

Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely :

Shri Aziz Imam,
 Shri T. Balakrishniah,
 Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia,
 Shri Chhuttan Lal,
 Shri Biren Dutta,
 Shri Nageshwar Dwivedi,
 Shrimati Ganga Devi,
 Shri S. B. Giri,
 Shri J. Matha Gowder,
 Shri Hukam Chand Kachwai,
 Shri L. D. Kotoki,
 Shri Raja Kulkarni,
 Shri Madhu Limaye,
 Shri K. Mallanna,
 Shri Tuna Oraon,
 Shri Damodar Pandey,
 Shri Ramsahai Pandey,
 Shri Pratap Singh,
 Shri Natwarlal Patel,
 Shri S. L. Peje,
 Shri Vayalar Ravi,
 Shri K. Ramakrishna Reddy,
 Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait,
 Shri Devendra Satpathy,
 Shri Ranen Sen,
 Shri Shiv Kumar Shastri,
 Shri Somchand Solanki,
 Shri G. Venkatswamy,
 Shri Amarnath Vidyalankar, and
 Shri N. P. Yadav.

on the 9th May, 1973 and communicated to this House on the 10th May, 1973 and do resolve that the following 30 Members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely :

Shri Aziz Imam,
 Shri T. Balakrishniah,
 Shri Raghunandan Lal Bhatia,
 Shri Chhuttan Lal,
 Shri Biren Dutta,
 Shri Nageshwar Dwivedi,
 Shrimati Ganga Devi,
 Shri S. B. Giri,
 Shri J. Matha Gowder,
 Shri Hukam Chand Kachwai,
 Shri L. D. Kotoki,
 Shri Raja Kulkarni,
 Shri Madhu Limaye,
 Shri K. Mallanna,
 Shri Tuna Oraon,
 Shri Damodar Pandey,
 Shri Ramsahai Pandey,
 Shri Pratap Singh,
 Shri Natwarlal Patel,
 Shri S. L. Peje,
 Shri Vayalar Ravi,
 Shri K. Ramakrishna Reddy,
 Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait,
 Shri Devendra Satpathy,
 Shri Ranen Sen,
 Shri Shiv Kumar Shastri,
 Shri Somchand Solanki,
 Shri G. Venkatswamy,
 Shri Amarnath Vidyalankar, and
 Shri N. P. Yadav

The motion was adopted.

12.42 hrs.

APPRENTICES (AMENDMENT) BILL—
contd.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“That this House do concur in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Plantations Labour Act, 1951, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH) : I had suggested to the Opposition and they had agreed also that this Bill which is a small non-controversial Bill may be passed without discussion, except that there are two official amendments.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) . Who agreed to it ? Was it placed before the BAC ? No It was not

MR SPEAKER If you want to have a discussion, then the other motion may have to be moved to a later time You agree to something and then you raise another point I thought that as you have been demanding the other discussion for so many days (Interruptions) Are you sure that we will be able to finish it in half an hour ?—Mr Dinesh Singh ?

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) It will not take very long We can do it today itself The BAC had agreed to it

MR SPEAKER So let us take item No 17 first and No 16 later on (Interruptions) Half an hour should be all right for Mr Dinesh Singh's discussion At 6 00 p m I will call him

SHRI DINESH SINGH Let us finish item No 17 and then take up No 16

MR SPEAKER All right Any way, after the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill which is expected to be finished in half an hour, you will get your discussion for half an hour and then we will take up item No 16

SHRI DINESH BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore) Why should priority be given, Sir ? If you take this item Item No 17, before the previous item, Item No 16, what will people think ?

SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH You don't follow what the Speaker has said

MR SPEAKER Item No 16 will be the last discussion

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) The Minister has not moved it

MR SPEAKER . If you are not attentive it does not mean everybody is not attentive He has already moved it This is from the

record of the proceedings of the House Yesterday the Minister said .

"This is a non-controversial Bill and as Members are inclined to pass it without any discussion, I do not want to make a speech "

Now, Shri Biren Dutta

SHRI BIREN DUTTA (Tirupura West) We have no information about the objects of the Bill Nothing is given Without giving the objects, this Bill has been brought forward

श्री बिरन बिहारी ब्राह्मणेयी (ग्वालियर)
जो बिल राज्य सभा में पाम होकर यहाँ आना है उस में मानकैक्टस नहीं होते हैं। इसी तरह से जो बिल यहाँ में पाम हो कर राज्य सभा में जाता है उस में भी नहीं होते हैं। हमारे पास पुराना बिल भी है जिन में उद्देश्य बनाए गए है। मगर मंत्री महोदय को अपना कुछ तो बूढ़ खालना चाहिए।

SHRI BIREN DUTTA I want to draw the attention of the hon Minister to this point In the present circumstances, without this amendment, what is the position of the Apprentices Act ? You are wanting compulsory registration of engineer technicians How can you say you are going to make for them better working and functioning ? They have already acquired some certificates You are forcing them to work again as apprentices For what purpose ? In this Bill it is stated that they are to be made more efficient in particular subjects But is there any hint that these engineers after getting their degrees again get into the apprenticeship and will they get any security of service ? Is there any hint in this Bill that after passing the apprenticeship they will be given another certificate, but that no surty will be given ? My point is this The establishments must have their own apprentices They will continue And these new apprentices will be inducted for the training purposes

All these apprentices are made to work more than what their employees are made to work. In the name of discipline they are employed as employees in the establishment and maximum labour is squeezed out from them, and yet they are not treated on a par with the other labourers and the employers do not care to give them the benefit of any of the labour Acts.

In the proposed amendment, what has been done is that they have been debarred even from demanding bonus. Also, the most stringent formulae have been laid down for being obeyed by the trainees in the name of discipline. Can there be no watch over their activities by agencies other than the authorities taking them as apprentices?

We know that in all the big concerns, the apprentices who are brought for training are mostly their relatives and others, they do not even get the actual training, and yet they are passed off as trained apprentices and given employment. But the poorer people who have got an engineering degree have to go through the process of apprenticeship and after they complete it, they have no guarantee of getting employment. So, what is the necessity to give scope to the employers again to exploit them only as trainees without giving them due remuneration and without giving them any benefit from their production? Why should we compel them to go through the process of apprenticeship finally to come out again as unemployed persons?

We know that for rapid industrialisation of our country we need more qualified engineers and technicians. But what is the reality? The new education system is such that while we establish some engineering colleges and train these engineers and technicians, after a few years we see that these engineers are no longer required, and they remain unemployed. These unemployed engineers are again to be given

a chance with the help of Government to be trained in industrial establishments, but again they will go as unemployed persons because they would have nothing to do. To become engineers, they have to undergo apprenticeship training, but even after that, they will come out without any security of job. What is the guarantee that this Bill gives to the engineers and diploma-holders for employment, for which actually this Bill is meant? I find that there is no such guarantee that after going through the apprenticeship they will be absorbed in the same industry or the same trade. That being so, I do not know why this Bill has been brought forward. Government have not stated the object for which this Bill has been brought forward. My feeling is that this Bill will only delay employment to the graduates and technicians who have already passed their examinations and who have got their diplomas or degrees or certificates. This might be used to delay their appointment by giving them again a process of training, not for their absorption. That is why I say that although Government have come with this non-controversial and simple Bill, this gives more opportunities for the employer, under whom they are to undergo training, to exploit the trainees more.

What should be done now? Government should bring forward a comprehensive Bill, not such a piecemeal legislation, in which they have brought in some provision under which if some concern refuses to give practical training, you can compel them now to have a quota as directed by Government for giving some training facilities. This is good as far as it goes. But we should see what is happening at present. What is the status of those who are undergoing training, how they have fared and how they come out after training. I think such piecemeal legislation as has been brought in now will not help the apprentices, not the engineers, not the

[Shri Biren Dutta]

technically qualified persons. For any real benefit to be given to them, Government must come with a comprehensive Bill, not with a superficial Bill like this in which there is no guarantee for the apprentices to get any job. Therefore, while not opposing the Bill, I want that Government should think of bringing forward a comprehensive Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY) : With your permission, I would like to make it very clear that there is no compulsion contemplated for graduates to become apprentices before securing employment. They are only being enabled to become apprentices. This is only an enabling measure rather than a Bill to compel the various industrial undertakings to give training to the graduates for the purpose of getting them more practical experience. Therefore, I hope hon. members would appreciate this position.

Then the trainees will be paid a stipend and the expenditure will be shared on 50:50 basis between the Government and the employer. Employers will take a prescribed number of graduate engineers and diploma holders for apprenticeship training. The standards of training, rates of stipend etc. will be prescribed by Government under rule-making powers in consultation with industry and the Central Apprenticeship Council. Consequential changes in the organisational set up will also be made in the Act and separate Apprenticeship Rules will be prescribed for graduate engineer/diploma holder apprentices.

As for the other point made that there must be compulsory employment for all those apprentices who had been taken on apprentice training by the particular industrial undertaking, though it is a very meaning full proposition, still it will have

to be further examined in all its implications. When the time comes, the entire question will be considered and proper legislation can be thought of.

As far as the present Bill goes, it is only an enabling measure. I have no doubt in my mind that it will be helpful to the engineer graduates to get training so that the industrial undertakings may not be in a position to refuse them employment. This measure will also help the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Does it apply to public undertakings also ?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY : Wherever it is necessary I think yes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : As the amendment at present stands ?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY : As the amendment stands, it is mainly for the industrial undertakings in the private sector. The scope of this can be further examined to see in what way the provision can be extended even to public undertakings.

This is the purpose and object of the Bill, This Bill, as I said, is a non-controversial Bill and it is only an enabling measure. I did not make a speech yesterday when I moved the motion.

13 hrs.

I hope the hon. Members will accept the Bill and agree that the motion be taken into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Apprentices Act, 1961, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : I am now taking clauses 2 to 9. There are no amendments to these clauses. The question is :

"That clauses 2 to 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 9 were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : Clause 10. There is an amendment. Shri Ram Singh Bhai Verma—he is not moving. The question is :

“That clause 10 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 11 to 24 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1—(Short title and commencement)

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY : I beg to move :

“Page 1, line 4,—for “1972” substitute “1973”” (2)

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“Page 1, line 4, —for “1972” substitute “1973””

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

MR. SPEAKER : There is an amendment to the Enacting Formula.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY : I beg to move :

“Page 1, line 1, —for “Twenty-third” substitute “Twenty-fourth”” (1)

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“Page 1, line 1, —for “Twenty-third” substitute “Twenty-fourth””

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :
“That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill”

The motion was adopted.

The enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY : Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :
“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

13.03 hours

DISCUSSION RE : LOCATION OF TRACTOR FACTORY AT PRATAP- GARH

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Dinesh Singh. You will finish at 1.30 and we shall take up the next discussion against item No. 16 at 1.30.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) : May I take 15 minutes ?

MR. SPEAKER : Unless others are there to speak, you can take the whole time.

SHRI DINESH SINGH : I have no objection to share the time with others.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am most grateful to you for permitting this discussion on the tractor factory to be located at Pratapgarh. I am raising this matter not merely because it is a factory that concerns my constituency but because it is story of Government's policy regarding locating factories in backward areas. I hope that during this discussion it will become apparent that whatever may be said by Government about their desire of implementing their policy of locating industries in the backward areas, nothing has been done by them which can show that they have any desire to implement this policy. This particular tractor factory was given a letter