Circular No. 289/51 dated the 6th October, 1951;

(b) whether and why the above circular fixed the three years 1948-1951 as the basic years of export; and

(c) whether the circular fixed any maximum for export of each commodity coming under the circular by any individual exporter?

**The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar):** (a) The hon. Member is presumably referring to E.T.C. Circular No. 289/51, dated 6th October 1951, issued by the Deputy Chief Controller of Exports, Madras. No commodity was brought under control through this circular which only notified the trade that export of chillies, which was already controlled, would, with effect from October, 1951, be regulated on the principle of established shippers, *i.e.*, it would be permitted by those shippers who had exported chillies during a prescribed period in the past.

(b) Yes, Sir. The reasons for choosing these three years were:

(i) During these three years a large section of the trading community had opportunities to enter into export trade in chillies, as for some period the established shippers system was in operation and, for nearly a year and a half exports were allowed on a competitive basis and any one could ship.

(ii) These were the three years immediately preceding the re-introduction of "established shippers" principle and, as a rule, we give shippers a choice between three different years on the basis of which they can claim future quotas for exports.

(iii) For other commodities also *e.g.*, groundnut oil, linseed oil, onions, jaggery, the same basic years had been prescribed; and

(iv) The trade which was consulted was generally in favour of this arrangement.

(c) Yes, the circular fixed a maximum limit of 15 tons for which a licence could be issued for the export of chillies to an individual shipper. This restriction, however, is no longer operative.

STRIKE IN TATAS HEAVY CHEMICALS FACTORY

*616. Shri Nambiar: Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the strike of 3000 workers of Tatas Heavy Chemicals Factory in Mithapur from 21st April, 1952;

(b) if so, whether it is a fact that hospital facilities have been stopped by the company to the workers on strike and that two workers have gone on hunger strike to protest against this action of the Company;

(c) if the answer to part (a) above be in the negative, whether Government propose to state why they did not take note of the letter written by Shri A. K. Gopalan, M.P., on the 16th May, 1952 on this matter and whether Government propose to place that letter on the Table of the House; and

(d) what action Government propose to take to save the lives of the workers on hunger strike and to settle the dispute amicably?

**The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri):** (a) Yes.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) and (d). A copy of Shri A. K. Gopalan's letter dated 16th May 1952 and a copy of my reply to him dated the 28th May 1952 are placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix III, annexure No. 49.]

Industrial disputes in factories manufacturing heavy chemicals fall within the jurisdiction of the State Governments under Section 2(a) (ii) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Central Government are, therefore, precluded from taking any measures under that Act for the settlement of the dispute. However, in view of the importance of the industry, they wrote to the Bombay Government on the 5th May 1952 requesting them to make special efforts to bring about an amicable settlement between the parties. It was learnt that the efforts of the Conciliation Officer to conciliate the dispute between the union and the company had failed. The Central Government again wrote to the Bombay Government on the 15th May 1952 requesting them to report the result of the efforts made by that Government to bring about a settlement between the parties. It is presumed that the Bombay Government are still continuing their efforts.

LOWER SAGILERU PROJECT

*617. Shri Eswara Reddy: Will the Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Madras drew the attention of the Central Government to the unanimous demand of all the people and parties