

consumers are being looted. Mr. Speaker, Sir, a large part of the country is facing drought. Various projects aimed at supplying water, containing flood and generating electricity are at stake.

It is about Bihar, Maharashtra and Punjab. If S.Y.L. project is implemented in Punjab, the water dispute between Punjab and Haryana could be resolved. Both the States are not in good terms over this issue.

The Kosi barrage Dam will bring radical change in Bihar. It is the biggest project in the world. It is to be completed by the Government of India. The Teesta project is located in North of Bengal. After the execution of this project, electricity will be available in the area at cheaper rates. It will help resolve power crisis. The Government of India has to take initiative to accelerate the pace of work. The State governments are not capable enough to complete these projects. Land ceiling and land consolidation should be implemented for the purpose of land reforms. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH:
.....(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will count and say whether it is for the tenth or eleventh time we are discussing the Bofors issue in the house. I would like to know particularly about the Solanki episode in Bofors case. The House had to be adjourned thrice yesterday in connection with the Solanki episode. The proceedings were stalled. There were discussions on it three to four times. We have not taken up anything extreme with the Government during that discussion. We have only asked the Government as to what it was doing India has become a subject of popular ridicule over the Solanki episode. It has created a sort of ill-feeling, and the proceedings of the house have been stalled. The business of the House should be resumed. It is not that our worries have been lessened. We expect that the Government should rise to occasion and say something. I appreciate the promptness shown by Atalji, Chandra

Sekhri and George Fernandes in raising the security scam issue involving Rs. 2000 to Rs.3000 crore. The hon. Finance Minister came immediately and tried to explain the position. He should have shown half that promptness in Bofors case. There is nothing to hide in the Solanki episode. I want to know as to why the Government does not say anything in this regard.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I initiated the discussion yesterday itself, not much progress was noticed in the matter. I want to touch one of the points of the case. When the discussion was held in the House on 23rd, the hon. Prime Minister while making a statement did not make any mention of this point. He said that they would be giving a written reply on the issue. I have an objection to the information that has been received by me. I want to place it before the Government and the House. The hon. Prime Minister has given us in writing in a letter which is in my possession now.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There should be a regular discussion on it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Why should there be a discussion. The hon. Prime Minister has misled the House over this letter. The Editor of the Indian Express has written in its front page..... (Interruptions) These people are not allowing me to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Please be brief.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES: Is there no other issue for discussion?

DR. R. MALLU (NAGAR Kurnool): Sir, he is taking a lot of time. The Prime Minister has given a reply. How many times will he repeat the same thing?

[Translation]

SHRI RABI RAY: I want to say that when Shri George Fernandes speaks, three M.Ps stand and interrupt his speech. It is not proper. You have allowed him to speak. You should prevent them from making interruptions. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I expect senior Members to go according to rules and not to raise matters only in zero hour.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Do not prolong the discussion. (*Interruptions*)

DR. R. MALLU: Mr. Fernandes was given the maximum time (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.M. SAYEED(Lakshadweep): Sir, he is a senior Member, he should understand this that there are other Members who also want to raise their points.

MR. SPEAKER: Within a short time, it will be over. Please take your seat.

Please be brief.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNADES: I want to make a point before you That is, what happens if the matter is not fully explained. I received this letter the day before yesterday. I gave it to the press at 2.30 p.m. Several newspapers have published the entire text of the letter. Today, an English daily published from maximum centres in the country, without mentioning the name of its editor, has written that the hon. Prime Minister was not shown the letter on the 25th. He was apprised of the matter on the 27th. (*Interruptions*) You should understand my point of view. How the hon. Prime Minister is presenting himself before the country today? The truth must come out in regard to the question being raised by me. The entire

Bofors case is a separate issue while the Solanki episode is different. I as well as the entire country want to know the facts of the Solanki episode. The Government is not prepared to reply the question raised by me to bring out the facts. Therefore, I suggest that the Government should take initiative to set up a Joint Parliamentary Committee. I have already told the Government this thing . If they don't want to bring out the facts, they should set up a Joint Parliamentary Committee. We will place the information before the Committee. We request you to help us in the matter. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, your leniency has been exploited by the hon. Members. Sir, let there be a discussion under any rule for four or five hours. We are also hon. Members of this House. we also have the right to raise our points.

SHRI A. CHARLES: We also have the privilege of raising the issues. This is very unfortunate that some of the Members are misusing the floor of the House everyday.

SHRISRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Sir...

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA(Cutack): Sir, yesterday, we were given to understand by the Chair that an all-Party Meeting is going on in your Chamber to sort out this problem. When we raised this matter in the House, then, there was an explosion from the treasury benches that this issue should not be raised. Then, we insisted that, let the Prime Minister come to this House and answer the queries which were raised by the opposition. The latter which was sent to Shri George Fernandes...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why don't you come under some rule? You are all senior Members. Everytime, you are coming and raising matters in the Zero Hour only.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: When the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair, he told the House that, in the Speaker's Chamber, meeting of all Party Leaders is going on. We want to know now what exactly had happened in that Meeting.

[*Translation*]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI(Gandhi Nagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday, Mr. Vajpayee said it and it was also said by several others. I understand that it is our responsibility to brief the House about the discussions we held in your Chamber on any serious matter. Either you should inform the House or have it done in some other way. If you kindly permit me, I will brief the House about the discussions we held with you today and yesterday. We did not discuss anything illegal. The discussions were held twice. The hon. Prime Minister has himself said in the House. After those two discussions the House has been convinced that the Government is conducting inquiry into the Bofors case and the Solanki episode is also linked with that Bofors case. Many questions arise you of it. We don't have an answer to them. It is not known to us till now as to who gave this letter to him. Who was that unidentified and unknown lawyer? We are not aware of it till today. Who told Mr. Bonant that it was given at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister. We have come to know from the discussions held in your Chamber that the Government still has no knowledge of it. We made a request that if the Government is not able to collect the information, it should be entrusted to the House which will do it through a Joint Parliamentary Committee. Going a step forward, I have suggested, and many other have shared my view that in order to remove the bottleneck the hon. Prime Minister should assure the House that he will gather information as to who was the person who passed the message to Mr. Bonant and who was that unidentified and unknown lawyer and who introduced this lawyer to Shri Solanki. Because I know that the hon. Prime Minister as well as the Government want to pursue the Bofors case. But there is some lobby which wants to stall the proceedings. It is the

same lobby which handed over that note through Mr. Lolanki. The Government should show as much eagerness as we are to expose the lobby and identify the lawyer. The inquiry to expose that lobby should be conducted either by a Parliamentary Committee or by the Government.

14.00 hrs.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these are the two suggestions I would like to make. The Government should give assurance to the House. It seems to me that the Government is giving thought to the points on which we held discussions in your chamber.

[*English*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapre): Since Shri Advani, with your permission, has sought to give a summary or the essence of what was discussed in your Chamber, and I also had the privilege of being present in that meeting, I would just like to supplement what he has said. I agree with him when he says that the proposals which were made on behalf of the Opposition leaders were eminently reasonable.

The main grievance of the spokesmen of the Government is that this matter is being raised to often on the floor of the House and that it is leading to a great waste of time a lot of argument, counter argument, charges, counter charges, altercations and nothing is coming out. We are also of that view—that is what we stated in the meeting in your Chamber—that what we wanted was to get at the truth relating to all these circumstances—mysterious circumstances I should say—concerning the Solanki episode. But what is happening in the House now for several days is not throwing any light on these matters. Therefore, we had suggested—and the country also, I believe and the public outside also feels—that this argumentation is not leading anywhere and we are accusing the Government of not being serious about pursuing the inquiry into these matters regarding Shri Solanki. I am not referring to the earlier main Bofors investigation which is

being carried on by the CBI. We do not want to interfere in that. Let it go on. But now, after this Solanki episode, we felt that if you do not want the matter to be raised continually here in the House and if proper replies are not given, to the questions which had been raised, to which we believe the Prime Minister has given only partial replies in his letters to Shri George Fernandes and Shri Jaswant Singh, if those replies were to be obtained and the identity of those persons concerned is to be established, then, let the whole matter be referred to a Joint Parliamentary Committee. Then the matter will not be raised here every day. You can proceed with your normal business. We are quite ready for that and the Parliamentary Affairs Ministers need not every day be so agitated and jumping about saying, that we have raised it nine times, ten times, more will not be allowed, and so on. We do not want to raise it. But there must be some method by which we can get at the bottom of what has happened, in the matter which has cost one Cabinet Minister his job and which led to an unsavoury implication of the Prime Minister's name in this whole affair and although more than a month has passed, nobody knows, who that unknown person was who handed over that note to Shri Solanki.

So, we suggested that this Joint Parliamentary Committee may be set up. Let its terms of reference be decided by consultation and agreement and let it be time-bound so that it does not go on for every. Let it be time-bound and let all parties be associated with that Joint Parliamentary Committee. We think that this is a reasonable proposal and to go on saying 'No' is not correct. But, Sir, what is this? We must have some remedy.

MR. SPEAKER: My difficulty is at three O'Clock the Private Members Business has to start.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I know.

MR. SPEAKER: If we are rising for lunch for one hour, it should be started at two O'Clock. I have some difficulties. That is why

I am trying to do something.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Shall we continue our submissions on Monday? Do you want us to continue our submission on Monday?

MR. SPEAKER: If senior Members want to do it, who can stop them?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: The Session cannot be adjourned without something coming out of this, on this issue.

SHRI A. CHARLES: I am only on a question of procedure.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: How can the matter be left hanging? What I am saying is this. Now there are two ways open. Either the Government should agree and Co-operate with others in agreeing to the formation of this Joint Parliamentary Committee or if they are dead against that, the only other remedy is-it is a sort of compromise proposal on our side-that the Prime Minister should come here and made a statement assuring the House about these two matters particularly regarding that note which was handed over to Shri Solanki. We do not know about that note except what has appeared in one daily paper. That note has not been recovered by the Government. We do not know what exactly are its contents. He should tell us that this matter is being seriously pursued and it will be investigated. Second is the identity of that person, of the so-called nameless lawyer, who handed over the note to Shri Solanki. Clues have also been given regarding that. But nothing is being followed up. It is not such a matter that it cannot be found out. All these various agencies are investigating and finding out many things and they cannot find out the identity of that person. We believe that a JPC can do it. We have some clues in our possession. we are sure that unless some body is vitally interested in concealing the truth, it is possible to find out. If it is found out, then further clues will be available as to what was behind that man; who were the people who put him upto it; who were the people interested in hiding the truth. Is it not

in the Country 's interest" Is it not in the Government's interest? Do they prefer to go around under a cloud of suspicion indefinitely? It is better that one proposal is objectively and dispassionately considered and the Government agrees to our proposal so that the daily scenes in the House can be avoided. We do not want that to go on. The alternative is the formation of a JPC. Why do they not agree to this?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I support this formation of a JPC. We also said this in the meeting. I wish to emphasise two things here..(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I did not say anything in the meeting. I just heard you.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I said that it was said in the meeting. Sir, whoever gave that note was interested in suppressing the inquiry or swtting the inquiry and cover up the whole matter. And that person obviously was instrumental in making over the note through an unnamed lawyer to Shri Solnki. Sir, this is nothing to do with Bofors. The whole attempt is being made as if we are trying to raise again and again the Bofors question. This is nothing to do with Bofors. Sir, the External Affairs Minister of this country had to resign. Is it a very simple matter? It is an ordinary routine matter? Now the story that is being said is that the Extern. Affairs Minister was given a document by somebody, whom he does not know and who made over that document. This is nothing but an Alice in Wonderland story. It is impossible for anybody to believe. Therefore, we are saying that these two facts should be made known and should be ascertained; as to who was the person who took the trouble of informing Mr. Bonaut that the Prime Minister has sanctioned the giving and handing over of the note. Sir, the country's interest and country's good name are involved here. Why is the Government taking up this attitude, I do not know.

Apart from Bofors, about which we have made our submissions earlier, this is a Solnki episode. This is a different chapter alto-

gether. The Minister had to lose his job, he had to resign. Sir, please go through the letter of the hon. Prime Minister. I am sure that many eminent draftsmen were utilised for this purpose in producing whatever product you may have produced. Many hours must have been spent on this. Not a single word about any attempt to find out the identity of that lawyer, the identity of the person who introduced that lawyer to Mr. Solnki, has been mentioned in that letter. It cannot be that an unknown person giving a document in Davas or wherever it was. An Indian lawyer goes to Switzerland and makes over a document to the External Affairs Minister and he very obligingly makes it over to his counterpart in Switzerland. This is very difficult to swallow. We can accept that situation. Therefore, we want the facts to come out. Now, they are not obliging. Therefore, in stead of leaving it to us to obtain clues from outside, they want that we should give them clues. With all their agencies, with all their might, Government of India, which its RAW, with its CBI, with its IB, foreign agencies etc. etc., they cannot find out the clues.. They have to wait and depend on us to give them clues. This is nothing but a deliberate attempt to suppress to truth. Therefore, we strongly support this demand for a JPC. Let all parties try to find out the truth in the matter.

[Translation]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the demand of JPC that has just now been sought by Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Somanath, Shri Advani and Shri George Fernandes, it will help the Government as well. Keeping in view the manner in which questions are being raised in the country, it would be better for the Government to concede soon with the demand of J.P.C. rather than allowing the clouds of doubt to hover. It will rather create an atmosphere of faith that the Government does not intend to hide anything. If the Government fails to obtain something within 6 weeks, it should refer the matter to the House for their approach so that at least the Members and the House will have the con-

solution that maximum possible is being done. The point is why do we raise the matter here again and again what should be brought before the House and what should not be brought is the question. We are being given to accept that a letter was given to a Minister of India by an Indian National or a lawyer or an advocate and the Government of India is so far unable to know the name of that person. That person is not a foreign national where our law does not apply, there he (the hon. Minister) had talk not with another person: he is the citizen of this very country who held talks with our hon. Minister. It is a wonder that Government of which the hon. Minister has been a part, itself states that it has not been able to know the name of that person even after six weeks. Then without knowing his name how did you come to know that the said person is an advocate, a lawyer.

It is quite surprising. That is why this question is raised here again and again. Who has introduced him? It is quite right that these people might be the same persons who are associated with that person and they are now much interested in suppressing the facts and preventing them from coming to light.

Sir, for the first time we made an effort once, other than allegations and taking it as a case, to bring the Bofors money from the A.E. Services to this country and also the concrete documents duly sealed by the court. This is for the first time that a man has been traced, those documents have been traced, this is for the first time that a man came into contact of a Minister of the Government; if we want to show our sincerity to go to the root of this matter, we must catch that person and take action against him.

So far as question of time of the House is concerned, Sir, if J.P.C. is constituted, it will not only save the time of this House, rather it will also remove the doubts that are reared against the Government. It will serve both the purposes. So the demand of J.P.C. should soon be accepted by the Govern-

ment. As they have said that the Hon. Prime Minister comes somebody gives an assurance that we would try to know about that person and about the document, then we take it that what has been Published is true, now I cannot say about the noting, handwriting etc. through which something can be known. We should try to know about that, but I do not want to indulge in any kind of speculations. I do not want to encourage that. But the J.P.C. will help in saving the time of the house and the Government will also get clearance. If you assure that you need time, then it is okay, let you fix a time period. They should bring out the name within that period. If they are unable to do so, they should give an assurance that the J.P.C. will be doing so because we see that we have arrived at a reality of the assurance in 3 to 4 years. We have at least reached upto A.E. Services and Jordan till yesterday. Now, it is upto you how for you push the matter from Jordan. Let us go ahead.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE:
(Dum Dum): Sir, only two aspects I want to raise... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: This is becoming a regular debate. It is not necessary. Please take your seat...

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I will not repeat, Sir. When the Government tries to convince us, at the same time, please admit that there are forces operating against Government's intention, and yet the Government does not try to crack them down. This is the reason which leads us to say... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Now you please take your seat. All the time you are imposing yourself on the House. You should speak

with the permission of the Chair. All the Members have made the points very clearly.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What to do Mr. Mohan Singh ji? you agree but he does not agree to sit down.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I will not repeat, Sir. My point is that can you imagine a situation when a government discovers that a force is working against the government policy, it keeps quiet?...(*Interruptions*).

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Sir, with great respect to hon. Leaders and Members of this House, Those who have raised this question yesterday and today also, I would like to submit that as far as the Bofors case is concerned, only one word I will speak of that.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why do you say all these things only in Zero Hour? Why don't you take resort to the rules?

[*Translation*]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Because you have raised this issue, on that question also I give the answer, Sir. It is repeatedly said that why raise it so many times. In fact, the record is whenever we have raised it, we have moved forward towards unravelling the mystery of Bofors. Initially it was stated that nothing has happened. Then it was admitted that yes, we were right. Then companies were mentioned. Finally, because we have raised it, the External Affairs Minister had to go. This is the justification why we raise it again and again. There is no doubt about the fact that if instead of the Government enquiring into it, a joint Parliamentary Committee is constituted...(*Interruptions*).

It is a great problem.

[*English*]

This is too much.

[*Translation*]

Do not force me to speak what you can digest

[*English*]

I will say that we have not stopped any investigation, nor are we interested in stopping or tampering with the process of investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: You should know that at three O'clock the Private Members' Business and to start. Those people who have given their notices will be deprived of the opportunity of discussing. The notices were discussed in the Committee, the time is fixed, and you, standing up in the Zero Hour, are not allowing them to take up that matter.

Yesterday, pointed questions were raised by hon. Members and the same pointed questions were raised by the hon. leaders in the meeting with the hon. Speaker. So, I would like to come to those two pointed questions.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: We have allowed them so long. Had the issue not been important, this would not have been raised.

As far as the Government is concerned, the Government has no hesitation in getting the copy of the note handed over by the former External Affairs Minister of India to the Swiss Foreign Minister. I think that should meet the point raised by hon. Members

MR. SPEAKER: Now you please take your seat...

yesterday and also today. As for the identity of the person is concerned, it is not only the hon. Members on the other side are keen but the Members of this side are also keen and the Government is equally keen to know the name and identity of the person involved. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: If it is not possible to know the name, let you know the physical features of that man. Whether he was a tall man like you or a short Dationed person like Shri Kumarmangalam, whether he was dark complexioned and fat. It becomes clear by physical features.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES: Sir, I want to know when the former Prime Minister ordered Fairfax enquiry, did he know who were the officers and who were used to find out the economic offences. That was not even recorded on the file. There was no order on the file. It was only an oral order. Let us look into that matter also. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: As I have already stated, we are equally keen to know the name and identify of the person, the 'so-called lawyer-I will not say lawyer, because I do not know whether he was a lawyer' we have only read in the papers that he was a lawyer; I will only say the so-called lawyer. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Shri Solanki's statement says he was a lawyer. *(interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, unless we get any clue, it is very difficult to proceed further in the matter. But

still...*(Interruptions)* Please let me complete. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIGEOGE FERNANDES (Muzafarpur): Why can you not prosecute Shri Solanki? You file a chargesheet against him today and you will get the truth tomorrow. Your prosecute him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Georgeji, will you please let me complete? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Why do you not prosecute Shri Solanki? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Therefore, whenever we will get any information or any clue, we will certainly proceed with this. As our hon. Member, our esteemed friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta said that he has some clue, I will welcome if he passes on that clue to us so that we can proceed with it. On our part whenever we will get any information or any clue, I will certainly say that, we will proceed with it.

I think, with this my hon. leaders and friends on the other side should be satisfied. I see that there is no reason for J.P.C. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: We are not satisfied with the reply of the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. We will raise this issue again on Monday. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We do not agree. We will give a notice in this respect and will be raising it again on Monday. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us now take up Papers to be laid on the Table of the House.