

where hundreds and thousands of Indian and foreign tourists would congregate. Besides, a number of tourist spots were destroyed by the recent earthquake in Garhwal in Uttar Pradesh. So, in order to provide amenities to tourists and for the development of destroyed tourist spots, will the Central Government release the entire sanctioned amount? This is part (a) of my supplementary... (*interruptions*).. What is the reasons for releasing less amount? Will the Government release the entire amount sanctioned for the repair of destroyed spots? In part (b) of my supplementary, I would like to know whether the Government is going to increase the amount.

[English]

SHRI MADHAVARAO SCINDIA: I would just like to add one more thing. I have just said about the totally cold response we have received from the Uttar Pradesh Government as far as the Yatri Niwas at Niwas at Ayodhya is concerned. I would also like to add that we have been receiving a similar cold response on Yatri Niwas in Chitrakut also.

(*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

Dr. Ramesh Chand Tomar. This is no ground for reducing the amount. Why the sanctioned amount of Rs. 398 lakh was reduced?

Shri Madhavrao Scindia: I am coming to that. Please have patience. In the Seventh Five Year Plan an allocation of Rs. 4.42 crore was made to Uttar Pradesh. In 1991-92 we wanted to sanction a sum of 2.20 crore. It is 50 per cent of the amount sanctioned during the entire Seventh Five Year plan, in one year. So everything depends on the response of the Uttar Pradesh Government. Whenever funds are sanctioned by the Central Government, it is also the endeavour of the Centre to take up a few projects on priority basis. In this connection we have been consulting the Government of Uttar Pradesh and corresponding with them for

their full cooperation in the matter of utilisation of funds amounting to Rs. 2.20 crore, if they are not responsive, then funds will not be released. The hon. Member has also desired to know as to why only Rs. 27 lakh were released out of the sanctioned amount of Rs. 54 lakh. In this connection, I would like to State that it is the reflection of the response we receive from the Government of Uttar Pradesh, both last year and during the current financial year.

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT SULTANPURI:

Mr. Speaker, is it a fact that for promoting tourism at Ayodhya and developing it as a tourist spot a number of temples have been demolished there thus causing widespread damage to tourism. Sir, through you, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government has received reports that a number of temples have been demolished by the B.J.P. Government of Uttar Pradesh. Besides, will the hon. Minister please State whether funds sanctioned for promotion of tourism at these spots will be misused or properly utilised?

SHRI MADHAVARAO SCINDIA: I have already given a reply in this connection in the other House and repeating the something here that no proposal to promote tourism at Ayodhya has been received from the Government of Uttar Pradesh by the Central Government.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question is regarding Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat, but the hon. Minister has shifted to Chitrakut all of a sudden. Even Lord Rama took a long time to reach Chitrakut from Ayodhya should an hon. Minister make use of the Question Hour to cast aspersions on a State Government? Though the question does not pertain to Madhya Pradesh, yet the hon. Minister has tried to drag the Madhya Pradesh Government into it. (*Interruptions*) Yes, please listen, Chitrakut is in Uttar Pradesh.

SHRI MADHAVARAO SCINDIA: I think Shri Vajpayee has forgotten his way. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: Chitrakut is in Uttar Pradesh.

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER: Shri Vajpayee should first visits Uttar Pradesh and find out himself (*Interruption*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE Mr Speaker, Sir, Chitrakut in Uttar Pradesh is adjacent to Madhya Pradesh border You may please ask the hon Minister so that the point is make clear please ask him as to which State, Madhya Pradesh or Uttar Pradesh, was in his mind when he was making a reference to Chitrakut (*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER No, Sir (*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER Question No 456

[*English*]

10. Telecom. Links in Orissa

456 SHRI ARJUN CHABAN SETHI Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state the names of important places in Orssa to be provided with STD facilities and other telecommunication links during 1992-93?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI P V RANGAYYA NAIDU) Subject to availability of resources, the names of places in Orssa planned to be provided with STD facilities and other telecommunication links in 1992-93 are given in statements 'A' and 'B'

STATEMENT A

Names of the Exchanges proposed to be provided with STD facility during 1992-93

S No Name of Exchange

1 2

1 Aul

2 Katikala

S.No. Name of Exchange

1 2

3 Keringa

4 Deogarh

5 Bonal

6 Khanar Road

7 Raj Khariar

8 Nawapara

9 Karanjia

10 Bangamunda

11 Athgarh

12 Chhendipada

13 Surada

14 Purusotampur

15 Buguda

16 Khalikote

17 Jaipatna

18 Daspalla

19 Khandapara

20 At tabira

21 Basudevpur

22 Nagram

23 Rupsa

24 Panital

25 Belpora

<i>S No</i>	<i>Name of Exchange</i>	<i>S No</i>	<i>Name of Exchange</i>
1	2	1	2
26	Binka	48	Bilel Pada
27	Harishankar Road	49	Gandia
28	Loisinga	50	Hanchandandpur
29	Salebhata	51	Ghargaon
30	Bahugram	52	Joranda
31	Balikuda	53	Tirtol
32	Baramba	54	Kankarada
33	Binjhapur	55	Banamalipur
34	Chhatia	56	Balakati
35	Laraka	57	Godaygin
36	Kujang	58	Bhati
37	Kandarpur	59	Radabahal
38	Kishore Nagar	60	Sohela
39	Khuntuni	61	Siakhandeita
40	Kuakhia	62	Paikmal
41	Kugupur	63	Pata Pur
42	Mouda	64	Pudaman
43	Sunbuda	65	Seregad (GM)
44	Nischinta Koili	66	Naria Road
45	Raghunathpur	67	Snepalli
46	Mahakal Pada	68	Jamsola
47	Pani Koili	69	Joshpur