

since morning. If you could kindly help us... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): I am sure the office will do that.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Okey.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, a copy of the Standing Committee Report may be made available to us and, as requested by the Minister, it should not be listed on Tuesday.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: The Business Advisory Committee would have to be told about the sense of the House and that they will have to find for this Bill next week. That is the understanding.

THE APPRENTICES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1995

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): Madam, I beg to move:

"that the Bill further to amend the Apprentices Act, 1961 be taken into consideration."

As the hon. Members are aware, the Apprentices Act was enacted in 1961 with the objective of regulating programmes of apprenticeship in industry for imparting practical training. The Act was amended in 1973 to bring within its purview the training of graduate engineers, diploma holders in engineering/technology as graduate/technician apprentices. It was further amended in 1986 to bring within its purview the training of technician (vocational) apprentices from the products of the 10+2 vocational stream of education. In reply to a question raised by the former Member of Parliament, Shri Jagdambi Prasad Yadav, and during subsequent discussions in this House, an assurance was given by the former Union Labour Minister in the 139th Session of Rajya Sabha on 20th August, 1986 for taking

up a proposal for bringing comprehensive amendment of the Apprentices Act.

In order to undertake the review, suggestions were invited from the Central Government, State Governments, industries, establishments, employers' and employees' representatives. The Central Apprenticeship Council, CAC, the apex tripartite statutory body set up under the Apprentices Act, considered these suggestions during its various meetings and constituted two Working Groups and a Task Force from amongst its members to make suggestions on the proposed amendments. The CAC, in its 22nd meeting on 30.1.1990, accepted the recommendations of the Working Groups and the Task Force after due deliberations.

Briefly, the amendments proposed are as follows. (1) Amendment of the definition of establishment, as given under Section 2(g) and also to add the definition of 'Worker' under Section 2(r). (2) Amendment of Section 7 of the Act by adding an additional clause to give benefit of training undergone with a former employer. (3) Amendment of Section 8(3) of the Act by addition of a proviso, to provide flexibility to the employers to adjust the number of apprentices in different trades. (4) Amendment of Section 9(8) (a) (i) and (ii) by lowering the limit of 500 workers to 250 for sharing the recurring cost of training including the cost of stipend. (5) Amendment of Section 11 of the Act to ensure availability of adequate and qualified instructional staff for imparting practical and theoretical training and for providing facilities for trade test of apprentices by the employer in their establishments. (6) Amendment of Section 33 of the Act regarding delegation of powers to the Deputy Apprenticeship Advisers and above for filing complaints regarding offences committed under the Act and the

Rules. Madam, amendment of Section 31 deals with imposition of higher penalty for failure to comply with the provisions of the Apprentices Act, 1961. The Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, 1995 was introduced in the Rajya Sabha on 25.8.95 by the former Union Labour Minister. It was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour and Welfare, where the matter was fully discussed. Madam, one of the recommendations made by the Parliamentary Standing Committee was an amendment to the penalty proposed in Section 31 of the Apprentices Act. The Committee suggested that penalties may be increased from Rs. 500, to a minimum of Rs. 3000 and a maximum of Rs. 6000. It is felt that the Apprentices Act, 1961 is a piece of welfare legislation and launching of prosecution is not its primary objective. The enhancement of the amount of fine from Rs. 500 to Rs. 3000 may not, by itself, bring about any radical or qualitative change or improvement in the situation. The Directorate General of Employment and Training, Ministry of Labour, needs to play a positive and pro-active role in persuading and carrying conviction to employers in private and public sectors for closer coordination and more effective implementation of the Act rather than going for a punitive approach. If the House approves the proposed amendments, it will be another step in the progressive development of our training schemes.

The question was proposed.

SHRI GOPALSINH G. SOLANKI (Gujarat): The present Bill, that is, the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, 1995 has been brought to amend Sections 2, 3, 31 and other Sections of the Act. Madam, I would like to bring to the notice of the House that the Bill was intended to meet the requirements of skilled labourers and workers in the industry. After the Law was enacted, the Act has been amended twice—in 1973 and 1986. But I would like to know whether the Act was fully

implemented. So far as Clause 2 is concerned, it has been newly introduced. It gives a wider meaning to establishment and other things. So far as the question of employment of Apprentices is concerned, I would like to know whether all the industries follow the prescribed norms laid down in the law. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to how many cases have been made out so far against the erring industries. How many industrialists have been punished? How many institutions or establishments have been punished? How many cases are pending in courts? I would like to draw the attention of the House to Section 33. It says, if any criminal prosecution has to be launched then it should be done with the permission of the Apprenticeship Advisor within six months from the date of the offence was committed. According to the Act, the punishment shall be imprisonment for three months or six months. According to the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, any offence is punishable with an imprisonment of six months or one year—the limit is one year—with fine or both. Therefore, many offenders have escaped so far. I would like to know from the Minister whether it has been in his mind to bring forth an amendment to Section 33 which is still there and when permission is to be sought within six months from the date of the offence. It is debarred by Section 468 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973. With this particular submission I would like to know how many cases could not be lodged in the courts of law. Then, as far as the question of sub-clause (r) of clause 2 is concerned, the definition of 'worker' is welcome. But so far as the question of clause 3 in relation to Section 7 is concerned, I would like to know how many industries and services have been there in which the apprentices are not taken. The industrialists have not followed this particular patent and there should have been a survey by a National Council or State Council or Apprenticeship Advisor or Deputy

Adviser or any Council or Director General of Training and Employment. Has it ever been done? Then, so far as amendment of Section 8, Sub-section 3 is concerned, it has been made flexible, with regard to the number of apprentices to be appointed. But I would like to suggest in Sub-Section 8 of 9 where the number of workers is stated to be 500 is to be amended to 250. This is the age of technology. Madam, industrialists and institutions have known to have computerised their business, in many industries. They have reduced the number of workers also and they are now employing no more than 100 or 150 workers in place of 2,000 workers who were working before. So the staff has been reduced; therefore, there is a likelihood of escaping from the responsibility of appointment of apprentices and educated people will have to suffer this way. So instead of 250, you are going to make it '250' from 500. But I would suggest that the number of workers in industries in which they are working should be only 100; in such industries also the apprenticeship should be introduced so that skilled people do not suffer. Of course, the law is not meant to be a deterrent and punitive one. As regards clause 7 in relation to Section 31, the proposal of the Joint Committee was Rs. 3,000, that the minimum should not be less than Rs. 3,000 and the maximum should be 6,000. But the law was introduced in the year 1961. Looking at the standard during those days, if it was 500, I think industrialists should be dealt with punitively and it should not be less than 10,000 now. The penalty to be imposed should not merely be a fine. There should be some sentence also so that there would be some fear in the minds of the people and they would obey the law.

I would like to suggest one more thing. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has got any plan to implement the recommendations made by the Committee which was set up in connection with this issue. According to

section 21, after the completion of the training period, a proficiency test will be taken and the National Council will issue a certificate to this effect. But such a certificate does not ensure that the services of the apprentices would be availed of, or they would be absorbed in the regular staff of the industries. I would agree that the particular industries which trained them would not like to absorb them in their regular staff. But is it not possible to introduce an amendment to this section so that such trained people could be absorbed in other industries, wherever there is a need for availing of their services; But it was not done. Industrialists just accept them for a meagre salary or stipend. As soon as the training period is over, they throw them out. This is nothing but exploitation and it has to be prevented. I think an amendment to section 21 is required to be introduced immediately.

Madam, I would like to touch upon one more issue. If a trainee is injured during the course of his apprenticeship, compensation equivalent to some months' salary is to be awarded. But the wages drawn by the trainees are very meagre during their training period. They are not even paid the minimum wages. I would suggest an amendment to this particular clause. It should be considered that the person so injured should be awarded compensation equivalent to salary which he is likely to receive after the completion of his training. It is necessary because the trainee so injured must be of very young age and if he becomes fully disabled and gets a compensation calculated in terms of his stipend or meagre salary that he is paid during the training period, he would suffer throughout his life. Even this aspect needs an amendment.

With these words, I support the Bill because it is in the interests of the workers, in the interests of the educated young people who are going to be apprentices in one firm or the other.

Thank you, Madam Vice-Chairman.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया (बिहार): उपसभा-ध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं अप्रेंटिस अमेंडमेंट बिल, 1995 का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। महोदया, जब यह अप्रेंटिस ऐक्ट बना था तो उसके पीछे दो मंशा थी कि जो लोग टैक्निकल इंस्टीट्यूट में थ्योरिटिकल पढ़कर अपने ट्रेड कोर्सेज के सर्टिफिकेट लेकर या डिप्लोमा लेकर डिफ्रेंट पोलिटेक्नीक और इंस्टीट्यूशन से बाहर आते हैं तो उन्हें प्रेक्टिकल एक्सपीरियंस गेन करने के लिए उनको अप्रेंटिस रखा जाए और जो नई-नई तकनीकियाँ हमारे देश में आ रही हैं उसके साथ उन्हें अवगत कराया जाए। महोदया, इस ऐक्ट के पीछे जो मंशा थी, दिनों दिन उसका क्षय हुआ है और यह मंशा करीब-करीब समाप्त हो चुकी है। आज एप्रेंटिसशिप के नाम पर शोषण होता है, एक्सप्लॉयटेशन होता है कि किस तरह से एक डिग्री होल्डर या डिप्लोमा होल्डर को कम तनखाह देते हुए उसे स्टाइपेंड में रखते हुए हम अपना काम चला सकें।

महोदया, 1971 में जब बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, क्रायला खदानों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, उस वक्त इंदिरा जी ने इसको बड़े जोर-शोर से शुरू किया था और खासकर पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग को ये निर्देश दिए गए थे कि इसको पूरी तरह से लागू किया जाए पर आज यह पूरी तरह से लागू नहीं हो रहा है। पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग जहाँ-जहाँ भी लागी, उसकी आधरआल डेवलपमेंट को मदद-नज़र रखते हुए वहाँ की राज्य सरकार से या केन्द्र सरकार की मदद से वहाँ पोलिटेक्नीक खोले गए। वहाँ ट्रेड कोर्सेज के लिए अलग इंस्टीट्यूट खोले गए और ऐसा एप्रोमेंट किया गया कि वहाँ के पोलिटेक्नीक के स्टूडेंट्स या जो ट्रेड कोर्सेज के स्टूडेंट्स पास करके निकलेंगे, उनको वहाँ पर एप्रेंटिस रखा जाएगा और अल्टीमेटली उनको उस इंडस्ट्री में एंबज़ॉर्ब किया जाएगा पर इसका सरासर उल्लंघन पब्लिक सेक्टर में होता रहा और आज भी आप देखिए इस पब्लिक सेक्टर अंडरटेकिंग की छत्रछाया में या इनके तहत जितने संस्थान चल रहे हैं, उनके छात्रों को एंबज़ॉर्ब करने की बात या उन्हें एप्रेंटिस रखने की बात मोची नहीं जाती है। कई लोगों में तो अभी तक भ्रम है कि जो लेबर ऐक्ट है, उसके अनुसार 240 दिन का कैजुअल लेबर पक्का हो जाएगा इसलिए 239वें दिन एक दिन का ब्रेक देकर उसे फिर से रख लिया जाए। वैसे ही ऐक्ट का प्रावधान ये एप्रेंटिस पर भी लागते हैं। जहाँ ट्रेनिंग साल भर की होनी चाहिए या दो साल की होनी चाहिए, उसको कहते

हैं कि छह महीने में ही समाप्त करो। छह महीने में नहीं तो आठ महीने में तो जरूर सम्पन्न कर दो क्योंकि ब्रेक अप इन सर्विस होना चाहिए नहीं तो वह परमानेंट हो जाएगा। तो मकसद क्या है हमारा? इस एप्रेंटिस ऐक्ट पास करने के पीछे हमारी मंशा क्या थी? आज कोई भी अखबार उठा लें, जितने एप्राइमेंट हैं, जितनी वेकेन्सीज़ हैं, हरेक में यह लिखा रहता है कि सिविल इंजीनियर चाहिए, केमिकल इंजीनियर चाहिए, इलेक्ट्रिकल इंजीनियर चाहिए, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स इंजीनियर चाहिए, इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन इंजीनियर चाहिए, हर तरह के इंजीनियर चाहिए विद फाइव ईयर्स एक्सपीरियंस, टेन ईयर्स एक्सपीरियंस, महोदया, जो छात्र इंडियन इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ टेक्नालॉजी का पढ़ा हुआ है, कुछ का तो कैम्पस से ही सलेक्शन हो जाता है। बड़ी-बड़ी कंपनियाँ कैम्पस से ही उठा कर ले जाती हैं उनको। अब जिनको नहीं उठा कर ले जाती है, जो रह जाते हैं, वे भाँ के गर्भ से तो एक्सपीरियंस लेकर नहीं पैदा हो सकते। कहीं न कहीं तो उनको एप्रेंटिस होने के बावजूद एक्सपीरियंस गेन करना होगा। पर एक्सपीरियंस गेन करने की सुविधा उसे उपलब्ध करने के कांसेप्ट के पीछे हमारे देश के पूर्व पुरुषों ने इसी संसद में एप्रेंटिस ऐक्ट पास करते हुए ऐसी मंशा रखी थी कि हमारे नौजवान जो स्कूल-कॉलेज से टेक्निकल एजुकेशन लेकर पास होंगे, उनको हम ट्रेनिंग पब्लिक सेक्टर के माध्यम से देंगे। सिर्फ प्रोडक्शन ही नहीं पर उनके एप्रेंटिस के माध्यम से ट्रेनिंग भी देंगे, स्टाइपेंड भी देंगे पर वहाँ जो अधिकारी लोग हैं, अपने स्वार्थ के कारण या अपनी सहूलियत के कारण उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया।

महोदया, इस बिल में जो अमेंडमेंट करना है, करें पर इसको ऐनफोर्स कैसे करेंगे, उसके लिए हमारे श्रम मंत्री महोदय एक रस्ता समाने लाए, उसके लिए एक प्रोग्राम लाएं कि हमारी जितनी पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज़ हैं, मैं तो कहूँगा पब्लिक सेक्टर ही क्यों, मैं इससे थोड़ा बाहर भी निकलना चाहता हूँ और कहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जितनी भी इंडस्ट्रीज़ और फ़ार्मेशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स की मदद से, जहाँ पर हमारे फ़ार्मेशियल इंस्टीट्यूशन्स के बड़े-बड़े शेयर हैं और बड़ा-बड़ा दाम है, वहाँ पर भी इस एप्रेंटिस ऐक्ट को लागू करना चाहिए। जितनी भी लिमिटेड कंपनियाँ हैं, वहाँ पर इसको लागू करना चाहिए कि हमारे नौजवान जो कॉलेज से निकलते हैं या टेक्निकल स्कूल से निकलते हैं, उन्हें यह सुविधा उपलब्ध हो सके कि वे कुछ कर सकें। मैं यही कह कर इसका समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद

करता हूँ कि ग्राम मंत्री महोदय इसको पूरी तरह से एनफोर्स करने के लिए कारगर कदम उठाएंगे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa: Madam, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, 1995. Madam, so far as this amendment is concerned, it is a welcome amendment. I would like to submit that while they are amending clause 33, at the same time, it should be in consonance with the Criminal Procedure Code regarding the Law of Limitations.

The other point I would like to submit is this. There is a great cry for proper employment and giving equal opportunities to the members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Here I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to section 3(a) it was inserted in 1973 by the Act of 27 that implementation of section 3(a) regarding reservation of training places for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in designated trades having regard to the population of the State. So, for the purpose of implementation thereof, I request the Minister to make a statement as to in how many States these provisions are being implemented.

The other thing is this. As you know, reservation for the OBCs has been made. So, I request the Minister that similar provisions should be made for the OBC people.

The other point I want to submit relates to clause 31. As you know, there is exploitation of employees by employers. So, I want to know how many prosecutions have been instituted against the persons who are exploiting employees by violating these provisions. With this, I support this Bill.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Vice-Chairperson, we generally support the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, 1995, but there are certain provisions which need to be further reviewed and the Government should pay adequate attention in order to

really make it a comprehensive one for proper benefit of technical passouts of our country. I particularly want to mention about the fate of women passouts who are coming out from rural technical institutes. It is absolutely necessary that an appropriate planning is made on behalf of the Central Government in order to absorb these women passouts of rural technical institutes, for apprenticeship and subsequent employment to apprenticeship. It is not only the question of women coming out of rural technical institutes, but also the question of SCs, STs, urban women coming out of ITIs, polytechnics and other technical institutions. Similar is the fate of other dispossessed and disadvantaged sections of society. Frankly speaking, it is not a question of these disadvantaged section of society alone. This problem is related to the basic process of industrialisation or de-industrialisation of our country. When this amendment was implemented and when these institutes were established, it was quite clear that this would help in the process of industrialisation of our country. But, that did not take place. As has already been point out, in the last five years the process of de-industrialisation has been evident in many horizons and trades. As a result of that, the apprentices have suffered the most. If this process continues, then the entire process of bringing in this Apprentices Act of 1961 and the entire policy perspective will be self-defeating at some point of time. Therefore, the Government must make appropriate planning in order to relate the question of apprenticeship and the question of employment subsequent to apprenticeship to the broad-based question of industrialisation of our country.

Here, the private sector is failing the most. This Bill has failed to provide relief to the ITI pass-outs and other technological pass-outs. The main reason is that private sector has not adhered to the norms. No punishment or penalty has been given to them. There has not been

consistent criminal proceedings against the erring private sector which is violating and defying the recommendations of the Committee. Are the Government planning anything? This amendment is welcome. Are the Government planning specific measures with regard to bringing to book the private sector? It is not the responsibility of the public sector alone. Will the public sector management be taken to task whenever they fail to properly absorb ITI pass-outs particularly from the rural background and from the background of the dispossessed and the disadvantaged? Will the Government ensure that the career does not end in apprenticeship? The question of providing employment subsequent to apprenticeship is also the moral and Constitutional responsibility. Will the Government try to incorporate this spirit? These are the main criteria. If these are not adopted properly, then the amendment will fail at some point of time and the situation, as Mr. Ahluwalia has pointed out just now, will remain the same with scores of advertisements. With the process of computerisation, reckless modernisation, the massive investments in these areas, the human resource of the country, the technical pass-outs, these institutions will go a waste. It will virtually be a national wastage. It may not be equivalent to brain-drain but it will be a wastage because they cannot be absorbed properly into proper designations and trades. I would again request the Government to consider this vitally important question particularly at a time when unemployment is massively rising. There is educated unemployment, technological unemployment and unemployment of the engineering graduates, polytechnic pass-outs, ITI pass-outs and many other professions. It is rising alarmingly in our country. This is the right time the Government paid adequate attention and incorporated the spirit in the Bill.

Thank you

SHRI R.K. KUMAR (Tamil Nadu):

This is a very simple amendment Bill. I do not have to speak much on this except to say that this piece of legislation, the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, is a classic example of how a noble purpose could be defeated in implementation. I know personally very well that many industrial establishments in Tamil Nadu have been misusing Apprentices Act by keeping many people as apprentices for a long time, as has been pointed out by Mr. Ahluwalia. They get away by paying them minimum wages as compared to regular workers. Effective implementation of the Act to absorb the apprentices as full time workers should be done. There is nothing much in this amendment and I wholeheartedly welcome it. I would add that this may be extended to various other public sector undertakings and it should also be extended to qualified technical engineering graduates, in the appraisal of technical things in banks financial institutions and other places. With these words I welcome this amendment.

श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी (बिहार): मैडम, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। इसमें जो संशोधन का उद्देश्य है वह है कि जो लोग अप्रेंटिसशिप किए होते हैं उनको वर्कर्स के रूप में मान्यता मिले। मैं इस अमेन्डमेंट का समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे साथियों ने सही कहा है कि आज हमारे विद्यार्थी आई०टी०आई०, पोलिटेक्निक या दूसरे इंस्टीट्यूटों से जो पढ़कर निकल रहे हैं वे मारे मारे फिर रहे हैं और जहां जाते हैं तो उनको कहा जाता है कि अपने 5-7 साल के एक्सपीरियंस का सर्टिफिकेट दीजिए। तो इस बिल में अमेन्डमेंट का उद्देश्य यह होना चाहिए कि ये यह ट्रेनिंग कर चुके हैं और एप्रेन्टिसशिप की व्यवस्था है तथा उसके बाद उनको नौकरी की गारंटी होनी चाहिए। उनका एम्प्लॉयमेंट होना चाहिए। कानून तो बन जाते हैं लेकिन कानून को लागू करने के लिए कोई मशीनरी काम नहीं करती है। इसलिए कानून, कानून की किताब में रहते हैं और उसका लाभ, जिनके लिए बनाया जाता है उनको मिल नहीं पाता है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए 2-3 सुझाव देना चाहूंगा माननीय मंत्री जी कि सचमुच इस बिल में जो आपने संशोधन किया है इसका प्रकसर और आपकी नीयत सही है लेकिन तब तक यह कारगर नहीं हो सकेगा जब तक आप, जो पढ़

लिख गए हैं उनको नौकरी देने की व्यवस्था नहीं करते। इसलिए चाहे वह पब्लिक सेक्टर हो या प्राइवेट सेक्टर हो, दोनों सेक्टरों में इन लोगों की बहाली की, एम्प्लॉयमेंट की व्यवस्था आप करें, तब इस बिल की कारगर उपयोगिता हो सकती है और आपका जो अमेंडमेंट है जिसकी दिशा सही है उससे लाभ मिलेगा। लेकिन जो मुख्य मकसद इन पढ़े लिखे विद्यार्थियों को एम्प्लॉयमेंट मिलने का, रोजगार मिलने का, नौकरी मिलने का है जब तक इसकी व्यवस्था आप नहीं करेंगे, इसकी गारंटी नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस संशोधन का लाभ उनको नहीं मिलेगा। इसी लिए मेरा सुझाव है कि इस पर आप गंभीरतापूर्वक विचार करें और इसको लागू करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

PROF. NAUNIHAL SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, a very important point has been raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Sengupta, with regard to unemployment because of modern technologies. The Bill says, 'training only once' and no more training. Here because of the 'technological unemployment', there should be re-training. This thing should also be included for providing re-training. Once an apprenticed employee has been demolished or he has become unemployed because of modern technology, then he should be retrained. It should be the responsibility of the Government under this Act that this young man who has been demolished, who has been taken off from employment because of the new technology, must be re-trained. So, the provision of re-training should also be provided in this particular Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): Madam, I am very thankful to the hon. Members who have responded to the amendments. In the light of new technological developments, these amendments are being brought in to enhance the scope of apprentice training. Madam, many hon. Members have asked whether after apprentice training they have been absorbed or not. As far as we are concerned, we have given clear guidelines to the public sector undertakings to fill up 50 per cent of the vacancies under the

direct recruitment quota with passed-out trained apprentices. Madam, suitable instructions on the basis of the judgement delivered by the Supreme Court have also been issued to all concerned.

Madam, in the private sector also we are monitoring. It has been confirmed that some private sector industries are absorbing passed trade apprentice in regular jobs. A few firms are following the Apprentices Act. Regarding absorption of SCST candidates, after training, under the Apprentices Act, I would like to say that vacancies are reserved for SCST in each designated trade based on the population of the SC/ST in the concerned State. The provisions of the Act, in this regard, are strictly followed. On this issue, the State Apprentices Advisors have been advised to ensure that the seats earmarked for SCST training are fully utilised and that concerted efforts are made to encourage candidates from reserved categories to join the apprenticeship training scheme in sufficient numbers. Madam, the progress is closely monitored through quarterly progress reports received from various State Governments and Union Territories. I have just asked my officers about the number of persons punished under this Act. They are not in a position to reply to this. I assure the House that I will collect the information from the various State Governments and place it on the Table of the House. Madam, you know very well that I assumed charge only three months ago. With this I request the hon. Members to pass the Bill. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): We shall now put the motion for consideration to vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Apprentices Act, 1961, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE

VICE-CHAIRMAN

(SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Now, clause 6. There is an amendment, No. 3, by Miss Saroj Khaparde. She is not here. I shall now put clauses 6 to 8 vote.

Clause 6 to 8 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): We shall now take up clause 1. There is an amendment by the hon. Minister.

Clause 1

SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM: I beg to move:

"That at page 1 line 3 for the figures "1995" the figure "1996" be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): We shall now take up the Enacting Formula. There is an amendment by the hon. Minister.

Enacting Formula

SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM: I beg to move:

"That at page 1, line 1 for the words "Forty-sixth", the words "forty-seven", be substituted."

The question was put and the motion was adopted

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

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM: Madam, I beg to move.

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION

Re. Proclamation issued by President in Relation to Uttar Pradesh

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MOHAMMAD MAQBOOL DAR):

Madam, I beg to move—

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on 17th October, 1996 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh."

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Mr. Minister, you can speak on it.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Not necessary. He does not want to speak. *(interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Do you want to speak on the Resolution, Mr. Minister?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: There is no need. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Do you want to speak on the Resolution or not?

SHRI MOHAMMAD MAQBOOL DAR: No, Madam.

श्री राजनाथ सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): मैडम, उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति की घोषणा के प्रस्ताव के अनुमोदन का विरोध करने के लिए मैं इस सदन में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैडम, मैं इस सदन से भी अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि जनता की हत्या करने वाली यह जो राष्ट्रपति की घोषणा है, इसका यह सदन विरोध करे, क्योंकि यह सदन हाउस आफ एल्डर्स कहा जाता है। यह बड़ों का