

शैक्षणिक सर्वेक्षण, एजुकेशनल सर्वे किया जा रहा है। इस के सिवा कलकत्ता कारपोरेशन से हम ने अनुरोध किया है कि एक ऐसा कार्यक्रम बना कर के पश्चिम बंगाल सरकार के सामने और केन्द्रीय सरकार के सामने रखें जिस का उन्होंने स्वीकार कर लिया है। इस के अतिरिक्त कलकत्ता कारपोरेशन से यह भी अनुरोध किया गया है, और उन्होंने स्वीकार किया है कि किस प्रकार से वहाँ अनिवार्य प्राथमिक निःशुल्क शिक्षा जारी की जा सकती है वह इस पर भी विचार करें, और अगर एजुकेशनल सेस भी लगाना पड़े तो इस के ऊपर भी विचार किया जाये।

इस सम्बन्ध में चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना के बारे में मैं कुछ आंकड़े आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। पश्चिम बंगाल सरकार ने जो कार्यक्रम तैयार किया है और उस में जो व्यवस्था की है उस के मुताबिक अगले पांच वर्षों में कलकत्ता महानगर क्षेत्र में 2 करोड़ 80 प्राथमिक शिक्षा फैलाने पर खर्च किये जायेंगे और 1 करोड़ 80 कुछ अन्य नागरिक क्षेत्रों में खर्च किये जायेंगे ?

श्री बी० चं० शर्मा : क्या योजना कमीशन से उस की मंजूरी हो चुकी है।

श्री भक्त दर्शन : जब आप मंजूर करेंगे, भगवन्, तभी वह लागू होगा।

राज्य सरकार ने जो अंतिम पत्र इस सम्बन्ध में भेजा है उस के अनुसार उन्होंने यह आश्वासन दिया है कि वे पहले से अधिक तेजी से इस के ऊपर ध्यान दे रहे हैं। उन्होंने एक तो आर्थिक कठिनाई बतलाई है; दूसरी कठिनाई उन्होंने यह बतलाई है कि कलकत्ते नरीखे महानगर में मकान मिलने बड़े कठिन हैं। लेकिन फिर भी आशा की जाती है कि चौथी पंच वर्षीय योजना के दौरानमें वहाँ जो इस समय असन्तोषजनक स्थिति है उस में काफी सुधार होगा और प्रायः सब लड़के पढ़ सकेंगे।

श्रीमन्, मैं सदन का और अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं माननीय सदस्य को और इस सदन को विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि कलकत्ता नगर हमारे देश का सब से बड़ा नगर है; अगर वहाँ पर शिक्षा की पूरी प्रगति नहीं होती है तो यह हमारे लिए अशोभनीय है, शोभा की बात नहीं है, बल्कि लज्जा की बात है, इस लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार, राज्य सरकार और कलकत्ता कारपोरेशन मिल कर इस को आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करेंगे; यह आश्वासन मैं देना चाहता हूँ।

श्री मधु लियये : एक बात का जवाब नहीं आया कि क्या 72 फीसदी लड़कों को फीस देनी पड़ रही है।

श्री भक्त दर्शन : जी हाँ, यह मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ।

18.45 hrs.

MOTIONS RE. INCIDENTS IN NEW DELHI ON 7TH NOVEMBER, 1966 AND BANNING OF COW SLAUGHTER—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall resume the discussion on cow-slaughter now. Shri Krishnapal Singh.

Shri Krishnapal Singh (Jalesar): Sir, it is really unfortunate that it should be necessary for a private member....

An hon. Member: What is the time left?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 50 minutes are left. How long does the House want to sit? I think if we hear the statement of the minister, it may cut short the discussion. As soon as he comes here, I will call upon him to make the statement.

श्री हुकम कन्द कछवाय (देवाम) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोग बैठने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन इस पर पूरी तरह चर्चा होनी चाहिये। दो घंटे का समय बढ़ाया जाये।

Shri Tyagi: Sir, I was on my legs
(Interruptions).

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
Sir, I move that we sit for two more
hours, that the time for this discussion
be extended by one hour and ten
minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If that is the
desire of the House, I have no ob-
jection.

Several hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right. It
is 6.45 now. We will go on till 8.45.

Shri Krishnapal Singh: Sir, it is un-
fortunate that this problem of impos-
ing a ban on cow slaughter and slaugh-
ter of other types of cattle should
be discussed in this House on a motion
moved by a private Member. It is still
more unfortunate that three of India's
leading saints, the Shankarachariya,
Swami Karpatriji and the great Brah-
machari Prabhhu Duttji and a number
of other Sadhus should risk their lives
by fasting unto death before this
Government accepts this ban or re-
fuses to accept it. It is most unfortu-
nate that the views of an overwhelm-
ing majority of people in the country
—all the Hindus, Jains, Sikhs, quite
a large number of Muslims and mem-
bers of other communities who are in
favour of imposition of a ban on cow
slaughter and slaughter of other types
of cattle should be ignored by Gov-
ernment, and it may be only a very
small minority, a handful of people
are opposed to this; yet, Government
is not able to accept it. In such cir-
cumstances the Government is feeling
so diffident to make up its mind.
They take up their stand on a techni-
cal ground, on an entirely technical
ground, that the Constitution does not
permit them to make a law, does not
permit the Union Government to
frame a law. Some hon. Member has
already pointed out that we have had
23 amendments of this Constitution,
some amendments on trifling mat-
ters, and yet when it comes to such an
important matter, a demand which is

backed by an overwhelming majority
of people in the country, this Gov-
ernment says that it has to amend
the Constitution and that is why they
cannot frame any law. Sir, it is for
the Constitution-pundits like my hon.
friend, Shri Chatterjee, to tell
us whether such a law can be
framed under the existing provisions
of the Constitution or not. I have here
the opinion of one of the lawyers, and
it is that the Union Government can
frame a law for imposing a ban on the
slaughter of cattle without amending
the Constitution. Well, conceding that
it will need an amendment of the
Constitution, I do not see why on such
an important matter Government
could not bring an amendment of the
Constitution before the adjournment
of this House. Now, the only alter-
native left to them is to ask the Pre-
sident to promulgate an ordinance and
I hope the Government will have the
wisdom to advise the President to do
it.

This problem has two sides; it can
be divided into two parts. One is
sentiment and the other economics.
Some people think that sentiment is a
matter to which much value need not
be attached. I ask these people how do
they determine the relationship be-
tween human beings if they do not
take sentiment into consideration. Is
our relationship with our friends, with
our parents, with our other relatives
determined by economics alone? Is it
ever possible in the human society to
decide everything on the basis of eco-
nomics? No, it is not possible. Sent-
iment plays a very important part in
our lives and in this particular matter,
sentiment of an overwhelming num-
ber of people is so strong that it is
time Government pays proper atten-
tion to it.

As regards the economic aspect, I
may be permitted to say that, first of
all, in my opinion—I have been a
farmer and I have studied this prob-
lem in the agricultural institute—no
cattle is uneconomic and no cattle is

unproductive, provided we make arrangements for grazing. In this country there are such vast areas of forests and grazing grounds in various parts of our country that all the so-called unproductive cattle can certainly be maintained on them.

If we are to go through the figures of estimated unproductive cattle we will notice one thing which is very significant. The number of unproductive cattle is more in States where there is no law banning the slaughter of cattle. I will read the figures. According to Government figures the percentage of unproductive cattle in different States is as follows: Jammu and Kashmir 0.77, Rajasthan 1.22, Bihar 1.92, Madhya Pradesh 1.51, Mysore 2.15, Punjab 0.7. Uttar Pradesh 0.78 (now I come to States where slaughter of cows is not prohibited by law) Assam 4.36, Madras 5.28, Andhra Pradesh 3.34 and West Bengal 2.47. So, the argument that a ban on slaughter of cattle will result in a larger number of unproductive cattle is absolutely incorrect. In fact, the position is just the reverse. There is a large number of unproductive cattle in States where there is no ban.

Then, people talk: cows give milk, it is all right, but why have bullocks; tractors are there for ploughing. But, then, will tractors yield any manure?

I am a farmer and I have given up the use of a tractor because I find that bullocks are more economical and better. We can get better cultivation with bullocks than by any tractor. I think, people who study the economics, the cost of cultivation by tractor and the cost of cultivation by bullocks, will always give their decision in favour of the bullocks.

I therefore think that it is absolutely necessary, from the point of view of sentiment and from the point of view of economics that we should impose a ban and the Centre should do it straightaway.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan):
 Sir, I want to inform the House that while we are debating this important

matter, there is very serious news that we have received. We have received very sad news that the condition of the Shankaracharya is very, very grave and there is rapid deterioration in the state of his health. Therefore, some Members of Parliament had the privilege to discuss the matter with the Home Minister. I am appealing that we should not now waste time in discussing the economic problem, the agrarian problem, the population pressure and other things. It is absolutely clear and I say it definitely, taking my stand on the clear enunciation of the law by the Supreme Court of India that total ban can be imposed in regard to two things.

My hon. friend, the Raja Bahadur, was asking my opinion. I am reading the judgment of Chief Justice S. R. Das in the great case of Quereshi against the State of Bihar (1958 Supreme Court, page 755). His Lordship is summing up the whole legal situation in paragraph 44. I had something to do with that case because I was then connected with an all-India organisation and also the anti-cow slaughter movement. Chief Justice S. R. Das says:—

“So approaching and analysing this problem, we have reached the conclusion (i) that a total ban on the slaughter of cows of all ages and calves of cows and calves of she-buffaloes, male and female, is quite reasonable and valid and is in consonance with the Directive Principles enshrined in our Constitution laid down in article 48;”

Chief Justice S. R. Das also goes on to say:—

“(ii) that a total ban on the slaughter of she-buffaloes or breeding of bulls or working bullocks (cattle as well as buffaloes) as long as they are as milch or draught cattle is also reasonable and valid”.

The only thing that His Lordship observed, could not be done is:—

“a total ban on the slaughter of she-buffaloes, bulls and bullocks

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

(cattle or buffalo) after they cease to be capable of yielding milk or of breeding or working as draught animals cannot be supported as reasonable in the interest of the general public."

Therefore, that cannot be banned.

So far as these two matters are concerned, I am appealing to the Home Minister today to make a definite and categorical statement so that the great tragedy may be averted. Whether we like it or not, the fact is that this Shankaracharya is an apostolic successor of the great maker of Hindu India, the Great Shankaracharya, and millions of people worship him as a God-given man. His life is in danger.

There is somehow a feeling—I told the Home Minister—that the exit of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda from the Home Ministry means a definite shift in Government policy. Therefore, there is a certain amount of misunderstanding and misapprehension that there has been, really some alteration in the stand. Let the Home Minister make it perfectly clear that he stands by the categorical statement which Shri Gulzarilal Nanda made and that he will take steps in two things. He should state that so far as the Union territories are concerned—it is completely in his hand—he will introduce the necessary legislation.

I saw the Chief Minister of one State. I take it that if the Home Minister wants it—the law is perfectly clear—a total ban can be imposed. Shri Nanda, as Home Minister, said that it should be imposed. The present Home Minister should make it perfectly clear that he will take immediate steps in that direction.

With regard to some States which have not yet introduced this kind of legislation, which is permissible and valid, the Home Minister assured us that he has taken some steps. Some States have responded; some States are not in a responsive mood. There-

fore, immediate—I do not say, pressure—steps should be taken to make them see sense. For instance, my State West Bengal, has not yet responded. I do not know why. Let that thing be clarified and let him take steps.

19 hrs.

If a categorical statement is made that at least in these matters, where the Union Government can immediately take action, there will be no hesitation, no delinquency, no shortcoming, I am quite sure the Shankaracharya and other great saints can be saved. One saint is already dead. We should remember that it is linked up with the evolution of Hindu culture and Hindu traditions through the ages, generations and centuries. The cow has been placed on a peculiar pedestal having regard to the evolution of our history. Even in Jammu and Kashmir State, as you know, this legislation has been honoured by all the Muslim and it is still honoured and, therefore, I think that there should be no hesitation in making a categorical and a definite statement in respect of two things. One is that total ban, as declared by the Supreme Court which is constitutionally legal and permissible, should be imposed. In Union Territories, where he can operate, the Home Minister should immediately make a categorical statement that it shall be done. In regard to other territories, it should be made clear as to which States have responded, and which States are not responsive and are still hesitant or diffident and are creating difficulties. The hon. Minister should take steps in the matter and I am sure, if that is done, not much of debate or discussion is necessary. It will clarify the situation and it will assuage the religious sentiments of the millions of the people. I say, save the life of one of the greatest saints of modern India. That life is precious and, God forbid, if something happens, there will be terrible repercussions and no amount of Emergency

or Preventive Detention law or any other law will be of any help in tackling the situation.

I again make this appeal that let the Home Minister, without any further discussion, make a categorical and a clear statement giving assurances, reiterating the stand, if possible, in stronger words than what was given by Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, that the Government's policy has not changed and that the new Home Minister does not mean any deflection from the old policy and that he stands with that fully and that he will see the implementation of what the Supreme Court has clearly laid down as permissible, valid and legally constitutional.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have moved this amendment to give a definite meaning and purpose to this discussion which has been held.

19.03 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Why don't you read the amendment?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It has been circulated.

The motion, as it stood in the name of my hon. friend, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, would have been discussed without any conclusions and we would have just talked it out. To avoid that, I have moved this amendment to give a definite meaning and purpose to the discussion.

I think, there has never been any doubt in our minds, at least so far as I am concerned, about the proposition which has been enunciated by my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee quoting the Supreme Court judgment. As a matter of fact, certain States have already taken this step. If certain States have already taken that step, that is quite clearly indicative of the fact that we not only accept that proposition but we have acted upon that proposition.

It has been said that there should be a central legislation and that the Central Government should be able to do it. But it has been conceded that it cannot be done without the passing of an amendment of the Constitution. Another point which has been made is that we have amended the Constitution twentythree times and why not do it the twentyfourth time. Let us understand that in this matter, when we amend the Constitution, we have to carry the States with us because we have got to get it implemented by the States because it is the States which are affected. Whenever we have amended the Constitution, we have always carried the States with us.

My hon. friend suggested that let the President pass an ordinance. I think, the President cannot pass an ordinance. The President cannot have the rights which this House has not got. The President has only those rights which this House has and those which can be endorsed and passed by this House. Therefore, there is no point in that.

Let us put the whole thing in a correct perspective. It is not the time when we have to depend on this side or on that side. We have to put it in a correct perspective. The Directive Principle is there; the principle is accepted. There are so many Directive Principles. I think, of all the Directive Principles, if any Directive Principle which has received, whether because of the Centre or because of the States, any implementation, this stands almost at the top. What has happened about Prohibition?

What about primary education? It is because of the compulsion of certain circumstances that we have not been able to go about it. I see the importance and urgency of this matter. It is not only economics that should be taken into account. The sentiments cannot be ignored. We are human beings and we live in a society where sentiments and feelings count. But at the same time let us not be

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

overwhelmed by these feelings and sentiments.

So far as India is concerned, our economy is based on cow. Ours is a cow-based economy as a matter of fact. Even when we are in the jet age today we believe,

हमारे देश में दूध, दही और गहूँ की नदियाँ बहें

Our economy is definitely based on cow. Even Mr. Khrushchev, when he was talking about agriculture said that we cannot think about agriculture, even in the scientific age, without animal husbandry. It is in that context that we have to see. Let it not be forgotten that it is in that context and in a very correct context that the Directive Principle has been made. If you read the Directive Principle, you will find that it is in the context of this maxim that this Directive principle has been given to us. I

wish the hon. House realise that. There is absolutely no going back upon what the hon. Home Minister has said. As a matter of fact, the former Home Minister, Mr. Nanda, made a very clear and categorical statement. There is absolutely no doubt about it so far as I can see it. Though it is for the Home Minister to say that in so many words, being connected with it and having discussed this matter with the Prime Minister and with the Home Minister, I see that there is absolutely no departure from that policy. As a matter of fact, they have gone a step further. May I inform the House that I congratulate the Government of Rajasthan in this matter? They have already taken a further step. There was a ban on cow slaughter altogether. Now they have gone a step further and placed a ban on even the export of cow from the State; no cow or no milch cattle can be taken out from the State. That was a point made out. We must be able to appreciate that it is not only that we are sticking to that statement, but we are also taking positive and concrete steps towards that direction and here is the Rajasthan Government which has taken that step.

A word is necessary about the approach. If we want that positive steps should be taken in this matter, then there are two things which must follow. One is that we must look also to the constructive side of it, that those people who are interested in cow and the protection of cow take these constructive steps which will enable us to give a full meaning to this—to banning cow slaughter. If you want a ban on cow slaughter, then it follows that the religious heads should give up their agitational approach. The agitational approach should be given up to further the interest of the cow. The agitational approach must be given up to further the interest which they have in their heart, so that positive steps can be taken in a cool, calm and collected manner. I am sure the Home Minister will spare no effort in this. About shifting the responsibility to the States, I have made the position very clear in my Resolution. Of course, we have to do it in co-operation with the States. For implementation it will be the States which will have to take action. I purposely have gone on record in this particular resolution where I have said that the Central Government take steps—not only steps but I have gone further to say that the Central Government take vigorous steps . . .

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): What does he mean by 'vigorous steps'?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It means that you take positive action which will bear result.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: The Prime Minister can talk to the Chief Ministers . . .

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Not in that manner. We do not take it in a leisurely manner. We take it in a sincere manner and we take all the necessary steps quickly and strongly, so that we may be able to

go ahead about it. Therefore, I want to impress upon the House the particular wording of this Resolution. Of course, we have to say that the Government will have to take vigorous steps for implementation of the ban. There is a small mistake; we have to say "for implementation of the ban". Let it be for implementation of the ban because it would be the State Governments which will have to do it. Let us come to grips with the problem instead of accusing each other or instead of trying to take any political benefit out of it. I do not want to take any political benefit out of it. Let us do something. It is very necessary that this House does something. I would appeal to the hon. Home Minister to accept this amendment. In this amendment I have fixed certain responsibilities on him. I have made certain requests and certain appeals to him. At the same time, I have made also a great appeal to all the persons concerned to give up this agitational approach and to forget the past. I do hope that the House will pass this resolution or amendment which will strengthen the hands of all friends who have this objective in view so that there would be a good response to what has been said by this House in the resolution that would be unanimously passed by this House. I am sure that what is said in this resolution to be passed unanimously by this House will be respected by Shankaracharya. We respect him, and I hope he also will respect the wishes of the House.

Mr. Chairman: Now, the hon. Home Minister. He is only intervening.

Shri Nambiar: Our views also should be heard before he speaks. Some more time has been given for this debate.

Mr. Chairman: The Home Minister is only intervening. We are not concluding the debate now. The reply will be there at the end.

एक माननीय सदस्य : सब की राय जानन के बाद गृह मंत्री अपनी बात कहें . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should listen to the Chair first. After we listen to the Home Minister, if there are any other points they could be made and the reply will come. It will be better if hon. Members listen to the Home Minister now.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Would you please listen to us for a minute? There are divergent views on the subject. Some views have been given expression to already. There are other views also which the Home Minister should hear before he makes his statement.

After the Minister's statement, we know what is going to happen to the debate, because already it is about 7.15 p.m.; after the Home Minister's speech, you know what will happen.

Shri Nambiar: We protest against this.

Mr. Chairman: What has the hon. Minister to say on this?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): I shall explain the position. The motion has not been moved by me, and so, there is no question of a reply from my side. The right of reply vests in the hon. Mover Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

What I propose to do is this. I am not going to reply to any of the points made here in this debate. The purpose of my intervention is to explain the policy of Government. So, there is no question of any reply to the debate or of joining issues with anyone. This will be my only speech in this discussion.

श्री हुक्म चन्द कछवाय : हमने ये आरोप लगाये हैं उजका जवाब देगा

श्री यशवन्तराव सहवाण : बृह मं दूंगा ।

श्री हुक्म चन्द कछवाय : हमारे आरोपों का जवाब आना चाहिए ।

Banning of Cow-slaughter (Ms.)

Shri Y. B. Chavan: First of all, I shall take up the question about what happened on the 7th November, and deal with some of the points made by certain Members, particularly Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya. He made some imaginary allegations and statements. He said that on that day, a large number of police officers and police constables were on leave and some goondas were imported from Calcutta. He mentioned certain figures. If these figures are true then I am tempted sometimes to say that he should be in charge of all the police activities.

An hon. Member: Goondas.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He cannot take charge of goondas. There is another man in Calcutta who is already in possession of that.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That may be so. I can only tell this House that there is no truth in what he has said. Possibly, he was misinformed or misguided.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : एन्वयारी कर्वाडये, सब सामने आ जायगा ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am making a statement here only after making all the inquiries that I could make.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आप न्यायिक जांच कर्वाडए न ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have heard what he wanted to say. Now, let him hear what I want to say.

So there was not any large number of people, men, on leave, so far as the police were concerned. So there was no question of there being any difficulty on that score.

I quite concede one point. This point was made by Dr. Singhvi also. We never said that those responsible leaders, saints and mahatmas who participated in this demonstration had any intention of committing violence or that they started with the purpose

of organising any violent demonstration as such. I quite concede that point. It is nobody's case; our only case is that though these things start innocently, they could not anticipate what was likely to happen. When on an explosive issue, lakhs of people have been organised to stage a demonstration like this, it was bound to go out of control. That is what exactly happened in this case. Now, they are trying to run away from the consequences of it. One can understand it. I do understand their difficulty in this matter. But it is no use saying that these violent activities flowing from this demonstration must have been organised by the police. It is a rather very interesting theory. But I would only request them and tell them that it is no use trying to resort to this sort of stratagem. The fact is that all these things which were innocently started ultimately resulted in violence. Therefore, it is no use trying to completely dissociate themselves from this. Some people did come or they could not organise it properly so as to control them. The fact remains that those responsible parties who organised these things got a very large number of people from outside. They cannot say that every person that was brought was certified one way or the other. When thousands of people come from thousands of places, it is quite possible—it is humanly possible—that some anti-social elements might have got involved in them. It only stands to reason that that should happen. I concede that point. But I am sure they will not concede it.

My case is that the demand they are making for some sort of judicial inquiry etc. is completely uncalled for. There is absolutely no case for it. The people who are involved in prosecution with whatever evidence is there will go through that. The matter is being examined and naturally those people who will be found guilty will certainly face the consequences thereof. To that extent, certainly the investigation and inquiry will go on.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are you sure there was no conspiracy by some in-

interested persons against Nandaji or anybody else?

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): It is a funny story.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As far as my information goes, there was no conspiracy of this type, to which they make a reference, but there was certainly this conspiracy to use this occasion to develop into some sort of violent activity.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is exactly the point. By whom? Is it not a fact that a lakh of Mr. Patil's sadhus clashed with a lakh of Nandaji's sadhus?

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalappuzha): The Minister himself has said that there was a conspiracy.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Conspiracy in this sense that some people organised this thing because these things do not happen without organisation. These matters are being investigated and will be pursued further. But the type of judicial inquiry asked for is not necessary and is not feasible in this matter; it is neither in their interest, nor in the interest of the country nor in the interest of anybody to have a judicial inquiry of the type demanded. I put a full stop to it there.

I come to the other motion.

Shri Bade (Kharagone): He has not mentioned about the dead bodies.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : 122 लोग मरे हैं इसके अन्दर... (व्यवधान) कुछ लोगों को पेट्रोल में जलाया गया ।

Mr. Chairman: When the hon. Minister is not yielding, there is no use interrupting.

श्री प्रकाशचर शरमा : कांग्रेस प्रेसिडेंट कामराज के दफ्तर पर हमला हुआ, वह भी एक बात है ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: All those things are being separately investigated. Every thing will depend upon the result of those investigations.

About the dead bodies, we did make inquiries, because certain allegations were made about this point in the other House as a result of which I had to make certain inquiries. My information is that that body was not in the hospital. That was the report. I asked some officer to make an inquiry. The statement of the medical officer was produced before me. The report that has been sent to me is that that body was not there.

Shri Bade: How is it that a photostat copy has been produced.

Shri Joachim Alava (Kanara): It is a forgery.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am not saying that.

Shri Bade: It was not a forgery at all. I can show you the letter.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister has taken note of your point.

Shri Bade: He makes wild allegations. Why don't you ask him?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: What is the photostat copy? It is the photostat copy of a note, a doctor writing a note to a nurse.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : असल कापी मेरे पास है ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan:... "Please see whether there is the body and tell the people who are bringing this any information about it." That note and its photostat copy does not convey more than that. We certainly took the statement of the nurse concerned. The nurse concerned says, "Nobody brought this note to me". Otherwise, if the note were conveyed or handed over to her, it would not have been with the person carrying the note, and again getting a photostat copy. It is a very obvious fact. Some people came to the doctor, and naturally, with a view to help them, he gave a note to the nurse to get the information. The nurse says nobody brought that note to her. Now we find that note in the form of a photostat copy. Instead of that note being produced before the nurse, it is being produced in Parliament.

Shri Bade: Because the dead body was not there, it was not produced.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am not drawing any inference. I am merely stating the facts as they were officially reported to me.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: If further facts are brought to your notice, kindly look into it.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If more facts are brought to my notice, I will certainly look into it. These are the facts brought to my notice, and I have looked into that. This is the result of that enquiry. Coming to the other motion, which is a very important motion . . .

श्री मुकरंजद ढडुवाय : बरपुः में
जो पैदाइ से जनमे गये

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am not going to say in a more deliberate or detailed manner, but only in a few sentences I would like to state the Government's policy in this matter. Mr. Chatterjee wanted a categorical statement, and he wanted to know whether Mr. Nanda's resignation was an indication of any shift of policy or any departure from the policy that he announced himself. No individual Minister makes the policy. Even when Mr. Nanda made the statement on the floor of the House, it was the Government's policy, and that Government's policy stands unchanged. There is no shift, there is no departure. So, I am making a categorical statement to assure Mr. Chatterjee and this hon. House, and through this hon. House the country, that the policy statement made by Mr. Nanda on the floor of the House stands unchanged.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why was Nandaji changed?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That is a separate matter.

There are certainly some realities in this matter that we must see. The Constitution has accepted the principle of a ban or cow slaughter. This

Government is bound by that constitutional provision, and as a result of this, not as a result of pressure of any movement or anybody, the majority of the States in this country have accepted this policy, legislated for it and they are implementing it.

But at the same time, there is also the constitutional position that States have their own rights in this matter. They will have to legislate, their legislatures will have to legislate.

Another feature of the statement that Nandaji made on the floor of the House was that he would take up these matters with the State Governments. Nandaji himself had taken up this matter with the State Governments, and I assure this hon. House that this Government will continue to take up this matter with the State Governments as vigorously as is contemplated by the amendment of hon. Mr. Shastri, more vigorously.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: That should not mean any pressure on State Governments.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: When you take up a matter vigorously with us, you do not pressurise us, do you? When we say that we take up the matter vigorously, it is a democratic expression to be understood in a democratic manner. So, Sir, when we say that this Government will take steps it does not mean any legislative steps. It certainly, naturally, means that we will have to discuss with the different State Governments and some State Governments have reacted very favourably. Andhra, Assam and I have information that Maharashtra also had appointed a committee to consider the other aspects of it because these State Governments have to implement it. It is not merely a question of having a law and adding to the statute book one more law.

Shri Namblar: Just like prohibition law. What is the use?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is a question of implementing it honestly. Therefore they have appointed some committees and are going into the matter. There are certain steps which we will have to sit and discuss, we will have to understand and advise about their difficulties, and try to remove the difficulties if any. That is a process which is inherently a long drawn out process. In order to complete that process successfully, it is the atmosphere that matters. It is the attitude of the whole country; it is the attitude of the whole number of parties that function in our country.....

Shri Nambiar: And the secular state of affairs.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: We do want to pursue this matter. We know the direction in which we have to go; we have made journey in that direction; a very substantial journey has been made in that direction. We want your help, support and co-operation; we want the co-operation of the State Governments in this matter. But this is not the way of getting co-operation of the State Governments by creating conditions and making one get the feeling that somebody is trying to wrongly pressurise or even coerce. I would request Shri Chatterjee and Shri Prakash Vir Shastriji to help the cause in which they have faith and we have faith. Faith in the ban on cow-slaughter is not the monopoly of any individual. It is a feeling and sentiment which we individually accept and it is also enunciated in the Constitution. We have accepted it and laws have been passed and we have implemented that. We want your co-operation in this matter. Every issue that is being tried to be solved through an agitational approach is a wrong thing. I am not merely telling this to hon. Member Shri Shastriji and other hon. Members also. The atmosphere of agitation takes away the necessary healthy atmosphere in which decisions can be taken and implemented. Let me also say

that I have got respect for all the great men who are on fast; we all respect the great Shankaracharya. But every Government and administration ultimately will have to function in a rational way and take certain rational decision. How can it be taken or implemented in an atmosphere which is vitiated by this kind of thing. I have made a categorical statement.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: What about Union Territories?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Some Union Territories have legislatures and they have also written to us that they are examining these questions. As far as Delhi is concerned, immediately after the Parliament session is over, the U.P. Act will be extended to this territory. We are advancing in this matter. It is a question of accepting the realities. I have mentioned the realities. It is a question of creating an atmosphere of co-operation; it is very essential. I would, therefore, request the hon. Members here to persuade those people who are on fast to give up this fast and persuade those people who are unnecessarily creating an atmosphere of agitation to give up that agitation. If necessary, discussions can be held and dialogue can be continued in the matter, difficulties of each other can be tried to be understood. It is only through this way that every important issue can be solved. That is, really speaking the way; as I understand it, of democratic functioning. If policies are there, these policies have to be implemented in a certain way. In this matter, it is not merely the Centre's policy but also the States' co-operation is very essential. I request the hon. House to help me in this matter by accepting—I must say that I am going to accept—the amendment suggested by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. I therefore request this hon. House to support—

Shri Nambiar: You are accepting his amendment?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Yes, I am accepting his amendment.

Shri Nambiar: The "vigorous" amendment?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Yes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Nambiar is always very vigorous in this House, and so, why should he object to my being vigorous or my government being vigorous?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I request this hon. House to accept the appeal I made and also the amendment moved by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Barupal.

श्री प० ला० बरूपाल (गंगानगर)

समापति महोदय, मैं आप का आभारी हूँ कि मुझ पूरे सेशन में तो बोलने का मौका मिला नहीं, लेकिन आज इस पवित्र और महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर आप ने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया।

‘जहां तक गोवध बन्द करने का प्रश्न है, मैं इस से सहमत हूँ। लेकिन आज मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि हमारे देश में ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं जो हिन्दू भी कहलाते हैं और जो गोवध बन्द करने के सम्बन्ध में बातें भी करते हैं, लेकिन व्यावहारिक तौर से, सैद्धान्तिक तौर से उन के कहने और करने में बड़ा अन्तर है। वह हमारी सरकार के लिये तो कहते हैं कि यह शर्म की बात है कि वह गोवध बन्द नहीं करना चाहती, लेकिन वह लोग दो अल्सेशियन कते रख कर पाल सकते हैं, आज उनके बच्चों के पीने के लिये दूध चाहिये, कुत्तों के लिये दूध चाहिये, कुत्तों के लिये मीठ चाहिये, लेकिन ऐसे आदमी एक गाय नहीं रख सकते। क्या यह उनके लिये शर्म की बात नहीं है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज उनकी भी उतना ही अपराध माना जाना चाहिये जो जब तक गाय दूध देती है तब उसका दूध पीते हैं लेकिन जैसे ही वह दूध देना बन्द कर देती है, उस गाय को अपने घर से निकाल देते हैं और वह गाय तड़प तड़प कर मरती है। ऐसे

आदमियों की सूची बनाई जानी चाहिये और ऐसी गायों की संख्या रखनी चाहिये जो घर से बाहर निकाल दी जाती हैं। जो लोग ऐसी गायों की देख भाल नहीं करते हैं उन को गोहत्याओं में शामिल किया जाना चाहिये और उन को दंड का भागी बनाया जाना चाहिये।

दूसरा निवेदन मैं यह करना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर बहुत से सत्यासी आये। कुछ सम्प्रदायों के साधुओं को छोड़ कर बहुत से साधु तो स्वभाव से ही सीधे होते हैं और उन के सीधा होने के कारण कुछ राजनीतिक लोग उन से फायदा उठाते हैं या फायदा उठाने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत से महात्माओं और बड़े बड़े ऋषि मुनियों ने आन्दोलन किया या चाहे जो किया हो, मैं हर एक के प्रति श्रद्धा रखता हूँ हृदय से उन को सद्भावना की दृष्टि से देखता हूँ, लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि लाखों की संख्या में ऐसे साधु भी हैं जिन को पीने के लिये दूध चाहिये। उन में से जो साधु जंगलों में रहते हैं उन को घास मुफ्त मिल सकती है। आज ऐसे धार्मिक लोग अधिक नहीं हैं जो उन साधुओं को गाय खरीद कर दे सकें। लेकिन वह लोग गाय नहीं पालते। उन को पीने के लिये दूध जरूर चाहिये। उन साधुओं के बारे में भी हम को सोचना चाहिये।

आज भी हजारों की संख्या में गाय जो मड़ सड़ कर, तड़प तड़प कर मरती हैं। उन गायों को पालने के लिये सरकार कुछ भी करती हो, लेकिन ऐसी संस्था है, ऐसे मन्दिर हैं, मठ हैं जिन के पास कराड़ों रुपयों की सम्पत्ति है। क्यों न उन का पैसा गोसंवर्द्धन के लिये लगाया जाये। यदि ऐसा किया जाये तो इस से गायों को बहुत कुछ लाभ हो सकता है।

जहां तक गोवधबन्दी का प्रश्न है, मैं उस को हृदय से चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग गोवध बन्दी की बातें करते हैं वह खुद उस का कार्य रूप में नहीं लाना चाहते

है। वह सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टि से अपनाना चाहते हैं लेकिन व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से कुछ भी नहीं करते हैं। जैसा मंत्रों महादय ने स्पष्ट शब्द फर दिया है, और इस में दो रायें नहीं हैं, लेकिन सोच विचार कर के यह तय करना चाहिये कि यह किस तरह से बन्द हो सकता है। आज तड़प तड़प कर गाये मरती है, उन का इन्तजाम समाज को करना चाहिये, मठाधीशों को करना चाहिये और हिन्दू धर्म के लोगों को करना चाहिये। वह खुद कुछ नहीं करते हैं और तमाम बातें सरकार पर छाड़ देते हैं और राजनीतिक दृष्टि से उस का नाजायज फायदा उठाते हैं। धन्यवाद।

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Nambiar, Before he starts, may I make an appeal. I see that many more Members are going to speak. If the House agrees, can I reduce the time-limit of 10 minutes to about five minutes each?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Five minutes each.

Shri Nambiar: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have also sentiments for the cattle and cows, and all living beings. But I have got sentiments first to protect the human beings. Here, the question is this: whether we should ban cow slaughter. Cow-slaughter is going on. Why? I had a cow; I got milk, but as soon as the productivity was over, however much I loved the cow, I did not have the money to feed it and so I had to dispose of it ultimately. That is what is happening. Even the very sadhus, if at all they possess any cow, would ultimately do so.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): What is the stand of your party?

Shri Nambiar: I am speaking on behalf of the Communist Party—Marxist Group. I have no fear. The minister may have fears because he is playing to the tune of somebody to catch votes. Let us not make this a vote-catching issue. I want to be frank. We love the cow and we will see that

it is protected as far as possible. But when that limit is exceeded, we will have to dispose of it. There is already scarcity of food and fodder and there are economic problems. We must see what is happening in the whole world. After all, cows are there in other countries also, which have their own economic problems. If any hon. members want to protect the cow, we will support them. If necessary I will bring some fodder in my pocket from Madras when I come next and hand it over to Mr. Kachwai. But there are sentiments of the other religions and castes in this country. We cannot pay lip sympathy to secularism in our speeches and in action do everything against it. We will be enacting Ayub Khan in India in another fashion if we do so.

Shri Bade: You are enacting Chou En-lai.

Shri Nambiar: Let us not worry about Chou En-lai. I am talking of the Indian cow, not Chinese cow. Ayub Khan wants to protect only Islam in Pakistan. Here if we do this we will be only protecting Hinduism in India. I have all the sympathy for cow, cow-worshippers and for the culture and sentiments of Hinduism. I also sympathise with the Shankaracharya who is fasting. But my request is they must also know the feelings of others and try to accommodate a part of the human race first before they extend their unaccounted for, unresolved and unexplained love for the cow.

We request the Government not to pressurise or bamboozle the State Governments to enact legislation compulsorily banning cow-slaughter. If that is done, it will only have the effect of a dead letter. Agitation has already been started in Madras and Kerla to counteract this move and orders under section 144 have been issued. We have to send food and fodder to Bihar and other places. There are so many other factors. Let us not for God's sake divert

[Shri Nambiar]

the attention of the people to a wrong channel. It has already been done by some of my hon. friends. It was witnessed on the 7th November at the gates of Parliament House. Let us not repeat that. Let us, for God's sake, work for the betterment of the Indian people and see that the people live in a better way. With these words, Sir, I warn the Government not to enter into the trap of any of these friends and get into a position of enacting a law which is not enforceable in this country.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza (Warrangal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, there is no doubt a very great and very deep religious sentiment around the cow for a large section of the people in this country, and I believe that it is the basis of secularism and tolerance not only to respect your own religion and your own point of view but to respect the sentiment of people belonging to other religions. That is really what secularism is. Whatever my personal view is, I know that millions of our bretheren in this country feel that the cow slaughter should be banned. They consider it as a sort of religious duty and their sentiment is very strong. Whatever be my views, I respect that sentiment and I support it.

It is not only that some people have gone on hunger-strike. One sadhu died and the lives of others are in danger. I think the appeal should go from this House to the Jagatguru that he should stop his fast and believe in the appeal made by our hon. Home Minister.

Some people not only do not want to ban cow slaughter but they want to ban hunger-strike. If there is any property that an individual possesses, it is his own life and nothing else. Even your own son you cannot say he is entirely your own, even a mother cannot say that her son is entirely her's. But the life of a person he can say is entirely his own, and I

think I as an individual should have the right to dispose of the only property that I possess for the right and moral cause. Therefore, I support and respect the steps that have been taken by the Jagatguru and others in this cause, excepting this. But this is not the end. In fact, it is the beginning of an end. Take for example a gentleman who has high regard for his cow. When the cow stops giving him milk, it is a burden on his finances. He has not got money to support his own children. What should he do? Should he drive the cow out in the street or should he send it to one of the goshalas. I have seen one goshla one time in my life and that will be the last time. If you go there you will see that there are some Marwaris who have donated money and who never go there. Half that money is eaten by the people who organise them. There are cows inside with a few blades of grass. There are wounds on them in which there are worms and crows are pecking on them. This kind of goshalas are existing in this country. If you want to really serve the cause you must see that the cows are insured so that just like old-age pension there must be places where these old cows can be kept. There is a huge amount of money, lakhs and lakhs of rupees at Tirupathi, Puri, Kashi and so on. Why can't they have a farm where fodder can be grown? There are very rich marwaris who want to have seed farms. Why can't they have fodder farms, get hold of these old cows and give a place for them to stay?

There are some people who think that the non-vegetarian beef eaters are a hindrance in this matter. I want to make it quite clear that only in Europe and America beef is considered a greater luxury than mutton and the price of beef is twice that of mutton. But in India it is one-fourth the price of mutton and those who go in for beef are the poorest in the land, who do not have anything else to eat.

Banning of Cow-slaughter (Ms.)

They go for beef because it is the cheapest food and nobody else wants to have it. Where the respect for the cow has grown in the country, it has its effect on each other. The respect for cow is also there in the mind of the Muslim, because they all live together. The Home Minister, when taking steps, has also to see that the ban on cow slaughter is also accompanied by provision for looking after aged cows so that useless and sick cows are properly looked after.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Mr. Chairman, we must commend warmly the very conciliatory and effective statement the Home Minister has made on the situation. This has been one of the thorniest problems facing us. Now I would say in Hindi:

हम दारू नहीं पीते, बीड़े नहीं पीते, तो का मांस नहीं खाते। ये तीरा कीज हम नहीं करते। क्या हम दूतों का बूा करेगे।

I would say that the cow is an animal to which sentiment is attached by the largest number of people in this country. After all, this is the land of Hindustan, which has been cruelly divided into two parts by British machivallism. Yet, a preponderating number of people being Hindus, even though I belong to another faith, I think people belonging to other faiths should respect the sentiment of the large number of people, namely, Hindus.

That also reminds me of what Mahatma Gandhi had to say, and I hope you would bear with me when I quote him. Mahatma Gandhi, whatever Dr. Soekarno might say today, was the greatest seer this country produced down the centuries. He was a great Hindu, a real Hindu, a real humanist. While undergoing imprisonment in the Yerwada Jail, this is what he had to say on cow slaughter which is worthwhile repeating:

"Hindu religion prohibits cow slaughter for the Hindus, not for the world. Religious prohibition comes from within. Any imposition from without means compul-

sion. Such compulsion is repugnant to religion. India is the land not only of the Hindus but also of the Muslims, of Sikhs, of Parsees, of Christians and of Jews, all those who claim loyalty to the Indian union."

These are the golden words by the greatest man, who paid the highest penalty of sacrificing his life. It is worthwhile preserving his message for ever in our minds.

Every word in the statement of the Home Minister was conciliatory. He fought against pressure. He appealed to the leaders of the opposition not to start agitations; he appealed to the holiest of the land not to go on fast. I hope they will heed his advice. Whatever victories are snatched by force are not worth keeping. Whatever victories are snatched by force and violence will not last long.

I think my friends on the other side, some of them, are wrong in their views about the disturbances of the 7th of November. What happened that day was terrible indeed. What would have happened if the House was set on fire? You and I, everyone of us, would have had to put down our heads in shame. When the party decided that one Minister was in a way responsible for not preventing the murderous disturbances in time, he was thrown out without any consideration to the individual. I am one of the greatest admirers of Shri Nanda's ideology but when the party decided that price has to be paid at the ministerial level it was done without the slightest hesitation.

I think my hon. friend, Shri Banerjee, who is not here—I wish he were present—is entirely wrong when he said that Shri Atulya Ghosh engineered the disturbances from Calcutta by bringing in or sending goondas, or something to that effect. I do not stand by everything that Atulya Babu may or may not do. He might do things which I, you or somebody else may not approve of, but to make a statement that he engineered the disturbances from Calcutta by send-

[Shri Joachim Alva]

ing the goondas here is not at all fair. It is scandalously false. We, Members of Parliament, as the representatives of the people, have to keep the scales even. We should not make such utterly defamatory statements. I say that the institution of photostat copies has now become the greatest bane of the land. I can forge the signature of anybody, put it on a paper, get it photographed and say, "Here is a photostat copy". The only time perhaps when we signed for others was during our law classes in the Bombay Law College nearly forty years ago. I have made an honest confession and you can take it for what it is worth.

Now, photostat copies have become the bane of our public life. You just get something and flourish it. In the first place, you steal a document and violate all principles of secrecy and of Government. Let us fight for principles; let us fight for great causes. But let us not do this. This cancer is big enough to blow us into pieces. We, as a Parliament, must set limits to our discussion to the issues that we raise. Let us raise great and noble issues. This land is full of grievances and let us raise them but let us not do like this.

My Chief Minister, Shri Nijlingappa, made a golden suggestion. What did he say? He said, let every State set apart 10 or 20 acres, or even a thousand acres. Let the richest people in India be the donors. Let them give money and the cows will be looked after in those farms. The farmers and those who want to give away their bad cows can dispose of them for a good sum of money. I think, Shri Nijlingappa's statement is worth consideration of the people.

How many of us worry about milk? I cannot do without my glass of milk at night. Milk is the test of our civilisation. Are you able to provide milk for the average man in India? That is your test. We cannot boast that we have given plenty of good milk to the people. Bombay City has taken a lead in the supply of good milk. I

have travelled throughout the length and breadth of the land and there is only one place which gives good milk. You will be surprised to know where it is. It is in the constituency of the hon. Home Minister—Satara. I have gone right from Bombay down to south and it is only in Satara that I got good milk. I have tasted it. I have often been finding fault with the milk given at railway stations and during rail journey water and powder are mixed in the milk. Why do you not give good quality milk? Why do our children not get good quality milk instead of the rotten milk mixed with water?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Joachim Alva: Shri Mathur's amendment is an excellent amendment. It praises the efforts of Government in this direction. Shri Mathur amendment says that whatever the Government has done has been done well and that it should continue those efforts. The second part appeals to all concerned for abandoning fasts. I would say one thing and sit down. Fasts have been undertaken by the greatest of men in the world. I remember, when I was a college boy, Mr. Terence McSwiney, Mayor of Cork, went on over eighty days' hunger strike and died. It will for ever be remembered in the annals of fasting and pages of Irish freedom. Thereafter Jatindranath Das undertook a fast and died. The great Pandit Motilal Nehru, the grandfather of our distinguished Prime Minister, fought for him and India was set on fire. Before the thirties, there was the first lathi charge in the south of Bombay. My hon. friend, that planning patriot, the late Yusuf Meherally and myself were the victims of that first lathi charge. Then, there was the fast into death of Pottu Sriramulu, the Andhra leader. But fasts should not be undertaken indiscriminately. This land is the land of fasts. We somewhat, off and on fast almost every day, but fasts should not be held as threats. I would

appeal to the holiest of men in India, men who are the holy of holies, who are in these temples to see that we do not undertake fasts and thus add a weapon in our armoury and that this weapon will not be indiscriminately used for pressure. We should never have disturbances of the type we had on November last. I think, the Home Minister will see that such kind of disturbances never occur again. People in the West try to make television shows out of them and throw them in our face! Do you like that? Do we like this land to be known as the land of stability and security or to be known as the land of superstition, confusion and chaos? If confusion ends in utter chaos, we shall not be able to put our head up.

I think, the debate has taken a good turn and this House will support Shri Mathur's amendment.

Mr. Chairman: When I call an hon. Member and he exceeds his time limit, it becomes difficult for the Chair to control. That is not a very happy thing. I think, every hon. Member will stick to five minutes strictly so that I can call as many Members as possible within the time available. Shri Vasudevan Nair.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Mahbubnagar): How long are going to sit?

Mr. Chairman: When the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair, he said that we will complete the discussion at 8.45 p.m. Extra two hours were agreed to by the House. So, we have to conclude the discussion and the voting at 8.45 p.m. Shri Vasudevan Nair.

श्री बागड़ी सभापति महोदय, मेरी पार्टी की तरफ से अभी कोई नहीं बोला है।

Mr. Chairman: I will call you.

श्री बागड़ी : आप मेरी बात तो सुन लीजिए।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, Nobody should speak when I am on my legs.

श्री बागड़ी आप तो बच्चों की तरह धमका रहे हैं। आपको बात सुनना चाहिये।

Mr. Chairman: You should be courteous to the Chair.

श्री बागड़ी : लेकिन चैयर को भी बच्चों की तरह धमकाना नहीं चाहिए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे दल की तरफ से अभी कोई सदस्य नहीं बोला है और मैं ही अकेला बोलने वाला हूँ। इसलिए मैं आप से निबंदन करूँगा कि जिन दलों के सदस्य बाल चुके हैं, उन से पहले मुझे बोलने का मौका दीजिए।

Mr. Chairman: I will call him afterwards. Shri Vasudevan Nair.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be very brief. On the question of November 7, disturbances, I should only like to reiterate the demand made on behalf of my Party even at that time that there is every reason for a judicial inquiry into that matter. The hon. Minister, in his statement, himself said that there was some kind of preparation made by certain groups at least for all that happened on that day and that itself is enough justification for a judicial inquiry. I leave it at that.

Coming to the question of ban on cow-slaughter, at the very outset I may say that—Mr. N. C. Chatterjee read out the judgment of the Supreme Court and everyone of us heard him reading that out—the Supreme Court judgment is very clear that there cannot be a total ban on cow-slaughter. That is the other side of the picture. He wanted to put only one side of the picture. But there is clearly the other side of the picture that the Supreme Court judgment itself did not say that there is any justification for a total ban. The hon. Home Minister tried to say that he is a rational being as far as his approach to this problem is concerned. But I am sorry to say that in his effort to accept this amendment of Mr. Mathur, he has behaved in the most irrational manner because

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

the point is that there cannot be a total ban on cow-slaughter all over the country.

Shri K. C. Sharma: The Supreme Court judgment has laid down that there could be a total ban on the slaughter of cows and calves.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Don't take away my time. You can speak on that. Then, the question of sentiment was the main issue raised by the hon. Members in this House. They should know that there are areas, provinces, States, in this vast country, with the complex and complicated nature, where the vast majority of people are not for a ban on cow-slaughter. The Central Government is going by surreptitious methods—they may say, this is all persuasion and all that; they are nice words used—and this is an effort to pressurise them. There is no doubt about that. They are going to coerce the State Governments where the vast majority of people do not have such a sentiment over that matter. My State is one like that. Including the Hindus of my State, there is not that kind of a feeling about it. That does not mean that they do not respect cows and that they do not love cows. Is there any human being in his normal senses who is going to kill a calf or a milch cow? That does not happen generally. That is madness. But as far as useless cows are concerned, the problem was very well posed by my friend, Mr. Nambiar, that if we are going to have a total ban on all kinds of cows all over the country, there cannot be a more irrational approach to the problem.

20 hrs.

That is going to put our economy in turmoil. The problems that we will have to face as a result of such a total ban will be tremendous. I request that more thought should be given to this problem. I should say that it is unfortunate that at this particular moment a dispassionate discussion of this topic cannot take place:

agitations are going on; people are on hunger strike; and elections are in the offing. In many States in India there are a large number of people who are agitated over it and deep sentiments have been expressed. Naturally many people can look at the problem only in a particular manner. So, I will request the Home Minister not to vigorously pursue this matter on the basis of this Resolution.

Even the West Bengal Government is a Congress Government. I hope that Mr. P. C. Sen is capable of appreciating the sentiments of the people. There are other people also in his own State. This is not a child's play. He has to deal with the whole State. There are minorities and if the majority of the people cannot appreciate the sentiments of the minority, then that is worse according to me. So, this is a problem that should be tackled very carefully. For instance, take the State of Kerala. There nearly 50 per cent of the population are Muslims and Christians. Of course, it is a State with Hindu majority, but the Hindu majority there is so little; the bulk of the people are following different faiths. Also, as one member has put it, there is the economic problem also. This is the cheapest food for a few millions of people in this country. All these issues will have to be considered dispassionately.

Shri Joachim Alva: The Kerala Christians are Hindus by culture and the religion for them is inside the churches.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I will invite Mr. Alva to Kottayam or Ernakulam and will ask him to make a speech in a public meeting and I am sure he will not speak like this. These are problems that should be taken into consideration. So, I am surprised that the Home Minister is going to accept this amendment. This amendment should not be accepted. There is a total ban in some States; there is a partial ban in some other States; and

there is no ban at all in a few other States. That position should remain; the status quo should remain and it should not be disturbed at this stage in the name of agitations and so on.

So, on behalf of my Party, I cannot accept this amendment moved by Mr. Mathur.

Mr. Chairman: Shrimati Sahodra Bai Rai.

Shri Tyagi: Have we to pass on slips to you or have we to catch your eye? What is the procedure? I would like to know, this.

Mr. Chairman: It can be done both ways. You have to catch my eye and if you want to remind me, you can send a slip also.

Shri Tyagi: I do not believe in passing on slips to the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: I am following the rule set by Mr. Tyagi.

श्री पाराशर (शिवपुरी) : श्रीमान् जी, आज अधिवेशन का आखिरी दिन है इसलिए जब तक हर एक बोलने वाला खत्म न हो जाय, तब तक कृपा करके सदन क टाइम बढ़ा दें । . . . (अध्वेशन) . . .

सभापति महोदय : श्रीमती सहोदरा बाई राय ।

श्रीमती सहोदराबाई राय (दमोह) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपको बधाई देती हूँ कि दो मिनट आपने मुझे बोलने को दिए । मैं मध्य प्रदेश से आती हूँ और हमारे यहां मध्य प्रदेश में तो मऊ कटना कतई बन्द है । वहां कोई गऊ नहीं कटती है । इस के साथ साथ एक बात और मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज लाखों एकड़ जमीन जो बंजर पड़ी थी वह ट्रैक्टरों के द्वारा जोत ली गई । अब गायें चरने के लिए कहां जायें ? गोचर के लिए कोई जमीन नहीं बची । गरीब हरिजन और आदिवासी गऊ को ज्यादा रखते थे और किसान लोग रखते थे । तो अब गरीबों

ने और हरिजनों ने अपनी अपनी गायें बेच दीं क्योंकि चरोखर के लिए और गाय के खड़े होने तक के लिए कोई जगह नहीं बची । इसलिए गऊ के लिए जमीन का भी ध्यान देना है जहां गऊचर हो और वहां उनके चरने का इन्तजाम हो सके ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि बड़े बड़े किसान लोग गाय और बैल जब बूढ़े हो जाते हैं तो उन को घर से निकाल देते हैं । वह गाय और बैल छूटते हैं तो किसान की जमीन में जाते हैं जहां रबी की फसल या ज्वार इत्यादि लगे होते हैं । वह वहां से उन को हांकेते हैं तो कांजीहौस में ले जाते हैं । कांजीहौस वाले ऐसी मरने वाली गायों को भन्दर नहीं करते । फिर बड़ैती और कांजीहौस वालों में वड़े झगड़े इस पर होते हैं और वहां के मेम्बर बहुत परेशान होते हैं । तो जो मालिक हैं उनके लिए प्रतिबन्ध होना चाहिए कि उस को छोड़ें न और दूसरे हर एक गाव में गोचर होना चाहिए ।

ट्रैक्टरों से ज्यादा खेती नहीं हो सकती । जिसके पास 6 एकड़ या 8 एकड़ जमीन है वह ट्रैक्टर से तो नहीं जोत सकते । इसलिए बैलों और गायों की जरूरत है । नहीं तो किसानों का काम नहीं चल सकता । इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूँ कि जो यह 7 तारीख को आन्दोलन हुआ था, मैं भी यहां । मुझे मालूम है इस में कुछ राजनीतिक तत्व थे और कुछ उम में ऐसे लोग थे जो बताने की बात नहीं है, जिन्होंने गलत फायदा इससे उठाया है । एलेक्शन पास में आया तो इन्होंने यह आन्दोलन उठा दिया । जब पंडित जी थे, तो इतना उपद्रव नहीं किया, शास्त्री जी आये तो इतना उपद्रव नहीं किया और जब मेरी बहन प्रधान मंत्री बनी तो इन लोगों को मौका मिल गया आन्दोलन उठाने का । इस लिए मैं अपनी बहन से प्रार्थना करती हूँ कि एक सभा पृथ्वी और लक्ष्मी भगवान के पास

[श्रीमती सहोदरा बाई राय]

गई। लक्ष्मी भगवान के चरण दबा रही थीं। तो लक्ष्मी और पृथ्वी ने भगवान से कहा कि मेरे ऊपर बड़ा अन्याय हो रहा है, आप उसे दूर कीजिए। मैं अपनी बहन से कहना चाहती हूँ आप लक्ष्मी का स्वरूप हैं। आप घोषणा कीजिए कि गऊ वध कतई बन्द हो जाय। कहीं गऊ न कटे। गोवध नहीं होना चाहिए जिसमें कि हमारे इन साधु संतों ने भी राजनीति की आड़ ली है। उन को मौका मिल गया कि अच्छा समय है चुनाव का। तो मैं तो समर्थन करती हूँ कि गोवध बन्द होना चाहिए। गऊ कतई न कटे। और यह भी प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूँ कि जो हमारे साधु महान्मा अनशन ठाने हैं, उनको अनशन बन्द कर देना चाहिए। उन के लिए राहत मिलेगी। उनकी बात मानी जायगी। जितनी महिलाएँ उत्तर प्रदेश में अनशन ठाने हैं वह तोड़ दें और हमारी बहन घोषणा करें कि गोवध कतई बन्द हो जायगा। उनका इतिहास स्वर्णशरो में लिखा जायगा कि एक हमारी बहन गद्दी पर बैठी थी और उसने गोवध बन्द कर दिया।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष जी, श्री करपात्री जी, श्री प्रभुदत्त जी ब्रह्मचारी, जगद्गुरु शंकराचार्यजी., श्री रामेश्वरानन्द जी, और श्री मुनि सुशील कुमार जैन, यह सभी महान् ऋषि नहीं, बल्कि इस देश के राज ऋषि कहूँगा क्योंकि इस देश के राष्ट्रपति और वक्त के मंत्री और प्रधान मंत्रियों ने वक्त वक्त पर इन के चरण चुचकारे हैं, आज जिस तरीके से सरकार इनके साथ व्यवहार कर रही है, कहीं भूख हड़ताल, कहीं भूख हड़ताल की दशा के अन्दर जगद्गुरु को यहां से पांडीचेरी, और भूख हड़ताल की दशा में पांडीचेरी से कहीं रांची और इसी तरीके से कहीं गोली लाठी चलवाना, यह सब ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि कहीं सरकार खुद इस देश के सामूहिक विद्रोह, जो देश

की जनता भुखमरी, अकाल, नाबराबरी के खिलाफ करना चाहती है, कच्चा विद्रोह खुद करवाना चाहती है इस बड़े विद्रोह को रोकने के लिए। अध्यक्ष जी, अध्यक्ष जी, डॉक्टर राम मनोहर लोहिया ने 7 तारीख के बारे में इसी सदन में कहा था कि 7 तारीख को श्री कामराज की कोठी पर कोई भी सशस्त्र पहरेदार नहीं थे और उनकी बन्दूक को ले लिया गया था। श्री चह्वाण साहब ने अपने जवाब में कहा है कि मैंने आई० जी० साहब से पूछा, अंग्रेजी में उन्होंने जवाब दिया है, आई० जी० साहब ने कहा है कि 7 तारीख को कोई भी सन्तरी सशस्त्र नहीं था और यही बात डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया साहब कह रहे थे कि पांच को है, छः को है, चार को है, सात को नहीं है। यही बात चह्वाण साहब कहते हैं और फिर कहते हैं कि यह सस्ता आरोप है जो खुद अपने बयान के अन्दर चह्वाण साहब मानते हैं। मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि ता० 7 को जो साधुओं पर गोली चजी और जनता के साथ जो अत्याचार हुआ, उस के सम्बन्ध में स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द के खिलाफ जो इल्जाम लगाया जाता है, स्वामी जी ने क्या कहा था? स्वामी जी ने कहा था कि अगर आप अमनी मांग ले कर आये हो, तो इत लोक सभा को चारों तरफ से घेर लो, बैठ जाओ, जब तक तुम्हारी मांग न मानी जाय, न अन्दर जाने दो और न बाहर आने दो। यह कोई जुर्म नहीं है.....

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : “बेरा डालो” कहा था।

श्री बागड़ी : हां, ठीक है बेरा डालो। मेरी पार्टी के नेता, समाजवादी नेता डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया 10 साल से यह बात कह रहे हैं और हमारी पार्टी की यह इच्छा है कि इस देश की जनता, इस देश के सारे चव्वानीस करोड़ लोग, इस देश का शोषित वर्ग भुखमरी,

अकाल और अष्टाचार के खिलाफ उठ कर, अगर यह सरकार न माने तो इस को धर ले, तो इस में क्या जुर्म है? स्वामी जी ने यह नहीं कहा था कि किसी को मारो या जलाओ। सरकार के अन्दर ये कुटिल और पापी तत्व कहीं न कहीं से शामिल हो गये हैं। जब उस दिन यह स्पष्ट इल्जाम लगाया गया था कि कलकत्ता से किराये के सरकारी गुप्डे लाये गये, जिन्होंने अग लगाई, जिनकी कामराज को कत्ल करने की खुल्लम-खुल्ला आज्ञा थी—यह बात साफ है। अगर यह बात न होती, तो दिल्ली की लोक सभा के नामने इतना बड़ा अत्याचार हुआ, साधुओं को गोली मारी गई, तो सरकार, क्या वजह है कि उसकी न्याय की जांच नहीं कराती, इसलिये नहीं कराती कि न्याय की जांच होती तो सब बातें खुलने वाली थीं।

इस देश के अन्दर सरकार की तरफ से जो कच्चे विद्रोह या वक्ती विद्रोह वा भुलावा दिया जा रहा है, इस देश की सामूहिक जन-तन्त्रीय क्रान्ति को रोकने के वास्ते एक हिन्दु-चिन्तक के नाते 6 हिन्दी प्रान्तों तथा आन्ध्र, उड़ीसा और असम, जो इस देश के भूधे प्रान्त हैं, इन के अन्दर निराशा की जो गलत भावना आ गई है, उसको आज जगाना है। जैसे आज हिन्दुस्तान में कोई गैर-हिन्दी भाषी प्रधान मंत्री नहीं बन सकता, अछूत प्रधान मंत्री नहीं बन सकता, मुसलमान प्रधान मंत्री नहीं बन सकता, मैं चाहूंगा कि फोरन इस देश के अन्दर कोई हिन्दी भाषी प्रधान मंत्री न हो, गैर-हिन्दी भाषी प्रधान मंत्री हो, ताकि जो हिन्दी भाषी को प्रधान मंत्री की लैमनचूम देकर बैठाया जा रहा है, यह जो राजनीतिक भावना यहां जम चुकी है, इस को बदलने के लिये जरूरी है कि फौरी तौर पर अहिन्दी भाषी को प्रधान मंत्री बनाया जाय। (व्यवधान)

एक मनिनीय सदस्य : बैठ जाइये।

श्री बागड़ी : कौन है बैठने वाला !

मैं प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री से निवेदन करूंगा कि स्वामी रामेश्वरानन्द को, जिनको गलत आरोप लगा कर गिरफ्तार किया गया है चुनाव नजदीक आ रहे हैं, उन को जल्द से जल्द छोड़ा जाय।

मैं एक बात और कहूंगा कि कभी पुलिस से शस्त्र ले लेना, कभी फौज बैठा देना, कभी विद्यार्थियों पर गोली चलाना, कभी बिहार का अकाल, इस प्रकार की मूनज्जिम देश के अन्दर जनक्रान्ति को रोकने के लिये जो सरकार कच्चा विद्रोह चलाती है, इस को रोका जाय और हिन्दुस्तान की 48 करोड़ जनता से यह चाहूंगा कि इस देश की सरकार जो जनता द्वारा उठाये गये जुल्म, अन्याय, भुखमरी, अकाल, असमानता, के खिलाफ जो कच्चा विद्रोह उठा रही है, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता उठे और एक जागृति ला कर जन-तान्त्रिक ढंग से सब पार्टियां मिल कर इस को मिटाये।

सभापति महोदय श्री त्यागी।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : मैं बहुत दिल से, तहेदिल से श्री माधुर... (व्यवधान)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. This type of behaviour in the House cannot be tolerated.

श्री बागड़ी : तुम तो रामेश्वरानन्द को पकड़वा कर भाग गये थे।... (व्यवधान)***

Mr. Chairman: Please sit down.

श्री हुकूम खन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूं मुझे कहा है, मैं बताऊं ***कौन है, यह गलत बात है... (व्यवधान) आप इस को विद्वा करवाइये।

Shri R. S. Pandey: It is a very bad word that has been used. It should be expunged. It is an insult to the hon. Member. He should express regret.

Mr. Chairman: That word should be expunged.

श्री बागड़ी : सभापति महोदय, क्या शब्द एकतरफ़ किये हैं, यह तो बता दो ।

Shri Tyagi: I whole heartedly support the amendment moved by Mr. Mathur, and I must congratulate the Home Minister for a very plain speech today. He has made it absolutely clear what the policy of the Government is.

If I am not divulging a secret, I might inform the House that an atmosphere has no doubt been created accusing the Congress Party and the Government of lapses on account of this cow-slaughter. I must say that the Prime Minister herself was there in the party executive; we sat together, discussed thoroughly, and we agreed to the idea that cow slaughter should be stopped. Ban on cow slaughter has to come. So, it is not a matter where the Congress in the least hesitated.

I am reminded of the old days of the Constituent Assembly, when you were also there, the nice atmosphere that was there when our late friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava moved this article 48 to give protection to cows, to improve the breed of all cattle, to bring about some improvement in agriculture and to place a ban on the slaughter of cows. The whole House was unanimous. That is the feeling of my party.

Even today my hon. friends Shri Mirza and Shri Alva, Christians Muslims, Hindus, we all stand for ban of cow slaughter.

Shri Raghunath Singh: All except the Communist Party of India.

Shri Tyagi: Why unnecessarily create misunderstanding. It is the Congress Party majority in the Constituent Assembly which had passed this article of directive principle. According to this directive, it is not that the Congress Government here and in the States have been sleeping over it. As the House knows Bihar has enacted

a law banning cow slaughter. So have Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Mysore, Punjab, U.P., Jammu and Kashmir and Rajasthan, and even, I am told, Delhi. We decided in the Party executive that where it has not been done, we shall start negotiations with them and persuade them to do it soon. It is not possible for the Centre to force the Government of a State on an issue which is on the State List. Things should not be done in a way to create any resentment or prejudice. It is not only the State Assemblies who have to act according to the Directive Principles; it applies to the Centre as well as the States. If my friends there say that the State Government may or may not do, I say that if the State belongs to the Union, it must abide by the directive principles given by the Constituent Assembly. Shall I quote Mahatma Gandhi; we are guided by his principles also? He has said: "I hold that the question of cow slaughter is of great moment, in certain respects of even greater moment than that of Swaraj. Cow slaughter and man slaughter in my opinion are two sides of the same coin." This is what Ghandiji said. Is there a Congressman who can defy Gandhiji? Leaving apart even sentimentality and other things, we stand by Mahatma Gandhi and by the Constituent Assembly. That being so, how can people doubt us and attribute motives to us? After the most convincing statement of the hon. Home Minister today, I would ask those friends from the Opposition to try and persuade Shankaracharya to give up his fast and co-operate with us in the efforts that we are making. All of us are agreed on this and so he must give up the fast. You will recollect that it was mentioned in the Constituent Assembly that, during the days of Babar, Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir and Aurazeb, cow slaughter was not in practice; it was also mentioned that in China cow slaughter was a crime, and it was banned in Afghanistan it was also mentioned that a year earlier in 1947, Burma had also passed a law banning cow slaughter.

We are an agricultural country and we cannot thrive without cows. We are sure that the people will appreciate the way in which the Congress Government is proceeding to ban cow slaughter.

Some hon. Members rose

Mr. Chairman: I think there are 25 minutes or so left. The hon. Members Shri Shastri and Kachavaiah have also to reply.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I have given my name five days before, not today. I have to say something about my own party also.

Mr. Chairman: Let us not waste any more time now. Shri A. P. Sharma. Two minutes each.

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा : सभापति महोदय, सरकार ने गोबध्वन्दी की नीति के ऊपर जो रवैया अपनाया है और पिछले दिनों श्री नन्दा ने सदन के सामने जो वक्तव्य दिया था उस का जो गुण्टीकरण वर्तमान गृह मंत्री ने किया है तथा जो इस बात का आश्वासन दिया है कि वह प्रान्तीय सरकारों को समझा बुझा कर उन के सहयोग से आगे आने वाले दिनों में इस देश में गोकशी को बन्द करेंगे, इस के लिये मैं सरकार को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ मुझे आश्चर्य भालूम होता है कि भारत की कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के रविये पर। आज देश में एक ऐसा मौका आया है जब कि देश की सभी पार्टियों के लोग एक राय हो कर इस सदन में यह विचार प्रकट कर रहे हैं कि देश में गोकशीबन्दी हो जाये तब कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी ने जैसे सन 1942 में देश के हित के खिलाफ काम किया था वैसे ही आज करने जा रही है। सारे देश में जो भी सेन्टिमेंट हो, जो भी विचार हो, तमाम पार्टियों का जो भी विचार हो, लेकिन तमाम धर्मों के लोग, हिन्दू, मुसलमान, सिख, ईसाई, सब चाहते हैं कि गोकशी बन्द हो। कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी ने आज फिर जो अपना भ्रम राग अलापा है देश इस बात को याद रखेगा और लोग इस

को याद रखेंगे। वे इस को कभी भी भूलेंगे नहीं कि कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी इस देश की पार्टी नहीं है, वह दूसरे देश के लोगों से और दूसरे देश के लोगों के विचारों से मतलब रखती है।

मैं इतना ही कह कर एक बार फिर सरकार को धन्यवाद देता हूँ, और महात्माओं हैं जैसे सभी लोगों ने दख्खान्त की है, मैं भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपना अनशन भंग करें और भारत में गोकशी बन्द हो कर रहेगी।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : सभापति महोदय, इस विषय को साम्प्रदायिक दृष्टि से नहीं देखना चाहिये। मुझे अफस है कि श्री वासुदेवन नायर ने इस विषय को साम्प्रदायिक दृष्टि से देखा है और यह प्रश्न उठ या है कि केरल में ईसाई और मुसलमान बहुत हैं। यह हमारे संविधान का विषय है। संविधान ने प्रदेश सरकारों को अधिकार दे रखा है, लेकिन वह उस का उचित उपयोग नहीं कर सकी। अब वक्त आ गया है जब हम इस को केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन करें। इस का कारण यह है कि जितने बड़े बड़े शहर हैं बम्बई, कलकत्ता जैसे, वहाँ दुधारू गायों को काटा जाता है, वहाँ सूखा, बीमार या कमजोर गायें नहीं कटती हैं। वह जिस आर्थिक स्थिति की बात कहना चाहते थे, वह तब तक बन्द नहीं होगी जब तक कि आप केन्द्र में कानून नहीं बनायेंगे।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में आज भैंस और गाय का एक इन्द्र चला हुआ है। मैं इस का एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। गुजरात में महसताना में एक मिल्क माउडर फ़ैक्ट्री लगाई गई है जिस में जो प्लान्ट लगा है वह हालैंड का है और गाय के दुध का है। भैंस का फ़ैट निकाल कर उस दुध को उस में डाला जाता है। इसलिये गाय की रक्षा करने के लिये भैंस के साथ जो उसका कम्पिटिशन चल रहा है उस को तय करने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि इस को जल्दी से जल्दी केन्द्र का

[श्री काशी राम गुप्त]

विषय बनाया जाये। अन्यथा सारे प्रदेशों में कांग्रेसी सरकारें हैं। क्या कारण है कि वे इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कर सकीं। गृह मंत्री जो दलील देते हैं कि व्यावहारिक कठिनाई है वह बीस वर्षों से चली आ रहा है। उस को दूर करने के लिये कोई उपवास करता है, कोई आन्दोलन करता है, जिस के लिये कहा जाता है कि नहीं करना चाहिये। लेकिन यह एक राजनीतिक दलील है।

मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि अब समय आ गया है जब इस के ऊपर गम्भीरता से सोच विचार करके सरकार ने जो कदम उठाने की बात कही है, जिस को वह जल्दी से जल्दी और शीघ्र कदम कहती है वह उठाया जाये। उस का तात्पर्य यह है कि सारी दलीलों पर विचार कर के कानून बनाया जाना चाहिये।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : महापति महोदय, पहले तो मेरे मित्र ने कामराज के मकान के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहा है। उस के सम्बन्ध में मैं उन को बतलाना चाहता हूँ। कामराज के मकान पर कभी वर्दी वाला ब्रांड गाँड़ नहीं रहा। कामराज के मकान पर 6 और 7 तारीख का सादी वर्दी में ब्रांड गाँड़ जरूर था। इस लिये यह कहना कि कामराज के मकान पर वर्दी वाला ब्रांड गाँड़ था यह गलत है।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर, श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय और मेरे नाम से जो संशोधन हैं, उस के पीछे एक भूमिका है। आज सबेरे महामंडलेश्वर श्री गंगेश्वरानन्द जी और दारिका के श्रद्धयास्पद शंकराचार्य जी महाराज हैं, उन से हम लोगों ने भेंट की। उस के बाद एक्जिक्यूटिव कमेटी की मीटिंग हुई। शंकराचार्य जी से मैंने कहा कि आप हम को कुछ लिख कर दीजिये। आप चाहते क्या है। जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा वह मैं आप को सुनाना चाहता हूँ। तीनों सज्जनों का

अमेन्डमेंट पहले का है। मैं अक्षर अक्षर पढ़ देता हूँ कि आखिर वह चाहते क्या हैं।

सम्पूर्ण देश में पूर्ण गोहत्या बन्दी हमारी मांग है। सम्प्रति जो वैधानिक स्थिति है उससे न तो केन्द्र और न राज्य सरकारें पूर्ण गोहत्या बन्दी की मांग पूरा कर सकती है। हमें यह स्थिति विदित है परन्तु...

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्या उनके इस पर दस्तखत हैं ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मेरे सामने लिख गया है। मैं खुद गया था। मैंने उन से कहा कि उनकी जो मांग है उसको लिपिबद्ध करके वह हमें दें; यह लिपिबद्ध करके हमको दो गई है। उन्होंने आगे कहा है :—

“परन्तु यदि केन्द्रीय सरकार अपनी यह स्थिति अधिकृत रूप से स्पष्ट करती है कि सिद्धान्त रूप से वह इस मांग को स्वीकार करती है केवल वैधानिक कठिनाइयों और समस्या के आर्थिक, राजनीतिक पहलुओं की गुत्थियाँ को सुलझाने के लिए... इत्यादि”

वापिस आने के बाद हम लोगों ने कांग्रेस मंसदीय दल की मीटिंग की। एक्जिक्यूटिव की मीटिंग करने के बाद एक संशोधन हमने दिया है वह जो अमेन्डमेंट है वह हमारी पार्टी का जो स्टैंड है, हमारा मत प्रदर्शित करता है। हिन्दुस्तान में गोबध बन्द होना चाहिये यह हमारी पार्टी का स्टैंड है। कम्युनिष्ट पार्टी का स्टैंड यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में गोबध बन्द नहीं होना चाहिये। अब हम इस बेसिस पर इलैक्शन लड़ेंगे। कम्युनिष्ट पार्टी आए मुकाबले में इस बेसिस को ले कर.... (इंटरप्राइज)

श्री शीर्ष (अलौगड़) : उन्नास साल तक क्यों नहीं आपने इसको किया? किस का ग.सन उन्नास साल से चला आ रहा है ?

अब इलैक्शन के मौके पर तमाशा दिखाने हो ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह आपका स्टैंड मालूम हो गया है ।

आर्टिकल 48 कंस्टिट्यूट असैम्बली में पेश हुआ था जिस के सभापति महोदय, आप भी सदस्य थे । यह 24-9-48 की बात है । आज से छठारह बरस पहले की बात है । जो कंस्टिट्यूशन हमने ड्राफ्ट किया उसका Article 48 says:

"The State shall endeavour to organise agriculture and animal husbandry on modern and scientific lines and shall, in particular, take steps for preserving and improving the breeds and prohibiting the slaughter, of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle."

कांग्रेस पार्टी का यह स्टैंड जब कंस्टिट्यूट असैम्बली थी उस समय भी था और अब भी है । हमारे मित्रों ने कहा है कि लोक सभा कोई प्रस्ताव पास करे । आर्टिकल 249 के अनुसार हम कोई प्रस्ताव लोक सभा में नहीं पास कर सकते हैं । यह अधिकार केवल राज्य सभा को है । वह भी केवल एक बरस के लिए । उसके लिए भी 2/3 मेंजोरिटी होना आवश्यक है । इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस का जो स्टैंड है वह सर्वविदित है । जो एमेंडमेन्ट हमने दी है यह एमेंडमेन्ट जो मांग है, उसको करीब करीब पूरा स्वीकार करती है ।

भंकराचार्य जी आज पुरी में अनशन कर रहे हैं । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो साधु वर्ग है वह बड़ा श्रद्धास्पद वर्ग है, पूज्य-नीय वर्ग है । मैं उन से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वे देश का नेतृत्व करें, धार्मिक नेतृत्व करें, सामाजिक नेतृत्व करें और जो पार्टियां

गोहत्या के प्रश्न को ले कर इलैक्शन लड़ने के लिए तैयारी कर रही हैं उनके फंदे में न फसे । वे इस झमेले से, इस जाल से भ्रमल हो जायें । जो अनशन इत्यादि कर रहे हैं उनसे मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि उसको त्याग दें । उनकी भावनाओं का आदर करते हुए हम इस संशोधन को स्वीकृत कर रहे हैं और उनको हमारी भावनाओं का आदर करते हुए आन्दोलन को खत्म कर देना चाहिये, पार्लियामेन्ट की भावनाओं का आदर करते हुए आन्दोलन और अनशन समाप्त कर देना चाहिये ।

Mr. Chairman: Shri Hukum Chand Kachhavaiya

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बहस में भाग लिया है और उन्होने जो तर्क रखे हैं, उनको मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना है । माननीय गृह-मंत्री जी के भाषण को भी मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना है . . . (इंटरप्शन) गृह-मंत्री जी ने जो उत्तर दिया है, उस में उन्होने कोई ऐसा संकेत नहीं दिया (इंटरप्शन) ।

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव (नांदेड़) : आपने कहा था कि आप दो दो मिनट सब को गे कई माननीय सदस्य रह गए हैं, जिनको समय नहीं मिला है (इंटरप्शन) ।

Some hon. Members: Sir, the time may be extended (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: If the House agrees we can sit for half-an-hour more.

Several hon. Members: Yes:

Shri Rajeshwar Patel (Hajipur): Sir, there is no quorum in the House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, Quorum has been challenged. The Bell may be rung.

[Mr. Chairman]

The Bell has stopped ringing. Even now there is no quorum in the House. The Bell may be rung again. The bell has stopped ringing. There is no quorum.

An hon. Member: We may waive that condition.

Mr. Chairman: Once the attention of the Chair is drawn to the fact that there is no quorum, the Chair has no discretion to waive that condition. There is no quorum in the House even after the ringing of the bell twice. The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

20.40 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die.
