارہی ہے - پنجاب کے اسی پرست بھائی بہن پنجابی بولتے ہیں لیکن جب سہنس ہوا تو . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ghani, you said you had finished your speech but you are starting all over again.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: Last word about Hindi, finishing touch.

[شری عبدالغنی]

لیکن ان اسی پرسنٹ والوں سے آپ کہنے میں کہ تمہارے اوپر ہندی لاگو ہوگی - اس طرح سے بھائی کسی کو یہ کہنے دینے کی مت کوشش کرو کہ بھائی ہندی ہندو کی زبان ہے پنجابی سکھ کی زبان ہے اردو مسلمان کی زبان ہے - باپو کا کہنا مانو اور ہندی و ہندوستانی کو ایک سمجھو -

[شری अब्दول گانی . مंडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन । मैं अफसोस करता हूँ कि अगर मेरे अमेडमेंट में इतना होता कि 'हिन्दी मीन्स हिन्दुस्तानी' तो शायद आप इजाजत दे देती, लेकिन चूँकि १४ जवानों वाली बात बदकिस्मती से मैं नहीं थी, इसलिए इजाजत नहीं मिली ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You have committed suicide.

श्री अब्दुल गानी : हा ! गलती खुद मेरी थी कि मेरा जो अमेडमेंट था, वह आउट ऑफ ऑर्डर हो गया ।

बहरहाल, डिप्टी चेयरमैन । मैं सरकारी बेंचों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जवान का मसला आज का नहीं है । इस पर आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी में माल-हा-माल बातचीत हुई और देशपिता महात्मा गांधी ने हिन्दी अथवा हिन्दुस्तानी कहा था । मंडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिब ! आप जानती है कि ७०० वर्ष तक यहाँ मुसलमान हुकमगान रहे और उन्होंने फ़ारसी ज़बान चलाई, लेकिन वह देश की ज़बान नहीं बन सकी तो हिन्दी को खाली सरकारी ज़बान बनाने से वह देश की ज़बान हो जाये, ऐसा नहीं है । जो भाई हिन्दी को प्यार करते हैं और मैं भी उनमें से एक हूँ, उनको समझ लेना

चाहिए कि वही हिन्दी कबूल होगी, जोकि देशपिता महात्मा गांधी के ज़हन में थी, जो कि यू० पी० में बोलने है, या जोकि सरल हिन्दी है । लेकिन यह वह हिन्दी नहीं है जोकि अखबारों में लिखी जाती है या आल इंडिया रॉडियो से ब्राडकास्ट की जाती है । यह बात मैं इन्तालफ़ कहता हूँ कि शाम्शी जी ने बड़े ज़ोर से कहा कि मैं अक्रोमोडेटिंग स्पिरिट का हूँ । लेकिन शायद उन्होंने अपने साथ भी इन्साफ़ नहीं किया और हाउस के साथ भी इन्साफ़ नहीं किया । वह जानते हैं कि जब हिन्दी का मसला चला, तब शायद दुनिया में जब से सिविलाइज्ड वर्ल्ड कायम हुआ है तब से इतने ज्यादा दस्तखतों से कोई मेमो-रेडम नहीं दिया गया है । लाखों भाइयों ने हिन्दू, मुसलमान, सिख और ईसाई तमाम ने मुल्क के राष्ट्रपति स्वर्गवसी डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद को एक मेमोरेडम दिया, जिसमें उर्दू के बारे में यानी हिन्दुस्तानी के बारे में कहा गया था । उस पर ८० लाख भाइयों ने दस्त-खत किये थे और उसको दिया था, लेकिन सरकार ने उनको कोई वजन नहीं दिया । तो उनका विशाल हृदय है, जैसा कि वह कहते हैं ।

अगर हिन्दी का मतलब वही हिन्दी लिया जाये, जोकि आज मेरे भाई वाजपेयी जी लेने हैं, तो मैं उनको यकीन दिलाता हूँ कि दस वर्ष क्या, ५०० साल में भी ऐसी हिन्दी लागू होने वाली नहीं है । सिर्फ़ पढ़ाने से या पढ़ने से ही वह देश की ज़बान बन जाये, ऐसा नहीं है । इस के लिए आप को लोगों के दिलों को जीतना है । स.उ.य के आर-पाच प्रान्त हैं और उन में करोड़ों लोग हैं तो क्या उन को नौकरियों के मसले पर फिर शूद्र बनाने जा रहे हैं । जिन को हिन्दी आती नहीं है उन पर आप हिन्दी लागू करते हैं तो उस का मतलब यह है कि वह मुल्क की तमाम तरक्की से महूरूम हो जायेंगे । अगर आपका विशाल हृदय है, तो आप ऐसा क्यों करने जा रहे हैं । ऐसा नहीं करेंगे ।

कान्स्टीट्यूशन को जन्म देने वाला हिन्दुस्तान का एक बड़ा पेट्रियोट डा० अम्बेदेकर था। इस आईन को बनाने में उस ने बड़ा खिदमत की थी, लेकिन सेटल हाल में वह कोई जगह नहीं ले सका, हालांकि ६ करोड़ भाई उसको अपना लॉडर मानते हैं। साउथ के किसी आदमी को वहां जगह नहीं मिली है। तो मेरा मतलब यह है कि आप बहुमत के बल पर, जोर पर, जो मन में आये, कांजिये लेकिन इस तरह की बातें न कांजिये, कि हिन्दी के माने वह जवान हैं जोकि तमाम देश की जवान नहीं हैं। आप का याद होगा कि मुसलमान हुजूमरान मजबूर हो गये कि वह कोई ऐसी जवान कबूल करे जा कि लश्करी जवान हो, जिसको कि साउथ और नार्थ के तमाम फौजी समझ सकें और उन्हें ऐसा करना पड़ा। आप ऐसा करने जा रहे हैं यह मैं नहीं जानता लेकिन मैं यह समझता हूँ कि कल को पि. सरकार को इस के लिए यहां आना पड़ेगा। उन के विशाल हृदय को शायद और बढ़ना पड़ेगा। बेलगाम की सीट आपने जीत ली तो वह इसलिये नहीं जीत ली कि साउथ वालों को भराता हो गया कि अंग्रेजी का आप रखने वाले हैं। यू० पी० के लिए उनका विशाल हृदय है, क्योंकि यू० पी० में एन्क्वेशन हो रहा है। क्यों नहीं वह उस को बाद में लाने और अभी न लाने।

तो मैं अर्थ कर रहा था कि आज नहीं दस वर्ष बाद, पच्चीस वर्ष बाद आप को एक ऐसी जवान को मानना पड़ेगा जोकि सब की जवान है। आप इस बात को महसूस नहीं करते हैं कि हकीकत में हिन्दुस्तानी बोलने वाले तो काफी होंगे लेकिन ठेठ हिन्दी बोलने वाले बहुत कम हैं। तो जब तक सारे देश को इस बात पर राजी न करें कि हिन्दी वह भाषा है जिस को कि साउथ और नार्थ वाले दोनों खूब समझ सकते हैं, तब तक हमें कामयाबी नहीं होगी। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब क्यों जुरंत से नहीं कहते कि जब तक हम रहेंगे, अंग्रेजी रहेगी। सब जानते हैं कि पंजाब का तमाम

रिकार्ड उर्दू में था। लेकिन जब चाहा तो एक मिनट में आर्डर कर दिया कि अब यह उर्दू में नहीं होगा। इसी तरह से अगर अंग्रेजी को खत्म करने वाले होते तो ये बेचारे साउथ वाले चिल्लाते रहते और यह उसको खत्म कर देते। लेकिन उनके अपने में ही अंग्रेजी बसी हुई है। यहां जो भाई हिन्दी चाहने वाले हैं उन की भी नब्बे फीसदी तकरारें अंग्रेजी में होती हैं। मेरा खयाल है कि भूपेश गुप्ता जी जितनी आसानी से अंग्रेजी में बोल सकते हैं और जितनी जोर बयानी, जादू बयानी उन की अंग्रेजी में है, उसमें ज्यादा शायद बंगाली से नहीं होगी और हिन्दी में शायद उतनी भी नहीं होगी . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No doubt about it.

श्री अब्दुल गनी : और यही हाल हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर का भी होगा। वह गाली देते हैं और पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों के लिए गुडाइज्म की बात कहते हैं, लेकिन उस में एक लफ्ज फारसी का है और एक अंग्रेजी का है तो दोनों को वह मिला कर कहते हैं। यह ठीक है कि हमारा प्रिविलेज मोशन नहीं आया।

(Time bell rings)

मंडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन। मैं कह रहा था कि हिन्दी ऐसी बनाओ, जिसको सारा देश कबूल करे, जिसको चलते फिरते लोग और बाजार में जो बैठे हैं और जो ट्रेन में सफर करते हैं वह बोले और समझे। मैं ने अपने अमेंडमेंट के द्वारा आप की तबज्जो इसी तरफ दिलाई थी। आप ऐसी भाषा को मान लें जिस को कि मैं हिन्दुस्तानी कहना हूँ। तो ऐसी भाषा को नहीं लागू करना है और ऐसी भाषा का लागू करना है जिस को कि साउथ के बहन-भाई अच्छी तरह से बोल और समझ सकें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : ठेठ हिन्दी किम कहते हैं ? ठेठ हिन्दी क्या है ?

श्री अब्दुल गनी : ठेठ हिन्दी वही है जो कि आल इंडिया रेडियो से आप ब्राडकास्ट करते हैं और जो अखबार में लिखते हैं । वह हिन्दी नहीं है । हिन्दी वह है, जिसको कि गांधी जी ने कहा था ।

मैंडम डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिब ! यह क्लाज २ ऐसा है जिस में सारा बिल कवर हो जाता है । चेयरमैन साहब ने यह फर्माया था कि मुझे मौका दिया जायगा और मुझे यकीन है कि आप भी मुझे मौका जरूर देंगे ।

उपसभापति : आपने पाच मिनट से ज्यादा ले लिया है और अभी कितने सारे अमेडमेंट्स हैं ।

श्री अब्दुल गनी : अगर मैं उस वक्त बोलता तो मुझे उतना ही वक्त मिलता, जितना कि बाकी मेम्बरो को मिला था । यह क्लाज ऐसा है जिस में सारा बिल कवर होता है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani, you are speaking on the amendments. Please be brief.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप क्या बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री अब्दुल गनी : आप घबराते क्यों हैं ? इस बात से घबराते हैं कि आप गांधी जी से बेवफाई कर रहे हैं, देश से बेवफाई कर रहे हैं । जरा देश से प्यार करो और प्यार करने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि आप कड़वी बात सुनने के लिये तैयार न हों । कड़वी बात भी आप को सुननी चाहिये । इस में देश का भला है ।

मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि अगर इस वक्त साउथ का प्यार साथ रखना है, साउथ का प्यार लेना है—क्योंकि वही जुबान

होगी, वही हुकूमत हुकूमत होगी जिसे दिलो दिमाग से साउथ वाले प्यार करे, नार्थ वाले प्यार करे—तो अगर उनका प्यार लेना है तो फिर आपको उनको मुतमैयन करना है । आप चाहते हैं कि जल्दी हिन्दी हो जाये, तो उनकी ज़बान में उन को इजाजत दी जाये कि तामिल में लिखे, तेलुगु में लिखे, मलयालम में लिखे, बंगला में लिखे, मराठी में लिखे । कोई आप का झगडा नहीं होना चाहिए । अगर जल्दी करनी है और अगर जल्दी नहीं करनी है और आप को उन्हें अपने साथ लेना है तो फिर आपको दोनों बातें माननी चाहिए, क्योंकि ज़बान का मजहब से ताल्लुक नहीं है । जब से आदम व होवा हुए, जब जब जैसे जरूरत हुई वैसा नाम रख दिया, वैसी ज़बान हो गई । आज हिन्दी ज्यादा बोलने वाले हैं, हिन्दुस्तानी जिसको मैं कहता हूँ, तो आप उस को मजबूत बनाइये । साउथ के भाइयो को मुतमैयन कीजिए और उससे ही हिन्दी की ज्यादा से ज्यादा महिमा होगी । डिप्टी चेयरमैन महोदया ! चूँकि आप हमेशा ही मुझे अकॉमोडेट करती हैं, इसलिए मैं आपका हुक्म मानता हूँ (Time bell rings) और दरखास्त करता हूँ कि हिन्दी को हिन्दुस्तान की जवान मानिये और अगर आप हिन्दी को आज देवनागरी में करते हैं तो आप मेहरबानी करें उसको सब ही जवानों में करने की इजाजत दीजिये ।

आखिरी बात मैं कहता हूँ कि हिन्दी इस तरह से नहीं बनेगी, जैसे पंजाब में बनने जा रही है । पंजाब के ८० परसेंट भाई-बहिन पंजाबी बोलते हैं लेकिन जब सेसज हुआ तो . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ghani, you said you had finished your speech, but you are starting all over again.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI: Last word about Hindi, finishing touch.

लेकिन उन ८० परसेट वालों से आप कहते हैं कि तुम्हारे ऊपर हिन्दी लागू होगी। इस तरह से भाई किसी को ये कहने देने की मत कोशिश करो कि भाई हिन्दी हिन्दू की ज़बान है, पंजाबी सिख की ज़बान है, उर्दू मुसलमान की ज़बान है। बापू का कहना मानो और हिन्दी व हिन्दुस्तानी को एक समझो।]

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa):
Madam, I want to speak on the clause.

I belong to a non-Hindi speaking area. I come from Orissa and I find that the entire Hindi house is on fire. Somebody says this is Hindi; somebody else says this is not but that is. The publications of the Government give out one type of Hindi while Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji talks another Hindi. Agra Hindi is different from Lucknow Hindi; Banaras Hindi is different and so on. So, this Hindi house has to be put in order first. (Interruption) And Mr. Yajee speaks Maithili. If this is not settled first, nobody would feel attracted to get into this house. I like Hindi and I have got reverence for Hindi, as for any other language. I also want to speak in Hindi but which Hindi am I to speak or am I to learn? If I am to learn the All India Radio Hindi, Mr. Vajpayee will say that this is no Hindi at all. There must be some standard Hindi and I would humbly submit . . .

प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर (बिहार) :
असली बात यह है कि गनी साहब जो बोले वह भी हिन्दी ही है, सत्यनारायण जी जो बोले सो भी हिन्दी है और आप जो बोलेंगे, वह भी हिन्दी ही है।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : अगर यह सब हिन्दी हम को सीखनी पड़ेगी, तो हमारी जिन्दगी सीखने में ही चली जायेगी।

That is why, Madam, I would humbly request the authors, the poets, writers in Hindi in this Parliament to

do something in the matter. Why should they go on demanding propagation of Hindi in Parliament? Let them do it in their own literature. I belong to Orissa, I speak Oriya but I have been reading Bengali literature in addition to my own because Bengali has attracted me because of Rabindra Nath Tagore, Sarat Chandra Chatterji and their writings. This is really what attracts people, the standard of the literature. That is why I would humbly beg of the poets and writers in Hindi not to demand here for the creation of Hindi as the national language or the official language as an imposition from the top but first of all to develop the language. They should raise the standard of their literature and once the standard is raised, people will be attracted to learn the language. If I take to learning Hindi in the various forms—Maithili, Bhojpuri, Nagpuri, Lucknavi, Agraee, Delhi Hindi and so on—then I shall throughout my life have to go on learning Hindi alone and not learn anything else. Fixation of any date would probably not serve the purpose. The raising of the standards must be attended to first.

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री आर० एम० हजरतबीस) : माननीय श्री कुण्ण चन्द्र ने जो संशोधन किया है, उसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ। उनके भाषण को मैं ने अच्छी तरह ध्यान से सुना लेकिन मेरे खयाल से वे समझे नहीं हैं इस कलाज को। कलाज ३ में हम जो व्यवस्था करना चाहते हैं, वह कलाज ५ की व्यवस्था से अलग है। कलाज ५ की व्यवस्था कलाज ७ की व्यवस्था से अलग है। कलाज ३ की व्यवस्था में २६ जनवरी, १९६५ को यह बिल आता है और कार्यक्रम के अनुसार १५ वर्ष खत्म होते ही अगर अंग्रेजी के लिये कुछ न कुछ योजना नहीं बनायी जायगी, तो अंग्रेजी के लिये कोई स्थान न रहेगा। इसलिये कलाज ३ में २६ जनवरी, १९६५ मुकर्रर किया हुआ दिन है। कलाज ५ के लिये उन्होंने कहा है कि २६ जनवरी, १९५० से ही आप को उस बात की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये, लेकिन

[श्री आर० एम० हजरनवीस]

उसके बारे में हम लोगो को कुछ न कुछ अच्छी तरह से व्यवस्था करनी पड़ेगी, उसका नियम बनाने पड़ेगे कि किस तरह से भाषांतर हो और उस को किस तरह से प्रमाणपत्र दिया जाय। इसका लिये भी सोचना होगा और इस में कुछ समय लगेगा। उन्होंने हमारी तरफ से यह आश्वासन चाहा है कि इसके बारे में समय की कोई अवधि मुकर्रर हो। कुछ तारीखे हम ने मुकर्रर की है, कुछ समय नियत किया है कि हम क्लोज ५ के मुताबिक कार्यवाही करेंगे या क्लोज ३ के मुताबिक कार्यवाही करेंगे। मैं उन का ध्यान क्लोज ३ के बारे में आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि उसके मुताबिक जो कार्यवाही करनी है, उसका अधिकार प्रान्त के सुपुर्द है, वह अधिकार हमारी मध्यवर्ती सरकार के पास नहीं है। तो इसलिये प्रान्तीय सरकार की मर्जी के ऊपर ही यह रखना चाहिये कि वह किस तारीख को करना चाहते हैं, वे कब उस काम को हाथ में लेना चाहते हैं। उसके बारे में हम उन के ऊपर कोई नियंत्रण डाले, यह हम लोग कोई ठीक बात समझते नहीं है और क्लोज ५ के मुताबिक भी अगर हिन्दी का भाषांतर यहाँ करना है और उसका प्रमाणपत्र देना है, तो मेरे खयाल में उसका लिये कुछ न कुछ हमको व्यवस्था करनी पड़ेगी और उस में देर लगेगी। इसके बारे में मैं इतना ही कह सकता हूँ कि वे जितना इसका बारे में उत्सुक है, उनसे ही उत्सुक हम लोग भी हैं और उस में कोई देर नहीं होने देगे। जब यह विषयक पारित होकर कानून बन जायगा तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करने के लिये कार्यवाही करने में जरा भी देरी नहीं करेंगे।

श्री साहव ने तो अपना भाषण उस संशोधन के ऊपर किया, जो कि अनियमित ठहरा दिया गया। उपसभापति महोदय, इसके बारे में आप के निर्णय देने के बाद भी उन्होंने वही भाषण किया। फिर भी मैं उन का ध्यान इस तरफ आकर्षित करता हूँ, उनकी

तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आईन में भी इस के बारे में क्लोज ३५१ है, जिस में हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी का परस्पर संबध क्या होगा, उसके बारे में हिदायत दी गई है कि हिन्दुस्तान का जो वाग्वय है, हिन्दुस्तान का जो वाग प्रचार है, वह हिन्दी में ज्यादा से ज्यादा लेने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और हिन्दी को भी हिन्दुस्तानी के जगिये मपन्न करना चाहिये। ता दोनों के सहयोग में हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी . . .

شہری عبدالغلی : اس کے یہ
معنی ہوئے کہ سرکار آل انڈیا ریڈیو
والوں کو حکم دیتی ہے لیکن وہ اس
کو قبول نہیں کرتے۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी : इस के यह मानी हुये कि सरकार आल इंडिया रेडियो वालों को हुक्म देती है लेकिन वह उसको कबूल नहीं करते।]

श्री आर० एम० हजरनवीस : मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि उस में इतने प्रतिशत हिन्दुस्तानी शब्द आने चाहिये, परशियन के इतने शब्द आने चाहिये और हम इस तरह की कोई ऐसी हिदायत नहीं दे सकते हैं कि इतने प्रतिशत हर एक भाषा के शब्द आने चाहिये। यह तो हर एक को मर्जी पर है कि वह जिस तरह की भाषा बोलना चाहे, बोल सकता है। मैं हिन्दी बोलने की कोशिश करता हूँ लेकिन मैं अच्छी तरह से हिन्दी नहीं बोल सकता हूँ क्योंकि वह मेरी मातृभाषा नहीं है। मुझे हिन्दी बोलने में दिक्कत मालूम पड़ती है, लेकिन मैं इस में संस्कृत के शब्द और परशियन के शब्द भी इस्तेमाल करता हूँ। विधान में साफ दिया गया है कि हिन्दुस्तानी के जरिये हिन्दी को सम्पन्न बनाना है। हिन्दी में कितने शब्द संस्कृत के हों, परशियन के हों, यह सब रजामन्दी पर निर्भर है। भाषा के बारे में हर एक को स्वतंत्रता होनी चाहिये, इस बात को हम ने मान लिया है। लेकिन लफ्ज सरल होने चाहिये

ताकि सब लोग अच्छी तरह से समझ सकें और मैं भी समझ सकूँ। इसलिए मैं यह संशोधन स्वीकार नहीं कर सकता हूँ और आप के सामने जो क्लोज़ है, वह पारित किया जाय।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): We could not follow what he said in Hindi. It would be better if he gives the gist of it in English.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think he has used simple Hindi and you know that much Hindi all right. I have been watching you.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I will summarise the whole thing in three sentences.

As regards the amendment of Shri Krishna Chandra, I said that the arrangements in clauses 3, 5 and 7 are different. So far as clause 3 is concerned, 26th January 1965 is fixed by the Constitution itself and unless this clause becomes law English will have no place, no validity. The proposal in clause 7 invests the Governor of the State, that is the State Government, with authority and, therefore, it must be left to their discretion so that they will be able to operate on the power which has been committed to them in clause 7. Clause 5 requires an organisation to be set up for the purpose of translation and that translation is not merely producing a variant of the Acts but it must also be invested with authority. For that purpose certain arrangements should be necessary and we will lose no time in making those arrangements because after all a certain responsibility is placed upon us by the Act, by the Parliament and we will certainly discharge it without delay.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: What about clause 4? What arrangements have you to make for it?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA: After the Government's statement, I am not pressing my amendments.

*Amendment Nos. 26 and 27 were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—Continuance of English language for official purposes of the Union and for use in Parliament

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I move:

5. "That at page 2, the existing clause 3 be renumbered as sub-clause (1) of that clause and after the clause as so renumbered, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(2) It shall be the duty of the Central Government to make appropriate arrangements for providing simultaneous translation of all proceedings in Parliament from Hindi to English and from English to Hindi.'

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

6. "That at page 2, line 3, for the word 'may' the word 'shall' be substituted."

[The amendment also stood in the names of Shri Niren Ghosh, Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy and Shri Anand Chand.]

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): Madam, I am not pressing this amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there are other names here.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam, I move:

*For text of amendments, see col. 2221.

[Shri A. B. Vajpayee.]

7. "That at page 2, line 3, after the words 'to be used' the words and figure 'till the year 1970' be inserted."

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam, I move:

9. "That at page 2, after line 7, the following be inserted, namely:—

'along with all the other languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India'."

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I move:

28. "That at page 2, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

'3. (1) Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used,—

(a) for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), Hindi may be used in addition to English for all or any of the purposes stated in clauses (a) and (b) of that sub-section.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing provisions of this section, Hindi only may be used to the exclusion of English for any of the purposes stated in clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (1) in any or all of the States where the mother-tongue of the people is Hindi.

Explanation.—For the purposes of sub-section (1) the word 'shall'

used in that sub-section is to be construed as mandatory'."

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam, I move:

29. "That at page 2, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

'3. Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used as alternate language to Hindi,—

(a) for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament until otherwise decided by Parliament'."

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Madam, I move:

31. "That at page 2, line 3, after the words 'in addition' the words 'or as an alternative' be inserted."

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam, I move:

32. "That at page 2, lines 3-4, for the words 'may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi' the words 'shall as from the appointed day' continue to be used as an associate language with Hindi' be substituted"

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

33. "That at page 2, after line 7, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that any speech or statement in whatever form and

in whatever language made in either House of Parliament shall be simultaneously translated in all the other languages except Sanskrit specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.'"

34. "That at page 2, after line 7, the following provisos be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that a member who is not in a position to speak in either English or Hindi shall have the right to speak in any language specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution except Sanskrit:

Provided further that such a speech shall be simultaneously translated in all the other languages except Sanskrit specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.'

The questions were proposed.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, what about my amendments Nos. 21 and 25?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are now on clause 3.

SHRI A. D. MANI: All right.

Madam, my amendment to clause 3 stipulates that it shall be the duty of the Central Government to make appropriate arrangements for providing simultaneous translations of all proceedings in Parliament from Hindi to English and from English to Hindi. This morning my friend, Mr. Annadurai, raised this as a point of clarification and the Home Minister replied that Mr. Annadurai and others should approach the Finance Minister to persuade him to release foreign exchange for this purpose. The amount of foreign exchange involved in this is very small. For introducing simultaneous language arrangements in this Chamber as well as in the other Chamber the Government need not spend an enormous amount of foreign

exchange. It looks very ridiculous; when they hold international conferences in Vigyan Bhavan where French is translated into English, where Chinese language is translated, where Russian language is translated, when these various languages are translated, it will be incongruous if in the Houses of Parliament we do not provide opportunities for Members not knowing Hindi to understand what is spoken in Hindi in this Chamber. After 1965, it is my hope that the major statements of policy from Government will be made in Hindi and not in English and it shall be the duty of the non-Hindi-knowing Members to understand what is being said through the medium of simultaneous translation arrangements. I therefore think that it is extremely important that this amendment of mine should be accepted by Government and I do hope that the Government will find the necessary foreign exchange in view of the demand that has been made on the floor of the House by one of those who are deeply affected by the Bill, namely, the leader of the D.M.K. in this House.

Madam, I press my amendment.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : महोदया, इस से पहले कि मैं अपने संशोधन में कुछ विचार प्रकट करूं, मैं श्री मणि के संशोधन का समर्थन करता हूं। जब तक केन्द्र में दो भाषाएं चलनी हैं तब तक उनके अनुवाद की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। जब केन्द्र में अंग्रेजी की आवश्यकता नहीं होगी, तो उसके अनुवाद करने की आवश्यकता नहीं रहेगी, लेकिन जब तक संक्रमण काल है, तब तक यह स्थिति ठीक नहीं है। बहुत से सम्मानित सदस्य जो न अंग्रेजी समझते हैं और न हिन्दी समझते हैं, सदन की कार्यवाही में उचित रीति से योगदान नहीं कर सकते हैं। जब कभी मंत्री महोदय हिन्दी में बोलते हैं तो उसका अंग्रेजी में अनुवाद किया जाय, अब भी माग होती है। इस सदन में ऐसे सदस्य हैं जो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं और जब माननीय मंत्री जी अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं

[Shri A. B. Vajpayee.]

अगर उस समय ऐसे सदस्य खड़े होकर कहें कि उन्हें हिन्दी में सब बातें समझाई जायें तो क्या संकट पैदा नहीं होगा ? लेकिन जो हिन्दी नहीं जानते वे अपनी बात पर अड़ सकते हैं, जो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते उन्होंने अभी अड़ना आरम्भ नहीं किया । लेकिन ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा न हो उसके लिए दोनों भाषाओं में अनुवाद संक्रमण-काल में होना चाहिये । मेरा संशोधन इस में भिन्न है और मैं अंग्रेजी को ५ वर्ष से अधिक अवधि देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ । इसलिए मैं ने इस क्लोज में संशोधन किया है जिस में कहा गया है—

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi.—"

इम विधेयक में १० वर्ष की व्यवस्था की गई है लेकिन वह व्यवस्था भी निश्चित व्यवस्था नहीं है, ऐसा नहीं कहा गया है कि १० वर्ष के पश्चात् हिन्दी केन्द्र की भाषा बन जायगी और समिति के निर्माण की व्यवस्था की गई है । मैं एक निश्चित लक्ष्य-रेखा खींचना चाहता हूँ जिस के बाद अंग्रेजी की आवश्यकता न पड़े और उसकी सीमा पांच वर्ष के लिये मैं रखने को तैयार हूँ । अगर आवश्यकता हो तो १९७० ई० में हम सारी स्थिति पर विचार कर के समय बढ़ाने के बारे में सोच सकते हैं लेकिन अभी से कोई सीमा निर्धारित न करना और समिति को भी १० वर्ष के बाद बनाने की बात कहना—यह अंग्रेजी को हटाने और हिन्दी को लाने की बात नहीं है ।

मैंने अपने मुख्य भाषण में इस सम्बन्ध में तर्क उपस्थित किये थे और मैं उन को दुहराना नहीं चाहता लेकिन शासन, जो १९६५ ई० तक अंग्रेजी को हटाने के लिये वचनबद्ध था, यदि थोड़ा समय चाहता है, तो हम उसे पांच वर्ष का समय देने के लिये तैयार हैं । मुझे

विश्वास है कि मेरे इस संशोधन पर सहानुमति के साथ विचार किया जायेगा ।

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA (Nominated): On a point of information; you are asking whether the translation from one language to another—English or Hindi—is there. Is there any provision in India that if a translation is demanded in any Indian language, it has to be denied?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, the hon. Home Minister made a very passionate and eloquent appeal for linguistic tolerance in the country. I wholeheartedly agree with his sincerity, but the Home Minister, who was trying to be reasonable, forgot to take into consideration the real state of affairs in the country today. He lost sight of the sense of realism that is so necessary in such an issue. Whenever he speaks Hindi, I always admire Mr. Vajpayee, though I do not understand anything at all of what he says. His speeches are like music. I simply admire them. But that does not mean that we should take the opinion of Mr. Vajpayee that a language can be developed in the country within five years or ten years.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Fifteen years have passed.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I do not think that any time-limit can be put at all in regard to development of languages. One has to study the history of languages of the world. One will appreciate that no language in the world has developed in a strait-jacket manner, on the basis of a time schedule drawn up, on the basis of a time-limit put. I do not think the language of a country can be developed by such means and by such methods. It would be improper and I consider it impossible to develop a vehicle of thought, rich and modern, understood by larger sections of every community in the land, in a limited period. When this matter was debated by the Constituent Assembly and was

included in the Constitution, perhaps the Members were emotional rather than realistic in their appreciation of the true reality of the problem. I have gone through the speeches of some of the Members at that time. I find one common theme in their speeches—we are free; we are independent today, therefore, we should have an independent national language. According to them at that time English happened to be the language of foreigners. Therefore, they thought that Hindi should be adopted as the official language and should be developed as a national language in course of time. That was the climate then. In their exuberance or zeal they adopted this provision in the Constitution and they were not right. When Mr. Vajpayee pointed out that a time-limit of five years arbitrarily fixed would enable the country to develop a first class language for India, I do not think that that is the correct view, that that is the correct outlook. That shows a certain amount of perversity in thinking. Mr. Vajpayee must pardon me for saying so. I say perversity or cussedness because one will quite appreciate that a language cannot be developed within a particular period of time.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: There is no question of developing the language.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: What else?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: The language has been developed. Let it be the official language.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Then again, there is controversy. My friend here was pointing out that Hindi is spoken in different places in different ways. There is no standard Hindi.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: That is also the case with Kannada.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: My friend, Mr. Vajpayee, agrees, I think, that there is no standard Hindi, uniform throughout, everywhere.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: There is no standard Marathi. In Nagpur people speak a different Marathi. In Poona people speak Marathi in a different way. That does not mean that Marathi is not the official language of Maharashtra.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I plead that he must not be too much exercised. He must not be too much emotional on such issues. I do not agree that by such practices of linguism and chauvinism, we will be able to perpetuate a language or we will be able to spread a language. I do not think it is possible to do so in this country.

Let me tell you of the reality that obtains today. We do not know how many people really understand the particular type of Hindi that Mr. Vajpayee is speaking. I know that it is beautiful Hindi, but how many people understand it. It is an Indian language like other Indian languages. It is not widely understood by many people. At the same time, it is true that English is not widely understood by many people. Then, our approach should be: What should be the pattern we should evolve in the existing circumstances, whether one language should be the medium for carrying on in public life? Should one medium be adopted or two media should be adopted or more? That should be the consideration. The criteria should always be that most of the people should have facility or convenience to carry on their activities. I am as much interested as Mr. Vajpayee about the unity of India. The unity of India should be maintained and strengthened. That is true. At the same time, there should be efficiency of administration. There has also to be equal opportunity for all people who speak different languages in the country. There should not be any linguistic domination, chauvinism, intolerance or any stifling of opportunity for any section at all. I want equal opportunities for every section. I would like to know from Mr. Vajpayee and other

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.]

friends whether by imposing Hindi, by spreading Hindi forcibly we will not be creating a situation in the country which would lead to nothing but conflict. Does he not know that this would lead to disunity again which we all want to avoid at any cost? Therefore, I would say that the criteria for deciding upon a language for India should be based upon a realistic appreciation of the situation that obtains.

Madam, English may be a foreign language, but I feel that it is irrelevant to talk about it. It is foreign no doubt, but what is the use of saying that English is foreign and so we do not approve of it and we do not speak about it? What is the use of doing that? The reality is otherwise. Even today, when Hindi is being spread everywhere, large numbers of people want to learn English. That is the tendency today. That has been the situation. It is no good saying that English is foreign and so it has to be removed from the Statute Book. We may amend the Constitution, we may pass legislation, but the situation persists. Large numbers of people are bound to speak English, they are bound to learn English. That is the situation. One may ask whether there should not be any development of our own link language, official language or national language. I agree with that view. We must have our own language, we must develop it. Hindi should be the common language of India for the future. I would like Hindi to develop, to increase its vocabulary, to enrich itself, so that after some time, after a period of time, it may be accepted by India, by all Indians, as the language of India not only for official but for all practical purposes. Let Hindi compete with English and with other languages. But let there be no imposition, by force, by statute, of Hindi on people who are not willing to accept it. Therefore, I would say that Hindi cannot be foisted on the people through statutes, through the passing

of an Act. If it is done, what will happen is that there will be resistance, there will be protests, there will be resentment. It will give handle to my friend, Mr. Annadurai, to start direct action and the like. It will bring about a new situation on us which the Home Minister and all of us have to face. I do not want such a situation to develop hereafter. Therefore, we have got to consider whether it will be right, proper, reasonable and realistic to accept this linguistic chauvinism that we have been propounding all along. I therefore plead with my friends—friends from Hindi areas and friends from other areas—that we have got to accept this position. The position is that India should live with two link languages, Hindi and English, yes Hindi and English. We have got to develop Hindi of course. At the same time we cannot dispense with English which is so necessary for carrying on our activities at the official level and also at the non-official level.

Therefore, Madam, I move my amendments to this clause. I want this clause to be recast so that there may not be any doubt left at all in the minds of non-Hindi people. There is considerable resentment felt by friends in non-Hindi areas about the intentions of the Government, about the policy of the Government in regard to languages. Rajaji is exploiting the situation no doubt, but what is the use of saying that he is exploiting the situation? So, let us recast the whole scheme so that it may not give an opportunity for anybody to exploit the situation. I know the good intentions of the Home Minister. He wants that both Hindi and English should go side by side for some considerable length of time. I appreciate his point of view. But at the same time, there are large areas where Hindi is not spoken, and it is not clear whether English has been given equal status or whether it is occupying an inferior status. Here, it is not a question of giving a status to English or Hindi. It is a question of giving opportunities for people who know

English and not Hindi in getting into services, in passing the examinations, and in competing with those people who come from Hindi areas. Therefore, it is only symbolic. I would like the Minister to consider whether we should not remove the apprehensions in the minds of those non-Hindi-speaking people by saying that English and Hindi deserve equal attention, equal parity, equal status for all considerations. Otherwise, the language clause would create unnecessary doubt. I am very clear about the mind of the Home Minister. He is very clear, indeed, about this. He wants to give equal treatment to both the languages and wants to create equal opportunities for one and all in respect of recruitment, in respect of examinations, in respect of everything. But, unfortunately, it creates the impression that English-knowing people will have a secondary status and Hindi-knowing people will have the prime status. That has to be removed. I would plead with my friends, Mr. Vajpayee and other Hindi protagonists, to understand this. Unless we cultivate tolerance and give up intransigence and stop creating linguistic conflicts, I think it would be difficult to maintain the unity and solidarity of the country which we all profess. Thank you.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, the speeches delivered by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Home Minister, as far as the Languages Bill is concerned, are very much welcome and they represent or rather they belong to the realm of political theory and the processes of justification. At present, we are concerned with a legislation implementing the political theory and in this context, we are mainly concerned with the statute and the scope of its interpretation and not with other matters.

If we look at this problem in the context of article 343 of the Constitution, article 343(1) contemplates that Hindi is the official language. When the Constitution was drafted, in order

to take away the rigour of article 343(1) a proviso was included, that is clause (2), saying that notwithstanding anything stated in clause (1), English shall continue to be used as official language. That is the purpose for which clause (2) has been incorporated in the Constitution after clause 343(1). And now, but for the Languages Bill that is before the House, English will go out of the picture from the appointed day, that is, 26th January, 1965. In order to achieve the same purpose contemplated in clause (2) of article 343, clause 3 of this Bill is introduced. Now, what we will have to see is whether this clause 3, as it is drafted, will achieve the same purpose as contemplated in clause (2) of article 343. For the purpose of achieving that effect the words used are: English may be used in addition to Hindi language from the appointed day. I humbly submit that we are mainly concerned with the interpretation of the statute and not with the assurances given by the hon. Ministers. When we are dealing with the interpretation of a statute, we will have to mainly depend upon the language of the statute. The hon. Home Minister was pleased to refer that he had consulted one of the noted jurists in this country about the interpretation of the language. I may quote in this context, Madam, one of the authorities on this subject, Mr. C. K. Allen, one of the greatest jurists in England, and he has dealt with the subject in his book "Law in the Making". He has said at page 485:—

"It is here that we see a permanent, and apparently an insoluble, dilemma of written law: on the one hand no human language can be completely self-explanatory and all-embracing, and on the other hand the interpreters of the written word cannot and should not guess at undisclosed meanings which merely open the door to speculative ingenuity.

"It may be that no process of interpretation can entirely dispense with some element of what at its lowest is called 'guesswork' and at

[Shri K. Raghunatha Reddy.]

its highest 'insight'; but it is clear that the phraseology of enacted law, which purports to be pre-eminently explicit, is the least appropriate field for this highly uncertain quantity."

On page 499, he explicitly puts it—

"A statute is the highest constitutional formulation of law, . . ."

which we are doing now—

" . . . the means by which the supreme legislature, after the fullest deliberation, expresses its final will. The language of a statute 'can be regarded only as the language of the three Estates of the realm, and the meaning attached to it by its framers or by individual members of one of those Estates cannot control the construction of it.' There is a great reluctance to go behind this definitive formulation in search of possible motives, intentions, and influences. Our judges are in the habit of regarding all 'written instruments' in this austere manner; when once a man has committed his intentions to writing, he must be taken to mean what he writes, since the very act of writing implies the purpose of placing intention on permanent record; and if this is true of private documents, it applies *a fortiori* to writings produced after such exhaustive consideration, and with so much technical skill of expression, as statutes of the realm."

So, Madam, in view of this authoritative statement made by Mr. C. K. Allen, we will have to consider whether the language of the statute is as it is provided, and we cannot go behind it. Now, in this context, if we say the words "may . . . in addition to Hindi" the point that should be noted by all those who are interested is that this language used in clause 3 is at complete variance with the language used in clause (2) of article 343. That must be admitted. When once that is admitted, the question that we will have to ask ourselves is: Will the interpretation of this clause 3 lead to a certainty in interpretation? Assuming by some process of reasoning that it is so, even taking the kind of interpretation that has been sought to be placed by the lawyer whose name has been mentioned by the hon. Minister, without conceding it, for the sake of argument, is it not open to dual interpretation? When once the clause is open to dual interpretation, then, it is for the court to decide. In the context of the political situation, in order to avoid any usage of this clause as a powerful weapon for propaganda on the one side and, on the other, to avoid its usage by all those who stand to impose Hindi, I wish this clause will have to be substituted by a clause with definiteness. For this purpose, I have given these amendments. The amendments contemplate three kinds of situations. One amendment says that English shall continue as the official language even after the appointed day. Then, clause 3 says that the English language may be used in addition to Hindi for all the official purposes as stated in sub-clauses (a) and (b). Then, it is provided that any of those States of Hindi-speaking areas, if they do not choose to use English at all, they have got the power not to use English; they can use only Hindi. The hon. Minister has posed a problem. If the State of Madras wants to write only in English, can it write so? If the State of Rajasthan wants to write only in Hindi, can it write so? Then, if we provide only 'shall', an absurd situation would develop. But if we provide for all the three or four contingencies contemplated, then what would happen is that we will not be obstructing the creative growth of Hindi and it can be used side by side with English. We will not be preventing people from using English. If the people in the Hindi-speaking States do not want to use English, they are at liberty to do so. I do hope that this amendment would serve the purpose contemplated by the hon. Minister and that the hon. Members of this House would kindly consider the scope of this amendment.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Before I speak on my amendment, I would like to support my friend, Mr. Mani. Yesterday also, I had made this point that necessary arrangements should be made to translate the speeches of hon. Members here simultaneously.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It should be available for every language.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I say that it is possible. We should have that machinery to translate all the speeches made here, whether they are made in Oriya or Tamil or Telugu or whatever may be the language I had suggested myself that if possible, it should be translated into all other languages including English, Hindi, Bengali and other languages. But if it is not possible to have that machinery, then I had suggested that at least the Members here should be allowed to speak in their own mother-tongues. They can speak in Tamil, Telugu, Gujarati or in Marathi. But all those speeches should be translated simultaneously in Hindi or English or in both, so that many people who cannot speak impressively in Hindi or English will be able to speak and contribute to the debates in the House. Therefore, if the speeches are simultaneously translated, they will be able to understand and follow the other Members and it will enable Members from all over India to participate in the debates of this House.

Coming to my own amendment, I request the hon. Minister to accept it. There should be no objection on the part of the hon. Home Minister because the Prime Minister has given a solemn assurance to the country and particularly to the people coming from non-Hindi speaking regions. The assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister is that Hindi will not be imposed on non-Hindi-speaking people. The other day, the hon. Home Minister stated in this House as well as in the other House that there were certain difficulties. If the word 'may' was substituted by the word 'shall', it might be interpreted

by judicial courts that all the business of the Government and Parliament must be continued in both the languages, that is English and Hindi. Therefore, it will be an impossible task for the administration to continue its work in both the languages. But if the hon. Prime Minister has given an assurance that English will be continued as long as the people from the South want it, and if we want to implement that assurance, then there is no difficulty in translating that assurance by making the necessary provision in this Act. Madam, we should visualise what would happen in the future. As I said, the other day, there are possibilities that, as expressed about ten or fifteen years back by Mr. Rajagopalachari, the South some day might revolt against the North. Such an eventuality should not happen. That is what we are worried about. Therefore, I request the hon. Home Minister to be frank with non-Hindi-speaking people, whether he wants to implement the assurance given by the Prime Minister or he does not want it. If he wants to implement that assurance, then I do not think that we have not got proper words or phrases which can be used in this Bill to translate that assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister. I have said in my amendment that as an alternate language English must be continued. I have used the words, 'alternate language'. It means that Hindi will be the first language, Hindi will be the official language but as long as the non-Hindi speaking people desire it, English also will be continued.

Secondly, Madam, I have suggested in my amendment that this arrangement will continue as long as Parliament will otherwise decide. In the other House certain amendments were moved that the Parliament, in future, should take the decision by two-thirds or three-fourths majority. In my amendment, I have not made that suggestion. I have only stated that unless Parliament decides otherwise, English shall be continued as an alternate language. Madam, if we do not make this provision in the Bill, if we do not

[Shri B. D. Khobragade.]

make efforts to translate the assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister, then we will be creating great disappointment so far as non-Hindi speaking people are concerned. We have given them a solemn assurance and a solemn pledge and we must implement it. As my friend has pointed out, it is not a question of an assurance given in this House that English will be continued. I may visualise a new Government; there might be a new Prime Minister, a new Home Minister. They may say that the language used in this Bill is 'may'; that it is not a mandatory provision. It is, after all, a discretionary provision and, therefore, it will be in the discretion of the Government to continue English, or not to continue English. And if the future Government decides that they do not want to continue English, then the non-Hindi speaking people will not have any protection, and if they will be going to the courts of law, the courts of law also will interpret the statute as it is, as has already been explained by my friend. Therefore the people from the South will feel frustrated; they will feel that they had been deceived. If you cannot implement the assurances, do not give them. Tell them frankly and fearlessly that you do not want to continue English after 1965, but do not deceive them for God's sake because, if you deceive them, then, perhaps, after the frustration, they will feel embittered against the Government, against the authorities, against the Northern people, and we will be giving them a handle to exploit the situation and to continue their agitation.

Therefore, Madam, in the end I will urge the hon. Home Minister to accept my amendment. If he cannot accept it, I would like to hear from him what are the reasons for not accepting the amendment. Thank you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam, I have certain amendments and I will speak on them and also make certain remarks.

The other day the Prime Minister told us that in Yugoslavia there are five official languages, and I myself know that in Switzerland, a smaller country, there are three official languages, and it is adding insult to injury that you include 14 languages in the Eighth Schedule as national languages but, in fact, you do not give them any status as national languages other than to Hindi. In any matter, whatsoever, it would have been good if we could follow the example of Switzerland or Yugoslavia, or something like that. Make all the 14 national languages the official languages and develop Hindi definitely, with State direction, so that it becomes the common link language, not immediately but over a long time. Then all these troubles would not have arisen; the controversy would have ended. But if it is not found convenient, situated as we are, we have got to fall back upon Hindi and English both, though giving prior place to Hindi. So, in this respect, unless the word 'may' is replaced by the word 'shall' it will not allay the suspicion in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people. It is necessary to do so. Secondly, 'may' can never be interpreted as 'shall'. It should not be left open to juridical interpretation, or something like that, always open to controversy, always open to wrangling. That would create discord in national life. For this second reason also 'may' should be replaced by 'shall'. And thirdly, the wording, as it is, means, to my ordinary common sense, that whatever the Act or enactment or law or judgment, it would be in Hindi, and it can also be in English. Obviously, that is an unreal proposition today and it will continue to be so until such time as Hindi can become authoritative for texts,—texts which can be found suitable for use all over India. So, for interpretation of Acts and laws English should be the text. So, what is the difficulty in having both the languages? If other countries have four or five languages, we can have at least two for a considerable period of time, fully guaranteed unless, by

common consent, through a gradual process, which we are trying to evolve, we can replace English and make it Hindi. Till that time the position should be made absolutely clear.

Then, there is the question of the use of languages in Parliament. Now only two languages are permitted, English and Hindi. And what, in fact, does it mean? It means this. I, for example, know there are a large number of Members of Parliament, some of whom at least I know, who cannot follow the daily List of Business even, circulated by the Secretariat, either in English or in Hindi, and there is a wider number of Members of Parliament who neither can follow the proceedings on the floor of the House, nor can participate in any way in the proceedings of the House, because they cannot speak in English or Hindi. As our Parliament is becoming the forum for the representatives of the vast masses of people, at least for that purpose, in Parliament all the 14 national languages should be allowed to be used, so that you make Parliament a really national Parliament. As the provision stands today, it is not a national Parliament; it seems to be foreign. You must also realise that to a large number of people Hindi is as much difficult or foreign as English is. So, being the most representative institution in our country . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Does my friend know that even the United Nations could not provide for more than four or five languages? And how does he think that for 14 languages here arrangement for simultaneous translation can be made? I think it is not a practical proposition.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is a practical proposition for a vast country like ours if we develop our resources.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have got enough burdens. Why do you, in addition take on the burden of the Home Minister?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I can inform you that many Members of Parliament, cutting across party affiliations, Tamil-speaking, Telugu-speaking, and others, say that, one day, in Parliament, they in a body would speak in Telugu, or speak in Tamil. That is what we would do, they say. (Interruptions.)

Yes, they have said it.

It is possible to make simultaneous translations, but if you find it impossible now to make all translations, at least make two translations, in Hindi and English. *Let one speak in Bengali, Oriya, Tamil, Gujarati, Marathi, as he likes, and let there be at least simultaneous translations in Hindi and English, to begin with, with the proviso that, in course of time, there will be simultaneous translation in all the 14 languages.* On paper you are saying that all are national languages, but you have relegated all the other 13 languages to a secondary status, to regional status; you give them no national status whatsoever. Their sentiments might not be expressed on the floor of Parliament, but they are ringing in the minds of millions of our countrymen, which you ought to realise.

3 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Niren Ghosh, please come to the amendment because the sentiments you are expressing may lead to a general discussion.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH:

"along with all the other languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India".

That is my amendment. So, I think some such provision should be there.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I think my hon. friend seems to be unaware of article 120 which specifically provides that wherever a Member of the House

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

cannot express in Hindi or in English, he will be entitled to speak in his own language and provide a translation of it.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: That article gives a Member the right to speak in any of these 14 languages. But he will have to file a translation of it in English.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: There is no such thing here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We understand, Mr. Santhanam, what you say.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam, it should be understood plainly that whenever a Member speaks, he should be understood by every Member. It is beside the point whether an authorised text of the translation is supplied to the Chairman or not for record.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think once in this House somebody did speak in Tamil. He gave a statement in English.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: That is not the point. The point I am raising is that suppose an hon. Member speaks in Tamil, he should be understood by every hon. Member sitting here. There should be some such arrangement that they can automatically, immediately, follow him. I say that there should be simultaneous translation in all the 14 languages. But if you cannot do that immediately, to begin with, arrange to have simultaneous translations in Hindi and English, if an hon. Member speaks in his own mother-tongue. Let it be a beginning towards that end. That is what I want to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you have made yourself very clear. Please come to the next point.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Lastly, Madam, I say that, really, language is a very delicate and, at the same time, an explosive factor. So, it should be handled very carefully, very

delicately, very tactfully. There should be no chauvinism, no attempt to force it, unless it is accepted by common consent. We cannot live in a sort of vacuum when the language of our Acts of Parliament, legislative enactments, High Court decrees is not intelligible to millions of our countrymen. Presently it is done in English and, to some extent, in Hindi. So I can say that 90 per cent. of our countrymen are debarred from following where the country is going, how it is going, how the Acts are being passed, how they are implemented and all that. That amounts to limiting, curbing and restricting democracy which is not at all a happy feature. All these factors should be taken into consideration. So, Madam, I would press for these two amendments, that "may" should be replaced by "shall" and that all the fourteen languages should be allowed to be used in Parliament with the provision of simultaneous translations, to begin with, in Hindi and English, and ultimately in all the 14 languages.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Madam Deputy Chairman, before I move and speak on my amendment, may I have an opportunity of referring to the speech which my hon. friend, Mr. Niren Ghosh, has delivered in this House just now? He has made out a magnificent case for having a common language. He says that all the 14 languages should be allowed to be used by hon. Members on the floor of this House. There is already a provision in the Constitution to that effect. But he goes further and says that each and every such speech delivered in any national language must be simultaneously translated in this House so that other Members who are not familiar with that language, may understand it. Now, that would convert this House into a regular "Battle of the Babel". Recently I came across a foreign news magazine in which this Bill, which is now before us, was sought to be described as the "Battle of the Babel". That is the way in which foreigners try to

ridicule us particularly on this question of language difficulty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He does not understand the thing.

DR. A. SUBBA RAO (Kerala): How can a foreigner understand our problems?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: We should not give any handle to all these foreigners and other people to justify their stand that we are a people of conflicting languages, conflicting cultures, that there is no unanimity about languages and we cannot arrive at any conclusion as to what should be the official language of this country. That is exactly the reason why a common language should be evolved. Whether it should be done today, ten years hence or fifteen years hence, is a different matter to be decided by us all. We are trying to evolve that common language by means of this particular Bill which is before us; we do not want to convert this or the other House into a battle ground for languages and convert them into babels.

Coming now to my amendment, it is with some hesitation but under an overwhelming sense of necessity that I have tabled my amendment and that too when I know that even if this House accepts this amendment, it will be difficult to get it on the Statute Book during this session when the other House is going to adjourn tomorrow. What I say is this that for the purpose of giving effect to the intention underlying this Bill, which has been very clearly and lucidly enunciated in his speech by the Home Minister, it is absolutely necessary that these words should be added, namely:—

"That at page 2, line 3, after the words 'in addition' the words, 'or as an alternative,' be inserted."

Now, the Home Minister has made it perfectly clear in connection with

the controversy raised by the use of the words "may" and "shall", that if the word "may" is replaced by the word "shall", then it will be incumbent upon every official to make every noting on every file both in the Hindi language as well as the English language. Every citizen who sends up an application to the Government of India must do it in both the languages, Hindi as well as English, if the word "may" is substituted by the word "shall". That is the position. The Home Minister said that a legal objection may be raised. Suppose any Government servant is using English. It might be that he cannot use Hindi but he will have to write in Hindi also. The noting on the file will have to be done in both the languages. That is the legal position. My apprehension is that it is not so much the controversy between "may" and "shall" which might result in that situation if the word "shall" is substituted in place of "may", but the words "in addition to Hindi" as they stand in this Bill today, that will create that situation in the absence of such words 'or in the alternatives' What is the plain reading of this clause?

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi, . . ."

So, Hindi gets the priority as it must under the Constitution, as it stands today. No doubt about that. But if English is to be continued to be used, it must be done in addition to Hindi. Therefore, Hindi must be the language in which an application or a noting has to be recorded, and in addition to that Hindi noting or the application, English may continue to be used. I am putting my stress upon the words "in addition". So just to find out what exactly is the connotation of the word "addition", I may refer to the Oxford dictionary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it pocket dictionary?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Yes, everything is in the pocket nowadays. Now, addition means "join by way of increase". Therefore, Hindi is there. You can increase it by using the English language. That is the position. You cannot do away with Hindi and make notings on the files only in English but you can add English to Hindi. The very clear purpose of this Bill which was enunciated by the Home Minister will be frustrated if the words remain as they are and if the words 'or in the alternative' are not found there. What is the meaning of the word 'alternative'? It means: "choice between two things". When it is a question of choice, you have to use the word 'alternative'. If it is a question of joining something else, you have to use the word 'add' or 'addition'. It is not the intention that English is to be joined to Hindi in every case. The intention is that there may be a choice left for the next 10 years, as between Hindi and English. That being the position, I would respectfully submit to you and to this House that it is absolutely necessary that the words 'in the alternative' after the words 'in addition' should be inserted in order to make the concept of choice absolutely clear. Otherwise, it means a super-imposition and addition and a joining of English to Hindi. That is not the intention of this Bill. It has been very clearly pointed out. It is a practical, objective and well-balanced measure which has been brought before this House in order to allay all apprehensions as between English and Hindi for the next 10 years or so. I would, therefore, submit to the consideration of the Home Minister—I know it is very difficult now to do anything but let it be on record if the courts care to see that this is the view which was put forward at least on the floor of this House. I have therefore moved this amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, my first amendment relates to the

precise point made by Mr. Niren Ghosh 'shall' and 'may'. Much has been said on the point but I would like to add one or two things in order to support the contention why 'shall' should be used rather than 'may'. But before that, I would say that I am not in agreement with Mr. Vajpayee when he wants again to put restrictions or time-limit, namely, restrict the continuance of English as an additional language till 1970, that is, for another 7 years. I think if we are to take such an approach, it would again give rise to misgivings in the minds of the people and complications even in the matter of implementation of what Mr. Vajpayee has in mind.

Broadly speaking, I share his views that some day, sooner the better but in the right way, we should come to a situation when we have one link language and that should be Hindi in Devanagari script. The debate in the country really is as to how to bring about a situation when we can have that as the exclusive official language of the Indian Union. In the course of the last 13 years, since the Constitution, it has been shown that a time-limit does not help us very much unless we get things done in practical life. The progress made in the 13 years since the Constitution or will have been made in the course of the next 2 years is certainly not what is expected in order to bring about this transition. The failure for this rests mainly on the Government. I have no hesitation in saying this. I know that Mr. Sastri may not like this because after all he happens to be the Home Minister of our Government and how can he like things being said against the Government? But the responsibility mainly for the failure in this matter rests with the Government of India. I specify the Government of India because the Constitution entrusted certain responsibilities to the Government of India in the matter of creating a situation when at the end of 15 years it would be possible for us to say: 'Here and now we

have Hindi as the official language of the Indian Union'. I can have no other authority except to quote here at the moment—I have many others—the report of the Official Language Commission. If you go through this report, you will find how this Government and the Home Ministry in particular, had been continually mis-managing the affairs of the language. Now chapter and verse can be quoted from it—there is no time for it—to show this. Orders have been passed by the Ministry and disregarded by them. Memoranda have been issued by the Ministry and disregarded by the Government. Then, we have Shri Lal Bahadur. Sometimes he is very self-critical admitting the mistakes when he went to Assam after the language trouble there. Therefore, the failure for this matter rests with the Government. Can we envisage a situation when this Government—in such matters thoroughly inefficient, and some of its activities are absolutely worthless—is going to bring about such a change in 7 years? Mr. Vajpayee may have illusions about this Government but I have none. I have none at all whatsoever because if Mr. Shastri could have done it, I would have supported Mr. Vajpayee's amendment. My fear is this that if we accepted this thing, the so-called Hindi protagonists—nothing wrong if you are a protagonist of an objective that we have set forth in our Constitution but—the Hindi chauvinists may run riot. When I mean Hindi chauvinists I have a small coterie of people in mind. We have got our great bureaucracy. Once a law is passed, it interprets it in its own way. The Home Department is a pastmaster in the bureaucratic anti-people interpretation of some of these legislations. We have seen it. Therefore I say even with Mr. Shastri, for whom we have great regard despite the fact that he has kept thousands of our people in jails, I would not like to invest so much authority because I have seen. We had Mr. Katju as Home Minister; he failed. Then we had Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant as Home Minister, with

all his great qualities, whatever they were, and he also failed; and now we have Mr. Shastri. At least he has a sober accent when he speaks on such matters but mind you, do not be carried away by Mr. Shastri. He looks very innocent—indeed he is very innocent. The presentation of this is almost winning but we are concerned with the Government of India and its Departments and we know to our cost what his assurances mean in the period of emergency when it comes to practical implementation under the D.I.R., etc. Therefore, I cannot at all trust. Besides, what will be the reaction? There I am in agreement with him; otherwise they would have put. I do not think Mr. Shastri is opposed to the idea of Hindi being placed as the official language of the Indian Union and no other language. I am not saying that he is a Hindi chauvinist. I think he is loyal to that aspect of the Constitution. He may not be loyal to the Fundamental Rights to that extent but certainly to this aspect of the Constitution he is certainly loyal but when he takes that approach. 'Do not fix the time-limit', I think it is right

(Interruption)

Let us see and let others feel. You have four Hindi-speaking States, shall we say, broadly speaking but the rest of the States in the Indian Union are not Hindi-speaking. Yet we are federal. We are not federal, they have not made federal Governments. However, we are a Government of this kind. It is a cross between unitary and federal government, something like that. Naturally you have to take into account how the people of Bengal, the people of the South, the people of Orissa and the people of Assam react to it. Do not be provocative right at the beginning. Therefore I say that this suggestion should not be accepted at all. The time-limit should not be there. At the same time, in the right direction, democratically and with popular orientation, efforts should be made to get the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

objective fulfilled. Therefore, I am in entire agreement with Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri but one thing I can tell him that his Ministry is responsible for ensuring the transition from English to Hindi and for bringing about a situation when we can finally say "good-bye" to English as the Union official language and place Hindi in its exclusive position. The Home Ministry has to play a very important part and I leave it to them. I do not know who the Home Minister will be then but the point we are concerned with is the law that is there. Parliament should discuss and give guidance in such matters from time to time. The time-limit would hustle them. The time-limit of this kind, within 1970 we must have it done, will provoke and the time-limit will encourage the bureaucrats to adopt methods in the matter that may be harsh, that may be aggressive and that may have elements of compulsion. Hence I cannot accept this and I would appeal to Mr. Vajpayee to withdraw this amendment. I like the Hindi that he speaks and I do not know whether I would ever be able to speak even twenty per cent. of the Hindi that he speaks.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I hope you understand it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do understand unlike the hon. Member. I understand by the look of Shri Lal Bahadur how many people he is going to arrest next time. That I understand.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You understand the implications also, it seems.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Are we in Parliament or are we in a *Baitakkhana*, as we call it in Bengali, indulging in cross talk about the number of people to be arrested and so on? This kind of thing must be brought to an end some time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will speak even though Mr. Santosh Basu

may not like it. I am not a flatterer, Mr. Santosh Basu may be. I shall give such instances as we have.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, call him to order. I shall give such examples with regard to this . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you speak on your amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, and in that, I shall give whatever instances I like in order to illustrate my views. Mr. Santosh Basu need not teach me about this.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Yes, he has got to be taught.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think you should tell Mr. Santosh Basu to try his parliamentary knowledge elsewhere, not with me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you better put in more reason and less passion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Reason is a relative term, Madam. Reason is relative. Obviously, whatever Mr. Basu is saying is unreasonable and what Mr. Niren Ghosh says is reasonable. Both are intelligent men. He was using bad language, saying *Baitakkhana*. I do not know what he meant, whether he meant the *Baitakkhana* of the Congress Party.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Everybody knows what you are doing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Parliament is a fighting institution. Madam, you will understand . . . He is a superannuated fighter. I am a young fighter.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Fifty per cent. of the time of this House is being wasted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is a superannuated fighter.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: On a point of order, Madam. You are in the Chair and always there is either the Chairman or one of the Vice-Chairmen in the Chair. How can the hon. Member then say that fifty per cent. of the time is being wasted, when the Chair regulates the proceedings?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I made a suggestion.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is being regulated by the Chair and so I would like a ruling from you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He can cast any reflection he likes on you, Madam, that is a different matter.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: There is no question of reflection on the Chair. I must take it clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, you are making it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, if you do not come back to the amendment, I will have to pass over to the other speaker. Please come to the point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I was coming but why did he interrupt?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You carry on now with your amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is very bad. I know Mr. Santosh Basu wants the favour of the Minister but I do not. He can say this.

I say that this time-limit should not be there. I was thinking of supporting but now I will not. The time-limit should go. Shri Lal Bahadur and others like him

would not support "may" and they would like something to be added in order to buttress the position from the point of view of "shall". That is what he has done. As you know, I am not uncharitable even to my bitterest opponent and, therefore, I say that Mr. Santosh Basu at least in this case has shown some ingenuity for which I congratulate him. You would consider this thing but the question arises whether the purpose of this measure will be compromised if we have "shall" and secondly, if we have "shall" instead of "may", whether it would give rise to certain administrative anomalies or difficulties of the kind the hon. Minister had in mind. I think these two are important questions which we should consider. If you refer to the Constitution, article 343 (2) envisages that for a fifteen-year period, English, whether you call it "shall" or "may", is to be used for certain purposes to be determined again by Parliament or for the purpose for which it was being used. The framers of the Constitution used the expression "shall" and now we have come to adopt the expression "may". I do not see why there should be a change here immediately. You have read the clause carefully here and then you will find, the article reads as follows:—

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may",

and if we use the term "shall", it will mean, "as from the appointed day shall continue to be used in addition to Hindi". If you insert "shall" in place of "may", how does it read? It reads "in addition to Hindi"; it is not as if Hindi is replaced; Hindi continues in addition to English and under this clause, Hindi has already been given the prior right. Whenever you say that something will be used in addition to another language, both the languages do not stand exactly on the same footing. One is basic and the other is additional and that is what,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

I believe, Mr Santosh Basu wanted to achieve to obviate some of the administrative or other difficulties he had in mind. If you accept the word "shall", then what happens? English shall continue, after 1965, for such purposes as are enumerated in clause 3, not in its own right absolutely but it continues as an addition to Hindi which has the first place, as determined by article 343 of the Constitution and then again in this Parliamentary legislation it is given the priority. Therefore, it cannot be said that we are putting both English and Hindi in the same category. What do you gain? You gain by putting this one advantage. You give an assurance to those in the non-Hindi speaking areas that English shall continue for this purpose and it becomes mandatory. That is to say, there shall not be any kind of measure or rule or regulation which detracts from the commitment that is given by the use of the word "shall" which would be in consonance with the amendment that is implied in the word "shall". That is the assurance that you are giving to the people in the non-Hindi speaking region. I think this will satisfy them and much of the controversy, which may arise in the South over this matter, will have been lessened as a result of its acceptance. Yet at the same time, those who stand for Hindi and rightly so, as the ultimate objective in the matter, will not have anything lessened. It is to be considered from that angle. If these things were not put in the same form as they are here, with the backing of article 343, I would not perhaps have said all that I am saying. I say this because I think that I am not being unfair to those who legitimately want Hindi to occupy a better place. I am not one who stands for the same equation in the relation between Hindi and English in the next 10, 12, 15 or 20 years. Certainly not; I want the equation to be gradually changed in favour of Hindi, English gradually getting dethroned and Hindi being placed more and more in its position but that equation has to

be brought about in a manner which

does not disturb the unity of the country or understanding in the country or does not give rise to any kind of complications in our national and public life. You should have considered this. Now, Mr Lal Bhadur Shastri said that if he had included the word "shall", probably the difficulty would have been that all the notings made will have to be accompanied by English translations. I am not prepared to accept that interpretation because this word should be read along with the other things, the entire Bill and the Constitution. Suppose somebody is making a noting now in Hindi, in some States notings are made sometimes in the regional language. Do they in every single case give an English version of it? No, they do not. Therefore, let us not stress this point too far to lead to this absurdity that every single note that we write in an order or anything, has to be necessarily translated into English if you had the word "shall" here. Suppose I look at it from another angle. Suppose you keep "may" and then say that "may" is actually "shall" here and quote the authority of interpretations to say that "may" is used here as "shall". Then also, the same complication can arise. Suppose somebody demands, 'You have given this in Hindi, where is the English translation?' Then we can quote the speeches of the hon. Minister to show that it was not the intention to rule out English translation. Therefore we are neither here nor there as far as this aspect of the controversy is concerned. That is why I say that it does not lead us anywhere. I think it is a practical question as to how the notings should be done. If it is a practical question then we can solve it in a different way taking into account that everybody would be reasonable but the main thing is this. A large number of people feel that if you had used the word "shall" here their apprehensions will have been greatly removed. Why should we not have done it? I cannot understand this at all when we are not materially and

substantially losing anything on this point, when in the Constitution we have the word "shall".

Then it is said that an assurance has been given by the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. But then a question may be asked, is this not a legislation? This legislation is too serious a thing to be satisfied with some assurance even if we feel that those, who are giving this assurance, are serious about it. You will try your best to implement but this is an Act of Parliament which not only becomes the law but also gives an orientation in our public policy, in our public thinking, in our public behaviour, in our mutual relations between the Hindi-speaking and the non-Hindi-speaking people in the regions which are not so-called Hindi regions. And this has another educative effect. You shall be confronted with the task of popularising this thing in the country; since you are committed to voluntary acceptance by the non-Hindi-speaking people of Hindi as the official Union language, would it not be better that we are better armed by a provision of this kind when we shall have the word "shall" so that we can tell those people that they need have no apprehension or fear whatsoever because that has been provided for at least for the next ten years. For the next ten years it is going to be used; although more and more we are in favour of giving the proper place to Hindi, English will also be used depending on the situation. Now theoretically it can be argued this way. Suppose a Government comes in after the fourth general election which does not believe in this. Suppose Mr. Vajpayee and some of our Hindi friends in the Congress Party are in a position to create a big volume of public opinion in the Hindi region, suppose in the Congress Party those people coming from the Hindi region are very dominant—not dominant in that way—but there are many such people who feel in a particular way, in the way our poets may feel, like Prof. Dinkar here, they may compel the Government to give up Eng-

lish altogether and they can easily say, 'Parliament never gave us a mandate; it is for the Government to exercise its discretion and decide whether to continue English or not and therefore, we think that it is no longer necessary to have the Government orders and regulations in English' and they may thus take away whatever assurances are implied in respect of clause 3. What is the guarantee against it except this assurance of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister? And Mr. Annadurai said, 'Should not the Home Minister become some day the President of India?' I can understand such a thing. I also ask the same question. But the trouble arises when Government yields to pressure. We from this side know that we can get things sometimes through movements. We have got Samyukta Maharashtra by agitation. Why can't I apprehend that in that context, the other side may develop such an unreasonable view and pull the Government to go back upon the assurance prematurely? If that is not absolutely within sight, it is a different matter but if we foresee such a situation then certainly the people living in the non-Hindi regions will be entitled to ask the question that if you meant that "may" should mean "shall", that if you meant that English should continue side by side as an additional language with Hindi, then why you did not provide for that. Well, I will have to answer this question if I am a *Hindi-Pracharak* and I should be handicapped in meeting this very legitimate question by such people. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, this should be seriously considered by the Home Minister. And this can wait. There is no hurry. Mr. Basu was apologetic because nothing could be done till the next session. It can be passed in the next session. We have got plenty of time. It is not 1965 yet. Therefore the whole thing can be fully debated and discussed.

My other amendments relate to other points; they are interesting points. Mr. Basu is a very esteemed

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
friend of ours and I am very sorry that I have to criticise his contention, not him; I love him but I dislike some of his arguments.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:
So do I love you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not only that; I respect you also.

Here I have said two things. Any speech or statement that is made in either House of Parliament in whatever language, should be simultaneously translated into other languages except Sanskrit. I think Sanskrit can be left out. Sanskrit may be one of the fourteen languages mentioned in the Schedule of the Constitution but I do not think there is anybody here who would say that we should have a Sanskrit translation also.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Why not?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you like it, I do not mind. (*Interruptions*). That is not the point. Sanskrit is a dead language for current purposes. We love it. What else are we if we do not have respect for the Sanskrit language? But we know for current purpose we do not need it. Therefore, according to me, there are 13 languages in the Schedule. Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri was absolutely on the defensive in his argument when this point was made. He said that we have not got foreign exchange and he asked us to appeal to the Finance Minister. We are always willing to appeal to the Finance Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which amendment are you speaking on?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Amendment No. 33. He asked us to appeal to the Finance Minister. I am prepared to join him in a deputation to the Finance Minister in order to get the necessary foreign exchange sanctioned. Let there be a deputation of Members of Parliament led by Mr.

Lal Bahadur Shastri in order to get the requisite foreign exchange. And I can get it. I can give concrete suggestions. The foreign exchange that is being sanctioned to the capitalists like Mr. G. D. Birla to go and make speeches in San Francisco can be stopped. Let this be stopped for a while and we can get the foreign exchange for the instruments. You see, long speeches are being made there. Cut them out so that we can hear our speeches in our country. How much? Has there been any estimate? I have been to countries and conferences. I have attended many. We are a very poor people, the Communist Parties of the world.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Do not be too modest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With your blessings the Soviet Union has got rockets and so on. Perhaps, as you are aware, they may be holding their Parliament in the Moon some time soon when we will be still discussing as to which should be our official language. Let us not go into that. But what will be the cost? Has it been found out? Was the Government serious? Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's only argument is money, but the question of money will arise only in 1965, not today, under this Bill. Therefore, we can wait. Meanwhile, we can find out money and we can levy some more taxes and so on for so many odd things. There are ways of getting money. We do not think that we are going to have the emergency and this sort of restriction for another year or two years. Meanwhile, even if we have the emergency, if we can avoid the trips of Ministers, Birlas and so on, we can find foreign exchange. The expense is not much. People have an idea that crores and crores of rupees will be spent. As I said, we are a very poor people, the Communist Parties. I attended two conferences of the World Communist Movement. There were arrangements for simultaneous translation in seven languages. It is so simple. Not only that. What happen-

ed? Diwan Chaman Lal did see it at the Peace Conference. I attended the conference. He attended it. Now, we were given something like a small transistor radio. Put it in your pocket, put something in your ears. As the speeches are being made, you tune in. They have no connection with anything. You can tune it in and get the English or Russian version as the case may be. If you are a Frenchman, put it in the right key and you get the speech in French. No connection whatever is there. It is a little thing. Therefore, you should get this. It is very simple. I am told that it is not at all expensive. In a much poorer country like Rumania I have seen it. In other countries also it is there. Let alone the Soviet Union which is technically advanced and so on. The cost is not much. I think the foreign exchange factor is not a factor. That is number one. I think it is within our competence to get it. Financially and technologically it is available to us, should we desire. Here we have got two boxes, galleries, always empty. Never have I seen in the past eleven years anybody either here or there. Now, easily this mechanism can be set up here. I have seen it in the Supreme Soviet and I have seen it in the Communist Party conferences. It is easily done with little technical connections, contrivances and so on. It can be easily done. And it is better to have those places occupied rather than have them empty all the while. It seems there are no visitors for this. I tell you that the cost will not be much. I think besides we can get credit for everything. *(Time bell rings)*. We get credit for our Bokaro plant. We get credit for Bhilai, the Heavy Electricals, etc. Who on earth told you that we may not get credit for this? Has anybody told you in the world that should the Indian Parliament decide to have this kind of arrangement for simultaneous translation, they would not be getting credit facilities in order to import the requisite implements and technical know-how? I am prepared, again, to go on a delegation led by any Minister and

I am sure if you decide, it is possible to get this equipment on rupee payment. I say straightway on rupee payment, without involving any foreign exchange for installation in this House. Since we are getting so many other things I think people, who are interested in Indian democracy and not interested in Kashmir, will know how to give us this equipment in order to see that all languages are spoken.

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. Mr. Santosh Kumar Basu's idea is not right. He said 'Babel'. He seems to be afraid of it. But that will be in the ears. All these microphones, earphones and other things will be yours. If somebody speaks, he speaks in the language he knows, for example, Bengali. It is not as if the translations are done simultaneously loudly so that everybody hears everything. I can assure you, Mr. Santosh Kumar Basu, that it is not at all that. You will hear only in the language of your choice and you will hear in no other language, including the language of the speech. If somebody makes a speech in Tamil, it is not that you hear it in Bengali or English or any other language. The translation is there simultaneously but you hear it in the language in which you wish to hear and no other. Therefore, the babel of tongues does not arise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, this will not do.

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have covered that point.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It will retard the progress of the common language.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan. I can tell you why.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

They will have respect for the Union language. All these people, who are coming from the regions, will understand that here in Parliament we do not mean the suppression of any language. The fear today is not that the regional language will continue to be suppressed by the English language. The fear in the non-Hindi region, whether you like it or not, is that their regional language may be suppressed by the Hindi language and, I think, one of the ways by which we can allay this fear will be by making this arrangement. Besides, we shall be solving another problem, that of people from various States, people who may not be well up in either Hindi or English but who may love their language and speak better in their own language. You can say that many Members in this House would like to speak in their own mother-tongue. Why should we deprive them of the benefit of speaking in their own language, giving the best of their ideas in the best of their languages? Why should we deny them the advantage of doing that?

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have said it many times and you have commented on both your amendments. Therefore, you will wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About my amendment No. 34 . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have spoken. Now, you will wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am winding up.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: This amounts practically to a monopoly of the House by one Member. I think something must be done about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can get up and speak. (Interruptions). I think the right under article 120 is and Hindi. But suppose I want to speak in Bengali, I cannot. This is the there only if I do not know English

position. Then, again, another restriction is that I have to give an advance translation. Even if you allow me to speak, when I do not know English or Hindi, I cannot understand why an advance copy of the translation should be given. Therefore, that again gives a feeling of anger that the regional language has been put on a different footing, on a lower footing. I think that should go. Therefore, from every account, the regional languages should be given whatever due right they are entitled to hear and I think nothing will be lost by that. We should like to hear Mr. Santhanam and I am prepared to sit till 12 o'clock tonight.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, Deputy Chairman, as regards the amendment moved by Mr. Mani, all that I can say at present is we shall give it the attention it deserves. It is already under our examination. We will examine it carefully and see whether it can be implemented.

Then, I will come to the main question here, whether the use of English, the right given under the proposed clause 3 to use English is liable to be restricted or abridged at the discretion either of the Government or any other authority. May I start by saying that for the purposes of implementation I see no difference between the language which we have used and the language of amendment No. 29 of Mr. Khobaragade? If I had the choice, I would certainly have replaced it by my own words. While dealing with this amendment and making my submission to the House on the language used in clause 3, where a particular form is used, I shall deal with some of the objections raised and doubts expressed by the hon. Member, Mr. Basu, and I hope to convince him that it is not necessary to change the language of clause 3 in order to achieve the purpose which we have set in view. Mr. Khobaragade's amendment is this:

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from

the commencement of the Constitution. . . ."

That rightly reminds us that we are legislating under article 343(3).

" . . . the English language shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used as alternate language to Hindi."

This is one way of expressing the thought. The other way is Mr. Basu's draft in which he says that English shall be used as an alternative of Hindi. We could as well have chosen another expression:

"As from the appointed day it shall be lawful to use either English or Hindi."

The present draft of clause 3, in my submission, Madam, means exactly the same thing. Unless it means the same thing, we are aware that we shall not be carrying out the assurance given by the Prime Minister. Why did we not choose these words which it is said, would have carried conviction? Why did we choose the other form? Now, what does clause 3 try to do? It tries to do two things. First of all, it permits the continuance of English or authorises the continuance of English for all purposes of the Union. It also permits the transaction of business in Parliament in either Hindi or in English. Now this legislation is necessary because under article 343(1) the official language of the Union is Hindi in the Devanagari script. Under clause (2), however, this does not become operative for fifteen years. But after fifteen years, under clause (3), English may be continued for such purposes as may be prescribed by Parliament. Now, under clause 3 we combine, Madam, two things: firstly, the authorisation of the use of English as an official language of the Union, and secondly, the transaction of business in Parliament either in Hindi or in English. Here we are concerned with two articles, articles 343(1) and 120. Let us

go to the phraseology used in article 120:

"Notwithstanding anything in Part XVII, but subject to the provisions of article 348, business in Parliament shall be transacted in Hindi or in English."

(Interruption)

I will answer all the questions at the end of my speech.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:
I would like to tell the Minister . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen to the Minister.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:
Madam, I want to point out one thing. I may only point out to the hon. Minister that the word used is a disjunction and not a conjunction. I would request him to keep that in mind.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Therefore, Madam, we could have adopted either of these expressions. But there is another provision in the Constitution, proviso to article 343(2), and in drafting clause 3 we have drawn upon the words of proviso to 343(2) . . .

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU:
And reversed it.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: . . .
and reversed it:

"Notwithstanding anything in clause (1)"—which makes Hindi the official language—"for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used. . . ."

Mark the words "shall continue to be used" because this is an expression which we get very often.

"shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement:

Provided that the President may. . . ."

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.]

Let us again mark the word "may".

"during the said period, by order authorise the use. . ."

That is to say, the President has to open out an area in which this proviso is to operate.

"authorise the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language" etc.

Here the words are "in addition". There are certain departments in which authorisation has been made, that is to say, though under article 343(2) English must be used or shall continue to be used, yet in addition to English Hindi may be used. That was the position. How was it interpreted in actual practice? What we understood by this provision, when we actually carried it into operation, was that in respect of the official business, for which this authorisation was made either Hindi was used or English was used at the discretion of the user. "May" is an enabling provision to the user. "May not" is also entirely at his discretion; it is not some outside authority who may not allow him to do it.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: That applies to the Government also.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: It does not apply to the Government.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: The Government may or may not.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: How does it come?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Government also needs for official business transaction to use English. Is it open to the Government to use either Hindi or English or is it necessary to use Hindi and English only as an optional addition?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I understand the difficulty of the hon. Member. Let us see. Official business of the Central Government—here the ex-

pression 'Central Government' is not used in a cumulative sense. When you speak of Government, it is possible to speak of it as a juridical person. But when we speak of Central Government, we mean distributively each person who discharges the function of the Government. I will illustrate my meaning when we go to the next clause, business in Parliament. Now, it is possible to refer to Parliament cumulatively as one entity, but when we refer to business in Parliament, we refer to the right of each one of the Members of Parliament. What exactly the clause aims at? We will have to consider it when we see the provision actually in operation under clause (b). Our business is transacted in Parliament either in Hindi or in English. Now I am speaking in English. Mr Vajpayee cannot object saying that I must speak in Hindi. Some time back I chose to speak in Hindi rather bad Hindi, but no one objected to my speaking in Hindi. Similarly in the transaction of official business it will be open to each person who constitutes the Government that he may use Hindi, he may not use Hindi. That is what it means. Therefore, the words "in addition" there in that context mean "in the alternative". And why did we choose the words? It is because the Constitution employs the words and Mr . . .

4 P.M.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: There is some ambiguity . . .

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Mr. Basu will try to see that when we are legislating under the Constitution, as far as possible we try to borrow the words of the Constitution. Otherwise, it is a rule of interpretation often observed, known to every lawyer, that when you change the language, there is imputed to you motive to express something which is different from that which was expressed earlier. Therefore, there is no mental reservation with us. Now, in another place, a very astute lawyer. Mr. Sachin

Chaudary, put the question in a neat form. He said, 'Who may not?' Read clause 3. You may use either English or Hindi but 'who may not?' You may not. You may use Hindi, you may not use it; you may use English, you may not use it. It is you. Therefore, I do not see that there is anything whereby anyone is prevented from writing in English. Therefore, that being the position, that being our interpretation, I have no doubt that the interpretation will be accepted because this is the basis on which we have worked out the proviso in the last fifteen years. The apprehension, which occurred to Mr. Basu does not rest on any secure foundation. Now, though we say that Hindi becomes the official language of the Union, no one is compelled to write in English and no one is compelled to write in Hindi. About legislation under article 343(3), we may note that it says, "Notwithstanding anything in this article". That is to say that it has the effect of excluding out of the operation of article 343(1) any legislation made under article 343(3).

Now, in this connection, again I will refer to the meaning which Shri Basu read from the Oxford Dictionary. I entirely agree when he says that 'addition' means something in excess. Now, what are the languages to be used? Article 343(1) says 'Hindi'. We add to that word 'English'. We do not add 'to each communication'. We add to the languages which are available for us. The addition is not to each of the orders which go from the Government, each expression of the Governmental opinion, resolve, communication. No. The addition is to the means of communication, namely, first of all, the Constitution having said 'Hindi', we add to that 'English' and then the appropriate word is 'may'—not 'shall'—because the moment we say 'shall', Mr. Basu will say that 'shall' will mean the compulsory use of both the languages together, which is certainly not the intention. That is not the intention at all. I see no difference between Mr.

Khobaragade's draft and the draft which we have made. We could have certainly changed the draft. But the reason why we are not changing it is that we are drafting under article 343(2) which permitted an interim arrangement. It is similar to the arrangement that we are now making, except that Hindi and English are reversing their positions. The two things had to be combined together—authorisation to use English for official purposes and in Parliament. Any good draftsman would combine two similar things together. The first thing that he will see is the economy of words. The second is that all the law should be found in one place as far as possible. One thing is common—the use of Hindi and English in the alternative. And there are two provisions together which are, of course, separated in the Constitution because one is dealt with under article 120 and the other is dealt with in article 343. Let us understand what the draftsman was trying to do. He says that Parliament is now legislating for the alternative use of Hindi and English. There are two provisions regarding it. He has tried to combine them at one place. He could have drawn, he could have utilised, the language of article 120. Instead of that, he chose the language of proviso to article 343 (2). But, in any case, a good draftsman will always, as far as possible, use the language which is known, though it may not appear to be clear, the language which is known, to which he is familiar, which has actually been interpreted in practice. Now, therefore, any apprehension on this score that we have not properly expressed the wish, I hope I have completely dispelled.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Just one word. In regard to the very lucid interpretation of the provisions of the Constitution by the hon. Minister, may I ask this question? He was referring to the usage and the practice which have grown up as a result of those words which have been used in the Constitution. But will the courts

[Shri Santosh Kumar Basu.]

refer to the practice and the usage in the Secretariat based upon those words in the Constitution or will they rely completely and exclusively upon the wording of the section in this Act? In my understanding, 'in addition to' means that Hindi must compulsorily be there in every case and that English may be added whenever the user chooses to use it. That is my only difficulty.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I think the wording 'in addition' merely refers not to, as I said, communication but to the languages which are available for us. But I do not say that the practice is something which the court must regard as decisive in interpreting. Of course, they would certainly consider what actually this expression is. It is not conclusive, it is not decisive. The courts are free to disregard the practice if it goes contrary to the plain meaning of this section. But in all this runs the assumption—and I think the natural assumption—that whosoever wants to communicate, at any time will use one language and does not require two languages.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I want to ask another question. Is it the hon. Minister's contention that the Government of India will not be in a position or will not have the power to restrict the use of English for any purpose of the Union? Is it his interpretation?

Let it go on record.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Yes

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Will not have the power?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Yes.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: 'Yes' means what?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: It will not have.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I should like to ask a point of clarification regarding Mr. Khobaragade's amendment. Am I to understand that the purport of the Official Languages Bill, as it stands now, is virtually to give the status of an alternative language to English? It is because you said that the drafting might have been different, might have been better. Am I to understand that it is the intention of the Government to give the same status to English as it would have, say, of an alternative language?

The second point that I would like to raise is that, I do not want to raise it at the end of the speech. The hon. Home Minister, when he spoke this morning, referred to the foreign exchange difficulties in regard to the acceptance of the suggestion that arrangements should be made for the simultaneous translation of speeches from Hindi to English and English to Hindi. Now, the Minister of State has mentioned that Government would consider the matter. Am I to understand that there has been a shift in the attitude of the Home Minister on this question? I would very much like the Home Minister to explain his point of view because, if he is prepared to consider this question, he will give a lot of satisfaction to this section of the House which wants that arrangements should be made for simultaneous translations.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Before the hon. Minister answers, I will . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let this be answered before that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I shall be grateful if the hon. Member will repeat the latter part of his question. I am sorry I could not catch it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In the morning, the Home Minister said that foreign exchange difficulties were there, and

he wanted Mr. Annadurai to put the question to the Finance Minister, to approach the Finance Minister for foreign exchange. He made it appear that the creation . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: For an incidental reason . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: Whatever it is; I am just quoting what he said. It gave me the impression that while the Home Minister may be in sympathy with the suggestion, he wanted it to be left to a voluntary agency, namely, the Members of the Opposition, to approach the Finance Minister to get the foreign exchange for this purpose. The Minister of State, however said that Government would consider the matter. I may be persuaded, Madam, to withdraw the amendment if the Home Minister were to say that his own attitude is that this question should be sympathetically examined and, if it is possible, such arrangement should be made for simultaneous translation of speeches from Hindi to English, and from English to Hindi. I would like the Home Minister himself to clarify.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Only for two languages.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, two languages.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: What my colleague had said was perfectly correct. He said that the matter would receive consideration—he said something on those lines. The House is aware that this proposal has not been made for the first time. The hon. Member might also be aware that it was strongly supported and recommended by the previous Speaker of the Lok Sabha. He had taken up that matter with the Government. So it is not, as I said, a new question. In fact almost everybody is in sympathy with this proposal. The only point is how to execute it in practice. Now, I had said it—I am sorry; I should perhaps not have expressed it that way here in

this House—in a somewhat light-hearted manner. It was really not light-hearted. I thought he would appreciate the humour of it.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But we would want you to appreciate our convenience also.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I think it is a matter which will receive, naturally, the consideration of Government, and in any case, I would not advise the hon. Member to press this amendment.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: As regards the amendment of the hon. Member, Mr. Vajpayee, it is against our policy to fix any time limit for the duration of clause 3.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, the Hon. Minister was pleased to take more or less the language of article 343(2) and article 120. Now, if you refer to article 120, the language used is "in Hindi or in English". "Or" is a disjunction, and when we use a disjunction, it will mean either this or that, but whether the words "in addition to" would amount to a disjunction in English grammar is the first question.

Now, the second question is that in article 343(2) the language is—

"Notwithstanding anything in clause (1), for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement."

and the question is whether the language used in clause (2) of article 343 can be equated to the first part of clause 3 of this Bill, where we use the words "in addition to", and also whether 'may' can mean 'shall'. These are the two questions which the hon. Minister will have to keep in mind when answering this question.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, I have already expressed my point of view, and I do not think that it gains in strength by mere repetition. I said "in addition" is an addition to the number of languages to be used. "May" is a disjunction . . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: One question I have to ask.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have spoken on your amendment already.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Only one question I would like to ask. I am sorry I cannot agree with the views expressed by the hon. Minister. (Interruptions.) He has said that the language used in that clause and in my amendment mean the same thing. Now, in the clause, the word used is "may" and in my amendment it is "shall". The other day the Home Minister said that 'shall' cannot be used, because it might give rise to some anomalies and some difficulties in administration. So I just wanted to know from the hon. Minister if, according to him, the meaning of the clause in the Bill and the language used in my amendment is the same, what objections are there, what reasons are there, not to accept the amendment and thus to allay the fears in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think he has answered these objections.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: He has not mentioned the reasons.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I put the amendments to vote. What about your amendment, Mr. Mani?

SHRI A. D. MANI: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment No. 5.

*Amendment No. 5 was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

6. "That at page 2, line 3, for the word 'may' the word 'shall' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at page 2, line 3, after the words 'to be used' the words and figure 'till the year 1970' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

9. "That at page 2, after line 7, the following be inserted, namely:—

'along with all the other languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

28. "That at page 2, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

'3. (1) Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used,—

(a) for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament,

*for text of amendment, see col. 2346 *supra*.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), Hindi may be used in addition to English for all or any of the purposes stated in clauses (a) and (b) of that sub-section.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing provisions of this section, Hindi only may be used to the exclusion of English for any of the purposes stated in clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (1) in any or all of the States where the mother-tongue of the people is Hindi.

Explanation.—For the purposes of sub-section (1) the word “shall” used in that sub-section is to be construed as mandatory.”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

29. “That at page 2, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

‘3. Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used as alternate language to Hindi—

(a) for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day; and

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament until otherwise decided by the Parliament.”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about your amendment, Mr. Basu?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: So long as the matter goes on record I am satisfied. I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

31. “That at page 2, line 3, after the words ‘in addition’ the words ‘or as an alternative’, be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

32. “That at page 2, lines 3-4, for the words ‘may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi’ the words ‘shall, as from the appointed day, continue to be used as an associate language with Hindi’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

33. “That at page 2, after line 7, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

‘Provided that any speech or statement in whatever form and in whatever language made in either House of Parliament shall be simultaneously translated in all the other languages except Sanskrit specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.’”

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

34. “That at page 2, after line 7, the following provisos be inserted, namely:—

‘Provided that a member who is not in a position to speak in either English or Hindi shall have the right to speak in any language specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution except Sanskrit:

[The Deputy Chairman]

Provided further that such a speech shall be simultaneously translated in all the other languages except Sanskrit specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.' "

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—Committee on Official Language

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala):
I move:

2. "That at page 2, line 8, for the words 'ten years' the words 'twenty-five years' be substituted."

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR: I move:

3. "That at page 2, after line 27, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

Provided that in order to achieve the purpose, set above, the Central Government will immediately evolve some appropriate machinery which will advise the Central Government on the progressive use of Hindi in the various branches of the Central Government and present periodic reports to the Houses of Parliament on the progress of Hindi so that by year 1975 Hindi becomes as effective a medium of legislation and administration as English is at present."

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I move:

10. "That at page 2, for clause 4, the following be substituted, namely:—

'4. (1) The President, before the end of the year 1967, shall, by order, constitute a Commission which shall consist of a Chairman and such other members representing the different languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India, as the President may appoint and the order shall define the procedure to be followed by the Commission.

(2) The Commission shall make recommendations to the President with a view to ensuring the complete changeover from English to Hindi for official purposes by the expiration of the year 1970.' "

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:
I move:

11. "That at page 2, line 8, for the words 'ten years' the words 'twenty-five years' be substituted."

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I move:

12. "That at page 2, for lines 8 to 18, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(1) At the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, the President shall constitute a committee on Official Language consisting of thirty members of whom twenty members shall be members of the House of the People and ten shall be members of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the members of the House of the People and the Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.'

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:
I move:

13. "That at page 2, line 14, after the words 'House of the People' the

words 'of whom not less than ten members shall be from non-Hindi speaking areas' be inserted."

14. "That at page 2, line 15, after the words 'Council of States' the words 'of whom not less than five members shall be from non-Hindi speaking areas' be inserted."

SHRI A. D. MANI: I move:

16. "That at page 2, lines 22-23, the words 'and the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to all the State Governments' be deleted."

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I move:

17. "That at page 2, line 23, for the words 'sent to all the State Governments' the words 'all the State Legislatures' be substituted."

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I move:

18. "That at page 2, line 23, for the words 'State Governments' the words 'State Legislatures for ascertaining their views on the recommendations of the Committee' be substituted."

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I move:

19. "That at page 2, line 23, for the words 'State Governments' the words 'State Legislatures' be substituted."

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam, I move:

20. "That at page 2, for lines 24 to 27, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(4) If the recommendations of the Committee are ratified by not less than two-thirds of the Legislatures of the non-Hindi speaking States, the President may issue directions in accordance with

the whole or any part of that report.'"

[The above amendment also stood in the name of Shri J. Venkatappa.]

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam I move:

21. "That at page 2, for lines 24 to 27, the following be substituted namely:—

'(4) On receipt of such report, the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament and shall also refer the report to the Legislatures of all the States for expressing their views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reerence.

(5) The President may, after consideration of the report referred to in sub-section (3) and the views, if any expressed by the Houses of Parliament and the State Legislatures thereon, issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam, I move:

22. "That at page 2, after line 23, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(3A) In making their recommendation under sub-section (3), the committee shall have due regard to the industrial, cultural and scientific advancement of India, in general and to the non-Hindi speaking areas in particular, and also to the interest of persons belonging to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to the Public Services.'"

[The above amendment also stood in the name of Shri J. Venkatappa.]

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Madam, I move:

23. "That at page 2, lines 25-26, for the words 'State Governments'

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

the words 'State Legislatures' be substituted."

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Madam, I move:

24. "That at page 2, lines 25-26, for the words 'State Governments' the words 'State Legislatures' be substituted."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 35 is negative, as it demands deletion of a clause.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Madam, I move:

36. "That at page 2, line 8, for the words 'ten years' the words 'twenty years' be substituted."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

37. "That at page 2, at the end of line 23, after the words 'State Governments' the words 'for ascertaining the opinions of the State Legislatures' be inserted."

38. "That at page 2, lines 25-26, for the words 'State Governments' the words 'State Legislatures' be substituted."

39. "That at page 2, line 26, after the word 'thereon' the words 'and after ascertaining the opinions of both Houses of Parliament' be inserted."

40. "That at page 2, lines 26-27, for the words 'the whole or any part of that report' the words 'the opinions of both Houses of Parliament' be substituted."

41. "That at page 2, after line 27, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no directions, contrary to the opinions so expressed by three-fourth or more of the State Legislatures, shall be issued.'"

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: Madam, I move:

47. "That at page 2, after line 18, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that of the members to be elected to the Committee, at least two shall be members representing minority languages, not being any of the regional languages or Hindi or English.'"

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Looking at the large number of amendments you will please be very, very brief, and give only the points that you want to press. Mr. Solomon.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: Madam Deputy Chairman, the sponsors of this Bill contemplate that ten years, after the commencement of section 3, would be sufficient for replacing English by Hindi. I moved my amendment because I do not feel that this period of ten years would be sufficient enough after which it could be examined by a committee whether English could be replaced by Hindi all over the country.

Madam, our Constitution-makers thought that English could be replaced by Hindi after fifteen years. But experience has taught us that their idea was not correct; their estimation completely failed. And now the government feels that after another ten years after this fifteen-year period, this gigantic task could be fulfilled by them. But what is actually going on? Even now our regional languages have not been accepted by all the States and the Union Government. They are not improving them sufficiently so as to enable Hindi to attain the status of the official language of the Union. Under the circumstances, I think we have to do many things to bring up the State languages to the position of official language of their States. Only after such a thing is achieved, can Hindi be accepted as the official language of the Union. For

this purpose, I submit, Madam, that first of all the 14 State languages must be used. That is to say, constitutionally and otherwise arrangements must be made to accept them as State languages for the purpose of medium of instruction as well as for use in Parliament.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: Unless we have taken such a step, we cannot come to the conclusion that Hindi could be accepted as the official language of the Union. So, before doing that, I think it would be premature to think of organising a committee to enable it to examine this question. That is why through my amendment I have asked for a period of 25 years for the consideration of this question by the Committee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief. There are 18 Members who are to speak on the various amendments. Therefore, you should just press the point necessary and be done with it. Prof. Dinkar.

प्रो० रामवारी सिंह दिनकर : उपसभापति महोदया, मेरे संशोधन का उद्देश्य बहुत साफ है । मैं समझता हूँ इस विधेयक से सरकार की कठिनाई कुछ बढ़ती है—वह इस तरह कि १९७५ में जो समिति बनेगी उसके सामने ठोस काम का लेखा-जोखा रखने के लिये सरकार को अभी से तैयारी शुरू कर देनी चाहिये । जिस प्रकार से काम अब तक चला है उस तरह से आगे नहीं चलेगा ।

मेरी कल्पना है कि संसद् सदस्यों की एक कमेटी अभी हो बना दी जाय जिसके अध्यक्ष स्वयं गृह मंत्री जी रहें । उस कमेटी का काम होना चाहिये कि वह समय-समय पर सरकार को सुझाव दे कि शासन के तंत्र में हिन्दी की प्रगति अंग्रेजी के साथ-साथ कैसे की जा सकती है । और उन सुझावों के आधार पर

सरकुलर जारी किये जाय और मेम्बरों को यह अधिकार रहे कि वे चाहें तो केन्द्रीय सरकार के कार्यालयों का निरीक्षण करें और यह पता लगायें कि सरकुलरों का पालन हो रहा है या नहीं ।

राष्ट्रपति की अप्रैल, १९६० वाली विज्ञप्ति में यह बात साफ कही गई थी कि १९६५ से हिन्दी मुख्य भाषा होगी और अंग्रेजी गौण भाषा के रूप में चलती रहेगी । जहाँ तक मेरा खयाल है वर्तमान विधेयक की धारा ३ का भी उद्देश्य यही है । लेकिन अगर सरकार ने जोर से काम नहीं किया तो स्थिति यह होगी कि it is not English which will be used in addition to Hindi but it will be Hindi which will be used in addition to English. क्योंकि सारी जगह अंग्रेजी के कब्जे में है, हिन्दी अभी कहीं प्रवेश नहीं पा सकी है ।

आज सुबह गृह मंत्री जी ने हमें यह आश्वासन दिया कि इस विधेयक के जरिये हम हिन्दी को निर्वासन नहीं दे रहे हैं । यह बात अगर मान भी ली जाय तब भी स्थिति यह दिखाई देती है कि संविधान में हिन्दी बहुत ही ठोस जगह पर थी । इस विधेयक के जरिये हिन्दी को हम एक कच्चे धागे से टांग रहे हैं । मेरे संशोधन का उद्देश्य इस बात की निगरानी करना है कि वह कच्चा धागा कहीं टूट न जाय । मेरा संशोधन ऐसा है जिसका समर्थन सदन के प्रत्येक सदस्य को करना चाहिये और वह इसलिये कि अंग्रेजी वाले जो चीज चाहते थे वह चीज उनको मिल गई । मैं करोड़ों जनता की ओर से हिन्दी के लिये सिर्फ अभयदान की याचना करता हूँ ।

आज प्रातःकाल गृह मंत्री जी ने बड़ी कृपा के साथ मेरे भाषण का कई बार उल्लेख किया जिसके लिये मैं उनका कृतज्ञ हूँ । लेकिन एक बात उन्होंने ऐसी कही जिसकी मैं थोड़ी सफाई देना चाहता हूँ । और यह बात मैं दो-चार अंग्रेजी के वाक्यों में कहूँगा, क्योंकि यह प्रसंग अण्णादुरै साहब का है ।

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.]

I felt that the Home Minister described me almost as an opposite number of Mr. Annadurai. If it is a question of the unity of the country, I have no objection to occupy that position, for Mr. Annadurai threatens the unity of the country, and I am prepared to suffer any amount of indignity and defeat if that helps the cause of the unity of the country. There has been a misrepresentation of the views prevailing in the Hindi-speaking areas so far as English is concerned. We in the Hindi-speaking States realise the importance of English as well as our countrymen do in the other parts of the country. I believe very strongly that English shall continue in India till a very long time as a language of comprehension and I feel that English should be taught and learnt the way Maulana Azad had learnt it. Maulana Azad did not write in English, did not speak in English but he understood English quite well and I tell you that everywhere in the world, English is learnt that way.

I have visited several countries of the world and come across the people who know English. There are very few people who can talk in English. But there are a large number of people who can take knowledge from English. But it will be very difficult to persuade the Hindi-speaking people to accept the proposition that English shall be perpetuated by law. That is the great difficulty. The Hindi-speaking people will not agree to perpetuate English. Whether we are perpetuating English by this Bill or not is a matter of opinion. In the other House the Home Minister was pleased to say that we are granting a further lease of life to English only indefinitely and not eternally. That is a good consolation. But the way, in which the Government have been working on this scheme, belies the hope and I am afraid "tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow" will surely creep into eternity. My amendment tries to eliminate that chance.

I have to make one more point. From the speeches delivered here, an

impression was created to the effect that those who stand for Hindi, those who are protagonists of Hindi, do not stand for the unity of the country. I assure the House that the anxiety for the unity of the country is nowhere greater than in the Hindi-speaking States. I give you two quotations. When I was working in the Official Language Commission, one day there was a little heat aroused in the discussions and the late lamented Pandit Balkrishna Sharma 'Naveen', who was a Member of this House, cried out: 'I shall bury Hindi five fathoms deep if it tries to come in the way of the unity of the country.' Naveenji was only echoing the sentiments of Shri Purushottam Das Tandon himself. You go and read the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly. When Tandonji was once faced by interruptors, he said: "I do not want that Hindi should be imposed on unwilling people and if the Members here feel that the people whom they claim to represent will not accept what the hon. Members accept here, they must listen to the small voice of their conscience and not vote for the measure."

That is going a little too far. But surely the Hindi speaking people do not want to break the unity of the country. For, Hindi does not gain anything thereby. If the country is broken, Hindi remains confined to the area where it is. It has a chance to spread all over the country only if the country remains one. That hope should always remain before the country and we should have a firm faith in the decisions we take and we must energetically work them out.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैंने जो संशोधन दिया था वह अलग भावना से दिया था। लेकिन धारा ३ का मेरा संशोधन रद्द हो गया है, इसलिये मैं इस संशोधन पर अधिक बल नहीं दूंगा। लेकिन इस संशोधन में जो भावना निहित है, अभी दिनकर जी ने उसको व्यक्त किया है। हिन्दी कितनी प्रगति करती है इसका

प्रति वर्ष लेखाजोखा संसद् के सामने रखा जाना चाहिये और कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिये जिससे दस साल बाद हमारे सामने वह स्थिति फिर से पैदा न हो जाय जो संविधान लागू होने के पन्द्रह साल बाद पैदा हो गयी। जिस समय शासन ने समझा कि पन्द्रह वर्ष की अवधि दे दी गई है तो उसका अर्थ यह था कि चौदह साल तो कुछ करने का जरूरत नहीं है और जब पन्द्रह वर्ष समाप्त हो जायेंगे तब देखा जायगा। इसी का आज यह परिणाम है कि हमें यह विधेयक लाना पड़ा है। क्या इस इतिहास की पुनरावृत्ति होगी, क्या दस वर्ष तक शासन सोता रहेगा और १९७५ में जाकर सदन के सामने फिर एक विधेयक लाएगा जिसमें नयी अवधि मानी जायेगी।

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: There will be no necessity. Now there is no time-limit.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: इसका मतलब यह है कि आप दस साल से ज्यादा जाना चाहते हैं।

SHRI P. L. KUREEL: *Urj Talib* (Uttar Pradesh): A beginning has got to be made. If there is no beginning today, there will never be a beginning tomorrow and English will continue for all times to come.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: मैं इस समय टाइम लिमिट की बात नहीं कह रहा, वह तो धारा ३ में जाती थी। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि दस वर्ष बाद जो संसद् की समिति बैठेगी, जैसा कि आदरणीय दिनकर जी ने कहा, उस समिति के सामने कैसा परिस्थिति आएगी, क्या पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी की तरह से वह समिति भी यह सिफारिश करेगी कि दस साल में शासन कुछ नहीं कर सका, इसलिए अभी अंग्रेजी चलनी चाहिये? कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था करने को आवश्यकता है कि जिससे हिन्दी की प्रगति की रिपोर्ट संसद् के सामने

आती रहे, हिन्दी धीरे-धीरे, उत्तरोत्तर राजकाज की भाषा बनती रहे—कोई देखभाल करने वाला हो, कोई अंकुश लगाए, कोई नियंत्रण करे। शास्त्री जी ने सवेरे अपने भाषण में इस प्रकार की समिति के विचार से अपनी असहमति प्रकट नहीं की है। मैं समझता हूँ, कि उन्हें दिनकर जी का संशोधन स्वीकार कर लेनी चाहिये, मैं अपना संशोधन वापस ले लूंगा। जो दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है, उसमें हम हिन्दी के समर्थक क्या करेंगे, समझ में नहीं आता। अंग्रेजी वाले तो खुश हैं लेकिन हिन्दी का क्या होगा? राष्ट्रीय एकता के सूत्र के रूप में कौन सी भाषा काम करेगी इसका अभी तक उत्तर नहीं मिला है। मुझे याद आता है वह दिन जब श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने संसद् में पहली बार रेलवे बजट हिन्दी में पेश किया था, वह एक ऐतिहासिक दिन था। और आज का दिन भी ऐतिहासिक दिन माना जायगा जब उन्हीं श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के हाथों हिन्दी का निर्वासन अवधि लम्बी की जा रही है। यह अवधि किस तरह से कम हो, शासन को किस तरह से जागरूक रखा जा सके, इसके लिये व्यवस्था करना आवश्यक है। दिनकर जी का संशोधन इसी दिशा में संकेत करता है। मुझे विश्वास है, उसे स्वीकार किया जायेगा।

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam, my amendment No. 11 suggests that the 10 year period fixed by clause 4 must be raised to a period of 25 years for very valid reasons. The ten year period fixed by Clause 4 is too small a period to evaluate the results of the various processes that are to be created through which the Hindi language is likely to grow in the various departments of life including the Administration and the High Courts. Then hon. Home Minister was pleased to say yesterday that the Indian Penal Code had been translated into Hindi. It is a very welcome sign and I only wish that the Courts would follow the statute as translated in Hindi and

[Shri K.V. Raghunatha Reddy.]

would start interpreting. After a period of hundred years after Macaulay had introduced the Indian Penal Code, I might tell the House that still we are struggling to unravel the difference between sections 299 and 300 of the IPC. I hope the hon. Mr. Santhanam would be able to support my statement. In that context, Madam, Hindi will have to be used in various departments of life and we have yet to start teaching this in the various Universities. There will be any number of difficulties to be encountered and they will have to be met and solved. For the last fifteen years we have not solved any difficulty and now within ten years we propose to solve all these difficulties and think of introducing Hindi for all these purposes. It is expecting too much. So, to be realistic, let us at least for this period of the interregnum, for a period of twenty five years, continue this arrangement so that the language may develop and serve a useful purpose. Then only will be the proper time for evaluating the results. I am not interested in the language to be used for purpose of communication. I am definitely interested in the language to be used for purposes of teaching, as the medium of expression in the Universities for science and technical subject. It is one thing to converse or to understand a cinema or sing a song in Hindi but it is another thing to express ideas on the various technical subjects like medicine, engineering and so on, including interpretation of the statutes. We have gone through any number of difficulties in trying to unravel clause 3 which has now become part of the statute. I think the interpretation given by the hon. Minister is not right and in such a case, what are we going to do? Is a ten-year period going to be such a prosperous period that in that we will be able to translate and do everything and then evaluate the results? Certainly not and, therefore, it is desirable that the whole thing should be postponed for a period of twenty-five years, otherwise we will be creating

the hope in the Hindi-speaking people that Hindi is likely to become the national language very soon in practice and it would also keep the non-Hindi speaking people in a state of suspended animation, not knowing what would happen after the ten-year period. I want this to be remembered by the hon. Minister.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Madam, it is my misfortune that I could not take part in the general discussion through my own cussedness in not being present at the opportune time. If I had been present, I would have made my position very clear before this hon. House but the point is that, in my opinion, once article 343 has been enshrined in the Constitution and the Constituent Assembly has come to the conclusion—an Assembly in which people from East, West, South and North were represented, stalwarts, if I may be permitted to use the term—that Hindi in the Devanagari script shall be the official language of the Indian Union. I think, Madam, this Bill should not have come before this House and Hindi should have reached the place whereby by 1965 it could become the official language. It has not come and, as my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, put it, the fault lies with the Government. It has not taken into account the wishes of the people of the Constituent Assembly and I might be permitted to say that I was one of them and, therefore, now we have got into difficulties. I do not know why Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was pleading the cause of Hindi the other day when he was speaking on the Bill on the general discussion, and today he was saying that English shall continue side by side with Hindi. I do not see why there should be that "shall" in his amendment. Madam I would like to say, with your permission, this: Why should there be so much of over-emphasis on this? There seems to be quite a lot of misunderstanding of the so-called Hindi-speaking people. Madam, I come from a part which is neither Hindi-speaking nor English-speaking but is a

pahadi-speaking. But the point is, what is the mother-tongue of these people? What is the mother-tongue of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta? What is the mother from which Bengali has come? Is it not Sanskrit? What is the mother out of which Oriya has come? Is that not Sanskrit? What is the mother out of which Gujarati and Marathi have come? Is that not Sanskrit? (*Interruption.*) Grand-mother, let us say.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: What about Tamil and Malayalam?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am coming to that. Therefore, when we say that Hindi is spoken by 40 per cent. of the people, we only take the figures of people who speak in Hindi in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and in certain parts of Delhi and Rajasthan. Why don't you add the people of Gujarat? Why don't you add the people of Maharashtra? Why don't we add the people of Orissa and Assam? If we do that, we come to a percentage of something like seventy of the people of this country.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: You can add the South also because Sanskrit is the aunt of our language.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I do not know if what Mr. Santhanam says is correct or not. When the framers of the Constitution put down this article, they did not so light-heartedly. It was discussed in all its aspects and what we here are trying to do is to alter something which was basically done at that time. I think that is the approach of my friend from the South who came here. He did not say "extend the life of English" but he said "revise the Constitution in so far as article 343 is concerned". That, I think, is an entirely wrong approach, an approach which under the Bill we are not competent to make unless we undo all that has been done by the Constitution.

I am not a lawyer and I do not know whether it has been properly worded or not. All I want to clarify in this

179 R.S.D.—6.

little amendment that I have given notice of is to specifically say what should be done, instead of leaving the whole thing vague. Under this clause, after the expiration of ten years, the President may appoint. Now, after the expiration, it may be even after twelve years or thirteen years or fourteen years or even twenty years. Let the hon. Minister enlighten us; he knows more law and I am just not even a student of law. If a committee is to be appointed after the expiration of ten years, then let it be as soon as those ten years are over. Let it be specifically said and let us say, as soon as those ten years are over—at the expiration of that—a committee shall be appointed. It cannot again be "may". This "may" here has come because, as the hon. Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs explained, the two words "may" and "shall" do not work well. They give different meanings. I entirely agree with this interpretation and so I have put it, 'At the end of ten years the President shall appoint a committee'. Let him do that as soon as ten years are over. As I said in the beginning, my mother-tongue is not Hindi. I did not read Hindi. I read Persian, Urdu and English and learnt Hindi as a subsidiary language but we know that it has to be the language which will integrate the country as a whole. Regional languages are also developing; after the reorganisation of the States, after the linguistic division of India into States, the regional languages are already there, developing. So, the limited purpose, that is to be served by Hindi, is only as the Union language and the language between States *inter se* and if they agree to it I do not see any harm because my amendment is of that nature.

With regard to my other amendment, if I might be allowed to say here . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, you are on Amendment No. 18, is it not?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Yes; that is all that I have to say.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:
Madam, I will combine No. 13 and
No. 14.

By these two amendments I seek to incorporate a provision in clause 4 which provides for the representation for non-Hindi-speaking Members of Parliament. By this amendment I seek to make that at least ten persons out of twenty, who are to be elected from the Lok Sabha, should be from the non-Hindi-speaking areas and at least five persons from the Rajya Sabha from non-Hindi-speaking areas. As one who knows the method of single transferable vote for the purpose of representation at the existing level, I can say that there can never be ten persons elected from the non-Hindi-speaking areas. So in order to ensure that there would be proper representation for persons who come from non-Hindi-speaking areas, so that they might judge their own case, so that they might understand their own problems and they might put forward their views in relation to the setting in which the problem has to be understood in their own provinces I have incorporated this provision so that there would be a statutory provision relating to representation instead of allowing it to be enforced according to the system of single transferable vote. I know if the hon. Minister were to deal with this matter he will be kind enough to give sufficient representation for the non-Hindi-speaking people but, I think, it is better to provide it by way of a legal provision.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam Deputy Chairman, can I combine Nos. 16 and 21?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI A. D. MANI: My amendments are self-explanatory. I have asked for the Report of the Official Committee on Languages to be appointed in 1975, to be placed before the State Legislatures. I mentioned in my intervention on this Bill before the consideration stage that the Government

should have consulted the State Legislatures on the draft Bill before they came to the Houses of Parliament to obtain sanction. There is a good deal of resentment in those areas which are opposed to some of the provisions of the Bill that this Bill should have been placed before Parliament without adequate consultation with the interests affected. I do hope that the Home Ministry will see the reasonableness of the suggestion made in both these amendments. What I am trying to do is to introduce the procedure which was followed by Government in respect of the States Reorganisation Commission. The reorganisation of the States was a very vital matter and the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission was placed before the State Legislatures for their opinion. Madam, there is one difficulty in my accepting the view of the Government that the views of the State Governments alone should be sought. I know that the Home Minister would argue that the State Governments are bound to consult the Legislatures but then, if Parliament is to have an adequate idea of what happened in the State Legislatures there should be a full-dress debate on the Report of this Committee to be appointed in 1975. Further, the fact that this matter is being discussed in the State Legislatures, will activate public opinion in those non-Hindi-speaking areas on this question of official language. It is necessary, therefore that avenues should be open to all affected opinions on this subject to be expressed fully and I do hope that the Home Minister would accept my amendments which are very reasonable. It is essential that the rights of those non-Hindi-speaking States should be protected in this manner, as I have said in my amendments Nos. 16 and 21.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I will combine Nos. 17, 20 and 22.

Madam, by my amendments Nos. 17 and 20 I am seeking to provide that the State Legislatures must be associated with the decisions to be taken in future for the purpose of introduc-

tion of Hindi. I have closely followed the arguments advanced by my esteemed friend, Mr. S. K. Basu. I see strong force in his argument when he said that when the word 'Government' is used, it is open to the Government to place the matter before the State Legislatures. There is strong force in that argument but what I want is that this matter should not be one to be left to be decided by the State Government alone in their discretion.

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

I want that this matter should be decided by the State Legislatures so that every Member of the Legislature may have his say in the matter. If they in their wisdom desire to decide on a suicidal policy in the nearest future, let it not be said that the Governments of the day without consulting the Legislatures have adopted a particular attitude. Let this responsibility be shared, one way or the other, whether it is for good or for bad, by every Member of the Legislature who is directly responsible to the people for any decision on this question. This is not a small matter; it affects, after all, millions of people in the South and it cannot be merely left to the State Governments because the Government by itself cannot take responsibility for a decision on this question. The matter must be left to the Legislatures so that the Members of the Legislatures may express their viewpoints, discuss the issue and take a decision. (*Interruptions*) When I say 'Government', I differentiate between the executive authority and the legislature. The Legislature may consist of a number of parties and it is better that each Member belonging to the different groups should be given an opportunity to express his own views, before a final decision is taken on this matter.

Now coming to my amendment No. 22. I have not brought in any new thing. The provision made in my

amendment already finds a place in article 344 of the Constitution. Though I have made certain changes here and there, I contemplate by my amendment that this Committee, constituted for the purpose of evaluating the results by which they are going to make recommendations to the President whether Hindi is to be adopted or not, should keep in their mind the directives given in clause (3) of article 344 of the Constitution. The Committee in particular should take into consideration the industrial development and the safeguards that are to be afforded to the non-Hindi-speaking people in services and also the cultural and scientific advancement of India. As I said before, I am not interested in what language we are going to speak as long as it is going to serve the interests of national development in relation to cultural and scientific advancement in the non-Hindi-speaking areas. We are prepared to accept any language that will deliver the goods and for that purpose the Committee should have in mind the predominant factors, the processes that would take place in relation to the development of industry, culture and science. This amendment, as I said, is already embodied in article 344 of the Constitution and I hope this at least would be accepted by the Home Minister.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Anand Chand, Amendment No. 18.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The normal procedure in the House, I may say, is that when a Member has various amendments to a clause, the Member when he speaks will speak on all the amendments relating to that clause.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I have spoken about it.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, my amendment is similar to the amend-

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

ments of Mr. Mani, Mr. Raghunatha Reddy and others. They have made some points but I want to add a few remarks to them. The hon. Home Minister said that the process of referring the Report of the Parliamentary Committee to the State Governments must be welcome. It 5 P.M. is also welcome that only two State Governments consulted their State Legislatures and the others did not. Now, I think this is a most unwelcome trend of thought and it does not meet democracy as well. To my mind, it appears that limiting the reference of the report to the State Governments only and not to the State Legislatures has been done out of party considerations and not considering the issue as a national issue. The ruling party knows as well that on the language question there are various trends of thought and the party becomes divided. So, the ruling party can control the State Governments and by issuing a whip it can also control its members in the State Legislatures and thereby throttle and muzzle discussion. So, as a matter of fact, on such questions it should be made obligatory to refer the report to the State Legislatures, so that the various trends of thought, the people's mood and will, can be reflected and can be made known to the President before the President proceeds to act on the report or a part thereof. Therein lies the danger that the President will be misled by the trend of discussions in Parliament or by the opinions of the State Governments only. He may act in a way which may give a sort of semblance of sham unity. It may not reflect the real, the widest possible measure of public opinion. That may serve the purpose of the ruling party, but to the country it may bode ill and not well, on such an issue which is not a party issue but a national issue. Therefore I would plead with the Government to seriously consider and accept the amendment that the report should be referred not only to the State Government. Reference also to

the State Legislatures should be made obligatory. Otherwise, serious consequences for the future of India may follow, unwarrantedly and unwittingly. Nobody will wish for that, but it may objectively follow. So, the dangerous possibility should be guarded against and in order to do that, this should be referred to the State Legislatures. It should be made obligatory in this Bill. I hope the Government will give serious thought to this amendment.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am of the view that any time schedule in regard to languages is unnecessary. It is so because a language cannot be developed or achieve full maturity or richness within a short period. Nor is it possible to evolve an adequate and effective language by an order of the Government. We cannot order the development of a language. Clause 4, to my mind, brings in the element of time schedule indirectly. In my previous speech, I pointed out that the time factor will bring in controversies inevitably. The Constitution prescribed fifteen years and, as we know, these fifteen years were found to be inadequate or short for the propagation of Hindi in the country. Therefore, we have been compelled now to review the whole position and change the provisions in the Constitution. Now, again the element of time schedule has been brought in in another form. According to the clause, after ten years, in 1975, a Committee of Parliament will be constituted and they will review the progress or evolution of Hindi and make recommendations on the basis of which the President will make his own decision. Here the element of time is brought in. It proceeds on an assumption, on an unwarranted assumption that after ten years it may be possible that Hindi would gain sufficient importance and that it would be learnt by a large number of people in India. Then, this Committee may review the whole position and recommend the substitution by Hindi completely and

the elimination of English. The speeches of my hon. friends, and particularly of Mr. Anand Chand, confirm the apprehensions. He was asking the Home Minister whether it was not true that the Government had failed to bring about the transformation or to translate the pious wishes of the Constitution-makers, and that as a result of this failure we were now forced to extend the period. I think Mr. Anand Chand will like the Government to force the use of a particular language within a particular period of time. I do not believe that it would be desirable or practicable to force the use of a language on the people. I want to know from him what he would expect of the Government, whether he wants the Government to pass an order that from such and such date the country should be prepared to use only Hindi. Or, does he want the people to know Hindi gradually and in an atmosphere of voluntariness? If there has to be voluntary effort, the Government can only create conditions for such an effort. I feel that if there has been failure on the part of the Government, it is only in regard to the creation of conditions for learning Hindi.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: May I just have half a second? I will just say this. What I was trying to point out was the fact that here was a thing which had been accepted under the Constitution. I am not going into the merits or demerits as to whether Hindi is going to be forced on a particular section of people against their will. All that I was pointing out was this. Here is a thing accepted in the Constitution as such and we can only change the Constitution with the willing consent of the people of this country, according to the procedure that is laid down for changing the Constitution. We should not try to amend what is enshrined in the Constitution under the guise of extending the period whereby we wish to perpetuate this—ten years, twenty years, thirty years or forty years. That was my submission.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: The Constitution itself provides for such a change, for such a revision of policy, if need be, and I do not think there is any doubt on that point. My main point is, in the context of things as they are, in the circumstances which obtain today, do we believe that within a decade we will be able to achieve what we have not achieved during the past fifteen years? Or do we believe that Hindi would be learnt by most of the people in India by 1975 so that we may eliminate the use of English once and for all? I feel, as I said, that it is impossible, physically impossible to achieve this. If that is so, why create fears and doubts and suspicions in the minds of non-Hindi-speaking people that after ten years a new controversy will start, a fresh review will be done and there may be a possibility of eliminating the use of English once and for all for official purposes? If that is not the case, then why this review after ten years? Even ten years, Mr. Vice-Chairman, are too limited a period, as I said. Even if that has to be reviewed, there can be a review after giving sufficient time for the language's growth and development. That is why I have indicated that instead of ten years there may be twenty years. But I gave another amendment for eliminating the whole clause, and that was not admitted on the ground that it was negative. I deliberately gave this amendment because I feel that this clause is totally unnecessary. Is it the contention of the Home Minister that Parliament in its sovereignty will have no power to review from time to time the development of Hindi, the learning of Hindi? Why this prescription of time for review? Even after five years by passing a resolution it may be possible for the Houses of Parliament to constitute a Committee to make recommendation. When that power is available for Parliament, I do not think it is necessary to have this clause at all. By having this time schedule for review it will be importing the controversial element, and after ten years I am sure there will be a fresh con-

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.]
trovery. I think that for a long time to come India has to live with two official languages. It is inevitable, it is unavoidable. I think this two-language pattern has to be accepted for years to come, and I do not think that by merely pleading for the acceptance of Hindi you will be promoting the cause of Hindi thereby, and you do not achieve anything at all by reducing the status of English to a subordinate position as has been done under clause 3. I sincerely believe that under clause 3 a second class of citizens speaking English has been created. I do not think that there is completely impartial treatment given to all sections speaking both Hindi and English. Apart from that, I would urge upon the Minister to consider whether it would be proper to have this kind of review after ten years and, even if he thinks it necessary, whether the time that is given, ten years, will be adequate for the purpose. Will it be possible for the people within this short time to achieve the expectations that the Home Minister wants them to achieve?

I have therefore moved this amendment for the acceptance of the House, and at least a twenty-year period will be a sufficiently long period for review, and I feel that it is quite an adequate period. If a period is necessary, my amendment may be accepted by the Home Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This clause deals with the situation after ten years, that is to say, the situation that will arise after the 26th of January, 1975. Here the Bill lays down its own approach with regard to this matter. In my series of amendments, I have also indicated an alternative approach to cover the period after ten years. What is it?

In the first place, I want to say that I am in favour of appointing a Reviewing Committee. Therefore, I have nothing much to say on this except to agree with the Government broadly, and we hope that a proper type of

Committee would be appointed by both the Houses of Parliament. But then, when it comes to the question of reference, I would like the matter to be referred not to the State Government but to the Legislature of the State. I have my serious objection to the stand the Government has taken in regard to this matter.

Now, as you know, this matter agitates the minds of all sections of the people, and naturally an attempt should be made to secure the willing acceptance of the people in different States. Is it the Government's contention that the best way to do so is to leave the matter entirely to the State Government which may or may not consult the State Legislature? I think that in this matter the Government has a narrow, partisan approach. I should like the hon. Minister to note these words, that in this particular matter the Government has taken a narrow, partisan, party approach, because to consult the Government may at best mean to consult the Congress Party, it may mean that it wants to consult those who control the Government, namely, the Council of Ministers or the Chief Minister or some Minister. This is the practical import of it. It may not even mean consultation with the Congress Party as a whole in the State. The matter may go to the State's Chief Minister, and if he is powerful enough, he can give his own opinion, and that goes as the opinion of the State or the State Government. Here the expression "State Government" has been used. In other cases sometimes we find that the word "State" is used. Therefore, it is narrowed down. Government here naturally does not even mind the opposition Parties. What are we? We are something in the States, and the opposition parties represent in most of the States the larger sections of the electorate between them. There are only two States today where the Congress has got the majority of votes under the third general elections. Now, the opposition parties or the Parties that sit in the

opposition groups between them represent the greater half of the electorate. Therefore, it is not right that a matter such as this, when you call it a national issue, should be left to the State Government. The other side of the picture or other people should be given—even if it is not the other side of the picture necessarily, others should also be given—the opportunity to express their views. Now, what is the guarantee that a State Government will consult the opposition parties and through them seek to find out whether a view contrary to its own view exists in the State or not? What is the mechanism? Nothing here. Therefore, it is undemocratic also. A matter like this should be left to the State Legislature when bodies, that are there under our Constitution, are available for consultation. I do not see why the Government should fight shy of the State Legislature, more especially, when they have the majority in all the States and they are at least confident that after ten years they are going to have the majority. I may not have that confidence but they have that confidence. Therefore, I think it is wholly wrong. It is most unfortunate that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister took a narrow, partisan approach. I shall be failing in my duty today if I do not register my strong opposition to this kind of attitude which treats the opposition parties in this manner. Here what you have laid down is only demonstrative of your scant regard for the opposition parties which can be rightly consulted when you take the matter to the State Legislature. Let it be discussed there. Now, even this much accommodation was not shown. I say, this is a partisan approach.

Then, I would ask the Home Minister. He was advising Mr. Annadurai not to go in for direct action and so on. Suppose in my State, I find—or in the State of Tamil Nad or Kerala or Andhra or Maharashtra, some people in the opposition find—that they are not being consulted by the State Government and the State Government's views have been based in

such a manner as is not democratic and also would not be acceptable to large sections of the people, what are they to do? If they do not have the chance even to discuss on the floor of the Assembly, they have to discuss it in the streets undoubtedly. And I have no doubt in my mind that if such a situation arose in my State or in any other State, as far as our Party is concerned, we shall not allow—or any party will not allow—the State Government to behave in this manner disregarding the opinion of the opposition parties. We shall take the issue to the streets and thrash it out. We shall do it; we have done it in the course of the formula that was made about Bengal and upset it not in the Assembly but in the streets, in the maidan. We have done it. We won Samyuktha Maharashtra near the Flora Fountain. Such things had happened. On the one hand, you ask Mr. Annadurai to resort to constitutional methods—that is also constitutional—to resort to methods of this kind of discussion in the Assembly. On the other hand, you are saying, do not discuss it in the State Assembly. This is not fair, this is illogical, this is undemocratic. It contradicts what you say by your expression of sentiment. Therefore, I oppose this.

Lal Bahadur Shastriji is a wonderful man, always. The more I see him, the more fascinated I get by his arguments. What did he say? No other top Minister would have said that kind of thing. He said, "Do we discuss such matters when we feel that feelings may be roused in the country?" Wonderful. See how he gets you on the right side. That is to say, when the States feel that this should not be discussed, they should not be forced to discuss it. Mr. Vice-Chairman, some of us are getting near fifty, others are over it. We should not be treated as if we are in a kindergarten when discussing such matters.

Let us see the fallacy of the argument before us. If there is such an opposition in the State, it is all the more reason why the matter should

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

be thrashed out in the State Legislature. The problem should be solved through debate and discussion; as you say, democracy by discussion. Let it be discussed. If you think that the moment you start discussing it there, there would be a flare-up, even then you should not blanket everything, you should not stifle discussion. Take the issue to the democratic forum, namely, the State Legislature, have it discussed within the constitutional framework and in a constitutional manner so that the people may feel that whatever has been decided, has been decided after a thorough discussion, after ventilation of various points of view, even human emotions, in such a matter. That would have been the right course. But you are burying this, which is exactly what should not be done in the event of any difference existing over such a matter. Suppose there is agreement—he might say that, I anticipated him—then where is the need? If there is agreement, then the resolution in the Legislature can be passed in five minutes' time. All that the Minister has to do after consulting the Members of the Opposition is to sponsor a formal resolution incorporating the accepted and agreed view and have it passed in five minutes. Therefore, when there is agreement, I can understand that there is no need for much discussion but the formality can be provided for so that if anybody has any objection, he can raise it and say something. In five minutes, it would be passed. Such things have happened in our State Legislature when there has been an agreement between the Congress Party and the opposition parties. I am very sorry that we are left out. I think all the opposition parties should take it as an insult to us because we are not in the Government. The Governments in the States are not collusion governments today. Well, in future if they are to be, we can consider such a matter. Today, when you referred to the State Government we felt that we were being ignored in this matter,

being treated not with that measure of attention and respect that as an Opposition in a democracy collectively we deserve. I think Shastriji has not been right in this matter. Therefore, his arguments are not right. I would ask the hon. Members opposite: Have all your affection for Shastriji but that does not mean that you need accept every single argument that he gives. I do not accept all the arguments that my mother gives me. I love my mother as anybody does but that does not mean that every argument put forward by my mother should necessarily be acceptable to me even in family matters.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): What about the philosophy of Communism? Do you accept everything that comes out of the Communist mouth?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I see. Let us deal with the States first, we shall travel to Communism later.

My next amendment is that you refer the matter to the State, get the opinion of the State Legislature and after that, Parliament should discuss it. It is not provided. Opinions of Parliament should be got. Parliament should have an opportunity of consultation with the States. After considering everything Parliament forms its opinion and that opinion goes to whom? That goes to the President and the President is bound by that opinion. That is what I say. Here, in the Bill it is not there. The first thing is, Parliament is not given the opportunity of discussion. I want it to be provided for in the law that after this opinion comes, we have a full-dress discussion.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: It is implied.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is implied in various other matters. Well, Mr. Vajpayee may say that it was implied even in the Constitution that there should be two Commissions. But only one Commission was appointed,

not the other, and the Minister said that they thought that no Commission was necessary, I mean the Language Commission. Therefore, do not go by implication. I say, it should be provided for. If it is not there obviously, then you can easily put it; there is no harm in it. Therefore, I think it is not right. What happens when Parliament gives an opinion? It goes to the President. The President may issue directions in accordance with the whole or part of any of the report. The report will come from the Committee—that is the basis—on which the President will reflect and, after thought, he will give opinion in regard to any part of it or whole of it. I want to alter it a little, modify it a little. The report shall come to Parliament, and Parliament will consider the report from various angles, formulate its opinion. The national discussion over this matter and the worth of the report over this matter will go to the President and only then will the President be entitled to give his opinion. And when he gives his opinion, I want directions. The President will give direction, and I want his direction also to be qualified. Can he give any direction? I say, no. Therefore, this is very important, according to me:

“Provided that no directions, contrary to the opinions so expressed by three-fourth or more of the State Legislatures, shall be issued.”

I bind the President here but the President will not be empowered to issue any direction if that direction is contrary—mind you, positively contrary—on anyone or more points, to the opinion expressed by three-fourths or more of the State Legislatures. That would be democratic. That is, that would mean that we are trying to carry the people. You are getting things done by persuasion, by discussion. Always before Parliament will be the preposition that they have to convince three-fourths of the States at least in order to get certain points acted upon by the President, or

in order to get the President to issue directions. Now, I thought that I was embodying the assurances given by the Prime Minister, I had occasion to discuss this matter very briefly with the Prime Minister—in some other connection I met him. He said, as to his assurance, that he stood by it. He said how this could be embodied in a statute. This was his problem. I thought that I might make an attempt to suggest to him that it was possible to formulate it in terms of a section or a clause in a Bill. That is why I have done it. This is why I have done this. Now, if it is your contention, if the Prime Minister's assurance as regards English is serious—here I may tell my friend, the Raja of Bilaspur that I am for . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: He is not ‘Raja’ now; he is ‘Shri’.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Mr. Anand Chand. I do not like feudal chiefs. Feudalism is abhorrent to me. He is Mr. Anand Chand and in this connection I can tell him that I am in favour of Hindi becoming the only official language, but it must be brought about properly. They have taken that approach. It will take a little more time if you fail to persuade people. But persuasion and voluntary acceptance are categorical imperatives in this matter. In order to bring about the change-over we cannot have it under the Defence of India Rules or at the point of a bayonet. We must have it through the willing acceptance of the people at that end and by our powers of persuasion at our end.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: That is why my amendment for referring this matter to the State Legislatures is on identical lines with that of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think sometimes we can come near each other. I am trying to persuade you with some measure of success, it seems.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Prime Minister has said that "I shall not impose Hindi if the non-Hindi regions do not accept it." It is a bold statement. In a way, in the context, it is a very radical utterance which at once stands to melt the hearts of many of the opponents of this Bill from the non-Hindi angle. I am not talking from the Hindi angle, I am talking from the non-Hindi angle and I do acknowledge that that was a great constructive statement that he made, because that should be the approach. Now therefore, if you have that in mind, all right, then accept my thing, that is to say, after ten years the President will not issue a directive that from a given point of time, Hindi shall be the only official language of the Union and English shall have no more any place if at least three-fourths, preferably more State Legislatures in India have expressed themselves against it. I do not say that they need express in favour of it. I am putting the other way, that no directive shall be contrary to this thing. Therefore I say that if three-fourths of the State Legislatures, that is to say, out of 16, 12 States express themselves against Hindi being made the sole official language at a given point of time, English losing its present position, namely, the position in the Bill as an additional language, well, if such situation comes, then it should not be, the President should not issue such a directive. That is number one. I think you will agree that the Prime Minister's assurance is clearly embodied in it, because what is it? If we cannot carry with us 12 States out of 16, we cannot think of pressing it, then it will be imposition. At least others will think it is imposition. Here we are thinking that, in the future, we should be in a position, by the manner in which we shall have administered the various provisions of the Act, taking other measures also to persuade people to accept it, make them feel the acceptance of it as the Union Official Language in the non-

Hindi regions as also in national interests. Therefore, I think the Prime Minister's sentiments, his assurance, can be easily embodied in a legislative provision, and it is not beyond the competence of the Law Ministry, not even beyond the competence of a humble person like me. I could do it and the Law Ministry can do it perhaps better, but I regret, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that some such provision was not made. If some sort of thing, if this thing or similar other thing was provided for in this measure, in this Bill, you would have seen that those who are resisting Hindi as the Union Official Language, as an objective, and the efforts to make it so in the South or in Bengal, would have been completely disarmed. I am offering it in a very constructive spirit, and in the next ten years let us make efforts in mutual understanding, let us make constructive efforts to win them over rather than to force them, rather than to thrust certain things down their throats. That is how it should be done. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have offered it, and in all humility I say to the Home Minister that I have offered a draft which embodies clearly the assurance of the Prime Minister, and I think that the Prime Minister should not find it difficult to accept, the Home Minister should not find it difficult to accept. If they think that now they cannot accept it because of various factors, I would ask them to consider this thing, to reconsider this matter later. An amendment can always be brought in to the Bill that is being passed.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do again appeal, I am not one of those who would like to see English remaining in its present status all the time; I like its dominance to go, but I like it to go in a manner which would be democratic, progressive and popular. I want to seek the objective in unity and through voluntary acceptance and, as far as Parliament is concerned, through persuasion. I do not like to use the President's authority

and power to impose something, to disregard the opinion of the State Legislatures, of the majority of them, or at least three-fourths of them, and so on. I do not like such a thing. Therefore I say that this suggestion should have been accepted by the Government even before we had brought it in. I would again appeal to the Home Minister that this matter should be seriously considered.

We in Bengal have to speak for Hindi, mind you. It is all right for those hon. Members who are in the Hindi areas. I know it is easy for them to say and speak, but it is a difficult job for us, whether in Tamilnad or in West Bengal, mind you. Mr. Annadurai has a strong party in Tamilnad, and we too are not in a weak party in West Bengal despite the attacks on us. Therefore, it shall be our job to popularise the idea, the concept of one Union Language ultimately, and we should be put in a better position to argue out the case, to seek support of such people, to allay the fears in the minds of the Bengali people, some may be wrong, some may be legitimate fears; some are legitimate fears. Therefore, I think the hon. Minister should try to take us with him. How can he expect to take Shri Rajagopalachari, who is totally opposed to him, with him? He should try to take people like us, sitting in this House, who are in principle in agreement with him, who support the thing but want such provisions to be made, because then his effort gathers a greater volume of support, and if he pushes us away, takes the opposition parties away when we make some such suggestions, I have my doubts, Mr. Vice-Chairman how far our attempts to persuade people will succeed, or how far Government will succeed in persuading the people, those who are with them already. If they do not try to consolidate that support and then expand on that, I do not see how it can otherwise expand. Therefore I say, make your efforts successful. I would appeal to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to tell me what is the meaning of the

Prime Minister's assurance; whether the amendment, No. 41, which I have suggested does not, in a sense, at least embody that assurance and whether, in practice, something will be done to ensure, by legislation, or otherwise if you like, by whatever you have, that Hindi is not going to be imposed directly or indirectly, but would be sought to be promoted through our own efforts, patient efforts, tireless efforts, on the one hand from the Centre, and by promoting confidence in it and voluntary acceptance of it in the non-Hindi areas—which, undoubtedly, is an uphill task, but certainly we can achieve it. We have confidence in our people. They will do so.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY:

Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thought it was my duty to move this small and simple amendment to the provisions of this Language Bill. If I did not move it, then I could not speak on this Language Bill, and I thought that I would be failing in my duty to the minority communities. I move this simple amendment to make provision for two Members from the linguistic minority community described in my amendment, because under this clause, you are taking thirty members of Parliament on the Committee, that is, twenty from the House of the People and ten from the Council of States. So, I want that amongst them there should be two Members whose language is other than Hindi, English or other regional languages. I think it should not be difficult for the hon. Home Minister to take two such Members from linguistic minorities.

Sir, our country is a multi-lingual country and I think the three-language formula may not cover all the linguistic groups in the country. Language is a sign of life. It is language which shows whether a nation or community is a living nation or community or not. And if we do not recognise the language of the linguistic minorities, I am afraid

[Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty.]
 We may not fulfil our desire to make this country a truly democratic country. Sir, there are so many linguistic minority groups in the country whose language is neither Hindi nor English nor any of the regional languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule. For instance, I come from a hill region of West Bengal. In that region Nepali is widely known. It is not only widely known there but it is the *lingua franca* of that area, including the whole of Sikkim and a part of Bhutan. The *medium of instruction there is Nepali*. So, this flourishing and living language, I think, should not be neglected by our democratic leaders and the Government. We Nepalese may be a linguistic minority in the country but, after all, we are also family members of the nation and we should enjoy equal rights in every respect along with other communities.

Sir, since there is not much time, I do not want to go into details and I want to be very short. I was saying, likewise there may be other linguistic minorities in the country whose language is not recognised either by the State or the Central Government and they are left out unnoticed. So, for the proper safeguard of the language of the linguistic minorities in the future, I have moved my amendment. Sir, today we have got very broad-minded leaders in whom we have got full faith. But tomorrow, who knows, we may not have similar leadership in the country. Therefore, there should be some proper safeguards for such linguistic minorities in this Languages Bill. Therefore, I think, when a Committee on Official Language, is constituted ten years hence, in this Committee there should be two Members of Parliament from linguistic minorities. I hope the hon. Home Minister will consider the question of acceptance of my amendment.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support some of the amendments to clause 4 of the Official Languages Bill.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: May I know Sir, how long the House is to today?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Up to six o'clock.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Besides Mr. Govinda Reddy, there may be amendments to be moved and spoken on.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The amendments to clause 4 have been moved. Mr. Govinda Reddy wants to speak now. His will be the last speech on clause 4.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It means we will have to consider this Bill further tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have to reply and then the amendments have to be put to vote.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I may take a little more time to reply . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let Shastriji take a little more time because what he says is important. After his reply let us adjourn till tomorrow morning. Tomorrow we can economise on the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I wanted to appeal to the House that this Bill be disposed of as early as possible. After clause 4 has been discussed, the other clauses are not as controversial as clauses 3 and 4. May I appeal to the House that it should be disposed of as early as possible, because the Constitution (Amendment) Bill has got to be considered tomorrow? Then there is also the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall save time on the Appropriation Bill. We have decided that. We are taking it up tomorrow also, and you will not lose because we shall economise on the Appropriation Bill. It is to suit your convenience or as you like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We have a function in the evening.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy. Please be brief.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support some of the amendments moved to clause 4 of this Bill. Time and again, the Prime Minister has stated here as well as elsewhere that there need not be any apprehensions in the minds of the non-Hindi-speaking people in the country, that they would like to give weight to the views expressed by them and only with their consent and assent will Hindi be made the sole official language.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Hindi was made the official language of the Union and a period of fifteen years was prescribed by which time Hindi would have developed to such an extent that it would have become the sole official language. They had also provided, under article 344, for the appointment of two Commissions, one in 1955 and another in 1960 to review the progress of Hindi during this period of fifteen years. Mr. Shastri explained why he could not appoint the second commission. The second parliamentary committee could not be appointed as the Government were unable to act on the recommendations of the first Commission. On that basis there is ample justification for us to say that a ten-year period that is now being fixed for appointing a reviewing committee in 1975 is too short a period.

Sir, the Government does not seem to be realistic. They do not seem to have assessed the position properly. However much one would like to have Hindi as the sole official language of the country, one can have it only with the consent and assent of the non-Hindi-speaking people of this Union. Within a period of ten years in addition to the fifteen years that will have to elapse by that time, I am

afraid we will not be in a position to say emphatically that the Hindi language has developed to that extent and that we can make Hindi as the sole official language. It is better to be realistic and so, instead of having this ten year period, if you put it as twenty year period and if a reviewing committee is appointed after that time, it is quite possible by that period we will have developed this language to that extent and the people in the non-Hindi speaking area will have also learnt this language and at that time they may not have objections to make Hindi as the sole official language as has been provided under the Constitution.

The Home Minister was telling us that when the last Parliamentary Committee was appointed, more than 20 Members out of 30 were from the non-Hindi-speaking area. So, there is no apprehension that when this Committee is appointed after 10 years, that the non-Hindi speaking elements will not predominate in this Committee. I would very much urge that instead of relying on the assurances a constitutional provision be made that at least 20 Members out of these 30 Members will be from the non-Hindi-speaking areas and so, an amendment to that effect has been moved already by my friend.

Then this reviewing Committee will go into the question and will submit a report. Under article 344(3), it is provided:

"In making their recommendations under clause (2), the Commission shall have due regard to the industrial, cultural and scientific advancement of India, and the just claims and the interests of persons belonging to the non-Hindi speaking areas in regard to the public services."

This is a very salient provision. The same thing should have been incorporated in clause 4. That would have been a directive to the Committee to formulate their recommendations to

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.] the President. I do not know why the provision that was found necessary to be incorporated in the Constitution has not been incorporated in clause 4.

Thirdly, the Committee will make a recommendation and that report will be sent to the President. The President will cause that report to be laid on the floor of the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha and the same report will be sent to the State Governments. It is not really sufficient that the report should be laid, though by implication the report may be discussed. A specific provision should have been made for making this report to be discussed by both the Houses of Parliament as the State Governments may give their own opinions either by consulting the State Legislatures or on their own. It would be better if a statutory provision is made that the report should be sent to the State Legislatures meaning thereby that the Legislatures will have an opportunity of expressing their views in view of the experience they will have gained in the last 10 years regarding the use of Hindi or any other language in the State or in the Union. So, I would urge that it should be made obligatory that this report will be placed and discussed in both the Houses of Parliament and should be sent to all the State Legislatures. It says in clause 4(4):

"The President may, after consideration of the report referred to in sub-section (3), and the views, if any, expressed by the State Governments thereon, issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

Here I am not satisfied with the wording "may". It should be made obligatory on the President that he can issue directions only after considering the views of the Parliament expressed on this report and also after considering the views of the State Legislatures. I very much agree with the amendment moved by Mr Bhupesh Gupta that at least three-fourths of the State Legislatures should give a positive vote with regard to Hindi being adopted or used as the sole official language. I would request the Home Minister to accept some of the amendments which are very salient and reasonable and which will allay the fears of the non-Hindi people so that the unity of the country, the integrity of the country and the oneness of the country, can be preserved.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Would the Home Minister like to reply tomorrow?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Why not reply tomorrow?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I might finish in 3 or 4 minutes.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: You should do justice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: You may reply tomorrow. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-six minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 7th May, 1963.