

The Assembly re-assembled in the afternoon at Four of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Dr. Rajendra Prasad) in the Chair.

DRAFT CONSTITUTION—(*Contd.*)

PART XIV-A—LANGUAGE

Mr. President : We have now to take up the articles dealing with the question of language. I know this is a subject which has been agitating the minds of Members for sometime and so I would make an appeal to the speakers who are going to take part in the debate. My appeal is not in favour of any particular proposition, but it is with regard to the nature of the speeches which Members may be making. Let us not forget that whatever decision is taken with regard to the question of language, it will have to be carried out by the country as a whole. There is no other item in the whole Constitution of the country which will be required to be implemented from day to day, from hour to hour, I might even say from minute to minute in actual practice. Therefore Members will remember that it will not do to carry a point by debate in this House. The decision of the House should be acceptable to the country as a whole. Even if we succeed in getting a particular proposition passed by majority, if it does not meet with the approval of any considerable section of people in the country—either in the north or in the south, the implementation of the Constitution will become a most difficult problem. Therefore, when any Member rises to speak on this language question I would request him most earnestly to remember that he should not let fall a single word or expression which might hurt or cause offence. Whatever has to be said, should be said in moderate language so that it might appeal to reason and there should be no appeal to feelings or passion in a matter like this.

Now I desire to say one word about the procedure which I propose to follow so that I could have the approval of the House for that procedure.

I have found that there are some three hundred or more amendments to these articles. If each one of the amendments is to be moved I do not know how many hours it will take if I am to allow ten minutes to each mover to speak. Many of these amendments overlap; many make only difference of a shade in their meaning; many make practically no difference except in their wording. There are some of course which are of a substantial nature. I, therefore, propose to take all the amendments as moved and ask the Members to start the discussion straightway. Every Member who wishes to speak is free to do so on his amendment, but he has to remember that he must confine his speech to about 10 minutes or 15 minutes at the most. If he wishes to cover all the amendments or all the propositions which arise, probably he will have no time to deal fully with the particular item to which he attaches importance. It, therefore, naturally follows that in observing the time-limit, Members may have to concentrate on particular points to which they desire to attach importance. If the house co-operates and if the Members co-operates, there is no reason why we should not be able to finish the discussion of this question within a reasonable time, as we have done with the rest of the Constitution. I would like to know if the House approves of the procedure which I propose to follow.

Honourable Members : Yes.

Shri Mahavir Tyagi : Sir, I do not accept the procedure suggested, if discussion is to be permitted to cover the whole field of amendments, one will not be in a position to know exactly what a particular amendment signifies or what an amendment to an amendment means. Therefore if the procedure suggested

by you is followed the House will not get the full benefit of the debate. I therefore suggest that either you may be pleased to take the salient points from these Lists of Amendments to be moved and take the decision of the House on them so that such decisions may thereafter be implemented by the Drafting Committee. If this is not done, and if discussion is carried on the question of the numerals, etc. simultaneously one would not know what he has to say. I therefore submit that the procedure suggested will not be fair.

Mr. President : I assume that the Members have read the amendments and understood their significance (Several Honourable Members : Yes.) It is on that basis that I placed my suggestion before the House.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani : May I suggest that the official resolution of Dr. Ambedkar and two others be moved and thereafter the amendments may be moved one after the other. They have become things of no significance. Therefore if you ask Dr. Ambedkar and his companions to come forward and move their amendments and then allow the amendments to those amendments to be moved, that will give a fair chance to honourable Members to express their views.

Mr. President : It is open to Members to say that they do not wish to move any particular amendment. Otherwise I will take all amendments as moved. We shall start the discussion.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani : I have proposed an amendment to the amendment proposed by Dr. Ambedkar. If he says that he does not want to move his amendment.
.....

Mr. President : Your amendment will be taken as moved.

Seth Govind Das (C.P. & Berar : General) : I would like to know whether, in view of the fact that you have said that all the amendments would be taken as moved, the discussion would take place on all the amendments or on each point.

Mr. President : I will follow the procedure which I followed earlier in the day in connection with the other proposition to which also we had a large number of amendments. I shall take the amendments first which cover the whole ground and after they have been disposed of, I shall take up paragraph by paragraph if Members so desire to discuss them.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma : You were pleased to state that we shall take all the amendments as moved. What then will be the order of the members whom you will be pleased to call upon to speak?

Mr. President : The same order which is ordinarily followed by any Speaker of the Assembly.

The Honourable Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla (C.P. & Berar : General) : Are we going to take amendment by amendment for discussion or are we going to take the whole lot of them?

Mr. President : The whole lot of them.

The Honourable Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla : If we take amendment by amendment, we shall be able to concentrate on each point. Otherwise there would be such a lot of confusion that you yourself would not be able to fix upon speakers.

Mr. President : That is why I suggested that Members in speaking will concentrate on the particular point to which they attach importance.

Mr. Mohamed Ismail Sahib (Madras : Muslim) : There are certain amendments coming still; are we to assume that they are all going to be taken as moved?

Mr. President : All the amendments which I have received up to this particular movement. They will be circulated this evening.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma : Will it be possible for you to take up article by article?

Mr. President : At the time of voting.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma : We can take up article by article and discussion will be confined to that particular article for the time being; then the second article can be taken up, so that if the same Member wishes to speak on that article, he can do so.

Mr. President : I do not like that, but of course it is open to the House.

An Honourable Member : Will every Member who has moved an amendment be entitled to speak as a matter of right?

Mr. President : I cannot say just now. I have not counted the number of Members who have moved amendments but I will try to accommodate every member who has moved an amendment.

Shri R. K. Sidhwa (C.P. & Berar : General) : What about those Members who have not moved any amendments? Would they also be entitled to speak?

Mr. President : I will try to accommodate every Member.

Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor : Sir, according to the suggestion which you have been pleased to make, all the amendments will be taken as moved. May I submit, Sir, that this whole Chapter deals with the question of language. Hitherto the practice adopted in this House has been that when a particular Chapter is under consideration, each article is taken up separately. The articles in this Chapter relate to entirely different subjects. One relates to numerals. Another relates to the language of the High Courts and the Supreme Courts, and another to the language of the States; another relates to the language which should be used in communications between one State and another. All these articles relate to absolutely different subjects, and I would therefore submit that, while there may be this departure which you have suggested, so far as taking up each article is concerned, the usual procedure that has been adopted so far may continue to be adopted. Otherwise there will be confusion.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : Why should this change be made at the fag-end of the Constitution-making?

Mr. President : Because it is the fag-end.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Then the time limit should be relaxed.

Mr. President : That is a matter about which I am prepared to re-consider. Instead of ten minutes, I may give some more time.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : I want that each Member should be strictly relevant.

Mr. President : That is exactly the difficulty.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : I have moved certain amendments. If I am not relevant at any time, you will be pleased to stop me, Sir.

The Honourable Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : You have given the ruling that all the amendments of which notice has been given will be taken as moved. Apparently there are two or three hundreds of them. Now, I imagine that some of them overlap and some are completely out of date. If we take them all as moved, ultimately it will take a lot of time. I am merely suggesting that those Members who want to withdraw their amendments might withdraw them by writing to you.

Mr. President : I am prepared to go a little further than that. I will call every amendment and then the member concerned can say if he wants to move it or not.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta (Delhi) : Since the Drafting Committee has not been able to put forward any agreed amendment on this question may I suggest even at this late stage a Committee of nine or eleven Members be appointed by the House, to go into the whole question once again and try to bring about some agreed amendment?

An Honourable Member : No, Sir.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta : At least, such an amendment can form the basis for discussion and the points of difference can be reduced. I suggest with your permission, Sir that the following members might serve on that Committee : The Honourable Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru....

An Honourable Member : No, we are not agreeable to the idea.

Mr. President : I do not think that is practicable. I understand that that procedure has been followed. It makes no difference.

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta : If we can have an agreed solution, that will save a good deal of time and botheration.

Mr. President : It will make no difference. I think I had better close this discussion now.

Shri B. Das (Orissa : General) : Sir, may I have your ruling if the amendments that have been tabled so far are the only amendment and that no further amendments will be accepted, so that time and expenses of the House could be saved?

Mr. President : The matter will be put to the vote now. The question is :

“That the procedure that I have suggested be generally adopted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President : I will now call the amendments one by one. Amendment No. 65.

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao (Mysore State) : I have tabled an amendment, Sir, that the question of the language be left to the future Parliament. If that amendment is accepted, all this discussion could be avoided.

Mr. President : There are so many other amendments which, if accepted, would throw all the other amendments out of the picture. I shall now call each of the amendments, and if any Member wishes to withdraw his amendment, he will let me know.

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 65 and 66 indicated that those amendments might be taken as moved.)

Amendment No. 67.

The Honourable Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla : Sir, I wish to move each item separately.

Mr. President : It will be a question at the time of voting from that point.

The Honourable Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla : My amendments so far as No. 67 is concerned contains three amendments : One is to delete articles 99 and 184. I wish not to move that. That may be dropped. As regards amendment No. 67, I have given notice of amendments to each article separately. I wish they may be taken as moved and not amendment 67. Amendment No. 67 may not be taken as moved, but the other amendments may be taken as moved.

Mr. President : Which are the other amendments?

The Honourable Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla : I have given amendments under each article under my name.

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 68 and 69 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

The Honourable Shri Ghanshyam Singh Gupta (C.P. & Berar : General): Sir, I have a point of order with regard to amendment No. 69. Shall I raise it now or at the time of voting?

Mr. President : At the time of voting.

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 70, 71 and 72 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

The Honourable Dr. B.R. Ambedkar : I am not moving amendment No. 73.

Shri Mahavir Tyagi : I move it, Sir.

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84 and 85 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : Sir, if an amendment is absolutely similar, is it permissible for an identical amendment being moved by several Members?

Mr. President : I shall leave them out at the time of voting.

(Member who had given notice of amendments Nos. 86, 87, 88, 89 and 90 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 91 was not moved.)

(The Member who had given notice of amendment No. 92 indicated that this amendment might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 93 was not moved.)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103 and 104 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

Shri Mahavir Tyagi : Those Members who are not moving their amendments may pass a slip to you and thus save time.

(The member who had given notice of amendment No. 105 indicated that this amendment might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 106 was not moved.)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 107, 108 109 and 110 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment Nos. 111 and 112 were not moved.)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 113, 114, 115, 116 and 117 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 118 was not moved)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 119 and 120 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

Shri H. V. Kamath : On a point of order, Sir, is it proper for a member to give notice of amendments which are inconsistent with one another? Dr. Ambedkar has given notice of several amendments which are mutually inconsistent.

Mr. President : It is nothing unusual for Members of this House to be inconsistent.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : Including the honourable member himself (*Laughter*).

Shri H. V. Kamath : My amendments have not been inconstant like that.

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 121, 122 and 123 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 124 was not moved.)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166 and 167 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 168 was not moved)

(Members who had given notice of amendments No. 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174 and 175 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

(Amendment No. 176 was not moved.)

(Members who had given notice of amendments Nos. 177 and 178 indicated that these amendments might be taken as moved.)

Mr. President : Is it necessary for me to go through the ceremony for the rest of the amendments? Nobody will be prepared to withdraw them. After going through 178 amendments, I do not think it is necessary to go through the ceremony for the rest, and I take them all as moved.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma : May I draw your attention to the fact that some of us gave notice of amendments even today and you were pleased to admit them on the Order paper. May I know, Sir, whether even those amendments which we have given notice will be taken as moved?

Mr. President : Such of the amendments as were given notice of up to the moment this sitting commenced, will be taken as moved. They will be circulated this evening. There was no time.

Now we shall start the discussion. Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar will move the first amendment No. 65.

The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar (Madras : General) : Mr. President, Sir, I take it that it is quite unnecessary for me to read the whole of this amendment.

Mr. President : I do not think it is necessary.

The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar : At the outset, I wish to say that I shall endeavour to the best of my ability to confirm to the appeal you made at the opening of this afternoon's session. I shall try to be brief and what is more, it will be my endeavour to be objective in dealing with this problem. The problem has been before us for quite a long time now. We have discussed it amongst ourselves in small groups, in larger groups in the country, in the Press and so on. A great deal has been said on this problem in all these various places. Opinion has not always been unanimous on this question. There was, however, one thing about which we reached a fairly unanimous conclusion that we should select one of the languages in India as the common language of the whole of India, the languages that should be used for the official purposes of the Union. In selecting this language various considerations were taken into account. I for one did not easily reach the conclusion that was arrived at the end of these discussions because it involved our bidding good-bye to a language on which I think, we have built and achieved our freedom. Though I accepted the conclusion at the end that that language should be given up in due course and in its place, we should substitute a language of this country, it was not without a pang that I agreed to that decision.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra : (West Bengal : General) : Unfortunately I am not able to catch what the honourable Member says. Will somebody adjust the mike?

The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar : The final decision, as all honourable Members know, on that particular question is that we should adopt Hindi as the language for all official purposes of the Union under the new Constitution. That of course, is and ultimate objective to be reached. It certainly involves that when that achievement takes place, we have to bid good-bye to a language on which many of us have been reared and on the strength of which as I said we have achieved our freedom, I mean the Kind of language.

The decision to substitute Hindi in the long run for the English language having been taken, we had to take also two subsidiary decisions which were involved in that one decision. Now the subsidiary decisions were that we could not afford to give up the English language at once. We had to keep the English language going for a number of years until Hindi could establish for itself a place, not merely because it is an Indian language, but because as a language it would be an efficient instrument for all that we have to say and do in the future and until Hindi established itself in the position in which English stands today for Union purposes. So we took the next decision, namely that for a period of about fifteen years English should continue to be used for all the purposes for which it is being used today and will be used at the commencement of the Constitution.

Then, Sir, we had to consider the other aspects of this problem. We had to consider, for instance, the question of the numerals about which I shall have to say something more detailed in the few remarks and I shall permit myself. Then we had to consider the question of the language of the States and we took a decision that, as far as possible, a language spoken in the State should be recognised as the language used for official purposes in that State and that for Inter-State communications and for communications between the State and the Centre the English language should continue to be used, provided that where between two States there was an agreement that inter-communication should be in the Hindi language, that should be permitted.

We then proceeded to consider the question of the language that should be used in our Legislatures and the highest courts of Justice in the land and we came to the conclusion after a great deal of deliberation and discussion that while the language of the Union 'Hindi' may be used for debates, for discussions and so forth in the Central Legislature, and where while the language of the State could be used for similar purposes in the State Legislature, it was necessary for us, if we were going to perpetuate the existing satisfactory state of things as regards the text of our laws and the interpretation of that text in the courts, that English should be the language in which legislation, whether in the form of Bills and Acts or of rules and orders and the interpretation in the form of judgments by Judges of the High Court—these should be in English for several years to come. For my own part I think it will have to be for many many years to come. It is not because that we want to keep the English language at all costs for these purposes. It is because the languages which we can recognize for Union purposes and the languages which we can recognise for State purposes are not sufficiently developed, are not sufficiently precise for the purposes that I have mentioned, viz., laws and the interpretation of laws by Courts of law.

Then we have to recognise one broad fact, viz., that while we could recognize 'Hindi' as the language for the official purposes of the Union, we must also admit that that language is not today sufficiently developed. It requires a lot of enrichment in several directions, it requires modernization, it requires to be imbued with the capacity to absorb ideas, not merely ideas but styles and expressions and forms of speech from other languages. So we have put into this draft an article which makes it the duty of the State to promote the development of

Hindi so that it may achieve all these enrichments and will in due course be sufficiently developed for replacing adequately the English language which we certainly contemplate should fade out of our officially recognised proceedings and activities in due course of time. Those generally speaking, are the basis of this particular draft which I have moved.

Now in considering this draft, I wish to place before the House one or two facts. The first that I wish to place before the House is that this Draft is the result of a great deal of thought, a great deal of discussion. It is also—what has emerged—a compromise between opinions which were not easily reconcilable and therefore when you look at this draft, you have to take it not as a thing which is proposed by an individual Members like me or by three Members if I include my two colleagues whose names are set down here. It is not to be looked upon as something which we have put forth. It is the result of a compromise in respect of which great sacrifices of opinion, of very greatly cherished views and interests, these have been sacrificed for the purpose of achieving this draft in a form that will be acceptable to the full House.

Now I wish to draw the attention of the House to one or two of the basic principles underlying this draft. Our basic policy, according to the framers of this draft, should be that the common language of India for Union purposes should be the Hindi language and the script should be the Devanagari script. It is also a part of this basic policy that the numerals to be used for all official Union purposes should be what have been described to be the All-India forms of Indian numerals. Authors of this draft contemplate that these three items should be essential parts of the basic policy in this respect for practically all times. I wish to emphasize that fact because I know there is a school of opinion in this House that so far as the international forms of Indian numerals are concerned, they should be placed in this scheme on the same footing as the English language. Those of us who are responsible for this draft, we do not subscribe to this proposition. We consider that to the same extent the Hindi language and the Devanagari script for letters in that language should form a permanent feature of the common language of this country, to the same extent should the international forms of Indian numerals be part of this basic policy. That is at the root of this draft.

It is true that in order to effect a compromise with those who hold a different view we made one or two concessions in this draft which we thought would persuade the others to all into line with us. One concession was that though the international forms of Indian numerals would be a permanent feature, the President even during the first fifteen years during which the English language will continue to be used practically for all purposes, during that period he may direct that the Devanagari numerals also should in addition to the international forms of Indian numerals be used for one or more official purposes of the Union.

The second concession that was made was that the question of the form of Indian numerals to be used for particular official purposes should be one of those questions which the Commission which would be appointed under article 301-B—I think it is 301-B—and it will be one of the duties of the Commission to make recommendations on that subject. We certainly visualised the possibility of that Commission saying, “Let the international forms of Indian numerals be replaced altogether by the Devanagari form of numerals.” But we were willing to make this concession, because we thought it would be a gesture which would be appreciated by those who take a different view, and we also were perfectly sure that before an impartial Commission of the sort that will be constituted in the future, arguments in favour of the retention of the international forms of Indian numerals permanently will weight more

[The Honourable Shri M. Gopalaswami Ayyangar]

heavily than it might in the atmosphere of a House where opinion is so divided as it is today in this House. Well, we were willing to take those risks. I mention these facts to show how great a sacrifice those who stand for the basic policy which I have enunciated have had to make for the purpose of reaching an amicable understanding with the exponents of a different view.

Now, I do not think it will be necessary for me to recommend the claims of the international forms of Indian numerals to this House. They must have read a great deal about it already, and I am sure those who will follow me here will have a lot more to say about it, and so I do not go into the history of this question. I will only mention one or two facts. These forms of numerals originated in our country, and therefore, we should be proud to continue the almost universal use of these numerals which is now made in this country as a part of the future language set-up in this country. (*Hear, hear*). Secondly the whole world, perhaps with one or two exceptions, has adopted these numerals. It is but right that we should keep in step with the whole world, or it should be really the other way, the whole world is already ready to keep in step with us who really gave these numerals to the world. And shall we throw away this proud position in the world with all the attendant advantages that it brings to us? Shall we do so in order to take to something which is not universally used even in this country and which it is impossible for the world at large to use in the future? Those two facts I should like to place particularly before this House before they reach a conclusion on this matter.

Now, Sir, with regard to this particular point a number of alternatives have been proposed, but I would refer only to the latest which was put into your hands in the course of today, and that is the proposal which says it will place the international forms of Indian numerals practically on the same footing as the English language in the scheme of things. That means that for the first fifteen years, the international forms of Indian numerals will continue to be used and after that period Parliament might be left to decide for what purposes the international form or the Devanagari form should be used, or both should be used. It looks a very attractive proposition. But at the back of it is this feeling that you visualise the prospect of displacing that international form of Indian numerals altogether in this country. To those of us who are responsible for this draft, that is not a prospect which we can contemplate with anything like equanimity in the largest interests of the country and the world. And therefore it is because of this wrong approach to the whole problem that I am constrained to say that it is not possible for those who hold our particular view to consider this alternative.

Now, Sir, a few words as regards the provision we have made in Chapter III, that is, the language of the courts. We consider it very fundamental that English shall continue to be used in the Supreme Court and the High Courts until Parliament after full consideration, after Hindi has developed to such an extent that it can be a suitable vehicle for law-making and law-interpretation comes to the conclusion that it can replace the English language. My own feeling is that English will last in the form of bills and Laws and interpretations of such laws much longer than fifteen years. That is my own expectation. Now, it is important that we should realise why this chapter has been put in. Law-making and law-interpretation require an amount of precision; they require a number of expressions and words which have acquired a certain definite meaning; and until we reach that stage in regard to the Hindi language—and I do not think at present the Hindi language is anywhere near it, ignorant as I am of Hindi myself (*hear, hear*)—I have seen a good deal of the Hindi translation of what happens in this House and I am constrained to say that even the little Hindi I know does not enable me to make out anything form

that kind of translation. Perhaps people more versed in Hindi may be able to understand it; perhaps I do understand it sometimes, because of the large number of Sanskrit words that are used in these translations. But that is not Hindi, in the sense that you could use it for court or legislative purposes.

I can tell you a story within my own experience. Ten years ago, I was making a Constitution for the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The language of the Legislature had to be described in a section, and those who were drafting it, those officers had simply copied out the language in the Government of India Act, that is to say, English should be the language, but if any member was unacquainted with it or was not sufficiently acquainted with the English language he might be allowed to speak in any language with which he was familiar. Well, it so happened that the late Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru happened to be in Srinagar when I was considering this draft, and I thought that I might take advantage of his presence there for advice and sent this draft to him. The only portion to which he objected initially was this section about the language of the Legislature. He said, "What, in an Indian State where Urdu is the language of the courts and schools, and so on, could you really put in English language as the language of your Legislature?" I had a long discussion with him; I told him, "I quite see your point. I am willing to agree that the language of the Legislature should be Urdu to the extent that those people who are not acquainted with English should be permitted to speak in Urdu. But you are a great lawyer and supposing tomorrow I want you to appear before either the High Court here of the Privy Council and argue and interpret a section of the Constitution, if it is framed in Urdu would you feel happy?" He appreciated my point I told him as a compromise: "I will put in Urdu as the language of the Legislature for debates which a proviso that the authoritative texts of Bills and Acts shall be in the English language." He instantly agreed to my suggestion and thought that this was the most sensible solution of the problem that confronted us both.

I am mentioning that to you, because at the present moment in India we have to face a similar problem. Our courts are accustomed to English; they have been accustomed to laws drafted in English; they have been accustomed to interpret in English. It is not always possible for us to find the proper equivalent to an English word in the Hindi language and then proceed to interpret it was all the precedents and rulings which refer only to the English words and not the Hindi words. That is why we felt it absolutely necessary—almost fundamental—to this Constitution if it is to work that this Chapter should go into it.

Sir, I do not wish to go into other matters, because I am afraid I have already exceeded the time you have fixed for me. I would only appeal to the house that we must look at this problem from a purely objective standpoint. We must not be carried away by mere sentiment on any kind of allegiance to revivalism of one kind or another. We have to adapt the instrument which would serve us best for what we propose to do in the future and I for one agree with you, Sir, that it will be a most unhappy thing, a most disappointing illustration of our inability to reach an agreed conclusion on so vital a matter if on this point we have to divided the House. I am sure that good sense will prevail.

Sir, I move:

That after Part XIV, the following new Part be added:—

New Part XIV-A

CHAPTER I—LANGUAGE FOR THE UNION

301A (1) The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script and the form of numbers to be used for the official purposes of the Union shall be the international form of Indian numerals.

[The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar]

(2) notwithstanding anything contained in clause (1) of this article, 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 at such commencement :

Provided that the President may, during the period, by order authorise for any of the official purposes of the Union the use of the Hindi language in addition to the English language and of the Devanagari form of numerals in addition to the international form of Indian numerals.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this article, Parliament may by law provide for the use of the English language after the said period of fifteen years for such purposes as may be specified in such law.

301B. (1) The President shall, at the expiration of five years from the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter at the expiration of ten years from such commencement, by order constitute a commission which shall consist of a Chairman and such other members representing the different languages specified in Schedule VII-Commission and Committee of Parliament on official language.

A as the President may appoint, and the order shall define the procedure to be followed by the Commission.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Commission to take recommendations to the President as to—

- (a) the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union;
- (b) restrictions on the use of the English language for all or any of the official purposes of the Union;
- (c) the language to be used for all or any of the purposes mentioned in article 301E of this Constitution;
- (d) form of numerals to be used for any one or more specified purposes of the Union;
- (e) any other matter referred to the Commission by the President as regards the official language of the Union and the language of inter-State Communication and their use.

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

(4) 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 chosen 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.

(5) It shall be the duty of the Committee to examine the recommendations of the Commission constituted under this article and to report to the President their opinion thereon.

(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in article 301A of this Constitution, the President may after consideration of the report referred to in clause (5) of this article issue directions in accordance with the whole or any part of the report.

CHAPTER II—REGIONAL LANGUAGES

301C. Subject to the provisions of articles 301D and 301E. a State may by law adopt any of the languages Official language or in use in the State or Hindi as the language or languages to be used for all or any of the languages of a state. official purposes of that State:

Provided that until the Legislature of the State otherwise provides by law, the English language shall continue to be used for those official purposes within the State for which it was being used at the commencement of this Constitution.

301D. The language for the time being authorised for use in the Union for official purposes shall be the Official language for communication official language for communication between one State and another between one State and another or State or between a State and the Union: between a State and the Union.

Provided that if two or more States agree that the Hindi language should be the official language for communication between such States, that language may be used for such communication.

301E. Where on a demand being made in that behalf the President is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of the State desires the use of any language spoken by them to be recognised by that State he may direct that such language shall also be officially recognized throughout that State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.

CHAPTER III—LANGUAGE OF SUPREME COURT AND HIGH COURTS, ETC.

301F. Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing provisions of this part, until Parliament by law otherwise provides—
Language to be used in the Supreme Court and in High Courts and for Acts, Bills, etc.

- (a) all proceedings in the Supreme Court and in every High Court,
- (b) the authoritative texts—
 - (i) of all Bills to be introduced or amendments thereto to be moved in either House of Parliament or in the House or either House of the Legislature of a State,
 - (ii) of all Acts passed by Parliament or the Legislature of a State and of all Ordinances promulgated by the President or a Governor or a Ruler, as the case may be,
 - (iii) of all orders, rules, regulations and bye-laws issued under this Constitution or under any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of a State.

shall be in the English language.

301G. During the period of fifteen years from the commencement of this Constitution no Bill or amendment making provision for the language to be used for any of the purposes mentioned in article 301F of this Constitution shall be introduced or moved in either House of Parliament without the previous sanction of the President, and the President shall not give his sanction to the introduction of

any such Bill or, the moving of any such amendment except after he has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Commission constituted under article 301B of this Constitution and the report of the Committee referred to in that article.

CHAPTER IV—SPECIAL DIRECTIVES

301H. Every person shall be entitled to submit a representation for the redress of any grievance to any officer or authority of the Union or a State in any of the languages used in the Union or in the State, as the case may be.

301I. It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of Hindi and to develop the language so as to serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichments by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India, and drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages.”

SCHEDULE VIIA

- | | |
|--------------|-------------|
| 1. Assamese | 8. Marathi |
| 2. Bengali | 9. Oriya |
| 3. Canarese | 10. Punjabi |
| 4. Gujarati | 11. Tamil |
| 5. Hindi | 12. Telugu |
| 6. Kashmiri | 13. Urdu |
| 7. Malayalam | |

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra : With regard to the draft to which the honourable members was just now referring, does he contemplate that any portion of the draft can be considered separately or in isolation?

The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar : I thought I said that the scheme should be looked upon as a whole. It was the result of a great deal of discussion and compromise. If I may emphasize it, it is an integrated whole. We cannot give up one part of it, unless it be a very minor or verbal correction

[The Honourable Shri N. Gopalaswami Ayyangar]

that you want to make, or even a minor matter of substances. It does not matter very much. But the important things in this draft are an integrated whole and if you touch one part of it the other things fall to pieces.

Seth Govind Das : Sir, it has been a problem for me in which language I should Address the House today.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member is supporting Hindi and he should not, therefore, speak in English.

Mr. President : I see no point of order in it. Any Member of the House is entitled to speak either in Hindi or in English, or in any other Indian language.

Seth Govind Das : I should like to say a few words to my South Indian Friends at the very outset. As I just now said, it has been a problem for me for a few days past and I have been thinking whether I should speak in English or in that official language which is going to be adopted by this House today.

I am convinced, Sir, that as far as well as are concerned, our views are made up and I do not expect that I shall be able to convert any Friend to my view. Therefore I do not want that it should go in the records of the history of our country that when I was speaking in favour of making Hindi as our official language I had spoken in English, in a foreign language and, therefore, I propose to speak in Hindi. I am sure that if my South Indian Friends will hear me attentively I shall try to speak in such language that they will be able to follow every word which I say.

Shri S. Nagappa : On a point of order, Sir. The honourable Member wants to carry the day without making us understand what he says. If he is to carry the House with him, is it not his duty.

Mr. President : There is no point of order in it. It is for him to decide whether he wants to carry the House with him or not.

Pandit Govind Malaviya (United Provinces : General) : May I make a request on behalf of those Members of this House who are supporters of Hindi that the honourable member may speak in English?

Seth Govind Das : *[Mr. President, I consider this to be the most important day in my life. Besides, the measure of my happiness at what is happening today is also very great. I express my gratitude to you, Sir, for the fact that you have always been kind to listen to whatever I have said here from time to time with regard to this issue. Also on the opening day of this august Assembly, when your Predecessor Dr. Sachidanand Sinha, who also hails from your province, was the provisional Chairman of this House, I had raised the question of National language. Thereafter, I have been raising this question here from time to time, which I feel may have caused annoyance to several of my Friends in the House. I have had too often to approach Members of this House with regard to this matter and it may not be an exaggeration to say that I must have covered miles upon miles in this House in doing so. I have visited them at their local residences; I have visited them in their home towns in connection with this question. I have been earnestly trying to persuade them to agree with our view-point in regard to this question.

I am very happy that agreement has been reached, as the Prime Minister puts it in respect of about 95 per cent. of the issues involved in this question. Nevertheless I would like to emphasize that on the question on which differences still exist, we should reach decisions in an amicable spirit. But if our

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

differences are not resolved and even if a division is demanded at the time these questions are put to the House no bitterness should be allowed to come in. We have accepted democracy and democracy can only function when majority opinion is honoured. If we differ on any issue, that can only be decided by votes. Whatever decision is arrived by the majority must be accepted by the minority respectfully and without any bitterness. You have made an appeal, Sir, to the House to this effect and Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar has also made a similar appeal and I too make the same appeal to the House.

I express my gratitude to my friends from South India and from other non-Hindi regions for having accepted at least one thing—that is Hindi in Devanagri Script alone can be the language of the Union, whether we call it the National language or the State language. As I have just stated, accordingly to our Honourable Prime Minister, unanimity has been reached amongst us over 95 per cent. of the issues, involved in the language controversy. In the remaining five per cent. some questions of principles are involved. If honourable Members from South India or from other regions are unable to agree to our view-point in regard to these questions, we should allow them the liberty to stick to their own view-point and without allowing any bitterness in our hearts we should leave the decision to be taken by votes.

I may now take the question of numerals for consideration. It is a question that is causing strong excitement in the minds of all. I fail to understand as to why it should cause any resentment at all. I would like to recall to the mind of the honourable Members, the events in connection with language question that have taken place during the last two or three years. When for the first time I had raised the question of national script before them, the question of numerals was not raised by my friends from the South. At that time they had a different outlook about this question and it did not then appear to them to be of such momentous importance as it appears to them today. In order to refresh their memory I am going to read out the formula that was signed by a large number of them. I read it out both in Hindi and English. In Hindi it reads thus:

“हम लोग इस बात के पक्ष में हैं कि भारत के विधान में यह रखा जाय कि राष्ट्रभाषा और राष्ट्र लिपि हिन्दी और देवनागरी होगी। राष्ट्र-संघ पार्लामेंट में सब काम हिन्दी और देवनागरी अक्षरों के द्वारा अथवा उस समय तक के लिये जो संघ पार्लामेंट निश्चय करे, अंग्रेजी में हो।”

Its English version is thus:

“We support the view that the Union constitution should lay down that the national language and character shall be Hindi and Devanagari respectively, that in the Federal Parliament business shall be transacted in Hindi written in Devanagari character or, for such period as the Federal Parliament decides, in English.”]

Kazi Syeed Karimuddin (C.P. & Berar : Muslim) : On a point of order, Sir, what is that document that is being read out in the House?

Seth Govind Das : *[This is a document that contains the formula regarding the national language. It was accepted and signed by a number of Members of this House. It contains the signatures of some of the big personalities here. It bears the signatures of Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Prof. Ranga, Shri Algesan, Shri Thirumala Rao, Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar and Shri Kala Venkata Rao.]

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

Shri Kala Venkata Rao : Why is my name being dragged? I do not understand the reference to me.

Seth Govind Das : You have signed this formula which I have just read. That is the reference in which your name has been dragged or has come in.

*[I submit, that when you had accepted Devanagari script you had accepted Devanagari numerals also, for otherwise you could have insisted on the introduction of international numerals even at that time.

Many of our Friends from Bombay also had given their acceptance to the formula and the signature of Sjts. Nijalingappa, Pataskar and Gupte are on the document.

Many of our Bengali Friends had also agreed to it. You will find on it the signature of Mr. Maitra, Mr. Majumdar, Mr. Guha and Shri Surendra Mohan Ghose and many others. Shri Bishwanath Das, Shri Lakshmi Narayan Sahu and Shri Yudisthir Mishra from Orissa had also given their consent to it. Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri and Shri Chaliha from Assam too had accepted the formula. Signatures of almost all the Hindi-speaking Members of the House are to be found on this document. What I mean to say is that the question of numerals has very recently been raised. Nobody gave any importance to this question at that time when this formula was adopted. I do not dispute any one's right to raise this question at this stage. Of course a Member has that right. My only submission is that when they were ready to accept Devanagari script in its present form, it is plain that they should accept Nagari numerals also, for numerals are an integral part of a script and are not something extrinsic to it. When they were in favour of accepting the Devanagari script they should at least permit us without any rancour, bitterness or anger, the right of remaining firm in our original views.

Now I take up the other points. The article moved by Shri Gopalaswami lays down that Hindi in Devanagari script shall be the official language of India. But if you read the article carefully, you will find therein an attempt to keep the day, when Hindi will take the place of English, as far as possible. This House seems divided into two groups on this issue. One accepts Hindi in Devanagari script to be the official language of the country but it wants to postpone the replacement of English by Hindi to the remotest possible date. The other group wants Hindi to replace English at the earliest possible moment. I would like to draw the attention of the honourable Members to the resolution passed by the Congress Working Committee—in this respect. The Working Committee wants that every attempt should be made completely to replace English by Hindi within the period of fifteen years so that English may have no place at all here after fifteen years. But Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar has told us in his speech today that English may have to be retained for long, even after fifteen years. I must tell him that we do not agree to this. Our definite opinion is that if English is at all to go from the country it must go at the earliest possible moment. We are accepting an interim period of fifteen years during which English should be replaced by Hindi. But this does not mean that during this period English cannot at all be replaced by Hindi in any sphere. Sir, you and also the Members of the House are aware that formerly we were of the opinion that the question of interim period should be left to the Parliament for decision. The formula that I have just quoted was accepted also by the non-Hindi speaking people; later on we agreed to a period of five years. We had then thought that English could be replaced by Hindi during five year, if we made earnest efforts in that direction. Thereafter a National Language convention was held in Delhi.

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

Though the convention was held under the auspices of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, learned persons from almost every region of the country were invited to it. I will content myself by saying that it was the first convention of its type in the country. Bengal was represented by Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Shri Sajni Kant Das, Secretary of the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad; Karnatak was represented by Shri L. Krishan Sharma, Secretary Kannad Sahitya Parishad. From Malayalam attended the great poet Vallathol who occupies the same exalted position in Malayalam literature as was occupied by the late Rabindra Nath Tagore in Bengali literature. Kunhan Raja of Malayalam also attended the convention. From Maharashtra, Mahamahopadhy Shri Kane was to come to it but being unable to undertake the journey he kindly sent a message for the convention; Shri Ale Ballabh from Orissa, Shri Nil Kant Shastri, Dr. Raghwan Bishwanath Satyanarayan, outstanding figures of Telugu had attended it.

Thus you will find that the convention, though convened by Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, was attended by scholars of almost all the regional languages of the country. It decided that Hindi should take the place of English within ten years. Thus the interim period of five years that was decided earlier, was extended at this stage to ten years. Thereafter, when our South Indian Friends expressed the view that the time of ten years appeared to them very short, we agreed to fifteen years. I do not claim that we have done them any favour in this respect; on the contrary we express our gratitude to them for the favour they have bestowed upon us by accepting Hindi in Devanagari script as the National language of the country. We have no objection at all to fixing the period at fifteen if it be convenient to them. A period of five, ten or fifteen years may be considered a long period in an individual's life, but in the life of a Nation it is not much. It is with this idea that we agreed to extend the interim period from ten years to fifteen.

Now the main question that concerns us is whether you are going to replace English within fifteen years or you require a still longer time. The Congress Working Committee has already given its verdict on this issue. The National Language convention too has stated its view in this respect in clear terms. Even then Shri Gopalaswami says today that he does not find any prospect of complete replacement of English by Hindi for a long time even after fifteen years. I beg to tell him frankly that we at least do not agree to this. This is the second point covered by my amendment.

The third point in my amendment is this. Why should the provinces, that have already adopted Hindi and where Hindi is already in use in High Courts, be forced to use English? Take for instance U.P. There everything is being done in Hindi. All the Bills and Resolutions are drafted in Hindi. Now, according to the article moved by Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, English will have to be used there for every purpose for fifteen years. It is plain that such a provision cannot take us forward in regard to the use of Hindi; it will only take us back in this respect. How can we accept a proposal which imposes English in the provinces where Hindi is already in use? In some States, Hindi has been in use, in Courts for all purposes, since long. But according to Shri Ayyangar's formula, Hindi should be replaced there by English. Well, there is wide difference between us and South Indian friends in this respect. We are unable to accept such a retrograde proposition.

Now I come to certain other points. A new charge has of late been levelled against the supporters of Hindi. We are accused of holding communal outlook in regard to language question. Even our great leaders have levelled this charge against us. I would like to tell them most humbly that so far as we are concerned, we do not look at this question from communal angle at all.

[Seth Govind Das]

We look at it, from a purely national point of view. I may point out that during my public life of the last thirty years I have never been a member of any communal organisation. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad is well aware of the fact that in 1921 when the Khilafat movement was afoot, I was a member of the Central Khilafat Committee. You may take the case of others also who are today taking any part in the Hindi movement. Tandonji's case is before you. Have we ever been connected with any communal organisation? In this connection, I may be permitted, Sir, to tell the House a few things about my own self. There was a time when Hindu-Muslim riots were frequent at Jubbulpore. During one of the riots a mosque was razed down. I got the mosque rebuilt at my own cost. At Khandawa, a town in my home province, my father has constructed a Dharamsala in memory of my respected mother at a cost of about few lacs of rupees. A temple of Shri Lakshmi Narayan had also been built in the precincts of the Dharamsala. The foundation of the temple was laid by Shri Vinoba Bhave. Almost all religious scriptures have been given a place in this temple. The Quaran is there; the Bible is there. Buddhist scripture, Guru Granth Sahib, Jain scriptures and Parsi scriptures are all there and their sanctity is duly mentioned. In view of this how can you accuse us, the supporters of Hindi, of communalism? It is a great injustice to accuse us of communalism.

I do not say that Urdu is used here only by Muslims. I do agree that many Hindu poets and scholars have also created outstanding literature in Urdu. Despite this, I cannot help saying that Urdu has mostly drawn inspiration from outside the country. If you want to verify the correctness of my observation, you may read the Urdu literature. I am not altogether a layman in this respect. I have some, though not profound knowledge of literature. In Urdu literature nowhere do you find any description of the Himalayas. Instead you find the description of *Koh Kaf*. You will never find your favourite *Koyal* (Cuckoo) in Urdu literature but, of course, *Bulbul* is there. In place of Bhima and Arjuna you will find there Rustom who is completely alien to us. Therefore, I must say that the charge that we hold communal outlook is absolutely unfounded. I do not say this because of any contempt for Urdu. We love Urdu and will continue to love it. I say so because it is a hard fact. To be frank, Sir, the supporters of Hindi have never been communal in outlook but the same cannot be said for the supporters of Urdu. They do have communal outlook.

Ours is a secular State and we all are one on this point. We treat every religion equally. We do not want to stand in the way of the development of any religion. But we do admit the fact, that in spite of our secularism there are different cultures in the country. There is Muslim population in China and Russia too but there is no difference at all among Muslim and non-Muslim population of these countries. There is no difference in their names; their dress, their language and their culture are all the same. It is true, we have accepted our country to be a secular State but we never thought that that acceptance implied the acceptance of the continued existence of heterogeneous cultures. India is an ancient country with an ancient history. For thousands of years one and the same culture has all along been obtaining here. This tradition is still unbroken. It is in order to maintain this tradition that we want one language and one script for the whole country. We do not want it to be said that there are two cultures here.

We have no hostility to any of the regional languages; we are well aware of the fact that the National language can never flourish unless the regional languages are fully developed and enriched. It is not to flatter my non-Hindi speaking friends that I am giving expression to this thought. In my Presidential address at the annual session of the All India Sahitya Sammelan held

at Meerut, I had made it clear that the regional languages must be given every encouragement to develop themselves and that they should be given the highest place of honour in their respective regions. Every State of the Union must use its own language in its schools and colleges, in its courts and Legislatures. It is not my intention in saying so that the languages other than the State language, but spoken by substantial persons of the people of that State should not be given any recognition. But, as has been laid down in the resolution of the Congress Working Committee, the language demanded should be recognised, only when twenty per cent of the people of the State want it to be recognised. But if one or two per cent of the population makes a demand for the recognition of a particular language, the State cannot afford to satisfy the demand, for it will retard the development of the State language. With this view I have put in another amendment also which lays down that if twenty per cent of the people in a State make a demand for the recognition of any language, that may be conceded. This is quite consistent with the resolution adopted by the Congress Working Committee in this respect.

Our ultimate object is that Hindi should take the place of English at the earliest possible moment and for this I have embodied certain suggestions in my amendments. I have suggested that there should not be appointed two bodies— one Commission and then one Parliamentary Committee—for the same purpose. There should be only one committee—Parliamentary Committee—for this purpose. This Committee should be assigned the task of finding out ways and means to replace English by Hindi within fifteen years.

Lastly, I have one more observation to make. We had, the people of India had, visualized a picture of free India and that picture will remain incomplete until the question of national language is resolved. The people of the country will understand the meaning of *Swaraj* only when this question is completely resolved.

I am very happy that every one of us is prepared to accept Hindi as a national and State language; we should make all possible attempts not to allow any bitterness to come amongst us with regard to this issue. Hindi had received already the blessing of Pandit Nehru. Some eighteen years ago he wrote me a letter which I am going to read out in Hindi. It is dated, Colombo, the 16th May 1931, and is to the following effect :

“I am sorry for not being able to come to Madura on this occasion. I wish I could come there and render some service which I possibly can, to my Tamil Nad friends. Particularly I wish I could take part in the deliberations of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. Hindi has now completely assumed the role of national language and most of the work of the Congress is being done in Hindi. It is gratifying to learn that Hindi is increasingly spreading in Tamil Nad. I would have come and gladly offered my co-operation in this pious task, but I am sorry that on account of compelling reasons I am unable to come there. I hope the session of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan will be a success and will pave the way for the spread of Hindi in Tamil Nad.

Sd. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.”

Panditji wrote this letter eighteen years ago and I am glad to find that we have assembled today to give concrete shape to the prophecy he made eighteen years ago.]

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Mr. President, Sir,.....

Shri Deshbandhu Gupta : I hope the Honourable Member would speak in Sanskrit.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : The subject before the House is of very great importance. I think in a matter of this great importance which affects thirty-four crores of people, there should be no quarrel, but at the same time I should say that there should be no unseemly or hasty compromise. It is not for as enlightened people as compared with the vast population of India to come here

[Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad]

and exchange courtesies and agree in a mere spirit of a compromise on something which affects many other outside. (*Hear, hear*).

I submit Sir, that we have not been taking into consideration what is compendiously described as the non-Hindi areas. It will not do to say that some Members have entered into a compromise, into an agreement. That agreement will not be binding on the people, and people will not accept it. I submit that in a matter like this, we should proceed with caution and from experience to experience. There should be no compulsion; there should be a national language on a free, voluntary basis. If Hindi is to be accepted as the national language of India, it should be free and voluntary choice. Its beauties and other virtues should be understood by the people before it would be possible to accept Hindi finally as our national language. While my esteemed Friend, the last speaker, was speaking in Hindi, I heard whispers even from those who understand a little bit of Hindi that the language was unintelligible. I submit, therefore, that we should not all at once try to make Hindi the national language of India.

The amendment which I have ventured to submit before the House is No. 277. It is not necessary to read the amendment, as I am sure many honourable Members have already read it. The main purpose of my amendment is that we should not make a declaration of an All India language all at once. My subject is that English should continue as the official language of India for all purposes for which it was being used, till a time when an All India language is evolved, which will be capable of expressing the thoughts and ideas on various subjects, scientific, mathematical, literary, historical, philosophical, political. I submit that this should be the way of approach. The suitability of the language for all India purposes for ever should not be a matter left to be decided without a mandate from the electorate, by 315 members. It is easy to be led away by courtesies and generousities. It is not a question of a marriage ceremony or a dinner party where we can afford to be generous. This is a matter which should be a matter of voluntary acceptance by the people.

I submit that so far as Hindi is concerned, it has yet to establish its claim. I have, however, heard the protagonists of the Hindi language say that this is the time when we should agree to have Hindi as our national language. I have also heard it said that if we do not accept Hindi now, the chances of Hindi would be gone for ever. If that is so, Hindi has no case for immediate acceptance. If it is a fact that this House, generously minded as it is, should agree in a voluntary manner without consulting the public convenience, without considering the necessary attributes of all All India language in a modern world, I think the voice of the people should be ascertained. But, I find that there is a tendency in this House to be overgenerous where they should be cautious and proceed on practical lines.

We have said that we want nationalisation. I hope it is already apparent that you cannot nationalise all at once and that it would be highly undesirable. We wanted to abolish the class distinction in the railways. We reduced the classes from four to three. I am sure now it is apparent to everybody that we have to revert to the four class system. We want to break capitalism all at once. I think there is already a realisation that though capitalism has its evils, it is a necessary evil. It should be modified, but should not be abolished. So also, in the field of industrialisation, much loose talk has dried the money-market. I should therefore think that in the matter of language, we should rather proceed in a cautious manner.

My suggestion is that English should continue for such a period till when an All India language is evolved. You cannot make a language suitable for

a modern world by a legislative vote. The suitability of a language requires a large number of things. It requires great writers, great thinkers, great men, scientists, politicians, philosophers, literateurs, dramatists and others. I believe without giving any offence, that Hindi is a language which is in a very rudimentary condition in this respect.

After all, India is free. We have to contend with modern forces in the international field. I submit in this modern world we cannot avoid English. We must have English whatever may be the other languages we may have. English is inevitable. But in this respect, we are showing a somewhat inferiority complex. We are really exhibiting what is called a compensatory behaviour. I should think there should be no inferiority complex in the matter of language.

An Honourable Member : Superiority complex!

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : It may be superiority complex which is even a bad thing. That would be a kind of weakness. I submit that the British have gone; British domination was a thing worth removing. But what about their language? Is the English language a British language? I submit it is a world language. Take the case of many other colonies and many other countries. Take the case of Japan. Japan thought that it must rise in the world. It adopted the English language as the official language voluntarily. They went to America and other places and learnt English and with the help of the English language, English science, modern thoughts and world activities were open to her. But for the unfortunate entry of Japan in the last war, Japan would have been one of the greatest nations of the world. That is why I submit that English should be compulsory. It may be a disagreeable necessity; but still, it is a necessity.

Now, the question of selecting a national language, in my opinion, should be dependent upon two conditions. Before putting down these conditions, I should like to ask honourable Members to consider the situation. If you have, I am speaking from the point of view of non-Hindi areas—if you have to learn Hindi, you have to learn it as a foreign tongue. You can learn your mother tongue without literacy; but a foreign tongue you can learn only through books. Now, in a non-Hindi area, a boy must be first of all literate in his own mother tongue before he can possibly learn an All India language, Hindi.

I submit, therefore, that before we impose upon the people of India compulsory all-India language, the pre-requisite should be their literacy in their own language. After fifty years of tremendous labour, and of over forty years talk about primary education, we have not been able to make literate more than 13 or 15 per cent. of our people. At least 85 per cent. of our people are absolutely illiterate. Does it stand to reason that you can teach Hindi as the official language to the people of India all at once? You cannot do so. The pre-requisite condition of imposing upon the people of India national language should, I submit, be mass literacy in the various areas. I should submit that the first condition is there should be a mass literacy campaign and there should be a minimum percentage of literacy in each area before we impose a foreign tongue upon an unwilling people.

The second condition which I should prescribe would be that you must re-group the provinces on a linguistic basis. The reason is simple. We recognise in this official compromise draft that there should be regional languages. If we have regional languages, there will be clashes between the various people talking different tongues huddled together in the same province. In order to avoid all troubles, people generally speaking one tongue should be placed in one province. If we do not proceed like this, the difficulty would be that there will be tyranny of the majority in a certain area over the minority.

[Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad]

I do not wish to go into the various controversies which are now raging. I believe these controversies should die down when we re-group the provinces on that basis. If we do not do it now, it will never be done and endless troubles will arise. If the provinces are re-grouped on a linguistic basis, then, it would be possible for them to think of a foreign all-India tongue. I submit that for a modern State like India, we require a modern language. I submit that simple Hindi can not be the official language. It must be a mixture in which the various languages of India should contribute. I am not a man who does not believe in an official Indian language, but I am not to be blind to facts. I cannot permit myself to be blind to facts even out of patriotic motives. So, time should be given to evolve a suitable language. Our Constitution and our laws are in English and yet we provide only for fifteen years for a substitute. If you will try to translate only our laws, you will find how difficult it is to do it accurately.

After all there should be a realistic approach. I submit that if we proceed unrealistically the result would be reaction in the various non-Hindi provinces. It will be extremely difficult for them to pick up the tongue, and acquire sufficient mastery over that tongue in order to discharge the functions of an all-India language. The great thing to remember is that Hindi itself would have to be developed. It is not a question of fifteen years it is a question of experiment and experience. It will take long years' for great writers and thinkers to be born who will develop it; and secondly, it will require a long time for the people not merely to speak conversational Hindi—which is very easy—but literary Hindi which would be extremely difficult.

I submit that in one of the clauses of the proposed article 301B, clause (3) it is provided that as far as possible the claims of non-Hindi areas should be reconciled in choosing men for public services. I submit this would be productive of considerable amount of hardship. Take the case of a boy in a non-Hindi area. He will have to learn his own mother-tongue which may be different from the regional language. The boy may have again to learn a mother-tongue which may be different from the regional tongue. He has therefore initially to learn two languages. If he is to aspire for higher honours in the public services and in the internal political field as well as in external field, he will have to learn English and then he will have to learn the official tongue—Hindi. Just think of the huge waste of energy which our boys and girls will have to undergo to learn these languages. The result would be that middle-class men of poorer means will be deprived of the advantage of learning English. The result of accepting an all-India language all at once would be that there will be less English schools and more Hindi schools; richer people—though we aim at a classless society—will become richer and poorer people will get poorer. English will be available only to children of richer people and therefore activities in the foreign field, activities in all-India field requiring knowledge of English in order to avail of the sciences and the arts of the West will be open only to them. The poor and the middle-classes will be deprived of it. This would be the effect of this sudden change. When British came here Persian was the official language and they waited for sixty years before they introduced English as the medium of instruction. Then again, they did not make it compulsory, they proceeded cautiously. I submit that we should take a leaf out of their experience. I have said in my amendment that there should be compulsory primary education and when we find that in each State there is at least 60 per cent. Literates in their own mother-tongue and when also the provinces have been divided on linguistic bases, then there should be a Commission and the Commission's report should be debated in the Legislative Assemblies and Councils as well as in the Parliament and

then these debates would be before the country for a sufficient time, and then we will get a more true and real picture of what is to come. Then it would be easy for the people to select or evolve the national language. If we proceed like this, then acceptance of a national language and the selection would be easy otherwise it would be fraught with grave difficulties. It is not permissible to dwell at length on these matters since the decision on this question must depend on broader issues.

I submit that besides Hindi there are other claimants. I have tabled an amendment that Bengali should have its claims. This is only by way of suggestion that Bengali is the most advanced Indian language in the whole Dominion. That is accepted by persons competent to speak. I submit the first Bengali book 'Charya' was published in the 12th Century. That is the earliest Indian book traceable apart from Sanskrit. Then in the 16th and 17th Centuries there were a lot of Bengali books. Then there were a large number of writers Charu Chandra Dutta, Bankim Chatterjee and a host of others who enriched Bengali literature and, omitting a large galaxy of writers, the late lamented Rabindranath Tagore. He wrote enormously and enriched Bengali literature and it is the finest medium of thought; and I believe if you consider a language on merit, Bengali will have a prior claim. I do not wish to detract from the utility and excellence of other languages but I only put the claim of Bengali on a proper plane. I submit that Bengali language is highly developed and its only difficulty is that it is not spoken by a vast majority. But an official language should not be based merely by the fact that a large number of people speak it. Its suitability to express modern ideas, scientific literary and other, should also be an important factor. I do not want to take up the time of the House on the beauties of the Bengali language.

The Honourable Shri Ghanshyam Singh Gupta : We want to hear your views on Sanskrit.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : I am extremely thankful to the honourable Member Mr. Gupta for anticipating me. If you have to adopt any language, why should you not have the world's greatest language? It is today a matter of great regret that we do not know how with what veneration Sanskrit is held in outside world. I shall only quote a few brief remarks made about Sanskrit to show how this language is held in the civilised world. Mr. W. C. Taylor says, "Sanskrit is the language of unrivalled richness and purity."

Mr. President : I would suggest you may leave that question alone, because I propose to call representatives who have given notice of amendments of a fundamental character, and I will call upon a gentleman who has given notice about Sanskrit to speak about it. The honourable Member had given notice of Bengali, English and also Sanskrit. So I think he can better leave it there. I think I had better allow a gentleman who has given notice of Sanskrit, independently of all other languages, to speak about Sanskrit.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Yes, Sir, I shall not stand in between. I will only give a few quotations. Prof. Max Muller says Sanskrit is the "greatest language in the world, the most wonderful and the most perfect." Sir William Jones said that "Sanskrit is of a wonderful structure, more perfect than Greek, more copious than Latin, more exquisitely refined than either. Whenever we direct our attention to the Sanskrit literature, the notion of infinity presents itself. Surely the longest life would not suffice for a single perusal of works that rise and swell, protuberant like the Himalayas, above the bulkiest compositions of every land beyond the confines of India". Then, Sir, W. Hunter says that the "Grammar of Panini stands supreme among the Grammar of the world. It stands forth as one of the most splendid achievements of human invention and industry The Hindus have made a language

[Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad]

and a literature and a religion of rare stateliness." Prof. Whitney says, "Its unequalled transparency of structure give it (Sanskrit) indisputable right to the first place amongst the tongues of the Indo-European family." Professor Bopp says "Sanskrit was at one time the only language of the world." M. Dubois says "Sanskrit is the origin of the modern languages of Europe." Professor Weber says "Panini's grammar is universally admitted to be the shortest and fullest Grammar in the world. Prof. Wilson says "No nation but the Hindu has yet been able to discover such a perfect system of phonetics." Prof. Thompson, says "The arrangement of consonants in Sanskrit is a unique example of human genius". Dr. Shahidullah, Professor of Dacca University who has a world-wide reputation as a Sanskrit scholar says "Sanskrit is the language of every man to whatever race he may belong."

An Honourable Member : What is your view?

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : My own view is that it is one of the greatest languages and.....

An Honourable Member : And should it be adopted as the National Language or not? It is not spoken by any one now.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Yes, and for the simple reason that it is impartially difficult to all. Hindi is easy for the Hindi speaking areas, but it is difficult for other areas. I offer you a language which is the grandest and the greatest and it is impartially difficult, equally difficult for all to learn. There should be some impartiality in the selection. If we have to adopt a language, it must be grand, great and the best. Then why we should discard the claims of Sanskrit. I fail to see. If the non-Hindi people have to learn a language, they would rather learn Sanskrit than a language which is infinitely below Sanskrit in status, quality and rank. And then with regard to the script of Hindi. I have here an article by Professor of Benaras University—Mr. C. Narayana Menon who has written a pamphlet entitled "Script Reform". He has pointed out the script in Hindi is the most erratic. It has hands and feet proceeding in all directions like an octopus. The script is not smooth and rounded and the language is not capable of being speedily or easily written. Sir, this ease of writing is also one of the factors to be considered in a modern language.

Sir, I have taken some time but I submit the considerations are very serious and I submit that we should not take any hasty step. We should all evolve a language and test it before we adopt it. I submit Bengali, Sanskrit and other languages are so many candidates and their cases have to be considered.

Shri Sarangdhar Das (Orissa States) : May I just ask one question of the honourable Member, whether.....

Mr. President : No question need be put or answered.

Shri Sarangdhar Das : I only wanted to know—I did not hear him clearly whether he said English was the official language in Japan?

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad : Yes.

Mr. President : I may explain to Members the procedure I am following in selecting speakers. I am taking amendments which are of a fundamental character and asking the Movers of those amendments to speak, so that all the points of view of a fundamental nature might first come before the House.

The Honourable Shri K. Santhanam (Madras : General) : I hope that giving an amendment is not the only criterion for calling speakers.

Mr. President : No, that is really no criterion at all. But I am selecting the speakers who have given notice of amendments of a fundamental nature so that they may speak on their resolutions. Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao.

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao : Sir, I have tabled four amendments. No. 69 says—that the *status quo* should be maintained and the question of language should be left to be decided by the future Parliament. In fact, when the Honourable Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar's amendment was distributed to us, I thought we had buried the hatchet and come to a decision about this language question. Sir, it is a most wholesome resolution which gives scope on the one hand for the Hindi protagonists to develop their language and to introduce it gradually as the common language in India. On the other hand it allays the fears of the other people of India that there will be no imposition of a language and that they will be allowed time to fall in line with their Hindi friends gradually and take their place in the Hindi speaking populations of India. But unfortunately the number of amendments of which notice has been given to this resolution makes me shudder, and I think it is better this question is left to the future Parliament to be decided. For the last two years, we have been wrangling over this question. It is unfortunate that we have not, though we have decided many questions by common understanding and adjustment, we have not been able to come to an understanding on this vital question. Sir, my submission, therefore, is that let the House accept my amendment to maintain the *status quo*.

My second amendment is about the clause which gives power to the President for the introduction of Devanagari form of numerals, in addition to the international form of Indian numerals in the common language of India. My submission is that this should not be to. In fact, as the Honourable Gopalaswami Ayyangar has already said, and as everyone knows, these international numerals are our numerals, and simply because they went out of India and others developed them and brought them up to their present form, that we should treat them as something foreign to us and that we should discard them, I think, will be the height of folly. Sir, are we going back or are we going forward with the rest of the world? It is the greatest contribution that India has made to the scientific thought of the world and revolutionised it, and I for one would never yield in my love of the international numerals which are Indian in origin and which are our numerals, and we should reclaim them as our own numerals and proclaim to the world that they are ours, and I think to discard them as something foreign is not in the interest of the whole country. So my amendment is that this power which has been given to the President in the proviso to clause (2) of 301A—the latter part of it—“Provided that the President may during the said period, by order authorise..... the use of the Hindi language..... and of the Devanagari form of numerals in addition to the international form of Indian numerals.” I mean the latter portion of it— “and of the Devanagari form of numerals in addition to the international form of Indian numerals” should be omitted, and we should stick to the international form of numerals only as it is really ours.

Then my next amendment is No. 188 that is, about the establishing of an academy to develop Hindi language so that it may be acceptable to the whole of India. My respectful submission is that today Hindi is only a regional language and a provincial language and just because it is being spoken by about ten crores of people out of thirty-two crores, we are raising it to the level of a common language. I would call all languages spoken in India as our national languages—Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, Bengali, Gujarati and all the other languages are national languages. But for the purpose of the Union, we want a common language and we are prepared to accept Hindi as our common language. But Hindi has to become such a language that its effect would be seen in all the ramifications of national life, and for this it should develop very much. My submission is that today Hindi has not yet developed to that stage. In fact I can quote from some of our own South Indian languages to show that they are far more developed than Hindi is

[Shri S.V. Krishnamoorthy Rao]

today. To give a few instances. For certain scientific terms these are the words used in the Great Indian English Dictionary published in Lahore—

For Hydrogen, the words used are	<i>Udajan</i>
Mr. Banerjee used the word	<i>Aardrajan</i>
For Bromine	<i>Duroghree</i>
Mr. Banerjee uses the word	<i>Baramina</i>
For Nitrogen	<i>Bhooyathid</i>
Mr. Banerjee uses the word	<i>Netrojan</i>
For Iodine	<i>Janebukee</i>
Mr. Banerjee uses the word	<i>Yethena</i>
For Oxygen	<i>Jaraka</i>
Mr. Banerjee uses the word	<i>Akshajan</i>
For Carbon	<i>Prangara</i>
Mr. Banerjee uses the word	<i>Karajan</i>

So far hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen and carbon we, in Kannada use 'Jalajanaka', 'Sarajanaka', 'Amlajanaka' and 'Ingala'. Thus, different words are used for different scientific terms. If that is to be the case, how are our students and scientists to deal with the rest of the world? I maintain that so far as scientific and technical terms are concerned we must use international terms. Take an article like 41 of the Constitution. It says, here would be a President for India. We have got four translations of it here and the terms used are quite different.

Shri Sundar Lal's translation gives	हिन्द का एक प्रजीडेंट होगा
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says	भारत का एक राष्ट्रपति होगा
Mr. Gupta says	भारत का एक प्रधान होगा
Kaka Kalelkar translates President as parama panch	परमपंच

In the South Indian languages we use the word Adhyaksha which is quite easily understood. Why not use that word?

I may give you examples of some constitutional words from these four translations.

Compensation : In Kanarese we use the word 'parihara'.

Kaka Kalelkar uses the word	नुकसान भरी
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan uses	क्षतिपूर्ति
Guptaji uses the word	मुआविजा
Shri Sundar Lal says	यतजाना 'yethjana'.

Citizen : We say 'paura.'

Kaka Kalelkar says	नागर
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says	नागरिक
Guptaji says	जानपद
Shri Sundar Lal says	नागरा

Republic : We use the words 'janta rajya'

Kaka Kalelkar says	लोकराज
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says	गणराज्य

Guptaji says गणराज्य
Shri Sundar Lal says लोक राज

Oath : We use the word 'pramana'.

Kala Kalelkar says सौगंध, शपथ, हलफ़
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says सम्बोधन, शपथ
Shri Guptaaji says निश्चयोक्ति, शपथ
Shri Sundar Lal says वचन भरना, हलफ उठाना

Take the word *Residuary powr* : We use the word Sheshadhikar.

Kala Kalelkar says बाकी बचे अधिकार
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says शेषाधिकार
Guptaji says अवशिष्ट विधान शक्ति
Shri Sundar Lal says रही सही शक्ति

Take the word *Lgislation* : We use the words 'sasana; kanun

Kala Kalelkar says क़ानून
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says व्यवस्था
Guptaji says विधान
Shri Sundar Lal says कानून

Take the word *Authentication* :

Kala Kalelkar says सचियाना, रपरमानन, सही करना
Shri Rahul Sankrityayan says प्रमाणित करना
Guptaji says प्रमाणिकता
Shri Sundar Lal says सही करना

I have taken only five words and for these each translation gives a different word. Then which of them are we to use in the Constitution? My submission is that constitutional terms have certain connotations in the international field. Take for example the word "Parliament" you may go anywhere in the world, it has got one particular meaning. What word are we to use for it? I submit that these terms have to be evolved by a committee of experts, not only Hindi speaking people, but experts from all the important languages of India. That is why I have tabled my amendment No. 188 which reads—

"That in amendment No. 65 above, the proposed article 301-I be renumbered as clause (1) of that article and the following be added as cause (2) :—

- (2) The president shall appoint a permanent Commission consisting of experts in each of the languages mentioned in Schedule VII-A for the following purposes :—
 - (i) to watch and assist the development of Hindi as the common medium of expression for all in India,
 - (ii) to evolve common technical terms not only for Hindi but also for other languages mentioned in Schedule VII-A for use in science, politics, economics and other technical subjects,
 - (iii) to evolve a common vocabulary acceptable to all the component parts in India."

I hope Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar will see his way to accept this amendment. In fact, my difficulty is that we use the same word to mean different things in the different languages of India. I will give you a few samples of these.

[Shri S.V. Krishnamoorthy Rao]

For the word aircraft the word given in this Kaka Kalelkar's glossary is *havagadi*. Why not use the word "viman"? It has been in common use. For bank the translation given in this is *sahukar*; *bunk*, whereas we have got a very fine word in Sankrit—it is *dhanakothi*. We use the word *mantri* for minister in South India, whereas in many of the invitations that we receive from our Hindi friends I find the word 'mantri' used in the sense of Secretary.

Then, for the Council of States the translation given is *riyasat sadan*. The States are gone now. Out of 582 States only two or three remain and still the old meaning of State is hanging over and is still being used.

The translation for the word 'court' is given as *qutchery*. We in the south use the word *kutchery* for office.

These are the words which are in common use in all the Indian languages. I began to learn *Devanagari* letters only when I learnt Hindi during my jail life. Hindi was for long called 'Musalmani' language in the South. This Hindi and Hindustani question is purely for the north. But we are prepared to accept Hindi. It was a great gesture when Maulana Abul Kalam Azad told us that Hindi in Devanagari script should be the common language of India. But a regular tirade is being carried on against him in some of the North Indian papers and he is accused of attempting to impose Urdu on the people of India. We cannot look at this question objectively at present. In the greater interests of the country this question should be decided in a dispassionate atmosphere when feelings have sobered down. That is the purport of my amendment.

So far as the time question is concerned, my submission is that there should be no relaxation of the fifteen years period. Sir, I have tried to learn Hindi. I have translated some books from Hindi into my own language Kannada also. But it is a very difficult language for me to make up my mind to speak before this House. We cannot learn the technicalities of the language, this idiomatic language of the Hindi-speaking people. It takes time. I would give a challenge. Let either Mr. Govind Das Tandonji or Guptaji live among the Tami people and learn to speak the Tamil language : the time taken, I will put it, as just enough for the introduction of the Hindi language for the south. They will take not 15 years, but 20 or 25 years. It is really a difficult problem. You cannot look at it only from your point of view. That is why I submit that a time lag is necessary and fifteen year is the minimum period that we can accept.

No language in the world can isolate itself. In fact I have got a glossary prepared by the Mysore Constituent Assembly for the technical terms. I just took out this book and tried to find out how many Urdu or Hindustani words were in this booklet. In fact this consists of 30 pages. We have got 67 words which are Urdu or Hindustani in origin. In our puritanism are we going to give up all these words? If you take English itself and study the history and development of that language, it has attained international importance because it has borrowed freely from other languages. If Hindi is going to be the common language of India and meet the needs of a growing nation, it should develop itself borrowing freely from all the languages. We cannot have any narrow outlook so far as the development of the language is concerned. Take the words 'bench', 'rail', 'table', etc. Many of these have become common words. What is the word that we can coin for bench in Hindi. Are we going to change them? I think that should be a most suicidal policy.

My next amendment, Sir, is about the connotation of the word 'Kannada'. In the schedule it is mentioned as 'Kanarese'. This is a hybrid form of Kannada and this was only used by the missionaries who no doubt have done yeoman's service to the Kannada language. Kannada is the word used by one of our

poets Nariapathunga in the 9th century. I hope Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar will accept my suggestion.

With these words, Sir, I commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mohd. Hifzur Rahman (United Provinces : Muslim) : *[Mr. President, my amendment relating to language is that in place of Hindi Hindustani should be the national language of India and it should be written in both the scripts—Devanagiri and Urdu. Moreover, wherever our esteemed Friend Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar has mentioned “Hindi”, that should be replaced by “Hindustani” and for the word “Hindustani” “Hindi and Urdu” should be substituted. This Hindustani should be so developed that it may absorb Urdu, Hindi and all other languages of India and thus it may get an opportunity of full development.

The language problem is so important that we have to think over it minutely. Since we have got an opportunity for discussing this problem in the Constituent Assembly, I propose, because I think it necessary, to express my views relating to this problem.

At this juncture the language problem has assumed greater importance. When we look back, we find that during thirty years’ battle of freedom which we fought under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, whenever the language problem was taken up, it was discussed fully. Today I am confused and confounded because till yesterday, the whole Congress was unanimous regarding the solution of the language problem. There was no dissenting voice. All said with one voice “Hindustani shall be the national language of our country, which shall be written in both the scripts, namely, Hindi and Urdu.” But today they want to change it.

Freedom of the country and language are among those problems in which Mahatma Gandhi was keenly interested and to which he attached very great importance. In the beginning when the Language problem came before the country he (Mahatma Gandhi) was enrolled as a member of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and he tried to advance the cause of Hindi. But slowly and gradually he realized that it was not the Hindi of his liking. It was a separate language which was Sanskritized and its protagonists were trying to make it more and more Sanskritized and call it “Hindi”. He differed and proclaimed that to him, “Hindi” meant “Hindustani”. This is the reason why he propagated for the advancement of “Hindi”, that is, “Hindustani”. Whenever I had any talk with him regarding this question, he always said to me “By Hindi I mean the language which is spoken in Northern India and which is spoken and understood by the Hindus and Muslims throughout the length and breadth of India”. This was the language which was according to Mahatmaji, Hindustani or Hindi. But when he realized that his object was not gained by calling it “Hindi or Hindustani” he resigned his membership of the Sammelan and espoused the cause of Hindustani and said that only this plain and simple language could be the national language. He also said that he did not want Hindi as “Rashtra Bhasha” and that he wanted this position for ‘Hindustani’, the cause of which he would propagate. In this connection his efforts were crowned with success. He told the protagonists of Sahitya Sammelan that he accepted only Hindustani as the simplest language of the country. He did his best for the advancement of Hindustani. I still remember and cannot forget 30th January when the greatest tragedy occurred and a tyrant snatched away Mahatma Gandhi from us. Three days before this occurrence, I had a talk with Mahatma Gandhi in Birla House.

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

[Mohd. Hifzur Rahman]

It was 10 or 11 O'clock at night. He told me "it is a source of greatest pleasure to me that now there is peace in the country. You have helped me in restoring peace in Delhi. Now I have to propagate the cause of Hindustani and you have to help me in this task also." We assured him of our full support.

Gandhiji's one desire was to raise India to the highest summit of glory and greatness. Throughout his life he endeavoured for the achievement of this objective and eventually sacrificed his life for it and thus gained his object. It baffles me to this how anybody—high or low—who desires that India should be great and glorious, could forget the great principle propagated by Gandhiji, and how it is that they want to die away with this language for which Gandhiji lived and died. Now they want to replace it by Hindi. It confuses me to think how Congress could forget the principles preached by Mahatma Gandhi, although his name is associated with every thing that is being done. You may retort saying "Why do you associate Gandhiji's name with this problem?" To that, I would reply that I have mentioned Mahatma Gandhi in this connection only because this was a very important problem for Gandhiji. In addition to this, Congress, too, had accepted Hindustani as the *lingua franca*; therefore whatever Mahatma Gandhi has said and whatever principles he has laid down, should be followed, and nobody should raise any voice against his commandments.

The language problem is one of those problems on which Mahatma Gandhi had laid emphasis. When he was publishing his paper in Hindustani, he felt the necessity of closing the publication of his paper in Hindi. On that occasion he had said if his Hindustani paper was a source of displeasure for the people and if they objected to his doing so and they would not read his paper, they should not run away with the idea that he would only close down the Hindustani paper, nay, the Hindi paper shall also cease publication. At that time we had submitted to him that he need not close down any one of them, and that we shall tour all over India, raise funds and enrol subscribers for these papers and shall recompense the loss incurred. The result was that only in Delhi alone we had procured 100 subscribers in one day. In short, to him Hindustani alone was suitable for India. He called this language Hindustani and not Hindi. If ever he used the word 'Hindi', he changed his opinion later on. This shows that after hard thinking and research he had arrived at the conclusion that Hindustani should be the *lingua franca* of India.

But today here and now Hindustani is being replaced by Hindi and obviously steps are being taken against Gandhian ideology and against the thirty years' history of the Congress. Formerly Hindi was not considered to be outside the pale of Hindustani. But when the voice was raised that Hindi should be the language of the Union, then I realized the difference between Hindi and Hindustani. I learnt that by Hindi they mean that language which shall be Sanskritized and the words of Persian, Arabic and Urdu origins shall be excluded and they shall be substituted by new words.

Again and again assurances are forthcoming that this is not the case and that by Hindi they do not mean to exclude the current words and the words of Arabic, Persian and Urdu origins. They assert that such words shall not be excluded nay, they shall remain as they are. We are consoled that these words shall exist. But take the example of U.P. As I have already pointed out in the party meeting in U.P. they have already declared Hindi as the language of the province and the State. The result is that new words are being coined and new methods are being adopted. Urdu words have been excluded and have been substituted by new words. They have also excluded

the current words. The words 'Wazir' and 'Naib Wazir' are understood by every one. But today the use of these words is considered to be a crime. These words have been replaced by "Sachiv" and "Sabha Sachiv". This is not all. Even current words as Muqaddama, Misil, Muddai and Muddalay which even villagers speak and understand and use in their day to day conversation, are being replaced by such expressions which even Hindus neither understand nor speak. This shows that by Hindi they mean Sanskritized Hindi, from which thousands of Urdu words shall be excluded and substituted by new words. At the same time every effort is being made to eliminate Hindustani and Urdu words. My Friend, Seth Govind Das, has just said that he had a soft corner for Urdu but it was the language of Muslims.]

Seth Govind Dass : A word of explanation, Sir, I never said that Urdu was the language of Muslims.

Mohd. Hifzur Rahman : *[Then please repeat what you have said. You made the following statement only because you accept Urdu as the language of a particular community :—

"I am compelled to say that in Urdu we find foreign expressions." I would like to submit that Muslims did not bring the language from Persia, Spain, or Arabia. Urdu is the product of Hindu-Muslim unity; their conservations and way of life, the glimpses of which could be found in every market-place, in every house and every lane and by-lane. It was the product of their mutual love and affection. But today it is looked down with contempt because it contains foreign expressions, and for this reason it cannot be the language of the Union." But I say with all the emphasis at my command that this proposition is wholly incorrect; because in spite of the assertion to the contrary, in point of fact, Urdu is pregnant with Indian thoughts and expressions. If you would study Urdu poetry and Urdu poets, you would realize your mistake. One of the modern poets of Urdu, namely Muslim of Kakori, while praising the Holy Prophet of Islam says thus :—

"From Kashi clouds are proceeding towards Mathura. The cool breeze has brought the sacred waters of the Ganges on her shoulders. The news has just reached that clouds are coming for 'Tirath' (Pilgrimage) : on the wings of clouds, etc. etc." Even in a religious poetry like this 'Ganges' and 'Mathura' has been mentioned. The poet has substituted 'Kashi', 'Mathura' and 'Ganges' for 'Macca', 'Medina' and 'Zem-Zem'. This is the correct position and I would like to say that any assertion to the contrary is wholly incorrect."

Like Muhsim, Nazir of Akbarabad also draws his similes metaphors and inspiration from Indian background. Here is an example :—

He gives us a pen-picture of death and says :—

”سب ٹھانڈا ہوا رہ جائے گا جب لاد چلے گا بنجارہ
جب چلتے چلتے رستے میں یہ گون تری ڈھل جائے گی
اک بدھیا تیری مٹی پر پھر کھاس نہ چرنے پائے گی
یہ کھپ جو تو نے لادی ہے سب حصوں میں بٹ جائے گی
دھبی، ہوت، جنوائی، بیٹا کیا ؟ بنجارن پاس نہ آئے گی
سب ٹھانڈا ہوا رہ جائے گا جب لاد چلے گا بنجارہ ،،

The poet means to say that when the "Banjara" (grain merchant) puts his loads on his carriers to leave the place, he has to leave behind all his grandeur, That is to say, when a man would die, he would leave behind all his worldly

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

[Mohd. Hifzur Rahman]

things here. In these lines the following words are purely of Indian origin and have nothing to do with Arabic and Persian:—

“(bullock)	(worldly things)
(grain merchant)	(daughter)

In this connection I can also mention Amir Khusrau and the modern poets like Iqbal and Akbar of Allahabad, who were influenced by the thoughts and ideals of this country.

This will have to be accepted in clearest terms that the present Sanskritized form of language which is being proclaimed as the *lingua franca* of India can never be the national language of our country. Similarly that from of Urdu which is encrusted with Arabic and Persian words, can never be the language of our day to day life, market-place and business. This is the reason why Mahatmaji had rightly said “If there is any language which can be the language of the Union, it is Hindustani in which both Urdu and Hindi are incorporated.” Even Bengali words and expressions of other languages of India have been included in this language.

The protagonists of Hindi assert that the State language should be the language which has been developed through Sanskrit, and thousands of Urdu, Persian and Arabic words should be eliminated which are generally used and are included in the language of the country, and these words should be replaced by the words of Sanskrit origin and thus literary Hindi should become the language of the country. Similarly, adoption of Urdu, as *lingua franca* means, the adoption of that language which has been developed through Arabic and Persian and which has no place for the words of Sanskrit origin.

Both these assertions are faulty. And I say that the language which is spoken in northern India should be accepted as State Language. It is simple and easy and possesses the tendencies of smooth development and popularity throughout the country, because it is not the creation of any particular individual.

There is yet another point. Some of my colleagues, while talking of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, have said that Mahatma Gandhi had said that India's language was Hindi : I want to inform you that he had changed this view, and consequently Mahatmaji, through the “Hindustani Pracharni Sabha”, advocated till his death that “Rashtra Bhasha” of the whole country should be Hindustani. Moreover, for the last thirty years, it has been declared over and over again from the platform of the Indian National Congress with unanimity that the State language of India would be Hindustani. And Hindustani has always been defined in these words :—“Hindustani is that language which is spoken from Bihar right up to Frontier”. If we leave the excluded area of the Frontier, even then the fact remains that this language is spoken and understood from Bihar up to East Punjab. Not only this, there are Hindus and Muslims all over the country who understand and speak this language. You are ignoring the principle of Mahatmaji and the thirty years old history of the Indian National Congress and compelling us to accept that thing which is against the history of language; and Congress and you want to impose it upon us and you tell us in authoritative tone that only that language can be and will be the language of the country which you decide to be the language of the Union. I had challenged it in the Party meeting and I am inquiring here also. Tell me why this baseless thing, which is against the principle of Mahatmaji and the thirty years' old decision of the Congress, is being put forward. But I regret to say that neither was I given a reply there nor have I received any reply here.

After all, tell me why this change has been made in the principles laid down by Mahatmaji and the decision of the Congress? I would like to say frankly

that unfortunately the partition has caused this bad effect on our minds and it was the result of this fact which has made us oblivious of such an important principle. This is the reaction of the partition. And it is due to this reaction that we are thinking in these terms. And in this state of grief and anger, which is the outcome of their own hands and for which all must share the blame, they are showing their narrow-mindedness against a particular community of the Indian Union. They want to settle the language question in the atmosphere of political bigotry and do not want to solve this problem as the Language problem of a country.

This is dangerous. I am astonished that in speeches this very sentiment is being expressed over and over again. And instead of settling this question amicably with mutual love, attempts are being made to overawe us with anger. But in my opinion, rather in the opinion of very wise man, this attitude is in no way helpful for the development of either the country or the language. In short, State language should be easily understandable and readily acceptable by the whole country. I should not be imposed by the majority, otherwise it would never attain popularity. For this very reason Mahatmaji had suggested Hindustani as the language of the Indian Union. The cause of Hindustani was espoused and advocated by the Congress for full thirty years before the whole world.

If we want to go back and decide to remain in the narrow sphere, as is happening today, we must not forget that in this world languages do not develop by putting limitations; on the contrary, they develop by expansion and by borrowing words from every language. They are not imposed on people. They attain popularity by their mode of expansion. History tells us that the languages of the world develop through expansion and by borrowing words from other languages. And if you coin and put forward new words for radio etc., it would become something like fun. The same sort of fun I find in the Assembly of U.P. As a member of the Assembly I have had chance to see that Ministers stand up and begin to read such words which they themselves find difficult to understand. But just after ten or twenty minutes when they stand to make a speech, they again begin to speak the same language which was declared by Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress as Hindustani.

Therefore, if you do not recognize the Hindustani language and adopt Hindi, it means that you are not following the right path. It is just possible that there would have been no intention to consider this matter on communal lines and this thing would have come to our minds spontaneously. But I think that the communal tinge is there. Sometimes it so happens that a thing enters into one's mind and he cannot explain how he conceived it. So it is quite possible that the change from Hindustani to Hindi would have occurred in this very way. Partition took place and created this bitterness and reaction. Today it is thought that to overawe a particular community, such a thing should be brought forward which might prove that the language question is being settled in a different way and not in the manner in which it ought to have been settled.

It has been said, we want only one Hindi language for this reason that we want one "Sanskriti". It fail to understand what you mean by that. In India some people speak Punjabi, some Bengali and other speak some other languages. If this thing affects and influences 'Sanskriti' then the languages of all the States and Provinces of India should be wiped out, because "Sanskriti" remains safe only when the language of the entire country is one. But I think that speaking of different languages does not affect culture. Switzerland is a small country, where four languages, namely, Italian, French, German and Swiss are spoken, and work is carried on in all these four languages which are recognized by the State. But this does not affect the culture of Switzerland. And if here it stands in the way of the cultural unity of India, then a pet language of a particular community should not be recognized by the State and a language easily understandable by all the communities and acceptable to all the communities and acceptable to all

[Mohd. Hifzur Rahman]

the citizens of India should be declared as the “Rashtra Bhasha” of our country. It is against justice and integrity to impose one’s “Sanskriti” on others.

Some people say that in Russia people have same names and they have the same way living. Excuse me, this is not the issue. This has been simply dragged in. You must know that in Russia’s several hundred different languages are spoken and all of them have been recognized by the State. In Russia people have still such names as Abdur Rahman etc. If somebody’s name is Abdur Rehman or Shanti Parshad, it does not effect the culture of any country. It does not make any difference if one religious ground somebody is named after

“Khuda” () or Ishawara” () If you talk of such a “Sanskriti” in which culturally all are one, I would submit that in this country I do not find that “Sanskriti”. The honourable Members sitting here are putting on different costumes, speak different languages, and have different names. Do these things affect their culture? No, this reaction is the product of Partition and under the influence of this reaction you are impressing upon a particular community in a roundabout way that they have to accept this particular way of life.

This is not the way of solving the language problem. Solve the language problem scientifically. Solve it reasonably. The arguments which have been put forward are neither in accordance with the principles of Mahatma Gandhi nor with that of the Congress. If you consider the language question in the right way, you will find that neither literary Hindi nor literary Urdu can be the language of this country. Only simple Hindustani can be the language of the country. Therefore, we should adopt this language (Hindustani) and only this can be the language of the people.

In so far as the question of script is concerned, I would submit that there is some difference between this question and the question of language. We find that in certain scripts some phonetic sounds cannot be expressed correctly. After declaring Hindi as the “Rashtra Bhasha”, will you not tell us, “you ought to say “Shakti” () and not “Taqat” () because the supporters of Hindi say that the word “Shakti” () should be used and not the word “Taqat” (). They say, use the word “Hirday” () and not “Qalb” () or “Dil” (); say “Samaj” () and not “Majlis” (), “Bhawan” () and not “Aiwan” () Hindi says use the word “Bhawan” and Urdu says use the word “Aiwan” then Hindustani comes forward and puts fourth the compromise. It says use “Samaj” as well as “Majlis”. Therefore, I say that the language ought to be such which contains all those words which are used generally. It should contain both the words “Taqat” and “Shakti”, “Hirday” and “Qalb”. It should accommodate all such words as “Samaj”, “Majlis” and “Society”. And it should be such a language which we can speak freely. If you want to adopt Devanagri script, I am not against it. But if you give Devanagri the first position, give Urdu script also an additional position.

For governmental information, communicate and court proceedings Urdu script, too, should be permissible.]

Shri Mahavir Tyagi : *[How will you accept numerals?]

Mohd. Hifzur Rahman : *[I feel if you solve the language question in this way, then certainly the language of the country would be such with

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

which every one would be completely satisfied, and it will be spoken and understood throughout the length and breadth of the country and people would be able to take part in the affairs of the country freely. Numerals are also connected with this question as has been pointed out by my Friend Mr. Tyagi. I have nothing to say on the question of retaining English for fifteen years. I have already spoken about it on a previous occasion. I say you may adopt the language of the country, whether you call it Hindi or Hindustani, as soon as you like. I am not against it. But I agree with the arguments that have been put forward in support of retaining English for fifteen years and adopting English numerals. By accepting English for fifteen years, English numerals would automatically come in.]

Shri Mahavir Tyagi : *[If you will write in Urdu seven hundred and eighty six, then you will have to write these figures in English numerals.]

Mohd. Hifzur Rahman : *[If you accept English numerals, I do not think there would be any difficulty in expressing these figures either in Urdu or English. Before hearing the arguments in support of the English numerals I was not aware of their importance. Of course after hearing these arguments, I have realized that it would be more convenient to adopt the numerals of a language which has been in use for a considerably long time than to adopt the Devanagari numerals. But with the gradual development of Hindustani and with the progressive replacement of English by it, you can certainly use the Hindustani numerals also. I mean to say, you can use Nagri numerals by all means.

As regards the directive principles in which you have said that Hindi ought to be developed in such a way that it may contain all the languages and cultures of India, I would like to submit that you give this status to Hindustani and not to Hindi. And it should be made clear herein that the language should be all-embracing, so that it may absorb literary Hindi, literary Urdu, Oriya, Punjabi and Bengali, etc.

I agree with the regional languages which are mentioned in this list. It has my full support. I accept that in various regions and Provinces these languages should have the second place as State language. This is my honest opinion that in Delhi and in U.P., which is a big Province, Urdu, the simple and easy language too, should have been the State language, for the simple reason that U.P. is the cradle of Urdu and it has been nursed and nurtured here. In the first place, Hindustani ought to be the State language in U.P. but if Hindi has been adopted, then Urdu also should be given the status of second language which like a State language should remain in use in educational institutions, High courts and Legislature. It may get a place there and may be used freely.

In conclusion I appeal to the House to accept Hindustani as the language of the Union and the country, because in comparison to other languages it is simpler and more appropriate to be the *lingua franca* of India. As I have told you that in Switzerland four languages are in use, in the same way, I do not think that there would be any difficulty if Hindi and Urdu script also remain in constant use for fifteen years with English. There would be no difficulty if in such a big country two scripts remain in use for ever.

If we recognize the secular State with all its implications, then I would submit that secular State is an ascertainment and no assertion can be true unless it has for its support some arguments and reasons. If we really believe in the secularity of the State then we should not consider such matters with a narrow outlook. And we should not give up those languages which we have nurtured here. We would not ignore Urdu which we even today own as ours.

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

[Mohd. Hifzur Rahman]

we ought to consider these matters with a clean heart. If you will consider this matter in this way, I am sure will with me that the language of this country ought to be Hindustani, Hindustani and nothing but Hindustani with Devanagri script, Urdu script should also remain.]

Mr. President : The House stands adjourned till 9 O'clock tomorrow morning.

The Assembly then adjourned till Nine of the Clock on Tuesday, the 13th September 1949.
