

(c) and (d). As a matter of policy Indian Missions abroad do not conduct publicity through paid advertisements by the Government. Our Press Releases however are carried sometimes by the newspapers free of charge.

(e) Question does not arise.

12:34 hrs.

**PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE**  
STATEMENT ON THE VISIT OF FOREIGN MINISTER OF JAPAN TO INDIA AND ANNUAL REPORT OF CENTRAL COAL MINES RESCUE STATION COMMITTEE, DHANBAD FOR 1974-75

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA):** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table (1) A statement (Hindi and English versions) on the visit of the Foreign Minister of Japan to India from July 19 to 22, 1977. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-843/77].

(2) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) on the working of the Central Coal Mines Rescue Stations Committee, Dhanbad, for the year 1974-75. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-844/77].

#### RE. CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

**ठाकुर बलदेव सिंह (जम्मू) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, पृष्ठ सैक्टर में पाकिस्तानी फौजियों ने भारतीयों के ऊपर पिछले छः दिनों फायरिंग की है। सात पाकिस्तानी और तीन भारतीय जख्मी हुए हैं—समाचार और पैट्रियट रिपोर्ट। पाकिस्तानियों द्वारा दर्जनों केसेज कैंटल लिफ्टिंग के छम्ब-जोरियां सैक्टर में पिछले चन्द दिनों से हो रहे हैं। मैंने काल अटेंशन भी दिया और तीन बार शॉर्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन भी दिया लेकिन मुताल्लिका मिनिस्टर से कोई जवाब नहीं मिला। जम्मू-कश्मीर का यह हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के साथ है और लोगों को डर है कि 1971 की लड़ाई में जैसे छम्ब इलाका पाकिस्तान को दे दिया गया था वैसे ही फिर और कोई इलाका तो नहीं दिया जा रहा है, क्योंकि सरकार ने कोई ब्यान नहीं दिया है। सरकार से अनुरोध है कि इस पर कोई स्टेटमेंट दे, जिससे क्लेरिफिकेशन हो और शंका दूर हो।

12:35 hrs.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

**REPORTED STRIKE IN KIRIBURU IRON ORE MINES.**

**SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPA** (Cannanore): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Steel and Mines to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"Reported indefinite strike in the Kiriburu Iron Ore Mines of National Mineral Development Corporation following the failure of conciliation efforts."

**THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK):** Kiriburu is one of the major mechanised iron ore mines of the National Mineral Development Corporation located in Singhbhum district of Bihar with about 1,600 employees. A scheme for expansion and modification of the scheme to produce annually 1.17 million tonnes of lump ore and 2.66 million tonnes of fines to meet the requirements of Bokaro Steel Plant has recently been completed and is undergoing commissioning trials.

The wages of N.M.D.C. workmen are being paid in accordance with the tri-partite wage settlement arrived at between the unions of N.M.D.C. and the Management in the presence of the Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central). As per this agreement the minimum wage paid to the lowest category is basic Rs. 290 per month, fixed D.A. Rs. 62 per month and variable D.A. Rs. 55.30 per month, totalling Rs. 407.30 per month. Additionally, the employees and their dependents are entitled to free medical facilities and free educational facilities for their children. Housing is also being provided for 70 per cent of employees at subsidised rent and those not provided with houses get house rent allowance. Transport facilities are provided from place of residence to worksite.

The Jharkhand Mazdoor Sargh, N.M.D.C. Workers Union, N.M.D.C. Shramik Sargh, Kiriburu jointly submitted on 1-6-77 a notice to go on strike from 18-7-77 if 46 demands presented by them were not acceded to. The Management initiated discussions with the Union representatives and the matter was also taken up in conciliation proceedings on 8th and 9th July, 1977 by the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Chaibasa. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure but the

[Shri Biju Patnaik]

Management of the N.M.D.C. again held discussions with the Unions on 13-7-77 in an effort to resolve the dispute.

On 16-6-77 the Chairman, SAIL invited the Union representatives to come for discussions of their demands either at Delhi or Hyderabad and made an appeal to them not to precipitate matters and to put off the strike till the discussions were held. The Unions refused to put-off the strike and wanted all their demands to be conceded. The Management however discussed the 46 demands with the Union representatives and accepted 26 of them. On the night of the 16th July, 1977 the Unions informed that they could defer the strike provided eight demands were met, especially an *ad-hoc* payment of Rs. 2,000/- per workman.

On 17-7-77 the Unions further communicated that the most important demand to be conceded was the cash payment, which they reduced from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 1,000. for all workers on an *ad-hoc* basis and without any justification. In an attempt to avert the strike the Management offered on 17-7-77 to pay 15 days wages to workmen on purely *ad-hoc* basis and to be adjusted against any amount due on account of final settlement of the various demands. Unfortunately, however, this offer was rejected by the Unions and they commenced the strike at Kiriburu on 18-7-77 at 06-00 hours.

The General Manager (Industrial Relation), SAIL accompanied by Director (Production) N.M.D.C. and the Regional Labour Commissioner, Dhanbad again visited Kiriburu on the 21-7-77 to hold renewed negotiations to call off the strike. The offer for payment of *ad-hoc* advance of 15 days wages was reiterated and the Management also agreed to consider introduction of production based incentive bonus from the current year. The Unions however did not agree to call off the strike. A further round of negotiations is being held at Hyderabad on the 30th July, 1977 by the Chairman, SAIL and the Union leaders from Kiriburu have been invited for discussions.

1265 regular staff and 146 daily workers are involved in the strike. 207 workmen are attending to essential services. A total production of 60,000 tonnes valued at Rs. 16 lakhs has been lost upto 26th July, 1977.

The Management is exercising extreme restraint in dealing with the situation which has remained peaceful so

far. However, there are reports of picketing on the roads leading to the Mines Office by the workers, provocative speeches by the Union Leaders instigating students to boycott schools and threats to supervisors attending to their duties etc.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPAN: I have gone through the statement made by the hon. Minister who tries to depict a rosy picture of the situation in the mines in Kiriburu. Certain basic factors which led to the situation had been ignored in the statement. Firstly, the local management is behaving in relation to the workers in an extremely arrogant manner. Most of them are tribal workers and that behaviour leads to the kind of tension all the time. All along the demand of the workers has been that the management should behave with them properly; that has never been looked into.

Secondly, government itself had given a direction in May 1975 that no more contract system should prevail in the mines; still contract system is prevailing even in those mines which are owned by the NMDC. Another important thing is that—this is a matter of national interest—even export is entrusted to Tatas and Dharamchand Jain and such big business houses. There are cases where even NMDC staff members had been beaten by the mine contractors. You can imagine what fate the poor workers will meet in the hands of contractors. A very arrogant management is often conniving with contractors. These facts never found mention in the statement. I was amused to hear the Minister's statement saying that the workers presented 46 demands and the government was prepared to concede 26. No solution can be found on a quantitative basis. The main points about bonus and incentive scheme which was taken away were not accepted. I should like the hon. Minister to enlighten this House on certain questions. The poor workers' representatives are called to Delhi and Hyderabad for negotiations. What prevents the Chairman of SAIL himself from going to Kiriburu along with senior officials and negotiate a solution there? Small officers who are sent do not have powers to settle the matter finally. The man with the authority is the chairman of SAIL and instead of representatives of the three unions and their advisers coming to Delhi, the chairman can go there and talk with the representatives. Would the hon. Minister direct the chairman to go to Kiriburu to conduct the negotiations?

Secondly, what are the important demands which the government cannot accept? Those are the most important demands on which the workers are agitated. Will the hon. Minister take a conciliatory attitude, as the workers have taken, to find a solution? The Minister read emphatically that the workers demanded Rs. 2,000 per head and they have come down to Rs. 1,000, as if to say: look, these are unreasonable demands. I must say that this is a conciliatory attitude shown by the workers and it is in that spirit you should negotiate with them. Mr. Fernandes will understand that. He should send a senior official including the Chairman to find a settlement. I hope Mr. Fernandes and Mr. Dandavate will support this.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I have nothing more to add. I think the hon. Member, whose party heads that Union, has rather misfired in making this agitation. The Government and the NMDC would always be prepared to discuss and come to any reasonable settlement in the context of the social order. I made bold to mention yesterday in another debate on the employment question that if we take the total facilities available to the mine workers in NMDC, it would come nearly to Rs. 500 per month. They are entitled to ask for more. Anybody is entitled to ask for more for that matter. But just two miles away from there, the workers in other mines, who do not belong to NMDC, hardly get Rs. 5 a day, without housing and such other facilities. Of course, it is within the rights of one set of workers to ask for more. I do not deny that. But there must be some reasonableness. In the social order, there cannot be high-paid staff and well paid Ministers or MPs here and the lowest worker getting Rs. 2 a day. I would recommend to the hon. Member that instead of fighting for a lost cause, we should get round the table. I have instructed the Chairman of the SAIL. Hyderabad was chosen because it is the Head Office of NMDC and that is where all the papers will be available and the matter can be settled. The workers there, whom the hon. Member calls poor, are not so poor. But anyway, their travelling charges will be met by the NMDC.

12.45 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

(i) DISMISSAL OF THE MINISTRY IN TRIPURA

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a different matter which is regarding the dismissal of the Tripura Ministry and installation of a new Ministry there by the President under article 356 of the Constitution. I am least bothered about the internal quarrels of the Janata Party where their own Chief Ministers have been overthrown by their own party men and then coalition Janata-CPM forming new Ministries.

The Speakers' Conference has recommended that the strength of the Government or the majority enjoyed by the Chief Minister should be tested on the floor of the House. When the Congress Government was in power and whenever there was any dismissal of a Government, the hon. Members on that side, who were then in the Opposition, criticised us on this ground. But now, the Chief Minister has not been given an opportunity to prove his strength even though he claims to have a majority in the Assembly, and the Government has been dismissed.

The Constitution is very clear. The President has to take over the charge. He can proclaim President's rule. But that should be done on the basis of the report of the Governor to the President when the Assembly is not in session, and when the President is satisfied that there is no majority. Then, of course, he can direct the Governor to dismiss the Ministry and impose the President's rule there. But there is no provision in the Constitution giving the Governor the authority to dismiss the Government *suo-motu*. This is a vital question. When the House is in session, I think, propriety demands the Home Minister to come before the House and make a statement about the dismissal of the Government and the installation of a new Government in Tripura. This House has every right to know as to what happened in the State, and whether they have acted according to the Constitution. What is the policy of the Government to test the majority enjoyed by the Chief Minister. Is it done on the floor of the House or are you satisfied with the Governor's report? Will it not be proper on the part of the Home Minister to come and make a statement as to how a Government has been dismissed and how a new Government has been installed. This is my point.