

12.02 hrs.

RE. CAUVERY WATER DISPUTE

[English]

Shri P. G. Narayanan (Gobichettipalayam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday, the Government of India had referred the Interim Order of the Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal to the Supreme Court for getting its opinion. There is no necessity for the Government to refer that matter because the Supreme Court had already dealt with that matter.

On the question of the validity of the Tribunal's powers and jurisdiction, the Supreme Court had already given its finding. The same issue has now been referred to the Supreme Court by the Government of India. It is a waste.

According to me, the act of reference is an eye-wash. It is just a pretext for delaying the matter and for delaying justice to Tamil Nadu. The Prime Minister has done a great injustice to Tamil Nadu. He is helping the Karnataka Government which is already at fault, by violating the Constitution. The Prime Minister should have referred the Ordinance of Karnataka Government to the Supreme Court for its opinion, whether it is valid or not under law. He should not have referred this matter to the Supreme Court. The people of Tamil Nadu are not satisfied with this act of the Prime Minister. There is a great unrest going on. Even if the Prime Minister gets the opinion from the Supreme Court on this point, what is the guarantee that the Karnataka Government will abide by its direction? How to enforce it?

So, the Prime Minister, even at this stage, can intervene and re-consider it and issue an Executive Order by invoking Article 256 of the Constitution.

Shri S. B. Simal (Belgaum): The Government of India has taken a step to refer it to the Supreme Court, the highest court of law in this country. I think there should be no fear for the Tamil Nadu people in this respect; they should not create any bad atmosphere in this country. Therefore, I think, the Central Government and the Prime Minister are justified in referring the matter to the Supreme Court of India; and they should accept it.

Shri K. V. Thangkabalu (Dharmapuri): Yesterday, the Cauvery water dispute was referred to the Supreme Court. It has created great unpleasantness in the State of Tamil Nadu. The people of Tamil Nadu are totally agitated against it. The Central Government is having powers under Article 256 of the Constitution to issue an order or direction to a State Government. It is very clear. But, I am sorry to say that the so-called legal luminaries might have mislead the Government and the Prime Minister in this regard to refer the matter to the Supreme Court. After the Interim Award is given, the Government of Karnataka has refused to honour it. There is a statement of the hon. Chief Minister of Karnataka.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to refer to it.

Shri K. V. Thangkabalu: It is a fact. I am not quoting it. The Chief Minister of Karnataka has questioned the very authority of the Central Government when the Central Government has referred the matter to the Supreme Court. This is a very serious matter. In all humility, we appeal to the Central Government not to proceed further with this. Article 256 of the Constitution has given powers to the Central Government to direct the State Government to implement the award. If the Supreme Court gives its decision, will the Karnataka Government agree to it? It is impossible according to the statement of the Karnataka, Chief Minister.

So, I urge upon the Central Government to direct the Karnataka Government to release 205 TMC water immediately. (Interruptions).

Shri S. Mallikarjunaiah (Tumkur): This matter has been raised in this House again and again. The Tribunal has passed an Award. On the basis of this Award, the Karnataka Government has promulgated an Ordinance in accordance with the Constitution. Now the matter has been referred to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court will give its final order. Whatever the final order the Supreme Court gives, it is binding on both the States. Therefore, why is there so much hue and cry.

Secondly, for the time being, they have got sufficient water. (Interruptions).

Shri K. V. Thangkabalu: It is totally false; we do not have any water. (Interruptions).

Shri S. Mallikarjunaiah: I think they have to discharge the water into the Bay of Bengal. Over one hundred years an injustice has been done to the Karnataka Government; and the agreement had come to an end in 1974. In spite of all these things, the Karnataka Government has been very generous; over and above this, they are releasing water to the Tamil Nadu Government. Taking advantage of these things, it is unfair on the part of the Tamil Nadu Government to sit on the neck of Karnataka Government. Therefore, since the matter has gone to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court will decide it.

Shri Anbarasu Era (Madras Central): The Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Chief Minister of Karnataka explaining the legal position that the Award is binding on both the States; and it is advisable to implement the Award. After having come to know these facts, through the PIO, the Karnataka Government has hurriedly promulgated an Ordinance without even consulting the Prime Minister. He has passed an Ordinance

which embarrasses the Government of India; he has also explained it to his own Cabinet without informing the High Command. The only recourse available to the nation is to get the petition before the Supreme Court disposed of as early as possible. Through you, I would request the Government of India to express their feelings that the petition before the Supreme Court should be disposed of immediately by taking it up on a day to day basis.

Another thing is the PIO should not have leaked out this information. He is not a mouthpiece of the Karnataka Government. He should be taken to task. The PIO has leaked out the official secret. He should not have done so. He should be taken to task.

Shri H. D. Devegowda (Hassan): Our Tamil Nadu friends are raising this matter today. It has no basis. There is no basis for the argument advanced by them. The Karnataka Government has promulgated an Ordinance. The Government of India has sought the Supreme Court's opinion about the merits and the demerits of the Ordinance promulgated by the Karnataka Government. The issue is limited to the Ordinance promulgated by the Karnataka Government.

So far the State Government of Karnataka has only promulgated an Ordinance which has been referred to the Supreme Court for its opinion. The question of acceptance of the interim order has ultimately to be decided on merits. The issue is now only about the Ordinance which has been referred to the Supreme Court.

The other issue which our friends are raising is about the Chief Minister of Karnataka requesting for permission to expand his Cabinet. He has very right to expand his Cabinet. I would beg to differ; it does not require the permission of the Tamil Nadu MPs or any others. In his own right, he has expanded and this should not be an issue.

Shri V. Dhananjaya Kumar (Mangalore): As we see the matter is *sub judice*.

Mr. Speaker: You can say that you endorse what has been said now.

Shri V. Dhananjaya Kumar: The matter is already *sub judice*. The Central Government has taken a decision to get the opinion of the Supreme Court. The President of India has already referred the matter to the Supreme Court for getting its opinion.

As we see, there are three faces to this problem. One is the legal issue. The other is the factual side or the facts of the case. The third one is the political issue. My friends from Tamil Nadu are now agitated and more worried about this political face of it. Though the Government of India is in a dilemma either to support the case of Karnataka or support the case of Tamil Nadu. I am very confident that the Hon. Prime Minister—who is a very able leader—will be able to satisfy both the States. He would call a meeting of both the Chief Ministers and he would arrive at a very reasonable settlement. Instead of again and again repeating the same things I would say that it reminds me of the story of Shylock. My friends here have been asking for their pound of flesh and we are bound to give it but without shedding a drop of blood.

Mr. Speaker: Do not introduce acrimony into the debate.

Shri V. Dhananjaya Kumar: We are prepared to abide by the order of the Tribunal, whatever may be the Tribunal's final decision. We are prepared to wait. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar (Mayiladuturai): If Karnataka is not satisfied with the legality of the interim award of the Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal, it is open to the Government of Karnataka to go to the Supreme Court in appeal. Instead of that, the Government of India has

gone and done the job of the Government of Karnataka. Not only have we been denied the justice that the Tribunal was giving to us on the specific direction of the Supreme Court but now we are also being denied the justice of the Government of India fulfilling its bounden duty. Why can't the good stand on the floor of the House and say that the only reason why it did not think it necessary to notify the interim Award of the Tribunal was because the order of the Tribunal was binding from the day it was given. And until either the Tribunal itself stays its Order or the Supreme Court stays that Order, it is the bounden duty of the Karnataka Government and also of the Tamil Nadu Government to obey that Order. The Government of India is now apparently conniving with the Government of Karnataka in not enforcing this Order. They are also not clarifying on the floor of the House that it is the bounden duty of the Karnataka Government to implement this Order. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee (Dum Dum): Sir, this cannot be a matter between two States only..... (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

Shri Fam Vilas Paswan (Rosera): **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, I have stood up to raise a point of propriety. It is a totally different issue. An hon. Minister of the Union Cabinet has issued a statement against the decision of the Union Government.....

Mr. Speaker: Paswanji, please... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Rabi Ray (Kendrapara): **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, my point is that the Cabinet has a collective responsibility. You may be surprised to know that a Member of the Union Council of Ministers, Shri Ramamurthy has formally written a letter to the Supreme Court on the Cauvery Water Dispute

[English]

Mr. Speaker : There were contradictory reports in the newspapers on that.

[Translation]

Shri Rabi Ray : He has formally issued a statement against the Government's decision, without tendering his resignation. I would like to know from the Government of India, from the Leader of the House, whether Shri Ramamurthy has resigned or not? According to newspaper reports the likelihood of the Minister's resignation is remote. After all, there is something like collective responsibility of the Cabinet. When a Minister has openly flouted that responsibility and issued a statement against a decision of the Council of Ministers, then the hon. Prime Minister should himself come and admit before the House that this is against the spirit of collective responsibility. This is my humble submission to you and I would like to know whether Shri Ramamurthy continues to be a Member of the Union Council of Ministers or not?

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Paswan and Mr. Kapse, do you also want to raise the same issue?

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already made it clear that I have stood up to raise a point of propriety. Had the Government listened to my counsel that day, there would have been no need for any discussion. Our stand on this issue is the same and that day also, on behalf of the entire opposition, we had called upon the Hon. Prime Minister to convene a meeting of the Inter-State Council and find out a solution to this vexed problem. Members belonging to the ruling party also had agreed with our proposal. However the most important issue, which I have stood up to raise as a point of propriety and towards which Shri Rabi Ray has drawn the attention of the House, is that a Member

of the Union Cabinet has openly criticised the decision of the Government on this issue and today's newspapers have given wide coverage to it. It is for the Government to decide about the distribution of water to these two States, but the issue in question is that a Member of the Union Council of Ministers has openly criticised the Government's policy. Through you, I would like to know from the Leader of the House, whether the said person is still a Member of the Union Cabinet or has he tendered his resignation?

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Kapse, you too want to speak on this issue?

[English]

Shri Ram Kapse (Thane) : Sir, I would like to quote one very important sentence from Kaul and Shak-dhar's book page No. 586. It says :

"Likewise if the Prime Minister finds that a colleague's view or actions are causing him embarrassment, he can appropriately ask for resignation."

Shri Ramamurthy is creating embarrassment for the whole Ministry. Shri Chidambaram and Shri Arunachalam are all facing the same problem. (*Interruptions*). I do not want to examine the merits of the case. But what about the Minister? He is creating embarrassment. Please ask him to resign. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Manoranjan Bhakta (Andaman-Nicobar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in a press report it was reported that the BKU leader in Uttar Pradesh has contacted the Punjab militant to procure arms. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Basu Deb Acharia (Bankura) : Sir, we have our views on Cauvery issue. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Lal K. Advani (Gandhi Nagar) : We would like to know the reaction of the Government on this matter. (*Interruptions*).

The Minister of Human Resource Development (Shri Arjun Singh): Many people have read reports to that effect. But I think, it will be fair to the House and to the hon. Member himself that first this report is verified and only then we pass comments. *(Interruptions).*

Shri Basu Deb Acharia: It has come out in all the newspapers and it has not been contradicted. *(Interruptions).*

Mr. Speaker: Shri Manoranjan Bhakta.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Only Mr. Bhakta will go on record.

*(Interruptions)**

Shri Manoranjan Bhakta: It has been reported in a section of the press that BKU leader has established contacts with the Punjab militants to procure arms.....*(Interruptions).* I want that the Home Minister himself should make a statement in this regard. *(Interruptions).*

[Translation]

Shri Rabi Ray: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very important question. Now that Shri Arjun Singh has spoken, I would like to raise this basic question. Over 12 hours has passed since Mr. Ramamurthy issued his statement. Shri Ramamurthy must have issued this statement yesterday night itself, otherwise it would not have made headlines in today's newspapers. Just now, Shri Arjun Singh stated that he is not in possession of any definite information.

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan: This news item has made headlines in the newspapers.

Shri Rabi Ray: Now, this means, that he has, in all probability, issued the statement yesterday. Shri Ramamurthy is a Member of the Council of Ministers, and I believe that he is

still in the capital. The Hon. Prime Minister is not present in the House, and Shri Arjun Singh says that he is not sure whether Shri Ramamurthy has issued the statement, attributed to him by newspapers across the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to know whether Shri Ramamurthy has tendered his resignation from the Cabinet. This is a very important question, I would say it is a fundamental question. You please call Shri Ramamurthy to the House so that the House gets an opportunity to listen to him, so that the entire country gets to know the facts, whether he has resigned or not etc. etc. This is a very important question.

[English]

Shri Lal K. Advani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Members generally use the Zero Hour to express their viewpoints or current issues, but the issue that has been raised today has a direct bearing on Constitutional provisions. This matter cannot be just disposed off with only the Members belonging to the opposition expressing their opinion. The statement made by the Leader of the House too is not satisfactory. In this context, I would like to quote the definition of collective responsibility. The Cabinet is collectively responsible to this House. And the essence of collective responsibility is that—

“A Minister is free to express his dissent when the policy is in the stage of discussion. But after a decision is taken, every Minister is expected to stand by it without any reservation. The only alternative therefore for a Minister, who does not see eye to eye with the Prime Minister in matters of policy or is not prepared to defend a Cabinet decision, is to resign.”

[Translation]

That is the only alternative, and in this particular case, this matter was repeatedly taken up for discussion

*Not recorded.

during the past five days and I am sure, that the Cabinet too has discussed this matter in detail before taking the final decision to refer the matter to the Supreme Court under Article 143 of the Constitution. The concerned Minister must have expressed his dissent at that time, which is his prerogative but once a decision has been arrived at and the matter has been referred to the Supreme Court, then the Minister, if he has any reservations, about the decision, has no alternative, but to resign. Or perhaps as you said, the news reports (attributing a statement to the concerned Minister) may not be true. Any way, it would be better if the person in question is summoned to the House and made to clarify his stand, otherwise he should resign.

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are the Guardian of this House. You are here to ensure that the Constitutional provisions are not violated. Today, one of them is in question. It would have made some sense, had the leader of the house flatly denied that the Minister of State of the Ministry of Labour has made any such statement, but that too, has not been done. The text of the statement has appeared in many newspapers and it is openly critical of the Government's decision. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, you being the guardian of the House should summon the concerned Minister and seek clarifications from him. Let him either deny that he has issued any such statement or let the House be informed whether he continues to be a Member of the Union Council of Ministers.

[English]

Shri Guman Mal Lodha (Pali): Shri K. Ramamurthy has committed total contempt by criticising the reference made to the Supreme Court. He has violated collective responsibility of the Cabinet, requiring his resignation. He has committed contempt of Supreme Court. After the

reference to Supreme Court, the matter is *sub judice* and any criticism of it more so by a responsible Minister, tantamounts to contempt of Supreme Court because in such circumstances, the Supreme Court may refuse to answer the reference about Cauvery Waters dispute between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. Shri Ramamurthy should, therefore, be sacked from the Cabinet.

[Translation]

Shri Bhogendra Jha (Madhubani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House has already spent much time discussing this issue. With regard to the statement made by the Leader of the House, I would like to say that if he is not aware of the actual position, as he says, then he should be given time to verify the news reports. However, today itself either the concerned Minister, Shri Ramamurthy himself of the Prime Minister, should make it clear before the House, whether the concerned Minister continues to be a Member of the Council of Ministers or not. It should be clarified today itself, it should not be delayed further. You please give the necessary instructions in this regard and the Government should abide by it. The Leader of the House is present in the House, but as he is uncertain about the facts, let him be given some time, so that he can make a statement in this regard after ascertaining the facts.

[English]

Shri Basu Deb Acharia (Banskura): Sir, the decision to refer Cauvery Waters Dispute to the Supreme Court was taken in the Cabinet. The decision was taken in the PAC which is more than the Cabinet. The decision was taken by the Government afterwards that they are to refer this matter to the Supreme Court. We would like to know as to when this decision was taken. Under the system of collective responsibility, can any Minister differ with this decision and can he make statement publicly? We want to know whether he has

made a statement in this regard. It has appeared in all the newspapers and he has not yet contradicted it. The Leader of the House also said that what has appeared in the newspapers should be verified, as if he does not know. The House should not be treated in such a casual manner. We want that the Minister should come and make a statement. Either he should contradict the press reports or he should resign. This is a constitutional question, the question of propriety. (*Interruptions*). The Speaker is the Custodian of the House (*Interruptions*).

Shri Rupchand Pal (Hooghly) : As a custodian of the House, you should give direction to the Prime Minister to come and make a statement in this regard whether Shri K. Ramamurthy is still in the Cabinet or Shri K. Ramamurthy should be asked by you to come and make a statement and clarify his position today.

Shri Jaswant Singh (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have altogether a different clarification to seek and the Leader of the House is present. It is connected, of course, with the incipient civil war that is now taking place. We have read news to the account that whatever function is attended by Messrs. Chidambaram or Arunachalam, will not be attended by Anna DMK Members of Parliament. This too is a function of the Parliament and the Parliament is in Session. Luckily they are not present here at the moment. (*Interruptions*). Kumaramangalam has been excluded from that. (*Interruptions*).

An hon. Member : Because he has kept mum.

Shri Jaswant Singh : But if, for example, Messrs. Chidambaram and Arunachalam were to be present jointly in the House, then would Anna DMK boycott the House? It is a very important question, Sir... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker : Please do not enter into this kind of arguments. Yes, Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad) : Sir, since Shri Ramamurthy is not in Delhi, he is away in Tamil Nadu, it is not possible for him to be present in the House. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Basudeb Acharia : Where is the Prime Minister?

Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad : Sir, unless it is not ascertained, and you cannot ascertain because he is not in Delhi. (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Advani. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri (Saidpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I request you to give me also an opportunity to express my view.

Mr. Speaker : I will allow you. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Lal K. Advani : An important Constitutional question has come before the House and the entire House is concerned about it, but the response from the Government side is that the position would be made clear when the Minister returns from Madras, where he has gone in connection with this matter. Now, the House is not going to be satisfied with this answer. The concerned Minister's opinion in this regard can be ascertained within one hour, because the reply given by the Leader of the House does not contradict the press reports. Had that been the case, the Leader of the House would have stood up and said that the reports are absolutely baseless. But he did not say that, since he has not contradicted the report, it confirms that the Minister has given such a statement. The House should get full information about it within an hour or else it would mean that [*English*]

collective responsibility has been not only violated but the principle of collective responsibility has been abandoned and the whole concept has broken down.

[Translation]

If the Government functions like this, it would be neither good for the House nor for the Government itself.

Shri Arjun Singh : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully agree with the Leader of the Opposition that collective responsibility has a significance and all of us are aware of it. I had only said that without ascertaining the facts nothing can be said about it. (Interruptions).

[English]

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : How much time do you require ?

Mr. Speaker : Let him complete what he has to say.....

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : Please allow him to complete.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shri Kalka Das (Karol Bagh) : The entire country is seized of the matter and you have not verified the facts so far. You are trying to mislead the House. (Interruptions).

[English]

Mr. Speaker : Please allow him to complete.....

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : Please sit down. Now, he is making a statement. Allow him to complete at least. Let us hear what he has to say.

[Translation]

Shri Arjun Singh : I was saying that it has to be verified. I agree that keeping in view the concerned of the Members on this issue the facts should be verified immediately. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker : Please sit down. It cannot go on like this.

(Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Speaker : Please, not now.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker : There are other subjects to be discussed. Shri Sonkar is also insisting on a point.

Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri : I want to raise a point in this regard only. (Interruptions).

[English]

Mr. Speaker : Please sit down. It cannot go on like this.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shri Kalka Das : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Leader of the House has not given a satisfactory reply. He has mislead the House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker : Kalka Dasji, please sit down. Please listen to me, first.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : What is all this going on ? Let me speak. What is this ?

(Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Speaker : At least hear what I have to say. If for every sentence and for every word you get up, then what can I say ? Now, please hear what I have to say.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri : We are listening to you patiently.

Mr. Speaker : That is good. Shri Sonkar is a good listener.

[English]

Now there are contradictory reports in the newspapers and the media. The Leader of the House has said that the matter would be verified. The Members want to know the factual position. I hope the Government will take note of it and do the needful.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker : Shri Paswan, please resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Speaker : Please sit down. Don't go on repeating. 'You are custodian, you are custodian'. I have said that the Government should take note of it and do the needful.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker : Kindly, sit down.

(Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Speaker : Mr. Rao, you will please take your seat first.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker : Not like this. When I have said 'do the needful' it means.

[English]

'They should come out with a statement'. Now, if you have heard carefully, you would have understood it.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : If you do not want any other matter to be discussed, I can allow you to continue this.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : Mr. Speaker, Sir, how much time does the Leader of the House want to verify the facts ?

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : Not like this.

(Interruptions)

Shri Lal K. Advani : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have directed the Government in this regard keeping in view the sentiments of the Members. I have a constructive suggestion. You ask them to make the statement by 3 p.m. or 4 p.m.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : Is he in Madras or has he gone elsewhere ?

(Interruptions)

Shri Lal K. Advani : It has been done many times earlier also. A time is fixed for making the statement.....

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker : OK, I will ask them the time by which they would make the statement ?

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : The Government should make a statement before the House adjourns for the day.

[English]

Mr. Speaker : I would like one more point to be clarified. It seems that all of you are on a very nice point. But let me know from you, supposing a Minister makes a statement which is not in line with the Government's policy. You can ask the Government to proceed against him. Is there anything like this ? Let me know it from you.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shri George Fernandes (Muzaffarpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to reply to your questions. (Interruptions).

[English]

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : Yes, I will cite an example. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee : We want that either he should resign or he should be dismissed. (*Interruptions*).

[Translation]

Shri Lal K. Advani : Mr. Speaker, Sir, they are speaking about the other aspect. We just want that when Members express their concern on a particular matter and the Leader of the House said he would verify.... (*Interruptions*). You also directed him to ascertain the facts. I think under these circumstances he should have ascertained on his own and made a *suo moto* statement that the press reports are wrong. He did not contradict the press reports. It would be better if you decide the time by which the Government should make a statement on this issue because the way the hon. Minister rose from his seat and said that the Minister in question has gone to Madras, it seemed as if it is impossible to contact him in Madras. (*Interruptions*). The Members are so agitated that I think you should yourself give reasonable time to the Government to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker : I will ask and then let you know.

(*Interruptions*)

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan : Sir, I would like to know from the Leader of the House, not from you, whether he would ascertain the facts and get us the information by the time the House adjourns for the day. (*Interruptions*).

[English]

Mr. Speaker : I think you can do your best.

Shri Arjun Singh : I will try to do my best. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee : If the Minister denies his statement,

does it require to be attested by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu ? (*Interruptions*).

Shri K. V. Thangakabalu : Sir, the Minister is not under anybody. He must understand that. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker : He is on the lighter side of it. Please do not take it seriously.

(*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker : He wants to reduce the tension.

(*Interruptions*)

Shri Manoranjan Bhakta (Andaman-Nicobar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is reported in a section of the Press that BKU leader in Uttar Pradesh has established contact with the militants of Punjab to procure arms and if it is so, I want a categorical statement from the Home Minister as to what is the truth. He should bring it before the House because, we knew, terrorism is engulfing the country. The Minister of State for Home Affairs is here and he should make a statement as to what is the position. You can give a direction. (*Interruptions*).

[Translation]

Shri Surya Narayan Yadav (Saharasa) : Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my submission in the House through you.....

Mr. Speaker : Please do that in little time as many other Members are there to make their submissions.

Shri Surya Narayan Yadav : Pakistan Army Chief General Baig has been making statements in the presence of military personnel at different places in Pakistan for the last two weeks and frequently talking of growing tension on the borders. He has claimed that the Jammu & Kashmir struggle has reached its last stage. At the same time, he has also warned that due to rapidly changing situation in the areas, war is inevitable.