

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHAR RAO): (a) The Ministry of Labour and Employment has no proposal for setting up of an Employment Commission.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

**Compensation to the workers of the closed industries**

139. SHRI MAM. RAMASWAMY: Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that due to cut throat competition and rapid technological changes, there has been instances of closure of certain manufacturing industries in the last three years;

(b) if so, the details thereof, State-wise, year wise;

(c) whether due compensation has been paid/being paid to workers of closed industries and the provisions available under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947;

(d) the number of cases pending in different labour courts for compensation, State-wise; and

(e) the steps taken by Government to give due compensation to workers on closure of such industries/units?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHAR RAO): (a) and (b) Yes Sir, there have been instances of closure of certain manufacturing industries in the last three years. A Statement showing State-wise number of closures during 2001, 2002 and 2003 is given in the Statement-I (See below).

(c) and (e) Provisions exist in the Industrial Disputes (I.D.) Act, 1947, for providing retrenchment compensation to workmen of the closed industries. In so far as the Central Public Sector Undertakings (CPSUs) are concerned, the workmen of the closed industries are normally provided compensation under Voluntary Retirement Scheme (VRS) in accordance with the guidelines issued by the Department of Public Enterprises (DPE). from time to time.

Where prior permission of Central Government is sought for closure under Section 25-0 of the I.D. Act, permission, wherever granted, is made

[2 December, 2004]

RAJYA SABHA

subject to payment of retrenchment compensation as per the provisions of the I.D. Act/VRS to the affected workmen.

(d) The total number of cases including compensation cases, pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunals cum Labour Courts, as on 30th September, 2004 is given in the Statement at Statement-II

**Statement-I**

*State-wise number of Closures in Manufacturing Industries during 2001-2003*

States/Uts	2001.	2002	2003
Andhra Pradesh	—	3	2
Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—
Assam	—	—	—
Bihar	—	—	2
Chhattisgarh	—	—	—
Goa	6	1	2
Gujarat	37	31	32
Haryana	1	3	1
Himachal Pradesh	2	5	—
Jammu & Kashmir	—	—	1
Jharkhand	—	2	4
Karnataka	7	9	4
Kerala	6	4	5
Madhya Pradesh	—	1	—
Maharashtra	—	1	—
Manipur	—	—	1
Meghalaya	—	—	—
Mizoram	—	—	—
Nagaland	—	—	—
Orissa	2	1	3
Punjab	1	1	—
Rajasthan	—	4	2

States/Uts	2001	2002	2003
Sikkim	—	—	—
Tamilnadu	4	—	—
Tripura	7	19	12
Uttar Pradesh	30	88	12
Uttaranchai	5	—	—
West Bengal	—	—	3
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	—	—	—
Chandigarh	10	1	—
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	—	—	—
Delhi	—	—	—
Daman & Diu	—	—	—
Lakshadweep	—	—	—
Pondicherry	6	4	2
<b>GRAND TOTAL :</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>88</b>

—:NIL

SOURCE: LABOUR BUREAU. SHIMLA

**Statement-II**

*Number of cases pending before the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Courts*

S.No.	Central Government Industrial Tribunals (CGITs)	Cases Pending in CGITs as on 30th September, 2004
1	2	3
1.	Mumbai I*	217
2.	Mumbai II	341
3.	Dhanbad I	1870
4.	Dhanbad II	1083
5.	Asansol	463

1	2	3
6.	Kolkata	212
7.	Chandigarh	2129
8.	New Delhi	544
9.	Kanpur	688
10.	Jabalpur**	1555
11.	Chennai	593
12.	Bangalore	362
13.	Hyderabad	652
14.	Nagpur	830
15.	Bhubaneshwar	424
16.	Lucknow	396
17.	Jaipur	130
18.	New Delhi II	541
TOTAL :		13030

\*upto August 2004.

\*\*upto June 2004.

#### **Notification regarding interest on Employees Provident Fund**

140. SHRI RAJKUMAR DHOOT: Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) Whether it is a fact that Government have not notified the final rate of interest on Employees Provident Fund for 2003-04;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) by when the notification in this regard would be issued?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHAR RAO): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) The matter is under consideration and no specific timeframe can be indicated at present.