

Improvement in the working of Coal India Subsidiaries

675. SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Will the Minister of ENERGY be pleased to state

(a) whether it is a fact that the Eastern Coal Fields Limited and Bharat Coking Coal Limited (BCCL) two subsidiaries of Coal India Limited have shown better performance recently; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof and what precise steps in the past were taken by Government to achieve this improvement?

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The total coal production by the Eastern Coalfield Limited in 1936-87 upto September, 1986 was 10. 56 million tonnes as compared to 9.82 million tonnes during the corresponding period in 1985-86. Bharat Coking Coal Limited produced 10. 27 million tonnes of coal upto September, 1986 as compared to 9. 03 million tonnes of coal during the corresponding period in 1985-96. Both these companies also showed an improvement in productivity in terms of output per man shift (OMS).; Eastern Coalfields Limited achieved an OMS of 0. 50 tonnes in 1986-87 as compared to 0. 46 tonnes in 1985-86. The output per manshift in case of Bharat Coking Coal Limited was 0. 60 tonnes upto September, 1986 as compared to 0. 54 tonnes during the corresponding period in 1985-86. The improverrent in performance of these companies may be attributed to better

management and improvement in productivity of labour.

Allegations against tyre Companies

676. SHRI RAM AWADESH SINGH; Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have recently taken up comprehensive investigation into the^ allegations made by several organisations and the Report by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices, Satyapal Committee etc., against the tyre companies in the country following unfair practices;

(b) if so, what are the names of the tyre companies against whom inquiry was conducted stating the nature of the allegations against them; and

(c) what is the outcome of the inquiry and what action has been taken and is proposed to be taken by Government in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) to (c) Based on a report of the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices, the M. R. T. P. Commission has ordered a preliminary investigation into certain Restrictive Trade Practices allegedly followed by the tyre manufacturing companies. The names of the companies and the nature of the allegations are mentioned in the enclosed statement (See below). The investigation report is yet to be submitted to the Commission.

Statement

S. No.	Names of the companies	Nature of allegations
1	M/s. Goodyear India Ltd., Ballabhagrh	(i) Acting in concert for the unified and coordinated increase in prices so as to Prevent, distort or restrict competition
2	M/s Modi Rubbar Ltd., Modipuram.	

S	Name of the companies	Namrejof allegations
3	M/s Premier Tyres, Kalamassery, Kerala	within the meaning of section 2 (0) of the MRTP Act.
4	M/s Appolo Tyres, chalakudy, Kerala	
5	M/s J. K. Industries Ltd., Udaipur.	(ii) Manipulation of prices of different types of tyres in such a manner as to impose on the consumers unjustified costs which is a restrictive trade practice within the meaning of section 2(0) of the MRTP Act.
6	M/s CEAT Tyres, Bombay. M/s	
7	Bombay Tyres, Bombay.	
8	M/s MRF Goa.	
9	M/s Vikram Tyres Ltd., Mysore. M/s	(iii) Manipulation of concitions of delivery for effecting the flow of supply in the market in respect of tyres in such a manner as to impose on the consu-
10	Dunlop India Ltd., Shahgar-j (W. B.) M/s	
11	Dunlop (I) Ltd., Ambattu, Madras.	
12	M/s India Tyres Rubber Co. coimbatore. Madras. M/s MRF, Tiruvettiyur, Madras.	mers unjustified costs or restrictions which is also a restrictive trade practice within the meaning of section 2(0) of the MRTP Act.
13		
14	M/s MRF Inchapudur.	(iv) Discriminatory discounts, rebates, or concessions which is a restrictive trade practice U/s 33(1) (e) of the MRTP Act.

Levy Cement

677. SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA; Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that cement industry is demanding rise in levy price of cement; if so, what are the details thereof;

(b) what is the cost of production per tonne of cement in India and other advanced cement producing countries;

(c) what is CIF value of imported cement and the sale price of levy as well free e sale cement produced in the country;

(d) what is the connected policy with regard to imports, distribution and pricing of cement; and

(e) whether this policy applies to all the varieties of cement as defined in Cement Control Order, 1967 or only to grey portland cement?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM):

(a) Yes, Sir. Representations have been received from the Cement Manufacturers' Association seeking increase in the retention price of levy cement by Rs. 36. 37 per tonne till January, 86 and again by Rs. 11. 18 per tonne in September, '86. The increase sought has been on account of cost escalation in power tariff, price of coal movement of coal by railways, increase in wages etc.

(b) As per the assessment made by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices in December, 1985, the direct cost of production of naked cement (excluding denreciation, interest on loans and return on capital) on normative basis worked out to approximately Rs. 310 per tonne. Information in other advanced ce. ment producing countries is not available in-as-much as cost of pro. duction of cement is a function of various factors including the seal's of operation and the cost of various