

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall make it clear. I am sorry it is my fault. I did not send a copy to him. I gave a copy here two days back, which says "The alarming situation created by the action of the Catholic Bishop of Trivandrum to ex-communicate all Catholics who had voted or worked for the Communist Party in the last elections." I would like to know from the Government as to what step they have taken, and this matter is within their knowledge. Sir, you are laughing. It is a serious matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is also laughing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Laughter is infectious. Now, it is a serious matter. I am getting reports every day from Kerala that they are being ex-communicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any answer?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had tabled an amendment to the Proclamation drawing attention to this very matter and that was ruled out by the Chair. Then, in the course of the discussion, he put before the House the whole of the matter, to a part of which he is drawing attention. How does the question of raising it today arise?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I seek your protection. I never mentioned this particular letter. Only you can protect. I never mentioned this particular Bishop giving an order. It is subsequent to that thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Well, the subject was raised here in the course of the discussion. There is nothing new about it and the question has been mooted more than once, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you are satisfied, I am satisfied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will see about it.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL, 1959—continued.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज (मुम्बई) : सभापति महोदय, कल मैं अपने भाषण में यह बता रहा था कि भारत में एक भी स्लाटर हाउस ऐसा नहीं है जिस में वैज्ञानिक तरीकों को इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा हो। अन्य देशों में जो Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals है उन की ओर से और अन्य संस्थाओं की ओर से प्रयत्न करने से यांत्रिक और इलेक्ट्रिकल हथियार इस्तेमाल किये जाते हैं। बूचड़ खानों में जा कर देखने से आप को वहां पर पशुओं पर कितनी निर्दयता होती है यह मालूम होगा। वह कैसे चिल्लाते हैं, उसका परिचय मिलेगा। एक जानवर को मारने से कितना आत्मक्लेश होता है, उस की कल्पना आयेगी। यह दुख हम अपनी आंखों से देख नहीं सकते। किन्तु इस बिल में उस का उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। मैं ने अपनी बहस में इस पर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया था। लेकिन अफसोस की बात है कि उस में से एक भी बात का इस बिल में समावेश नहीं किया गया है।

आधुनिक शास्त्रीय पद्धति से बना हुआ एक भी कत्लखाना भारत में नहीं है। सब कत्लखाने पुराने ढंग के हैं। मुझे सन्तोष होता है कि कोई ऐसी बात इस बिल में कही गई है, लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूं कि हमारे भारत में आधुनिक दृष्टि के कत्लखाने होने चाहियें। आजकल उन के अन्दर जो गन्दगी होती है और जो प्रैक्टिस होती है, उन को देखते हुए हमें भी शर्म आ जाती है। कई दिन पहले एक कमेटी नियुक्त की गई थी श्री दत्त के नेतृत्व में। उस का नाम था : Committee on Slaughter Houses and Meat Inspection Practices." उस ने इस बारे में बहुत सी रिपोर्टें की हैं जिन से हम कत्लखाने में सुधार कर सकते हैं और निर्दयता भी कम कर सकते हैं ? तो

मैं मंत्री महाशय को निवेदन करूंगा कि इस पर उन की मिनिस्ट्री ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, स्लाटर हाउसेज में हमारे लोग काम करते हैं । वह एक बड़ा उद्योग है । यदि हम उन में सुधार करें तो पशुओं के ऊपर होने वाली निर्दयता कम होगी । मैं थोड़े दिन पहले जापान, आस्ट्रेलिया और अमेरिका गया था और वहां मैं ने देखा कि वहां के स्लाटर हाउसेज में और यहां के स्लाटर हाउसेज में कितना फर्क है । हमें भी इस पर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है । वहां जो जानवर मारे जाते हैं, उन का पहले डाक्टर के पास इक्जामिनेशन होता है और फिर वे काटने के लिये भेजे जाते हैं । लेकिन यहां ऐसे मरे हुए जानवर आते हैं जिन को देख कर बहुत खराब लगता है और यह समझ में नहीं आता है कि लोग उन को खाते कैसे हैं । बात यह है कि जिन की आदत पड़ गई है, वही खाते हैं । लेकिन उन को देखने के बाद हमारे दिल को ऐसी चोट लग गई है कि हम माननीय मंत्री, पाटिल साहब, से यह प्रार्थना करते हैं कि इस बिल के आप जिम्मेदार हैं, इसलिए स्लाटर हाउसेज में पशुओं पर जो निर्दयता होती है उस को बचाने में आप हमें कुछ न कुछ मदद दें । आप हमारे मंत्री हैं, इसलिये हम आप के सामने यह बात रखना चाहते हैं । तो मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जैसाकि दूसरे देशों में है कि स्लाटर करने के लिये जो जानवर होते हैं उन को पहले डाक्टर के पास ले जाते हैं और वह उन को एग्जामिन करता है, उसी तरह से हमारे यहां भी होना चाहिये । यहां तो उन को जिधर से चाहे उधर से ले आते हैं । बहुत लोग बोलते हैं कि गोरक्षा करनी चाहिये लेकिन गोभक्षण ही ज्यादा होता है । मुझे यह दुख होता है । यू० पी० में भी एक बिल इस निर्दयता को रोकने के लिये पास हुआ है लेकिन वहां होता यह है कि जो खराब गायें हैं उन को लोग इधर उधर

छोड़ देते हैं और वे कसाईखाने में चली जाती हैं । तो मेरा कहना है कि ऐसी निर्दयता के ऊपर जुर्माना लगाना चाहिये । अगर कोई भैस रखता है तो फिर उस के लिये यह जरूरी करार दिया जाय कि वह उस के खाने पीने का इंतजाम करे और उस को दया की दृष्टि से देखे और उस को कसाईखाने में नहीं जाने दे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि स्लाटर हाउसेज शास्त्रीय उपकरणों सहित बांधे जायें तथा पशुओं को वहां मारने का नया तरीका जैसे कि स्टनिंग करने का, आवश्यक करार दिया जाये और इस के लिये एक नया आइटम इस बिल में समाविष्ट किया जाये ।

श्रीमती रुक्मिणी देवी जी ने अपने नोट में बड़ी अच्छी बातें कही हैं । मेरे पास समय ज्यादा नहीं है । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि खटिकखाने में जो अनावश्यक निर्दयता होती है वह ह्यूमन किलर्स (human Killers) को इस्तेमाल करने से कम की जा सकती है । जिन्दी बकरियों के सामने अन्य बकरियों को मारा जाता है और एक एक प्राणी वहां ढकेला जाता है, जानवर तड़पता है और बाद में मरता है और उस का खून बहता है और जो खटिक है, उस की औरत और उस के बच्चे हैं वे भी वहां होते हैं । जब यह है तो कैसे उन का संस्कार अच्छा होगा और कैसे कल्चरल दृष्टि से वे आगे बढ़ेंगे । देश आजाद हो चुका है और कई ऐसी बातें हमारे देश में हैं । अंग्रेजी ने हमारे देश को सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से, सामाजिक दृष्टि से बदलने की कोशिश नहीं की । तो खटिकखाने का जो इतिहास है, उस में जो निर्दयता है उस को मैं कह नहीं सकता । अभी किसी ने सूअर मारने का जिक्र किया था । सूअर मारने के मैं खिलाफ हूं क्योंकि यह एक निर्दयता है । उस को मारने का एक खास तरीका होता है । उस के लिये

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

उस में एक तीक्ष्ण खाँचा किया जाता है और उस के बाद फौरन उस की छाती में चाकू घुसाया जाता है और हृदय काटा जाता है और फिर सूअर को खून बहने के लिये लिटाया जाता है और खून के पूरी तरह से बहने के बाद उस को गरम पानी के बर्तन में उस के कड़े बाल निकालने के लिये डाला जाता है। किसी भाई ने कहा कि उस को शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के लोग मारते हैं लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि दूसरे लोग भी इसे मारते हैं, यह तो एक पेशा है, लेकिन इस को हमें छोड़ देना चाहिये क्योंकि निर्दयता किसी भी ढंग से नहीं होनी चाहिये।

हलाल के बारे में भी बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। हमें कोई भी धर्म से नफरत नहीं है और न हम को कोई भी धर्म की भावना को धक्का पहुंचाने की इच्छा है। सब धर्म अच्छा है लेकिन फिर भी इस में कुछ न कुछ बदलाव होना चाहिये।

श्री अब्दुल लतीफ (त्रिपुरा) : हमारे धर्म में बदलाव नहीं है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : शान्ति रखिये, मैं बताता हूँ। कोई भी धर्म यह नहीं कहता है कि प्राणियों पर अत्याचार करो। ऐसा कौन सा धर्म है? अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप बहुत दयालु हैं, आप जानते हैं।

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That will do.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : मैं इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि आप का हृदय दयालू है। किसी के ऊपर जुल्म नहीं होना चाहिये, मार पीट नहीं होनी चाहिये, निर्दयता नहीं होनी चाहिये। धर्म के बारे में मैं बोलना नहीं चाहता हूँ। इस्लाम बहुत बड़ा धर्म है उस में भी दया, धर्म इत्यादि अनेक उच्च तत्वों के पालन करने की शिक्षा है। मुझे विश्वास है कि यह हलाल की जो पद्धति है

उस को किसी न किसी तरह से जरूर बन्द होना चाहिये। यह क्या कि हर समय हलाल, हलाल। मेरे मुसलमान भाईयो को जरूर चोट लगेगी, लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि थोड़ी थोड़ी कोशिश कर के इस को बन्द करें, जल्दी नहीं करें, थोड़ा थोड़ा कर के बन्द करें।

श्री अब्दुल लतीफ : हमारे धर्म में जो बात है वह पहले से तय हो गई है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : आप को चोट लगती है। तो झटका की पद्धति, हलाल की पद्धति, कई ऐसी बातें हैं। श्रीमती रुक्मिणी देवी जी ने अपने नोट में पृष्ठ १५३ में लिखा है, वह मैं आप को पढ़ कर बताता हूँ :

"The connection between the killing of animals and religion is itself a demoralising and debasing relationship and a general stimulus to cruelty, leaving alone all the horrible cruelties which have been perpetrated in these sacrifices."

तो मुस्लिम खटिकों की हलाल की जो पद्धति है उस का अवलम्ब कुरान में से मंत्र पढ़ कर किया जाता है और ज्यों लोगों की शेचिता पद्धति जो है, जोकि हलाल के जैसी ही है, उस में राब्बी को इस्तेमाल किया जाता है, तो इन सब को बन्द कर के स्टनिंग की पद्धति का उपयोग किया जाय।

Ad hoc Committee on Slaughter Houses and Meat Inspection Practices की जो कमेट्री अनाज-कृषि मंत्रालय ने १९५५ में नियुक्त की थी उस की रिपोर्ट में लिखा है :

"None of these methods of slaughtering is however preceded by stunning to render the animal insensible to the pain caused during and following the process of cutting

the throat. In at least one pig-slaughter-house (Madras) there were arrangements for stunning pigs electrically before slaughter, but the practice had been given up some years ago and the apparatus was lying unused and out of order."

हलाल के सिलसिले में भी कमेटी ने अपना मत व्यक्त किया है और मेरी प्रार्थना है कि किसी न किसी तरह से इस को बन्द करने की जरूर कोशिश करनी चाहिये । उस ने लिखा है :

"From discussions which the Committee had with the butchers and others it was evident that any stunning etc. before slaughter by the *halal* method would not be acceptable to the Muslims, though in certain other countries the Mullas, including the Imam in London, have declared that stunning before slaughter by the *halal* method would not render the flesh unholy for Muslim consumption."

तो इस प्रश्न को हल करने के लिये आधुनिक पद्धति के शस्त्रों को इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये, जैसेकि कैप्टीव बोल्ट पिस्तौल, कार्बन-डायऑक्साईड का इम्माबिलाइजेशन चैम्बर, इलेक्ट्रिक की छुरी या रेमिगटन आर्म्स कम्पनी ने जो नया स्टनिंग का हथियार बनाया है उस का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये । इस प्रकार से निर्दयता कम होगी और साथ ही साथ मारे हुए प्राणियों से जो बाईप्राइक्ट्स निकलते हैं उन से हम को फारेन एक्सचेंज भी मिलेगा । तो यह प्रश्न पुराना होने पर भी हम को आधुनिक पद्धति से हल करना चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, बौद्ध ग्रंथों में ब्राह्मणों द्वारा यज्ञ में पशुबलि का अनेक उल्लेख आया है । एक जगह कुटदन्त सूत्र में लिखा है कि कुटदन्त ब्राह्मण जो कि महाराज विम्बिसार द्वारा सम्मानित था, एक बड़े यज्ञ की तैयारी कर रखी थी । उस यज्ञ में ७०० बैल, ७००

बछियां, ७०० बछड़े, ७०० बकरियां, ७०० भेड़ें बलि देने को रखे गये थे लेकिन भगवान बुद्ध का उपदेश सुन कर उसने बगैर किसी जीवको मार ही अपना यज्ञ समाप्त किया ।

(Time bell rings.)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा अभी कुछ भी भाषण समाप्त नहीं हुआ है । मैं कोटेशंस दे रहा हूँ । मैं जल्दी जल्दी उनको पढ़ता हूँ ।

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Eight minutes that day and fifteen minutes today. You have taken twenty-three minutes. Take five minutes more.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, गिरनार का द्वितीय शिलालेख जो है उसमें लिखा है :

"देवताओं के प्रिय प्रियदर्शी राजा के राज्य में सब जगह तथा जो सीमावर्ती राज्य हैं जैसे चोड़, पांड्य, सत्यपुत्र, केरलपुत्र, ताम्रपर्णी (नंका) तक और अन्तियोक नामक यवनराज और जो उस अन्तियोक के पड़ोसी राजा है उन सब के देशों में देवताओं के प्रिय प्रियदर्शी राजा ने दो प्रकार की चिकित्सा का प्रबन्ध किया है—एक मनुष्य की चिकित्सा के लिये और दूसरा पशुओं की चिकित्सा के लिये । औषधिया भी मनुष्यों और पशुओं के लिये जहां जहां नहीं थी वहां वहां लाई और रोपी गई है । इस तरह मूल और फल भी जहां जहां नहीं थे वहां वहां सब जगह लाये और रोपे गये हैं । मार्गों में पशुओं और मनुष्यों के आराम के लिये कुएं खुदाये गये हैं और वृक्ष लगाये गये हैं ।"

मद्रास में जब एक यज्ञ होने वाला था तब गांधी जी ने एक तार भेजा था और उसमें कहा था :

"Sacrifice of animals in the name of religion is a remnant of barbarism."

[श्री पा० न० राजभोज]

और हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी लिखा था :

"I think that such sacrifices are barbarous and they degrade the name of religion."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, और भी कई बातें हैं। भगवान बुद्ध के समय में यज्ञों में हजारों जानवर मारे जाते थे, लेकिन भगवान महावीर और बुद्ध के प्रयत्न से इस तरह की पशुबलि बन्द हुई। हिन्दुओं के धर्म ग्रंथ भागवत पुराण में भी यज्ञ के बलि कर्म को बन्द कराने के लिये भगवान बुद्ध का अवतारित होना कहा गया है। गीत गोविन्द नामक ग्रंथ में भी कहा है कि केशव ने यज्ञों के बलि कर्म को रोकने के लिये ही बुद्ध का अवतार धारण किया था।

भगवान् बुद्ध के परम अनुयायी महाराज अशोक ने जीवदया का सबसे ज्यादा प्रचार किया। विश्व में मनुष्यों के साथ साथ पशुओं के लिये भी सबसे पहले उन्होंने ही सार्वजनिक अस्पताल खोला। मनुष्य और पशुओं के ये अस्पताल भारत में ही नहीं बल्कि यूरोप तक में धर्मराज अशोक द्वारा खोले गये। धर्मराज अशोक ने अपनी राजकीय घोषणा में भी उसका उल्लेख किया।

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान कुछ चित्रों की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ जो मेरे पास हैं। इसमें एक कुत्ते की तस्वीर आई है—एक छोटा सा कुत्ता है जिसकी गर्दन पर दूसरे कुत्ते का गिर जोड़ दिया है और लिखा है : "Two heads worse than one". यह कितनी क्रूरलटी है। दूसरा चित्र मंकीज का है और लिखा हुआ है : How many monkeys does India export?

हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब हंस रहे हैं। थोड़ा देखिये और इस चीज का इलाज कीजिए, कितनी क्रूरलटी हो रही है? करीब करीब २ लाख ५० हजार monkeys are exported from Indian annually for research.

ये फिगर्स मिनिस्टर साहब को हमको हाउस में बताने चाहियें। इस हाउस में हम आये किस लिए हैं? मैं एक श्लोक पढ़ कर अपना भाषण खत्म करता हूँ :

‘वृक्षादिच्छत्वा पशून् हत्वा कृत्वा रुधिरकर्दमम् यद्येवं गम्यते स्वर्गं नरकं केन गम्यते?’

कई एक बातें हमारे शास्त्रों में अच्छी लिखी हैं। इसका अर्थ है पेड़ों को काट कर, पशुओं की हत्या करके तथा खून का कीचड़ बनाकर यदि आदमी स्वर्ग जाता हो तो फिर नरक जाने वाला कौन रह जायेगा? तो हमें यह निर्दयता बंद करने के लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिये और प्राणी मात्र के प्रति दया करनी चाहिये। मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि मेरे सुझावों पर सरकार अमल करने की कोशिश करे। धन्यवाद।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will answer at 3.30 P.M. The Lunch Hour will be from 1 o'clock to 2 o'clock. At 4 o'clock the Second Reading will take place and amendments will be taken up.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, some of the provisions of the Bill were subjected to strong criticism yesterday. I should like to deal briefly with them and, if possible, to remove the misapprehensions under which the critics of the Bill are labouring.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Some of the provisions have been criticised on the ground that they lead to unwarranted interference with the religious beliefs of some communities. Clause 9(f) was referred to in this connection, and it was held that it justified the apprehensions that were entertained. Now, this clause simply says that the functions of the Board shall be among other things to take all such measures as the Board may think fit whether by means of propaganda or otherwise, to eliminate the sacrifice of animals. Let me point out that animals are sacrificed not merely

by Muslims but also by other communities. One has only to think of the City of Calcutta in order to become aware of the fact that animal sacrifices are being made on a large scale by Hindus also. If, therefore, this clause hits anybody, it will hit persons belonging to all religious communities. But, apart from that, you have to construe properly the language of this clause. Objection has been taken to the words 'by means of propaganda or otherwise' and it has been said that the words 'or otherwise' mean that the Board may without any propaganda prohibit the sacrifice of animals. Now, the character of the Board is advisory as clause 9 shows. The Board cannot take executive action. Secondly, if the Board wants to take any action under clause 9(f), it will doubtless make some regulations in order to deal with this matter. Clause 10 of the Bill says—

"The Board may, subject to the previous approval of the Central Government, make such regulations as it may think fit for the administration of its affairs and for carrying out its functions."

Now, if the Board makes any regulations—and I submit it must make regulations as has been said in clause 10—to carry out its functions, then the validity of these regulations will depend on the approval of the Government. It is obvious, therefore, that clause 9(f) cannot hit any religious community. This clause cannot be so used by the Advisory Board as to prohibit or to permit the sacrifice of any animal however much some of us may want to do so. However ardently some of the members of a community might have believed in ahimsa, the provision to which I have referred does not authorise the Board to take any action of the kind apprehended by the Muslim Members of this House.

Again, another clause that has been referred to in this connection is clause 29. Clause 29 says—

"If any person is charged with the offence of killing a goat, cow or its progeny contrary to the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (1) of section 11, and it is proved that such person had in his possession, at the time the offence is alleged to have been committed, the skin of any such animal as is referred to in this section with any part of the skin of the head attached thereto, it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved that such animal was killed in a cruel manner."

There are two or three things that have to be pointed out in connection with this clause. It is well known that a clause of this kind exists in the existing Cruelty to Animals Act. But it has been said that the existing Act, though it has been extended in theory to the whole of India, has been applied only to the municipal areas. Well, the municipal areas are the most important areas in which animals are slaughtered, and if an offence of the kind mentioned in clause 29 is committed, you may practically be certain that it will be committed in some town. This section in the existing Act to which I have drawn the attention of the House has not operated to the detriment of any community. Is there any reason to believe that by virtue simply of the fact that this Act will be operative in the whole of India, it will interfere with the religious beliefs of any community? I venture to submit, Sir, that any apprehension on this score is ill-founded. Again, Sir, it is plain that the object of this clause is to see that animals are not flayed alive; that is the purpose. And who is there in this House, Hindu or Muslim, however religious he may be, who will, even for scientific purposes, allow the flaying alive of animals? Rajkumari Amrit Kaur and Dr. Gour referred yesterday to the need for research in order to save human life. I am sure that they too will not permit for a moment such an atrocity.

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.]

Lastly, Sir, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the provisions of sub-clause 11(1) (1); referred to in clause 29. Now clause 11 refers to what would be regarded as cruelty to animals under this Bill, and one of the kinds of cruelty enumerated by it in sub-clause (1) is this:

"needlessly mutilates any animal or kills any animal in a cruel manner;"

This is sub-clause (1) of clause 11. Now what is there in this sub-clause to justify the assertion that this would interfere with those communities which take meat? Now, Sir, this sub-clause (1) does not stand by itself; we have to read it along with sub-clause 11(3)(e). Sub-clause 11(3) enumerates those matters to which clause 11 will not apply, and one of these is mentioned in sub-clause (e) thereunder which runs as follows:—

"the commission or omission of any act in the course of the destruction or the preparation for destruction of any animal as food for mankind unless such destruction or preparation was accompanied by the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering."

This means, Sir, that, generally speaking, sub-clause (1) of clause 11, referred to in clause 29, will not have effect if the animal has been destroyed for purposes of food unless such a destruction or the preparation for destruction was accompanied by infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering and I am sure, Sir, that my Muslim friends will object as much to the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering on an animal slaughtered for food as any other person. I submit, Sir, for the reason that I have given, that the apprehension that any provisions of this Bill will interfere with the religious beliefs of any community, or will authorise the Committee that may be appointed under the Bill to prohibit the sacrifice of animals, is totally unfounded.

Now I shall refer, Sir, to one more objection before I sit down, and this related to the Chapter which deals with Experimentation on Animals. Now it was said by some speakers yesterday that this was necessary in order to gain physiological knowledge or knowledge which will be useful for saving or for prolonging human life, and the fear was expressed that the Committee which might be appointed by the Central Government under clause 15, might interfere with Experimentation on Animals to the detriment of human welfare. Here again, Sir, there seems to be some misunderstanding. Clause 15 which relates to the appointment of a Committee says:—

"If at any time, on the advice of the Board, the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary so to do for the purpose of controlling and supervising experiments on animals, it may, by notification in the Official Gazette, constitute a Committee, consisting of * * * officials and non-officials . . ."

Now clause 17 says:—

"It shall be the duty of the Committee to take all such measures as may be necessary to ensure that animals are not subjected to unnecessary pain or suffering before, during or after the performance of experiments on them, . . ."

and it has been authorised for that purpose to make rules, by notification in the Gazette of India and subject to the condition of previous publication.

Now the fear has been expressed that this Committee might interfere unnecessarily with the activities of those who experiment on animals in the interest of human welfare. Now, Sir, we have to read in this connection sub-clause 17(3) in order to know how the rules can be made. The sub-clause says:—

"In making any rules under this section, the Committee shall be

guided by such directions as the Central Government (consistently with the objects for which the Committee is set up) may give to it, and the Central Government is hereby authorised to give such directions."

Now, Sir, this Committee, if it is appointed by the Central Government, will doubtless have highly qualified doctors on it, and this Committee, at their instance and with their approval, will make rules relating to Experimentation on Animals, and these rules will be subject to such directions as the Central Government might give to the Committee before the rules can become effective. Now is it conceivable, Sir, that the Central Government which appointed this Committee and which provided for such measures as may be taken, without inflicting unnecessary pain or suffering on animals in the matter of experimentation on animals that are conducive to human welfare, will itself instruct the Committee to proceed in such a manner as to make experiments on animals impossible? It is inconceivable to me, Sir, that the Central Government would take any such action. The broad purpose of this Chapter is defined in sub-clause 17(2)(b).

That purpose is to see that:—

"experiments are performed with due care and humanity, and that as far as possible experiments involving operations are performed under the influence of some anaesthetic of sufficient power to prevent the animals feeling pain;"

I cannot, therefore, agree to the suggestion made by Rajkumari Amrit Kaur that the chapter relating to experimentation on animals should be deleted. If there is anything in the clauses in this chapter which requires some modification, amendments can be brought forward, and I am sure that the Food Minister, who is in

charge of the Bill, will give his best consideration to an amendment moved for this purpose.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR (Punjab): May I say, Sir, that I never said that the chapter should be eliminated? I drew the Minister's attention to the formation of the Committee. I wanted an assurance that this Committee will consist of technical personnel because there are plenty of people in our country who think that experimentation on animals is cruelty. Also I asked for the deletion of sub-clauses (e) and (f) of clause 17. I did not ask for the deletion of the chapter. I thought that we could have an assurance that there would not be any undue interference. I would like to repeat that in no teaching institution are people more careful about not causing pain to the animals than the doctors themselves; it is part and parcel of their profession.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I am glad to know from Rajkumari Amrit Kaur that my fear that she had asked for the deletion of this chapter is not correct. But I hope she will agree that the general purpose of this chapter is what I have described it to be, and here what we are concerned with is the prevention of experimenting on animals without making them unconscious.

Sir, I personally am not prepared to allow vivi-section, that is, allow experiments to be performed on animals for any purpose whatsoever, even for gaining scientific knowledge, before they have been made unconscious. To act otherwise is to indulge in unnecessary cruelty, cruelty unbefitting any human being. Can we, Sir, for our own benefit allow cruelty to be shown to any human being? There is no being in the world, whether it is human or not, which does not feel pain when it is pricked, and I can say for myself that if my life depended on such experiments, I would prefer death to the prolongation of my life.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, while speaking on the Bill on "The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 1953", moved on the 5th March, 1954, by Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale, the Prime Minister observed:—

"We have a Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, I think, passed in 1890. It is our misfortune that even today that Act is hardly applied in this country. Much can be done no doubt in improving it and going much further. For my part, I would not mind—I would in fact welcome—the idea of this whole subject being thoroughly gone into to find out what we can do about it . . ."

He went on to say:—

"If we go back to the history of civilization, it has been one of struggle and it has been one of the growth of the idea of compassion. I entirely agree with the hon'ble the Mover that one test of civilization—a very major test—is the growth of this feeling and practice of compassion . . ."

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I quite agree that the history of civilization has been, if I may use the Prime Minister's words, the history of the growth of compassion. I find myself largely in agreement with the general scheme of the Bill, but there are provisions to which I think one can take legitimate objection.

Sir, it is inevitable that after seventy years, we should be revising the Act of 1890, but in doing so let us not ignore certain basic realities. I must not be understood, as I said, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to agree with all parts of the Bill. I will, therefore, make my position clear with regard to those parts to which I have objection.

I agree, broadly speaking, with the idea of an Animal Welfare Board, but some of the functions entrusted

to it are of too sweeping a character which take no account of the religious background of this country. I am particularly referring to sub-clauses (e) and (f) of clause 9. Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not a religious person myself, and I am proud of calling myself a rationalist. I am a rationalist in the sense that I do not believe in any revealed religion. I think we have arrived at, what you call, truths not through a process of any revelation but by our own effort. I do not believe in supernatural phenomenon, but I am not India, and I am not here to propagate my views on rationalism. My function here as a legislator is to legislate for the people of this country and, therefore, I have to take into account their religious susceptibilities.

Sir, the mark of a truly educated man, the mark of a truly tolerant man, is that he understands or appreciates, even if he does not agree with the point of view of others. Therefore, I think, Sir, it is a vast responsibility for the State, it is a wrong thing for the State to sponsor an Animal Welfare Board, one of the objectives of which will be to carry on propaganda against certain religious beliefs. I am personally opposed to religious sacrifices myself. I do not believe in religious sacrifices and I do not believe in anthropomorphic God. But I do not think that you can propitiate God or you can appease Gods by religious sacrifices, or you can propitiate any deity by animal sacrifices. I think if God exists, he must be a very loving person. That is my conception of God. But in the history of civilization other ideas have prevailed with some religions. We parliamentarians have to act, not as propagandists, but as statesmen who must not do anything which will disturb communal harmony.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Not only parliamentarians but also elders.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We must not disturb the harmony which exists in

this country among different religions. We are a secular State and I take it that one of the responsibilities attaching to a secular State is that it should be neutral in regard to matters where religious beliefs are concerned. I quite agree that the function of the Board is only advisory. I quite agree that the Board will be a responsible Board but I say that it is wrong in principle, for the purpose of making people feel that religious sacrifice and the slaughter of animals is wrong, to have a State-sponsored Board. That, I think, is the basic objection to that clause. After all the funds with which this Board will carry on its activities will be contributed to by all the communities in the country and we have no right therefore to sponsor or to have a Board appointed, one of the objects of which would be abnoxious to a certain section of the community.

I refer to clause 9(f) where it says:

"to take all such measures as the Board may think fit, whether by means of propaganda or otherwise, to eliminate the sacrifice of animals."

The proper method of carrying on this propaganda is to have non-official agencies for this purpose. This is not what you would call, strictly speaking, a non-official agency. It is an autonomous institution financed by the State, financed by the community and I think it is not right that the finances of the community should be spent for sponsoring propaganda of any particular nature. It is not right that the finances of the State should be spent for propagating a particular set of views. I do not believe in animal sacrifice, I do not believe in any sacrificial ritual. I do not believe in any ritual except in a very broad sense. I cannot call myself religious at all because my outlook in these matters is a rational one and I think that from the point of view of a rational outlook, it is necessary that this clause should go and I would earnestly appeal to the Minister to

rise to the occasion and have this clause deleted from this Bill. I do not think that slaughter of animals for religious sacrifices is more cruel than their slaughter for other purposes.

May I also say that I was not impressed with the arguments which were advanced by Dr. Kunzru in regard to clause 29 of this Bill? Dr. Kunzru's difficulty is that he is a very strict vegetarian and naturally, his views are also coloured to a certain extent by the fact that he happened to preside over this Committee. Therefore his interpretation of clause 29 regarding cruelty may not necessarily be accepted as correct. I will read the clause which says as follows:

"If any person is charged with the offence of killing a goat, cow or its progeny contrary to the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (1) of section 11 . . ."

It is important to notice these words:—

"and it is proved that such person had in his possession, at the time the offence is alleged to have been committed, the skin of any such animal as is referred to in this section with any part of the skin of the head attached thereto . . ."

It is important again to emphasise these; words:—

"it shall be presumed until the contrary is proved that such animal was killed in a cruel manner."

You have here a broad definition of what a cruel manner is. In clause 11 it says:—

"(1) needlessly mutilates any animal or kills any animal in a cruel manner".

Now the test of cruelty is that a part of the head attached thereto should be found on the body of the animal. You know that among the Muslims, there is an injunction that they can only eat meat if the animal has been killed by the Halal method. It may

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

be a cruel method or may not be a cruel method. I am not going to argue that but I have known many Muslim friends who will not eat any meat if it has not been killed by the method of Halal. The other day I had a young Muslim lady dining with me and she was a Miranda College girl and she said: 'For all practical purposes, I am a vegetarian because I eat only meat which is Halal meat'.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): What is the reason behind Halal?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: What is the reason behind so many things in the world? Religion is not rationalism. It is a matter largely of belief, largely of faith. I do not know whether we are living in an age of rationalism or we are living in an age of barbarism. I think it is barbarism not to respect other people's religious beliefs.

SHRI HARIHAR PATEL (Orissa): Do you mean to say that religion is devoid of rationalism?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have said that personally I do not believe in religion. I am not religious myself. You ask me whether I have any faith in Halal or Jhatka and I will say no. I would like the animal to be slaughtered, if it has to be slaughtered, in the least cruel manner. But I am here not as a propagandist of any particular set of views. I am here as a legislator in this Parliament to exercise my brain to evolve remedies which will unify the communities and which will not disrupt our national life over small things. It is not a matter of separate electorates or of partition over which I should fight my Muslim friends and over which I did, in my own way, fight my Muslim friends.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you likely to take some more time?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Yes, Sir. I will take some more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue at two o'clock after lunch. The House now stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, The VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): There are still a large number of hon. Members on the list who desire to speak. I would, therefore, request the speakers to be as brief as they possibly can. Mr. Sapru will now continue his speech.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was developing the point that clause 29, read with sub-clause (1) of clause 11 might give rise to some trouble. The Muslim butcher must not feel that he is liable to be harassed under that provision. I do not say Halal necessarily comes within the mischief of this sub-clause, but it is possible to argue that it does. In one respect the old Act of 1890 had a saving clause which the present Bill has not. The old Act of 1890, I think, stated that . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I am told there is a Government amendment which will be reintroducing the same clause in this present Bill by means of a proviso. There is such a Government amendment, I am told.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: In the previous Act there was a provision to the effect that nothing would be an offence if it was sanctioned by religious usage or custom of any community, or something to that effect.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI S. K. PATIL): To cut short the discussion I may say that in my opening speech I have said that that is accepted. I have got

an amendment also. Therefore, on that nobody's mind need be exercised.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Then I come to the point which was raised by Rajkumari Amrit Kaur and Dr. Gour about vivi-section. Personally, I feel that we should develop in this country the scientific mind and the scientific spirit.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Hear, hear.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And I would like Dr. Seeta Parmanand to develop the scientific mind and the scientific spirit also and then I will appreciate this 'hear, hear'. Sir, I think it is essential in the interest of all those students who will be working in our laboratories and who will be laying the foundations of future medical research in this country that they should not feel that they can be brought under the clauses of the law which we are now enacting. Clause 15 gives power to the Central Government to constitute a committee for controlling and supervising experiments on animals. Sir, many committees are needed for controlling and supervising experiments on human beings, but we have not yet solved the problem of human beings. We are more anxious to solve the problem of animals than the problem of human beings. I do not think a committee for that purpose is needed at all. I think it may hamper research, it may hamper the development of the scientific spirit, of the scientific mind, among our students, and I think it is essential that full facilities for vivi-section should be provided in our medical institutions and in our scientific institutions.

Then I have not been able to understand the reason for the provision in clause 17, sub-clause (2)(e) where it is said that experiments on larger animals should be avoided wherever it is possible to do so and they should experiment on small laboratory animals like guinea-pigs, rabbits and

rats. Is it suggested that guinea-pigs, rabbits and rats are less sensitive to pain than the larger animals which may include tigers, lions and even elephants? Conceivably they can include these animals and I have not been able to appreciate the logic behind this provision.

Then again it is said that experiments are not to be performed merely for the purpose of acquiring manual skill. I cannot understand that.

And then sub-clause (2)(b) emphasises:—

“that experiments are performed with due care and humanity, and that as far as possible experiments involving operations are performed under the influence of some anaesthetic of sufficient power to prevent the animals feeling pain;”.

All these things are desirable. But if you insert them in a statute, then students who are doing research and who are carrying on experiments may feel a little alarmed or they may feel a little disturbed as to what might happen to them if they do things which the Welfare Board which will probably exercise a great deal of influence, may think are not consistent with the Board's notions of humanity.

I have not been able to understand why a special responsibility should be cast upon the head of the institution for ensuring that experiments are performed under proper conditions and in a humane manner. What I want to emphasise is that it would be disastrous for the future scientific development of this country or for the future development of medicine in this country if a feeling is generated amongst our students that they are not free to experiment in the laboratories in the manner that students in other countries are free to experiment in their laboratories.

I would like to say a word about the committee contemplated in clause

[Shri P. N. Saprú.]

15. If there must be a committee, I should like it to be a committee of experts. I am not in favour of any committee at all, I am not in favour of this supervision and control by a committee but if there must be a committee, it should be a committee of experts. I think the non-official will be completely out of place in a committee like this and there is the apprehension that we may have a non-official who may have more regard for animal welfare than for human welfare. The most important problem in this country is that of human welfare. We have got very great love for animals. I like to see a person who loves his dog; I like to see a person who finds fellowship with the animals but I like a person who cares for human beings more, who cares for the future of human beings more than for the welfare of the animals and the future of the animal race.

I am bound to say, Sir, that I am not altogether happy with clause 11 also. It reads as follows:—

“If any person—

(a) beats, kicks, over-rides, over-drives, over-loads, tortures . . .”

Over-riding, over-driving and beating are all things which are not capable of exact definition in law. Some beating may be necessary in order that the tongawalla might be able to make his horse run. I want to emphasise that this part of the Bill, when it becomes the law of the land, should be administered with care and humanity by magistrates and by the police. There must not be any harassment of the public in the interests of prevention of cruelty to animals.

I do not see why the word ‘animal’ should have been defined as ‘any living creature’. I suppose this definition would include snakes, white ants, wasps, bees, etc., and I also suppose that it is cruel to inflict pain on these

living creatures which are enemies of mankind. I do not know whether the gospel of the Buddha teaches us to treat the scorpion and the serpent as friends of mankind. I know that there have been sages and saints who have loved serpents and today also we see snake charmers and yogis performing tricks which delight the public and which make the people think that they are very holy men. All that has to be stopped, I quite agree, but I do not like this definition and I wish the Committee had evolved a better definition of the term ‘animal’. This is a very very wide definition and it would probably cover even the cells which are in our body. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am bound to say that this clause too has not been properly framed or properly phrased.

These are the reflections of a general character which I felt I must make on this Bill. I must not be understood to say or to suggest that we should not be humane in our treatment of animals. I think it is right, as the Prime Minister emphasised, that we should develop a feeling of compassion. The story of civilisation is the story of the development of compassion. I think that is a principle which all of us must learn but in our endeavour to achieve the objective of a society in which animals will be treated with humanity, we must not forget the hard facts of our life. We must not place animal interest before human welfare. Human welfare requires that there should be experiments on animals and experiments on animals should be allowed freely. That is my point and from this point of view, I think the Bill is far too sweeping in character and it should be modified to some extent in order to enable it to function in a manner which will be beneficial both to the human race and the animals.

Thank you.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we must

recognise that mankind is not civilised enough to recognise the right of animals to live unmolested but at the same time we should at least not claim that we have any right to kill them. I am referring to an amendment wherein it is said that this Bill should not interfere with the right of the Muslims to kill animals. I would recommend and plead with our friends that instead of 'right' we should use the word 'practice'. We vegetarians recognise the right of animals to live. Therefore, please do not expect us to recognise the right of anybody to slaughter or ill-treat any animal. We know that the practice of killing is there and we do not claim any right to interfere with that practice. That ought to be enough for all concerned.

It is said that we must develop a scientific spirit. No doubt we should. But what is science? Is cruelty an element of science? If we are anxious to alleviate the sufferings of man, we should, at the same time, be able to alleviate the sufferings of animals also and I do not think science would lose if we renounced the practice of killing animals for medical research. There can be various other ways in which science could be developed. This barbarous method of torturing animals to gain some knowledge is unbecoming of the dignity of human beings. At the same time, since mankind has been killing animals for food, I do not see how we can prevent the experiments on animals for enriching knowledge. That is why I would allow under very strict conditions experiments on animals, but that must be under the control of people who have genuine respect for all life and respect for the right to exist of animals and not of those who feel otherwise. Although vegetarians and those who want to be kind to animals are in a minority, in the world to-day, a strong public opinion, substantial public opinion, is gaining ground whereby people recognise the right of animals to live. Even the great historian, Toynbee, the other day appreciated

the spirit of India which recognises that the animals also belong to our family and that they do deserve to have some respect, some rights, at our hands. So I would say that our legislation in India should be fairly in advance of other countries. All other countries have their own legislation as regards prevention of cruelty to animals. We in India who have a great heritage, a great past regarding the love of animals, should have our legislation in advance of the world and not behind it. I recognise the sentiments of the Muslims and I think there should be some provision in the Bill whereby we could allay the fears and suspicions of the Muslims chiefly because the world must know that because Muslims do not see eye to eye with us we are making some provision and are not going far enough. At the same time I would appeal to the Muslim community that they must recognise that they are living in India, a country which has made great experiments and great tapasya in recognition of sacredness of the life of animals. We expect that once their fears are removed, they would grow with us and be loyal to the spirit of India. Meanwhile the world must know that we are struggling under this great handicap, because, according to the interpretation of the Muslims of India, Islam demands that animals should be killed in a particular way by way of sacrifice. But even there I would not say that we recognise the right of the Muslims. How can we recognise any right, when we feel that it is all wrong? But if they feel that their practice of Halal is enjoined by their religion, with a sad heart we recognise the practice and promise not to interfere with that practice. Beyond that we cannot go, the legislation ought not to go; and I would resist any measure which recognises any right of human beings to kill animals. There can't be any such right.

Now, as regards cruelty to animals, it is not the practice of only one religion. People have been cruel; in India, we have been extremely cruel

[Kakasaheb Kalelkar.]

to animals and some provision must be made in law against overloading, torturing etc., and I think the Bill, as it has been presented to us, makes good progress although I am not satisfied with the whole of it; I would wish it to go a little further. Whatever it is, we should not, in the name of rationalism or in the name of science, be guilty of a conduct which is inconsistent with the trend of Indian culture and heritage of Indian humanity. We should be able to progress to some extent, and not be a painful surprise to the rest of the world. We get letters from other parts of the world asking, 'why is it that India is not going forward and not even going as far as we are going?'. So I think we should think seriously and try to have better provisions in this Bill in the interest of the animal world and not circumscribe it. As far as the provisions restricting the practice of vivisection are concerned, I think they should be very very stringent. It is, only because we are allowing animals to be killed for food, we cannot ask people not to kill animals for experimentation. But all cruelty is unscientific, irrational and also irreligious. Therefore . . .

SHRI N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): The animals killed for food are killed immediately, instantaneously; not so animals on which experiments are made.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: I do not know.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: As far as possible, but not so animals on which experiments are made. Sometimes it takes days and days to kill them.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: May soul rebels against the killing of animals no matter what way they are killed, instantaneously or not. All that I would say is, since so much cruelty is being practised and tolerated, the cruelty practiced by the scientists should be tolerated and we should try to reduce it to the minimum. I am afraid we cannot stop scientists from making experiments on animals

at this stage of our civilisation. But we can prohibit the export of monkeys and other animals for these experiments. Let them do that in our country under our supervision and control.

قاضی احمد حسین (بہار) : جناب

وائس چیرمین صاحب - یہ جو بل پریولیشن آف کرویلٹی تو اینیملس ہمارے سامنے پیسے اس پر بہت سے لوگ بول چکے ہیں - اور اس کی جو کمزوریاں اور خامیاں ہیں وہ ہاوس کے سامنے آچکی ہیں - اس میں سب سے بڑی بات یہ ہے کہ مکھی منچھر سے لیکر میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ کوئی جاندار بچتا نہیں ہے - اگر اس طرح کا وسیع بل ہماری حکومت لا رہی ہے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بل شاید دنیا میں ایک ہی ہوگا اور یہ بڑھ کر مایہ پیا اور سل کے جرمس سے بھی بہت آگے چلا جاتا ہے - لیکن اس بارے میں بہت کافی گفتگو ہو چکی ہے اور میں اسے یہیں چھوڑتا ہوں -

اس بل میں جو عام نقائص ہیں ان کو بھی بہت لوگ پھس کر چکے ہیں - میں اس وقت صرف مسلمانوں کے بارے میں آپ سے یہ بات کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ان کو اس سے بہت تکلیف پہونچے گی - اس لئے جو ترمیمیں مظہر اسام صاحب اور محمد علی صاحب نے پیش کی ہیں اگر ان ترمیموں کو آپ قبول کر لیں تو

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بہت اچھا ہوگا اور میں آپ سے نہایت ادب سے عرض کروں گا کہ آپ ان ترمیموں کو ضرور قبول کر لیں۔

اس بل کے دفعہ ۹ میں یہ ہے کہ حکومت کا ایک بورڈ مستقل ہوگا جو کہ سیکریٹریانسز کے خلاف پروپیگنڈا کریگا اور دوسرے طریقے بھی اختیار کریگا۔ سیکریٹریانسز کا لفظ اس قدر وسیع ہے کہ وہ مسلمانوں کی قربانی پر بھی عائد ہوتا ہے۔ اس لحاظ سے بڑی انقلابی بات یہ ہے کہ اب حکومت ایسے بورڈ بھی بنائیگی جو ہمارے مذہبی معاملات کے خلاف پروپیگنڈا کر سکیں گے۔ اس سے مسلمان یہ محسوس کریں گے کہ قربانی کے سلسلہ میں ان کا جو فرض ہے اس سے ان کو مسئلے اور ایگزیمپٹ نہیں کیا گیا۔ اس طرح ان کو یہ خیال ہو سکتا ہے اور خیال ہی نہیں بلکہ ان کو یقین ہو جائے گا کہ حکومت ان کے مذہب کے خلاف پروپیگنڈا کرتی ہے جبکہ ان کے مذہبی حقوق کیلئے کانسنٹی ٹوشن میں پروٹیکشن ہے ایسی حالت میں اگر آپ اس چیز کو واضع نہیں کر دیں گے کہ اس کا مقصد وہاں تک جانا نہیں ہے تو پھر اس سے بہت سی غلط فہمیاں پیدا ہو سکتی ہیں۔ اور حکومت کے خلاف غلط فہمیاں پیدا ہونا ہر لحاظ سے برا ہے۔ ہمیں یہ بھی یاد رکھنا چاہئے کہ ہماری پارٹی

حکومت ہے۔ اگر اس طرح کے قانون آئیں گے تو اس کا اندازہ ہم کو اس وقت ہو یا نہ ہو لیکن مسلمانوں میں اس کے خلاف جو پروپیگنڈا کیا جائے گا اس سے ہماری پارٹی بھی بہت غیر مقبول ہو سکتی ہے۔ یہ ہم اس لئے کہتے ہیں کہ ہم مسلمانوں کے دو میدان دھتے ہیں اور ان کے احساس کو ان کے خیال کو دوسروں سے کچھ زیادہ محسوس کر سکتے ہیں اور سمجھ سکتے ہیں۔

اس لئے جب یہاں مسلمانوں کے بارے میں ہماری باتیں پھیں ہوں تو آپ کو ان کو مناسب وزن دینا چاہئے۔ اگر آپ ایسا نہیں کریں گے تو ہم محسوس کرتے ہیں کہ ہم لوگ بہت ہی مصیبت میں پھنس جائیں گے اور مسلمان ہماری باتوں کو اس وقت جبکہ ہم ان کے پاس جائیں گے تو کوئی وزن نہیں دیں گے۔

ہم یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ دفعہ ۲۹ میں آپ نے کچھ ترمیم منظور کر لی ہے اور اس سے ہم پر بھی جو پریشانی آ سکتی تھی وہ دور ہو گئی ہے اور ہم اس کے لئے شکریہ ادا کرتے ہیں لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ دفعہ ۹ (ایف) کے بارے میں بھی میں آپ سے کہوں گا کہ اگر اس دفعہ کی مصیبت دور نہ ہوئی تو مسلمانوں میں بہت سی غلط فہمی پیدا ہو جائیگی۔ اگر آپ ہماری بات کو قبول کر لیں گے تو اس

[قاضی احمد حسین]

سے نہ تو اس بل میں کوئی فرق آئیگا اور نہ اس کام میں جو کہ آپ ہلکدوڑوں میں کرنا چاہتے ہیں - صرف یہ ہوگا کہ مسلمانوں کو کچھ! اطمینان ہو جائیگا - میں امید کرتا ہوں کہ آپ ہماری ان معروضات کو قبل کیلئے -

†[काजी अहमद हुसैन (बिहार) :
जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन साहब । यह जो बिल प्रीवेन्शन आफ क्रुएल्टी टू एनीमल्स हमारे सामने पेश है उस पर बहुत से लोग बोल चुके हैं । और इसकी जो कमजोरियां और खामियां हैं वह हाउस के सामने आ चुकी हैं । इसमें सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि मक्खी-मच्छर से लेकर मैं समझता हूं कि कोई जानदार बचा नहीं है । अगर इस तरह का वसीह बिल हमारी हुकूमत ला रही है तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह बिल शायद दुनिया में एक ही होगा । यह बढ़ कर मलेरिया और सिल के जर्मज से भी बहुत आगे चला जाता है । लेकिन इस बारे में बहुत काफ़ी गुफ़्तगू हो चुकी है और मैं इसे यहीं छोड़ता हूं ।

इस बिल में जो आम नुकायज़ हैं उनको भी बहुत लोग पेश कर चुके हैं । मैं इस वक्त सिर्फ़ मुसलमानों के बारे में आपसे यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि उनको इससे बहुत तकलीफ़ पहुंचेगी । इसलिये जो तरमीमे मजहर इमाम साहब और मुहम्मद अली साहब ने पेश की हैं अगर उन तरमीमों को आप कबूल कर ले तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह बहुत अच्छा होगा और मैं आपसे निहायत अदब से अर्ज करूंगा कि आप इन तरमीमों को जरूर कबल

इस बिल के दफ़ा ६ में यह है कि हुकूमत का एक बोर्ड मुस्तकिल होगा जो कि सेक्रीफ़ाइ-

सेज के खिलाफ़ प्रोपोगेण्डा करेगा और दूसरे तरीके भी अख्तियार करेगा । सेक्रीफ़ाइस का लफ़्ज़ इस कदर वसीह है कि वह मुसलमानों की कुर्बानी पर भी आयद होता है । इस लिहाज़ से बड़ी इन्कलाबी बात यह है कि अब हुकूमत ऐसे बोर्ड भी बनायेगी जो हमारे मजहबी मुआमलात के खिलाफ़ प्रोपोगेण्डा कर सकेंगे । इससे मुसलमान यह महसूस करेंगे कि कुर्बानी के सिलसिले में उनका जो फ़र्ज़ है उससे उनको मुस्तसना और ऐक्ज़ेम्प्ट नहीं किया गया । इस तरह उनको यह ख्याल हो सकता है और ख्याल ही नहीं बल्कि उनको यकीन हो जायेगा कि हुकूमत उनके मजहब के खिलाफ़ प्रोपोगेण्डा करती है, जब कि उनके मजहबी हुकूक के लिये कान्टी द्यूशन में प्रोटेक्शन है । ऐसी हालत में अगर आप इस चीज़ को वाज़या नहीं कर देंगे कि उसका मक़सद वहां तक जाना नहीं है तो उससे बहुत सी ग़लत फ़हमियां पैदा हो सकती हैं । और हुकूमत के खिलाफ़ ग़लत फ़हमियां पैदा होना हर लिहाज़ से बुरा है । हमें यह भी याद रखना चाहिये कि हमारी पार्टी हुकूमत है । अगर इस तरह के कानून आयेंगे तो इसका अन्दाज़ा हमको इस वक्त हो या न हो लेकिन मुसलमानों में इसके खिलाफ़ जो प्रोपोगेण्डा किया जायेगा उससे हमारी पार्टी भी बहुत ग़ैर मकबूल हो सकती है । यह हम इसलिये कहते हैं कि हम मुसलमानों के दरमियान रहते हैं और उनके एहसास को, उनके ख्याल को दूसरों से कुछ ज्यादा महसूस कर सकते हैं और समझ सकते हैं ।

इसलिये जब यहां मुसलमानों के बारे में हमारी बातें पेश हों तो आपको उनको मुनासिब वजन देना चाहिये । अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो हम महसूस करते हैं कि हम लोग बहुत ही मुसीबत में फंस जायेंगे और मुसलमान हमारी बातों को उस वक्त जब कि हम उनके पास जायेंगे तो कोई वज़न नहीं देंगे ।

हम यह देखते हैं कि दफा २६ में आप ने कुछ तरमीम मंजूर कर ली है और उससे हम पर जो भी परेशानी आ सकती थी वह दूर हो गई है और हम उसके लिये शुक्रिया अदा करते हैं, लेकिन इसके साथ साथ दफा ६ (एफ) के बारे में भी आपसे कहूंगा कि अगर इस दफा की मुसीबत दूर न हुई तो मुसलमानों में बहुत सी गलतफहमी पैदा हो जायेंगी। अगर आप हमारी बात को कबूल कर देंगे तो उससे न तो इस बिल में कोई फर्क आयेगा और न इस काम में जो कि आप हिन्दुओं में करना चाहते हैं। सिर्फ यह होगा कि मुसलमानों को कुछ इल्मिनाम हो जायेगा। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आप हमारी इन मारुजात को कबूल करेंगे।]

श्री निरंजन सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस सम्बन्ध में सभा भवन का ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। मुझे सिर्फ दो, तीन बातें कहनी हैं।

सब से पहले मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने हमारे सोशल ऐक्ट्स बनते हैं वे केवल मन भरने के लिये बनते हैं, उनसे कोई सार निकलने को नहीं रहता है। उनको किस तरह से एवायड किया जाय, यह जनता के सामने पहले से ही रख दिया जाता है और उसी बेसिस के ऊपर ये ऐक्ट्स बनते हैं। मैंने पहले भी कहा था और अभी भी उसको मैं दुहराना चाहता हूँ कि इससे जो हम फायदा करना चाहते हैं वह फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। जैसा कि मैंने कहा कि जितने ऐक्ट्स बनते हैं, चाहे डाउरी का हो, मैरिज का हो, जितने भी सोशल ऐक्ट्स बनते हैं उनमें इतने लूपहोल्स रख दिये जाते हैं कि उनसे कोई फायदा नहीं होता है और उनमें से ही यह एक बिल है। इस बिल को बनाने के लिये एक पाश्चात्य ढंग को क्यों अपनाया गया है, यह समझ में नहीं आता है। हिन्दुस्तान में अहिंसा सब से भारी चीज है और उसके ऊपर ही हमारा धर्म बना है और मैं समझता हूँ कि जगह जगह पर उसी की बेसिस पर रेलिजस

सेंटिमेंट्स बड़े हैं। तो जब सोसाइटी में इस तरह की परम्परा है तब आप ऐक्ट के द्वारा और क्या करेंगे? यह मेरी समझ के बाहर की बात है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जनता की समझ के भी बाहर की बात है; क्योंकि कानूनों के द्वारा जो सोशल रिफार्म होते हैं वे ज्यादा इफेक्टिव नहीं होते हैं, सोशल रिफार्म तो हृदय परिवर्तन से होते हैं। कानून की तलवार के द्वारा कोई भी सामाजिक परिवर्तन करना उचित नहीं होता है और वह स्थायी भी नहीं होता है।

अब दो, तीन बातें और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। एक तो रेलिजस राइट्स की बात है। यहां पर हिन्दू और मुसलमानों की बहुत बात हुई। मैं मानता हूँ कि हिन्दुओं में भी और मुसलमानों में भी सैक्रिफाइस करना जायज माना गया है, लेकिन एक तीसरी क्लास भी है और वह आदिवासियों की है जिनको कि आप समझा नहीं सकते, जिनके कि बीच में आज तक कानून पहुंचा नहीं है और जिनको कि आज कानून की समझ के परे काम करना पड़ता है। तो उन आदिमियों के लिए आप चाहते हैं कि वे तुरत पुलिस के द्वारा तंग किये जायें और रिश्त बड़े और आपके एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में जो करप्शन है वह करप्शन बढ़ता जाय। तो जहां तक रेलिजस राइट्स का सवाल है उसके ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना हमारे लिये उचित नहीं है। तो इसको आप चेंज कीजिये। एक भाई ने कहा कि हम बुद्धिस्ट रेलिजन को मानने वाले हैं और वह इस देश में पनपा है। अशोक ने जो अहिंसा का प्रचार किया वह कानून के द्वारा नहीं किया और कानून के द्वारा न करने के कारण परिणाम यह हुआ कि देश में और विदेशों में अहिंसा पनपी। तो यदि आप इस तरह का खुद अनुकरण करें तो ज्यादा अच्छा है। हम यहां ऐक्ट बनाते हैं लेकिन हम खुद उस परम्परा में पड़े हैं जो कि हिंसक है, तो कैसे हो सकता है? दोनों चीजें नहीं हो सकती। पहले आप अपना आचरण सुधारिये, आपका आचरण सुधारने

[श्री निरंजन सिंह]

के बाद मानव समाज उसका अनुकरण करने लगता है। तो जहां तक रेलिजस राइट्स का सवाल है, मंत्री महोदय के यहां एलान करने से कुछ नहीं होता है। एक मंत्री जाता है और दूसरा आता है, यहां हाउस में डिक्लेयरेशन करने से कुछ नहीं होगा, इसमें अमेंडमेंट होना चाहिए कि रेलिजस राइट्स के ऊपर कोई आक्षेप न हो।

दूसरी चीज जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह मारने के बारे में है। क्लॉज ११ (ए) में यह है। मैंने वहां भी उदाहरण दिया था और उसको अभी आपके सामने सभा भवन में भी देना चाहता हूं। मान लो कि एक घोड़ा अड़ने वाला है और उस पर बैठा हुआ सवार पुलिस थाने के सामने उस घोड़े को मारता है। या तो वह गिर पड़े, या उतर जाय या उसको आगे नहीं बढ़ाये, लेकिन यदि वह उसको वहां मारता है और पुलिस वाले उसका चालान करते हैं तो उसका कन्विक्शन हो सकता है, उसको सजा हो सकती है और उमरे लिए कोई रोक नहीं है। आपने यहां, जहां कि शब्दों की परिभाषा की है वहां उस में "नेसेसरी" की डेफिनिशन नहीं दी है। इसी तरह से यदि कोई गाड़ी में बैल को जोतता है और वह अपना पैर फेंकता है तो फिर उसको टोंचा लगाना पड़ता है। उस समय अगर उसको मारे नहीं तो करे क्या? तो खेती के सम्बन्ध में या सवारी के सम्बन्ध में जो इस तरह की चीजें होंगी उससे लोगों को तकलीफ होगी, उसका हैरेसमेंट होगा और बेचारे को सजा भुगतनी पड़ेगी और आप खुद समझ सकते हैं कि बेचारे के पास सिवाय पैसा देने के और कोई उपाय ही नहीं होगा।

तीसरी चीज को कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूं। इसको मैंने वहां पर भी कहा था और अब यहां भी कह देना चाहता हूं। वह यह है कि जो एंजोयमेंट की, अपने प्लेजर की बात है उसको आपने रखा है। शिकार खेलने में आपको और जो दूसरे विदेशी आते हैं उनको

बहुत आनन्द आता है और उसके लिए होता यह है कि एक भैंसे को बांध दिया जाता है, ताकि शेर को शिकार के लिए फांस सकें। वह उसको पंजा मारता है और उसको तड़फा तड़फा कर मार डालता है और उससे शिकार खेलने वाले आनन्द उठाते हैं। भैंसे की जान भी उतनी ही बड़ी है जितनी कि बकरी की है या बैल की है या घोड़े की है। इस बिल में उसको इस तरह से मारना वर्जित नहीं है। तो आप इज्वायमेंट के लिये यह चीज करना चाहते हैं। जिसमें आप को आनन्द होगा, जिस में आपको आराम मिलेगा और जिसमें आपकी आंखें संतुष्ट होगी और जिसमें आपको अच्छा मालूम पड़ेगा, वह आप करना चाहते हैं और जो सचमुच में एक ठीक चीज करनी चाहिए उसको नहीं करना चाहते हैं।

ये तीन चीजें ही मुझे कहनी थी और अब मैं सभा भवन का ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा।

श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज का विवाद और यह विधेयक जिस पर कि कल से विचार चल रहा है, हमारे सामने एक बहुत गम्भीर प्रश्न ला कर खड़ा करता है और वह प्रश्न है कि मनुष्य बड़ा है या पशु। इस प्रश्न को दो दृष्टियों से देखा जा सकता है। दृष्टिकर्ता ने मनुष्य और पशु दोनों को एक सा ही बनाया है। दोनों उसी के बनाये हुए हैं, दोनों के अन्दर एक ही प्रकार की आत्मा प्रवाहित हो रही है। "एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः" हमारे उपनिषदों का कथन है। तो दार्शनिक दृष्टि से यह कहना होगा कि मनुष्य और पशु दोनों में कोई भेद नहीं है; क्योंकि दोनों का निर्माता परमात्मा है और दोनों के अन्दर एक ही आत्मा है, विश्व आत्मा के दोनों ही भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के रूप हैं। किन्तु, यदि पशु और मनुष्य में कोई भेद है, यदि मानव की कोई विशेषता है तो वह है उसके अन्दर बैठी हुई दया की भावना, भूत-दया। यही मनुष्य की एक विशेषता है और इसी के कारण मनुष्य के लिए यह कहा जा सकता है कि वह तो पशु से भिन्न है। अपने धर्म-

शास्त्रों में और दूसरे देशों की भी सम्यता के अनुसार, संस्कृति के अनुसार, दया और करुणा का बहुत ही महत्व है। शैक्सपियर ने अपने किसी नाटक में यह कहा है :—

The quality of mercy is twice blessed.
It blesseth him that gives and him
that takes.

इस प्रकार से, इस दृष्टि से दया की जो भावना है वह परमात्मा का मनुष्य के लिए सब से बड़ा उपहार है, मनुष्य की सब से श्रेष्ठतम थाती है और जो भी सम्यता होती है, जो भी राज्य होता है, शासन होता है वह यह प्रयत्न करता है कि उसके देशवासी जो कि उसकी संतति है, उसके अन्दर वह दया की भावना अक्षुण्ण बनी रहे जिससे कि संस्कृति का प्रवाह, सम्यता की उड़ान अंचाई की ओर जाती रहे। श्रीमन्, इस दृष्टि से देखने से जो आज का विधेयक है जिसका उद्देश्य है दया की भावना को आगे बढ़ाना, इसका बड़ा महत्व हो जाता है। एक दूसरे दृष्टिकोण से जब हम देखते हैं तो मनुष्य का जीवन पशु के जीवन से ज्यादा कीमती है। मनुष्य पशु से बड़ा है। वह उसका चाहे जैसे प्रयोग कर सकता है—उसका भोजन बना सकता है, उसका शिकार कर सकता है, उसके ऊपर तरह तरह के परीक्षण कर सकता है। मनुष्य का पशु के ऊपर सर्वाधिकार है, एबसोल्यूट राइट है। तो यह दृष्टिकोण जो है इसको चालू दृष्टिकोण कहा जा सकता है। जो पहला दृष्टिकोण मैंने आपके सामने रखा उसको दूसरा दृष्टिकोण या दार्शनिक दृष्टिकोण कहा जा सकता है, या आदर्शवादी दृष्टिकोण भी कह सकते हैं। तो उन दोनों दृष्टिकोणों को इस बिल के अन्दर इस बिल के निर्माताओं ने मिलाने का, एडजस्ट करने का, प्रयास किया है और उनकी जो भावना है, उन दोनों दृष्टिकोणों को मिला कर चलने की, वह बहुत सुन्दर है और उनका उद्देश्य भी बहुत अच्छा है। इसमें तो ज़रा भी सन्देह नहीं कि इन दोनों दृष्टिकोणों को मिला कर चलने के अतिरिक्त

शायद कोई दूसरा रास्ता इस बिल के निर्माताओं के सामने था ही नहीं और इसीलिये उस रास्ते का उन्होंने अवलम्बन किया।

यह बिल यह आधार बनाकर चलता है कि मनुष्य का पशु के ऊपर सर्वाधिकार है, मनुष्य पशु का सब प्रकार से अपने उपयोग के लिए एक्सप्लॉइट कर सकता है और जैसा कि मैंने कहा मैं इस दृष्टिकोण को मैटीरियलिस्टिक यानी चालू दृष्टिकोण कहती हूँ और इसके आधार पर बिल के निर्माताओं ने दूसरा दृष्टिकोण यानी आइडियलिस्टिक विचारधारा का पुट देने का प्रयत्न किया है। इससे भी मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं। लेकिन मुझे थोड़ी सी शिकायत है तो इस बात से है कि बिल का जो उद्देश्य बताया गया है वह उद्देश्य यह है कि वह पशुओं के साथ जिस क्षेत्र में भी और जहाँ भी निर्दयता का, क्रूरता का बर्ताव हो उसको रोकने का प्रयत्न करेगा। उसको रोकना इस बिल का उद्देश्य है। यद्यपि मैं समझती हूँ कि यह उद्देश्य एक बड़ा सीमित सा उद्देश्य है क्योंकि इससे दृष्टिकोण कुछ सीमित सा हो जाता है लेकिन फिर भी मुझे कोई शिकायत नहीं; क्योंकि इसके पीछे जो भावना है यह बड़ी ऊँची भावना काम कर रही है। लेकिन मुझे एक शिकायत यह है कि इस सामंजस्य करने के प्रयास में जो बिल के निर्माता हैं उनके हाथ बहुत ज्यादा बंधे थे और इसलिए जो बिल का उद्देश्य है उसके साथ भी पूरा न्याय नहीं हो पाया है। उदाहरण के तौर पर मैं अपना मतलब साफ कर देना चाहती हूँ। जैसा कि मैंने बताया पशुओं के साथ हृदयहीनता का, कठोरता का और निर्दयता का जो बर्ताव होता है उसको रोकना है तो हम देखते हैं कि सब से बड़ा क्षेत्र जहाँ पशुओं के साथ निर्दयता का, क्रूरता का बर्ताव होता है, वह है हमारे देश के अन्दर चल रहे हज़ारों की संख्या में स्लाटर हाउसेज़ जहाँ पर पशुओं का वध होता है, एक दिन में हज़ारों पशुओं का वध किया जाता है लेकिन स्लाटर हाउसेज़ की तरफ इस बिल के निर्माताओं का ध्यान

नहीं गया, हालांकि इस बिल पर जो कमेटी बनी थी उसने उनका ध्यान आकर्षित भी किया था। एक पूरा चैप्टर, पूरा अध्याय स्लाटर हाउसेज पर दिया गया है और उसमें बतलाया गया है कि किस प्रकार से कठोरता का बर्ताव पशुओं के साथ होता है, स्लाटर हाउसेज को किस प्रकार चलाने की व्यवस्था हो और किस प्रकार के तरीके बरते जाते हैं पशुओं का वध करने के। लेकिन फिर भी इस बिल के अन्दर उन मेथड्स को संशोधित करने का कोई प्रयास नहीं किया गया। वध के तरीके जैसा कि मैंने कहा अत्यन्त अवैज्ञानिक, बहुत ही एक प्रकार से जिनको कहा जाय असम्भ्य, क्रूड, और क्रूरता से भरे हुए हैं और हम यह देखते हैं कि उस कमेटी की रिकमेंडेशन है, सिफारिश है कि इस प्रकार अपने देश के अनुकूल परिस्थितियों के अनुसार मेथड्स अपनायी जाये जैसे कि विदेशों में, जैसे इंग्लैंड और दूसरे देशों में अपनाये जा रहे हैं। इस प्रकार की सिफारिश भी की गई है लेकिन फिर भी इस प्रकार का कोई तरीका अपनाने का इसमें कोई सुझाव नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, मुझे इस बात को देखकर हैरानी होती है कि जब इंग्लैंड सरीखे देश वध करने के नये तरीके अपना सकते हैं, नये वैज्ञानिक तरीके अपना सकते हैं तो क्या वजह है कि हम जो कि अपने को गांधी जी का अनुयायी कहते हैं, अहिंसा के उपासक कहते हैं, हम भी उन आधुनिक वैज्ञानिक तरीकों को नहीं अपना सकते। इसलिए यह एक सब से खटकने वाली कमी हम इस बिल में पा रहे हैं।

दूसरी बात एक्सपेरीमेंटेशन, अर्थात् परीक्षण के विषय में है। यह ठीक है कि आज अपने देश के अन्दर जो वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि से परीक्षण पशुओं पर हो रहे हैं उस के पक्ष में एक बहुत बड़ी फीलिंग है लेकिन इस सारे प्रश्न को एक दूसरी दृष्टि से भी देखा जा सकता है। वह यह कि क्या मनुष्य के लिये उचित

है कि वह अपना दुःख मिटाने के लिये पशुओं को दुःख दे—अपनी तकलीफ मिटाये और पशुओं को तकलीफ दे। मैं समझती हूँ मारेलिटी की दृष्टि से, नैतिकता की दृष्टि से यह मनुष्य के लिये किसी भी हालत में शोभाजनक नहीं, उसकी प्रतिष्ठा से नीचे की बात है। किन्तु यदि इसे व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से भी देखा जाय, तो यह मानना पड़ेगा कि जैसे जैसे ये परीक्षण हो रहे हैं वैसे वैसे रोगों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है। जैसी कि धारणा है कि परीक्षणों के परिणामस्वरूप रोगों की संख्या घट जायगी तो वह गलत है। आज नये नये रोग दिखलाई दे रहे हैं। ऐसे रोग जिन का हमारे पूर्वजों ने कभी नाम भी नहीं सुना वे आज प्रकट हो रहे हैं। परीक्षणों द्वारा जिस परिणाम पर हम पहुंचते हैं वे सदा ठीक ही निकलते हैं ऐसी बात भी नहीं है। परीक्षणों के परिणामस्वरूप आज जो औषधियां निकाली जा रही हैं उन से रोग ठीक होते हैं ऐसा भी नहीं है। अगर मान लीजिये टाइफाइड का इलाज होता है और उससे बुखार दब जाता है तो फिर टी० बी० हो सकता है। टी० बी० को अच्छा किया जाता है तो कैंसर हो जाता है और उसको दबाया जाता है तो दूसरा रोग हो जाता है। इससे मानना पड़ेगा कि एक्सपेरीमेंट के परिणाम से जो औषधियां निकल रही हैं वे रोगों को तो दबा सकती हैं लेकिन रोगी को बिल्कुल अच्छा नहीं कर सकतीं। इसका कारण यह है कि रोग नये नये रूपों को धारण कर के बाहर निकलता है।

श्रीमन्, एक बात यह भी है कि वैज्ञानिक प्रगति और उसके परिणामस्वरूप जो औषधियां निकलती हैं तथा वैज्ञानिक अन्वेषण जो होते हैं उनको हम किस हद तक अपनायें ? यह सभी लोग जानते हैं कि वैज्ञानिक प्रगति तेजी से हो रही है। वह कोई ऐसी रुकने वाली चीज नहीं। आज जो परीक्षण हो रहे हैं उनसे हम जिस परिणाम

पर आज पहुंचते हैं कल वही परिणाम गलत दिखायी देने लगते हैं, वे अधूरे दिखलायी देने लगते हैं क्योंकि विज्ञान दिन प्रति दिन प्रगति करता है। यह भी हो सकता है कि किसी दिन विज्ञान प्रगति करते करते यहां तक पहुंचे वैज्ञानिक इस परिणाम पर पहुंचे कि कैंसर का इलाज मनुष्य के फेफड़े से वैक्सिन बना कर ठीक हो सकता है। तो उस समय क्या आप फिर मनुष्य पर परीक्षण करना प्रारम्भ कर देंगे। मेरा यह विचार है कि विज्ञान उसी दिशा में बढ़ता जा रहा है, उसी दृष्टि से चल रहा है। आपने सुना होगा मनुष्य का खून लिया जाता है और जब एक बीमार मनुष्य कमजोर हो जाता है तो उसका इलाज दूसरे मनुष्य का खून लेकर किया जाने लगा है। कोई ताज्जुब नहीं कि विज्ञान बढ़ते बढ़ते अपनी प्रगति के अनुसार इस परिणाम पर पहुंच जाय कि जो मानसिक रोग हैं वे मनुष्य के भेजे पर, मनुष्य के मस्तिष्क पर परीक्षण करने से जो परिणाम निकलेगा और उसके अनुसार जो औषधि निकलेगी उससे वह ठीक होंगे। तो यह देखना होगा कि हमें किस हद तक वैज्ञानिक उन्नति का अनुकरण करना है। क्या हम उस पर अपनी मानवता को बिल्कुल न्योछावर कर देंगे। आज हमें याद आते हैं आचार्य विनोबा के शब्द, वे कहते हैं कि विज्ञान के साथ अहिंसा की भावना, मानवता की भावना को न जोड़ा जायगा तो विज्ञान किसी दिन मानवता को ही निगल जायगा, मानव को ही खत्म कर देगा। आज वह दृश्य हमारे सामने आने भी लगा है। इसलिये श्रीमन्, इस बिल द्वारा वैज्ञानिकों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने के लिये जो कमेटी बनाने का सुझाव है उसका मैं हार्दिक स्वागत करती हूं। यद्यपि यहां पर विचार इसके कुछ प्रतिकूल भी रखे गये हैं लेकिन मुझे तो यह बिल्कुल ठीक लगता है कि इस प्रकार की वैज्ञानिक प्रगति और वैज्ञानिकों पर किसी न किसी प्रकार की शकावट होनी चाहिये। मैं तो इतना और भी चाहूंगी कि इस कमेटी का यह भी कार्य

होना चाहिये कि वह कुछ आलटरनेटिव बात भी सोचे कि किस प्रकार से एलोपैथी के अलावा, होमियोपैथी, नेचर क्योर और आयुर्वेद में रिसर्च किया जाय और उस के अनुसार ऐसे ऐसे तरीके निकाले जायें जिस से नये नये रोगों का जो पैदा होते जा रहे हैं, उनका इलाज किया जा सके।

इसके अलावा श्रीमन्, एक बात मैं एनिमल सेल्फाइस के सम्बन्ध में भी कहना चाहती हूं। हम यह बरदाश्त कर सकते हैं कि पशु-वध का विचार खाने के साथ जोड़ा जाय, हम यह सहन कर सकते हैं कि इस को एक्सपेरिमेंट के साथ जोड़ा जाय, लेकिन जब कोई पशु-वध के विचार को धर्म के नाम पर जोड़ता है तो मैं आपको सच बतलाना चाहती हूं कि मेरी अंतरात्मा विद्रोह करने लगती है। हम यह कभी बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकते हैं कि धर्म और पशु बलि दोनों को साथ साथ जोड़ा जाय। धर्म का सम्बन्ध दया से है, करुणा से है, परमात्मा से है और उस के साथ मैं पशु बलि, पशु को मारने का जो विचार है, वह किसी तरह से मेल ही नहीं खाता। जो लोग यह सोचते हैं कि पशु की बलि चढ़ा कर परमात्मा को प्रसन्न किया जा सकता है और परमात्मा के वरदानों को प्राप्त किया जा सकता है, इससे ज्यादा (Interruption) मुझे अपने विचार कहने दीजिये, मुझे अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अधिकार है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि इससे ज्यादा हास्यास्पद विचार कोई नहीं हो सकता है। धर्म के नाम पर आज अपने देश में जिस प्रकार का ढोंग चल रहा है, शायद ऐसा पाखंड दुनिया के किसी और देश के अन्दर नहीं चल रहा होगा। यह मानना होगा कि यह जो पशु बलि का विचार है यह हमारे धर्म पर एक कलंक है और मानवता को अपमानित करने वाली चीज है। जितना जल्दी इस कलंक को धोया जाय हमारा धर्म—कम से कम हिन्दू धर्म के बारे में मैं बोल सकती हूं—उतनी जल्दी हमारा हिन्दू धर्म पवित्र होगा।

श्रीमन्, मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ कि यह बिल जिसका उद्देश्य यह है कि पशुओं के प्रति जो निर्दयता का बर्ताव हो रहा है उसे रोका जाय, इस सम्बन्ध में इस बिल द्वारा जितना साहसिक एटीट्यूड लिया जाना चाहिये था वह नहीं लिया गया है, मुझे इस बात का दुःख है।

श्रीमन्, तीन बातें जो मुझे इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में खटकती थीं वे मैंने कह दीं। इसके अलावा मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगी कि इस बिल में कई सुन्दर चीजें हैं, इस बिल का उद्देश्य बहुत ऊँचा है और यह एक बहुत सुन्दर बिल है। बोर्ड की नियुक्ति, वैज्ञानिकों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने और कंट्रोल करने के लिये जो कमेटी है, ये सब बहुत सुन्दर चीजें हैं, बहुत सुन्दर प्रयास हैं, मैं इन सब का अभिनन्दन करती हूँ। मैं सिर्फ यह चाहती हूँ कि कम से कम जो बातें मैंने अभी वर्णन की हैं, उन पर मंत्री महोदय अवश्य ध्यान देंगे। जो अमैजमेंट इस सम्बन्ध में रखे गये हैं, उन पर विचार किया जायगा ताकि जिस उद्देश्य से यह बिल रखा गया है उसे सफलतापूर्वक पूरा किया जा सके।

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support this Bill generally.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Please be brief.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Certainly I will be brief. People who did not have an opportunity to speak when the Bill was referred to the Joint Select Committee will be shown some consideration. I hope.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): The time is limited.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: There is no time-limit for the First Reading and for the Bill, the time has not been limited by the

Business Advisory Committee. May I proceed without being reminded of the time-limit? I will certainly try to be as brief as possible.

Sir, I used the word 'generally' because in my opinion, there are certain lacunæ left in some of these sub-clauses of the Bill to which I will come later. I have been listening to the debate on this Bill and watching the trend that it is taking and I am trying to understand myself in what way this Bill can be considered to be either against the Constitution or against the sentiment of any religion. We are in the twentieth century trying to make our country a progressive one, and we have to see to the needs of science also. I would also point out that those of us who object to certain types of meat for eating according to the way in which the animal is slaughtered, as was referred to by Dr. Sapru, would realise that when we go to foreign countries, we do not wait to see in what way the animal is slaughtered. I suppose that it was for that reason perhaps that the reference was to the slaughter of the animal only on a particular day—it may be Bakrid or some other day of the Hindus. The Hindus have not tried to put forward here that particular point of view, but maybe, there are some outside this House who may have that point of view. But I would ask such people who are objectors on the grounds, maybe, of conscience or maybe as respectors of all the practices in the name of religion, whether they would permit human sacrifice in the case of cannibals, because it has been the practice of cannibals, cannibalism is not a religion. May be. But their practices are as dear to them as some other practices are dear to others. We have cannibals in the Andamans. They are away from us and we are unable to see them or hear their voice. But, Sir, that does not mean that today when science and also humanity tell us that we have to show a humane attitude towards animals, we should just try to see how it conforms to certain age-old practices. I

would also ask such people who object whether they are aware that in olden days there were certain tenets and principles accepted which were associated with religion also. For instance, it was believed that the earth was static. Later on, science revealed that the earth was not static, it was moving, and it has now become a principle with their religion. It was part and parcel of many religions including Christianity to believe that the earth was static and that it was not moving. Why I am giving this instance is, I say that a scientific approach has to be made and a scientific approach should teach us that the human society is not static, it is dynamic, and therefore we have to see—and teach those of our fellow-beings or countrymen who do not understand this—that these points are considered and that we cannot stick to the old ideas about these things.

Sir, while I was listening to the debate, I have not been able to understand—and it is my ignorance, I confess, that I have not tried to find it out—what this particular merit is about what is called *halal*, the way in which it is done, why it is done and why a particular religion does say that it should be so. I would also ask those people who quote any particular practice of a religion being sacrosanct, whether they have shut their eyes to the conditions of the world outside where people of their community—I am referring here in this particular instance to the Muslim community—have adopted practices which perhaps in this country even today they would say that they would not allow in the name of their religion. Sir, where people are self-governing, they want to become part of one world with fast shrinking distances and become one world community, and they try to forget all these old ideas and keep only those practices of the religion as unchanged which are concerned with the elevation of the soul and the en-

3 P.M. nobling of the society. The previous speaker stopped by saying that both human beings

and animals had their feelings but perhaps one was not able to express them and he pointed out this difference. I would say that the main difference is that animals have no parliaments; they have not got the power to express themselves and so they cannot come forward and make demands about them. So from all these points of view, I would like to appeal to all people who think that this Bill is something new—which, in fact, is more or less an amending Bill, because there was such a Bill about seventy years ago—to say that this Bill is not something so revolutionary, as they think, and that it encroaches on the rights of any community and even among the Hindus there are certain sects who set a great deal of value on sacrifices and I appeal to them that they should also look at and modify those old practices from the point of view of the interest of the larger community I should say, of animals, because they are even a larger community than the human beings who inhabit India and the world.

Now, as the time at my disposal is very limited—as you rightly pointed out—I shall hurriedly try to refer to some of the clauses where I think further attention is required. I refer to the definition of 'animal' in clause 2, and with reference to the context of other definitions that follow, I would ask whether fish and chicken are included in them. Then the method in which they are killed is not at all considered, and if we try to stretch these definitions, we would have to consider the horrible manner in which the chickens are killed by the cooks, in every house, practically every day. Then we should take into consideration the way in which fish are taken out of tanks in Bengal and in Travancore-Cochin, taken fresh, just like fresh vegetables from the gardens, how they are taken out of water and then made to suffer on land, and we do not know—because fish cannot speak—to what torture they are subjected. We can only imagine, when fish are taken out of water, what sufferings they will

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] undergo, and how they will feel when they are thus tortured. Now, Sir, I do not know what innumerable personnel we will require and how we will be able to bring all those people to book who cause unnecessary pain and suffering to these animals, within the purview of this law. It should not mean only animals which are large in size, like the goat, and it may be that guinea-pigs, etc. need not be shown the same consideration as is shown in sub-clause 11(1)(d) where, I think, the reference is to monkeys, and the sub-clause reads:—

"conveys or carries, whether in or upon any vehicle or not, any animal in such a manner or position as to subject it to unnecessary pain or suffering;"

I have in mind the way in which the other animals—not monkeys only that might be carried in crates when taken from place to place—at other places might be treated, for example, the guinea-pigs in the scientific chairs, and the other things, the rabbit, or even smaller animals, as was said the cockroaches and others. Well, they are not considered here as being of any consequence. If we are going to base this Bill on the Buddhist principle or on the principle of *ahimsa*, I suppose we will have to go even to the extent of flies and stop the use of fly-killers used to kill them. But that will lead to some absurd unrealities and so I would not go into that, but I do feel that here, as a result of some of the things I would point out it may be necessary to consider whether that clause 29 will not have to be deleted, not because of what the other people say, that it would lead to harassment. As regards the method of killing I made enquiries during recess periods and came to know that the back skin of the neck was left intact which, in fact, happens to be the portion, in my opinion,—I am not a medical woman—which, because of that, keeps the sense and consciousness of the animal yet alive and in a tormented condition. It would be

the case with anybody when the back portion of the neck is also not severed. To leave it like that, I am told, is what is called *halal*. For that reason, Sir, because of these anomalies, perhaps the Minister may have to bring in an amendment himself later on. How far it would be consistent to keep clause 29, in view of certain anomalies with regard to this clause, especially when we are not able to see that chickens are not killed in a manner that a portion of the neck is left uncut or half-twisted by the cooks in every home, I cannot say.

Then, Sir, with regard to 'street' defined in clause 2, I would like to read out what has been included here and I think it makes the definition very impractical and also widens the scope of the Bill; it would make it difficult to be implemented. The definition says:—

"'Street' includes any way, road, lane, square, court, alley, passage or open space, whether a thoroughfare or not, to which the public have access."

I would like to ask, Sir, how it would be possible to implement this in villages, how to say whether a stray animal is in a lane or in open space or in a passage, and for that reason, though it is a very good provision, that should be there for municipal towns. It would be better to restrict this particular definition of 'street' to municipal towns, so that implementation of the Act is made easy.

Then with regard to clause 5, to begin with I would like to point out that according to the usual practice in the ratio of representation allotted to the two Houses of Parliament—it is six mentioned in the sub-clause—the number should be really five, giving three to the Lok Sabha and two to this House. Otherwise, as is the provision now, it will disturb the usual ratio of representation between the two Houses, because the number of Members also is in that proportion.

Now I come to page 9, to sub-clause (g) and (h) of clause 11, and they read:—

"being the owner, neglects to exercise or cause to be exercised reasonably any dog or other animal habitually chained up or kept in close confinement; or

being the owner of any captive animal, fails to provide such animal with sufficient food, drink or shelter;"

Well, these are very good clauses, but I do feel that not only would it be difficult to get these clauses implemented but they may be taken as grounds for causing harassment to people who perhaps may not really own that animal and it might be shown that they owned it, and there is really no yard-stick by which to decide whether that animal was given sufficient food, drink or shelter, or not. These provisions particularly would apply and would do a lot of good to big towns, to congested cities like Bombay or Calcutta, but as far as that goes, that is something very good in this Bill, because at the railway stations and hospitals we find today so many animals let loose, and dogs and very often goats are roaming about the place, and the rabid dogs are a great danger to human life, and because this provision is there, if the owners could be traced, they should be taken to task. But again here I feel it would be necessary to confine the operation of this clause also to mofussil towns.

Then I take up sub-clause (p) on page 10 and that is with regard to somebody using a sharp point for an animal and the sub-clause reads:—

"uses upon any animal any appliance with a sharp point except for medical purposes;"

I think that the object is to see that such prick-pointed sticks are not used for driving cattle or horses, etc., and for that reason I feel it is necessary

to add the words, 'for goading them for better performance'. My point is that you should clarify the point and make it easy for implementation.

I now come to clause 17, sub-clauses (d) and (e).

Now, sub-clause (2)(e) of clause 17 says:—

"that experiments on larger animals are avoided when it is possible to achieve the same results by experiments upon small laboratory animals like guinea-pigs, rabbits and rats;"

Sir, only guinea-pigs, rabbits and rats are mentioned here, but smaller creatures like cockroaches, etc. are not mentioned. Therefore, I am mentioning that.

As you rung the bell, I would not take much more time of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): The hon. Member has already taken 15 minutes.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: That is why I am finishing in one minute.

Sir, with regard to the contested clause 29, relating to 'the possession of the skin of any animal with any part of the skin of the head attached thereto', I would suggest that it would be better to apply this clause to mofussil towns, and make modern medicines, which insensitivise animals available for the slaughter houses. If such medicines are provided to slaughter houses, Muslims should have no objection.

With regard to infirmaries and other things, I would like to point out that as long ago as twenty years, a Forest Committee was appointed in Madhya Pradesh which recommended the provision of sanctuaries not only for unwanted cattle but for cattle during their dry period. But even in that State, which has so many forests, it has not been possible to put that

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] recommendation into practice. While there are no infirmaries even for human beings to take care of the aged and the destitute, I do not know how far it will be a practicable proposition to hope to have infirmaries for cattle. But, if we can do that, certainly we should have them. But it is no use putting down things in our legislation which we will not be able to fulfil. We should first see that we are able to establish some homes for the children and infirmaries for human beings and then think of providing infirmaries for animals.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): Shrimati Ramamurti. Only five minutes please.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): What can I say in five minutes?

Sir, this Bill has the very fine and laudable objective of preventing cruelty and maltreatment to animals. In this land, where *Ahimsa* has been the doctrine from time immemorial, where Dharmaraja Yudhistara would not enter the portals of Heaven because a dog was not allowed to follow him, we need not say that people are not humane to animals or they, all of them, are unnecessarily cruel to animals. While supporting the humane objective underlying the Bill, I would say that there are various clauses, like clause 11, sub-sections (a), (b), (f) and (k), as my friends have already pointed out, which are very vague and which would lead to mischievous interpretation by neighbours and bullies who will bring in complaints against poor, innocent farmers because they happen to drive with a stick a bullock into their field and plough, or against persons who are keeping pets but might have tied the dog for a little longer. It will lead to all kinds of personal complaints as between people and people. That is my fear. Police and mischievous neighbours may abuse this to harass innocent farmers and people.

Sir, there are so many clauses, as has been pointed out—time does not permit me—relating to beating up of animals, overloading an animal, pricking an animal with sharp points and various other clauses that have to be modified if this Bill is to be enforced.

With regard to the interpretation of the very first clause—which has also been touched by my friends—you will have to find out some other suitable definition of the word 'animal'. Here 'animal' means, under clause 2(a) page 3, 'any living creature other than a human being'. It looks almost ridiculous to include all living beings, right from the worm, the bug, the mosquito, the silver fish and other worms that destroy your clothes to the white ants that destroy your furniture, and all kinds of insects that we have been campaigning against in the medical field, where we say that these insects are carriers of disease, against which laboratories not only in this country but all over the world have launched a campaign, and great scientists have carried out experiments even at the risk of their lives for the advancement of medical science to promote the welfare of human lives, to promote health and hygiene and medical advancement in the society. Now, according to this definition, animal means all animals other than human beings. Sir, if a cobra comes along and stands before me, well, what shall I do? Of course, from the religious point of view we do not kill a cobra. We do not believe in 'Either I kill thee or thou kill me'. If a fire ant bites me, I would ask the honourable House, would they pick up the ant very neatly and very carefully and tell it, 'I am very kind to you, ant. Please go your own way' and let it go. If a mosquito stings you, what is your reaction, I ask. You should define where humanity has to be shown. You must provide a definition that you eliminate these insects and other categories that are being killed and will be killed whether this Bill is there or not.

There was a Matron in our hostel. Please excuse me for relating this story. She was a follower of Mahatma Gandhi. When a scorpion appeared in the hostel, she picked it up with an iron tong. I asked, 'Where are you carrying it?' She said, 'I would not kill it; I shall put it in the neighbour's garden.' This is Dharma!

So I would request the hon. Minister to devise some way of modifying that definition, and also of modifying other clauses where our friends have pointed out some vagueness, and to frame it in such a manner as to make this very laudable objective of prevention of cruelty to animals practicable.

Sir, with regard to the appointment of the Welfare Board—clause 4—from among the Members of this House as well as the other House, I would suggest that if the Welfare Board is appointed, women should be on it in a proper proportion.

The other important clause that I object to is clause 15 on page 12 which envisages the appointment of a committee to supervise experiments in scientific laboratories, experiments conducted by technical experts who have the love for science and the zeal for promoting the well-being of the society. My sisters have pleaded for the rights of animals. Now I plead for the rights of scientists to promote the well-being of the society. It will be an infringement of the rights of these scientists and young students who are enthusiastic about experiments in order to help the society. It will be a disservice to education and an infringement of their rights if this Committee were to go and supervise. Clause 18 says:—

"For the purpose of ensuring that the rules made by it are being complied with, the Committee may authorise any of its officers or any other person in writing to inspect any institution or place where experiments are being carried on

and report to it as a result of such inspection, and any officer or person so authorised may—

(a) enter at any time considered reasonable by him and inspect any institution or place in which experiments on animals are being carried on;"

Sir, an experiment means a controlled atmosphere. Even when we make psychological experiments on children, we see that even leaves do not shake. That sort of atmosphere is required for experiments. But, according to this clause, you are authorising a lay body, not of technicians, but of officials and non-officials—and I do not know how many politicians; I do not cast any reflection—who might not have been experts in any field, to go and very pompously march into a laboratory and ask, 'Are you conducting the experiment according to these regulations?' I say, what has happened to this country? With all the earnestness in me, with all my zeal for the promotion of all that is best in the field of science and research departments including the research in cancer that we are carrying on in Madras, I would appeal to the Minister to knock out this clause from this Bill. He should see that the vague clauses are modified, the definition is also modified to bring some meaning into this Bill. In a general way, to prevent cruelty to animals is a very fine objective, but to guarantee humane treatment towards animals and to all living beings need not be preached through this Bill to the detriment of progress of science for human well-being. It has been in the heart of the whole culture of this nation. Therefore, I would request you to make this Bill practicable. Thank you.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Sir, I was expecting to speak at 3 o'clock. I was told that I would be given half-an-hour. When do I have to finish?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA): You can take your time.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Sir, I have been listening with very great interest to all that has been said. Before I speak, I would like, first of all, to say that it gives a very gratifying feeling to me that the Bill that I brought in 1954 before Parliament should have at last come to fruition today and I feel—even though the Bill is not by any means what I wanted, still—that due consideration has been given and some great improvement has, as a result, been planned in this measure. I certainly have to thank all our Food and Agriculture Ministers from Mr. Kidwai down to our present Minister and, of course, our Prime Minister who have all shown great sympathy and interest in this work. I am unable to understand when anybody says 'We in India do not need to be told what is *Ahimsa*, we do not need to be told what is kindness'. They say all this and yet they are not able to support fully a Bill like this. It seems to me, however much we may be proud of our ancient traditions and background, today we cannot be proud of India as it is, at least not the educated India. We can as easily be ashamed of this India that is not eagerly and happily willing to bring forward a Bill that will help the animal world which we have always considered as part of our own life. From ancient days, great teachers like Mahavira, Lord Buddha and others have taught reverence for all life and in this they included the animal kingdom. Compassion has been the chief quality of every religion although today some people seem to have to defend religion. And how do they defend it? Instead of defending religious practice by saying that animals must be protected, they defend it by saying that animals must be sacrificed. It is absolutely the opposite of what I should have even imagined of the import of religious precept. To me this is indeed a great surprise. I must here agree with what had been said yesterday with feeling by Prof. Malkani. We are not treating the subject as we really should. Throughout the year, all the 365 days, we are bringing forward Bills for the

welfare of humanity and yet when the one Bill that we are bringing forward for helping animals comes, someone says, 'why not human beings first? Let us be kind to human beings first and we shall be kind to the animals afterwards.' Let me ask this: Are we really kind to human beings? Even from the very people who say so I would like to know how much compassion, how much love they show towards human beings, to the poor people. They talk about poor people more as a political slogan than as a result of real compassion. It is not possible to compartmentalise our hearts and say 'I am compassionate to man today and I will be compassionate to animals tomorrow.' If you have compassion, you have compassion for all, and this includes human beings. It is not a question of choice between a human or an animal. It is a question of human beings and animals. This is what we have to realize. I wish people had feeling for this subject. I am sorry to say that in so many discussions, especially when we had certain resolutions on the export of monkeys and so on, I know of people laughing and laughing all the time as if such a resolution was something ridiculous. Are we not tired of laughing on so serious a matter? You think it is ridiculous. How can it be ridiculous when there is so much suffering to so many creatures? Do we know and do we go anywhere near them? Are we in contact with them? Do we look after them when they suffer? If we still love them, then we are sure to feel for them also. It is a sad thing that this should be so. Kakasaheb Kalelkar said one thing which is of great importance, that if we have a law in this country, it must be better than any law in any country in the world. Surely, if we are so proud of our country—we tell everybody how marvellous is our culture—let us prove the beauty of our culture today. Culture is not mere dancing on the stage or singing or producing performances. Its result is not even the sending of cultural missions abroad. Culture is the way that we feel and the way that we act

towards every creature that suffers and it is only when we feel for them, we can say that this is the land of Asoka, whose emblem we are using. It is perhaps very difficult for the Minister to bring in a law as I want or even as he wants because already I see how there are divisions of opinion which pull him in different directions. This only goes to prove that democracy can definitely be wrong. A wise dictatorship is perhaps even better and it was proved by Asoka when, throughout the State, in every single monument, he wrote that he would take care of animals as well as of human beings.

Members have been speaking a great deal about animal sacrifice. Well, the Animal Welfare Board, even the propaganda which the proposed Animal Welfare Board may do against sacrifice, which really means only education, people think is wrong. They say it is wrong even to educate people to give up animal sacrifice. They say it interferes with religion. We have interfered with religion already in many ways. We have passed marriage acts whereby we have removed child marriages which were prescribed by religion. We have interfered with religion by removing Sati. Suppose, if I may say so, our Muslim friends say—of course it is only a supposition—that according to their religion they should allow Sati, are we as a State going to allow it? The Hindus also sacrifice animals. The Hindus do not want to prevent propaganda and stopping that which is immoral and when we speak of our Constitution, we must also think of what is repugnant to public morality. Should not our children learn to live better than we are living? Should not they learn to be more compassionate than we are? If children are going to watch all this kind of sacrifice, I think it will be demoralising to our country. This is my opinion; of course, I give full respect to anybody who gives his own opinion with all his conviction; I respect everybody's view, but this is my view and I certainly say that to allow sacrifice is unfortunate. Of course, I

know that India is now more and more ready to abolish animal sacrifice. I can prove this because four States in India—Madras, Andhra, Kerala and Mysore—have prohibited animal sacrifice in temples and in the vicinity of temples. Have these States interfered with the Constitution?

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: And successful.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: They have not considered it as interference with our Constitution. So they have done it. Not only this. I would say that if this clause is removed from the objects of the Animal Welfare Board, I shall consider it as interference with the Hindu religion. We can consider it as interference because I would like to educate people. I would also say, this education of our people can never do any harm to the Muslims because the Muslims are much more loyal to their religious practices than perhaps we are.

I do not think they are going to be affected by this propaganda at all. The propaganda is in a general way and people can take it as they like and they can apply it to themselves or not.

Then comes the question of *halal* and clause 29; I am not going to discuss it in detail because Pandit Kunzru has already explained the entire problem. An amendment is to be moved and our Minister has already said that he is considering accepting that amendment in which case there will be no worry for the Muslims at all. That being so, I do not see why we should waste so much of time talking about that aspect of the matter.

I would like to say this with regard to medical experiments. Even here, I am unable to understand the criticism. The thing that we have provided in the Bill is about the minimum that we can possibly do. As a law it is absolutely the minimum. I entirely agree with Raj-

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.]
 Kumari Amrit Kaur when she says, 'way should small animals be experimented upon'. I entirely agree; I would like that clause to be removed so that no animals are experimented upon. Of course, that is not what she meant but I take it that way. She has been Health Minister and it was during her time as Health Minister that this Committee functioned. There was a representative of her Ministry, a very very strong representative. We had the eminent doctor, Dr. Gilder, in that Committee. Then we had Dr. Kaura representing the Veterinarians. All the three of them agreed on this point and they said that they would accept this proposition as we have put in the draft Bill. Still more, I would like to point out that this particular clause exists in the Australian law and in the English law and it has not interfered with science and the development of scientific research. People may say that such practices do not exist in India, that in our laboratories the animals are kept so humanely, that they are kept in air-conditioned rooms and so on. It is just like saying to a man before he goes to the guillotine, 'What a lovely and beautiful bedroom has been given to you? Tomorrow you may go up the guillotine but today you are living in a beautiful room.' Well, they are keeping the prisoner most carefully. It amounts only to that. I have seen the laboratories and I have seen how these animals are kept imprisoned in small cages. When I see that, I feel that there is no compassion for the animals at all. They say that the animals are very well kept and that they are very well looked after, but what for? It is not because they love the animals but because they cannot experiment on unhealthy animals. If they can, I suppose they would like to save the lot of money that is being spent on taking care of these animals. I have asked questions in those places. Take these rabbits. They keep them and

they go on experimenting with them. They go on drawing blood from them and inject them with all kinds of disease-bearing virus. When I asked them as to what happens to the rabbits afterwards, they said, 'Oh!'. It was a surprise to them; they have never thought of that question before. The reply invariably is, 'Oh, we just sell them. Dispose of them'. If you love your animal and you become fond of it, you just do not dispose of it without knowing anything as to what will happen to it afterwards. That is exactly what is happening in these places. I have seen and I have seen enough and I am more and more convinced that the idea of experimentation on animals is fundamentally and basically wrong. It is morally wrong. They say that we are going to benefit by this but what for? Is it for improving our lives so that we may become healthy? Do we become healthy only by taking medicines? As has been pointed out earlier, there are many ways of becoming healthy so far as the mind, soul and body are concerned. You may certainly improve the body by these injections, although I have my doubts, but there are other ways by which you can improve your body better. By this way, you are only killing your soul and if you are going to kill your soul, what is the use of living? What is the use of prolonging life? Ultimately, are you going to save life? You are not going to save life by taking an injection for curing illness. Thank God we have not come to that stage of being able to stop death; otherwise we shall live for ever and ever and be a burden probably to our civilisation as well. Let us hope that the future generation, the younger generation, will be better than we are. I feel that experimentation is definitely wrong. Though it is wrong and I definitely say so, I know positively that all that I want cannot be achieved; I know I cannot achieve all but I do hope that we can achieve at least the abolition of cruelty,

cruelty in the extreme. You may say that such cruelties do not exist in India but do not forget two things. We are the biggest imitators of anything that goes on in the West. We still have a great admiration for whatever happens in the West and that is why we are anxious to have scientific development. Now, scientific development in our country is going to be a very big thing and, therefore, it is a very dangerous thing also unless side by side the ideals of compassion, deep feeling and reverence—these great ideals—are brought before us. Otherwise, we shall become cruel. I am quite sure of this because we are so imitative and our feelings are getting gradually killed out. We shall definitely import all those experiments from the foreign countries. It has been said by many people, and Pandit Kunzru also mentioned it, that every animal should be anaesthetised before operation. I would like to say that operation is not the only form of experimentation; experiments are carried on along so many lines. The biggest kind of experimentation is in the drug industry. Certainly here large vested interests are concerned. Doctors may perform operations and they may discover the use of serum but the people who sell such serum are deeply interested and there should be very definite control on such people. Why should experiments be repeated? Why should they be performed again and again as they are being done. Prof. Malkani talked of the dogs and said that they are treated better in the Western countries. Here they are very badly and terribly treated. They are tortured and they become unwanted animals because they get rabies. I know that there is no alternative but to destroy them but if you are going to kill them, can't you at least kill them quickly, can't you kill them with mercy? We always talk of death without suffering so far as human beings are concerned; death without suffering is a blessing for which everybody wishes but can we not

give that blessing to the animals? We should not kill them but if they have at all to be killed, then let it be done quickly, let it not be a long-drawn out torture. There are very many cruelties in this country. Prof. Malkani said that the dogs are well looked after in the Western countries. It may be true that the pets are very well looked after but the pets are being stolen and sent to the laboratories for most terrible tortures and cruelties. Dogs, cats and many other animals come within this category. I regret to say—this will be a shock to some of my friends, I am sure—that in America it has now been made possible for even the S.P.C.A. officially to hand over stray animals to the laboratories.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

The humane workers there are shocked and they are protesting against it. These things are happening now and more scientific development will lead perhaps—I hope not in this country—to children, to young people experimenting. I read something the other day and I would like to quote it here and that is regarding 'Experiments made by the American children'. Paul Harvey, National Radio Television News Commentator broadcast the following comments in December, 1958, in America:

"A helpless kitten was cut open in a high school biology class last month. It was obviously inadequately anaesthetised. The instructor defended this experiment with these words: 'We have got to develop scientists. In Russia they do these things in Grammar Schools'."

In fact, they feel that they are not so advanced as Russia in this particular respect.

"In 1955 we published accounts describing how Middle School children observed the onset of blindness in animals which have been deliberately deprived of proper nourishment. Frequently death ensued. The children were an-

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.]
courage to carry out animal experiments in the privacy of their homes."

So this is where science has brought us. We talk about religion. But we are not as religious-minded today as we are scientific-minded. People say all scientists are kind. Before our Committee many scientists gave evidence and they said that all scientists were kind, that there was no cruelty in science and if there was cruelty, then it was not science. That is what they were all the time saying. And yet there are among scientists many who think otherwise. One of them, a very great doctor in America, Dr. Henry Bigelow, says this. I would like to quote him, for he says it much better than I myself can. He says:

"The torture of helpless animals, more terrible by reason of its refinement and the effort to prolong it than burning at the stake, which is brief, is now being carried on in all civilized nations, not in the name of religion, but of science. There can be no doubt that in this relation, there exists a case of cruelty to animals far transcending in its refinement and in its horror anything that has been known in the history of nations."

That is what a doctor who is himself not specially a humanitarian, has expressed. So you can see how opinion in other parts of the world which we respect so much, is slowly growing towards humanitarianism, while in our country it is getting less and less. This follows the pattern of so many other things, like vegetarianism which is growing in the Western countries and is growing less and less in our own country.

I would like to say that this Bill does not go far enough. I want people to know that. Take the killing of pigs, for example. Somebody mentioned it. I hope everybody who eats something would realise what he is eating. I am sorry to say that

even in some of the Delhi hotels chickens are boiled alive, I know how the pig is treated most cruelly. The pig is the one animal which is born not only for a cruel death, not only for the diet of man but it is born exclusively to be tortured. They are burnt alive. They are flogged. They are poked with hot iron rods and they are beaten to death. I do not want to go into all those gruesome details.

It was said, I think by Mr. Jaswant Singh, that in animal sacrifice there was no cruelty, except the killing. That is not true. There are many varieties of cruelties. I am in a position to say and I know because I have had some experience in this particular work also. There are many other things which should be prohibited. What about hunting?

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: What about the silkworm which is killed to make silk?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Excuse me, the hon. Member is making a big mistake, for I am particular to buy only *ahimsa* silk.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: What about the other ordinary silk?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: I think silk should be definitely abolished. I am only experimenting with *ahimsa* silk. I am no perfect example. I wear leather shoes, it is true. I should not wear even the by-product of the slaughter house. But less and less I am doing it. As Asoka said, 'Less and less animals are killed in my palace for food,' less and less in my life I shall kill animals for my own personal pleasure. That is definitely true.

Let me finish by saying that two or three important clauses have not been included here. Take hunting. We have allowed hunting. Yesterday Mr. Jaswant Singh was saying that it was chivalrous, it was manly, it was wonderful sport. But that is all for the benefit and pleasure of man and

we do not think of the animal at all. You chase the animal while you are fully protected with a gun, on an elephant, and God knows with what else with you. You are comfortably off and then you run after the poor, helpless animal. You call it manly; I call it cowardly. I would like to see hunting for pleasure prohibited also, because fundamentally, according to me, it is wrong.

In spite of all this, in spite of the fact that the Bill is different from what I would like it to be, I would like to accept this Bill because, as the hon. Minister said, though it is not an ideal Bill, it is a beginning. Let us have a beginning. The most important clause in it to which I give my full support is the one about the Animal Welfare Board. If that Board formed with the best people in India, who really love animals and who do not merely talk about animals when the occasion comes, if that Board is properly organized, then it can be of great service to our country. Also it should have financial support from the Government. There are many humanitarians and humanitarian organisations that are ready to serve, that are ready to sacrifice themselves for this very great work, there are men who are willing to give up other things for this work and this Animal Welfare Board can help those people to do something for the animals.

I do not know why there should be opposition if one speaks for the welfare of animals. Somebody asks, 'Don't you eat this? Don't you eat meat? Don't you eat this and that?' Well, we are all eating. Even those who talk about kindness to animals do eat some things. We here say: Protect the poor man. He is helpless and you must exempt him from this law. Protect the religious persons because it is a question of religion. Therefore, don't bother about the animal sacrifices. Protect the scientists because what they do is in the

name of science. Therefore you should not interfere with his experiments. No law should be there to protect the animal. Protect the sportsman, because it is all sport. Nothing need be done for the animal, because it is sport. Then protect somebody else because it is something else. So what happens finally? You protect everything today, except animals. You do not protect the animals at all. That is what it really boils down to. That is what it finally comes to, because everybody wants exemption from something; for experimentation for animal sacrifice, for hunting, for the rich man, the poor man and so on. Let me say incidentally, that in India today, the ordinary, ignorant, uneducated people are ready to understand a law like this far better than the educated person whose heart has become absolutely cold and hardened by wrong education.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question:

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Question? The proof is what I have seen when working among the poor and also among the educated people here in Parliament and elsewhere. This proof I can give. I can give the proof, because I myself have been connected with a group of people who have stopped animal sacrifices in many temples without much trouble. We talked to the poor people about compassion and they immediately understood us and gave it up.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: In Bihar also they did so.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: It is indeed the poor, uneducated person who is really the hope of our country, if I may say so, and also women.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): That Chaprasi.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: I am asked to give one particular incident. I will not mention any name, but a very high official went to a slaughter-house in Calcutta and his chaprasi went with him. He saw the way animals were being killed and that night he was miserable and he felt sick. He could not eat. But the high official had a dinner party and was able to eat anything that was provided for him, even the very animal that was killed that very day, perhaps. And that chaprasi, as a result, became a vegetarian. So here is the proof. That chaprasi came to me. I did not know him at all. He came and visited me in my flat in North Avenue and said, 'I am grateful to you.' 'Why are you grateful to me?' I asked, and then he said "Such and such things happened to me in my life and from that day onwards I and my children are vegetarians."

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): Does the hon. Member know that Hitler also was a vegetarian?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Yes, Hitler was a vegetarian. I do not say that all vegetarians are kind people. But I do say that vegetarianism is a better way of life. I am not saying that a person who is a vegetarian is a better person than a person who is not a vegetarian.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Does the hon. Member mean to say that character is to be judged by what a person is eating, whether he is a vegetarian or a non-vegetarian?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: No, I am only trying to prove how the heart of a poor man was moved. That is what I was trying to do. The poor ignorant man does not and cannot argue like Members of Parliament. He knows only one thing and that is what he feels.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Can't you conclude that the heart of that uneducated man was weak?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: If you like, you may think so. By all means you can do that. But by all these remarks you are making, you are only proving what I am saying, that we are far less moved by these things than the ordinary man, because the very remarks that you are making to interrupt me show how deeply you are feeling on this particular subject. Well, it does not matter. We have to struggle for this great and humanitarian work and whatever anybody might say, according to me this is not only animal welfare work but it is also human welfare work because the human being is human only when he is a decent person, when he is really humanitarian. If a human being has no heart, he will be like Hitler whom somebody was just mentioning. A civilised human being is he who feels for the sufferings of others and therefore according to me this Bill for the prevention of cruelty to animals is a humanitarian Bill both for the animals and for human beings. It is of great importance as well for India. That is what I really feel. This is a measure to help humanity to make ourselves more decent people than we are.

This is all I have to say. I am afraid I have kept you and kept the hon. Minister for a long time. I pray and hope that the hon. Minister will not give way too easily and that he will do the very best that he possibly can, because to me the provisions contained here are the least while according to many others we have been too favourable to animals. Whatever this may be, may this Bill be the beginning of a great movement in this country which will justify the pride that we have in the past, which will justify the name that we have, the name of Asoka whose symbol is above you, which will justify the teaching of the great teachers of humanity who have been born in this country. Let us hope that it will bring happiness to all living creatures. And let me say with Pandit Kunzru that I would personally rather die

than live at the cost of the suffering of other creatures.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

"That the question be now put."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have taken part in this discussion—as many as 21—for the interest that they have created in this very important subject, for the wealth of information that they have given and for the wise criticism that they have offered. I said at the very beginning that this is by no means an ideal Bill. It is impossible for any Government to bring in ideal Bills. If it were open to me, surely I would have gone as near Shrimati Rukmini Devi as I possibly could but I won't bring my own sentimentalism into this matter because we have got to be practical where legislation is concerned. Now, as I said in the beginning for the last 70 years, since 1890, we have been operating an Act—The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act—but it was contended here that that Act was not operated. Hon. Members who said that were wrong; they were talking without their book. The Act may not have been operated in villages and other places but in very many places, especially in big towns and cities, the Act was operated. Again the fact that it was not operated does not mean that the Act was bad. It only means that we have got really to energeise ourselves and do something very serious in this matter. It is precisely for that reason that this Bill is brought forward. I am not a believer in one thing that we can create kindness for animals by passing one or even a hundred measures. It has got to be done outside this Bill but the Bill was necessary so that it could serve as some nucleus round which we can build up tradition, build up practices so that in time to come we can improve upon this Bill, amend

it, and what has been left out today can also be included. And I can assure my hon. friend, Shrimati Rukmini Devi, the one person who has taken so much interest in it, how very grateful I am to her sentiments because it enables the Government to do something which has been long delayed. I am equally grateful to Dr. Kunzru for the very able explanation that he has given of those particular clauses that were contended in this House. Now, I would not go into those details, or into emotional things, because the time is running fast and I must bring this to a close quickly so that the Bill may be passed here—everybody is anxious that this should be passed—and also in the other place so that it will become an Act soon and so that we can start setting up the Board and other things and begin to function.

Before going to the criticisms Member by Member, I shall first go to those very important clauses which have been very hotly debated in this House and give my reaction to them, the Government's reaction to them and show how we want to treat them. There are people here—quite a number of people—who spoke that this Bill, especially clause 29, interfered with the religious practices of a particular community, that is, the Muslim community. I would not read this particular clause because it will take time; everybody knows it. That clause refers to presumption as to guilt in certain cases. As you know, for cruel killing some penalties have been laid down in this Bill but this particular clause is not for the prevention of that cruel killing but it connects the evidence to the act of criminality. It has nothing to do with cruel killing. That is covered by another clause. But naturally our Muslim friends thought—they have got the right to think and I have no quarrel with them—that possibly by some stretch of imagination it could mean or it could be interpreted in a court of law or by those who have got the responsibility of executing action under that particular clause that it might cover the halal way of killing also

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

because there the skin is not separated from the head. That was the charge and I could quite understand it. I began by saying the other day that during the last 70 years that the old Act had been there not a single case anywhere—I am not talking about the villages but even in towns and cities where this Act operated—has come to a court of law where that particular section was used against a particular community, and particularly the Muslims. But even then if the Muslim friends want, to make assurance doubly sure, a hundred times sure, I can make it clear by having something in the Act itself that it is none of the intention of Government to interfere with any religious practice of the Muslims. We shall protect these religious practices in every manner possible.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: What about other religions?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: They do not have such practices. I do not think so.

There is an amendment that has been given by my hon. friend, Mr. Bhargava, which I have decided to accept but I am now trying to improve upon it if the House would permit me. That is amendment No. 17. That amendment was:—

“That at page 10, for lines 34 to 38, the following be substituted, namely:—

‘(e) the killing of any animal for food in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and usages of any race, sect, tribe or class.’”

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: That is amendment No. 18 and not 17.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Yes; you are right. It is No. 18.

Now, if you come to page 10 of the Bill, the relevant clause reads:—

“(3) Nothing in this section shall apply to—

* * * *

(e) the commission or omission of any act in the course of the destruction or the preparation for destruction of any animal as food for mankind unless such destruction or preparation was accompanied by the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering.”

4 P.M.

Now, we want the deletion of that clause and instead use this:—

“(e) the killing of any animal for food in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and usages of any race, sect, tribe or class.”

Now, I shall come from clause 29 back, in order to explain to you how it applies to clause 29. Clause 29 says:—

“If any person is charged with the offence of killing a goat, cow or its progeny contrary to the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (1) of section 11 . . .”

Then alone he will be charged. Therefore, here is a reference to clause (1) of sub-section (1) of section 11. If you come to clause 11, you will find that sub-clause (1) says—it is cruelty to animals:—

“(1) needlessly mutilates any animal or kills any animal in an unnecessarily cruel manner;”

The word ‘unnecessarily’ is not there, but I am accepting the amendment in order to have it there. If it is in ‘an unnecessarily cruel manner’, then it comes within the purview of this Bill. But that again is covered by the exceptions that have been given, that is:—

“(3) Nothing in this section shall apply to—

‘(e) the killing of any animal for food in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and usages of any race, sect, tribe or class.’”

If you would permit me to say, this is a little roundabout way to come to the same thing. I could not have accepted any amendment to clause 29, because clause 29 for that purpose is not a substantive clause. It is only a clause that connects it to something else, that it is a proof, it is an evidence that if anybody is found in possession of a skin attached to the head, then the presumption is that he must have done an act of cruelty. Therefore, it refers back to clause 11 (1) which says, anybody who unnecessarily inflicts pain, even while killing, and to that an exception has been added that if he has killed it for any religious purpose, it is not an offence. Instead of doing that, it would be better to my way of thinking—there I go to the old Act, where there is a better provision—if that can be introduced, which serves the same purpose and gives complete guarantee not only to Muslims but to everybody, in a clause, which is independent, so far as religious practices are concerned. If you come to Chapter VI, at page 17 of this Bill, it says ‘Miscellaneous,’ ‘Miscellaneous’ covers many things. If you begin by adding clause 27A at the very beginning of ‘Miscellaneous’ that:

“Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and usages of any community,”

then, it is a much better way of doing it. Because in one clause, coming after these penal clauses, separately it says, notwithstanding anything that has gone before in these five chapters:

“Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and usages of any community.”

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: I wanted to say one thing: Not only community, but tribe also.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: No. I am not going to tribe.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: If it is mentioned, then it is going to encourage most horrible cruelties, because I know personally that, for example, in Hyderabad in a certain place they were killing goats by beating them to death. I know it.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: We cannot provide for everything.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: If the Muslims object to the Bill as far as halal is concerned, why can't we also?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: That is true. I do not want to bring Muslim halal in an Act. I am doing this in order to avoid that. There is no other way of doing it. If you put that, it is maimed. I would appeal to Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale that it is not by mere Acts or by the mere letter of the law that we can change society. I am equally anxious. Although I may not be as anxious as Shrimati Rukmini Devi, surely I am anxious that this should be done. But let us proceed in a methodical manner, in a practical manner. The susceptibilities and sentiments of the Muslim community have got to be respected. I assured them even at the stage of the Joint Committee that I was for giving that assurance. But as they say, Ministers come and Ministers go. Therefore, the assurances remain where they are. But the letter of the Act will be there. Therefore, I am further fortifying it or supporting it by the letter of the law, by adding a clause which is 27A, as I have said. It will be re-numbered:

“Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religion or religious rites and ways of any community.”

[Shri S. K. Patil,]

I am merely saying this because I dreaded that this kind of interpretation might be put. Why don't you put Muslims? That is rather dangerous.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): In a nutshell you are taking away by one hand what you are giving by the other hand.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I am quite sure I am doing nothing of the kind. It is impossible to get that kind of fool-proof law that you require. This is a country which has got so many religions, so many practices. We have got to find our way very tactfully and very cleverly, at the same time appealing to the hearts of the people and not merely to the letter of the law saying that this should be done. I think that should solve the question better than anything else.

Having said that, another thing that was objected to was sub-clause (f) of clause 9. Clause 9 deals with the functions of the Board. In that there is a function which is:—

"(f) to take all such measures as the Board may think fit, whether by means of propaganda or otherwise, to eliminate the sacrifice of animals . . ."

When this particular clause was added, the word "or otherwise" did not exist. I became a little doubtful as to what the meaning of the words "or otherwise" is, because in law you should not put words which again have got to be interpreted by somebody. Now, that was the trouble. It was pointed out to me and I was a little doubtful about the words 'or otherwise'. Propaganda has to be carried on, whether by the Government of India or the Board. I personally feel that it is the right of any committee, any board, to carry on propaganda. But that was put there and that became a kind of thing which was objected to by people.

Even some of the articles of our Constitution were pointed out to show that perhaps goes against the provisions of those particular articles. Particularly article 25 of our Constitution says:—

"Subject to public order, morality and health and to the other provisions of this Part, all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion."

It may perhaps be said that it is far-fetched. Because it was pointed out, I had to consult law and I had to consult many things, because I did not want, in the initial stages, any trouble, any misunderstanding about it. If a section of the community has a right to practise and propagate their religion, as Islam has got, it has to say halal is the only method by which this should be done. I hope they would not propagate it, but possibly they have got the right under the Constitution and it could be, by some stretch of imagination, argued that the Board means the whole State. The State represents India. It spends the money from the public exchequer of India. So, that particular part of it perhaps could be conceivably brought under it. I am not going so much into the law now, but there may be people who may argue one way or the other, whether it comes or not. I am of this opinion, of the very firm opinion, that it is not by legal quibbling that we can advance the cause of animal welfare. Surely, if that propaganda has got to be done, that propaganda has got to be done not so much by a corporate board but by acting together, by hundreds of institutions, to which I, Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale and many of you belong. Nobody stops anyone from doing that. But surely so far as the inclusion of that particular thing is concerned, it subjects us to a kind of doubt which has been raised by that article of the Constitution. Therefore, I consulted legal opinion on that subject, which

the Government is bound to consult, and I am told that it would be much better if that clause does not find a place here. That does not mean that Shrimati Rukmini Devi or anybody should be aghast that that does take away the right of any individual to do any propaganda, but surely everything that the Board does is propaganda. Whatever it is, it has been found that that particular sub-clause, sub-clause (f), might perhaps go against that particular article of the Constitution. The legal opinion that I have consulted is like that.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Can you use the word 'education' instead of the word 'propaganda'?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Is it necessary? My point is this. I am looking at it with the same kind of scrupulous care with which she does look at it. It does not prevent any substantive action of that Board. One feels it because it has now come and it is going. Therefore, the omission is causing this anxiety. But it is nothing of that type. Even if it did not exist, it would not mean anything, because the powers of the Board are so wide. It is not because powers are given to the Board, but it also depends on the personnel of the Board. It does not simply come in because we have so provided in the Act. So, when these things are taken away, I submit that perhaps 90 per cent. of the criticism that has been levelled that we are trying to do anything that will interfere with the religious practices or things of that kind will disappear.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You want to omit 9(f)?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Yes, I can tell my Muslim friends that things cannot be done by compulsion but can always be done by sweet persuasion. I can give you an example. Some examples have been quoted, but I can

tell you my own personal example in the City of Bombay. I am connected with slaughter houses and all that, because I happened to be connected with that organisation for almost a quarter of a century where millions of animals were killed. I appealed to my Muslim friends not regarding this halal way of killing, but the subject was beef. I said to them, "look here, although you can eat beef, if you find that millions of people, who are your brethren, who stay side by side with you, are hurt really by your eating that beef, is it not proper for you that you yourselves should come and say, 'We are prepared to do this sacrifice for your sake, we will not eat that?'" Similarly, is it not possible for the Hindus to give up eating pork? Pork is not the only meat. There is any amount of other meat. After all you have heard from Shrimati Rukmini Devi as to how those pigs are treated. It is very dangerous to eat that pork. I tell you that in the public meetings where thousands and lakhs of people gathered, not one but a series of public meetings, the Muslim leaders came forward and said, 'here we are ready. We shall not do that. We will stop it by voluntary action if it pleases the Hindus and thereby brings about communal amity.' I am not a vegetarian. If I do not eat pork, it is simply because I know it hurts the sentiments of millions of people. I resist that temptation. What is possible for a humble man like myself is possible for millions of people. I am merely saying this not because it has any reference to this Act. Let us not quibble about what we find in the laws. If we go a step further, we will find that humanity is larger than the Act itself. If they behave in a manner by which this thing can be done, possibly there will be no objection. Nobody will force them to do or act in a particular manner. Surely it is our duty to see that the protection of the animal becomes as perfect an accomplished fact as possible in this country. But for that they should voluntarily come forward and co-operate in this noble work.

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

Having said that, I will now come to one thing to which my friend, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, took objection, and she wanted some kind of guarantee in that connection. It is in connection with clause 15. That clause says:

"Committee for control and supervision of experiments on animals. If at any time, on the advice of the Board, the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary so to do for the purpose of controlling and supervising experiments on animals, it may, by notification in the Official Gazette, constitute a Committee consisting of such number of officials and non-officials, as it may think fit to appoint thereto."

Then again, the words to which she took objection were 'for the purpose of controlling and supervising experiments on animals'. Now the two things have got to be separated. I can understand what is at the back of her mind, and it is that any scientific research or investigation ought not to be interfered with. If that is the objective of hers, I am one hundred per cent. with her. But that is not the purpose of this Bill. In fact the whole framework of this Bill has been so designed that there should be no obstruction whatsoever, even in the slightest degree, to scientific research, because it is so very necessary for the welfare of mankind. Whether some of the humanitarians go the whole hog with that proposition or not does not matter. What is sought to be done here in the name of experiments and other things—I am not talking of doctors, and I agree with Dr. Gour in many of the things that he said. Doctors are the kindest of persons. After all it is a profession that makes a man kind. I am not attacking them that they are doing it. But sometimes there have been some kinds of research, and the research process could be improved upon so that you can get the same result without being cruel. Therefore, she was afraid that

if there was a Committee of laymen who were not experts, who were not technicians, who were not doctors, who were not scientists, then there was a danger. I give her the assurance that the Committee will very largely, if not wholly, consist of technicians, doctors, etc., so that there should not be the slightest fear that we are interfering with research, etc. But why is it necessary? Not that immediately it has got to be appointed because the advice of the Board has got to be sought, and after the advice has been received and if the Government feel that the time has come when such a Committee should be appointed, then it will be appointed. Surely the Government has got to control and supervise on the advice of that Committee. Suppose the Committee comes to the conclusion that certain things should be avoided and certain things should be done—it is a distinct possibility, and it is a Committee of technicians and people who themselves make research—then surely the Committee could control and supervise. It is very necessary indeed. Supervision has no meaning unless somebody controls it. I supervise a thing and find that something is wrong as a result of that supervision; if I have no right to control or perfect or stop the thing, then surely it has no meaning.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: The function of the Committee is not only to supervise research but also to see that excessive pain is not inflicted during research. It is a double function Committee.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sometimes we carry things from the sublime to the ridiculous.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: There are two functions of the Committee . . .

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I have heard Prof. Malkani. I am really grateful for his great sentiments. What I am saying is that this Committee is not going to do that work. A committee of three or four people is not going to

go round and find out things. They are to suggest ways and means and advise the Government, if necessary. Nobody need be afraid, especially after the assurance I am giving that the Committee shall be composed of men who are experts and technicians, who are research people themselves. You must understand the Government which is so anxious to do this thing. The first thing that we should do is to trust the Government because it should be implemented. The idea is not that we do something by which these things could be made null and void. Therefore, I would beg of her that she should first try to wait a little. If after the experience of a year or two she really find that any objection is being raised, then surely I promise to look into it, whether I am a Minister or not, the promise of a Minister given at the time when the Bill is being debated upon carries some value. I am merely trying to do this in order that the maximum co-operation that is very much needed for such a Bill should be forthcoming.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: I accept your assurance with thanks. I am only concerned with the teaching aspect.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I do not go into all that, because these are matters, whether it is the big animal or the small animal, which, as I said, range from the sublime to the ridiculous.

Everybody went in to the definition of the word 'animal'. Some said that there was some greater definition. About this definition I tell you that hundreds of people who are experts in defining things have considered this subject, not only in this country but in other countries too. It is not so very easy to define an animal because, unfortunately, a human being is an animal, out of perhaps millions of animals that you are thinking of. And what a poetic description of it was given by Mr. Tajamul Husain as to how the fish would come out and how it would be asphyxiated and how it would die and so on and so forth. I

thought that after that he would never touch a fish in his life. Therefore, this is not intended, because we have defined 'animal' in a particular manner. You have got to have two conditions. Unnecessary pain must not be inflicted upon anything being an animal. But suppose it is a scorpion. It is very necessary that it has got to be killed. I mean, it does not come under the definition of animal. There is the wasp; there is the scorpion. I can quite understand that superstition. There was some story. I do not know whether it actually happened or it was just a story.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: I said it actually happened.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I think that it did happen. It was a good story. It made us laugh. These are some of the superstitions from which people suffer and they should not be there. But that does not mean that the scorpion should not be killed or that the wasp should not be killed. This is really a kind of necessary killing that one has got to do; it is not an unnecessary infliction of pain. Therefore, let us not go in for including all the five hundred animals in that definition. The one simple definition that occurred is given. If anybody at any time feels after the passing of this Bill that a better definition can be devised to define that word 'animal', the Government will be prepared to accept it, and therefore, we need not be in any particular hurry about it.

Then, Dr. Gour referred to the students. What we have done in clause 17 is in cases where the experiments are performed in any institution, the responsibility is placed on the person in charge of the institution, the dean or the superintendent or whatever is his title, and in cases where the experiments are being performed outside an institution by individuals, we see that they are qualified and that the experiments are performed on their full responsibility. Surely, there is no intention that any-

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

body or any officer will go to the place where the experiments are going on and catch a student because he is doing it in a particular manner. No. When instructions have got to be conveyed, the intention is that everything cannot be put into the clauses of this Bill, but that the head of the institution, whether it is the dean or the superintendent or whatever may be his name, is conveyed those instructions. Possibly, he is a man who is a technician. (Interruption). Therefore, I do not think there is any difficulty in that description.

I would appeal to you, Sir, and as I said—and I again repeat . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the Committee, according to this clause, will lay down certain rules? Now, the rules will be conveyed to the head of the institution. There is no doubt about it. But the students will come under the mischief of clause 20 of the Bill. If any person contravenes an order of the Committee or commits a breach of any condition imposed by the Committee, the head of the institution will not come; the manager or the proprietor or the principal of the college will not come. The person who will come under this clause obviously is the student who is conducting that experiment. That is point No. 1

I may also draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that students conduct experiments at home also because they have got the things with them . . .

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Clause 20 does not come there, because, as I said, under clause 17 when the instructions have got to be conveyed, they have got to be conveyed to the head of the institution, and I do not think that the idea seems to be that everybody wants to punish everybody under this Bill. Surely, it is not the case. But when you enact an Act, then surely,

clauses are there which are penal clauses. The idea is not to punish everybody. I hope there would be no case of punishment and that everybody will behave according to the context of this Act and therefore no such difficulty will arise. But the intention is not that the individual students are to be taken and to be punished; not even the principal is to be punished. But suppose later on someone in a million shows a contumacious disregard of any instructions that are issued in this behalf, then it would be a worthy case for trial, but I am not expecting that. Therefore, beyond that there is nothing at all that is contemplated in this.

There are many things which have been said. I have decided to accept some of the amendments tabled—maybe, they are verbal amendments, small amendments, here and there that Mr. Bhargava has given notice of. Barring that, I would say that as Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale and Kakasaheb Kalelkar have pointed out in their speeches, our Bill should be something which is worthy of the rich heritage and the great traditions that this country has got. I do not claim that this Bill goes to that extent but, surely, if you compare it with the Bills that are elsewhere so far as the contents—not how many clauses are there, etc.—and the purpose and the objective of this Bill are concerned, I dare say that it is a much better improvement upon the existing ones anywhere else in the world. We are now going, howsoever slowly, in a positive direction which we have chalked out. If we succeed and if we implement the various provisions of this Bill, a time will come when we shall improve upon it and wherever we find that there is difficulty, that can be set right. But let there be some beginning which is really countrywide which is caused by the passing of this particular Bill because under clause 40 whatever the provisions of the old Act which are touched upon by this particular Bill may be, they will become obsolete as soon as this Act comes into force.

With these words, Sir, once again I appeal to the House, 'Let us do something in our generation so that we shall live to see that it is done well, so that posterity will be really richer by the experience that we have given them?'

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to prevent the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering on animals and for that purpose to amend the law relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals, as reported by the Joint Committee of the Houses, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 8 were added to the Bill.

Clause 9—Functions of the Board

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL: Sir, I move:

1. "That at page 7, lines 25 to 29, for the words 'in connection with slaughter of animals so that unnecessary pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is eliminated in the pre-slaughter stages as far as possible, and animals are killed, wherever necessary, in as humane a manner as possible' the words 'on adoption of suitable methods of making animals unconscious before slaughter so as to render them insensible to pain or suffering' be substituted."

SYED MAZHAR IMAM (Bihar): Sir, I move:

2. "That at page 7, lines 30 to 32 be deleted."

(The above amendment also stood in the name of Shri Mohammad Ali).

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

12. "That at page 8, after line 9, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(j) to advise and assist animal welfare organisations to supply animals on hire or otherwise to persons in need of them when their animals are incapacitated for work by reason of illness or for any other reasons'."

The questions were proposed.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I may point out that there cannot be any deletion of clause 9, because . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. It is only about sub-clause (f) of clause 9—it is about the omission of clause 9(f). (To Shri S. K. Patil). So, you accept amendment No. 2?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Yes, Sir.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Then my amendment No. 24 goes, if No. 2 is accepted.

श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल : श्रीमन्, मेरा अमेंडमेंट ६(ई) पर है। मैं किलिंग का विरोध करना नहीं चाहती और न कोई ऐसा आशय है। इसमें जरा भी सन्देह नहीं है और इस बात को सब मानेंगे कि हमारे स्लाटर हाउसेज में जानवरों को मारने का जो मैथड बरता जाता है वह निश्चय ही क्रूरतापूर्ण है और काफी निर्दयतापूर्ण है और ऐसी निर्दयता को अवायड किया जा सकता है, रोका जा सकता है। मेरे अमेंडमेंट का केवल यही आशय है। जो कमेटी इससे पहले बनी थी उसने भी इस प्रकार के रिक्मेंडेंस किये हैं कि ऐसे तरीके अपनाये जायें कि जानवरों को मारने के पहले उनको बेहोश कर दिया जाये, अनकांशस कर दिया जाये। पश्चिमी देशों में भी इस प्रकार के तरीके बरते जा रहे हैं। ऐसी दशा में मुझे कोई ऐसा कारण नजर नहीं आता कि हम भी इस प्रकार का कोई तरीका क्यों न बरतें। तो सिर्फ मैं यह चाहती

[श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल]

हूं कि मंत्री महोदय इसको मंजूर कर लें कि हमारा यह जो एनिमल वेल्फेयर बोर्ड बना है उसका यह भी कर्तव्य होना चाहिये कि वह ऐसा मैथड निकाले जिससे कि जानवरों को मारने से पहले अनकांशस, बेहोश, कर दिया जाये। मैं समझती हूं कि इसमें एक हस्तक्षेप लाया जायेगा कि मुसलमानों के यहां जो हलाल का मैथड बर्ता जाता है उसके साथ यह मेल नहीं खाता है और उसके विरोध में यह जाता है, लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि ऐसा नहीं होता है। यह मैं इसलिये कह रही हूं कि कल लाबी में इस बारे में बात हो रही थी, उस वक्त हमारे यहां के एक मौलवी साहब बैठे हुए थे, कुछ और मुस्लिम सदस्य और बन्धु बैठे हुए थे, उनसे पूछा गया कि अगर अनकांशस करने का तरीका अख्तियार कर लिया जाये तो आपके हलाल के खिलाफ जायेगा या नहीं तो उनका पहला स्वाभाविक रिएक्शन यह था, उनका जवाब यह था कि अगर हलाल करने से पहले हमें यह विश्वास हो जाये कि जानवर मरा नहीं है सिर्फ बेहोश है। उसमें जान है तो फिर हलाल के साथ उसका कोई विरोध नहीं है और हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। तो मैं समझती हूं कि इस प्रकार से जो अनकांशस करने का तरीका है उससे उनको कोई उज्र नहीं होगा, उनको कोई आबजेक्शन नहीं होगा। मुझे आशा है कि मंत्री महोदय इस अमेंडमेंट को स्वीकार करेंगे और मैं तो यह फील करती हूं कि अगर वह इस अमेंटमेंट को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं तो वह एक सब से बड़ी बात बिल में स्वीकार कर लेते हैं क्योंकि आज जो सब से बड़ी क्लफ्ट हो रही है वह स्लाटर हाउसेस में हो रही है। आज हमारे देश में दो हजार के करीब स्लाटर हाउसेस हैं और वहां रोज हजारों के करीब जानवर इस तरीके पर मारे जाते हैं और अगर इस तरीके को बदल दिया जाये तो बहुत कुछ निन्द्यता और क्लफ्टी बन्द हो जाये। बस मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY:

I think, Sir, this amendment is a very simple amendment and it should be considered. It seeks to add:

"to advise and assist animal welfare organisations to supply animals on hire or otherwise to persons in need of them when their animals are incapacitated for work by reason of illness or for any other reason;"

When the Government is going to set up this Animal Welfare Board, this Board should take care of these diseased animals and give good animals for work in exchange. This should be treated as a humanitarian service for the poor people, who suffer, who on account of their animals getting diseased cannot use them for work, or for other reasons. So I think the Minister would accept this amendment.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, one thing is not clear to me. I agree that the hon. Minister will be moving an amendment in the form of New Clause 27A to respect sentiments, religious rights, customs, etc.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are now on clause 9.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I am just pointing out a relevant thing. I particularly refer to page 235 of the Report of the Committee in 1957, and in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Bill, 1957—page 235 of the Report—we find mentioned the 'Functions of the Board' and in clause (f) under the 'Functions of the Board' we find this:—

"to take all such measures as the Board may think fit, whether by means of propaganda or otherwise, to eliminate the sacrifice of animals in places of religious worship, etc. etc."

The Joint Select Committee purposely omitted the group of words beginning

with 'in places of religious worship', etc. which are mentioned in the Report, from this Bill. Now the point I want to raise is this. You have already, by a particular clause, given the right to the people who want to follow a particular type of sacrifice. That is all right. But now you want to denude the Board of a power, namely, of making propaganda, of imparting education that animal sacrifice is not a very healthy practice. Can there be any objection to such educative propaganda because, as you will find, it says:—

"to take all such measures as the Board may think fit." . . .

Now what are the functions of the Board? The functions of the Board are to advise the Government—

"to take all such measures as the Board may think fit." . . .

and that would be certainly in accordance with the provisions of this Bill, whether by means of propaganda, or otherwise, to eliminate the sacrifice of animals. This is a very innocent thing and it does not come in conflict with the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister to include a New Clause, 27A. Therefore, Sir, the Board should have the power. It does not mean—supposing there is a particular community, I exclude Muslims for the time being . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think what he said was that the mere omission of this clause does not take away the right to do propaganda; that right is already there.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: I would respectfully like to know where that right is.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is unnecessary . . .

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: The question that requires to be put before the House, according to me, is—I may be wrong, absolutely wrong, in my line of thinking—whether the

Animal Welfare Board would be entitled to make propaganda among people or educate the people that animal sacrifice is not essential.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Why not?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: That is what is the scheme of the Bill as mentioned in that Report, the scheme of Functions of the Board, and the whole scheme of the Bill is prevention of cruelty to animals, unnecessary pain or suffering to animals. If you look to the various recommendations and particularly if you look to Chapter V, it deals with slaughter of animals and animal sacrifices about which Rukminiji mentioned that various State Legislatures had legislations passed and asked how you are going to reconcile both, reconcile that legislation whereunder animal sacrifice has been prohibited, with this all-India Act. I think, Sir, it would be the duty of the Board to make propaganda and educate the people. Therefore I do not find any contradiction between the two, and there is no need for deleting this clause. Anyway, that is my humble submission.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: I wish to draw your attention to page 66 of that Report of 1957 to point out the Committee's recommendation in this regard. The Committee has made many recommendations and this, I personally think, is the strongest, and it has no conditions attached, it is unconditional. you may say. It says here:

"Need for prohibiting animal sacrifices.—Almost everybody who has submitted written or oral evidence has strongly urged that the inhuman practice of sacrificing animals for the purpose of propitiating deities should be put an end to as soon as possible."*****

They make a definite recommendation lower down, and this is the recommendation:

[Shri N. R. Malkani.]

"The Committee, therefore, recommends that the sacrifice of animals, including birds, in any place of public worship or any other public place*** should be banned***"

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: The Joint Select Committee has deleted it.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: It is a very strong and a very clear recommendation. As a matter of fact, Sir, there are States which have already banned it, and successfully banned it. That is point two.

The third point is, wherever we went, we found educated opinion very strongly in favour of stopping this practice. And after all the Hindu community has a conscience, which is now rising, which is more sensitive, which is more active, and it wants to express itself, and I think, Sir, it is the duty of law to allow this conscience to express itself to the fullest extent in the noblest manner possible. Under this Bill, which we will be just now passing—as the hon. Minister said yesterday—is created an Animal Welfare Board. It is the biggest contribution of the Bill and the functions of the Board are extremely important, and I do think this should be one of the most important functions of that Board. Sir, in the Committee, actually I moved an amendment and I am moving an amendment here, which is a substantive amendment, for banning sacrifices. Then they said: The best way is to allow the Board to function, to give the function to the Board to do propaganda, to educate public opinion. Not I alone but we were told reliably that we had only to give a little push to the opinion existing, to do a little more propaganda, a little more education, and the thing will go. It is already crumbling; it is disappearing; we only have got to give a little push. Of course I know that the Muslim sentiments are there, and I have said, not once but ten times, not I alone, but everyone in the House has given them guarantees, and the hon. Minister has

gone out of his way, to my mind, to give them the assurances. Give them any more if you want, but no community should hinder the advance of any other community—it is of course the majority community—which considers itself as a progressive community, which has almost a religious fervour about this matter of sacrifices. I do not see why the progress of this advancing outlook to ban animal sacrifices should be hindered, and this provision taken away. By so doing I do think that we will be hampering the effective action of the Bill and the functions of the Animal Welfare Board will not be properly performed. (Interruption.) Have as many exemptions as you like.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sir, I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment of Shrimati Lakhanpal, and for that matter, also of Shrimati Maya Devi Chettry for the simple reason that though I agree with them, I do not like the words like "wherever necessary, in as humane a manner as possible". These are not things which can come in law. We are not dealing with humanitarian institutions. It is something different. I can quite understand that it is all necessary. It is not for that reason that I am not accepting the amendment, but can you administer that law if you say 'until modern slaughter houses are built'? In clause 9 you would see that we have already provided for such a thing—

"(e) to advise the Government or any local authority or other person in the design of slaughter-houses or in the maintenance of slaughter-houses or in connection with slaughter of animals . . ."

I can quite understand that. Somebody made a reference to slaughter houses where stunning becomes a possibility. But today it will remain a dead letter. I do not want my law to be a dead letter. I want it should function, it should operate. Therefore, I am saying that when it is provided for, surely those methods can be adopted.

With regard to pigs, somebody mentioned that it was common knowledge. Perhaps some methods have been found in other countries, for instance, in America where some kind of gas is given to the pig till such time as it becomes unconscious after which you can kill it. But all that can come where mass killing is done, where a lot of money is spent, where modern slaughter houses have been built. Until that is done, it is a pious hope which will not be implemented. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment, not because there is some sentiment involved in it. Let us wait. Rome was not built in a day. Animal welfare is not going to be accomplished within 24 hours. (*Interruption.*) Whatever it is, I am not yielding.

Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty also suggested some good thing, but is it a thing that a law should do? Should the organisation do it? Should they keep some bulls and other things, etc., etc.? Can I compel an organisation, for which I am not paying hundred per cent., to arrange for such a thing? It is the duty of the workers of this organisation to have such societies. There are societies which are helped by Government. If they have such a society, they can come to us for larger grants. I can understand that sort of thing. But I cannot say that by law we should arrange such a thing, namely, providing bulls, etc.

So far as the argument that nothing would be lost if that provision remained and propaganda was carried on is concerned, the Bill is not for preventing animal sacrifice only. That is one thing. There are hundred other good things. Prof. Malkani had suggested several things in the Joint Select Committee. Even on whatever remained, legal opinion was consulted and they thought that there was the possibility of its coming within the purview of article 25 of the Constitution. Therefore, I said, let us work it and find out the practical difficulties. I thought there was no use adding something which might again give rise to litigation

and which might come within the purview of article 25. For these reasons I am unable to accept these amendments, except amendment No. 2 which suggests the deletion of sub-clause (f) of clause 9.

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at page 7, lines 30 to 32 be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

12. "That at page 8, after line 9, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(j) to advise and assist animal welfare organisations to supply animals on hire or otherwise to persons in need of them when their animals are incapacitated for work by reason of illness or for any other reason;'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

Clause 11—Treating animals cruelly

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I move:

3. "That at page 8, line 28, for the word 'beats' the words 'mercilessly beats' be substituted."

**For text of amendment, vide col. 2523 supra.*

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL: Sir, I move:

5. "That at page 10, line 12, for the word 'twenty-five' the word 'fifty' be substituted."

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I move:

6. "That at page 10, after line 25, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(2A) No animal shall be killed, maimed or subjected to pain in the name of, or for, the Hindu religion in connection with rites or usages of any tribe, sect or class professing the Hindu religion.'"

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Sir, I move:

13. "That at page 9, line 14, the words 'or other animal' be deleted."

14. "That at page 9, line 29, for the word 'in a' the words 'in an unnecessarily' be substituted."

15. "That at page 10, lines 9 and 10 be deleted."

17. "That at page 10, line 27, after the word 'branding' the words 'or nose-roping' be inserted."

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

16. "That at page 10, lines 12-13, the words 'or with imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month, or with both,' be deleted."

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Sir, I move:

26. "That at page 10, for lines 9 and 10, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(p) uses upon any animal any appliance with a sharp point so as to subject it to unnecessary pain or suffering;'

The questions were proposed.

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Sir, my amendment is very simple. Sub-clause (p) of clause 11(1) on page 10, says:—

"uses upon any animal any appliance with a sharp point except for medical purposes;"

This might create difficulties as far as elephants and other animals are concerned. Therefore, through my amendment, I have suggested:

"uses upon any animal any appliance with a sharp point so as to subject it to unnecessary pain or suffering;"

This is modelled on the idea of the original sub-clause and will remove all the difficulties which can arise because of the passing of the sub-clause as it is. I hope the hon. Minister would consider and agree to this.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I hope the hon. Minister would give a very kind thought to my amendment. Let him not be so cruel to my amendment. For the first offence, my amendment seeks punishment with fine of Rs. 25 only. Of course, if he does not pay, he will be subject to imprisonment. That is a different matter. But there should not be one month's imprisonment along with fine or both for the first offence. That is my feeling. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly consider it.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: My amendment, No. 13, wants only the deletion of the words 'or other animal' in line 14, at page 9, which have been added by the Select Committee. After all the debate that we had, I think it is unnecessary to have these words.

As regards amendment No. 14, it was also there in the original Bill, 'in an unnecessarily cruel manner', but it was deleted by the Joint Select Committee. I think the substitution for the words 'in a' by the words 'in an unnecessarily' will bring in more clarity.

Amendment No. 15 seeks the deletion of the words:

"uses upon any animal any appliance with a sharp point except for medical purposes;"

There again, it was not in the original Bill. Its deletion would take us to the original clause. My amendment No. 17 is for the addition of words in clause 11(3), where I want to add 'or nose-roping'. That makes the position a little clearer and I hope all these amendments will be accepted by the Minister.

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL: According to my amendment I want that the fine of Rs. 25 should be raised to Rs. 50 because it was so in the original Bill also. The punishment should be deterrent if you want it to have any weight. It should be in proportion to the enormity of the offence. If we want the punishment to have any weight, it should be a bigger one.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): I would like to support Dr. Gour's amendment as far as the first offence is concerned. Fine of Rs. 25 should be all right because imprisonment will only add to cruelty to the animal. If the owner goes to prison, who will feed the animal?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I am accepting amendment Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 17 moved by Mr. Bhargava. So far as Dr. Gour's amendment is concerned, I am combining the one moved by him and another moved by Shrimati Lakhanpal. I quite understand that for the first offence, imprisonment should not be there. So I would revert to the original provision which was in favour of a fine of Rs. 50 but no imprisonment. Let us have a compromise by accepting that amendment but no imprisonment for the first offence. The second thing stays. This is in regard to No. 16 of Dr. Gour. I am not accepting that amendment—I mean that the acceptance of this meets that purpose.

DR. R. B. GOUR: You are accepting both? She wants to raise the fine to Rs. 50.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: She wants Rs. 50 as fine because she wants to make it deterrent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You accept both the amendments?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: How can I accept both? I accept the amendment proposing Rs. 50 as fine without any imprisonment.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It means both.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Yes.

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendments No. 3 and No. 6.

**Amendments, No. 3 and No. 6, were, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at page 10, line 12, for the word 'twenty-five' the word 'fifty' be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

13. "That at page 9, line 14, the words 'or other animal' be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

14. "That at page 9, line 29, for the words 'in a' the words 'in an unnecessarily' be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

15. "That at page 10, lines 9 and 10 be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

**For texts of amendments, vide cols. 2532; 2533 supra.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

16. "That at page 10, lines 12-13, the words 'or with imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month, or with both,' be deleted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

17. "That at page 10, line 27, after the word 'branding' the words 'or nose-roping' be inserted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Amloakh Chand, do you press your amendment?

SHRI AMOLAKH CHAND: Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment No. 26.

**Amendment No. 26 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 11, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 12 and 13 were added to the Bill.

Clause 14—Experiments on animals

SHRI N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I move:

8. "That at page 12, after line 9, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no surgical operation on animals shall be performed without administering anaesthetics.'

**For text of amendment, vide col 2533 supra.*

Sir, I plead that it should be accepted by the Minister.

The question was proposed.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I am not accepting it Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

8. "That at page 12, after line 9, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that no surgical operation on animals shall be performed without administering anaesthetics.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 15 and 16 were added to the Bill.

Clause 17—Duties of the Committee and power of the Committee to make rules relating to experiments on animals.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

19. "That at page 13, line 19, after the word 'rabbits' the word 'frogs' be inserted."

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: Sir, I move:

20. "That at page 13, after line 26, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(i) that research and other efforts directed towards discovering suitable alternatives to animal experimentation are encouraged and supported and such suitable alternatives as may be discovered

are used to replace experiments on animals as soon as possible."

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

27. "That at page 13, lines 20 and 21 be deleted."

28. "That at page 13, line 25, after the word 'tha' the words 'as far as possible' be inserted."

29. "That at page 13, line 32, after the word 'Committee' the words 'shall be so made in consultation with the Indian Institute of Scientific Research and' be inserted."

The questions were proposed.

DR. R. B. GOUR: It should not be difficult to accept No. 19 because in the list, I only want to add 'frogs'.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: For the sake of amity, we shall have 'frogs'.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Amendment No. 27 is for deletion. Experiments are not performed merely for acquiring manual skill. Sometimes it is necessary also, to teach the holding of knives. So I do not think you can force any scientific institution. If you add 'as far as possible,' I have no objection, otherwise delete it. It is difficult for a teaching institution to abide by this because you have to teach holding of knife. You must consider that point. Regarding suitable records to be kept, it should be 'as far as possible' suitable records should be kept. I do not know whether students will be asked to do this. Again I have to base my argument on that, whether they will be asked to keep them. If it is to be done by the Institute or the Principal, then I have no objection as they can keep suitable records but if the Minister is quite sure that students will not be called upon to keep the records, then it should be amended by the words 'as far as possible'.

Regarding the rules this Committee is going to make, I want that they should be subject to the approval of the Indian Institute of Scientific Research. That is necessary because

even if this body is composed of experts, it is quite possible that they are liable to commit mistakes. So all these rules must be made in consultation with the Institute. The clause says:

"All rules made by the Committee shall be binding on all individuals performing experiments outside institutions and on persons in charge of institutions in which experiments are performed."

My amendment is:

"All rules made by the Committee shall be so made in consultation with the Indian Institute of Scientific Research and shall be..."

The rules are important and they will have to be proclaimed by the Institute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall we sit for a few minutes more and finish this? I hope the House agrees.

(No hon. Member dissented.)

5 P.M.

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY: Sir, my amendment is:

"That at page 13, after line 26, the following be inserted, namely:—

(i) that research and other efforts directed towards discovering suitable alternatives to animal experimentation are encouraged and supported and such suitable alternatives as may be discovered are used to replace experiments on animals as soon as possible."

Sir, this is a very reasonable amendment, because even the Committee has recommended that special efforts should be made to develop suitable alternatives to animal experiments and to the extent that the systems of medicines other than the modern system need not rely on animal experiments, they deserve encouragement. Therefore, I say this Committee has recommended it and so this amendment that I have moved is a reasonable one. Therefore, I commend amendment No. 20 for the acceptance of the House.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sir, this whole Committee is being appointed for that purpose and it is going to consist of experts, technical men, doctors and so on and I think we should leave it to them rather than try to dictate something from here as to what they should do. The purpose may be all right, but it is the business of this Committee to do that and therefore I am not accepting the amendment.

I am accepting amendment No. 19 which seeks to include frogs also.

Next I accept amendment No. 28 moved by Dr. Gour, though I would like to point out that there is a slight mistake in that amendment. Instead of having the words 'as far as possible' not in line 25, but in line 20.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I accept that correction, Sir. It should be in line 20 and not in line 25.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So the amendment will read as follows:

"That at page 13, line 20, after the word 'that' the words 'as far as possible' be inserted."

SHRI S. K. PATIL: That is acceptable. The others are not.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What about the rules being approved by the Indian Institute of Scientific Research or being made in consultation with that Institute?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: No, we do not have anybody outside that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

19. "That at page 13, line 19, after the word 'rabbits' the word 'frogs' be inserted."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

20. "That at page 13, after line 26, the following be inserted, namely:—

'(i) that research and other efforts directed towards discovering suitable alternatives to animal experimentation be encouraged and supported and such suitable alternatives as may be discovered are used to replace experiments on animals as soon as possible.'"

The motion was negatived.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, since the hon. Minister has accepted the addition of the words 'as far as possible' in line 20, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment No. 27.

**Amendment No. 27 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

28. "That at page 13, line 20, after the word 'that' the words 'as far as possible' be inserted."

The motion was adopted.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I am not pressing my amendment No. 29 which I beg leave of the House to withdraw

**Amendment No. 29 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 17, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 17, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 18 and 19 were added to the Bill.

Clause 20—Penalties

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

21. "That at page 14, after line 29, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

**For texts of amendments, vide ol 2539 supra.*

'Provided that nothing in this section shall apply to students of bona fide colleges and institutions who use animals for experimental purposes in the course of their studies.'

The question was proposed.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I would request the Minister to remember this fact that even those students who are conducting these experiments may come under the mischief of clause 20. It is not the head of the institution who is going to be prosecuted for any violation of the rules made by this Committee, but the person who is conducting the experiment is going to be punished under this penal clause No. 20. It is very clear from clause 20 here that the person conducting the experiments will be hauled up if he is violating the rules framed by the Committee. Outside the institution also students do these experiments, in their houses they catch hold of a frog and do experiments and so on. Therefore, I think the students should not be brought within the purview of this penal clause. Otherwise they are subject to the clause dealing with propaganda.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, are we going to complete the work on this Bill today?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we may sit for a few minutes more and complete it.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sir, I am not able to accept this amendment. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend's interpretation of this clause is wrong. I do not want students to be subjected to this penalty and by no stretch of the imagination can they come in, because they are students of the institution, and as we have said in the previous clause, it is the head of the institution who is negotiated with. So this fear is far-fetched.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In that case, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment No. 21.

**Amendment No. 21 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 20 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 20 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 21 to 27 were added to the Bill.

New Clause 27A—Saving with respect to religious usages

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sir, I move:

"That at page 17, in Chapter VI, after line 13, the following new clause be inserted, namely:—

"27-A. Saving with respect to religious usages.—Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religious or religious rites and usages of any community."

The question was proposed.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to say a few words about this new clause. I appreciate the consideration that has impelled the hon. Minister to suggest this amendment at this late stage. I am one with him and I share his anxiety to allow for the religious feelings of any particular community. But may I suggest that this amendment need not be so wide as it is at the moment, and we may delete the last few words 'or religious rites and usages of any community'? After this deletion it will stand like this:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any

**For text of amendment, vide cols. 2542-43 supra.*

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]

animal in a manner required by the religion of any community."

Let us respect religious feelings of any community, but let us not go much beyond that.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Beyond what? What is the fear at the back of my hon. friend's mind?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I do not suffer from any fear, Sir. I am only submitting that we have already agreed to delete part (f) from clause 9. Let us not go very much beyond the very objective of this Bill. If you go on deleting bit by bit, then virtually it will be reduced to nothing. I do not know what particular necessity the hon. Minister feels for introducing this amendment with the words 'religious rites' and even 'usages'. So far as the substantive part of it is concerned, I say, let us respect a religion in all its details. But if you go and want to recognise something more, usages, customs and so on, then that is going too far. So I request the hon. Minister not to have the words 'or religious rites and usages'. Sir, I have here the Oxford Dictionary according to which the word 'usage' has been defined as something 'habitual or customary practice', 'manner of using or treating, treatment'. My submission is that the word 'religion' may remain but that the words 'religious rites' and more particularly the word 'usages' should go. If we do not do this, much of the purpose of this enactment would go away. That is my humble suggestion. Let us respect religion in all its aspects.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I am prepared to accept this amendment.

The new clause will then be,

"Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religion of any community."

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Thank you, Sir. That is what I wanted.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE: Lately a case came to my notice and I sent it on, I think. Some people wanted to kill a goat according to the Vedic rites by blocking all passages. That is something which actually happened recently. Are we going to allow this kind of thing?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Therefore the hon. Member should agree with me.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think the fears of Mrs Arundale will be allayed by what the Minister has accepted. He is not accepting usages, conventions and all the rest of it. He is only accepting religious requirements.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I am supporting the view of Rukmini Devi because I am taking away customs, usages, etc. I am covering only the Muslim community because of the religious rite prevailing in that community.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to vote the amendment as further amended by the Minister.

The question is:

"That at page 17, in Chapter VI. after line 13, the following new clause be inserted, namely:—

"27-A. *Saving with respect to religious usages.*—Nothing contained in this Act shall render it an offence to kill any animal in a manner required by the religion of any community."

The motion was adopted.

New Clause 27-A, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 28 to 40 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI S. K. PATIL: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was proposed.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Only one sentence, Sir. I congratulate the hon. Minister for the accommodative spirit that he has shown. I hope he will continue this.

سید مظہر امام : میں آنریبل

مینسٹر کو بہت ہی مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ہم لوگوں کے جذبات کو کنسیدر کیا اور انہوں نے اس بل میں اس طرح سے امینڈمنٹ کیا - میرے خیال سے جس طرح سے امینڈمنٹ انہوں نے کیا ہے اس سے صرف یہاں کے مسلم ممبروں کو ہی نہیں بلکہ ہول مسلم کمیونٹی کو بہت سیٹسفیکشن ہوتا ہے - تو اس لئے میں ہول ہار ٹیڈل کی تمام لوگوں کی طرف سے ان کو کانگریجولیمٹ کرتا ہوں اور ان کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں -

†[سید مجاہد امام : میں آنریبل مینسٹر کو بہت ہی مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے ہم لوگوں کے جذبات کو کنسیدر

†[] Hindi Transliteration.

کیا اور انہوں نے اس بل میں اس طرح سے امینڈمنٹ کیا ۔ میرے خیال سے جس طرح سے امینڈمنٹ انہوں نے کیا ہے ان سے صرف یہاں کے مسلم ممبروں کو ہی نہیں بلکہ ہول مسلم کمیونٹی کو بہت سیٹسفیکشن ہوتا ہے ۔ تو اس لیے میں ہول ہارڈلی تمام لوگوں کی طرف سے ان کو کونگریچو لٹ کرتا ہوں اور ان کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں ۔]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE SITTING OF THE HOUSE ON SATURDAY, THE 5TH MARCH, 1960

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to announce that the House will sit on Saturday, March 5, 1960, for the transaction of official business, that is, further discussion on the General Budget.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 3rd March 1960.