

[Shri V. V. Giri]

forced to retreat to the South Division Port Police Station. The police, however, returned with reinforcements to disperse the mob which, by then, had become riotous. The police fired eight rounds and made lathi charges. About 40 policemen, including four officers, were injured in the clash. The exact number of workers injured is not known, but according to an estimate, the number of injured, including the policemen, was about 100. Of these, only half a dozen are reported to have been injured seriously. The situation was brought under control at about 6-30 P.M. i.e., within half an hour of the outbreak of the trouble. About one hundred and ten arrests have been made.

The incident which took place on Saturday has nothing to do with the normal functioning of the Dock Labour Board. There is nothing to show that any obstruction is being placed in the work of the Board by anybody. The Chairman of the Board has stated that the Board would not tolerate any interference from any quarters. From the first reports received from the Calcutta Port Trust, it would appear that the clash took place when workers were assembled at the call stand for booking their work. When workers working in the same area belong to different unions, it is not possible to avoid their coming into contact with one another, and if they are bent on trouble, it would be difficult to avoid these incidents altogether. An attempt will, however, be made to see whether it is possible to ensure booking of pool workers at more than one call stand with a view to reducing the concentration of workers at any one place.

I submit, Sir, that the complaint forming the subject of adjournment motion is wholly misconceived. As already stated, this is a law and order matter with which the State Government is mainly concerned.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): Before you dispose of the Adjournment Motion, I have a small question to put to the hon. Minister. Is it a

fact that it was the Port Police—not the ordinary Police—which is under the Central Government that took the initiative and assaulted the workmen?

Shri V. V. Giri: I have no information on that point.

Mr. Speaker: It is clear from what has been stated that it is entirely a matter for the State Government and a peace and tranquillity business, and has nothing to do with the responsibility of the Central Government.

SUPPLY OF SUGARCANE TO MILLS

Mr. Speaker: Now, there is another motion. Here, too, I have not been able to understand how this can come in under the Parliament, but I shall read the notice:

"The decision of the Conference of canegrowers at Ramkola in Deoria District, Uttar Pradesh, to stop supply of sugarcane to the mills from the second week of January, 1954, as a retaliatory step against the Government's decision to reduce the price of sugarcane."

May I know who has ordered the reduction of prices?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Kidwai): The Government of India has increased the price and not reduced it. Last year the prices were Rs. 1-5-0 and Rs. 1-3-0. This year they are Rs. 1-7-0 and Rs. 1-5-0. I do not think they can protest against it.

Mr. Speaker: It is a simple matter. There is no reduction of price.

Shri Kidwai: No.

Mr. Speaker: What has the hon. Member to say?

Shri Kidwai: May I give some further information to the hon. Member? There is a conference of cane-growers which has been convened on my advice, and I am going to be present there, and this is wrong news that they are going to stop the supply.

This is all based on wrong information. The conference will be held in Deoria, I will attend the conference, and we will discuss the question.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): The Minister says that it is the Government of India that increases or reduces the price. I have it from a newspaper report—based on which I gave notice of the Adjournment Motion—that the price used to be Rs. 1-12-0 and last year it had been fixed at Rs. 1-5-0 and this year Rs. 1-7-0. That is the complaint. Moreover, sugar is controlled by the Government of India, and if these mills stop because the cane-growers do not supply cane from the 15th January, then it is necessary to discuss the matter now and get an assurance from the Government that the mills would not be closed and some settlement will be made in regard to the reduction in price. That is why I gave the adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: Now, in view of what the Minister has said, I do not think there is any ground at all for assuming there was a reduction. Even assuming there was any, I do not give my consent to this.

Shri R. N. Singh (Ghazipur Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—South West): One question, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: One question about what?

Shri R. N. Singh: About that conference. मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह कान्फ़ेंस किस के द्वारा की जा रही है ?

श्री किशवर्दी : सवाल, यह था कि साउथ इंडिया में एक सितमा फारमूला है जिससे केन ग्रेडर्स को अलावा मामूली कीमत पाने के कुछ ज्यादा मिल जाता है अगर शकर में ज्यादा मुनाफा होता है । वह चाहते हैं कि वही यहां भी हो । उसी के लिए यह कान्फ़ेंस की जा रही है ।

Shri Sarangadhar Das: Will you please allow me to read a portion of this despatch?

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary now. It has been disposed of. I am not going to give my consent to the Adjournment Motion.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: The conference being initiated by him may be another conference.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to go into it now.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): On a point of order, Sir. May I know why the hon. Minister does not answer the question. He asked: किन के जरिये से यह कान्फ़ेंस हो रही है ।

Shri Kidwai: I had advised convening of the conference.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a matter of the hon. Member putting a question. The Chair wanted some information only for purposes of judging the admissibility of the motion. I have already said that I refuse to give my consent. And if the Chair allowed one question, it does not mean that other questions also can be put.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of the Council of States:

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill, 1953, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 14th December 1953, and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make....