

**Election to Committee
Animal Welfare Board**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI S. C. JAMIR): On behalf of Shri Annasahib Shinde, I beg to move:—

“That in pursuance of section 5 (1) (i) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Animal Welfare Board for the next term commencing from the date of election, subject to the other provisions of the said Act.”

MR. SPEAKER : The question is:

“That in pursuance of Section 5 (1) (i) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Animal Welfare Board for the next term commencing from the date of election, subject to the other provisions of the said Act.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we adjourn for lunch. In future, if I forget to mention the time, to meet again at such and such time kindly take it that we re-assemble after one hour. We adjourn to meet again at 2-30 P. M.

13 30 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at thirty-seven minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[Shri Prakash Vir Shastri in the Chair]

ARCHITECTS BILL—(Contd.)

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday, I was in the

process of congratulating the Government for having brought forward this Bill after 25 years of consideration. After having congratulated them yesterday, I have to congratulate them again today, because it is now 25 years and one day. I must also congratulate the Minister for, he is really fortunate in being the successor to a long line of Education Ministers who had tried to bring this measure and had not succeeded to this day.

Sir, as you know, this Bill is a non-controversial one. It is non-controversial because all it merely seeks to do is to protect the word ‘Architect’. I think, the Architects of this country would have liked very much had the Bill been much stronger and protected the profession of Architecture. But, unfortunately, the conditions of this country being as they are, it was not possible and it would not get the necessary support to protect the profession but it was still necessary that the title ‘Architect’ should be protected. And therefore this Bill does nothing other than merely protect that title.

According to this Bill, those who are qualified as Architects in our country should be allowed to register themselves as Architects. All those who have been earning their livelihood as architects will also be allowed to register themselves as Architects. What is the position in future? Not only will all those who have an architectural qualification be permitted to practice architecture, but anybody else also can do the same thing provided they do not call themselves as Architects. As I said, this Bill is so very non-controversial that I do not wish to make a lengthy speech on the subject.

There are a couple of Amendments that which I have suggested which, at this point of time I would advocate for the consideration of the Minister and of the House.

One of the main amendments which I think is basic to the healthy growth of architecture is that the professional body representing architects in this country should be very actively associated with the practice of architecture. This is the practice that is followed in many countries. 1