

make it necessary, we shall convene an emergent Session of the Parliament at the shortest notice to consider that situation.

—

THE DELIVERY OF BOOKS (PUBLIC LIBRARIES) AMENDMENT - BILL, 1956

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR. MONO MOHAN DAS): Sir, on behalf of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Delivery of Books (Public Libraries) Act, 1954.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Delivery of Books (Public Libraries) Act, 1954.”

The motion was adopted.

DR. MONO MOHAN DAS: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

—

THE KHADI AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES COMMISSION BILL, 1956—continued

THE MINISTER FOR PRODUCTION (SHRI K. C. REDDY): Mr. Chairman, I must express my deep appreciation of the welcome that has been accorded to this Bill by all the hon. Members who spoke yesterday and the general support that they have extended to the same. The House will note that no notice of any amendment to this Bill has been received. That, I submit, is an indication that the provisions of this Bill have the general acceptance of the House as a whole. This Bill has been passed by the Lok Sabha and has now come before this House. In the course of the debate yesterday, most of the hon. Members dwelt firstly, on some major aspects, which I must say are outside the scope of this Bill and, secondly, with regard to the various details of the provisions of this Bill. I imagine that in the fairly lengthy speech that I made yesterday, I covered almost all the important aspects that have any relevance to this Bill as it was introduced in this House. I don't think that I need cover the same ground

again but it shall be my duty, it shall be my endeavour, to refer to some very important aspects of policy that were prominently brought out by some hon. Members of this House. I don't think any additional arguments are needed on my part to commend this Bill as it is before the House for their acceptance. So I shall, within the few minutes that I will take, dwell on certain important aspects that have been brought out in the course of the debate. Before I do that, I would like to answer one criticism made by my friend Prof. Malkani, who I am sorry to notice is not here and also by one other hon. Member. They referred to the delay that has occurred in bringing this Bill before the House—about 15 months or so after its introduction in the Lok Sabha. They seemed to think that this was perhaps partly due to indifference or taking things in a leisurely manner or perhaps because we have not been giving the necessary or due importance that a measure of this kind should receive at our hands. Yesterday in the course of my remarks, I, in one sentence, indicated the reason for this—what may be called—‘delay’ viewed from one point of view. After this Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha, the Karve Committee was appointed by the Planning Commission. This Committee, which went carefully into several aspects of cottage and village industries and other industries coming under the general category of small-scale industries, made several recommendations and among the other recommendations that they made, one was that the question of giving statutory status to these boards that we wanted to function in the country should be very carefully gone into. I quote a sentence from their report:

“Before the process of conferring statutory status on this and similar Boards” . . .

The reference here is to the Khadi and Village Industries Board.

“. . . is further extended, it is desirable to give fresh consideration to the whole question.”

So before we could take the Bill for consideration in the Lok Sabha, we had to give fresh consideration to this question as recommended by the Karve Committee. So we gave fresh consideration to this question.