

## Bill

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

मित्र ने कहा कि इंग्लैंड के बारे में अवधि क्यों कम कर दी गई है, दूसरी चीजों के लिये जब कि चौदह साल की अवधि रखी गई है, इंग्लैंड के लिये 10 साल की अवधि कर दी गई है—मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह अवधि और भी कम होनी चाहिये थी, क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी इतनी ज्यादा है कि अगर दो या तीन साल भी किसी पेटेन्टी को अपना माल बेचने के लिये मिल जाय तो वह 50 करोड़ की आबादी से करोड़ों रुपये कमा सकता है। इस लिये ज्यादा अवधि रखने की जरूरत नहीं है। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि सरकार बिल को कन्ज्यूमर के प्वाइन्ट आफ व्यू से, एक साधारण आदमी के प्वाइन्ट आफ व्यू से कौम्प्रीहेन्सिव शकल में बनाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मुझे खेद है कि इस मामले में मैं बनस्वित श्री दंडेकर के, जिनके साथ मैं बैठता हूँ, सरकार के ज्यादा नजदीक हूँ।

15.01 Hrs.

## COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

## THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT

SHRI K. M. Koushik (Chanda) : I beg to move :

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 7th August, 1968."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 7th August, 1968."

*The motion was adopted*

15.02 Hrs.

## CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

(Amendment of article 120) by Shri Era Sezhiyan

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now we take up further consideration of the follow-

ing motion moved by Shri Era Sezhiyan on the 26th July, 1968 :—

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

The time allotted is one hour and 30 minutes, of which 18 minutes have been taken. We have now got one hour and 12 minutes. I think, I can call the Minister at ten minutes to 4.00...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Yes.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : I am afraid, we have to extend the time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That we shall see, from the progress of the debate.

Mr. Sheo Narain to continue his speech.

श्री शिवनारायण (बस्ती) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे संविधान के आर्टिकल 120 में दिया गया है कि इस सदन का काम काज चलाने के लिये हिन्दी या अंग्रेजी ये दो भाषायें सर्वमान्य रहेंगी। लेकिन आज मैं क्या देखता हूँ कि देश में भाषा के नाम पर कितनी कटुता बढ़ती जा रही है। हिन्दी जो राष्ट्र की सब से बड़ी भाषा है, देश के सब से ज्यादा लोग जिसको बोलते हैं और ममझते हैं, लंगड़ी और टूटी-फूटी हिन्दी बंगाल में बोलते हैं, बम्बई में बोलते हैं, मद्रास में भी बोलते हैं, आन्ध्र में भी बोलते हैं, आन्ध्र में मैं स्वयं गया हूँ, वहाँ पर मैंने देखा है कि हिन्दी और उर्दू मिली जुली भाषा की शकल में बोली जाती है, मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो भाषा देश के इतने बड़े भाग में बोली जाती है, फिर यह कटुता क्यों ? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, संविधान कोई मजाक नहीं है कि हर समय उस में अदलाव-बदलाव किया जाता रहे। मैं हर भाषा का सम्मान करता हूँ। मैंने अपनी ओपनिंग स्पीच में यह कहा था कि हम उत्तर भारत के लोगों को मलायलम पढ़नी चाहिये ताकि हमारे डी० एम० के० के भाइयों को जो ग़ज है, वह दूर हो सके। अभी तो दो ही भाषाओं की यहाँ पर व्यवस्था है, अगर 14 भाषाओं में यहाँ पर कार्यवाही

प्रसारित होने लगीं तो आप अन्दाजा लगाइये कि कितनी दिक्कत हो जायगी, कितनी बार आपको स्विच घुमाने पड़ेंगे तब आप उन को सुन सकेंगे। इस लिये मेरा आपसे यह अनुरोध है कि इस समय हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी की जो व्यवस्था है वह बिलकुल दुरुस्त है, इस में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होना चाहिये, लेकिन इस का अर्थ यह नहीं है मैं दूसरी भाषाओं का विरोध कर रहा हूँ लेकिन कांस्टीचूशन में 14 भाषाओं का अमेण्डमेंट कर के हम उस को वेल्यू को घटा देंगे—इसलिये ऐसा करना ठीक नहीं है।

मैं इस अमेण्डमेंट का विरोध कर रहा हूँ, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ अपने दक्षिण के भाइयों से कि वे ईमानदारी से हिन्दी, उर्दू और अंग्रेजी तीन भाषाओं को रहने दें तो सब का परपञ्च साल्व हो जाता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उर्दू काश्मीर से लेकर हैदराबाद तक बोली जाती है, सारे उत्तर प्रदेश में बोली जाती है—इस में दो रायें नहीं हैं...

**श्री लोबो प्रभू (उदीपी) :** उर्दू नहीं, हिन्दुस्तानी।

**श्री शिवनारायण :** मैं उस पर भी आं रहा हूँ, जनाब : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जापान में जापानी बोली जाती है, रूस में रूसी बोली जाती है। मैं कोसिगिन साहब का बहुत सम्मान करता हूँ—जिस समय लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी के मरने के बाद वह यहाँ आये, उस समय उन्होंने यहाँ पर रूसी भाषा में भाषण दिया था और उस का अनुवाद हिन्दी में किया गया था, हमारे हीरेन मुखर्जी साहब उसी प्लेटफार्म से अंग्रेजी में बोले, हम बरबा अंग्रेजी में बोले—आपने उस समय देश की कितनी बड़ी नाक काटी, हमारे देश के ये नेता लोग जो अपने आपको प्रोग्रेसिव कहलाते हैं, उन के आगे पीछे घूमते हैं, उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में भाषण दिया, लेकिन कोसिगिन साहब ने रूसी में भाषण दिया और हिन्दी

में उसका अनुवाद किया गया, अंग्रेजी में उस का अनुवाद नहीं हुआ। मैं कहता हूँ—

रहिमन वे नर भर चुके जो कहूँ मांगन जाय,  
उन के पहले वे मुए, जिन मुख निकसत नायं।

राष्ट्रीय सम्मान के लिये हिन्दुस्तानी को लेकर मैं लोबो प्रभु जी की बात का समर्थन करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तानी होनी चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तानी—हिन्दी और उर्दू की मिली हुई भाषा है, यह लश्करी भाषा रही है, देश में कायस्थ और दूसरे लोग इस भाषा को बोलते रहे हैं—

न पैमां शिकन हूँ, न गद्दार हूँ हम,

वतन परवरी के खतावार हूँ हम।

एक शेर आपको और सुनादूँ—

कुलजमें हस्ती से तू उभरा है मानिन्दे हुंबाब,  
इस जयां खाने में तेरा इम्तिहां है जिन्दगी।

मैं इस भाषा का विरोधी नहीं हूँ। 5 करोड़ मुसलमान इस भाषा को बोलते हैं, उर्दू हमारी जुबान है, सिर्फ मुसलमानों की जुबान नहीं है। लेकिन संविधान की भुजा के बास्ते इस का सम्मान करो—अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी को रहने दो। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के लोगों से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि डटकर मलायलम पढ़ो, वर्ना हमारी गाड़ी पिछड़ जाएगी। डी०एम० के० वाले हिन्दी पढ़ रहे हैं, इस लिये मैं अपने बच्चा से अपील करना चाहता हूँ, पत्रकारों से अपील करता हूँ कि वे इस बात को फ्लेश करें कि हमारे इधर के लोग मलयालम पढ़ें, दक्षिण की एक भाषा हम लोगों को जरूर पढ़नी है, देश के सम्मान की दृष्टि से हम को ऐसा जरूर करना है। हमारे भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति डा० राधाकृष्णन् किसी समय काशी विश्वविद्यालय के बाइस चांसलर थे, वे संस्कृत के बड़े भारी पंडित हैं, इसलिये मैं सरकार से अपील करता हूँ कि संस्कृत को प्रोत्साहन दें, प्राचीन काल में तो तोते भी संस्कृत बोलते थे, फिर इन्सान क्यों नहीं बोल सकता। अगर संस्कृत का ज्ञान लोगों को नहीं होगा तो हम राजनीति को नहीं समझ सकेंगे। अगर लेमिन की भाषा की

## Bill

## Bill

[श्री शिवनारायण]

पढ़गे तो चाणक्य नहीं बन सकेंगे, गीता का ज्ञान हम को नहीं हो सकेगा।

मैं इस देश के संविधान का सम्मान करता हूँ, इसलिये कहना चाहता हूँ, कि भाषा के नाम पर आपस में न लड़ो, देश के चारों तरफ दुश्मन फैले हुए हैं, ऐसे समय में हम आपस में भाषा के नाम पर लड़ रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं मूवर महोदय से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस बिल को विदड़ा करें, हिन्दुस्तानी जुबान देश में कायम रहे, हम सब इस संविधान का आदर करें—चाहें अंग्रेजी बोलें या हिन्दी बोलें। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आप इसको विदड़ा करेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to point out that Shri Sheo Narain has perhaps unwittingly extended the scope of the debate. First, let us understand what is contained in the Bill. Here, the main question is what the floor language in the House should be, though according to the Constitution it is permissible to have all languages, and whether all languages should get an opportunity of as simultaneous translation at least into Hindi or English. That is the purpose of the Bill if I have understood it correctly. It is not a language controversy which is introduced by this Bill.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (भोपाल): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक सदन के सामने है उस में जैसा अभी आपने बताया वास्तव में कोई स्पर्धा या विवाद नहीं है। संविधान में यह अधिकार दिया गया है कि सदन के अन्दर जो अंग्रेजी या हिन्दी में अच्छी तरह से अपने विचार प्रकट नहीं कर सकते, वे सदन के अध्यक्ष की अनुमति से अपनी मातृ-भाषा में अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकते हैं। यह संविधान में ही लिखा हुआ है, संविधान की कोई अवहेलना करने का उद्देश्य इस विधेयक के अन्तर्गत आता नहीं है। अब सवाल यह है कि लोकतन्त्र दिन बदिन ध्रामों तक पहुंच रहा है, अब वह समाज के ऊपरी स्तर तक सीमित नहीं है। संविधान ने यह अधिकार हरएक

को दिया है, किसी भी भाषा का ज्ञान उसको हो जोकि यहां के लिए खड़ा होना चाहता है, जो भी कुछ उसकी क्वालिफिकेशन्स हों, हिन्दी जानता हो या अंग्रेजी जानता हो लेकिन कोई भी ज्ञान अनिवार्य नहीं समझा गया है, यहां तक कि सदस्य यहां पर जो शपथ ग्रहण करते हैं वह भी वे खुद पढ़ नहीं सकते, वे शब्द बोलने पड़ते हैं ताकि वे उसको दोहारा दें। तो संविधान ने जब हरएक आदमी को यह अधिकार दिया है फिर इस सदन में बैठने वाला हरएक सदस्य इस सदन की कार्यवाही में हिस्सा ले, यहां पर अपने विचार प्रकट करे, इसके सिवा और कुछ हो नहीं सकता। अब सवाल केवल यह आता है कि जिस सदन में पहले अंग्रेजी या हिन्दी के अनुवाद की भी व्यवस्था नहीं थी, वह व्यवस्था अब हो गई है, अब उसके दायरे को ही बढ़ाना है। आठवें शेड्यूल के अन्तर्गत स्वीकृत की हुई जो भारत की भाषायें हैं, उनमें यदि कोई सदस्य यहां पर अपने विचार प्रकट करे तो केवल उसका अनुवाद कराने की व्यवस्था इस विधेयक के अन्तर्गत आती है। पिछले साल से एक सीमित दायरे में वह व्यवस्था शुरू भी हो चुकी है। यु० एन० ओ० में 5 भाषाओं का अनुवाद होता है। इसी प्रकार से कोई अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हो तो उसमें भी अनुवाद की व्यवस्था करनी पड़ती है। उसी प्रकार से इस लोक सभा के अन्दर भी, यदि कोई माननीय सदस्य उन 14 भाषाओं में अपने विचार प्रकट करे तो उसके अनुवाद की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। जहां तक सिद्धान्त की बात है, उसका तो कोई विरोध करेगा नहीं क्योंकि हरएक को यहां पर बोलने का अधिकार है। किन्तु वह क्या बोले? प्रोसीडिंज में वह आ नहीं सकता, हरएक उसे पढ़ नहीं सकता। सम्मानित सदस्य क्या बोले, इससे सारे बंचित रह सकते हैं। अभी माननीय शिव नारायण जी ने यहां पर कुछ शेर पड़े किन्तु तमिल भाषा में भी बहुत उत्कृष्ट, अत्यन्त सुलभ और अर्थ-गर्भित ऐसे उदाहरण हैं। वे भी यहां पर बोले जायं,

उसका अर्थ हम भी समझ सकें तो हमें भी उसका आनन्द प्राप्त होगा। इतना ही नहीं, अक्कमहादेवी, बसवेश्वर जी के वचन हैं— हम तो यहां केवल शेर ही सुनते हैं—बसवेश्वर जी, तुकाराम, तुलसी की जो वाणी है उसको भी हम सब समझे, यह आवश्यक है। अब केवल सवाल यह है कि यहां यदि 14 भाषाओं में अनुवाद हो तो कितना खर्चा आयेगा। अभी संयुक्त समिति बैठो थी सदस्यों की तन-रूबाह, भत्ते बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से तो उसका एक ही मूल उद्देश्य है कि जो भी सदन के सदस्य हैं वे किस प्रकार अच्छे तरीके से सदन की कार्यवाही में भाग ले सकते हैं। इस दृष्टि से उस समिति की ओर से जो सिफारिशें आई हैं उनको कार्यान्वित करने में ज्यादा पैसा खर्च होने की गुंजाइश है। उसी सिद्धान्त पर इसके लिए भी कुछ पैसा खर्च किया जा सकता है। यदि यह पता लगे कि बहुत ज्यादा खर्चा होगा तो फिर हम कोई बीच का रास्ता निकाल सकते हैं कि 14 भाषाओं में अनुवाद न होकर दक्षिण की एक दो भाषा, बंगाल और इस तरह से चार पांच भाषाओं में ही अनुवाद हो सके ताकि फिर आगे चलकर धीरे धीरे—अभी अकेले हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी ही इस सदन में चलती है। उसके साथ भारत की जो भाषायें संविधान के अन्तर्गत स्वीकृत हैं उनमें से किसी में भी सम्मानित सदस्य अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकें। जैसा कि शिव नारायण जी ने कहा, मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ, कन्नड़ मातृ-भाषी होने के बाद भी मैं हिन्दी बोलता हूँ, हिन्दी कठिन नहीं है लेकिन जबतक कि सभी हिन्दी में ठीक तरह से बोल और समझ नहीं सकते तब तक के लिए यह व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। इस दृष्टि से मैं इस विधेयक का पूरी तरह से समर्थन करता हूँ।

**डा० गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) :** उपाध्यक्ष जी, जो विधेयक यहां पर उपस्थित हुआ है, उसका मैं समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। कुछ लोग मूर्ख प्रायः गलत समझते हैं जब वे कहते हैं कि मैं केवल हिन्दी का

समर्थक हूँ। मैं समस्त भारतीय भाषाओं का जोकि हमारे संविधान में हैं, समर्थन करता हूँ। साथ ही मैं उन भाषाओं का भी समर्थन करता हूँ जिनको कि अभी संविधान में स्थान नहीं मिला है जैसे कि अभी थोड़े दिन पहले सिन्धी भाषा को मिल चुका है। लोक सेवा आयोग की परीक्षाओं का माध्यम हमारी सभी भाषायें हों, यह मैं ने कहा है। जैसा कि अभी आपने भी कहा, यह विधेयक भाषा के विवाद से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखता, यह विधेयक इस बात से सम्बन्ध रखता है कि लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में हम किन भाषाओं में बोल सकते हैं। मैं हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन के अध्यक्ष की हैसियत से हमेशा कहता रहा हूँ कि जितनी भी हमारी भाषायें हैं सभी हमारे राष्ट्र की भाषायें हैं; हमें सभी पर समान श्रद्धा और भक्ति रखनी चाहिए। जिन राज्यों की भाषा हिन्दी नहीं है, मेरा यह मत है कि उन राज्यों में समस्त काम वहां की भाषा में ही होना चाहिए। वहां के सचिवालय का काम, वहां के न्यायालयों का काम बल्कि उच्च न्यायालय का काम भी उस भाषा में ही होना चाहिए। वहां की शिक्षा का माध्यम और वहाँ के विश्वविद्यालयों में भी वही भाषा होनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 14 भाषाओं में अनुवाद करने की व्यवस्था में कोई बहुत बड़ा खर्चा हो जायेगा, मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता। जबकि सरकार का बजट अरबों में है तब यदि हमारे सभी भाषा-भाषी इससे संतुष्ट होते हैं कि उनकी भाषा को भी लोकसभा और राज्य सभा में वही स्थान हो जैसा कि हिन्दी को है या अंग्रेजी को है, तो उनके संतोष के लिए सरकार को यह खर्च भी स्वीकार करना चाहिए और यहां पर सभी भाषाओं के अनुवाद की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। परन्तु यदि इस विधेयक में एक बात न होती तो मुझे और हर्ष होता : और इन इंग्लिश। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश का उत्कर्ष तब तक सम्भव नहीं है जबतक कि विदेशी भाषा से

## [श्री० गोविन्द वास]

हमारा पिंड छूट नहीं जाता। मैं संविधान सभा का भी सदस्य था, मुझे याद है कि इस बात का कितना प्रयत्न किया गया कि हमारे शेड्यूल में हमारा अन्य भाषाओं के साथ अंग्रेजा भी जोड़ा जाये और प्रयत्न करने वालों में, मेरे मित्र जाँकि जबलपुर से हाँ आते हैं श्री एन्टाना, उनका विशेष स्थान था पर पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने उसे स्वीकार नहीं किया। उन्होंने कहा कि अंग्रेजा हमारी भाषा नहीं है, इसलिए अंग्रेजा हमारे संविधान के शेड्यूल में नहीं रखा जा सकता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पौने दो सौ वर्षों के अंग्रेजी राज्य के बाद भी जिस भाषा का दो प्रतिशत लोग समझते हैं वतिका वे भी ठीक तरह से न समझते हैं, उसी भाषा में आज दो के बीस वर्षों के पश्चात् भी हमारा काम चलता रहे, यह गलत बात है। इसलिए संविधान में "आर इंग्लिश" न रखते तो मुझे और ज्यादा हर्ष होता। मैं अंग्रेजा का भी द्वेष नहीं हूँ। मैं एक छोटा सा साहित्यकार हूँ, कोई भी साहित्यकार सरस्वती के किसी रूप का द्वेषी नहीं होता। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मेरी स्थिति महात्मा गांधी जैसी है। वे हमेशा कहते थे कि मैं अंग्रेजा का आदर करता हूँ, उनसे प्यार करता हूँ लेकिन इस देश में जो अंग्रेजी राज्य छाया हुआ है उसको उलटना चाहता हूँ। अंग्रेजी भाषा बड़ी ऊँची भाषा है, उसका बड़ा अच्छा साहित्य है, मैं उसका भी आदर करता हूँ, मुझे उनसे स्नेह है, वह अपने स्थान पर रहे, जो भी पढ़ना चाहे उसको पढ़ें और सीखें, अंग्रेजी के साथ साथ दूसरी विदेशी भाषायें भी सीखें लेकिन अंग्रेजी भाषा का इस देश में जो साम्राज्य छाया हुआ है, इतने प्रयत्न के बाद भी आज तक हम उससे मुक्त नहीं हो रहे हैं, उससे हमको मुक्त होना ही पड़ेगा नहीं तो आगे की पीढ़ी, तीस चालीस वर्ष के बाद हम पर हंसेगी, हमारा उपहास करेगी कि इस देश में स्वतन्त्रता के बाद भी एक विदेशी भाषा का यहाँ दौर दौरा रहा। इसलिए इस विधेयक में अगर "आर इंग्लिश"

न होता तो मुझे बड़ा खुशा होती। लेकिन यह तो मेरा केवल इच्छा है। जहाँ तक आपन कहें कि भाषा का विवाद स इस विधेयक का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं, इस विधेयक का केवल इस बात से सम्बन्ध है कि लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में लोग अपना अपना भाषा में बोल सकें। इसलिए मैं इस विधेयक का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : One hon. Member from the Congress side was very eloquent that we should be proud, like some other countrymen, to say that we are Indians and so we speak Hindi. I am sorry to say there cannot be more ridiculous proposition than this. Fortunately for those countries, they have got only one language, but in our country the fact is that different sections of the people speak different languages. We just cannot wish away the realities of life, we have got to live with them.

As per your guidance, I would like to confine myself to the Bill as it is. Simultaneous translation was, in the beginning very much opposed. Actually, during the tenure of Mr. Mavalankar as Speaker, Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar from Madras wrote a letter to him requesting him for simultaneous translation, pointing out that it would be a mockery of democracy if there was no intelligible discussion among the members in the Houses of Parliament, but his request was not conceded, and the reply given to him by the Speaker was that if there was simultaneous translation from Hindi to English and vice-versa, there would not be any incentive for non-Hindi members to learn the Hindi language. There cannot be a worse provocation than that for non-Hindi people to decide not to learn this language at all, but that was the situation at that time.

Then, during tenure of Mr. Hukam Singh, this matter came up again in the and the opposition as well as some Congress Members were insistent. He had a meeting of all party leaders, and in that from the DMK side we insisted that there should be provision for all languages, but friends persuaded us, including the Speaker, not to insist on that, to be satisfied with translation from Hindi to English and English to Hindi for the time being, and so we accepted that.

What is the present position? Though the members are said to be more than 500 in this House, I am correct in assuming that we can as well say it is only 400 or even less. I am safe in assuming that there are more than 100 members in this House who do not have knowledge either of Hindi or English. Is it right and proper, is it fair even in the name of the Constitution, to allow them to come to the House, and then to prevent them from partaking in the deliberations in the House? They are doing a grave injustice to their constituencies. Either you amend the election law and prescribe that only those who understand English or Hindi should contest the elections, or accept the Bill before the House. I am afraid the other thing cannot be done, so naturally you have got to accept this Bill and amend the Constitution. So, it is a very reasonable request, and I do not know why members get doubts.

This should have been done long ago, but why has it not been done? I feel very sorry to say that the Government seems to be very anxious and very much concerned to promote the cause of Hindi by fair or foul means, without paying any attention to the genuine difficulties that the members have to face here.

Today some members were saying that we have to learn Hindi. It may happen or may not. As far as my party members are concerned, I may frankly say that all the 25 of us do not know Hindi except for a few common words that we have to use in the hotel and other places, which are inevitable for carrying on day to day life. Even if we do learn that language, we have to wait for sufficient knowledge to be able to take part in the deliberations of the House in that language. Even after that, what is the guarantee that I would be returned after 1972? As far as Tamil Nad is concerned, a qualification in Hindi is most likely to be considered as a disqualification as far as the electorate is concerned. This is the real position there.

So, these are all basic issues. How can anybody suspect the *bona fides* or honest intentions of the member when such a Bill comes before the House? I strongly feel that the Government should accept this Bill.

With regard to the attitude of the Government, I want to say a few words. I brought to the notice of the Speaker and with his permission on the floor of the House also some difficulties about the copies of proceedings sent to Members. At present, Hindi speeches are recorded in Hindi and English speeches are recorded in English. It so happens that a Minister or a Member begins speaking in English or Hindi and after sometime switches on to Hindi or English with the result the speech is partly English and partly Hindi. We are getting simultaneous translation in the House but when we go to consult the speeches in the Library, we are confronted with this difficulty and we have to refer only to the summarised version or we have to consult yet another translated version for that portion. I wrote to the Speaker that we should get a unilingual copy that we opt for; if I want an English version—which is the only language that we can understand here—we should be supplied that version. Those who want Hindi version can be supplied Hindi version. This is simple and involves no additional expenditure. I wrote to the Prime Minister about this in February and she replied that she had referred the matter to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to do the needful. Nothing has been done; five months have passed. I refer to this matter only to show that even in matters involving so much of inconvenience to Members of Parliament, the Government is indifferent. As I said already, no additional expenditure is involved. I have not asked for translation to be given to me in Tamil which is my own language. I have asked for a translation to be given in English. It is a foreign language but it is still a language which I can understand. Such simple and reasonable requests are not conceded. This attitude will only fan the anti-Hindi feeling that is already there. Government should see that as early as possible they make arrangements to use all the languages here and simultaneous translation is provided in these languages. We have been known for our tolerance and patience but Government should not take advantage of it unduly and force us to take extreme steps...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are widening the scope of the discussion. The scope here is very limited.

**SHRI S. KANDAPPAN :** ...which we ourselves are reluctant to take. I appeal to the Government to accept this Bill.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I have received ten or eleven slips. Even if I were to give only five minutes, it is not possible.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Extend the time by half an hour.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Even if I extend the time by half an hour, I cannot give more time.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** I have to go to the Rajya Sabha.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** I cannot take that into consideration. I must look to the sense of the House. I can extend the time by half an hour. But I request Members to be very brief.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** I shall intervene in the debate earlier and later on the Mover will give his final reply.

**SHRI S. KANDAPPAN :** Are they accepting the Bill ?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** No, no. But apart from that, I am sorry so many Members would like to participate, but..

**SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) :** Give more time.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** ...the time is limited, at the most I can give five minutes each. We will try to conclude as early as possible.

**श्री ओंकार लाल बोहरा (चित्तौड़गढ़) :**  
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्री सेझियान को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि आखिरकार उन्होंने इस बात को महसूस किया कि इस संसद में हमें अपनी अपनी भाषाओं में बोलने की सुविधा मिलनी चाहिये। आज तक जो स्थिति रही उस में हम केवल अंग्रेजी में या हिन्दी में ही इस संसद में भाषण करते रहे। आज तक हम केवल इन दो भाषाओं का ही प्रयोग पार्लियामेंट के फ्लोर पर करते रहे। मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती अगर मैं माननीय सदस्य के इस बिल का हार्दिक समर्थन कर सकता। मुझे इस बात से पूरी सहमति है कि लोकतन्त्र के अन्दर जनता की भावनाओं को दृष्टि में रखते हुए

संविधान में आठवें परिशिष्ट के अन्दर जो भी भाषाएं स्वीकृति को गई हैं उनके प्रयोग का अधिक से अधिक अवसर मिलना चाहिये और उनमें जनता की भावनाओं को व्यक्त करने की अधिक से अधिक आजादी होनी चाहिये। आखिरकार, हम यहां पर जनता की भावनाओं को रखने के लिये ही तो आये हैं। कई संसद के सदस्य अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं और कई हिन्दी नहीं जानते हैं। कई ऐसे हैं जो न हिन्दी जानते हैं और न अंग्रेजी जानते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उनका अधिकार है कि हम उनको अपनी मातृ भाषा में बोलने का अवसर दें। मेरा खयाल है कि हमारा यह परम्परा रही भी है और उनको यह अवसर बराबर दिया जाता रहा है।

15.32 Hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMAL RAO in the Chair]

लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में जो पेचोदा स्थिति रहा है उसका जिक्र करके मैं अपना स्थान ग्रहण करूंगा। मान लीजिये कि एक सदस्य तमिल में, अपनी मातृ भाषा में, बोल रहे हैं तो तमिल में बोलते समय हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी दोनों में एक साथ अनुवाद किया जाये, अगर कोई कन्नड़ में बोल रहे हैं तो उस का अनुवाद अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी में किया जा सके और जो इन भाषाओं को नहीं जानते हैं साथ ही कन्नड़ भी नहीं जानते हैं, सिर्फ तमिल जानते हैं तो उनके लिये तमिल में भी अनुवाद साथ-साथ होना चाहिये। इस तरह से जो सदस्य केवल तमिल जानते हैं उनके लिये कितनी भाषाओं के अनुवाद की व्यवस्था रहेगी? मैं तो कहता हूँ कि सदस्य महोदय अपनी भाषा में बोलना चाहें तो यह उनका हक है और उन्हें उसमें बोलने का मौका मिलना चाहिये, लेकिन हम को और दृष्टियों से भी इस पर विचार करना चाहिये।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हम लोगों ने अपने संविधान के अन्दर हिन्दी को एक राष्ट्र भाषा स्वीकार किया था। इसके बारे में संविधान का हवाला देकर आपके सामने सिद्ध करने की

आवश्यकता मैं नहीं समझता। सच बात तो यह है कि जिस समय हम आजाद हुए थे, उसके पहले हिन्दी को दक्षिण भारत, बंगाल, गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र के करोड़ों लोगों का हादिक समर्थन प्राप्त था। हिन्दी केवल हिन्दी भाषा प्रदेशों से आये हुए सदस्यों की वजह से संविधान में स्वीकृत नहीं हुई थी। मैं इस बात को स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा तब स्वीकृत हुई थी जब दक्षिण भारत, बंगाल, गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र या अहिन्दी भाषा भाषा प्रदेशों के सदस्यों ने उसके लिए सहमति दी थी। यह निश्चय किया गया था कि देश की एक भाषा होगी केन्द्र के अन्दर, और संसद् के अन्दर तथा वह हिन्दी होगी। इसको लाने के लिये पन्द्रह वर्ष का समय निश्चित किया गया था। मैं नहीं चाहता कि संविधान का हवाला देकर या चूँकि मैं हिन्दी भाषा प्रदेश से आता हूँ इसलिये हिन्दी को वकालत करूँ या यह कहूँ कि हिन्दी किसी पर लादी जाये। अगर हिन्दी लादी जाकर राष्ट्र भाषा स्वीकृत हुई होती तो उस समय दक्षिण भारत, बंगाल, महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के सदस्य विरोध कर सकते थे। अपने उन भाइयों का हम को हादिक अभिनन्दन करना चाहिये जिन्होंने बिना किसी प्रकार का होला हवाला किये हुए, बिना किसी विरोध एक स्वर से देश के करोड़ों लोगों द्वारा बोली जाने वाली भाषा को राष्ट्र भाषा स्वीकार किया, जिस प्रकार आजादी के पहले हम लोगों ने एक झंडे, एक दृष्टि और एक भावना के अन्तर्गत कि हम को साम्राज्यवाद से लड़ना है, अपनी आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी। हमने देखा कि स्वयम् श्री राजगोपालाचार्य ने, गांधी जी ने, बंगाल के बड़े-बड़े मनोषियों ने, सुभाष बाबू ने हिन्दी सोची। और भी बड़े-बड़े नेताओं ने हिन्दी सोची। और क्यों न सोखें? हिन्दी कोई हिन्दी भाषा भाषा प्रदेशों की ही बपीती नहीं है। इस लिये जब हम हिन्दी की कोई बात करते हैं तो हमारे मन में यह भावना नहीं आनी चाहिये कि यह कोई प्रान्तीयता का सवाल है।

अब रहा सवाल इस बात का कि अगर हम हिन्दी या अंग्रेजी नहीं बोल सकते हैं तो हम अपनी मातृ भाषा में क्यों न बोलें? जैसा अभी मैंने निवेदन किया, यह उनका हक है कि वह अपनी भाषा में बोलें और यह हक उन्हें मिलना चाहिये। हमें इसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये। लेकिन कल्पना कीजिए कि मैं केरल से आया हुआ हूँ और मलयालम में बोलना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मलयालम में बोल कर मैं सभी भाषाओं के आदमियों तक अपनी आवाज नहीं पहुँचा सकता क्योंकि जो आदमी न तो अंग्रेजी जानते हैं और न हिन्दी जानते हैं, केवल बंगला जानते हैं या कन्नड़ जानते हैं, वह उसको नहीं समझ सकेंगे? तब हमें कितनी भाषाओं के अनुवाद की व्यवस्था करनी पड़ेगी? इस तरह से यह मसला पेचीदा हो जायेगा। इस लिये इस पर हम को बड़ी गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये।

मैं विधेयक के इस सिद्धान्त से सहमत हूँ कि हमें अपनी भाषा में बोलने की सुविधा होनी चाहिये, हक होना चाहिये, लेकिन यह हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता का ही प्रश्न नहीं है, यह संविधान का प्रश्न भी नहीं है, बल्कि संसद् में काम कितनी सुविधा और सुगमता से हो सकता है, इसका प्रश्न है। इसलिये इस बिल के अन्दर जो खास बात है कि सभी भाषाओं के अनुवाद की व्यवस्था हो, इसके बारे में हमारी कठिनाइयाँ क्या हैं इस को सोचने का मौका संसद्, को मिलना चाहिये ताकि वह इसकी गहराई में जा सके। इस प्रस्ताव के पास कर देने से सभी सदस्य चाहेंगे, जो अपनी मातृ भाषा में बोलना चाहते हैं, कि उनकी आवाज करोड़ों लोगों तक पहुँचे, सभी उन की बात को सुनें और समझें। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं नहीं समझता कि यहां पर जो अवसर मिलता है हिन्दी में बोलने का तब एक भाषा में बोलने का, जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों द्वारा समझी, पढ़ी और लिखी जाती है, हम लोग विचार क्यों न करें?

## [श्री ओंकारलाल बोहरा]

इसके साथ-साथ मुझे एक निवेदन और करना है। इस बिल में जो भी स्कोम रखी गई है अंग्रेजी को साथ-साथ चलाने को, उस के बारे में मैं एक बात स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस बिल का इस शर्त पर समर्थन कर सकता हूँ कि प्रस्तावक महोदय इसमें से अंग्रेजी हटा दें। कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है कि इसमें अंग्रेजी रखी जाये। जो भी संविधान की 14 भाषायें हैं उन के साथ हम अंग्रेजी को क्यों रखें। केवल हिन्दो में अनुवाद हो और हम धी-धीरे हिन्दो को स्वीकार करते चले जायें। हम उसके अनुकूल होते चले जायें।

जब यहाँ पर सब भाषाओं के अनुवाद की बात चल रही है तब मैं अपने मित्र श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोगा की इस बात में सहमत नहीं हूँ कि केवल चार भाषायें चुन ली जायें तब इस पर सब एकमत हो जायेंगे। चार-पांच भाषाएँ चुन ली जाने के बाद दूसरी भाषाओं के लोग समझेंगे कि उनको साथ समाप्त हुआ है और अब अपने नेतृत्व में भाषाओं को स्वीकार करने के लिए आगे बढ़ेंगे। इन लिये बुनियादी तौर पर हमें जो लक्ष्य दिमाग में इस बात को स्पष्ट विद्यमान है कि अगर हम कोई देश को राष्ट्रभाषा विकसित करना चाहते हैं तो हमें उनके ऊपर ईमानदारी और प्रतिष्ठा के साथ काम करना चाहिये। आज हिन्दो को देश ने स्वीकार किया है तो राष्ट्रिय एकता के लिये सच्चे मन से हम को इसको मानना चाहिये।

अब मैं आप का अधिक समय न लेते हुए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ इस शर्त पर कि हमारे माननीय सदस्य या तो राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दो में बोलें या फिर अपनी मातृ भाषा में बोलें। मातृ भाषा में बोलने का उनका हक है और उन्हें उनको बोलने दिया जाना चाहिये। संविधान में स्वीकृत 14 भाषाओं की परम्परा को स्वीकृत करते हुए और अंग्रेजी को निकालते हुए हम इस बिल का हादिक समर्थन करें। अंग्रेजी का रहना देश के लिये ठीक नहीं है,

देश को प्रतिष्ठा के लिये उचित नहीं है। आज केरल के लोग जिस भाषा में बोलते हैं, उसे अपनी मातृ भाषा में अपनी भावना को अभिव्यक्ति करें, यह बात तो समझ में आती है, लेकिन जो हमारे तमिल भाषा भाषी मद्रास के मित्र अपनी मातृ भाषा के साथ साथ अंग्रेजी का भी चाहते हैं, उनको बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। मैं नहीं समझ पाता कि क्यों करा तुफ है।

इसलिये इन विधेयक का हादिक समर्थन करते हुए मैं निवेदन कलंगा कि इसमें से अंग्रेजी को हटा दिया जाये।

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a simple but very essential Bill which I wish Government has the wisdom to accept in principle. There might be some technical complication to be encountered if this Bill is going to be operated, but in regard to that, we might leave it to the future. But the Government might very well accept this measure in principle.

I am very glad that this Bill has had support generally speaking from all sides of the House. Except for a diversion of the speech by Mr. Sheo Narain, everybody has supported the substance of the measure. It was specially notable that our venerable friend, Seth Govind Das, supported this measure, even though he put in a caveat, as did my friend over there, against the intrusion of English in this proposal.

The substance of this Bill the Government should have no hesitation in accepting because, if democracy in our country is going to have any meaning at all, it is quite clear that discussion in Parliament has got to be held in our own Indian languages. More and more those whom the people of the country are sending as their representatives in Parliament are very fortunately not the kind of people who used to come to legislatures in the olden days and so many of them do not happen to know English or Hindi, which are the two languages now current in our Parliament, and it will be quite impossible to function in Parliament in the near future if we have the present rule in regard to Hindi and English being the only two permissible languages. Even as it is, quite frequently

the Chair permits what is a technical violation of the Constitution—but the Chair does it with very good reason, and everybody supports the Chair—when speeches are made in a language which is not either Hindi or English. My hon. friend over there quite frequently makes speeches in Kannada and everybody has to listen, but we like the whole idea in spite of the fact that an article or other of the Constitution goes against it. Now the Chair has very willingly come forward to recognise this matter on principle, and there is nothing to prevent government from coming forward here and now to say that they accept this Bill on principle, that there are certain difficulties, technical complications which are going to be seen to in the immediate future.

The only difficulty that can arise appears to be the difficulty in regard to simultaneous translation, but if for the time being, simultaneous translation is rendered into Hindi and English, the speech in Oriya or in Malayalam would be translated into Hindi and English, only one additional effort is needed for the time being, and this can perhaps be done without much difficulty.

Some of us happened to be in the Soviet Union recently with the Speaker at the head of our delegation, and we tried to find out what they do in regard to simultaneous translation. They have a provision in their Supreme Soviet for translation into thirteen languages. They do not usually need to have it but that is a different matter. They are in a fortunate position because Russian is a language very largely understood, and even largely spoken, by people who do not belong to the Russian nationality. But, anyhow, technically it is possible to have translation into thirteen different languages.

Now, this matter can very well be looked into in more details, our technicians could look into this matter and it could easily be done. As I said before, this thing should not be postponed. Because, after all, when you come down to brass tacks, a man is always happier when he uses his own language. We may learn Hindi or English so that we might be able to speak in it, but those of us who do not belong to the Hindi-speaking area, we do not learn Hindi as

we imbibe our mother's milk. We learn our own language and there is no shame in it. Shri Sheo Narain tried some cheap jibe at the expense of people who are non-Hindi-speaking, who cannot speak Hindi when they go abroad and he said how it is a matter of shame. It is nothing of that sort. We are a multi-lingual country and it is not a matter of shame that we are a multi-lingual country. And in spite of our being a multi-lingual country there is a cultural unity in this country which transcends so many divisions, linguistic or other. There is no shame if some of us are not able to speak in Hindustani.

Besides, if we rake up the past and talk in that way, we shall only delay and, perhaps, prevent the solution of our linguistic problems. Raking up the past would mean that we remember how Mahatma Gandhi's suggestion regarding Hindustani, and not the kind of Sanskritised Hindi which has no life of its own, which would not developed as a really popular language and that kind of thing, but Hindustani, if that was the national language, if it could be written in Devanagari as well as in the Persian script, which was Gandhiji's suggestion, if that idea was brought forward and implemented in 1917 and in the immediately following years, possibly all this linguistic trouble would have been nipped in the bud.

But that has not happened and it is no use crying over spilt milk; it is no use merely beating our breasts and saying, "We did not do this or did not do that 20 years ago." It so happens that we are confronted today with a particular situation. How do we deal with it? Here is a very reasonable request and I personally am quite sympathetic to the idea that we do away with English. The sooner we can do away with English the better; the sooner we can do away with this kind of slavish mentality which persists in our minds that a speech in English would mean something more significant, would get better publicity in the papers and that kind of thing, the sooner we get rid of that mentality the better for all of us. But the practical problem today is that there are so many of us who do not know Hindi and, therefore, for their purposes English has got to continue for at least a certain length of time. If a really sympathetic and understanding approach is

## Bill

## Bill

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]  
adopted on the linguistic problem, maybe after a decade or so we can fix upon one or two Indian languages as the languages which could be understood by all our people.

Therefore I feel that English has got to be retained on account of practical considerations which we cannot brush aside. But the Bill only asks for something which is on principle absolutely unexceptionable. The Bill only gives rise to a certain minor technical complication which could easily be managed if the Government is serious about it. Therefore I suggest to Government that they accept the view of the House as already expressed in the different speeches made, accept on principle the Bill and leave the implementation of it to further discussion and consideration of the problems involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Panigrahi.

SHRI RABI RAY (Puri) : *Spoke a few words in Oriya.*

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : *Spoke a few words in Oriya.*

SHRI RABI RAY : *Spoke a few words in Oriya.*

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend asks me to speak in Oriya. I am willing to speak if the House can understand it.

Just now I heard our friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, who spoke on this occasion. I hope there is not much of difference so far as the spirit of this Bill is concerned. I quite agree with Shri Sezhiyan and all those friends who have said that the Government should accept it in principle. In effect we have accepted it in principle; *de facto* acceptance is there. Almost all the recognised languages are being spoken; whoever likes to speak in them can do so.

The question arises as to the simultaneous translation of the 15 languages that have been included in the Eighth Schedule. Of course, as Shri Mukerjee has pointed out, and perhaps all our friends will agree, there may be some technical difficulties. I have had the opportunity of attending some of the international gatherings where in fact five languages have been accepted for simultaneous translation, namely, French, English, Russian, Spanish and Chinese.

We cannot say that all these 14 languages that we have accepted in the Eighth Schedule have no tradition. Take, for instance, Oriya; we have a tradition of 2,000 or 3,000 years. Or, take the case of Tamil; it has a rich heritage extending to 3,000 years. Almost all the languages, Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, have rich heritage extending to thousands of years. We want to develop them. The Government of India is spending crores of rupees for developing all the languages. It is good that we are spending huge sums for developing these languages. It is good that they also get recognition in this sovereign House; otherwise, there is no meaning in it.

Now because we are extending the scope of democracy more and more people are gradually participating in the administration of this country both at the Centre and in the States as also at the village level. Even 15 years ago we could not conceive of it. When today millions of people are participating in the administration of the country, it is good and necessary that the respective languages must be given due dignity and priority in the transaction of business in this House.

I, therefore, quite sympathise with the spirit of this Bill, but I would request the Government and the hon. Minister that while taking into consideration the spirit of the Bill they must try to find out whether it is really possible technically. I think, there might be difficulties as Shri Bohra pointed out in translating simultaneously into 14 languages. That is different. But once we accept the principle, it can be worked out. Therefore, without going into details, I extend my full support to the spirit underlying the Bill.

I hope, keeping in view that this country is a multi-lingual country having a rich heritage of language and culture, it is good that the Government should accept the Bill in principle and should try to see that all the languages get the facility of being used in the business of the House. At the same time, they should try to find out how far it is technically possible to have simultaneous translation of all the different languages.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The debate on this Bill is to conclude by 4 o' Clock. Let us give 10 minutes to the Minister to reply.

I think most of the Members are agreed on the principle of the Bill.

श्री रवि राय : सभापति महोदय, कम-से-कम एक घंटा बढ़ा दिया जाये। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not in my hands. Many arguments are common. Therefore, I would request the parties to cooperate with me. The Minister has got some other work. When he is in a mood to accept the principle of the Bill, it is better to take it earlier than delaying it.

SHRI DINKAR DESAI (Kanara) : You should give chance to representatives of each group.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not in my hands to implement your suggestion. The time remaining was only 1 hour and 12 minutes. You must give 10 minutes to the Minister to reply.

श्री रवि राय : डिप्युटी स्पीकर ने आघ-घंटा तो पहले ही बढ़ा दिया है।

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Ernakulam) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the mover of this Bill because it is one of the most important subjects affecting the national unity and the national integration. I remember the day when we had a discussion about having a Parliament session at Bangalore. Then also, the question came up that by merely having a session at Bangalore or Hyderabad or at any Southern area, will not solve the problem. The main problem we have to solve is the question of language. The equality of languages must be recognised by Parliament. Recognising all the languages in Parliament means that if I speak in Malayalam, that must be understood by others simultaneously and for that such a machinery must be arranged. That is the only way out. Although I can speak some English or, even if I want, I can manage to speak some Hindi, my ideas, my feelings, can be expressed more fully and adequately only in my mother tongue. Hence, such an arrangement is highly essential. The Congress Government that has been ruling the country for the last 20 years has not done that. The time has now come when the Congress Government must take a decision to implement such a progressive measure

and they must come forward to accept this Bill.

I remember the day, when the debate was going on about having a session of Parliament in the south, when the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, promised before this House that they were thinking about it and that they were considering it. My humble submission is that the Minister should accept this amendment. After accepting this amendment, we can, naturally, proceed further and solve some technical difficulties. Some of my friends were saying that simultaneous translation of 14 languages is difficult and all that. These are small things. Comrade, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, has already said about what happens in the Soviet Union. My humble submission is : If there is a will, there is a way. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has already promised that he will do it. My humble submission is that this amendment should be accepted. After accepting the amendment, within such and such time we can arrange all those things. After all, 14 cabinets must be arranged and some machinery must also be arranged. So far as the technical part is concerned, the Soviet experts can come here and it can be done in no time. We are spending a lot of money on various things. If you really want national integration in this country, then this must be done. I am coming from the southern-most State where we speak Malayalam. If an ordinary Malayalee is elected and he comes over here, he must get a chance to speak in his mother-tongue, and the facility of simultaneous translation must be there. My hon. friend, Mr. J. H. Patel, always speaks in his mother-tongue in Parliament. But we cannot understand him. We must have the facility of understanding him simultaneously as and when he speaks; he may be saying very important things and we must understand that; then only, the debate can be conducted properly; only if we understand, can we answer those points and support or oppose the views expressed. So, such an arrangement is highly essential if you want the unity of the country to prevail. If Mr. Sheo Narain's attitude is taken, then we can realise what will happen. My humble submission is that these Hindi fanatics have done much harm to the Hindi language; to speak the truth, that is the correct thing. I am not going into the lar-

[Shri Viswanatha Menon]

ger question. My humble submission is that at least in Parliament there must be equality of languages and for that purpose, such a machinery must be accepted. My humble submission is that this amendment, which has come very correctly and in time, must be accepted. I congratulate the Mover once more and I give all the support to his Bill on behalf of my Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. J. H. Patel.

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands) : We also want to speak. Please be fair to this side also.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am not partial to anybody; I have to maintain the balance.

Mr. J. H. Patel.

SHRI J. H. PATEL\* (Shimoga) : I support the Bill brought forward by the member of the D.M.K. It is important that when a member speaks it should be understood by everybody.

When I speak, you should understand, and when I speak in this Lok Sabha which is the 'House of the People', it should be understood by all the people just as I have an obligation to speak in a language understood by the House, the House of the People should transact in such languages which are understood by the people. House of People without people's languages is a mockery of the Constitution and of democracy. Otherwise the very words "Lok Sabha" have no meaning and it would then be termed as "Pur-lok Sabha".

(परलोक सभा)

It is therefore necessary that the transaction of business in Lok Sabha should be in a language which is understood by everybody. It was in this connection only that I suggested to the Speaker and the Prime Minister in March, 1967 to have arrangements made for the simultaneous translation of my speech—a regional language into other languages. But so far no action seems to have been taken.

We do not hesitate to construct revolving tower or embark upon any schemes, which are luxurious and costly, because we had seen them in foreign countries. We want to introduce automation, because now this is the keynote in the West. In all these matters we spend large sums of money. But to introduce a basic thing and essential thing which is vital to the large majority,

we delay and vasilate. I therefore request that Government should think over this problem and see that proper arrangements are made for translating speeches of members speaking in their respective regional languages into other languages.

16 Hrs.

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : चेयरमैन महोदय, यह जो बहस हाउस के सामने है, इसके दो पहलुओं पर हम गौर कर सकते हैं— एक आइनी पहलू और एक सियासी पहलू। आइनी पहलू तो इस बहस का यह है कि विधान पर हम नजर डालें तो हर एक का बुनियादी हक है कि वह जिस जवान में भी अपने ख्यालात का इजहार करना चाहे कर सकता है। जब बाहर कर सकता है तो हाउस में क्यों नहीं कर सकता? एक बात तो यह है। दूसरी यह कि आज से तीन चार महीने पहले हमने रेजोल्यूशन पास किया, लेंगेज बिल सामने आया, ऐक्ट बन गया कि तमाम इलाकों की जवानों जो हिन्दुस्तान की हैं, उनकी पूरे जोर से परवरिश की जायगी। अगर की जायगी तो यहां उस जवान में बोलना भी उस जवान की परवरिश करना है। जब बाहर परवरिश की जाती है हिन्दी की, बंगला की, तामिल की, तेलगू की, मलयालम की, उर्दू की या पंजाबी की या हरियानवी जवान की तो यहां क्यों न की जाय? मैं यह आइनी पहलू रख रहा हूँ। मेरे भाई ने जो यह बिल पेश किया यह न सिर्फ कानूनी नजर से ठीक है बल्कि अखलाकी तौर से भी हम सब का यह फर्ज है न सिर्फ हाउस का बल्कि सारे देश का कि हर एक भाई की जो जवान है कन्याकुमारी से लेकर इधर लद्दाख तक और आसाम से लेकर गुजरात तक हर एक की जवान की तरक्की हो... (व्यवधान) ... चेयरमैन साहब, मैं अजं कर रहा था कि डंडे के जोर से कोई बात नहीं चलेगी चाहे हिन्दी वालों की मेजारिटी हो, चाहे अन्ग्रेजी वालों की मेजारिटी हो चाहे दूसरी किसी भाषा वालों की मेजारिटी हो, कोई भाषा किसी आदमी पर जबरदस्ती थोपी नहीं जा सकती न लिखने में न बोलने में। मैं सौ

\*The original speech was delivered in Kannada.

प्रतिशत साउथ के अपने भाइयों के साथ इस मामले में हूँ कि इन की जो जवान है पूरे तौर से उस जवान की परवरिश होनी चाहिए। रहा सवाल यह कि यहां कितने पैसे इस में लगेंगे तो यह दुकानदार की दुकान नहीं है, यह हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट है। कितने पैसे खर्च होंगे, इसका सवाल नहीं उठाया जा सकता। जितने भी पैसे खर्च होंगे उस का बन्दोबस्त करना होगा। मेरे फाजिल दोस्त ने बिलकुल ठीक उस की बात की जहां सौ जवानों के आदमी बगते हैं और सौ जवानों के अलग-अलग सोवियट रिपब्लिक्स हैं, जब यहां बन्दोबस्त है, सुप्रीम सोवियट में उनके बोलने का तो यहां क्यों नहीं हो सकता। वह इस्तेमाल करें या न करें, यह दूसरी बात है। और मैं तो इस व्यू का हूँ कि बन्दोबस्त आप कर दें कि कोई आदमी हिन्दी में या अपने प्रान्त की जवान में बोलना चाहे तो बोल सकता है, तो ऐसी स्थिति हो सकती है कि जो ट्रांसलेटर्स हैं उनको इस्तेमाल करने की जरूरत न पड़े क्योंकि आज तो यह स्थिति इसलिए है कि वह यह समझते हैं कि यहां एक जवान है दूसरी नहीं होगी, इस वास्ते यह बात ज्यादा होती है। यह तो हुई आइनी बात।

दूसरी बात है सियासी। चेरमैन महोदय, मैं इस बात का कायल हूँ कि देश के इन्टीग्रेशन पर, नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन पर, इमोशनल इन्टीग्रेशन पर, इस बात का बहुत अच्छा असर पड़ेगा। लोग महसूस करेंगे कि हां, रवादारी है, टालरेशन है, एक दूसरे की व्यू को एकमोडेट करने का माद्दा है। इन्होंने यह बिल पेश कर के जो बात हम आज तक ऐसे नहीं कर सके थे उसको करने का मौका सामने ला दिया। इसके द्वारा अब हम उसको कर सकेंगे। इसलिए इसको आने दीजिए। उनकी जवान ज्यादा मुश्किल है, एक किसान उसे जल्दी सीख नहीं सकता। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ और अपने सब भाइयों से जो नार्थ के हैं उनसे कहूंगा कि साउथ की जवान में तकरीर करना सीखें। वह साउथ की कोई जवान से लें, मलयालम

हो, तामिल हो, कोई भी जवान जो उन को अच्छी लगे, वह ले लें और उस में तकरीर करें और इसी तरह साउथ वाले भाइयों से कहूंगा जो मेरे प्यारे भाई यहां बैठे हैं, जो बड़े ही होशियार हैं, वह भी नार्थ की किसी जवान में बंगला में, हिन्दी, में हरयानवी में, राजस्थानी में, काश्मीर की जवान में, इनमें से किसी में बोलना सीखें लव वीगेट्स लव। अगर हम उनसे प्यार करेंगे तो वह हमसे दुगुना प्यार करेंगे। अगर हम इनकी बात नहीं मानेंगे, अगर हम अपनी बात को ठूंसें, यहां भी और वाहर भी, तो मैं इनके साथ हूँ, मैं नहीं चाहूंगा कि कोई बात किसी के ऊपर जबरदस्ती ठूंसी जाय।

तो मैं पूरे जोर से शिद्दत के साथ जो बात महसूस करता हूँ वह यह है कि भाई चारे से, रवादारी से और एक दूसरे के परसुएशन के तरीके से तो चाहे सब से हिन्दी बुलवा लो, लेकिन जबरदस्ती कोई एक राठ के जरिए से, फौनेटिसिज्म से कोई बात नहीं हो सकती है और न हमें करनी चाहिए। तो यह जो बिल हाउस के सामने आया है मैं समझता हूँ कि सियासी नजर से भी यह जरूरी है और आइनी नजर से भी यह तकाजा है कि यह बात होनी चाहिए। मेरे भाई ने जो बात कही है मैं तो ट्रेजरी बेंच से भी और अपने नौजवान मंत्री शुक्ल जी से कहूंगा कि इसकी स्पिरिट को पकड़ें और अगर होम मिनिस्टर इस बात को इम्प्लीमेंट करें तो बड़ा शानदार देश के इत्तहाद में, देश की हिफाजत में, देश की एकता, उसकी तरक्की, उस के बचाव, देश के इन्टीग्रेशन और आइन्दा देश की मजबूती के लिए यह बात बड़ी कामयाब होगी और इसका बड़ा असर पड़ेगा।

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : My task has been made very easy because of the speech of Mr. Randhir Singh. He has put so many good things today into a single small speech.

The argument has been made on the ground of understanding of the language. I will go a little further. It is not merely

## Bill

## Bill

[Shri Tenneti Viswanatham]

a question of understanding. It is a question of equality and equal dignity of all the languages of this country. We have divided India on linguistic basis and the Constitution says, every time the matter comes up here Parliament says, that all languages are equal and have got equal status. When we come to this forum, what do we find actually? I suppose there are 12 crores of people who are educated in this country and about 6-7 crores will be reading newspapers. In the morning and evening when they open the newspaper what is it they find? They find English or Hindi, they do not find the dignity of their language maintained in the central forum of this great Nation. It is here that we want that equality, not in the Eighth Schedule, it is here that we want encouragement of our own languages, not in our States where certainly they are the official languages.

After all, are not our languages good enough to sit in the same seat or 'gadi' in this House as Hindi or English? Is not the language spoken by Tagore good enough to be spoken here and to be reported as it is spoken in the newspapers? Is not the language spoken by Bal Gangadhar Tilak good enough, is not the language in which Upendra Bhanj wrote the Ramayana, *Vaidehi Vilasa*, fit enough to have the same status as other languages? We should have it here. The language in which Thiagaraja wrote, the language which was the mother tongue of Sankaracharya and the language in which Kambar wrote are not these good enough and should they not have the same status in this national forum? Take for example Mr. Randhir Singh's speech. It was fairly all right and we could understand it without a translation. Please do give us that sense of equality and dignity. Then it will not merely be national integration but it will be natural integration of the nation. That will be when we have got the right to speak our own language outside and in my State, why cannot I do so in this forum? I must have the facility. Mr. Patil spoke in Kannada; he always speaks in Canarese. He has to be understood by others?... (*An Hon. Member* : He has suffered for that). He is not suffering; we are all suffering. For example, he said a very nice thing: this is not Lok Sabha; this is para Lok Sabha. When you do not have the language of the people, it

will be para Lok Sabha so far as those people are concerned. That is the reason why I want this Bill to be passed and implemented with as much alacrity as possible. If that is done with sincerity and speed, all the national problems in the way of national integration will be solved in the most natural way. That is why I say there will be natural integration. I heartily support this Bill and I commend this for the sincere acceptance and implementation by the Government.

SHRI DINKAR DESAI (Kanara) : I rise to support wholeheartedly this Bill. Without taking much time, I shall confine myself to the translation question. My friend Mr. Patil spoke in Kannada; he always speaks in Kannada. What is the result? His speech is not translated into Hindi or English. We have thus shown disrespect to that Member because we have said: we do not want to hear your speech and know what you say. It is disrespect not only to him but to the language which he speaks, to the Mysore State which speaks that language and to the people who have elected him to this august body. More than that, it is disrespect to the whole of Indian democracy. No democracy is complete unless it allows a Member to speak in his own mother tongue. There are other implications as well. The electorate may feel or say: "what is the use of sending a Member to Lok Sabha if he cannot speak English or Hindi; and if he speaks his own mother tongue, it is not translated into either of these two languages; nobody understands him." You are thus restricting the right of the electorate also. Anyone who is above 25 years of age can be a candidate. But in practice, this is the restriction that is placed. What is the percentage of people who can express themselves well in Hindi or English? Five per cent. If the choice is restricted to that five per cent, is that democracy? Our Congress friends say: we accept this Bill in principle and in spirit, but not in practice. This is dishonesty. That is what the Government also says: we accept the principle but do not want to put it into practice. It is practicable to have translation arrangements. It must be done. If in the Soviet Union, there could be translation arrangements simultaneously in 13 languages, can it not be done for 15 languages in India? Instead of 13 buttons, you have to place 15 buttons in front of your seat; it is not at all difficult. How it is impossi-

ble, I would like to know. If 13 buttons could enable you to listen to every language, 15 buttons could also do the same work. It is a simple proposition. Even an ordinary man can understand this. Is it not practicable ?

Today, we are flying to the moon. Science has advanced so much. But at the same time, we do not want to keep 15 buttons in front of our seats so that democracy can be complete! That is why I request the Government to accept this proposition. It is no use speaking in our own language and not getting a translation of it. It must be translated.

My hon. friend talked about national integration. Translation will help integration also. Then there was the question of costs which may extend to a few lakhs of rupees. It does not matter if a few lakhs of rupees for a country like India are spent on this. There is a proposal for increasing our allowance. Stop that. We do not want even a single rupee more, but even if it costs Rs. 50 lakhs for making the translation arrangements, those arrangements must be made in this House.

With these words, I wholeheartedly support the Bill and I do hope that the Government will accept it not only in spirit and in principle but in actual practice from the next session onwards.

श्री अब्दुलगनी दार (गुडगांव) : चेयरमैन साहब, चौधरी रणधीर सिंह के एक-एक लफ्ज की मैं ताईद करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि शुक्ला साहब इस रेडोल्यूशन को कबूल फ़रमायेंगे ।

[شری عبدالغنی دار (گڑگانوں)]

چیرمین صاحب چودھری زندھیر سنگہ کے ایک ایک لفظ کی میں تائید کرتا ہوں اور امید کرتا ہوں کہ شکلا صاحب اس ریزولوشن کو قبول

فرمائیں گے]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as the House knows, it has been the firm policy of the Government to

encourage all the 15 national languages in the country, and in pursuance of this policy, we have announced recently that in the Union Public Service Commission examinations we shall permit candidates to appear in all the 15 national languages of the country. Also, in pursuance of this policy, several other measures have been taken and I would invite the attention of the hon. Members to the new educational policy that has been enunciated by the Government, in which also it has been provided that the highest education would be now possible in the Indian languages which are provided in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.

As far as this particular policy is concerned, it is not a policy of the post-Independence era. Even before Independence, this policy was adopted by the Indian National Congress when they adopted a resolution regarding the linguistic States. It was then laid down that after Independence, India should be reorganised on the basis of the regional languages so that the administrative units could conduct their administration in the people's language. It is apparent that if there is more than one language spoken or used by the people of a particular State administrative unit, it may not be possible for the State to use one of those languages without difficulty. And that is why the linguistic States were formed in order to enable the State Governments to use the language of the people for the administration of that particular State.

Here, when this question is considered, the question of money is the least. There is no question of money or resources involved in this matter: neither is there any technical difficulty; there can be no technical difficulty. If there is need, and there is a decision that it has to be done, anything can be done. This is not a very major technical hurdle. The main question that we have to consider is that when we have two Union official languages at present, can the Union Parliament have 15 official languages here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not ?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: This is the main question. I am only posing the question. You have to consider this. This is the only point I would beseech our hon. Members to consider. Now the plea is made that all the 15 national

languages should be made Union official languages. This is the plea of certain parties in the country.

**SHRI DINKAR DESAI :** We have not said all the 15 national languages should be made Union official languages. We only want the 15 languages to be used for debates in the Parliament.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** I am not saying that the hon. member said it. I said, this proposal has been made by one of the political parties CPI(M)—that all the 15 languages of the country should be made Union official languages.

**SHRI DINKAR DESAI :** That is not the purpose of this Bill. Why should he mix up the two ?

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** The hon. member's case is not so weak as to get excited. I am only trying to develop the point and explain the practical difficulties before the Government in accepting this constitutional amendment.

We welcome the spirit of this Bill and we would not mind if these 15 languages are used here. But the point is, the Union of India has got now 2 official languages and ultimately it is envisaged that there will be only one official language. In that case, would it be possible or proper to have all the 15 languages as official languages in the Union Parliament ?

Prof. Mukerjee was pleased to say that there was a technical violation of the Constitution whenever any hon. member spoke in any language other than English or Hindi. I will invite his attention to article 120(1) which says :

“Provided that the Chairman of the Council of States or Speaker of the House of the People... may permit any member who cannot adequately express himself in Hindi or English to address the House in his mother tongue.”

So, it is not as if anybody violates the Constitution.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE :** It is necessary for the person concerned to get prior permission of the Chair and also furnish a copy of the speech which he is going to deliver. Here in this House that rule has been more or less abrogated.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** He is right, but that is not provided in the Constitution. The Constitution permits any hon. member to speak in his mother tongue without any hindrance. But the Speaker was somehow pleased to direct that there should be a translation, etc. That is only a direction which he can change at any time. The basic law of the country permits any hon. member to speak in his mother tongue in this House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** But the contention of the members is that the member who speaks in his mother tongue suffers from the handicap of not being understood by the rest of the House. Therefore, they want arrangements for translation.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** I was coming to that. First of all, there is no constitutional hindrance to speaking in one's mother tongue here. But the kind of handicap which you have been pleased to mention is somehow inherent in the whole scheme of things as it obtains in the country.

Now, take the question of the official language of the Union. The official language of the Union has been determined to be Hindi, and English has been taken as an associate official language. Now you can very clearly see that this gives a handicap to all those people in our country whose mother tongue is not Hindi. This is a fact with which we have to contend with. I am not saying that it is proper or improper but this is a situation in which we find ourselves, because this is the constitutional provision and position today.

**SHRI P. R. THAKUR (Nabadwip) :** The Constitution can be amended. Why not amend it ?

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :** But that is not what we are discussing—the amendment of the Constitution with a view to changing the official language of the Union. In that way, everything can be amended. Even the whole Constitution can be amended and thrown away. But that is not the point we are discussing. The point is, as the scheme exists today, as the constitutional position exists today, there is a certain amount of unfortunate handicap to those people in the country whose mother tongue is not Hindi, whose mother tongue is not English. That is the position. Whether it is a right position or wrong position

is another matter on which I am not expressing an opinion. The position being so, I am only saying that you cannot change that position by making a provision for use of all the 15 languages here. That is not going to make any appreciable difference in the position that exists today.

This is the point that I want to put forward in this House for the consideration of the hon. Members. It is not my case that what has been stated here by the hon. Members is wrong. It is quite right that hon. Members here should have the option to speak in their own mother tongue because that is the medium through which they can express themselves best and the present arrangement certainly causes a certain amount of handicap to those hon. Members who cannot speak Hindi or English in a proper manner. The constitution-makers foresaw this difficulty and provided for it in the Constitution by saying that members can speak here in other languages also.

My only point is that the overall position in our country is such that if we only take this matter regarding Union Parliament and leave the rest of the things as they are it will create all sorts of practical difficulties. I am not going into the technical difficulties or difficulties of finance, because they are not the main difficulties. The main difficulty is that in place of one Union official language we cannot have 15 languages. That is the difficulty. I hope hon. Members will consider this before they express their view on this matter.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : *Spoke a few words in Tamil.*

Mr. Chairman, in the introduction I wanted to thank all the hon. Members and all the parties which gave their valuable support to the Bill that I have brought forward. Sir, now for whose benefit am I supposed to speak? The Minister in charge is not present in the House.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Sir, is it proper for the Minister to walk away like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think he is coming back.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Then, should he wait till then to speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Minister in charge should have been present in the  
351 SS/68—11

House to hear the reply to the debate. This is not proper or fair.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : In the beginning, I want to express my thanks to all the members and parties that supported the Bill brought forward by me. I wanted to express my gratitude and thanks in my own mother tongue because it comes from my heart. That is why I expressed this in my own language.

Almost all the Members who participated in the discussion accepted my Bill. They unanimously, except for two dissenting voices from the Congress side—I am not dubbing the entire Congress Party because Shri Randhir Singh and Shri Panigrahi gave generous and wholehearted support—supported it.

AN HON. MEMBER : Seth Govind Das.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Also Seth Govind Das, the veteran Member to whom I made a reference on the last occasion itself when I moved the Bill. I pointed out then that as early as 1927 Seth Govind Das brought forward a Private Member's Resolution in the Central Assembly asking for this right for the Indian languages, specially Hindi and Urdu to be used along with English. The same facility or the same logic we now want to be extended to all the other languages which are now being used and which have attained the status of national languages in India. It is a very basic issue.

As I said in my opening speech, I did not want to encroach upon the entire ambit of the official language question. It is not the question of the Union official language. That comes under a different chapter and has different scope. My point in this Bill is confined only to what languages we, the Members, have got a right to express our thoughts in in this Parliament.

Here I can say that if I go to Ceylon, I find that in the Parliament there a member coming from a Tamil province is allowed to speak in Tamil.

AN HON. MEMBER : Translated also?

SHRI SEZHIYAN : And it is translated. If you go to Singapore, you will find that four languages—Chinese, Malaysian, Tamil and English—have been allowed in the

## Bill

## Bill

Singapore Parliament. A Tamilian in Singapore can speak in his language in the Singapore Parliament. The same thing is there in Malaysia.

When a small country like Singapore can afford four languages in Parliament, can we not, a big country, a vast sub-continent in which entire Europe minus Russia can be put, afford it? Should we not have the magnanimity or the dignity to accept equal status for all the languages?

The Minister was very pointed in his reply. He said that there was no practical difficulty. He said that once the principle was accepted we could implement it. At least one or two Members who gave qualified support said about practical difficulties, but the Minister erased even that idea. That means, in principle he is not accepting it; in principle he is not accepting the unanimous opinion of the House that all the languages should be given equal treatment and equal status here.

16.34 HRS.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Professor Mukerjee was kind enough to point out that in Soviet Russia there are facilities for all the 13 languages there to be spoken without any restriction or without any handicap. My hon. friend, who spoke in sweet Kannada and which I can follow to a certain extent, said that we have been imitating so many things—we want to set up a revolving tower here at a cost of lakhs of rupees, we want to put up a shower which is a fashion in Germany, we want to send rockets on the lines of America, we want to put computers here and throw thousands out of employment—when we are imitating so many things, he asked why we do not do this which is obtainable in Soviet Russia.

A confusion has been created by the Minister when he tried to reply to our points, perhaps because of that qualification he is a Minister here. As per the Constitution, only Hindi or English has been allowed as the languages for the business of Parliament but if a Member cannot express himself adequately in either then he may be allowed to speak in another language by the Speaker. There are two implications in this. Just now Shri Randhir Singh spoke. He knows both Hindi and

English—English to a certain extent, to a good extent, I should say—but he has got the right to choose to speak in his own language. Because of a crime that I did in learning some English I am forced to speak in that language because the Chair should be convinced that I cannot express myself adequately in English.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not the present position.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: That is the constitutional position. That is what Prof. Mukerjee said.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When I gave that ruling, it implied that it was not necessary to prove that he cannot express himself. I said that you could speak in your language but the only question is about reporting. That is all.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: It is due to the magnanimity or the broad-mindedness of the Chair. What Prof. Mukerjee said was that it is not given as matter of right in the Constitution. As a matter of right, I should be able to come and express myself in my language. Secondly, what I express in my language should be understood by others. These two facilities should be there. The freedom of expression becomes meaningless when it is not understood by others.

The hon. Minister, when he replied, raised the question as to how they are giving equal treatment to all the national languages. He quoted an example of the U.P.S.C. where they have allowed all the national languages. Then, he pointed out the Education Policy wherein they want to do something for all the languages. I want to ask Government: Why can't they give the facility that they want to give to a candidate appearing for the UPSC examination to the hon. Members of Parliament who have come to Parliament elected by millions of people? The UPSC is intended for recruiting candidates for the all-India services. He points out to an article wherein Hindi is the official language with English as an associate language. Therefore, they cannot give the facility for all the languages here. What happens to the scheme of things for the UPSC then? The same should apply here also. If they relax there or give the facility of allowing all the 15

languages for the UPSC examinations, I do not know how and in what way they are prevented from giving the same facility to the poor Members of Parliament here.

Another thing that I want to impress upon him is that...

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : On a point of order, Sir. Where is the Minister? The Minister went away after intervening in the debate. There are some Deputy Ministers of different Departments. We do not know who is who in Government. At least I cannot keep track of them. Where is the Minister in-charge of the Bill? The debate has not concluded yet.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : When he wanted to intervene and then leave the House, because he had some business in the other House, I said that it was not proper and that he must show proper courtesy to the House.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Somebody should be here from the Home Ministry.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Deputy Law Minister is here, of course...

SHRI SEZHIYAN : If you want, I can postpone my speech.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Where is his deputy? Is there a Deputy Minister of Home Affairs there? Somebody should be here.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM) : What is the difficulty, Sir? I am here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is a question of how Ministers should treat the House. It is not an individual question. I recognise he has some work in the other House. But, at the same time, they have raised a very pertinent point that nobody from the Home Ministry is here. The Home Minister intervened and went away. I can understand he has gone to the other House. But his deputy should have been here.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : Sir, my submission is that this is a Constitution Amendment Bill and I am here... (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That is all right. But his deputy should have been

here, not necessarily the Minister. (Interruption) Now it is all right. The Deputy Prime Minister is present.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : If it is not possible for the Ministers to be present, is it not proper for them to inform earlier so that the debate could be postponed to a later date? (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I must remind you that he indicated that he had some business in the other House and I said that it would not be possible for him to intervene at that stage and that he should take the debate seriously. He replied to the debate and then left the House. He should have placed his deputy here in addition to the Deputy Minister of Law. Now, the Deputy Prime Minister is here. The hon. Member should conclude now.

SHRI ANBAZHAGAN (Tiruchengode) : The Deputy Prime Minister may accept the policy of the Bill, so that this debate can be concluded without any trouble.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : We wanted the Home Minister. We have got every respect for the Deputy Prime Minister. But this question concerns the Home Ministry. Somebody from the Home Ministry should be present. After hearing my argument, he may concede some points...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already said that the Deputy Home Minister should have been here. But now the Deputy Prime Minister is here. He will consider every aspect.

SHRI THIRUMALA RAO (Kakinada) : Government owes responsibility to the House. Exigencies of business and other difficulties may entail the absence of certain Ministers at certain times. They have deputed the Deputy Law Minister, who is equally seized of the matter and the nature of the Bill. You can accept him as the representative of the Government to deal with this. We are now at the voting time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already explained. The Minister of State need not have been present, but his Deputy in the Home Ministry could have been here; that would have been better...

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : I think, I can be a better Deputy than the others.. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As soon as the Deputy Prime Minister entered, the whole controversy was put to an end.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Let us postpone the debate and resume it on the next occasion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now there is no ground for postponement. The Deputy Prime Minister is here.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : It is not so simple as that. The subject is handled by the Home Ministry. The Home Minister is not here, the Minister of State is also...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now the Deputy Home Minister has come.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : As soon as the reply was over, the Minister of State without even informing the House saying, "Kindly excuse me; I have got business elsewhere", simply turned his back and went away. Now what has happened? The Chief Whip went out and as in that story, 'bring the first man available for the marriage of my daughter', he found out the Deputy Prime Minister and has brought him here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Sezhiyan.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Now the Deputy Home Minister is here. I presume he will be able to clarify certain points here.

The Minister of State, who was here before him, made some points about the difficulties in translation and all those things...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The time is limited. We have already extended it once. He may try to conclude.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : So much time was taken away by none of the Ministers from the Home Ministry being present here. I am just concluding.

A few points were made. But this has to be understood correctly. One is a Constitutional provision and the other thing is simultaneous translation. Simultaneous translation has nothing to do with the Constitutional provision. The Constitutional provision which gives permission for the business in Parliament to be transacted in Hindi and English was made in 1950, but

the facility for simultaneous translation was made in available only two years ago. Till then, what was the position? A member who could speak in Hindi was speaking in Hindi, though the facility of simultaneous translation was not there. If a member spoke in English it was recorded. There was no translation facility. What I want to say is this. Introducing or amending this one does not necessarily lead, as per the Constitutional provision, to simultaneous translation. That is a separate matter. Even when the Constitutional provision was there for the use of both English and Hindi, there was no simultaneous translation facility available in 1950; it was only in 1965 when there was so much of demand, that facility was provided. So, that has to be separated from this one. Simultaneous translation is not the problem involved in this Bill; the problem involved in this Bill is whether you can allow, in principle, the languages listed in the Eighth Schedule to be used here. That is the first point that has to be conceded. This point should be clarified. The Constitutional provision is one thing and simultaneous translation is another thing. Let us not worry about simultaneous translation facility being there or not; that is a separate matter to be gone into by technical people. The Government could at least start this kind of thing: they can accept all the 14 languages to be used here; and to begin with, they can translate in two languages that are given here, namely, English and Hindi.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : To Begin with.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : He may not be there; we may not be there. But let us begin it.

SHRI SEZHIYAN : If the technical difficulties are overcome and technically it is found feasible to give a translation in the respective languages, well and good. But to begin with, let us have some facilities. We can allow a member to express himself in his own language and give a translation thereof with the facilities we have got.

Therefore, let us not put any difficulty there.

As I said, article 120 is not a facility given by the Speaker by altering the rules of the House. It is a matter of right, the right of a member to speak in his own

language in this august House, the supreme Parliament of this country.

Therefore, I appeal to the Deputy Minister who has come just now to accept this amendment. Later on we can work out the details. I also appeal to the Deputy Prime Minister to accept this Bill in principle at least; then we can thrash out the details. If there are any difficulties, technical or otherwise, we are always prepared to co-operate and conduct the business of the House in an intelligent and concrete manner.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I oppose it in principle.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Is he pressing the Motion ?

SHRI SEZHIYAN : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This being a Constitution (Amendment) Bill, voting has to be by division. Let the Lobbies be cleared.

The Question is :

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

*The Lok Sabha divided.*

Division No. 11]

AYES

[16.52 Has.

Abraham, Shri K. M.  
Anbuezhian, Shri  
Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh  
Desai, Shri Dinkar  
Gowda, Shri M. H.  
Gowder, Shri Nanja  
Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao  
Kandappan, Shri S.  
Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.  
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
Misra, Shri Srinibas  
Molahu Prasad, Shri  
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.

Muthusami, Shri C.  
Nihal Singh, Shri  
Patel, Shri J. H.  
Patil, Shri N. R.  
Ram Charan, Shri  
Ramamoorthy, Shri P.  
Satya Narain Singh, Shri  
Sen, Shri A. K.  
Sezhiyan, Shri  
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar  
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti  
Vashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Ankinnedu, Shri  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar  
Bansh Narain Singh, Shri  
Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri  
Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar

Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Desai, Shri Morarji  
Dhillon, Shri G. S.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
Ering, Shri D.  
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri

## Bill

## Bill

Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal  
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal  
 Jagiwan Ram, Shri  
 Jaipal Singh, Shri  
 Kamble, Shri  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.  
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao  
 Master, Shri Bholu Nath  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Melkote, Dr.  
 Minimata, Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Pahadia, Shri  
 Pandey, Shri K. N.  
 Partap Singh, Shri

Parthasarathy, Shri  
 Patel, Shri Manubhai  
 Patil, Shri Deorao  
 Patil, Shri S. B.  
 Patil, Shri T. A.  
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
 Ram Dhan, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Rao, Shri Thirumala  
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila  
 Saleem, Shri M. Y.  
 Sanji Rupji, Shri  
 Sarma, Shri A. T.  
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Siddeshwar Prasad, Shri  
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Tula Ram, Shri  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Yadab, Shri N. P.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The result\* of the Division is : Ayes : 26; Noes : 73.

The motion is not carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting. Therefore, the motion is lost.

*The motion was negatived.*

16.50 Hrs.

ALL INDIA AYURVEDIC MEDICAL COUNCIL BILL

SHRI A. T. SARMA (Bhanjanagar) : I beg to move :

"That the debate on the motion 'That the Bill to provide for the constitution of an All India Ayurvedic Medical Council for India, maintenance of an Ayurvedic Medical Register for the whole of India and for matters connected therewith, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session' which was adjourned on the 10th May, 1968, be resumed now."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the debate on the motion 'That the Bill to provide for the constitution of an All India Ayurvedic Medical Council for India, maintenance of an Ayurvedic Medical Register for the whole of India and for matters connected therewith, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session' which was adjourned on the 10th May, 1968, be resumed now".

*The motion was adopted.*

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : आयुर्वेद के बारे में जो बिल सदन के सामने आया है मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। यह एक शुभ चीज है। अंग्रेजी दवाओं के बजाय आप देश की जो परम्परा रही है, जो पुरानी परम्परा रही है उसको अपनायें। वह बहुत उपयोगी है।

हमारे जंगलों में, हिमालय की कंदराओं में लाखों किस्म की जड़ी बूटियाँ पाई जाती हैं लाखों किस्म की दवायें मौजूद हैं। ये ऐसी दवायें हैं जो कि बहुत उपयोगी साबित हुई हैं। आमको मालूम ही है कि जब लक्ष्मण मूर्छित हो गए थे तो हिमालय से ही संजीवनी बूटी लाई गई थी और उसको सूँघ कर, वह होश में आ गए थे। जड़ी बूटियों के द्वारा बीमारियों का इलाज करना हमारी पुरानी परम्परा रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हैलथ मिनिस्ट्री मेहरबानी करके इस चीज पर डीपली थिंक करे, बहुत ही ठंडे दिल से विचार करें। मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि जल्दबाजी में कोई कदम वह उठाये। मैं सरकार को लम्बा समय देने के पक्ष में हूँ। चार महीने या छः महीने के बाद मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इसके बारे में एक कम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल लाए। वैद्यक युग हमारे देश की रीढ़ रहा है, हमारे देश की संस्कृति का आधार रहा है। हमक अपने देश की परम्पराओं पर चलन चाहिये उनको पुनरुज्जीवित करना चाहिये। यह जो बिल है इसको लाने के लिए मैं माननीय सदस्य को हार्दिक धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। यह बहुत ही सुन्दर बिल है।

मान्यवर, मैं असम्बली का भी मैम्बर रहा हूँ, काउंसिल का भी रहा हूँ.....

श्री भोलू प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : पार्लियामेंट में कैसे आ गए ?

श्री शिव नारायण : तमीजे नवाशत कमदे-देवा उलटनी थी रोटी उलट दी दवा। मैं कैसे आया यहाँ, उसका जवाब यह है कि जनता ने मुझ को यहाँ भेजा, इसलिए मैं आया। हमारे वोटरों ने हम को वोट किया और मैं यहाँ आ गया। साढ़े उन्नीस हजार की मजोरिटी से जीत कर मैं यहाँ पार्लियामेंट में आया हूँ। एक बार नहीं, दुबारा आया हूँ। गरीब गरीब आदमियों को मैं रिप्रेजेंट करता हूँ और मैं भी

\*The following Members also recorded their votes :—

AYES : Shri Bhogendra Jha;  
NOES : Sarvashri P. K. Khanna and Nawal Kishore Sharma.