

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
almost, If I may say so, as a condition that a Judge of the Supreme Court will only take this up if his future advice is not subjected to public discussion in Parliament or elsewhere. He made that almost a condition. It is not normal for a Supreme Court Judge to take up this kind of work, but as a matter of public duty he will do so, but he does not want to have a Supreme Court Judge's opinion, etc., subjected to this kind of discussion.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether a *prima facie* case has been made out in the note by the Attorney-General in regard to Mr. Malaviya which requires the institution of a further enquiry. Secondly, I would like to know in what way it is considered that the suggestions made by the Chief Justice of India in regard to the enquiry should not be discussed by the Houses of Parliament. Whether this position is acceptable to the Prime Minister or to the House I do not know, but I feel that it has to be made clear to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court that this matter has to be discussed in both Houses of Parliament. We cannot be denied this right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter can be discussed but not his advice.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I point out that I do not quite agree with the hon. Member? I am asking for some help and advice, whether it was from the Attorney-General or from a Judge of the Supreme Court, and it will be his advice to me. It is for me, having regard to all the circumstances, to consider—and the circumstances include the wishes of the person giving that advice—whether that should be published or placed on the Table of the House or not. Of course the conclusion I shall place. Essentially as Prime Minister I am responsible for what should be done in regard to this matter, and these are advices of very eminent people, whose

advices I am supposed to accept; that will be given to me. So, I do not agree to any kind of assurance that I shall place those papers when they come to me on the Table of the House

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Sir, one question I should like to ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That should be enough.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME BILL, 1963

II. THE GOVERNMENT OF UNION TERRITORIES BILL, 1963

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

I

"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 Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill, 1963, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th April, 1963."

II

"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 Government of Union Territories Bill, 1963, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 4th May, 1963."

Sir, I beg to lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL, 1963—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to legislative business. I call upon the Home Minister.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Sir, before the Home Minister replies, there is only one point which I want to ask so that he may reply to that also. I will not take more than half a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Already we have taken 17 hours over this.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: If you are angry, Sir, then I shall sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not at all angry.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I have never tried to waste the time of the House at all. I make only points. If you do not want me to make the point, then I shall sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: The only point I want to raise is in regard to clause 4. The scope of enquiry of this Committee is fundamentally different from the scope of enquiry of the Language Commission of article 344. Therefore, I presume that the Government considered the scope of the enquiry and felt that it will not be possible for the Committee to consider any restriction on the use of English as it has been envisaged in article 344. I want to make that clear because it was made clear by the Minister of State that so long as Parliament does not change it and clause 3 remains, Government will not have the power to restrict the use of English for any purpose, and I want to make sure that this Committee also will not have the power to restrict the use of English.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS): As I read the Bill, no individual shall be deprived of his right to use English if he so wishes instead of Hindi, under clause 3.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is in the records. I had the report only this morning I asked him three times whether the Government will have the power to restrict the use of English, and three times he said that it will not have the power. It is there in the record.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: What I then said was, and what I now also say is, this. With regard to the choice of using either Hindi or English, it is for the individual user to choose his medium of communication, and it is not within the power of any one to deprive him of his freedom to choose either Hindi or English. This is what I said yesterday. This is what I say even today.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Sir, a number of amendments were moved to clause 4, and I shall refer to a few of them. I need not quote the various amendments or read them out, but in a general way I shall refer to the points made out here.

Some of the amendments suggested that the period of ten years provided in clause 4 should be increased. There was an amendment, I think from Shri Gurupada Swamy, that it should be increased to twenty years. There was another amendment which suggested that it should be increased to twenty-five years. So, it seems that even amongst the Members of the opposition there is no agreement, but I can quite appreciate the difficulty because in the matter of fixing any such period in regard to these matters, one cannot be quite sure as to what the period should be. It is difficult to convince them that ten years are the right time limit. Similarly I think it would not be very easy for Mr. Gurupada Swamy to convince me that twenty years would be the right period. There is some arbitrariness involved in this matter whenever a period is fixed. So, I think that this period of ten years is quite reasonable, because what is the purpose? Ten years would be a fairly reasonable period to review the progress made, as has been mentioned in clause 4, and if you wish to extend the period, what would be the result? It will create some kind of complacency in us. What would be the recommendation and what would be accepted by the President is a different matter. But the point is that if we accept the principle of the progressive use of Hindi in the years to come, then some

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

steps have to be taken and I think ten years would be a reasonable period to consider, to review, the actual progress made, and to consider other matters relating to the same. So, I do not want the officials also to sleep over the matter. If we fix a period of 25 years or 20 years, my fear is that for a long time to come no definite step would be taken in regard to the use of Hindi. It may be, as I said, done voluntarily and it will be done. Still, some positive, constructive steps have to be taken.

In the same connection, may I refer to what Mr. Santhanam said? I do not entirely agree that no restrictions could be imposed on English in any branch of administration or in a limited field of administration. But it can be easily combined with what my colleague, Mr. Hajarnavis, has said. Even today in small sections and branches we are making some experiments. Long before this Bill was considered or was placed before this House or before the Cabinet, we were just making a small experiment in small branches where Hindi could be used as far as possible for the purposes in that particular department or branch of activity. But we have been very careful in this matter that if any official working in that department did not know Hindi, he will not be placed in any embarrassment. It is therefore that Mr. Hajarnavis said that there would be complete freedom to the user to use any language he likes, either Hindi or English. As I said, it would be so in the programme of our progressive use of Hindi. We can, or any department can, suggest that in an office which has, say, about thirty people working in it, an experiment might be made that in that particular branch of work Hindi may be tried giving absolute freedom to the individual official working in that department.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: May I know how it is possible? Out of the thirty officials, if ten officials function in English, how can you make it exclusive for all the thirty officials in that department?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Ten will be writing in English. Then it will be the work of the department to translate it into Hindi. It will not be the work of the English-knowing official, but it would be the work of the department to translate it and then send it on to another official who knows English. I might inform Mr. Santhanam that in the year 1949 I had passed an order on these lines; not here at the Centre, I was then in U.P. But I had taken enough precaution not to create any difficulty. My Home Secretary there did not know Hindi but he tried to sign the file at least in Hindi and write down his notes in English. I do not say that it should be done or it has to be done on a big scale but I do not want to rule it out completely, of course, without causing any embarrassment or any inconvenience to each and every officer. That is the point.

Then, I might also just add that this period will not be of ten years but it would be of twelve years—it has to be remembered—because as from 1965 it will be ten years. Now with these two years more, which still remain, they will also have to be combined with it. So a Committee will have to be set up or will be set up after twelve years, after the expiration of this period. That is, when actually twelve years have expired, only then will it be set up. Well, it may not be absolutely essential. Perhaps, the Raja of Bilaspur said something about it that it should be—I do not know before or . . .

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): At the expiration.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: At the expiration? Well, if it is 'after the expiration', there is some sense in that. It may not be absolutely essential to set up a Committee at all. Just as a hypothetical case I am suggesting. Suppose twelve years later Parliament feels or the Committee of Members of Parliament feels that enough progress has been made and that no further review is necessary. Suppose it is felt like that;

well, it may not be necessary at all to appoint a Committee. And if you make it just at the expiration of ten years, I do not want it but suppose there is some special situation in the country; suppose an emergency arises. We may not then consider it advisable to set up the Committee. It would be subject to the approval of Parliament. I think Parliament will give its approval about which I have no doubt. Bill these are, I mean, various matters. I do not want to . . .

SHRI ANAND CHAND: May I clarify the point? What my suggestion is that it is not only that the term 'after the expiration of ten years' is vague but there is the other wording also that is used in the same section and that is that the 'President may appoint'. What I have suggested in my amendment is that at the expiration of ten years, the President shall appoint a Committee. Now, if the hon. Home Minister feels that there might be conditions on account of which the appointment of the Committee at a particular stage is undesirable, then the word 'may' may be added because there should be no doubt about it. As he himself said, it is twelve years from now though it is shown as ten years, and the Committee shall be appointed. It is his intention. But if for certain reasons the Committee is not to be appointed, for other considerations, I am quite prepared to say that the President 'may' appoint so that it would read that 'at the expiration of ten years the President may appoint'. And if the position is intact and it . . .

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I follow the hon. Member. I am merely touching it academically. We should take it for granted that a Committee will be appointed after ten years. Well, I am sorry went into legal quibblings. I should leave it to my hon. colleague, Mr. Hajarnavis. But the hon. Member has perhaps got an older copy of the Bill. There is no mention of the word 'President' there, that the 'President may appoint a

Committee'. It is not mentioned here at all. No, he need not feel embarrassed. Formerly when the Bill was drafted, it was put in that "the President may appoint a Committee. . . ." We found that the language was a bit confusing in this form, namely, 'that the President may appoint a Committee whose Members shall be elected by both Houses of Parliament' was not at all clear, I mean, it did create confusion. The Members of the Committee will be elected by Parliament and so how can the President appoint that Committee? So we have changed the construction and now the Bill clause reads like this:

12 Noon

"...there shall be constituted a Committee on Official Language, on a resolution to that effect being moved in either House of Parliament with the previous sanction of the President and passed by both Houses."

Therefore there will have to be a motion by the Minister concerned for the appointment of this Committee, and the Committee will then be appointed of course, but the motion will have to be made with the approval and consent of the President. That is the position.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am sorry; I now stand corrected. I asked for a copy and the Secretariat supplied me with one and it seems now that it was an old edition.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Then, Sir, it was suggested that there should be ten Members from the non-Hindi speaking areas on this Committee—there are some amendments. Well, I have already explained the position fully, while replying to the debate, that this Committee will be elected on the basis of the single transferable vote, and we have done that only with a view to giving representation to all the States, to all the different viewpoints held by different sections

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

of Members, and as such I do not know why there should be shown such kind of distrust, as is obvious from the amendments moved. In fact, I had said that in the last Parliamentary Committee, out of thirty Members, twenty or more Members came from the non-Hindi speaking areas and I believe that even in the next Committee two-thirds of the Members will be from the non-Hindi speaking areas, and the rest will be from the Hindi-speaking areas. Therefore, the non-Hindi speaking areas will have a sizeable majority over the Hindi-speaking areas. Now you will have the majority and it would be for the majority to convince the minority. The Hindi-speaking people or Members will be in a minority. So there should be no question of any kind of suspicion or distrust in this regard. What is provided for in clause 4 of the Bill is perfectly all right.

I am surprised, Sir, that Bhupesh Guptaji—perhaps there is an amendment—said that it should be clearly provided for in clause 4 that the report will be discussed in Parliament, in the Rajya Sabha to which he belongs.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Both Houses.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Both Houses; I am thankful he has so much consideration for the other House as well. But I do not see any necessity . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You came first to this House, Rajya Sabha—you may remember it—and then promoted to that House.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Therefore I love and like both the Houses; I do not make any distinction between one and the other. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is exceedingly zealous of the rights of this House; of course he should be zealous of his own rights, but why should he envy the other House in any shape or form?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. I say we have produced people like that from this House.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But I wanted to tell Shri Bhupesh Gupta and the House that I myself moved an amendment in the other House suggesting that it shall be the duty of the Committee to review the progress made, etc. and submit a report to the President making recommendations thereon and the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament, etc. It was not there before, in the first draft, and, as I said, I myself moved that the President shall cause the report to be laid on the Table of both Houses. Thus I made my intention absolutely clear. And since the report is placed on the Table of the House, it is open, Sir, with your permission—if you will allow—to have a discussion on that report, and I know, Sir, you are so generous; you will never refuse a discussion on any such report, a report of this kind which would be of such vital importance, and Shri Bhupesh Gupta should not bother at all. He starts discussion on matters which are absolutely unrelated to anything, and only the other day, Sir, while no paper was laid on the Table of the House, he censured the Government, if I might use that word, censured the Government as a whole that this report was a report . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never accused you

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: And he did not allow me to say a word. We had deliberately taken a decision not to place the first part of the report on the Table of the House because further enquiries were to be made in order to prosecute the persons if there was a *prima facie* case. That was why we deliberately did it and we are exceedingly sorry that the leakage took place, and it is just possible that the parties concerned might take advantage of it. So I need not go into that further, but I merely wanted to refer how Shri Bhupesh

Gupta is powerful enough to raise questions on matters, as I said, unrelated, in regard to which no paper is even laid on the Table of the House. So he should have no doubt in his capacity to raise any matter whenever he likes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will not be here after ten years.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I might assure him and the House that there is absolutely no doubt that the report submitted by the Members of the Committee of Parliament will definitely be laid on the Table of the House and it can be discussed in both Houses of Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope he won't have that paper in advance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Necessitating enquiry immediately after that.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Then Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty put forward an amendment suggesting that some representatives of the linguistic minorities might also be made Members of this Committee. Sir, she was not quite clear. There are many many linguistic minorities in this country, especially round about the borders of different States. For example, in Madras there are linguistic minorities speaking Telugu or Kannada. Similarly, in Assam there are Bengali-speaking minorities and tribals, and especially because of the reorganisation of States a special situation arose and the States Reorganisation Commission made specific recommendations as to how to deal with the situation, especially in regard to the difficulties which linguistic minorities may have to face. So if she is referring to that, I can only tell her that we have taken various steps during the last year and a half to give necessary relief to the linguistic minorities. In the Central Government we have the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities, who goes round to different States, meets those people and tries to know their difficulties. Then the Commissioner submits his report to

the President and the report is placed on the Table of both Houses and is discussed in both Houses. So Parliament has enough and ample opportunity to express its views. And then we take up the matter with the State Governments. Besides that, Sir, recently in accordance with the resolutions of the National Integration Conference and the recommendations of the National Integration Council we have held several meetings and, in fact, every Chief Minister has taken it upon himself to carry out the decisions of the National Integration Council and the advice tendered by the Government of India. So I do not think, Sir, there will be any special difficulty in regard to the linguistic minorities, and if we go on adding members in this manner, I have no doubt there will be so much duplication. We will have to have perhaps two members from the same area, and it might create confusion also. In so far as Nepali is concerned, the Nepali-speaking people in Darjeeling had some difficulties before, but now the Bengal Legislative Assembly has passed a law, and Nepali at the district level is now being freely used as I mentioned about Bengali being freely used in Cachar in Assam district. So these problems we could discuss separately, and at other levels. I do fully appreciate some of her doubts, but I am quite sure she can take it up at other levels, and the matter could be solved.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY (West Bengal): My amendment was not related to the 14 languages which are in the Constitution. My amendment refers to the other languages not in the Constitution and to the linguistic minority communities speaking them. That was my amendment. There are so many linguistic minorities in the country and their languages do not come under the 14 languages incorporated in the Constitution. I am speaking of those languages and those linguistic minorities whose languages are not covered in the Constitution.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I can somewhat understand that. But there will be many such languages. It is not a question of one or two languages. There are the hill tribes in Assam who speak a number of languages.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: They may not be languages. There may be so many dialects. What I mean to say is that from the linguistic minorities there may be so many Members here in Parliament. Among these 30 Members of the Parliamentary Committee, have two from the linguistic minorities. That is what I meant.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: The hon. Member has to realise that I am not talking of dialects. There are languages also. And amongst hill tribes there are many dialects, but there are a few main languages, in Bihar, in Assam. If we take the hill tribes, they do not insist their dialects to be used, but they do want that some of their main languages should be given an opportunity to flourish and to grow, and they want that the same language should be used at the district level for administrative purposes. So it is not a question of any one language but there will be many such languages and as I said, Sir, it would be exceedingly difficult to give representation to all of them on this Committee.

She is also not quite correct when she says that there are no Members in Parliament who will be from those areas and who speak those languages. There are Members in the Lok Sabha who have been elected from Assam and belong to hill tribes. (*Interruption*). Anyhow, I have made my position clear and I cannot clarify it further.

Sir, a good deal of discussion took place about the report being considered in the State Legislatures. I do not know, Sir, if I should repeat all that I had said. I have personally no objection to the report being discussed in the State Legislatures. I made it

quite clear in the beginning itself. Of course, it would be entirely in the discretion of the State Government to decide as to whether they should place it before the State Legislature or not. If they do so there is no bar. But if they do not do so, why should we compel them to place it and discuss it in the State Legislature?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They should consult the Opposition.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will come to know the view of the State even when the report is not considered in the State Legislature. He has his own party, and a fairly strong party, I believe, through which he can know so many things. But I do not deny the fact that the report could be discussed and my impression is that it would be discussed in the State Legislature. It is not absolutely necessary to provide it here in clause 4 itself.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): May I ask, Sir, whether it would not be a matter of privilege of Parliament if the report made by a Committee of Parliament, submitted to Parliament, is to be considered by State Legislatures?

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): No privilege is involved.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: That is why we have taken adequate care not to mention anything about State Legislatures in the Bill. However, as I said, this matter could be discussed. And, as I said, the other day, it was discussed in two Legislative Assemblies—the last report of the Parliamentary Committee. But the other State Governments did not consider it advisable to discuss the report in the State Legislatures.

There was a suggestion, Sir, that if three-fourths of the State Legislatures reject the report, it should be thrown out by the President or it should not be accepted by the President, something on those lines.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have misunderstood. What I said was that the President's direction should come after the State Legislatures have considered the report. I said that the President should issue no directive or direction which are in a positive way contrary to the opinion expressed by three-fourths of the State Legislature. Suppose on an issue no opinion has been expressed. On that the President can give his direction, whatever he likes. But suppose on an issue some opinion has been expressed in the State Legislature, and there three-fourths of the State Legislature have given a particular opinion. In such a case it would not be open to the President to issue directions contrary to the opinion expressed in the State. I thought that they would be in conformity with the assurance given by the Prime Minister.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Naturally, the views expressed by the State Legislature, or three-fourths of its Members will have its own weight while the President is making recommendations on the report. But to make any specific provision in the Bill here, I do not think would be advisable.

A second reason for my not accepting this is this, that in regard to certain national matters of policy, it is only the President who can take a final decision. We cannot leave it to the State Governments to be entirely guided by the representatives of the State on matters which are of vital importance in the sense that the integrity of the country has to be maintained. Where there may be a fear of some kind of chaos being created, it should be entirely the responsibility of the Centre and the President to take the final decision. What I mean to say is this that it is possible—I do not want to accuse any State. But, for example, take my own State. It is very easy for them to suggest that Hindi should be immediately intro-

duced in the Union Government. Similarly, perhaps the hon. Member's own State might advise that Bengali should be immediately introduced in the Union Government for their use.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My State cannot do it. It is prevented by the Constitution.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But there is no bar to making any recommendation. I am not saying that they will pass a resolution and we have to abide by it. But the report will have its own weight, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should remember.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): You are underlining Bengal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So it is easier for the State Government to patronise or to support their own regional language in their own sphere.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: They can even say "All the fourteen languages". For example, Mr. Annadurai said the other day, or perhaps some Member in the Lok Sabha of the D.M.K. said that all the fourteen languages should be made the official languages of the Union. We are brainy enough to consider various matters and to give various suggestions. So it is not impossible for a State Government to make a report on those lines. But I do not say that they will do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That would be out of order.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Recommendation cannot be out of order. Recommendation will have to be considered though we may reject it. What I want to emphasise is the fact that it is essential that this matter should be considered and considered finally only at the level of the President and at the level of the Central Government. We cannot shirk our responsibility in this regard. We will have to carry the whole country with us, and it is essential that we maintain and preserve the unity and solidarity of the country.

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

Madam, I have taken much time. I shall say only a few words about what Dinkarji said and a word about what Vajpayeeji said. Dinkarji said that I equated him with Shri Annadurai. I never wanted to equate Dinkarji with Shri Annadurai on the question of the unity of the country. I know the views of Shri Dinkar fully. He holds clear and categorical views on the matter. But what I had meant was that there was on the one side the extreme view taken by Mr. Annadurai and on the other hand Dinkarji said that what Seth Govind Das had said was right and his views should prevail, his views should be implemented. When he said that . . .

प्रो० रामधारी सिंह दिनकर (बिहार) :

ऐसा कहा था मैंने कि भविष्य अन्त में श्री फ्रैंक एथनी का साथ नहीं देगा वह अन्त में सेठ गोविन्द दास का साथ देगा, जिसका अभिप्राय यह है कि अगर कभी यहां सार्वदेशिक भाषा बनेगी तो वह हिन्दी होगी वह अंग्रेजी नहीं होगी ।

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: He coupled Seth Govind Das with Mr. Frank Anthony. Then I have nothing further to say. I had only said that Dinkarji also expressed some extreme views and Mr. Annadurai did the same thing. I had said in that way but I do not want to add anything further. I am glad Dinkarji has clarified the position but in regard to his suggestion that a Committee should be appointed, I agree with him. It should be left to the Government to decide as to what kind of a Committee it should be and how it should be constituted. It is advisable that there should be some Committee to draw up a programme of work. We have some programme of work already. We have before us the difficulty of implementing that programme. I fully realise my responsibility when this Bill has been approved by this House as to what we have to do in regard to the progressive use of Hindi. It is an exceedingly difficult task to achieve. Whatever steps

I or the Government might take, might create some misunderstandings or misapprehensions in the minds of the people living in the non-Hindi areas. So we must be extra careful but we must be steady in our pace, we must go ahead. I have no doubt in that matter but as regards the suggestion by Dinkarji that there should be a Committee, as I said it was suggested by a prominent Member of Tamilnad or some others that it should be a Committee constituted of Members from the different areas. It was a good suggestion. We will think over it but I am not much enamoured of a Committee of Members of Parliament to be appointed in this regard because it will be a matter of day-to-day work. It will have to be considered too as to why the Members of Parliament only should be on that Committee. However . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Are they excluded?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: They need not be excluded, nor it should only be a Committee of Members of Parliament. I shall certainly think over it and take some decision.

Shri Vajpayee said that I spoke in Hindi first on the first occasion. It is true and my love for Hindi is still the same but I shall accept one thing. I have not changed in my views on any matter since I came from U.P. to the Parliament but I must accept one thing that I had to change my views in regard to the language problem when I came here. The wider picture of the country was much clearer before me here in Delhi than what it was in Lucknow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As it should be.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: But it has to be accepted—perhaps Shri Vajpayeeji will accept—that I want to serve Hindi now in a much wider context. In U.P. I was restricted to the State of U.P. Now I want to help in the growth and expansion of Hindi throughout the country. Therefore I am trying to

serve Hindi in a much better way, in a much wider area and I feel completely satisfied over it. However it is not myself alone who speaks in English. Even Mr. Vajpayee, the biggest exponent of Hindi, often speaks in English.

AN HON. MEMBER: In good English.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Yes, in very good English indeed, much better than my English, I admit entirely. But there is a proverb in Hindi—

भूत वह है जो सिर पर चढ़ कर बोले ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मगर भूत को उतारना पड़ेगा ।

श्री लाल बहादुर : मतलब यह कि वह वाजपेयी जी के सिर पर भी चढ़ गया तो मैं उसमें क्या करूँ ।

I shall not say anything more about direct action. I was surprised that in spite of my earnest appeal to the House and especially to Mr. Annadurai and his Party, that no direct action should be resorted to, Shri Bhupesh Gupta felt it advisable to suggest that it was not possible for him to accept.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please do not misunderstand me. I said in the context of my suggestion the matter should be discussed in the State Legislatures. There I said if you close the avenues of public discussion and debate over matters like this, people will be left with going out in the streets and demonstrating and all that. Whether you call it direct action, I do not know, but that is what I meant. This is what I said, I am not threatening you with direct action. I am subjected to your action.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am glad that for the first time he has spoken like a Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is it a compliment or a denunciation?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I do not want to take more time but I must again emphasise the fact that it would be indeed most unfortunate if this matter,

the question of language, which is so vital and important for us, vital and important for the unity of the country, for the complete integration of the country, is to be decided in the streets or on the roads of any city. We must move together and I have no doubt that the country as a whole will accept the lead given by this House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendments Nos. 2 and 11.

*Amendment Nos. 2 and 11 were, by leave, withdrawn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 3. Mr. Dinkar, do you press it?

प्रो० रामचारी सिंह दिनकर : आश्वासन मिलने के बाद मैं भी इस संशोधन को वापस लेता हूँ ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he the leave of the House to withdraw?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. The question is:

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.'"

The motion was negatived.

*For text of amendments, see cols. 2403 and 2404 of Debate dated 6th May 1963.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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.'"

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 12.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment No. 12.

**Amendment No. 12 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I beg leave to withdraw my amendments Nos. 13 and 14.

**Amendment Nos. 13 and 14 were, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: *Amendment No. 19 is barred.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Madam, mine is not alone. There are other amendments also, for instance there is of my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta. They may be taken together. I press my amendment No. 18 for the simple reason that I feel that along with the State Governments, the State Legislatures should also be consulted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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 motion was negatived.

*For text of amendments, see cols. 2405 and 2405 of Debate dated 6th May 1963.

*For text of amendments, see col. 2405 of Debate dated 6th May 1963.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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 reference.

(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.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'(3A) In making their recommendations 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 motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: *Amendments Nos. 24 and 38 are barred.

The question is:

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

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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.'

The motion was negatived.

*For text of amendments, see col. 2407 of Debate dated 6th May 1963.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about your amendment, Mrs. Chetty?

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: If the hon. Minister has got some soft corner for the linguistic minorities, I would like to withdraw it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The soft corner business is over now. Are you pressing it?

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: I would like to withdraw it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has she the leave of the House to withdraw?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Madam, no.

HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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 motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4 part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5—Authorised Hindi translation of Central Acts, etc.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: Madam, I beg to move:

4. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 28, for the words 'A Translation in Hindi' the words 'Translations in all the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule

to the Constitution except Sanskrit' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 34, the words 'in Hindi' be deleted."

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I beg to move:

50. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 28, for the word 'Hindi' the word 'English' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 34, for the word 'Hindi' the word "English" be substituted."

51. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 36, for the word 'English' the word 'Hindi' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 38, for the word 'Hindi' the word 'English' be substituted."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: Madam, by this amendment I want to draw the attention of the House to the Official Language Committee's Report which says that for the convenience of the subordinate judiciary and the public it would be necessary to make arrangements also for providing translation in the official language of the States. This, therefore, is not the opinion expressed by myself alone but is the recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee that such enactments must be translated into the official language. It would be convenient for the States and also for the public. I need not say much and I hope the hon. Home Minister will take serious note of this and accept this amendment.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया:
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने जो संशोधन रखे हैं उनका मुख्य आशय यह है कि जब सब लोग यह मानते हैं कि हमारे देश की राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी बनाई जाय और उसके लिये प्रयत्न किया जाना चाहिये तो हमको ठोस कदम

उठाना चाहिये। ऐसा तो होता नहीं कि
“जामुन मेरे मुंह में गिर जा” कहने से जामुन
मुंह में गिर जाय और खा लिया जाय . . .

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: This amendment is out of order because so long as article 348 (1) is there, this is the only possible thing that could be done. This article says that all proceedings of the Supreme Court and the High Court shall be in the English language and therefore there is no question of translation into English. There could be translation into Hindi only.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it is not out of order.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Until Parliament by law make . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :
मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जैसे हम आथोरिटेटिव्ह
टेक्स्ट अंग्रेजी का मानना चलते हैं वैसे ही
जितने भी आर्डर्स हों, आर्डिनैंसेज, लाज,
रूल्स एंड रेगुलेशन्स हों उनका आथोरिटे-
टिव्ह टेक्स्ट हम हिन्दी का मानें और उसके
साथ अंग्रेजी के ट्रांसलेशन दे दिये जायें,
क्योंकि यहां बहस के दौरान अच्छी तरह से
प्रमाणित हुआ है कि हमारे देश की अधिक
जनसंख्या हिन्दी जानने वालों की है, काफी
जनसंख्या अन्य प्रादेशिक भाषायें जानने
वालों की है, अंग्रेजी जानने वालों की संख्या
कम है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में हम क्यों नहीं
पहला कदम यह उठायें कि हम सारा आथा
रिटेटिव्ह टेक्स्ट हिन्दी का रखें और उसके
साथ साथ अंग्रेजी का ट्रांसलेशन बराबर देते
रहें। जब तक हम पूरी तौर पर हिन्दी को
सब लोगों की भाषा नहीं बना सकें तब तक
के लिये यह कदम उठाया जाना आवश्यक
है और मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना
करूंगा कि यदि सचमुच में उनका इरादा है
कि इस दिशा में सही कदम उठायें तो मेरा
यह अमेन्डमेंट स्वीकार करके इसको आगे
बढ़ाने का कष्ट करें।

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, I oppose the amendments because, as Mr. Santhanam has pointed out, the hon. Member appears to have lost sight of article 348(1) which says:

“(b) the authoritative texts—

(i) of all Bills to be introduced or amendments thereto to be moved in either House of Parliament or in the House or either Houses of the Legislature of a State,

(ii) of all Acts passed by Parliament . . .

shall be in the English language.”

So far, English was the language of the Bills and English has been the language of the enactments and till Parliament by law changes, English shall be the language of all Acts. Therefore, we start with the authoritative text in English and what we must have, if we want to change over to Hindi, is the authoritative texts in Hindi. That is what clause 5 provides. The hon. Member, who has moved the amendment, cannot by mere wish transform the existing fact, namely, existence of the Acts in English into Hindi and so far as translations into the regional languages are concerned, primarily it is the duty of the State Legislatures and when they introduce that language, they will certainly see that translations are provided.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON: The Official Language Commission recommended this and said that this must be done by the Union Government.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: This is only a suggestion which may be taken into consideration.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. “That at page 2,—

(i) in line 28, for the words ‘A Translation in Hindi’ the words Translations in all the languages

[The Deputy Chairman.]

specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution except Sanskrit' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 34, the words 'In Hindi' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

50. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 28, for the word 'Hindi' the word 'English' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 34, for the word 'Hindi' the word 'English' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

51. "That at page 2,—

(i) in line 36, for the word 'English' the word 'Hindi' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 38, for the word 'Hindi' the word 'English' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"Clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6—Authorised Hindi translation of State Acts in certain cases

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I beg to move:

42. "That at page 3, after line 10, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that in the event of any conflict between the language of the text in which such Acts

were originally enacted or Ordinances originally promulgated and their translation in Hindi language, the natural meaning of the former shall prevail.' "

This is a very simple amendment. When you are providing for the Hindi translations to serve as authorised translation of all the materials, documents, orders, ordinances, etc. in the non-Hindi-speaking States, then you must also bear in mind the point that there may arise some conflict in the Supreme Court because of difference between the Hindi text and the text in the regional language in, shall we say, Tamil or Bengali. What would happen in such a case? We are passing through a transition and so I think that the natural meaning of the language in which the Act was originally passed or the ordinance promulgated should prevail. You may ask, why should we foresee any conflict between the Hindi translation and the regional languages? They have their affinities but they have, at the same time, also got certain divergence. A particular word, in translation may not convey the same sense as is done by the word in the regional language. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the law was passed in the regional language and the framers of the law must have had in mind a meaning that would be conveyed in the language in which it was formulated. I say this because when we deal with State matters, the regional languages should have priority. I make it absolutely clear that in the sphere of the State, the regional languages, Hindi or some other language, should have priority over the Union official language. It is absolutely certain and in respect of such a conflict naturally when it does not relate to a matter concerning the Central Government or the Central Act the meaning of the original language, the natural meaning, should prevail. I think this suggestion can well be accepted.

The motion was proposed.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: There is only one point here. I think the whole thing is a case of bad drafting. There cannot be an authoritative text in Hindi and an authoritative text in English. There can be only one authoritative text for the purpose of interpretation in courts of any Bill or anything else. I do not understand what is meant by 'authoritative text in Hindi'. Either it can be an authoritative text or not at all. Therefore this is here as a sop to please the sentiments of people. If a thing in English is to be the authoritative text, it will be the authoritative text for all purposes. You cannot have another Hindi authoritative text or *vice versa*. Therefore this is a bad clause. I do not know why they should have drafted like this.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): I had pressed for a clarification and the Home Minister gave an assurance that the meaning in the language in which the Bill is originally proposed will be the authoritative meaning. So if it is in Bengali, it will be Bengali, if it is in Hindi, it will be in Hindi. To say that the Hindi translation will be authoritative in Hindi, has no meaning. It is simply an eye-wash.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, there seems to be some confusion about the exact connotation of the expression 'authoritative text'. Mr. Santhanam had difficulty to reconcile himself to the existence of two authoritative texts. May I draw his attention to article 348(1) which says that the authoritative text of all Acts passed by Parliament until Parliament by law otherwise provides shall be in English? And sub-clause (3) says that notwithstanding anything in sub-clause (b) of clause (1) where the Legislature of a State has prescribed any language other than the English language for use in Bills introduced in, or Acts passed by, the Legislature of the State or . . . the translation of the same in the English language . . . shall be deemed to be the authoritative text thereof in

the English language. Therefore the Constitution itself contemplates authoritative texts in more than one language. Why do we say that there is going to be a conflict between the various authoritative texts? If I may state theoretically, the position is that there is no conflict between the two authoritative texts. I say, authoritatively one. They may appear to be different. It may be that two persons looking at the two texts may come to two different conclusions but in theory there is no conflict because the legislature make only one law, not two laws.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: But the court will have to interpret both the texts.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I am coming to that. In the court a question arises as to what the law is, what the printed words in a particular thing mean, what is the rule which the court is going to apply in a particular case? Law is something apart from the text. Law is the rule which the court will apply to the controversy which arises before the court. Now before the court rival contentions may be raised as to what a particular provision of a law may mean. I can conceive of a case, though rare, where one of the parties would rely upon the Hindi authoritative text and say that it bears out his contention while on the other side the other party may say, 'Look at the English text; it bears out my meaning'. Such a contention can certainly be raised. When confronted with such a problem the court will certainly have regard to both because both are authoritative. Both being authoritative texts, the court will look into those texts and find out what the rule is and once the court, the Supreme Court or the High Court, has decided what the rule is, that rule shall be the meaning of both the texts. Once the court has decided that this is the meaning, this is the rule, then all of us, who have to administer the laws—whatever our preconceptions were—

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.]
either about the Hindi text or the English text—will have to take whatever the courts decide as the meaning of both the English as well as of the Hindi texts, because two laws are not being administered. If I may give an analogy, suppose a photograph is taken of the Taj Mahal from different angles. It is the same Taj Mahal but it is photographed from the different angles. Now the photographs may be different and it may appear that they are two different objects but the building is the same. Similarly . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Law is to be interpreted in this way?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: . . . you reach to the same objective reality, namely, the will of the Legislature. The apparent inconsistency between the two has got to be reconciled by the courts. That, I submit, is the answer.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Article 348(1) says that the Acts, etc. shall be in English and that will be the authoritative text.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: But it also says, until Parliament by law otherwise provides.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: Your interpretation means that the assurance given by the Home Minister has no meaning. I say that if a non-official Bill gets passed in both the Houses in Hindi then the courts should have no authority to interpret it through an English translation. If a Bill is passed in Hindi originally, it should be the authoritative text. Often the connotation of the words in Hindi is not the same as in English. The two languages are different; the connotations are different. Each word covers different areas. Therefore to impose English interpretation is not only unjust and humiliating; it is also incorrect. Therefore if a Bill is passed in Hindi the Hindi interpretation alone must be accepted and the courts should have absolutely no discretion in the matter.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: May I answer the hon. Member? Wherever we try to understand what the other man expresses we try to find out what are the words that he has actually used. Naturally the language that he used would be the primary authority. If he spoke in Hindi then of course we will first of all see what words he used in Hindi. That would be seen first. But suppose somebody did not know Hindi and he tried to cite from the English authoritative text, certainly it could not be barred.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: May I take it that as a result of this interpretation the glorious uncertainty of the law will be greatly increased?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The simple question is, in the event of a conflict which prevails? If the text is in Bengali or Tamil and the Hindi translation comes into conflict with the original text which prevails?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: The court will decide that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think the Minister made it very simple. He said if the picture is taken from one side and also from another side, it was same. Suppose I take a picture from his front and another one from his back. Are they same?

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the Minister has explained fully.

The question is:

42. "That at page 3, after line 10, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

"Provided that in the event of any conflict between the language of the text in which such Acts were originally enacted or Ordinances originally promulgated and their translation in Hindi language, the natural meaning of the former shall prevail."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7—Optional use of Hindi or other official language in judgments etc. of High Courts.

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

25. "That at page 3, line 18, after the words 'English Language' the words 'and the Hindi Language where the official language of the State is other than Hindi' be inserted."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

43. "That at page 3,—

(i) in line 13, the words 'Hindi or' be deleted;

(ii) in line 18, after the words 'English language' the words 'and in Hindi, where the official language is other than Hindi' be inserted."

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: Madam, I move:

52. "That at page 3, for clause 7, the following be substituted, namely:—

"7. As from the appointed day or any day thereafter, the Governor of a State may authorise the use of Hindi or the official language of the State for the purposes of any judgment, decree or order passed or made by the High Court for that State and where any judgment, decree or order is passed or made in any such language it may be accompanied by a translation of the same in the English language issued under the authority of the High Court, if applied for."

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, you should not be permitted to

move your amendment. You were not in your seat. Anyway, I allow you.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I came rushing because I heard that the amendment was coming up. I think it is necessary that this amendment should be accepted by the House if we are really sincere in our professions for developing the Hindi language. According to my amendment, even in those areas where the regional languages are not Hindi, that is to say, in the South Indian States, the judgments of High Courts shall also have a translation in Hindi. It is not only the regional language and the English language, which is the language of the Supreme Court. There shall also be a translation of it in the Hindi language. What will be the position in 1975 when the change-over to Hindi takes place, in the bilingual State and in the unilingual States, when Hindi is the national language? If in those States where the regional language is other than Hindi, High Court judgments are allowed to be written in the regional language or in English, there will be no Hindi copy of those judgments and decrees. It will prevent the development of a common system of law based on the Hindi language. I think this lacuna has got to be filled in and it is for that purpose that I have moved that in those States where Hindi is not the official language and the judgments are given in regional languages, the judgment shall be accompanied by a Hindi translation. I may add here that the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General, that is, Mr. M. C. Setalvad and the present Attorney-General, who was formerly the Solicitor-General expressed as their view that Hindi should be ultimately the language of the Supreme Court. We will be preventing Hindi becoming the language of the Supreme Court if we do not ask those High Courts—where the regional language has been adopted as the language—to have a translation made of their decrees and orders in Hindi also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I speak on my amendment No. 43. This raises rather a serious point, a point of principle. Now, here you will see that what is provided for is that in the case of States which may not be Hindi speaking States, the Governor, may with the previous consent of the President, make provision for the use of Hindi, or the official language, that is to say, it is at the discretion of the Governor, subject to the consent of the President whether or not Hindi or the official language of the State has to be used for judgment, etc. Now, this goes against the principle of regional language being the official language in the State. Now, for example, take West Bengal. There the language should be Bengali and all judgments, decrees and so on of the High Courts should be issued only in Bengali, not in any other language. Translations may be there of this and that language. It is a different matter. What is provided for here is this. The Governor may also order that instead of Bengali, Hindi may be used, judgment to be issued in Hindi. That cuts across the very principle of the regional languages being put in their rightful place in the sphere of the States. I would say this is an intrusion of Hindi. With all respect to our friends who want Hindi to flourish I would say that this is an intrusion of Hindi into the non-Hindi-speaking region, in a sphere which exclusively belongs to the regional language. Where does it come from?

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is an imposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, it is an imposition. I would like it to be taken out. My amendment is to this effect. If you will refer to the Report of the Official Language Commission, in paragraph 89, at page 414, it is given. You will find the recommendation made, which was not a very happy thing for that Commis-

sion to do. There it is said that according to the view of the Commission, Hindi should really be the language of the High Courts for passing orders, judgments and so on. We opposed this at that time and I am reiterating my opposition to it. This is what paragraph 89 says in the recommendation:—

“There are several strong and, in our opinion, conclusive reasons in favour of deciding that when the time for the change-over arrives, the language of the judgments, decrees and orders of the High Courts must be a common linguistic medium for the whole country and therefore these should be in the Hindi language in all regions.”

Therefore, this was a reactionary recommendation of the Official Language Commission, which wanted that Hindi should be the language of the High Courts all over the country, irrespective of the fact whether the regional language is the official language of the State or not. As far as Hindi-speaking regions are concerned, it is all right. But then why should we accept the situation where the Governor can say that we can have another language? You can provide for translation in Hindi, as has been done. Therefore, I think, the judgments in the non-Hindi speaking regions or in the Hindi-speaking regions should always be in the regional language only and we should aim at achieving this objective. We must have the change-over from English to the regional language not only in the States or in the Legislature but also in the High Courts. If I may take a little of your time, what is provided for here is that instead of Bengali or Tamil, you can also introduce Hindi. I think this is called an imposition. While I am for one official language being evolved for the Indian Union, I cannot bring myself up to accept this surreptitious intrusion of Hindi under the provisions of the Bill in the regional sphere in the High Court. The objective is that all the

proceedings will have been conducted in the regional language. Judges and normally lawyers will have spoken in the regional language—Bengali or Tamil, whatever it may be or Hindi in the Hindi region. Why then should you introduce another language here, apart from the regional language and authorise the Governor to do so? Therefore, this is acceptance of a reactionary recommendation of the Language Commission which I cannot support. This is only so far as amendment No. 43 is concerned.

Regarding the other part of the clause, I want to amend it in that way, the last two lines. You will see that it shall be accompanied by a translation of the same in the English language and in Hindi where the official language is other than Hindi. We provide for a Hindi translation only where the official language, of course, is not Hindi. Otherwise, the original text remains. But under no circumstances should we make it obligatory on the High Court or anybody to provide for the judgments to be given in the Hindi language in the non-Hindi region. Such little things create a lot of misgivings in the minds of the people. Now, I know that this will be at once seized upon by people who are otherwise bitterly opposed to Hindi being the Union official language.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA (Nominated): Why are you afraid of it? It is not entirely limited. The High Court is not a watertight compartment. It is connected with the Supreme Court, with the law of the country as a whole.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, we are making a serious compromise. Then you say this. This is precisely what we will not accept. I say the country will not accept. Yes, we are connected with the Supreme Court. So, is the Supreme Court with Tamil language or Bengali. But what is this thing? If you want, have a translation of the Supreme Court documents

in order to be operative in West Bengal or Tamilnad as the case may be. It must be translated by the Government there or by the Central Government. Similarly, the link between the Supreme Court and the High Court of a non-Hindi region has to be established not by an imposition but by arranging for a translation. Let the important cases, laws and other things be translated into Hindi and be brought to the Supreme Court. Now, this is how it should be done. Now, if you, in a vital sphere of the judiciary, extend Hindi, regardless of what happens to the regional language, it will not be fair. What is more, the regional language will be offended by it, the linguistic group will be offended by it, and in the sphere of the High Court, in the judicial sphere, one of the three arms of the State, namely legislature, executive and judiciary, you are making an imposition whatever your intention may be.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the House will adjourn today for half an hour. We shall reassemble at 1.30. The House stands adjourned till 1.30.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past one of the clock, **THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I oppose the amendment of the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. My point is, there must be some stage where there should be some emphasis on the integrity and the unity of the country. While discussing the President's Address I also referred to this point that so far as the High Courts are concerned, the judgements should be in one language and not in fourteen languages. It may be not today, it may be after five years or ten years or fifteen years. That I concede, but there must be a stage where the High Court judgements

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]
should be in one official language or national language of India. Otherwise the judicial system that has been made up with the best efforts of the best brains in our country will get very much weakened, and it will not be in the interests of best administration of justice and progress of our country. So my point is this. I may state with due respect that in the Legislatures we are allowing the regional language to the highest degree, and in executive matters we are allowing the regional language to the highest degree. But so far as the Supreme Court is concerned and so far as the judgements and decrees are concerned, I do feel that the provision that has been made in this Bill is a very sound provision and it should be kept up. While we want a common language, if we follow what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said, it will sabotage that common language. So there will be all sorts of difficulty and confusion. With these words I oppose the motion of my learned friend.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I wanted to say that this amendment is not at all practicable, because apart from the reasons which were given by the hon. Member who spoke before me, there are other difficulties which have to be considered. The hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, was pleased to say that there should be translations of the Judgements and the proceedings if required. When we are on the one hand talking of the delays and expenditure involved in legal proceedings, I feel that it would be the most impractical procedure to follow, to translate all the judgements and certain evidence that would be necessary as also the proceedings in the Supreme Court. Therefore, if at all the hon. Member meant that his aim ultimately was to have a common language for all India, at least in this sphere by insisting that in the High Courts the proceedings should be in English and Hindi we

will be able to have a common language, because through these proceedings the lawyers and others will learn Hindi and keep on with Hindi; and that is how we will ultimately have one common language.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA:
Madam, as one who was associated with the Official Language Commission, and having heard Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and remembering what he had said in that particular paragraph, I may bring to the notice of the House that this particular aspect was discussed in the Official Language Commission for two days and ultimately we came to this conclusion for two reasons. Firstly, the High Court judgment must be in the all-India language for two reasons: (1) it has to get the consent of the Rashtrapati who will not be expected to have one particular regional language alone. He is associated only with the all-India language. (2) All those proceedings of the State Legislature naturally will be in the State language, and naturally the enactment also will be in the State language. When that enactment comes, it will be discussed in the High Court, and if it is presumed that there will be lawyers knowing only the State language, it is a mistake. In every High Court it should be expected that there will be lawyers who know both the languages, who can speak both the languages. Then alone we can have an all-India Bar and an all-India enactment. For that purpose all those lawyers who can participate in the discussion either in the regional language or in the all-India language will be allowed. Therefore, whatever may be the enactment's language, the ultimate authoritative text which will get the consent of the President should be in the all-India language. Then alone it will have the authority. Therefore, it is wrong to say that the judgment of the High Court should be only in the regional language and that it ought not to be in the all-India language. If it is not in the all-India language, innum-

able difficulties will come and we will not be able to have a law established on an all-India basis.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have it translated.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA: Yes, the translation will have the authority. It is not a question of translation or original. It is a question of which should bear the authority. The authority means the Government, whoever is authorised to give the authority. It is the authoritative text. The language does not carry any authority by itself. It is only the authority that is lent to it by the authority who possesses the authority. That is how it gets the authority. Therefore, whatever document is given it bears the authority, and that authority will be in the all-India language, because that will be the connecting link between the Supreme Court and the High Court, between the Rashtrapati and the Governor and between people of all-India character and State character. So a monolithic system for the purpose of having an all-India enactment in Hindi is an absolute necessity. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. He says that we must have a common language. We must be prepared to reconcile ourselves to this position. Otherwise it will not be possible for us to keep up that integration.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am just asking this. This was with the unanimous approval of the Official Language Commission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what he has said.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: Madam, my amendment reads:

"That at page 3, for clause 7, the following be substituted, namely:—

'As from the appointed day or any day thereafter, the Governor of a State may authorise the use of Hindi or the official language of the State for the purposes of any judgment, decree or order

passed or made by the High Court for that State and where any judgment, decree or order is passed or made in any such language it may be accompanied by a translation of the same in the English language issued under the authority of the High Court, if applied for."

संशोधन के रूप में यह एक नया क्लॉज रखने का कारण यह है कि जो वर्तमान धारा ७ है उसके अन्तर्गत एक तो "एपाइन्टेड डे" का बंधन है, फिर "एपाइन्टेड डे" के बाद भी एक और रास्ता निकाला गया कि उसे 'एपाइन्टेड डे' के अन्दर अगर वहां का गवर्नर उचित समझे तो उसको अपनी स्वीकृति देने के बाद फिर राष्ट्रपति महोदय की स्वीकृति लेनी होगी और उसके बाद हिन्दी अथवा रीजनल लैंग्वेज में वहां की कार्यवाही चल सकती है। उसके साथ एक बंधन और लगा दिया है कि

"It shall be accompanied by a translation of the same in English."

जैसा कि मुझ से पूर्व की वक्ता श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द ने कहा कि उसमें अपव्यय भी होता है और देरी भी होती है, तो मेरा संशोधन खर्च और देरी दोनों को कम करने वाला है। आप रीजनल लैंग्वेज को और हिन्दी को जिसको आप राष्ट्रभाषा बनाने वाले हैं, महत्व देने वाले हैं। लेकिन उसमें एक तो एपाइन्टेड डे रखा ही है मगर जो गवर्नर के बाद राष्ट्रपति द्वारा स्वीकृति लेने का बंधन लगाया है, वह राष्ट्रपति के द्वारा स्वीकृति लेना आवश्यक नहीं, क्योंकि मान लीजिये उत्तर प्रदेश में या मध्य प्रदेश में वहां का गवर्नर उचित समझता है कि वहां के न्यायाधीश हिन्दी का उपयोग करें और न्यायालयों में हिन्दी में ही निर्णय दिये जायें तो उसमें राष्ट्रपति की स्वीकृति की कोई आवश्यकता मैं इसलिये नहीं मानता कि वह कोई पाप का काम नहीं कर रहे हैं, वह रीजनल लैंग्वेज को लगाकर अपनी राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी को वहां चलाकर कोई ऐसा बुरा काम नहीं कर रहा है जिसके लिये राष्ट्रपति की स्वीकृति

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया] की आवश्यकता है। दूसरी बात इसमें जो बंधन लगाया गया है कि अंग्रेजी का ट्रांसलेशन जरूर ही दिया जाना चाहिये, मेरी समझ में यह व्यर्थ का खर्चा है। अगर कोई मांग करे तो दिया जा सकता है, लेकिन अगर कोई मांग न करे तो उसका अभाव में इसमें कोई बन्धन नहीं लगाया जाना चाहिये कि अंग्रेजी का ट्रांसलेशन भी दिया जायेगा। इससे एक व्यर्थ का खर्चा होगा और इससे यह मालूम होता है कि हमारा अंग्रेजी के प्रति जो मोह है उसको छोड़ नहीं पा रहे हैं।

उपसभापति महोदया, इस रेफरेंस में मैं यह कहना उचित समझता हूं कि पिछले मध्य भारत में इन्दौर, ग्वालियर हाई कोर्ट के जजमेंट और बहस तथा सब काम वहां पर हिन्दी में हुआ करता था, लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश बनने के बाद सरकार का अंग्रेजी के प्रति मोह ज्यादा हो गया है और वहां पर हिन्दी ने जो प्रगति की थी, जो पुरानी प्रथा हिन्दी में काम करने की थी वह सब समाप्त कर दी गई है और वहां पर अंग्रेजी के प्रति फिर से मोह जाग्रत हो गया है। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि यह जो अंग्रेजी के प्रति मोह बढ़ता जा रहा है उसको पहले समाप्त किया जाना चाहिये। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि अगर किसी प्रांत का गवर्नर यह चाहता है कि उस प्रांत की रोजनल भाषा में—चाहे वह अंग्रेजी हो, तामिल हो, बंगला हो, तेलुगू हो—वहां का कामकाज चले तो उसने लिये राष्ट्रपति की स्वीकृति लेना आवश्यक नहीं होना चाहिये। यह तो पहली बात हुई। दूसरी बात यह है कि अंग्रेजी ट्रांसलेशन जरूर ही दिया जाना चाहिये चाहे कोई मांग करे या न करे। इसमें व्यर्थ में खर्चा बढ़ेगा। अगर हम देश में राष्ट्रभाषा की उन्नति करना चाहते हैं तो हमें यह बात करनी पड़ेगी और इस बात को दृष्टि में रखकर मैंने अपना संशोधन दिया है और आशा करता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी इसे स्वीकार करेंगे।

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I just want to make these three points. On the

merits, I agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I think that when once all proceedings in the Supreme Court and in every High Court should be in English, it seems to be very anomalous that orders and judgments alone should be in Hindi or other languages. So long as article 348(1) (a) which states 'all proceedings in the Supreme Court and in every High Court' is not changed, the orders and judgments should be in the same language as the proceedings. But here in clause 7, only the orders and judgments can be in some other language, while the proceedings are in English. It seems to be a rather anomalous state of affairs. The third point is that in any case, I consider this clause 7 to be *ultra vires* because power is given to Parliament only to change article 348(1), while this actually changes the proviso to article 348(2), which, I think, we have no power to do.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): I oppose the amendments both of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and of Mr. Chordia. After all, in our Constitution we have accepted that Hindi is to be our official language, maybe in a very distant future. But that is a settled fact and the provision in clause 7 has been made for the gradual introduction of Hindi in the High Courts. This is just clearing the way for an all-India language to come into the High Courts of the States. The High Courts, the Supreme Court and the Parliament and such other institutions are the symbols of our all-India unity. It is in these institutions that we have to introduce the language which we have accepted for our common use and it is in these institutions that we can encourage the unity and integrity of our nation. For all purposes in the States, the regional languages may be sufficient but for all-India purposes, it is only the All-India official language which should be used, the language which we have accepted for the whole country. That should be used, maybe gradually.

and I oppose the amendment of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—he paves the way for Hindi to come in there—and also the amendment of Mr. Chordia—it does not mention Hindi at all, it mentions regional languages and English and thus bans Hindi to come in. I oppose both these amendments.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Nearly all the amendments, I am afraid, have not taken into consideration the various provisions of the Constitution relating to the subject-matter of clause 7. Article 348(1) says—

“Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Part...”

This refers to article 343(1) by which the official language of the Union is declared to be Hindi in Devanagari script. Now, upto fifteen years, we continue the use of English. After 1965, of course, Hindi comes into its own. That is the scheme under article 343. But article 348(1) says—

“Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Part...”

That refers to article 343(1), 343(2) and 343(3). That is to say, whatever decision we may arrive at in respect of employing the official language for the various items of business, so far as what follows under article 348(1) is concerned, that does not apply.

“Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Part, until Parliament by law otherwise provides—

(a) all proceedings in the Supreme Court and in every High Court, . . .

shall be in the English language.”

That is to say, unless there is a specific legislation by Parliament, proceedings in the Supreme Court and in the High Courts shall be in the English language and no other language shall be used, whatever may be the effect of article 343(1), the extension of the 15-year period and legislation under clause (3). Now, we come to clause (2), and it is the opening words of this clause (2), which, I

submit, seem to have escaped the attention of my friend, himself an erudite Constitutional lawyer, Mr. Santhanam.

“Notwithstanding anything in sub-clause (a) of clause (1), the Governor of a State may, with the previous consent of the President, authorise the use of the Hindi language, or any other language . . .”

And I would respectfully draw the attention of the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that under article 348(2), choice is given to the Governor of a State which means, of course, the State Government, that he might authorise—of course, with the previous consent of the President—the use of the Hindi language or any other language used for any official purposes in the proceedings in the High Court having its principal seat in the State. So though there is the provision under clause 348(1) that the proceedings of the Supreme Court and the High Courts shall be in the English language, there is an exception grafted on it under clause (2) by which the Governor, of course acting on the advice of the executive, of the parliamentary executive, will authorise the use of the Hindi or the official language of the State in the proceedings in the High Court. And then he has the choice. There is no question of the imposition of Hindi at all to which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has made a reference. It is not imposition at all. The State is being given a choice. The State Government has been vested with a discretion that in the High Court, the proceedings shall either be in the official language of the State or it shall be in Hindi. So, it is their free choice and no one is imposing, no extraneous authority is imposing, Hindi upon them.

Then follows the proviso; the proviso says that in respect of the proceedings of the High Court, it shall not apply to any judgment, decree or order passed by such High Court. I

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.]
 am told that in one or two High Courts probably—I am not quite sure—such an order has been made but the judgements, decrees and orders continued to conform to the provisions of article 348(1); that is to say, they shall be in the English language until Parliament by law otherwise provides. Now what we do is, we try by clause 7 to remove the proviso to clause (2), saying that the order of the Governor to apply the choice of Hindi or English to the proceedings in the High Court can also be extended to judgment, decree or orders of the High Court. This is the clause. First of all, dividing the proceedings in the High Court, dividing them into two parts, one, proceedings other than judgment, decree or order, those proceedings, if the Governor authorises, can be either in Hindi or the language of the State, but the proviso says that the authority cannot extend to judgment, decree or order until Parliament, by law, otherwise provides. Clause 7 provides that where such an order has been made under clause (2) they may go further and say that it can also apply to judgment, decree or order, and the same choice is there, either of Hindi or of the language of the State.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: May I ask a question? Supposing a Governor has not used clause (2) of article 348, will clause 7 cease to apply?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Again, clause 7 is also permissive.

“As from the appointed day or any day thereafter, the Governor of a State may, with the previous consent of the President, authorise the use of Hindi or the official language of the State, in addition to the English language, for the purposes of any judgment,”

etc., and I am quite sure that no State Government will, without making an order under clause (2), will make an order under clause 7. It presupposes that the arguments, etc. will be in English but the decree or

order may be in Hindi; no one is going to make such an order. This is again a permissive provision for which the restriction contained in the proviso to clause (2) is being removed. I will not repeat what fell from the hon. Member, Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand, an experienced lawyer, but I will say this that if in each case we go on insisting upon the Hindi translation, then it will add to the costs. There will be very few cases which are likely to come to the Supreme Court. Of course, eventually, there will be only one all-India language which will be used in the Supreme Court, and the Official Language Commission has given a great deal of thought and consideration to this question and they look forward to the day. In the High Court, as far as possible, Hindi may be used by the lawyers. Even today the proceedings in High Courts are bilingual—I won't say two languages are used in all proceedings in all High Courts. I won't say that they have declared that both the languages can be used. Some lawyers probably know English only, and those who know Hindi will hereafter be able to use Hindi and if they have any ambitions in the bar, I am quite sure they would look forward to argue in the Supreme Court and if they have to argue there, they will have to argue in Hindi at a future date, I refer to the future generation of lawyers, not of my generation, and probably they might like that in the High Court itself the proceedings should be taken in Hindi so that the all-India Acts which come up for construction, for interpretation will be referable to them as they are passed. But this they can do entirely of their own; no one is going to impose. That being the position, Madam, I oppose the amendments.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

25. “That at page 3, line 18, after the words ‘English Language’, the words ‘and the Hindi Language where the official language of the

State is other than Hindi' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

43. "That at page 3,—

(i) in line 13, the words 'Hindi or' be deleted;

(ii) in line 18, after the words 'English language' the words 'and in Hindi, where the official language is other than Hindi' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

52. "That at page 3, for clause 7, the following be substituted, namely:—

'7. As from the appointed day or any day thereafter, the Governor of a State may authorise the use of Hindi or the official language of the State for the purposes of any judgment, decree or order passed or made by the High Court for that State and where any judgment, decree or order is passed or made in any such language it may be accompanied by a translation of the same in the English language issued under the authority of the High Court, if applied for.'

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 44 seeks the introduction of a new clause 7A, but this amendment is out of order as it deals with languages for State Services and All-India Services examinations, and with

promotions and confirmations, and that is outside the scope of this Bill. Therefore this amendment goes.

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

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA (Uttar Pradesh): It has already been moved and rejected in connection with another clause. So, I do not want to move it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments to clauses 8 and 9.

Clauses 8 and 9 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here I would like to elaborate the ideas incorporated in my amendment for the insertion of a new clause 7A. I think it could have been included in the scope of this Bill because it, after all, . . .

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: On a point of order; when a decision has been given, can an hon. Member reargue about the admissibility of his amendment declared out of order?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is the third reading. We will have to hear him.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: I think the hon. Member draws a line somewhere at least.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then the line will not be drawn. Madam, I shall state briefly the idea set out in my amendment; I need not read it; that will take time. Now the Government is going to implement it, and there will be efforts to bring about the change-over, and it is needless to say that it has to be done with a great amount of circumspec-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

tion taking into account the reactions and the problems of the people coming from the non-Hindi region and of the people living in the non-Hindi region. As far as the people in the Hindi-speaking region is concerned, the problem is not so difficult, but then efforts should be made to adopt the language to the requirements of its being the Official Language of the Indian Union. That would be the task assigned to people who will be directly concerned with developing it further, and in my view it has to be developed further for the purpose of its becoming the Official Language, the Hindi language. I leave it to them. Madam Deputy Chairman, one of the reasons why apprehensions are in the minds of the people is because they feel that in the matter of the Central Government Services difficulties might arise; the non-Hindi speaking people might be put to great difficulties and disadvantages. Now I do not say that everything that is said in ventilation of these suspicions and grievances is justified, but at the same time you cannot say that there is no basis for this kind of apprehension at all on the part of those who are in the Government Services coming from the non-Hindi speaking regions, or who are likely to join the All-India Services. Now if you refer to the Report of the Language Commission, page 121, you will find that the Central Government had supplied the Commission certain particulars about Grade IV officials in the Central Government resident in Delhi who were due to retire before 1965. What was the picture then. There are other grades. A, B, C, etc.—I will come to them later. Now, of the 20,006 people comprising the Class IV staff, Hindi-speaking accounted for 6,606, and others accounted for non-Hindi speaking people—13,340; that is to say, you see a large number of Government officials, Grade IV staff working even in Delhi coming from the non-Hindi regions, or people whose language is not Hindi—these figures show—and the picture has not

materially changed since. Therefore, the apprehensions and fears arise from this single fact that the people in other States feel that they may be put to certain difficulties because they may not be so well-off in Hindi as those coming from the Hindi-speaking regions. You will understand, Madam Deputy Chairman, that those who know English better, they do well compared to those who are not so proficient in English when examination is conducted in English. The persons may be otherwise very well qualified, but they might suffer from the language difficulty. Therefore, it is neither in the interests of these people nor in the interests of the administration of the country that a language bar should be created when we want to recruit talent. How we can get over this thing is the problem today. Therefore, I suggest the following thing:—

2 P.M.

“For All-India Services, the candidates shall have the right to answer papers in Hindi, English and any other regional language. There shall be moderation in marks made in such manner as may be prescribed by rules made under this Act, in favour of those candidates answering questions in a language other than their mother-tongue.”

That is to say, if I were to take a paper in Hindi, then there should be moderation in favour of me in that paper. Similarly, Hindi-speaking candidates should be allowed to take a paper in one of the modern Indian languages other than Hindi and the same moderation should be made in respect of them, so that they stand, more or less, on the same footing, and by reason of one being proficient in another language, one language compared to the other, one does not get an advantage. That is the suggestion that I will make.

“After selection, the candidates may be required to pass a paper in Hindi if their mother-tongue is

not Hindi and if their mother-tongue is Hindi, in one of the languages specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution save and except in Sanskrit."

I do not dilate upon this.

"Promotion or confirmation of those already in the Service of the Union Government on the date this Act comes into force shall not be held up if they are unable to fulfil the conditions of sub-section (3), . . .".

—according to my amendment in the earlier thing that I have read out—

" . . . provided that they have gained a working knowledge of the language specified therein."

That is to say, one has acquired working knowledge in any of the languages specified therein. In that connection he should not suffer any handicap

Madam, I thought that if we adopt these measures, much of the apprehension will have gone on the part of those who are in Government services coming from the non-Hindi-speaking regions, or those who will be in future taken into Government service from the non-Hindi regions. It will be most unfortunate if a kind of feeling is allowed to develop or allowed to grow in the services that some are in an advantageous position compared to others because of language. That will damage the administration, the morale of the administration. That is why I suggested that it should be considered in the implementation.

What happens, Madam Deputy Chairman? When the Central Government departments function in States, shall we say in Bengal, Tamilnad or Andhra, how do they carry on their business. That is also a problem to be seriously considered. Even if you have to keep some of the books in the Hindi language because you are in a Central Government department, I think in the

interest of the country and from the democratic point of view, the administration or the work of the Central Government in those States—whether it is the Postal Department, or the Railway Department or certain public sector departments or certain other Ministries like the Ministry of Commerce and Industry—when they function in different regions, as far as possible, in addition to Hindi and English, in their relation with the people and the public sector, they should conduct the work in the regional languages. That is how you draw people closer and also get drawn closer to the local people. This is very, very important. I say this thing because in the next few years there shall be expansion of the activities of the Central Government more and more in different spheres of the State because of the economic and other developments. Let it not be said that these will be conducted in disregard of the language spoken by the people there and will be conducted in Hindi or English or in both languages only. Even when we know that many people will not be in a position to either understand or speak Hindi much less English. This again is a problem for the Home Ministry to think over. I cannot offer any ready-made suggestion. I see the difficulties on either side also. But I think the Government should consider, in the implementation of this measure, that such clashes of interests are avoided. It would be most unfortunate if by virtue of what we have advocated in the Constitution or the Union Official Language Bill that thing by our actions is allowed to come into conflict with the regional needs. It would be most unfortunate. Whatever may be the intention, if that line is allowed to develop, then it will be doing disservice to the cause of the propagation of Hindi as the Union language as well as disservice to the growth of regional languages.

Therefore, Madam, this point also I want to stress. I want to make it very clear that the transition from

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

English, in the sphere of the State, must be in the regional language of the State. And that is a question to be remembered by us. In Bengal it must be in Bengali, Nepali language getting the minority right, or any other language wherever linguistic minorities are there. But speaking broadly, the transition must be from English to the regional language. My fear is that there we have neglected the regional languages, we have not fostered the regional languages in many parts of the country and sometimes we want to escape our responsibility blaming the Hindi protagonists, as they are called. I think that should be avoided. Every encouragement should be given to the State Government to accept, at the Central level, gradually, step by step, by persuasion, Hindi certainly. Only then a synthesis will be arrived at between the Union language on the one hand and the regional languages on the other, avoiding contradiction and antagonism between the two. And that will symbolise also the coming together of the people culturally, politically, in every possible way.

Madam Deputy Chairman, therefore, I appeal to the Government that they should hold consultations with various parties in the interest of the country, at the Central and State levels, and work out ready, democratic, progressive methods of implementation of the measure. They should hold consultations with Government officials, Government employees, and others at the State level, and more especially at the Central level, in order to understand what apprehensions are there still in the minds of the Government employees coming from the non-Hindi regions so that they can evolve rules and regulations in order to allay fears and apprehensions.

Madam, we wish all luck to the good provisions of the Bill though they are not as satisfactory as we would have liked them to be. But at the same time since this is going to be passed, we appeal to the Central

Government that it should learn from the past experience and adopt a policy of tolerance, of consultation, of mutual accommodation, of objectivity and respect towards the regional languages in the country in the interests of all sections of our society. This is all that I have to say, and I hope that this Bill will be implemented in a bright spirit, in a democratic and popular way.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Madam Deputy Chairman, towards the end of his reply to the first reading of the debate, the hon. Minister was pleased to say that there should be no apprehension in the minds of non-Hindi-speaking people about their entry into All-India Services and also in connection with their promotion. I feel a little bit of confusion might arise which needs to be clarified and I would like to put before the House my point of view in this respect.

Madam, we are going in for All-India Services in very many departments out of a desire for national integration in the interest of the country's unity. I do not see why in the case of promotions there should not be any compulsion about passing a departmental examination in Hindi. As an alternative it might be said that there should be two examinations right from the beginning, one for All-India Services and the other for State Services. And even if promotions are to be made from State Services to the All-India Services, there should be again an examination where a compulsory examination in Hindi ought to be prescribed. Otherwise, we will again be left in the same position in which we find ourselves today, about services finding it difficult to pass over from English to Hindi, and I thought the hon. Minister might give a clarification because the remarks which have fallen from the lips of my friend over there may be interpreted in some other manner. So from that point of view, I thought I would put forward that suggestion. Thank you.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : महोदय, तृतीय वाचन के अवसर पर इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में मेरा जो दृष्टिकोण है, उसमें मैं एक बार फिर स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दी किसी प्रान्तीय भाषा की जगह नहीं लेना चाहती। मेरे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्ता को इस सम्बन्ध में कोई शका नहीं होनी चाहिये। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के क्षेत्र निर्धारित है, उनमें प्रान्तीय भाषाएं चलेगी, उन की प्रभुता रहेगी। यदि कहीं हिन्दी के साथ किसी प्रान्तीय भाषा का संघर्ष हुआ है तो वह बड़ा दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण रहा है। जैसे पंजाब में हिन्दी और पंजाबी का एक विवाद खड़ा हो गया, ऐसे विवाद खड़े नहीं होने चाहिये। हिन्दी और पंजाबी का विरोध नहीं है, हिन्दी और उर्दू का कोई विरोध नहीं है, उर्दू बाहर से नहीं आई, उर्दू यहां पैदा हुई, हमारी भाषा है। वह उर्दू किसी प्रदेश की राजभाषा बने यह प्रश्न अलग है। लेकिन उर्दू विकसित हो, फलेफूले, इस सम्बन्ध में दो दृष्टिकोण नहीं हो सकते हैं लेकिन अभी श्री भूपेश गुप्ता ने स्वीकार किया कि प्रान्तीय भाषाओं की भी प्रगति नहीं हो सकी। हमें उस के मूल कारण में जाना चाहिये। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के मार्ग में हिन्दी बाधक नहीं बनी, अंग्रेजी बाधक बन रही है। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का झगड़ा हिन्दी से नहीं है और जब तक अंग्रेजी रहेगी तब तक प्रान्तीय भाषाएं जितनी विकसित होनी चाहिए उतनी विकसित नहीं होंगी।

इस विवाद में कहा गया है कि हिन्दी विकसित नहीं है। यह ऐसे माननीय सदस्यों की ओर से कहा गया है जिन्होंने साथ ही यह भी दावा किया है कि बेहिचक नहीं जानते। जो हिन्दी नहीं जानते वे यह दावा करें कि हिन्दी विकसित नहीं है। तो मुझे थोड़ा सा बुरा लगता है। हिन्दी एक विकसित भाषा है, सूक्ष्म से सूक्ष्म विचार हिन्दी के माध्यम से प्रकट किये जा सकते हैं। स्वतंत्रता के पहले मध्य भारत में, इन्दौर में, ग्वालियर

में, हिन्दी हाईकोर्ट की भाषा थी। हिन्दी में बहसे होती थी, हिन्दी में निर्णय लिखे जाते थे। स्वतंत्रता के बाद हिन्दी की क्षमता कम हो गई है यह मानने के लिये। तैयार नहीं हूँ। लेकिन एक बात का हम विचार करें कि भाषा कैसे विकसित हो? अगर भाषाओं को अवसर नहीं मिलेगा, भाषाओं का प्रयोग नहीं होगा, भाषाएं प्रचलित नहीं होंगी, अगर भाषाएं शासन का, न्यायालयों का, शिक्षा का माध्यम नहीं बनेगी, तो भाषाएं कैसे विकसित हो सकती हैं? कोई तुलसीदास स्वांतः सुखाय रामचरित मानस की रचना कर सकते हैं, कोई मैथिलीशरण गुप्त अपनी प्रतिभा के प्रकटीकरण के लिए साकेत लिख सकते हैं, लेकिन फिजिक्स, कैमिस्ट्री, अर्थ, बाणिज्य, उद्योग के ग्रन्थ तब तक नहीं लिखे जायेंगे जब तक उन की बाजार में मांग नहीं होगी; क्योंकि कोई प्रकाशक उन ग्रंथों को छापने के लिए तैयार नहीं होगा। जब बाजार में मांग होगी। तब ही ग्रंथ लिखे जायेंगे। बाजार में तब मांग होगी जब भाषा शिक्षा का माध्यम बनाई जायेगी, शासन का माध्यम बनाई जायेगी। बिना पानी में उतरे क्या कोई तैरना सीख सकता है? भाषा प्रयोग से पुष्ट होती है। हम भाषा को चलने का मौका न दें और फिर यह शंका करें कि भाषा चल नहीं सकती, चलती नहीं, यह ऐसा दृष्टिकोण है जिसे स्वास्थ्य दृष्टिकोण नहीं कहा जा सकता है। मुझे खेद है १५ वर्ष की अवधि को अनिश्चित काल की अवधि में बदला जा रहा है।

मुझे खेद है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने आश्वासन दिया, वह संविधान की भावना के प्रतिकूल दिया और होना यह चाहिये था कि यह संसद् उनसे कहती कि आपने संविधान के खिलाफ ऐसा आश्वासन क्यों दिया, लेकिन जो आश्वासन संविधान के खिलाफ है . . .

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : ३४३(३)

के बाद भी हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी कुछ कामों के लिए काम आ सकती है, सब कामों के लिये; वह भी तब जब कानून बनाये। जब कानून बनाने की स्थिति आती तब सदन के सामने ऐसी बातें कह सकते थे। आश्वासन पहले आया, कानून बाद में बने, और कानून बनने से पहले इस बात पर विचार नहीं किया कि हिन्दी ने प्रगति की है, सरकारी काम के लिए हिन्दी का प्रयोग हो रहा है? हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के लिए ऐसे आश्वासन देना कोई नई बात नहीं है। काश्मीर के मामले में भी वे जनमत संग्रह का ऐसा आश्वासन दे गये, जो आज तक हमारे गले में अटक रहा है। ऐसे आश्वासन से संसद् को बांध नहीं जाना चाहिये।

लेकिन जो विरोध नहीं है, उनको बढ़ा चढ़ा कर बताया जाता है। अभी नौकरी के सम्बन्ध में आंकड़े दिये गये। १९ हजार केन्द्रीय कर्मचारी हैं, जिनमें ६ हजार हिन्दी भाषी हैं और बाकी जो १३ हजार बचे हैं, उन में से कितने हिन्दी जानने वाले हैं, इस का पता नहीं लगाया गया। कर्मचारियों के लिए ऐसी व्यवस्था की जा सकती है कि उन्हें कोई कठिनाई न हो। लेकिन प्रश्न नौकरी का नहीं है, अंग्रेजी का है, अंग्रेजी के मोह का है। अंग्रेजी के साथ अंग्रेजियत आती है और वह अंग्रेजियत हम को स्वतंत्रता के स्वाभिमान से वंचित कर रही है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The report says that they are speaking Punjabi, Urdu—not from the region but as those who speak a particular language—and that is how the figures are given 13,340 are non-Hindi speaking people. That is how the figure is given.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: That I have said.

६ हजार हिन्दी बोलने वाले हैं, १३ हजार हिन्दी नहीं बोलने वाले हैं, तो यह कहने का कोई अर्थ नहीं कि यह सभी कर्मचारियों की समस्या है और मैंने कहा कि कर्मचारियों की समस्या है, तो उसको हल करने का रास्ता निकल सकता है; लेकिन उसके लिए हम अंग्रेजी को हटाने का कोई लक्ष्य निर्धारित न करें, और अंग्रेजी को भारत की १४ राष्ट्रीय भाषाओं में शामिल करने के लिए मांग करें, फिर यह तर्क दिया जाय कि हिन्दी विदेशी है और अंग्रेजी विदेशी नहीं है, या यह विद्वत् दृष्टिकोण का परिचायक नहीं है। मुझे खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि यह विधेयक इस विद्वत् दृष्टिकोण के साथ समझौता करता है। मुझे और मेरे मित्र श्री अण्णादुरै को एक ही स्तर पर रख कर यह विधेयक बीच में चलता है और इसलिए अच्छा होगा, यह तर्क दिया जाता है श्री दिनकर ने स्पष्ट कहा था कि हमारा अंग्रेजी से विरोध जिस भावना से प्रेरित है वह भावना श्री अण्णादुरै की भावना नहीं है। वह भारत को बांटने की बात जिस भावना से कहते हैं। उसी भावना से अंग्रेजी को बनाये रखने की बात कहते हैं। उस भावना को हम अराष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण कहकर उसकी निन्दा करते हैं, और दूसरी को पुरस्कृत करते हैं, उनके साथ समझौता करते हैं, उन्हें अनिश्चित काल तक छूट देते हैं।

इस विधेयक के प्रति मेरा विरोध कायम है। मैंने निवेदन किया कि मैं धमकी नहीं दे सकता हूँ। सिर्फ भूपेश गुप्ता यह कह सकते हैं कि हम सड़कों पर, बाहर निकलकर, इस प्रश्न को हल करेंगे; लेकिन एक बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिये कि भारतीय भाषाओं के जागरण को रोक नहीं जा सकता है और अगर यह प्रांतों में उठेगी, बढ़ेगी, तो नई दिल्ली में अंग्रेजी नहीं रह सकती है।

हिन्दी राजभाषा बन गई तो वह हमारी नहीं रही, सारे देश की भाषा हो गई। यह उत्तर प्रदेश की हिन्दी नहीं होगी, मध्य प्रदेश की नहीं होगी, वह हिन्दी पंजाब वालों की बन गई, वह हिन्दी महाराष्ट्र वालों की बन गई, कन्नड़ और तेलगू वालों की बन गई; लेकिन वह हिन्दी बननी चाहिये, वह हिन्दी चलनी चाहिये, उस हिन्दी का रूप सारे देश में निर्धारित...

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Then, why are you worried?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : लेकिन मुझे बरी इसलिए है कि *You are enamoured of English.*

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: Why are you worrying about it?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : जो प्रधान मंत्री जी का आश्वासन है, वह नान-हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग पीपुल के लिए था, इंग्लिश-स्पीकिंग पीपुल के लिए नहीं था, जैसे प्लेबिसाइट का आफर काश्मीर के लोगों को था, पाकिस्तान के लोगों को नहीं था। मगर इस सवाल पर, इस विवाद में जो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते और हिन्दी नहीं जानते उनकी तो आवाज कोई सुना ही नहीं है। इंग्लिश-स्पीकिंग पीपुल समझते हैं कि हमको आश्वासन दे दिया गया, यह बात गलत है, अगर आश्वासन दिया गया, तो वह नान-हिन्दी स्पीकिंग पीपुल के लिये दिया गया और अगर हम इस संघर्ष को मातृभाषा और अंग्रेजी का संघर्ष बना कर केरल में, मद्रास में, आंध्र में रखें तो अंग्रेजी नहीं जीत सकेगी, मातृभाषा विजयी हो कर आयेगी। लेकिन अंग्रेजी के जो हिमायती हैं, वे संघर्ष बनाते हैं, हिन्दी में और मातृभाषा में, वह घर की लड़ाई कराना चाहते हैं, वह फूट डाल कर अंग्रेजी के प्रभुत्व को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं। लड़ाई है अंग्रेजी की और मातृभाषा की।

श्री क० सनातन : नहीं नहीं, कोई लड़ाई नहीं है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं नहीं समझता कि मद्रास की जनता यह चाहती है मैं मद्रास में जाकर भाषण कर आया हूँ। मुझे दुख है कि श्री संतानम् सन् १९५६ में भाषण देते थे कि हिन्दी अनी चाहिये, हिन्दी ही लिख लैगुएज हो सकती है और आज १९६३ में संसद् में बैठ कर कहते हैं कि हिन्दी नहीं होनी चाहिये।

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: He is misrepresenting me. Even today, I am saying it but I want English also to be there.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Santhanam is supporting you.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: For an indefinite period, till eternity. This is not the way to bring forward Hindi. There should be no self-deception, Mr. Santhanam. I can understand your love for Hindi. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also loves Hindi. The Prime Minister also loves Hindi. Everybody loves Hindi but nobody is prepared to make Hindi the official language of the Union. That is the tragedy.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: We have made it in the Constitution.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : महोदया, मैं इस अवसर पर, तृतीय वाचन के अवसर पर गर्मी पैदा करना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: With affection and consideration.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी :यह विरोध हिन्दी को लादने की भावना से नहीं किया जा रहा है। हम हिन्दी को किसी पर लादना नहीं चाहते लेकिन हम अंग्रेजी का लादा जाना भी बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते। क्या कोई कह सकता है कि अंग्रेजी लोगों ने इच्छा से स्वीकार की है? अगर आज देश में कोई भाषा लादी गई है, तो अंग्रेजी लादी गई है और नारा लगाया जाता है कि हिन्दी लादी जा रही है। हम हिन्दी को किसी पर लादना नहीं चाहते हैं लेकिन अंग्रेजी हम पर लादी जाय, यह

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते और यह विधेयक हम पर अंग्रेजी लादता है, यह भारत की ६८ फीसदी जनता को विदेशी भाषा की गुलामी में बंताये रखना चाहता है। इस विधेयक के विरुद्ध हमारा संघर्ष जारी रहेगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lingam. Please be brief. There are so many speakers. A minute and a half each.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): I speak with a very heavy heart at this stage because . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can you speak at all with a heavy heart?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Yes, I am forced to because of the performance of my hon. friend, Mr. Vajpayee, after hearing the proceedings of this House on this important question. We of the non-Hindi speaking areas have viewed this Bill not as a perfect instrument of giving shape to the wishes and the aspirations of the non-Hindi speaking areas but essentially as a compromise of the various viewpoints on this very important question. We are aware too that the provisions of the Bill are not in tune with the assurance given by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. If even with this attitude we lend our support to the Bill, it is only and essentially as an act of faith—I want to make this clear—faith in the statesmanship of the Government, faith in their assurance and faith in their ability to steer clear of all the difficulties that this measure will create in the course of its implementation.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Even after they have broken faith or assurance, as you put it?

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: They have not broken faith at all. Madam, under the Constitution, if this measure is passed, from the year 1965, the basic and obligatory language will be Hindi and English will be optional. That is to say, the position

that obtains now will be completely reversed. That is the position under the Constitution but according to the assurances given by the Government, the *status quo* will continue. We have voted for the Bill in view of the assurances given and not because of the provisions of the Bill and I hope Government will scrupulously observe the assurances, will not force the pace, will not hustle people into any action but take the people of the entire country along with them so that no section, however small it is, is injured and implement the measure in the spirit in which it has been introduced and concluded by the hon. Home Minister.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदया, हिन्दी के बारे में जिस प्रकार से चर्चा चल रही है, उसके बारे में मेरा निवेदन है कि मैं भी उस क्षेत्र से आता हूँ, जहाँ कि—जैसा कि अभी वाजपेयी जी ने फर्माया—हाई कोर्ट तक में हिन्दी में जजमेंट लिखे जाते थे और बहुत अच्छे सुन्दर जजमेंट लिखे जाते थे और यह आज से १५ साल पहले की बात है जब कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में हिन्दी को राजभाषा माना गया। उस वक्त से बजाय इसके कि हमें और आगे उन्नति करने का मौका मिलता, हम हिन्दी के बारे में पीछे गये और इंग्लिश में ही वहाँ जजमेंट, डिक्री वगैरह सब लिखी जाने लगीं और अब तो यह हाल हो गया है कि एक मामूली से मामूली जज भी इंग्लिश ही मामूली से मामूली आर्डर, डिक्री, जो आर्डिनरी रूटीन के आर्डर होते हैं, उनको लिखने में अपनी शान समझते हैं और ये सब इंग्लिश में अब लिखे जाते हैं। तो यह सब चीज चलती है और यह सब चीज बर्दाश्त की जाती है। पहले भी बर्दाश्त की गई और अब भी बर्दाश्त की जाती है और यह इसलिए कि हम सब प्रान्त वालों के साथ मिल कर चल सकें और जिसको राजभाषा माना है उसकी उन्नति सब जगह एक सी हो सके। हमने देखा कि मद्रास में इस बारे में बहुत काफी

उन्नति की जा रही है। मुझे तो सन् १९४७ और सन् १९४८ का अनुभव है जब कि मैंने देखा था कि डा० पट्टाभि के जरा जरा से बच्चे इतनी अच्छी हिन्दी बोलते थे कि वैसी हिन्दी हमारे लोग भी नहीं बोल सकते हैं। तो इस प्रकार से सब जगह यह चीज चल रही है और सब लोग उसको सीखने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। देश की यूनिटी को कायम रखने के लिये और देश के सब लोगों को एक साथ लेकर चलने के लिये अगर हमें हिन्दी के बारे में इस तरह से थोड़ा सा पीछे भी जाना पड़े तो हमें उसमें कोई दुःख मानने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि अल्टीमेटली हमने उसे राजभाषा माना है और वह राजभाषा बन कर रहेगी इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। तो थोड़े समय के लिये उलझन में पड़ जाना और इस तरह से विचार करना कोई मुनासिब चीज नहीं है। किसी लक्ष्य को देख कर हमारी इच्छा होती है कि हम वहाँ पहुँच जायें—तो हमारे एक साहब ने बताया था कि हमारी इच्छा तो पहुँच जाती है लेकिन हम सशरीर नहीं पहुँच सकते हैं और नहीं पहुँच पाते हैं। तो मेरा अर्ज करना यह है कि हमारी यह इच्छा है कि यह राजभाषा बन जाय लेकिन सब को साथ लेकर न चले यह कोई मुनासिब नहीं है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिल जो आया है वह निश्चय ही इतना अच्छा है कि इससे न तो हिन्दी-भक्त खुश हैं और न अंग्रेजी-भक्त खुश हैं। यह उसका नमूना है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : अंग्रेजी-भक्त जरूर खुश हैं।

श्री राम सहाय : जी नहीं।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : अंग्रेजी-भक्त जरूर खुश है।

श्री राम सहाय : जी नहीं हैं। आपने श्री फ्रेंक एन्थनी के भाषण सुने होंगे, उन्होंने किस किस तरह के इल्जाम लगाये और क्या क्या बातें की। मैंने हिन्दी-प्रेमी या अंग्रेजी-

प्रेमी का लफ्ज इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है, मैंने भक्त का लफ्ज इस्तेमाल किया है। तो न हिन्दी के भक्त खुश हैं और न अंग्रेजी के भक्त खुश हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिल जैसा आया है बहुत अच्छा है और जिस रूप में आया है बहुत ठीक है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chordia.

(Several hon. Members stood up.)

Do all of you want to speak on the Third Reading?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chordia, please be brief.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : यह जो विधेयक अब पारित होने जा रहा है उसका तो मैं विरोध करता ही हूँ मगर साथ साथ शासन से यह भी निवेदन करता हूँ कि हिन्दी के बारे में अभी तक जो उसने अपनी गति बहुत धीमी रखी है उसमें कुछ सुधार करे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। संविधान में यह बन्धन के रूप में डाला गया था कि १९६५ ई० तक हिन्दी को अपने यहां राजभाषा पूरी तरह बना लेंगे परन्तु संविधान की अपेक्षा आश्वासन को ज्यादा महत्व दिया गया है और माननीय लिंगम साहब ने भी उसका बड़ा महत्व बताया है। मैं उसके बारे में कुछ विशेष कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ, मैं भी शासन से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उसने अभी तक अपनी गति को बहुत धीमी रखा है। हमारे पड़ोसी देश चीन ने पाँच छः वर्षों में ही हजारों किताबें अंग्रेजी भाषा की, जर्मन भाषा की और दूसरी सब भाषाओं की ट्रांसलेट करके अपनी भाषा में कर ली और उनका रूपांतर करके सारा ज्ञान विज्ञान अपनी भाषा में कर लिया।

मगर १२ साल के बाद भी हम कुछ विशेष कर पाए ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है। कई छोटे छोटे देश हैं जो अपनी मातृभाषा में

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]

भ्रम चलाते हैं और बड़े आनन्द से रहते हैं। हमारे यहां न जाने क्यों अंग्रेजी से इतना मोह हो गया है। आज हमारे मंत्रेरियट लेवल के जो लोग हैं, अफसर हैं, वे समझते हैं कि यह भाषा हमारी चली जायेगी तो एक इंटरमीडियरी के रूप में जो आज है हम समाप्त हो जाने वाले हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अभी तक इस दिशा में हमारी गति जिस प्रकार धीमी रहती है, उस को तीव्र बनाना चाहिये।

उदाहरण के लिये माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, मैं आप को बतला दूँ कि हमारे यहां सरकारी विज्ञापन किस प्रकार दिये जाते हैं। यह जानते हुए भी कि भारतवर्ष में हिन्दी का और रीजनल लैंग्वेज का बाहुल्य है, हमारी सरकार का एक सांस्कृतिक विभाग जिसका इस ओर विशेष ध्यान जाना चाहिये, उसके द्वारा भारतीय भाषाओं में जारी किये हुए विज्ञापनों का प्रतिशत, और इन में हिन्दी भी शामिल है, इस प्रकार है— भारतीय भाषाओं में जारी किये गये सजावटी विज्ञापनों पर हुआ खर्च ११ परसेन्ट, वर्गीकृत विज्ञापन २४.८ परसेन्ट और अंग्रेजी में जारी किये गये सजावटी विज्ञापनों पर हुआ खर्च ८६ परसेन्ट और वर्गीकृत विज्ञापनों पर ७५.२ परसेन्ट। तो इस तरह से अंग्रेजी के प्रति जो हमारा मोह है और रीजनल भाषाओं के लिये, हिन्दी के लिये नहीं है और प्रकाशन के मामले में उनका खर्च ११ प्रतिशत है जब कि अंग्रेजी का ८६ प्रतिशत है (Time bell rings.) एक मिनट और। तो इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस दिशा में कुछ कदम उठाया जाना चाहिये। जैसा कि पूर्ववक्ता महोदय ने बताया कि हमारे कर्मचारियों को कुछ न कुछ रूप में हिन्दी लिखना पढ़ना और समझना आवश्यक होना चाहिये, उसके लिये प्रयत्न करना चाहिये लेकिन जैसा कि हमें मालूम है हिन्दी के क्यासेज हम ने शुरू किये मगर अनुपस्थित रहने

वालों की संख्या अधिक है। तो वे कम्पलसरी होने चाहिये और हिन्दी पढ़ने वालों के लिये एक विशाल शब्द कोष तैयार किया जाना चाहिये। हिन्दी की उन्नति के लिये वर्तमान गति बहुत धीमी है और इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी के प्रति जागरूक होने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तो बहुत अच्छा होगा।

(Many hon. Members stood up.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think those who have not spoken on the Bill should get a chance to speak now and not those who have already spoken.

Mr. Tariq, you have not spoken on the Bill.

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق (جموں اور

کشمیر) : میڈم ڈپٹی چیئرمین -

مجھے اس بات سے اتفاق ہے بلکہ

اس بات پر فخر ہے کہ ہندی

راشٹر بھاشا ہے اور اس ملک کی

ایک ہی زبان ہے جو اس ملک کی

راشٹر بھاشا ہو سکتی ہے - مجھے

ان دوستوں سے اتفاق نہیں ہے جو

ہندی اور انگریزی کو ایک دوسرے

کے مقابلہ میں لا کر کھڑا کر دیتے

ہیں - ہندی اور انگریزی کا کوئی

جھگڑا نہیں ہے - انگریزی ایک

غیرملکی زبان ہے لیکن اتنی ترقی

یافتہ ہے کہ اگر ہم نے اس ملک کو

اقتصادی میدان میں سائنس کی

دنیا میں، قیامیسی میں، تجارت

میں اور دوسری باتوں میں آگے لے

جانا ہے تو یقیناً ایک ایسی زبان کا

استعمال لازمی ہوتا ہے جو بین الاقوامی

زبان ہے - ہمیں چاہیئے ہندی میں

وہ تمام چیزیں پیدا کر دیں جو کہ ایک بڑی زبان کے لئے "لازمی" ہیں۔ ہندی اس ملک کی زبان ہو چکی ہے اس میں کوئی دو رائے نہیں ہوں گی لیکن ہندی کے دوستوں سے بھی میری ایک گزارش ہے کہ وہ ہندی کو ایک ایسی زبان نہ بنائیں جو ہماری سمجھ سے دور ہو ہمارے سوچنے سے بہت دور ہو۔ ہندی کی حیثیت ایک ماں کی سی ہے اگر کچھ لوگ کسی جذبہ کے تحت چاہے وہ انتہائی جذبہ ہو یا محبت کا جذبہ ہو اس ماں کی صورت کو اس قدر بے بنائیں کہ بچوں کو اس سے خوف لگے تو ہمارا قصور ہوگا۔

مجھے وہ زبان بے حد اچھی لگتی ہے جو گاندھی جی بولتے تھے اور کبھی کبھی اکثر راجپوتی صاحب اس کا استعمال کرتے تھے۔ ہمیں اس زبان سے کوئی شکایت نہیں ہے بلکہ شکایت ہے ان لوگوں سے جو کبھی کبھی ہندی کے مقابلہ میں انگریزی کو لا کر کھڑا کر دیتے ہیں۔ انگریزی اور ہندی کا کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے۔ نہ سرکار اس کو کوئی جھگڑا تصور کرتی ہے اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ سرکار جو یہ بل اس وقت لائی ہے تو ہم سب بغیر کسی سیاسی مقصد کے بغیر اس بات کا خیال کئے کہ ہم کس ایریا کے ہیں اس کو سپورٹ کرتے ہیں۔ پہلے تو میری سمجھ میں ہی یہ

بات نہیں آئی کہ ہندوستان کا حصہ کس نے تقسیم کیا یہ کہہ کر کہ یہ ہندی ایریا ہے یہ نان ہندی ایریا ہے۔ ہندوستان کا ایک ملک ہے اس کی ایک ہی زبان ہے وہ ہندوستانی ہے وہ ہندی ہے دونوں میں اس میں کوئی دو لفظ نہیں ہیں صرف وہی لوگ ہندی کو اس قدر سخت بنا دیتے ہیں جس سے راجپوتی صاحب شاید اتفاق نہیں کریں گے۔ کئی دفعہ انہوں نے مجھ سے کہا کہ وہ بہت سی ہندی نہیں سمجھتے ہیں جس کا وہ اثر پرچار کرتے ہیں۔ تو میں ان تمام لوگوں سے درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ اس بل کو ایک ضروری چیز سمجھ لیں۔ یہ مان کر نہیں کہ یہ ہندی اور انگریزی کا جھگڑا ہے بلکہ یہ سوچ کر کہ یہ اس وقت کی موجودہ ضرورت ہے اور ہم کو تمام لوگوں کو مساوی کوشش سے خلوص سے، محبت سے یہ کوشش کرنی چاہیئے کہ انگریزی خود اس ملک سے رخصت ہو جائے اور ہندی اس کی جگہ لے۔ اور مجھے توقع ہے کہ اس ایوان کے تمام ممبران اس بل کی حمایت کریں گے اور اس کی ضرورت کو سمجھیں گے۔

†[श्री ए० एम० तारिक (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : मैडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, मुझे इस बात से इत्तफाक है बल्कि इस बात पर फ़ख़ है कि हिन्दी मेरी राष्ट्रभाषा है और

[श्री ए० एम० तारिक]

इस मुल्क की एक ही ज़बान है जो इस मुल्क की राष्ट्रभाषा हो सकती है। मुझे उन दोस्तों से इत्तफाक नहीं है जो हिन्दी और अंग्रेज़ी को एक दूसरे के मुकाबले में लाकर खड़ा कर देते हैं। हिन्दी और अंग्रेज़ी का कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। अंग्रेज़ी एक गैरमुल्की ज़बान है लेकिन इतनी तरक्कीयाफ़्त है कि अगर हम ने इस मुल्क को इक्तसादी मैदान में, साइंस की दुनिया में, डिप्लोमेसी में, तिजारत में और दूसरी बातों में आगे ले जाना है तो यकीनन एक ऐसी ज़बान का इस्तेमाल लाजमी होता है जो बेंतुल-अक्वामी ज़बान है। हमें चाहिये हिन्दी में वो तमाम चीज़ें पैदा कर दें जो कि एक बड़ी ज़बान के लिये लाजमी हैं। हिन्दी इस मुल्क की ज़बान हो चुकी है। इस में कोई दो राय नहीं होंगी। लेकिन हिन्दी के दोस्तों से भी मेरी एक गुजारिश है कि वो हिन्दी को एक ऐसी ज़बान न बनायें जो हमारी समझ से दूर हो। हमारे सोचने से बहुत दूर हो। हिन्दी की हैसियत एक मां की सी है। अगर कुछ लोग किसी जज़्बे के तहत चाहे वो इंतकामी जज़्बा हो या मोहब्बत का जज़्बा हो इस मां की सूरत को इस कदर भयानक बनायें कि बच्चों को इससे खौफ़ लगे तो हमारा कसूर होगा। मुझे वो ज़बान बेहद अच्छी लगती है जो गांधी जी बोलते थे और कभी कभी अक्सर वाजपेयी साहब उसका इस्तेमाल करते हैं। हमें इस ज़बान से कोई शिकायत नहीं है बल्कि शिकायत है उन लोगों से जो कभी कभी हिन्दा के मुकाबले में अंग्रेज़ी को ला कर खड़ा कर देते हैं। अंग्रेज़ी और हिन्दी का कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, न सरकार इसको कोई झगड़ा तसब्बुर करती है। और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार जो यह बिल इस वक़्त लाई है तो हम सब बग़ैर किसी सयामी मकसद के, बग़ैर इस बात का खयाल किये कि हम किस एरिया के हैं इसको सपोर्ट करते हैं। पहले तो मेरी समझ में ही यह बात नहीं आई कि हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा किसने तकसीम किया यह कह

कर कि यह हिन्दी एरिया है यह नान-हिन्दी एरिया है। हिन्दुस्तान का एक मुल्क है उसकी एक ही ज़बान है, वो हिन्दुस्तानी है, वो हिन्दी है दोनों हैं, उस में कोई दो लफ़्ज़ नहीं हैं। सिर्फ़ वही लोग हिन्दी को इस कदर सख़्त बना देते हैं, जिससे वाजपेयी साहब शायद इत्तफाक नहीं करेंगे। कई दफ़ा उन्होंने मुझ से कहा कि वो बहुत सी हिन्दी नहीं समझते हैं जिसका वो अक्सर प्रचार करते हैं। तो मैं उन तमाम लोगों से दरख़वास्त करूंगा कि वो इस बिल को एक ज़रूरी चीज़ समझ लें। यह मान कर नहीं कि यह हिन्दी और अंग्रेज़ी का झगड़ा है बल्कि यह सोच कर कि यह इस वक़्त की मौजूदा ज़रूरत है और हम को तमाम लोगों को मसावी कोशिश से, खुलूस से, मोहब्बत से यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि अंग्रेज़ी खुद इस मुल्क से रुख़सत हो जाये और हिन्दी इस की जगह ले। और मुझे तबक्को है कि इस ऐवान के तमाम मेम्बरान इस बिल की हिमायत करेंगे और इसकी ज़रूरत को समझेंगे।]

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: I think it is no use our accusing each other of mala fides or anything. The fact is that the whole struggle for independence was headed by people who were used to the English language and the whole Administration was also used to the English language. Those practices and inertia are still prevailing and it is not the champions of English but the champions of the status quo who have captured the whole Government and they want to perpetuate that situation. Today the assertion of the people's rule and their language must be with the provincial languages. A sop is being given to the Hindi people that the regional languages will be subordinate both to English and Hindi. Because they cannot plead the case for English only they bring in Hindi also. They always say English and Hindi shall be the general languages for the whole country. Let us assert therefore that in the States

only the provincial languages shall rule. When this is finally established, then will come the time when Hindi could be introduced. Today in the name of Hindi the position of English is being assured and strengthened. Now, I would support this Bill simply because we have to pay the price for the predilection of those who have been ruling us so well. But I want to warn them; English is not going to be the language of emotional integration. During British Rule they said that English was the only uniting factor in the country. The knowledge and use of English now is not going to unite us emotionally. All the other great elements of emotional integration are being disregarded or being minimised or even opposed. Therefore I am sure the continuous use of English is going to weaken Government, is going to weaken our culture and ultimately the masses will have to rebel against this rule of a foreign language. Therefore those who care for the unity of the country, those who want that the country should be strong and united, should shed this feeling in favour of English—really it is a feeling in favour of inertia—and unless they come to the rescue of the people's languages in the States first and Hindi afterwards, they are going to lose everything in spite of all the good name and all the progress that they have made.

شیخ بیارے لال کدیل دہ طالبہ

(اترپردیش) : مہودیہ - میں اپنے
وچار اس سدن کے سامنے پہلے رکھ
چکا ہوں - میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ
یہ ودھیک ہمارے سمنوہان کے خلاف
ہے اور سمنوہان کی گئی دھاراؤں کا
النگھن کرتا ہے - میں صرف ایک
چیڑ کی طرف اس سدن کا دھیان
دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس وقت
80 RSD-4.

ہندی راشٹر بھاشا بن گئی اس وقت
ہماری کھلدیریہ سرکار نے اور پرائیوٹ
سرکاروں نے بھی کچھ آدیش جاری
کئے تھے - اس میں یہ کہا گیا تھا
کہ جو بھی سرکاری کام ہو وہ ہندی
میں ہونا چاہیئے یہاں تک کہ
مستریوں تک کو یہ ہدایت کی
گئی تھی کہ وہ تھیں مہملے کے اندر
یا چھ مہملے کے اندر ہندی سیکھ
لیں - اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ ان کو
یہ بھی ہدایت کی گئی تھی کہ وہ
اپنے جمہوریت ہندی میں دیں - اس
طرح سے تمام ڈپارٹمنٹوں میں کھلمی
سی میچ گئی تھی کہ ہندی آدھی
ہے اور سب لوگ اس کو سیکھنے
کی کوشش کرنے لگے - چند سالوں
میں سارے دیہے میں ایسا وٹاوارن
بن گیا اور لوگ سمجھنے لگے کہ
ہندی سیکھنی چاہیئے اور لوگ
سیکھ بھی رہے تھے - اس سے
مستریوں کو بھی ہندی میں
فیصلہ دینے لگے تھے لیکن کچھ سے
بعد مستریوں نے دوبارہ انگریزی
میں فیصلہ دینا شروع کر دیا -
ہماری سوشلسٹ پارٹی نے برابر
دیہے میں بڑے بڑے آندولن ہندی
کو پرچلت کرنے کے لئے کئے جس کا
نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ یو - پی - میں
ہائی کورٹ میں ہندی میں بحث
کی جا سکتی ہے اور ہندی ہی میں
کاغذات پڑھنے کئے جا سکتے ہیں مگر

[شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالب:]
چند سالوں سے وہاں بھی اس کی
طرف کوئی توجہ نہیں دی جا رہی
ہے۔ ہمارے بھوت پورو راشٹریتی شری
راجندرپریشاد نے ایک پرسنرا قائم کی
تھی کہ وہ پریڈیڈنشل ایڈریس
ہندی میں دیتے چلے آ رہے تھے لیکن
۱۹۶۳ء میں ہمارے ورتمان راشٹریتی
نے انگریزی میں پہلی بار بھاشن دیا
جس پر ہمارے سوشلسٹ سندھ
سدن سے واک آؤٹ کر گئے۔۔۔

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam,
on a point of order . . .

شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالب :

ہمارے راشٹریتی سنسکرت کے بڑے
اسکالر ہیں اور انہوں نے سنسکرت
میں بہت کتابیں لکھی ہیں کہا
وجہ تھی کہ انہوں نے اپنا ایڈریس
ہندی میں نہیں دیا ؟

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pra-
desh): He must not mention the Pre-
sident.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You
must not mention the President at
all, no reflection on the President.
You wanted two minutes and your
two minutes are over. (Time bell
rings.)

شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالب :

میں ان کے خلاف کسی قسم کی—
میں صرف یہ بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ
وہ ہندی میں اپنا بھاشن دے سکتے
تھے۔ بھوت پورو راشٹریتی نے ۱۹۶۰ء
میں یہ کہا تھا کہ سنہ ۱۹۶۵ء کے
بعد سب کام ہندی میں ہوگا۔ مگر
ان کی آکھا کا پالن نہیں کیا جا
رہا۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your
two minutes are over. No reflection
on the President. Please sit down.
The Minister will reply.

شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالب :

میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس بل
کے ذریعہ ۱۹۶۵ء کے بعد بھی انگریزی
جاری رہے گی۔ جب کہ ہمارے
دیہی کی راشٹر بھاشا ہندی ہے
لیکن پھر بھی ہر نام انگریزی میں
چلے گا۔۔۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order,
order. Please sit down. I have called
the Minister.

شری پیارے لال کرپل دہطالب :

اس طرح سے ہندی کو پیچھے دھکولا
جا رہا ہے اور اس بات کی کوشش
کی جا رہی ہے کہ ۱۹۶۵ء کے بعد
بھی انگریزی جاری رہے۔ مجھے اس
بات پر سخت اعتراض ہے۔ میں
سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بل دیہی دروہی
بل ہے اور دیہی کے لوگوں نے
سمجھنے کے خلاف ہے۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' (उत्तर
प्रदेश) : महोदया, मैं अपने विचार इस सदन के
सामने पहले रख चुका हूँ। मैं यह समझता हूँ
कि यह विधेयक हमारे संविधान के खिलाफ
है और संविधान की कई धाराओं का उल्लंघन
करता है। मैं सिर्फ एक चीज की तरफ इस
सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस
वक्त हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा बन गई उस वक्त
हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ने और प्रान्तीय सर-
कारों ने भी कुछ आदेश जारी किये थे। उसमें
यह कहा गया था कि जो भी काम हो वो हिन्दी

में होना चाहिये यहां तक कि मजिस्ट्रेटों तक को यह हिदायत की गई थी कि वो तीन महीने के अन्दर, छः महीने के अन्दर हिन्दी सीख लें। इसके साथ ही साथ उनको यह भी हिदायत की गई थी कि वे अपने जजमेन्ट हिन्दी में दें। इस तरह से तमाम डिपार्टमेंटों में खलबली मच गई कि हिन्दी आ रही है और सब लोग इसको सीखने की कोशिश करने लगे। चन्द सालों में सारे देश में ऐसा वातावरण बन गया और लोग समझने लगे कि हिन्दी सीखनी चाहिये और लोग सीख भी रहे थे। उस समय मजिस्ट्रेट लोग भी हिन्दी में फैसला देने लगे थे लेकिन कुछ समय बाद मजिस्ट्रेटों ने दुबारा अंग्रेजी में फैसला देना शुरू कर दिया। हमारी सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने बराबर देश में बड़े बड़े आन्दोलन हिन्दी को प्रचलित करने के लिये किये। जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि यू० पी० में हाईकोर्ट में हिन्दी में बहस की जा सकती है और हिन्दी ही में कागजात पेश किये जा सकते हैं मगर चन्द सालों से वहां भी उसकी तरफ कोई तवज्जो नहीं दी जा रही है। हमारे भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति श्री राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने एक परम्परा कायम की थी कि वो प्रेजिडेंशियल एड्रेस हिन्दी में देते चले आ रहे थे लेकिन १९६३ ईस्वी में हमारे वर्तमान राष्ट्रपति ने अंग्रेजी में पहली बार भाषण दिया जिस पर हमारे सोशलिस्ट सदस्य सदन से वाक् आउट कर गये . . .

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, on a point of order . . .

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालिब' हमारे राष्ट्रपात संस्कृत के बड़े स्कालर हैं और उन्होंने संस्कृत में बहुत कितने लिखी हैं क्या वजह थी कि उन्होंने अपना एड्रेस हिन्दी में नहीं दिया।

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): He must not mention the President.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must not mention the President at all, no reflection on the President. You wanted two minutes and your two minutes are over. (Time Bell rings.)

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालिब' : मैं उनके खिलाफ किसी किस्म की . . . मैं सिर्फ यह बताना चाहता हूं कि वह हिन्दी में अपना भाषण दे सकते थे। भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति ने १९६० ई० में यह कहा था कि १९६५ ई० के बाद सब काम हिन्दी में होगा। मगर उनकी आज्ञा का पालन नहीं किया जा रहा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your two minutes are over. No reflection on the President. Please sit down. The Minister will reply.

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालिब' : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस बिल के जरिये १९६५ ईस्वी के बाद भी अंग्रेजी जारी रहेगी। जबकि हमारे देश की राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी है। लेकिन फिर भी हर काम अंग्रेजी में चलेगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please sit down. I have called the Minister.

श्री प्यारेलाल कुरील 'तालिब' : इस तरह से हिन्दी को पीछे धकेला जा रहा है और इस बात की कोशिश की जा रही है कि १९६५ ईस्वी के बाद भी अंग्रेजी जारी रहे। मुझे इस बात पर सख्त ऐतराज है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल देशद्रोही बिल है और देश के सेन्टीमेंट्स के खिलाफ है।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, this Bill marks a landmark in our transition to develop one language for this nation. I do not regard this Bill as replacing one regional language by another, as the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, was pleased to say, but of adopting a common language which will serve as a means of communication between the various parts of India. To hear Mr. Vajpayee's speech is almost to admit that on the 26th January, 1950, a magic wand was waved in this country and after the Constitution came into force everybody could, if he wished, speak Hindi as eloquently as Mr. Vajpayee. Yet,

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.]

on account of certain cussedness we refused to do so. I may submit that in this he is less than fair to us, non-Hindi-speaking people. Except for a very small minority, an unrepresentative minority, here no one says that he will not speak in Hindi. But as the hon. senior, respected Member, Shri Kalelkar, said, we are presented with a certain situation. It may be that if he accuses us that we have succumbed to certain forces of inertia, if such a charge should be made he may say, we cannot defend it. But it must be remembered that here there is a large portion of the country, a large number of inhabitants who could not speak Hindi, who found it difficult to speak in Hindi. If they felt that their ignorance of Hindi stood in the way of realising the natural expectations, say, entry or promotion in Government service, business, etc., those apprehensions ought to be removed. That problem has got to be solved. Now, Mr. Vajpayee did mention the problem. He said that so far as 6,000 persons are concerned, they speak Hindi. There is no problem for them. The problem of only 13,000 has got to be solved. Now, how is he going to solve it? If he did not have a magic wand in 1950, I am sure he does not have a magic wand in 1965. During this period some progress has been made. It may be that the progress has not been rapid enough to the satisfaction of many of us. But some progress has been made. Now, the progress may be accelerated is a proposition which can certainly be advanced and which we have got to consider. But to think that it is a practical proposition to abolish the use of English altogether in this country is not to have regard for any sense of reality. Those of us who do not speak Hindi are yet very enthusiastic supporters of Hindi. We know that we belong to an unfortunate generation. When we were born, we found ourselves under alien domination, much against our wish. We had to learn an alien language and we have not learnt it well. Mr.

Bhupesh Gupta had to spend several years in England in order to learn English. That is my despair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can fully assure you that Mr. Asoke Sen went there to learn English. I believe he stayed in England. Poet Rabindranath Tagore said: You have not learnt English and you have forgotten Bengali.

Many of us belong to that category.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: So far as we are concerned, we have neither learnt English nor have we devoted enough attention to learn our own mother-tongue, in which we are not very proficient. Mr. Vajpayee is only one of the few individuals who are fortunate to express themselves so well, so eloquently and so effectively in their own mother-tongue. I cannot. So far as Hindi is concerned, all the Hindi that I know is that which enables me to make a few purchases in the bazar. But we in this generation have got to live during this transitional period and you have got to make adjustments during this transitional period. Now, we know with what poignant feelings we lend our support to this Bill. It is difficult for us, at this stage, to learn Hindi, to become proficient in Hindi. If tomorrow the language in this house were Hindi and if I had to speak against Mr. Vajpayee, I do not think I would be able to express even the broadest of propositions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Many of us will have to get out.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Let alone express the delicate thoughts which he mentioned.

But we realise that these national issues are not judged in terms of one's personal fate. We have got to make certain adjustments; certain sacrifices. We are prepared to make them. Speaking on behalf of the non-Hindi-speaking people, I would appeal to the Hindi-speaking people

that the difficulties are inherent in the situation in which we find ourselves today. What is the Hindi that has to be evolved, that the Constitution enjoins on us to use? I will read article 351:—

“It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages.”

Madam, this vehicle of common expression—which will be Hindi of course—will only develop if we proceed gradually, resolutely and we make a determined but cautious approach to the whole problem. And we are alive to the various problems which have been mentioned by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and by Mrs. Seeta Parmanand, the problem of entry of youngmen into the all-India Services. It is an exceedingly difficult problem and a very delicate problem. I do not claim on behalf of the Government that we have found a ready and easy solution, but it will be certainly solved so that no linguistic groups in India are placed at a disadvantage, so that they will continue to enjoy the same advantages which they had before this Bill came to be passed.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: But you have not justified the encroachment by English into the provincial languages.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think all those points have been made clear.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Madam, before the question is put, we would like to withdraw from the House with

your permission as a protest against this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is left to you.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): I am against this Bill. I am tearing it into pieces and in protest walking out of the House.

شہری پھارے لال کوریل مد طالبہ:

میں مانیہ سدسیہ سے اتفاق کرتا ہوں۔
ہمارے ساتھ ایک بڑا انیائے ہو رہا ہے
اور یہ ایک دیہی دروہی بل ہے۔ اور
اس لئے میں بھی واک آؤٹ کرتا ہوں۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब': मैं माननीय सदस्य से इत्फाक करता हूँ। हमारे साथ एक बड़ा अन्याय हो रहा है और यह एक देशद्रोही बिल है। और इसलिए मैं भी वाक आउट करता हूँ।]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That the Bill be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

SHRI T. M. DASGUPTA (Tripura): Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that one Member has torn the Bill on the floor of the House. I think this matter should be brought to your attention.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have not taken any notice of it. This thing should be expunged. I say that it should not go into the press. I suggest that this be expunged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Let us ignore it.

THE APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS) NO. 3 BILL, 1963

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY): Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

“That the Bill to provide for the authorisation of appropriation of

†[]Hindi transliteration.