

Mr. Duggal's question and Mrs. Ambika's question I have said that I accept the suggestions which they have made. I am not leaving it entirely to the States. The Central Government would consider whether an initiative in this regard to bring these States together and hold discussions with them on this issue would be profitable at this point of time and do the needful. I don't think the Government of India can abdicate its responsibility not only in this matter but also in respect of all disputes pending between these States. In this case also I have already said that the Government would consider the possibility of taking a pro-active step.

*182. [The questioner (Shri D.P. Yadav) was absent.

For answer, vide page 26 *infra*.]

Operational Performance of SEBs

*183. SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the financial health and operational performance of the SEBs are a critical constraint in the future development of the power sector;

(b) whether most of the SEBs continue to suffer from a shortage of resources to finance projects or raise resources; and

(c) if so, how Government plan to resolve this problem?

THE MINISTER OF POWER (SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM): (a) to (c) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir. A Statement indicating the profit and loss of SEBs during the year 1998-99 is enclosed at Statement-I (*See below*)

(c) The Conference of Power Ministers' was held on 26.2.2000 to address these problems. A copy of the Resolution adopted in the Conference is at Statement-II.

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

Statement-I

Statement of surplus and deficit of SEBs

(Rs. in crores)

Sl. No.	Name of SEBs	1998-99 (With subsidy)	1998-99 (Without subsidy)
1.	APSEB (A)	112.83	-1961.82
2.	ASEB	**	**
3.	BSEB	**	**
4.	GEB (U)	126.45	-1966.43
5.	HSEB	**	**
6.	HPSEB (U)	-6.27	-6.27
7.	KEB (U)	66.99	-847.8
8.	KSEB (U)	38.75	-262.96
9.	MPEB (U)	116.93	-1580.22
10.	MSEB (A)	376.15	21.01
11.	Me SEB (U)	-23.29	-32.79
12.	PSEB (U)	50.9	-876.97
13.	RSEB	**	**
14.	TNEB (U)	334.94	-741.28
15.	UPSEB (U)	410.64	-1746.91
16.	WBSEB (U)	-717.79	-904.15
ALL INDIA :		—	—

A — Audited

U — Unaudited

** Account for 1998-99 Not Received.

Source : CEA

Statement-II***Resolutions of the Chief Ministers/Power Ministers' Conference held on 26.02.2000***

The Power Ministers' Conference took note of the impending difficult situation facing the power supply industry in the country due to continuing decline in commercial viability of the sector as a whole. It noted the fact that:—

1. Outstanding dues of CPSUs have been increasing and have now reached Rs. 23,000 crores. This trend if maintained, would adversely affect their current operations apart from inhibiting their future expansion plans.
2. Financial closure for private power projects is becoming increasingly difficult.
3. The States are unable to finance new projects on their own.
4. Increases in budgetary support from State Governments as well as Central Government for this sector is not feasible due to fiscal deficits.

II. The primary factors responsible for this unsustainable financial situation are:

- (i) Theft and pilferage at the macro level are estimated to be over Rs. 20,000 crores per annum.
- (ii) Technical losses in transmission and distribution for the country are also too high.
- (iii) Large number of the thermal stations in the state sector run at an operational efficiency of less than 40%.
- (iv) The average annual operational losses of the State Power Sector for the country is over Rs. 12,000 crores.

III. It was also recognised that the cross subsidies cannot be sustained if industrial tariffs make Industry non-competitive in the new environment of increasing globalisation with elimination of quantitative and other restrictions. It becomes necessary to ensure that Indian Industry is not handicapped by unsatisfactory power

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

supply or by tariff which makes it non-competitive. Further, the consumer, including the farmer has a legitimate claim for uninterrupted good quality power supply. His willingness to pay reasonable costs is underestimated.

Resolutions

1. The Power Ministers' resolved after taking into account all the problems facing the power sector, that with the intention of achieving commercial viability and providing power at reasonable rate to all, reform must be undertaken with determination, vigor and a sense of urgency. Delay in reform only increases the financial cost of reforms, and the burden of liabilities only increases. Reforms must begin to show results within the next 2-3 years. The key elements of the reform strategy are:—

- a. Energy Audit at all levels.
- b. Time-bound programme of 100% metering of all consumers by December 2001.
- c. Reduction and finally, elimination of power theft within a specified time frame.
- d. Strengthening/upgradation of sub-transmission and distribution system by taking sub-station as an unit on a priority basis.

2. If the above appears unattainable in the existing set up corporatization/cooperatization/privatization of distribution, would have to be undertaken.

3. Since a large number of thermal stations within the State sector are running at a PLF below 40%, immediate Renovation and Modernisation including Life Extension would need to be undertaken on an urgent basis. Similarly, R&M/LE would require to be undertaken for old hydel power plants on priority.

4. Effective functioning of State Electricity Regulatory Commissions is essential for rationalization of tariff, and balancing the interests of the consumer and the need for commercial viability of the utilities in the environment where private sector participation in the industry is expected to gradually increase.

5. Unboundling and corporatization of State Electricity Boards/ bench-marking through separate distribution profit centres/ corporations/companies may facilitate the Regulatory Commissions in promoting competition within the power supply industry-competition being the key to lower prices.

6. It was noted that the power system network in country has an unmatched reach to consumers and with the installation of optic fibre cables along the existing power lines using its right of way, it has the potential of generating very large resources in the coming years by providing facilities for multipurpose communication including cable TV, IT services, Telecom services, etc. Hence efforts need to be made to creatively tap this potential source of large revenue from convergence.

7. In order to promote reforms, a new draft central legislation which obviates the need for separate enactments for the States, is being considered. The draft Bill submitted by the NCAER would form the basis for a national debate and a consensus on the contents of the new Bill. The States would be sending their detailed comments on this draft Bill, to the Ministry of Power at the earliest.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I cannot expect a better reply than what has been given by the Government because this is the stereotyped reply that we get every time. We expect something better from Shri Kumaramangalam, who is a young and a dynamic Minister. Sir, the Electricity Boards in the country are in a very bad shape. There is no doubt about it. The hon. Prime Minister, in the recent State Energy Ministers' Conference held on 26th February, expressed his helplessness as regards the performance of the State Electricity Boards. In this Conference, the power situation was discussed and certain resolutions were adopted. There is nothing new in that. The State Electricity Boards continue to loose Rs. 12,000 crores per year. The country continues to reel under a shortage of power. Industries continue to suffer. No concrete steps have been taken by the Government. I want to know from the hon. Minister as to what effective steps are being proposed, or, have been

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

taken, so as to ensure that the power situation somehow improves in the country. Sir, about an year ago, the hon. Prime Minister laid the foundation stone of two mega power plants in Bihar. The Government also announced doubling the capacity of the Kahalgaon power plant. It was also discussed that immediate steps would be taken to ensure that this expansion programme is taken up. But, unfortunately, nothing has been done so far. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, in specific terms, as to when these two mega power plants would be taken up for implementation, and also what the status of the project relating to the Koel Karo power plant is, as far as the doubling of the installed capacity is concerned.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member for having raised this question. This is in two parts. One is a question which specifically relates to three power plants, namely, the North, the Barh and Koel Karo Power Plants. These three power plants are being put up by the National Thermal Power Corporation. They have been provided for by the NTPC in its Budget. The procedure, which is required for any thermal power plant, is, getting the environmental impact analysis done, which involves four seasons of analysis of that area. This has been undertaken. In fact, my good friend may be a little surprised to note that Koel Karo Power Plant is going to be the first plant to expand because land is already available, and the process is on. The main plant package is soon to be tendered. And, I should expect that all the three plants would be put on stream by the end of the Tenth Five-Year-Plan. It should take four years from today for all the three plants to be put on stream.

With regard to the general observations, I must request him to forgive me for not arising up to his expectations. But the fact is that the new Resolution which was passed by the Chief Ministers and the Power Ministers on 26th February categorically laid down some specific steps. First of all, I think it necessary to bring this aspect to the notice of the House because this is the fundamental issue. The Energy Audit at all levels is the problem which we are facing, and all the Ministers as well as the Chief Ministers of the States agreed to do

this on a time-bound schedule. They have also agreed that hundred per cent metering of all the consumers will be done by December, 2001, which is a very major step because, today, we have only about 43 per cent metering of the officially-connected consumers.

They have also decided to draw up a schedule for reduction and final elimination of power thefts within a specified time-frame. The real problem with the SEBs is the revenue. It is not a problem of other matters. Technologically, many of them are at international level. They are not in a situation where one can challenge them. But the real problem is revenue collection which starts with the essential problem of lack of metering. When you don't know how much power you are supplying to whom, how do you charge them? That is where the real genesis of the problem lies. They have decided to address it. I think that is the first major step they have taken. Meanwhile, even a draft Bill for looking at the reform of the sector is being discussed. It was discussed at that conference. It has been opened up with the consultative Committee. Many Members of Parliament have been given copies; whoever is interested, can give his suggestions. Even before the Government finalises its view on the Bill, we are going through a process of wide consultation so that the power sector reforms have accessibility across party lines because, I believe, power is a sector which needs to be addressed across party lines, with no partisan feeling. So, my good friend, I think, would forgive me. I did put the resolution there, hoping that he would understand from the resolution that very detailed decisions that were taken.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: The Resolution is there, but it is only on paper. The reason being, energy is audited at all levels. Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a fact that if somebody consumes power, there has to be a meter and it has to be billed and it has to be paid for. But, Sir, what is the financial position of SEBs? Take, for example, the A.P. State Electricity Board. It was minus by Rs. 1134.36 crores in 1997-98, it increased to Rs. 1961.82 crores in 1998-99. That means, in one year, the loss increased by almost Rs. 800 crores in just one Electricity Board. There are many such examples. So, Mr. Chairman, Sir, my point is, when the situation of

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

SEBs is so bad, how do they expect that they would be able to provide meters to all the consumers, when 60 per cent of the consumers do not have meters? I mean, something concrete has to be done. Sir, the power theft is equivalent to Rs. 20,000 crores per year as per your information, as per your reply. The Hon. Prime Minister in the newspaper—as per Press reports—has put it at Rs. 30,000 crores. I do not know which figure is correct. But I presume that since you have given the reply in Parliament, we take your calculation to be correct. The power theft is Rs. 20,000 crores per year, and it is going on. The SEBs are in a bad shape. The losses have increased by four times in ten years. In one decade, the loss has increased by four times. According to your reply, by 2012, the loss will be Rs. 1,70,000 crores. So, Mr. Chairman, Sir, no specific thing has been suggested in this Resolution. My point is, something concrete should be done because there is no politics, as far as the power situation is concerned. All the hon. Members in this House and in the other House are concerned about the power situation. My question to the hon. Power Minister is: how is he going to implement this Resolution, without any specific financial assistance to the State Electricity Boards? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I think this House did not have the opportunity to discuss the Budget that the hon. Finance Minister was pleased to present recently, for this year. In the Budget, he has actually provided for Rs. 1000 crores as grant to the SEBs which would be leveraged, and I think it would come to approximately Rs. 4000 crores. It should be made available this year for those States which are reforming, for both renovation and modernisation, improving the systems; in other words, transmission as well as metering. We are providing financial support through grants and loans, at subsidised interest, to States which are positive in implementing the reforms. Reforms do not mean privatisation. But in reforms, we are very clear that we are addressing the revenue angle as the first step. If you improve your revenues, “We are willing to support you, to bail you out from the problems of the past”. We have said this more than once. We have States who have improved

their account. But I think it is my duty to bring to the notice of this House that the annexure to my answer very categorically says that with subsidy, the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board, which has an audited account, has got a plus Rs. 112.83 crores profit. Without subsidy, it is Rs. 1961.82 crores for 1998-99, meaning...

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: I think there is some mistake, hon. Minister. As far as the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board is concerned, the figure of Rs. 112.83 crores that you are referring to is the deficit. This is not the profit.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: One second, please. It is plus here. It doesn't say it is minus.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: You see, this is a statement of surplus and deficit.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Hold on, hold on. That is why if you look down, you will see, there are pluses and there are minuses opposite the figure. But all I am trying to say is that if you take into account the amount of subsidy that the State has to give, then the differential is about Rs. 1,700 crores in the year 1998-99. This is because they are having tariffs in agriculture and other areas which are below the cost of power, and they are doing subvention. Wherever the State does it, the State Electricity Board is in a much better position. But then, we do have States who do not even have the money to do subvention and that is why the question that you have asked is very relevant. It is relevant essentially because, today, these State Electricity Boards require support just to get over and improve themselves. And we have said, "If you commit yourself to improving the programmes, we will see that support is made available to you to pull you out". We are sitting with them. It is not a question of telling them that they have done this bad or done that bad. I think all of us together have been jointly responsible in some form or the other to have brought the State Electricity Boards to this position. Therefore, all of us need to sit together with them and bail them out for the present moment. That is why you will see, the resolutions are not resolutions which are harsh on either side, but giving a very clear

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

intent and giving deadlines in respect of schemes and schedules. Once they adhere to it, we will. We have had an agreement with Karnataka and with Uttar Pradesh—Maharashtra is coming forward and so is Madhya Pradesh—to sit down and work out how money can be given by the Centre directly and through its financial institutions as well as other sources to bail out the Electricity Boards to see to it that they become commercially viable. And we are quite clear that that is the first priority that we are looking at.

**WELCOME TO HIS EXCELLENCY MR. PIUS MSEKWA,
SPEAKER OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF TANZANIA
AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMONWEALTH
PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I have an announcement to make.

We have with us, seated in the special box, His Excellency Mr. Pius Msekwa, Speaker of the National Assembly of Tanzania and Chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Executive Committee currently on a visit to our country as our honoured guest.

On behalf of the Members of the House and on my own behalf, I take pleasure in extending a hearty welcome to His Excellency Mr. Pius Msekwa and wish our distinguished guest an enjoyable and fruitful stay in our country. We hope that during his stay here he would be able to see and learn more about our Parliamentary system, our country and our people, and that his visit to this country will further strengthen the friendly bonds that exist between India and Tanzania. Through him we convey our greetings and best wishes to the Parliament and the friendly people of Tanzania.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS—*Contd.*

Q. NO. 183—*Contd.*

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Sir,...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. Your two supplementaries are over. Shri Pranab Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I compliment the Minister for, at least, getting the Power Ministers agree to pass a resolution—which he has referred to in his statement—where some of the issues which are plaguing the State Electricity Boards are addressed. But it is not a question of merely passing a resolution. We can take the horse to the water, but the important thing is, we must ensure that the horse drinks the water. I have found from my own experience that in the Chief Ministers' Conference to determine the minimum power tariff for agriculture, how the Chief Ministers, after going back to their States, simply decided not to adhere to their own decision. My point is not in regard to the resolution, but to what the hon. Minister, in the concluding part of the second supplementary, has stated. I do agree with him that here we need to build up a consensus and put our political will at our command to ensure that one of the major areas of our weakness in our three important sectors is resolved. But I disagree with him because these figures themselves show that if you look at the subsidy in isolation, either in the power sector or in the food sector or in any other sector, I am afraid, you will never be able to reach a conclusion, unless you take an integrated approach which, we, from this side of the House, are hammering. During the United Front regime, a Paper on subsidy was floated by Mr. Chidambaram; I don't know where it is gathering dust. If the Government is serious in dealing with the problem, as the figures which are stated in Statement-I itself will show how deteriorating the picture is. Except the Maharashtra State Electricity Board, in the case of all other State Electricity Boards, without subsidy, the position is very bad. Therefore, in that context, would the Minister be in a position to assure that instead of taking an isolated view in regard to subsidy, the Government would look into

the whole area in an integrated manner; otherwise, it will be extremely difficult to achieve the objective which we want to achieve.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member, the hon. Member had been the Finance Minister and I think I should thank him. I must tell the House, Sir, that the Government is looking at the matter in an integrated fashion. How the Finance Minister is looking at it; I think, he would have a opportunity to present his approach on this when the Budget is discussed, but it is not that power sector subsidies are being looked at separately. We are looking at power, foodgrains; even areas where we are talking of an extreme debt situation which we have landed in, the interest which we pay; various forms of subsidies exist in our system. As rightly pointed out, it is becoming a major issue. As for the question whether we can afford this variety of subsidies and the form of subsidies, and the way in which we need to privatise it, I can assure the hon. Member, through you, Sir, that the Government is definitely addressing the issue; and addressing it in an integrated fashion. But in an integrated issue also, there are parts, each part has to find its own solution. In the power sector, we are trying to find our own solution. I do believe that if one goes on having such subventions from the State Budgets for power, the State Budgets will have no money for any other activity at all, and that needs to be addressed very seriously. I am grateful for his suggestion.

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे: सभापति जी, माननीय मंत्री जी ने नए ड्राफ्ट बिल, नेशनल डिबेट और कन्सेंसस के लिए अपने लास्ट पैरा में जो बात कही है, मैं मानता हूँ कि देश की इलैक्ट्रिसिटी के बारे में जो स्थिति है इससे बाहर निकलने के लिए ये सारी बातें कहीं हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि रिजोल्यूशन में जो सुझाव दिए हैं क्या आप इनको ड्राफ्ट बिल में शामिल करेंगे? जब आप इनको शामिल करेंगे तब इस नये बिल से आने वाले दिनों में इलैक्ट्रिसिटी की कमी होगी तो क्या टाइटल वेब्ज में अन्य चीजों के लिए बिल में अलग से कोई प्रावधान करेंगे?

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, I will send a copy of the Draft Bill prepared by the National Council of Applied Economic Research to the hon. Member. He will find that most of the issues

which have been resolved are being addressed. With regard to non-conventional energy, we are in the process of taking a decision on how best to ensure that its non-economic factors can be compensated from conventional energy.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I welcome the last paragraph where he says regarding the new Draft Bill, 'That a consensus and national debate is being called for on the Draft Bill.' I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the other part of this very debated issue, which has been debated for the last six-seven years. The other option which is being looked into is the so-called reforms. There, in the second page, it is mentioned that 'Reforms must begin to show results within the next two-three years.' My specific point to the hon. Minister is, as he is aware, the reforms in the way it was desired had been carried out in Orissa about five years ago. I would like to know whether any study/examination has been done, keeping in view the latest problems which the Orissa power sector *vis-a-vis* the rural sector is facing after the cyclone; whether any analysis/examination of the post-reforms process in Orissa has been carried out by an independent agency; if so, whether some report can be placed in the House for examination. There is a general feeling in the whole of the country, and an atmosphere has been built up, as if everything is privatised, the problem of the power sector is off. I would like to know about the results of the Orissa reforms, without any bias. Would he like to get it examined by an independent agency? It should not be done by politicians, or—please excuse me—by bureaucrats or by industrialists. Why not by professionals, like the Indian Institute of Engineers? In the British Parliament, after the British reforms, the Institute of Engineers placed a report before it on the positive as well as the negative side of the privatisation reforms. Would you like to get the Orissa reforms examined, as it is, as to where does it stand *vis-a-vis* the social obligations in the power sector? Will the power sector have any social obligations? If not, to that extent, what has been the result of the Orissa reforms? Let it be studied by an independent agency of professionals, I insist on professionals. Can he assure it and will he

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

see to it that a paper is laid here on what the results of the Orissa reforms are?

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the process of reforms in Orissa started five years ago, but the actual privatisation has not crossed the second financial year. Unfortunately, in the first stage itself, the super cyclone did hit. We, from the Central Government, have helped substantially in ensuring that the power was up and on in record time, even where transmission towers were picked up and thrown by the cyclone. We managed to see that they are connected. But, I must clarify right here that I do not, nor does my Government, believe that privatisation is the magic formula, a panacea, for all our ills. It is not so. But, at the same time, if there is a no-option situation, it is an option which will have to be resorted to in such situations. I would like to point out that we are interested in the Orissa reforms experiment, and I am grateful to the hon. Member for suggesting that a group of professionals of engineers, chartered accountants, cost accountants, etc., should be set up. I must say that it is a good suggestion because the Orissa reforms had actually created a dichotomous situation because we have today generation in private hands; we have distribution in private hands, while transmission remains in the hands of a State agency called GRIDCO, and that State agency has taken on its shoulder all the liabilities, but while the benefit from sales of generation has gone to the State exchequer, instead of coming to the settled accounts of the TANSO rather the GRIDCO, as it is called. We need to look at it because though the generation, transmission and distribution being separate, as being separate from profit centres, may be an ideal solution, but the way in which the reform is being carried out may not be the appropriate thing because to try and sell assets in the process of privatisation only to cover the State Government's requirement is not an answer in the power sector. So, I would definitely take the offer on and we would constitute a committee to look at it more really to find out what the errors are. But, I would take this opportunity to say that in Uttar Pradesh it did not happen. When we undertook reform in Uttar Pradesh, the three organisations

which were created out of the SEB, today have the books of accounts clean and no liabilities have been handed over to any of these organisations and the Government itself has settled accounts neatly enough, taken the liability on its shoulder because what was past is past, and it was part of the Government accounting. That really is the method by which we will have to go on to reform because there is no use having reforms and putting a huge amount of liability on any one of the reform instruments that comes into being.

SHRI ONWARD L. NONGTDO: Sir, I would like to put a specific question regarding my State in two parts, (a) whether the Minister is aware that financial crisis of Meghalaya State Electricity Board is mostly due to the non-payment of its dues by the Assam State Electricity Board and heavy expenditure on the salary and over-staffing of the State Electricity Board, and (b) whether the Minister is aware of the proposal of the State Government to export hydel power to Bangladesh in order to improve the financial position of the State because this will bring foreign exchange to the country. If so, what is the response of the Central Government in this regard?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Which part does he want me to answer because this question is in many parts? Mr. Chairman, Sir, with regard to the Assam State Electricity Board, yes, a certain amount of attention is being paid and we are having discussions on how much we can help them to bail them out and how much financial institution can help them. They are in a bad situation essentially because of the same problem, that is, recovery of, what I would call, the power sale. Metering is at very low level in Assam and we need to improve metering system. We need to improve sub-transmission system. Despite North-East being linked to the Eastern Region and having high frequency due to bad transmission and distribution system, the quality of power is very poor. We are looking at it very sincerely from the point of view of how to improve it. A certain amount of money is being earmarked this year for sub-transmission and transmission system to see that at least we can improve the quality of power. There is no real shortage of power in the North-East. But, unfortunately, it should be an area

[8 March, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

which should be surplus in power due to hydel power which is valuable power, but there are not enough hydel projects in existence. We have started after our Government has come in to move on to the hydel arena with full speed. We have a major project called Subanski and Dhiang having four stages, which when completed, would have 21,000 MW. At that stage we will have power to sell to Bangladesh. We are definitely open on it. Already we are having some power exchange with Bangladesh mainly because they need some requirement in one place and we require in some other place.

But, that is a sort of barter of power rather than real sale of power. We are positive on that. The moment we have enough surplus power to sell, we will sell it.

श्री नरेश यादव: सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के रिप्लाई के पृष्ठ 2 के पैरा 3 के आलोक में माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि कोयल कारो विद्युत परियोजना, जो 1970 के दशक से लंबित है और जबकि आपने उसे एन० एच० पी० सी० में ले लिया है, और राज्य सरकार के द्वारा क्लीयरेंस होने के बावजूद भी, जो भी शर्तें रखी गईं, उन सारी शर्तों को राज्य सरकार ने पूरा कर दिया है, तब भी आपके पास लंबित है, तो इसे आप कब क्लीयरेंस देंगे, कब स्वीकृति प्रदान करेंगे, कृपया यह बताने की कृपा करें?

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: In fact, the Koel Karo Project which was once shelved by the earlier Government on the ground that it was economically not viable. Our Government, however, in line with our decision to give priority to hydel power, decided to remove the ban, clear it in principle, and the D. P. R. has been worked out. The only thing that needs to be done is to accord sanction to the power purchase agreement with the various Governments and the S.E.Bs. in that region. That is being done. I wish to assure the hon. Member that their project will go on stream. It is not going to be dropped even if Bihar does not buy it. We will see somebody else buys the power.

*184. [The questioner (Shrimati Kamla Sinha) was absent. For answer, *vide* page 27 *infra*.]

*185. [The questioner (Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy) was absent. For answer, *vide* page 28 *infra*.]