

Article 38, as amended, was added to the Constitution.

Mr. Vice-President : We now come to new article 38-A—amendment No. 1002 standing in the names of Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava and Seth Govind Das.

Article 38-A

Seth Govind Das : Sir, I have an amendment to the amendment of Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava which I will move after Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava has moved his amendment.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava (East Punjab : General): *[Mr. President, the words of the amendment No. 72 which I am moving in place of amendment No. 1002, are as follows:—

“That for amendment No. 1002 of the lists of amendments to 38-A the following be substituted:—

‘38-A. The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall in particular take steps for preserving and improving the breeds of cattle and prohibit the slaughter of cow and other useful cattle, specially milch and draught cattle and their young stock’.”

At the very outset I would like to submit that this amendment.....]

Shri S. Nagappa (Madras : General): Sir, on a point of order, my honourable Friend, who can speak freely in English, is deliberately talking in Urdu or Hindustani which a large number of South Indians cannot follow.

Mr. Vice-President : The honourable Member is perfectly entitled to speak in any language he likes but I would request him to speak in English though he is not bound to speak in English.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : I wanted to speak in Hindi which is my own language about the cow and I would request you not to order me to speak in English. As the subject is a very important one, I would like to express myself in the way in which I can express myself with greater ease and facility. I would therefore request you kindly to allow me to speak in Hindi.

*[Mr. Vice-President, with regard to this amendment I would like to submit before the House that in fact this amendment like the other amendment, about which Dr. Ambedkar has stated, is his manufacture. Substantially there is no difference between the two amendments. In a way this is an agreed amendment. While moving this amendment, I have no hesitation in stating that for people like me and those that do not agree with the point of view of Dr. Ambedkar and others, this entails, in a way, a sort of sacrifice. Seth Govind Das had sent one such amendment to be included in the Fundamental Rights and other members also had sent similar amendments. To my mind it would have been much better if this could have been incorporated in the Fundamental Rights, but some of my Assembly friends differed and it is the desire of Dr. Ambedkar that this matter, instead of being included in Fundamental Rights should be incorporated in the Directive Principles. As a matter of fact, it is the agreed opinion of the Assembly that this problem should be solved in such a manner that the objective is gained without using any sort of coercion. I have purposely adopted this course, as to my mind, the amendment fulfils our object and is midway between the Directive Principles and the Fundamental Rights.

I do not want that due to its inclusion in the Fundamental Rights, non-Hindus should complain that they have been forced to accept a certain thing against their will. So far as the practical question is concerned, in my opinion, there will be absolutely no difference if the spirit of the amendment is worked out faithfully, wheresoever this amendment is placed. With regard to Article 38 which the House has just passed, I would like to state that Article 38 is like a body without a soul. If you fail to pass Article 38-A which is the proposed

* [] Translation of Hindustani speech.

amendment, then Article 38 will be meaningless. How can you improve your health and food position, if you do not produce full quota of cereals and milk?

This amendment is divided into three parts. Firstly, the agriculture should be improved on scientific and modern lines. Secondly, the cattle breed should be improved; and thirdly, the cow and other cattle should be protected from slaughter. To grow more food and to improve agriculture and the cattle breed are all inter-dependent and are two sides of the same coin. Today, we have to hang our head in shame, when we find that we have to import cereals from outside. I think our country is importing 46 million tons of cereals from outside. If we calculate the average of the last twelve years, namely, from 1935 to 1947, then it would be found that this country has produced 45 million tons of cereals every year. Therefore, it is certain that we are not only self-sufficient but can also export cereals from our country. If we utilize water properly, construct dams, and have proper change in the courses of rivers, use machines and tractors, make use of cropping and manuring, then surely the production will increase considerably. Besides all these, the best way of increasing the production is to improve the health of human beings and breed of cattle, whose milk and manure and labour are most essential for growing food. Thus the whole agricultural and food problem of this country is nothing but the problem of the improvement of cow and her breed. And therefore I would like to explain to you by quoting some figures, how far cattle-wealth has progressed and what is the position today.

In 1940, there were 11,56,00,960 oxen in India and in 1945 only 11,19,00,000 were left. That is to say, during these five years, there was a decrease of 37 lacs in the number of oxen. Similarly the number of buffaloes in 1940, was 3,28,91,300 and in 1945, this figure was reduced to 3,25,44,400. According to these figures, during these five years, their number was reduced by four lacs. Thus during these five years there was decrease of 41 lacs in the sum total of both the above figures taken together.

Besides this, if we see the figures of the slaughtered cattle in India we find that in 1944, 60,91,828 oxen were slaughtered, while in 1945 sixty five lacs were slaughtered *i.e.*, four lakhs more. In the same year 7,27: 189 buffaloes were slaughtered. I do not want to take much of your time. If you wish to see latest figures then I have got them upto 1945. You can see them. I have got figures for Bombay and Madras. A look at these figures will show that there has been no decrease in their slaughter, rather it is on the increase. Therefore, I want to submit before you that the slaughter of cattle should be banned here. Ours is an agricultural country and the cow is '*Kam-Dhenu*' to us—fulfiller of all our wants. From both points of view, of agriculture and food, protection of the cow becomes necessary. Our ancient sages and Rishis, realising her importance, regarded her as very sacred. Here, Lord Krishna was born, who served cows so devotedly that to this day, in affection he is known as "Makhan Chor". I would not relate to you the story of Dalip, how that Raja staked his own life for his cow. But I would like to tell you that even during the Muslim rule, Babar, Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir and even in the reign of Aurangzeb, cow slaughter was not practised in India; not because Muslims regarded it to be bad but because, from the economic point of view, it was unprofitable.

Similarly in every country, in China, cow-slaughter is a crime. It is banned in Afghanistan as well. A year ago, a similar law was passed in Burma, before that, under a certain law cattle only above fourteen years of age could be slaughtered. But eventually, the Burma Government realised that this partial ban on slaughter was not effective. On the pretext of useless cattle many useful cattle are slaughtered. I have read in newspapers that the Pakistan Government has decided to stop the export of cattle from Western Pakistan, and they too have enforced a partial ban on slaughter of animals. In the present conditions in our country, cow-breeding is necessary, not for milk supply alone, but

[Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava]

also for the purposes of draught and transport. It is no wonder that people worship cow in this land. But I do not appeal to you in the name of religion; I ask you to consider it in the light of economic requirements of the country. In this connection I would like to tell you the opinion of the greatest leader of our country—the Father of the Nation — on the subject. You know the ideas of revered Mahatmaji on this topic. He never wanted to put any compulsion on Muslims or non-Hindus. He said, “I hold that the question of cow-slaughter is of great moment—in certain respects of even greater moment—than that of Swaraj. Cow-slaughter and man-slaughter are, in my opinion, two sides of the same coin.”

Leaving it aside, I want to draw your attention to the speech of our President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad. After this the Government of India, appointed a committee—an expert representative committee—to find out whether for the benefit of the country the number of cattle can be increased, and whether their slaughter can be stopped. The Committee has unanimously decided in its favour. Seth Govind Das was also a member of the Committee. The committee unanimously decided that cattle slaughter should be banned. Great minds were associated with the said committee. They examined the question from the economic view-point; they gave thought to the unproductive and unserviceable cattle also. After viewing the problem from all angles they came to the unanimous decision that slaughter of cattle should be stopped. That resolution relates not to cows alone. Slaughtering of buffaloes, which yield 50 per cent of our milk supply, and of the goats which yield 3 per cent of our milk supply, and also bring a profit of several crores, is as sinful as that of cows. In my district of Haryana, a goat yields 3 to 4 seers of milk. Perhaps a cow does not yield that much in other areas. Therefore I submit that we should consider it from an economic point of view. I also want to state that many of the cattle, which are generally regarded as useless, are not really so. Experts have made an estimate of that, and they came to the conclusion that the cattle which are regarded as useless are not really so, because we are in great need of manure. A cow, whether it be a milch-cow or not, is a moving manure factory and so, as far as cow is concerned, there can be no question of its being useless or useful. It can never be useless. In the case of cow there can be no dispute on the point.] (*Hearing the bell being rung.*) Am I to stop?

Mr. Vice President : Yes, I am asking you to stop.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : Could you give me two minutes more?

Mr. Vice-President : You have already had 25 minutes.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : *[As the Vice-President has ordered me to finish off, I shall not go into the details; otherwise I can prove by figures that the value of the refuse and urine of a cow is greater than the cost of her maintenance. In the end, I would wind up by saying that there might be people, who regard the question of banning cow-slaughter as unimportant, but I would like to remind them that the average age in our country is 23 years, and that many children die under one year of age! The real cause of all this is shortage of milk and deficiency in diet. Its remedy lies in improving the breed of the cow, and by stopping its slaughter. I attach very great importance to this amendment, so much so that if on one side of the scale you were to put this amendment and on the other all these 315 clauses of the draft, I would prefer the former. If this is accepted, the whole country would be, in a way, electrified. Therefore, I request you to accept this amendment unanimously with acclamation.]

* [] Translation of Hindustani speech.

Seth Govind Das : *[Mr. President, the amendment moved by Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava appears to be rather inadequate as a directive in its present form. I therefore move my amendment to his amendment. My amendment runs thus:

“That in amendment No. 1002 of the list of Amendments in article 38-A the words ‘and other useful cattle, specially milch cattle and of child bearing age, young stocks and draught cattle’ be deleted and the following be added at the end:

‘The word “cow” includes bulls, bullocks, young stock of genus cow’.”

The object of the amendment is, I hope, quite clear from its words. The amendment moved by Pandit Bhargava prohibits the slaughter of cow and other useful cattle but according to it unfit or useless cows may be slaughtered. But the object of my amendment is, as far as cows are concerned, to prohibit the slaughter of any cow, be it useful or useless and in my amendment word ‘cow’ includes bulls, bullocks and calves all that are born of cows. As Pandit Thakur Dass told you, I had submitted this earlier to be included in Fundamental Rights but I regret that it could not be so included. The reason given is that Fundamental Rights deal only with human beings and not animals. I had then stated that just as the practice of untouchability was going to be declared an offence so also we should declare the slaughter of cows to be an offence. But it was said that while untouchability directly affected human beings the slaughter of cows affected the life of animals only—and that as the Fundamental Rights were for human beings this provision could not be included therein. Well, I did not protest against that view and thought it proper to include this provision in the Directive Principles. It will not be improper, Sir, if I mention here, that it is not for the first time that I am raising the question of cow protection. I have been a member of the Central Legislature for the last twenty-five years and I have always raised this question in the Assembly and in the Council of State. The protection of cow is a question of long standing in this country. Great importance has been attached to this question from the time of Lord Krishna. I belong to a family which worships Lord Krishna as “*Ishtadev*”. I consider myself a religious minded person, and have no respect for those people of the present day society whose attitude towards religion and religious minded people is one of contempt. It is my firm belief that *Dharma* had never been uprooted from the world and nor can it be uprooted. There had been unbelievers like *Charvaka* in our country also but the creed of *Charvaka* could never flourish in this country. Now-a-days the Communist leaders of the West also and I may name among them Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin, declare religion “the opium of the People”. Russia recognised neither religion nor God but we have seen that in the last war the Russian people offered prayers to God in Churches to grant them victory. Thus it is plain from the history of ancient times as also from that of God-denying Russia that religion could not be uprooted.

Moreover, cow protection is not only a matter of religion with us; it is also a cultural and economic question. Culture is a gift of History. India is an ancient country; consequently no new culture can be imposed on it. Whosoever attempts to do so is bound to fail; he can never succeed. Ours is a culture that has gradually developed with our long history. Swaraj will have no meaning for our people in the absence of a culture. Great important cultural issues—for instance the question of the name of the country, question of National Language, question of National Script, question of the National Anthem and question of the prohibition of cow slaughter—are before this Assembly and unless the Constituent Assembly decides these questions according to the wishes of the people of the country, Swarajya will have no meaning to the common people of our country. I would like to submit, Sir, that a referendum be taken on these issues and the opinion of the people be ascertained. Again, cow protection is

* [] Translation of Hindustani speech.

[Seth Govind Das]

also a matter of great economic importance for us. Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava has shown to you by quoting statistics how the cattle wealth of the country is diminishing. This country is predominantly agricultural in character. I would give some figures here regarding the position of our cattle wealth. In 1935 there were one hundred nineteen million and four hundred ninety one thousand (11,94,91,000) heads of cattle. In 1940 their number came down to one hundred fifteen million and six hundred ten thousand, and in 1945 it further came down to one hundred eleven million and 9 hundred thousand. While on one side our population is increasing our cattle wealth is decreasing. Our Government is carrying on a Grow More Food Campaign. Millions of rupees are being spent on this campaign. This campaign cannot succeed so long as we do not preserve the cows. Pandit Thakur Dass has given us some figures to show the number of cows slaughtered in our country. I would like to quote here some figures from the Hide and Skin Report of the Government of India. Fifty two lakhs of cows and thirteen lakhs of buffaloes are slaughtered every year in this country. It shows in what amazing numbers cattle are slaughtered here. Thirty six crores acres of land are under cultivation here. These figures also include the land under cultivation in Pakistan. I have to give these figures because we have no figure of the land under cultivation in India since the secession of Pakistan from our country. We have six crores bullocks for the cultivation of the land. A scientific estimate would show that we need another one and a half crore of bullocks to keep this land under proper cultivation.

So far as the question of milk supply is concerned I would like to place before you figures of milk supply of other countries as compared to that of our country.

In New Zealand milk supply *per capita* is 56 ounces, in Denmark 40, in Finland 63, in Sweden 61, in Australia 45, in Canada 35, in Switzerland 49, in Netherland 35, in Norway 43, in U.S.A. 35, in Czechoslovakia 36, in Belgium 35, in Australia 30, in Germany 35, in France 30, in Poland 22, in Great Britain 39 and in India it is only 7 ounces. Just think what will be the state of health of the people of a country where they get only seven ounces of milk per head. There is a huge infantile mortality in this country. Children are dying like dogs and cats. How can they be saved without milk?

Thus even if we look at this problem from the economic point of view, we come to the conclusion that for the supply of milk and agriculture also, the protection of the cow is necessary.

I would like to place before the House one thing more. It has been proved by experience that whatever laws we may frame for the prevention of the slaughter of useful cattle, their object is not achieved. In every province there are such laws. There people slaughter cattle and pay some amount towards fines and sometimes escape even that. Thus our cattle wealth is declining day by day.

Sometime back there was a law like that in Burma but when they saw that cattle could not be saved under it, they banned cow slaughter altogether.

I would like to emphasise one point to my Muslim friends also. I would like to see my country culturally unified even though we may follow different religions. Just as a Hindu and a Sikh or a Hindu and a Jain can live in the same family, in the same way a Hindu and a Muslim can also live in the same family. The Muslims should come forward to make it clear that their religion does not compulsorily enjoin on them the slaughter of the cow. I have studied a little all the religions. I have read the life of Prophet Mohammad Sahib. The Prophet never took beef in his life. This is a historic fact.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava pointed out just now that from the time of Akbar to that of Aurangzeb, there was a ban on cow slaughter. I want to tell you what Babar, the first Moghul Emperor told Humayun. He said: "Refrain from cow slaughter to win the hearts of the people of Hindustan."

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava just now referred to the Committee constituted by the Government of India for this purpose. It recommended that cow slaughter should be totally banned. I admit that the Government will require money for the purpose. I want to assure you that there will be no lack of money for this purpose. If the allowance given to cattle-pounds and Goshalas is realised from the people by law, all the money needed would be realised. Even if the Government want to impose a new tax for this purpose every citizen of this country will be too glad to pay it. Therefore our Government should not raise before us the financial bogey so often raised by the British Government. I have travelled a little in this country and I am acquainted with the views of the people.]

Sir, I wish to say a few words in English to my South Indian friends.

Mr. Vice-President : I am afraid that if I give you that permission, other speakers will not have sufficient time to speak. You asked for ten minutes and I have given you fifteen minutes plus four. If you insist on more time I am prepared to give it but you could have addressed them in English.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena—Amendment No. 87 of List 4.

Shri R. V. Dhulekar (United Provinces: General): Sir, I have sent a little request for permission to speak.

Mr. Vice-President : If honourable members will kindly take their seats, I shall be able to say something. We have adopted a certain procedure. The amendments have to be move done after another.

Mr. Shibban Lal Saksena.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : Sir, I had given notice of an amendment in which I desired that cow slaughter should be banned completely. But after the agreement arrived at about Pt. Thakur Dass Bhargava's amendment, I waive my right to move my amendment.

An Honourable Member : But what is the amendment?

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : It is No. 87 in list IV, but I am not moving it.

Mr. Vice-President : In that case you cannot speak.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : But there is no other amendment. I may speak on the clause now.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (United Provinces: General): Sir, may we know where we stand? Is the Honourable Member moving his amendment or is he taking part in the general discussion of the clause?

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : I am speaking generally on the clause.

Mr. Vice-President : In that case, you must wait till Shri Ram Sahai moves his amendment also No. 88, list IV.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (United Provinces: General): On a point of order. Professor Saksena has copied out the whole of Pt. Thakur Dass' amendment and added only one or two words. In such cases only those new words should be taken as his amendment, and the whole of the amendment should not be owned by him.

Mr. Vice-President : But he has said he will be taking part in the general discussion only.

Now, Shri Ram Sahai.

Shri Ram Sahai (United State of Gwalior-Indore-Malwa: Madhya Bharat):
*[Mr. Vice-President. In regard to this matter I have already tabled an amendment seeking to add these words in article 9 of Part III "The State shall

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

[Shri Ram Sahai]

ban the slaughter of cows by law". But for the very reasons that led Mr. Bhargava not to move his amendment, I have also now decided not to move mine. Still there is another amendment in my name in Part IV of the Draft Constitution.

My only object in tabling this amendment was to secure complete prohibition of the slaughter of cows. But I find here that a section of the House does not like this. I also do not like, on my part, to make any proposal that may not receive the unanimous acceptance of the House nor a proposal which may lead to the curtailment of the freedom of the provinces in this matter. Under the Directive Principles of State Policy, Provinces will have the power to stop cow slaughter totally or partially. Though there is a ban in one form or another on the slaughter of cows, in almost all countries of the world, yet I would not emphasise that fact before you.

I hope Honourable Dr. Ambedkar will appreciate and accept the amendment moved by Mr. Bhargava because it is on the basis of the assurance to this effect given by him that the amendment has been moved as a compromise.

In view of that assurance I am not moving my amendment.]

Mr. Vice-President : There is another amendment which I had overlooked. It is No. 1005, standing in the name of Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhari.

Chaudhari Ranbir Singh (East Punjab: General): Sir, I do not propose to move that amendment. But I would like to speak on the general clause.

Mr. Vice-President : All right. Professor Saksena.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : Sir, there are two aspects to this question. One is the religious aspect and the other is the economic aspect. I shall first deal with the religious aspect. I am not one of those men who think that merely because a thing has a religious aspect, it should not be enacted as law. I personally feel that cow protection, if it has become a part of the religion of the Hindus, it is because of its economic and other aspects, I believe that the Hindu religion is based mostly on the principles which have been found useful to the people of this country in the course of centuries. Therefore, if thirty crores of our population feel that this thing should be incorporated in the laws of the country, I do not think that we as an Assembly representing 35 crores should leave it out merely because it has a religious aspect. I agree with Seth Govind Das that we should not think that because a thing has a religious significance, so it is bad. I say, religion itself sanctifies what is economically good. I wish to show how important cattle preservation is for us. Mahatma Gandhi in fact, has written in so many of his articles about his belief that cow protection was most essential for our country. From the scientific point of view, I wish to point out that Dr. Wright who is an expert on the subject in his report on our National Income says that out of 22 crores of national income per annum, about eleven crores are derived from the cattle wealth of India, representing the wealth of most of our people who live in the villages.

Sometimes it is supposed that we have too many cattle and that most of them are useless, and therefore, they must be slaughtered. This is a wrong impression. If you compare the figures, you will find that in India there are only 50 cattle per 100 of the population, whereas in Denmark it is 74, in U.S.A. 71, in Canada 80, in Cape Colony 120 and in New Zealand 150. So in New Zealand, there are about three times the number of cattle per head of population than we have here. So, to say that we have too many cattle is not right. As for useless cattle, scientists say that their excreta has value as manure and its cost is more than the expenditure on the upkeep of such cattle.

*[] Translation of Hindustani speech.

Then again, our agriculture depends mostly on cattle, as it is mostly of small holdings where the cultivators can not make use of tractors and other implements. They depend on bullocks, and if you compare the figure of bullocks, you will find that although we have got an area of $33\frac{1}{2}$ million acres of land to cultivate, we have only six crores of bullocks which works at about 16 bullocks per 100 acres of land which is quite insufficient. Therefore, even from the point of view of our agricultural economy, we need a very large number of bullocks. It has been estimated that to meet our requirements, we would require about eleven crores more bullocks.

Then, coming to our requirements of milk and other products, if we compare our milk consumption with that of other countries, we find that it is only 5 oz. per head, and that is very little, compared to the figures of other countries. Therefore I think that we must have this amendment incorporated in our Constitution.

The other important evils in our country are infant mortality and tuberculosis which have their origin in deficient milk diet. These evils can be remedied only if we preserve our cattle and improve their breed, which is the purposes of this amendment. I therefore think that this amendment should be accepted.

Then there is the use of Vanaspati ghee, which has become an economic necessity, because there is no pure ghee available anywhere. If we are able to give effect to this amendment we can improve the breed of cattle and then we will be able to do away with the use of Vanaspati, which is so injurious to the health of the nation.

Also from the point of view of the requirements of our climate this amendment is very necessary. I think the amendment is very well worded. It says that we shall try to “organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and in particular take steps to preserve, protect, and improve the useful breeds of cattle and ban the slaughter of cow and other useful cattle, especially milch cattle and of child-bearing age, young stocks and draught cattle”. I think the amendment of Seth Govind Das is included in it. I am sure, representatives of people elected on adult suffrage will surely incorporate in their State laws legislation which will give effect to this amendment and we shall then have in our land no cow slaughter. I therefore support this amendment wholeheartedly.

Dr. Raghu Vira (C.P. and Berar: General): Sir, I think it my most bounden duty in this House to express the feelings, feelings which no words can really convey, that not a single cow shall be slaughtered in this land.

गौर अहन्या भवति। न हिंसितव्या। न हिंसितव्या।
यः कश्चिद् गां हिनस्ति महापातकी भवति।

These sentiments which were expressed thousands of years ago still ring in the hearts of tens of millions of this land. My friends tell me that it is an economic question, that Muslim kings have supported the preservation of cows and banned the killing of the cows. That is all right. But when we attain freedom, freedom to express ourselves in every form and manner—our Preamble says ‘There shall be liberty of expression’—is that merely expression of thought or is that the expression of our whole being? This country evolved a civilization and in that civilization we gave prominent place to what we call *Ahimsa* or non-killing and non-injury, not merely of human beings but also of the animal kingdom. The entire universe was treated as one and the cow is the symbol of that oneness of life and are we not going to maintain it? *Brahma hatya* and *go-hatya*—the killing of the learned man, the scientist, the philosopher or the sage and the killing of a cow are on a par. If we do not allow the killing of

[Dr. Raghu Vira]

a scientist or a sage in this land it shall certainly be ordained by this House that no cow shall be killed. I know in my childhood we were not allowed to drink until the cow has had its drink and we were not allowed to eat till the cow has had its meal. The cow takes precedence over the children of the family, because she is the mother of the individual, she is the mother of the nation. Ladies and gentlemen in this House, I appeal to you to look back with serenity and to search your souls. We are representatives of millions of our people.....

Mr. Vice-President : The Honourable Member must address the Chair. This is not a public platform.

Dr. Raghu Vira : Through you, Sir, I wish to convey the feeling of this House and other people of this country that the cow shall be saved in the interests of the country and in the interests of our culture. And with these words, Sir, I take your leave.

Shri R. V. Dhulekar : Sir, I always believed from my childhood that India had a mission and because India had a mission therefore I wanted the independence of this country. Many millions of the people, who died for this country, also like me had believed that India had a mission, and what was that mission? The mission was that we should go about the world and carry the message of peace, love, freedom and *Abhaya* (freedom from fear) to every body in the world. When independence was achieved I was happy to believe that I shall carry out my mission, that I shall carry to the world this message, *viz.*, that India has got no grudge against any country in the world, it has no expansionist ideas but that it is going to save the whole world from the danger of internecine war, bloodshed and many other ills that humanity is suffering from. In the same way and for the same purpose I appeal to the House to discuss this subject from a dispassionate point of view. It is not the crumbs, the loaves and fishes that we are fighting for. Loaves and fishes were left behind by some people thirty years back and by some others fifty years back. We did not want to achieve this independence for loaves and fishes. Those who want them are welcome but men like us who have a mission or a message for the world cannot love loaves and fishes. We do not want ambassadorship, premier ships, ministerships or wealth. We want that India should declare today that the whole human world as well as the whole animal world is free today and will be protected. The cow is a representative of the animal kingdom, the *peepal* tree is the representative of the vegetable kingdom, the touchstone or the *shaligram* is the representative of the mineral world. We want to save and give peace and protection to all those four worlds and therefore it is that the Hindus of India have put these four things as representatives of this world—the human being, the cow, the *peepal* and the *shaligram*. All these were worshipped because we wanted to protect whole humanity. Our *Upanishad* says:

ईशावास्यमिदम् सर्वम् यात्किञ्चित् जगत्यां जगत।
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथाः मागृधः कस्य स्वित् धनम्॥

We do not want this property, we do not want this food; we do not want this raiment—not because we cannot take it; not because we are cowards; not because we cannot carry Imperialism to the four corners of the world; but we may not have it because we see the whole world identical with our own soul. So our humanity which resides in this *Bharatvarsha* for several thousand years has marched forward and has taken the cow within the fold of human society. Some people here talked to me and said “You say that you want to protect the cow and want it to be included in the Fundamental Rights. Is the protection of the cow a fundamental right of a human being? Or is it the fundamental right of the cow?” I replied to them and tell them suppose it is a question of saving your mother or protecting your mother. Whose fundamental right is

it? Is it the fundamental right of the mother? No. It is my fundamental right to protect my mother, to protect my wife, my children and my country. In the Fundamental Rights you have said that you will give justice, equity and all these things. Why? Because you say "it is your fundamental right to have justice". What does that justice mean? It means that we shall be protected, our families shall be protected. And our Hindu society, or our Indian society, has included the cow in our fold. It is just like our mother. In fact it is more than our mother. I can declare from this platform that there are thousands of persons who will not run at a man to kill that man for their mother or wife or children, but they will run at a man if that man does not want to protect the cow or wants to kill her.

With these few words, I wish to say that these two amendments which have been put forward by Mr. Bhargava and Seth Govind Das should be dealt with dispassionately. I shall appeal to you that only that amendment should be passed which is very clear. If Mr. Bhargava's amendment is doubtful, then certainly Seth Govind Das's amendment should be passed.

Mr. Vice-President : Following my usual practice I must give an opportunity to people who hold different views from the majority view and I am therefore calling upon Mr. Lari to speak.

Mr. Z. H. Lari (United Provinces : Muslim): Mr. Vice-President, I appreciate the sentiments of those who want protection of the cow—may be on religious grounds or may be in the interests of agriculture in this country. I have come here not to oppose or support any of the amendments but to request the House to make the position quite clear and not to leave the matter in any ambiguity or doubt. The House, at the same time, must appreciate that Mussalmans of India have been, and are, under the impression that they can, without violence to the principles which govern the State, sacrifice cows and other animals on the occasion of *Bakrid*. It is for the majority to decide one way or the other. We are not here to obstruct the attitude that the majority community is going to adopt. But let there not linger an idea in the mind of the Muslim public that they can do one thing, though in fact they are not expected to do that. The result has been, as I know in my own Province on the occasion of the last *Bakrid*, so many orders under Section 144 in various places, districts and cities. The consequence has been the arrests of many, molestation of even more, and imprisonment of some. Therefore, if the House is of the opinion that slaughter of cows should be prohibited, let it be prohibited in clear, definite and unambiguous words. I do not want that there should be a show that you could have this thing although the intention may be otherwise. My own submission to this House is that it is better to come forward and incorporate a clause in Fundamental Rights that cow slaughter is henceforth prohibited, rather than it being left vague in the Directive Principles, leaving it open to Provincial Governments to adopt it one way or the other, and even without adopting definite legislation to resort to emergency powers under the Criminal Procedure. In the interests of good-will in the country and of cordial relations between the different communities I submit that this is the proper occasion when the majority should express itself clearly and definitely.

I for one can say that this is a matter on which we will not stand in the way of the majority if the majority wants to proceed in a certain way, whatever may be our inclinations. We feel—we know that our religion does not necessarily say that you must sacrifice cow; it permits it. The question is whether, considering the sentiments that you have, considering the regard which the majority have for certain classes of animals, do they or do they not permit the minority—not a right—but a privilege or a permission which it at present has? I cannot put it higher. I won't class it as interference with my religion. But I do not want that my liberty should be taken away, and especially the peaceful celebration of any festival should be marred by the promulgation of

[Mr. Z. H. Lari]

orders under Section 144. I have come only to plead that. Therefore, let the leaders of the majority community here and now make it clear and not leave it to the back-benchers to come forward and deliver sermons one way or the other. Let those who guide the destinies of the country, make or mar them, say definitely "this is our view", and we will submit to it. We are not going to violate it. This is the only thing I have come to say. I hope you will not misunderstand me when I say this. It is not due to anger, malice or resentment but it is out of regard for cordial relations between the communities, and what is more, due to the necessity of having a clear mind that I say this. Henceforward the Muslim minority must know where they stand so that they may act accordingly, and there be no occasion for any misunderstanding between the majority and the Muslims on this point.

In view of what I have said, I would not oppose nor support any of the amendments, but I would invite a very clear and definite rule instead of the vague phraseology of the clauses which have been put forward. It proceeds to say that we should have modern and scientific agriculture. Modern and scientific agriculture will mean mechanisation and so many other things. The preceding portion of the clause speaking about modern and scientific agriculture and the subsequent portion banning slaughter of cattle do not fit in with each other. I appreciate the sentiments of another member who said "this is our sentiment, and it is out of that sentiment that we want this article". Let that article be there, but for God's sake, postpone the discussion of the article and bring it in clear, definite and unambiguous terms so that we may know where we stand and thereafter there should be no occasion for any misunderstanding between the two communities on this issue which does not affect religion but affects practices which obtain in the country.

Syed Muhammad Saiadulla (Assam : Muslim): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, the subject of debate before the House now has two fronts, the religious front and the economic front. Some who want to have a section in our Constitution that cow killing should be stopped for all time probably base it on the religious front. I have every sympathy and appreciation for their feelings; for, I am student of comparative religions. I know that the vast majority of the Hindu nation revere the cow as their goddess and therefore they cannot brook the idea of seeing it slaughtered. I am a Muslim as everyone knows. In my religious book, the Holy Qoran, there is an injunction to the Muslims saying—

"La Ikraba fid Din", or

or, there ought to be no compulsion in the name of religion. I therefore do not like to use my veto when my Hindu brethren want to place this matter in our Constitution from the religious point of view. I do not also want to obstruct the framers of our Constitution, I mean the Constituent Assembly if they come out in the open and say directly: "This is part of our religion. The cow should be protected from slaughter and therefore we want its provision either in the Fundamental Rights or in the Directive Principles."

But, those who put it on the economic front, as the honourable Member who spoke before me said, do create a suspicion in the minds of many that the ingrained Hindu feeling against cow slaughter is being satisfied by the backdoor. If you put it on the economic front, I will place before you certain facts and figures which will show that the slaughter of cows is not as bad as it is sought to be made out from the economic point of view. I have very vast and varied experience of the province of Assam and therefore I will quote you figures from Assam only. In the year 1931, under the orders of the then Central Government a census of the cattle wealth of the province was undertaken. We found that in 1931, Assam had 70 lakhs of cattle as against a human population of 90 lakhs. It will stagger my friends from the other parts

of India when I place before them the fact that the average yield of an Assam cow is but a quarter seer of milk daily and that it is so puny in stature that its draught power is practically nil. Assam is dependent for her draught cattle on the province of Bihar. During the last war, when there was tremendous difficulty as regards transport, we could not get any cattle from Bihar, with the result that we were compelled to use our own small cattle for the purpose of ploughing. In order to conserve this cattle, the Government of Assam passed a law prohibiting the slaughter of cattle in milch or cattle which could be used for the purpose of draught. But, wonder of wonders, I personally found that droves of cattle were being taken to the military depots for being slaughtered not by Muslims, but by Hindus who had big "*sikhas*" on their heads. When I saw this during my tours I asked those persons why, in spite of their religion and in spite of Government orders, they were taking the cattle to be slaughtered. They said: "Sir, these are all unserviceable cattle. They are all dead-weight on our economy. We want to get ready cash in exchange for them".

My friend Seth Govind Das mentioned the case of cattle that were killed. I questioned him privately. The figures in the Hides and Skins Report are from the hides. I know there is a community amongst Hindus themselves who go by the name of 'Rishis' in our part of the country whose sole occupation in life is to take away the skin from dead cattle. They have got absolutely no objection even to flay the skin of slaughtered cattle. The figures given by Seth Govind Das include the numbers of both the dead and slaughtered cattle. Similarly the figures given by Pandit Bhargava are not the figures of cattle slaughtered during normal times. They were, as Honourable Members know, war years and, on account of the fact that the Japanese had invaded India through Assam, Assam alone had to accommodate about 5 lakhs of fighting men and an equal number of camp followers. Cattle from all parts of India were then taken to Assam to feed these ten lakhs of people from America and elsewhere, whites as well as blacks. Even the Chinese soldiers were there in Assam, not to speak of soldiers from every part of India. Therefore, those were abnormal years and you can not base your arguments on the figures of the years 1945 and 1946.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava: But, during those years, there was a ban on the slaughter of cattle imposed by the Government of India. They had issued orders banning the slaughter of cattle. It is in spite of that that the figures of slaughter have been so high.

Syed Muhammad Saiadulla: I do not want to be side-tracked. The point is that there are cattle and cattle. We were trying to get cattle from West Punjab just before Partition. The cattle there on an average give half a maund of milk. The Assam Government have been trying to improve the milk yield of their cattle by introducing cattle from England, Australia and the Punjab. We have yet touched only the fringe of the problem with our Government cattle farms and we have succeeded only in Shillong. The milk yield there has increased but in the plains the milk yield is only quarter seer daily.

The motion of Pandit Bhargava is that, in order to improve the economic condition of the people, we should try scientific measures. That presupposes that the useless cattle should be done away with and better breeds introduced.

Now, I ask you what is to be done with these seventy lakhs of cattle that we have got in Assam? Therefore, Sir, if you place it on the economic front, you are met with this proposition that we have got such a big number of uneconomic cattle that must be done away with before you can supplant them with a better breed. Another point is.....

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : Does not the honourable Member know that many useless cattle have been turned into good cattle by goshalas and other organisations and at least 90 per cent can be salvaged by proper feeding and treatment.

Syed Muhammad Saiadulla : Sir, I do not know of goshalas in other parts and I do not want to reply to Pandit Bhargava as I have only ten minutes to speak. I was telling the House that there is a lurking suspicion in the minds of many that it is the Muslim people who are responsible for this slaughter of cows. That is absolutely wrong.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : Quite wrong.

Syed Muhammad Saiadulla : I am glad that the Mover of this amendment says that it is quite wrong. There are lakhs of Muslims who do not eat cow's flesh. I am not speaking in any sense of braggadocio when I say that I myself do not take it. Before the partition the Muslims were only one-fourth of the total population. They did not raise sufficient cattle to kill. It is the majority people who sold their cattle to the Muslims to be killed. Now the Muslims form only one-tenth of the population of the Dominion of India. Do you think that the Mussalmans can raise sufficient cattle to slaughter them? Muslims are poorer than our Hindu brethren. The Muslims are as much agriculturists as the Hindus and the cattle in their farms form their capital asset, the natural source of their power to till the land and produce the food which will maintain them for the entire year. Therefore it is wrong to say that the Muslims kill the cows either to offend my Hindu friends or for any other purpose. Fortunately or unfortunately the Muslims are a meat-eating people. The price of mutton is so high that many poor people cannot buy it. Therefore on rare occasions they have to use the flesh of the cow. From my own knowledge, it is only the barren cows that go to the butcher. Speaking for Assam, it is the hill people who are the worst culprits in this respect. In the town of Shillong, there is only one Muslim butcher against seventy from the hill people, who deal in beef. Sir, in these circumstances, in the name of the economic front, I cannot lend my support to the motion moved by Pandit Bhargava. I am sorry that for the reasons given already, I am compelled to oppose the amendment of Seth Govind Das.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : I accept the amendment of Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava.

Mr. Vice-President : I shall now put the amendments one by one to the vote. The amendment of Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava. That is No. 72 in List II.

Seth Govind Das : What about my amendment which has been moved as an amendment to Pandit Bhargava's amendment? That should be put to the vote first.

Mr. Vice-President : You moved your amendment as an amendment to No. 1002 which was not moved.

Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava : I substituted No. 72 for No. 1002.

Seth Govind Das : My amendment is an amendment to the amendment which Pandit Bhargava just moved.

Mr. Vice-President : All right. I am willing to put your amendment to the vote. Now, the amendment of Seth Govind Das, *i.e.*, 73 in List No. II, is now put to the vote.

The question is:

"That in amendment No. 1002 of the List of Amendments, in article 38-A, the words 'and other useful cattle, specially milch cattle and of child bearing age, young stocks and draught cattle' be deleted and the following be added at the end:—

The word 'Cow' includes bulls, bullocks, young stock of genus cow.' "

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Vice-President : Now amendment No. 72 in List II by Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava is put to the vote.

The question is:

“That in amendment No. 1002 of the List of Amendments, for article 38-A, the following be substituted:—

‘38-A. The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry in modern and scientific lines and shall in particular take steps for preserving and improving the breeds of cattle and prohibit the slaughter of cow and other useful cattle specially milch and draught cattle and their young stocks.’ ”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Vice-President : Article 38-A will consist of the amendment of Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava. The question before the House is:

“That article 38-A in the form just mentioned form part of the Constitution.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 38-A, as amended, was added to the Constitution.

Article 39

Mr. Vice-President : Shall we now go on to the next item in the agenda? No. 1003 has been covered by one of the previous amendments. No. 1004 has also been disposed of. Then No. 1005. The first part of it cannot be moved, but the second part can be moved. (Not moved.)

Then the motion before the House is that article 39 forms part of the Constitution. There are several amendments to this.

(Nos. 1006, 1007 and 1008 were not moved.) No. 1009 by Dr. Ambedkar and his colleagues.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : Sir, I move:

“That in article 39, after the words ‘from spoliation’ the word ‘disfigurement’ be inserted,

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : Mr. Vice-President, Sir, I beg to move:

“That in article 39, after the words ‘from spoliation’ the word ‘disfigurement’ be inserted, and all the words after the words ‘may be’ to the end of the article be deleted.”

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : Why do you want to make a speech when I am going to accept it?

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena : I am glad that Dr. Ambedkar is going to accept it. Because this article is to be a directive principle, it should not mention about laws of Parliament and so we must omit the words “to preserve and maintain according to law made by Parliament all such monuments or places or objects.”

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : Sir, I accept the amendment.

Mr. Vice-President : There is another amendment in the name of Shri Ram Sahai, which is identical in words. I shall put this to vote.

Shri Ram Sahai : *[Mr. Vice-President, Sir, there are two amendments in my name, and one of them is covered by the amendment just moved by Mr. Shibban Lal Saksena. As Mr. Saksena’s amendment has been accepted by Dr. Ambedkar, I need not move mine. Now I move my other amendment that seeks to replace the words “It shall be the obligation of the State” in Article 39 by the words “The State shall”. My object in moving the amendment is that the words “The State shall” should be in Article 39 just as they have been put in the preceding article and the words “It shall be the obligation of the State” should not be put in here. I have moved this amendment to bring all these Articles into conformity. I hope Dr. Ambedkar will accept it and so will the House.]

Mr. Vice President : I am now putting the amendments one by one.

The question is:

“That in article 39, after the words ‘from spoliation’ the word ‘disfigurement’ be inserted.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Vice-President : There is the amendment of Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena.

* [] Translation of Hindustani speech.