

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.