

Date 25.11.2

**THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)  
**OFFICIAL REPORT**

---

2729

2730

**HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE**

Monday, 21st December, 1953

*The House met at half past one  
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

(See Part I)

2-35 P.M.

**MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received notices of three Adjournment Motions. In the first place I find that these Adjournment Motions—or at least two of them—are unduly long and argumentative. However, I do not propose to reject them on that ground. But *prima facie* it appears they all deal with subjects with which the States are concerned—that is what I find.

**ADMISSION IN ANGLO-INDIAN SCHOOLS**

**Mr. Speaker:** One is by Mr. Anthony about “the violation of the mandatory provision in Article 337 of the Constitution laying down that Anglo-Indian schools shall admit at least 40 per cent. of pupils of other communities, as a pre-condition to the receipt of Government grants, by prohibiting Anglo-Indian schools in the Bombay State, by Government letter so and so, dated so and so.....” I need not read the other part of it. Obviously, this is a letter written by the Government of Bombay giving instructions to their Inspectors of Schools.

630 P. S. D.

**Shri Frank Anthony** (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): May I make a submission, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** He can, if he likes. I have read his letter also which argues as to how it is a breach of the Constitution. There is ample scope for difference of opinion on the interpretation of this provision. But whatever that may be, if there is a violation of any mandatory provisions, the question has first to be agitated, to my mind, in the Bombay State, which is competent to issue instructions. Parliament is not the place for it.

If still the hon. Member is dissatisfied, the law courts will provide him the relief.

**Shri Frank Anthony:** Sir, may I respectfully point out that this is one of the safeguards given in the Constitution to the minorities. The implementing of these safeguards is the sole responsibility of the Home Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I do not think that the responsibility for implementing every safeguard, which is the business of the States to implement, can be the responsibility of the Home Minister at the Centre.

I do not think I can give my consent to this Motion.

**TRANSPORT STRIKE IN TRAVANCORE-  
COCHIN**

**Mr. Speaker:** In so far as the other motion is concerned, I have nothing to say about its form. But clearly, it is also a State subject. It reads like this:

“That the House be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent

[Mr. Speaker]

public importance namely, the situation arising out of the country-wide transport strike in Travancore-Cochin State."

It is primarily a subject of a State.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair** (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): It is an inter-departmental conflict. There an employee has been assaulted by the Police and the entire staff of the transport service have gone on strike.

**Mr. Speaker:** Whether it is an inter-departmental, or it is a matter of only one Department of the State, admittedly it is a State subject.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** There is no legislature there now.

**Mr. Speaker:** So, they will have to approach the Ministry there. It is not a matter which can be discussed on an adjournment motion in this House.

#### DOCK LABOUR BOARD

**Mr. Speaker:** The third motion is by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:

"That the business of the House do adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, *viz.*, the situation arising out of the failure of the Central Government to take effective measures for ensuring the normal functioning of the Dock Labour Board, Kidderpore, Calcutta, against the attempts of stevedore and the local police to subvert the Board, for the protection of workers loyal to the Board against the attacks by stevedore financed goondas and the police as evidenced by the unwarranted assault and vandalism perpetrated on the Board Office and the dock workers standing in file before the Dock Labour Board Call Office to register attendance on 19-12-53."

It is difficult to see how this is admissible. But I want to know what is this Dock Labour Board, what has

Government to do with that? If anything, from the form of the motion, it appears the aggrieved party is the Dock Labour Board in this case.

**Shri T. K. Chaudhuri** (Berhampore): Sir, there was a news item in yesterday's papers about large-scale disturbances before the office of the Dock Labour Board and some sixty persons were injured by police firing and some 112 persons were taken under police custody. As the paper reports have revealed, it had something to do with the Dock Labour Board. But you have often advised us not to rely on paper reports. It was apparent to me from the conflicting versions appearing in papers that there was something fishy about it. Most of the papers mentioned one union, the Dock Mazdoor Union whose representatives have already been appointed by the Central Government in the Dock Labour Board. So far as that union is concerned, it seemed to me that there would have been no objection from the side of the common mass of labourers. But I put myself in touch with the leaders of the union over the telephone and I have received telegrams, and now the Calcutta papers have also arrived.

Now I have to give some background history of the thing as briefly as possible.

**Mr. Speaker:** We are concerned here with the admissibility of the motion. I want to know how the question of responsibility of the Central Government arises in this case.

**Shri T. K. Chaudhuri:** The responsibility of the Central Government arises, Sir, because of the fact that the Dock Labour Board has been appointed by the Central Government, and the Central Government are fully aware that since the inception of the Board it has been the anxiety of the Calcutta stevedores, the majority of whom are Europeans, to see that the Board does not function properly—because it is the function of the Dock Labour Board to afford some sort of