

[श्री मधु लिमये]

कर लेंगे लेकिन किसी भी कीमत पर मुझे यह 11 प्रतिशत वाला कबूल नहीं है क्योंकि उस में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होता है । उसको छोड़ कर बाकी एक राय है । इसलिए सदन की इजाजत से मैं अपने इस विधेयक को मंत्री महोदय के प्राश्वासन पर और इस प्राशा पर कि सरकार जल्द से जल्द स्वयं एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत करेगी, वापिस लेना चाहता हूँ ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात का ब्युत्सास कर देना चाहता हूँ । मंत्री की परिभाषा हमारे नियमों में है इसलिए मैंने यहां पर नहीं की थी । हमारे नियम के अनुसार मंत्री की जो परिभाषा दी गई है उसके अनुसार उस में कैबिनेट मंत्री, राज्य मंत्री, उप मंत्री और पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरीज सभी आते हैं । स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर इसको विधेयक में रखने का विरोध करने की कोई बात नहीं है । यह ठीक है कि नियमों में हमारे वह है लेकिन नियम तो हम बहुतम से बदल सकते हैं इसलिए अच्छा यह होगा कि यह चीज संविधान में आ जाये । कानून व संविधान में अगर यह आ जायेगी तो बहुत अच्छा होगा ।

जसा मैंने पहले कहा इस प्राशा पर कि मंत्री महोदय शीघ्र इस तरह का एक अच्छा विधेयक सदन के सामने मंजूरी के लिये ले आयेगे मैं अपने विधेयक को वापिस लेने की इजाजत चाहता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his Bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: I withdraw the Bill.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

17.13 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of article 120) by
Shri Sezhiyan

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam):
Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

My Bill seeks to amend article 120 of the Constitution. The principle on which this article is based is a very vital one. It has been raised here several times in the past and even in the last Lok Sabha I gave notice of a Private Member's Bill and several other Members belonging to other Parties gave notice of similar Bills. Only now I have the good fortune to have it balloted and get priority. I do not want to go into the entire question of the official language policy of India and that is not under discussion now. This has only limited scope. What should be the language that can be used in Parliament, by Members of Parliament and the discussion is confined to this narrow ambit. When we begin to speak, several Members ask: why don't you speak in your own mother tongue? We readily agree; we want to; it will be a happy occasion when we can do so. But there is the impediment of the Constitution. Article 120 defines the languages in which the business of Parliament should be conducted.

Article 120 says:

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

And there is a proviso which reads;

"Provided that the Chairman of the Council of States or Speaker of the House of the People, or person acting as such, as the case may be, may permit any member who cannot adequately express himself in Hindi or in English to address the House in his mother tongue."

Here comes a very important question. There are two aspects: one is, a Member who can adequately express himself in English can speak in that language, adequately and fully. In the same way, a person whose mother tongue is Hindi can also express himself well. But what about a person whose mother tongue is neither Hindi nor English? He is also elected by the due process of democratic elections; he also represents a million people, but if he does not know and he cannot express himself adequately in either of these two languages, what is the scope of his functioning here? They say that first of all, "He should convince the Speaker that he cannot adequately express himself in Hindi or in English." But it is natural to say that I can adequately express myself only in my mother tongue. It is the basic truth. Anybody can adequately express himself in his mother tongue. Because I got some English education, they force me to speak in a language which is not my own.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would like to correct the impression. At the present juncture, we are following a practice wherein a Member is permitted to speak in his mother-tongue. The question is one of technical arrangement only, namely, translation. Today, the practice followed according to the Constitution is that we give him permission to make his submission in his mother tongue.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat): That is not recorded in the proceedings of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I said that it is a technical difficulty.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I concede that point: in practice they allow us. But as per the Constitution I cannot claim it as a matter of right. I cannot claim it as a matter of right to speak in my own mother tongue.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have read the Constitution and when that question was raised I gave my ruling. It is a question of procedure that we are adopting so far. The procedure was that a Member should give an advance copy of the translation and then alone he could make his speech.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: He wants that right to be incorporated in the Constitution.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I accept your position. Suppose if we say, "in practice," there is nothing which should prevent the Government to put it in the Constitutional form itself. Therefore, it is very easy from the point of view which you suggested. Just now you said in your ruling that we should give a translation before we make the speech in the mother tongue.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That was the procedure. We are not following that procedure any more. The only question is, as Dr. Ranen Sen said, that of reporting and translating, and the question of other Members following what one Member is speaking. These are technical difficulties that all of us are experiencing.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : हम हिन्दी में बोलें तो (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It was in keeping with the Constitutional provisions.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: The Constitution overrides any other thing. If anything is found *ultra vires* of the

[Shri Sezhiyan]

Constitution, then the Constitutional provision stands. Today, we have got good Speakers who can understand the sense of the House and they come to our rescue. But as long as the Constitutional provision is there, it does not clearly spell out what you said as a ruling. The Constitutional provision stands. So, to put the matter in order, I have brought this Bill.

Here, I can say one thing. In the State Assemblies, the respective mother tongue, that is, the national language of each region has been allowed to be used as the State language and these languages are being freely used in the State Assemblies. If we go to Tamilnad and sit in the Assembly and watch the proceedings, we find that almost all the speakers—100 per cent—speak in the language which is their mother tongue. All the proceedings are recorded in the same way the members speak. According to the present arrangement here if I make a speech in my mother tongue it has either to be translated by somebody else or I should give a translation myself and only the translation would be recorded. The speech that I make will not be recorded. But if I go to the State Assembly and make a speech in Tamil, say, in the Madras Assembly, it will be recorded in Tamil as I make it. If a member from the State Assembly who can speak only in Tamil which is his mother tongue comes here, even though he may be a very effective speaker, he will not be able to speak. Even if he speaks in his own language, he will not have the benefit of his speech being heard and understood by others. Sir, why do we speak here? We speak here to convey certain thoughts to others. If that purpose is not served, there is no use of our talking. We do not take pleasure in hearing our own voice. But once it is made Constitutional, once this provision is incorporated in the Constitution, then I can insist on my getting all the facilities.

The question to be considered is whether it is desirable and whether it is practicable. I do not think anybody will contest that this is not desirable. Everybody will accept it is desirable and everybody will also agree that the Members who come elected to this House should be allowed to express their thoughts in their own language. After all, if you look into the relevant provision of the Constitution you will find that there is no disqualification to be a Member of this House for not knowing a particular language. There are many disqualifications stated in article 102 but none of them is about absence of knowledge of a particular language. Under the present arrangement if a person who does not know either English or Hindi comes elected to this House, for a major portion of the proceedings he will have to keep mum with the result that he will not be able to function as a true representative of the people who elected and sent him here. We should, therefore, remove this anomaly and that is the purpose of my Bill.

As I said earlier, everybody will agree that this is a desirable method by which democracy can function effectively and we will be making it easier for the effective use of Members and giving opportunities to all persons to get elected and represent their people here. If we continue the present provision in the Constitution and somebody insists that the provision should be followed to the very letter, then we will be cutting away a major portion of the people who can come here. If they come here and cannot express themselves either in English or Hindi, they will not be able to function effectively as representatives of the people. We require that all the people of India who are otherwise qualified are able to come here and function in an effective way.

I think it is possible to do that. Firstly we must see that the Consti-

tution allows it. The Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker may rule that a Member can speak here in any language, but if somebody goes to the court they will stick to the Constitution whatever your ruling may be.

Some may say that we have 13 or 14 languages and it may not be possible to provide translation facilities in all the languages. But we find that in many other countries where many languages are spoken their representatives hold meetings at a particular place and speak many languages. They have found it possible to allow all to speak in their own mother tongue. One classical example is Soviet Russia. There are as many as sixteen republics which go to make the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. If you take their Constitution you will find that there is no clause which state that such and such a language should be learned by all the people in Soviet Russia. There is no compulsion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: One thing needs to be clarified. Should the translation be provided in one language or in all the 14 languages? In Russia, if I have understood the position correctly, while a member is allowed to speak in any language he likes, the translation for the benefit of the other members is given only in one language.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: But they are allowed to speak in any one language.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am asking for your views. Would you insist on translation in all the languages mentioned in the Schedule or you want translation only in one language? Which would you accept?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: If you accept in principle that all the languages listed in the Eighth Schedule can be used on the floor of the House.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is one part. What about the other part?

SHRI SEZHIYAN: The question how far it is possible to translate *inter se*, that has to be considered and solved. Technically speaking, I understand that it can be done with the help of modern computers. The Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, are at it and I think they have demonstrated it also. If that process succeeds, it will help us immensely. When I went there, they told me how it would work. They will feed one language, either English or Tamil, at one end and the translation will come out at the other end. It is said that it can be done with the help of computers. So, the technical feasibility of that question should be gone into.

Once you concede the point that a member who comes here can speak in his own mother tongue, that will go a long way in solving the present difficulties felt and experienced by people who do not know either English or Hindi, or those who know it but not sufficiently enough to express themselves adequately in those languages because they are not his mother tongue.

I do not want to take much time. So, I commend this Bill for the consideration of the House. Today is a very happy day for us because the Minister just now accepted in principle the Constitution (Amendment) Bill moved by Shri Madhu Limaye. I hope he will accept in principle this Bill also. We can work out the details later.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In practice the House has accepted it.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I want to get constitutional sanction for this practice. That is why I move this Bill.

This is not a new idea. I note that the veteran Congress leader, Shri Govind Das is not here. As early as 1927 he moved a Private Members' Resolution in the House to the effect that English, Hindi and Urdu should be accepted as floor languages in the legislature. So, if he had been here

[Shri Sezhiyan]

I am sure he would have accepted my Bill, because it takes his argument to its logical conclusion, by providing that all the national languages of India could be used here. All the national languages of India should be given equal dignity and opportunity and they should be treated equally at the highest forum where all the people meet. With these words, I again commend my Bill for the acceptance of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र ने जो प्रस्ताव रक्खा है मैं जसमें थोड़ा सा संशोधन करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने 14 भाषाओं की मांग की। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि इस देश में एक दक्षिण की भाषा और एक उत्तर की भाषा हो। उत्तर की भाषा हिन्दी हो और दक्षिण की कोई भी एक भाषा हो। हम भी सीखें और वह भी सीखें। मैं आप के द्वारा सरकार से भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और सदन से भी कहना चाहता हूँ, हर मੈम्बर से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम को निहायत ईमानदारी और नेक-नियती से देश को एक रखना है तो हम को और आप को गठबध्न्न करना होगा, मिल कर रहना होगा और देश में एकता लाना हांगी क्योंकि हमारे देश की चारों सीमाओं पर लड़ाई के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं। इस समय देश में कोशिश की जा रही है कि हम को भाषा के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, इंटेग्रिटी के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, दीन के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये और रोटी के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, रोटी के लिये हम को अमरीका मांगने जाना पड़ता है, मिग मांगने के लिये हम को रूस जाना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सब परेशानियाँ हल हों और हम छोटी छोटी बातों को खत्म करें। अभी कल इस हाउस में हिन्दी

के नाम पर बड़ा उबाल आया। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ के लोग भी गर्म हो गए। तब मैंने कहा था कि अगर अंग्रेजी बोलनी हो तो करेक्ट अंग्रेजी बोलो, हिन्दी बोलनी हो तो करेक्ट बोलो। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक ही वाक्य में प्रेजेंट टैस भी और फ्यूचर टैस भी जुड़े हुए हों। मान्यवर, नब्बे परसेंट यहां गलत अंग्रेजी बोली जाती है। मान्यवर मैं आपके आशीर्वाद से आठ बरस तक इंग्लिश का टीचर रहा हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि नब्बे परसेंट गलत अंग्रेजी लोग बोलते हैं। इस से तो बेहतर यह है कि लंगड़ी लूली हिन्दी बोली जाए, टूटी फूटी तेलगू, मराठी, बंगला आदि भाषायें बोली जायें। वह ज्यादा बेहतर होगा।

ज्यादा नहीं चार भाषायें आप लें। एक मराठी लो, एक बंगला लो, एक दक्षिण की भाषा लो और एक हिन्दी लो। चार ले लो लेकिन अंग्रेजी को जरूर सलाम बोलो। चौदह को आप चार करो। इस से देश का काम चल सकता है। बंगला, उड़िया, मराठी गुजराती के अक्षर एक हैं। डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने एक सर्जेशन दिया था कि इस देश में एक डिक्शनरी बनाओ जिस में सभी भाषाओं के शब्द देवनागरी में लिखे हों। चार पांच बरस के अन्दर अन्दर देश की सभी भाषाओं के लिए आप देवनागरी लिपि को अपना लें। वही हमारे लिए रोमन लिपि है। इंग्लिश की लिपि रोमन है और हमारी भाषाओं की रोमन लिपि देवनागरी लिपि है।

जहां तक संस्कृत का सम्बन्ध है . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अगली बार अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

17.32 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

VISIT OF PAKISTANI EXPERTS TO FARAKKA BARRAGE SITE

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,