

**श्री बागड़ी :** मैं आप का निर्णय चाहता हूँ, मेरी अर्ज मून लें। आज से तीन दिन पहले पानी के संकट के बारे में मैं ने एक कार्लिंग अटेंशन नोटिस दिया था, अभी तक उससे के ऊपर कोई फैसला नहीं हुआ। मैं जानता चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्ट्री के जवाब का इन्तिजार कब तक किया जायेगा। यह पानी के संकट का सवाल है, इस पर जल्द निर्णय होना चाहिए।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप मेरे पास आ जाएं, मैं आप को बुलाऊंगा। आपने जो नोटिस दिया है उस को तिकाल कर देखूंगा और आप को बतलाऊंगा।

**श्री बागड़ी :** पानी का संकट एक बड़ा संकट है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने समझ लिया। लेकिन उन को तो म्युनिसिपल कमेटी दूर करेगी, हम तो उन से डील नहीं कर सकते।

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** I am asking with your permission whether that particular point which was taken up yesterday at 5.30 has been decided now, regarding the Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill for the calling of the Attorney-General.

**Mr. Speaker:** At this moment how can I say?

12.12 hrs

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES BILL—  
Contd.

CLAUSE 2 (contd.)

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up further clause by clause consideration of the Bill to provide for the languages which may be used for the official purposes of the Union, for transaction of business in Parliament, for Central and State Acts and for certain purposes in High Courts.

Clause 2 is under consideration.

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** श्री बनर्जी।

मेम्बर साहिवान से मैं कहूंगा कि अब बोल चुके हैं, इन लिए जो कुछ कहना हो बहुत मुश्किल में प्याइटरा की शकल में कहें। नए सिरे से स्पीचेज नहीं होनी चाहिए।

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** You said that anybody who did not take part in the first reading will be given a chance. You will understand that I belong to no party.

**Mr. Speaker:** My difficulty is that he belongs to many parties, not only one.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** I will take only five minutes.

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल के जिनने भी संशोधन हैं वे सब नामंजूर होने वाले हैं। लेकिन मैं सिर्फ एक चीज कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमेशा के लिए अंग्रेजी जवान रहेगी तो हिन्दी या कोई दूसरी भारतीय भाषा, चाहे वह तामिल हो या बंगला हो या उरदू हो या और कोई भाषा हो, कभी तरक्की नहीं कर सकेगा। अभी इसी सदन में "मै" और "शैल" को ले कर काफी झगडा हुआ और प्रधान मंत्री तथा गृहमंत्री के भ्रमझाने के बाद भी लोगों का दिमाग साफ नहीं हुआ है।

आज कोई इस चीज का झगडा नहीं है कि अंग्रेजी हो या हिन्दी हो। लेकिन एक बात को हमारे देश के हर निवासी को मान लेना चाहिए कि जो जवान हमारे देश में रहे उन लोगों की जवान न हो जिनहीं इस देश को चूना है, इस देश को धंटा है और काटा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन जवान को यहां रखना हमारी भूत होगी। मैं अंग्रेजी जवान के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि उनमें बहुत अच्छी कामियाएँ और नाटक हैं और मैं उनकी तारीफ करता हूँ। कुछ लोगों के दिमाग में यह शक है कि अगर हिन्दी या और कोई भारतीय भाषा राजभाषा हो जाएगी तो उन लोगों को क्या होगा जो अंग्रेजी

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

जानते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन लोगों को अपने दिमाग से यह शक निकाल देना चाहिए। यह शक गलत है। अगर अंग्रेजी के लिए दस बीस साल की अवधि रखी गयी होती तो मैं समझ सकता था कि उस के बाद इसको खत्म कर दिया जाएगा और वह राज्यभाषा नहीं रहेगी। जो लोग उस को शीकिया पढना चाहें पढ़ेंगे। लेकिन यह तो नहीं होगा कि हमारे बच्चे अंग्रेजी जवान सीखने के लिए मजबूर हों। लेकिन अगर अंग्रेजी को रखने की कोई मियाद नहीं रहेगी तो मैं अपने बच्चे को चाहूँ मैं उनको सरकारी कर्मचारी बनाना चाहूँ या अपनी तरह चुनाव लड़ कर यहाँ आने के लायक बनाऊँ, मैं उसको हिन्दी नहीं सिखाऊँगा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हम जनता के जज्बात को अंग्रेजी की सहायता से नहीं उभार सकते। कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कहा था कि आन्दोलन में जनता तक पहुँचने के लिए उनको हिन्दी का सहारा लेना पड़ा था। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भगत सिंह, सुखदेव, राजगुरु जिन तरानों को गाते गाते फांसी पर झूले थे व अंग्रेजी के गाने नहीं थे। जब बेम्ब्रि पर कफन धोष कर निकले थे तो उनका यही तराना था :

सर फरोशी की तमन्ना अब हमारे  
दिल में है।

जब चन्द्र शेखर आजाद से कहा गया कि यह जो कदम तुमने आगे बढ़ा दिया है इस को हटाना होगा तो उस ने कहा था :

मैं ने जब वादिए गुरवत पै कदम रखा था,  
दूर तक याद धतन आयी थी समझाने को।  
तो हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं ने यह जरूर कहा था कि जिन को पाले मौका नहीं मिला है उनको मौका दूंगा लेकिन कलाज पर बोलने की बजाए वह कुछ और बोल रहे हैं। यह तो डेफीनीशन का कलाज है। कुछ तो ऐसा

बोलिए कि पढने वाला यह समझे कि जो भी कुर्सी पर बैठा था वह कुछ तो देख रहा था कि क्या होना चाहिए। अंग्रेजी पर आपको कहना है तो कलाज ३ पर कहें।

**श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :** मेरा कहना सिर्फ यह है कि हिन्दी को सब आसानी से सीख सकते हैं। कल कुछ लोगों ने वाक आउट किया। इस पर मुझे दुःख हुआ। वे लोग कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दी इम्पीरियलिज्म उन पर लादना चाहते हैं। लेकिन यह अजीब इम्पीरियलिज्म है कि जिससे देश की एकता को चोट पहुँच रही है। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि इस बिल से देश में एकता बढ़ने के बजाये उसको ठेस लगी है। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बिल को अभी न लाकर सन् १९६४ या १९६५ में लाया जा सकता था। आज तो इससे देश का एका नहीं बढ़ रहा है। मेरे ब्याल से इसका इस वक्त लाना गलत है। साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि जो लोग इसके विरोध में हवन कर रहे हैं या जो इसके विरोध में वाक आउट कर गये वह भी गलत है।

मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ। मेरा निवेदन है कि अब भी सोचा जाये और सरकार लोगों की सलाह को मान ले और कह दे कि हिन्दी जबान इतने समय के बाद आने वाली है। हम हिन्दुस्तानी हैं और हमारी जबान हिन्दी ही हो सकती है या कोई भारतीय भाषा हो सकती है, अंग्रेजी नहीं। हम देखते हैं कि जब बच्चा पैदा होता है तो वह मम्मी डैडी नहीं कहता वह मां कहता है।

**Shri Bade (Khargone):** I beg to move:

Page 1, after line 14, insert

'(c) "the authoritative texts" means the texts in Hindi language.' (81)

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैंने कल भी इसके बारे में कहा था। इसमें यह उल्लेख नहीं है कि आया-



रिटेटिव टैक्स्ट कौन सा होगा। इसमें तो सिर्फ अनुवाद की बात लिखी है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसमें यह कर दिया जाय कि हिन्दी का टैक्स्ट आथॉरिटेटिव होगा। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप किस भाषा को राष्ट्र भाषा बनायें, आप चाहे तमिल को बनायें या मराठी को बनायें या किसी अन्य भारतीय भाषा को बनायें, लेकिन अंग्रेजी को कायम रखने की बात ठीक नहीं है।

**ध्यक्ष महोदय :** आप तो इस पर कल भी बोल चुके हैं ?

**श्री बड़े :** आज फिर यह निकला तो मैं फिर इस पर बोलना चाहता हूँ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** दूसरी दफा नहीं बोल सकते। मैंने आपको बुलाया यह मेरी गलती हुई।

The hon. Minister.

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis):** We are dealing with amendment No. 81, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** Only amendment No. 81 and the points made during the discussion.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I have listened carefully to the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Banerjee. I did not see anything common between the amendment No. 81 and his speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Bade made some points.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** To Mr. Bagde, I would say that the Act has got to be construed . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** His name is 'Bade'.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is Mr. Bade, I may be corrected, if I am wrong.

**Shri Bade:** There is different between Roman and Devanagari scripts. My name is 'बड़े' that is, a great man.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then, I would address him as 'great man'.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** That would be the English text of his name, Sir.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** It is obvious that the Roman script is defective; it cannot represent Indian names properly.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** The Acts are to be construed either in the Supreme Court or in the High Court. They may also have to be referred to other States. Therefore, it would be necessary that the English text should also continue to be provided. I may refer to article 348 which say: that until Parliament by law otherwise provides, all the authoritative texts shall be in English. What we are providing is that the Acts which are today in English shall be translated into Hindi, and when that translation is published in the Gazette, under the authority of the President that shall be deemed to be the authoritative text in Hindi.

There may be three authoritative texts, one in English one in Hindi and one in regional language, if it is so decided by the State Legislature. So, there would be three authoritative texts. There would be no question arising as to what exactly the law means; whoever wants to consult one of the three languages, the authoritative text would be available. Therefore, we cannot confine the word "authoritative" only to Hindi.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** He said the authoritative texts shall be in all the three languages.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** It may be in all the three languages.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** Suppose in translation, they do not agree and there is a difference of interpretation. Which will be the authorised to be recognised by the courts? There have been differences of interpretation when there are more than one text.

**Shri Bade:** In Madhya Pradesh, there was difficulty in the interpretation of the Hindi and English texts.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I think it is to be construed in one language. One language text will be referred to. If there is any difference of opinion between the three texts, the interpretation is not the text, but the law which prevails.

**Mr. Speaker:** Suppose there are three texts and they are considered to be equal. Suppose when the Judge has to interpret that, he finds a different interpretation can be put . . .

**Shri Hajarnavis:** May I submit, law is something apart from the text.

**Shri Tyagi:** Translations cannot differ.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** The translations will not differ. The Judge will try to reconcile all the three. (*Interruptions*).

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar** (Fatehpur): The Minister should reply whether the Hindi version is authentic or the English version is authentic.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I submit, Sir, you have been an eminent Judge. The Minister has made a statement that law is different from the text. Will you please enlighten the House?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am always getting compliments from my friends. I would request him not to use adjectives for me. Sometimes I might be criticised also. It may also be said that I am a bad judge.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I never said you have been a bad judge.

**Mr. Speaker:** He has always used good words for me. Some others have got the right to criticise me.

**Sari Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I look upon you as an eminent judge.

**Mr. Speaker:** Thank you for all that. The question is:

Page 1,—

after line 14, insert—

'(c) "the authoritative texts" means the texts in Hindi language.' (81)

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

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

**Mr. Speaker:** What are the amendments that hon. Members would like to move to this clause?

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

for clause 3, substitute—

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

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

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament". (35)

(ii) Page 2, line 3,—

for "may" substitute "shall". (36)

(iii) Page 2,—

for clause 3, substitute—

"3. Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, English shall be the

alternate language as from the appointed day and continue to be used,—

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

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament, until otherwise decided by the non-Hindi speaking Legislatures". (145)

(iv) Page 2,—

for clause 3, Substitute—

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

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

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament, until otherwise decided by a majority consisting of three-fourths of the members of the House of the People and Council of States respectively." (146)

**Shri Bade:** I beg to move:

Page 2, line 3,—

for "continue to be used, in addition to Hindi" substitute "be discontinued". (58)

**Shri Raddelal Vyas:** Sir I beg to move:

Page 2, line 3,—

after "day" insert—

"without prejudice to the other provisions of the Constitution in this regard". (126)

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar):** Sir, I beg to move:

439 (Ai) LSD—4

Page 2, line 4,—

after "Hindi" insert "for a period of ten years". (60)

**Shri Balmiki (Khurja):** Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page 2, line 3,—

after "used" insert "upto 1980 only". (147)

(ii) Page 2,—

after line 7, insert—

"(2) For the vigorous propagation, development and growth of Hindi in Hindi-speaking areas in general and non-Hindi speaking areas in particular a definite and well planned scheme shall be drawn out to replace English before 1980." (149)

**श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा भी एक अर्मेंडमेंट है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या 52 नम्बर का अर्मेंडमेंट माननीय सदस्य का है ?

**श्री बागड़ी :** जी नहीं। अर्मेंडमेंट तो श्री रामसेवक यादव के नाम पर है लेकिन उन्होंने मुझे चिट्ठी लिख कर उसे मूव करने के लिये ऐयोराइज कर दिया है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** चिट्ठी पर यह नहीं किया जा सकता है। किसी का अर्मेंडमेंट दूसरा आदमी मूव नहीं कर सकता है।

**श्री बागड़ी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्लाज 3 पर मेरा भी एक अर्मेंडमेंट है। राष्ट्रपति जी की स्वीकृति की चिट्ठी भी आ गयी है हालांकि मेरे पास अभी उसकी इतिला नहीं आई है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** क्या वह कोई दूसरा अर्मेंडमेंट है ?

**श्री बागड़ी :** जी हां वह मेरे नाम से है। मैंने राष्ट्रपति जी को.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बागड़ी साहब का कौन सा अर्मेंडमेंट है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : अभी वह तलाश करने बाहर चले गये हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : १५२ नम्बर का अर्मेंडमेंट उनके नाम से है। अगर वह उसे मूव करना चाहें तो मुझे बतला दें।

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Sir may I make one submission? If you take clauses 3 and 4 together, it will facilitate the discussion.

Shri Frank Anthony: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: That would create confusion.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: There are precedents in this House.

Shri Hajarnavis: I do not agree. That will result in confusion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hooshangabad): We do not agree.

Mr. Speaker: No one agrees.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बागड़ी साहब का कौन सा अर्मेंडमेंट है ?

श्री बागड़ी : मेरा अर्मेंडमेंट नम्बर १५२ है जोकि मैं मूव करता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत अच्छा, बागड़ी साहब का १५२ नम्बर का अर्मेंडमेंट मूव्ड है।

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2, line 3,—

after "used" insert—

"for a further period of ten years." (127)

Shri Bagri: Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2,—

after line 7, insert—

"Provided that the original Bills, Ordinances and statements shall be in Hindi." (152).

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalazhava): Sir, I want to move my amendments Nos. 57 and 62.

Mr. Speaker: No. 57 is the same as No. 36 and therefore, it is barred. No. 62 does not stand in his name and therefore he cannot move it.

Clause 3 and the amendments are before the House.

Shri Frank Anthony: Mr. Speaker, the four amendments of mine are, firstly, that "may" be substituted by "shall", secondly, that English shall be the alternate language, thirdly, that English shall be the alternate language until otherwise decided by a majority of the non-Hindi speaking States and, fourthly, that English shall be the alternate language until otherwise decided by a majority of three-fourths of the members of the House of the People and the Council of States respectively.

I was hoping that we would get some enlightenment on the Bill itself from the Prime Minister's speech. Unfortunately, it had very little to do with the Bill and was more a sort of philosophical dissertation on language and content, and the few remarks that were vouchsafed with regard to the Bill were in respect of certain interventions made by me. The only issue before this House in clause 3 is whether the Prime Minister's assurance that English shall be an associate and alternate language until otherwise decided by the non-Hindi-speaking States is being translated into the statute book. That is the only simple issue. The issue is not this that this assurance should be compromised. Every member of the Congress Party who has spoken has said that this Bill is an excellent

compromise. I agree that it is a compromise with the assurance, that it is a dilution of the assurance in order to mollify the Hindi extremist section. My grievance with the Home Minister is this. Has he implemented the assurance?

I am glad to say that one thing has emerged very clearly from the Prime Minister's statement. He has reaffirmed his assurance. He said: "Yes, I mean this; I meant shall". He has re-affirmed that. I quote from a letter which the Prime Minister was pleased to write to me on the 18th of April, and I do not think the Prime Minister will mind my quoting it. It was written to me in reply to a representation sent by fifteen Members of this House. Obviously, it was not intended to be personal and, in fact, certain other persons to whom it was shown have published a summary. Among other things, this is what the Prime Minister has stated in his letter to me.

"I think that the use of the word "may" in clause 3 of the Bill is quite adequate for the purpose. It is well-known that in this context it means 'shall'"

This is the Prime Minister's stand. He has sought to re-affirm that in the House. When I asked "does not 'may' mean 'may not'?" he said "it is absurd". Now with great respect to the Prime Minister, I am not going to teach him law, or the element of law, but, in the context of this Bill, 'may' can only mean 'may', and this was made abundantly clear by the Home Minister. So, obviously, on this issue, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister are at loggerheads. The Prime Minister says that his assurance was not "may", his assurance was "shall". He goes further and says "by 'may' I meant 'shall' and that in that context it is "shall," Obviously, and I say this with great respect, the Prime Minister has been misled. The Prime Minister's assurance was "shall", he has intended it to be "shall" and he has argued, quite untenably of course, that it

means "shall". And now the Home Minister tells us that it is not 'shall', it is 'may'. It must be obvious to all that the counterpart of "may" will be "may not".

That is why we wanted to meet the hon. Prime Minister. He meant "shall" and he still believes that "may" shall mean "shall". Who has misled him? The hon. Home Minister has said that it cannot be "shall" and look at the reasons that he gives. He says that if "shall" is used then it will require the simultaneous use, unnecessarily, of Hindi and English. Yes. But that is because advisedly the hon. Home Minister has used a language which will be an instrument for using this argument against the use of "shall". Why could not the hon. Home Minister or those who have advised him have said that the hon. Prime Minister has always meant "shall"? Why could they not merely have said that English shall be the alternate language? Then there was no argument that with the phraseology that has been used it would postulate their simultaneous use. Alternate language means used alternately. That was the assurance of the hon. Prime Minister. He repeats it to me. He says:

"Your reference to what I said previously in the Lok Sabha that in my opinion English should be used as the associate language or the alternative language until otherwise decided by the non-Hindi-speaking people continues to represent my opinion."

Why could it not be a simple translation of this assurance? Then they would not have got the argument of the hon. Home Minister.

Another argument was that if they use "shall", they will have to prescribe the period. With great respect to the hon. Home Minister I say that he has not consulted the Law Department. I am not betraying any secrets. I went to the head of the Drafting Section and I said, "Convince me how

[Shri Frank Anthony]

the use of 'shall' is repugnant to the Constitution. I will convince you that it is not" because article 343 gives uninhibited power to Parliament to extend its use for a specified period.

**Shri Tyagi:** May.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** But the power to extend is uninhibited. I say that under that clause Parliament may say that English shall be the principal official language for 100 years. He agreed.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi** (Jodhpur): That is hardly possible.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** They said categorically to me—I do not want to name the gentlemen.... (*Interruption*). This is categorical..... (*Interruption*). I am making my proposition. They said categorically... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Hajarnavis:** On a point of order, Sir..... (*Interruption*).

**Shri Maurya** (Aligarh): Article 343 is quite clear.... (*Interruption*). As far as the Constitution is concerned... (*Interruption*) ...that Hindi shall be the national language.

**Mr. Speaker:** Should he go on speaking without getting my permission?

**Shri Hajarnavis:** My hon. friend is an eminent lawyer and, I believe, he knows English much better than others. I will accept that he is entitled to consture the language and I will try to answer him. But why should he bring in officers of the Government who must remain outside the controversy. Why does he refer to the officers? I do not think it is quite fair for him to refer to any civil servant.

**Shri Tyagi:** Was it fair for the officers to go on giving interpretations outside?

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I know the word "shall" is not repugnant. As-

suming for the sake of argument that what the hon. Home Minister has said was correct, namely, that the use of the word "shall" would require a prescription of the period, would not a clause like this, that is, "shall be used as the alternate language until otherwise decided"—by whom? The hon. Prime Minister said that the suggestion that it should be left to the non-Hindi-speaking States was absurd and fantastic except for lurid ipse dixit. I would say, with great respect to the hon. Prime Minister that it is ultra-absurd and ultra-fantastic to suggest that Parliament cannot legislate. I agree, it may be anomalous but certainly not illegal to say "until otherwise decided". It may be anomalous. But there never was the will. That is my quarrel.

So many formulae were available. One was "until otherwise decided by three-fourths of the State legislatures" by implication meaning that the decision would require the concurrence of the non-Hindi-speaking people. I have given an amendment to the effect "by a three-fourths majority of Members of each House respectively". What is wrong with it? The hon. Prime Minister says that it is absurd and fantastic. The hon. Prime Minister does not even remember the Constitution. What is there absurd, fantastic, illegal or unconstitutional with it? We have built-in provisions in the Constitution. You know, Sir, that article 368 prescribes certain preliminary majorities, two-thirds majority of the whole House. What was it?

As I said, they shied away from giving effect to what was intended by the Prime Minister, "shall be the alternate language".

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I think he is not quite fair to the Prime Minister. What the Prime Minister was trying to do was to meet the argument of the hon. Member who said that this matter should be decided by the votes of the Members of the non-Hindi-speaking areas. The Prime Minister

pointed out, that the decision on behalf of the Parliament cannot be taken by a section of the House. It will certainly be unconstitutional.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** But that is exactly what I am saying. I am only saying that. (*Interruption*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** All that I have stated is, obviously the Prime Minister has been misled. He meant 'shall'. He intended 'shall', he tried to argue untenably that it was 'shall'. The Home Minister said, it was not 'shall'. So, he has been misled. The Members of the other side have been misled. I am still pleading with the Home Minister. He says, I am imputing motives, questioning his *bona fides*. What is the difficulty? Simple, straight-forward there is my amendment, "shall be the alternate language until otherwise decided by a major of three-fourths on a parity with article 368 of the Constitution."

**Shri Ranga (Chitoor):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, this question has aroused deep emotions as well as antagonisms among different sections of our own House and also within the Congress, the ruling party and the ruling party has the satisfaction that they have reached a kind of compromise in the shape of this Bill as well as the two official amendments which are also tabled here. But then we have to look at it from the national point of view. I do sympathise and I do appreciate the standpoint of our Hindi friends. They happen to live in such a large part of our country that it appears to be almost the whole of the country to them and, therefore, such of us as do not belong to that area do not have the privilege of claiming this Hindi language as our mother tongue and that they are obliged to ask for all these special concessions, according to them, appears to be extremely unreasonable. They begin to wonder, "Here is Hindi which is our own language. Here is that English which was not

our language to start with and which came to be introduced here under the aegis of the British and British regime and, therefore why should we now continue to hug this English which has been an alien language till now to us and why should these unreasonable people now create all the difficulties and impediments saying, 'No, no, we do not want Hindi language as the sole official language.'" I cannot understand their attitude. I cannot agree with them. Those of us who come from the south look upon the Ganges, the Jamuna, Hardwar, Rishikesh and all these places as so sacred, as so important in our national life that everyone of us feels it his cultural and religious duty to try and go and visit them at least once during one's life time and take that earth and pay homage to that earth. But I do not know whether, similarly, strong feelings are entertained by as many as possible, as universally and as continuously, who live in this areas in regard to similar sacred places in the south. (*Interruptions*)

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir):** Right upto Rameswaram every place is sacred to us.

**Shri Bade:** Ramaswaram is sacred to us. (*Interruption*)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order order.

**Shri Ranga:** I do not question anybody's religious sentiments. My only point is, here, our people are living in such a huge area, it is excusable for them—I am only pleading for those friends. It is excusable for them—it is understandable also—if they were to feel that this area alone is as much as the whole of India. Unfortunately, there are other areas also in this country and those areas also happen to be just as sacred to our mother India as the Gangetic valley, as well as Rishikesh right down to Calcutta and in those areas we have to speak other languages. And if at all anybody has got to be reconciled to Hindi it is the non-Hindi-speaking people. It is the special responsi-

[Shri Ranga].

bility of Hindi-speaking people to try to reconcile with the non-Hindi-speaking people with their own passion for Hindi and win over their allegiance, their affection and in that way help in the re-building, in the re-knitting and strengthening the bonds of unity within our country. Unfortunately, for their own very good reasons some of our friends belonging to certain political parties as well as cultural groups have taken the other view and they have begun to feel that just as they feel about Hindi, other people also should begin to feel strongly and emotionally for Hindi and, therefore, they seem to be ready to get into temper and annoyance just because non-Hindi-speaking people wish to express their views in regard to Hindi a little differently than themselves. Therefore, I would like to appeal to them to have some patience, to display a sense of toleration and what is even more to be prepared to entertain that sense of comradeship with the rest of us so strongly as to give us the feeling that our interests will be as safe in their hands as they will be in our own hands and it is that assurance, unfortunately, which the Prime Minister has been trying to give—his earlier assurance and also through his speech now—does not come forward from the Home Minister.

In this country the time has come when we people have to realise that the Prime Ministership and the Prime Minister stand for an institution and the Prime Ministership cannot be separated from the personal views and personal proclivities of the person, of the incumbent, who occupies that particular position and goes about as the Prime Minister. And our Prime Minister has been here for the last 17 years so much of our country has come to treat him as an institution. He has given an assurance. Why did he give the assurance. He gave that assurance in the light of the historical conditions in our country. So many things had happened in the past. So has been like so many of us

authors as well as victims of things that had happened as a result of the obdurate position that we have taken over the question of parliamentary democracy in our country. In 1963, the Congress was able to attain the majority in the general elections in quite a large number of States including the then United Provinces. It so happened that Muslim League did not wish to join the Congress and stood by itself and, as was natural, the Muslim League happened to be in a minority. Then, they found to their disappointment that they were not being given any representation at all in the then Ministry in that State. Therefore, they asked for representation in that Ministry. Then, unfortunately, because we were under the impression that a party which has a majority would alone be competent to and should form the Ministry, the Congress Party refused to give any representation to the Muslim League. This happened in UP as well as in many other States also. We all thought that we were doing a right thing by refusing to give representation to the Muslim League because that was the way in which we had been brought up in regard to the conventions of parliamentary democracy. But, unfortunately for us, Indian conditions would not fit into the English conception of Parliamentary democracy. So much so, the Muslim League felt, according to them rightly, according to us wrongly, that they were being wronged by not being taken into that Ministry, by not being given representation. We know the result. We know the consequence of that terrible mistake that we made, a mistake made in a genuine fashion, thinking that we were not making a mistake at all. As a result of that blunder, this country is faced with this calamity of having been split up into two Governments, Pakistan Government and our Government. I do not want a similar calamity to overtake our country and our national life as a result of the passions that we give rise to....



**Some Hon. Members:** No, no. (Interruption).

**Shri Ranga:** . . . both of us according to our ownlights, both of us being under the impression that we are doing the right thing and we are pleading for the right thing and so on.

So far as the non-Hindi-Speaking people are concerned, it is clear now, they accepted it at the time of the passing of the Constitution, and I was one of them that in the right time, Hindi was accepted first of all as a national language and should later grow to be the official language. That is not questioned. There are some people even now, great people, good people, genuine people, statesman like people, experienced people who question, according to them rightly that Hindi should not be the official language. We cannot quarrel with them. That is their view (Interruptions). So many of us who were participators in the discussions of the Constituent Assembly, who had the privilege of signing the passing the Constitution, agreed that Hindi should be the principal national language, and also the official language. We accepted it and then we put our imprimatur on it. Nevertheless, even at that time, we were conscious of the fact that English had to be our official language. So we made provision for that also. We gave ourselves sufficient time and in addition to that, we gave also freedom to Parliament to continue the use of English as official language for a much longer period if found necessary. That is the reason why we are face to face with this particular problem as well as with this legislation. I do not see any reason why those friends who are fortunate enough to be born in the Hindi-speaking areas and who are able to claim Hindi as their mother tongue, should display so much of impatience with us who are not so fortunate, who are obliged to learn this language now, even though it be a part of our notional culture, who are obliged to go through all these disabilities which are attendant on those

people to whom it is not mother tongue, who are obliged to compete with these Hindi-speaking people to whom Hindi is mother tongue in regard to competitive examinations, in regard to services, in regard to the development of our social economy in our country. Why should they be impatient with us just because we say this? As the Prime Minister put it, the link language—because the Link has come and it is very favourite with the ruling party and therefore he has called it link—fortunately that word is a very appropriate word in this connection—the link language Hindi should come to serve as link some day. In the meanwhile, the Prime Minister himself has realised that for the time being the really effective link language can only be English. It happens to be English and it has got to be continued for some time longer. Time would come when it would have to be given up. When is that time, who has to decide? Is it the Hindi-speaking people? If they were to insist on it, I wish to warn them that the non-Hindi-speaking people would be justified in continuing to feel as they have been feeling very strongly and expressing themselves also with so much of emotion, that they are being imposed upon. If, on the other hand, the Government were to be good enough, to be loyal enough to stand by the assurance given by the Prime Minister—I am using the word loyal advisedly, towards the Prime Minister, its own Prime Minister, to stand by the assurance given by the Prime Minister, they should certainly agree to the amendment suggested by my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony and also by some of our friends on my right that instead of 'may', the word should be 'shall'. They would not agree, because . . . (bell rings) I want a little more time.

**Mr. Speaker:** In amendments, of course. . . .

**Shri Ranga:** It is not a question of amendment. I did not speak on the principal thing. I have got to have my say. I do not propose to take too long. It is not a pleasure for me to

[Shri Ranga].

take too long on an emotionally surcharged subject like this. I am speaking only because I must as a matter of duty. Otherwise, it is not a pleasure to me.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Will you kindly extend the time for the second reading as you said?

**Mr. Speaker:** How much we have extended already, he knows.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You said, yesterday...

**Mr. Speaker:** If I can extend it more, then we may decide to sit tomorrow.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Tomorrow we are sitting.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is all right. If we are sitting tomorrow, I can extend.

**Some Hon. Members:** No. (Interruption).

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, probably, hon. Members should agree even if they did not desire it earlier, now we shall have to sit tomorrow because we have been extending for this Bill. Therefore, even if we are put to some inconvenience, we should now agree to sit tomorrow so that enough time may be given to this Bill and the other thing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would further propose that this discussion on the Official language Bill might continue for the whole day and non-official business we might put up for tomorrow.

**Some Hon. Members:** Yes.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Agreed.  
**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** It would not be appropriate to sit tomorrow. We have our own engagements.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry. Even if it causes some inconvenience to a few Hon. Members, they should adjust themselves. Because, otherwise, it would not be possible to finish the work.

**Shri Ranga:** As it is so happened, the fires of this controversy were going on with the result that the Prime Minister thought it fit to accept the advice given by one of our national leader Shri K. M. Munshi that a National Integration conference should be called. He called it. The Prime Minister presided over it. They appointed a committee also. That committee met. Soon after the Chinese communists invaded our country they met and in the light of the upsurge of national sense of unity, they said, national unity has come to be achieved and therefore, there is no need for their committee to function and they dispersed. It was soon after that or may be just about that time, the Prime Minister also was so happy over the display of...

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां प्राइम मिनिस्टर की बात का प्रश्न है या कांस्टिट्यूशन की बात का ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप स्वयं ही ध्यान से सुनें । आप बड़ी अच्छी तरह से समझ रहे हैं, आप को सारा पता है ।

**Shri Ranga:**.....a national sense of unity. I am only mentioning in what circumstances the Prime Minister thought it fit to reiterate the assurance. It was then at that time that the Prime Minister's assurance was again repeated and the Government took the trouble—I do not know under what department; I think it was Audie Visual Publicity—to publish in all the daily papers, in the language papers as well as in the English papers this particular portion, the relevant portion of the assurance

given by the Prime Minister to the non-Hindi-speaking people.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** On a point of order,.....

**Shri Ranga:** This is the advertisement that has been published with the Prime Minister's photograph....

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. A point of order has been raised. The hon. Member should listen to that.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** I rise to a point of order. Every time, the assurance of the Prime Minister is being repeated in this House. May I know whether any assurance can vary the mandatory provisions of the Constitution? When it is given in the Constitution that Hindi shall be the official language, can the word 'shall' be added at all in view of the existing provision in the Constitution? I want your ruling on this point whether any sort of assurance which against the provisions of the Constitution, can even stand or can ever be cited.

13 hrs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** There is nothing that requires further elucidation.

**Shri Ranga:** An assurance was given. The Prime Minister says that he gave it. He has repeatedly said that he stand by that. Where is the question of the Constitution being abrogated there?

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** That is not my point....

**Mr. Speaker:** If some Members want to argue their case on that how can I stop them from doing so?

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** That is not my point....

**Mr. Speaker:** Can I say that this argument cannot be advanced?

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** No, that is not my point. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** That is exactly what he intends to say.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** Is it practical and feasible to just cite that assurance all the time?

**Mr. Speaker:** The feasibility is to be judged by the House when it votes.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** As a matter of fact, the very demand that the word 'shall' be substituted would mean the changing of the Constitution, and that cannot be done now.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member shall have the liberty to vote as he likes at that time. I cannot restrict the hon. Member from arguing his case.

I do not think that this display is necessary, because the Prime Minister has said that he stands by that.

**Shri Ranga:** I am coming to that, because it is an assurance not only of the Prime Minister but it is an assurance also on behalf of Government.

And this advertisement was published at the cost of Government in all the papers, on the 7th of November, 1962 just when we were in the midst of that terrible situation in the midst of that national emotion of unity when our duty was to see that our Motherland was protected and defended and her honour was sustained; it was at the height of that crisis that the Prime Minister had again repeated this, and it was published by Government at their own cost by paying money. And how did the advertisement read? It read thus:

"English will continue as an associate language, and I would not take it away till I was asked to take it away by the non-Hindi-speaking areas — Jawaharlal Nehru."

[Shri Ranga].

The Prime Minister was also good enough to say day before yesterday:

"The assurance that I gave re presented not only my viewpoint but also the viewpoint of our Government. When the assurance was given, it was made with a large approval of this House. We stand by that assurance completely."

Now, I ask the Government and my hon. friend Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri whether they are really standing by the Prime Minister's assurance and the assurance of the Government, in the terms in which that assurance was given, in the spirit in which that assurance was given. I feel that the Home Minister is not being fair to himself, not to speak of his being fair to the Prime Minister and his Government. I do not know; something has gone wrong with this Government somewhere. Otherwise, we would not find a good man and a statesmanlike man like the Home Minister coming forward and saying, this word 'may' is advisedly used here, because otherwise, every time the official language is referred to it would be two languages, and it would be waste of money to use both languages, because then Bills have to be passed in both languages, statements have to be published in both languages and so on and so forth. On the other hand, the Prime Minister says that according to him, according to his understanding.....

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal):** The word used in that advertisement is 'will' and not 'shall'.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think that if he is allowed to finish it, probably, that would be better.

**Shri Ranga:**... 'may' means only 'shall'. Therefore, even there, there is this contradiction. I would like my hon. friend the Home Minister to try

to resolve this contradiction. But one thing is clear that they do not seem to be ready either to resolve this contradiction or to reassure the people that the assurance given by the Prime Minister is an assurance and it can be acted upon and can be relied upon and cannot be pooh-poohed or ridiculed or dismissed or whittled away in various ways under the stress of various forces that may be swirling round the Government.

So, I want Government to make up their mind. If they find that it is not in the interests of the country that they should scrupulously and honestly and fully implement that assurance given by the Prime Minister, as he has put in, with the authority and with the concurrence of his Government, and with the general sense of this House at that time, then the only alternative left to them is to resign. If they are not prepared to resign, it is for the Prime Minister himself to resign. They cannot very well have it both ways; either they should implement this assurance or they should resign.

Now, I would like to make one appeal to my hon friends who come from the Hindi-speaking areas. I wish to assure them that of all the South Indian statesmen, it was Rajaji who took the initiative in 1922 to found the Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha, and who provided the introduction to the book that they published in various languages, entitled *Hindi Swabodhini*. I learnt my little Hindi only from that book while I was in jail. All of us used to learn our Hindi only from that *Hindi Swabodhini*. My hon. friend the leader of the Communist Party will also bear me out, because we were together in the same jails.

Rajaji was then such an enthusiast about Hindi, as good an enthusiast as any of my hon. friends including our Arya Samaj leaders, he was enthusiastic about it to such an extent that

he went to the extent of insisting that Hindi should be compulsorily taught in the schools.

श्री बागड़ी : हम आर्य समाजी नहीं हैं ।

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri (Bijnor): On a point of order....

Shri Ranga: I have not said anything against my hon. friend.

When Rajaji did that, there was a satyagraha movement against him.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri: On a point of order....

Shri Ranga: How can there be a point of order, when I praise him?

Mr. Speaker: There is a point of order being raised. If the hon. Member feels that there is a point of order and he rises and submits that there is a point of order, would he like me to proceed further without listening to it?

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : इनका मस्तिष्क जगदा गरम हो रहा है इसलिए मैं बड़ी नम्रता से आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि रंगा साहब इन सदन के बड़े जिम्मेदार और पुराने मेम्बर हैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है या आप केवल निवेदन करना चाहते हैं ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो उसे कहिये :

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उन्होंने अग्नी आर्य समाज का नाम लिया । आर्य समाज का उन्होंने इस हिन्दी के प्रश्न से किस प्रकार संबंध जोड़ा । अगर एक सांस्कृतिक संगठन का यहाँ इस तरह नाम लिया जायेगा तो स्थिति विवादास्पद हो जायेगी । वे किसी

सदस्य का उद्धरण करते और उस पर अपनी बब रखने का यहाँ रखते तो ठीक था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मगर यह किसी नियम का उल्लंघन नहीं है ।

Shri Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool). I think the hon. Member meant the Jan Sangh and not the Arya Samaj.

Shri Ranga: I am sorry I made a reference to Arya Samaj; I withdraw it, so far as the Arya Samaj is concerned.

Rajaji as Chief Minister—at that time, he was called the Prime Minister....

Mr. Speaker: Now, he should try to conclude.

Shri Ranga: Yes, but let me complete my point.

Rajaji, when he was Chief Minister of Madras, took the trouble of having all the odium of sending,—when satyagraha was offered against the compulsory teaching of Hindi—thousands of people to jail, and he quarrelled with one of his best friends, the great Naicker, Periyar Ramaswami Naicker as he was called. They were all put in jail. Then, he learnt his lesson, his bitter lesson that it would not do to impose Hindi on any people when they did not want it and that too in a compulsory manner. It was as a result of that experience that ever since he has been saying, let us wait, and let us be patient with these non-Hindi-speaking people until they are ready to accept Hindi, in the meanwhile, let us propagate Hindi. That is where I agree with the criticism made yesterday by my hon. friend Shri Dasappa,—and he has been making it for years and years, and yet the Education Minister did not take heed,—that this Government of India have not done enough. That is where I do not agree with the Prime

[Shri Ranga].

Minister when he quarrels with us when we say that the Government of India have not done enough. This Government of India has not done enough to propagate Hindi in the south and to see that Hindi is popularised in our schools and in our universities. I have been wondering also why it is that in the non-Hindi-speaking areas, at least in the universities and in the high schools. Hindi has not been taught, and special encouragement has not been given for the teaching of Hindi.

Therefore, I would submit that we are anxious to learn Hindi. But, for God's sake, let all these friends of ours who come from the Hindi-speaking areas have that much of statesmanship and that much of forbearance and that much of patriotism as to have patience and a sense of understanding towards the non-Hindi-speaking people when they say that they are willing to learn Hindi, but English is there with them and they want to go on with English until they are in a position to accept Hindi as the official language. When are we to do it? And how are we to decide on that matter? There also, I join issue with my hon. friend the Home Minister. We are anxious, and we have always understood when the Prime Minister gave that assurance, that our State Legislatures would be asked to express their views as to when they are ready to give up English and accept only Hindi as the official language. Instead of that, he says, you are here anyhow, you are expected to look at all these problems only from a national point of view, and, therefore, you are the best and most competent people, you alone should be given the privilege and the liberty as well as the duty and the responsibility of deciding when Hindi alone should be accepted and English should be given up. That is a very unsatisfactory state of things. We are anxious that not only the State Governments but also State legislatures concerned in this

matter should be given an opportunity of saying either by two-thirds or three-fourths or whatever majority they decide upon, when the time comes when English could be given up.

I want also to give an assurance to my friends in the north. I claim to know a part of the mind of the non-Hindi speaking people; no one can claim to know the whole of the mind. They are just as keen as other friends not to depend upon English alone, as we are depending upon English. We do not want to give up English for very good reasons which were given by the Prime Minister. We cherish English and are very glad indeed that we have learnt English. At the same time, we would like to depend primarily on Hindi as official language in good time, as soon as we possibly can. How soon it would be is the question. It may not be in my life time. It may be after two generations of our students have been able to learn Hindi and begun to operate through Hindi. When they grow into the proper age for political and effective national work, that is, 40 years or so, when those young people have been able to operate through Hindi effectively, then it would be time for that. I am sure they would be only too glad to switch over to Hindi and embrace the other friends from the Hindi-speaking areas.

But, if on the other hand, these friends continue to be as emotionally surcharged as they seem to be and they go on irritating themselves and irritating us because of their impatience, the calamity that is likely to overtake our country is something that I do not wish to visualise, not to think of putting into words.

Shri Radheyial Vyas: As I was listening to Prof. Ranga, I was really surprised to hear some of the remarks made by him, especially the interpretation that he gave to the advertised statement of the Prime Minister. In that advertisement which he read out, the word 'will' has been used, and not 'shall' He has been a professor in

a college or University. I would humbly tell him that 'will' denotes future tense, nothing else; 'shall' has a greater significance. The Prime Minister has not used the word 'shall' in that advertised statement.

Then he referred to the assurance that he will not take away English unless he asked to do so by the non-Hindi speaking people. What does it mean? It means English will not be removed altogether, but that does not mean that no restrictions can be put on the use of English has been provided for in the Constitution. The Prime Minister is a most responsible person. He knows his responsibility. He had been a party to the framing of the Constitution and he has taken place under it. So he cannot be expected to give an assurance contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution.

With regard to the words 'may' and 'shall', I was really surprised to hear some of the speeches made yesterday and today also. The hon. Minister has amply clarified in his speech yesterday that the appropriate word would be 'may' and its substitution by 'shall' would create so many difficulties. Should we not examine that? Is it not a fact that really there will be difficulties? If 'shall' is incorporated, we will be going against the Constitution in some respect. I will cite one or two instances. Suppose Government decide that some of their correspondence or the language of agreements or treaties entered into with foreign countries should be in Hindi. I do not think any of my friends in the non-Hindi speaking areas will have any objection to it. Is it not derogatory to us that even now after 15 years of independence we should use a foreign language and not our own language? When the Russian leaders, Khrushchev and Bulganin came here, came here, that visit opened our eyes. We were really ashamed to see that we are still using English and we cannot use our own language in our relations or correspondence and communications with foreign countries. So if Government were to decide that

only Hindi will be used or any other national language will be used, does it mean that 'shall' should be there and along with our own language (the English language should also be used)? That is not the spirit of the Constitution. So I submit that 'shall' is not the appropriate word but 'may' is and it should be there.

Now I come to my amendment. I have suggested that after the word 'day' on page 2, line 3, the words 'without prejudice to the other provisions of the Constitution in this regard, should be inserted. It is an innocent and harmless amendment. I do not think the hon. Minister can have any objection to it except on the ground that if the Constitution is there, nobody is going to go against it. That can be the only argument. I submit the Constitution has been there, was there and is there. But may I ask humbly whether we have followed it up and whether we have abided by the obligations and duties implicit in the special provisions made with regard to the use of the official language? I think we have miserably failed in that respect. It is with this object that while passing this clause 3, we should bear in mind that clauses 3 and 4 do not override the provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, there is no harm in accepting this amendment to this clause.

As I submitted, the provisions of the Constitution have not been followed. I was really surprised yesterday to hear the speech of Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya, for whom I have very great regard and esteem. Before coming to that, let me congratulate my friends from the non-Hindi speaking areas on the great restraint they have shown and on the support they have given to this Bill, barring of course, a section behind me....

**An Hon. Member:** They are not here.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** They are not here, but their seat is there. As I said, there has been general support. Leaving a side the speakers from the

[Shri Radhelal Vyas]

Hindi-speaking areas, I am particularly grateful to friends from Bengal—Shri H. N. Mukerjee supported the use of Hindi as the official language—who have supported the substitution of English by Hindi as the official language, the friends from Maharashtra—Dr. Aney vehemently supported the proposition that there should be one language for the country—our friends from Gujarat and so on. Unfortunately for us, those who come from the Hindi-speaking areas, our language happens to be Hindi, but that does not mean that Hindi is a regional language. It is the language of the country. It is not spoken only by 40 per cent of the people, as stated, 40 per cent of the people live in the four northern States of UP, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Bihar. But there are people in Punjab, a majority of whom speak Hindi; there are people in Himachal Pradesh, in Kashmir, in Delhi and other States who speak Hindi. That population has not been taken into account in this calculation. Take the whole of the States of Gujarat, Bengal, Maharashtra, Assam or Orissa. If you go even to the remotest corner or village, every person will be able to understand Hindi, he may not be able to express himself well in Hindi.

Mr. Speaker: He should be brief.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I shall try. I did not get an opportunity to speak on the motion for general consideration.

My name was on the list, and I personally approached you through a letter.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, he must have been convinced that approaches do not have any effect.

13.20 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Radhelal Vyas: So I was submitting that barring four States in the South, whose population is 11 crores,

40 percent people in the Hindi-speaking areas plus 35 per cent people in the non-Hindi-speaking areas can very well understand Hindi. Even in the four southern States, there are sufficient number of people who can understand Hindi. As you know, in Travancore as far back as 1940 learning of Hindi was compulsory, even before independence. Shri Vesudevan Nair, who comes from Kerala, told me. In other States also, the learning of Hindi has been going on for years together in the South. So, a sufficient section of the people knows Hindi even in the South. So, it is because 80 per cent of the people know Hindi that it has been declared the official language, and not because the people from the Hindi-speaking areas have been espousing or propagating the cause. There should be no such misunderstanding. It is because the nation has decided it should be the official language. It is really derogatory on our part to continue to use English for ever.

So, I would submit that "shall" should not be accepted. The amendment that I have moved may be accepted by the hon. Minister as there is no harm, as it does not go contrary to the spirit or the declared policy of the Government.

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय. एक कहावत है कि सोते हुये को तो जगा दिया जाये, लेकिन जागते हुये को कोई नहीं जगा सकता। जागते हुओं को जगाने के लिये मैंने यह प्रमोडमेंट रखा है कि पेज २, लाइन ४ पर शब्द "हिन्दो" के बाद ये शब्द बढ़ा दिये जाये : "फार ए पीरियड ग्राफ टेन यीग्रज", और इस प्रकार अंग्रेजी के प्रयोग की अवधि दस वर्ष निश्चित कर दी जाये। इन शब्दों को जोड़ने की जरूरत दो कारणों से है। पहला यह कि इस क्लोज का संबंध भगली क्लोज से है और अगर इन शब्दों को नहीं जोड़ा जायेगा, तो भगली क्लोज से इस



का संबंध नहीं जुड़ेगा और दूसरा यह कि इन शब्दों को जोड़े बगैर हमारा यह मंशा पूरा नहीं होगा कि सरकार पर यह दबाव डाला जाये कि वह इस संबंध में तेजी से काम करे ।

मैंने बहुत स्पष्ट तरीके से देखा है कि बी० एम० के० के साधियों का मंशा केवल यह है कि हिन्दी के मामले को लेकर एक फसाद पैदा किया जाये । वे तो ईमानदारी से यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि भारतवर्ष एक रहे और उनका मंशा यह है कि भारतवर्ष का विभाजन हो जाये । मैंने बहुत नजदीक से उनको देखा है और उनसे बातचीत की है । मैंने उन से सीधा प्रश्न किया कि अगर वे समझते हैं कि हिन्दी न रहे, तो कौन सी भाषा रहे । उनका कहना है कि अंग्रेजी रहे । जब मैंने उनसे कहा कि अंग्रेजी सब की जुबान नहीं है और वह एक फारेन लैंग्वेज है, तो उन्होंने कहा कि तब इस देश की चौदह पन्द्रह सब भाषायें रहें । इससे साफ मालूम होता है कि उनका मंशा केवल यह है कि यह मसला किसी भी प्रकार से हल न हो और इस आधार पर वे अपना राजनीतिक उल्लू सीधा करते रहें । मुझे यह देख कर बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री फ्रैंक एन्थनी, जो बहुत तजुर्बेकार हैं, इन दिनों उनके साथ बैठ कर बार बार यह चर्चा करते रहे कि अंग्रेजी को कैसे आगे बढ़ाया जाये । मैं समझ नहीं पाया कि क्या वह हिन्दुस्तान के विभाजन की नीति का भी समर्थन करते हैं और क्या उनका मंशा यह है कि उन के जरिये से अंग्रेजी हमेशा के लिये हम पर थोपी जाती रहे ।

इस समय यह स्थिति बन गई है कि जैसे पहले जमाने में विभाजन से पहले कांग्रेस हिन्दुओं की संस्था कहलाती थी और मुस्लिम लोग मुसलमानों की, उसी तरह आज जब हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज का कोई आदमी यह कहे कि संविधान का पालन करो और यह शिकायत करे कि यह

सरकार संविधान का पालन करने में असमर्थ रही है, फेल हुई है, उत्तीर्ण नहीं हुई है, तो उसका मंशा यह लगाया जाता है कि हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज वाले अपनी बात को दूसरों पर थोपना चाहते हैं । इससे अधिक शोचनीय बात कोई नहीं हो सकती है । कोई हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग एरिया वाला हिन्दी को थोपने की बात कैसे कर सकता है ? आज हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज के लोग केवल यह कर सकते हैं कि वे संविधान के पालन के लिये जी जान से जुट जायें और सरकार को मजबूर कर दें कि वह तेजी से संविधान की व्यवस्थाओं को अमल में लाये ।

आज हम देखते हैं कि लोग बार बार हिन्दी हिन्दी स्पीकिंग एरियाज वालों को उपदेश देते हैं, गृह मंत्री भी हमें उपदेश देते हैं, जैसे हम ने कोई बहुत बड़ा पाप किया है । अगर किसी ने पाप किया है, तो संविधान बनाने वालों ने किया होगा, जिन्होंने हिन्दी को संविधान में रखा । जिन्होंने संविधान को बनाया, उन्हीं की आज हुकूमत भी है और अधिकतर वही लोग आज सरकार में बैठे हुये हैं । अगर वे अपने पाप को छिपाने के लिये नान-हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग एरियाज को आड़ लेकर चलते हैं, तो इससे अधिक शर्म की कोई बात नहीं हो सकती है ।

मैं तो यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि अगर नान-हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग एरियाज में हिम्मत है, तो वे इकट्ठे हो कर एक कांफ्रेंस करें और यह तय करें कि वे किसी एक जुबान को स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार हैं । हम संविधान में दो जुबानें रखने के लिये तैयार हैं, इस देश में दो जुबानें चलाने के लिये तैयार हैं ॥ नान-हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग एरियाज में जितने भी प्रदेश हैं, उन के नेता इकट्ठे होकर इस बारे में फ़ैसला करें । लेकिन अगर वे फ़ैसला कर सकते, तो यह स्थिति पैदा न होती । संविधान के बनाने के समय भी ये सब बातें सामने आई थीं ।

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

डी० एम० के० का तरीका तो दूसरा है, लेकिन बाकी साथी दबी जुबान से यह कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दी चाहते हैं, किन्तु जब लिमिट, अवधि, बांधने का सवाल आता है, तो वे क्यों घबराते हैं? बिना अवधि बांधे काम नहीं चलेगा। अगर सरकार पर अवधि बांधने का डंडा नहीं रहेगा, तो जब अवधि बांधने पर भी यह दशा हो गई, तो अवधि के वगैर तो दशा और भी बिगड़ेगी। इस बारे में मैं इस समय अधिक नहीं कहूंगा, क्योंकि अगली अमेंडमेंट्स पर विस्तार से यह कहने का मौका मिलेगा कि किस प्रकार हिन्दी बढ़े और किस प्रकार से उसका काम हो। इस वक्त मैं केवल यह निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर दस साल की अवधि की बात इस क्लोज में न जोड़ी जायगी तो न वह अगली क्लोज से जुड़ेगी और न हमारा यह मंशा पूरा होगा कि सरकार पर दबाव डाला जाये कि वह तेजी से काम करे।

इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि गृह मंत्री कृपा कर के इस बात पर ध्यान दें और हिन्दी स्पाकिंग एरियाज वालों को उपदेश न देकर नान-हिन्दी-स्पाकिंग एरियाज वालों के साथ अवधि के बारे में चर्चा करें कि वे कितनी अवधि रखने के लिये तैयार हैं, उनकी क्या रुकावटें और कठिनाइयां हैं और उनको देखकर अवधि को व्यवस्था इस क्लोज में रखें।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Prabhat Kar.

**Shri Sham Lal Saraf:** May I know whether today also the speakers are going to be called according to the list that is with the Speaker, whether only those who have moved amendments will be allowed to speak I want to speak on this amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But let those who have tabled amendments speak first.

**श्री बागड़ी :** मेरी भी एक अमेंडमेंट है।

**श्री भक्त दर्शन (गढ़वाल) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत से सदस्य पहले नहीं बोल पाये हैं। इसलिये अगर उनकी कोई अमेंडमेंट्स नहीं भंग हैं, तो विशेष परिस्थिति में—क्योंकि यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण क्लोज है—उनको भी बोलने की इजाजत दी जाये।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have taken nearly 16 hours on the general discussion.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It has been extended for tomorrow. He has agreed to it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would request the hon. Member to limit it to five minutes.

**Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat):** Will only those who have given amendments be allowed to speak on this clause?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am giving chances to others also.

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakar:** Those who are opposing this amendment should be given time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Five minutes each.

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** So Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, so far as our contention is concerned, as a party, we made our position clear during the speeches made by the Deputy Leader of our Group, Shri H. N. Mukerjee and also by Shri Vasudevan Nair. We do not agree either with Shri Frank Anthony's contention or with the contention of the leader of the Swatantra party that English should continue for all time to come. We say that it should be replaced by an Indian language, and that language should be Hindi. Having agreed to that, we have also moved an amendment which is almost the same as amendment No. 36. My amendment is No. 57.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You are speaking on 62?

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** I am speaking on amendment No. 57 which is to the effect that "may" shall be substituted by "shall" in clause 3. It has been moved.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes; 57 is the same as the amendment of Shri Frank Anthony.

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** In spite of the step that we have taken, we have moved the amendment that "may" shall be substituted by "shall." During the last three days we have had discussion, and barring perhaps very few Members,—at least as far as I know, all of us came to the conclusion, and there was almost a unanimous view, that the question of the continuance of English does not arise, and that Hindi should replace English as early as possible. In spite of that, we wanted that the word "may" should be changed into "shall". We have seen since the last three days how legal quibbles have taken place to the effect that "may" may mean "may not", "may" may mean "shall" and that "shall" may also mean "may." In view of this, and also due to the insistence on the part of the Government and also on the part of some other Members that "may" should not be changed into "shall", there is a genuine apprehension in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people that today the Government wants to foist Hindi on them. We want that this apprehension should be removed. It should be made quite clear that the Government or the Parliament is not imposing Hindi against the will of the non-Hindi speaking people.

I would also draw your attention to the provisions of the Constitution Article 343 (1) says that the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script. Clause 343 (3) says as follows;

"Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, . . ."

So, it is within the discretion of Parliament to extend the period; the power is vested in Parliament. We are extending the period now. We have seen that there was opposition to the introduction of the Bill by a section of the people. Not only that. Yesterday, there was some type of amendment moved by Shri Frank Anthony and Shri Ram Sewak Yadav who wanted that the Bill should not be introduced, and Shri Frank Anthony wants the continuance of English.

The main point is, what we are deciding now. We are saying that English language may continue. Who will decide again whether it will continue or not? Under these circumstances, when we are thinking in terms of passing statutes in Hindi, knowing fully well the difficulty of the Hindi language as it stands today, and the flexibility of the English language and the way the laws and the Constitution are interpreted — the lawyer Members will know how these things are or can be interpreted and misinterpreted—at this particular time, we still give scope for such misinterpretations. Not only that. This will create a feeling in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people that we are today trying to foist Hindi against the will of the non-Hindi speaking population. I do not agree with Shri Frank Anthony that the Home Minister was speaking completely contrary to what the Prime Minister said. As I understand, both of them wanted that English should continue. I think that, from what the committee has done and also from other things, the status of English also as the official language will remain the same as it was. That was the assurance that was given and that is exactly what I understand from the speeches. If that is so, what is the harm in clearing the doubt and allaying the apprehension and fear in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people, and making it categorical? That is what I want, without going into other questions. We want the integration of the country so that there could be no misunderstanding on the part of any one section.

[Shri Prabhat Kar].

For example, I come from West Bengal, a non-Hindi speaking area. I can speak fluent Hindi. Our education has been in the foreign language all these years. Now we want that it should be in an Indian language and that it should be the Hindi language. But then the process should not be hurried through, and there should not be any feeling in the minds of the non-Hindi speaking people that they are being forced to learn Hindi. Let there be a natural flow; let the learning of Hindi by the non-Hindi speaking people continue and have a natural flow.

Further, it appears that there is an apprehension among certain sections that hence forward, unless a person knows Hindi perfectly, his chances of entering the all-India services will be affected. Are we not to clear up these apprehensions. Are we not to place before this country our stand that, as at present, English will continue in the same position as it was till again we discuss and finalise the thing? That is why, in spite of our having categorically made the statement, I commend this amendment. I would request the hon. Home Minister to realise that the refusal of the Government to accept this amendment will create further complications in the minds of the non-Hindi-speaking people to the effect that the Hindi-knowing friends are not agreeing to accommodate on this particular point, and that they are trying to foist Hindi against the will of the non-Hindi speaking people. That is why I appeal to the hon. Home Minister to look at it from this angle and accept this amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Balmiki.

**Shri Bade rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have called Shri Balmiki.

**Shri Bade:** I have got an amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Balmiki.

श्री बाल्मीकी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी दो अमेंडमेंट्स हैं १४७ और १४९। हिन्दी

या अंग्रेजी के बारे में राज भाषा के रूप में अगर देश में व्यापक मत लिया जाये, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि देश का व्यापक मत हिन्दी के पक्ष में आयेगा। हिन्दी भाषी तो इसके पक्ष में मत देंगे ही लेकिन जो अहिन्दी भाषी हैं, वे भी अधिकतर इसके पक्ष में मत देंगे। यहाँ सदन में अनेक अहिन्दी भाषी सदस्यों ने हिन्दी के पक्ष का समर्थन किया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, संविधान निर्मात्री परिषद ने हिन्दी को तथा दूसरी जो प्रादेशिक भाषायें हैं, उनको राष्ट्र भाषा का जो स्थान प्रदान किया है, वह स्थान उनको प्राप्त नहीं हो रहा है, वह मैं समझता हूँ कि एक प्रकार से संविधान की आत्मा का उल्लंघन है, आत्मा का हनन है। अभी जो विधेयक हमारे सामने है उसमें चूँकि किसी भी प्रकार की अवधि निर्धारित नहीं है, इसलिये उसका संघा सा अर्थ यह निकलता है कि अंग्रेजी को स्थायी स्थान दिया जा रहा है, उसको स्थायित्व प्रदान किया जा रहा है। यह कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के बीच यह एक समझौता है और दोनों को समान स्थान इस में प्राप्त होगा। इससे मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। यदि जिस प्रकार का यह विधेयक है, इसको इस प्रकार से, इस शक्ल में पारित किया जाता है और अंग्रेजी को बिना अवधि निर्धारित किये रखा जाता है तो अंग्रेजी को जो प्रमुख स्थान इस समय प्राप्त है, वह उसको आगे भी प्राप्त रहेगा और प्रमुख स्थान हिन्दी को नहीं मिल सकेगा।

आप देखें कि हमारे राष्ट्र में हिन्दी का क्या स्थान है। वह बहुमत का भाषा ही नहीं है बल्कि जिस तरह से दूसरी भाषायें बंगाली, मराठी आदि संस्कृत से निकली हैं, उसी तरह से हिन्दी भी संस्कृत से निकली है। हिन्दी का संस्कृत से निकली अन्य भाषाओं के साथ भगिनी का नाता है। जहाँ तक लिपि का संबंध है, हिन्दी और संस्कृत की लिपि

(देवनागरी) समान है और इस नाते दूसरी भाषाओं में भी उसका समावेश हो जाता है। हिन्दी में संस्कृत गभित शब्द होने से उसको एक विशेष स्थान प्राप्त हो जाता है। लेकिन आज यह कहना कि हमारे राष्ट्र हित में और भावात्मक एकता को रखने के लिये अंग्रेजी का एक विशेष स्थान हो सकता है, मैं इस विचार से सहमत नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि किसी भी देश के अन्दर एकता को देखते हुये, देश की शक्ति को देखते हुये, देश के अन्दर समान विचार तथा आत्म गौरव को देखते हुये वही भाषा उपयुक्त हो सकती है जो अधिकतर लोगों के द्वारा बोली जाती है और समझी जाती है तथा वह स्थान आज हिन्दी को ही प्राप्त हो सकता है। मुश्किल यह है कि २ फी सदी अंग्रेजी बोलने वालों के हित की रक्षा की जाती है और १८ फी सदी जो भारतीय भाषाओं के बोलने वाले हैं और जिन के द्वारा हिन्दी अधिकतर समझी जाती है उन के हितों का उपेक्षा की जाती है। मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि प्रादेशिक भाषाओं का अपना एक स्थान है, उनका एक अपना साहित्य है, उनका एक उच्चता है लेकिन हिन्दी का भी अपना एक साहित्य है, उसका एक उच्चता है। साथ ही मैं यह भी कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि प्रादेशिक भाषा तो एक प्रदेश के अन्दर संमित रह जाती है, वह कुछ ही दूर तक जाती है, लेकिन जहाँ तक हिन्दी का संबंध है, वह सारे देश के अन्दर व्यापक रूप से समझी जाती है। इस प्रकार हिन्दी में ही राष्ट्र भाषा बनने की सारी योग्यतायें हैं।

प्रोफेसर रंगा जब बोल रहे थे उनकी एक बात सुन कर मुझे बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ। उन्होंने एक धर्मान्धता व एक संकुचित मनो-वृत्ति की बात यहाँ कही कि देश के अन्दर उत्तर भारत के लोग एक तरह से सोचते हैं और दक्षिण भारत के लोग अन्य तरह से सोचते हैं। मैं तो कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि सारा देश आज एक है, वह आज एक इकाई के

रूप में है, सारे देश के अन्दर आज भावात्मक एकता है और सारा देश एक तरह से सोचता है। जिस तरह से आज सारा देश एक तरह से हिमालय के लिये सोचता है, उसी तरह से एक एक नदी के बारे में, चाहे वह गंगा हो या गोदावरी, जो कि दक्षिण की गंगा है, समान, प्यार, समान सद्भावना और समान आदर सारे देश के अन्दर है। उत्तर भारत में अवतार अवतरित हुये हैं और दक्षिण भारत से आचार्य आये हैं, लेकिन आचार्यों और अवतारों में एक प्रकार से और समान प्रेम है। भक्ति का भाव दक्षिण से आया है। हमारे अन्दर उन आचार्यों उन महापुरुषों के लिये, विशेष रूप से जो शंकराचार्य हुये हैं, उनके लिये पूरा आदर है, जो हमारे दक्षिण के तीर्थ स्थान हैं, उनके लिये हमारे हृदय में विशेष आदर है।

**Shri Maurya:** He established the caste system.

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** अब उम कास्ट सिस्टम को भूलना ही चाहिये। किन्तु उसका तरह से यह अंग्रेजों को मोलने का मोह भी कास्ट सिस्टम बन कर रह जाता है क्योंकि उसका एक अलग एटिकेट और लहजा है।

मेरे कहने का अर्थ यह है कि एक अवधि निर्धारित होनी चाहिये कि कब तक अंग्रेजी अंग्रेजी चलेगी। जब तक आप वह अवधि निर्धारित नहीं करते तब तक हिन्दी को उचित स्थान नहीं मिल सकता है। एक अवधि निर्धारित कर देना है और साथ में यह भी तय कर देना है कि इस अवधि के अन्दर, जिसको मैंने १९८० तक रक्खा है, अंग्रेजी को हटाना पड़ेगा। हिन्दी का जो विशेष स्थान है वह उस अवधि के बाद उस को मिलना चाहिये। यदि उसको उचित स्थान नहीं दिया जाता तो वह हमारे हित में नहीं होगा। मैं यहाँ पर "मि" और "शेल" के झगड़े में नहीं पढ़ना चाहता। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि "शेल" जो है वह जरूरी नहीं है, "मि" जरूरी

[श्री बाल्मीकी]

है, लेकिन हिन्दी के हित के लिये अवधि देना आवश्यक है ।

जो मेरा दूसरा अमेंडमेंट है वह यह है कि सरकार की ओर से विशेषकर हिन्दी का जो अपना स्थान है, सांवाधानिक स्थान है, उसके प्रति उदासीनता रही है, उसमें ढील रही है और अब भी वह ढील चल रही है । मेरा ऐसा विश्वास है कि आगे वह ढील नहीं चलेगी । गृह मंत्री जी से मेरा आग्रह है, विशेष रूप से कि जो दूसरा मेरा संशोधन है, उस पर वे विचार करें और स्वीकार करें । उस संशोधन के संबंध में मैं एक मिनट में निवेदन करना चाहूंगा । वह संशोधन यह है :

"For the vigorous propagation, development and growth of Hindi in Hindi-speaking areas in general and non-Hindi-speaking areas in particular a definite and well-planned scheme shall be drawn out acted upon to replace English before 1980".

इस प्रकार से मेरी अर्ज यह है कि हिन्दी के प्रचार तथा प्रसार के लिये सरकार को विशेषकर एक ऐसी व्यापक स्कीम बनानी चाहिये और इस विचार को पक्के ढंग से लेकर बनानी चाहिये कि इस अवधि के अन्त तक अंग्रेजी मिनिमाइज होती चली जायेगी, घटती चली जायेगी और हिन्दी को अपना उचित स्थान धीरे धीरे मिल जायेगा ।

मैं तो समझता हूँ कि हिन्दी ही नहीं, भारत की किसी भी भाषा को वह स्थान प्राप्त हो सकता है, लेकिन दूसरे देश की भाषा हमारे देश पर हमारी इच्छा के विरुद्ध नहीं लादी जा सकती । हमारी इच्छा है कि हमारे देश में हिन्दी को वह स्थान प्राप्त होना चाहिये और मुझे आशा है कि सरकार इस में अपना योगदान देगी ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की आज्ञा से तो एक मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The Hon. Member should resume his seat. Shri Bade.

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** सरकारी क्षेत्रों में सरकारी काम काज में हिन्दी का अधिकारिक प्रसार किया जाय लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक आप प्रथम श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों और अधिकारियों को पूरे तरीके से बल लगा कर हिन्दी नहीं सिखायेंगे, तब तक उन के हृदय में हिन्दी के प्रति प्रेम पैदा नहीं करेंगे, तब तक हिन्दी का हित नहीं हो सकता है । केवल छोटे कर्मचारियों को ही हिन्दी सिखाने से कोई फायदा नहीं है ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. He should finish now. I have called another Member.

**श्री बाल्मीकी :** एक मुझाव तो मैं यह देना चाहता हूँ । दूसरा मुझाव यह देना चाहता हूँ कि देश के गौरव तथा सम्मान को दृष्टि में रखते हुए हमारे राजदूत जो परिचय पत्र अपने साथ ले जाते हैं वे हिन्दी में जाने चाहिये, तीसरा मुझाव मेरा यह है कि जो हमारे व्यापारिक समझौते होते हैं, वे हिन्दी में होने चाहिये ।

**श्री बड़े :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रथम तो मैं आप से और हाउस से यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरी मातृ भाषा मराठी है । मैं मध्य प्रदेश में रहता हूँ और खानदेश के बार्डर का रहने वाला हूँ । मैंने कभी हिन्दी पढ़ी या सीखी नहीं है । लेकिन कोर्टम में जाने से हिन्दी सीख गया । वहाँ पर जो मेरे जैसी हिन्दी बोली जाती है वह मराठी और हिन्दी मिक्सड होती है । इस प्रकार से वहाँ के कोर्टम में होता है । लेकिन श्री फ्रैंक ऐन्थनी ने जो अमेंडमेंट रक्खा है "मे" और "शेल" के बारे में, मैं उस का विरोध करता हूँ ।

**श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :** काम बनाओ हिन्दी है ।

**श्री बड़े :** उसका कारण यह है कि उन्होंने एक अमेंडमेंट दिया है, और रंगा साहब ने भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की तस्वीर के साथ ऐडवर्टाइजमेंट निकाला कि इंग्लिश कायम रहगी । लेकिन मैं इस हाउस में कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने हाउस में कोई ऐश्वर्य दे दिया है तो क्या वह हाउस के लिये बन्धनकारक होगा ? वह कोई मोगल बादशाहों का फरमान नहीं है या जिस तरह से पहले हमारे यहां एक श्री शंकर आर्डर निकलता था उस तरह का श्री शंकर आर्डर नहीं है, जिसको मानना ही चाहिये कि अंग्रेजी रहनी चाहिये । श्री ऐन्थनी तो जबलपुर के रहने वाले हैं और कोर्ट में हिन्दी में काम करते हैं, फ़ास एग्जामिनेशन हिन्दी में करते हैं और पक्षदार सारे जो आते हैं वे हिन्दी वाले आते हैं । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्यों उनका इस प्रकार का हट्ट है कि हिन्दी नहीं होनी चाहिये । मैं श्री ऐन्थनी साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपना आश्वासन छोड़ दिया तो जो ३४३ आर्टिकल है कांस्टिट्यूशन का कि :

"The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script."

और जो यूनिवर्सिटी पास हुआ था, तथा उस पर श्री फ्रेड ऐन्थनी ने दस्तखत किया है, उसको वे कैसे भूल गये । जब समय बदल जाता है, जब परिस्थिति बदल जाती है, तब आदमी को भी बदलना पड़ता है । नीतियां जो हैं उनमें लिये आदमी नहीं है, आदमियों के लिये नीतियां हैं । खुद ऐन्थनी साहब कांस्टिट्यूशन पर दस्तखत करने के १० या १५ साल बाद बदल जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि हिन्दू कम्यूनलिज्म हटा गया इस लिये वह ऐश्वर्य बदल गया, मैं यह कहता हूँ कि हिन्दू कम्यूनलिज्म यह कैसे हटाया हिन्दी भाषा से ? यदि ऐन्थनी साहब यह कहते कि यहां जो उद्देश्य है वह होनी चाहिये तब भी मैं मान सकता

था कि वह भारतीय भाषा चाहते हैं । लेकिन वह उसको नहीं चाहते हैं । वह तो चाहते हैं कि यहां पर अंग्रेजी चले । मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि उनका अंग्रेजी क्यों चाहिये । अगर वह भारतीय भाषा कहते हैं तो उसको समझ सकता हूँ ।

रंगा साहब के मन में बड़ा झगड़ा चल रहा है क्योंकि वे तो पार्टी को लेकर बंटे हुए हैं । स्वतंत्र पार्टी को हिन्दी एरिया में भी काम करना पड़ता है और दक्षिण भारत में भी काम करना पड़ता है, उनको डी० एम० के० के विरोध में खड़े होना पड़ता है, इस लिये उन्होंने कहा कि अंग्रेजी नहीं होनी चाहिये हिन्दी भाषा होनी चाहिये, लेकिन हिन्दी धीरे धीरे आगे बढ़नी चाहिये । पहले उन्होंने हिन्दी का काफी विरोध किया, लेकिन आखिर में कहा कि यहां पर हिन्दी को धीरे धीरे लाने की बात मानी जाय । उन्होंने एक कम्प्रोमाइज कर लिया । उनकी पार्टी में भी हो मत है । एक तो यशपाल सिंह जी बोले दूसरे एक मद्रासी सदस्य बोले उनमें, शायद श्री रेड्डी साहब । दोनों बोले और उनका आपस में झगड़ा हुआ । श्री ला मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि "मे" के माने "शेल" भी हो सकता है और "शेल" के माने "मे" भी हो सकता है । तो क्या देवल शब्द बदल देने से माननीय सदस्यों का समाधान हो जायेगा ? लेकिन उसमें पीछे एक भावना है और मैं उस भावना का विरोध करता हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर राष्ट्र भाषा होनी चाहिये, ऐसी कोई बात रक्खी जाय । यहां की राष्ट्र भाषा हिन्दी होनी चाहिये । कोई साधु कन्याकुमारी से काश्मीर तक चला जाये, अगर वह हिन्दी जानता हो तो अपना काम चला सकता है । जिनके माननीय सदस्य हैं, चाहे वे बंगाल के हों, या मद्रास के हों, या गुजरात के हों, जब वे बाजार जाते हैं तो उनका सार व्यवहार हिन्दी में ही चलता है, अंग्रेजी में नहीं चलता । इसी लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दी ही राष्ट्र भाषा हो ।

## [श्री बड़े]

एक सदस्य ने डर दिलाया कि अगर हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा हो जायेगी तो नार्थ और साउथ के दो हिस्से अलग अलग हो जायेंगे। देश का पार्टीशन हो जायेगा। मैं देश का पार्टीशन नहीं चाहता। मैं इस संबंध में आपको एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। एक बच्चे को दो स्त्रियाँ अपना बच्चा बतलाती थीं और उनके लिये झगड़ती थीं। वे मजिस्ट्रेट के सामने गयीं। तो मजिस्ट्रेट ने कहा कि इस बच्चे के दो टुकड़े करके हर एक स्त्री को एक एक टुकड़ा दे दो। इस पर जो झूठी माता थी वह तो राजी हो गयी, पर जो सच्ची माता थी उसने आँखों में आँसू भर कर कहा कि मेरा बच्चा जिन्दा रहे, मैं नहीं चाहती के इसके टुकड़े किये जायें। आप यह बच्चा उम दूमरी औरत को ही दे दीजिये। वहीं जिन्दा रहे। तो यही मेरा उन लोगों से कहना है कि जो भाषा के प्रश्न पर देश का विभाजन करना चाहते हैं, वह झूठी माता के समान हैं। यदि वे चाहें तो किसी भी भारतीय भाषा को राष्ट्र भाषा बना लें, मैं उनके साथ हूँ, लेकिन शब्द का विभाजन न करें। लेकिन विधान के अनुसार हिन्दी ही राष्ट्र भाषा हो सकती है। इसीलिये मैंने कहा है कि इस देश में एक प्रधान, एक विधान, एक निशाण और एक जुवान रहेगी इसी लिये मेरा संशोधन है कि —

After 1965 it may be discontinued.

हमारे संविधान की धारा ३४३ में साफ लिखा है :

Official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devnagri script.

लेकिन मुझे यह देख कर ताज्जुब होता है कि दक्षिण के कुछ भाई अंग्रेजी को लाना चाहते हैं। मुझ को उनकी लाजिक समझ में नहीं आती। हम यह मान लें कि वे हिन्दी को नहीं चाहते, तो उसका स्थान पर कोई भारतीय भाषा लाने को कहें। वह बंगला, मराठी,

तमिल जो भी भाषा चाहें उसके लिये कहें तो समझ में आ सकता है। लेकिन यह कहना कि अंग्रेजी लानी चाहिये, इसमें कोई राष्ट्रीयता नहीं है। और अगर इस स्थिति में लोग उनकी देश भक्ति पर मन्देह करें तो उनको बुरा न मानना चाहिये। श्री शंकराचार्य केरल के थे लेकिन हमने उनको माना और उन्होंने चारों दिशाओं में मठ स्थापित किये। नदियों के नाम हमारे सब संस्कृत में हैं। हमारे रंगा साहब कहते हैं कि हम रामेश्वरम् को नहीं मानते। यह बात सही नहीं है। हम रामेश्वरम् को उतना ही मानते हैं जैसा कि हरिद्वार को। इसी लिये मैंने कहा है कि सन् १९६५ के बाद अंग्रेजी को डिस्कॉन्टिन्यू कर देना चाहिये। और यह जो 'शैल' और 'मे' का झगड़ा है इसको भी समाप्त किया जाना चाहिये। हमारे संविधान में धारा ३४३ में साफ लिखा है।

Official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devnagri script.

मैं प्रधान मंत्री जो से कहता हूँ कि अगर वे मध्य प्रदेश में चुनाव लड़ने जायें तो उनको पता चले कि लोग हिन्दी को कितना पसन्द करते हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि हिन्दी जो कि एक बड़ी सरल भाषा है, हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा होनी चाहिये। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि १९६५ के बाद से अंग्रेजी को समाप्त किया जायें।

हमारे ला मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो कहा है कि :

"shall" may be interpreted as "may" in this context and "may" can be interpreted as "shall".

मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ। "मे" के स्थान पर "शैल" होना चाहिये और जैसा मैंने कहा है सन् १९६५ के बाद अंग्रेजी को डिस्कॉन्टिन्यू करना चाहिये, यही मेरी विनती है।



श्री बागड़ी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा अमेंडमेंट नम्बर १५२ है। यह मेरा बदकिस्मती है कि इस समय न तो प्रधान मंत्री जी और न गृह मंत्री जी उपस्थित हैं। आज मैं उन से दो चार बातें भाषा के बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता था।

सन् १९५० में जब हमारा विधान बना उसमें कुछ ही समय पहले गांधी जा देश से अन्तर्दान हुए थे। उस समय गांधी जी की आत्मा का कुछ असर था और कुछ गांधी जी के विचारों और प्रचार का असर था। इसलिए सन् १९५० में हमारे विधान में यह चीज रख दी गयी कि सन् १९६५ के बाद हिन्दुस्तान में अंग्रेजी राजभाषा नहीं रहेगी; बल्कि इस देश की राजभाषा हिन्दी होगी। अगर गांधी जी जिन्दा होते तो यह बात उसी समय से लागू हो जाती। यही हममें कमजोरी रही।

और १५ साल के अर्से में हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार ने क्या किया? मैं आपकी मारफत अर्ज करता हूँ कि अगर कोई गलब सरकार होती, अपनी जवान का पाबन्द सरकार होती तो उसका यह धर्म और फर्ज था कि वह अपने बचन पर कायम रहती। लेकिन यह सरकार अपने बचन पर कायम नहीं रही; इसने हिन्दुस्तान को जनता को धोखा दिया और विधान के साथ विश्वासघात किया। किसी सरकार को नापने का यही पैमाना होता है कि वह अपने बचन पर कायम रहे।

आज यह कहा जा रहा है और यह आलोचना हो रही है कि अंग्रेजी रहे, अंग्रेजी भागे बढ़े, हिन्दी से नहीं चलेगा, दो तरीके हो जायेंगे, तीन तरीके हो जायेंगे। इसका कारण क्या है? हमारी सरकार के नेता १५ साल तक राष्ट्रभाषा को बढ़ाने में नहीं रहे, वे १५ साल तक राष्ट्र भाषा को तोड़ने में रहे। और हिन्दी को हिन्दुस्तान की अन्य प्रांतीय भाषाओं से लड़ाया और राष्ट्र भाषा को बदनाम किया और उसी का आज यह नतीजा है कि आज हमारे लोग हिन्दी के मुकाबले में एक विदेशी भाषा को हिमायत कर रहे हैं, वे लोग जिन्होंने देश के अन्दर आदर पाया है, जिन

लोगों ने देश की आजादी की लड़ाई में हिस्सा लिया, जिन्होंने कुरबानियाँ कीं, जो लोग गांधी जी को सर्वोत्तम समझते थे और उनके बचनों को वेद वाक्य मानते थे, आज वह लोग कहते हैं कि हमें हिन्दी, कां, परवाह नहीं, चहे हिन्दी डूब जाय लेकिन अंग्रेज़, न डूबे। ऐसा लगता है जैसे कि चर्चिल बोल रहे हों और अंग्रेज़ों का, नुमायन्दगी कर रहे हों। इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण यह है कि पंजाब में हिन्दी और पंजाब, कां, लड़ाई चली, मराठी और गुजराती की लड़ाई चली। देश की अन्य भाषाओं से राष्ट्र भाषा को लड़ाया गया। जहाँ इस सरकार का यह फर्ज था कि राष्ट्र भाषा की तरक्की करती वहाँ इसने ऐसा परिस्थिति पैदा कर दी कि आज उसका विरोध हो रहा है। इसके लिए सरकार मुजरिम है। जहाँ आज लोगों की यह मांग होनी चाहिए थी कि हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा हो वहाँ आज हिन्दी का विरोध हो रहा है और इस पवित्र सदन में खड़े हो कर लोग कहते हैं कि अंग्रेजी रहे। यह कितनी लज्जा की बात है। आज वह अंग्रेज़ जोकि सौ पचास साल इस देश में पूजा जा रहा है। आज वे विदेशी लोग अपनी भाषा को यहाँ पुजवा रहे हैं। लेकिन हम लोग जो बापू का आदर करते थे, हम ने यह नारा उठाया था कि हमको अंग्रेज़ों को देश से हटाना है और उससे भी ज्यादा जरूरी यह है कि हम अंग्रेज़ों को देश से हटाएँ। आज बापू चले गए। उनके नारे के लिए हमारे मासूम बच्चों ने अपने सीनों पर गोलियाँ खायीं, हमारी माताओं और बहनों ने अपने मुहाग लुटवाये और उनका एक नारा पूरा हो गया, अंग्रेज़ यहाँ से चले गया। लेकिन जो दूसरा नारा था कि अंग्रेज़ से भी ज्यादा यह जरूरी है कि अंग्रेजी भाषा को हटाया जाए वह पूरा नहीं हुआ। इसका सबसे बड़ा दोष इस सरकार को है जो कि बापू की नामलेवा सरकार है। इसके लिए मैं तो सब से ज्यादा प्रधान मंत्री को जिम्मेदार समझता हूँ, जो कभी दक्षिण में जाकर लोगों को एक बचन दे देते हैं, कभी उत्तर में कुछ बचन दे देते हैं। कभी

[श्री बागड़ी]

उरदू की बात करते हैं, कर्मा हिन्दों की बात करते हैं, कर्मा पंजाबों की बात करते हैं, कर्मा मराठों की बात करते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की भाषाओं की सरकार की तरफ से तरक्की नहीं की गयी। यह उनके साथ अन्याय हुआ। अन्य भाषा भाषियों को यह बताया कि तुम्हारी लड़ाई तो राष्ट्र भाषा से है। प्रान्तीय भाषाओं के दिलों में यह शक किसने पैदा किया? सरकार ने। इसके लिए सरकार जिम्मेवार है। सरकार का फर्ज था कि प्रान्तीय भाषाओं को उठाती और राष्ट्रभाषा को भी उठाती, तो प्रान्तीय भाषाओं में और राष्ट्र भाषा में संघर्ष न होता।

मैरा जो तरमांम है वह यह है कि अंग्रेजी ऐंडोशनल भाषा होगा। गज भाषा हिन्दी रहेगा। मन् १९६५ से पूरे तौर से इस देश को राज भाषा हिन्दी हो जायगा। लेकिन अगर कोई दक्षिण के भाई समझना चाहेंगे और अंग्रेजा में चाहेंगे तो मन् १९६५ के बाद उन दस्तावेजों का तर्जुमा अंग्रेजी में कर दिया जायेगा। वैसे इंडियन यूनिन का पूरे तौर पर राज भाषा हिन्दा बन जायेगा।

14 hrs.

आज अभाग्यवश यह जो हिन्दा-अंग्रेजा के मवाल पर उत्तर और दक्षिण का मसला खड़ा किया जाता है दरअसल यह चांज कुछ और है। दरअसल यह उत्तर और दक्षिण का झगड़ा नहीं है। दक्षिण के राजे, उत्तर के राजे और यह सब पूंजीपति लोग एक हों हैं और उन सब को भाषा अंग्रेजा है। हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब दलित, दुखी किमान व मजदूर चाहे वह उत्तर में रहते हों या दक्षिण में रहते हों, वे आज से नहीं बल्कि हजारों साल पहले से शोषित रहे हैं और शासक वर्ग द्वारा सदा उनका शोषण होता आया है और आज भी वहाँ किया जा रहा है। जनता की, शोषित वर्ग की भाषा, कभी भी

राज भाषा नहीं रही है और आज भी वही चीज देखने में आ रही है। जब इस देश पर हिन्दुओं का राज्य था तो संस्कृत यहाँ की राज-भाषा होती थी। यदि दलित व शोषित वर्ग वाले संस्कृत पढ़ते थे तो उन के कानी में सीसा डाल दिया जाता था। जब इस देश में यवनों का राज्य आया तो अरबी व फारसी इस देश की राज भाषा बनी और आम जनता की भाषा उम गौरव से बंचित रही। जब अंग्रेजों का इस देश पर राज्य कायम हुआ तो अंग्रेजी इस देश की राज भाषा बनी। जनता और शोषित वर्ग की भाषा कभी राज भाषा नहीं बन पायी। हालांकि अंग्रेज इस देश से चले गये, देश का शासन भारतवासियों के हाथ में आ गया तो भी हम देखते हैं कि काले रंग वाले अंग्रेजों के राज्य के अन्दर अभी भी अंग्रेजी चल रही है। उससे शासक वर्ग चिपटे बंठा है। अंग्रेजी के मुकाबले देश की जन भाषा आज भी नहीं बँठ पाती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज देश की जो दुदंशा हो रही है उस से मुझे तो मालूम पड़ता है कि बापू ने जो शब्द कहे थे वे सच साबित हो सकते हैं। यह कांग्रेसी भाई, मुझे तो ऐसा जान पड़ता है कि वह दिन नजदीक लाने वाले हैं जिम दिन के लिए गांधी जी ने कहा था कि वह समय दूर नहीं जब इस देश की जनता इन गांधी टोपी पहनने वाले कांग्रेसियों को चुन चुन कर मारेगी। आज शासक वर्ग और जनता के बीच की खाई बजाय घटने के और अधिक गहरी होती जा रही है। आज जहाँ देखिये अंग्रेजी का बोलवाला दिखता है। अब प्रधान मंत्री जी क्यों न अंग्रेजी की हिमायत करें? उनमें दोहते अंग्रेजी पढ़ रहे हैं और उन की तालीम पर ५०० रुपये महीना खर्च होता है लेकिन गरीब हरिजनों के बच्चे कैसे अंग्रेजी पढ़ सकते हैं। राजा जी अंग्रेजी की वकालत करते नहीं थकते क्योंकि जिनकी और से वे बोलते हैं, वे सब राजा महाराजा, नवाब और देश के पूंजीपतियों के बच्चे अंग्रेजी ही तो पढ़ते हैं। इसी तरह श्री एन्वनी अंग्रेजी के लिए क्यों न कहें? वह तो

ऐसा कह कर अपना कर्तव्य पूरा करते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी उनसे चाहते हैं वही वह कहते हैं। एन्वनी ग्राह्य पंडित नेहरू के विन्कुल रूप हैं। उन्होंने उनको नोमिनेट किया है तो वह उसका बदला चुका रहे हैं। दोनों एक ही रूप हैं। पंडित नेहरू जितना उनको कहते हैं वह यहां कहते हैं। आज भाषा के नाम पर ही हिन्दुस्तान की भोली भाली जनता को उकसाया जा रहा है और आपस में लड़ाया जा रहा है। आज अगर कोई देशवासी चाहे वह बंगाली हो, गुजराती हो या अन्य प्रांत का, अगर वह अपनी प्रादेशिक भाषा के सवाल को उठाये तो मैं उसकी फर्र कर सकता हूँ और मैं समझूंगा कि वह अपने प्रांत का भक्त है और प्रांत की गरीब जनता का भक्त है। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि आखिर दक्षिण में जो गरीब लोग बसते हैं, भोज मांगते फिरते हैं क्या वह अंग्रेजी जानते हैं? कुछ थोड़े से लोग अपना स्वार्थ साधने के लिए शोषित लोगों को लूटने के लिए उन की कमाई पर डाका डालने के लिए अंग्रेजी का सवाल बुलन्द करते हैं। जिस तरह अंग्रेज हिन्दुस्तान को गुलाम बनाये रखने के लिए अपनी भाषा का प्रचार करने से उसी तरीके से हिन्दुस्तान के यह दो फीसदी लूटेरे हिन्दुस्तान के लाखों, करोड़ों गरीबों की कमाई पर डाका डालने के लिए और उनको हमेशा अपने नीचे रखने के लिए अंग्रेजी का शासन चलाना चाहते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर शासक वर्ग वाणी के बारे में भाषा के बारे में देश की नीति जानना चाहता है तो अभी उत्तर प्रदेश के अन्दर उपचुनाव हो रहे हैं, उनको भाषा के आधार पर लड़ कर देख लिया जाय कि जनता हिन्दी चाहती है या अंग्रेजी ?

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya** (Rai-ganj): That is what you want. You want to utilise it for the purpose of bye-elections in U.P. That is not the purpose.

**श्री बागड़ी** : यह विलायत में जाकर बोलिये।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय** : माननीय सदस्य का अमेंडमेंट अंग्रेजी में है।

**श्री बागड़ी** : मैं अपने अमेंडमेंट को हिन्दी में बतला रहा हूँ और हिन्दी में ही भाषण दे रहा हूँ . . . . .

**श्रीमती रेणुका राय** (माल्दा) : आप बंगला में बोलिये।

**श्री बागड़ी** : ठीक है आप बंगला में बोलिये लेकिन आप तो अंग्रेजी के लिए काम कर बैठे हुई हैं।

**श्रीमती रेणुका राय** : बंगाल में बंगला आफिशिएल लैंग्वेज हो गयी है

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय** : माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो रहा है।

**श्री बागड़ी** : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं केवल दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त किये देता हूँ।

मैं आप की भाफंत इस सदन की सेवा में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान आज घोर संकट के अन्दर है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों पर खतरा है। इस अवसर पर हिन्दुस्तान में एकता की बहुत जरूरत है। हिन्दुस्तान को कोई एक नेहरू, एक लाल बहादुर शास्त्री या और कोई एक व्यक्ति नहीं बचा सकता है। हिन्दुस्तान को इस देश के ४५ करोड़ नर नारी ही बचा सकते हैं। वह तभी बचा सकते हैं जब भारत इकट्ठा हो। भारत इकट्ठा कब हो सकता है? जब भारत की कोई अपनी एक भाषा हो। भाषा के बगैर भविष्य नहीं हो सकता। आज हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्रभाषा के खिलाफ जो कहता है वह हिन्दुस्तान के भविष्य के खिलाफ जा रहा है और हिन्दुस्तान की एकता के खिलाफ जा रहा है। आने वाला युग और आने वाले गरीब लोग उनको नहीं बर्सेंगे। चीन के मुकाबले में भारत की जो हार हुई, उसके लिए जहाँ कई कारण हैं वहाँ एक कारण यह भी था कि अंग्रेजी पढे लिखे लोगों को

[श्री बागड़ी]

जनरल और करनल बना कर भेजा हुआ था और वे लोग अंग्रेजी में गिटपिठ करते थे और हमारे जवानों को ठीक तरह से उनका डाइरेक्शंस समझ में नहीं आते थे। वे बिल्कुल अंग्रेजियत में डूबे थे और कोट, पतलून और नैकटाई पहन कर छूरी, कांटे से खाते थे और फौजी जवानों से बिल्कुल अलग अलग रहते थे, भाषा, खाना पीना और रहन-सहन सब कुछ अलग था और अफसर और जवान में फ्रंट पर जो एक बिलकुल नज़दीक का सम्बन्ध और सहयोग होना चाहिए था उसका वहां सर्वथा अभाव था। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि जो फौजी जवान ठीक हों, रेकार्ड अच्छा हो उनको भी जनरल और करनल बनाया जाये और यह तरक्की सिर्फ अंग्रेजी दां लोगों के लिए ही न रहे।

आप इस अंग्रेजी को पीछे डालिये और हिन्दी जो कि इस देश की राष्ट्र भाषा और राज भाषा है उसको उसकी उपयुक्त जगह पर बिठाइये। लेकिन बदकिस्मती की बात है कि आज ऐसा नहीं हो रहा है और अंग्रेजी से अभी तक चिपटे रहने की कोशिश हो रही है। अगर कोई व्यक्ति तेलगू को राजभाषा बनाने के लिए बोले तो मैं उस को सम्झ सकता हूँ क्योंकि तेलगू भारतवर्ष की एक प्रदेश की मातृभाषा है लेकिन ऐसा न करके जब कितनी लोगों द्वारा अंग्रेजी के पक्ष की वकालत की जाती है तब मुझे उन पर तरस आता है। इस देश से अंग्रेज चले गये। भारत स्वाधीन हो गया तो यहाँ की भाषा भी कोई अपनी देशी भाषा होनी चाहिए। विदेशी भाषा का क्या काम? लेकिन पता नहीं क्या कारण है कि कुछ लोग पुराने संस्कारों के कारण अभी तक अंग्रेजों से प्यार और मोह करते हैं?

अपनी राष्ट्रभाषा को अपनाते न इस देश का भविष्य बनेगा। आज इस देश के लाखों और करोड़ों गरीब लोग इस सरकार की ओर देख रहे हैं कि वह भाषा के सम्बन्ध में क्या नीति अपनाती है? मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि प्रधान मंत्री बिना बात देश के

सामने उत्तर-दक्षिण की एकता टूटने का हीवा खड़ा कर रहे हैं। उनका तो यह तरीका रहा है कि कभी एक को उक्सा दिया तो दूसरे को बिठा दिया। कभी उत्तर वालों को उक्सा दिया तो दक्षिण वालों को चुप करा दिया तो कभी दक्षिण वालों को भड़का दिया और उत्तर वालों को दबा दिया। कभी स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द को उभार दिया तो कभी उनको दबा दिया। आज स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द या कोई भी व्यक्ति यदि इस देश में हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा और राज भाषा बनाने के लिए कहता है तो वह गलत नहीं कहता है। देश की एकता मजबूत करने की बात कहता है और न्याय की ही बात कहता है। अगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी राष्ट्रभाषा के खिलाफ कुछ कहते हैं तो वे देश के और राष्ट्र के खिलाफ कहते हैं और उसके साथ बेवफाई करते हैं। बस मैं एक चीज़ कह कर बैठ जाता हूँ:—

“हम तो समझे थे कि राहत से बसर हो जायगी,  
क्या खबर थी कि वह हुकूमत ददें सिर हो जायगी।”

हमें क्या पता था कि यह प्रधान मंत्री जी और श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री हिन्दुस्तान की भाषा के लिए ददें सिर बन जायेंगे?

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, clause 3 is the main clause of the proposed Act. So, the scope of this clause covers practically the entire field of the Bill. Shri Frank Anthony has stated that this Bill is the result of some compromise, compromise between the assurance of the Prime Minister and the demand of Hindi enthusiasts. I do not think that is a correct appraisal of the Bill. Surely, it is the result of some compromise.

**An Hon. Member:** It is not a compromise. It is a concession.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** It is the result of some compromise between two contending sections of the Indian nation.

There is the Hindi element as also the non-Hindi element. There must be some compromise between the two elements, if India is to continue as a nation and if we are to maintain our integrity.

My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, recalled the case of the Muslim League demand and gave a sort of warning to us and to the Government. I do not like to go so far but, surely, we should take a lesson from what happened during those days. From that point of view, both sides should take this problem in a serious mood, in a mood of some compromise and accommodation.

If India had been a unilingual State, with only one language then, on the 16th August 1947 India would have taken to that language, discarding English language. There would have been much difficulty in finding proper administrative words, there would have been great difficulties in putting down notes and other things by the officials, who had been trained in English, who had been brought up in the English atmosphere and English administrative form but, all the same, in spite of all these difficulties, I am sure, India would have immediately taken to that one language, if India had been a one-language State.

But, fortunately or unfortunately, India is a multi-lingual State. That is why in the Constitution also some compromise has been made. It had been admitted in the Constituent Assembly that no nation can, with any amount of self-respect, continue to use a foreign language as the official language. A nation must have a language of its own. What that language should be was the point for consideration and the consensus of opinion—I should say, the unanimous view—of the Constituent Assembly including that of Shri Frank Anthony was that Hindi in Devanagari script should be the official language of India. But as a sort of a compromise and for the convenience of the administrative services as also for the convenience

and interest of the non-Hindi-speaking element it was provided in the Constitution that for 15 years English should continue to be the official language and continue to be used for all purposes for which it was used upto the 25th January, 1950.

According to clauses (1) and (2) of article 343 Hindi becomes the effective official language from the 26th January, 1950. But there is another clause in article 343, namely, clause (3), which provides that Parliament may, by law, provide for the continuation of English for any specified purpose. This Bill is providing that. By this Bill the non-Hindi-speaking element gets what is the most essential thing for it, that is, the administration of the country will be permitted to continue through the English language. The Hindi speaking element also, I think gets the essential thing for it, that is, according to the provisions of the Bill, Hindi will now become the first language.

In the proviso to clause (2) of article 343 it has been stated, namely,—

“Provided that the President may, during the said period, by order authorise the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language”.

But now that has been changed. Now, this Bill permits that—

“the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi”.

Upto the 26th January 1950 English will occupy the first place for the purpose of the Union Government but from then on, at least technically, Hindi will occupy that position but English may be permitted to be used for any official purpose.

Much has been said about the terms “may” and “shall” during the last few days in this House. “May” and “shall” have been interpreted in so many ways that laymen like me would get confused about the proper

[Shri A. C. Guha].

use of these two words. I am not a lawyer, nor have I got any pretension of any education outside India. So, I cannot claim any good knowledge of English also. Still, I think, in this clause "may" may be more appropriate than "shall" which would require a time limit to be put.

Further, I do not know what we would gain. I belong to the non-Hindi-speaking element; that is why I say what we would gain by substituting "shall" for "may". This Bill should not be taken as an essay on English grammar. It should be taken as a political document. The assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister and the assurance which is conveyed through this Bill is to be taken in the political background. If the Government or the Prime Minister at any time decides to drop English, even "shall" may not prevent them from doing that.

This Bill is not a part of the Constitution. This is only a Bill. Shri Frank Anthony wants to provide in it that any change in the position of English should be made with three-fourths majority of both the Houses, but even if that is provided in this Bill, this Act, after its enactment, can be modified by a simple majority of one man. By a simple one man majority this Act may be modified and all the provisions that Shri Frank Anthony wants to be incorporated can be changed. That would not require a three-fourths majority. "May" or "Shall" would not give him that security if the Government at any time makes up its mind to make a political decision that English should not be used. That is why my point is that this is a political document and I expect that no Government or no Prime Minister, in any foreseeable future, will have the foolhardiness to ignore the feelings of the non-Hindi-speaking section of the people because then that would not be the establishment of Hindi but the disintegration of India. The real spirit behind this Bill

is the real assurance of the hon. Prime Minister that Hindi can be introduced only with the willing consent of the non-Hindi-speaking element.

At the same time, coming from the non-Hindi-speaking element, I would not like nor would I feel it to be dignified for me or for any non-Hindi-speaking person that he should have the power to veto the use of any Indian language as official language. Willing consent is one thing but to provide that three-fourths majority of all the legislatures or of the two Houses of Parliament would be necessary to change the position of English would be giving the power of veto to one-fourth of the whole nation or of the House. I think, that is against the spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution did not envisage any such provision that a Bill, except a Bill for amending the Constitution, can be passed only by a certain or only a three-fourths majority as in this case. I do not find there is any gain to be had by changing "may" into "shall", nor is there any justification.

But at the same time there is a genuine element of fear in the minds of the non-Hindi-speaking people. Though personally I do not feel that that is any gain to be achieved by us, if the Government may feel that to allay the fears of the non-Hindi-speaking element they may change the word "may" into "shall", I think, that will be a welcome step. My personal feeling, as I have said, is that we do not gain anything. This Bill can be changed any day by the Government if the Government makes a decision like that. But still considering the volume of feeling expressed in this House and at other places also, particularly when "may" and "shall" according to legal terminology do not make much difference in meaning, if the Government can do that, I would rather welcome that. Otherwise, I fully support the provision of clause 3 and, I think, it will be accepted. Government may only consider if they can accept "shall" in place of "may".

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this clause which is one of the two pivotal clauses of the Bill has unfortunately attracted the hostility of two extreme sections of opinion in our country, sections whom I would not like to describe as fanatics, but may I describe them, with all respect, as linguistic totalitarians.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Enthusiasts.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I would prefer "linguistic totalitarians" or "absolutists". I am sure the House would have agreed if the Government had deferred the introduction of this Bill till some time later in the year because at a time when China is busily, though secretly, preparing to mount another offensive on the Himalayan border and extending its offensive operations to the Bay of Bengal, it would have been much better if the phenomenal unity which was forged in the wake of the Chinese aggression at the end of last year was maintained and was not ruptured even to the slightest extent. But the Government, for better or worse, have brought the Bill before us, and we have to consider it on its own merits. I am in the fortunate or curious position of having an eclectic approach to language. It may be called rational, but I would call it eclectic, not an emotional, approach to language. The circumstances in which my life has been cast have inculcated in me such an approach. My mother-tongue is Konkani. I learnt Kanada at school. Later on, I picked up some Tamil and Telugu when I was in Madras for three years at college. Then, a few years later, my life was cast in a bi-lingual province of C.P. and Berar where I picked up both Hindi and Marathi. So, I love all the languages. I do not hate any language. I do not dislike any language.

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** You did not learn Bengali?

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I am sorry. I did not mention it. I spent some time in Bengal for some six

months or so and I picked up a very crude smattering of Bengali which might give umbrage to my Bengali friends if I try to speak it. That is why I do not dislike, nor do I hate any language. I love every language and I feel happier the more languages I know. Unfortunately, the limitations of time are such that I cannot learn more languages than the very few which I have learnt already.

There are some sections in our country—they are small sections perhaps; they do not represent the mass of public opinion—who want either absolutely Hindi, totally Hindi and others who perhaps want English equally with Hindi, or without. This, may I submit in all humility, with all respect is an emotional approach, not a rational approach, not an eclectic approach. There is a section of opinion of people in our country who would burn the Official Language Bill just as there was—I do not think there is—a section of people, of our citizens in the south who at one time burnt, used to burn the map of India minus Tamil Nad.

**Shrimati Vimla Devi (Eluru):** Not South India, but Tamil Nad.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I said, a section of people in the south. I did not say, all the south. What is wanted today is not the burning of Bills, nor the burning of maps, but the burning, the extinguishment of narrowness in our hearts.

Unity, as my friend Shri Bagri has said, is the paramount need of the hour. What is wanted today in India is 440 million minds but a single heart. That will beat as one. To this end we must bend all our energies and all our efforts and while considering this matter we have to consider it in its three aspects, the necessary, the desirable and the feasible. These three aspects....

**Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati):** And inevitable.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Inevitable is destiny. God only knows what is inevitable. And there are various barriers, psychological as well as practical barriers that come across our path in this particular matter. While we look at the fascinating multi-lingual mosaic of our history and our culture, we cannot fail to be struck by the genius for assimilation and synthesis that our country has displayed through the millenia of her chequered history. Even today that genius for assimilation and synthesis is evident in every field of endeavour in our country. Even in Parliament our Hindi-speaking friends, whose mother-tongue is Hindi, have used Hindi with marvellous ability and skill. It shows the real genius for synthesis! I have got some very interesting examples of Hindi used in this very House and if that Hindi can be used in future, I would like to use that Hindi. But I am a purist in language. When I speak a language, I would like to do it as well as I can. That is why I wish to speak in English here though outside in public meetings I use Hindi. I would like to use in Parliament a language which I can wield with ability and precision. In public meetings precision is not necessary, but in Parliament precision of speech is very necessary. Here I have got two or three instances—I would not take too much time of the House. One question which was put some time ago was:

इस एमरजेंसी पीरियड में गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी बदलने वाली नहीं है क्या ?

The second instance was:

इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आने में कितना टाइम लगेगा ?

Another one, recently, was:

माइनर इरिगेशन स्कीम में जो स्टेट-वाइज कमी हुई है—

श्री भक्त दर्शन : किस की हिन्दी है यह ?

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : यहाँ की है । आपकी नहीं है । आप बहुत अच्छी हिन्दी बोलते हैं । शास्त्री जी और आप बहुत सुन्दर और मधुर हिन्दी बोलते हैं । माइनर इरिगेशन स्कीम में जो स्टेट-वाइज कमी की गई है, उसको फिर से रेस्टोर करने का इरादा है क्या ?

**Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** 24 carat Hindi.

श्री त्यागी : यह कौन सी जुबान में टाक रहे हैं आप ?

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : यह वह जुबान है, जो यहाँ पर इस्तेमाल की गई है ।

श्री बागड़ी : गांधी जी की जुबान में बोलिये ।

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** He is quoting from the proceedings of the House.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I have been admiring the skill and genius for synthesis that has been displayed, and it is perhaps in line with the article of the Constitution which aims at a composite Hindi language. May I, before I close, urge very strongly that the touchstone of National unity, the test of national unity...

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** You must have heard Mahatma Gandhi speaking Hindi at the very early stages. How did you like him?

**Shri Tyagi:** He liked it all right.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** We are not discussing the Hindi spoken outside.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : आप आदर्श हिन्दी बोल रहे हैं या अपनी हिन्दी बोल रहे हैं? यह मैं समझ नहीं पाया हूँ ।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : जोहोनी चाहिये । लेकिन आज कल जो इस्तेमाल की जा रही है इस सदन में उसकी मिसालें पेश की हैं मैंने ।



**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Khichri.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I do not hate even this language. What is a language after all? It is a vehicle of thought, medium of communication. I do not wish to use the term as my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee used. I would like to urge that the test of national unity and nationhood is not one national language. It is not a question of राष्ट्र भाषा here, as my hon. friend Shri Bagri has referred to. All 14 languages are राष्ट्र भाषायें । There is not one राष्ट्र भाषा . The question here is राज्य भाषा ।

May I submit in all humility and earnestness that the test of national unity is not one official language? The test of national unity is one heart, one goal, one objective for the nation, not one official language. That comes second. May I, therefore, plead with my friends on the extreme sides—there are two extreme sides. May I plead with my friends who want English to be continued indefinitely that that is not a correct position to take? They would do well to fall in line with the general national sentiment and accelerate the pace of development of Hindi as the official language. And may I with equal earnestness plead with the advocates, the absolutists, the totalitarians of the Hindi language: love all the languages of India, cherish them, all for one supreme purpose and that is maintaining the development and fostering of our national unity and our national progress at this juncture. In the end I would only say that when I take up this attitude it is not for any other purpose than the supreme, dominating, over-mastering one, which I can very well put in a very few words: Not that I love Hindi less, but I love India and Indian unity more.

**Shri Tyagi:** I would not take much of the time of the House. My only

submission is that the alarm which has been caused outside among the Hindi-speaking people is really very false and is misleading Hindi. Some people are making capital out of it. There is no change that is effected. Factually speaking, India has agreed to it in the Constitution, and my friends from the non-Hindi speaking area have not disputed the fact that the Constitution lays down that the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in the Devanagari script. That is not being contradicted at all. It is only a question of convenience. After all, we are one. And we have to remain one now, particularly when all around we find that people are casting an evil eye on our country. We have to be one. For that purpose, how can we be one if we cannot express ourselves freely in a language which could be understood by one another? It is for this purpose that we are extending English further. And this is in the best spirit.

I am grateful that the non-Hindi-speaking area representatives have really been very generous in accepting this Bill as it is and I am afraid my friend Mr. Anthony is unnecessarily alarmed. There is nothing which goes against what he wants. He surely cannot claim English to be perpetuated. A foreign language cannot be perpetuated in this country, and my friend Mr. Anthony also does not want it. He only wants the safety that so long as Hindi does not become a common language, the *lingua franca* of India, English may be resorted to, it may remain. That is all that he wants. He is a big lawyer. It is difficult for me to deal in legal phraseology, but even then mine has been a hobby. I suggest that this "may" and "shall" is a difficult job. I do not know how my friend is interpreting it. But suppose we were to have "shall" in this clause, then the other clauses will become redundant altogether. Suppose it is "shall" here. Then what about this Committee to be appointed under clause 4, about which it is said:

"It shall be the duty of the Committee to review the progress

[Shri Tyagi].

made in the use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union and submit a report to the President making recommendations thereon.

The President may, after consideration of the report referred to in sub-section (2), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report."

If the word is "shall", the President cannot make any changes unless there is a regular amendment Bill brought here in the House. So if we want to maintain this clause, then clause 3 must have the word "may".

The spirit is apparent, and the treasury benches have openly said that the spirit of the announcement of policy, which the Prime Minister has done long before, is still maintained. This word "may" has to be kept only just to see that the other clauses which follow and their recommendations may be accommodated. If the word is "shall", there is no accommodation. Therefore, "may" has to be kept. This is one point that I wanted to emphasise in the best spirit.

My friend Shri Ranga is not really alarmed, because I know that he understands these things much better than I do. He is a senior politician. He has been in this House for a pretty longer time than I have been, and he knows the phraseology of a Bill.

Then another difficulty comes. As a layman I may be wrong. I cannot argue with Mr. Anthony who is a seasoned lawyer. But in the Constitution, article 343(2) is like this:

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

"Shall be used" is limited here. It says: Notwithstanding that Hindi is the official language—which is not disputed even today, even after the introduction of this Bill. Hindi still remains the language of the Union, and the Hindi-speaking people need not be afraid at all, because their language still remains as the official language of the Union. So where is the danger to Hindi, I cannot understand. But in this case English was permitted with the word "shall", because notwithstanding anything in clause (1) it said that for a period of fifteen years English shall be used. So there is "shall".

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** If that "shall" in clause (1) is interpreted as "may", where will Hindi be?

**Shri Tyagi:** Not here. There it said that it shall be used for fifteen years, so that within fifteen years no change can be effected. Fifteen years was the period fixed. So, if we bring English now, it means that it goes beyond fifteen years also. Up to fifteen years it was permitted by the Constitution, which means that the Constitution did not envisage a permanent use of English and therefore it said fifteen years. But further on, the Constitution allowed this Parliament to make a law to extend that period. Extension does not mean perpetuation. If it were to be perpetuated with the word "shall" without any fixed limit, it will go against the Constitution. Because, the spirit of the Constitution is that English may be permitted for a limited period; it may further be extended, but it cannot be perpetuated for ever. And, therefore, the word "shall" was there. It cannot be used here.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Why not support my amendment?

**Shri Tyagi:** If you want to say "shall be used for ten years" then it will be quite all right. Within that period of ten years no change would

be effected. After that Parliament may extend it. But if you bring the word "shall", to be consistent with the spirit of the Constitution you will have to fix a period, because in the original article a period has been fixed. We cannot do away with it and keep it permanently by saying "shall be used". It means for all time to come.

This is the only difficulty, technical. The spirit is the same as of Mr. Anthony or other friends.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** May I ask my hon. friend, Mr. Tyagi, why not "Until otherwise decided by a three-fourths majority"? They will decide.

**Shri Tyagi:** I am grateful to the Home Minister and his colleagues that they have accommodated by saying that they will lay the Report before this House. And the Committee will be composed of Members of this Parliament elected by the system of single transferable vote. Single transferable vote system means an exact replica of the Parliament, and representation according to the strength of the parties goes into the Committee. It is an exact replica of the Parliament as far as political parties are concerned. Therefore, it is a smaller Parliament that makes the recommendation.

Again, it is not left there. Because some friends have some doubts etc., therefore to accommodate them the Home Minister has agreed that it will be again before the House, it will be discussed, and it will be referred to the State Governments as well. And these State Governments will be at liberty to take the opinion of their respective legislatures. That is again accommodated. Let us be generous in our interpretation. When the Prime Minister said that Hindi will not be imposed without the consent\* of the non-Hindi speaking people, by "people"—surely the literal meaning is not to be taken—he did not mean a referendum. "People" means that their representatives' opinions will be heard, because "people" did not mean every indivi-

dual in that area. People meant that of course. So the State Governments are being consulted, and the majority of the people are represented in those Governments, and they too will be at liberty to take the opinion of their respective legislatures. I hope there is nothing to doubt about it.

In the end I wish to say, let this Bill go in the best spirit of accommodation. That is all my appeal.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker in moving my amendment No. 14,.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** You have no amendment to clause 3.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I have an amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is not moved. Clause 3A is a new clause. That will come after clause 3.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** There is an amendment to clause 3.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It has not been moved. You can speak on the clause.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** At any rate, Sir, the purpose of my amendment which was notified to the House is to provide for a certain time limit, a certain definition of duration within the scheme of this Act. In doing so all I am seeking to do is to duplicate the time table scheme which finds acceptance in the Constitution itself.

The Constitution says:

"The official language of the Union shall be Hindi.....

.....for a period of fifteen years.....the English language shall be continued to be used for all the official purposes of the Union...."

The Constitution also stipulates this time table scheme that after the first five years and then after 10

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi].

years, certain Commissions and Committees will review the situation. All I am seeking to suggest by means of my amendment is that there should be a time limit for the continuance of the English language for which purpose this Bill is brought and the time limit should be 12 years so that, after 10 years, we may again review the situation and after 12 years we may bring about the actualisation of the original provision of the Constitution. In providing for a time limit, I think we would be acting very much more in consonance with the Constitution. Because, as I have said on earlier occasions, an enactment which even injures the spirit of the Constitution, the underlying scheme of the Constitution cannot be countenanced in this House. I say this not because I hold any hostility against the English language. I think it is one of the most beautiful languages in the world today. There is no doubt that English has provided us with a very efficient instrumentality of expression. But, if I may quote Shri Frank Anthony's speech in the Constituent Assembly,—I have quoted him in another context yesterday; I quote him again because he has emerged as the most powerful proponent of the extreme point of view—he said that if we are merely interested in a national language, let us all suffer an abatement of our respective vested interests. The first part which he had directed to the nation at large, it was a generous expression he used, it was an effective expression he had used. I hope the House and he himself would respond to the very plea he had made for abatement of our vested interests.

I am in agreement with the underlying idea of this Bill which wishes that the period for continuance of the English language should be extended. There is no doubt that for all practical purposes, we will have to extend the time for the use of the English language for the official purposes of the Union. But, is it in consonance

with the Constitution? The Constitution itself in the parent article provides that Hindi shall be the official language and there is only one exception to it and that exception is that English shall continue for 15 years. It is not proper, therefore for us to resort to article 343(3) for saying that English could be continued for an indefinite period of time or as Shri Frank Anthony was pleased to say, for even 100 years. I do not think Parliament could, possibly, consistent with the provisions of the Constitution, enact legislation providing for the continuance of the English language for 100 years without doing conscious injury to the provision, not only the spirit, but also the letter of the Constitution that we have given unto ourselves. It is quite clear that the Constitution requires its observance not only in letter but also in spirit. If we were to provide either by express provision or by implication for indefinite continuance of English language, we would be doing injury to the provisions of the Constitution.

The assurance of the Prime Minister has been repeatedly referred to till it has become an idolatrous attachment for some who wish the Government to stick by the assurance given. Both the assurance of the Prime Minister who is a great statesman and who had to say things in the context of our national situation and this very Bill which we are considering at present have to operate within the scheme of the Constitution. Therefore, in the first place, I request that a certain time limit should be provided. Once you provide a time limit, it is even possible to say that 'may' shall be substituted for 'shall'. I shall go so far. Because, if you do not provide a time limit and say that English shall continue, the 'only' meaning is that English shall continue indefinitely. That would be disregarding the provisions of the Constitution. So that, if my friends who are propounding this position are anxious that 'may' should be substituted by 'shall', should agree to the

provision of a time limit in clause 3 of this Bill.

The amendment that have been moved by Shri Frank Anthony, particularly amendments 145 and 146 postulate three main concepts. One of them is that English shall be described as an alternate language. Another is, 'may' shall be substituted by 'shall'. The third is—this is, with all respect, a pernicious concept in the frame work of our Constitution—that three-fourths of the legislatures of the States will have to approve before Hindi could be brought. This Parliament cannot abdicate or abrogate its functions. This is a provision which goes against the very scheme of the Constitution. It is a provision which runs counter completely to the spirit and letter of the Constitutional mandate, that we are bound to observe. Therefore, I only make a plea that a provision for time should be made and that no reference to the States should be countenanced by this House.

**Dr. Sarojini Mahishi** (Dharwar North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I hope you will give me a few minutes more. I did not speak on the Bill yesterday.

मैं तो हिन्दी में बोलना चाहती हूँ जिसे कि हिन्दी प्रान्त वाले मेरी बात को अच्छी तरह समझ सकें। अंग्रेजी को ज्यादा समय तक जारी रहने दिया जाए, इसके बारे में अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी दोनों के जानने वाले और अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी के अलावा उत्तर भाषाएँ जानने वाले जो अभिप्राय देंगे उनका अधिक मूल्य हो सकता है। सिर्फ अंग्रेजी जानने वाले या हिन्दी जानने वाले जो अभिप्राय देंगे वह एक तरफा हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के अलावा अन्य भाषाओं के जानने वाले जो अभिप्राय इस मदन में और इस सदन के बाहर देंगे वह ज्यादा मूल्यवान होगा।

हिन्दुस्तान स्वायत्त घटकों का एक संघ है, एक फेडरेशन है, एक यूनियन है और अन्य प्रान्तों की भाषाओं को और उनकी संस्कृतियों को और उनके साहित्य को अच्छी तरह समझने वाले लोग उनके बारे में अभिप्राय दे सकते हैं और उसका ज्यादा असर भी होगा। मेरा तो यह कहना है कि जब से प्रान्तों का पुनर्गठन भाषाओं के आधार पर हुआ तब से हमें यह ध्यान रखना पड़ा कि हर एक प्रान्त की अलग अलग भाषा है, उनकी अलग संस्कृति है और उनका साहित्य भी अलग है। इसी लिए हम हर एक भाषा को राष्ट्र भाषा के तौर पर मान्यता दे देते हैं। फिर भी हमको इस बात का ध्यान रखना होगा कि हिन्दी का स्थान क्या होगा और इसलिए यह सोचना पड़ता है कि हिन्दी को और अंग्रेजी को कब तक साथ साथ रखा जाये।

क्योंकि भाषाओं के आधार पर प्रान्तों का पुनर्गठन हुआ इसलिए हमको सबसे ज्यादा ध्यान उन भाषाओं का और देना पड़ता है। हमको यह देखना चाहिए कि अहिन्दी प्रान्त वालों का हिन्दी के बारे में क्या अभिप्राय है। ऐसा बात नहीं है कि वे हिन्दी को नहीं चाहते। वे हिन्दी को चाहते हैं लेकिन कब चाहते हैं और कब तक चाहते हैं इस बारे में मतभेद हो सकता है। मतभेद तो ठीक है। माखन लाल चुनौदा के शब्दों में मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि मतभेद तो बाग के विभिन्न वृक्षों के भिन्न भिन्न फूलों के समान हैं जिनसे बाग सुन्दर नजर आता है। लेकिन अगर मतभेद संघर्ष में परिवर्तित हो जाते हैं तो उनका असर बुरा हो सकता है। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि उत्तर भारत की भाषाएँ संस्कृत जन्म हैं और दक्षिण की भाषाएँ द्रविड़ भाषाएँ हैं। संस्कृत से प्राकृत निकली, अपभ्रंश निकला, पेशाबो निकला, और गुजराती, हिन्दी, बंगला, विहारो और छत्तीसगढ़ उससे निकला। इतना भाषाएँ संस्कृत से पैदा होने पर और संस्कृतजन्म होने पर भी बंगाली लोगों का भाषा बंगाली हो सकती है। वह लोग अहिन्दी वालों में अपनी गिनता कर सकते हैं। इस का अर्थ तो यही

[डा० सरोजिनी महिषी]

होता है कि हिन्दी बोलने वालों की संख्या कितनी है और हिन्दी न बोलने वालों की संख्या कितनी है, या चूँकि अहिन्दी लोगों की संख्या कम है, इसलिए हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा होनी चाहिए या आर्काशयल लैंग्वेज होना चाहिए या नहीं, इस के बारे में ज्यादा कुछ कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझती हूँ क्योंकि जो संविधान का धारा ३४३ है उस में काफ़ी स्पष्ट रूप से बताया गया है :—

"The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script."

इसलिए आज उसको फिर से खोल कर सोचने की कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है। लेकिन यहाँ एक प्रश्न हमारे सामने है कि अंग्रेज़ों की हिन्दी के साथ साथ कहां तक इधर स्थान मिलना चाहिए ? आज हमारे सामने प्रश्न यहाँ है कि उसका स्थान कहां तक होगा और कितना होगा और उस के साथ हिन्दी को बढ़ाने में, हिन्दी के कोष को बढ़ाने में और हिन्दी का प्रचार करने में सरकार कहां तक मदद कर रही है ?

मुझे मालूम है कि भारत में एकछत्राधिपत्य अंग्रेज़ों के आने के पहले कभी नहीं था। सम्राट अशोक दक्षिण की ओर आये फिर भी पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर एक छत्राधिपत्य स्थापित नहीं कर सके। हर्षवर्धन के राज्य में भी यह नहीं रहा। पुलकेशी—दो सैकेंड ओफ़ दो बालुक्या डाइनेस्टो, ने हर्षवर्धन को पराजित किया शिलालेखों में यह खुदा हुआ है :—

"येन चाकारि विगलितहर्षो हर्षः"

हर्षवर्धन का सारा हर्ष निकल गया। हम सोचते हैं कि अंग्रेज़ों का स्थान भी हिन्दुस्तान के जीवन में कुछ है, हिन्दुस्तानियों के जीवन में, उनका विचारधारा में और राष्ट्रीय जीवन में, व्यक्तिगत जीवन में नहीं, लेकिन भारत के राष्ट्रीय जीवन में अंग्रेज़ों का स्थान भी है और उस को तुरन्त हटा नहीं सकते हैं। दक्षिण वालों को यह भी डर है कि हिन्दी भाषा अ

जाने से वे हिन्दी भाषा लोगों के मुकाबले में एंग्रामिनेशंस और कम्पटीशंस में आ नहीं सकेंगे और वे पराजित हो सकते हैं। वे उनके मुकाबले कम्पटीटिव एंग्रामिनेशंस में स्पर्धा नहीं कर सकते हैं इसलिए उनको हिन्दी लागू हो जाने से डर रहता है। लेकिन यह तो संविधान की इस घटना को स्वीकार करने के बाद मुझे लगता है कि दोनों तरफ़ के लोगों में, हिन्दी का समर्थन करने वालों में और हिन्दी का समर्थन न करने वालों में, इन दोनों में कुछ हद तक सहिष्णुता होनी चाहिए। अहिन्दी लोगों ने तो इस को स्वीकार कर लिया है लेकिन सवाल तो यह उठता है कि हिन्दी को कहां तक बढ़ाया जाय ? हमारे सामने बात यह है और इसलिए इस के बारे में हमें और आपकी सोचना चाहिए।

संस्कृत को हिन्दुस्तान में मुग़ल बादशाहों ने भी आश्रय दिया है। और नान्चे जो दक्षिण भारत में लोग थे उन्होंने भी उसे आश्रय दिया है। इस अवसर पर मुझे एक, दोहा याद आता है जो कि राजकवि जगन्नाथ पंडित ने शाहजहाँ बादशाह के दरबार में कहा था। उन्होंने यह श्लोक कहा था :—

"दिल्लीश्वरो वा गजदंश्वरो वा मनोरथान्  
पूरयिवं समर्थो ।

अन्यैः नृपालैः परिदयमानं शाखाय वा  
स्यात् लवणाय वा स्यात् ॥'

दो हाँ लोग हमारे मनोरथों को पूरा कर सकते हैं, दिल्लीश्वर और गजदंश्वर। अन्य राजा नोग यदि चाहें तो हमें पैसा दे सकते हैं उससे काफ़ी नमक ख़रीद सकते हैं, सब्ज़ा ख़रीद सकते हैं लेकिन इसके अलावा और कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। लेकिन वह बात अलग है। संस्कृत का एक स्थान था। दक्षिण वालों की कठिनाइयाँ यह हैं कि उनका द्राविड़ भाषा है और हिन्दी भाषा को वे अच्छी तरह से पढ़ नहीं सकते हैं और समझ नहीं सकते हैं। लेकिन

यह कहना गलत होगा कि दक्षिण वालों को हिन्दी के प्रति द्वेष भाव है। मैं बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि जब हिन्दी को इस देश में राष्ट्रभाषा के रूप में स्वीकार नहीं किया गया था तब दक्षिण भारत हिन्दी प्रचार सभा ने दक्षिण में हिन्दी की सेवा के लिए बहुत प्रयास किया और उसी का परिणाम रहा कि हजारों और लाखों की संख्या में दक्षिण के विद्यार्थियों ने हिन्दी का परीक्षाएं पास कीं। पहले हमारे समाज में एक ऐसा विचार चलता था कि जब तक लड़की अंग्रेजी नहीं पढ़ लेती थी तब तक उसको शादी नहीं हो सकती है। लेकिन अब ऐसा समय भी आ जाना चाहिए कि जब तक लड़की हिन्दी न समझ ले तब तक उसका शादी नहीं हो सकती है। आज इस तरह की भावना पैदा करने की जरूरत है। ऐसा होने से इस का बहुत असर पड़ेगा।

मुझे बलाज २ के बारे में एक बात कहनी है

"as from the appointed day, continue to be used."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

**Shri Tyagi:** She is making a very sweet speech.

**डा० सरोजिनी महिषी :** "कंटीन्यु टु बी यूज्ड" इसका असर बहुत होता है। अब जैसा कि इस्तेमाल करते थे उसी तरह से होता रहेगा।

"continue to be used in the same way; without any prejudice to the use of English, Hindi will be used." In addition to,

इसका अर्थ यही है कि कम्प्रोमाइज करने का प्रयास किया गया है। हालाँकि इस तरह किसी ने नहीं कहा लेकिन कम्प्रोमाइज इस के साथ है। १५ वर्ष के बाद

"Either in English or in Hindi" for a period of 15 years from the commencement of the Constitution. That clause will be read as if the words 'or in English' are omitted.

कांस्टीट्यूशन में जो धारा है उसको फिर आगे रखने के लिए और उसको अमेंड करने के वास्ते और फिर हिन्दी को प्रधान रूप देने के लिए यह जो कम्प्रोमाइज करने के लिए उधर यह क्लॉक रक्खा गया है उसे मैं इस तरह समझती हूँ।

बिल का शीर्षक 'आफिशिएल लैंग्वेज बिल' है। यह आफिशिएल लैंग्वेज बिल नहीं है। इसका अर्थ यह भी हो सकता है कि अंग्रेजी हिन्दी दोनों को इस तरह एक जगह पर मिलाया गया है। शब्द "मे" की लीगल टर्मिनलजी में "शैल" की स्प्रिट हो सकती है। इसलिए "मे" रखने से जो कठिनाइयाँ एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में आ सकती हैं, गृह मंत्री जी ने उसको बतलाने की कृपा की। चूँकि कठिनाइयाँ आ सकती हैं इसलिए उनको हटाने के लिए यह उधर रक्खा गया है। मैं समझती हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आश्वासन दिया है और गृह मंत्री जी ने विवेचन किया है उसमें तो कोई संघर्ष नहीं है। कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बारे में बतलाने की कोशिश की कि

The Prime Minister and the Home Minister are at loggerheads. मैं समझती हूँ कि उनका ऐसा विवेचन करना ठीक नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो आश्वासन दिया था उसी का परिणाम यह बिल है। उस आश्वासन की पूर्ति की और यह बिल एक कदम है। गृह मंत्री जी ने इस बिल के उद्देश्यों को बहुत अच्छी तरह से समझाया भी है। इस बारे में मुझे श्री नम्मट का यह संस्कृत श्लोक स्मरण हो आता है :—

"वाक्यार्थबाधे तद्योगे रुद्धितोऽय प्रयोजनत् ।  
अन्यार्थो लक्ष्यते यत् सा लक्षणारोपिता क्रिया ।"

### [डा० सरोजिनी महिषी]

जब किसी शब्द का अर्थ ठीक ढंग से संदर्भ के अनुसार नहीं निकलता है तब दक्षिण वालों की भावनाओं को समझते हुए यह "मे" या अर्थ क्या होना चाहिए यह तो सदन को मालूम हो गया है और ऐसी हालत में जब किसी शब्द का अर्थ ठीक ढंग से समझ में न आये तो रूढ़ि और प्रयोजन और जो स्प्रिट है उसके साथ साथ हर एक शब्द का अर्थ अलग अलग हो सकता है। इसलिए "मे" का जो अर्थ है, वह अहिन्दी वालों की भावनाओं को देखते हुए, उसका अर्थ यही "शैल" होगा। इसलिए हिन्दी वालों को डर है कि वह ठीक नहीं है। अब यह जो रक्खा गया है वह ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की मुविषा की दृष्टि से और अन्य कारणों से रक्खा गया है वह ठीक ही रक्खा गया है।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्या अब समाप्त कर दें।

**डा० सरोजिनी महिषी :** बस एक वाक्य कह कर मैं समाप्त किये देती हूँ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने परसों हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी के स्थानों के बारे में बोलते हुए एक बात कही। डरबन में गांधी जी के जीवन में एक घटना हुई। उन्होंने कस्तूरबा को घर से बाहर हटा दिया। लेकिन कस्तूरबा ने गांधी जी से पूछ लिया कि भारत में अगर आप मुझे अपने घर से हटाते तो मैं अपने रिश्तेदारों के यहाँ चली जाती लेकिन यहाँ दक्षिण अफ्रीका में मुझे हटाते हैं तो मैं किधर जाऊँ ? मैं समझती हूँ कि भारत में भी कस्तूरबा को गांधी जी हटाते थे कस्तूरबा कहीं अन्यत्र नहीं जाती थीं। लेकिन उन्होंने इसका उदाहरण देते हुए एक प्रश्न पूछा कि अंग्रेजी को आप हटा देते हैं तो अंग्रेजी इंग्लैण्ड में रह सकती है लेकिन अगर हिन्दी को आप हटा देते हैं तो यह हिन्दी किधर जायेगी ? लेकिन यह बात कि अंग्रेजी किधर चलेगी और किधर

रहेगी इसके बारे में हम सोये रहे हैं, उसकी हम चिन्ता नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम यह नहीं पूछ रहे हैं कि अंग्रेजी इंग्लैण्ड में रहेगी या किधर रहेगी ? इसके बारे में हमारा ध्यान नहीं है। अलबत्ता अंग्रेजी कहाँ तक हमारे जीवन में उपयुक्त हो सकती है, कहाँ तक उस का हम फायदा उठा सकते हैं, दूसरों के लिए और हमारे वास्ते उसका उपयोग कहाँ तक होगा इसके बारे में हम सोच रहे हैं। अंग्रेजी का असर वैज्ञानिक क्षेत्र में और हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन में काफी हो चुका है और इसको अभी कुछ समय तक इधर रचना है।

मैं एक चीज और कहना चाहती हूँ। जब यूनिवर्सिटीज़ में इंग्लिश और रीजनल लैंग्वेज का ओप्शन दिया गया, किसी भी माध्यम से आप पढ़ सकते हैं, एक इस तरह का ओप्शन दिया गया तो सभी विद्यार्थियों ने अंग्रेजी का चुनाव किया। ऐसी बात नहीं है कि हमारे प्रेडिसिमेंट ने अंग्रेजी में शिक्षा दी है इसलिए अब किस तरह से प्रान्तीय भाषा में शिक्षा लें। इन तरह से नहीं सोचते हैं। अलबत्ता यह जरूर सोचते हैं कि इसका असर कहाँ तक रहे ? सरकार की ओर से दक्षिण भारत में हिन्दी का प्रचार और व्यापक रूप से होना चाहिए। हिन्दी भाषा निश्चित रूप से तब बढ़ेगी।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा मन्त्रालय में हिन्दी का प्रचार करने के लिए एक अलग हिन्दी विभाग बना दिया गया है। हिन्दी का प्रचार करने और उसे प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए एक अलग समिति भी नियुक्त हो चुकी है लेकिन दक्षिण भारत में इसके लिए जो कार्य किया गया है वह बहुत थल्प और



अपर्याप्त है। उत्तर भारत में बहुत ज्यादा मदद दी गई है। इसके अलावा यह जो समिति है इस समिति में उत्तर भारत के लोग ही हैं। अब दक्षिण भारत में जिस हद तक मदद देनी चाहिए, इसके बारे में सोचने के लिए वे कहते तो हैं लेकिन मदद जितनी मिलनी चाहिए पर्याप्त मात्रा में नहीं मिल सकती है। इसलिए मेरा विचार है कि इसमें दक्षिण भारत वालों को प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिए। इसके लिए संविधान के आर्टिकल ३५१ में यह लिखा हुआ है :—

"It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India."

यह उचित ही लिखा है और इसका तो समर्थन ही होगा।

**Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar:** I rise to oppose the amendments which have been moved by Shri Frank Anthony, on constitutional and legal basis. He wants that the word 'shall' be substituted for 'may'. With your permission, I will read out clause 3:

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

then follows another clause which is very pertinent—

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

15 hrs.

As long as sub-clause (a) is there, it is crystal clear that English is

being allowed to be used in the same manner in which it has been used up to this time according to article 343. According to article 343:

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

I submit that by putting in sub-clause (a) above in the present Bill, the provision in article 343(2) has been re-enforced. So there is no scope for any misapprehension that the use of English will be discontinued.

I must submit one thing. Shri Frank Anthony must know that a definite period was mentioned in the Constitution for the continuance of English, namely 15 years. That meant that English would not continue after 15 years. But we are now extending the time. The assurance given by the Prime Minister as referred to and repeated in this House only goes to this extent that English will be continue in the same manner in which it was used; as long as the people residing in the non-Hindi State do not agree to a changeover to Hindi.

I submit that by attempting to substitute the word 'may' by 'shall' an attempt is being made to make English continue on an equal status with Hindi, that is, in addition to Hindi. If 'may' is retained it will mean that English will get the same position and status it has been having in accordance with article 343(2). My interpretation is that there is an attempt to go ahead still more and secure for English a status more than that actually given according to the Constitution. Otherwise, there should be no apprehension and no doubt when after fixing a specific period, we are extending the period. Here of course I have to state my definite view

[Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar].

about this provision of the Bill that as long as English is allowed to continue in any shape, be it associate language, be it anything else, Hindi can never take the place of official language which it has been given in the Constitution. When Government have not been able to do a thing in 15 years, what is the guarantee that the same Government will do that thing in the next ten years to come or in the next two decades to come? So my view is that there is a very great danger, not from the English language as such, but of the environment of 'angrezism' that the English language is perpetuating in the country. Even now if there are some persons, so-called decent persons, sitting in a hotel, restaurant or in a first-class compartment, they would like to talk with one another in English and if per chance anybody intervenes and talks in Hindi, he is considered to be lower in status in terms of modern decency or etiquette. This is the mentality which the English language has left behind. So to get rid of that, a period has got to be fixed.

If no definite period is fixed, I think it will be a very great advantage to people like Shri Anthony. I would congratulate them on their having succeeded in seeing that English gets along with Hindi for at least three or four or five decades to come. But that is a different matter. I submit that the substitution of 'may' by 'shall' goes against the provision of the Constitution and even against the particular Bill which is being discussed. The difficulty will be this. At present anybody can speak in English or Hindi; anybody can communicate with others in Hindi or use Hindi in correspondence. If 'shall' is introduced, no Hindi correspondence will be entertained unless English is also there side by side. This will be giving to English a status much higher than what it has been enjoying up to this time. Hence this attempt is being made by the back door to bring

English on an equal footing with Hindi by the introduction of 'shall'.

There has been much sloganising on this issue. It is said that the Hindi-knowing people should be tolerant. I submit there is no intolerance from this side. We are prepared to accept any other regional language, be it Telugu, Tamil or any other, but to raise this slogan that English should be made the official language or there should be a change in the Constitution is something which is very reactionary.

In conclusion, I would submit by this Bill an attempt is being made to by-pass certain mandatory provisions of the Constitution. As a lawyer, I am of the view that unless article 343 is amended, there cannot be any genuine attempt to extend the period of the English language or to make any such changes. A measure like this is definitely an attempt to by-pass the constitutional provision. How far it will be constitutional or *intra vires* has got to be seen.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central): I am a signatory to an amendment which has already been moved which seeks the substitution of 'may' by 'shall'. I am still pleading with Government that this amendment be accepted. I will try and state my reasons very shortly.

The Home Minister has used the expression that this Bill envisages a period of 'prolonged bi-lingualism'. As far as we are concerned, I hope we have sufficiently explained our point of view, and I expect we shall not be accused of any kind of antagonism towards Hindi or any of the other national languages of our country. But the fact of the matter is that the Home Minister himself has been constrained to say that he envisages a period of 'prolonged bi-lingualism'. As far as I am concerned, I would like the length to be as short as possible. But he has talked about 'prolonged bi-lingualism'

The Prime Minister has also said in this House—no use harping on what he said much earlier—only yesterday that the status quo was to continue indefinitely. Therefore, as far as Government is concerned, and its assurances are concerned, the country is being told that at least for the time being, for an indefinite period to ensue from today, English would continue to be used as an addition language. The difficulty comes when the word "may" is injected into the picture, and the difficulty arises because, as I tried to say during the first reading stage, of the habits of interpretation which we have inherited from British jurisprudence, and that is why we have heard in this House what we cannot dismiss as so much nonsense, because it was not nonsense. It is a very serious matter that under the canons of interpretation of British statutes, "may" can mean "shall", and "shall" can mean "may". I know as a lawyer, though I have forgotten most of my law, that it is a fact that on occasions "may" may mean shall and "shall" on occasion may even be construed as meaning "may".

**Shri Hajarnavis:** May I again repeat the difficulty pointed out by the Home Minister yesterday? I have very high regard for his knowledge of English, but supposing you use the word "shall" instead of "may", as the Home Minister pointed out yesterday, we will have to use both the languages simultaneously as a matter of interpretation. This was realised by Shri Anthony and he has come out with another draft where the use of word "shall" is unexceptionable.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** As far as I am concerned, I was actually going to refer to what my hon. friend the Minister of State has just now said, namely that the Home Minister has brought in an argument to which he made reference just now. I will come to it a little while later.

In English jurisprudence we have got this position where "may" can be

interpreted as "shall" and "shall" can be interpreted as "may". As a lawyer or a former lawyer, whatever you choose to describe me, I am quite prepared to say that the use of "may" as it has been made here does really appear to be capable of being construed as "shall", and that was the understanding of the Prime Minister, and that was the understanding which he conveyed in his letter to Shri Anthony.

I am envisaging a time as rapidly as possible when all our statutes shall be available in their official texts not in English, but in Hindi and the other national languages. I am thinking of a time when our subjection to the laws of interpretation of statutes as expounded by Maxwell and that sort of people would no longer pass muster in our country, and we will have to interpret our own Hindi or Bengali or Tamil statutes in our own way. I told the Home Minister in my speech day before yesterday that if he had a translation of this into Hindi, he would be hard put to it to be able to say as he can say now, that "may" means "shall".

So, all over the country there is now a controversy over this, a controversy which can easily be allayed. If there was some insuperable difficulty as Shri Tyagi wanted to point out and as the Home Minister had also indicated, that is a different matter, but my submission would be that it is not by any means an insuperable difficulty. Therefore, I would say that "may" could be substituted by "shall". What Shastriji said yesterday was an additional argument which he perhaps borrowed from Dr. Mahatab, who had also said it, that if "shall" is used, it would mean duplication of avoidable work. That was the one argument. The Hindi speaking States could communicate with the Centre only in Hindi, and they would not be under an obligation to give an English translation of their communication if "shall" is not there and "may" is there. My submission is that we are discussing this matter from the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee].

national point of view. The Hindi States would be communicating from time to time not only with the Centre, but also with the non-Hindi States. That is to say, communications between States might very well continue for a certain length of time to be bi-lingual. When the Home Minister himself said that he envisages a prolonged period of bi-lingualism, he certainly does not mean that in so far as the Hindi speaking States are concerned, bi-lingualism would be dropped like a hot potato straight-away. No. The Hindi States also being part of India would be practising bi-lingualism, which, unfortunately for us, is more or less unavoidable in the present context,...

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Either, or, not both.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:**...by translation of correspondence. That additional expenditure should not be an objection of an insuperable character.

Shri Tyagi brought up an argument of a more serious nature. Shri Tyagi pointed out that if we have "shall" in this Bill, then for all time to come we are precluded from getting rid of English as an additional language for official purposes. With great respect to Shri Tyagi I submit that that is not a correct interpretation of the matter. In the Constitution, as far as the present position is concerned, it is stated in article 343 that English shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union during this period from 1950 to 1965. In this period, therefore, there is no question that English can be used, and in spite of the Swamiji or anybody else, English has a right, and whoever chooses to speak in English has a right to express himself or herself in this language. We have got this constitutional safeguard.

What are we envisaging in the period which is to follow? If the *status quo* is continued, if prolonged bi-lingualism is the proclaimed ob-

jective of the Government, then surely we are permitting English to have the same kind of opportunity and privilege in official matters as it used to have between 1950 and 1965. But are we under any obligation, because we pass an Official Languages Bill, in 1970 or somewhere like that to continue English for ever and ever? We are not amending the Constitution. We are only having an ordinary Bill, which can be changed by ordinary methods of amendment. And what happens after ten years? According to this Bill, there is a parliamentary committee. That parliamentary committee reports. That report goes to the President, that report goes to the State Governments, that report is very conceivably and rightly discussed by the State legislatures because the State Governments would like to fortify their position by sounding the opinions of the legislatures, and after all this process has been gone through, it comes back to Parliament, and Parliament decides what to do. Parliament on that occasion, let us hope, would decide that there is no further reason for continuing to give English the status which it has got today, and Parliament would come up with legislation of whatever kind is necessary, and we shall have the best solution conceivable at that point of time of our languages problem.

So, I feel that if in this legislation today we stick to "may", the prejudice already in the mind of the people in the non-Hindi areas would be accentuated, the suspicion already in the minds of the people in the non-Hindi speaking areas would be intensified, and you know very well how language is a particularly incendiary factor. If some people are given the opportunity of exploiting linguistic issues in that incendiary manner.

Therefore, when the country requires integration, when the country requires maximum possible unanimity on every single issue of importance,

our legislation should not be formulated in such a manner for legalistic or other things which can only give room for more suspicion to accumulate, for animosities to grow, as between our linguistic groups. Therefore, I feel very strongly that if "may" is substituted by "shall" it might mean some additional expenditure as far as this correspondence of the States with the Centre and among themselves is concerned, but that would not be particularly prohibitive, and there would be no problem as far as the Parliament and the country are concerned, after a lapse of ten years or so, to have a kind of legislation which would say good-bye to the status of English as far as official purposes is concerned.

I do, therefore, feel strongly and I earnestly ask the Home Minister not to consider this matter, not to look upon it as something obstinately put forward by the non-Hindi-speaking people. I am sure that many of the Hindi-speaking people will come to see the logic of what we are trying to point out. As I said before, we do want the transition as quickly as ever it is possible to our own languages, and personally speaking—I am speaking purely in my personal capacity—I am not so happy with the expression "prolonged bi-lingualism" which Shastriji uses. Why should it be so prolonged? Why should we not rather envisage that we should go ahead much quicker than we have done so far? Why should we not try to encourage Hindi and the other national languages to grow in such a manner that we can get out of the English swaddling clothes as early as possible? But we are not moving in that direction. If we do not want to pay the price for any change, we shall never have any change in this country. If we really had a thorough-going revolution, perhaps Hindi and the other national languages would have come into their own a long time ago, but because we did not have a thorough-going revolution, because we inherited the entire apparatus of the British administrative system, because

we wanted to go slow, because we believed in the inevitability of gradualness, because we do not want to bring about a sea change in the manner of life which our people are conducting in different areas of our country, we have chosen to proceed in a rather **small-like** pace. That is why even in regard to our Plan we cannot go ahead. Let us try to follow a more imaginative policy; let us try to take that imaginative policy to the country and let us try to enthuse our people and then only we shall have emotional integration. Otherwise, all this talk about some legalistic methods of going ahead with lead us nowhere. That is why I feel that we should go ahead as quick as we can. But we should not take any hasty or precipitate step which would create a dangerous situation. Let us not intensify the suspicion, the doubt which is there, not merely lurking there, but which is very much on the map. And there are people who positively are going to exploit that lurking suspicion and doubt in the country. That is why I am making a very humble submission to the Government to consider this amendment and accept it.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.

**Dr. Melkote (Hyderabad):** I have been waiting to catch the eye of the Speaker for the past four days.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have to conclude the debate. I will give five minutes each. Dr. P. S. Deshmukh.

**Shri P. S. Deshmukh:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendments proposed by my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony. The reasons have been partially covered already by my hon. friends Shri Tyagi and Dr. Singhvi. I firmly hold that it is not a mere question of duplicating the work or some little expenditure on going on with two languages. I personally feel that the use of the word "shall" will be against the Constitution. This point has also been

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

urged by quite a few hon. Members probably not so emphatically. I emphatically feel that to put the word "shall" in the place of "may" would be to give a complete go-by to the existing provisions in the Constitution especially article 343.

Secondly, the use of the word 'shall' will also be absolutely inconsistent with the Bill as we have it before us. The Bill has a specific purpose. It is not just to make provision for an alternative or an additional language, but it is for the purpose of providing certain language, but it is for the purpose of providing certain definite purposes, namely, to use it in Parliament and to use it as the language for official purposes. So, if we put the word "shall" and accept also the other amendments of Shri Frank Anthony, then, as has been pointed out, by one or two hon. Members, it would seek to occupy more or less the same position as Hindi which can never be the case so long as the article, as it has been worded, remains as a part of the Constitution.

The whole approach as between Hindi and English seems to me absolutely unrealistic and wholly wrong. Any two languages of India could be compared with each other. There might be rivalry between them, but any rivalry between English and Hindi, I cannot understand, so long as English is a language which has been thrust upon us by the domination of a foreign power. Of course, we are anxious to take advantage of even this misfortune of ours and to that extent we are prepared to respect English. I for one love the English language. Nonetheless, I think it is wholly wrong to compare English with Hindi and to try to give English the same position as Hindi should occupy or Hindi occupies under the Constitution. After all, Hindi is an indigenous language; it is the language of the Indian people, but unfortunately we are too much embroiled in

political matters. We want to win the elections and want to sway public opinion by certain things which are, in my opinion, somewhat fantastic and utterly unnatural. Probably the fault lies with some of these Hindi sponsors trying to go fast and too far and not taking the trouble to really educate public opinion especially those people who do not speak Hindi. If we were to go to the common people and really ask them which language they would prefer, as between Hindi and English, I have not a shadow of doubt that the man who knows neither English nor Hindi is bound to prefer Hindi and not English. But unfortunately, all of us are raging for certain political achievements and certain successes. Therefore we leave the basic fact-aside and try to infuse fanaticism where there should be no room for it.

I was also amazed when Shri H. N. Mukerjee spoke in two voices. First of all, he pleaded that we should have a dynamic policy, a go-ahead policy. When it is a go-ahead policy, the natural policy is to accept the Constitution as it is and not have this compromise or concession which we are making by this Bill. This Bill is not a compromise; it is a concession to those people who feel that unless there is some time given for the change-over from English to Hindi, probably their interests will suffer. This is a concession; this is not a compromise. This is really extending the provisions and our intentions behind the Bill a little too far. On the other hand Prof. Mukerjee wants us to take every one with us, which means go slow.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi wanted 12 years. I do not know why he wanted 12 years. Already ten years are provided, and there is a provision that after ten years a review or examination will take place. The position will be determined how far English should continue. So, I feel that all the amendments of Shri Frank Anthony deserve to be opposed, and they are not really speaking covered by the Bill: It

would be extending the scope and destroy the very purpose of the Bill that is before us.

**Shri G. N. Dixit** (Etawah) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment moved by Shri Frank Anthony. He has relied for his argument on the assurance given by the Prime Minister and his supporter, Shri Ranga, also relied on the assurance, I could understand Shri Ranga but I could not understand Shri Frank Anthony why he forgot the Constitution. He is not only a Constitution-maker but also a constitutional lawyer. I would like to reply on both these grounds.

So far as the assurance of the Prime Minister is concerned, according to me, it is a political wish of a political leader. And whenever it is to be implemented in this House it has to be implemented within the framework of the Constitution. No political leader worth the name can ever give an assurance that will transcend the Constitution. Not only this. Even when the assurance was given in respect of the other matter at the Colombo powers conference, it was definitely understood that the matter would come before this House and unless the approval is given by the House that assurance shall not be binding. My submission is this: that it was a political wish expressed in that assurance by the Prime Minister, and that political wish was subordinate to the Constitution.

My second point is this: we should all be obliged to Shri Ranga; he read out to us dramatically by giving us a register and showing the photos on that page that the wish or the assurance expressed by the Prime Minister did use the word 'will' and not 'shall' which is now being sought to be introduced by Shri Frank Anthony. My submission is this: so far as the Constitution is concerned, I very much doubt that even clause 3 as it stands, whenever it comes before the court after 1965, will hold water or will be declared to be void, much less

the word "shall". Because, after all, article 343(3) has to be kept in view. The present law or the present legislation that is being enacted is not on the basis of an assurance, but is within the framework of article 343(3). Article 343(3) says:

"(3) Notwithstanding anything in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use after the said period of fifteen years, of—

- (a) the English language, or
- (b) the Devanagari form of numerals,

for such purposes as may be specified in the law."

The limited scope, the restrictive purpose, has to be specified in the law, and so let us see what article 343(3) says. I will now read out article 343(2):

"(2) Notwithstanding anything in clause (1), for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution, the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union—

please note, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the words used here—

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

But the word used in sub-clause (3) is "for such purposes as may be specified in the law". The sense of sub-clause (3) is restrictive. It cannot be equal to what is contained in sub-clause (2). Therefore, the word "shall" will make it entirely void, because any law repugnant to the Constitution shall be void, according to article 13. Therefore, to enact a law which is going to be void shall never be the right thing for this House to do.

The argument is advanced that "may" means "shall" and "shall" means "may". If that is so, what is

[Shri G. N. Dixit]

the good of bringing the word "shall" in place of "may"? If "may" can mean "shall" and "shall" can mean "may", there is no point in changing the words. "may" and "shall". But the fact remains that "may" means "may" and "shall" means "shall" except in exceptional circumstances. Those exceptional circumstances shall be interpreted by the court of law and they shall be interpreted in view of the terminology of article 343. Whether you put "shall" or "may", it will have to be interpreted as "may" in view of the language laid down in article 343(1), because the official language of the Union shall be Hindi and not English. Therefore, by no law enacted in this House, you can place English on an equal status with Hindi, because the constitutional provision is there.

My humble submission is, when Mr. Anthony was making that argument about the Prime Minister's assurance, my mind went back to all those who are harping on plebiscite in Kashmir. That demand is also based on an assurance given by the Prime Minister in 1947 or 1948. They also repeat times without number that an assurance was given by the Prime Minister. But the assurance given by the Prime Minister is to be implemented within the frame work of the Constitution. Therefore, that assurance is being fully implemented within the framework of the Constitution in terms of the law as it is before the House. Therefore, I support clause 3 as it stands and oppose the amendments of Mr. Anthony.

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा (खम्मम) :  
उपाध्य महोदय, मैं इस क्लज का पूरा पूरा समर्थन करना चाहती हूँ। मैंने यहाँ आने के बाद हिन्दी सीखना प्रारम्भ किया। इसलिए मेरी भावना है कि मैं हिन्दी में ही बोलूँ। हमारे सदस्य डॉ. सहाय ने मुझे दो किताबें दीं। वह चुपचाप हिन्दी की सेवा कर रहे हैं।

मैं अपने हिन्दी भाषी भाइयों से और सेठ गोविन्द दास जी से यह बोलना चाहती हूँ कि

इस क्लज का उद्देश्य हिन्दी को सदा के लिए समाप्त करना नहीं है। यदि ऐसा हो तो मैं उसका अवश्य विरोध करूँगी। लेकिन उसका ऐसा उद्देश्य नहीं है। हिन्दी को व्याप्त होने तक अंग्रेजी को सह-भाषा बनाना अनिवार्य हो जाता है। जब हम आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे थे तो हिन्दी हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन का प्रतीक थी। हिन्दी सीखना और उसका प्रचार देशभक्ति का प्रथम कर्तव्य माना जाता था। किन्तु आजादी के आते ही एक ओर हमने जहाँ हिन्दी को राष्ट्र भाषा के पद पर बिठा दिया वहाँ दूसरी ओर उसके मार्ग में जाने अनजाने कई बाधाएँ खड़ी करते रहे। इसलिए हिन्दी आज तक एक प्रान्तीय भाषा ही बनी रही है। उसका साहित्य भी कई बोलियों में बँटा हुआ है। आधुनिक खड़ी बोली रूप में हिन्दी का विकास उस मात्रा में नहीं हो पाया है जिस मात्रा में अन्य भारतीय भाषाओं का हुआ है। इसलिए हिन्दी को एक वास्तविक अधिकारक भाषा बनाने में अनेक कठिनाइयाँ पायी गयीं।

इसके अलावा एक ऐसी भाषा को जिस का विकास अत्यन्त सीमित रहा, सारे देश के प्रशासन पर लागू करना और कठिनाइयों के बावजूद लागू करने का आग्रह करना मेरी सम्मति में बड़ी भूल थी। और जब यह आग्रह हिन्दी भाषी भाइयों की ओर से होने लगा तो तुरन्त उसे "हिन्दी इम्पीरियलिज्म" का स्वरूप प्राप्त हुआ। इसी का मुझे खेद है।

भाषा मानव समाज को सभ्य बनाने और भुव्युओं का एक दूसरे के पास लाने का साधन मात्र है। इसके अनिर्वाक उसका कोई असाधारण महत्व नहीं होना चाहिए।

मैं दक्षिण भारत से आती हूँ। आन्ध्र के कौने कौने में जनता हिन्दी सीखना चाहती है। मैं यह सुझाना चाहती हूँ कि आज से हम हिन्दी का राष्ट्रभाषा के रूप में विकास करना शुरू करें और आज की परिस्थिति में इसी का



अनुमोदन करें। यदि रचनात्मक दृष्टि से हिन्दी के विकास में जुट जायेंगे तो बार बार इस बिल की पुनरावृत्ति नहीं करनी पड़ेगी और भविष्य में इस प्रकार के बिल की आवश्यकता नहीं होगी।

मैं भारत सरकार से यह अनुरोध करना चाहूँगी कि हिन्दी प्रान्तों में लिखी पुस्तकों और साहित्य को अहिन्दी प्रान्तों में सिखाने के बदले अहिन्दी प्रान्तों में ही हिन्दी साहित्य वहीं के जानकारों और साहित्यकों द्वारा लिखवाने का पूरा प्रबन्ध किया जाये जिस दिन काश्मीर से लेकर केरल तक और कच्छ से लेकर कानरूप तक देश के कोने कोने में हिन्दी कवि और लेखक तैयार हो जायेंगे वही दिन सच्चे नातों में राष्ट्रभाषा की स्थापना का दिन होगा।

हिन्दी का विकास सारे राष्ट्र की जिम्मेवारी होनी चाहिए। वह विकास बहुमुखी होगा।

इतना ही कह कर मैं समाप्त करूँगी।

**डा० मेलकोटे :** डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, आज इस सदन में जो लोग देशभक्ति को प्रकट करना चाहते हैं उन सबके लिए हिन्दी में भाषण करना जरूरी है। मैं खास कर आनरेबिल मेम्बर एंथनी साहब को विनती करना चाहता हूँ कि वह नामिनेटेड मेम्बर होने के कारण हम लोगों की दिक्कतों को महसूस नहीं करते।

देश में ६०, ७० या ८० फीसदी लोग जो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानने वाले हैं, उनके सामने जाकर अगर अंग्रेजी में अपना मन्तव्य प्रकट करेंगे तो डिमांन्सेस कहां रहेगी, इसके बारे में उनको सोचना चाहिए। अगर उनको हमारी तरह इलेक्शन लड़ना पड़े तो उनको पता लगे कि जनता के साथ किस भाषा में बात की जा सकती है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन में जो हम लोग अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं उसका कारण यह है कि हम जानते हैं अगर हम अपनी भाषाओं में, कन्नड़ में, तमिल में, बंगला में, गुजराती आदि में बोलेंगे तो अन्य लोग हमारा बात नहीं समझ सकेंगे, लेकिन अंग्रेजी में समझ सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरी डिप्टी स्पीकर महोदय से विनती है कि वह ऐसा प्रबन्ध करें कि देश की १४ भाषाओं का ट्रांसलेशन साथ साथ हो सके। ऐसा करने से हर एक सदस्य को अपनी भाषा में बोलने की सुविधा हो सकती है। आज तो स्थिति यह है कि अगर कोई अंग्रेजी या हिन्दी के सिवा किसी मातृभाषा में बोलना चाहे तो उसको अपनी स्पीच का लिखित अनुवाद देना पड़ता है। दिल की भावना मातृभाषा के सिवा दूसरी भाषा में कैसे व्यक्त कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब जब १४ भाषाओं को राष्ट्रभाषा माना जाता है तो उन सबके लिए सदन में ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि उनका साथ साथ अनुवाद हो सके जैसा कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सभाओं में होता है।

तीसरी बात मैं यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि कई मर्तबा मुझे विदेशों को जाने का मौका मिला। वहां पर जब एक हिन्दुस्तानी दूसरे हिन्दुस्तानी से मिलता है तो अंग्रेजी में बात करता है। तो वहां के लोग पूछते हैं कि क्या आपकी अपनी कोई मातृभाषा नहीं है। अगर एंथनी साहब विलायत जाएं तो वे अपनी भाषा क्या बतलायेंगे, हिन्दी या अंग्रेजी। हमको यह देख कर दुःख होता है कि हमको आपस में अंग्रेजी में बोलना पड़ता है, हम अपनी मातृभाषा में नहीं बोल सकते हैं। मैं एक बात आपके सामने साफ साफ रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं दक्षिण भारत से आता हूँ। मेरी मातृभाषा हिन्दी नहीं है। आप तमिल को नेशनल लैंग्वेज बनाएं, मैं आपकी तारीफ करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। लेकिन अंग्रेजी को हमेशा के लिए रखने को तैयार नहीं हूँ।

[डा० मेलकोटे]

लेकिन हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब पोलिटिकल हालत को मटेनजर रखते हुए और उसे महसूस करते हुए आर हिस्टारिकल रोजन्स जो हैं उनको ध्यान में रखते हुए अग्रेजों को थोड़ा समय आगे ले जाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। वह तो किसी कदर ठीक है। लेकिन हिन्दी की प्रगति की दिशा में इन पिछले १५ वर्षों में कोई ठोस चीज अथवा कार्य नहीं हुआ है। यहां सदन में जो बजट आदि पास हुए हैं, उनको देखने से मालूम होता है कि दक्षिण भारत में हिन्दी को बढ़ाने और उसका प्रचार करने के हेतु अब तक एक पैसा नहीं दिया गया है। कोई रकम इसके लिए बजट में नहीं प्रोवाइड की गई है। यहां से कई मतों पर आवाज उठाई गई कि हिन्दी प्रान्तों में हिन्दी को प्रचार को ज़रूरत नहीं है, अहिन्दी प्रान्तों में हिन्दी के लिए सहायता दी जाय लेकिन उधर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। हम एक हिन्दी यूनिवर्सिटी बनाने के लिए काफ़ी कोशिश कर रहे हैं। हिन्दी का ज्यादा प्रगति करने के लिये काफ़ी पैसा भी हमने जमा किया है। तत्कालीन पिछले ४० साल से हम उधर लोगों को हिन्दी का ज्ञान कराने के लिए कोशिश कर रहे हैं। हम काफ़ी समय से हिन्दी को सेवा करते आये हैं।

अहिन्दी भाषा भाषा लोगों को आज हिन्दी के प्रति जो एक डर है उसको शलत नहीं समझा जाना चाहिए। चीज यह है कि उधर के लोग चूँकि हिन्दी का उनको इतना अच्छा ज्ञान नहीं हो पाता है इसलिए उनको डर रहता है कि दक्षिण के उम्मीदवार उत्तर भारत के उम्मीदवारों के मुकाबले में इम्तिहानों और कम्पटीशन में ठहर नहीं पायेंगे। इसलिए ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि उन्हें हिन्दी सिखाने के लिए प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय। उधर हिन्दी की यूनिवर्सिटीज स्थापित की जायें और उनको उसके लिए अधिक मदद और रकम दी जाय। इसलिए दक्षिण भारत के लोगों में

आज जो एक डर है उसको उत्तर भारत के लोगों को दूर करना देना चाहिए और दक्षिण भारत में हिन्दी को बढ़ाने के लिए अधिकाधिक रकम प्रोवाइड की जाय और वहां के लोगों को इसके लिए सभी सम्भव प्रोत्साहन दिये जायें। साथ ही मैं कहूंगा कि हमारे दक्षिण भारत के लोग आगे आये और उन्हें तेजों के साथ हिन्दी का ज्ञान प्राप्त करना चाहिए। वहां पर हिन्दी यूनिवर्सिटीज होनी चाहिए और उसके लिए काफ़ी रकम मिलनी चाहिए। इसी तरीके से उत्तर प्रदेश के जितने लोग हैं उनको चाहिए कि वे दक्षिण की कोई प्रादेशिक भाषा सीखें और उनको कोई अहिन्दी भाषा सीखने के लिए और समझने के लिए रकम मिलनी चाहिए और सरकारी मदद व प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिए। इस तरह से लोग शिक्षण लें और इस तरह से देश का १४ भाषाओं को मदद मिले तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह दिन शीघ्र आयेगा जबकि सारे राज्यों और केन्द्र का सारा काम यहां की प्रान्तीय भाषाओं और सेंटर का हिन्दी में होने लगेगा।

आज देश में यह भावना मौजूद है कि हमारे देश की राजभाषा इन १४ प्रादेशिक भाषाओं में से कोई एक हो जाय लेकिन इस देश की राजभाषा इंग्लिश न हो। प्रैक्टिकल रोजन्स को बिना पर अग्रेजों कुछ दिन के लिए भले ही रह सकती है लेकिन हमेशा के लिए वह राजभाषा नहीं बनो रह सकती है। १४ भाषाओं में से कोई भी एक इस देश की राजभाषा हो जाय लेकिन वह इस देश की हो। जब तक हम इस चीज का समर्थन नहीं करेंगे हम देश के प्रति द्रोही माने जायेंगे। मैं इसलिए श्री एन्थनी से विनती करूंगा कि यह जो "मे" शब्द रक्खा गया है इसका समर्थन उत्तर प्रदेश और अन्य हिन्दी भाषा भाषी प्रदेशों और दक्षिण के लोगों ने भी किया है और "शैल" को उन्होंने उचित नहीं समझा है क्योंकि हम सब लोगों के सामने जो जाकर

बात करना चाहते हैं वह बन्द हो जायगी । इसलिए मैं श्री एन्थनी से पुनः आग्रह करूँगा कि वे अपने अमंडमेंट्स को वापस ले लें । होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जिस रूप में यह बिल पेश किया है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ ।

**Shri M. Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri):** Mr. Deputy-Spaker, Sir, I support the amendment that is before the House, the amendment moved by Shri Frank Anthony. In supporting that, I will have to say a good deal about the reasons that prompt me to support it. I have been trying for the last so many days to catch your eye and to get an opportunity of speaking in the general discussion of the Bill before us, but I was not given an opportunity then. Therefore, I think you will show a little more latitude than what you promised a few minutes ago for me, so that I may put forward my views as to why I am compelled, in the interest of the country and in the interest of the nation to support the amendment that has been moved by Shri Anthony.

There has been much discussion about the difference between the words "may" and "shall". The Law Minister said that "may" has the force of "shall". The Prime Minister said that it should be "shall". Therefore, I think the Home Minister also may agree with the other two ministers, so far as Government is concerned, and agree to this word "shall". So far as I am able to understand the provision in the Constitution regarding this matter, there would not be any difficulty because there also the word "shall" has been used and there is nothing to preclude the use of the word "shall" in this connection.

But the most important thing, in this connection, that we have to understand is why our friends are insisting upon the continuance of English as the official language—the emphasis is on "official language". Of course, language is not a mere question of expression conveying our ideas from one people to another. It affects

the whole life, and official language has got its own influence upon the people. It affects the economic sphere of the people. The educational, social and other aspects of life are being influenced by the language and the official language also. Supposing we make one of the national languages of the country, one of the 14 languages of the country, as the official language, what happens? Some of our hon. friends, even the previous speaker, said that they would not have much objection if our friends wanted one of the other 14 languages to be made the official language. I do not think they are very serious about the matter (*Interruption*). But the non-Hindi-speaking friends have not now demanded that one of their mother tongues should be made the official language in the place of Hindi. They are very reasonable. They have not made that demand.

Now, you take Hindi or any other language which is the mother tongue of a group of people in the country. What happens? In course of time that will become the language of the ruling party, that will bring into existence a ruling party, and the other people who do not have that particular language which is the official language as their mother tongue will surely be at a disadvantage. Their children and others who try to master that language cannot become so proficient as the people who have got that language as their mother tongue. This is the real difficulty. Therefore, the bitterness will grow amongst the people, there will be conflicts whereby the unity of the country will be affected, the integration of the nation will be affected.

Adoption of English is a thing that has been necessitated or brought into being by the peculiar conditions of our country. We cannot in every respect take the example of other countries. In our country there are languages, not only languages but there are blocks of people....

**Shri Hajarnavis:** This country was partitioned even though English was the common language.

**Shri S. M. Bancrjee:** Partitioned because of Englishmen.

**Shri M. Muhammad Ismail:** The country has been reorganised according to the languages spoken by the people. Therefore, these languages will exist. Perhaps some people may cite the example of America and say that almost every day people speaking different languages go to America and they all take to one language. But here in our country are states which are organised on the basis of language. Therefore, we must take the peculiar condition of our country. If we take any one of the mother tongues of the people of this country that will give rise to conflict. Then, people who speak one particular language will become the ruling class, and we would be creating a ruling class and a ruled class. That cannot be allowed in a democracy, surely. I want everyone to consider this very very calmly. Let them not bring passion into play in this matter. We have to take the circumstances of the case. Therefore, they must take this question into consideration and decide what is it that they want, whether they want the ascendancy of one particular language, the pride of place to be given to one language, or they want the unity of the country and the integration of the country to be maintained over everything else in this country. That is the choice before them (*Interruptions*) and that choice has to be made. So, in the interests of the unity of the country, the people of the non-Hindi-speaking areas implore you to come to a right decision on this matter.

**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, clause 3 of the Bill relates to two articles of the Constitution, namely, articles 343 and 120. Up till now, the entire attention of the House has been rivetted only on article 343. I want to draw the attention of the House to the other article, to

which also clause 3 is related, namely, article 120. Sub-clause (b) of clause 3 relates to article 120. Since clause (1) of article 343 says that the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script, a question was raised by some hon. Members whether any lease of life can be granted to the English language so long as the article remains as it is. I only suggest to those hon. Members to look at article 120. What does it say?

It 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."

There are two elements in this article. Of course, it is limited to fifteen years. That limitation is there. But there are two elements in article 120 which deserve notice. Firstly, it overrides article 343; the entire Chapter XVII, except article 348, is overridden by article 120. So, English not only may but shall continue to be used in the same status as Hindi in the business of Parliament. This is so far as Parliament is concerned.

There is another element in this article. The language used is "business in Parliament shall be transacted in Hindi or in English". So, Hindi and English are placed in the same status, and any one of these may be used alternatively. That is the position created by article 120. Up till now, the attention of the House has not been drawn to this, and that is why I thought I should crave your indulgence to draw attention of the House to this.

I shall make only another remark regarding the speech and the amendments of Shri Hiren Mukerjee, because his speech has been commended both by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. The standpoint that Shri Mukerjee has taken up in his

speech, and in Amendment No. 61 that he in conjunction with Shri Gopalan has put in, is that he is prepared to dispense with English only on some conditions, and the conditions are that all the languages in the Constitution should be allowed to be used in this Parliament equally and there should be arrangements for simultaneous translation to all the languages; further, there should be no requirement that advance copies, either in English or in Hindi, should be required to be submitted to the Speaker. It is only subject to these three conditions that Shri Hiren Mukerjee is prepared to dispense with English. If these conditions are conceded by Government, I believe then all these questions that are being raised now about Telugu, Tamil, Bengali and Marathi will disappear at once. If every Member is permitted to speak in Parliament in his own regional language, and if all the regional languages are given the same status, these difficulties will at once go away. I believe, after the commendation that Shri Mukerjee has received both from the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, this position will be considered by Government. I believe, I have correctly stated what Shri Mukerjee stated in his speech and in his amendment. That is all I have got to say.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after the clear and complete exposition of the policy which underlines this Bill, both by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, I do not propose to deal with the criticism of those who do not agree with the policy and who would have us change it. I would only expound clause 3 from the legal point of view and try to convince you, Sir, that it carries out, both in spirit and in letter, our policy, as embodied in the assurance of the Prime Minister, and that there is no discrepancy whatsoever between the Prime Minister's policy statement and the exposition which the Home Minister made in this House yesterday.

15.56 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHASHI *in the Chair*]

I will again read clause 3, which says:

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

and here I may emphasise, Madam as you did, and I shall have to borrow, not for the first time, some of the very weighty observations that fell from you when you were speaking on this very Bill:

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

(b) for the transaction of business in Parliament."

Now, it says two or three important things. First of all, it refers to the expiration of the period of fifteen years. Then, it permits the use of English in addition to Hindi for purposes which are mentioned in clauses (a) and (b). I also owe a debt of gratitude to the speaker who preceded me. He has pointed out, as I intended to point out, that clause 3 combines the provisions in two articles. So, we have to consider the effect of those two articles if we want to see the effect which the clause seeks to provide. As you rightly emphasized, Madam, in your speech, though the period of fifteen years has expired, the *status quo* in respect of these two matters continues, the two provisions had to be combined in one statement in the interest of brevity and compactness. When in a Bill two similar ideas are to be combined, the draftsman tries to put at one place the similar ideas and also tries, if possible, to include all the law on the subject, so that whoever has occasion to consult the law may find it at one place. This is his attempt, and this is what we must realise before we try to construe the law and examine as to

[Shri Hajarnavis]

why it is cast in this form.

Before I come to my submission, my exposition, as to why the draftsman has used a particular phrase, we must try to understand the difference between the clause and draft amendment No. 34, which has been moved by my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, because I find there is practically no difference, so far as implementation is concerned. Though the clause, as it is, is somewhat different, in actual practice, I think his apprehension is entirely misplaced. I am merely saying that even though the draftsman has used the word "may", even then the use of English is unrestricted. If he wants the use of English, he shall not be deprived of his right to do so by another person, except by his own will. That is contained in clause 3 and that is the reason why I oppose the amendment.

16 hrs.

Coming back to article 343, much emphasis has been laid on clause (1) of article 343. Of course, it enshrines Hindi as our official language which is also our national language. Clause (1) says:—

"The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script."

That is a part of the Constitution. But then it also provides further by clause (2), which is also a part of the Constitution, that English shall continue to be used, as it was being used, for 15 years. Clause (2) is as much a part of the Constitution as clause (1) and those who try to swear by the Constitution, who exalt the Constitution, must also remember that clause (2) is as much a part of the Constitution as clause (1).

Then, there follows clause (3) which, again I emphasise, is a part of the Constitution, under which we are legislating. A part of the Bill falls

under clause (3) of article 343. Therefore we are not in any way contravening the Constitution. We are not in any way going against the Constitution in bringing forward this Bill.

Clause (1) of article 343 is subject to clause (3) where it has been said:—

"Notwithstanding anything in this article"

which includes the period of 15 years mentioned in clause (2)

"Parliament may by law provide for the use, after the said period of fifteen years, of the English language".

I might point out that the words used throughout this article are "use of language". Therefore, if a certain continuity had to be maintained in law which derives from this part of Constitution, then, I think, the draftsman was quite right in borrowing or using the words which are used in the Constitution itself. So, he had to use the expression "use of the English language".

Then, there is the other article which is combined with it. It was read a short while ago by my hon. friend, Shri Chapala Kanta Bhattacharyya. There the word used is "shall". That form used is the same as has been used by my hon. friend, Shri Anthony, in his amendment. He uses the word "shall" but uses the word "or". Now the same idea can be used in numerous ways. I will not say that his draft is better than mine or that my draft is better than his, but I will say that my draft is as good as his. It conveys the same meaning. Therefore I see no reason why I should change it and why I should apologise.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Why not be generous and interchange them?

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Why? Article 120 uses the other phrase, namely--

"business in Parliament shall be transacted in Hindi or in English".

The draftsman and the Constitution could have said that in transacting the business in Parliament Hindi or English may be used. There the word that would be used will not be "shall" but it will be "may" because that "may" gives the discretion to the speaker. Today I can start speaking in English and I shall be in order. I may start speaking in Hindi and I will be in order. The word "may" gives the discretion. It gives the discretion to me. It does not give the discretion to anyone in the House to say, "You will not use Hindi but you will use English" On the other hand, if I am now speaking in English, no one can suggest that I am out of order in speaking in English. That is to say, a right has been given to the user of that language to use any of these two at his will. Therefore you will see that the proviso to article 343(2) upon which we draw also uses the same language as has been reproduced in clause (3). Referring to 343(3), legislating upon power which is expressly given by article 343 (3). I do not think that the draftsman could do anything better than use the same language as the article uses.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** Article 343 (3) actually says that it should be confined (*Interruption*). It is not for you. I take serious exception to the gesture of asking you to ask me to sit down.

**Mr. Chairman:** He is not going to yield.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** When the hon. Minister makes that, it is unparliamentary and impolite. It is not for him to say that should sit down. (*Interruption*). When he says that article 343(3) says so, I said that it is not permissible.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member may ask a question afterwards. He should not interrupt him now. (*Interruption*).

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Coming to clause (2), having said in article 343 (1) that

the official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script, it says:—

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

As you pointed out some time back in your speech, the words that are important, that give vitality to this Bill, that give substance to this Bill are "continue to be used". That is to say, we visualise what the *status quo* was. Then these words are apt to describe the continuance of that *status quo*. Therefore we will have to see what the *status quo* was before the stage which is continued by this legislation. So, the words are "shall continue to be used for all official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement: Provide, that the President may—" I pause here. Here the word "may" occurs. Hon. Members who have doubt about the word "may" may refer to this "may". Then it says:—

"during the said period, by order authorise the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language".

The phraseology, the expressions used are exactly the same as here in clause 3. During the 15 years we were operating on the proviso, we were working the proviso, during this time English was used for all purposes; but the President could make an authorisation, and by his order he opened out a certain area. Some areas have been opened and what happened? English, of course, had to be used because that is the substantive part of the article. English could be used, but in addition Hindi may be used. That is to say, while dealing with the Hindi section, if I felt like noting in Hindi, I could do it. It is merely permissive.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** That is right.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Similarly here, as the hon. Prime Minister pointed out, what has been done is that though article 343 comes into effect, after that English loses all status if we do not legislate under article 343(3)—English then loses all its right to being used....

**Shri Frank Anthony:** The issue is: you legislate either mandatorily or permissively. You remove the restriction. Why do you remove it permissively and not mandatorily? That is the simple issue.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I will answer it; I am answering it.

16.08 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

First of all, start with the position which article 343(1) brings into effect, namely, after the expiry of 15 years Hindi becomes the official language. No other language has any status. No person has any right to use any other language so far as official purpose is concerned. Then what do we do? We make English as an additional language. Is there anything permissive about it? Is there anything to say that the status of English or the function that we are attributing to English is permissive?

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It is the use that is permissive.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** It is the use. But the use is by the user.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** He may not use it.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** We go on the supposition that a person at a time uses one languages. If I have got to talk to Shri Anthony, I shall speak to him either in Hindi or in English. What the word "may" says is that I might either speak to him in Hindi or in English.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** You may not speak in English.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Now the word, as Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri, who is a very eminent lawyer of vast experience, yesterday in his speech said, "may" does, of course mean "may not". But who may not? The question is, "who may not?"

**Shri Frank Anthony:** The Central Government.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** No, there is nothing like the Central Government. There is no person or entity called "the Central Government". For this context we are all a collection of persons who form the Central Government. In the Central Government.....

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** It is very strange.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** The hon. Member may learn many strange things. He has still time to learn. He need not despair.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I think, time is not lost even for him to learn.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur):** Everybody learns in life.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I will always learn.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** Who learns most?

**Shri Hajarnavis:** In the official function of the Central Government more than one person is engaged. He might use English; he might use Hindi. If tomorrow I were to write to my secretary in Hindi or in English and if he were to write in English, I will not be able to object if he wrote to me in English. After clause 3, I will not be able to say, he has not used the official language. Suppose we proceed to transact the official business. Now, after 1965, if anyone writes to me and if I were to reply, I have got to write in Hindi. That is the injunction of article 343 of the Constitution. If anyone tried to reply to me, I would say, the official reply must be in Hindi. What



does clause 3 say? He may, in addition to Hindi, use English. This is what the Prime Minister's assurance was. This is what he said. I asked a pointed question of Mr. Mukerjee whose knowledge of English is second to none—I hope Mr. Anthony will pardon me.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I agree. That is why I agree with his arguments.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** So, I asked him how he met the point which was made by the Home Minister yesterday that if 'may' is substituted by 'shall', it will mean in every case, whoever writes in Hindi will also be compelled to write in English. Then, there shall have to be two communications. If I were to write in Hindi, I will have to use English. That is the import of the word 'shall'. This is the point which has been realised by Mr. Anthony. I know, so far as his legal knowledge is concerned, his integrity is very high and, therefore, he has cast it in another form, I say it can be done. It follows the pattern somewhat on the line of article 120. I am not finding fault with the draft. I am merely defending my own draft and I claim for it that in this it reproduces the language of the Constitution, of the very article of the Constitution on the basis of which or for the working of the scheme of which this clause is being used. I submit there are two things. One is giving a certain validity to the use of English. A certain status to the use of English that unambiguously, that indefinitely without the limitation of time, without there being any extraneous control excepting the will of the user the right to use English in addition to Hindi is guaranteed under clause 3. There is no limitation of any kind. The Prime Minister said so. The Home Minister said so. Today I also say so. To my pointed question, as to how, 'shall' can be used in clause 3, Prof. Mukerjee, I am sorry to say, had no answer. I thought it was only lawyers, when they were pressed for an inconvenient answer, evaded it. I do not know it happens also in the case

of professors. I am not quite sure whether Mr. Anthony would use the word 'shall' here.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** On a point of order, Sir. He cannot address Mr. Anthony personally, or directly.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Therefore, I submit this clause, as it is framed, does two things. One is, though after the expiration of the 15 year period Hindi alone is the official language, after 15 years English shall be placed by its side. If any friend from south India would continue to use English, if anyone thinks that his knowledge of Hindi is inadequate and that he will have to rely upon the use of English for the purposes of (a) and (b) of clause 3, then he may rest assured that if he intends to use English for both these purposes, there is no extraneous control over him. There is no outside power which will prohibit him from using that right. The significance of the word is 'in addition'. In addition to Hindi, English can be used and may be used. As Dr. Mahishi pointed out in her very informed speech, very learned speech, the most important phrase in this clause is 'continue to be used'. Have you anything to complain against the use of English during these 15 years in matters relating to (a) and (b)? If it has worked well, if you have not found any difficulty in using English during this time, then in the same manner you can continue to use English. The emphasis is again on the word 'continue'. Therefore, any apprehensions that have been voiced in the House rest on no foundation whatsoever. I hope those of us who agree with the policy will agree that clause 3 does embody the Prime Minister's assurance and our policy and it has the additional advantage that it reproduces the language of the Constitution.

I would not like to say anything against Shri Ranga. He referred to a very unhappy incident in the life of

[Shri Hajarnavis]

this nation. He thinks that certain mistakes were committed. But, it almost sounded to me as if it was an incitement to disruption. On an occasion like this when we are trying to develop a common language.

**Shri Ranga:** I gave a warning. You turn it into an incitement. What a mockery?

**Shri Hajarnavis:** It looked like that Shri Radhelal Vyas said that we should add to the clause without prejudice to the Constitution. Nothing that we do prejudices the Constitution, changes the Constitution unless the Constitution is amended in the manner provided by article 366. No draftsman will use the word, 'without prejudice to the Constitution'. We have all sworn to abide by the Constitution. We act within the Constitution. Whatever legislation we try to bring before the House, we must satisfy ourselves that it does not prejudice the Constitution.

Some Members have sought to move amendments which would restrict the duration of clause 3 to a definite period. As I have already said, it is a matter of policy. The Prime Minister has said that it will continue indefinitely. As regards consultation of non-Hindi States, as the Home Minister pointed out yesterday, that there has been a constant and intimate consultation with the Governments of the non-Hindi States. I believe we are right in treating their opinion on what should apply to their states a little more authoritative than Shri Frank Anthony's. With these words, I move.

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** On a point of clarification....

**Mr. Speaker:** We have had enough, I suppose.

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** This is a very important point. One clarification. The hon. Minister said just now that,

so far as the word 'may' here is concerned, it is in addition to Hindi. That means, if any one likes to write or correspond in English, that is allowed. That is what he has said. That is where I wanted a clarification. Take, for instance, an official document sent to me which is in Hindi. Under this clause, I am not entitled to say, because I do not know Hindi, it must be in English. This is how the explanation is given. It is left to the person who is not debarred from writing in English. He may. In addition to Hindi: that means, if he writes in Hindi, he will not be asked to write in English. He may write in English. To me an official document is sent from the Central Government. It is in Hindi. In that case, according to this explanation that he has given, even though I may not understand Hindi, that official document I shall not claim that it should be written in English. Is that the clarification? That is exactly what he said. That is not the explanation given by the Home Minister.

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Legally either language can be used. Just as in Parliament, I can speak in Hindi or in English, similarly I can use either Hindi or English.

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** That is not the explanation of the Home Minister or the Prime Minister.

**श्री बागड़ी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात नहीं समझ पाया अपने अमेंडमेंट के बारे में जो कि १५२ नम्बर का है। इसमें अंग्रेजी जो होगी वह ऐडिशनल लैंग्वेज होगी और हिन्दी आफिशल लैंग्वेज होगी। उसमें मेरी तरफ़ीम यह थी कि जो ओरिजिनल बिल बगैरह होंगे वह आफिशल लैंग्वेज हिन्दी में होंगे और उनका ट्रांसलेशन जो ऐडिशनल लैंग्वेज इन्डिश है उसमें किया जाय। इस के बारे में माननीय मन्त्री महोदय ने कुछ नहीं बतलाया।

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I oppose all the amendments.

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, I shall put the amendments to vote. Do hon. Members want to have division on any one amendment?

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** I want division on amendment No. 57.

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment No. 57 is barred, because it is the same as amendment No. 36.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Then, we can divide on amendment No. 36.

**Mr. Speaker:** So, I suppose I can put all the other amendments together to vote.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** I would beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment No. 126.

*The amendment (No. 126) was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I would like amendment No. 146 to be disposed of by voice vote.

**Shri Bade:** I would like amendment No. 53 to be disposed of by voice vote.

**Mr. Speaker:** So, I shall put the other amendments together to the vote of the House.

**Shrimati Savitri Nigam:** I also beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment. But before doing so, I should like to say a word.

**Mr. Speaker:** But she never moved her amendment.

I shall now put amendments Nos. 35, 145, 60, 147, 149, 152 and 127 to vote.

*The amendments (Nos. 35, 145, 60, 147, 149, 152 and 127) were put and negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put amendment No. 58 to vote. Those in favour of this amendment may say 'Aye'.

**Some Hon. Members:** 'Aye'.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those against may say 'No'.

Several Hon. Members: 'No'.

**Mr. Speaker:** The 'Noes' have it...

**Shri Bagri:** 'A-y-e-s', 'A-y-e-s'.

**Mr. Speaker:** There ought to be some dignity and some decorum maintained at least.

**श्री बागड़ी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो बात समझेंगे नहीं, उसमें डिग्नटी कैसे होगी ?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मगर यह क्या है कि चाहे जिस वक्त जो मुंह में आया, वह कह दिया ?

**श्री बागड़ी :** जो मुंह में आया वाली बात नहीं है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** और क्या है ? हाउस में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसका ख्याल किये बिना जब चाहे दखल दे दिया । माननीय सदस्य समझें कि क्या हो रहा है । यहाँ पर सब को हाउस के रूल्ज के मुताबिक चलना होगा ।

**श्री बागड़ी :** इसीलिए तो मैं कहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी को हटाओ ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अंग्रेजी इस तरह से नहीं हटेगी, जिस तरह से कि आप कह रहे हैं ।

**श्री बागड़ी :** जब ऐसे लोग आयेंगे, तभी अंग्रेजी हटेगी ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** जब ऐसे लोग आयेंगे, तो शोर मच जाएगा । मैं माननीय सदस्य को कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह बार-बार यहाँ ही दखल न दिया करे ।

**श्री बागड़ी :** वगैर शोर वाले तो पन्द्रह साल के बाद भी नहीं हटा पाए हैं ।

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order, now.

*The amendment (No. 58) was put and negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put amendment No. 146 to vote.

The amendment (No. 146) was put and negated.

Mr. Speaker: Now, only amendment No. 36 remains.

The question is:

Page 2, line 3, for "may" substitute "shall". (36).

Lok Sabha divided:

### Division No. 17 ]

### AYES

[ 16.25 hrs.

Anthony, Shri Frank  
Barrow, Shri  
Buta Singh, Shri  
Elias, Shri Mohammad  
Gopalan, Shri A.K.  
Ismail, Shri Muhammad  
Kapur Singh, Shri

Kar, Shri Prabhat  
Kunhan, Shri P.  
Laxmi Dass, Shri  
Mukerjee, Shri H.N.  
Nair, Shri Vasudevan  
Pottakkatt, Shri  
Raghavan, Shri A.V.

Ranga, Shri  
Reddy Shri Eswara  
Singh, Shri J.B.  
Swamy, Shri M.N.  
Vimla Devi, Shrimati  
Warior, Shri

### NOES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati  
Alva, Shri Joachim  
Aney, Dr. M.S.  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bade, Shri  
Bagri, Shri  
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan  
Bakliwal, Shri  
Balkrishna Singh, Shri  
Balakrishnan, Shri  
Balmiki, Shri  
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati  
Basappa, Shri  
Besra, Shri  
Bhakt Darshan, Shri  
Bhargava, Shri M.B.  
Bhatkar, Shri  
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.  
Brahm Prakash, Shri  
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri  
Priy Basi Lal, Shri  
Brij Raj Singh, Shri  
Chakraverti, Shri P.R.  
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotam  
Chandra Shekhar, Shrimati  
Chavan, Shri D.R.  
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan  
Dass, Shri G.  
Deo Bhanji, Shri P.G.  
Deshmukh, Shri B.D.  
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji R.  
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri  
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.  
Elayaperumal, Shri  
Ering Shri D.  
Gaitonde, Dr.  
Ganapati Ram, Shri  
Gandhi, Shri V. B.  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Govind Das, Dr.  
Guha, Shri A.C.  
Gupta, Shri Kanahi Ram

Gupta, Shri Priya  
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan  
Hajarnavis, Shri  
Hansda Shri Subodh  
Hanumanthaiya, Shri  
Iqbal Singh Shri  
Jain, Shri A.P.  
Jamir, Shri S.G.  
Jamunadevi, Shrimati  
Jedhe, Shri  
Jha Shri Yogendra  
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra  
Jyotishi, Shri J.P.  
Kadadi, Shri  
Kamble, Shri  
Kedaria, Shri C.M.  
Keishing, Shri Rishang  
Khanna, Shri P. K.  
Kindar Lal, Shri  
Kisan Veer, Shri  
Kurreel, Shri B. N.  
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati  
Lali Sen, Shri  
Lonikar, Shri  
Mahadeo Prasad, Shri  
Mahtab, Shri  
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojibi  
Masmoona Sultan, Shrimati  
Mahaen, Shri  
Mandal, Dr. P.  
Marandi, Shri  
Maurya, Shri  
Mehrotra Shri Braj Bihari  
Mehta, Shri J. R.  
Melkote, Dr.  
Menon, Shri Krishna  
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali  
Mishra, Shri Bibhut  
More, Shri K.L.  
Mukhe, Shri  
Murli Manohar, Shri

Naik Shri Maheswar  
Naskar, Shri P.S.  
Nigam, Shrimati Savitri  
Pande, Shri K. N.  
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
Pant, Shri K. C.  
Paramasivan, Shri  
Patel, Shri Chhotubhal  
Pa e, Shri P. R.  
Patel, Shri Rajeshwar  
Patil, Shri D. S.  
Patil, Shri M. B.  
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.  
Pratap Singh, Shri  
Puri, Shri D.D.  
Raghunath Singh Shri  
Ram, Shri T.  
Ram Sewak, Shri  
Ram Singh, Shri  
Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R.  
Ramaswamy, Shri V.K.  
Rampure, Shri M.  
Rane, Shri  
Ranga Rao, Shri  
Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda  
Sadhu Ram, Shri  
Saha, Dr. S.K.  
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar  
Samnani, Shri  
Sanji Rupji, Shri  
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati  
Shashank Manjar, Shrimati  
Shashi Ranjan, Shri  
Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur  
Shastri, Shri Ramanand  
Sheo Narain, Shri  
Siddiah, Shri  
Singh, Shri D.N.  
Singha, Shri Y.N.  
Sonavane, Shri |  
Subbaraman, Shri  
Subramanyam, Shri T

Suma Prasad, Shri  
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
 Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi  
 Tahir, Shri Mohamad  
 Thimmaiah, Shri  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary Shri K. N.

Tiwary, Shri R.S.  
 Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo  
 Uikay, Shri  
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt  
 Utiya, Shri  
 Varma, Shri M.L.  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.

Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Vidyalankar, Shri A.N.  
 Vishram Prasad, Shri  
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal  
 Wadiwa, Shri  
 Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh  
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

**Mr. Speaker:** The result of the division is: Ayes 20; Noes 145.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*

*New Clause 3A*

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—after line 7, insert—

"3A. (1) The President shall appoint a special officer to be known as Commissioner for Hindi whose principal function shall be to pursue and promote the progressive use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union.

(2) The President shall by notification to be published in Gazette Extraordinary prescribe the terms and conditions of service for the aforesaid officer". (171).

**Shri Sivamurthi Swamy:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—after line 7, insert—

"3A. For all official purposes of the States and Union, the respective regional language may be used for which it is being used in the State Legislatures and State offices concerned". (128).

**Mr. Speaker:** These amendments are before the House. We have discussed every aspect. Now hon. Members shall be brief.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I shall not refer to any matter not within the confines

of the proposed amendment for the insertion of which I have moved. I have proposed that the President shall appoint an officer to be known as Commissioner for Hindi.

"The President shall appoint a special officer to be known as Commissioner for Hindi whose principal function shall be to pursue and promote the progressive use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union."

The second part relates to the modality and the mechanism for effectuating this particular affirmation.

I have been impelled to move this amendment for the insertion of this particular clause because I find that the advice which was tendered to the nation by Dr. Rajendra Prasad when he spoke from the Chair while presiding over the deliberations of the Constituent Assembly to give effect to these provisions in respect of Hindi have not really received much attention at the hands of the Government. I feel that this is a relatively non-controversial proposal, because what I am moving for is only to ensure that the promises and the assurances enshrined in the Constitution and reiterated by many responsible members of the Government may actually materialise.

In moving this amendment, I would also like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a time schedule should have been drawn up by the Government in seeing to it that Hindi was developed for its progressive use as the language for official purposes. No time schedule was drawn up, no

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

targets were actually fixed. The Government, which believes so much in planning, has failed entirely in planning the progressive use of Hindi as the official language of the Union. It is in this context that I have moved this particular amendment.

Another matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the House is that we are considering this Bill without the advantage of having the findings of a second Commission as contemplated in article 344. No amount of legal logic or interpretation, the burden of which it appears the Minister of State carries very heavily on him, would be able to justify the fact that no such Commission as enjoined by article 344 was appointed before we were asked to discuss this matter.

It is in view of the fact that the Government has certainly failed,—as Dr. Aney pointed out, this Bill itself is a confession of the failure of the Government to effectuate the provisions in relation to Hindi—it is because of this failure, it is because of the apprehensions that we entertain because of the fact that the Government has failed to plan for the targets and draw up a time schedule for the progressive use of Hindi, that I am impelled to move for the insertion of clause 3A.

**श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने ३ (ए) इंसर्ट करने के लिए एमेंडमेंट पेश की है। जब हम अंग्रेजी को हटाने के पक्ष में हैं तो हमें यह भी सोचना होगा कि हमारे देश में बहुत से ऐसे राज्य हैं जिनकी भाषा हिन्दी नहीं है और जब हिन्दी आफिशल लैंग्वेज बन जाएगी तो उन राज्यों में रहने वालों को दिक्कत होगी। हम इंग्लिश को इंडेफिनिट पीरियड के लिए बनाये रखने के बिल्कुल खिलाफ हैं। लेकिन उनके साथ साथ हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि उन राज्यों में जिनकी भाषा हिन्दी नहीं है जो कि हिन्दी को अमल

में नहीं ला सकते हैं, उनको आजादी होनी चाहिये कि वे अपनी अपनी रिजनल लैंग्वेज में, अपनी अपनी मातृभाषाओं में केन्द्र के साथ पत्र व्यवहार कर सकें, खतों-किताबत कर सकें। अगर ऐसा किया जाता है तो किसी को हिन्दी से डर नहीं हो सकता है, रिजनल लैंग्वेज को डर नहीं हो सकता है और उनका हिन्दी में या अंग्रेजी में ट्रांसलेशन भी हो सकता है। हमारे मेलकोटे साहब ने कहा है कि अगर इसकी इजाजत हो जाती है यहां पर पार्लिमेंट में या केन्द्र के साथ पत्र-व्यवहार में अपनी मातृभाषाओं का आजादी के साथ इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं, तो इसका उन भाषा भाषी लोगों पर बहुत अच्छा असर पड़ेगा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी तथा हमारी सरकार की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि जो चौदह लैंग्वेज हैं वे सब हमारी नेशनल लैंग्वेज हैं, लेकिन जब तक जो हम चाहते हैं वह नहीं किया जाता है, कभी भी यह मुमकिन नहीं हो सकता है कि वे नेशनल लैंग्वेज मानी जा सकें। उनको उचित उचित स्थान देना बड़ा जरूरी है। मैंने अपनी एमेंडमेंट में कहा है :

"for all official purposes of the States and Union, the respective regional language may be used for which it is being used in the State legislatures and the State offices concerned."

अगर इसकी आजादी दे दी जाए तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जो डी० एम० के० के० के इशारे पर दक्षिण भारत में मूवमेंट चल रही है और दक्षिण भारत में गलतफहमी पैदा की जा रही है कि हिन्दी को उन पर जबर्दस्ती लादा जा रहा है, वह गलतफहमी पैदा नहीं होगी और वह मूवमेंट भी खत्म हो जाएगी। अगर यह मान लिया जाए कि तमिल को भी, कन्नड़, मराठी इत्यादि जितनी भी भाषायें हैं, उनको भी आफिशल काम काज में यहां

लाया जा सकता है और उनके जरिये भी पत्र-व्यवहार किया जा सकता है और लोक-सभा में भी तमिल इत्यादि भाषाओं का बिना इजाजत इस्तेमाल किया जा सकता है, तो बहुत सी जो गलतफहमी है, वह दूर हो सकती है। इनको यहां पर इस्तेमाल में लाने की जो इजाजत लेनी पड़ती है, उसकी जरूरत नहीं नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर कोई इन में से किसी भाषा में बोलता है तो मजबूरी की वजह से ही बोलता है। मेरा यह पक्का विश्वास है कि अगर मेरी इस प्रमोशन को मान लिया जाता है तो अभी जो हिन्दी के बारे में यहां प्रमोशन शुरू हुआ है और सो दो सी आदमी पकड़े गए हैं, वह खत्म हो सकता है और भाषा के नाम पर लोगों को जो भड़काया जा रहा है और उनको एक्सप्लायट किया जा रहा है, वह बन्द हो सकता है। अगर इंडेफिनिट पीरियड के लिए अंग्रेजी को रखा जाता है तो कहीं ऐसा न हो कि वह एटर्नल हो जाए, जो कि हम कर्मा नहीं चाहते हैं। रिजनल लैंग्वेज डिवेलप हो रही है, यूनिवर्सिटीज वर्ग-रू में मीडियम आफ इंस्ट्रक्शन बन रही हैं। इस दृष्टि से भी और जो नई जैनरेशन आ रही है उसके हित की दृष्टि से भी यह जरूरी है कि अंग्रेजी की जगह हिन्दी और रिजनल लैंग्वेजिज जल्दी आए। इंग्लिश बहुत कुछ कम हो गई है इसका पता पार्लियमेंट की कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है, उसमें चलता है और उससे यह भी पता चलता है कि इसका स्टैंडर्ड गिरता जा रहा है।

चूंकि समय नहीं है इसलिए मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि दक्षिण भारत में जो जो कुप्रचार हो रहा है और लोगों को एक्सप्लायट किया जा रहा है, उसका अगर आप अन्त करना चाहते हैं और देश की एकता को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं तो इस बात की इजाजत दें कि बिना इजाजत रिजनल लैंग्वेजिज का इस्तेमाल हो सकता है और इस दृष्टि से मैंने जो प्रमोशन पेश की है, उनको माल लें।

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Sir, I regret I have to oppose this amendment though I

am a great deal in sympathy with the spirit of the amendment. I can assure the hon. Member that we will take all the steps to discharge the responsibilities which the Constitution and the Parliament have cast upon us. With this assurance I hope he will withdraw the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

Page 2, after line 7, insert—

“3A. For all official purposes of the States and Union, the respective regional language may be used for which it is being used in the State Legislatures and State Offices concerned.” (128).

Those for the amendment will please say Aye.

**Some Hon. Members:** Aye.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those against the amendment will please say No.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Noes have it.

**Shri Sivamurthi Swamy:** The Ayes have it.

**Mr. Speaker:** At that moment, when I called on them, he did not say anything. If he insists on a division, I will certainly— (Interruption).

**Shri Sivamurthi Swamy:** I do not press it.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. I had already put it.

*The amendment was negatived.*

**Mr. Speaker:** What about Dr. Singhvi? Is that also to be put to the vote?

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** It should be put to the voice vote.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right.

The amendment (No. 171) was put and negatived.

Clause 4—(Committee on Official Language)

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up clause 4 of the Bill. The following amendments are moved:

**Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:** I beg to move:

(1) Page 2,—

for clause 4, substitute—

"4. After the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, that section shall stand repealed, unless Lok Sabha by a resolution passed by it with the majority of votes of the total number of members representing the non-Hindi area constituencies, resolves that the section shall continue to be in force for any further period not exceeding five years." (64).

**Shri Radhelal Vyas:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

for clause 4, substitute—

"4. (1) As early as possible before the date on which section 3 comes into force, the President shall appoint a special officer, whose duty shall be, to review from year to year the measures adopted for the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union, the actual progress made and the difficulties encountered and to make recommendations to the President with a view to overcome such difficulties and to promote the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union and the President shall cause such report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

(2) There shall be constituted a Committee consisting of thirty members of whom twenty shall be members of the House of the People and ten shall be members

of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the members of the House of People and the members of the Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote. It shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the special officer appointed under sub-section (1) and to report to the President their opinion thereon.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 3, the President may after consideration of the report referred to in sub-section (2), issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of that report." (69).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

for lines 8 to 15, substitute—

"4. (1) After the expiration of twenty-five years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, there shall be constituted a Committee consisting of fifty members of whom thirty-five shall be members of the House of the People and fifteen shall be members of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the members of the House of the People and the members of the Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote". (38).

(ii) Page 2,—

for lines 8 to 15, substitute—

"4. (1) After the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, there may be constituted a Committee consisting of thirty members of whom twenty shall be members of the House of the People and ten shall be members of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the



members of the House of the People and ten shall be members of the Council of States to be elected respectively by the members of the House of the People and the members of the Council of States in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote". (39).

**Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana):** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

for lines 8 and 9, substitute,—

"4. (1) After the expiration of five years from the date on which section 3 comes into force, the President shall appoint a Committee". (20).

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment No. 21—  
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav—absent.  
Amendment No. 150.

**Shri Bagri:** I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9,—

for "After the expiration of ten years from the date on which section 3 comes into force" substitute—

"After the expiration of five years from the date on which the Act comes into force." (150).

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendment No. 22—  
Shri Shankaraiya is absent Amendment No. 65 not moved. Amendment No. 41—Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri—absent. Amendment No. 68 not moved. Amendment No. 24—Shri Karuthiruman—absent. Amendment No. 130—Shri Siddiah—absent. Amendments Nos. 29 and 44—absent. Amendment Nos. 30 and 47—absent. Amendment No. 40—Shrimati Savitri Nigam—not moved. Amendment No. 27—Shri Narasimha Reddy—absent. Amendment No. 73—Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri—absent. Amendment No. 74 also—Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri—absent.

**Shri Bade:** I beg to move:

Page 2, line 8,—

for "ten years" substitute "five years" (66).

**Shri Bade:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

for lines 9 to 15, substitute—

"section 3 comes into force, the use of Hindi language shall be made for all official purposes of the Union and for the transaction of business in Parliament." (67).

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 9 and 10,—

for "the President may appoint a Committee consisting of thirty members", substitute—

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

(1A) The Committee shall consist of thirty members". (158).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg to move:

"That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 158 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

(i) for "there shall be" substitute—

"there may be"

(ii) for "thirty members" substitute—

"fifty members". (168).

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I beg to move:

"That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 158 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

for "there shall be constituted" substitute—

"the President shall constitute". (172).

**Shri Ranga:** I move amendment No. 164 with a small change. It will be

[Shri Ranga]

an amendment to clause 4(3) instead of to clause 4(1). I beg to move:

Page 2, line 19,—

after "President" insert—

"shall not take any decision to reduce the position of English in administrative, Legislative and judicial work without the concurrence of all the non-Hindi State Legislatures obtained by resolutions passed by three-fourth of the total strength of each Legislature and". (164).

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:** I beg to move:

(i) Page 2, line 15,—

add at the end—

"The Committee shall go into the detailed question of progress of use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union, and if in its Report it also mentions some sound grounds for further continuance of English, as additional language, the time-limit of such use, can be extended by the President upto a period of five years or for ten years by Parliament provided not less than three-fourth of the Legislatures of Non-Hindi speaking States demand and recommend such an extension, by passing Resolutions to the effect on the strength of not less than two-third votes of the Members present on the days fixed for convening the meetings of the respective Legislatures. Thereafter, English shall also cease to be an additional Official Language."

Page 2,

omit the lines 16 to 21. (70).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

for lines 16 to 18, substitute—

"(2) It may be the duty of the Committee to review the progress made in the use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union

and submit its report to Parliament which shall make its recommendations thereon." (42).

(ii) Page 2, line 16,—

for "shall" substitute "may" (43).

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** I beg to move:

Page 2, line 18,—

for "the President" substitute "Parliament". (165).

**Shri Hajarnavis:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"and the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament, and sent to all the State Governments". (159).

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ ।

(i) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 159 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

after "State Governments" insert—  
"and State legislatures" (162).

(ii) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 159 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

for "and the President shall cause the report to be laid before each House of Parliament" substitute—

"and the report shall be laid before each House of Parliament". (166).

**Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:** I beg to move:

(i) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 159 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

before "and the President" insert—

"The Committee shall also report on the restrictions (partial or full) needed in connection with further use and continuance of English as an additional official language and while so recommending the final time limit, if any, required for its continuance". (169).

(ii) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 159 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

after "State Governments" insert—

"In the meanwhile the Government of India and the State Governments, shall from now onwards take such continuous effective steps (inclusive of non-official co-operation) in a planned and organised way, that introduction and use of Hindi needed in the respective spheres is possible to be done to such an extent as to minimise to the maximum possible extent all chances of continuance of further use of English as an additional official language, by the time the Committee on the subject is constituted and brought into being." (170).

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** I beg to move:

That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 159 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

omit "and sent to all the State Governments". (173).

**Shri Yashpal Singh:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"(2A) The President shall cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament the report of the Committee." (28).

439 (ai) LSD—8.

**Shri A. C. Guha:** I beg to move:

Page 2,—

after line 18, insert—

"(2A) The report of the Committee shall be placed before Parliament and also be circulated to all the States." (133).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

for lines 19 to 21, substitute—

"(3) The President may, after consideration of the recommendations of Parliament and the opinions of the State Legislatures, issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of those recommendations and opinions." (45).

(ii) Page 2,—

for lines 19 to 21, substitute—

"(3) The President may, after consideration of the recommendations of Parliament, issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of those recommendations." (46).

**Shri Prabhat Kar:** Sir, I beg to move:

(i) Page 2,—

for lines 19 to 21, substitute—

"(3) The President shall thereafter, refer the report to the State Legislatures for their opinion. The President shall refer the report together with the opinion of the State Legislatures to Parliament for its recommendations before decision is taken." (75).

(ii) Page 2, line 19,—

for "report" substitute "Parliament's recommendation". (76).

**Shri A. C. Guha:** Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2, line 19,—

after "report" insert—

"and the views of Parliament and the States". (134).

**Shri Hajarnavis:** Sir, I beg to move:

Page 2, line 20,—

after "in sub-section (2).", insert—

"and the views, if any, expressed by the State Governments thereon." (160).

**Shr. Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Sir, I beg to move:

(i) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 160 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

after "State Governments" insert—  
"and State Legislatures". (163).

(ii) That in the amendment proposed by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, printed as No. 160 in List No. 11 of amendments,—

after "expressed by" insert "Parliament and". (167).

(iii) Page 2, line 20,—

after "in sub-section (2)", insert—

"and after ascertaining the opinion of Parliament and State Legislatures in regard thereto in such manner as he may deem necessary". (161).

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, my six amendments are briefly to the following effect. The first seeks that the committee will be appointed after a period of 25 years—the period is extended to 25 years—and the committee will consist of 50 and not 30 members. My second amendment keeps the period the same—after a period of ten years—but the appointment will be permissive because there is the word "may". My next amendment leaves the duty as being permissive, to review and to submit to Parliament. My fourth amendment requires the President after considering the recommendations of Parliament and the opinions of State legislatures to issue his order. Then, my amendment No. 168 consists of two amendments to the amendment given by the Home Minister by which in-

stead of "shall" I put the word "may" and the number of 30 be raised to 50.

Now, Sir, I feel that my first amendment is not an un-reasonable one. It seeks to raise the period after which the committee will be appointed from 10 to 25 years. I feel there are many people who consider that this is a very reasonable and even a minimum period. For many reasons it is both reasonable and a minimum period. Without wanting to cast any kind of aspersion on Hindi, I would say that even the Language Committee felt that the language is a developing language lie the economy of the country and it will take at least another 25 years for it to be sufficiently strengthened to meet many of the official purposes of the Union.

Then, Sir, there is a feeling—that was expressed very eloquently by one of the lady Members—that 25 years is the minimum period because it will give the present generation time as they grow into adulthood, time to master the Hindi language and—perhaps here the Home Minister will not agree with me—it will qualify the resistance to Hindi. I know I have been singled out for all manner of abuses. I am old enough and I have grown old in this game. But many Members have paid me tribute, quoting from my speeches in the Constituent Assembly,—all hostages to my bona fides—advocating that Hindi should not be the official language, but the national language how it should be taught compulsorily from class 5 and how, as Dr. Singhvi just now said, we should all suffer an abatement of our vested interest in order to promote Hindi. They are all hostages to my bona fides. I hate to disillusion the Home Minister, but I know in my capacity as the Chairman of the Education Board, the growing resistance to Hindi in the non-Hindi-speaking States. His information may be different. Let me give him an example, another hostage I gave to Hindi. The first school to

subscribe to the three-language formula in the country was the Anglo-Indian school, long before any other school in the country. Under that formula, I was responsible for making Hindi a compulsory second language. I wanted it. What happened? Immediately, Madras and Bengal said: you cannot teach Hindi as the second language. I said: all right; I made it a compulsory third language. Fairly recently, Madras said: you cannot teach it even as a third compulsory language; it must be absolutely optional. So, I say to the Home Minister, whatever the wishful thinking of Government might be, because of the insistence of the Madras Government that Hindi cannot be even a third compulsory language but only an optional language, the study of Hindi in Madras has become in many of the schools nothing more than a joke. So far as West Bengal is concerned, they allow us to teach it as third language, but only for a period of two years. And if anybody thinks that one can get even a smattering of Hindi in two years, he must have a very poor opinion of Hindi. But, that is the position. There is a growing resistance to the efforts of people like myself to propagate the knowledge of Hindi. I feel that if this period is extended, that resistance will be considerably less in the non-Hindi-speaking States.

Then, I just do not understand this attitude of hatred. I think I have enough education, and I have enough to do with education, but I cannot understand this attitude of hatred. I have argued about English not being a foreign language. The Supreme Court has held it is not a foreign language, because it is my language and because it is a dominant language. That is the decision of the Supreme Court. But there is no point in arguing with obscurantists who will not see the obvious truth. But there is this thing. Who can hate a language? In my capacity, having a lot to do with hundreds of schools, what I hate today is the fact that Hindi has become identified with intolerance, with aggress-

sion, with every form of vulgarity. Who can hate Hindi? One of my pre-occupations every morning is to get the *Subodhini* to pick up Hindi because, as everyone else, I want my living and a commendable living. I have lost very few murder cases in which I have cross-examined and argued in Hindi. Nobody can talk about it. But I cannot understand this hatred which exudes from some of the Hindi imperialists. So, I say that those of us who are interested in language for language's sake are doing what we can to promote the knowledge of Hindi, and an increasingly adequate knowledge of Hindi.

As Chairman of the old Senior Cambridge Examination, which has now been brought to India, I have seen that we have a higher standard in Hindi. We have upgraded it to such an extent that they say that Hindi in our higher secondary schools is equivalent to almost the intermediate or degree papers in the Hindi States. So, every effort is being made by us. And I say this. If we could get away from the sheer, unreasonable hatred and fanaticism which exudes from some of the Hindi protagonists, there are reasonable people who are not obscurantists, people who will promote it. So, why not have a reasonable period so that it will qualify itself for acceptance by others!

I have said about the use of the word "shall". I have asked for the increase of the number of members in the Committee to 50. I know, Shri Shastri very disarmingly said that the Committee is a microcosm of the House and there was a cross-section in the last Committee, 21 members from the non-Hindi-speaking areas were there. Sir, no one is more jealous than I am about the privileges and the honour of the Members of the House. I know that every Member is literally an hon. Member and is, in fact, an hon. Member. But, don't let us deliberately indulge in self-deception. There are such things as party whip, and the larger the party, the more strident the whip and the louder it cracks.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

What happened in the last Committee? I say this objectively. I wanted the Committee to function in the open. I said: here is a Committee dealing with issues of critical importance to everyone in India, let us have it in the open forum. I was over-ruled. Then I argued and said: why not re-examine the Chief Ministers of Madras and West Bengal. Because, I knew that the Madras Government had changed its stand from the time it had submitted its memorandum to the Language Commission. Their latest stand was almost permanent or prolonged bilingualism which was not the stand they took before. I knew that both the West Bengal legislatures had unanimously passed a resolution saying that on the day Hindi is brought in as the sole official language they will insist that Bengali should be given equal official status. So, I asked for both these. Once again I was overruled.

Then I said, "How are we going to function in this conspiratorial *sub rosa* manner?" I said, "Admit the press." Once again I was over-ruled. I do not know, Parliamentary Committees may function—I will not say in a *sub rosa* manner—behind closed doors. But this was not in a technical sense a Parliamentary Committee. It was a constitutional committee, a committee charged with the vital duty to the whole country. I said, "Let the press come in." The press was excluded. Only now and then they doled out some official information.

Then what happened last time. Everything has done *sub rosa*. There was a tremendous cracking of the party whip. I am not betraying the confidence—I said it before when the recommendations were brought to the committee. I enumerated briefly my reasons for not being able to accept the report—Atulya Babu at least said this, "I agree with Shri Anthony's views, but as a loyal Congressman, I am bound to sign the report". That is why I have asked why a commit-

tee functioning *sub rosa*, almost in a conspiratorial attitude, is going to decide the fate of the language pattern in this country.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** On a point of order, Sir. I have been trying to be very patient, but Shri Anthony is referring to the work of a Parliamentary Committee appointed by the last Parliament on which I happened to have been one of those who tried to work very humbly. He is referring to that committee and what is supposed to have transpired in that committee according to his version of things. He is characterising the work of that committee as having been conducted in a conspiratorial way, *sub rosa* and, God knows, what other kind of language which many of us do not even understand. Is it permissible in Parliament to refer to what happened inside the Parliamentary Committee and also to make the most derogatory observations about Members also and those who formed the committee which had the late Govind Ballabh Pant as its chairman? We had as distinguished a composition as this Parliament could think of at that time and as represented by different elements. Is it permissible to refer to hon. Members who said one thing inside the Committee or voted one way inside the Committee and said something else to Shri Anthony or to X, Y or Z outside? Is it permissible in this Parliament to make references to a Parliamentary Committee in this manner and to prejudice the work which was seconded by the House after it was discussed openly?

**Mr. Speaker:** If the question were so far as the Parliamentary Committees are concerned, I am clear that no proceedings that took place inside the committee can be disclosed or discussed here. It is not proper to state here what had happened inside the committee which was a Parliamentary Committee. But here the difficulty was that this was not a Parliamentary Committee.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** It was a constitutional committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Here it was not a Parliamentary Committee over which I had any control; it had not to make a report to Parliament at all.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** This is the position I took.

**Mr. Speaker:** The report also had to be made to the President and not to the Speaker or to Parliament. So, so far as the Rules that we have and we are governed with are concerned, they are about the Parliamentary Committees. According to them,

"Parliamentary Committee" means a Committee which is appointed or elected by the House or nominated by the Speaker and which works under the direction of the Speaker and presents its report to the House or to the Speaker and the Secretariat for which is provided by the Lok Sabha Secretariat;"

In that sense it was not a Parliamentary Committee at all and I had no control over it. Though according to normal practices and commonsense it ought to be rather just and fair to the Committee that we should not, even though it may not be a Parliamentary Committee, discuss those things that had happened there, I have no power to regulate that.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** As I said, I did not want to say that but I just wanted to show our difficulty.

**Mr. Speaker:** It did not appear dignified that what transpired inside should be disclosed.

17 hrs.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** We did not function in the open. The press were not admitted there. The party whip did crack loudly. That is my whole reason. What has Home Minister done? His amendment purports now to canvass the views of the State Legislatures. It does not improve the position. The amendment, I say with great respect, does not advance the position by one iota. I say, why short-

circuit Parliament? What was the assurance? It was that the non-Hindi-speaking people will decide it. Now, their views are being taken all round. I am satisfied if the recommendations come from Parliament. The recommendations must be not from the Committee although the report will come. What happened last time? The Report came, but our debates never went to the President. The President's Order was in the precise terms of the Committee's Report. I do not want that I say, when the matter comes to the House, all the proceedings will be open; it will be open to the press. It is much easier in a small committee, I say this with all respect even for hon. Members to be directed and regimented. When it comes to the House, you get a much wider cross-section view and you are not able to regiment Parliament in that way. What is wrong if the matter comes to Parliament and the recommendations go from Parliament with the views of the States?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes, Shri Prabhat Kar.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** It is 5 O'clock, Sir. Shall we not switch over to the other Bill?

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. This we will take up tomorrow at 11 O'clock. We will proceed to the other Bill—The Compulsory Deposit Scheme Bill.

17.03 hrs.

COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME  
 BILL—contd.

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** Sir, in the morning I wrote to you about this. There was the point raised by Shri Jain yesterday and it was discussed—it was a constitutional point. Apart from the constitutional question, the point was raised that there was a difference of opinion as to whether it is *ultra vires* of the Constitution. Mr. Jain raised a point yesterday and a request was made that on this matter before we proceed