

ing parity in allocation of funds. I would arrange to send it to the hon. Member.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member, Mr. Rajan Cnellappa had put a very pertinent question regarding the East Coast road which connects Madras and Rameswaram. Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry are not having the same railway traffic as the adjoining States of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka are having. The main mode of transport for goods and for passengers is only by the road. The East Coast project was started in 1985. The project had been sanctioned and funds were allocated but it is moving at a snail's pace. After ten years even 100 KMs stretch of road between Madras and Mahabalipuram has not been completed. Some people have filed a petition on the ground of environment. Now, it has been cleared. If this construction work goes up at this pace, then, construction of road up to Rameswaram would take more than 25 years. My worry is that there will be a cost escalation and time overrun. With the cost escalation the Central Government has to add to its original budget and the Government has to lose.

Now, Sir, the private sector people are coming forward to invest in the road sector. In this connection, the hon. Minister has also announced a scheme. In Tamil Nadu the people are very much depending upon the roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am coming to my question. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government of India has received any proposal for private investment from foreign countries in the road sector and if so, whether they are going to consider these on a priority basis in connecting important State capitals so that traffic movement is more.

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have received a lot

of proposals from foreign investors as well as Indian companies who would like to build these express ways. We are working on them on a priority basis. Then, we would give these to them.

I would like to add to the answer which I have given earlier to a question put by the hon. Member on the East Coast road which I was not able to answer then. I was wondering myself as to why I was not ready with an answer. I just came to know that the East Coast road is a State project; and it does not come under the Central Government. However, that is also being developed with the assistance of the Asian Development Bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Q. No. 4.

SHRI KRISHAN LAL SHARMA: Yes, Sir, Q. No. 4.

**New Trust for Construction of Temple of Ayodhya**

\*4. SHRI KRISHAN LAL SHARMA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Supreme Court has returned the reference of Ayodhya issue back to the Government;

(b) if so, what further action Government propose to take or have already taken thereafter;

(c) whether it is also a fact that Government have decided to form a new trust for the construction of temple at Ayodhya; and

(d) if so, when and what are the other details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): (a) and (b) The Supreme Court of India vide its judgement dated the 24th October, 1994, in the proceedings related to the validity of the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Ordinance Act, 1993 and the maintainability of

the Special Reference on RJB-BM dispute .... (Interruptions)..

SHRI MD. SALIM: Mr. Chairman. Sir, it is a written answer. (Interrup-Uonc)..He is reading it.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL; Mr. Chairman, Sir, through the head phon« we cannot hear anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't hear?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: No.

SHRI DINESHBHAI TRIVEDI: On the headphone, it is not audible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you not able to hear?

SHRI DINESHBHAI TRIVEDI: No.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: We are hearing only the translation.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Have you tuned it to the proper channel?

SHRI DINESHBHAI TRIVEDI: Yes, yes.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: We are able to hear only the translation.

DR. NAUNIHAL SINGH: I am not able to hear the English version, Sir,

SHRI G. G. SWELL: The floor language does not come on the headphone. Only the translation is coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are checking up. (Interruption) Please check up whether you are hearing now.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL; The original reply is not being heard.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN; The Supreme Court of India, vide its judgement dated the 24th October, 1994, in the proceedings related to the validity of the Acquisition of Certain Areas at Ayodhya Ordinance Act.. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Sir, the statement is already circulated. There will be no supplementary. The time will be over. (Interruptions).

DR. NAUNIHAL SINGH: We cannot hear at all.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: We are hearing only the translation (Interruptions).

SHRI MD. SALIM: Let us have the supplementaries.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: You can take it as read (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN; Teething troubles of new technology!

(Interruptions). Take the answer as circulated.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN; (a) and (b) The Supreme Court of India vide its judgement dated the 24th October, 1994 in the proceedings related to the validity of the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Ordinance Act, 1993 and the maintainability of the Special Reference on RJB-BM dispute, has upheld all the provisions of the acquisition Act except section 4(3) thereof. It has also held that all pending suits and other legal proceedings relating to the disputed area within which the structure (including the premises of the inner and outer courtyards of such structure), commonly known as Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid stood stand revived for adjudication of the dispute therein. It has also held that vesting of the disputed area in Central Government is limited, as a statutory receiver, with the duty for its management and administration, maintaining status quo therein (according to the provisions of the Act) and handing it over in terms of the adjudication made in the suits for implementation of the final decision therein. In view of above. Supreme Court has returned the Special Reference unanswered finding the same as superfluous and unnecessary.

(c) and (d) In terms of the provisions of the Acquisition of Certain area at Ayodhya Act, 1993, it is not for the Government to constitute a trust. It is for the body or trust, formed on or after the commencement of the Acquisition

Ordinance/Act to make a proposal with regard to the vesting of right, title and interest or any of them in relation to the area or any part thereof to be vested in such trust or body. No such proposal has been received by the Government so far.

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : सभापति महोदय, मेरे प्रश्न का जो उत्तर सरकार की तरफ से दिया गया है... (व्यवधान)

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : माइक ऑन कीजिये शर्मा जी।

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : मैंने ऑन किया हुआ है। जो उत्तर दिया गया है, ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार (व्यवधान)

श्री अजीत जोगी : माइक ऑन नहीं किया।

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : मैंने तो किया है।

श्री अजीत जोगी : सुनाई नहीं दे रहा है, थोड़ा जोर से बोलिये।

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : मैं ऊंचा बोलना चाहता हूँ।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : आपकी अवाज सरकार तक नहीं पहुँच पा रही है।

मौलाना अबेदुल्ला खान आजमी : ऐसा लगता है कि यह तय कर लिया गया है इस क्वेश्चन का जवाब न दिया जाए। इतना अहम क्वेश्चन है। (व्यवधान)

مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی، ایسا لگتا ہے کہ یہ طے کر لیا گیا ہے کہ اس کو شیپن کا جواب نہ دیا جائے۔ اتنا اہم کوئشن ہے۔ "مداخلت"

Translation in Arabic Script.

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय पर पहले-पहल जब 6 दिसम्बर को यह दांचा गिरा था, जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कहा था कि वहाँ पर मस्जिद बनाई जायेगी... (व्यवधान)...

श्री मोहम्मद तलोम : गिराया गया था... (व्यवधान)...

شمس المصطفیٰ: گویا کیا تھا۔ مداخلت۔

श्री कृष्ण लाल शर्मा : यह मामला सुप्रीम कोर्ट को इसलिए दिया गया था कि वह यह डिटरमिन करे कि वहाँ कोई मन्दिर था या नहीं था। मेरा यह कहना है कि अब सुप्रीम कोर्ट से रिकेस रिटर्न होने के बाद जो सारे सूट रिवाइव हो गये हैं क्या उसमें यह विषय भी इनक्लूड है या कोई यह तय करेगा कि उस जगह पर मन्दिर था या मस्जिद थी या इस चीज पर डिस्सिजन के लिए कोई चीज है या नहीं है और सरकार इस विषय को डिटरमिन करने के लिए अपने तौर पर क्या कदम उठाना चाहती है? जब तक यह निर्णय नहीं होता कि वहाँ पर मन्दिर है या मस्जिद है, हमारा यह कहना है कि वहाँ पर मंदिर है, मन्दिर चल रहा है, अब सरकार इसके बारे में बताए कि इस चीज को डिटरमिन करने के लिए आगे क्या कदम उठाए जाएंगे?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: It is very difficult for me to give the exact reply to the question the hon. Member is putting. Ultimately, it is not the Government which is going to interpret what the judgement contains. It is a public document which everybody can go through and try to find out as to whether it answers your question. But, according to the interpretation that we are still having about it, there are two options left. One is, the Supreme Court itself in an obiter dictum

has stated that this is a matter on which negotiations should be carried on and a negotiated settlement should be possible in one of the ways that they have suggested. Another way is to resort to Article 138(2). This is also another issue which can be considered. Besides these two, there can be other alternatives also. (Interruptions) we have still not finalised it.

SHRI CHATURANAN MTSRA: What about this second alternative?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question Hour is over. (Interruptions) There are only two alternatives. The third is, Question Hour is over.

#### WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

##### Reinstatement of BSF Personnel

I. SHRI RAJ NATH SINGH: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of BSF personnel who have been terminated from service during the year 1993-94, the name-wise details thereof;

(b) whether Government have received any representation from the personnel of the 25th Battalion of BSF whose services have been terminated on 6th March 1993 and whether they have requested the competent authorities for reinstatement;

(c) if so, the details thereof; and

(d) whether Government have any proposal under consideration to reinstate the said employees if so, what are the reasons for the delay?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): (a) Services of following 4 Group 'A' Officers of BSF were terminated during the year 1993-94:—

1. Shri M. L. Purohit, Comdt.
- Shri A. S. Bedi, DIG.
3. Shri G. P. Trivedi, Oy. Comdt.
4. Shri Ram Chander Singh, AC.

As details of Group 'B', 'C' and 'D' categories of the Force are not maintained at the BSF HQs. the same are being collected from field formations.

(b) and (c) Services of only one Constable of 25th Bn. of BSF were terminated on 6th March, 1993. A representation has been received for his reinstatement.

(d) No, Sir.

Clearance of dues from NTPC

\*5. SHRI E. BALANANDAN:

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE:

Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Railways have taken up the matter of clearance of dues from NTPC plants around the country for the work done;

(b) if so, which of the NTPC plants are involved in such defaults; and

(c) what is the present position of dues and details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C K. JAFFER SHARIEF): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) The detailed position of outstanding railway dues of the NTPC Plants as on 30-9-1994 is as under:—

S. No.	Name of the NTPC Plant	Amount in Crores of Rs.
1.	Badarpur Thermal Power Station at Tuglakabad	555.06
2.	Dadri	22.37
3.	Unchahar	16.87
4.	Pamagundam	1.52
5.	Tildanga	0.57
6.	Kahalgachhi	0.10
7.	Bindhachal	0.04
8.	Shaktinagar	0.03
To. Al.		9