

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
 in sending out notices to their clients and in making up their accounts, and in view of the fact that we are going to have adult education where the introduction of this system will be very useful and in view of the fact that the prices are going down, it is far better to adopt this new method. It is far better to give our people 100 pices instead of 64 pices because when prices come down, if you increase the number of pice in the rupee then naturally the man will get the same number of pice as before or even more and so he will not feel that prices are going down. There will be this psychological benefit to him. So I maintain that this is the right time to introduce this change. It should never be done when prices go up. When the situation is such that prices are going down then it is better to increase the number of pice in the rupee.

Therefore, Sir, I commend my Bill for the consideration of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Indian Coinage Act, 1906, be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived.

THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL, 1953

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (DR. P. S. DESHMUKH): Sir, before the hon. Member makes the motion, I want to make an appeal to her to postpone making this motion, for the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That cannot be done. The motion must be first made, before you can make an appeal.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to prevent the infliction of cruelty on animals and for that purpose to amend and codify the law relating to prevention of cruelty to animals be referred to a

Select Committee consisting of the following Members:—

Shri C. C. Biswas,
 Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai,
 Diwan Chaman Lall,
 Shrimati Lakshmi Menon,
 Syed Nausher Ali,
 Shri V. K. Dhage,
 Kakasaheb Kalelkar,
 Prof. N. R. Malkani,
 Shrimati Mona Hensman,
 Prof. G. Ranga,
 Shri H. N. Kunzru,
 Shri B. C. Ghose,
 Shri P. T. Leuva,
 Shri Amolakh Chand, and

The mover."

Sir, in bringing this Bill before the Council of States I wish to say that this Bill is in accordance with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act which exists today, but the present Bill brings it not only up-to-date, but includes many provisions which have not been included before, making it comprehensive and an expression of Indian ideals according to our own ideas of commonsense, justice and right. I believe that it is of tremendous importance to India owing to the growing sentiment of the people towards the abolition of many cruelties which they had once thought were necessary. It is necessary that we should be in advance of the ordinary ignorant ideas on this subject and that there should be legislation to prevent the many cruelties that are taking place. I know very well that legislation is in itself not sufficient, because there are many cruelties which take place today even against the law. Side by side with legislation there must be education, the education of the public, the education of youth and even the education of those who are educated, because most of us are ignorant of the many things that are taking place. There is among us a great amount of suffering, there are a great num-

ber of horrible things that are taking place in this country. The prevention of cruelty to animals is a fundamental issue for if we are really going to follow the ideas of *ahimsa* we should go to the root of the problem. It is not enough to say that we believe in *ahimsa*; we must try to put it into practice. Especially as we have accepted the emblem of Asoka, which is in essence compassion, kindness and justice to all, it is our duty to try to live up to it.

Besides, I believe that the only way to promote understanding and kindness to humanity is to develop the spirit of kindness to every living creature. So fundamentally, kindness to animals is really kindness to people. In fact, it is kindness itself.

From that point of view, I have brought in a comprehensive Bill with many clauses. There are, of course, many general cruelties which are now covered by the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act; but the Act is not complete and it would be shocking for people to know what are the general cruelties that take place, not only without our seeing them, but even before our very eyes; how in the streets today there are many cruelties that take place unnoticed, or noticed with indifference. It is very difficult to go into all the details of all the cruelties that are taking place.

We use the horse, we use the bullock, in fact there is hardly a single field in which we are not using animals, and there is hardly a single field in which we use animals where they are not ill-treated. Of course, we can say that the general cruelties are perpetrated by the ordinary man in the street and that we could stop those cruelties. Of course, we must stop those cruelties but we are not in a position to stop them because in this field we are not even able to observe them. It is only when we observe and *when we feel* that we can stop them. Because of this lack, even many of us take part

in those cruelties. We get into the tongas and all sorts of vehicles but we do not know how these animals are kept. We often argue with the drivers about the fare that we pay, but we do not know how much the owner has to feed the animal or take care of it. We do not know how the bulls and the cows are taken care of by milkmen. Although we take milk from them we use the cows and also the bulls for all sorts of purposes. In how many ways does humanity exploit the animal kingdom? It is rather surprising to me to see that though we lack imagination or creative spirit in many other things, we do not seem to lack imagination of the creative spirit when it comes to the invention of cruelty. That seems to be a unique contribution that even the most ordinary man is able to make. We get the milk from the cow, but do we know how we get the milk? For example, there is an ordinary cruelty called "phooka" that is perpetrated everywhere by which salt or chilli powder or any other irritant is put into the private parts of the cow in order to make it give the last drop of milk. The calves starve. Very often, even those of us who think about cruelty, think more about how much milk one can get rather than how much the calf gets, though it is the calf that is primarily entitled to the milk of the cow. Look at the way the animals are castrated. There is no way or principle or rule laid down. Look at the way they goad the horses. Look at the way they goad the cows, the bullocks and the other animals. Look at the cock fights that are taking place. Look at the way animals are under-fed. Of course, when we speak to the poor man he says, "We ourselves are under-fed. How can we feed the animals?". It is true that we cannot blame them because we ourselves must set the example and unless we set that example it is no use speaking to the poor man; it is no use asking him to sacrifice when we are not all of us going to sacrifice something for the sake of kindness. Do we believe in the

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.]

fundamental principle that we must not get benefit for ourselves at all costs? Are we going to get benefit at all costs? Do we believe that the animals are our slaves? Do we believe that their feelings do not matter? That is the question we have to answer for ourselves. This is really the crucial point because that is where the test of our character and our moral principle lies. India must set a great example to all countries in the world. We must set the example not because I think we are superior, but because we have spoken about *ahimsa* far more than any other country. The very word *ahimsa* comes from India; it belongs to us; we have that tradition. We have had examples, great examples in history of *ahimsa*, and kings like Asoka have practised these things. So, the more we talk about it, the greater is the responsibility to put it into practice and that is why I believe that such a Bill as this is absolutely necessary.

Under general cruelties I can give you not one, but hundreds and hundreds of examples. I am not going into all those details because it will take too long. One of the provisions of the Bill is about the captive animals. I have said that we should not have animals in captivity and though we may have zoos—although the educational value of zoos may be admitted to be very interesting—I have said in one of the clauses that if we have new zoos, it is absolutely necessary that they should be upto date, they should be according to the principles of kindness. You find so many places where these animals are kept, even private individuals keep them. I know some who keep the animals in small places where they cannot even turn in their cages; they do not feed them properly. They keep birds but they are not able to take care of the birds. Look at the number of birds and animals used for

our pleasure. Even though we may think that the animals do not matter, they are lesser than ourselves, that they feel less—all the same we do think of them when it comes to our own enjoyment or our own pleasure.

The present zoos are kept under horrible conditions. I know, as a matter of fact, that in zoos live animals like goats and sheep are fed to the tigers and lions. You may say, "how are lions and tigers to be fed?". I know of hundreds of zoos in Western countries where they do not feed live animals to the captive-ones. There is even more the unhealthy habit of advertising such a thing so that hundreds of people, especially young people, go to see them to watch these animals being eaten up by the tigers and lions. Now, leaving aside the cruelty of it, is it not also training young people in cruelty? Is it not also unnecessarily appealing to the public excitement for these things? Is it not the beginning of education in sadism? That is how I view it.

In all things we have to educate ourselves and I think even in kindness we have to educate ourselves. If young people are given the opportunity of seeing beautiful things and if they are not shown these horrors, I am sure, they will grow to be much more kind-hearted than they are today. In making provisions about the zoos, I have tried, as far as possible, to be practical and I have only said that if new zoos are to be created, they should be created according to these principles of kindness and fairness. I personally believe that every animal and every bird should be treated as if it is really a citizen of this country. Why should not our citizenship include also the animals? This may seem strange, but I know there are certain places, for example, in England, where they give the freedom of a city to the people and, in the same manner, they give it to the birds.

I have known some interesting cases of kindness in Western countries. Though there are many cases of cruelty, there is a general idea of kindness in ordinary life which we do not find here. I can give you an example which happened some years ago, thousands of birds were flying away to the South because winter was coming. The winter came too early. I happened to be in Vienna, and when these birds were all falling down frozen, I saw special aeroplanes were chartered in order to take these birds and fly them to the South. That was such a beautiful and such a wonderful thing that took place. It was a thing which I saw personally. How wonderful it would be if we had all those ideas of kindness in our daily life! These are the things that we can learn from the West.

And one other provision with regard to performing animals. Now perhaps people do not know how much cruelty takes place behind the scenes when it comes to performing animals. We all go to circuses and we enjoy them. I do not personally understand why human beings should enjoy to see animals do things that are unnatural and unusual. When a four-legged animal walks on two legs we are filled with pleasure just because it is doing something unnatural and unusual and we seem to think how clever that animal is which is walking only on two feet. I know for certain that there are cruelties and very rarely are animals trained without cruelty. Individually in homes I have known animals do all sorts of things entirely due to affection, but when they are trained with affection it takes a very much longer time. It is not for commercial use and also the number of animals that can be trained like that are very few and what the animals cannot do they are not forced to do. That is different from those who are having these animals perform feats on demand entirely for the sake of money that they can earn out of them and for the fun

of it. We do not know these things because we have not thought about it.

I can give you many examples and instances which I have noted down. I know how bears, which are kept in cramped places in which they are unable to move, are forced to climb ladders and so on, and how are they forced? They use nails, sticks and sometimes even electric rods. They use many cruel methods of training animals. You will very rarely find an animal performing such acts without fear.

Lions, for example, are made to jump through rings of fire. How are they made to jump? Can we say that a wild animal is not afraid of fire? Of all things, a wild animal is most afraid of fire, except perhaps of man, and it looks as if in the circuses the animal is certainly more afraid of man than fire because it is willing to jump through that ring. It is because of the rod that the man has and it is years and years of beating them, and years and years of frightening them, that makes these animals jump through.

Now dogs. They are made to walk on a trapeze. How are they trained? They are made to sit on their hind legs for hours together over a long period in a cruel manner. It is in that way they are trained and if an animal one day fails to do that trick the punishment that it gets is something appalling which I do not want to describe.

These are merely examples of how animals are made to perform feats and nearly all the animals are made to perform in this way in the circuses and so on.

Of course, when it comes to entertainments it is very sad how we in India can enjoy so many things. It was very sad to see the other day in the newspaper how in Jodhpur they caught hold of lions and wild boars and other creatures who were put together. Tickets were sold so that everybody could see these crea-

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale]
 does fight with each other. But it does happen very often that animals a more sensible than human beings and these animals, even after much goading, refused to fight with each other.

Leaving aside the cruelty for the moment, I believe that it is immoral and wrong education for our young people. This is one of the unhappiest ways training young people. We speak about morality for the young. But true morality is obviously compassion. True morality is obviously gentleness and kindness. If we want our young people to be trained in these ways they will certainly grow insensitive. They get used to seeing these things.

Then when it comes to transport, well, perhaps nobody knows the suffering that animals undergo when they are transported. We are not really looking after them as much as we should even though there is a law against this type of cruelty. The law has to be improved and I believe the law can be improved only by specific rules that can be made by the Government.

What a number of instances I can give! Here is an instance which has happened in India which has an eyewitness and he says "We were loading yesterday at Tuticorin about 1000 goats for Ceylon. These goats came in liters and were hauled on board under heavy weather conditions. The haulage took place in ordinary nets with about 15 goats per trip with their legs hanging through the nets packed upside down with the full weight of the animals on the lowest one. This net was simply dumped on the deck causing breaking of legs and other dreadful wounds. The goats with the broken legs were picked up by the legs and dragged along the deck to their pen. These goats are shipped at the rate of about 1500 per week in the same fashion."

This is only one example of what happens, but certainly you can see

many examples on the railways. You can see the animals have hardly any space. Many sights have been seen where cows and other animals which are being transported have hardly even sufficient water to drink. In England there is a law that if animals are transported beyond certain distances there must be proper facilities for food, for drinking water and so on. But we do not have specific rules and therefore these are some of the reforms which we have to make.

The next point is about sport. Now is there any doubt that one of the most unhappy things that we can do is the fact that we should be hunting for pleasure. Of course people say "Many wild animals are decreasing and therefore we should not hunt." But leaving aside that point of view, is it not a most horrible thing that animals should be hunted just for our pleasure? Is it not demoralizing for our own character that we should find pleasure in such things? Should not India set an example?

The next thing I would like to speak about is one of the most important and that is animal sacrifice in the name of religion. Now I know very well there are many points of view with regard to this, but I have now come to the conclusion, not only by my own feeling and thought, but actually by contact with the people and by working among them, that a large number of Indian people are ready for this reform. We often think that people do not want the reform. We must also remember that even those who sacrifice animals in the name of religion very often do so because they are afraid of their next door neighbours, not because they are themselves convinced of the necessity for it. We have in some places stopped animal sacrifices by appealing to the people's hearts, and I may assure everyone here that the ordinary poor man who does the animal sacrifice is much more sensitive to the ideas of kindness than we would imagine. If you appeal to his

heart he is able to see the wrong he is doing, and I know personally that many of our ordinary people have stopped animal sacrifices the moment the right ideas were put before them. Already in Madras, Karnataka and Travancore there are laws, although they are incomplete. Animal sacrifice is one of the most barbarous things that exists in India. Some people believe that in the name of religion we must sacrifice animals. I myself am religious, but I believe that religion must be universal, religion must be without distinctions or prejudices or cruelties. If there is no compassion, how can it ever be called religion, for there is no religion without compassion. There is no religious teacher who has found a religion without this essential quality of compassion. Without compassion is there a spiritual law? Without compassion is there a cultured man? I need not merely speak of my ideas as there are many great people who think along these lines. I know that Gandhiji himself had thought and what he had said, and what messages he had sent to those people who were sacrificing animals. And, if our Prime Minister would not mind I would quote a message which was sent by him to a place called Palamcottah. This is what he said:

"I am grieved to learn that it is proposed to offer animal sacrifice in temples. I think that such sacrifices are barbarous and they degrade the name of religion. I trust that the authorities of the temple will pay heed to the sentiments of cultured people in this matter and refrain from such sacrifices."

And very beautiful and very wonderful things of course were said by Gandhiji. I feel sure that we need not be afraid of this reform because people are beginning to be ready for it. What did Gandhiji say? He said

"I hold that the more helpless a creature, the more entitled it is to protection by man from the cruelty of man. It is my constant prayer

that there may be born on earth some great spirit, man or woman, fired with divine piety, who will deliver us from this heinous sin, save the lives of the innocent creatures, and purify the temple."

Perhaps people do not know what animal sacrifice is. They may think, "After all, it is only a killing of animals, and what is the harm in killing animals?" But in reality in the name of religion, there is a great amount of cruelty which is connected with animal sacrifice besides the cruelty of the killing. What are the cruelties? I can hardly read these to you, because you will be surprised to learn that in our country such extraordinary things are happening. I will read out a few. They are as follows:

"In Andhra near the temple of the village Goddess, a branch with a twig is fixed into the ground. A buffalo calf is brought and its head is brought under the twig and in that position a sword is used several times to cut off the head. As the neck of the calf is very fat and of hard skin, the act of cutting is repeated at least four or five times."

"In some taluks, under instruction of the village officers, a Pariah will cut open the stomach of a goat and remove the intestines to wear like a sacred thread as he goes around the village. They believe this will prevent disease among the animals in the village. The disembowelled goat is left to die in misery."

"Some Brahmins continue the animal sacrifice in the name of Vedic Yagna. The victim is a goat whenever these Yagnas are performed. Reciting Vedic hymns, these Brahmins close all the openings of the external organs (nine in number) and thus bring the victim to gradual ending of life. This is supposed to invoke Indra and to be granted the boon to enjoy all the pleasures and beauties of paradise."

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.]

"The womb of a pregnant sheep is torn open and the young ones are taken out to offer to the Goddesses in the Tinnevely district"

"Pigs are thrown from a high pedestal over sharp spears that are planted erect below so that the animals might be pierced through. Consequently the spears are filled one after the other with tortured, weeping animals."

"In Moharram festival when men go about assuming tiger forms, they take live sheep along with them. In the course of the display of tiger feats, they bite the back of the sheep and lifting them up throw them forcibly to a distance."

Even if it is supposed to be done in the name of religion, should we not change these customs in our country? Nobody can say that it is a necessity, or that people want it. Of course, when I bring these things to the notice of this House, I am not thinking of any particular religion. I am thinking of the principle itself. These are the Hindu ways of doing these things, and there are other ways. There are many ways and each one has a unique method. If people think that it is interfering with religion, I can answer that it is interference for the sake of morality, for it is surely bad for all of us to have such things in our midst. I know also that in the case of Muslims the very essence of the Quran is compassion. And therefore, for the sake of public morality, common-sense and because of the growing conscience in our country, we should refrain from doing these things. Long, long ago there were human sacrifices, but we gave them up. So now the time has come when animal sacrifices must also be given up, and I hope that each one of you will be full of feeling and understanding and realise the urgent need for these reforms.

Though there are various other things to be said, I now come to a

subject which is perhaps the most difficult of all to argue. But I have plenty of points, facts and cases. I have included, of course, a clause to the effect that vivisection should be abolished. There can surely be no doubt about this if we really intend to prevent cruelty to animals. Not only if we read about experiments, but also if we contact even the medical profession, we will discover that quite a significant number of medical people are definitely able to testify that vivisection involves cruelty. There are a considerable number of them who say that vivisection is unnecessary; there are a considerable number of them who say that there are many mistakes due to vivisection. And surely few, if any, of the major diseases have been cured by this process. I am not a doctor, but I have the opinions of eminent doctors, not only of doctors who are anti-vivisectionists, but also of doctors who are vivisectionists. They themselves have said that it is cruel. We are now sending a large number of animals to foreign countries and many of them, as we know, go to foreign countries for vivisection. This is true particularly of monkeys. Because we are not always able to kill them owing, as we say, to the religious sentiments of our people, we catch them and send them to the laboratories where they have a fate even worse than death.

I cannot say personally that there are no medicines discovered by this method. The most important issue in this is, of course, the moral issue. Assuming that there is benefit, do we want to gain it for ourselves at any price? Do we want to take part in things that are cruel? Are we going to argue that we have right to benefit from our own cruelty to other helpless creatures? If so, what about the argument of people who say that idiotic, useless or old human beings should also be used for important scientific research, for vivisection, in order to benefit all of us, that without the use of human beings we cannot discover certain things? There were many Nazi doctors who thought

that without human experiments there were certain remedies and techniques which could not be discovered. And so, the moral issue, the principle of any means to a good end, is the most vital issue of all.

If people knew the cruelties that really exist in the laboratories, I am sure that many people would shrink from taking certain types of medicines and from tolerating the practice of vivisection. These cruelties can be proved. I can prove it by the statements of the vivisectioners themselves. Also I have met a number of doctors who have personally themselves vivisected, and who have given it up. There is no doubt that these cruelties are going on and therefore I have said that there should be no exports of animals for vivisection and also that vivisection should be abolished in India.

I request every one to consider these reforms from a human point of view, from a mercy point of view, and to see and accept the principle behind the Bill. In detail, there may be some small variations, but it is the principle that matters because that is the fundamental thing which will affect, not only ourselves, but our country. I am of the belief that we who say we are working for peace, whatever we may say about the need for scientific development—though I believe in scientific development—if it does not grow side by side with mercy, it will only lead to greater misunderstanding and more exploitation of those who are weak, which always leads to war. Today, even if we do not have a shooting war, we do not understand each other, we have no sympathy for each other. There is war in our hearts because there is lack of compassion. It is this lack which makes the fundamental difference between the cultured man, the divine man, and the Asura. What is the difference between the Asura and the Deva? The Asura may be intelligent, brilliant, and capable and may possess any other virtue provided he is without that one quality of compassion which alone makes all the difference.

It is on this basis, with this idea and ideal, irrespective of any special opinions, or religious difference, or consideration for modern or ancient ideas, basing it merely on the ideals of kindness, that I have brought this Bill before this House. I hope that every single individual who sees principle behind it will be able to realise that by instituting these reforms India is going to set a unique example to the whole world. No other country in the world could so easily have laws which put mercy above the fruits of cruelty and have wide support from the people. How many letters have I not received from foreign countries there still remains something of the Indian spirit within us. Even if we do not practise it, we at least think that we should practise it. That is the only hope for this country in facing the tremendous problems of the day, that we can base our attitude and actions on this Indian spirit, putting kindness first above all.

Therefore, it is essential for the Government to accept this work as its work, because animal cannot speak. We say that every individual in India is entitled to justice and protection including a nomad, but an animal is not. Why should we not treat the animal as if he can speak? Is it his fault that he cannot speak? If he could speak, what would he want? Let us try to anticipate it, let us try to be sympathetic and, as far as possible to give to the animal happiness it deserves. After all, what does an animal ask for? It does not ask for money, or name; it asks only for our affection and nothing else. If you ill-treat a dog, but afterwards you pat him on the head with affection, he will wag his tail in gratitude. He will forget all your cruelties. Animals are grateful, more grateful than human beings. If someone ill-treats us we forget all but this one act, whereas animals forget the cruelties quickly but seldom the kindness. That is the difference between

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.]

the animals and most of us. Man's truest friend, they say, is the dog. How many lonely people have found friendship in the dog! If your family or your friends desert you, the dog stands by you. There are some qualities in animals which seem far more developed than in human beings. Let us appreciate these qualities, and let our hearts go towards our young friends in compassion and in kindness. They work for us, they die for us, cannot we even avoid being cruel to them? If we can accept this, we shall then be able to put on the top of the lions the "chakra" which is the true symbol of "dharma" for the highest *dharma* is compassion. In the Mahabharata every story and every great person shows that this is the real teaching of India.

Therefore I place this Bill before you and hope for sympathetic consideration and support. I hope for the protection that we and our Government must give to every single living creature on this earth, particularly in our country, acting as father and mother to all the creatures who cannot speak for themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to prevent the infliction of cruelty on animals and for that purpose to amend and modify the law relating to prevention of cruelty to animals be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members:

Shri C. C. Biswas
 Shri Rafi Ahmad Kidwai
 Dewan Chaman Lall
 Shrimati Lakshmi Menon
 Syed Nausher Ali
 Shri V. K. Dhage
 Kakasaheb Kalelkar
 Prof. N. R. Malkani
 Shrimati Mona Hensman
 Prof. G. Ranga
 Shri H. N. Kunzru
 Shri B. C. Ghose

Shri P. T. Leuva

Shri Amolakh Chand and

Shrimati Rukmini Arundale."

Now this motion is before the House. The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, I do not know what most of the Members of this House have felt after hearing the moving speech of the hon. Member who has put forward this motion. I presume that most of them must have listened to her with a very great deal of sympathy and agreed with many of the principles she has laid down. Indeed, how can any one of us disagree with the basic approach which she has put forward? Nevertheless, in reading through this Bill one sees so many things attempted to be done. I am trying to think—I am not for the moment going into the merits of this Bill—that if this Bill is passed as it is, or more or less as it is, it would be a totally ineffective measure. We have a Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, I think, passed in 1919. 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. Now I confess that while looking at this Bill as it is, and the subjects which come in its wide scope, about which the hon. mover spoke so movingly—whether it is sport or *shikar*, whether it is religion or custom, etc., that is affected or whether it is the investigation of science that is affected—it seems to me that the Bill is so comprehensive and so widespread in its scope that apart from agreement or disagreement, it can hardly be given effect to. When we speak of India, we find that it is a great country with enormous varieties and with all kinds of customs, good or bad, and if we imagine that we are going to reform the whole of this country from the northern and the north-eastern moun-

tain regions—the people who are living there—to the south-east and the west, and if we think that we are going to change them basically and fundamentally by some Act passed here, I think that we are imagining too much. In fact it is just a possibility that the customs that we seek to put an end to in this way might not only flourish but flourish aggressively, possibly in some parts of India, not all. Almost every argument that the hon. Member has advanced can be advanced against the killing of animals for food. It might well be described, I think, in a sense as an uncivilised thing. I suppose, many of the Members of this House indulge in this uncivilised practice, and quite a large number of the people of our country indulge in it. I am not saying whether it is good or bad, but by some law if we try to change that practice—a change in fact of our social fabric—I think we would not succeed, and the things that we seek to do might not be done. I am entirely one with the hon. Member when she says that any kind of killing in the name of religion is bad. It is difficult for me to connect the idea of a noble thing, of any noble principle, which is enshrined in religion, with killing. Nevertheless, I certainly would hesitate in imposing my will on others in that respect. I would try certainly to put a stop, an absolute stop, to the many barbarous and horrible things that she has related. But, if I may say so, by laying down some broad principles, however, everything is likely to fail. While we may have different views, I do not profess to express an opinion except to say that it is well over 36 years now since I used a gun against any living thing, and the last living thing that I attempted to shoot was a bear 37 years ago. Since then I have not done so because I have no desire to do so, and the very idea is somewhat repugnant to me. But for me to say that by a law I put a stop to all this business of what is called *shikar* in India seems to be a large order, and an order which we will not be able to enforce though we try. Of course there are basic considerations which may lead us into long avenues of thought. Nature is said to be red

in tooth and claw. In spite of what the hon. Member said about the nature of animals, I agree that by and large animals are not cruel in the sense that human beings are cruel. Animals kill normally for food, not for pleasure. But the fact is that it is a little difficult for me, not having adequate information on this subject, to say what would happen if every living thing in this world was allowed to live on.

I read somewhere that if all the fish were allowed to exist, in two days' time there would be no human beings left and that if all the termites were allowed to exist, our world would cease to exist within a very short time. I know that there is some exception in the case of insects in this, but one of our major difficulties in food production is the destruction of food crops by all kinds of animals. We unfortunately suffer from two disabilities. We, as a people, are given to the worship of animals, and it is a sure sign that, if you worship something, you gradually destroy it. With all our worship, in this country the animals are in a worse state as compared with other countries. Secondly, in our desire to protect, we are actually sometimes much more cruel than we might be. We try to avoid killing but we do not seem to mind cruelty and callousness of other kinds. That, of course, you have to change not by law but by other ways. I do not like vivisection and yet I do not know where to draw the line. There is no doubt about it that science has progressed by what might be called experiments in animals, though they need not be brutal experiments. There are many instances. There is the famous instance of the great biologist, Pavlov. I do not think he killed any animals but he experimented upon them and a whole science has grown up around it. It is difficult for me to say positively where the right lies, where the good lies, in such matters. I submit, therefore, to this House and to the hon. the Mover of this Bill, that there is such a great field for us to act and act firmly that we spoil our work if we make that field much vaster by including many aspects in it about which it is difficult for me, at any

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

rate,—it may not be for many Members of this House—to express any opinion without any doubt and about which, I have no doubt, many people in the country also will be doubtful. Therefore, let us seize hold of that field which we can and which really would make a tremendous difference to this country if we can stop cruelty to animals in that particular field. I do not mind this Bill or anything like it being considered, but my difficulty is that, according to the rules governing legislation, one accepts the principle of it and the main features of it at this stage; you pass the consideration of the Bill and then you send it to a Select Committee. Now, so far as the main feature of this Bill is concerned, i.e. prevention of cruelty to animals, I have no doubt that everybody in this House will accept it, but there are many other things in it which, as I said, create difficulties. I would have personally preferred this matter certainly considered and considered soon by a fully competent Committee—may be a Committee of the very names that are suggested here as a Select Committee and then a Bill—a more practical measure which can be given effect to—brought before this House rather than something which, with all the noble sentiments behind it, is not very practicable in application and otherwise. My colleague, the Minister for Agriculture, was telling me that he himself was going to propose some such thing. I have no objection to the further consideration of this Bill if the House so desires it. Government will not stand in the way, but we feel that the better way of doing this would be not to get tied up with this comprehensive measure in any way, but rather for the House and for the Committee to be so appointed, apart from this Bill, to consider this question—consider even what is contained in this Bill, without being bound down by constitutional procedures—and bring forward a measure as soon as possible which can be rapidly given effect to. Of course, it is as well for us—absolutely right for us—to consider this question of preventing any cruelty to animals

not only because of the animals themselves but much more so, as the hon. the Mover said, because of the human being involved in it; it is a debasing thing for the person who indulges in this cruelty. Perhaps the effect is worse in his case than in those who suffer that cruelty. I agree with it entirely. Nevertheless, it seems to me—if I can say so with all respect—that human beings also suffer cruelty, not only cruelty in some crude and barbarous fashion like this, but sometimes even worse cruelty, because it is a long-drawn out thing, whether it is from hunger or starvation or whether it is something else which people dislike. For example, I dislike men pulling the rickshaw, even though I do not say it is the worst occupation. There may be many occupations which may be worse than that, but even that does not appeal to me. Sometimes I feel that we are apt to forget the human being in thinking of the non-humans. Some of the extreme advocates of *Ahimsa*, I am told, even offer themselves to the insects as food, but they are very few no doubt. They also hire people so that they may offer some food to some of these various types of insects. That is, what I call, a complete perversion of the idea of *Ahimsa*. If we go back to the history of civilisation, 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. the Mover that one test of civilisation—a very major test—is the growth of this feeling and practice of compassion. All the great men have said so and said so rightly, if I may say that with all humility, but compassion has to be effective compassion and not merely some kind of, if I may say so, flabby feeling which really creates more misery instead of removing misery. Therefore, I would suggest to the House that the Government attitude is that we do not wish to come in the way of further consideration, but we do think that there are a number of clauses in this Bill with which we do not agree. I would suggest to the hon. the Mover and this House that the better method would be not to proceed with this Bill but to

have the subject of this Bill considered fully by a Committee to be appointed very soon.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): I would like to ask one question. Because this is a procedural matter, I should like to know the attitude of the Government first. If you like, we might have a discussion still and the Government will probably oppose the whole motion. If the Government's attitude is that a Committee should be appointed and if the Mover also agrees with it, the discussion may be cut short, because I presume that the Government will be opposing the Bill as it is; or is that not so?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We would prefer the hon. the Mover, with the consent of the House, not to proceed with this matter on the understanding that Government will very soon appoint a Committee to consider the various things contained in this Bill.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): This Committee does not include any doctor. There are very many eminent doctors here.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am not responsible for the names put forward. I just heard the names for the first time. I think that a much better way is to deal with it in that way, instead of continuing the arguments about the merits of this Bill and then for the House either to accept or reject it as the case may be, but the Government, as I said, will not stand in the way if the House wishes to proceed with the Bill. I do not wish, in such a matter as this, to compel any Member—I am sorry I used the word 'compel'—to indicate to any Member to vote in any direction other than in accordance with his own wishes in the matter. But I wish to make it perfectly clear that if the matter is ultimately referred to a Select Committee, so far as the Government is concerned, we are not bound to accept it. We have not agreed with certain important provisions in this Bill although of

course on the larger question of preventing cruelties we entirely agree. We want to find out how. But again I think it would be a better method to leave this to a separate Committee.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): When the Committee makes recommendations, will the Government frame a Bill accordingly in conformity with most of those recommendations?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am sorry. If a Committee makes some recommendations, I cannot obviously say that the Government will accept every recommendation that it makes. But the Government certainly are bound to frame a Bill to the best of their ability on that subject.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: May I ask the Prime Minister if he would appoint the Committee straight-away?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I think it could be done within a few days' time—just the time required to consult the people.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: He has indicated that perhaps the same people.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be a separate Committee appointed by Government.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I did. As an hon. Member pointed out, there is no doctor in it. We should have a fair percentage in it who represent well, expert opinion also as well as the other aspects. It need not be confined to Members from this House only. We can have Members from both the Houses.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): May I suggest that the Committee should be formed in consultation with the Mover?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Undoubtedly. I am sure the Mover is bound to be in the Committee.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: May I also ask if the Committee could be composed of people who are really deeply interested in this subject? On principle there should be people of some experience along that line.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It goes without saying

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): It should be left to the Government.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: I am not experienced in this. If I may ask the Prime Minister.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Let us say most Members in this House or many of them would be interested. In fact there will be far more people interested than we could put in any Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the intention of the Mover?

SHRIMATI RUKMINI ARUNDALE: With the assurance of the Prime Minister that he will do something about it as soon as possible, I naturally accept it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the hon Member leave of the House to withdraw the Bill?

(No hon. Member dissented.)

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF
BILL, 1953

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next Bill is that of Mr. Sundarayya. There is a technical objection that it requires the recommendation of the President.

SHRI P SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Sir, I applied for it. I should like the consideration of the Bill to be postponed till I get the permission.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. The consideration of the Bill is postponed. There is another Bill—The Indian Penal Code Amendment Bill. Mr. Rama Rao.

THE INDIAN PENAL CODE
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

SHRI RAMA RAO (Andhra). Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860, be taken into consideration”

Sir, my Bill is self-explanatory. It attempts to control a growing evil. There is need of an all-India legislation on this subject of crossword puzzles. Vested interests, very powerful too, are growing up and before they become too powerful to put down, it is necessary that they are attacked forthwith.

Section 294A of the Indian Penal Code deals with control of lotteries. Mine is an addition to that section in order to bring it up-to-date. There are no decided cases in India about the validity of crossword puzzles, which are a new phenomenon. In any case it is necessary that a law is passed to control them.

The main question is whether these crosswords or squareword puzzles as they are called, partake of the nature of gambling. I have no doubt they do. They involve besides, a lot of waste of time. People who want to solve them for money run after illusions and in the end they lose more than their gain. Most Members of this House would have at one time or another attempted their luck in this tricky field and failed. Here are two passages from a judgment of the King's Bench Division in an appeal which prove the gamble these puzzles are:

“The magistrate had thought fit to find that this competition involved and contemplated a degree of skill. But skill about what? The element of skill, if any, is, in my opinion, to