

[Kazi Ahmad Hussain.]

میں کہتا ہوں کہ اگر آپ کو اس طرح کا ریفارم کرنا ہی ہے تو آپ کو ہلکے ہلکے ریفارم کو لاگو کرنا چاہئے۔ اگر آپ اسکو تیزی سے کرنا چاہیں گے تو ہندوؤں کے اندر ایک بڑا ریپولیشن ہوگا جس کا کہ آپ کو مقابلہ کرنا ہوگا۔

مسلمان تو سارے ملک میں مائنداریتی میں ہیں۔ انہوں نے بھی اپنے ہندو بھائیوں کی طرح آزادی کی لڑائی میں حصہ لیا ہے اور اس ملک کو آزاد کرایا ہے۔ آج ہر اسٹیٹ لوکر اگر وہ اپنے کو ہندو کہتا ہے ہم سے جب چاہے وفاداری کی سند مانگتا ہے اس سے ان کا دل ٹوٹ گیا ہے۔ مسلمان اس وقت خوفزدہ ہیں ان میں آج انکی ہمت نہیں کہ وہ کہہ سکیں کہ یہ قانون ہمارے لئے تھیک نہیں ہے۔ وہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ اس طرح کی باتیں کریں تو شاید آپ خفا ہو جائیں اور ہو سکتا ہے کہ کل آپ ہم لوگوں کو کونسل آف اسٹیٹس میں جگہ نہ دیں۔ تو اس قسم کی باتیں ہیں اس لئے آپ کو مسلمانوں کے قانون جاننے والے لوگوں سے بھی آپ کو صلاح لے لینی چاہئے۔ آپ کو مائنداریتی کا بڑا خیال رکھنا چاہئے۔ ہندو قانون میں اگر آپ کوئی ترمیم کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو آپ کو یہ حق ہے۔ مگر اس کے ساتھ ہی یہ آپ کو دیکھنا ہوگا کہ عام لوگوں کے لئے وہ قابل قبول ہے

بھی یا نہیں ہے۔ اگر آپ ایسا نہیں کریں گے تو ہماری کانگریس پارٹی جس نے ملک کو آزاد کرایا جو کہ ملک میں زیادہ لوگوں کی ترجمانی کرتی ہے وہ ایسا اعتماد کھو دیگی۔ اس وقت سب سے بڑی بات یہ ہے کہ کانگریس عام لوگوں میں غیر مقبول ہوتی جا رہی ہے۔ ہمارے جو دشمن ہیں اور ہمارے جو مخالف ہیں وہ ہم کو دونوں طرف سے آڑے ہاتھ لیتے ہیں۔ جب ہم کوئی قانون نہیں بناتے ہیں تعلیم یافتہ طبقہ کے لوگوں میں ایک ہلکا سا برپا کر دیتے ہیں کہ سرکار اس طرح کا قانون نہیں بنانی ہے۔ کانگریس کے بھی عجیب لوگ ہیں کہ آگے بڑھنا نہیں چاہتے ہیں۔ اور جب کوئی قانون بنایا جاتا ہے تو وہ دھرم کے نام پر عام جلتا کو اس طرح بھڑکاتے ہیں کہ یہ سرکار تو عام لوگوں کے مذہب اور دھرم میں دخل دے رہی ہے۔ آپ جو یہ قانون پاس کرنے جا رہے ہیں اس سے مسلمانوں، عیسائیوں اور ہندوؤں کا فائدہ ہونے والا نہیں ہے۔ اس سے تو طرح طرح کی کئی دقتیں سامنے آجائیں گی۔ یہ کوئی ریفارم نہیں ہوگا جس سے کہ عام جلتا کو فائدہ پہنچ سکے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہمارے بہت سے دوست جو برلن والے ہیں وہ اس مسودہ قانون کی غلطیوں کو اور آپ لوگوں کے سامنے رکھیں گے۔

ایک بات یہ بھی ہے کہ جو مسودہ ہم لوگوں کے سامنے رکھا گیا ہے اس کے بارے میں میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس میں مسلمان عورتوں کے اسوقت جو حقوق ہیں اس کا بھی خیال نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔ میرا آپ سے یہ کہنا ہے کہ مسلمان عورتوں کی شادی کے وقت ان کے کچھ خاص حقوق ہوتے ہیں جنکی طرف آپ کو خیال کرنا ہوگا۔ شادی کے وقت ایک رقم عورت کے لئے مقرر ہو جاتی ہے۔ مثلاً ایک ہزار، دو ہزار، پانچ ہزار، دس ہزار اور ایک لاکھ مختلف طرح پر یعنی جسکی جتنی حیثیت ہو اسی حساب سے مقرر کی جاتی ہے۔ یہ ایک مسلمان عورت کے لئے بہت بڑی اہمیت کی چیز ہے۔ ہمارا تجربہ ہے کہ اس طرح سے مرد اپنی عورت کے ساتھ جب کافی دلچسپی نہیں رکھتا ہے اور اس کے ہر حقوق کا خیال نہیں رکھتا ہے۔ مرد عورت کے حقوق کو پامال کرتا ہے تو وہ اس سے اپنی رقم سے کام چلا سکتی ہے۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے کہ عورت نے ہاتھ میں کچھ نہ کچھ ہوتا ہے۔ ہمارے یہاں جو رقم لڑکی کو دی جاتی ہے وہ اس کے آئے وقت میں کام آتی ہے جب کہ اسکا شوہر اس کو کچھ نہیں دیتا ہے زندگی کی دوسری ضروریات کو پورا نہیں کرتا ہے تو اس وقت وہ اس رقم کو استعمال کرتی ہے۔

اس وقت جو قانون ان کے حق میں ہے وہ اس قانون سے خطرہ میں پڑ جاتے ہیں۔ فرض یہ ہے کہ جو حق انہیں اس وقت حاصل ہے وہ اس قانون کے ذریعہ ختم ہو جاتے ہیں۔ اس لئے آپ کو اس پر خاص طور پر توجہ دینی ہوگی۔

اگر آپ یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ملحد عورتوں کے قانون میں تبدیلی ہو جیسا کہ آپ نے ملحد کوٹہ بل بذا کر پاس کرنا چاہتے تھے تو کو دیکھئے اسی طرح آپ مسلمان عورتوں کے لئے بھی ایک الگ قانون بناویں جس سے کہ ان کے حقوق جو انگریزوں کے وقت بدل گئے ہیں درست ہو جائیں اگر ان دو قانون پر کچھ لوگ چاہتے ہیں تو ایک تیسرا قانون بذا دیا جائے جس کے مطابق وہ چل سکے۔ جو ملک کے رائج قانون کو نہیں پسند کر سکتا۔ اسی سے مذہبی اور غیر مذہبی دونوں جماعت کو اطمینان ہو جائے گا۔

[For English translation, see Appendix V, Annexure No. 97.]

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Sir, I move that, in view of the fact that sufficient discussion has taken place and that there will be enough opportunity for Members to speak afterwards, the question be now put. (Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will take the sense of the House. The question is:

"That the question be now put." The motion was adopted.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: Sir, in spite of all that has been said against the Law Minister, that he is the arch-villain of the piece, and that he must be held responsible for whatever delay may occur in getting this Bill passed, I propose to finish my reply in the next five minutes. Sir, I am very anxious that this motion for reference to a Select Committee should go through today. We should not wait for the next session.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the ether House?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: The Bill was placed on the agenda many many days ago. It was not my fault that it could not be taken up earlier. What could I do? It might be said that the Law Minister should do this and should do that, but it is not in the hands of the Law Minister.

Be that as it may, I am thankful to the hon. Members who have expressed their views on some of the clauses and I can assure them that they will all be fully considered in the Select Committee and therefore I do not propose to deal with them now. Moreover I have no time, otherwise I could have given my own views.

I will only just deal with one point made by Dr. Ambedkar.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: But many more hon. Members wanted to express their opinions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Select Committee will welcome all your suggestions.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: If there are any Members who wish to forward any suggestions of theirs for consideration in the Select Committee, I invite them to do so, and I shall certainly place them before the Select Committee if they will write to me.

Then, Sir, I was referring to what Dr. Ambedkar said. His main point was that this legislation should not

have been introduced in this fashion, and that mere amendment of the Special Marriage Act of 1872 would have been sufficient. I am very sorry that a view of that kind was expressed by such an experienced legislator. He knows more about the Hindu Code and the Special Marriage Bill than anybody else here. In my speech when I was moving for circulation I had explained why I did not adopt that procedure. There were fundamental changes which it was the object of this Bill to make. They had been referred to by my hon. friend Mr. Rajagopal Naidu also. There is no point in my going over it again; you will find it all in my previous speech. The question is, if I retained so many provisions of the old Act, why instead of proceeding by way of an amendment, I still introduced a new Bill. Sir, Dr. Ambedkar has not given any new information to the House. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons he will clearly see that I have myself indicated which of the clauses of this Bill correspond to sections of the existing Act. So he did not give us any new information. It was only a repetition of that. That comparative statement is there for everyone to see, to read and to digest. The fundamental changes which it was the object of this Bill to bring about had to be incorporated in it, but I did not stop there. I knew that the other provisions which were included in it were the same as were embodied in the legislation of 1872 and I know also that 1953 is not 1872. Many changes have taken place. But instead of trying to thrust my own views on these matters, I thought the best way would be to consult public opinion. I wanted to find out the reaction of the public to the changes which have taken place in social conditions during the last so many years. Sir, opinions have been now received, and effect will have to be given to those opinions in the Select Committee. That is why I am moving this motion for Select Committee. It would have been an easy task for me just to introduce a mere amending Bill, amending one clause here and one clause there. But that would not have served my purpose. Take for instance the

provisions relating to joint family. I have retained the existing provisions in the Bill. But let not the hon. Members think the possibility of a change escaped my attention. If two Hindus marry, why should they be severed from the joint family? That is a legitimate question. I referred to that in my speech today. But then on these matters I simply reproduced the provisions of the existing Act in the Bill in order to give the public the fullest opportunity of expressing their views. I wanted to take the public into confidence. And that is why, Sir, I adopted this procedure. Sir, there are only two minutes left and I will therefore not take any further time of the House.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: On a point of information, Sir. May I know from the hon. mover if he has tabulated the opinions received so far?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They have all been circulated.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: I have for myself tabulated a statement. I did not place it before the Members.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: How many are for and how many against?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can look into the opinions. I will now put the motion to the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide a special form of marriage in certain cases, and for the registration of such and certain other marriages be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 Members, 15 Members from this Council, namely:

1. Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand
2. Shrimati Savitry Nigam
3. Shrimati Violet Alva
4. Khwaja Inait Ullah
5. Shri M. Valiulla
6. Dr. P. C. Mitra

7. Shri R. P. Tamta
8. Shri B. K. Mukerjee
9. Shri Rama Rao
10. Shri H. N. Kunzru
11. Principal Devaprasad Ghosh
12. Shri V. K. Dhage
13. Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha
14. Shri Amolakh Chand and
15. Shri C. C. Biswas.

and 30 Members from the House of the People;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this Council relating to Select Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that this Council recommends to the House of the People that the House do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this Council the names of Members to be appointed by the House to the Joint Committee; and

that the Committee shall make a report to this Council within two months after its appointment."

The motion was adopted.

## HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

### APPOINTMENT OF CENTRAL TRIBUNAL FOR DEALING WITH DISPUTES BETWEEN NEWS-AGENCY MANagements AND THEIR EMPLOYEES.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now take up the Half-an-hour discussion. Mr. B. V. Kakkilaya.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI V. V. GIRI) : Sir, before the hon. Member addresses the House *on this* subject, I may be allowed to make a statement which may clarify the

[Shri V. V. Giri.] position and shorten the discussion. With your permission I would like to make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would it not be better if your statement is made after his speech?

SHRI V. V. GIRI: My statement would shorten the discussion and clarify the position.

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA (Madras) : I have no objection to the hon. Minister making his statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI V. V. GIRI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have no doubt that my hon. friend who has raised this discussion has done so out of a genuine sense of disappointment that an adequate machinery has not been made available for looking into the grievances or a body of men who play an extremely vital role in the governance of the modern State. Without prompt and reliable news, public administration must come to a virtual standstill. Life has become so complex and developments on the various fronts so fast and quickly—changing that if the supply of current news does not keep pace with happenings, it would be no exaggeration to say that life and property might well be in constant jeopardy. So I say that these men who supply us with the basic data required for day-to-day administration are themselves an important source of strength to that administration and are entitled to every reasonable consideration and protection in the matter of their terms and conditions of employment.

I am, therefore, approaching the problem raised by my friend not in the spirit of a lawyer narrowly interpreting the law to suit the occasion, but as one who, having been closely associated with many journalist friends throughout a life-time of public service, considers himself their friend and well-wisher intent on seeking some remedy for their ills. And yet we cannot ignore the 'law as, it stands even though we are entitled, and, hi

fact, required, to see whether that law needs any change. Under clause (a) of Section 2 of the Industrial Tribunals Act, the "appropriate Government for dealing with disputes between a news-collecting and distributing agency, such as the P. T. I., and its employees is the State Government. A question was rightly asked on the previous occasion as to which that State Government which was entitled to deal with the present dispute. I am afraid, my answer to that question must be somewhat disappointing, for I would say that it is the State Government within the jurisdiction of which a dispute arises, that must take steps to settle it, if need be, by a reference to an industrial tribunal for adjudication. Let me be more precise. In an industrial dispute between an employer and his employees, a State Government has jurisdiction only in so far as the employees situated in that State are concerned so much so that a tribunal set up by one State Government has no jurisdiction to give relief to employees stationed in another State. Thus in the case of the P. T. I., a number of State Governments may have to refer for adjudication the disputes relating to the employees stationed within their States. I can realise the difficulties which a federation of employees claiming membership from all States has to face and yet there is at present no ready remedy. I will, of course, be asked why the law should not be changed so as to bring such an establishment with branches in the various States within the Central sphere for purposes of settlement of disputes. If the P. T. I. were the only organization of that kind, it would have been easy enough to accept the suggestion, but there are many big establishments with branches spread over several States. Practically every big industrial or commercial establishment in the country has branches in more than one State. That

is the case, for instance, with the main oil distributing countries, the more important manufacturers and distributors of textiles, cigarettes,

chemicals and various other commodities and transport and river navigation companies operating in several States. Inter-State trade and commerce are so widespread these days that if the Central Government decide to bring within their jurisdiction disputes in all establishments with branches in more than one State, they will have to take over an unmanageably large portion of the work now shouldered by State Governments. This, let me be frank, will Inevitably lead to administrative delays, practical inconvenience to parties in having to go to distant places to meet Central Government Officers and agencies for the settlement of disputes, and consequent widespread dissatisfaction. We have had experience of all these. On top of these difficulties or perhaps, I should say, in view of them, the general consensus of opinion among State Governments and central organizations of workers and employers is that the Central Government's jurisdiction in the matter of industrial relations should not be unduly enlarged.

*(Shri B. V. Kakkilaya rose in his seat.)*

SHRI V. V. GIRI: If you will kindly hear my whole statement, you will be able to appreciate all the suggestions, the constructive suggestions, that I am making. I shall certainly hear the other point of view.

When I have said all these, I do realise that in the case of what might be called a truly all-Indian employment or establishment—in the sense that it has employees stationed not merely in two or three States but in the large majority of the more important States—the question of providing a unified machinery for the settlement of disputes between the employer and employees will arise. Whether the providing of such a machinery will necessitate the bringing of the employment or establishment within the Central sphere is a matter which has to be further examined. In evolving any such arrangement, one should bear in mind

the important consideration I have already mentioned, namely, that greater centralisation will inevitably-mean greater delays and inconvenience to the parties. The advantages and the disadvantages, have, therefore, to be balanced before a final decision is taken. In the light of these observations, Government will re-examine the position. I feel, however, that I should not be rushed to conclusions or forced to take any immediate or precipitate action. If I find it possible to evolve any proposals, I shall include them in the Industrial Relations Bill which is soon coming up here.

For the present, however, it is not legally permissible for the Central Government to set up a Central Tribunal to deal with the disputes between the P. T. I. and their employees. At the same time I know that the difficulties of adjudication in half a dozen or more States are immense. I would, therefore, suggest a practical solution which, however, can be put into effect only if management and employees actively cooperate with each other. The parties must first try out the possibilities of mutual negotiation over the entire range of dispute. If this fails, or has already failed, they might agree to the adjudication of the dispute in the State which has the largest number of P. T. I. employees. The parties must simultaneously agree that such of the findings of the Tribunal as are of universal application would, subject to the provisions of appeal, be extended to employees in all other States. There will be other items in respect of which local adjustments may be necessary. The parties must agree that in all such matters they will abide by the advice tendered by the original Tribunal. Binding agreements should then be entered into between the parties in respect of employees in the other States, based on the adjudication and the advice tendered by the Tribunal. All this requires a lot of give and take, but I have no doubt that the necessary measure of accommodation will be forthcoming from the parties if they

[ Shri V. V. Giri. ] realise that they are engaged in the common task of serving the country in a particularly important way. I would request my friend who has raised the discussion and others like him interested in the maintenance of this public utility service at a high pitch of efficiency to exert their influence in favour of an amicable and reasonable settlement.

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA: The hon. Minister has made my work very easy, but I find that the different parts of his statement contradict one another. The hon. Minister in the beginning alluded to the difficult task that the journalists of our country are performing and the deplorable conditions in which they have to work today, but he made certain suggestions which to put in practice will take, I think, at least six months or one year. Now, knowing the legal position, the management of the P. T. I. have already started to take measures of vendetta against the employees. Only recently when the representatives of the Employees' Federation met the management, I am told that the Chairman of the Board of Directors threatened them. He told them, I understand, that he would rather preside over the liquidation of the P. T. I. than concede the demands of the employees. Perhaps he is under the impression that such an important institution as the P. T. I. which serves more than 177 newspapers in the country and which gives us foreign news and which takes our country's news abroad, can be liquidated at the whims and fancies of any individual who happens to preside over the institution for the time being.

Now, Sir, when the entire institution is placed in the hands of certain individuals like these who are having their own chain services to feed their papers, who are running their own chains of newspapers, certainly the interests of the institution and the interests of the employees will not be well looked after. These Directors

who are today managing the P. T. I. have their own chain services, their own correspondents and sources of supply of news to their papers all over India and they are given licenses to have their own teleprinters. I am also told that some of these bosses who have their own teleprinters use these machines not only for *bona fide* transmission of news but also for transmission of their private affairs and commercial communications and make profit out of that. That is a question which Government should look into and if they find out that *mala fide* use of these transmission machines is being made, then, of course, Government must bring these people to book and take necessary action. But this is a different matter. As far as P. T. I. is concerned, these people are certainly not interested in the welfare of the P. T. I. as a whole or of the employees because the P. T. I. today serves mostly the interests of the smaller newspapers in our country. The bigger news papers have their own correspondents and their own chain services. The small newspapers contribute the largest amount towards the revenue of the P. T. I. and they get the smallest service. They get minimum service but they contribute the largest amount and these big bosses who preside over the destinies of the P. T. I. are interested in seeing that the P. T. I. does not work efficiently and does not cater to the needs of the smaller papers properly so that the efficiency of the smaller papers goes down and the smaller papers die and these big bosses can have a monopoly over the press in India. So the management of the P. T. I. today are trying to see that the demands of the P. T. I. employees are not complied with and that the P. T. I. employees are disrupted and put down. For example, recently, after the P. T. I. employees put forward their demands before the management, I am told that the management have come forward with a new proposal. It seems that for the last 29 years, even before this concern became P. T. I., the company itself was bearing the cost of the

revenue stamp which were to be affixed on the receipts of the employees for their salaries. Now the management have come forward and said that the employees must bear the cost. ■Of course, I have no objection to the employees paying for their own revenue stamps, but the management have chosen this occasion to bring forward this proposal just to compel the employees to pay for the stamps as a measure of vendetta against them for being bold enough to put forward their demands before the management.

The hon. Minister suggested that the Government of the State, where largest number of employees are working, should appoint a Tribunal and the dispute could be considered by that Tribunal and the award of that Tribunal could be applied to the other States also. This is not a practicable solution. It will lead to enormous difficulties later on. We don't know whether the awards will be implemented in all the States when it is entirely left to the State Governments themselves. We know many cases where industrial disputes were referred to tribunals and the awards given by the tribunals were not implemented by the State Governments.

Again, the hon. Minister said that there are several all-India concerns and if we appoint a Central Tribunal, all the other industrial concerns also will come forward, the employees of other concerns also will come forward and say that Central Tribunal must be appointed and that will mean a heavy burden on the Central Government and the Labour Department. This argument is not correct. There is no comparison between other all-India industrial or commercial concerns and the P. T. I. All these concerns also have their branches 1PM throughout India; that is true. But these branches function,

more or less, as autonomous units. They are not very much dependent upon each other. The position of the different branches of the P. T. I. is not like

74 C.S.D.

that. The P. T. I. has different branches throughout the country and all these branches entirely depend upon one another every minute. Every branch supplies news to the other branches and to the head office, and the head office supplies news to all the branches. Therefore if there is dislocation in any branch, that would disrupt the entire news service of the P. T. I. So the entire P. T. I. concern must be taken to be one single unit. You cannot compare it with other industrial or commercial concerns which have branches throughout the country, as those branches function as autonomous units. This is a special case where the Central Government has to come in and it is a special case which can be handled only by the Central Government.

Another thing to which I want to invite the attention of the hon. Minister is this. The hon. Minister just now said that the management and the employees themselves should come together and arrive at an amicable settlement. Sir, it is very good to say that; but it is very difficult to bring that about, it is difficult to bring together the management and the employees. I have already stated that the management of the P. T. I. treat their workers with vindictiveness and they are not prepared to come to terms with the employees. But I am sure, if the hon. Minister for Labour or the Prime Minister who has also evinced so much interest in the welfare of the employees of the P. T. I. and other journalists in our country would exert their influence over the management, then the management may come forward and sit round the table with the representatives of labour and an amicable settlement may be possible. But if the Central Government keep themselves away, if they say—you come together and arrive at an amicable settlement, then that will not be possible, and the hon. Minister would only be giving this excuse to shirk his responsibility for settling this dispute.

SHRI V. V. GIRI: Not at all

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA: I would request the hon. Minister to use his good offices and urge upon the management of the P. T. I. to come forward and meet the representatives of the Federation and come to an amicable settlement. While doing this, I would also request the hon. Minister to look into another matter. The hon. Minister said that it was not possible to amend the law immediately and that we have to work under the existing law. That is true. But you might remember that when the dispute between the management and the employees of the Bharat Bank came up, certain State Governments appointed tribunals, certain other State Governments did not and there was some trouble about it. The Central Government came forward with an Ordinance to enable the appointment of a Central Tribunal to go into the dispute between the management of the banks and their employees. I ask the hon. Minister why can he not take the same stand now regard to disputes between management and the employees of a news service? The hon. Minister can come forward with an Ordinance which will empower him to refer this dispute to a Central Tribunal, an Ordinance which will also include the working journalists in the definition of workmen. It will also define the Central Government as the appropriate government to refer disputes between the managements and the employees of news services of an all-India character to a Central Tribunal. If the hon. Minister brings forward such an Ordinance, nobody in this House or in the country will ever say that he is bureaucratic, that he is taking the law in his own hands.

Certainly, everyone will support him. In the coming session of Parliament this can be incorporated in the Industrial Disputes Act and everything can be regularised. So, I request the hon. Minister to clarify the position as to whether the Government is prepared to bring forward an Ordinance to enable the Central Government to appoint a Central Tribunal.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Four hon. Members have given their names and they can put one question each.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): is there a limit on questions, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "Any member who has previously intimated to the Chairman may be permitted to put a question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact".

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): "A question" is not limited to one question. It means "any question."

*(Interruption.)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa): Supporters of the proposal must be persons who are interested.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They must give intimation.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I hope then, Sir, that I will be allowed to make a very complex sentence. I do not want to waste the time of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reddy, there are three more Members. If you want a reply from the hon. Minister you must give him time.

SHRI V. V. GIRI: I would try to reply to all the points.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must put the question in such a way as to give opportunity to the others.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I should like to ask, Sir, whether Government are aware that in other countries where national news agencies operate, the government takes a very active interest in the growth and the good state of that industry and, if so, in what manner Government have been giving sustenance and support to or exercising superintendence over the P. T. I.; and whether Government