

<i>India/State or Union Territory</i>	<i>Females Percentage of workers</i>		<i>Percentage increase in the number of workers</i>
	<i>1981</i>	<i>1991 @</i>	<i>1981-91</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
17. Punjab	6.16	6.78	33.08
18. Rajasthan	21.06	27.01	63.72
19. Sikkim	37.61	52.74	84.71
20. Tamil Nadu	26.52	30.88	33.51
21. Tripura	12.78	14.31	49.76
22. Uttar Pradesh	8.07	12.87	99.64
23. West Bengal	8.07	11.67	80.84
Union Territories			
1. Andaman & Nicobar Islands	10.78	12.86	84.19
2. Chandigarh	9.10	10.52	66.77
3. Dadra & Nagar Haveli	41.33	48.88	56.08
4. Daman & Diu	22.62	23.06	25.26
5. Delhi	6.84	7.67	71.43
6. Lakshadweep	9.16	7.48	3.19
7. Pondicherry	13.48	15.48	52.92

* Excludes Assam and Jammu & Kashmir.

@ Figures are provisional.

Japanese Investment in India

1171. SHRI MANIKRAO HODLYA
GAVIT: Will the PRIME MINISTER be
pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have urged
the industrial, commercial and financial es-
tablishments of Japan to invest in Indian
industries; if so, the details thereof;

(b) whether the response from Japan so far is not encouraging; and

(c) if so, the steps taken to highlight the new industrial policy as well as to create facilities to attract Japanese investment in India?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): (a) to (c). Various policy initiatives detailed in the Statement on Industrial Policy tabled in both Houses of Parliament on 24th July, 1991 are aimed at generally attracting foreign investment and technology transfer. Companies from various countries including Japan, have shown interest in investment in India. The total direct foreign investment in India proposed by Japanese Companies in the foreign collaboration approvals issued after the announcement of the new Industrial Policy totals Rs. 40.32 crores till 31st December, 1991. This is more than 8 times the Japanese direct foreign investment approved during the calendar year 1990.

[*Translation*]

Report of Ramanujam Committee

1172. SHRI BARE LAL JATAV: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether necessary deliberations have been held with the State Government and Administration of the Union Territories for examining the report of Ramanujam Committee on Industrial disputes;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) if not, the reasons for delay therein?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI PABAN SINGH GHATOWAR): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The 40th Labour Ministers' Conference was held in New Delhi on 6.2.92. The Conference *inter-alia* considered the report of Ramanujam Committee on Industrial Relations Law.

There was a consensus in the meeting that the recommendations of the committee which are unanimous may be adopted. It was also decided to appoint a committee of five State Labour Ministers to examine the areas of disagreements in the Ramanujam Committee Report with a view to arrive at a consensus. In pursuance of this decision, a committee consisting of Labour Ministers of Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu under the Chairmanship of Shri P.A. Sangma, Minister for Coal has been constituted.

(c) Does not arise.

[*English*]

Non-Payment of P.F. to Working of Closed Industrial Units

1173. SHRI VUJAY NAVAL PATIL: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government have received complaints of non-payment of Provident Fund and other benefits to employees of sick units that have been closed;

(b) if so, the steps the Government propose to ensure that workers are paid off all pre-closure arrears of wages and other benefits;

(c) whether the Government propose to create a special cell to settle the problems arising due to closure of these industrial units; and

(d) if so, the guidelines that are to be given to the special cell?