

22nd January 1930

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume I, 1930

(20th January to 24th February, 1930)

SIXTH SESSION

OF THE

THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1930

~~Chamber Registered~~ 18-X-73



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1930

Legislative Assembly.

President :

THE HONOURABLE MR V. J. PATEL.

Deputy President :

MAULVI MUHAMMAD YAKUB, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

PANDIT MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA, M.L.A.

MR. M. A. JINNAH, M.L.A.

SIR DARCY LINDSAY, KT., C.B.E., M.L.A.

SIR ZULFIQAR ALI KHAN, KT., C.S.I., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MR. S. C. GUPTA, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI SAHIB D. DUTT.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN SURAJ SINGH BAHADUR, I.O.M.

CONTENTS.

PAGES:

VOLUME I—20th January to 24th February 1930.

Monday, 20th January, 1930—

Statement by Mr. President <i>re</i> Protection of the Assembly Chamber and its precincts	1-3
Members Sworn	3-4
Questions and Answers	4-44
Unstarred Questions and Answers	44-81
Resolution <i>re</i> Attempt to wreck the Viceroy's Train—Adopted	81-84
Governor General's assent to Bills	85
Statement laid on the Table	85-86
The Indian Sale of Goods Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	86
The Indian Contract (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	86
The Inland Steam-vessels (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	86
The Dangerous Drugs Bill—Appointment of Mr. E. F. Baum to the Select Committee	87
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation Amendment) Bill—Appointments to the Select Committee	87
The Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	88
Resolution <i>re</i> Fixing Minimum Wages—Adopted, as amended	88-92

Tuesday, 21st January, 1930—

Members Sworn	93
Questions and Answers	93-130
Statement by Mr. President of his position in relation to the boycott of the Legislatures	131-34
Statement laid on the Table	134-61
The Hindu Widows' Right of Inheritance Bill—Circulated...	162-68
The Imperial Bank of India (Amendment) Bill—Motion to consider negatived	168-93
The Arya Marriage Validation Bill—Discussion on the Motion to refer to Select Committee adjourned	193-97

Wednesday, 22nd January, 1930—

Resolution <i>re</i> Stipends of the Members of the Carnatic Family --Adopted	199-201
Resolution <i>re</i> Currency Offices—Withdrawn	201-02
Resolution <i>re</i> Slaughter of Milch Cows—Negatived	203-35

Thursday, 23rd January, 1930—

Member Sworn	237
Statement of Business	237
The Arya Marriage Validation Bill—Circulated	237-63

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Thursday, 23rd January, 1930—*contd.*

The Reservation of the Coastal Traffic of India Bill—Re-circulated	263
The Indian Steam-vessels (Amendment) Bill—Passed	263-66
The Mussalman Wakf Validating (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	266
The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	266-68
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Motion to circulate, negatived	268-71
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill—Withdrawn	271-74
The Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	274
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	275
The Indian Religious Pictures Trade Marks (Prevention) Bill—Introduced	275

Saturday, 25th January, 1930—

Address by H. E. the Viceroy to the Members of the Legislative Assembly	277-82
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	--------

Monday, 27th January, 1930—

Member Sworn	283
The Indian Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Bill—Appointments to the Select Committee	283
The Indian Patents and Designs (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	283-88

Tuesday, 28th January, 1930—

Closing of the Galleries of the Legislative Assembly Chamber	289
Short Notice Question and Answer	289-90
Resolution <i>re</i> Recruitment for the Indian Medical Service—Adopted, as amended	290-312

Wednesday, 29th January, 1930—

Questions and Answers	313-38
Unstarred Questions and Answers	339-48
Statement of Business	348
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	348
The Indian Sale of Goods Bill—Passed	348-58
The Indian Contract (Amendment) Bill—Passed	358
The Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill—Passed	359

Tuesday, 4th February, 1930—

Questions and Answers	361-83
Unstarred Questions and Answers	383-94
Short Notice Questions and Answers	395-404
Resolution <i>re</i> Report of the Indian Road Development Committee—Adopted, as amended	405-91

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Wednesday, 5th February, 1930—	
Questions and Answers	423-36
Unstarred Questions and Answers	436-37
Statement laid on the Table—Reports on the Damage done by Floods in the North West Frontier Province and Baluchistan	437-44
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—(Amend- ment of section 552)—Motion to refer to Select Committee negatived	444-50
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—(Amend- ment of sections 205 and 540A)—Motion to refer to Select Committee negatived	459-69
The Indian Religious Pictures Trade Marks (Prevention) Bill —Circulated	469-73
Thursday, 6th February, 1930—	
Statement of Business	475
The Dangerous Drugs Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	475-76
The Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill—Passed	476
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed	476-79
Demands for Supplementary Grants, in respect of Railways...	479-83
Working Expenses—Administration	479-81
Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance and Operation	481-83
Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund	482-83
Strategic Lines—Working Expenses and Miscellaneous	483
Saturday, 8th February, 1930—	
Questions and Answers	485-90
Unstarred Questions and Answers	490-92
Resolution <i>re</i> Relations between Railways and Inland Steamer Services in Eastern Bengal—Withdrawn	492-96
Resolution <i>re</i> the Present System of Education in India— Adopted, as amended	499-543
Resolution <i>re</i> Medical Research—Debate adjourned	543-50
Tuesday, 11th February, 1930—	
Members Sworn	551
Questions and Answers	551-72
Short Notice Questions and Answers	572-75
Messages from His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor- General	575-76
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation Amendment) Bill— Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	576
Resolution <i>re</i> Medical Research—Withdrawn	576-89
Resolution <i>re</i> Enfranchisement of Indians in Ceylon—Adopted	590-618
Wednesday, 12th February, 1930—	
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	619
The Indian Merchandise Marks (Amendment) Bill—Presenta- tion of the Report of Select Committee	619

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES

Wednesday, 12th February, 1930—*contd.*

The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	619
The Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	619
The Indian Lac Cess Bill—Introduced	615-20
The Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	620
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	620
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Introduced	621
The Dangerous Drugs Bill—Passed	621-24
Amendment of Standing Orders—Motion to refer to Select Committee, adopted	624-25
Election of Members to the Select Committee on the Amendment of Standing Orders	625

Thursday, 13th February, 1930—

Motion for Adjournment—Strike on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway—Motion for leave being granted fallen through	627-31
Statement of Business	631-32
The Hindu Gains of Learning Bill—Referred to Select Committee	632-45
The Special Marriage (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the Motion to refer to Select Committee adjourned	645-75

Monday, 17th February, 1930—

Members Sworn	677
Questions and Answers	677-718
Short Notice Question and Answer	718-19
Unstarred Questions and Answers	719-22
Election of Members for the Select Committee on the Amendment of Standing Orders	722
Statement laid on the Table	722-27
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1930-31	727-37
Panel of Chairmen	737

Tuesday, 18th February, 1930—

The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	730-40
The Insolvency Law (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	740
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	741
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	741-44
The Indian Lac Cess (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	745-47
Election to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	747
Election of Members for the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	747
Election of a Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	748
Demands for Supplementary Grants	748-56

CONTENTS—*contd.*

Tuesday, 18th February, 1930—<i>contd.</i>	
Elections to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association, the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and the Central Advisory Council for Railways	756
Wednesday, 19th February, 1930—	
Election of Members to the Select Committee on the Amendment of Standing Orders	757
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	757-812
Thursday, 20th February, 1930—	
Questions and Answers	813-22
Orders by His Excellency the Governor-General	822-23
Allotment of Dates for the General Budget	822
Discussion of certain Heads of Expenditure by the Legislative Assembly	823
Message from His Excellency the Viceroy	823-26
Arrangements for Protection of the Assembly Chamber and neglected	859-59
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed, as amended	827-28
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation Amendment) Bill—Considered	829-43
Statement of Business	843-44
Arrangements for Protection of the Assembly Chamber and its Precincts	844-45
Friday, 21st February, 1930—	
Member Sworn	847
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—	847-93
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	847-93
Standardisation of Wages	847-48
Recent revised rates of East Indian Railway Wages ...	848-49
Abolition of the additional post of Labour Member on the Railway Board	849-84
Displacement of Anglo-Indians and domiciled Europeans on the various Railways	884
Re-examination of the Convention of the Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance	884-93
Saturday, 22nd February, 1930—	
Member Sworn	895
Questions and Answers	895-901
Unstarred Questions and Answers	902-12
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	912-66
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	912-66
Re-examination of the Convention of the Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance	912-44
Relations of Railways with their customers	944-48
Indianisation of the staff of Railways	948-49
Failure of the Railway Board to settle Labour Problems and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Labour troubles	949

CONTENTS—*concl'd.*

PAGES.

Saturday, 22nd February, 1930—*cont'd.***The Railway Budget—List of Demands—*cont'd.*****Demand No. 1—Railway Board—*cont'd.***

Non-development of Railway communications in Orissa... 950-51

Reorganisation of the Central Advisory Council for Railways and of Local Advisory Committees ... 951-55

Removal of penal clauses from the agreements by Company-managed Railways and their reintroduction ... 955-58

Policy of Government Recruitment to Accounts and Audit Department of Railways and how Provincial quota is neglected ... 958-59

Larger employment of Mussalmans ... 959-66

Monday, 24th February, 1930—

Appointment of Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru to the Library Committee ... 967

The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee ... 967

The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee ... 967

The Railway Budget—List of Demands—*cont'd.* ... 967-1020Demand No. 1—Railway Board—*cont'd.* ... 967-1020

Larger employment of Mussalmans ... 967-98

Desirability of State Railways running Steamer Services between Important Points in the Railway System ... 998-1002

The Dacca-Aricha Railway Project ... 1002-20

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 22nd January, 1930.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE STIPENDS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CARNATIC FAMILY.

Mr. President: The House will now resume further consideration of the following Resolution moved by Mr. K. Ahmed on the 24th September, 1929:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the stipends of the members of the Carnatic Family which were discontinued on account of their participation in the Khilafat movement be restored to them with retrospective effect."

Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Sahab Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): Sir, as has been pointed out by you, this Resolution was moved in the Simla Session by our friend, Mr. K. Ahmed, whom we miss here to-day. Sir, certain members of the Carnatic family took part in the Khilafat movement, because they were fully convinced of the fact that it was a constitutional movement and was sanctioned by the divines of the Muslim community; in that connection they were obliged to take to non-violent non-co-operation, as that also was sanctioned by the Jamiat-ul-ulema. After all, it cannot be gainsaid that neither the Khilafat agitation nor the non-violent non-co-operation movement was unconstitutional. It has been recognised even by the Government of India that these two movements were constitutional. As I said, a few members of the Carnatic family took part in those movements for which their stipends have been withheld. As regards those stipends I have to bring this matter to the notice of the House: that under certain treaties which were entered into between the Government and the then Nabobs of the Carnatic, even one-fifth of the revenue of the whole of Madras, including the Tamil Nad, a portion of Kerala and Andhra, was set apart towards the upkeep of the Carnatic family. Latterly it was reduced and reduced horribly. Now the members of that family get hopelessly poor and inadequate stipends. Even those stipends have been discontinued simply because a few members took part in these movements which, as I have already pointed out, were quite constitutional, and no religiously-minded Mussalman could but have taken part in those movements. Hence it was that a Resolution of this nature was moved in the Madras Council, where it was viewed sympathetically; but somehow or other nothing has come out of it. That is why this question has risen here, so that the Government of India may view the question sympathetically and see their way to ask the Government of Madras to restore those stipends, in view of the fact that those members of the family, as Mussalmans, could not have refrained from taking part in the movements which had been sanctioned not only politically but also religiously. In these circumstances I would request the Government of India to accept this Resolution and to restore the stipends which have been withheld with retrospective effect. So, I support this Resolution and expect that the House, including the Government Benches, will accord its whole-hearted support to it.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish also to say a few words in support of the Resolution which was moved in September last. As we know, the Nabobs of the Carnatic belonged to a very old and distinguished family, and it was that family which immensely helped the British Government when they at first settled in India. Their state was subsequently resumed and they were offered certain stipends. They were enjoying those stipends for a long time and there was nothing against the loyalty of the descendants of that ancient family. During the days of the Khilafat movement, when the whole Islamic world was in a state of turmoil and tumult, it is not surprising that some members of that family were also moved and probably they did certain acts which were not looked upon with favour by the British Government. All those things are now gone and forgotten. Even Germany, who was the greatest enemy of the Government during the great war, is now a friend of the British Government. Turkey itself is now not on unfriendly terms with the British Government, and all traces of that bloody war are now being forgotten. So it is quite in the fitness of things that the stipends of these descendants of an ancient Muslim family, of which they were deprived during those days, should also be restored. Since the announcement of His Excellency the Viceroy, the days of distrust and bickering have passed, and must pass in India, and every one of us is anxious that a calm atmosphere should prevail throughout the whole country in order to have an amicable adjustment for the future constitution of this country. So it will also be in the fitness of things, when we want a calm atmosphere throughout the whole of India, that this poor family should also be restored their stipends and their grievances removed. With these few words I support the Resolution.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I wholeheartedly support this Resolution for, in my opinion, a fault committed by some members of the family cannot deprive them of their well-earned stipends. I have got nothing more to say except that I support the Resolution.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Resolution before the House. I do not like that political pensions of those who at one time owned mighty kingdoms and with whom the East India Company or the British Government came to a certain agreement at the time to give a certain pension, should be stopped and that they should be mere street beggars. The subject matter before the House is not a very difficult one for the Political Department to handle, and the sum of money involved is very trifling. So I do hope that my Honourable friend Mr. Howell, our new Foreign Secretary, whom I am glad to welcome once again in this House, will handle this matter sympathetically. I also hope that he will handle, not only this matter sympathetically, but that he will deal with similar questions in the same sympathetic spirit and will not be unusually hard on the descendants of the ex-Kings of India, whenever such similar questions crop up.

Mr. E. B. Howell (Foreign Secretary): Sir, I count it a piece of great good fortune that, on my return to the fold after an absence of three years, this should be the first occasion for me to take an active part in the proceedings of this House. It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to appear

before you in the guise of a dove with an olive branch in my mouth." I should like to say that, although perhaps I do not accept as historically correct every word that fell from the first speaker,—I do not wish to enter into these matters now,—I wish to say that I am authorised on behalf of Government to say that they are not disposed to be at all vindictive in this matter. They are ready to let bygones be bygones and to adopt a most sympathetic attitude towards the subject matter of this Resolution. I would also like to say on my own part, in view of the very kind remarks which my friend Mr. Das made just now, that I hope I will always do my best to follow the great example left to me by my distinguished predecessor Sir Denys Bray. His attitude is well known to Members of this House, and in so far as in me lies I will try my best to imitate his example.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the stipends of the members of the Carnatic Family, which were discontinued on account of their participation in the Khilafat movement, be restored to them with retrospective effect."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE CURRENCY OFFICES.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammedan):
Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to appoint a Committee of official and non-official Members to inquire into the grievances regarding the scales of pay, Provident Fund and other service conditions of the non-gazetted staff, both menial and clerical, of the Currency Offices in India and Burma, and to suggest ways and means for their redress."

Sir, before I proceed to dilate on this Resolution, I understand that the Finance Secretary has a suggestion to make in this connection, and it would be to the best interests of the non-gazetted staff of the Currency Offices in India and Burma that he may be allowed to make that statement. (*An Honourable Member:* "The Finance Member is going to make a statement.')

I am sorry, Sir, I mentioned that the Finance Secretary was going to make a suggestion. I understand that the Honourable the Finance Member himself is going to make a statement, and I would request you kindly to permit him to make a statement at this stage before I proceed further with the Resolution.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must move his Resolution.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I have already moved it. Under your orders I again move, Sir, the following Resolution:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to appoint a Committee of official and non-official Members to inquire into the grievances regarding the scales of pay, Provident Fund and other service conditions of the non-gazetted staff, both menial and clerical, of the Currency Offices in India and Burma, and to suggest ways and means for their redress."

After moving the Resolution, I beg to make a request to you, Sir, that the Honourable the Finance Member may be permitted to make his statement, because, after that, it will be unnecessary to proceed with this Resolution.

Mr. President: I do not quite follow what the Honourable Member says. Does he wish to make any speech on this Resolution or not?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I will make a speech if necessary, Sir, after I hear the statement.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will not be entitled to make any speech except by way of reply to the Resolution.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I accept the situation, Sir.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): Sir, I have to make not so much a statement as a suggestion, and with your permission I should like to make that suggestion if I can do so without in any way interfering with the course of the debate in case it should not lead to the withdrawal of the motion. My suggestion is based on these considerations, Sir. These matters of improvement of conditions of service are matters of very grave concern to me, and I have given this particular matter very long and careful thought and study, and it seems to me, Sir, that a debate on the floor of this House is not the best method of arriving at a full discussion of the issues. The issues are very complicated. They involve a comparison of the terms applicable to the Currency staff with the terms applicable to the other staffs, and I believe that we are likely to get at cross purposes if we debate such a matter on the floor of the House. I think that a small meeting where there could be give and take and an examination of the points in detail would be a better method of arriving at a common understanding. That is one point which I have to make, Sir.

The second point is that, taking into account certain remarks that fell from my Honourable friend Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya yesterday, I wish to make it clear that the Government have no desire to take advantage of their present majority in the House to prevent a full and fair discussion of matters of this kind.

At the same time, I must make it quite clear that I would, in debate, have to oppose the motion for the appointment of a Committee. I also wish to make it clear that I believe that full justice has been done by the Government to this particular staff. But I am open to listen to argument on the subject, and I also desire an opportunity to explain to those who have the interests of this staff at heart exactly what the position is and what considerations have influenced the Government. My suggestion, therefore, is that, if any Members who are interested in this question so desire it, I should meet two or three of them in the Finance Department, and we could then thoroughly discuss the whole question. I believe that I can convince them that the attitude of the Government is justified. On the other hand, as I have already said, I am quite willing to listen to their arguments, and if they can convince me that I am wrong, I shall be the first to acknowledge the fact. What we want to do in these cases is to arrive at justice, having due regard on the one hand to the fair claims of Government employees, and on the other not neglecting the urgent need for avoiding growth of expenditure and extravagance in the Government service. Sir, that is my suggestion.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member accept the suggestion of the Government Member?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I accept the suggestion of the Honourable the Finance Member and beg leave to withdraw the Resolution.

The Resolution was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

RESOLUTION RE SLAUGHTER OF MILCH COWS.

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh (Bihar and Orissa: Landholders):
Sir, I beg to move the Resolution that stands in my name and which reads thus:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take suitable and effective measures to prevent throughout British India the slaughter of all milch cows and prime calves except for strictly religious purposes."

At the very outset, Sir, I must say that, in commending my Resolution to the House, I take my stand solely on economic, as distinguished from religious or humanitarian grounds. I know religion is fast yielding place to secularism on the one hand and to communalism on the other, and in legislatures one has to steer clear of it if he wants to press his point home.

Sir, the question of cow protection is not a new one. Intrepid and indefatigable patriots and workers like the late Lala Sukhbir Sinha and my esteemed friend, Seth Govind Das, have spared no pains in the past to urge the point in the other House with all the warmth and earnestness they could command, but to no purpose. Seth Govind Dasjee moved his first Resolution on the subject in the Council of State as late as September 1927, but had to withdraw his Resolution in deference to the wishes of all sections of the House to avoid discussion on the question which was already engaging the serious consideration of the Unity Conference, which happened to be then sitting in Simla. Sethjee, true to his instincts, did not let the grass grow under his feet and came up with a more or less similar Resolution in February 1929, and with his characteristic zeal and wealth of detail, tried to convince the House and the Government of the indispensable necessity of some effective action in the matter, but the Resolution was unfortunately negatived.

Sir, if with the disappointing results before me of the noble efforts made by abler men in this direction I choose to bring up the matter once again, it is because I feel that it is so urgent and its immediate solution so indispensably necessary that it has to be dinned into the ears of the Government again and again until they feel called upon to stir and apply all their resources of statesmanship to it.

Sir, when one considers that about 88 per cent. of the Indian population depend solely on agriculture, when one considers that the chief implements of agriculture in this land are and must remain the bullocks, and that good bullocks can be had from good cows only, the necessity for some effective steps for preservation of the cow becomes quite obvious. Even the Agricultural Commission has had to admit that "good bullocks are very few in India". That the cow and its progeny are indispensable for the chief industry of the country, viz., agriculture, and their preservation and improvement matters of utmost necessity, is a proposition so obviously true that it indeed takes one's breath away to find the Government anything but fully alive to a sense of its duty in this behalf.

I know, in course of the debate on Seth Govind Das's Resolution in September, 1927, it was said by the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah, that Government had been fully alive to its sense of responsibility in the matter, and that it had been trying in various ways to tackle the matter of improving the breed of cattle. He said more efficient agencies had been established for gathering statistics and for popularising and encouraging the sale and use of pedigreed stock of cattle. I know

[Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh.]

that ever since Lord Reading said to a deputation on behalf of the Cow Protection League in March, 1922, that India suffered more from the multitude of her cattle than from its fewness, and so what was wanted was not increase in the number of cattle but an improvement in their quality, this has remained the attitude and policy of the Government towards the question. But, Sir, I must say, with due deference to the Government, that it is not only a soulless but a bad policy. The Agricultural Commission itself, on whose recommendations so much in regard to this matter was made to hang by the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah, has said that the improvement of cattle is a slow and difficult business. So, in view of the tardy ways of doing things that are generally adopted by the Government in matters like this, one would not be surprised if, by the time statistics are collected to satisfaction and full use of pedigreed stock is made, the cow species itself will have become virtually extinct from the country. On March 1929, in reply to a question from Seth Govind Dass in the Council of State as to the number of cows slaughtered in the country, the reply of Sir Muhammad Habibullah was that he possessed no statistics on the point. But it is not difficult to form a rough estimate from the reply given by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to another question by Sethjee. His Excellency said that in 1926, 8,510 tons and in 1927-28, 8,340 tons of beef were consumed by the Indian Army. 8,500 tons are equivalent to 2,38,000 maunds or thereabout. Taking each cow to be capable of supplying 30 seers of beef we come to the conclusion that 3,17,000 cows are slaughtered every year for beef supply to the Army alone. Sethjee was able to elicit some figures with regard to the quantity of dried beef exported from the country. The reply given on behalf of the Government was that in 1924-25, 2,222 hundredweights of dried beef were exported. Sethjee says in his presidential address at the All-India Cow Conference, held at Lahore in December last, that he has reasons to think the figures so supplied by the Government are wrong. He says that, according to the Collector of Customs of Burma, from Indian ports alone 4,28,598 hundredweights of dried beef reached Burma in one year. So, taking each cow to yield 8 to 10 seers of dried beef, it will be found that, for supply of dried beef to Burma alone, 23,40,144 cows were slaughtered. Add to this the number slaughtered in municipal butcheries and in notified areas. The All-India Cow Conference attempted to arrive at approximate figures and has found that 75 lakhs of cows and bullocks are slaughtered in the country annually. The total number of cows and bullocks in the country being 15 crores, one can imagine at what a horrifying rate the depletion of the stock is proceeding.

Over and above this, the cattle exported from the country are among the best of their kind, as no man in his senses would take away bad cattle. The number exported in 1924-25 was 10,195 and now it is 18,348. These figures are taken from the Report on the sea-borne trade in British India. It is also to be borne in mind that, of the cattle so exported every year, the bulk is formed by bulls. If fine bulls in such large numbers be exported from a land whose cattle wealth has so far deteriorated, one can understand what such a state of things means to it. If these bulls were to remain in the country, it can be imagined that good breeds could be raised from them. The Agricultural Commission, too, was forced to recommend that the export of cows and heifers is usually undesirable and

should be closely watched by Government. The result of this unconscionable depletion is that a pair of plough cattle is supposed to till 19 acres whereas the utmost it can efficiently till is 5 to 6 acres. Sir, in view of the state of things revealed by the figures quoted by me, is it any wonder if the average out-turn of crops per acre in India is found to be 11.5 bushels whereas it is 33 in Denmark, 14 in Spain, 18.5 in France, 29.8 in Great Britain, 18.7 in Italy, 23 in Norway, 30 in the Netherlands, 28 in Sweden, 32.5 in Switzerland, 17 in Canada, 14 in the United States, 32 in Japan and 29 in Egypt? I am sure His Excellency Lord Irwin, who has all along evinced such keen interest in the improvement of agriculture in the country, and whose sincerity of purpose and solicitude for the well-being of the peasantry even his worst critics do not and cannot deny, will be able to find some practical solution of the problem.

Sir, this is so far as the effect of this rapid decline in the cattle wealth of the country on agriculture is concerned. Let us turn to its effect on the health of the people. The rate of mortality per thousand in India is 36, whereas in other countries it ranges between 9.9 to 27.8. Infant mortality is simply appalling. It has been estimated that about 20 lakhs of babies die here mostly of preventible diseases owing solely to scarcity of milk. Colonel MacTaggart, Sanitary Officer of the United Provinces, says :

"By cheapening the price of milk so as to bring it within the reach of the poorer classes, more would be effected towards reducing the infantile mortality than the presence of any number of trained *dais* would accomplish."

The rate of infant mortality in India is the highest of all in the civilised world. And no wonder, for is it not a fact that good milk is not available even at the rate of three to four seers in the rupee in big cities? In 1857 milk sold at 4 maunds (160 seers), in 1890 at 64 seers and in 1918 at 4 seers in the rupee. Since then, though the prices of wheat, gram and rice have gone down, that of milk has remained stationary. Sir B. N. Sharma, Ex-Executive Councillor of His Excellency the Viceroy who happened to be in charge of the Agricultural Department, Doctor Harold H. Mann, Director of Agriculture, Bombay Presidency, Mr. Hamilton, Director of Agriculture, Punjab, Mr. R. C. Wood, Director of Agriculture, Madras, Mr. S. Miligan, Imperial Agriculturist, Pusa, Mr. C. M. Hutchison, Imperial Agricultural Veterinarian, Pusa and Mr. C. F. Pyne, I.C.S., Chairman, Calcutta Corporation, have all testified to the havoc played by the ruthless slaughter of cows with milk supply. I will not tire the patience of the House by quoting the opinion of each and every one of them *in extenso*.

The Agricultural Commission also has had to admit, "the necessity for efforts to secure for dry cows and cows-in-calf better treatment than they now receive". The treatment, Sir, that they receive now is that good cows are imported into towns from the country side, but as soon as they go dry, they are sold away to butchers.

Sir, it is to prevent this indiscriminate slaughter of milch cows and prime calves that I have ventured to bring up my humble Resolution. It will be seen that my purpose is a restricted one, confined as it is to the prevention of the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves., I am sure, Sir, if my proposal is accepted and given effect to, there will be a better supply of milk to the poorer classes, as also for infants, and the effect of that on the health of the population will be remarkably salutary. It will not do to say that only useless cattle are slaughtered for the Army.

[Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh.]

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief distinctly said, in reply to a question, that the age limit for cattle slaughtered for the Army was between three and nine years. Everybody knows that cows can and do continue to give milk up to the age of ten, and calves remain prime up to the age of six. So cows slaughtered for the Army are mostly useful animals. I appeal to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to be pleased to give the matter his most sympathetic consideration and impose such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves for Army purposes, and the resourceful Government will be able to find a few lakhs of rupees more for the purpose, if necessary. Sir, if you can find an additional Rs. 1½ crore a year to give effect to the Lee-Commission's recommendations, if you can find many crores to maintain the highest paid Civil Service in the world, you can easily find some lakhs a year more to cheapen the supply of good milk and so to reduce the dreadful rate of infant mortality.

Then, Sir, as regards administrative difficulties, I shall only say that, unless you have become bankrupt in statesmanship, you will see your way to find suitable and effective means to give effect to the Resolution. You have only to realise the utmost need for taking the step that is recommended to be taken and the way will be found. Where there is a will there is a way.

Sir, it is usual on such occasions to raise the bogey of raking up feelings between Hindus and Muslims. I have made an exception for religious purposes. I hope and trust my Muslim friends will duly appreciate it. It is significant, as has been shown by Doctor Syed Mahmud, Ph. D., that Muslim Emperors took special and decisive steps to prevent cow slaughter in the country. Babar's confidential will to his son Humayun is a well known document on this point. It is also well known that Akbar prohibited the slaughter of cows throughout his vast dominions on pain of death. Even now slaughter of cows is prohibited in many Muslim States. I am strongly persuaded, Sir, that these Muslim Emperors took the preventive measures that they are credited with by historians not simply out of regard for the Hindu religious sentiment but because they realised the great utility and economic value of the cow and her progeny. I feel sure that the Honourable Muslim Members as well as the rest of the House will not grudge me their valuable support in the matter. I once more appeal to them and to the Government in the name of the teeming millions of the poor and the infants, Muslims, Christians and Hindus alike, who are dying for want of cheap milk.

With these words, Sir, I commend the Resolution to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am very glad to support the Resolution so ably moved by Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh. In doing so I want to bring a few facts before the House. About 50 years back Denmark was a very poor country and the farmers of that country were living from hand to mouth, but to-day we find that that country exports milk and milk products to the whole world. And not only that, but at the same time it is a very prosperous country. It is all due to the fact that they took up the dairy industry in right earnest and within a short period they have been able not only to get milk for themselves but to supply it to the other countries also. In the same way, Sir, I feel that if the dairy industry in India had been organised, there-

was a possibility of getting milk at a very cheap rate in this country and of being able to export milk and other milk products outside, but unfortunately that has not been done. The present Resolution does not deal with the whole animal husbandry problem, but it only asks Government to stop the slaughter of milch cows. From my own little experience I can say that all the good breeds of cows in this country have become extinct. It is a statement which I make fully knowing the conditions of the country as they are. I hope, Sir, Government will admit that in the United Provinces the Kosi breed is extinct to-day. If you go to Montgomery, that Montgomery breed too is fast disappearing practically every day. The same is the case with the Sahiwal and the Sindhi breeds. The question is how it has happened. There are only two factors which have brought it about. The best breeds and the best cows in the country were purchased by the military farms. They were crossed with English bulls or other foreign blood, and the result was that the progeny, not being immune from diseases, they died, and in this way, after some years, the best cows became extinct.

Secondly, the best cows were taken and are being taken from all the parts of the country to Calcutta and Bombay where they are allowed to give milk for one lactation period, and after that period, they are slaughtered. It does not pay the *goalas* to keep these cows, and the railways do not offer special transport facilities and cheap rates to send these cows back to the mofussil. Only recently I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Railway Board explaining that position. This shows clearly how these different breeds are becoming extinct every day. It is no good saying that it is uneconomical to rear a cow in this country. It is not so, and it was never so. I know perfectly well that the cows of to-day are uneconomical, but the reason for that is not far to seek. There were very good economic cows in this country, which by degrees have become extinct now, and only the worst uneconomic cows are left. Government did not take care to improve these different breeds and allowed them to become extinct. For India, cows are a necessity not only for milking purposes but also for giving the best draught animal, and with that idea the people of this country tried to develop those breeds which gave very good milkers as well as very good draught animals. These are the two qualities which are developed in the breeding cows of this country. But the military farms concentrated their entire attention in producing the best milkers and hence they failed. It is only seldom that the breed has been improved by selection. Only last month I went to Pusa. I saw even there that the effort is made only to improve the milking qualities of the cow and not to develop a breed possessing both the qualities. Naturally it does not appeal to the cultivator to have a cow which will give more milk, but which will not produce a good draught animal. If milch cows are not allowed to be slaughtered, then the result would be that the *goalas* would not take to the practice by which the cows are made sterile by the *phuka* system after one lactation period. The Government have not taken any action so far in this direction. There is not sufficient milk produced in the country, but if we pass this Resolution and the Government agree to adopt it, the result will be that there will be more milk available in the country. In India milk is sold at a much higher rate than it is sold in other countries. I think I am right when I say that the price of milk per pound in London is much less than the price of milk per pound in Calcutta or Bombay. In an agricultural country where the people are mostly vegetarians, to get milk at such a prohibitive price means degeneration in health and physique.

[Mr. Mukhtar Singh.]

It is one of the main causes of high mortality in Bombay, Calcutta and other towns. I therefore submit that, if we agree to pass this Resolution, we shall be doing a really good service to the country. Though the prohibition of the slaughter of milch cows will not solve the problem, it will certainly help it to a very great extent. With these words, I second the motion.

Sir Frank Noyce (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, in rising to oppose this Resolution, I should like to make it clear at the outset that I do so on purely economic grounds. I am glad that those are the only considerations which have actuated my Honourable friends, the Mover and the seconder. The point on which I wish to lay stress is not that the Honourable Mover's Resolution is ill-timed or that it is impracticable, but that it is unnecessary. As regards its impracticability, I have been waiting throughout both his speech and that of the Honourable Mr. Mukhtar Singh to find what measures they would suggest that the Government should take to stop the slaughter of cows and calves. I have heard nothing on that subject. I shall proceed on the assumption that the Honourable Mover is desirous of protecting the agriculturist by providing him with an adequate supply of cattle both for draught and dairying, and that he is also anxious to safeguard the interests of the consumer of dairy produce by ensuring for him a supply of cheap milk. It is on that assumption that I shall now attempt to prove that his proposal to prohibit the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves is unnecessary for the reasons which I now propose to elaborate.

In the first place, there can, I think, be little or no doubt that the vast majority of the cattle in this country which are sent to the slaughter house do not fall within the category which the Honourable Member wishes to protect. I have taken pains to find out what the relative value of a cow is in milk and of that cow when it is sent to the slaughter house. A report received from Calcutta shows that on the 16th December last, the value of a first quality Nagava cow, as a milking cow, was Rs. 160, whereas its slaughter value was only Rs. 90. For a *deshi* milk cow the corresponding figures were Rs. 100 and Rs. 60 and for a Hatus cow—I must confess that I am not familiar with the names of these breeds—the corresponding values are Rs. 45 and Rs. 25. Similarly for Bombay, I have it on excellent authority that the slaughter value of a dry milch buffalo not pregnant varies from Rs. 100 to Rs. 120, whereas the value of a buffalo which is pregnant or with a newly born calf varies from Rs. 250 to Rs. 400. Similarly the value of the best type of cow varies from Rs. 75 to Rs. 150 when pregnant or newly calved, whereas the slaughter value varies between Rs. 40 and Rs. 60. It is, I venture to think, absolutely clear from these figures that milch cows are not in ordinary circumstances sent to the slaughter house. It is unnecessary for the Governor General in Council to take effective steps to prevent them being sent there because financial considerations act as a far more effective deterrent than any action on his part could do. Most of the animals sent to the slaughter house in this country are old, and it could hardly, I think, be the desire of the Honourable Mover and seconder of this Resolution, who have displayed so much solicitude for the cattle breeder whose profession they want to make a lucrative one, to impose on him an additional tax by preventing him from selling his old cattle when they are no longer fit for work. I admit, Sir, that it is unfortunately true that there is a certain number of

cattle in Bombay and Calcutta which are slaughtered when they are still capable of producing calves. The reason for that is, as the Honourable Mr. Mukhtar Singh pointed out, that selected cows purchased up-country at comparatively high prices are sent down to Bombay or Calcutta or other cities, are milked there as long as possible and then without being again brought into calf are sold to the butcher. It is unfortunate that this should be so, but the remedy for this state of affairs is not the prevention of their slaughter; it is to encourage people to buy them and to keep them for the dry period. The municipalities of India could make quite an appreciable contribution to the solution of this question if they were to make proper arrangements for keeping dry cows outside the municipalities for short periods on reasonable terms. The great progress in co-operative milk supply in Bengal shows what could be done. The number of societies in the neighbourhood of Calcutta in recent years has more than doubled. This is another way in which progress could be made towards the solution of this problem.

Sir, the problem of city milk supply is only one aspect of the question. The Honourable Mover of this Resolution brought forward the argument that the slaughter of cattle is depleting the cattle wealth of the country. He produced certain figures to prove his contention, but those which I have hardly bear him out. The first real cattle census in India, that of 1919-20, showed that there were 146 million bovine cattle in British India. The second census, held about five years later, between December 1924 and April 1925, showed that the number had increased to 151 millions. What evidence is there, as against these figures, that the slaughter of cattle is acting as a clog on the development of the cattle wealth of the country? There seems to be no ground for any feeling of apprehension that it has had any such deleterious effect. It is unfortunate that there are no figures available showing the number of cattle slaughtered for domestic consumption except the figures of the export trade in cattle to which the Honourable Mover also referred with some apprehension. Here again, Sir, the figures that I have hardly bear him out. For the last ten years the total amount of meat exported from India to Burma and from Burmese ports to foreign ports was some 820,000 cwt. or an average of 82,000 cwt. per annum. Experts tell me that not more than 82,000 animals could have been normally slaughtered for the export trade. A very simple sum in arithmetic will show what is the proportion between 82,000 and 151 millions. There is here no ground for any apprehension.

The true way to approach the problem, however, is from quite another angle. From one point of view, that of the Honourable Mover of this Resolution, the increase in the number of cattle, as shown by the figures of the cattle census, should be a matter for congratulation. I can hardly regard it entirely in that light. As the Royal Commission on Agriculture pointed out, what we want is not more cattle, but better cattle. They made an interesting comparison between conditions in this country and in Holland and Egypt. I may perhaps be permitted to refer to their Report. They selected Holland because it possesses the largest number of cattle in relation to the size of the country. They selected Egypt because conditions in Egypt and in certain provinces of India are very similar. What they found was that India had 67 head of cattle for 100 acres of net sown area, whereas Holland had 38 head of cattle for 100 acres of cultivated area and Egypt 25. That, Sir, shows what the Royal Commission emphasised time and again, namely, that in India there are far more cattle than the

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

land can really bear. Another very interesting comparison between conditions in India and conditions in Holland is that a Dutch cow may give anything from five to ten times as much milk as an Indian cow. There, Sir, is the crux of the question. Mere addition to the number of cows in India without an improvement in breed and an improvement in grazing facilities will not solve the milk problem. What you have to do is to improve the quality of your cows. The action proposed by my Honourable friend the Mover of this Resolution would have the effect of accentuating the difficulties of the question. It would involve a burden both upon the cultivator and on the limited grazing facilities that exist. It would penalise him as well as the useful cattle whose available stock of fodder is in inverse proportion to the number of cattle to be fed.

I turn, Sir, to the lines on which the Government of India would tackle this problem and have been doing for many years past. The Imperial Department of Agriculture has a cattle-breeding farm at Karnal. It is only 70 miles from Delhi, and I very much wish that Members of this House would take the opportunity of going over there and of seeing for themselves what the Government are doing to improve the breeds of cattle in this country. We should welcome them there if they could spare the time. That farm is run under the auspices of the Imperial Institute of Animal Husbandry and Dairying at Bangalore, where there is a much smaller farm. We have another dairy farm at Wellington and a creamery at Anand. Pusa has also its pedigree herd. The efforts which the Imperial Department of Agriculture is making are supplemented by those of Local Governments. The Royal Commission's description of what has been done both by the Government of India and by the Local Governments will be found in Chapter VII of their Report, to which I would refer Honourable Members. The Royal Commission held that neither the Government of India nor the Local Governments were doing all that they could. They realised the magnitude of this problem. They knew how much Indian agriculture was dependent on bullocks and the country on its milk supply, and they therefore suggested that the Government of India should do more than they are doing, especially in the direction of co-ordinating the efforts of Local Governments. It was for that reason that they suggested that the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research should have as one of its expert officers an adviser in animal husbandry and veterinary matters. We are doing our best to get a suitable officer to fill that appointment and hope we shall be able to do so before long. Another step which the Royal Commission recommended was the continuance of the cattle conferences which have been held for some years past and which form a very useful meeting ground for the exchange of views between experts in animal husbandry. We are going a little further than that. The Board of Agriculture has now been split up into two sections, one of which will be entirely devoted to the consideration of animal husbandry and veterinary questions. I can therefore assure the House that this most important problem has engaged, is engaging, and will continue to engage the earnest attention of the Government of India. They will do all that lies in their power to further the interests of animal husbandry and to provide expert advice and assistance in this matter and I trust that, with that assurance, the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution will agree to withdraw it.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable the Mover wish to withdraw?

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh: No.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am sorry, but I am not surprised at the reply which the Honourable the Secretary of the Department of Education, Health and Lands has given on this Resolution. I also feel that it is useless to try to commend this Resolution to the House at this moment, but the Resolution having been brought before the Assembly, I feel it my duty to draw the attention of Honourable Members to a few aspects of the question. In the first place I wish to ask every Member of the House, what—
12 Noon. ever his creed, whatever the community he may belong to, to think what we all human beings owe to the cow. I suppose most Members, if not all, use cow's milk—at any rate with the tea that they take in the morning and evening

Dr. A. Suhrawardy (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Mahatma Gandhi takes goat's milk.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I wonder if Dr. Suhrawardy takes goat's milk; but whether he does so or not, I wish my remarks to apply to the goat as well as to the cow. I wish Members when they take milk, whether goat's milk or cow's milk, to remember that there is such a thing as gratitude to those who confer benefits on them, and I wish them to think of the gratitude which mankind owes to the cow, even more than to the goat, though it owes it to the goat also; and I wish Members to consider whether it is right that the dear animal which helps mankind to substitute for the mother's milk, from the time that it ceases to get it, its own milk, and to live by and flourish on it, until the last days of our existence—to consider whether apart from any religious consideration, such an animal does not deserve our grateful sympathy. I know that during the days of the Ramzan, after the days fasting, my Muslim friends love nothing better in the evening than to take cow's milk, and I know that no European can fail to admit what a blessing cow's milk is, whether taken along with his tea or in other ways. I think therefore that it is the duty of every man, of every country and of every clime, to protect the cow, to protect in fact all animals which give us milk, but more especially the cow which stands at the head of the dear animals which supply milk to mankind; and I do appeal to everybody to look at this problem in this light.

Looked at in this light, the problem assumes a very much higher aspect than it wore in the remarks to which we have listened. We all know what reverence we pay to the mother because she brought us up on her breast, because she supported us by her milk; and the cow supplies her milk to us throughout our lives which the mother ceases to supply after some time. Therefore I submit in all humility and in all love, without any other religious feeling, than the feeling which should pervade us all, the common feeling of loving God's creatures, particularly those who do us good, that we should save the cow from being killed. That is the first aspect.

The second aspect of it is the economic aspect. Is there an animal living in this wide land of India to whom man is more gratefully indebted than the cow? You have heard of the milkers; you have heard of the draft cattle which the cow gives to the country. Where would India have been if the cow did not exist in India? The economic aspect of the question deserves more consideration than it has yet received either from the Government of India or from the agricultural population. Figures are easily stated and can be made to produce a certain effect; but I put two very simple questions. What has my Honourable friend opposite to say to the

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

statement of Chaudhuri Mukhtar Singh that milk is dearer in Bombay and in Calcutta than it is in London? Is milk available to the people of India to the same extent to which it was twenty years ago? Have the Government taken note of the heavy mortality of children in Calcutta and Bombay? Have they also noted that in Eastern Bengal, among the Muslim population, the mortality of children is even greater than among the Hindus in that part of the country? Have they ever pondered over the question as to how much of this heavy child mortality is ascribable to the want of cheap pure milk? Can there be any answer to this question that milk has become very much dearer than it was twenty years ago, and that it has become very difficult for people to get pure milk even in the larger cities?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca Division: Muhammadan Rural): Why milk only? Everything is becoming dearer.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Have the Government got any answer to give on that point? A military gentleman—I regret I do not remember his name—who gave evidence before the Royal Commission on Agriculture, stated that for meat there was a substitute in the shape of pulses, but that for milk there was no substitute. That was the evidence of an English military gentleman before the Royal Commission on Agriculture. I submit therefore that this aspect of the question deserves more consideration.

Then take the draught cattle. Has the Honourable Member any information as to the immense rise in the price of draught cattle throughout the country and of the difficulties which face the agriculturist on that account? Has he considered what a terrible waste the killing of cows involves? I will mention one simple instance. There is a *goshala* at Benares. The *brahmachari* who works it showed me a cow which was going to be sold to a butcher for four rupees. It was a small blind cow. The *brahmachari* purchased her and took her to the *goshala* at Rameshar in Benares; he told me that this cow had been with him for some years and had given three calves; two of them had become breeding bulls—one of them a small bull whom I saw fighting a very big bull in that *goshala*; and a cow which was giving a plentiful supply of milk. Now, put four rupees on one scale; and on the other, three calves, of whom two were bulls and one a cow at the time I saw them—perhaps there are three more by this time—and all the milk they have given and all the draught power and all the ploughing service which has been obtained from them. Can there be a greater, more tremendous, a more criminal waste of the great gift which God has blessed man with, than that such a cow should be sent to the slaughter house? I hope this aspect of the question at least might appeal to many Members to whom the first part of my submission may not. But looking at the question from both points of view, the humane and the economic it is a matter for serious consideration whether steps should not be taken to prevent the slaughtering of at least the cows mentioned in the Resolution. So far as I am concerned, I wish no cattle to be slaughtered, no cows, no goats, no sheep to be slaughtered. God in His bounty has given us plenty to eat, the daintiest of cereals and the most delicious of fruits, and at the same time plenty of milk to drink in addition. Gratitude to God demands that no creature of God shall destroy another creature of God either for pleasure or for profit. Let me support what I have said by the words of a great poet. Wordsworth was going through a village when he saw a well with an epitaph put upon it. His shepherded guide told him that

a knight errant was chasing a deer, and that to save its life the deer, after running a long distance, jumped into the well and died. The knight was chastened, and repenting of the wrong he had done, he put on the epitaph which was there. Wordsworth has incorporated touching that story in a beautiful piece of poetry—the Hart Leap Well—which concludes as follows :

“One lesson, shepherd, let us two divide,
From all that nature teaches and conceals,
Ne'er to blend our pleasure or our pride
With sorrow of the meanest thing that feels.”

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, as my Leader has just said, the reply which came from the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce was disappointing, though not quite unexpected. The Resolution which has been moved by Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh is itself a very limited one. It does not go over the whole question of the breeding of cattle or animal husbandry, but it is limited to the consideration of the question of milk supply in India, and I believe the question could have been more sympathetically and reasonably considered by the Government. I really find that the Honourable the Mover has approached this question entirely from the point of view of the supply of pure cow's milk in this country, but there are other considerations involved in the subject matter of the Resolution before the House. Sir, every one of us knows that cow is not merely an animal for supplying milk to the people of this country, but she is the mainstay of the chief industry on which this country lives. The manner in which our friends on the Treasury Benches look at this question is different from the way in which we look at it. They look upon cow not so much as the one object on which the chief industry of the country depends, but they look upon it as an object for their enjoyment both for the sake of food and for getting some dainty things on their tables.

Sir, the Government Member who replied to this Resolution told us that he wanted to examine this question purely from an economic point of view. But he must know as a responsible Member of the Government that the question of the cow in India is not only an economic one, but there is a deep sentiment also that has gathered round the question in this country. That being the case, though the question admits of being discussed from an economic point of view as well, there is another aspect of it to be considered, and in giving a reply on behalf of Government, he should have borne in mind both these things. When he said that the saving of useless cattle was uneconomical, he did not know what amount of injury he was doing to the sentiments of those who look upon the cow as something far more sacred. What appears to him to be a useless economic thing, a thing that ought not to live, is a thing for which a Hindu, out of his regard for his religious feelings, will lay down his life. I think, therefore, that the Honourable Member who spoke on behalf of Government did not give that serious attention to this question which it really deserved. As a matter of fact, even if we consider the economic aspect of the question, what did he prove? He quoted certain figures of the cattle census and showed that the number of cattle had not decreased. It may be so. But he forgot one thing. If we look at the figures of cattle and compare them for one period with the figures for another period, we have also to take into account the facts showing the requirements of the period selected for comparison and compare the requirements of one period with the other period for which he quotes the figures. It must be remembered that the population has increased, land under cultivation has increased, and the

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

requirements of the people have also therefore increased correspondingly. Unless these factors are properly taken into account, it can not be found out that the number of cattle to-day are sufficient to meet the requirements of to-day. Merely quoting figures without any discrimination cannot and will not satisfy any reasonable man who has made a study of the economic position of the country. Sir, the efforts which the Government have so far made in this direction have been characterised in this book, I mean the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, as having produced no tangible effect upon cattle breeding and upon giving a good supply of bulls which are required for agricultural purposes. This Report is not a certificate to the Government for the efforts they have made. It is rather a qualified condemnation of the comparative indifference they have shown towards the proper solution of this question. It may supply Government with some arguments to oppose Resolutions of this character, but generally the attitude of the Government towards the question of animal husbandry in this country has been far from sympathetic, systematic and just. It is no certificate at all to the Government. It only shows that the Government have not taken proper steps and have not done what they should have done in this matter. In this connection I would only draw the attention of the House to the observations made at page 213 of the Agricultural Commission's Report. The Honourable Member referred to the efforts that are being made by the Government and the amount of interest they are taking in the question, but let us see what the Agricultural Commission have to say in this matter. This is what they say on page 213 of their Report:

"When the British Government began to share in the work of livestock improvement some fifteen years ago, it was not necessary for them to breed bulls."

Here it must be remembered that the attention of the Government was drawn to this question only 15 years ago although they have been in this country for over 150 years. However, let us proceed to read what they say further:

"Suitable animals were already there; what was needed in Britain was to make these valuable cattle available to small farmers, who were, in many districts unable to afford to use them. With this object the 'premium bull' system was introduced. In India, as we have seen, really good cattle, once the property of professional breeders, are disappearing from many parts of the country, and when agricultural departments began, as one or two did thirty years ago, or more, to introduce in India the 'premium bull' system, they found it impossible to purchase useful animals. Thus, in India, the expensive but essential work of building up herds of pedigree cattle, which in Britain was accomplished by private enterprise, must fall on the taxpayer."

Further on they say this:

"Since, in a number of provinces, little progress has yet been made in breeding pedigree cattle, we propose to confine our review of this branch of activity to the work done in the Punjab, the United Provinces, Bombay, the Central Provinces and Madras, where most experience has been gained."

Sir, the experiments that have hitherto been made do not show that much progress has been made in the direction of cattle breeding. That is the attention which the Government have bestowed on this important question. The whole point is this. Shall we allow these milch cows to be indiscriminately slaughtered as they are being at present?

I am not now tackling the general question of cow protection. If that had been the case, I would have taken objection to the last clause in the Resolution. As a Hindu, I cannot tolerate the existence of the last

clause in the Resolution. But the Resolution is there, and I am confining myself only to the terms of the Resolution, and I say that we should not allow milch cows to be indiscriminately slaughtered. From certain figures which have been read out by my Honourable friend, he makes an attempt to show that the cows which are generally slaughtered do not come under the category of milch cows. He tried to bring out that point by reading out to us certain valuations of slaughtered cows and other cows and so on. Sir, if milch cows are not slaughtered at all, and if Government is so sure of that then they must have some method by which they can exclude milch cows from being taken to the slaughter house. That is quite obvious from the very statement which my Honourable friend makes that milch cows are generally not slaughtered at all. If that is so, then I repeat that there must be some method by which those cattle are being excluded from being taken to the slaughter house. And then I further contend that if there is already some method like that, then it was not proper for him to have observed that no practical suggestions have been made to enable the Government to give effect to this Resolution.

Sir Frank Noyce: I pointed out that financial considerations are a great deterrent to milch cows being slaughtered, their value as milking animals being greater than when slaughtered. There is nothing secret about that.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I wanted to know definitely whether it was a fact that milch cows were not being taken to the slaughter house. If he only takes it as an inference drawn from certain valuations which he has cited, then he has not given us any fact, but he is only giving us an inference. Am I right?

Sir Frank Noyce: Quite.

Mr. M. S. Aney: This is not a matter that stands merely on inference. Merely because we find that at certain places the valuation of milch cows is something far greater than slaughter cows, it does not necessarily mean milch cows are not being taken to the slaughter house. One cannot accept that position. It requires further investigation into the matter. I have no doubt that the slaughter of these cows can be prevented and suitable measures taken. I hope that Government themselves will generally realise this much that the taking of milch cows to the slaughter house, if they are being taken at all, amounts to a very serious economic loss to the country. Even from the comparative figures of valuation which have been placed before the House, we can see that, in allowing milch cows to be slaughtered, not only does the country lose the cow, but also it is a serious economic loss to the country. For the sake of preventing that economic loss, it is up to the Government to take certain measures to prevent these cows from being slaughtered. If as they contend, these cows are not slaughtered at all, then so much the better. But whether they are being slaughtered or not is a point for investigation, not merely an inference to be drawn from the comparative valuation of the two things found in the markets of Bombay and Calcutta. That is not sufficient to arrive at the correct position in a matter of this nature. The Honourable the Mover of the Resolution has quoted certain figures which indicate that the evil against which he is making his complaint does exist and that it is not a mere imaginary evil against which he is raising his cry.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

The third thing is this. It is only as regards the slaughter that this Resolution has tried to suggest certain remedies. But the reduction in the number of milch cows is also due to the very indiscriminate policy which the Government has adopted as regards forest grazing. Restricting the grazing area and restricting the number of cattle to be admitted to the grazing area have also seriously told upon the number of milch cows to be maintained by the cultivators and peoples living in the neighbourhood and vicinity of forest areas. How it affects them is very well known to a man in my position because I live in the close vicinity of a forest area. One of the taluqs of my district was known as the breeding ground of fine cattle for the whole of Berar. As a matter of fact I have seen with my own eyes the deplorable change that has taken place during the last twenty-five years in the matter of maintenance of cows by the cultivators. Those cultivators who were maintaining something like 20 or 25 head of cattle in addition to those that were required for the purpose of cultivation cannot now maintain even five head of cattle because they cannot get admission of their cattle to the forest grazing areas on account of the stringent rules and regulations which the Government have introduced in the matter of allowing forest grazing. It is this forest policy of Government that has also helped in the reduction of the number of milch cows and consequently told upon the supply of milk in the provinces. So, if the problem of milk supply is to be solved, the Government have to take all possible steps to prevent indiscriminate slaughter of cows as well as to alter their forest policy with a view to enable the people to maintain a larger number of cattle in a suitable and efficient state of health. Unless these steps are taken, there is no hope of the country getting a proper and adequate supply of milk. Why do we often hear the cry of adulterated or vegetable *ghee* coming into this country? Do not the Government hear of that complaint from everywhere? In the markets you do not get pure *ghee*. The only nutritive articles of food in the dietary of those who are vegetarians in India are milk and *ghee*, and when these two essential articles in the dietary of those who are mainly vegetarians are not being had in sufficient quantity, it is a national problem which the Government of India have to tackle, and it is no use trying to brush it aside on certain *a priori* grounds. That point has been touched here at one place in the Report of the Agricultural Commission. They say:

"In a country so largely vegetarian, the room for expansion of milk consumption ought to be very great. A cow producing more milk for household use ought to be of great value to the cultivator in raising his standard of living and if there is a surplus for sale, there would be an increase in his cash receipts."

These are the natural advantages which the country in general and the cultivator in particular will gain if proper arrangements are made to enable the people to maintain the requisite number of cattle in the country. In the absence of any settled policy, in the absence of a determination on the part of Government to put an end to the indiscriminate slaughter of cows or at least to put an end to the slaughter altogether of milch cows, it is difficult for the people even to get the only two articles which really form the most nutritive elements in the dietary of Indians who are vegetarians. If you care for the health and prosperity of the country, then the Government have seriously to consider this Resolution and accept it and take such steps as they immediately can to give effect to it. With these words, I support the Resolution.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, while opposing the motion of my Honourable friend, I should like to say in the very beginning that I have every sympathy for the preservation of milch cows and prime calves. My opposition is based on two grounds. The first is that my Honourable friend has chosen a very wrong time for moving this Resolution, and the second is that he has chosen an absolutely wrong place for moving this Resolution. When I came to the House, I thought that I might not have to face this situation. At the time when you called out the name of the Honourable the Mover, Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh, I saw that he was hesitating to rise and your attention was next drawn to the next item in the agenda and you actually called out the Honourable Member in whose name the next motion stood. I thought that my Honourable friend had got the best of counsel and that he would not commit the mistake of moving his Resolution.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): He belongs to no party.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi: There is no question of party. I am not blaming any party here. I know that during the last six years that I have been in the Assembly, several attempts of this kind have been made, sometimes by my friend and sometimes by other friends, but on all occasions better counsel prevailed and the proposers were advised not to move their Resolutions. I had anticipated the same thing on this occasion, because I knew that my friends here who form the opposition now were not a bit less anxious than those who were in their place to keep harmony between the Hindus and Musalmans at the critical juncture through which we are passing. But I find that, soon after that group has gone away, better discretion has also gone out of the House. I thought we had a very important and urgent Resolution in the name of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai about political prisoners.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I will take the advice you gave just now and not move it.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi: I thought it was the most important Resolution of the day that had been tabled and he had been fortunate in getting his name in the ballot. The opposition would do its best to see that the Resolution was passed and all attention directed towards that object because that was really the prime object of the country at the moment. But I find now that we have got something else to face in this House. However fate ordained like this and we have got to meet it.

Now, Sir, as I said in the beginning my whole-hearted sympathies are for the preservation of milch cows and prime calves. There is no one with any sense in him who will try to kill a cow when she is giving milk or try to kill a calf while he or she is useful. So far as I know my country, I trust I am absolutely correct in saying that no one slaughters a cow while she is giving milk, or slaughters a calf while he or she is considered useful. But the question comes in when a milch cow does not give milk and a calf is useless for any purpose. Then the question comes what to do with it. I do not think we are at present in a position to devise means for the preservation of cows when we are not in a position to devise means for 32 crores of human beings. I do not understand

[Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi,]

how one can think of cattle and have his attention directed towards them when we are confronted with the fate of 32 crores of human beings, especially at this moment when the larger interests of the country are confronting us, and every effort has to be made to better the condition of the people while they are under foreign domination.

I find that my friend is thinking of cows who do not give milk and are a burden to their owners and who therefore consider it better to get rid of them after getting a few rupees for them. My friend comes from Bihar from which I also come. I think both of us know very well that the conditions in Bihar, so far as grazing grounds are concerned, are very deplorable, so much so that when I took up politics, my idea was that the first thing that I should do was to try to have grazing grounds in all villages to such an extent that the poor cultivators who own cattle may not feel the necessity of parting with them simply because they cannot maintain them. I thought efforts should be made towards that object in the Provincial Council and I therefore pressed upon my friends there that the first item in the preservation of cattle was to have grazing grounds all over the villages so that these poor people, who cannot now get sufficient fodder for their cattle, may have it; and that would be the most effective means of preserving the cows while they are not giving milk but are expected to give milk in the other seasons. But that effort has failed because the zamindars of Bihar have been opposed to it and they would not allow grazing grounds for cattle. They thought it would mean loss of money to them and they should not therefore lend their support to any scheme by which grazing grounds might be provided in the villages.

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh: I do not think the landholders were opposed to it.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi: That is my information, and I believe it has not yet been passed in the Council. It was opposed and was rejected. That is my information.

Mr. B. Das: Then do away with the zamindars and you will get better grazing grounds.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi: Therefore my submission in this case is that my friend is wrong in moving this Resolution at this stage. Whatever my friend might say, the idea behind the whole thing is, as Mr. Aney has rightly put it, the religious sentiment which my Hindu countrymen have got. I respect that sentiment. I feel that if that sentiment is so deeply rooted in the minds of my Hindu countrymen, I should respect it. But I would at the same time ask them not to impose it upon others. It is for them to do everything they can to preserve the cattle, but to ask those who do not worship the cow to bear the burden of feeding the cattle when they are not giving milk and are of no use is something not desirable. The implication of the Resolution of my friend is the one that I have just now said. It certainly means that every one in India would be compelled by some measure or other not to sell an animal, not to sell a cow or a calf when he or she is not of any use to him. That is too much to ask from men who do not worship them.

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh: The Resolution relates to milch cows and prime calves.

Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi: I have told you that milch cows and prime calves are not slaughtered. You do not require any Resolution for that purpose. But when the cows are not giving milk and when there is no fodder for the animal, when the man cannot keep the cow hanging on, it is only then that he sells it either for the purpose of slaughter or for any other purpose and makes the best use of it. I have said that already. Whatever my friend might say, the thing behind his back is that religious sentiment prevailing amongst the Hindus. He would like that in Hindustan this thing should become the law and that at the point of the bayonet, not by persuasion, by trying to win over the hearts of the people towards his side by showing the economic value of preserving the animal. I should say that is not the right course. The right course lies somewhere else. It is not right to ask the Legislature to enact a measure by which the cows which the Hindus consider very sacred should be preserved. Of course you have got every right to consider them sacred and you have got every right to preserve them yourselves. But you should not take the aid of law. You should not try to impose your will on others by enacting measures penalising any action which amounts to slaughtering the animal. I do not like to make the matter more bitter. I have given out my views to my friend. I would only say in the end that my friend should not have used these tactics of vote-catching in a cause like this. It is a very sacred matter and it ought to have been treated as most sacred, and it ought not to have been used for the purpose of catching votes in the next election.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, my sympathies are undoubtedly with the Mover of the Resolution in his desire to preserve milch cattle for the whole country. But how this object is to be attained is not equally clear to me. My Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, endeavoured to explain that it was most unlikely that milch cattle would be slaughtered. I think his point was that it was the barren cow that was no longer of any use for milking that was sent to the slaughter-house. As to whether that is quite the case, I am not entirely sure. I rather think that in big cities the milch cow is sent down from the country for milking, and when she becomes dry, owing to the heavy cost of returning her to the country, the owner finds that it pays him better to send her to the slaughter-house, and that is an aspect of the case that I would suggest to my Honourable friend to examine. If we could get the Government to assist his Department in any way towards the preservation of a perfectly good cow till it became a mother by returning the cow to grazing grounds, I think a very good object will have been served. I suggest, Sir, that the Railway Department are to some extent responsible for this not being more commonly carried out. The heavy railway freight is against the proposal that I make. My friend Mr. Aney, in referring to cattle, seems to have implied that it is the milch cow that is also largely used as a draught animal because he said it was not only in the matter of milk that these animals should be preserved but also for the general use of the country. I was always under the impression—I may be wrong—that it is not the milch cow that is used for draught purposes, for ploughing, etc.

Mr. N. C. Kelkar (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): He did not mean that.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: As regards the price of milk in India, reference has been made to the high cost as compared with milk in other countries. I agree that the price is extraordinarily high. I think in cities—I can talk for Calcutta—we get about three seers to the rupee. In England I know the retail price is 2 s. per gallon. I am trying to find out from the Honourable Member in charge how many seers go to the gallon of milk.

Sir Frank Noyce: Ten pounds of milk to the gallon.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: That will be 5 seers. The wholesale price of milk in England is in the neighbourhood of 1s. per gallon.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: And that is the price of guaranteed pure milk.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I do not quite follow my Honourable friend. What is the difference?

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: In England you cannot sell adulterated milk.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I hope you do not sell adulterated milk here. In the matter of milk supply I think every encouragement should be given. There is a great deal to be done by co-operation, by the co-operative societies. I was very interested the other day in going over an establishment in Calcutta entirely run by the co-operative society. It began in a small way and has grown up to a distribution of as much as 1,200 gallons of milk per day. Small farmers within a radius of 25 miles from Calcutta are the owners of this factory. They are the shareholders. They send in their milk which is brought in by rail. It is treated in the factory, pasteurised, and a very ready sale is found. The farmers are feeling the advantages of this good work and are using every endeavour to improve the breed of their cattle. It is in that way that the country can advance. It costs practically as much to feed a cow that is giving very little milk as a cow which is giving two or three times the quantity. The Indian cow is not a prolific milk giver due to breed and due to the absence of good grazing, and any steps that can be taken by Government and by individuals to improve the breed of the cattle and to secure a greater quantity of milk are the direction in which I consider we should move. Sir, I have nothing more to say on the point. I started by saying that I sympathise with the Mover of the Resolution and with the object he has in view, but I cannot see how the Government can move in the manner that he hopes for because it is entirely a question that rests with the owner of the animal as to whether he is going to go on feeding an animal that is of no use to him or send it to a market where he can get a return for his property.

Dr. A. Suhrawardy: Sir, I had no desire to intervene in this debate, but after listening to the speeches of the supporters of the motion, I feel that I should make a few observations to make my position clear. Two arguments have been put forward, broadly speaking, in support of the motion, the economic argument and the argument based on sentiment and gratitude. So far as the economic argument is concerned, that has been adequately dealt with by the Honourable Member who opposed the Resolution on behalf of the Government. As regards the argument based on sentiment, that argument appeals to me. But unfortunately the gentlemen who have put forward that argument have themselves weakened it by saying that they are not supporting the motion on the basis of sentiment. My Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has declared that he is not in favour of the slaughter of animals at all, and he referred to certain lines of

Wordsworth. I am in entire agreement with him, but I should wait for a comprehensive Resolution, proceeding either from the Honourable Pandit or from my friend Rai Bahadur Harbilas Sarada, which would make animal slaughter unlawful. So long as that is not before the House, I cannot really understand how I can or how any orthodox Hindu can support the Resolution of my Honourable friend Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh, basing his support on an argument of sentiment or on the ground of the sanctity of the cow, because this Resolution, as it stands, does not prevent the slaughter of cows altogether. On the other hand, it permits the slaughter of cows for religious purposes.

As regards the argument based on gratitude, put forward by my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, I am sorry to find that this Resolution is really based on an argument of ingratitude. After the milch cattle has been sucked dry, it is the height of ingratitude then to permit of its being sent to the slaughter-house and slaughtered. That is what it comes to. You appeal to our sentiment, you remind us of our taking cow's milk with our tea or in the month of Ramzan, and you then support a Resolution which condemns that unfortunate cow after it had been sucked dry to be driven to the slaughter-house by Hindu *goalas* to be butchered to make a Moslem holiday or a Roman holiday. I think the Honourable Pandit, although I deeply sympathise with him, has really not understood exactly, if I may say so with deep respect, the implications of this Resolution.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I thought I made my position quite clear that I should like to save every cow, every goat and every sheep from the slaughter-house.

Dr. A. Suhrawardy: I am waiting for a comprehensive Resolution saying that no animal will be sacrificed, whether at Kalighat or anywhere else. I make the declaration on the floor of this House that I would support such a Resolution. But my objection to this Resolution is on the ground of its impracticability. No suggestion has been made as to what suitable and effective measures are to be taken to prevent the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves. Well, Sir, in replying to a remark made by my friend Maulvi Mohammad Shafee Daoodi, Mr. Lalchand Navalraj said he accepted his advice and had withdrawn or was going to withdraw the Resolution about political prisoners. I think, Sir, if he is going to do so, he does so because of the difficulty as regards the definition of "political prisoners".

Mr. Lalchand Navalraj: No, not at all.

Dr. A. Suhrawardy: That may not be the reason, but there are practical difficulties as regards definition of "milch cows" and "prime calves", and as regards "strictly religious purposes". Who is going to define, who is going to tell us on each occasion what is "strictly religious purposes"? Are the Police going to do that or any other agency? Is it the Chief Commissioner of Delhi or the Home Department that is going to determine the question whether a Mussalman can sacrifice a cow on a particular occasion for a purpose which he alleges to be religious? Let me disabuse the minds of my Honourable friends that *Bakr-id* is not the only occasion on which a cow can be sacrificed for religious purposes. That occasion may arise every day. Who is going to find out whether the purpose is a strictly religious purpose or not? Apart from this the question of the age when a cow ceases to be productive or until which a calf is considered a prime calf is not free from difficulty. Good breeding and good physique are the prime

[Dr. A. Suhrawardy.]

considerations now-a-days, and perhaps Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarda may be able to introduce a Bill for that purpose even though he may not be able to determine whether the purpose for which a cow is sacrificed is a religious purpose or not? I need not dwell upon this question further. Briefly, my reason for opposing this Resolution is based on the ground of its impracticability. With these observations, Sir, I oppose the Resolution.

Dr. B. S. Moonje (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan). Sir, my Honourable friend Sir Frank Noyce made a rather long speech. I listened to it with feelings of surprise and disappointment—surprise because I was wondering whether in the end he was going to support the Resolution because all the arguments that he used were in support of the Resolution. I could summarise his speech into one single sentence quoted by him with so much approval as defining a principle which, he says, ought to govern this subject. He said that we do not want more cattle, but better cattle, and that is exactly what the Resolution wants us to do. Does he mean to say that milch cattle are not better cattle? Does he mean to say that prime calves are not better cattle? The Resolution does not want you to protect all cows and calves, whether good or bad. The Resolution only says, protect good cows, the better cows and calves, and that is the principle that my Honourable friend Sir Frank Noyce enunciated with approval. I do not want to deal with the extraneous feelings that have been imported. The Resolution is simple and goes straight to the point; it says that Govern-

ment should take suitable and effective measures to prevent the
 1 P. M. slaughter of prime calves and milch cows. Is it not what my friend, Sir Frank Noyce, would ask the Government to do himself if he believes in the principle enunciated by him? If that is so, if milch cows are the better cows, if prime calves are the better calves, I have not been able to understand the reason why he wound up his speech by opposing the Resolution.

The same remark applies to the speech of my friend, Sir Darcy Lindsay. He said that he has got full sympathy with this Resolution; if he has got full sympathy, where does his objection come in? Let us all combine together and call upon the Government to accept this Resolution and suggest to the Government the ways and means as to how to bring about the end for which you and I have got so much sympathy.

As regards Maulvi Mohammad Shafee, I do not think this is an occasion when it is just or right to go behind to probe into the motives of a person bringing forward such a Resolution. The motive is clear and clean and straight; it is to prevent the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves. There is no other motive behind the Resolution as it stands to-day. When an occasion comes, if it comes at all, and when some one will bring forward a really objectionable Resolution on the subject, then it will be time enough to consider whether to oppose or support it as one thinks fit.

As for my friend, Dr. Suhrawardy, he must understand that this Resolution has not been inspired by the well-known religious sentiment of the Hindus in respect of cows. As far as I am personally concerned I give him full guarantee to do what he likes as needed for his religion, without provocation to others. The Resolution amply provides for it and says, "except for strictly religious purposes."

Dr. A. Suhrawardy: Who is to define the purpose?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: The Government are there and you can contribute all your intelligence.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official): Then I see that you are prepared to give this power to Government?

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Yes, to protect prime calves and to protect milch cows; that is exactly what the Resolution says, and why I am here to support it. I have nothing more to say.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Patna and Chota Nagpur cum Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I do not understand the mentality of my Hindu friends in the matter. They ask Government to stop this thing, but is it not entirely in their power to do so? Are not the *goalas* all Hindus? The right thing would be to move in that direction and to ask the *goalas* to stop selling their cows to non-Hindus. As for the question of religion, Muhammadans are permitted and allowed to eat beef. No one, no Government can stop them from eating beef; otherwise it will be pure and sheer interference with religion.

Mr. B. Das: What about the Christian?

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: The Christians are, I think, non-Hindus. Government has no right to do it; it will be interference with religion. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya said "Oh, God has given us cereals and other things; why should we kill animals?" But God himself kills animals.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: He does not; he never does; it is blasphemy to say so.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Yes, he does. These are my only remarks.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Sir, I had no intention of speaking on this Resolution, but I have been impelled by two or three reasons to do so. The first is that this Resolution enures to general good: it is to the advantage not only of India but of the whole world that this Resolution should be passed. The Resolution aims at stopping the slaughter of milch cows only. India, Sir, cannot live without the cow and the bullock: indeed, the whole world cannot live without these animals; and if we take any step in the direction of preserving these animals, I submit, the whole House should be unanimous in supporting this Resolution.

Sir, the second reason that has impelled me to speak is the attitude taken by Government on this Resolution. I never expected that Sir Frank Noyce would surprise me by his arguments. The attitude of the Government should be a better one on occasions like this, when we are meeting without many of the representatives of the people being in the House. I was very glad to learn only a short time ago from Sir George Schuster, who is not in his seat now but for whom I have great regard for the way in which he has been dealing with the House—at least he never becomes checky—that the Government were not desirous of taking advantage of the thinness of the House—I have great respect for what he said but the facts speak for themselves. We have seen since yesterday what has happened; and there have been friends here who have advised Members, as my Honourable friend, Maulvi Mohammad Shafee did now with regard to this Resolution that non-official motions should not be moved as there

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

was no chance of their succeeding owing to the small number of members on this side of the House. He also remarked, and I replied to it at the time and I repeat it now, that I would follow the advice in not moving my Resolution regarding the release of political prisoners. I must assure the Honourable Members that I do not drop it because I feel that the definition of political prisoners is a difficult one, as was remarked by Dr. Suhrawardy. The definition is plain and it was given in this House when my friend the Honourable Maulvi Mohammad Shafee moved his Resolution on 26th January, 1926 for the release of the political prisoners and quoted the Encyclopædia of the laws of England, Part II, page 208, defining the same.

Mr. President: Order, order. We are not dealing with that Resolution now.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am not dealing with it, Sir. I only made a reply to that remark. I shall proceed with this Resolution. As regards this Resolution, I submit it is a great mistake to think that there would be a difficulty in enforcing this Resolution when passed, or that it would not be practicable. We must know in the first place that no definition of milch cow is needed for an Indian or even for a European. People know what a milch cow is. The question is how are we going to carry out this Resolution in practice. Everybody knows—I think Honourable Members fully know—that in every municipal town and even in every municipal local area there are officers such as inspectors in charge of these slaughter-houses, and when cows are taken there, they can see for themselves whether a cow is a milch cow or not, such as to be prevented from being slaughtered. What difficulty is there, therefore, for Government to enforce it? I submit that this is a Resolution which can give no difficulty to the Government. If the Government have a mind to accept the Resolution, then no reasons are required to convince them of the necessity of passing such a useful Resolution as this.

Sir, I was very sorry to hear a remark from the Honourable Maulvi Mohammad Shafee that the object of this Resolution is something different from the object put forward in the Resolution itself. In the first place, we have no reason to doubt the *bond fides* of this Resolution, and we have no right to attribute motives like that to the Honourable the Mover who has the privilege of bringing forward such a commendable Resolution as this.

Then, Sir, the Resolution is a modest one; it is very plain; it interferes with no religion. There ought to be no fear on that score at all. Those who say they are in favour of not allowing all animals to be slaughtered should take the first step of accepting this Resolution to show that they are really serious about it. Of course, a general Resolution of that kind may be brought forward, but I doubt if many Members would support it. Let us however see their *bond fides* by passing this Resolution, which does no harm at all.

Sir, the Resolution refers to the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves as an economical problem only; it has nothing to do with any religion and specifically does not interfere with the religion of any community. If we want cows for all the communities, it is advantageous that Members representing all the communities in this House should accept this Resolution. This Resolution in plain words says what it seeks to achieve, and

you are not to import anything else in it by mere implication. I would therefore request, without taking any more time of the House that all the Honourable Members in this House should pass this Resolution un-animously.

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Many of the Members will wonder, Sir, what a man whose training has been mainly military can know about the cattle problem in India. But I have taken the trouble to go to Pusa and see for myself what steps are being taken to improve animal husbandry in this country. One of the first points that strikes me in this debate, and it is certainly a matter of regret to me, is that there is not a single practical farmer present in this House to represent the enormous number of farmers that there are throughout the countryside, who can get up and give his views on this subject. . . .

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Yes, there is Choudhry Mukhtar Singh here.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I am glad there is one, but one Member cannot give adequate representation for such a big interest in India. It is really a matter of regret that the biggest industry in this country should be so inadequately represented in this House. Now, Sir, I am afraid of giving my sympathy to the Honourable Mover of this Resolution for fear that Dr. Moonje will at once pounce upon me and say that I must vote for it. That is not my point of view. But there is undoubtedly every necessity in this country to consider the question of an adequate milk and cattle supply to meet the requirements of this country.

Mr. Aney has, I think, very ungenerously accused the Government Members of having only one eye on the cattle question, and that on the provision of food for the table. Now, Sir, I have been to Pusa and I have discussed this matter with the Government officials there

Mr. M. S. Aney: I quoted it from the Agricultural Commission's Report.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I may have misunderstood my Honourable friend, but I understood him to say that the Britisher looked upon this problem with the one object of providing food for the table. However, Sir, the real problem is to get in India a stamp of cattle that will be useful both for draught purposes and milk purposes, and Government are devoting their attention to that aspect of the problem

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: They are not. Their main purpose is to produce good milkers.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: They are trying to produce a combined animal that can give you milk and at the same time do the draught purposes for which cattle are undoubtedly necessary in this country. One of the difficulties with which they are faced is the fact that there is not enough grazing ground in India and that the ryot himself does not allot a portion of his land for purposes of cultivating forage for his cattle.

Now, Sir, if we are to allow our head of cattle to increase beyond our capacity to feed them, we shall certainly reduce our milk supply. That seems to be the difficulty. We have to-day got cattle for which we cannot find food; the cattle that we have to-day are eating the food that really belongs to the people, and therefore you must try and curtail your activities, and you must try and produce cattle that can give you more

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

milk—not more cattle to give you less milk, but you must produce fewer cattle to give more milk, that is the true aspect of the problem. Now, does the Honourable Mover, in urging the stoppage of the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves, really tackle the problem before us? I submit not. I do not believe that legislation such as that suggested is practical to start with, and if it was introduced, I do not think it would have any effect upon the problem which we are trying to deal with. We should take a much larger view of the subject. I support what Sir Darcy Lindsay said in Calcutta, that you can do something there to prevent the *goala* from selling a cow that has gone dry. That is a problem that can be dealt with adequately by the Calcutta Corporation

Dr. B. S. Moonje: Do you prevent the milkmen from practising the system of *phooka* for sterilising the cows prematurely and unnaturally and from selling such cows?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I think you can do something in that direction. That is only one small item in the large problem we have got to face. Personally, as I said, I regret the paucity of any practical farmers in this House, and secondly I believe the problem needs to be dealt with in a far larger manner than it has been dealt with in the Resolution put forward by the Mover. With these words, Sir, I oppose the Resolution.

The Revd. J. O. Chatterjee (Nominated: Indian Christians): Sir, I have very sincere sympathy with the motives and objects underlying the Resolution moved by Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh, and especially after the very feeling appeal which my Honourable and learned friend Pandit Malaviya made, I would have very much liked to have voted for this Resolution. But, Sir, I find some difficulty in supporting this Resolution, because in the first place, it is couched in such general terms, and secondly the Honourable Mover has not set forth any practical means for achieving the end in view. He has made his Resolution so general that it seems to me that, if it were passed and Government accepted it, it would be impossible to give effect to it. No body can deny the need of good milk supply in this country. No body can deny that there is need in this country for immense improvement in the quality of milch cows and prime calves. All these things are certainly undeniable. But then, are the methods put forward, or rather, what is asked for in this Resolution at all a suitable method for obtaining the desired improvement?

Mr. President: What is the amendment of the Honourable Member?

The Revd. J. O. Chatterjee: I am not moving any amendment. I am speaking on the Resolution. Let us look at the practical aspect of the problem. Take for the instance, the city where we are sitting to-day. If we were to look at the records of the Delhi Municipality; we would find that, from 1861, the year in which it was constituted, almost every year or every few years, the Municipality has had to consider with all seriousness the nuisance caused by stray cattle and buffaloes that roam about in the streets. I believe all Honourable Members who come to Delhi have had a very great deal of difficulty in the way of traffic and in going about in the city owing to obstruction caused by these stray cattle that go about. The Municipality have had, on many occasions, to tackle the problem, namely, how to remove these stray cattle, and on every occasion they have failed. They once caught hold of these bulls and exported them to the other side of the Jumna, making a present of them to the farmers and

cultivators living there, and told them to make use of these cattle as they were obstructing traffic in the city.

Mr. B. Das: Is it relevant to the subject matter of the Resolution?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is relevant.

The Revd. J. C. Chatterjee: Thank you, Sir. After a very few days, those people came back with folded hands and said, for goodness sake take back these animals; we cannot get any work out of them. The result is these animals go on increasing in numbers and occasionally one finds them rushing into the shops and booths on the road side, breaking things and sometimes causing very serious injury to life and property. Finally the only method that could be found to decrease their number was to house them in the local pinjrapole to which the Municipality makes a contribution of Rs. 1,000 monthly. The Municipality made it known that any person who caught these bulls and took them to the pinjrapole would receive a reward of Rs. 5 per bull, and the Municipality itself is paying Rs. 7-8-0 per bull for its monthly maintenance to the pinjrapole. Therefore if these bulls go on increasing and if a motion of the kind contained in the Resolution were to be made law, their number might become legion and there would be great difficulty in finding fodder for them. The good citizens of Delhi would have unnecessarily to pay heavily to maintain these bulls in ease and comfort without doing any work.

Take another side of the question. For the last two or three years, we have had a serious famine and the worst effect of that famine has been that there has been a great scarcity of fodder. The number of cattle being what it is, they are miserably starving for want of fodder. No one has suffered more from this famine in the Delhi Province than the milch cows and cattle, many of which are economically useless, because fodder is not forthcoming. It has been urged that in England, the condition of cattle, of milch cows and of buffaloes is very much better than that in India. The reason for that is that useless animals there or animals that cease to be useful are somehow or other weeded out. That is the case with regard to every animal—even with fowls and birds. This is so in England because they are well looked after and their number is not allowed to increase beyond the limit where it becomes impossible to supply them with food. If the Honourable Mover had suggested some practical methods; if for instance, he had said that the export of dried meat to Burma was a very serious drain on the animals in the country, if he had been a little more moderate, or a little more practical in his demand and asked Government to prevent the export of dried meat to Burma, then he would certainly have had my vote in his favour. If he had described some practical means by which the wastage of good cows and good buffaloes could be prevented, then again one would have unhesitatingly supported his Resolution. But when he merely asks for legislation to prevent the slaughter of all animals, however one may sympathize with him, however one may feel the appeal on behalf of these dumb animals who certainly are benefactors of the human race, it is very difficult to vote for it. I believe, it would be quite impossible, by means of legislation, to prevent the slaughter of cattle nor would it be possible to make such legislation effective. Are we going to penalise slaughter of all cattle? And if such law were to be passed, would it not lead even to worse bloodshed perhaps than the slaughter of these poor animals? Therefore, Sir, I hope that the Honourable Mover of the Resolution will find it possible to put forward an amendment, or to further restrict

[The Revd. J. C. Chatterjee.]

its terms as will give this Resolution a practical shape and so make it possible for us to vote for it.

***Mr. H. P. Mody** (Bombay Millowners Association: Indian Commerce): It is a matter of very great regret that this question should have been discussed in the acrimonious and controversial way in which it has been. (Hear, hear). Constituted as the House is at the present moment, I should have thought that we on the non-official Benches at any rate, would resolutely eschew all temptation to give a religious or a communal colour to any question that comes up for our consideration. That is an obligation which is imposed upon us at all times, but I should have thought that that obligation is even more insistent at the present moment when the non-official Benches have been thinned so sadly as they are at present. Sir, the question is entirely an economic one and should be discussed entirely on its merits. I do not see where religion comes in. I do not see where the communal aspect comes in into a discussion of this question. An immense mass of literature has gathered round it in the past and the question has been debated at considerable length in the various important municipalities in India, and up to now, no practical solution has been found for it. I am therefore not surprised that the Government and a section of the House are opposed to the Resolution as it stands on purely economic grounds. I sympathise with their attitude in a sense, in that they find it impossible to accept the Resolution in the mandatory form in which the Honourable Mover has put it. I would therefore suggest for the consideration of Government whether they would not like to accept the Resolution if it is amended in a slight way. I would suggest that:

“For the words ‘to take suitable and effective measures’, the following be substituted: ‘to take such measures as may be practicable’.”

With your permission, Sir, I should like to ask the Honourable Mover whether he would accept my amendment.

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh: I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. H. P. Mody: The Honourable Mover has accepted the amendment and I therefore press it very strongly on the Government.

Mr. President: What is the amendment of the Honourable Member?

Mr. H. P. Mody: My amendment is to insert the words “such measures as may be practicable” in the place of the words, “suitable and effective measures”. As the Honourable Mover has accepted my suggestion, the Resolution loses its mandatory character. I cannot conceive that the Government can have any objection to a Resolution of this sort, because if they find that particular measures for the prevention of the slaughter of milch cows and prime calves are not practicable, then they need not take those measures. My anxiety is this, that this Resolution should not be entirely got out of the way by being thrown out at this stage, because the question is one of very considerable economic importance, and if Government persist in their attitude, then what happens? The Resolution is thrown out and there is nothing else left for consideration, and the great economic grievance remains unremedied. I therefore hope that Government will accept the modified Resolution as it stands, and with your permission, I should like to ask the Honourable Member, Sir Frank Noyce, whether he is prepared to accept it.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will have his right of reply.

Mr. H. P. Mody: What I say, Sir, is this, that if the Government are not disposed to accept this amendment, then I am afraid they will have forfeited their right to be regarded as reasonable in this matter.

Mr. President: It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Yes, Sir. I am merely giving my opinion, and I am afraid my opinion will be very strongly confirmed unless Government accept the point of view from which I have placed the matter before the House. My Honourable friend Sir Frank Noyce made a very well reasoned speech which went to show that the proposition could not be accepted as it stands. But when he comes to define his attitude towards the proposition as modified, if he still maintains that he cannot accept it, then I say a great deal of the force of what he said will be lost. If the Government are asked now to take whatever measures are practicable to prevent the slaughter of milch cows, how can they say that they will not even take these practical measures to prevent their slaughter? Does any man contend that milch cows and prime calves ought to be slaughtered if there are practicable ways of preventing that slaughter?

An Honourable Member: You have made no suggestion.

Mr. H. P. Mody: The question can at any rate be considered. We are not here to suggest practicable means. The effect of passing this proposition will be that Government will set about devising practicable ways. If there are no practicable ways, they will not do it. But if my Honourable friend persists in his previous attitude, what will happen is that an important question will be got out of purview by being thrown out and there will be nothing left. That is a position on which I do not think my Honourable friends can congratulate themselves, because the fact is undoubted that, so far as the main object of the proposition is concerned, it is a matter of very considerable importance that has been brought before the House. I move the amendment, Sir.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty Minutes to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty Minutes to Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

Sardar Bahadur Honorary Captain Hira Singh, Brar (Punjab: Nominated Non-official): Sir, I feel that as a farmer I must also say something in connection with the Resolution moved by the Honourable Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh. Sir, the Punjab used to be a famous place for good cattle, good bullocks and good horses. The Punjab Government, in my opinion, is still alive to the scarcity of good cattle. It is making all efforts to breed good cattle and it has started several cattle farms at several places in the new colonies such as Montgomery, Lyallpur and other places. But there is something wrong. The big areas of 100 rectangles or squares are allotted to the cattle breeders. But what happens? These people think that by keeping many cattle and by selling them at high

[Captain Hira Singh, Brar.]

prices they can make more money and live as rich men. Those cattle breeders have not been of any benefit to the farmers. As regards the Agricultural Department, they try to make every effort to improve the cattle breeding, but that is not done on any large scale. Good bulls are given here and there, but the heifers are not available to be given to the ordinary farmers. Of course I do not think that this Resolution has got anything to do with that. It is purely economic. Now, Sir, we see in the country the ordinary farmers possessing very poor draught animals which can hardly plough a *biga* of land throughout the whole of the day. There is no doubt that the good breed is gradually disappearing, both in respect of the draught animals and the milch cows. I see that half of the milch buffaloes are used as ploughing animals. I remember 30 years ago not a single male buffalo was seen in the ploughs. Most of them are using camels instead of bullocks because they think that the camels are little better than the male buffaloes. The result is that, unless the land is well ploughed and well tilled, no good and prosperous cultivation is possible.

As regards milk and *ghee*, everybody knows that it is a general cry in the country that we are getting more and more adulterated *ghee* and adulterated milk. In the big towns and in the cantonments I do not think anybody can get good milk unless it be from the military dairy farm or from one who maintains his own cow. It is impossible to get good milk even for a sick man. All that we get is either skimmed milk or adulterated milk or some cheap kind of milk. I know how important it is to have good milk when sick men are lying on their beds and they are prescribed seers of milk every day as their chief diet. About 30 or 40 years ago, Sir, I remember how much milk we used to have. If a passenger went to a village, he used to get as much milk as he could take. Now we all say that the deterioration of the race is due to want of good food and nourishing food like good milk. In my part of the country among the rural population they used to feed young children on cow's milk alone, and they possessed much better physiques than they possess now.

Sir, as for the draught animal, good bullocks and good milch cows are very scarce. There is no doubt there is something wrong somewhere. If the Agricultural Department extend their cattle breeding farm to every tahsil or sub-tahsil and to all districts and distribute good breeds among the cultivators, and also keep a register as they do for the horses, I think that would improve the breed of cattle. Of course it is a very big problem, but something ought to be done. There is no doubt that it is a very important question; it touches more the farmer than the citizens in towns who are simply keen on having good milk. If good breeds are preserved and are distributed, and a register kept, and an order issued that no animal will be destroyed out of that breed without the special sanction of the agricultural officers, I think that will make for improvement. As for grazing areas, Sir, as was suggested by some Honourable Members, I do not think that grazing in jungles can improve the breed more. It is the fodder, it is the grain on which the improved breed should live. I think it will be better, Sir, if some Committee is appointed and the question discussed as to how to improve the breed of cattle.

Mr. President: That is not the question; the question raised is of the prevention of the slaughter of milch cattle.

Sardar Bahadur Captain Hira Singh, Brar: About the slaughter of cows I support the Honourable Mover's Resolution that, except on religious occasions, the slaughter of cows of the improved breed should not be allowed and all good breeds should be preserved either locally or maintained by the agricultural farms. We want good bullocks of course for ploughing, and we want good cows for milk. Of course, if this question is brought before a Committee, they will reach some better conclusion. With these few remarks, I finish.

The Honourable Sir James Oserar (Home Member): I should like to take this opportunity of indicating very briefly the attitude of Government towards one or two points which have arisen in the course of this debate. I need not emphasise the fact that Government regard the subject-matter of the Resolution as one of the very greatest importance. I do not propose, and indeed it is not necessary for me, to traverse the ground which has already been covered much more adequately than I could cover it, by my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce. The Resolution which has been moved is one which the Government consider, as I understand its Mover also contemplated, raises primarily and solely very important economic issues, and it is from that point of view alone and with severe regard to practical necessities and possibilities that Government have considered it. I am, therefore, disposed to agree with the view which was expressed earlier in the debate that it would be regrettable if matters which are really extraneous to the question before the House were unduly dwelt upon. As I said, the problem has been regarded by Government as a purely economic one. Far be it from me to deny due weight to the considerations of humanity which were so eloquently urged by my Honourable and learned friend the Leader of the Opposition, whom I am glad to welcome here in that capacity. Every man will doubtless give the fullest weight to those considerations, but I am also disposed to agree with the point of view which was urged in that connection that the welfare and the prosperity of the humanity of this country is the greatest and most compelling of humanitarian considerations. Nevertheless, as I have already suggested, the point of view from which I think the House will be desirous of considering this question, and the point of view to which the Government must restrict its own consideration of the question, is the economic point of view. Now, having regard to the importance of this question, I ask the House to consider this: that it would be an act of unwisdom on the part of Government and might indeed lead to charges of breach of faith if they accepted a Resolution which committed them in such vague, such general and such indeterminate terms. I am unable to see in what respect the amendment moved by my Honourable friend from Bombay really affects the substance of the Resolution. The original Resolution recommended to Government to take suitable and effective measures. The amendment proposed by my Honourable friend from Bombay, I understand, is to make a recommendation to the Government to take all such measures as may be practicable. I cannot myself distinguish in any way between the practical effect of the original Resolution and the amendment of my Honourable friend, and I hope that he will on reflection not be prepared to take the somewhat drastic view which he announced if Government were not prepared, or found themselves unable, as it is now my object to inform the House that Government find themselves unable to accept his amendment. And for this reason. If Government accepts a Resolution proposed in this House in such terms as the present, they will be expected to do so with the intention of acting as fully as any practicable

[Sir James Crerar.]

interpretation of the Resolution might require them to do. There are many constructions which could be put upon the amendment proposed by my Honourable friend, many constructions which Government would probably find impossible to carry into effect; and I am most
 3 P.M. reluctant therefore to accept, on behalf of Government, a Resolution which commits them in vague and general terms. Apart from that, the course of the debate has elicited some very important points of view and some very important particular considerations. I am glad to have had the opportunity of hearing the matter discussed from the point of view of the practical farmer and one or two other practical suggestions have been made. It has been pointed out by one speaker that the question of cows which cease to be milk-bearing in the cities and which might possibly be restored to a milk-bearing condition should be considered, and it has been suggested that the question of railway freights has a bearing in this. Other similar aspects of the problem have also been raised, and to this and other similar practical points which might contribute very materially to a solution of the question in certain of its aspects the Government will be fully prepared to give the closest possible examination. But I regret that neither to the original Resolution nor to the Resolution as it is proposed to be amended can Government give its assent, in view, as I have explained before, of the very vague and very general commitments by which Government would thereby be obliged.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Mover wish to reply?

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh: Yes, Sir. I have carefully listened to the speeches in opposition to my Resolution. I do not want to give a long reply, as my friends who have spoken in support have already exhaustively dealt with the points taken. It has been admitted that a good case has been made out. Figures can be pitted against figures, arguments against arguments *ad infinitum*. But one cannot disbelieve the evidence of his own senses. So long as no pure milk can be had at more than five seers to the rupee, no genuine *ghee* at more than 10 chittaks to the rupee, so long as the vast majority remains vegetarian by long habit and temperament as also from sheer necessity, so long as lakhs and lakhs of infants in this country die like so many tiny insects for want of good milk, who can deny that things are not what they should be in so far as the caretaking of milch cattle is concerned. I beg to appeal once again to those who have misunderstood me to be kind enough to reflect on the matter calmly. Mussalmans too have to depend on agriculture as much as Hindus. Infant mortality makes no exception in favour of Mussalmans or Christians. I therefore say that the Honourable Mussalman Members will be rendering a valuable service to their own community as well if they will support my humble proposal or the amendment. If the Government will be pleased to assure the Assembly that a suitable scheme will be launched to achieve the end in view, this House, I am sure, will vote for the extra expenditure, seeing the immense relief that it will bring to the ill-fed and enfeebled millions and the poor nurselings.

Regarding the practical suggestions that my Honourable friends asked for, I would suggest first the transport of milch animals to places where breeding takes place and where it will not be profitable for a *goala* to sell them at cheap prices. I ask that the *phooka* system should be made penal under the Cruelty to Animals Act. I ask for more provision for

pasture grounds in all places where it is practicable, and I ask for a change in the forest policy. These are some of my practical suggestions.

I appeal to the Government once again to take some effective action to stop, or at least to minimise, the appalling infant mortality which, as their own medical experts say, can be combatted only by cheapening good milk supply.

The Agricultural Commission in fact felt constrained to say as follows:

"The position may be summed up by stating that there is unquestionably a large unsatisfied demand for ghee; there is a relatively small unsatisfied demand for butter; there is also in all cities, an unsatisfied demand for milk at lower prices. It must therefore be inferred that consumers in general are not able to pay the prices which, in existing conditions, are required to produce the supply."

So, Sir, all that is needed is a keen imagination to visualise the pathetic state of things as also the will to put an end to it, and ways and means are bound to suggest themselves.

With these few words, I beg to leave the Resolution and the amendment in the hands of the House and I thank you, Sir, for having given me a patient hearing.

Sir Frank Noyce: Have I your permission to reply, Sir?

Mr. President: The case for the Government has been fully stated by the Honourable Leader of the House. Is there anything new which the Honourable Member wishes to say?

Sir Frank Noyce: One or two points I might be able to clear up with your permission, Sir.

Mr. President: The Leader of the House has just spoken and he had every opportunity of stating the full Government case. In that view I cannot give permission.

* The original motion was:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take suitable and effective measures to prevent, throughout British India, the slaughter of all milch cows and prime calves, except for strictly religious purposes."

Since which an amendment has been moved,

"That for the words 'to take suitable and effective measures', the following be substituted: 'to take such measures as may be practicable'."

The question is that that amendment be made.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—24.

Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
Das, Mr. B.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mody, Mr. H. P.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
Sarda, Rai Sahib Harbilas.
Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.

NOES—45.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Alexander, Mr. W.
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.
 Banarji, Mr. Rajnarayan.
 Baum, Mr. E. F.
 Chambers, Mr. G. W.
 Coatman, Mr. J.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Crerar, The Honourable Sir James.
 Crosthwaite, Mr. H. S.
 Farookhi, Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb.
 Ferrers, Mr. V. M.
 French, Mr. J. C.
 Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
 Gwynne, Mr. C. W.
 Hamilton, Mr. K. L. B.
 Howell, Mr. E. B.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
 Mitter, The Honourable Sir Brojendra.

Monteath, Mr. J.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi Sayyid.
 Noyce, Sir Frank.
 Pai, Mr. A. Upendra.
 Rahimtulla, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sahi, Mr. Ram Prashad Narayan.
 Sams, Mr. H. A.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
 Shafee Daoodi, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
 Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
 Slater, Mr. S. H.
 Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tin Tut, Mr.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.
 Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Sir.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question is that the following Resolution be adopted :

“This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take suitable and effective measures to prevent, throughout British India, the slaughter of all milch cows and prime calves, except for strictly religious purposes.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—24.

Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.
 Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Moonje, Dr. B. S.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
 Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
 Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib Harbilas.
 Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad,

NOES—47.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.	Monteath, Mr. J.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.	Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.	Murtuza Sahab Bahadur, Maulvi
Alexander, Mr. W.	Sayyid.
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.	Noyce, Sir Frank.
Banarji, Mr. Rajnarayan.	Pai, Mr. A. Upendra.
Baum, Mr. E. F.	Rahimtulla, Mr. Fazal Ibrahim.
Chambers, Mr. G. W.	Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
Chatterjee, The Revd. J. C.	Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Coatman, Mr. J.	Sahi, Mr. Ram Prashad Narayan.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.	Sams, Mr. H. A.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.	Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
Crerar, The Honourable Sir James.	Bahadur.
Crosthwaite, Mr. H. S.	Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Farookhi, Mr. Abdul Latif Saheb.	Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
Ferrers, Mr. V. M.	Shafee Daoodi, Maulvi Mohammad.
French, Mr. J. C.	Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.	Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
Gwynne, Mr. C. W.	Slater, Mr. S. H.
Hamilton, Mr. K. L. B.	Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Howell, Mr. E. B.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.	Tin Tut, Mr.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra	Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Nath.	Young, Mr. G. M.
Mitter, The Honourable Sir Brojendra.	Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Sir.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 23rd January, 1930.